



**2004**  
**ORI Research on Research Integrity Conference**  
*hosted by the*  
**University of California, San Diego School of Medicine**  
**Paradise Point Resort & Spa**  
**November 12-14**

*(Preliminary Program - June 2004)*

**Friday, November 12**

**1:00 - 1:30 PM      Registration**

**1:30 - 1:45 PM      Opening Session**

Chris Pascal (Office of Research Integrity), Welcome from ORI

Edward Holmes (University of California, San Diego), Welcome from UCSD

**1:45 - 3:15 PM      Plenary: Overviews of Current Research and Problems**

Nicholas Steneck (University of Michigan / Office of Research Integrity), Research on Research Integrity: 2004 Update

Focus: research on research integrity conducted over the last four years.

Lawrence Rhoades (Office of Research Integrity, HHS), Institutional Research Misconduct Activity: 1991-2000

Focus: the reporting of research misconduct activity (the conduct of inquiries and investigations) by institutions conducting research supported by the Public Health Service from 1991-2000.

Brian C. Martinson, (HealthPartners Research Foundation), Scientists' Perceptions of Working Conditions and Self-Reported Misbehaviors

Focus: the relationships between scientific misconduct and other behaviors that may compromise the integrity of science and scientists' perceptions of their working conditions, based on the social-psychological frameworks of work strain theory, equity theory, and organizational justice, augmented by the concept of alienation.

**3:15 - 3:30 PM      Break**

**3:30 - 5:30 PM      Plenary: The Impact of the Research Environment on Research Integrity**

Eric G. Campbell (Institute for Health Policy (Harvard Medical School)), Data-withholding Among Trainees in Science: Results of a National Study

Focus: the phenomena of data-sharing and withholding among doctoral students and post-doctoral fellows (trainees) in the life sciences, computer science and chemical engineering.

Melissa S. Anderson (University of Minnesota), Willingness to Share Scientific Information: Generational or Maturation Effects?

Focus: the differences between faculty members and early-career scientists in willingness to share scientific information with other scientists, looking at the willingness to share and actual sharing behavior as functions of contextual and individual variables, such as normative systems and industry involvement.

Lisa M Jones (University of Minnesota, Consortium on Law and Values in Health, Environment & the Life Sciences), Gender Differences: Competition and Collaboration in Scientific Research

Focus: gender differences among trainees in life sciences, computer sciences, and chemical engineering in the relation to the competitiveness of the research field, the influences on data sharing, industry financial support, productivity, intentional withholding, willingness to share, and attitudes about how academic scientists should behave.

**Karen S. Louis (University of Minnesota), The Effect of Mentoring, Unit Size, and Workplace Climate on Individual Productivity Among University-Based Researchers in the Life Sciences**

Focus: the effects of workplace climate on the training of doctoral students and post-doctoral fellows at Research I universities, considering personal factors such as student characteristics, attitudes, behaviors, and experiences as well as structural factors such as departmental size.

**5:15 - 6:00 PM Break**

**6:00 - 7:30 PM Poster Session and Buffet Dinner**

**Madeline Alexander (The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia), The Use of Focus Groups to Identify Responsible Conduct of Research Training Needs of International Postdoctoral Fellows**

Focus: the specific training needs of international postdoctoral fellows in relation to the development of responsible conduct of research programs.

**Kirsten A. Barrett (Virginia Commonwealth University), Research Methods and the Study of RCR Instruction**

Focus: methodological considerations related to a longitudinal study of the effectiveness of training in the responsible conduct of research (RCR).

**Ruth Ellen Bulger (Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences), Assessing the RCR Educational Literature for Core Content**

Focus: the generally agreed upon core content for RCR instruction based on content analysis for each of the ORI's nine core areas of RCR as presented in thirteen key educational resources (six comprehensive textbooks, four anthologies, and three collections of case studies pertaining to RCR).

**Christine Chuani (Moi University College of Health Sciences), Developing Capacity for Collaborative Research: The Experience of the College of Health Sciences, Moi University, Kenya**

Focus: the results of an effort to promote local and international research collaboration of the Institutional Research and Ethics Committee (IREC) by focusing on development of structures, systems and processes for expeditious and reciprocal review and approval of collaborative research taking cognizance of the local values of the institution and adhering to internationally accepted research practices.

**Tony Hecimovic (Montana State University - Billings), How a Masters University I Fulfills OHRP Requirements to Protect Human Research Participants (Poster)**

Focus: how a small, regional masters university I with a modest research agenda can and does meet the spirit of OHRP guidelines for the protection of human research participants.

