Authors: Zollitsch, L., Vilter, N., Niesel, D., Wilder, N.

DOI:

Version 1 (May 2019)



Path2Integrity questionnaire for students without an academic degree (undergraduates)

Instructions

During this evaluation, we kindly ask you to respond to the following 5 case scenarios about research practices. Each case scenario starts with a short description followed by 4 steps which build on one another. Only one option can be chosen for each question.

First decide which action is in line with good research practices and then use the slider to indicate how confident you feel about your answer.

Please choose a reason for your answer by choosing the option that best suits your opinion and then use the slider to indicate how confident you feel about your answer.

Please note that you cannot return to a previous page of the survey! But you may always skip a question, stop the survey, or withdraw from it completely.

Rory got research funds for his new project and had to decide how to use it. To get clear results, he needed 20 people to participate in the project. To ensure this, Rory used all of the money and payed for a nice dinner for all participants, after they have successfully finished the study. After checking, Rory found other studies that worked this way and that there are no contradictions with the guidelines of the funders.

Is Rory's decision in line with good research practices?

a) Yes.

b) No.

- a) He has the money to pay for a nice dinner for the participants and it is allowed to do so.
- a) It is a proper and conscientious use of research funds to pay for a nice dinner for the participants in order to get the required number of persons.
- a) Providing people with nice incentives makes science interesting for social society.
- a) The participants are an important part of the project, so it is proper to use the money for them.
- b) Nice dinners are no adequate compensation for allowance.
- b) Paying for a nice dinner will falsify the results.
- b) It is not allowed to pay anything for or to the participants.
- b) It is not allowed to pay for a nice dinner with the obligation that they have to successfully finish the study.





Sarah did a small research project which does not produce any new knowledge but nevertheless she wants to write about it in her homework. Because she has never done so before, she asked her mentor about it, who stated: "You can write about it in your homework, but you have to present all data as open and transparently as possible." With this, she started writing about her research project and the results.

Is Sarah's decision in line with good research practices?

a) Yes b) No

- a) It is good scientific research to write about projects.
- a) It is good scientific research to write in an open and transparent manner.
- a) Before writing a homework it is important to consult the mentor.
- a) Every written work must be completely transparent.
- b) It is not allowed to present data open and transparent, Sarah must maintain confidentiality.
- b) When not having found new knowledge, writing about it is pointless.
- b) Writing about a research project is no good scientific practice.
- b) By asking the mentor about what to write, Sarah will decrease her reputation.



Bill and Lorenzo are discussing a possible instance of scientific misconduct of research integrity by their professor Steven. "Since it concerns his part of the work, maintaining research integrity is his responsibility", Bill stated. So they both went on doing their part of the research project.

Is their decision in line with good research practices?

a) Yes b) No

- a) In a collaborative working group everyone is only responsible for their own part.
- a) It is the responsibility of the ethics committee alone to keep an eye on research integrity.
- a) They are not allowed to get involved in the actions of their professor.
- a) Since Steven is their professor, research integrity is his responsibility.
- b) They should have elected a responsible person before starting the project.
- b) All members of a collaborative working group are responsible for research integrity.
- b) Everyone should always question the actions of others.
- b) If it turns out to be a misconduct, this will damage the reputation of their working group.



A research group of 6 persons is working together on a study. The group consists of teams with two people, each focussing on a different priority, because everyone is an expert in a different research field and they want to combine their competencies. Amar and Ivana made significant results in their part of the study, which they published in a magazine and notified the others about it after the paper got accepted.

Is their decision in line with good research practices?

a) Yes b) No

- a) It is good scientific practice to inform the others about your findings.
- a) It is their own work they are publishing, so they don't need to inform the others before publishing.
- a) It would disturb the others if they are constantly notifying them as to what they are doing, so it is better to tell them after the paper gets accepted.
- a) When notifying the others after the publication, everyone can read it instantly.
- b) As part of a research group they have to inform and consult the whole group before publishing something.
- b) As part of a research group, they cannot decide anything on their own regarding the project.
- b) They need the approval of all project partners to publish.
- b) Since they are a research group, everyone should be author of the paper and at least prove-read it, before it will be submitted



Gabriela had published her research project in a journal. While she was working on this, she talked with Michael about ways to structure the reference list for her project. He told her how he managed it in his work and later asked to be listed as co-author on the paper. Gabriela nevertheless did not accept the request but listed him in the acknowledgements.

Is Gabriela's decision in line with good research practices?

a) Yes. b) No.

- a) Michael just talked about his own research, so it was not directly related to the research of Gabriela.
- a) Michael did not make any substantial contribution to Gabriela's research, so it is not appropriate to list him as a co-author.
- a) Gabriela did not record her discussion with Michael for this particular research, so she cannot prove that he provided any substantial contribution to the research.
- a) In order to be listed as an author, it is necessary that you have written to the text.
- b) Because she has nothing to lose in accepting the request to list Michael as a co-author.
- b) It is Gabriela's paper and therefore her right to define the authorship.
- b) The multiple authorships will increase Gabriela's reputation as a team player.
- b) Because Michael has contributed to Gabriela's research by discussing the structure of the reference list.



Hannah has made a long-term research over 10 years. After analysing all results, she found out that her hypothesis was wrong. She decided to publish the results the way she found them. Although her mentor, Lara, stated: "You should rewrite your hypothesis and publish positive results. Because confirming valid, positive results is the heart of science"

Is Hannah's decision in line with good research practices?

a) Yes. b) No.

- a) For good research it is important to publish.
- a) Every publication will increase her reputation as researcher.
- a) As long as her publication is citable, she should publish it.
- a) Her negative results are as valid as positive findings for publication.
- b) It is important to present positive results after such a long time of research.
- b) She has to consider that only positive results are valid for publication.
- b) Publishing positive results will increase her reputation.
- b) Only positive results in a publication are citable.