

## Research Ethics and Good Research Practice, 5 credits

### *Forskningsetik och god forskningssed, 5 högskolepoäng*

<b>Course Code/Codes</b>	15SO004
<b>Subject Area</b>	Sociology
<b>School/equivalent</b>	School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences
<b>Valid from</b>	2019-11-05
<b>Approved</b>	2019-06-18
<b>Revised</b>	2025-06-23
<b>Approved by</b>	Head of School
<b>Translation to English, date and signature</b>	2019-07-10 CHK

## 1 Course content

This course provides an introduction to research ethics and good research practice. It deals with general issues within research ethics, where both norms in science and fundamental ethical perspectives are discussed. Ethical reasoning has a general character but carries different meaning and has different implications depending on the nature of the research. Based on this general orientation, the course discusses external and internal research ethics, that is, the role of research in society and its responsibility towards those who are affected by how the research is carried out and its results. Course participants are trained in identifying research-ethical issues in others' as well as their own research, and how these issues should be handled.

## 2 Outcomes

### 2.1 The course in relation to the doctoral programme

The course shall primarily refer to the following intended learning outcomes for third-cycle courses and study programmes as described in the Higher Education Ordinance, i.e. the doctoral student shall demonstrate:

#### *Knowledge and understanding*

- familiarity with research methodology in general (part of outcome 2)
- familiarity with the methods of the specific field of research in particular (part of outcome 2)

#### *Competence and skills*

- the capacity for scholarly analysis and synthesis (part of outcome 3)
- the capacity to review and assess new and complex phenomena, issues and situations autonomously and critically (part of outcome 3)
- the ability to identify and formulate issues with scholarly precision critically, autonomously and creatively (part of outcome 4)

- the ability to identify the need for further knowledge (outcome 7)

#### *Judgement and approach*

- intellectual autonomy and disciplinary rectitude (part of outcome 9)
- the ability to make assessments of research ethics (part of outcome 9)
- specialised insight into the possibilities and limitations of research, its role in society and the responsibility of the individual for how it is used (outcome 10)

The intended learning outcomes are listed in the same order as in the general syllabus for the programme.

## **2.2 Intended course learning outcomes**

To obtain a passing grade, the doctoral student shall demonstrate:

Specialised knowledge about

1. various forms of normative reasoning about the value of science and of research ethics guidelines,
2. the meaning and significance of research ethics guidelines,
3. problems of research ethics within one's own research subject, and
4. good research practice and researchers' rectitude.

Ability to

5. apply normative ethical reasoning within research-ethical problem areas,
6. write and assess an ethical review application, and
7. provide, orally and in writing, a nuanced representation of different possible approaches to specific research-ethical problems.

## **3 Reading list and other teaching material**

The following course readings and teaching material will be used on the course:

There may be additional readings of approximately 100-150 pages.

Albert, Tim and Wager, Elisabeth (2003) "How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers", pp. 32-34 in *The Cope Report 2003*. Available online: <http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/2003pdf12.pdf>

Berggren Christian and Karabag, Solmaz Filiz (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>

BioMedCentral (2016) *How to deal with text recycling* (3 p.). Available online: [http://publicationethics.org/files/BioMed%20Central\\_text\\_recycling\\_editorial\\_guidelines.pdf](http://publicationethics.org/files/BioMed%20Central_text_recycling_editorial_guidelines.pdf)

*CODEX-regler och riktlinjer för forskning* <http://www.codex.vr.se/index.shtml> (section "Forskarens etik", <http://www.codex.vr.se/forskarensetik.shtml>)

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

*Forskarens etik*, <http://www.codex.vr.se/forskarensetik.shtml>

Hansson, Sven Ove (2017) "Editorial: Who should be author?" *Theoria*, 83 (2): 99–102. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/theo.12116>

Harcourt, Deborah and Quennerstedt, Ann (2014) "Ethical Guardrails When Children Participate in Research: Risk and Practice in Sweden and Australia", *Sage Open*, 2014, 4.

Helgesson, Gert and Eriksson, Stefan. 2015. Plagiarism in research. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy* 18:91–101, DOI 10.1007/s11019-014-9583-8 (available at <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs11019-014-9583-8.pdf>)

- Horbach, S.P.J.M. and Halfman, 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*. (32 p.)  
<https://council.science/publications/freedom-responsibility-and-universality-of-science-2014>
- 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 (2001) "The Guilt of Whistling-blowing: Conflicts in Action Research and Educational Ethnography", *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 35 (3): 423-441.  
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/1467-9752.00236>
- 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](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK214568/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK214568.pdf)
- Pring, Richard (2001). The Virtues and Vices of an Educational Researcher. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 35(3), 407-421. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-9752.00235>
- Resnik, David 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>
- Salwén, Håkan (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, William 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>
- 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](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 (86 p.). The report is retrievable from <https://www.vr.se/english/analysis-and-assignments/we-analyse-and-evaluate/all-publications/publications/2017-08-31-good-research-practice.html>
- World Medicine Association 2008. *Declaration of Helsinki – Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects* (4 p.) <https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/>
- Reference readings
- Buchanan, Elizabeth A. & Zimmer, Michael, "Internet Research Ethics", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.).
- CODEX-regler och riktlinjer för forskning <http://www.codex.vr.se/index.shtml> (avsnitt "Forskarens etik", <http://www.codex.vr.se/forskarensetik.shtml>)
- Emmerich, Nathan. 2018. *Virtue Ethics in the Conduct and Governance of Social Science Research*. Emerald Publishing (248 p.)
- Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Humanities, Law and Theology*. (2016). Norway: The National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (44 p.). [https://www.etikkom.no/globalassets/documents/english-publications/60127\\_fek\\_guidelines\\_nesh\\_digital\\_corr.pdf](https://www.etikkom.no/globalassets/documents/english-publications/60127_fek_guidelines_nesh_digital_corr.pdf)
- Helgesson, Gert (2015) *Forskningsetik*. Lund: Studentlitteratur (176 p.).
- Holden, Erling, Linnerud Kristin and Banister, David (2017) "The imperatives of sustainable development", *Sustainable Development* 25: 213-220. Available at:  
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/sd.1647>
- Israel, Mark. 2014. *Research Ethics and Integrity for Social Scientists. Beyond Regulatory Compliance*. London: Routledge (264 p.)