**Rudolph J. Marcus (Stories and Questions), I Didn't Know I Had**

Focus: Demonstration of a unique approach to online RCR education.

**Monica Mata (Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences), The Peru – U.S. Forum for Research Ethics**

Focus: how collaborative international research with human volunteers in foreign countries, knowledgeable members and staff of local research ethics committees can review and approve proposed studies.

**David B. Resnik (Brody School of Medicine, East Carolina University), Using Electronic Discussion Boards to Teach Responsible Conduct of Research**

Focus: the use of electronic discussions boards in teaching courses on the responsible conduct of research,

**Ginamarie Scott (University of Oklahoma), Historical misconduct cases: Content coding the bad guys**

Focus: situational influences on scientific misconduct using a set of objective behavioral markers to content code historical cases.

**Rachel Wilkins (Case Western Reserve University), CREC Online- Interactive Online Training in the Protection of Human Subject Protection**

Focus: the use and benefit of interactive online training across a diverse online audience, consisting of web-based educational modules for researchers, key personnel and IRB members and with the aims to provide an accessible method of continuing education in the protection of human subjects in research.

**7:30 - 9:00 PM      Plenary: Reflections on RRI Methods**

John M. Kennedy (Indiana University), A Guide to the Use of Survey Methods in Research on Research Integrity

Focus: techniques that researchers can use to develop surveys related to research integrity issues.

Wayne Sullender (University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham), Assessment of Perceptions of Research Integrity

Focus: development of a multidimensional measure to assess expected behaviors in RI situations, as described in an open-systems model.

Douglas Adams (University of Arkansas), The Flaw in the Ointment: What Research on Research Integrity can Learn from Research on Crime

Focus: aspects of opportunity theory that are most readily translated from criminology to the study of research integrity along with several interventions, including methods of data collection and analysis and administrative procedures.

**9:00 - 10:00 PM      Informal Special Meetings**

Kalichman (University of California, San Diego), RCREC Meeting

Purpose: an opportunity for any one interested in RCR education to meet and talk with RCR Education Consortium leaders.

Mary Scheetz (Office of Research Integrity), RRI Program PIs meeting

Purpose: a chance for researchers funded by the ORI RRI Program to meet and share experiences.

**Saturday, November 13**

**7:00 - 8:00 AM      Breakfast / Breakfast Sessions for Special Interest Working Groups**

**8:00 - 10:00 AM      RCR I: Assessing the Impact of RCR Education**

Michael Kalichman (University of California, San Diego), Instructor Perceptions of Goals for Teaching Responsible Conduct of Research

Focus: an effort to create a framework for defining goals and assessing effectiveness of RCR courses.

Elizabeth Heitman (Vanderbilt University Medical Center), New Graduate Students' Baseline Knowledge of RCR

Focus: the evaluation of the baseline knowledge of core RCR concepts in a cohort of new graduate students at four universities, the sources of their knowledge of RCR, and the variability in their knowledge in relation to their gender and the country in which they received their undergraduate training.

Dena Plemmons (University of California, San Diego), Student Perceptions of Outcomes for Responsible Conduct of Research Courses

Focus: improving the outcomes of RCR courses based on students perceptions of what they learned following completion of research ethics courses.

Carolyn L. Funk (Virginia Commonwealth University), Effectiveness of RCR Instruction: Initial Findings

Focus: the effectiveness of RCR instruction on student awareness, attention, and behavioral judgments related to research ethics.

**8:00 - 10:00 AM      Authorship & Publication I: Rules and Practices**

Darko Hren (Croatian Medical Journal), How intuitive are ICMJE criteria for authorship?

Focus: how “naive” medical students perceive 11 possible research contributions as criteria for authorship established by International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE).

Miguel Roig (St. John’s University), Integrity in “Instructions to Authors”: An Exploratory Study in a Sample of Psychology Journals.

Focus: the application of methods used by Scheetz (2002) to review the instructions to authors (IA) in a sample of biomedical journals to a sample of psychology journals.

Ana Marusic (Croatian Medical Journal, Zagreb University School of Medicine), Authorship Criteria and Contributions Disclosure: Comparison of Three General Medical Journals with Different Author Contribution Forms

Focus: the prevalence of honorary authorship in three general medical journals with different authorship/contributorship forms.

