



Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences
Sindicatelor Street, no. 7, 400029, Cluj-Napoca
Tel: 0264 405337 Fax: 0264 590559
E-mail: psiedu@psiedu.ubbcluj.ro

DOCTORAL SCHOOL „EDUCATION – REFLECTION – DEVELOPMENT”

SYLLABUS

Ethics and academic integrity

GENERAL INFORMATION

DOCTORAL SCHOOL „EDUCATION – REFLECTION – DEVELOPMENT”				
DISCIPLINE	Course hours	Seminary hours	Doctoral studies coordinator	Credits
Ethics and academic integrity	2	1	Prof. PhD. Cristian Nicolae Stan	6
Contact information: Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences Cluj-Napoca, Sindicatelor 7, Office 25 Email: cristiss2004@yahoo.com Tel. 0744779429				

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Scientific research is the main factor for the progress of contemporary society. As with other dimensions of human activity, or even more, scientific research activity must comply with moral and ethical principles and rules of academic integrity from at least three points of view :

- The purpose of the research and its possible implications on human or non-human beings as well as on the environment as a whole;
- The correctness of the effective realization of the research undertaken and honesty in the presentation of the results;
- Physical and psycho-emotional security of subjects directly or indirectly involved in the investigation.

Thus, the course aims at familiarizing Ph.D. students with moral and ethical values, principles and norms that guide the scientific research activity in order to ensure the quality standards that contemporary society imposes

The themes of the course

The structure of the course incorporates six exhaustive themes, articulated in such a way as to provide the PhD students with a comprehensive picture of comparative research in education. The themes are organized as follows:

1. Moral, ethics, deontology, academic integrity - conceptual clarifications;
2. Fundamentals of deontology; Perspectives in the Ethics and Deontology of the 21st Century;
3. Intellectual property and copyright;
4. Plagiarism and auto-plagiarism;
5. Ways to verify the originality of texts. Practical application;
6. Academic integrity. Consequences of lack of academic integrity.

Main course objectives

- 1) Acquiring the basic values and notions specific to the ethics and deontology of academic activity;;
- 2) Knowledge of the explicit and implicit principles and rules governing academic activity and scientific research;
- 3) Assuming, internalizing and implementing in practice the principles governing academic activity and scientific research;

Supportive bibliography

1. ALLEA. (2017). The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA Ed.). Berlin: ALL European Academies.
2. ANDRONICEANU, Armenia, Fundamente *** International Ethical Guidelines for Health-related Research Involving Humans, CIOMS, Geneva, 2016, online la <https://cioms.ch/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/WEB-CIOMS-EthicalGuidelines.pdf>
3. ANOSR și SAR, Ghid de scriere academică pentru studenți, 2017, disponibil la <https://www.romaniacurata.ro/anosr-si-sar-lanseaza-doua-ghiduri-care-vin-in-spijinul-studentilor-pentru-a-i-ajuta-sa-respecte-standardele-de-scriere-academica-si-pentru-a-semnala-si-combate-derapajelor-de-la-norme-de-etica-univ/>
4. ARCE, Daniel and Gunn, Beth. "Working Well with Others: The Evolution of Teamwork and Ethics", Public Choice, Vol. 123, No. 1/2, 2005
5. BABBIE, E. R. (2015). The practice of social research: Nelson Education.

