

Amsterdam Business Research Institute

Research Integrity

Responsible Research in Business & Management

Course Manual Academic Year 2025 – 2026



Faculty

Prof.dr. Philipp Tuertscher (course coordinator and lecturer, philipp.tuertscher@vu.nl) and various guest lecturers.

Target groups

The course *Research Integrity 2025-2026* is open to PhD candidates, research master students, postdocs, and junior faculty. The course workload represents 3 ECTS.

Course Content

The basic premise of this course is that research integrity is a cornerstone for the quality of academic research. Issues of research integrity are particularly important in these times in which the credibility of science is at stake. Research integrity involves avoiding academic misconduct, engaging in responsible research practices, ethical treatment of research participants, careful research data management, and accurate and fair communication about research. This course addresses the norms that have emerged regarding each of these aspects, but also recognizes that there are no absolute standards. Research practices and norms in fields evolve and researchers are confronted with grey areas and dilemmas. This course helps junior researchers to reflect on research practices and navigate grey areas towards more responsible research practices.

Learning Objectives

After finishing this course, participants have developed their:

- understanding of the importance of research integrity for research quality and credibility
- ability to recognize questionable research practices and reflect on their use
- understanding of open science and responsible research practices in quantitative and qualitative research
- ability to reflect on dilemmas regarding the ethics of research with human subjects and the reporting of research findings
- knowledge of the principles of research data management and ability to develop a data management plan.
- know the VU and SBE requirements and processes for research ethics, privacy, research data management, and research integrity at large

Course Design

The course is organized around six interactive sessions and individual assignments. Participants are expected to come well prepared to these sessions to be able to engage in reflective discussions. Assignments and evaluation criteria for grading will be explained separately.

Assignments

1. Personal reflection essay

The first assignment is to write an essay on research integrity and responsible research practices. You have to select a specific topic, issue, dilemma or example with regard to research integrity and/or responsible research. The topic can relate to your own (future) research: for instance, how transparency requirements can be incorporated in your research. You can also reflect on an issue relating to the content of the course without reference to your own research, or focus on a dilemma in which multiple norms seem conflicting. A last option is to pick as topic a real-life case of fraud, questionable research practices, or responsible research practices. Only select an example that has been sufficiently documented. For the essay, you have to analyze this topic, issue, dilemma, or example using the literature offered in the course (and possibly additional literature). Conclude the essay with formulating your personal opinion, rooted in your analysis. The essay should be about 2000 words.

2. Data management plan (DMP)

First draft DMP

Peer Review

The first draft of your DMP will be reviewed by another participant of this course as well as by someone from your faculty (in most cases this will be the faculty data steward). They will provide feedback, which you are expected to take into consideration and to incorporate into the final version of your DMP. In order to successfully complete this assignment, a first draft DMP must be uploaded before the deadline after which you provide a peer-review of your assigned DMP within the time frame. Canvas provides the description of the assignment on a separate Instructions page.

Final version DMP

The teacher of this course or another RDM expert from the University Library will review your DMP and assess whether you pass this assignment. Your DMP will be reviewed based on the rubric on Canvas. In order to successfully complete this assignment, all criteria in the rubric should be at least evaluated at the level of 'sufficient'.

Grading

Attendance and active participation in the sessions is mandatory to pass this course. The requested readings mentioned above are assumed to have been read prior to class.

Participants receive two grades: one grade for class participation (50%) and one grade for the final individual assignment (50%). The final score is the weighted average of these two grades.

The data management plan needs to be completed and evaluated as satisfactory to pass the course. Participants who created a DMP are exempted from this requirement.

Tuition Fee

Tuition fee (3 ECTS Course)	€750
20% discount on early bird registration	€600

Workload and credits

The estimated time participants spend on study activities is:

Attending Sessions	18 hours
Studying Literature	36 hours
Completing the Individual Assignments	<u>30 hours</u>

Total *84 hours (3 ECTS)*

Schedule

Date	Location	Time	Instructor	Topic
Wed Jan 7	HG-05A36	9:30-12:30	Philipp Tuertscher + Eric Bartelsman	Introduction to research integrity
Tue Jan 13	HG-05A36	9:30-12:30	Philipp Tuertscher	Questionable & responsible research practices (1)
Thu Jan 15	HG-05A37	9:30-12:30	Erik van Raaij	Questionable & responsible research practices (2)
Tue Jan 20	HG-05A36	9:30-12:30	Kacana Khadjavi Pour	Research ethics & privacy
Tue Jan 27	HG-07A37	9:30-12:30	Kacana Khadjavi Pour	Research data management
Thu Jan 29	HG-07A36	9:30-12:30	Philipp Tuertscher	Reporting and publishing research

Session overview

Session 1: Introduction to research integrity

Content

- integrity = quality
- scientific norms
- credibility crisis?
- academic misconduct & responsible research practices
- institutional structures and processes for research integrity

Requested readings

Christensen, G., Freese, J., Miguel, E. (2019). Chapter 2: What is ethical research?
In: *Transparent and reproducible social science research: How to Do Open Science*. University of California Press, pp.11-28.

Butler, N., Delaney, H., & Spoelstra, S. (2017). The gray zone: Questionable research practices in the business school. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(1), 94-109.

Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2018).

Optional readings

Aguinis, H., Archibold, E. E. & Rice, D. B. (2022). Let's fix our own problem: Quelling the irresponsible research perfect storm. *Journal of Management Studies*, 59(6), 1628-1642.

Merton, R.K. (1973 [1942]). The normative structure of science. In *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 267-278.

Hall, J. & Martin, B. R. (2019). Towards a taxonomy of research misconduct: The case of business school research. *Research Policy*, 48, 414-427.