Vesna Ilakovac (Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek School of Medicine), Authorship: Contributions Disclosure for All Authors as Stated by Corresponding Author or by Individual Authors

Focus: the contributions described by the corresponding author and individual authors in the Croatian Medical Journal (CMJ) and satisfaction of authorship criteria of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE).

### **8:00 - 10:00 AM      FFP & QRP I: Numbers, Causes, and Procedures**

Lawrence Rhoades (Office of Research Integrity, HHS), PHS Research Misconduct Investigations: 1994-2003

Focus: major characteristics of roughly 260 investigations conducted by institutions, PHS agencies, or the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) on allegations of research misconduct involving research supported by the U. S. Public Health Service from 1994 to 2003.

Sheldon R. Gelman (Yeshiva University, Wurzweiler School of Social Work), An Analysis of Cases of Scientific Misconduct and Implications for Behavioral Health Research

Focus: major characteristics of a body of cases of scientific misconduct, as reported in the media, in the behavioral health disciplines.

Mark S. Davis (Kent State University), Narcissism, Entitlement and Ethical Compromises in Research

Focus: the causes of research misconduct analyzed from the perspective of narcissism.

Joe G. Delap (Jacksonville State University), The Role of the Research Integrity Officer: Employing a Least Invasive Procedure (LIP) Model for Responding to Research Misconduct Allegations and Cases

Focus: allegations of multiple counts of falsification in reporting of research data brought administratively to an institution by the ORI Division of Investigations and Oversight.

### **8:00 - 10:00 AM      Clinical & IRB I: IRB Role, Ideals, and Problems**

Patricia Keith-Spiegel (Children’s Hospital, Boston), What Scientists Really Want: The Ideal IRB

Focus: what investigators would see as an ideal IRB.

Laura Stark (Princeton University, Department of Sociology), Practicing morality: Psychological research practices and the rise of human subjects regulations in postwar America

Focus: the influence of the research practices defined by professional psychologists as morally acceptable for their own discipline on the creation of US federal human subjects regulations in the 1970s.

Jim Vander Putten (University of Arkansas-Little Rock), Exploring Organizational Culture and Climate for the Responsible Conduct of Research in the Social/Behavioral Sciences

Focus: the perceptions of University IRB Chairs, IRB Administrators, and IRB members regarding organizational culture and climate characteristics that promote the responsible conduct of human participants research in the social and behavioral sciences.

T. Gregory Barrett (University of Arkansas at Little Rock), **Outliers: Social Scientist Frustration with IRBs – Implications for Culture and Climate**

Focus: the perceptions of twelve full-time social science faculty members regarding the culture and climate for the responsible conduct of research and frustration with their university's Institutional Review Board.

**10:00 - 10:20 AM Break**

**10:20 - 11:50 AM Plenary: Data and the Accuracy of the Research Record**

Ken Wilson (East Carolina University), **Scientific Record Keeping and the Responsible Conduct of Research**

Focus: actual record keeping practices in research and some of the problems with scientific record keeping that institutional officials encounter when they investigate and adjudicate allegations of misconduct.

Mike Rossner (The Journal of Cell Biology), **Digital images and the journal editor**

Focus: an initiative by The Journal of Cell Biology to implement a completely electronic workflow, whereby all figures are submitted to the journal as electronic files.

Sandra Titus (Office of Research Integrity, HHS), **Descriptive Study on Biomedical Research Integrity Methods used in Laboratories: Data Management, Written Guidelines and Supervision**

Focus: the diversity in the reports by lab directors regarding their reported methods on data storage, use of written procedures, degree of supervision, and training of researchers.

**11:50 - 1:00 PM Lunch**

**1:00 - 2:30 PM RCR II: Training Programs**

Francis L. Macrina (Virginia Commonwealth University), **RCR Education and NIH F32 Awards: Trainee Profiles and Instructional Formats**

Focus: The awareness, attentiveness, and behavioral judgments NIH F32 postdoctoral fellowship awardees to research ethics.

Julka Almquist (Mayo Clinic), **Efficacy of RCR Training: Influences of Trainee Experience and Lasting Impacts**

Focus: if and how an RCR course influences participants.

**1:00 - 2:30 PM Authorship & Publication II: The Role of Journals**

Kirby P. Lee (University of California, University of California, University of California, San Francisco, CA), **Evaluation of the Editorial Decision-Making Process at Major Biomedical Journals**

Focus: factors influencing editors' decisions to accept or reject original research articles for publication in biomedical journals and to identify sources of systematic bias in the editorial review process.

