I. Context: The Modern History of Research Misconduct


Jones, James. *Bad Blood: The Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment: A Tragedy of Race and Medicine.* The Free Press. (1981) *Comment:* The discovery of the Tuskegee study was one of the galvanizing incidents leading to federal human subject protection and, later, misconduct regulations. An important piece of history and background.


Taubes, Gary. *Bad Science: The Short Life and Weird Times of Cold Fusion.* Random House, 1993. *Comment:* An interesting, well-written exposition, although it could have been edited down somewhat—tends to wander a bit towards the end. Pathological science or fraud? You decide.

Taubes, Gary. "Misconduct: Views From the Trenches." *Science,* August 27, 1993. *Comment:* A concise description of the process and how it worked in universities in the 1990s. (It's not all that much different today.)

Walker, Paulette V. "1865 Law Used to Resolve Scientific-Misconduct Cases." *The Chronicle for Higher Education,* January 26, 1996. *Comment:* The *qui tam law*—designed for bounty-hunters—continues to be an unresolved legal issue in addressing scientific misconduct nationally. Worth understanding. This is a good introduction.

II. Case Studies and Teaching Materials


Integrity in Scientific Research Five Video Vignettes. Videotape. American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1996. Comment: These are “trigger” films that set up a difficult situation and then pose dilemmas for group discussion. Includes a discussion guide.


III. Insights into Plagiarism

Bowers, Neal. Words for the Taking: The Hunt for a Plagiarist. W.W. Norton and Company. 1997. Comment: Bowers, a poet, writes movingly about his experiences with having his work taken by a serial plagiarist. Bowers is especially powerful when he discusses how many of those who hear about his problem try to minimize the nature of the offense and/or blame him for it. Unfortunately, many of these same reactions, and ambivalence about the value of intellectual work, can be seen in situations involving scientific misconduct.


IV. Statements/Definitions


V. Historical Documents on Defining and Responding to Misconduct


*Schachman, Howard. “What is Misconduct in Science.” Science, July 9, 1993. Comment: Schachman has been an influential figure in the definition battles of the last 15 years. Both through FASEB and as a roving ombudsman for the Director of NIH, Schachman fought vigorously against regulations he saw as hampering scientific inquiry.


National Science Foundation. “Misconduct in Science and Engineering: Final Rule.” 1991. Comment: Presumably will be replaced by mandated new regulations within the next year or so.


*Commission on Research Integrity. “Integrity and Misconduct in Research.” 1995. Submitted to: The Secretary of Health and Human Services, The House Committee on Commerce, and The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. Comment: Known as the Ryan Commission Report, this was a controversial proposal for re-working federal misconduct regulations. Strongly criticized in many quarters, aspects of this report were completely rejected (especially the abandonment of FFP
for MIM), but its recommendations nonetheless had significant influence on the revisions to the federal regulations proposed by the Office of Science and Technology Policy in December 2000.