REDUNDANT PUBLICATION AND SELF-PLAGIARISM IN LITHUANIAN ACADEMIA

DR. LORETA Tauginiienė

5th World Conference on Research Integrity
28-31 May 2017, Amsterdam, Netherlands
STRUCTURE

Intro
National ethics infrastructure for research (mis)conduct as context
Aim
Methodological approach
Research findings
Conclusion
INTRO

Academic Ethics Centre

✓ **Vision** is to turn into the advanced and socially responsible university that follows and supports the highest standards of ethics in academia, carries out research on academic ethics and disseminates its results.

✓ **Prior activities**
  ✓ Study on *status quo* on academic integrity at MRU

✓ **On-going activities**
  ✓ Erasmus Plus project “European Network for Academic Integrity” (leading one of the outputs)
TEAM
BIO

Doctoral Dissertation on social responsibility in the management of research performance (2013)
- Baltic University Programme (BUP) Honorary Recognition for the Best PhD thesis in 2013 (in the field of Sustainability)

Lately acting as Head of Academic Ethics Centre at Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania
- Prior workplace – policy advisor in the Office of Ombudsman for Academic Ethics and Procedures

Consultancy, expert work (e.g. EC, OECD, Transparency International Lithuania Unit, Lithuanian Standards Board)

Membership in the Board of the European Network for Academic Integrity

Areas of research: research policy; doctoral studies; academic ethics; social responsibility; responsible research and innovation; public engagement
NATIONAL ETHICS INFRASTRUCTURE FOR RESEARCH (MIS)CONDUCT

- **Research Council of Lithuania (Government):**
  - Commission for the Ethics of Research Performance
    - Examination of violations of ethical principles in research performance;
    - Ethical supervision of researchers’ behavior
- **Parliament:**
  - Ombudsman for Academic Ethics and Procedures
    - Ethical infringements in higher education and research institutions (in higher education and research)
  - Equal Opportunities Ombudsman
    - Examination of violations in higher education and research institutions in terms of equal opportunities
- **Ministry of Health (Government):**
  - Bioethics Committee
    - Ethical supervision of biomedical research

Advisory Committee *Ad hoc* expert groups
NATIONAL ETHICS INFRASTRUCTURE FOR RESEARCH (MIS)CONDUCT

1991
Recovery of Independence

2005
Recommendations for codes of academic ethics (MoES)

2009
Ineffective recommendations
Establishment of Ombudsman for Academic Ethics and Procedure

2013
Appointment of the Ombudsman (OAEP)

2015
Recommendations for codes of academic ethics
Embedding Academic Integrity in Public Universities

Abstract

Particular concern about academic ethics in higher education and research institutions (HERIs) in Lithuania was addressed in 2009 by the national decision to establish an Office of Ombudsman for Academic Ethics and Procedures (Office). The decision was taken during the approval of the revised Law on Higher Education and Research by the Parliament of Lithuania. Following two failed attempts to appoint an ombudsman, the Office began to function in 2014. Since then, the ombudsman, alongside other state institutions, has been empowered to implement national higher education and research policy. At the outset of the Office activity it is important to
AIM

To examine national decisions of the OAEP in order to figure out what evidence and arguments are brought in regarding redundant publications and self-plagiarism.
## Methodological Approach

### 4 out of 60 decisions | Qualitative content analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of publications under OAEP's investigation</th>
<th>15 papers</th>
<th>1 book</th>
<th>2 books</th>
<th>1 handbook (3 editions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 book</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International publications</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of research</td>
<td>Physical sciences</td>
<td>Biomedical sciences</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Alleged violations

Image manipulation | Data fabrication |
Redundant publication | Self-plagiarism | Plagiarism

Evidence

- Whistleblowers
- Editors
- Publishers (e.g. Elsevier) / Publishing house
- University
- Investigative author
- Co-authors
- Reviewers (of books, handbooks, monograph)

Arguments

- OAEP’s Advisory Board
- Scientific literature
- National regulations on the evaluation of research performance
- State Commission of the Lithuanian Language
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Alleged violations

Image manipulation | Data fabrication |
Redundant publications | Self-plagiarism | Plagiarism

Evidence

- Whistleblowers
- Editors
- Publishers (e.g. Elsevier) / Publishing house
- University
- Authors
- Co-authors
- Reviewers (of books, handbooks, monograph)
RESEARCH FINDINGS

No evidence on

- Agreement provisions between editor / national publisher / national publishing house and author(s) or any other regulations
- Ethics policy of national editors / national publishing house
- Not all co-authors were detected
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Detected violations

Redundant publications (1) | Fraud (1)

Incomplete evidence infuses misinterpretations:

- A handbook is not a scientific work, so no citation to indicate is necessary (the list of references is sufficient)
- Absence of citations in his / her own works pretends to be as continuous works, so no citation to indicate is necessary
- Transgressions related to copyright law are uninvestigated as out of scope of Ombudsman's formal competence
- Self-plagiarism is undefined, so there is no ethical infringement, but the violation of the principle of academic integrity
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Incomplete evidence infuses the lack of arguing, i.e. the non-detection of research misconducts (such as (self)-plagiarism):

- 1 out of 4 decisions provides definitions of redundant publication and self-plagiarism (referred to Elsevier’s (COPE member) ethics policy for publications)

- The ensuing decisions say that there is neither plagiarism nor self-plagiarism or redundant publications when features speak on the contrary

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE OAEP?
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Incomplete evidence infuses inefficient sanctioning:

- Only publicizing
- No retraction
- No career suspension or dismissal

- BUT in 2017 Research Council introduced the prohibition to submit research proposals for 5 years
CONCLUSIONS

- Homogenous detection of such research misconducts as redundant publication and self-plagiarism is a prerequisite to shape trust-based practice either by the OAEP or universities / research institutes.

- The arguing practice should be improved in order to expose the substance of academic shortcomings. At present, the power of national publisher / national publishing house is not fully enabled.

- In a historical context of research publishing culture, academic ethics policy, and scarce practice to build ethics infrastructure, it is evident that it is not enough to have two legal concepts (notably citation and misappropriation of authorship) in the hand.
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