

NOTE #3

An analysis of gender equity in scientific authorships: a case study of the National Institute for Health Research Oxford Biomedical Research Centre

By Rinita Dam, Syed Ghulam Sarwar Shah, Pavel Ovseiko, Lorna Henderson, Vasiliki Kiparoglou and Alastair Buchan



RRI IMPLEMENTATION IN BIOSCIENCE ORGANISATIONS

GUIDELINES FROM THE  STARBIOS2 PROJECT



Andrea Declich with the STARBIOS2 partners



STARBIOS2 project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 709517.

NOTE #3

An analysis of gender equity in scientific authorships: a case study of the National Institute for Health Research Oxford Biomedical Research Centre

By Rinita Dam, Syed Ghulam Sarwar Shah, Pavel Ovseiko, Lorna Henderson, Vasiliki Kiparoglou and Alastair Buchan

Women are under-represented in academic medicine [1-2] including the authorship of scientific publications [3-5]. Funding requirements for the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centres (BRCs) have resulted in many improvements for women via the Athena SWAN Charter on gender equality [6]. However, there are still areas which need addressing. The number of women and their achievements are not tracked routinely by the NIHR BRCs and little is known about how much women contribute to research and innovation in the BRCs. It is therefore imperative to inform the acceleration of women's advancement and leadership in translational research not only in line with the stated objectives of the NIHR within the UK but also from the Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) perspective within the wider European Research Area through the collection of gender-disaggregated bibliometric data and gender analysis of scientific authorships.

Aim: To undertake retrospective bibliometric analyses of authorship by gender using the NIHR Oxford BRC publications for the period from April 2012 to March 2017.

Methods: The authorship of NIHR Oxford BRC's research publications (n=2409) was analysed for gender of the first author, joint first authors, first corresponding author, joint corresponding authors, the last author and joint last authors. The gender of author(s) was used as a binomial variable: male and female. The gender of the authors was identified from the names of authors through a rigorous methodology. When the authors' names were difficult to associate

with the appropriate gender, further information was sought, such as their institutional affiliations, or social networks e.g. LinkedIn and ResearchGate. Gender API (gender-api.com) was also used when it was not possible to ascertain the gender of the authors via their institutional affiliations or via the social networks. In addition, some authors were contacted directly to ascertain their gender.

Data analysis: Data were analysed using frequencies and descriptive statistics in the SPSS (version 25 for windows). Publications with 'missing data', 'unable to determine gender of authors' and authors reported as 'trial groups' were not included in the analysis. In terms of calculating the proportion of female and male authorships, only authors with defined gender were included in the analysis. Chi-Square tests and *p* value less than 0.05 were used for identifying statistically significant differences in various types of authorship between male and female authors.

Results: The gender of the first author was mostly male (59%, *n*=1430) compared to female (41%, *n*= 994). 458 publications included joint first authors (authors that were named as equal contributors in publications), which included both male and female (57%, *n*=262), male (28%, *n*=127) and female (15%, *n*=69). The first corresponding authors were mostly male (65%; *n*=1565) compared to female (33.5%, *n*=806). 169 publications reported joint corresponding authorship which involved mostly male (63%, *n*=107) than female (29%, *n*=49) and both male and female (8%, *n*=13). Senior authors were mostly male (77%, *n*=1853) compared to female (23%, *n*=553). Joint senior authors reported in 229 publications were mostly male (47%, *n*=108) followed by both male and female (43%, *n*=98) and only 10% were female (*n*=23). Chi-square goodness-of-fit tests showed that the proportion of female authors was statistically significantly lower than the proportion of male authors in all categories of authorships in our sample.

Impact: STARBIOS2 has acted as a catalyst of structural change as these findings prompted the NIHR Oxford BRC to routinely record gender in scientific authorships and measure gender equity in research reporting.

