Introduction

Other roles of a researcher

- Supervisor
- Teacher
- Application and proposal reviewer
- Publication reviewer (peer review)
- Committee member
7.1 Role of a researcher as a supervisor

**Scenario**

- The supervisor shares a bonding with the researcher. Out of bonding the supervisor is very demanding of the researcher’s time outside working hours and often asks for unprofessional favors from the researcher (for example: supervisor ask the student to go on a fishing trip with him, even though the student doesn’t have free time due to other social commitments or supervisor ask the student to go and pickup his car from the garage over the weekend)

- The supervisor also is interfering in the social life of the researcher

Now the student is in a dilemma of weather to confront the supervisor and say no (which has several risks for him) or continue to feel exploited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other group members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree with the supervisor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possibilities:</strong> Improved chances of getting good support, extra benefits, lenient review, easy working conditions <strong>Risks:</strong> mental stress, feeling like a servant.</td>
<td><strong>Possibilities:</strong> Can exploit the student more freely for personal gains. Can ask for more social favors from the student. <strong>Risks:</strong> Would understand student's dissatisfaction therefore leading to less productivity of his, decrease professional bonding with the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree completely</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possibilities:</strong> Complete mental satisfaction. Feeling right or maybe bad for the supervisor. <strong>Risks:</strong> His research credits not being fully given to him, losing supervisor's support, feeling discriminated.</td>
<td><strong>Possibilities:</strong> Supervisor understands student's stand and change his behavior or vice versa <strong>Risks:</strong> Supervisor might feel risk of there being a complaint to the committee. Poor productivity of his students, bad reputation, bad progress in work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree but set limitations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possibilities:</strong> Mental satisfaction. Good for both researcher and the supervisor. Increased productivity and quality of work. <strong>Risks:</strong> supervisor may feel otherwise.</td>
<td><strong>Possibilities:</strong> Supervisor is changed and a better person or he may disagree with the limitations. <strong>Risks:</strong> May feel bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report it to the discipline committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possibilities:</strong> bold move, set an example in the university. <strong>Risks:</strong> becoming a topic of gossip or discussion</td>
<td><strong>Possibilities:</strong> Supervisor abides by the committee's dictate or stand against it. <strong>Risks:</strong> May feel discouraged if things go to a discipline committee, risks his career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discuss it with other group members</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possibilities:</strong> Talk remain within few people and prevent spreading of it. Prevent being a gossip topic throughout the university. Can come up with an informed.</td>
<td><strong>Possibilities:</strong> Supervisor might feel suspicious of the behavior of the other group members. Can be more easily explained and advised by the close group members without the risk of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the other group members might come up with the same issue or knows the supervisor better that the student himself</td>
<td>He might be unhappy with all the people in the group the student shares the information with. Therefore, the supervisor might behave oddly with those people which again could lead to same big issue in future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Option 1:** Excluded. It has the largest ethical implications. Injustice with the student as he is being continued to exploit. The supervisor shall increase asking for more favors. It carries great risk for the student and the research quality.

- **Option 2:** Not a good idea on its own. Too low chance at success for everyone.

- **Option 4:** A bold move. This option should only be considered if all other options fail.

- **Conclusion:** The decision stands between option 3 and 5. This decision is most productive for research environment. The student can take an informed decision, other group members know effective solution. The gossips remain within the group members.
7.4: Teaching responsibility of a researcher

- Time and interest of researcher
  Should I spend my research time on teaching and what do I teach?
- Obligated to teach?
- Ethical guidelines
  Quality, consideration, fairness, openness.
Reviewing applications and proposals

- Job applications
  - Binding contracts, high cost for a research group.

- Conference participation applications
  - Which groups or universities are accepted for posters and presentations?

- Funding applications
  - Funding for specific subjects of research.

- Experiment proposals
  - High cost for experiments run in special facilities.
7.4. Reviewing manuscripts for publication

- Peer review for most of the scientific journals
  - Reviewer need to be knowledgeable in the field
  - Evaluation of work from competing groups

**Ethical dilemma**

- Reviewer able to delay/stop publication
  - Enable own research group to be first
- Possibility of using ideas of competing groups without proper acknowledgement

Several solutions identifiable
7.4. Reviewing manuscripts for publication

- Open peer review (Author knows identity of reviewer)
  - Power is still on the side of the reviewer but author knows who is trying to delay/stop publication
  - Stolen ideas can be much easier identified

  might be solution but need to be implemented by journals

  (could lead to less critical review of publications)
7.4. Reviewing manuscripts for publication

- Publishing research freely (ArXiv, website…)
  - Marks your research ideas
  - No review → mistakes or inaccuracies are not identified → no check for misconduct
    (quality of publications might decrease)
  - Evaluation of research through high impact journals → funding problems
7.5 Committee work

Committee members:
• involved in decisions and appraisals concerning other people’s research
• Should try to be independent of their own research community and to avoid showing special favor to their own university, colleagues and students

In practice:
• may be seen by their close colleagues as their representatives
• the member should represent the entire research community