PHILOSOPHY

REPORTING MISCONDUCT

29.02.2020

When?

Table 2 Types of misconduct reported

Was it reported?	Yes	No	Don't know	NA
Plagiarism (N=60)	38 (63%)	14 (23%)	5 (8%)	3 (5%)
Authorship (N=49)	16 (33%)	31 (63%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)
Cherry picking (N=28)	9 (32%)	18 (64%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
Falsification (N=14)	6 (43%)	7 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)
Fabrication (N=13)	11 (85%)	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Text recycling (N=7)	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Data manipulation (N=5)	3 (40%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Don't understand (N=5)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Do not wish to answer (N=1)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Source Horbach 2019 (visited 28Feb2020) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-020-00202-8

Who?

In our limited sample, professors reported a witnessed case of alleged misconduct more often (67% reported vs 29% not reported) than other members of academia ... we found that researchers in permanent positions report incidences of suspected misconduct twice as often as those in temporary positions... here was little difference between men and women regarding the reporting of alleged research misconduct.

Why?

Table 1 Experimental findings: community members' evaluations of data falsification and fabrication ($n = 415$) versus selective reporting ($n = 406$) (Study 1)

Variables	Falsification and fabrication Support (%)	Selective reporting Support (%)	z	p
Morally unacceptable	96	71	9.59	<.001
Should be fired	96	63	11.75	<.001
Should receive funding ban	93	73	7.75	<.001
Should be a crime	66	37	8.34	<.001

Source Pickett 2016 (visited 28Feb2020) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-017-9886-2

(morally unacceptable, see Kant [1, 2 "falsiloquium dolosum"), 3]