

## 2014 (2012) Erasmusuniversiteit Rotterdam onzorgvuldigheid gegrond (vervolgonderzoek)

### 1. Onderwerp van de klacht

In December 2012 the Executive Board of ... decided formally to appoint a ... Follow-Up Investigation Committee. The Executive Board asked the Committee to investigate the scientific integrity of ... academic work and to further investigate those of ... papers which had not been withdrawn as a result of the findings of the initial investigation Committee.

### 2. Korte omschrijving van de feiten

Paper ...

There is strong evidence that some data values in Studies 1 and 3 have been changed manually. Study 2 also shows many problems in the construction of the scales. In addition, the ... method gives much stronger support for manipulation than independence of the respondents for two of the four variables. The Committee concludes that this paper contains violations of the Scientific Code (Criterion 7: committing imputable inaccuracies when undertaking research) of Conduct and holds .... The Committee recommends retraction of this paper.

Paper ...

The authors state that respondents were randomly assigned to the different experimental conditions. However, a test of independence of gender with the experimental conditions shows that this not the case ( $p < 0.001$ ). In a response, ... acknowledged this observation. The Committee considers this to be a major methodological mistake that can affect the interpretation of the paper referring to Criterion 7: committing imputable inaccuracies when undertaking research. As ... was in charge of data collection the Committee holds ... solely responsible. The Committee recommends retraction of this paper.

Paper ...

The Committee sees two major problems with this paper. The first is the omission of six participants from Study 1a without providing a justification in the paper. This omission violates Criterion 7: committing imputable inaccuracies when undertaking research. The second concerns the extreme sloppiness in data-handling in Study 3, again a violation of Criterion 7. ... was in charge of the data collection and data analyses, and the Committee holds him solely responsible for this violation of scientific integrity. The Committee advises this paper be retracted.

Paper ...

The Committee sees three main problems with this paper. First, the way the combined scores for ... were formed is problematic. Second, different measures for ... were used in the ANOVA (the combined scores) and the moderated mediation analysis of ... participants (scores of ...). Third, the way the ...measure was used in the analyses is inconsistent with the information provided in the paper. Because of the severe problems mentioned above, the

Committee has no confidence in the used measures of ... in Study 1. ... was in charge of data collection and data analyses, and the Committee holds ...solely responsible for this violation of scientific integrity (Criterion 7: committing imputable inaccuracies when undertaking research). The Committee therefore recommends retraction of this paper.

### **3. Advies van de commissie aan het college van bestuur**

The committee advises the retraction of four papers in which ... was the main author or one of the main authors (in addition to the three papers that the initial Committee advised to retract).

### **4. Oordeel van het college van bestuur over de gegrondheid van de klacht**

Het College van Bestuur heeft op 4 maart 2014 besloten de conclusies van de vervolgcommissie met betrekking tot de papers over te nemen.