

PUBLICATION ETHICS

Case Study 1

David, Carol, Peter and Ann have worked on a project on the predictors of nurse job satisfaction in hospitals for two years. Ann's role was as the research grant holder. She designed the research initially but thereafter had little day-to-day involvement. She attended most of the monthly research planning meetings, at which she made useful suggestions.

Peter worked part-time for the team (10 hours a week) for the whole two years to support his study as an undergraduate in the Psychology Department. He played a major role in the research in getting questionnaires printed, distributing them, entering the data and performing some basic quantitative data analyses the team directed him to perform (descriptive data and some one-way analyses of variance). He also helped transcribe many of the 'open comments' on the questionnaire on to a single file that could be used in conjunction with a qualitative analysis package. David is one of the three professors in the department and was named on the original grant proposal, though he has played no role in the development of the research from design through to writing up. However, his measure of job satisfaction was the central scale used in the study. Finally, Carol supervised the project throughout the two years, and was closely involved throughout. She wrote the complete first draft of the paper reporting the results of the study.

Who should get authorship and in which order?

- A) Carol, Ann, Peter, David
- B) Carol, David, Ann, Peter
- C) Ann, Carol, David, Peter
- D) Carol, Peter
- E) Carol, Ann, David
- F) Carol, Ann



CASE STUDY 2

Geoff's work on neural networks has been difficult to conduct, but with the help of Gregory he has accomplished what promises to be a very important piece of research – the only issue confronting them is who should have first authorship on the paper. Both have made enormous and, they both believe, equal contributions to the work. However, Geoff has committed substantial resources from his department in the form of secretarial support and some funding for the research that Gregory's less well-off department could not in any way match. Geoff's head of department and Gregory's head of department have been asked for advice and both firmly agree that, in these circumstances, it is right that Geoff should be first author.

Who should be first author?

- A) Geoff B) Gregory C) neither D) both

CASE STUDY 3

Joe and his supervisor Emma together developed the ideas for a project in his supervisor's area of expertise (bullying in schools). Emma, who is a lecturer in the Department of Psychology, helped Joe get access,

discussed the research ideas with Joe, and gave him copies of her papers so he could design the research appropriately. He wrote the project up for his master's thesis. It was examined and awarded a good mark. Emma then undertook to use the thesis as the basis for partially reanalysing the data and writing the article up for publication in a BPS journal. The order of authorship they agreed was Emma first and Joe second.

Who should have first authorship?

A) Joe B) Emma

CASE STUDY 4

Alisha has been working with Simon, a colleague from another university, and they are nearing the completion of an ESRC-funded research project on decision making in teams. They have both contributed extensively to every stage of the research from its conception. The research has thrown up some intriguing and unexpected findings, which Alisha and Simon have pondered over at length. Alisha takes the lead in drafting a paper based on the research findings. Simon makes some comments on the draft, and between them they agree that Alisha should present the paper at a BPS conference. At the conference, a member of the audience, Daniel, is particularly interested in the research. He has written in the area himself and makes a number of useful suggestions for interpreting some of the unexpected findings. Following the conference, Daniel and Alisha exchange a series of e-mails in which they further discuss the research findings. Daniel's insights are incorporated in the final version of the paper that is subsequently submitted for review to a BPS journal.

How should each individual's contribution to the final paper be accredited?

A) Alisha as first author, Daniel second, and Simon third

B) Alisha as first author, Simon second, and Daniel third

C) Alisha as first author and Simon as the only co-author

D) Alisha as first author, Simon as co-author, and a note of acknowledgement crediting Daniel's input

CASE STUDY 5

Narinder has recently completed a research study for his MSc in occupational psychology, examining the relationships between team composition, team processes, job satisfaction and job-related strain in members of breast

cancer care teams. Margaret, a senior lecturer and one of the Chartered Occupational Psychologists in the department, has supervised him. Margaret has long-standing interests in team working and negotiated access to the teams for Narinder. She also gave him a good deal of guidance in relation to both theory and research design. The research reveals a strong correlation between the two outcome measures (satisfaction and strain) of .81, along with some interesting differences between the variables predicting these outcomes. They have an extensive debate and decide that Narinder should get first authorship on the most interesting paper (strain) and Margaret should have first authorship on the paper dealing with satisfaction.

Do you agree with this decision?