

Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scholarly Practice and Prevention of Scholarly Misconduct at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg

**Agreed upon by the IFSH Advisory Board and issued by the Managing Scientific
Director on 18 November 2004**

Preliminary Remarks

Following the recommendations of the German Research Society (DSG) the IFSH Advisory Board has issued “Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scholarly Practice and Prevention of Scholarly Misconduct at IFSH”. The impetus for these “guidelines” is to keep alive awareness of the basic rules of scientific practice and convey them to colleagues and to the up-and-coming new generation of scholars as well as the IFSH students as essential conditions for scientific work. These “guidelines” should make it clear that IFSH cannot accept scholarly misconduct because this would, among other things, undermine the public trust in science and in scientists.

§ 1

Good scholarly practice

- (1) Scholarly work rests on basic principles valid in all scientific disciplines. The first among these is honesty towards oneself and towards others. It is the basis for the rules of scholarly professionalism that vary from discipline to discipline.
- (2) The following may be considered to be examples of good scientific practice:
 - fundamental principles of scientific work, especially
 - *working *lege artis*,
 - *documenting results,

- * questioning one's own findings
- * maintaining strict honesty with respect to the contributions of partners, competitors and predecessors
- Cooperation and leadership responsibility in working groups
- Mentoring and promotion of young scholars
- Safeguarding and storing primary data
- Publication in scientific journals as a medium for scientists' accountability for their work
- Respect for the intellectual property of others
- Observing ethical standards in collecting data

(3) Good scientific practice can only be achieved through the collaboration of all colleagues as well as the young scholars at IFSH. Observing and transmitting the relevant rules is incumbent, first of all, on those currently in charge, in so far as they are acting as project leaders, working group leaders, mentors or immediate superiors. The scientific collaborators/colleagues at IFSH carry out those tasks delegated to them in educating and promoting young scholars and in organizing the research and scholarly work. The Director of the Institute is responsible for creating organizational and institutional conditions for ensuring good scientific practice.

§ 2

Unethical scholarly behaviour

- (1) Inappropriate scholarly behaviour occurs when ethical norms in the context of scientific data collection are violated consciously or in a seriously neglectful fashion, when false statements are made, the intellectual property rights of others are damaged or their research work is otherwise impeded. The circumstances of each individual case are the decisive factor.
- (2) In particular behaviour considered unethical for scholars would be:
 1. Misrepresentation by:
 - Fabrication of data,
 - Falsification of data or sources, as for instance by,
 - * Suppression of relevant sources, records or texts
 - * Manipulation of sources, accounts or pictures
 - * Undisclosed selective reporting and rejection of undesired results
 - False statements in a letter of application or in an application for support (including false statements about publications in which work is said to have appeared or to be in press)

- False statements about the scholarly accomplishments of applicants in the selection or evaluation committee.
2. Violation of intellectual property rights with respect to a copyrighted work or scientific knowledge, hypotheses, theories or research methods of others by:
 - Unauthorized use involving usurping authorship (plagiarism)
 - Misappropriation of research methods and ideas, particularly as an expert assessor (theft of ideas)
 - Usurping scientific authorship or co-authorship without a scientific contribution of one's own
 - Falsification of the contents
 - Unauthorized publication or making accessible to third parties work, findings, hypotheses, theory or research methods which have not yet been published
 - The assertion of (co-) authorship by other person without his or her consent
 3. Impairment of the research work of others including:
 - Sabotage of the research of others through
 - * Damaging, destroying or manipulating equipment, documents, hardware or software needed by another person to conduct his or her research
 - * Malicious obstruction or removal of books, archives, manuscripts or data
 - * Intentionally making scientifically relevant sources of information unusable
 - * Removal of primary data insofar as this would violate legal requirements or recognized bases of scientific work in this area
 - * Unauthorized destruction or unauthorized sharing of research material.
- (3) Joint accountability may come about, *inter alia*, from active participation in the misconduct of others; having knowledge of falsification committed by others; co-authorship of publications tainted by falsification; gross dereliction of supervisory duties.