6. BARROW, Robin and Keeney, Patrick (eds)., *Academic Ethics*, London: Routledge, 2006
7. BELLU Nicolae, *Morala în existența umană*, Editura Politică, București, 1989, p. 50-63
8. BOON, Marcus (2010), *In Praise of Copying*, Harvard U.P. (disponibilă și online la: <http://www.hup.harvard.edu/features/in-praise-of-copying/>)
9. BOOTH, W., “Why Banning Ethical Criticism is a Serious Mistake”, *Philosophy and Literature*, (Vol. 22, 1998).
10. CARROLL, J. *A handbook for deterring plagiarism in higher education*. Oxford: OCSLD, 2007.
11. CARROLL, N., “Moderate Moralism versus Moderate Autonomism”, *British Journal of Aesthetics*, (Vol. 38, Issue 4, 1998a).
12. CĂTINEANU T., *Elemente de etică*, vol. I, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1982, p.24-60, 77-85.
13. CHENG, Michael. “Deception and informed consent in social, behavioral, and educational research (SBER)”, *Tzu Chi Medical Journal*, vol. 24, no. 4, 2012
14. CIRCA, Adrian (2013). *Protecția drepturilor intelectuale. Actualități și perspective*. Universul juridic, București
15. CORLETT, Angelo. “The Role of Philosophy in Academic Ethics”, *Journal of Academic Ethics*, Volume 12, Issue 1, pp 1–14, 2014
16. DE VRIES, Raymond et al,” *Normal Misbehavior: Scientists Talk about the Ethics of Research*”, *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, Vol 1, Issue 1, pp. 43 – 50, 2006
17. EBONY Elizabeth Thomas and Kelly Sassi, “An Ethical Dilemma: Talking about Plagiarism and Academic Integrity in the Digital Age”, *English Journal* 100.6, pp. 47–53, 2011
18. *Evaluarea cercetării științifice Ad Astra* 4, 2005, www.ad-astra.ro/journal
19. EVANS M. “Beyond the integrity paradox—Towards ‘good enough’ governance?” *Policy Studies*, 33(1), pp 97-113, 2012
20. FISH, R., HURA, G. 2013. —Students’ perceptions of plagiarism, în *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 13 (5), pp. 33 – 45.

21. FISH, Stanley. Professional Correctness: Literary Studies and Political Change. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
22. FLOREA Simona, „Plagiatul și încălcarea drepturilor de autor”, *juridice.ro*, 20 septembrie 2016 <https://www.juridice.ro/467536/plagiatul-si-incalcarea-drepturilor-de-autor.html> (autoarea își exprimă puncte de vedere argumentate pe legislația specifică, face propriile interpretări, dar, corect, adesea citează și punctele de vedere contrare)
23. FLORESCU, Marian. „Plagiatul. Scurte considerații . https://www.luju.ro/static/files/2012/iulie_2012/22/Plagiatul._Scurte_consideratii.pdf
24. FLOWERDEW, J., & LI, Y. (2007). “Plagiarism and second language writing in an electronic age”. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27, 161-183.
25. FOUCAULT, Michel, *Ce este un autor?*, Idea Design & Print, Cluj-Napoca, 2004
26. FREY, William J., “Ethics of Team Work”. *Ethics in Science and Engineering National Clearinghouse*. 334, 2007
27. GAVRILESCU, Maria, *Strategia elaborării lucrărilor științifice publicabile în reviste științifice internaționale (incluse în baze de date și WEB of Science)*, Universitatea Tehnică „Gheorghe Asachi” din Iași
28. GÂNJU Traian, *Lumea morală*, vol.1, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1982.
29. GERT, Bernard. *Common Morality. Deciding What to Do.*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004
30. GINGRAS, Yves. *Bibliometrics and Research Evaluation. Uses and Abuses*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016
31. GOLDIȘ, Alexandru. *Critica în tranșee: De la realismul socialist la autonomia esteticului*. Polirom, 2011.
32. GROSS, Michael and Carrick, Don, *Military Medical Ethics for the 21st Century*, London: Routledge, 2012
33. GUERIN, Wilfred, Earle Labor, Lee Morgan, Jeanne Reesman, and John Willingham. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. Oxford: OUP, 2010.

