

RESEARCH
&
PUBLICATION ETHICS

Wakil kumar Yadav

Jitendranath Gorai

Ms Seema Shukla

Yogendra Kumar

Dr Dinesh Sriwash

Dr Dev Brat Mishra Dev

Kamlesh Paswan

NOTION PRESS

NOTION PRESS

India. Singapore. Malaysia.

ISBN-13:9781685546717

This book has been published with all reasonable efforts taken to make the material error-free after the consent of the author. No part of this book shall be used, reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission from the author, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

The Author of this book is solely responsible and liable for its content including but not limited to the views, representations, descriptions, statements, information, opinions and references [“Content”]. The Content of this book shall not constitute or be construed or deemed to reflect the opinion or expression of the Publisher or Editor. Neither the Publisher nor Editor endorse or approve the Content of this book or guarantee the reliability, accuracy or completeness of the Content published herein and do not make any representations or warranties of any kind, express or implied, including but not limited to the implied warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose. The Publisher and Editor shall not be liable whatsoever for any errors, omissions, whether such errors or omissions result from negligence, accident, or any other cause or claims for loss or damages of any kind, including without limitation, indirect or consequential loss or damage arising out of use, inability to use, or about the reliability, accuracy or sufficiency of the information contained in this book.

Contents

Contents

Preface.....	7
1. UGC-Care listed Journal.....	8
Dr.E.Uma.....	8
2. Finding Solutions to the Main Problems Faced by a Researcher	23
Grace P. Varghese.....	23
3. Book Review: Ranjit Kumar’s Book on Research Methodology	25
Abdul Karim Gazi	25
4. What is an Academic Research?.....	28
Ms. Gopika M S.....	28
5. Publication Ethics & Misconducts	30
Dr. Chhaya Shishir Pawar.....	30
6. Publication Misconduct: Concept, Types, Reasons and Consequence	34
Amitabha Mondal.....	34
7. Use of Urkund Software for Plagiarism Detection in Tumkur University : A Study.....	37
Dr. B. Raviivvenkat.....	37
8. Ethics of Research.....	44
Shivaji G Jetithor, Datta A.Nalle.....	44
9. Variables in the Educational Research	48
Dr. Sowmya.H.S.....	48
10. Educational Research Hypotheses	52
Dr. M. Sudarshan.....	52
11. Methods of Data Collection in Research	60
Dr. Gajanan S. Futane.....	60
12. Ethics, Ethical Principles in Scientific Research and Higher Education.....	67
D.T. SAKHARE.....	67
13. Research and Publication Ethics.....	79
Kamlesh Paswan	79
14. Publication Ethics-Definition, Introduction and Importance	91

8. Ethics of Research

Shivaji G Jetithor, Datta A.Nalle

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Fishery Science, Yeshwantrao Chavan Mahavidyalaya, Tuljapur Dist. Osmanabad. (Maharashtra) India.

²Department of Zoology & Fishery Science, Rajarshi Shahu Mahavidyalaya (Autonomous) Latur (Maharashtra) India.
E-Mail: shivajijetithor@gmail.com¹, iprometheous007@gmail.com²

Albert Einstein very popular Quote “If we knew what it was we were doing, it would not be called research” is tells us much more depth of the research. Research is sometime creativity it’s been hypothesis and has many unsolved questions in mind before we think to start it. But the prime think is to know the ethics of research

Dictionary defines the ethics as moral principles that govern a person's behaviour or the conducting of an activity. The standard of research is been maintained by various ethics and hence it become necessary to think Ethics in Research work our aptitude to surprise generates idea of research.

The aptitude of humans to transfer the new information to the next generation leads in development of the subject specific knowledge .Inquisitiveness and the self-driven hard work to please individual curiosity form the basis of research.

Research involves methodical and original investigations in any field of comprehension be it about rational or acquisitive issues, or anything in this Universe that. Such acts improve the understanding, enable postulation of operative laws and enhance knowledge. The improved knowledge in turn facilitates new conclusions and raises new questions. Being a social organism, it is natural that individuals, who acquired new knowledge/ understanding, share the same with others. This in turn implies that the society comprises both the owners and recipients of new information.

Ethics of Research: Chaddah, (1). Defines concept as Different but complementary domains so that the question being asked can be examined from different perspectives. In some cases collaboration develops at a late stage of investigation when help of another laboratory or researcher is required to fill in some gap/s for which the original lab is not so competent Developing and maintaining healthy and productive collaboration requires good ethical practices. Such collaborations within the institution or outside should be forged on good and a priori well defined understanding to avoid possible conflicts at a later stage.

A healthy and lasting collaboration is built on honesty and mutual trust for the long-term sustenance. Depending upon the need in specific cases, collaboration may be a one-time event or may be a long-term partnership. In either case, the bases of collaboration and credit-sharing should be understood and agreed upon at the initial stages itself as a safeguard against any later stage misunderstanding or dispute.