REFERENCES

- Ahuja, S.K., Aiuti, F., Berkhout, B., Biberfeld, P., Burton, D.R., Colizzi, V., Deeks, S.G., Desrosiers, R.C., Dierich, M.P., Doms, R.W., Emerman, M., Gallo, R.C., Girard, M., Greene, W.C., Hoxie, J.A., Hunter, E., Klein, G., Korber, B., Kuritzkes, D.R., Lederman, M.M., Malim, M.H., Marx, P.A., McCune, J.M., McMichael, A., Miller, C., Miller, V., Montagnier, L., Montefiori, D.C., Moore, J.P., Nixon, D.F., Overbaugh, J., Pauza, C.D., Richman, D.D., Saag, M.S., Sattentau, Q., Schooley, R.T., Shattock, R., Shaw, G.M., Stevenson, M., Trkola, A., Wainberg, M.A., Weiss, R.A., Wolinsky, S., Zack, J.A. (2006). A plea for justice for jailed medical workers. *Science*, 314(5801).
- Alberts, B., Kirschner, M.W., Tilghman, S., & Varmus, H. (2014). Rescuing US biomedical research from its system flaws. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(16).
- Alsop, R., Bertelsen, M., Holland, J. (2006). Empowerment in practice: from analysis to implementation, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.
- Ambrosio, A.M., Mariani, M.A., Maiza, A.S., Gamboa, G.S., Fossa, S.E., Bottale, A.J. (2018). Protocol for the production of a vaccine against Argentine Hemorrhagic Fever in Maria S. Salvato (ed.) Hemorrhagic Fever Viruses: Methods and Protocols. *Methods in Molecular Biology*, vol. 1604. Springer. Doi 10.1007/978-1-4939-6981-4_24.
- Andoh, C.T. (2011). Bioethics and the challenges to its growth in Africa. *Open journal of philosophy*. 1(02), 67-75. 10.4236/ojpp.2011.12012.
- Bamgbose, A. (2011). African languages today: The challenge of and prospects for empowerment under globalization. *In Selected proceedings of the 40th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. ed. Eyamba G. Bokamba, et al., 1-14. Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville. www.lingref.com, document #2561.
- Barugahare, J. (2018). African bioethics: methodological doubts and insights. *BMC medical ethics*. 19(1), 98. 10.1186/s12910-018-0338-6.
- Battilana, J., Leca B., and Boxenbaum E. (2009). "How actors change institutions: towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship." *Academy of Management annals* 3.1 (2009).
- BBSRC Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (2018). "Forward look for UK Bioscience" released on 29 September 2018. <https://bbsrc.ukri.org/documents/forward-look-for-uk-bioscience-pdf/> (accessed on: 05/09/2019).
- Beckert, J. (1999). Agency, entrepreneurs, and institutional change. The role of strategic choice and institutionalized practices in organisations. *Organisation studies*, 20(5).
- Bendels, M.H., Dietz, M.C., Brüggmann, D., Oremek, G.M., Schöffel, N., Groneberg, D.A. (2018). Gender disparities in high-quality dermatology research: a descriptive bibliometric study on scientific authorships. *BMJ Open* 2018;8:1-11. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020089

- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1969). *La costruzione sociale della realtà*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Besley, J.C., & Nisbet, M.C. (2013). How scientists view the public, the media and the political process. *Public Understanding of Science*, 22(6), 644–659. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662511418743>
- Bijker, W.E. & d'Andrea, L. (eds.) (2009). *Handbook on the Socialisation of Scientific and Technological Research, Social Sciences and European Research Capacities*, Rome: River Press Group.
- Boylan, J., Dacre, J., Gordon, H. (2019). Addressing women's under-representation in medical leadership. *The Lancet*. 2019; 393(10171): e14.
- Bromme, R. (2000). Beyond one's own perspective. The psychology of cognitive interdisciplinarity. In P. Weingart & N. Stehr (Eds.), *Practising interdisciplinarity* (pp. 115-133). Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Bubela, T. (2006). Science communication in transition: Genomics hype, public engagement, education and commercialization pressures. *Clinical Genetics*, 70(5), 445–450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-0004.2006.00693.x>
- Bubela, T., Hagen, G., & Einsiedel, E. (2012). Synthetic biology confronts publics and policy makers: Challenges for communication, regulation and commercialization. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 30(3), 132–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2011.10.003>
- Burchell, K. (2015). *Factors affecting public engagement by researchers: literature review*, Policy Studies Institute, London, <https://wellcome.ac.uk/sites/default/files/wtp060036.pdf> (accessed on: 24/07/2019).
- Burns, D., Squires, H., (2011). *Embedding public engagement in higher education: Final report of the national action research programme*, NCCPE. https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/action_research_report_0.pdf (accessed on: 26/07/2019)
- Burns, T.W., O'Connor, D.J., & Stockmayer, S.M. (2003). Science communication: A contemporary definition. *Public Understanding of Science*, 12(2), 183–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09636625030122004>
- Capps, D.K., & Crawford, B.A. (2013). Inquiry-Based Instruction and Teaching About Nature of Science: Are They Happening? *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 24.
- Cartwright, N., & Hardie, J. (2012). *Evidence-based policy: A practical guide to doing it better*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caulfield, T. (2005). Popular Media, Biotechnology, and the “Cycle of Hype”. *Houston Journal of Health Law & Policy*, 337(2004).
- Chen, H.T. (2012). Evaluation von Programmen und Projekten für eine demokratische Kultur. In R. Strobl, O. Lobermeier, W. Heitmeyer (eds.). *Evaluation von Programmen und Projekten für eine demokratische Kultur*. Fachmedien Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organisational Pathways of Transformation*. Pergamon, http://blog.ub.ac.id/yogidwiatmoko/files/2012/12/gibb_hannon.pdf (accessed on: 17/09/2019).

- Clark, H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, L.J., & Kitney, R.I. (2016). Syntheticbiology in the UK—an outline of plans and progress. *Synthetic and systems biotechnology*, *1*(4), (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5625736/> (accessed on: 18/07/2019).
- Colizzi V., de Oliveira T., Roberts R.J. (2007). Libya should stop denying scientific evidence on HIV. *Nature*; 448 (7157):992.
- Colizzi V., et al. (2019). Structural Transformation to Attain Responsible BIOSciences (STARBIOS2): Protocol for a Horizon 2020 Funded European Multicenter Project to Promote Responsible Research and Innovation. *JMIR Res Protocl* 8(3):e11745, <https://www.researchprotocols.org/2019/3/e11745/> (accessed on: 30/09/2019).
- Condit, C. (2001). What is “public opinion” about genetics? *Nature*, 2(10). <https://doi.org/10.1038/35093580>
- d’Andrea, L., Marta, F.L., Kahma, N. and Vase, S., (2017). FIT4RRI, Project Report on the Literature Review, Deliverable 1.1 (public), December 31st, 2017, <https://zenodo.org/record/1434349#.W8iFg3szbcs> (accessed on: 30/09/2019).
- d’Andrea, L., & Declich, A. (2005). The sociological nature of science communication. *JCOM*, *4*(2).
- d’Andrea, L., Quaranta, G., & Quinti, G. (2005). *Manuale sui processi di socializzazione della ricerca scientifica e tecnologica*. CERFE, Rome.
- Dahler-Larsen, P. (2006). Evaluation after Disenchantment? Five Issues Shaping the Role of Evaluation in Society. In Shaw, I.F., Greene, J.C., Mark, M.M. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Evaluation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Dahler-Larsen, P. (2012). *The evaluation society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- D’Armiento, J., Witte, S.S., Dutt, K. Wall, M., McAllister, G. (2019). Achieving women’s equity in academic medicine: challenging the standards. *The Lancet*. 2019; 393(10171).
- Declich G., d’Andrea, L. (2018), “Triggering Institutional Change Towards Gender Equality In Science. Final Guidelines of the TRIGGER Project”, project funded by the European Commission under the FP7 for Research.
- de Oliveira, T., Pybus, O.G., Rambaut, A., Salemi, M., Cassol, S., Ciccozzi, M., Rezza, G., Gattinara, G.C., D’Arrigo, R., Amicosante, M., Perrin, L., Colizzi, V., Perno, C.F. (2006). Benghazi Study Group. Molecular epidemiology: HIV-1 and HCV sequences from Libyan outbreak. *Nature*. 2006; 444.
- Döring, N., & Bortz, J. (2016). *Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation in den Sozial- und Humanwissenschaften*. Berlin: Springer.
- Eden, G., Jirotko, M., & Stahl, B. (2013). Responsible research and innovation: Critical reflection into the potential social consequences of ICT. In *Research Challenges in Information Science (RCIS), 2013 IEEE Seventh International Conference on*. IEEE.
- Elster, D. (2016). Deliverable 5.1 First Interim Report, University of Bremen, Bremen.
- Elster, D., Barendziak, T., Birkholz, J. (2016). Science Education as a Trigger to Attain Responsible Research and Innovation. In *Pixel: New Perspectives in*