34. HAMILTON, Neil. *Academic Ethics*, Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2002
35. *Harvard College Handbook for Students*. Faculty of Arts and Sciences. University of Harvard.
36. HARVEY, G. (2008). *Writing with Sources. A guide for students*. 2nd. Indianapolis, Ind: Hackett Pub. Co.
37. HAVILAND, Carol Peterson, MULLIN, Joan A. (2009). *Who Owns This Text? Plagiarism, Authorship, and Disciplinary Cultures*, Utah University Press (citatul e din Valentine, Karen. 2006. —Plagiarism as literacy practice: Recognizing and rethinking ethical binaries”. *College Composition and Communication* 58 (1): 89–109.)
38. HERTWIG, Ralph; Ortmann, Andreas. “Deception in Experiments: Revisiting the Arguments in Its Defense”, *Ethics & Behavior*, vol. 18 no.1, 2008
39. HOSTIUC, Sorin; CURCA, George Cristian, *Etica publicării științifice. Mic îndreptar pentru științele biomedicale*, Casa Cărții de Știință, Cluj-Napoca, 2012
40. ISOC Dorin, *Ghid de acțiune contra plagiatului. Buna conduită, prevenire și combatere*, *Ecou transilvan*, ClujNapoca, 2012
41. JACKSON RJ, Ramsay AJ, Christensen CD, Beaton S, Hall DF, Ramshaw IA. “Expression of mouse interleukin4 by a recombinant ectromelia virus suppresses cytolytic lymphocyte responses and overcomes genetic resistance to mousepox”. *Journal of Virology*, no. 75, 2001
42. KANT, Immanuel. *Întemeierea metafizicii moravurilor*. București: Humanitas, 2007
43. KAPTEIN, Muel. *Ethics Management: Auditing and Developing the Ethical Content of Organizations*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998
44. KRAPEŽ, Katarina, *The (Un)Originality Of Scientific Papers – An Analysis Of Professional Quality Standards*, International Conference, Zadar Croatia, 2013
45. LAZĂR C., *Autoritate și deontologie*, Editura Licorna, 1999, p. 103-117
46. LUKE, Allan. “Introduction: Theory and Practice in Critical Discourse Analysis”. În L. Saha (ed), *International Encyclopedia of the Sociology of Education*, Elsevier Science Ltd. <https://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/ed270/Luke/SAHA6.html>

47. MACFARLANE, Bruce. *Researching with Integrity. The Ethics of Academic Enquiry*, London: Routledge, 2009.
48. MACINTYRE A., *Tratat de morală. După virtute*, Editura Humanitas, București, 1998, p. 62-101.
49. MAURER, Hermann, F. Kappe, Bilal Zaka. "Plagiarism – A Survey." *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, vol. 12, no. 8 (2006), 1050-1084.
50. MILGRAM, Stanley. "Behavioral Study of Obedience". *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, vol. 67, no.4, 1963
51. MILGRAM, Stanley. *Obedience to Authority: an Experimental View*, Harper & Row, 1974 5. *** The Belmont Report, 1979, online la <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmontreport/index.html>
52. MILL J.S., *Utilitarismul*, Editura Alternative, 1994.
53. MILL, John Stuart. *Utilitarismul*, București: Paideia. 2003
54. MILLER, Seamus., Selgelid Michael. "Ethics and the Dual-Use Dilemma in the Life Sciences". In: Allhoff F. (eds) *Physicians at War. International Library of Ethics, Law, and the New*, vol 41. Dordrecht: Springer, 2008
55. MILLER, Seamus., Selgelid Michael. *Ethical and Philosophical Consideration of the Dual-Use Dilemma in the Biological Sciences*, Springer, 2008
56. MUKHTAR, Nasiru, *Journal of Politics and Law* 6, no. 2 (2013), (<http://www.questia.com/read/1P33089447481/nature-and-scope-of-intellectual-property-law-an>).
57. MUREȘAN, Valentin. *Managementul eticii în organizații*, București: Editura Universității din București, 2009
58. NOWAK, Rachel. "Killer mousepox virus raises bioterror fears", *New Scientist*, 10 January 2001, online la <https://www.newscientist.com/article/dn3111-killer-mousepox-virus-raises-bioterror-fears/>
59. NYHAN, Julianne and Duke-Williams, Oliver. "Joint and multi-authored publication patterns in the Digital Humanities", *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 2014
60. *Oxford Dictionary of English*. (2nd Ed., 2003) Entry on Original and Originality. (p. 1242). Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