A collaborative work may also involve one or more Ph.D. student(s). In such cases, the basis for inclusion of specific aspects of the collaborative outcome in the doctoral thesis of the student/s should be understood and agreed upon ab-intio, by collaborating partners. This would ensure error-free data, avoid any accidental plagiarism and would make the dissemination of the research output smoother.

Collaboration may also be required in some cases when a research proposal is required to be submitted to make use of a centralized user facility (e.g., synchrotron radiation sources, neutron sources, particle accelerators, an inter-university Centre, a centralized or national computational facility or an instrumentation center) where use of the facility is allotted based on merit of the proposed work.

Research Supervisor-Student Relationship

Paul Gill in 2008 (2) noted that Research has shown that effectual direction can significantly influence the quality of the PhD and its eventual success or failure. Consequently, many common problems experienced during a PhD often relate to difficulties in the supervisory process. PhD students and supervisors often have different expectations, needs and ways of thinking and working. The purpose of this paper is, therefore, to provide an overview of the key elements of research supervision.

The affiliation among a research guide and Ph.D. scholar is markedly dissimilar teacher-student relationship. It requires interaction so that the actual research work gets better synergized and the research student gets really involved in planning and execution of the plan, rather than working only as a technical help to the supervisor. Since the doctoral degree is generally the last step in formal learning, a good foundation in ethical practices is essential to prepare quality researchers who can be effective leaders in times to come. Some general practices that should be followed by the supervisor and students are noted below.

The research objectives and research plan that a new Ph.D. scholar wishes to undertake for his/her doctoral thesis should be adequately discussed by supervisor and student. For an informed and meaningful discussion leading to student's desire to work on the given topic, the student also needs to have read the relevant literature. A research student should choose the doctoral supervisor keeping in view his/her personal interests and competence in a given field and the research interests and competence of the proposed supervisor. A good matching of 'wavelengths' of the supervisor and student is essential for developing a healthy and lasting relationship.

The research plan should be discussed by both the student and the supervisor so that the research student understands why a given strategy is being followed as also the modus operandi on data collection, recording of observations and interpretations. Research supervisor should guide and steer progress of the student's research efforts so that the work to be embodied in the doctoral thesis can generally be completed within the stipulated time-frame available to the Ph.D. scholars. An overly ambitious plan with a large proportion of uncertainty should generally be avoided. However, if an enthusiastic student is willing to take the challenge, he/she may work on such questions with an explicit understanding that negative results can also be useful science. It must be realized at all level that more than anything else; a doctoral thesis is a training for a student to learn to carry out a project independently. This focus should never be lost.

Supervisor needs to ensure adequate training of research students on safe, ethical and appropriate usages of the various research methods and equipment. While they learn the technique, they should also be trained to understand their operative principles. Students should be encouraged to read widely, to participate in seminars and discussion meetings and to periodically present their own data and/or data from other publications to improve their ability to effectively communicate. They should be encouraged to share their ideas and it is the responsibility of the senior to create an ambience of trust.

Research students need to be encouraged and provided with opportunities to improve their writing skills (Moore, 2018). They should be encouraged to prepare the first drafts of manuscripts for publication or for the doctoral thesis. Any corrections/modifications made by the supervisor

Responsible research publication

Accuracy and Reliability: The research being reported should have been conducted in an ethical and responsible manner and follow all relevant legislation. The research being reported should be sound and carefully executed. Researchers should use appropriate methods of data analysis and display (and, if needed, seek and follow specialist advice on this). Authors should take collective responsibility for their work and for the content of their publications. Researchers should check their publications carefully at

all stages to ensure methods and findings are reported accurately. Authors should carefully check calculations, data presentations, typescripts/submissions and proofs.

Honesty of research publication: Researchers should present their results honestly and without fabrication, falsification or inappropriate data manipulation. Research images (e.g. micrographs, X-rays, pictures of electrophoresis gels) should not be modified in a misleading way. Researchers should strive to describe their methods and to present their findings clearly and unambiguously. Researchers should follow applicable reporting guidelines. Publications should provide sufficient detail to permit experiments to be repeated by other researchers. Reports of research should be complete. They should not omit inconvenient, inconsistent or inexplicable findings or results that do not support the authors' or sponsors' hypothesis or interpretation. Research funders and sponsors should not be able to veto publication of findings that do not favour their product or position. Researchers should not enter agreements that permit the research sponsor to veto or control the publication of the findings (unless there are exceptional circumstances, such as research classified by governments because of security implications). Authors should alert the editor promptly if they discover an error in any submitted, accepted or published work. Authors should cooperate with editors in issuing corrections or retractions when required. Authors should represent the work of others accurately in citations and quotations. Authors should not copy references from other publications if they have not read the cited work.

