

Supplerende standarder for ansvarlig forsknings- praksis ved Aarhus BSS

Supplerende standarder for ansvarlig forskningspraksis ved Aarhus BSS

Som supplement til de fælles retningslinjer for ansvarlig forskningspraksis på Aarhus Universitet (AU) har Aarhus BSS udarbejdet nedenstående fagspecifikke standarder særligt gældende for de samfundsvidenskabelige og erhvervsøkonomiske fagområder.

Generelt

Aarhus BSS tilslutter sig naturligvis politik og retningslinjer for ansvarlig forskningspraksis ved Aarhus Universitet samt den nationale Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. Aarhus BSS ønsker at understrege vigtigheden af kravet om maksimal transparens og uafhængighed i alle faser af forskningsprocessen som et centralt kriterium i de fælles retningslinjer lokalt såvel som nationalt.

Endvidere understreges det, at det løbende arbejde ved Aarhus BSS med sikring af ansvarlig forskningspraksis i den sidste ende er forankret hos de personaleansvarlige i de faglige miljøer – in casu; institutternes ledelser, fakultetsledelsen og i sidste ende dekanen. Eksistensen af en AU-rådgivergruppe og et AU-udvalg for ansvarlig forskningspraksis må IKKE føre til, at de faglige ledelser frasiger sig dele af personaleansvaret.

Specifikt om forfatterskab

AU har tilsluttet sig Vancouver-reglerne en bloc. Vancouver-reglerne/-principperne udformet af The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE, ofte benævnt "Vancouvergruppen") definerer forfatterskab og opstiller klare kriterier for medforfatterskab. Vancouver-reglerne/-principperne er konsolideret i et ganske detaljeret og langt dokument, der kun svært kan "bringes i arbejde" blandt de op mod 1000 ansatte ved Aarhus BSS, der er i berøring med organisationens forskningsproduktion. Aarhus BSS finder derfor behov for at præcisere og uddybe centrale dele af principperne i kort form. Aarhus BSS ønsker med afsæt i ICMJE-anbefalingerne (december 2014, s. 2) at formulere følgende (se <http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf>):

"[...] that authorship [should] be based on the following 4 criteria:

- 1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND*
- 2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND*
- 3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND*
- 4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved."*

In addition to being accountable for the parts of the work he or she has done, an author should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific other parts of the work. In addition, authors should have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their coauthors. All those designated as authors should meet all four criteria for authorship, and all who meet the four criteria should be identified as authors. Those who do not meet all four criteria should be acknowledged [...]. These authorship criteria are intended to reserve the status of authorship for those who deserve credit and can take responsibility for the work. The criteria are not intended for use as a means to disqualify colleagues from authorship who otherwise meet authorship criteria by denying them the opportunity to meet criterion #s 2 or 3. Therefore, all individuals who meet the first criterion should have the opportunity to participate in the review, drafting, and final approval of the manuscript.”

Som yderligere forklaring og retningslinje vedr. bidragydere, der ikke lever op til alle fire kriterier, tilføjes følgende:

“Contributors who meet fewer than all 4 of the above criteria for authorship should not be listed as authors, but they should be acknowledged. Examples of activities that alone (without other contributions) do not qualify a contributor for authorship are acquisition of funding; general supervision of a research group or general administrative support; and writing assistance, technical editing, language editing, and proofreading.” (The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE), December 2014, s. 3 (se <http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf>)).

Som yderligere forklaring og retningslinje vedr. forfatteransvarlighed tilføjes følgende:

*“As with citations, author listings establish accountability as well as credit. When a paper is found to contain errors, whether caused by mistakes or deceit, authors might wish to disavow responsibility, saying that they were not involved in the part of the paper containing the errors or that they had very little to do with the paper in general. However, an author who is willing to take credit for a paper must also bear responsibility for its contents. Thus, unless a footnote or the text of the paper explicitly assigns responsibility for different parts of the paper to different authors, the authors whose names appear on a paper must share responsibility for all of it.” (National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering and Institute of Medicine (Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy), *On Being a Scientist: Responsible Conduct in Research*, 2nd ed., The National Academy Press, Washington DC, 1995, pp. 14-15 (<http://www.nap.edu/read/4917/chapter/9#14>)).*

Specifikt om håndtering af data

Aarhus BSS bemærker, at muligheden for verifikation, replikation og falsifikation af forskningsresultater, som det afspejles i AU's generelle retningslinjer for ansvarlig forskningspraksis, er helt central for det omgivende samfunds tillid til forskningens integritet. Derfor skal det som udgangspunkt altid være muligt for andre at kunne få adgang til benyttede data med henblik på transparens.