

21-24 July 20109, Singapore
the 2 nd World Congress on Research Integrity

Researcher's integrity:
acquiring reactivity and
losing responsibility

Tohru Masui, Ph.D., Director
Department of Disease Bioresources Research
Office of Policy and Ethics Research,
National Institute of Biomedical Innovation, Japan

Research Integrity and culture

- Research Integrity
- International Recognition of Research Integrity
- Culture of Nation or/and Society
- **Culture of Research Community**
- Culture of an Institution
- Culture of Research Group
- Behavior of a Researcher

Japanese Research Ethics System

Biomedical research

Autonomy
Informed
consent

Research
ethics
committee

Privacy
protection

Research ethics guidelines

Inverse order of the regulatory frame

Guidelines on

Responsible Ministries

Genome research:
Mar 2001

MEXT

MHLW

METI

Epidemiological research:
Jun 2003

MEXT

MHLW

Clinical studies:
Jul 2003

MHLW

Effects of Ethical Guidelines on Biomedical Research

- They set the outside frame of the research
- Researchers have become passive to the research guidelines
- Researchers complain on guidelines

At the Establishment of Data Protection Act

- Late 1990 discussion had started in the government
- 2000-2002 Prototype Bill was presented and discussed
- That time, Academic Researchers discussed actively on the issues of Data Protection.
- They also appealed their opinion on the use of Data in academic research
- Late 2002 Bill **incorporated Exemption of academic use of Data.**
- After this, **Researchers Stop the discussion and appeal almost immediately.**

What did it mean?

- Researchers were **satisfied** by the exemption
- The exemption was incorporated, **since the act appreciated “freedom of expression”**.
- **Freedom should make academic researchers responsible**
- However, they did not discuss or establish their own self-regulatory code on the use of Data in academic research

What does “Exemption” mean?

- The Act appreciates the freedom of expression in Academic Research.
- Self-regulation of Academic researchers is essential in protection of Data.
- It was the responsibility of the researchers to **work on their self-regulation system.**
- It did not happen.
- They were satisfied by the incorporation of exemption.

Researchers became “Reactive”

- The guidelines said researchers should be obedient to them.
- In the course of establishing research ethics guidelines;
 - **Researchers : Obedient, Rigidity, and Reactive**
- Research integration requires
 - **Researchers: Freedom, Flexibility and Responsibility**
- Governmental guidelines incubated totally opposite culture of researchers

Why did it happen?

- “Ethics” is translated into a word “Rinri (倫理)”
- **Authoritative:**
 - some other person knows the right thing.
- At the discussion on the ethical guidelines:
 - Legal academics and scientists of high position led discussion and decision
 - **Lack of understanding on the nature of science**
 - **Formal discussion** made by high position scientists
- These situations made lay researchers reactive.

One Nature of Science

- 1) No one gets the final say.
- 2) No one has personal authority.

Jonathan Rauch

Think the opposite:

“It is true, because I said so.”

Helsinki Declaration 2008

30. . . . Negative and **inconclusive** as well as positive results should be published or otherwise made publicly available.
30. . . . 消極的結果および**結論に達しない結果**も積極的結果と同様に、公刊または他の方法で一般に公表されるべきである。刊行物の中には、資金源、組織との関わりおよび利益相反が明示される必要がある。