Workshop on Academic Integrity

Prof. Carol Upadhya

NIAS

24 September 2019

NIAS POLICY FOR PROMOTION OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND PREVENTION OF PLAGIARISM

- UGC Notification: University Grants Commission (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018 (23rd July 2018)
  - These regulations shall apply to the students, faculty, researchers and staff of all Higher Educational Institutions in the country.
- NIAS Policy
  - Applies to students, faculty, researchers and staff
- Objectives:
  - To create awareness about responsible conduct of research
  - Promotion of academic integrity and prevention of misconduct
  - To establish institutional mechanism through education and training to facilitate responsible conduct of research and deterrence of plagiarism
  - To develop systems to detect plagiarism, set up mechanisms to prevent plagiarism and to respond to acts of plagiarism

Institutional Academic Integrity Panel (IAIP)

- IAIP: body at institutional level to consider and take appropriate decisions in respect of allegations of plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct, and make recommendations on penalties to be imposed.

Terms of reference:

- The IAIP shall follow the principles of natural justice while deciding about the allegation of plagiarism against the student, faculty, researcher and staff.
- The IAIP shall have the power to assess the level of plagiarism and recommend penalty(ies) accordingly.
- The IAIP after investigation shall submit its report with the recommendation on penalties to be imposed to the Director within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of complaint / initiation of the proceedings.
- The IAIP shall also investigate cases of plagiarism as per the provisions mentioned in these regulations.

Other provisions

- NIAS shall conduct sensitization seminars/ awareness programs once a year on responsible conduct of research, thesis, dissertation, promotion of academic integrity and ethics in education for students, faculty, researcher and staff.

- NIAS shall provide a mechanism so as to ensure that each of the paper publication/thesis/ dissertation by the students of NIAS are checked for plagiarism at the time of forwarding/submission. The plagiarism software will be made available to all faculty, researchers and staff, who will be encouraged to check and correct their scripts before submission.

Some definitions

- 'Academic Integrity' - intellectual honesty in proposing, performing and reporting any activity which leads to the creation of intellectual property or original academic work

- 'Plagiarism' - the practice of taking someone else's work or idea and passing them as one's own

- 'Author' - includes a student, faculty member, researcher or staff member of NIAS claims to be the creator of the work under consideration

Research misconduct – NIAS Research Ethics Policy

- Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism, including misrepresentation of credentials, in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting or publishing research results.

- It is a primary responsibility of a researcher or writer to avoid making either a false statement or an omission that distorts the research record. Any intentional or reckless disregard for the truth in reporting observations may be considered to be an act of research misconduct.

- False or deceptive public statements about one's research must be avoided.

- Reporting suspected research misconduct is a shared and serious responsibility of all members of the academic community.
  - All reports are treated confidentially to the extent possible, and no adverse action will be taken, either directly or indirectly, against a person who makes such an allegation in good faith.

- It is unethical to release to the media scientific information contained in an accepted manuscript prior to its publication.

Research misconduct

- Maintenance of records and data: In order to preserve accurate documentation of observed facts with which later reports or conclusions can be compared, every researcher has an obligation to maintain a clear and complete record of data acquired.

- The intentional destruction of research records or the failure to maintain and produce research records supporting a questioned research publication or report may be considered to be circumstantial evidence of research misconduct.

- In some disciplines, such as anthropology, field notes are viewed as the product of the researcher rather than as data, and are not customarily made available to others for ethical reasons. To the contrary, they must be stored carefully to protect the privacy and confidentiality of subjects. If funding agencies or researchers' institutions require the archiving of such material, it must be redacted to protect the anonymity of subjects.

Research misconduct

- Acknowledgements, due credit, and plagiarism: The work of others should be cited or credited, whether published or unpublished and whether it is written work, an oral presentation, or material on a website. Authors who present the words, data, material, or ideas of others with the implication that they are their own, without attribution in a form appropriate for the medium of presentation, may be guilty of *plagiarism* and/or *research misconduct*.

- The same definition of plagiarism that applies to publications also applies to student submissions for coursework, dissertations in draft and final form, and applications and proposals (including the background and methodological sections).