Anne Victoria Neale (Wayne State University), **Correction and Use of the Literature Following Scientific Misconduct**

Focus: how users of bibliographic databases and e-journals become aware of publications affected by misconduct and the particular problems with affected publications, based on an investigation of compliance with directives for corrections and retractions, as represented in PubMed.

Robert J. Silverman (Fielding Graduate Institute), **Journal Peer Review and Its Relation to Research Integrity**

Focus: the relationship between journal peer review practices and research integrity, including an effort to demonstrate that there are ideal review models that support alternative epistemologies.

**1:00 - 2:30 PM FFP & QRP II: International Considerations**

Nanyan Cao (Tsinghua University), **Characteristics of Research Misconduct in China during Social Transforming Period**

Focus: the main characteristics of research misconduct in China, with the goal of providing recommendations for effective measures for preventing RM and improving research ethics education in China.

Hanne Andersen (University of Copenhagen, Panum Institute ), Ignorance or Misconduct? A lesson from “The Sceptical Environmentalist”

Focus: the ruling of the Danish Committee on Scientific Dishonesty on the controversial book “The Sceptical Environmentalist” and the debate following this ruling.

N. Raghuram (GGS Indraprastha University, India), Research sans integrity: case studies from India’

Focus: Indian controversies that illustrate how research integrity often has a major bearing on ‘scientific’ policy making and how researchers and their institutions are often at the core of the very controversies that they tend to resolve or ‘scientifically’ arbitrate.

### **1:00 - 2:30 PM Clinical Trials & IRBs II: Collaboration and Outcomes**

Benjamin Djulbegovic (H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute, University of South Florida),  
Equipoise Principle is Not Violated in the NCI-sponsored Clinical Trials

Focus: the role of the equipoise principle in the NCI-sponsored trials.

Penny Jester (University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham), Developing multicenter collaborative studies of an emerging infection: time and variability of IRB approval

Focus: timing and expediency of institutional review board (IRB) approval in two multi-center trials of West Nile Virus (WNV).

Yuan-I Min (Johns Hopkins University), Survey on quality assurance in clinical trials

Focus: a survey of trialists to describe the practice ‘norm’ of QA procedures in trials and the perceived utility of selected QA procedures in ensuring data quality and integrity.

### **2:30 - 3:00 PM PM Break**

### **3:00 - 4:30 PM Research Integrity and Medical Students**

Sean Powell, (University of California, San Diego), Effectiveness of Research Ethics Courses for Medical Student Researchers

Focus: the measurement of the efficacy of an RCR course at UCSD as a first step in creating a framework for evaluating the efficacy of RCR courses in general.

Lidija Bilic-Zulle (Rijeka University School of Medicine & Clinical Hospital Center, Croatia), Prevalence of Plagiarism among Medical Students

Focus: the rate of plagiarism among medical students while writing papers and the influence of covariates (sex, paper subject, clear warning of plagiarism prohibition, examination grade) on the plagiarism rate.

Darko Hren (Croatian Medical Journal), Moral Reasoning, Machiavellianism and Deception among Medical Students entering a Science Course

Focus: the moral reasoning and other characteristics of second year medical students entering a science methodology course that could be critical to future attitudes toward research integrity .

### **3:00 - 4:30 PM The Role of Mentoring in Promoting Integrity in Research**

Sandra Titus (Office of Research Integrity, HHS), Education versus Mentoring: Laboratory Directors Views on Promoting Research Integrity

Focus: statements offered by lab directors on ways they recommend promoting more responsible conduct of research, with particular attention to mentoring.

David Wright (Michigan State University), Mentoring and Research Misconduct: What do we know?

Focus: ORI case files (n = 57) on misconduct involving graduate students and post docs to determine if there is supporting evidence that poor supervision/mentoring was present.

**Caroline Whitbeck (Case Western Reserve University), Authorship and Mentoring Concerns in Faculty-Trainee Discussions**

Focus: concerns of faculty members and trainees in various disciplines and research institutions about authorship and mentoring and on their state of knowledge about standards for responsible conduct.

**3:00 - 4:30 PM Professional Organizations and Lay Research Staff**

**Sharon E. Moss (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA)), Research Integrity in ASHA: Educational Practices**

Focus: patterns of teaching and learning about issues of research integrity and the conduct of science among members of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.

**Margaret Gibelman (Yeshiva University, Wurzweiler School of Social Work), Educating for Responsible Research Conduct: The Case of Behavioral Health**

Focus: the research review and monitoring mechanisms utilized by the educational programs representing five key behavioral health professions: psychiatry, social work, psychology, counseling, and psychiatric nursing.

