

- Which rules exist? What are the intentions of the rules?
- What are the problem areas already known? Why do they emerge?
- What does the own institution and scientific community expect?
- Which rights and obligations do students/researchers have?
- Which institutions offer help in cases of problems and violations of the rules
- Which are possible consequences of scientific misconduct?

Objectives:

- Knowing definitions of “good scientific practice” and “scientific misconduct”;
- Sensitiveness for rules of the own institution and the recommendations of the DFG;
- key measures to ensure gsp: communication/discussion/supervision; scholarly publishing (duty), principle of authorship and responsibility, peer reviewing and others;
- Knowing duties and responsibilities of profession as a scientist/scholar.

Methodological Competence:

- Structured planning, shaping and documenting of the own research process;
- Ability to recognise critical situations during courses/interaction with colleagues/the public
- Options of how to react and act in the event of problems or suspected misconduct.

Personal Competence/Reflection on personal situation:

- Reflection of values and norms within the context of science and scientific profession/scholarly research.
- Procedural knowledge: Understanding that addressing ambiguities at an early stage causes fewer problems than solving conflicts once they occur.

Categories for self-reflection (suggestion):

- Personal conduct – doing research and science: “practices”;
- Personal environment – research and science as a social process (key areas of potential conflicts/misconduct; thinking “large”!);
- Institutional environment – rules and regulations (for conduct, misconduct, help with problems)

European Code of Conduct for Integrity in Science and Research

Principles

- Honesty in communication; “trust”;
- Reliability in performing research;
- Objectivity;
- Impartiality and independence;

- Openness and accessibility;
- Duty of care;
- Fairness in providing references and giving credit;
- Responsibility for the scientists and researchers of the future.
- Defining “misconduct”: fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, un-ethical behaviour,
- Consequences of scientific misconduct

Bibliography

General Preparation:

Galtung, Johan (1981): Structure, culture, and intellectual style: An essay comparing saxonic, teutonic, gallic and nipponic approaches. In: Social Science Information, 20, 6 (1981), pp. 817-856.
 <<http://www.transcend.org/galtung/papers.php>> or
 <<http://ssi.sagepub.com/content/20/6/817.refs>>

Basics:

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Ed. 2013): Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice. Memorandum. Recommendations of the Commission on Professional Self Regulation in Science. Expanded Edition, Weinheim: Wiley-VCH.
 <http://www.dfg.de/download/pdf/dfg_im_profil/reden_stellungnahmen/download/empfehlung_wiss_praxis_1310.pdf>

European Science Foundation (2010): Fostering Research Integrity in Europe. A report by the ESF Member Organisation Forum on Research Integrity. Strasbourg: ESF.
 <http://www.esf.org/fileadmin/Public_documents/Publications/ResearchIntegrity_report.pdf>

European Science Foundation / All European Academies (2011): The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. Strasbourg: ESF.
 <http://www.esf.org/fileadmin/Public_documents/Publications/Code_Conduct_ResearchIntegrity.pdf>

Special (Issues, Questions, Problems):

Albert, Tim / Wager, Elizabeth (2003): How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers. In: The COPE Report 2003, COPE – Committee on Publication Ethics, pp. 32-34,
 <<http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/2003pdf12.pdf>>

Roig, Michael [2012]: Avoiding plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and other questionable writing practices: A guide to ethical writing. In: Enrio - European Network of Research Integrity Offices,
 <<http://www.enrio.eu/training-education-3>>