Session 2: Questionable & responsible research practices (1)

Content

- reproducibility and replicability
- questionable practices in quantitative research (e.g. publication bias, p-hacking, HARKing)
- questionable practices in qualitative research
- responsible research practices: open science & transparency
- QRPs, responsible research, and the institutional environment

Requested readings

Hensel, P. G. (2021). Reproducibility and replicability crisis: How management compares to psychology and economics - A systematic review of literature. *European Management Journal*, 39(5), 577-594.

O'Boyle Jr, E. H., Banks, G. C., & Gonzalez-Mulé, E. (2017). The chrysalis effect: How ugly initial results metamorphosize into beautiful articles. *Journal of Management*, 43(2), 376-399.

Anonymous. (2015). The case of the hypothesis that never was; Uncovering the deceptive use of post hoc hypotheses. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24(2), 214-216.

Pratt, M. G., Kaplan, S., & Whittington, R. (2020). Editorial essay: The tumult over transparency: Decoupling transparency from replication in establishing trustworthy qualitative research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(1), 1-19.

Haven, T.L., & Van Grootel, D. L. (2019). Preregistering qualitative research. *Accountability in Research*, 26(3), 229-244.

Optional readings

Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251).

Bergh, D. D., Sharp, B. M., Aguinis, H., & Li, M. (2017). Is there a credibility crisis in strategic management research? Evidence on the reproducibility of study findings. *Strategic Organization*, 15(3), 423-436.

Nosek, B. A., Hardwicke, T. E., Moshontz, H., Allard, A., Corker, K. S., Dreber, A., ... & Vazire, S. (2021). Replicability, robustness, and reproducibility in psychological science. *Annual Review of Psychology*.

Hollenbeck, J. R., & Wright, P. M. (2017). Harking, sharking, and tharking: Making the case for post hoc analysis of scientific data.

Session 3: Questionable & responsible research practices (2)

Content

- an example of questionable practices: excessive and inconsistent data reuse
- openness & transparency requirements
- preregistration

Requested Readings

van Raaij, E. M. (2018). Déjà lu: On the limits of data reuse across multiple publications. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 24(3), 183-191.

Beugelsdijk, S., Van Witteloostuijn, A., and Meyer, K.E. (2020). A new approach to data access and research transparency (DART). *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51, 887-905.

Optional Readings

Aguinis, H., Ramani, R. S., & Alabduljader, N. (2018). What you see is what you get? Enhancing methodological transparency in management research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12: 83–110.

Jacobs, A. M., Bütthe, T., Arjona, A., Arriola, L. R., Bellin, E., Bennett, A., ... & Yashar, D. J. (2021). The Qualitative transparency deliberations: Insights and implications. *Perspectives on Politics*, 19(1), 171-208.

Bamberger, P. A. (2019). On the replicability of abductive research in management and organizations: Internal replication and its alternatives. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 5(2), 103-108.

Session 4: Research ethics & privacy

Content

- informed consent
- harm and vulnerability
- ethics review procedures
- privacy & GDPR
- ethics of web scraping

Requested Readings

Bell, E., Bryman, A., & Harley, B. (2018). Chapter 6: Ethics in business research In: *Business research methods*. Oxford University Press, pp. 109-136.

[SBE Research Ethics Regulations for Researchers](#) (2021).

Optional Readings

Bell, E., & Bryman, A. (2007). The ethics of management research: an exploratory content analysis. *British Journal of Management*, 18(1), 63-77.

European Data Protection Supervisor. (2020). *A Preliminary Opinion on Data Protection and Scientific Research*: Chapter 6. Accessed from: https://edps.europa.eu/sites/edp/files/publication/20-01-06_opinion_research_en.pdf

Plankey-Videla, N. (2012). Informed consent as process: Problematizing informed consent in organizational ethnographies. *Qualitative Sociology*, 35(1), 1-21.

Quinn P. (2021). Research under the GDPR—a level playing field for public and private sector research? *Life Sciences, Society and Policy*, 17(1), 1-33.

Session 5: Research Data Management

Content

- Data management plans and the research life cycle
- Data management and open science

Requested Readings

- SBE RDM Policy (Available here under [Research Data Management](#))
- Familiarize yourself with RDM at the VU by navigating through the Research Data Support Portal: vu.nl/rds
- UGent Data Stewards. Knowledge clip: [FAIR data principles](#). Watch the video and get familiar with the properties of data repositories that help making your data FAIR.
- Michener, W. K. (2015). Ten simple rules for creating a good data management plan. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 11(10), e1004525.

Optional Readings

- Aguinis, H., Hill, N. S., & Bailey, J. R. (2021). Best practices in data collection and preparation: Recommendations for reviewers, editors, and authors. *Organizational Research Methods*, 24(4), 678-693.
- Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., ... & Mons, B. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific data*, 3(160018), 1-9.

Session 6: Reporting and publishing research

Content

- authorship
- plagiarism
- peer review
- independence and conflicts of interest

Requested Readings

Pfleegor, A. G., Katz, M. & Bowers, M. T. (2019). Publish, perish, or salami slice? Authorship ethics in an emerging field. *Journal of Business Ethics* 156, 189–208.

Academy of Management (2011). [VIDEO SERIES](#): *The ethics of research and publishing*. (In particular videos on authorship; plagiarism; slicing the data; and reviewing manuscripts).

Optional Readings

Chen, X. (2011). Author ethical dilemmas in the research publication process. *Management Organization Review* 7, 423–432.

Pruschak, G. (2021). What constitutes authorship in the social sciences? *Frontiers of Research Metrics and Analytics*, 6, 655350.