Building and maintaining healthy mentor/mentee relationships.

"For example, mentee may not report the mentors scientific misconduct such as falsifying the research results in order to keep a closer/good relationship with his or her mentor."

"If the mentor or mentee doesn't keep in contact, through email or meetings, then it would create issues with the relationship."

Publication and peer review.

"A statistician may be under pressure from a collaborator to find a particular result in their data, or to go on a fishing expedition."

"One issue might be getting assigned to review a paper that uses very similar techniques and gets very similar results as a paper that you are currently working does, or suspecting that a reviewer for your paper is in that situation."

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO IF THIS HAPPENS?

Data and the reproducibility of research results.

"If the research results cannot be reproduced, it may lead to questions about whether they were accurate in the first place, or whether the Statistics PhD student fabricated his or her results."

How to avoid mistakes; when a mistake becomes negligence.

"Researchers may make mistakes when they are careless in inputting data/numbers correctly. Even though researchers weren't falsifying the data deliberately, this can be a violation of RCRS."

LAST YEAR, A STUDENT WROTE:

"Mistakes are bound to happen when we do research. When a mistake is found, whether by the researcher or someone else, it should be acknowledged and dealt with in a timely manner. If it's not, then I would classify it as a case of negligence."

NOTE THAT WHEN WE MAKE QUICK RESPONSES, THERE ARE OFTEN MISTAKES THAT COULD HAVE BEEN RESOLVED IF THE RESPONDER HAD BEEN GIVEN MORE TIME. HOWEVER, IT CAN BE INTERESTING TO LOOK FOR THE MISTAKES IN QUICK RESPONSES.

WHAT IS THE MISTAKE HERE?

Recognizing and responding to conflicts of interest.

"It is the resposibility of every researcher to be driven by certain unselfish goals. Otherwise it might also affect the congenial relationships among collaborators and hamper active research."

SHOULD WE ALSO BE DRIVEN BY SELFISH GOALS?

HOW SHOULD WE BALANCE RESPONSIBILITIES TO OURSELVES AND TO OTHERS?

WHAT ARE THE DANGERS OF BEING TOO IDEALISTIC ABOUT THE SCIENTIFIC PROCESS?

"When several researchers argue about different contributions to a specific work, a researcher submit the paper in accordance to his view before they settle down the conflict."

COMMENT ON THE INTERPRETATION OF 'CONFLICT' IN THIS RESPONSE.

Misconduct in research: plagiarism, falsification and fabrication.

"A Ph.D student might resort to falsification of results in order to get a paper published. Or he might copy another persons work from an obscure journal without giving credit to said author. This would break the trust of the scientific community and make others question the originality of his entire work."

AT WHAT LEVELS OF SENIORITY ARE MAJOR SCIENTIFIC MALPRACTICES LIKE FALSIFICATION MOST LIKELY TO OCCUR? WHY?

Plagiarism in coursework.

"Student should report their own work for a class. They should not collaborate with other students when homework assignment is not group assignment. They should not copy the solution from available online resources. If they want to use online solutions, they should refer to that page and they should write it with their own words."

"A student plagiarizes on his or her homework, which calls into question the trust-worthiness of the student. Advisors wonder whether a similar thing will be done with regards to the student's research."

IS IT PLAGIARISM TO PASTE FROM THE READING ASSIGNMENT (WITHOUT ATTRIBUTION) IN AN 810 HOMEWORK?

"Plagiarism in coursework can be overlooked but it is important because writing his/her own answer is the first step of presenting his/her thought/achievement/ability."

"It happens a lot. But students should ask for help and then do it independently."

What are the main sources of funding for research? How has this led to the current requirements on teaching and practicing RCRS?

"The current main sources of funding come from national and state grants, so indirectly from taxpayers. Thus, the current requirements are meant to protect the public's investment in research."

What role does RCRS play in the value of scientific research and scholarship to society as a whole? What are the benefits and costs to individuals?

"It can fascilitate the development of science. Individuals can trust each others works so they can build on other researchers works. Individually, it can be more time consuming to be responsible to all of his/her works."

"They give some kind of guideline about how to act properly in certain situation. And this would eventually led things toward goodness of society. But at the same time, topic or direction of our research could be restricted toward goodness of society."

How does your reputation as a responsible researcher and scholar become generated and transmitted through the academic community?

"Your reputation is generated in large part by the quality of your publications. Consistently high-quality, reproducible research will help colleagues recognize you as a responsible scientist. Additionally, retractions for falsified results or similar infractions may spread quickly through readers of particular journals or the Retraction Watch blog."

AS RECENTLY AS A FEW YEARS AGO, PROPERLY REPRODUCIBLE STATISTICAL RESEARCH WAS SO RARE THAT IT SEEMED UNCLEAR THAT THE EXTRA WORK REQUIRED WAS PROPERLY VALUED. SEVERAL RECENT DEVELOPMENTS (GITHUB, R PACKAGES, KNITR, ONLINE ELECTRONIC SUPPLEMENTS FOR JOURNAL ARTICLES, ETC) HAVE MADE REPRODUCIBLE

RESEARCH MUCH EASIER. INCREASINGLY, TOP-LEVEL ACADEMIC WORK IS SUPPOSED TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THESE DEVELOPMENTS.

How important is reputation as a responsible researcher and scholar, in the context of a modern academic career? How does this kind of reputation compare in importance to quantitative measures of academic success?

R1: *"A reputation as a responsible researcher and scholar is crucial in the context of a modern academic career. It is incredibly difficult to get tenure or work at a respectable university without a reputation as a responsible researcher. This reputation is just as important as quantitative measures of academic success, especially considering it will be difficult to publish in reputable journals or receive large research grants if you have a reputation as an irresponsible researcher."*

R2: *"Your reputation as a responsible researcher largely goes unnoticed and unappreciated, that is, until you dont have it. Being exposed as an irresponsible researcher is relatively rare, so major errors can become major news stories in the field and have long-lasting impacts on your reputation. Ideally, the peer review process means that publications should and reputation should be highly correlated, where the approval of referees and editors continuously helps build your reputation."*

R1 APPEARS MORE IDEALISTIC THAN R2. WHICH DO YOU AGREE WITH MORE?