- Lahman, Maria K.E. 2018. *Ethics in Social Science Research. Becoming Culturally Responsive*. London: Sage (312 p.)
- Mustajoki, Henriika and Mustajoki, Arto. 2017. *A New Approach to Research Ethics. Using Guided Dialogue to Strengthen Research Communities*. London: Routledge (236 p.)
- Nakray, Keerty, Alston, Margaret, Whittenbury, Kerri. 2016. *Social Science Research Ethics for a Globalizing World. Interdisciplinary and Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. London: Routledge (332 p.)
- Oliver, Paul (2010). *The Student's Guide to Research Ethics*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition.) Maidenhead: Open University Press. (224 p.) (The book can be read online via the University Library.)
- Quennerstedt, Ann; Harcourt, Deborah and Sargeant, Jonathon (2014) "Forskningsetik i forskning som involverar barn", *Nordic Studies of Education* 33 (2): 77-93.
- Renn, Ortwin, Klinke, Andreas and van Asselt, Marjolein (2011) "Coping with complexity, uncertainty and ambiguity in risk governance: a synthesis", *Ambio* 40: 231-246.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-010-0134-0>
- Resnik, David B. 1998. *The Ethics of Science: An Introduction*. London: Routledge. (232 p.)
- Shamoo, Adil. E. and Resnik, David B. (2015) *Responsible Conduct of Research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press (360 p.)

## 4 Teaching formats

Teaching on the course takes the following format:

The course is offered in the form of lectures and compulsory seminars.

## 5 Examination

The course is assessed through an examination consisting of the components listed below. The individual components are not graded separately but together they provide the basis for assessment and grading.

1. Oral and written presentations of all seminar assignments linked to the different themes on the course.
2. An independent written assignment followed by a presentation at the final seminar.

*For examinations consisting of several examination components, the following applies:* If during the course it is concluded that a doctoral student is unable to complete a certain examination component, the examiner may set a substitute assignment provided that circumstances do not reasonably allow for the course component to be completed at a later date during the run of the course.

## 6 Grades

Examinations on third-cycle courses and study programmes are to be assessed according to a two-grade scale with either of the grades 'fail' or 'pass' (local regulations).

The grade shall be determined by a teacher specifically nominated by the higher education institution (the examiner) (Higher Education Ordinance).

To obtain a passing grade on examinations included in the course, the doctoral student is required to demonstrate that he/she attains the intended course learning outcomes as described in section 2.2. Alternatively, if the course consists of multiple examinations generating credit, the doctoral student is required to demonstrate that he/she attains the outcomes that the examination in question refers to in accordance with section 5.

A student who has failed an examination is entitled to a retake.

If an examination consists of several examination components, and a student fails an examination component, the examiner may, as an alternative to a retake, set a make-up assignment with regard to the examination component in question.

A doctoral student who has failed an examination twice for a specific course or course element is entitled, upon his/her request, to have another examiner appointed to determine the grade.

## **7 Admission to the course**

### **7.1 Admission requirements**

To gain access to the course and complete the examinations included in the course, the applicant must be admitted to a doctoral programme at Örebro University.

Those admitted to doctoral-level education at another equivalent higher education institution are also eligible to apply to the course.

### **7.2 Selection**

Selection between applicants who have been admitted to doctoral programmes at Örebro University and who otherwise meet the admission requirements as listed above is made according to the following order of precedence:

Priority is given to doctoral students admitted to the Faculty Board of Humanities and Social Sciences at Örebro University. Secondly, doctoral students admitted to other programs at Örebro University may participate. If space is available, then doctoral students from other universities may participate.

If no other selection criteria are specified in this section, priority shall be given to applicants with a lower number of course credits left before the award of their degree over applicants with a higher number of remaining course credits. Should two or more students have equal number of credits, selection will be done through the drawing of lots. This also applies within any selection groups listed unless otherwise stated.

### **7.3 Other applicants than doctoral students admitted at Örebro University**

Other applicants than doctoral students admitted at Örebro University may be given access to the course on the grounds of provisions for and/or agreements regarding contracted courses, joint degrees, national graduate schools or cooperation in other respects with other universities.

Any decisions on what such other applicants may be given access to the course are made separately and on the basis of the provisions and/or agreements that occasion the student to apply for the course.

## **8 Transfer of credits for courses, study programmes and other experience**

Provisions on the transfer of credits can be found in the Higher Education Ordinance and on the university's webpage.

## **9 Other information**

The course language is English. The written examination assignments may be written in English or Swedish.

### **Transitional provisions**

No transitional provisions apply.