

ETHICAL CODE AND AUTHORSHIP PROTOCOL FOR PHD-STUDENT/STAFF COLLABORATIONS

Preamble

Sole authorship remains as yet the dominant model in the Humanities. These past few decades, however, there has been a massive increase in the number of multi-authored papers. There are several kinds of collaborations in scientific research (e.g. collaboration between two or more senior specialists in one discipline, multidisciplinary collaborations, student-faculty collaborations, etc.). The present ethical code applies to student-staff collaborations. The prevalence of various unethical authorship practices (such as dilution of authorship responsibility, 'guest', 'pressured' and 'ghost' authorship) is increasing. Student-staff collaborations may also be affected by unethical practices (e.g. dissertation supervisors who insist on being listed as an author although their contribution to the paper is unsubstantial, supervisors who unrightfully insist on being ranked as the main author, etc).

The Faculty of Arts and Humanities wishes to react against these practices by introducing the following ethical code and authorship protocol. Both code and protocol are designed to lay down rules and guidelines for pre-doctoral publications, although they are also applicable to and to be recommended for every constellation in research collaboration. The specific situation of pre-doctoral students requires a clear and unambiguous publication strategy, a correct distribution of responsibilities and a fair acknowledgement of achievements and merits. PhD-students can, however, still publish their research results as sole authors if there are no other "authors" involved. Otherwise contributions and responsibilities have to be acknowledged fairly, meaning that promoters whose contributions to a publication are intellectually substantial, should be recognized as co-authors.

The Faculty of Arts and Humanities has decided to adopt a modified version of the Harvard Medical School Authorship Guidelines.

Authorship

1. Everyone who is listed as an author should have made a substantial, direct, intellectual contribution to the work. For example (in the case of a research paper) they should have contributed to the conception, design, analysis and/or interpretation of data. Honorary or guest authorship is not acceptable. Acquisition of funding and provision of technical services, patients, or materials, while they may be essential to the work, are not in themselves sufficient contributions to justify authorship.
2. Everyone who has made substantial intellectual contributions to the work should be an author. Everyone who has made other substantial contributions should be acknowledged.
3. When research is done by teams whose members are highly specialized, individuals' contributions and responsibility may be limited to specific aspects of the work.
4. All authors should participate in writing the manuscript by reviewing drafts and approving the final version.
5. One author should take primary responsibility for the work as a whole even if he or she does not have an in-depth understanding of every part of the work.
6. This primary author should assure that all authors meet basic standards for authorship and should prepare a concise, written description (the authorship protocol, cfr. Infra) of their contributions to the work. The authors should decide the order of authorship together, should approve it all, and the record should justify the order of authorship and reflect the division of workload. Pre-doctoral students are required to complete an authorship protocol for any

publication preceding or directly following and related to their PhD dissertation, even in the case of sole authorship. All publication protocols should be approved by the doctoral guidance committee. Protocols may be changed under the same conditions.

7. All publication records should remain with the pre-doctoral student and with the chair of the doctoral guidance committee. In case of litigation between the PhD-student and the promoter and if no protocol has been agreed, the PhD-student's viewpoint shall prevail automatically.
8. Research teams (including PhD-staff collaborations) should discuss authorship issues frankly early in the course of their work together. The authorship protocol fixes the respective roles of authors in advance.
9. Authors are recommended to specify in their manuscript a description of the contributions of each author and how they have assigned the order in which they are listed so that readers can interpret their roles correctly.
10. Disputes over authorship are best settled at the local level by the authors themselves. If local efforts fail, the Faculty can assist in resolving grievances through the ombudsperson, the Dean and the Faculty's Ethics Committee.
11. These policies should be reviewed periodically because both scientific investigation and authorship practices are changing.