

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY
2016

Table of Contents

Profile of an ethical pursuit of science and scholarship within the Institute of Psychology	3
I. Introduction	3
II. Profile of an ethical research policy - benchmarks	3
1. Exchange between colleagues and institutional embedding	3
2. Ethical pursuit of science and scholarship:	3
3. Trust and confidentiality	4
References	4
III. Executive measures promoting the ethical pursuit of science and scholarship	4
1. Personnel policy	4
2. Teaching	5
3. Research	5
Appendix 1. Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct APA. Standard 8.	6
Appendix 2. Singapore Statement on Research Integrity	9
Appendix 3. Types of Research Misconduct	10
Appendix 3. Statement on scientific Integrity	11
Appendix 4. LEIDRAAD voor leidinggevendenden bij een melding van inbreuk op wetenschappelijke integriteit	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Profile of an ethical pursuit of science and scholarship within the Institute of Psychology

I. Introduction

All staff members and students of the Institute of Psychology are expected to be familiar with the university research protocol, “[The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice](#)” and the APA Ethics Code (see Appendix 1 for Standard 8 on Research and Publication). Professional codes and research protocols guide and support researchers towards achieving integrity in their research. However, expanding and fine-tuning professional codes and protocols into ever more detail alone does not offer an effective answer to seriously unacceptable behaviour on the part of individual researchers. What is equally important is the way in which the work environment is organized and contributes to a shared sense of responsibility regarding integrity.

The Board of the Institute of Psychology considers an ethical pursuit of science and scholarship to be the joint responsibility of staff and students. It sees as its task to offer a suitable framework for both teaching and research in which accountability can be openly discussed, and concerns about integrity can be expressed. The Institute Board wants to highlight the importance of responsible and transparent behaviour in a safe environment for staff and students, together with a shared commitment and responsibility. Discussions with colleagues, cooperation in mutual trust and a shared commitment are important ingredients of an ethical, reliable and sound pursuit of science and scholarship.

II. Profile of an ethical research policy - benchmarks

The Executive Board of the Institute of Psychology works with three benchmarks for an optimal ethical quality of research. Research that is part of an ethical, reliable and sound pursuit of science and scholarship within the Institute of Psychology is characterized by:

1. *Exchange between colleagues and institutional embedding*

- Organizationally, all research forms part of a research program registered at the Institute, whose scientific quality has been positively evaluated by the Institute itself or an external organization;
- Prior to being actually carried out, each research project has been subjected to a process of organized *peer review* and *peer pressure* ([KNAW 2013a, pp.43 ff.](#)). The latter term includes discussions about and presentations of research plans for colleagues in the unit, the institute or in an informal network, at a very early stage. It is part of the shared responsibility that there should be space for critical scrutiny in a safe, constructive and transparent atmosphere;
- Research within Psychology can be carried out only after a positive assessment by the Committee Ethics Psychology instituted by the Board of the Institute of Psychology;
- For each research project actually carried out the division of labour, for instance regarding personnel, finances, and data management ([KNAW, 2013b](#)), as well as the responsibilities of the researchers in question must be clearly set out. A careful division and distribution of responsibilities in a research project ensures optimal integrity and reliability in the pursuit of science and scholarship.

2. *Ethical pursuit of science and scholarship:*

- Academic integrity is a topic regularly on the agenda in all degree programs, from Bachelor to Research Master/PhD ([KNAW, 2012](#));

All new staff members including research assistants sign a **Statement on Scientific Integrity (Appendix 3)**, as one of the forms they fill in at their appointment, about the confidentiality and responsible handling of research data.

Academic integrity is explicitly discussed during initial performance and development (P&D) interviews, and is a standard topic in the yearly P&D interviews with staff.

3. Trust and confidentiality

Research results will be presented in substantively consistent form, irrespective of the audience (potential sources of funding, policy makers, fellow-researchers or other groups such as the media and external partners). One of the reasons for using forms of peer review/peer pressure is the wish to prevent over- or under-reporting, which can seriously damage not only trust among colleagues but also public confidence in science and scholarship.

Colleagues have regular discussions about each other's research projects;

The Institute has designated that the supervisor or the chair of the unit is the first port of call for consultation by staff members with questions or concerns about an ethical, reliable and sound pursuit of science and scholarship. For students the first port of call is their mentor or the internship and/or thesis coordinator. This point of contact first and foremost offers an opportunity to exchange doubts and worries about integrity. In principle this precedes, and is a separate track from, any formal notification procedure. For questions or circumstances relating to academic integrity and suspected violations by staff of Leiden University, members of staff can consult the Confidential Adviser for the university. For a formal consult they go to the Academic Integrity Committee.

