Good Academic Practice:
Exploring Responsibility
in the Humanities and the Social Sciences

Block Course, Winter Semester 2016/2017
Friday 27 & Saturday 28 January 2017, Room A 004, Im Moore 21 (Bldg. 1146)

Course Concept and Aims

This course offers an introduction to Ethics of Science for graduate students in the Master's Program *Philosophy of Science* (M.A. *Wissenschaftsphilosophie*) as well as the PhD research training group *Integrating Ethics and Epistemology of Scientific Research* (DFG GRK 2073, https://grk2073.org). Topics that will be addressed include the general foundations of ethics of science, guidelines for the safeguarding of good scientific practice, as well as specific topics from the domain of Ethics of Science which are of special interest to researchers in the humanities and the social sciences (e.g., publication ethics, the role of philosophers in public debates, the social responsibility of scholars in the humanities and social sciences). The fundamental debate on what constitutes good practice in the humanities and social sciences will occupy a central position in the course.

Course Plan

Fri., 27 Jan 17

9:00 – 11:00	(Lecture)	*What is good academic practice? What could it be?*
11:00 – 12:30	(Group work)	*Developing a set of guidelines for good academic practice I*
12:30 – 13:30	(Lunch break)	
13:30 – 15:30	(Lecture)	*Issues in publication ethics – authoring, refereeing, editing*
15:30 – 18:00	(Group work)	*Dealing with issues in publication ethics*

Sat., 28 Jan17

8:00 – 10:00 h	(Lecture)	*Responsibility in research and teaching in the humanities and the social sciences*
10:00 – 12:30 h	(Group work)	*The philosopher in the world – possible role(s) in society, public engagement, changing the world?*
12:30 – 13:30 h	(Lunch break)	
13:30 – 14:30 h	(Lecture)	*Philosophy engaging with the world – X-Phi, outreach, advocacy, the philosopher as expert (but for what?)*
14:30 – 17:00 h	(Group work)	*Developing a set of guidelines for good academic practice II: What could responsible academic work in relation to the world outside academia be?*

Readings (boldface indicates primary readings, normal type indicates secondary literature)

For the Friday morning session:

DFG (2013): *Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis / Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice (ergänzte Auflage)*, **Weinheim: Wiley-VCH.**

ESF / ALLEA (2011): *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*, **Strasbourg: European Science Foundation & ALLEA.**

LUH (2016): Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Universität Hannover – Regulations for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice (unofficial translation provided by the LUH).

National Advisory Board on Research Ethics (2009): *Ethical Principles of Research in the Humanities and Social and Behavioural Sciences and Proposals for Ethical Review*, Helsinki: National Advisory Board on Research Ethics.

NESH (2016): *Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Humanities, Law and Theology*, Oslo: The Norwegian National Research Ethics Committees.

Steneck, N.H. (2007): *ORI Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research (Revised Edition)*, **Services.**

For the Friday afternoon session:

Albert, T. & Wagner, E. (2003): 'How to handle authorship disputes: A guide for new researchers, *The COPE Report 2003*, **pp. 32-34.**

Bird, S.J. (2002): 'Self-plagiarism and dual and redundant publications: What is the problem?', *Science and Engineering Ethics* **8: 543-544.**

Csiszar, A. (2016): 'Troubled from the start', *Nature* 532: 306-308.

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (2003): 'Guidelines on good publication practice', *The COPE Report 2003*, **pp. 69-73.**

Loui, M.C. (2002): 'Seven ways to plagiarize: Handling allegations of research misconduct', *Science and Engineering Ethics* 8: 529-539.

Wiley (2014): *Best Practice Guidelines on Publishing Ethics: A Publisher's Perspective*, Hoboken (NJ): John Wiley & Sons.

For the Saturday morning and afternoon sessions:

Bacon, F. ([1627] 1906): "The New Atlantis", in: Bacon, F.: *The Advancement of Learning and The New Atlantis*, London, New York & Toronto: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, pp. 237-275.

Bush, V. ([1945] 1960): *Science: The Endless Frontier, A Report to the President on a Program for Postwar Scientific Research (July 1945, reprinted July 1960)*, Washington (DC): National Science Foundation, 'Summary of the report' & 'Introduction', pp. 5-12.

Barker, G. & Kitcher, P. (2014): *Philosophy of Science: A New Introduction*, **New York: Oxford University Press, Chap. 6 ('Science, values, and politics'), pp. 136-163.**

Sarewitz, D. (2016): ‚Saving science', *The New Atlantis*, Spring/Summer 2016: 5-40.

Wyndham, J.M. et al. (2015): *Social Responsibility: A Preliminary Inquiry into the Perspectives of Scientists, Engineers and Health Professionals*, **Washington (DC): American Association for the Advancement of Science.**

Good Academic Practice:
Exploring Responsibility
in the Humanities and the Social Sciences

Group work assignment 1

Have a look at the six readings for this part of the course and answer the following questions by way of discussing possible answers and views within your group. Please prepare a (very) short presentation of your answers.

- Do the guidelines for safeguarding good scientific practice provide you with the guidance you need?
- How would you define the boundary between scientific misconduct and "mere" sloppy research?
- Consider the "FFP" definition of scientific misconduct, and the various extended definition given in the texts. What would you remove from the definitions, what would you add?
- What elements would a definition of scientific misconduct for the humanities have to include? And a definition of good academic practice?

Good Academic Practice:
Exploring Responsibility
in the Humanities and the Social Sciences

Group work assignment 2

Answer the following questions by way of discussing possible answers and views within your group, using the readings for this part of the course as background material. Please prepare a (very) short presentation of your answers.

- Are self-plagiarism and dual publication to be considered scientific misconduct? Or are they legitimate academic practices? How would you draw the boundaries?
- Suppose you are a member of a committee tasked with formulating a brief and practical set of regulations or guidelines for self-censoring in academic publications. Develop such a set of regulations or guidelines that tells the researchers in your university at minimum (1) when self-censoring is appropriate or even called for, and (2) which options for self-censoring they should consider in which cases.
- Can you come up with cases in the humanities in which self-censoring might be appropriate or even called for?

Good Academic Practice: Exploring Responsibility in the Humanities and the Social Sciences

Group work assignment 3

Answer the following questions by way of discussing possible answers and views within your group, using the readings for this part of the course as background material. Please prepare a (very) short presentation of your answers.

- Do scientists have a general responsibility / duty / obligation to engage with the public? If so, in what way(s) should such engagement take place and what is the role of scientists in such contexts?
- Do you agree with Wolpert's argument that scientists have a special obligation to engage in activities aimed at furthering the public understanding of science *because* they have access to special knowledge (i.e., because they are experts for a particular area)? In other words, does the possession of expert knowledge imply an obligation to bring one's knowledge into the public arena? If so, what is such an obligation founded upon?
- Answer the same questions for academics in the humanities, and in particular in philosophy.
- Karl Marx once said that "The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it." (*Theses on Feuerbach*, Thesis 11). Can philosophers change the world? If so, how? And how can they do this in a responsible manner?

Good Academic Practice:
Exploring Responsibility
in the Humanities and the Social Sciences

Group work assignment 4

Answer the following questions by way of discussing possible answers and views within your group, using the readings for the entire course as background material. Please prepare a (very) short statement to be presented to the class.

- What are the essential elements / aspects of good academic practice?
- What does responsible academic work in relation to the world outside academia consist in?