

Örebro University
School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences
PhD-course Research ethics and good research practice, 5 credits, Fall 2022
Course responsible: Rolf Lidskog, rolf.lidskog@oru.se

Study guide for PhD-course Research ethics and good research practice, 5 credits

Information about the course

The course will be given in English. The written examination assignment can be written in English or Swedish.

The number of participants is maximized to 15 participants.

The course includes in total four sessions and one examination seminar, which all are mandatory.

To facilitate learning, it is strongly recommended to prepare for each session in accordance with the instructions of this study guide.

Lecturer

Rolf Lidskog, professor of sociology (session 1, session 4 and examination)

Ann Quennerstedt, professor in education (session 2)

Jonas Persson, professor in psychology (session 3)

Session 1 Wednesday 7 September, 13.15-16, P236

Introduction: research, ethics and research ethics (Rolf Lidskog)

Content

- What is science?
- What is ethics?
- What is research ethics?
- How to appropriate and institutionalize research ethics?

Literature

Berggren C. & Karabag, S.F. 2019. Scientific misconduct at an elite medical institute: The role of competing institutional logics and fragmented control. *Research Policy* 48 (2): 428-443.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.03.020>

CODEx-regler och riktlinjer för forskning <https://codex.uu.se/>

CODEx rules and guidelines for research <https://codex.uu.se/?languageId=1>

Horbach, S.P.J.M. & Halffman, W. 2017. Promoting virtue or punishing fraud: Mapping contrasts in the language of 'scientific integrity'. *Science and Engineering Ethics* 23: 1461-1485.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-016-9858-y>

ICSU 2014. *Freedom, Responsibility and Universality of Science* (26 p.)

National Academy of Sciences (2009) *On being a scientist: A guide to responsible conduct in research*. National Academies Press (82 p.).
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK214568/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK214568.pdf

Resnik, D. B. (2015). Institutional Conflicts of Interest in Academic Research. *Science and Engineering Ethics* (9 p.) <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s11948-015-9702-9.pdf>

Swedish Research Council (2017) *Good Research Practice* Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet (86 p.)
<https://www.vr.se/english/analysis/reports/our-reports/2017-08-31-good-research-practice.html>

Session 2 Wednesday 14 September 8.15-12, P236

Ethical considerations in research involving humans (Ann Quennerstedt)

Content

- Respectful research
- Informed consent
- Confidentiality

Literature

Harcourt, Deborah and Quennerstedt, Ann (2014) Ethical Guardrails When Children Participate in Research: Risk and Practice in Sweden and Australia. *Sage Open*, July 2014: 1-8.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014543782>

Pring, Richard (2001). The Virtues and Vices of an Educational Researcher. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 35(3), 407-421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.00235>, <https://web-a-ebscohost-com.db.ub.oru.se/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=4ed00a6d-6d78-4ee4-b796-23fd1a245adf%40sessionmgr4006>

Swedish Research Council (2017) *Good Research Practice* Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet
<https://www.vr.se/english/analysis/reports/our-reports/2017-08-31-good-research-practice.html>

World Medicine Association 2013. *Declaration of Helsinki – Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects*. <https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/>

Session 3 Wednesday 21 September, 13.15-16, P276

Ethical vetting (Jonas Persson)

Content

- Why is there a need for ethical review of research?
- How is it organized?
- Rationale for ethical evaluation and approval

Litterature

CODEX-regler och riktlinjer för forskning <https://codex.uu.se/>

CODEX rules and guidelines for research <https://codex.uu.se/?languageld=1>

Etikprövningsnämnden: www.epn.se

EPN. *Etikprovningens historia*. <https://etikprovning.se/etikprovningens-historia/>

SFS 2003:460 *Lag om etikprovning av forskning som avser människor*.

https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/lag-2003460-om-etikprovning-av-forskning-som_sfs-2003-460

Swedish Research Council (2017) *Good Research Practice* Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

<https://www.vr.se/english/analysis/reports/our-reports/2017-08-31-good-research-practice.html>

Session 4 Thursday 29 September 13.15-16, F105

Ethical problems in research practice (Rolf Lidskog)

Content

- Deviation from good research practice: Ethical misconduct, ethically questionable conduct and ethical unawareness
- Fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, self-plagiarism
- Ethics in scientific publication: when to publish, what to publish, where to publish, who to publish (co-authorship)
- The ethics of whistle-blowing

Literature

Albert, T. and Wager, E. 2003. How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers. The Cope Report 2003. <http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/2003pdf12.pdf>

Biomedcentral. 2016. How to deal with text recycling.

http://publicationethics.org/files/BioMed%20Central_text_recycling_editorial_guidelines.pdf

CODEX-regler och riktlinjer för forskning <https://codex.uu.se/>

COPE (2017) *Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers* <https://publicationethics.org/node/19886>

Forskarens etik, <https://codex.uu.se/forskarens-etik/>

Hansson, S. O. (2017). Editorial: Who should be author? *Theoria*, 83(2), 99–102.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/theo.12116>

Helgesson, G & Eriksson, S. 2015. Plagiarism in research, *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy* 18:91–101 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-014-9583-8>

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) guidelines on authorship and contributorship. Available online: <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html>

McNamee, Mike The Guilt of Whistling-blowing: Conflicts in Action Research and Educational Ethnography, *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 35(3), s 423-441.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/1467-9752.00236>

Swedish Research Council (2017) *Good Research Practice* Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

<https://www.vr.se/english/analysis/reports/our-reports/2017-08-31-good-research-practice.htm>

Salwén, H. (2015). The Swedish Research Council's Definition of 'Scientific Misconduct': A Critique. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 21(1), 115–126.

<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs11948-014-9523-2.pdf>

Schultz, W.G. 2007. Giving proper credit. Ethics violations by a chemist in Sweden highlight science's unpreparedness to deal with misconduct. *Science & Technology*, 85 (12): 35-38

<https://pubs.acs.org/email/cen/html/032007181930.html>

Wednesday 12 October 13.15-17, F136

Thursday 13 October 13.15-17, P260

Examination seminar (Rolf Lidskog)

- Obligatory participation at one of the two examination seminars.
- 30 minutes per paper. A course participant will serve as commentator.
- 5 minutes for presenting the paper, 15 minutes for comments by the commentators, 10 minutes for general discussion.

Course assignment

Besides active participation in the group discussion in the lecture, the course is examined by a written assignment. You should reflect on your own PhD-work and discuss ethical aspects that arise in your work. The paper should consist of **maximum 2000 words (4-6 pages)**. Remember, analytical quality is more important than length; structure and precision (non-redundancy) are core values in scientific writing.

29 August 2022/Rolf Lidskog