Science Education, Conference Proceedings 2017, Florence/LibreriaUniversitariaEdizioni.

- Elster, D., Barendziak, T., Birkholz, J. (2019). Towards a sustainable and open science. Enhancing responsible research and innovation in the biosciences at the University of Bremen. Bremen: University of Bremen.
- Equality Challenge Unit (2005). Athena SWAN Charter. 7th Floor, Queen's House, 55/56 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, WC2A 3LJ <https://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/>
- ERA CoBioTech (2018). Strategic Agenda – a vision for biotechnology in Europe, November 2018, https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/7D5DE99D41EC4DCCE0539A695E869159/current/document/114492_ERA_CoBio_agenda_final_high-res.pdf (accessed on 18/07/19)
- ERA CoBioTech (2018). Strategic Agenda – a vision for biotechnology in Europe, https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/7D5DE99D41EC4DCCE0539A695E869159/current/document/114492_ERA_CoBio_agenda_final_high-res.pdf (accessed on: 18/07/19)
- ESFRI European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures (2006), Roadmap for European Research Infrastructure. Report of the Biology and Medical Science. Roadmap Working Group, October 2006, https://ec.europa.eu/research/infrastructures/pdf/esfri/esfri_roadmap/roadmap_2006/bms-report-roadmap-wg-2006_en.pdf (accessed on: 05/09/2019).
- European Commission (2016). SheFigures 2015, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, Brussels.
- Eze, M.O. (2008). What is African communitarianism? Against consensus as a regulative ideal. *South African Journal of Philosophy*. 27(4). 10.4314/sajpem.v27i4.31526
- Faria, N.R, Quick, J, Claro I.M, Theze, J, de Jesus, J.G, Giovanetti, M. et al. (2017). Establishment and cryptic transmission of Zika virus in Brazil and the Americas. *Nature* 546.
- Faria, N.R. et al. (2016). Mobile real-time surveillance of Zika virus in Brazil. *Genome Medicine*, 96.
- Felt, U., Fochler, M., & Sigl, L. (2017). IMAGINE RRI: A Card-based Method for Reflecting Responsibility in Life Science Re-search
- Filardo G, da Graca B, Sass DM, Pollock BD, Smith EB, Martinez MA. Trends and comparison of female first authorship in high impact medical journals: observational study (1994-2014). *BMJ* 2016;352:1-8. doi:10.1136/bmj.i847
- Flipse, S.M., Van der Sanden, M.C., & Osseweijer, P. (2014). Setting up spaces for collaboration in industry between researchers from the natural and social sciences. *Science and engineering ethics*, 20(1).
- France, B., Gilbert, J.K. (2006). A model of communication about biotechnology. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers in cooperation with The New Zealand Biotechnology Learning Hub.
- Gade, C.B. (2012). What is ubuntu? Different interpretations among South Africans of African descent. *South African Journal of Philosophy*. 31(3). 10.1080/02580136.2012.10751789