References

- Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (2013). [Responsible research data management and the prevention of scientific misconduct](#). Advisory report. Den Haag: KNAW.
- De Nederlandse Gedragscode Wetenschapsbeoefening: <https://www.knaw.nl/and/topics/ethiek/wetenschappelijke-integrity>

III. Executive measures promoting the ethical pursuit of science and scholarship

This section contains a number of concrete measures regarding personnel policy, teaching and research, all intended in an amicable spirit, to stimulate responsible academic behaviour.

However, it is not these measures, but rather the daily actions of our staff members that in the end determine the actual ethical quality of teaching and research throughout our Institute. With this detailed profile the Executive Board hopes to provide some guidance to the staff of the Institute of Psychology regarding a consciously ethical behaviour, and so to contribute to the continuation and further development of a responsible organizational culture in the Institute.

1. Personnel policy

All supervisors and staff members will see to it that during the yearly P&D interviews the topic of integrity is explicitly put on the agenda. The question should be addressed in how far all research in which the staff member participates has been approved by the Committee Ethics Psychology or the Committee Medical Ethics. The supervisor will also check whether over the preceding period the staff member in question has had experiences with teaching, doing research or fulfilling administrative tasks that have raised questions of ethics, or require closer consideration.

2. Teaching

In the spirit of ‘teach what you preach’, responsible and respectful behaviour is expected of both teaching staff and students. This includes not only mutually correct manners in written and oral communication, but also adequate care for privacy, mutual trust and safety on both sides. See also the university code of conduct on conduct between lecturer and student ([Code of conduct on standards of behaviour between lecturers and students](#)) and the code of conduct specifically in ICT support ([Code of Conduct for TEACHERS and STUDENTS in ICT supported education](#))

3. Research

All research staff of the Institute of Psychology are bound to the general rules for integrity in teaching and research of Leiden University:

Each staff member of the Institute of Psychology is expected to be familiar with the “Singapore Statement on Research Integrity”(see appendix 2) and the main “Types of Research Misconduct” (see appendix 3);

Within the Institute of Psychology staff members will carry out only research which has received a positive assessment in writing from a recognized Committee Ethics Psychology.

The Institute of Psychology has formulated rules for the management of data.

Appendix 1. Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct APA. Standard 8.

Standard 8: Research and Publication

8.01 Institutional Approval

When institutional approval is required, psychologists provide accurate information about their research proposals and obtain approval prior to conducting the research. They conduct the research in accordance with the approved research protocol.

8.02 Informed Consent to Research

(a) When obtaining informed consent as required in Standard 3.10, Informed Consent, psychologists inform participants about (1) the purpose of the research, expected duration and procedures; (2) their right to decline to participate and to withdraw from the research once participation has begun; (3) the foreseeable consequences of declining or withdrawing; (4) reasonably foreseeable factors that may be expected to influence their willingness to participate such as potential risks, discomfort or adverse effects; (5) any prospective research benefits; (6) limits of confidentiality; (7) incentives for participation; and (8) whom to contact for questions about the research and research participants' rights. They provide opportunity for the prospective participants to ask questions and receive answers. (See also Standards 8.03, [Informed Consent for Recording Voices and Images in Research](#); 8.05, [Dispensing with Informed Consent for Research](#); and 8.07, [Deception in Research](#).)

(b) Psychologists conducting intervention research involving the use of experimental treatments clarify to participants at the outset of the research (1) the experimental nature of the treatment; (2) the services that will or will not be available to the control group(s) if appropriate; (3) the means by which assignment to treatment and control groups will be made; (4) available treatment alternatives if an individual does not wish to participate in the research or wishes to withdraw once a study has begun; and (5) compensation for or monetary costs of participating including, if appropriate, whether reimbursement from the participant or a third-party payor will be sought. (See also Standard 8.02a, [Informed Consent to Research](#).)

8.03 Informed Consent for Recording Voices and Images in Research

Psychologists obtain informed consent from research participants prior to recording their voices or images for data collection unless (1) the research consists solely of naturalistic observations in public places, and it is not anticipated that the recording will be used in a manner that could cause personal identification or harm, or (2) the research design includes deception, and consent for the use of the recording is obtained during debriefing. (See also Standard 8.07, [Deception in Research](#).)

