Why case studies?

A core function of the UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) is to provide independent, expert, and confidential advice on the conduct of research, from promoting good practice to addressing allegations of misconduct. We have been doing this since 2006.

Each request for assistance received by UKRIO increases our body of knowledge. These 'lessons learned' not only inform our response to subsequent enquiries but also underpin our other activities, especially UKRIO's education and training work.

We have found that illustrative case studies are an excellent way to raise awareness of research integrity and research culture and to illustrate the complexities and 'grey areas' that can occur.

Case studies are not literal accounts of any enquiry to UKRIO. Instead, they are scenarios, based on real-life situations, which illustrate recurring or notable issues and problems that have been brought to our attention. While some case studies may mention a particular discipline or setting, they contain themes that are relevant across subjects.

Please note that this case study is fictitious. Any similarity to actual persons, organisations or events is coincidental.
Case study 3

You are the person in your university responsible for receiving allegations of research misconduct and any other concerns about research conducted under the auspices of the university.

Professor Z is an academic in the Philosophy department at your institution with a high media profile, including a regular podcast and occasional TV appearances, and who often writes articles for daily newspapers. She has just had a book published, which has appeal to the general public as well as academia.

A journalist has recently contacted your institution stating that large portions of Professor Z’s most recent article, which appeared online in a major national newspaper, were plagiarised substantially from several different sources. He has not yet publicised the matter beyond contacting your institution but there is no guarantee this will continue.

Professor Z has responded to your initial contact with her over the matter by partially refuting the allegation and has pointed out that the article was not research but journalism.

Please discuss and decide:

1. How do you respond to the journalist?
2. How do you take the matter forward?