

UTDRAG FRA RAPPORT

Til bruk for medarbeidersamtaler og andre typer lokale kartlegginger for å kunne ta opp forhold rundt redelighet i forskning

PRINTEGER: Promoting Integrity as an Intergral Dimension of Excellence in research (2018)» - Authors Eric Breit and Ellen-Marie Forsberg – OsloMet

<https://printeger.eu/>

(from 'summary', p. 5) «.. we have sought to select tools for research leaders and managers from the area of organisational and workplace development and 'translated' them into the context of research integrity. We have done so by describing the original method and providing an example of how it could be operationalised. The hypothesis, derived from our empirical studies, is that the better research organisations are in organisational development the better likely they are in developing and working with research integrity.

Section 3.2 (p. 16) Employee appraisal conversations

When seeking to develop research integrity, we suggest adding a few questions specifically about ethics and integrity to this list of questions. It is important to mention that this is a suggestion only – ideally, the content and the formulation of the questions should be discussed in local context. We suggest adding the following questions - -

- Are there areas tied with the proper conduct of your research in which you feel that you require additional competence or information?
- Are there work-related ethical challenges that you would like management support in tackling?
- Are there work-related ethical challenges that require organizational responses?

Annex 2 (p. 27): Example – work environment mapping

Research integrity

1) How confident are you in your understanding of research misconduct?

Options: Not at all | Somewhat | Moderately | Very | Completely | No basis for judging

2) How consistently do managers in your department communicate high expectations for research integrity?

3) To what degree would you feel responsible to report internally or externally the suspected misconduct if you witness any of the following?

- Fabrication of data
- Plagiarism
- Falsification of data
- Selective dropping of “outlier” cases without transparent explanation
- Trying out a variety of different methods until one is found that yields a result that is statistically significant
- Withholding data from the research community
- Falsification of bio-sketch, resume or personal reference statements
- Non-disclosure of conflicts of interest
- Pressure from a study sponsor or contractor to engage in unethical research conduct or skewed presentation of research

4) Do you agree with the following statement about whistleblowing?

- I know the appropriate routines for whistleblowing in the event of witnessing misconduct
- I feel confident that I would be protected as a whistleblower
- I feel confident that the faculty (or other relevant bodies in the university) would take seriously the whistleblowing and act accordingly.

5) Does the quality of your research

- Suffer due to strict time constraints?
- Suffer due to insufficient available data?
- Suffer due to other reasons? (If yes, specify qualitatively)