§ 3

Preventing scholarly misconduct

To ensure good scholarly practice and prevent scientific misconduct in research, the following regulations are to be observed at IFSH:

- (1) The basic rules for scientific work and good scholarly practice will be conveyed to all newly hired scientific colleagues, young scholars and those who are studying at IFSH when they begin their work. The possibility of scholarly misconduct should be mentioned appropriately to sensitize new professional colleagues, students and young scholars to it.

(2) Whenever possible working groups should be formed for carrying out research as well as for preparation beforehand and discussion of results afterwards. Collaboration in such working groups should be so organized that the results of the specialized work sectors are shared with one another and examined in a critical discourse so they can be integrated into a joint presentation of the state of knowledge.

(3) Mentoring for young scholars must be guaranteed. In particular individual mentoring will be undertaken and contact persons for all issues of good scholarly practice identified.

(4) Quality and originality always have priority over quantity as a standard for achievement and criteria for evaluation in exams, awarding degrees, promotion, hiring, appointments and allotment of funding.

(5) Primary data used as a basis for publications within or outside of IFSH will be retained for ten years in a durable, secure manner.

(6) Strict honesty with respect to the contributions of partners, competitors and predecessors must be maintained. Only those who have contributed significantly to the research may be mentioned as co-authors.

§ 4

Ombudsperson

(1) The Director of IFSH, on the advice of the Advisory Board of the Institute, will name an appropriate member of the Institute, as a rule, one of the scientific staff, for a three year period as a confidential contact person (ombudsperson) for members of the Institute who have accusations or indications of unethical scholarly behavior to present. Reappointment of this person is possible. The name of the ombudsperson will be published in the staff list of the IFSH (Homepage)

The ombudsperson should have considerable experience in carrying out research projects and in training of young scholars and have, at his disposal, both national and international contacts. Every member of IFSH has the right to speak personally with the ombudsperson at short notice. The ombudsperson will summarily examine the accusations for truthfulness, meaning, and possible motives keeping the possibilities for clarification in mind

§ 5

Commission

- (1) When there are accusations of scholarly misconduct a commission, composed of three persons, may be established by the director to investigate and assess the accusations. The ombudsperson is an advisory member of the commission. An elected member of the works council has an advisory role in the discussions
- (2) The commission meets in private. Decisions are made by a simple majority vote. If there is a tie the vote of the chairman is decisive.
- (3) Bias on the part of the investigator may be asserted at any time by himself or by the one affected

§ 6

The Procedure in the case of scholarly misconduct

- (1) The ombudsperson or the commission has the right to collect the information and views needed to clarify the circumstances. In addition the commission has the right, in individual cases, to consult specialist assessors in the scholarly area involved as well as other experts. The commission will examine in an open assessment of the evidence whether scholarly misconduct has taken place.
- (2) The ombudsperson may present suspicious factors – on behalf of the informant as well – with revealing the identity of this person. The incriminating facts and, if applicable, proof are to be made known to the affected person promptly. Both he and the informant are to be given an appropriate opportunity to comment. If they wish, their oral comments should also be heard. Both the person affected and the informant may bring in a trusted person as support.
- (3) If the identity of the informant is not known to the person affected, it is to be disclosed if the person affected cannot otherwise defend himself appropriately, particularly because the credibility of the informant for the determination of professional misconduct is of considerable importance. If the situation and the evidence are already known, disclosing the identity of the informant may, in this case, be dispensed with.
- (4) The commission presents a final report of the findings of its investigation to the Director of the Institute along with a recommendation for further action. At the same time it informs the person accused and the informant about the significant findings of the investigation
- (5) Based on the final report and the recommendations of the commission, the Director decides whether the proceedings should be suspended (the case should be dropped) or whether scholarly misconduct has been proven sufficiently. In the latter case, the Director also decides what measures to take. If the suspicion of scholarly misconduct has been raised wrongfully, the Director will ensure that the reputation of the person accused is restored.

Further Information:

- Principles for ensuring good scientific practice“ (DFG) Recommendations I-VIII