The Seven SOURCE Scales of Organizational Climate

Institutional Resources for Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR)
The degree to which respondents think educational opportunities are effective for learning about responsible research practices in the organization; the accessibility of: research policies, procedures and research ethics experts for consultation; the commitment and effectiveness of institutional administrators in communicating about responsible research, and the respondents' degree of confidence in knowing where to turn for institutional resources on procedures for reporting misconduct. (6 university-level items: 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11). Questions:

How accessible are your university's policies/guidelines that relate to responsible research practices?

How effectively do the available educational opportunities at your university teach about responsible research practices (e.g., lectures, seminars, web-based courses)?

How accessible are individuals with appropriate expertise that you could ask for advice if you had a question about research ethics?

How confident are you that if you needed to report a case of suspected research misconduct, you would know where to turn to determine what procedures to follow?

How effectively do the senior administrators at your university (e.g., deans, chancellors, vice presidents) communicate high expectations for research/scholarly integrity?

How committed are the senior administrators at your university (e.g., deans, chancellors, vice presidents, etc.) to supporting responsible research/scholarship?

Institutional Regulatory Quality
The degree to which regulatory committees such as Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUCs) treat researchers fairly and with respect; and how well respondents think these committees understand the research they review. (3 university-level items: 3, 5, 10).

How respectful to researchers are the regulatory committees or boards that review the type of research/scholarship you do (e.g., IRB, IACUC)?

How well do the regulatory committees or boards that review your research/scholarship (e.g., IRB, IACUC) understand the kind of research you do?

How fair to researchers/scholars are the regulatory committees or boards that review the type of research you do (e.g., IRB, IACUC)?

Integrity Socialization
The degree to which organizational subunits are committed to the effective socialization of junior researchers including commitment by supervisors to talk with supervisees about key principles of research integrity; the consistency of unit administrators in communicating high expectations for research integrity and the consistency with which supervisors communicate with advisees regarding clear performance expectations related to intellectual credit. (4 subunit-level items: 8, 10, 11, 13).

How committed are advisors in your department/program to talking with advisees about key principles of research/scholarly integrity?

How consistently do advisors/supervisors communicate to their advisees/supervisees clear performance expectations related to intellectual credit?

How effectively are junior researchers socialized about responsible research practices?
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How consistently do administrators in your department/program (e.g., chairs, program heads) communicate high expectations for research/scholarly integrity?

Integrity Norms
The degree to which people in the organizational subunits value scholarly integrity including appropriate acknowledgement of the work of others; following institutional policies; valuing honesty in the conduct of research, and maintaining data integrity and data confidentiality. (4 subunit-level items: 7, 15, 16, 19).

- How consistently do people in your department/program obtain permission or give due credit when using another’s words or ideas?
- How consistently do research/scholarly practices in your department/program follow established institutional policies?
- How valued is honesty in proposing, performing, and reporting research/scholarship in your department/program?
- How committed are people in your department/program to maintaining data integrity and data confidentiality?

Advisor - Advisee Relations
The degree to which advisors in the unit treat advisees with fairness and respect, and the degree to which supervisors are available to advisees. (3 subunit-level items: 14, 17, 21).

- How fairly do advisors/supervisors treat advisees/supervisees?
- How respectfully do advisors/supervisors treat advisees/supervisees?
- How available are advisors/supervisors to their advisees/supervisees?

Absence of Integrity Inhibitors
The degree to which certain conditions produce negative effects in the organizational subunits, including difficulties in conducting responsible research due to a lack of adequate human or material resources; pressure to obtain funding, pressure to publish, lack of protected time for research and competition and suspicion among researchers. For this report we have reverse-coded this scale, so that, like the six other scales, a higher score indicates a more positive climate. (6 subunit-level items: 4, 6, 9, 12, 18, 20, [22]).

- How difficult is it to conduct research/scholarship in a responsible manner because of insufficient access to human resources such as statistical expertise, administrative or technical staff?
- How guarded are people in their communications with each other out of concern that someone else will “steal” their ideas?
- How difficult is it to conduct research/scholarship in a responsible manner because of insufficient access to material resources such as space, equipment, or technology?
- How true is it that pressure to publish has a negative effect on the integrity of research/scholarship in your department/program?
- How true is it that pressure to obtain external funding has a negative effect on the integrity of research/scholarship in your department/program?
- How true is it that people in your department/program are more competitive with one another than they are cooperative?
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Expectations

The degree to which subunit expectations to publish and obtain external funding are fair. (2 subunit-level items: 3, 5).

*How difficult is it to conduct research/scholarship in a responsible manner because of insufficient access to human resources such as statistical expertise, administrative or technical staff?*

*How guarded are people in their communications with each other out of concern that someone else will “steal” their ideas?*

For all scale scores, the “low,” “moderate,” and “high” percentage categories represent the proportion of individuals whose scale score was below 3.5 (low), 3.5 to less than 4.5 (moderate), and 4.5 and above (high).

For individual question items, the “low” category represents those who responded with a 1, 2, or 3, on the response scale (which ranged from 1-5), while the “moderate” category represents those who responded with a 4 on the response scale, and the “high” category represents those who responded with a 5.