8.04 Client/Patient, Student, and Subordinate Research Participants

(a) When psychologists conduct research with clients/patients, students or subordinates as participants, psychologists take steps to protect the prospective participants from adverse consequences of declining or withdrawing from participation.

(b) When research participation is a course requirement or an opportunity for extra credit, the prospective participant is given the choice of equitable alternative activities.

8.05 Dispensing with Informed Consent for Research

Psychologists may dispense with informed consent only (1) where research would not reasonably be assumed to create distress or harm and involves (a) the study of normal educational practices, curricula, or classroom management methods conducted in educational settings; (b) only anonymous questionnaires, naturalistic observations or archival research for which disclosure of responses would not place participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or damage their financial standing, employability or reputation, and confidentiality is protected; or (c) the study of factors related to job or

organization effectiveness conducted in organizational settings for which there is no risk to participants' employability, and confidentiality is protected or (2) where otherwise permitted by law or federal or institutional regulations.

8.06 Offering Inducements for Research Participation

(a) Psychologists make reasonable efforts to avoid offering excessive or inappropriate financial or other inducements for research participation when such inducements are likely to coerce participation.

(b) When offering professional services as an inducement for research participation, psychologists clarify the nature of the services, as well as the risks, obligations and limitations. (See also Standard 6.05, [Barter with Clients/Patients](#).)

8.07 Deception in Research

(a) Psychologists do not conduct a study involving deception unless they have determined that the use of deceptive techniques is justified by the study's significant prospective scientific, educational or applied value and that effective nondeceptive alternative procedures are not feasible.

(b) Psychologists do not deceive prospective participants about research that is reasonably expected to cause physical pain or severe emotional distress.

(c) Psychologists explain any deception that is an integral feature of the design and conduct of an experiment to participants as early as is feasible, preferably at the conclusion of their participation, but no later than at the conclusion of the data collection, and permit participants to withdraw their data. (See also Standard 8.08, [Debriefing](#).)

8.08 Debriefing

(a) Psychologists provide a prompt opportunity for participants to obtain appropriate information about the nature, results, and conclusions of the research, and they take reasonable steps to correct any misconceptions that participants may have of which the psychologists are aware.

(b) If scientific or humane values justify delaying or withholding this information, psychologists take reasonable measures to reduce the risk of harm.

(c) When psychologists become aware that research procedures have harmed a participant, they take reasonable steps to minimize the harm.

8.09 Humane Care and Use of Animals in Research

(a) Psychologists acquire, care for, use, and dispose of animals in compliance with current federal, state and local laws and regulations, and with professional standards.

(b) Psychologists trained in research methods and experienced in the care of laboratory animals supervise all procedures involving animals and are responsible for ensuring appropriate consideration of their comfort, health and humane treatment.

(c) Psychologists ensure that all individuals under their supervision who are using animals have received instruction in research methods and in the care, maintenance and handling of the species being used, to the extent appropriate to their role. (See also Standard 2.05, [Delegation of Work to Others](#).)

(d) Psychologists make reasonable efforts to minimize the discomfort, infection, illness and pain of animal subjects.

(e) Psychologists use a procedure subjecting animals to pain, stress or privation only when an alternative procedure is unavailable and the goal is justified by its prospective scientific, educational or applied value.

(f) Psychologists perform surgical procedures under appropriate anesthesia and follow techniques to avoid infection and minimize pain during and after surgery.

(g) When it is appropriate that an animal's life be terminated, psychologists proceed rapidly, with an effort to minimize pain and in accordance with accepted procedures.

8.10 Reporting Research Results

(a) Psychologists do not fabricate data. (See also Standard 5.01a, [Avoidance of False or Deceptive Statements](#).)

(b) If psychologists discover significant errors in their published data, they take reasonable steps to correct such errors in a correction, retraction, erratum or other appropriate publication means.

8.11 Plagiarism

Psychologists do not present portions of another's work or data as their own, even if the other work or data source is cited occasionally.

8.12 Publication Credit

(a) Psychologists take responsibility and credit, including authorship credit, only for work they have actually performed or to which they have substantially contributed. (See also Standard 8.12b, [Publication Credit](#).)