- Gardy, J.L., and Loman N.J. (2018). Towards a genomics-informed, real-time, global pathogen surveillance system. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 19(1).
- Gerber, A. (2018). RRI: How to 'mainstream' the 'upstream' engagement. *Journal of Science Communication*, 17(3), C06, https://jcom.sissa.it/sites/default/files/documents/JCOM_1703_2018_C06.pdf (accessed on: 21/07/2019)
- Gibb, A. and Hannon, P. (2006). "Towards the entrepreneurial University?, in *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, v. 4, http://blog.ub.ac.id/yogidwiatmoko/files/2012/12/gibb_hannon.pdf (accessed on: 30/10/2018)
- Gittelman, M., (2016). The revolution re-visited: Clinical and genetics research paradigms and the productivity paradox in drug discovery. *Res. Policy*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.01.007>
- GREAT (2013). *Annual report on the main trends of SiS, in particular the trends related to RRI*, http://www.great-project.eu/deliverables_files/deliverables05.
- Griffiths, R. (2004). Knowledge production and the research- teaching nexus: The case of the built environment disciplines. *Studies in Higher Education* 29, no. 6.
- Healey, M. (2005). Linking research and teaching: Exploring disciplinary spaces and the role of inquiry- based learning. In *Reshaping the University: New Relationships Between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*, edited by R. Barnett. Maiden head, UK: McGraw- Hill/Open University Press.
- Herschberg, C., Benschop, Y., & van denBrink, M. (2018). Precarious postdocs: A comparative study on recruitment and selection of early-career researchers. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 34(4).
- Herzog, C. (2016). Successful comeback of the single-dose live oral cholera vaccine CVD 103-HgR. *Travel medicine and infectious disease*, 14(4). doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2016.07.003.
- Hill, S.C. et al. (2019). Emergence of the Zika virus Asian lineage in Angola. *bioRxiv* 520437; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/520437>.
- Jagsi, R., Guancial, E., Worobey, C., Henault, L., Chang, Y., Starr, R., Tarbell, N., Hylek, E. (2006). The 'Gender Gap' in Authorship of Academic Medical Literature – A 35-Year Perspective. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355.
- Jenkins, A. (2004). *A Guide to the Research Evidence on Teaching- Research Relations*. York, UK: The Higher Education Academy. Available online: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/id383_guide_to_research_evidence_on_teaching_research_relations.pdf (accessed on: 20/06/2019).
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E., Ovseik, P.V., Henderson, L.R., & Kiparoglou, V. (2019). Understanding the Athena SWAN award scheme for gender equality as a complex social intervention in a complex system: analysis of Silver award Action Plans in a comparative European perspective. *bioRxiv*. doi:10.1101/555482.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. & Cacace, M. (2017). Addressing gender inequality in science: the multifaceted challenge of assessing impact. *Research Evaluation*, vol. 26, no 2.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. & Cacace, M. (2018). Setting up a Dynamic Framework to Activate Gender Equality Structural Transformation in Research Organisations. *Science and Public Policy*, vol. 59.

- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. (2009). Evaluation, in Bijker W. E. & d'Andrea (eds.), *Handbook on the Socialisation of Scientific and Technological Research, Social Sciences and European Research Capacities*, pp. 169-189, Rome: River Press Group.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. (2016). Development of monitoring and assessment tools of structural transformation actions to attain responsible biosciences. STARBIOS2 report.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E.K., & Cacace, M. (2018). Setting up a Dynamic Framework to Activate Gender Equality Structural Transformation in Research Organisations. *Science and Public Policy*.
- Kuhlmann, S., Lindner, R., & Randles, S. (2016). Conclusion: making responsibility an institutionalised ambition. In *Navigating Towards Shared Responsibility in Research and Innovation: Approach, Process and Results of the Res-AGoR A Project* (pp. 161-166). Fraunhofer ISI.
- Kwiek, M. (2015). "Academic Entrepreneurialism and the Changing Governance in Universities. Evidence from Empirical Studies", in Reihlen, W.M., Frost, J., Hattke, F. (eds.) *Multi-level Governance of Universities: The Role of Strategies, Structures, and Controls*
- Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). Institutional work: Refocusing institutional studies of organisation. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1).
- Lederman, N. G., Antink, A., & Bartos, S. (2014). Nature of science, scientific inquiry, and socio-scientific issues arising from genetics: A pathway to developing a scientifically literate citizenry. *Science & Education*, 23(2).
- Lindlof, T.R. (1995). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. London: Sage.
- Lutz, D.W. (2009). African Ubuntu Philosophy and Global Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 84(3), 313-328. 10.1007/s10551-009-0204-z
- Mann, A., & Di Prete, T.A., (2013). Trends in gender segregation in the choice of science and engineering majors. *Social science research*, 42(6), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24090849> (accessed on: 26/07/2019)
- March, J.G., Gherardi, S., & Cimmino, S. (1993). *Decisioni e organizzazioni*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Mezzana, D. (2018). Some Societal Factors Impacting on the Potentialities of Electronic Evidence, in M.A. Biasiotti et al. (eds.), *Handling and Exchanging Electronic Evidence Across Europe, Law, Governance and Technology Series 39*, Springer, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74872-6_14.
- Mezzana, D. (ed.) (2011), *Technological responsibility. Guidelines for a shared governance of the processes of socialisation of scientific research and innovation, within an interconnected world*, Roma, CNR: www.scienzecittadinanza.org/public/SetDevGuidelines.pdf (accessed on: 08/11/2018)
- Msoroka, M.S. & Amundsen, D. (2018). One size fits not quite all: Universal research ethics with diversity. *Research Ethics*. 14(3), 1-17. 10.1177/1747016117739939.
- Musselin, C. (2007). *The Transformation of Academic Work: Facts and Analysis*. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE. 4.07. *Center for studies in higher education*;

- Naveca, F.G. et al. (2019). Genomic, epidemiological and digital surveillance of Chikungunya virus in the Brazilian Amazon. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, 13, 3-0007065.
- Nowotny, H. (2007). Knowledge Production and its Constraints: epistemic and societal considerations, paper presented at the Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon, 2007, http://helga-nowotny.eu/downloads/helga_nowotny_b58.pdf (accessed on: 18/07/2019)
- Nowotny, H., Scott, P., Gibbons, M., & Scott, P.B. (2001). *Re-thinking science: Knowledge and the public in an age of uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Owen, R., Forsberg, E-M., Shelley-Egan, C. (2019). RRI-Practice Policy Recommendations and Roadmaps, RRI-Practice project report. Deliverable 16.2, <https://www.rri-practice.eu/knowledge-repository/recommendations/> (accessed on: 21/07/2019)
- Pan-African Bioethics Initiative (PABIN), (2003). PABIN Third Conference: **Good Health Research Practices in Africa**. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Pawson, R. & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage.
- Pierini, M. (2008). Le prix de la liberté: Libye, les coulisses d'une négociation, Actes Sud.
- Pinheiro, R., & Stensaker, B. (2014). Designing the entrepreneurial university: The interpretation of a global idea. *Public Organisation Review*, 14(4).
- Quaranta, G. (1985). L'era dello sviluppo, Franco Angeli, Milano.
- Quick, J., et al. (2017) Multiplex PCR method for MinION and Illumina sequencing of Zika and other virus genomes directly from clinical samples. *Nat Protoc*, 2017. 12(6).
- Reale, E., Nedeva, M., Thomas, D., & Primeri, E. (2014). Evaluation through impact: A different viewpoint. *Fteval Journal*, 39.
- Reydon, T.A., Kampourakis, K., & Patrinos, G.P. (2012). Genetics, genomics and society: the responsibilities of scientists for science communication and education. *Personalized Medicine*, 9(6). <https://doi.org/10.2217/pme.12.69>
- Rog, D.J. (2012). When background becomes foreground: Toward Context-Sensitive Evaluation Practice. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 135.
- Rome Declaration on Responsible Research and Innovation in Europe https://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/rome_declaration_RRI_final_21_November.pdf (accessed on: 26/07/2019)
- Royal Society (2006). *Survey of factors affecting science communication by scientists and engineers*, the Royal Society, https://royalsociety.org/~media/Royal_Society_Content/policy/publications/2006/1111111395.pdf (accessed on: 24/07/2019).
- Ruggiu, D. (2015). Anchoring European governance: Two versions of responsible research and innovation and EU fundamental rights as 'Normative anchor points'. *NanoEthics*, 9(3).
- Sadler, T.D. (2011). Socio-scientific issues in the classroom. Heidelberg, Springer.
- Sambala, E.Z., Cooper, S. and Manderson, L. (2019). Ubuntu as a Framework for Ethical Decision Making in Africa: Responding to Epidemics. *Ethics & Behavior*. 10.1080/10508422.2019.1583565
- Shendure, J., Ji, H., (2008). Next-generation DNA sequencing. In *Nature Biotechnology*, 26.

