

Information Sheet for Doctoral Students concerning scientific honesty

I. Doctoral students working as academics at the university

§ 3 ¶ 5 sentences 1 and 2 of the Landeshochschulgesetz (LHG Higher Education Act) reads as follows:

"All academic staff and students at the university are obliged to be scientifically honest. To this end, the generally accepted principles of good scientific practice must be observed."

§ 22 ¶ 3 LHG in connection with § 9 ¶ 1 LHG states that matriculated doctoral students are members of the faculty at which the doctorate is awarded and members of the university. The doctoral candidates of the University of Tübingen therefore fall under the term "scientifically active persons" and are personally responsible for adhering to the principles of good scientific practice.

The DFG memorandum "Securing Good Scientific Practice" (as of September 2013) states:

"Through their research activities and their wealth of ideas, doctoral candidates contribute to the continuous generation of knowledge (p.10)."

"The freedom of science in research, teaching and study is guaranteed in Germany's constitution. Freedom of science is inseparable from responsibility. This applies to every scientist as well as to the institutions in which science is written. Each scientist bears sole responsibility for his or her own conduct (p.15 and following)."

II Guidelines of the Senate of the Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen to ensure good scientific practice

All doctoral candidates are thus subject to the guidelines of the Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen on safeguarding good scientific practice and on dealing with scientific misconduct, as well as the stipulations on avoiding misconduct in science made in the official announcements of the University of Tübingen on 15 August 2000 (Annex) in accordance with the resolution of the Senate in its session of 25 May 2000.

III. Avoidance of Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a violation of good scientific practice and proven plagiarism can have serious consequences.

- 1.) It is expected that any literal or only slightly reworded text passage from another work will be marked as a quotation. The - only occasional - mention of the other work in a footnote or in the bibliography does not meet the requirements for correct citation in this respect. This also applies to pictures/photos, representations of a scientific or technical nature, such as drawings, sketches or tables from the work of another author. All sources and aids used must be disclosed, including copies from works whose author is not named, such as articles from the Internet. In case of doubt, it is the doctoral candidate's responsibility to enquire.
- 2.) If the requirement under 1.) is not met and if plagiarism is proven to a legally relevant extent in the dissertation, this shall be regarded and punished as deception about the independence of the scientific work performed.
- 3.) If the plagiarism is established in the review process during the current doctoral procedure, this will lead to the dissertation being assessed as "insufficient" and the dissertation being rejected in accordance with the regulations of the applicable doctoral regulations.

Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, University of Tübingen

- 4.) If the plagiarism or deception is established after the award of the doctorate and after the doctoral certificate has been issued and handed over, the PhD Committee shall examine the prerequisites for withdrawing the doctorate in accordance with the statutory regulations.
- 5.) Violation of the declaration expressly made in the application for admission to the doctoral qualification process that the thesis was written independently, that only the sources and aids specified were used and that citations taken over verbatim or in terms of content were marked as quotations will be regarded as deliberate deception. According to the doctoral regulations, this also applies to untrue statements in the other declarations to be submitted to the Dean's Office with the application for acceptance as a doctoral candidate and the application for admission to the doctoral qualification process.
- 6.) In the case of an affidavit in lieu of an oath, it will also be examined whether the criminal law requirements for a false affidavit in lieu of an oath have been met and whether the university will file a criminal charge and a criminal complaint.
- 7.) In addition, the violation of copyrights may be punishable according to the offences in the Copyright Act. In this respect, the author of the work from which the quotation was copied without quotation has the possibility of filing a criminal complaint.
- 8.) Plagiarism in the form of self-plagiarism also leads to the illegality of the doctoral thesis. Just as the lack of evidence of adopted findings of other authors, the failure to disclose earlier findings of one's own that are published elsewhere is unlawful according to audit law. This is not changed by the fact that the candidate was also the author of the earlier publication.

IV. Requirements for a publication-based or publication-oriented dissertation

- 1.) A publication-based or publication-oriented dissertation ("Essays on ..."), according to § 6 ¶ 1, number 2 of the doctoral regulations of the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences of the Eberhard Karls University Tübingen of 20.12.2016 (henceforth abbreviated as PromO), is a format in which scientific publications or manuscripts intended for publication are included in the dissertation, resulting in a coherent overall concept for the topic of the dissertation. The purpose of this definition is to avoid the use of disparate papers for a dissertation. Typically, a publication-based or publication-oriented dissertation will contain three or more unpublished working papers and/or previously published articles that were sole or co-authored, which constitute the core chapters of the dissertation, framed by an introductory chapter and a concluding summary chapter and a common bibliography.
- 2.) The working paper or publication on which a chapter or section of a publication-based or publication-oriented dissertation is based is to be made clear by a detailed quotation in a footnote at the beginning of the corresponding chapter/section. The inclusion of the text of a working paper or a publication in a publication-based or publication-oriented dissertation with the corresponding reference is of course not a self-plagiarism.
- 3.) A publication-based or publication-oriented dissertation may contain working papers or publications that have been co-authored. Individual achievement must be clearly identifiable, and the applicant's contributions must correspond to the salary and scope according to the requirements laid down in § 6 ¶ 1 of the PromO. In accordance with § 6 ¶ 1, number 3, the doctoral candidate must outline the framework of the joint work, state the names of the employees and their share in the overall project and describe the significance of his own contributions for the joint work.