(b) Principal authorship and other publication credits accurately reflect the relative scientific or professional contributions of the individuals involved, regardless of their relative status. Mere possession of an institutional position, such as department chair, does not justify authorship credit. Minor contributions to the research or to the writing for publications are acknowledged appropriately, such as in footnotes or in an introductory statement.

(c) Except under exceptional circumstances, a student is listed as principal author on any multiple-authored article that is substantially based on the student's doctoral dissertation. Faculty advisors discuss publication credit with students as early as feasible and throughout the research and publication process as appropriate. (See also Standard 8.12b, [Publication Credit](#).)

8.13 Duplicate Publication of Data

Psychologists do not publish, as original data, data that have been previously published. This does not preclude republishing data when they are accompanied by proper acknowledgment.

8.14 Sharing Research Data for Verification

(a) After research results are published, psychologists do not withhold the data on which their conclusions are based from other competent professionals who seek to verify the substantive claims through reanalysis and who intend to use such data only for that purpose, provided that the confidentiality of the participants can be protected and unless legal rights concerning proprietary data preclude their release. This does not preclude psychologists from requiring that such individuals or groups be responsible for costs associated with the provision of such information.

(b) Psychologists who request data from other psychologists to verify the substantive claims through reanalysis may use shared data only for the declared purpose. Requesting psychologists obtain prior written agreement for all other uses of the data.

8.15 Reviewers

Psychologists who review material submitted for presentation, publication, grant or research proposal review respect the confidentiality of and the proprietary rights in such information of those who submitted it.

Appendix 2. Singapore Statement on Research Integrity

Singapore Statement on Research Integrity

Preamble. The value and benefits of research are vitally dependent on the integrity of research. While there can be and are national and disciplinary differences in the way research is organized and conducted, there are also principles and professional responsibilities that are fundamental to the integrity of research wherever it is undertaken.

PRINCIPLES

Honesty in all aspects of research
Accountability in the conduct of research
Professional courtesy and fairness in working with others
Good stewardship of research on behalf of others

RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1. Integrity:** Researchers should take responsibility for the trustworthiness of their research.
- 2. Adherence to Regulations:** Researchers should be aware of and adhere to regulations and policies related to research.
- 3. Research Methods:** Researchers should employ appropriate research methods, base conclusions on critical analysis of the evidence and report findings and interpretations fully and objectively.
- 4. Research Records:** Researchers should keep clear, accurate records of all research in ways that will allow verification and replication of their work by others.
- 5. Research Findings:** Researchers should share data and findings openly and promptly, as soon as they have had an opportunity to establish priority and ownership claims.
- 6. Authorship:** Researchers should take responsibility for their contributions to all publications, funding applications, reports and other representations of their research. Lists of authors should include all those and only those who meet applicable authorship criteria.
- 7. Publication Acknowledgement:** Researchers should acknowledge in publications the names and roles of those who made significant contributions to the research, including writers, funders, sponsors, and others, but do not meet authorship criteria.
- 8. Peer Review:** Researchers should provide fair, prompt and rigorous evaluations and respect confidentiality when reviewing others' work.
- 9. Conflict of Interest:** Researchers should disclose financial and other conflicts of interest that could compromise the trustworthiness of their work in research proposals, publications and public communications as well as in all review activities.
- 10. Public Communication:** Researchers should limit professional comments to their recognized expertise when engaged in public discussions about the application and importance of research findings and clearly distinguish professional comments from opinions based on personal views.
- 11. Reporting Irresponsible Research Practices:** Researchers should report to the appropriate authorities any suspected research misconduct, including fabrication, falsification or plagiarism, and other irresponsible research practices that undermine the trustworthiness of research, such as carelessness, improperly listing authors, failing to report conflicting data, or the use of misleading analytical methods.
- 12. Responding to Irresponsible Research Practices:** Research institutions, as well as journals, professional organizations and agencies that have commitments to research, should have procedures for responding to allegations of misconduct and other irresponsible research practices and for protecting those who report such behavior in good faith. When misconduct or other irresponsible research practice is confirmed, appropriate actions should be taken promptly, including correcting the research record.
- 13. Research Environments:** Research institutions should create and sustain environments that encourage integrity through education, clear policies, and reasonable standards for advancement, while fostering work environments that support research integrity.
- 14. Societal Considerations:** Researchers and research institutions should recognize that they have an ethical obligation to weigh societal benefits against risks inherent in their work.

