Cross-Cutting Themes: Mentor-mentee relationships, Collaboration

**Topic Overview – What’s at stake?**

* Research misconduct is formally defined as falsification, fabrication and plagiarism. These acts directly undermine trust in research and the body of scientific knowledge.
* Numerous other acts of detrimental or questionable behaviors can impact the research environment and the integrity of research produced (e.g. guest authorship, failure to dislose COI, harassment, bias, and poor mentoring practices).
* These other aspects of integrity happen with greater frequency than research misconduct and so may have a greater effect on science and research in general, and because they are not federally defined, they can fly under the radar of oversight and accountability.
* Recognizing and working to amend these other aspects should be a responsibility for all scientists. Having research practices and climates that support integrity of the work, and quality and productivity for everyone, is key to the future of science.

**Getting the Discussion Started:**

* What experiences in sciences have you had that you feel may have effected the integrity of the research?
* What are the norms within your research group regarding how you all get along? How are behaviors that fall outside these norms treated?
* Based on the assigned reading for this group, do you think harassment should be treated as scientific misconduct? Why or why not?

**Use the 4 R’s to think through a particular case or issue.**

**Process for Thinking through Difficult Ethical Dilemmas**

**Recognition***: What are the issues being raised? What is the underlying ethical concern? How does this issue impact me?*

**Reasoning***: What values are at stake? Are there competing points of view? What are the potential benefits and harms of different actions? Are there any rules or guidelines that can help?*

**Responsibility***: What are my responsibilities? Do others have responsibilities also?*

**Response***: What should I do – and why?*

**“Backpocket” Cases:**

1. A graduate student has been running experiments to try to get to a significant result so they can publish (a requirement for graduation). On the second try, they get a significant result, but it is not confirmed on the third try. A senior member of the group tells them to just go ahead and write up the one successful experiment for submission (they are running out of funds to support the student’s work and are ready to move on). What should the student do?

**Assigned Reading:**

* Erika Marín-Spiotta, Harassment should count as scientific misconduct. Nature (09 May 2018). <https://www.nature.com/magazine-assets/d41586-018-05076-2/d41586-018-05076-2.pdf>

**Resources and Additional References**

* Questionable Research Practices and Recommendations for Better Practices (2015). <https://replicationindex.wordpress.com/2015/01/24/questionable-research-practices-definition-detect-and-recommendations-for-better-practices>
* Office of Research Integrity (HHS): ori.hhs.gov/