

PRACTICING RESEARCH INTEGRITY



WHY 'PRACTICING'?

- Other terms: Negotiation, Contestation, Performance
- The aim of the project:
 - How integrity is embedded, translated and constituted through and by practice
- Explored on multiple scales
 - Work package 1: Policy histories
 - Work package 2: Institutionalization
 - Work package 3: Training and scientific culture reproduction
 - Work package 4: Early Career Scientist life worlds
- Practitioners are found on all scales!



RESEARCH QUESTIONS

WP1. History and context for the emergence of ‘integrity’ in international and national codes and regulations.

- Why and how ‘integrity’ arose at particular moments, and how ‘integrity’ relates to ‘ethics’, ‘trust’, ‘responsibility’?

WP2. Translation of Danish Code into universities and university colleges

- How and to what extent have integrity policies been integrated into management structures and incentives?

WP3. Formal doctoral training in integrity principles and practices

- How are concepts and codes of integrity understood and translated into training courses in different disciplines (health, natural sciences, arts, social sciences)?

WP4. Navigating integrity in practice

- How do PhDs form their conceptions of integrity and their research practices in the context of training, organizational setting, research and funding conditions and challenges of career development?



WP1

American Prehistory

- The adversarial 1980s
- Series of falsification and fabrication scandals in the USA
- Desire to legislate against fraud
- Recourse to the self-correcting nature of science



European Futures

- In comparison with 2000, we now have a plethora of international and national statements
 - The World Conference series attempts to convene a Global Fora for discussing matters of research integrity
 - There is a highly active publication landscape (multiple new documents in 2017)
 - More attention is being paid to the environment, role of institutions and universities.
- "The research process goes beyond the actions of individual researchers. Research institutions, journals, scientific societies, and other parts of the research enterprise all can act in ways that either support or undermine integrity in research."
- Source: 2017, introduction of the ALLEA Research Code of Conduct for Research Integrity

WP2

Organisational translation:

Several clusters of universities ranging from high degree of translation and infrastructure to low and moderate

UCs vary - but are clearly still in process

Drivers behind translation

Imitation of seemingly successful or established institutions

Packaged ideas?

Challenges: institutionalization and cultural embedding, “ceremonial implementation?”

Sensemaking - re-translation

Acknowledgement of “the problem”, but also belief in self-regulation

Concerns of formalization vs. institutionalization

Location of the problem

- The burning platform and the “need” for a good scandal

And of responsibility

- Individual, local or systemic?



WP3

Research integrity emerges as embedded in multiple and diverse problem narratives

Scandal as didactic tool

Reflexivity (personal or collective) becomes the answer

Responsibilizing the researcher and research group

Research integrity as issue of individual research practice

	Health	Natural Science	Humanities	Social Sciences
Title	Responsible Conduct of Research	Responsible Conduct of Research	Research Ethics and Research Integrity	RCR for PhD students
Duration	2 days + 8-hour online pre-course	3 hours are mandatory - 2 days voluntarily	2 days + 1 day workshop with paper	2 day workshop
Capacity	25	20	25	30
Mandatory since	April 2016	N/A	Spring 2017	Spring 2017
Previous tradition	Continuously developed since 2014	Continuously developed since approx. 2012 – earlier “Good Scientific Practice”	Non-mandatory Research Ethics course Elements of ethics training in other courses	In development – first course conducted in March 2017
Format	Lectures, active participation and casework	Lectures, active participation and casework	Lectures and active participation – bringing issues from own practice	Lectures, active participation and casework
ECTS	3.1	1 + 1 extra ECTS awarded for additional assignment	2 days 1.5 3 days 2.5	No
Problem narratives	All researchers are (unconscious) small cheaters – and creating reflexivity about this is pedagogically demanding	Responsibility for ‘good science’ must be enhanced	‘Integrity’ as standards for conduct needs a dialogical relationship to ‘ethics’ as a reflexive practice relevant in all subfields	The scientific system is ‘broken’ and young researchers need to navigate this



WP4

- PhDs concerned inwardly to act as a ‘decent’ researcher and outwardly to comply with standards.
- Concerns about non-compliance, but no definition of compliance.
- PhDs draw on disciplinary and wider societal conversations in defining ‘integrity’.
- Notions of research integrity is continuously developed and expanded in PhD practices.

“I like to think of myself as educated with a certain ethics and integrity foundation. ... But that said, I would like to know more about what the rules are!”



INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND/OR INDIVIDUALIZATION

- Throughout the material we see a tension between individualization vs. institutionalization
 - Rotten apple vs. rotten system
- Integrity is articulated as embedded in the institutional setup and policy systems
- But integrity is also seen as an “individual trait”, inherent to the individual researcher
- The balance between these two understandings, defines the conceptualizations, problematizations and solutions posed
 - Who owns the problem?



SCIENTIFIC QUALITY - PUBLIC LEGITIMACY

Integrity as quality

- Common sense
- Bound to disciplinary norms and socialization
- Quality criteria (validity, reliability, credibility)
- Internal to scientific community
- “It’s about proper behavior”

Tends towards individualizing the problem

- Educational and “moral” obligations

Integrity as legitimacy

- Formalization and legalization
- Bound to external, systemic pressures for credibility
- Data challenges
- Trust (and funding)
- Related to the external audience to science production

Tends towards “institutionalizing” the problem

- Policy and infrastructure-building



POLICY TRAJECTORY

- Tension between increasing formalization of processes and conceptions and the multiscale contestation and conceptual expansion.
- How can these two processes be balanced and linked in a mutually productive way?
- How to loop the reflexivity and creative articulation of research integrity at different scales to the policy process and debates in the research community about science and how science engage with the world?





AARHUS
UNIVERSITY