- Smith, R.D.J., Scott, D., Kamwendo, Z.T., Calvert, J. (2019). An Agenda for Responsible Research and Innovation in ERA CoBioTech. Swindon, UK: Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council and ERA CoFund on Biotechnology
- https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/85886BE9C7161C71E0539A695E865A64/live/document/ERA_CoBioTech_RRI_Framework.pdf (accessed on: 18/07/19)
- Spruit, S.L., Hoople, G.D., & Rolfe, D.A. (2016). Just a cog in the machine? The individual responsibility of researchers in nanotechnology is a duty to collectivize. *Science and engineering ethics*, 22(3).
- Stephan, P. (2013). How to exploit postdocs. *BioScience*, 63(4).
- Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42(9).
- Sutcliffe, H. (2011). A report on Responsible Research and Innovation for the European Commission. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/rri-report-hilary-sutcliffe_en.pdf (accessed on: 30/9/2019).
- Temoshok, L.R., & Wald, R.L. (2008). Integrating multidimensional HIV prevention programs into healthcare settings. *Psychosomatic medicine*, 70(5). doi: 10.1097/PSY.0b013e31817739b4.
- Thézé, J. et al. (2018). Genomic Epidemiology Reconstructs the Introduction and Spread of Zika Virus in Central America and Mexico. *Cell Host Microbe*. 23.
- Van Belle, S.B., Marchal, B., Dubourg D. and Kegels, G. (2010). How to develop a theory-driven evaluation design? Lessons learned from an adolescent sexual and reproductive health programme in West Africa. *BMC Public Health*, 10, 741.
- Van Schomberg, V. & van Schomberg, R. (2013). A Vision of Responsible Research and Innovation. In Owen, R., Heintz, M. & Bessant J. (Eds.), *Responsible Innovation* (pp. 51-74). London: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Von Schomberg, R. (2019). Why Responsible Innovation. In *The International Handbook on Responsible Innovation. A Global Resource*. Von Schomberg, R. and Hankins, J. (Eds.). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. Forthcoming.
- Watermeyer, R. (2015). Lost in the 'third space': the impact of public engagement in higher education on academic identity, research practice and career progression. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 5:3, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/21568235.2015.1044546> (accessed on: 24/07/2019).

ABOUT THE STARBIOS2 GUIDELINES

This guideline aims to help readers formalize and trigger structural change aimed at introducing appropriate RRI-related practices to their own organisations. This is not a series of prescriptions, but an itinerary of reflection and self-interpretation addressed to different actors within the biosciences. To support this itinerary of reflection and self-interpretation, the document provides...

- a description of a general RRI Model for research organisations within the biosciences, that is a set of ideas, premises and “principles of action” that define the practice of RRI in bioscience research organisations,
- some practical guidance for designing interventions to promote RRI in research organisations in the Biosciences, putting into practice the RRI Model,
- a set of useful practices in implementing the structural change process,
- and information on particular STARBIOS2 cases and experiences, as well as materials, tools and sources, are also provided in the Appendix and in the Annex.



LSC Laboratory of
Citizenship
Sciences

Universität Bremen



ABI

UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET



AARHUS UNIVERSITET

Ministero di Sanità
Fondazione Osservatorio Crea
Fondazione Osservatorio



UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
of MARYLAND

