



Seminar II: Field-specific research ethics & AM tool

Anirban Krishna Bhattacharyya
Xinyi Chen Lin

Problem

Collaborative research: Multiple supervisors, one PhD student. One of them (junior supervisor) came up with new idea for experiment. PhD student started working on experiment. Supervisor started writing paper. Initial problems with experimental setup, student solves problem without any intervention of supervisors. Gets good results, which show the effectiveness of the new developed method. Supervisor asks student for results, writes paper, with himself as first author.

Problem owner and dilemma

Problem owner:

Phd Student - put in all the effort but was taking time to finish due to unforeseen problems, worked hard, but was sidestepped when publishing

Supervisor - young researcher himself, had the idea, worried about his position and group reputation.

Dilemma: PhD student can complain to other supervisors about the situation but at the cost of relation with the supervisor. Supervisor has to justify his step to other members of the group

Multiple authors – responsibility – publication rules

“One common tradition is to **list the authors in alphabetical order**, unless one of them has had a clearly dominant responsibility for the work presented. If the order is other than alphabetical, the **first author** will generally have made the **most important contribution**. Appearing first in the list will then carry most credit (assuming it is a good article). Names that come later in the list will often carry descending credit reflected by their distance from the first name, except for the **author listed last**, who is often the one who **bears overall responsibility**.”

from Good Research Practice

Autonomy Matrix

All principles, values, interests, duties, feeling, needs etc of all involved parts					
All reasonable alternative actions to solve the problem		Relation to the supervisor	Student's career	Student's feeling towards his work	Research group
	Supervisor's line	Positive, but similar situations may happen again	A little bit affected	Less motivated	Positive, new publication
	Student complains to other supervisors	Negative, but the unfairness will be pointed out	Negative if the supervisor doesn't give in	Frustrated	Internal conflict, but if solved, it can be good
	Negotiate for the next time (agreement on authorship)	Positive, more transparent	A little bit affected, but positive in future	More motivated	More integrity

PhD Ombudsman

- Two PhD students employed by the Department
- Support the PhD students in times of need
- All issues, great or small, personal or general
- Strict confidentiality
- Issues regarding financing, terms of employment, harassment, discrimination and problems with the supervisor or colleagues
- Disclosure only after given prior permission by the PhD student in question
- Organizing and chairing the PhD Student Council