- 4.) Such a publication-based or publication-oriented dissertation meets the requirements of § 38 ¶ 1 LHG, according to which a doctorate is based on independent scientific work. The publication-oriented dissertation is the rule in the doctoral subjects of empirical educational research and psychology; in the doctoral subjects of educational science, political science, sociology, sports science and economics, the publication-based dissertation is an alternative to the classical variant (monograph). Details of the subject-specific regulations for publication-based or publication-oriented dissertations are listed in the appendix to the Guide to Doctoral Degrees (see homepage).

V. Review when co-authorship has taken place

In its meeting on 29.05.2017, the PhD Committee of the Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences of the Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen addressed the following question pertaining to co-authorship.

In the case of the peer review of publication-based or publication-oriented dissertations, the doctoral committee shall decide that of the two peer reviewers appointed by the Chair of the PhD Committee in accordance with § 8 (1) of the PromO, only one may be co-author of one or more working papers or publications that are part of the publication-based or publication-oriented dissertation. This means, among other things, that if two of the supervisors are co-authors of joint working papers or publications which are part of the publication-based or publication-oriented dissertation, only one of them may be commissioned to review it. The second reviewer must then be a non-participating person with the appropriate expertise (possibly external).

Furthermore, the chairperson of the examination board shall not be a co-author of papers that are part of a publication-based or publication-oriented dissertation.

**Decision by the University Senate,
meeting on 25.05.2000**

I. Guidelines on ensuring good academic practice and on the handling of academic misconduct at the University of Tübingen

a) For the purpose of these guidelines, academic misconduct is assessed according to the University of Tübingen's rules of procedure for dealing with academic misconduct [Updated version:] dated 20 December 2013 (Appendix 1). Academic misconduct is defined as follows: Academic misconduct is present when, in an academic context, a misrepresentation is made either deliberately or with gross negligence, particularly in the forgery, fabrication or manipulation of data; when the intellectual property rights of another are infringed, when uninvolved parties are named without justification as authors of a work, when co-authors of a work are not named, or the research of others is unlawfully impaired, encumbered or destroyed. Academic misconduct is also present when a person deliberately enables or takes part in the misconduct of others.

b) Above and beyond this comprehensive definition, the University of Tübingen Senate is in agreement with recommendations by the DFG (German Research Foundation) and has directly adopted some of its wording (Appendix 2: recommendations 1-8 for implementation; recommendations 9-16 to be noted: Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis/ Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice), as well as with the current recommendations of the HRK (German Rectors' Conference). Accordingly, the Senate regards the following as academic misconduct:

aa) Misrepresentation:

- in the fabrication of data, particularly
 - the omission of undesired results without disclosure of the omission,
 - the manipulation of a diagram or image;
- incorrect statements in a job application or a grant application (including misrepresentations regarding publications and articles awaiting publication.)

Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, University of Tübingen

bb) Infringement of intellectual property rights

- regarding a copyrighted work created by others or significant academic findings, hypotheses, doctrines, or experimental paradigms originating with others:

cc) • the unauthorized utilization and pretense of authorship (plagiarism)

- the exploitation of others' experimental paradigms and ideas, particularly as a supervisor/ referee (intellectual property theft);
- the pretense or unfounded assumption of academic authorship or co-authorship,
- the manipulation of content,
- the unauthorized publication and the unauthorized making available of a work to third parties as long as the work, the finding, the hypothesis, the doctrine, or the paradigm has yet to be published, or
- the arbitrary delay of publication of an academic work, particularly as a publisher or supervisor/ referee, as well as the suppression of publications or findings;

dd) laying claim to another's (co-)authorship without his/her consent,

ee) sabotage of research work (including damaging, destroying or manipulating experimental setups, equipment, data, hardware, software, chemicals, cell and microorganism cultures or any other thing which another needs to carry out an experiment),

ff) disposal of source data, insofar as this infringes legal requirements or the accepted guidelines for academic work in the relevant discipline.

A share of the responsibility for misconduct can arise from, among other things, active participation in the misconduct of others,

- having knowledge of manipulations carried out by others
- co-authorship of publications tainted by manipulation,
- gross negligence of the duty of supervision.

Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, University of Tübingen

II. To avoid academic misconduct, the University of Tübingen Senate¹ sets out the following:

a) All academic activities must comply with the rules of good academic practice, in particular as set out below (2. b - f). These rules are an integral part of the training of junior researchers. Within the framework of research projects, this is the duty of the person responsible for the project.

b) All bearers of responsibility in research and teaching must ensure, via appropriate organization of their field of operations, that the tasks of management, supervision, mediation of conflicts and quality assurance are clearly assigned and that it is guaranteed that they are properly administered.

c) Academic teachers must pay special attention to the training and support of junior researchers. They must ensure that there is adequate supervision. This includes regular discussions and supervision of the progress of work.

d) In performance and assessment criteria for examinations, the awarding of academic degrees, promotions, hiring staff, the appointment of professors, and the allocation of funds, originality and quality should always take preference over quantity as valuation standards.

e) The person responsible for a research project must ensure that source data forming the basis for publications is stored on durable and secure media for 10 years. Further legal obligations to store data, as well as measures to protect personal data, remain unaffected.

f) Authors of an academic publication bear the responsibility for its content jointly. Exceptions must be clearly indicated. All researchers who have made a significant contribution to the idea, planning, execution or analysis of the research work should have the opportunity to beco-

¹ largely (a - f) in agreement with the decision by the University of Konstanz Senate on 15 July 1998 following, as recommended by state Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts (MWK)

authors. Persons who made smaller contributions are to be mentioned in the acknowledgments.

g) Upon their appointment, all the University's academic staff are to be given a copy of this decision by the Senate, with appendices, to enable compliance. The delivery of this document is to be confirmed by signature.

III. This decision by the Senate is to be published in the University's official notices.