### Introduction

Responsible conduct of research (RC) is ubiquitous and present in most areas of research. One area that has received little attention is Research Creation (RC) - an emergent field at the interface of academic research and creative activities — in Quebec, Canada. RC is defined as “research activities or approaches that foster the creation or interpretation/ performance of literary or artistic works of all types”.

Researchers-creators — who are at the same time researchers and practitioners, artists, musicians, or designers — may be faced with very different issues or challenges from colleagues in the rest of academia.

- How are RCR issues articulated in RC?
- How does the heterogeneous RC community respond to institutional policies or provincial/territorial RC guidelines?

This review aimed to identify and categorize RCR issues, and RC-specific factors.

### Methods

Scoping review of academic literature dealing with RCR in RC; n = 2,523 papers

- Analysis of titles and abstracts reduced sample to 181 papers, which were then read in detail and coded using QDA miner software.
- This literature review was the first step in a two-year project to build tools which will raise awareness and support RCR in RC.

Two research strategies on 10 databases from humanities (ex: Scopus) to biosciences (ex: EBSCO):

- R1 “CRE keywords” AND “RC keys words”
- R2 “RC” keywords only

### Literature review objectives

1. Map key challenges to determine scope and nature of RC-specific issues
2. Synthesize data
3. Identify specific determinants of RCR issues in RC

### General research objectives

1. Explore RCR challenges — common and distinct — that arise in RC
2. Document perceptions of researcher-creators about these issues and the application of RCR principles/frameworks
3. Identify needs and gaps in existing policies (institutional, national) and develop awareness and management tools for RC

### RESULTS

**Sample code by family (proportion of results)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts/Photography/Collage</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film/Cinema/Screenwriting</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Art Practice</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 77 secondary domains listed, the most represented were: 
- a/r/tography (4.6%),
- music therapy (4.6%),
- arts-based health research (3.3%),
- creative writing (2.3%),
- documentary (2.3%), and
- socially-engaged art (2.3%).

### Discussion and conclusion

More than just having the potential to deal with sensitive subjects, creation is a flexible, subjective and even “narrative” approaches capable of generating a high degree of emotional involvement. And this raises important RCR issues:

1. Participatory nature means power relations, so risks regarding recognition, interpretation and use of contributions;
2. Reflection on anonymity, authorization (participant and audience), dissemination, and secondary use of artistic productions (which risk “romanticizing” data or academic productions (which risk “psychologizing” data);
3. Tension between need to ensure free and informed consent and iterativity and inductive nature (or even unpredictability) of creative approach makes it difficult to use conventional approaches and traditional RCR tools (eg, consent forms).

Very few articles dealt directly with RCR in RC.

- Possibility widespread use of non-RCR language to describe similar (but also different) issues.
- Definition and quality were the most commonly reported issues in RC, while traditional RCR challenges (related to KT and authorship, funding and conflicts of interests and commitment) were less discussed.

Differences of language used in RC to talk about RCR may limit our research results (as we used RCR keywords for R1), also, the issues reported only come from academic publications (in/about RC) which could limit the results. These findings highlight the need to develop RCR guidance that is pertinent and adapted to the realities of the RC community, and confirm the need for adapted and relevant RCR training tools.
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**Sample representation by region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>