**Camille Nebeker (San Diego State University), A Model to Develop RCR Curriculum Targeting Lay Research Staff**

Focus: a culturally tailored, content-appropriate, Spanish language research ethics curriculum for training Community Health Advisors/promotores. T

**3:00 - 4:30 PM Conflict of Interest and Institutional Considerations**

**Michelle M Mello (Harvard School of Public Health), Legal Relationships in Industry-Sponsored Clinical Trials**

Focus: the extent to which academic investigators and institutional research administrators find it acceptable to cede control over aspects of clinical trials to industry sponsors and the institutional structures (such as formal policies) academic medical centers use to safeguard the integrity of industry-sponsored research and prevent conflicts.

**Elizabeth A. Boyd (University of California, San Francisco), Defining Conflicts and Managing Relationships: An analysis of university conflict of interest committee decisions**

Focus: how university conflict of interest committees actually implement financial disclosure policies, define conflicts of interest, and decide appropriate management strategies for investigators reporting personal financial relationships with industry sponsors of their research.

**Rebecca Lind (University of Illinois at Chicago), An evaluation of resources designed to enhance the responsible conduct of research: Minimal or useful?**

Focus: the extent to which universities provide resources designed to enhance research integrity and the effectiveness of such resources.

**4:30 - 5:30 PM Keynote address**

Michael Zigmond (University of Pittsburgh), Keynote Address

**5:30 - 7:00 PM Reception**

**7:00 PM Free Time & Dinner on Own / Dinner Reservations for Working Groups**

**Sunday, November 14**

**7:00 - 8:00 AM Breakfast / Breakfast Sessions for Special Interest Working Groups**

**8:00 - 10:00 AM      Dealing with FFP and QRP in Clinical Research**

Marion E. Broome (Indiana University School of Nursing), Scientific Misconduct: The Role of the Research Coordinator

Focus: a national survey of clinical research coordinators in order to describe their beliefs, attitudes about and experiences with scientific misconduct.

Joan Liaschenko (University of Minnesota), Nurses: Research Integrity in Clinical Trials

Focus: the ethical concerns of nurses working in biomedical clinical trials, looking particularly at the work and ethical concerns embedded in the day-to-day work of conducting clinical trials.

Katrina A. Bramstedt (Cleveland Clinic Foundation), A Study of Warning Letters Issued to Clinical Investigators by the US Food and Drug Administration

Focus: the frequency and content of Warning Letters issued to clinical investigators by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) with regard to the conduct of drug, device and biologics research studies.

**8:00 - 10:00 AM      The Impact of Politics and Personal Factors on Research Integrity**

Bryan Benham (University of Utah; Department of Philosophy), Deception in Social-Behavioral Research: How Much is Too Much?

Focus: researchers' judgments about proper or improper use of deception in experimental settings with human subjects.

L. Stephen Kwok, (Prince of Wales Hospital, The University of New South Wales), Abusive Co-Authorship And The White Bull Effect

Focus: the role of power asymmetry in distorting co-authorship by intimidation and coercion of junior researchers.

Bradley D. Freedman (Washington University School of Medicine), Perceptions and Attitudes of Genetic Research Held by Surrogate Decision Makers for Critically Ill Patients

Focus: the attitudes and perceptions of surrogate decision makers regarding the biological and social implications of genetic testing.

Dan Laitsch (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), Political and policy constraints on scientific practice, research, and research integrity: Scientifically based research, the What Works Clearinghouse, and the legislating of methodology in research.

Focus: the practice, ethical, and policy implications of the defining of research methodologies in Federal law—specifically the effect on the integrity of research when policymakers mandate scientific methodologies that emphasize experimental random assignment studies within the social sciences.

**10:00 - 10:20 AM      AM Break**

**10:20 - 11:50 AM      Plenary: Ideals and Conclusions**

Nancy L Jones (Wake Forest University School of Medicine), Scientific Professionalism and A Code of Ethics for Bioscience”

Focus: the codification of scientific professionalism and the implicit norms for the practice of bioscience.

L. Stephen Kwok (Prince of Wales Hospital, The University of New South Wales), Code of Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research

Focus: codes of ethical research conduct required to protect junior co-authors.

Nicholas Steneck (University of Michigan/ORI), Working Group Reports & Conference Conclusions

**11:50 AM      Conference ends, box lunch available for pick up when leaving**