The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity was developed as part of the 2nd World Conference on Research Integrity, 21-24 July 2010, in Singapore, as a global guide to the responsible conduct of research. It is not a regulatory document and does not represent the official policies of the countries and organizations that funded and/or participated in the Conference. For official policies, guidance, and regulations relating to research integrity, appropriate national bodies and organizations should be consulted. Available at: www.singaporestatement.org

Appendix 3. Types of Research Misconduct

Source: OECD Report (2010). Best Practices for Ensuring Scientific Integrity and Preventing Misconduct. Workshop 2007 page 3. ([Full text](#))

During the course of preparing the OECD workshop, interviews with experts revealed a broad spectrum of types of misconduct by scientists, as shown in the following table¹:

<p>Core “Research Misconduct” Fabrication of data Falsification of data Plagiarism FFP normally includes: Selectively excluding data from analysis Misinterpreting data to obtain desired results (including inappropriate use of statistical methods) Doctored images in publications Producing false data or results under pressure from a sponsor</p>	<p>Research practice misconduct Using inappropriate (e.g., harmful or dangerous) research methods Poor research design Experimental, analytical, computational errors Violation of human subject protocols Abuse of laboratory animals</p>
<p>Data-related misconduct Not preserving primary data Bad data management, storage Withholding data from the scientific community NB: The above applies to physical research materials as well</p>	<p>Publication-related misconduct Claiming undeserved authorship Denying authorship to contributors Artificially proliferating publications (“salami-slicing”) Failure to correct the publication record</p>
<p>Personal misconduct Inappropriate personal behaviour, harassment Inadequate leadership, mentoring, counselling of students Insensitivity to social or cultural norms</p>	<p>Financial, and other misconduct Peer review abuse e.g., non-disclosure of conflict of interest, unfairly holding up a rival’s publication Misrepresenting credentials or publication record Misuse of research funds for unauthorised purchases or for personal gain Making an unsubstantiated or malicious misconduct allegation</p>

At the core of the spectrum of inappropriate behaviours is “Research Misconduct”, consisting of Fabrication, Falsification and Plagiarism (FFP). Various definitions of these terms are possible. For example, the United States government defines research misconduct in a way that has been adopted in some other countries: Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Fabrication is making up results and recording or reporting them².

¹ The chosen classification scheme is not intended to be exhaustive, or to constitute a universally valid intellectual framework for theoretical studies of research misconduct. In this report, it is presented merely as a way to summarise the information distilled from the expert interviews.

² The definition given above is not unique. It can, for example, be broadened to include “... significant departure from accepted practices of the scientific community”. Alternative broad formulations can be used, such as “Behaviour by a researcher, intentional or not, that falls short of good ethical and scientific standards”. The latter text has been adopted by the Committee on Publication Ethics

Appendix 4. Statement on scientific Integrity

Statement on Scientific Integrity

The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice drawn up by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands sets out the principles to be observed by scientists at our university individually, towards one another and towards society.

The Code applies to scientific activities, including teaching and research, at all universities in the Netherlands.

Scrupulousness, reliability, verifiability, impartiality and independence are the key principles on which the Code is founded.

Scientific activities must at all times be governed by standards of the most scrupulous care. Pressure to perform cannot be regarded as a reason for any lowering of these standards.

Each and every scientist shares in the responsibility for the reputation of the scientific world for reliability. A scientific practitioner must demonstrate reliability in how he or she conducts research and reports on the findings of such research, as well as in disseminating his or her knowledge through teaching and publications. A scientific practitioner will not claim the scientific work of another individual as his or her own.

All information presented must be verifiable. When research findings are made public, a clear indication must be given of the sources on which the information and conclusions are based, from where the findings are derived, and where they can be verified.

Scientific practitioners will be motivated in their work only by scientific interests, and will be prepared at all times to justify their actions.

Scientific practitioners carry out their work in an environment of academic freedom and independence. Any restrictions on this freedom will be clearly indicated.

The Code of Conduct can be downloaded via <http://staff.leiden.edu/research/policy-regulation/scientific-integrity.html>

The undersigned confirms that he or she has read the content of the Code, undertakes to observe the Code and will do all in his or her power to promote and maintain the integrity of the Code in his or her academic environment.

Date

Name

Signature

Wassenaarseweg 52
Postbus 9555, 2300 RB Leiden
E-mail: pzinfo@fsw.leidenuniv.nl