NIAS Research Ethics policy – definition of authorship

- An author is an individual judged to have made a substantial intellectual or practical contribution to a publication and who agrees to be accountable for that contribution. This would normally include anyone who has:

  - made a significant contribution to the conception or design of the project or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND/OR

  - drafted the work or reviewed/revised it critically for important intellectual content.

- This is a general guideline and may not apply to all disciplines or journals which may set different standards.

- Anyone listed as an author on a paper should approve the final version of the paper and accept responsibility for ensuring that he or she is familiar with its contents and can identify his or her contribution to it.

Principles of authorship and acknowledgement

- If more than one person contributes significantly to the work, the decision of which names are to be listed as co-authors should reflect the relative contributions of various participants in the research and in the writing for the publication.
  - A person whose contribution merits co-authorship should be named even in oral presentations, especially when abstracts or transactions of the proceedings of a conference at which a paper is presented, is published.
  - These criteria are intended to reserve the status of authorship for those who deserve the credit and can take responsibility for the work.
- Both 'ghost' authorship and 'guest' authorship should be avoided. Ghost/guest authorship occurs when an individual makes/does not make a substantial contribution to the research OR to the writing of the paper but who is not listed/listed as an author.
- Authors should be careful to ensure fair and proper acknowledgement of contributions from individuals who have not been listed as an author and make sure that acknowledgements fully reflect the level of the input of the contributor.

Who is an author?

- Many journals currently adhere to the guidelines of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), which has established four criteria that each author of a paper should meet:
  - Significant involvement in study conception/design, data collection, or data analysis/interpretation;
  - Involvement in drafting or revising manuscript;
  - Approval of final version of manuscript for publication; and
  - Responsibility for accuracy and integrity of all aspects of research.

- Authors 'should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific other parts of the work…[and] have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors'. (ICMJE)
- An author must have made "substantive intellectual contributions" to the manuscript. Creative input is thus more eligible for authorship than purely mechanical work. (ICMJE) https://www.aje.com/arc/ethics-manuscript-authorship/
- Issues:
  - Contribution ambiguity
  - Authorship order
  - Honorary authorship

Disciplinary cultures of authorship

- Social-cultural anthropology – tradition of individual field research and single authorship
  - PhD supervisor is never a co-author

- Other social sciences – differing conventions of multiple/ single authorship

- British Sociological Association guidelines:
  - Authorship should be discussed between researchers at an early stage in any project and renegotiated as necessary
  - Students should normally be the first author on any multi-authored article based on their thesis or dissertation.
    - "Students should be aware of their rights...to publish papers independently of their supervisors. Where students are working as part of a larger project team, or where joint supervisor/student publications are proposed, questions of intellectual property rights should be carefully considered" (BSA guidelines 1996).
  - Authorship should be reserved for those, and only those, who have made significant intellectual contribution to the research. Participation solely in the acquisition of funding or general supervision of the research group is not sufficient for authorship. Honorary authorship is not acceptable.

BSA guidelines – attributing authorship

- Everyone who is listed as an author should have made a substantial direct academic contribution (i.e. intellectual responsibility and substantive work) to at least two of the four main components of a typical scientific project or paper:
  a) Conception or design
  b) Data collection and processing
  c) Analysis and interpretation of the data
  d) Writing substantial sections of the paper (e.g. synthesising findings in the literature review or the findings/results section)

- Everyone who is listed as an author should have critically reviewed successive drafts of the paper and should approve the final version.

- Everyone who is listed as author should be able to defend the paper as a whole (although not necessarily all the technical details).

- All those who make a substantial contribution to a paper without fulfilling the criteria for authorship should be acknowledged, usually in an acknowledgement section specifying their contributions.

- Source: https://www.britsoc.co.uk/publications/guidelines-reports/authorship-guidelines.aspx

References and resources

- University Grants Commission Notification: University Grants Commission (Promotion Of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018, New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2018. F. 1-18/2010(cpp-ii)

- University of Cambridge, Research Integrity, Guidelines on Authorship. vhttps://www.research-integrity.admin.cam.ac.uk/research-integrity/guidelines/guidelinesauthorship

- Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals, International Council of Medical Journal Editors, 2014. Available at: http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf

- British Sociological Association, Authorship Guidelines https://www.britsoc.co.uk/publications/guidelines-reports/authorship-guidelines.aspx