Balance: New findings should be presented in the context of previous research. The work of others should be fairly represented. Scholarly reviews and syntheses of existing research should be complete, balanced, and should include findings regardless of whether they support the hypothesis or interpretation being proposed. Editorials or opinion pieces presenting a single viewpoint or argument should be clearly distinguished from scholarly reviews. Study limitations should be addressed in publications.

Originality: Authors should adhere to publication requirements that submitted work is original and has not been published elsewhere in any language. Work should not be submitted concurrently to more than one publication unless the editors have agreed to co-publication. If articles are co-published this fact should be made clear to readers. Applicable copyright laws and conventions should be followed. Copyright material (e.g. tables, figures or extensive quotations) should be reproduced only with appropriate permission and acknowledgement. Relevant previous work and publications, both by other researchers and the authors' own, should be properly acknowledged and referenced. The primary literature should be cited where possible. Data, text, figures or ideas originated by other researchers should be properly acknowledged and should not be presented as if they were the authors' own. Original wording taken directly from publications by other researchers should appear in quotation marks with the appropriate citations. Authors should inform editors if findings have been published previously or if multiple reports or multiple analyses of a single data set are under consideration for publication elsewhere. Authors should provide copies of related publications or work submitted to other journals. Multiple publications arising from a single research project should be clearly identified as such and the primary publication should be referenced. Translations and adaptations for different audiences should be clearly identified as such, should acknowledge the original source, and should respect relevant copyright conventions and permission requirements. If in doubt, authors should seek permission from the original publisher before republishing any work.

Transparency: All sources of research funding, including direct and indirect financial support, supply of equipment or materials, and other support (such as specialist statistical or writing assistance) should be disclosed. Authors should disclose the role of the research funder(s) or sponsor (if any) in the research design, execution, analysis, interpretation and reporting. Authors should disclose relevant financial and non-financial interests and relationships that might be considered likely to affect the interpretation of their findings or which editors, reviewers or readers might reasonably wish to know. This includes any relationship to the journal, for example if editors publish their own research in their

own journal. In addition, authors should follow journal and institutional requirements for disclosing competing interests.

Acknowledgement: The research literature serves as a record not only of what has been discovered but also of who made the discovery. The authorship of research publications should therefore accurately reflect individuals' contributions to the work and its reporting. In cases where major contributors are listed as authors while those who made less substantial, or purely technical, contributions to the research or to the publication are listed in an acknowledgement section, the criteria for authorship and acknowledgement should be agreed at the start of the project. Ideally, authorship criteria within a particular field should be agreed, published and consistently applied by research institutions, professional and academic societies, and funders. While journal editors should publish and promote accepted authorship criteria appropriate to their field, they cannot be expected to adjudicate in authorship disputes. Responsibility for the correct attribution of authorship lies with authors themselves working under the guidance of their institution. Research institutions should promote and uphold fair and accepted standards of authorship and acknowledgement. When required, institutions should adjudicate in authorship disputes and should ensure that due process is followed. Researchers should ensure that only those individuals who meet authorship criteria (i.e. made a substantial contribution to the work) are rewarded with authorship and that deserving authors are not omitted. Institutions and journal editors should encourage practices that prevent guest, gift, and ghost authorship all authors should agree to be listed and should approve the submitted and accepted versions of the publication. Any change to the author list should be approved by all authors including any who have been removed from the list. The corresponding author should act as a point of contact between the editor and the other authors and should keep co-authors informed and involve them in major decisions about the publication (e.g. responding to reviewers' comments). Authors should not use acknowledgements misleadingly to imply a contribution or endorsement by individuals who have not, in fact, been involved with the work or given an endorsement.

Responsibility: All authors should have read and be familiar with the reported work and should ensure that publications follow the principles set out in these guidelines. In most cases, authors will be expected to take joint responsibility for the integrity of the research and its reporting. However, if authors take responsibility only for certain aspects of the research and its reporting, this should be specified in the publication. Authors should work with the editor or publisher to correct their work promptly if errors or omissions are discovered after publication. Authors should abide by relevant conventions, requirements, and regulations to make materials, reagents, software or datasets available to other researchers who request them. Researchers, institutions, and funders should have clear policies for handling such requests. Authors must also follow relevant journal standards. While proper acknowledgement is expected, researchers should not demand authorship as a condition for sharing materials. Authors should respond appropriately to post-publication comments and published correspondence. They should attempt to answer correspondents' questions and supply clarification or additional details where needed.

Reference

1. [Paul Gill](#) (2008) The student-supervisor relationship in the PhD/Doctoral process May 2008 British journal of nursing (Mark Allen Publishing) 17(10):668-71
DOI:10.12968/bjon.2008.17.10.29484
2. Chaddah Praveen (2018) Ethics in Competitive Research: Do not get scooped;do not get plagiarized, ISBN: 978-9387480865