61. RAWLS, John. A Theory of Justice (revised ed.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999
62. SANDU, Dumitru. (2016). Plagiat masiv, intenționat, cu complicități multiple. Contributors.ro (<http://www.contributors.ro/administratie/educatie/plagiat-masiv-intenționat-cu-complicitați-multiple/> , consultat septembrie 2017).
63. SELGELID, Michael, “Governance of dual-use research: an ethical dilemma”, Bulletin of the World Health Organization, vol.87, 2009
64. SEUCAN, Andreea Pavel (2015). Drepturile morale și drepturile patrimoniale de autor, ed. a II-a rev., Universul juridic, București
65. SEWELL, Graham. “Teamwork, Ethics, and the Quality of Working Life”. In: Reilly N., Sirgy M., Gorman C. (eds) Work and Quality of Life. International Handbooks of Quality-of-Life. Springer, Dordrecht, 2012
66. SHAMOO, Adil and Resnik, David, Responsible Conduct of Research, (3rd ed), Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2015
67. SHAMOO, Adil E., RESNIK, David B., Responsible Conduct of Research. Oxford University Press, New York, 2003
68. STAN, Raluca Etica în cercetare. Buna conduită în activitatea de cercetare-dezvoltare Universitatea Politehnica din București, Program postdoctoral pentru cercetare avansată în domeniul nanomaterialelor
69. STURE, Judi, The Ethics and Biosecurity Kit for Scientists, London: World Scientific Publishing, 2017 8. *** “An interview with Ronald Jackson and Ian Ramshaw on dual-use research”, EMBO Reports, vol.11, no.1, 2010
70. SUNSTEIN, Cass. Infotopia: How Many Minds Produce Knowledge. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2006
71. ȘERCAN, E. (2015). TOBĂ DE CARTE. 250 de pagini din teza de doctorat a ministrului de Interne, Petre Tobă, sunt copiate din alte lucrări. Press One (<https://pressone.ro/toba-de-carte-250-de-pagini-din-teza-de-doctorat-aministrului-de-interne-petre-toba-sunt-copiate-din-alte-lucrari/>, consultat septembrie 2017) (v. și ȘERCAN 2017, Fabrica de doctorate sau Cum se surpă fundamentele unei nații. București: Humanitas)

72. ȘERCAN, E., Deontologie academică. Ghid practic, Editura Universității din București, 2017
73. The Oxford Thesaurus. (2nd Ed., 1997). Entry on Original and Originality. Great Britain: OxfordUniversity Press.
74. University of Melbourne. Academic Skills, disponibil la www.services.unimelb.edu.au/academicskills
75. Webster Comprehensive Dictionary: International Edition. (Vol. 2, 1992). Entry on Original and Originality. (p. 890). Chicago, IL: J. G. Ferguson Publishing Company.
76. WILLIAMS Bernard, *Introducere în etică*, Editura Alternative, 1993, p. 80-87.
77. “Plagiarism “. Academic Integrity at MIT. A Handbook for Students. Massachussets Institute of Technology. <https://integrity.mit.edu/handbook/what-plagiarism>.
78. “Plagiarism”. Hixon Writing Center, Caltech (California Institute of Technology). <https://www.writing.caltech.edu/plagiarism>
79. “Plagiarism”. University of Cambridge. <http://www.plagiarism.admin.cam.ac.uk/>
80. “Study Skills and Training. Plagiarism”. University of Oxford. <https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/guidance/skills/plagiarism?wssl=1>
81. “What Is Plagiarism?” Office of Community Standards. Student Affairs. University of Stanford. <https://communitystandards.stanford.edu/student-conduct-process/honor-code-and-fundamentalstandard/additional-resources/what-plagiarism>
82. „Ghid împotriva plagiatului”. Centrul de Cercetare în Etică Aplicată. Facultatea de Filozofie, UB. http://www.unibuc.ro/depts/limbi/literaturi_orientale/docs/2014/oct/16_09_46_47_Ghid_impotriva_plagiatului.pdf
83. „Ghid împotriva plagiatului”. Facultatea de Jurnalism și Științele Comunicării, UB. http://www.fjsc.unibuc.ro/home/doctorat/ghid-impotriva-plagiatului_privind_elaborareaunei_lucrari_stiinifice, Editura Universitară, București, 2017

METHODS OF ACTIVITIES CONDUCTING

- Interactive lectures;
- Learning through cooperation;
- Group activities;
- Debates;
- Project development, group presentation and evaluation;
- Exposing the conclusions, aspects of the elaborated project and debating them;
- Analysis / evaluation of existing materials on relevant educational websites.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION:

Course - *interactive lectures*, debates, case studies, ongoing tests of knowledge.

Seminar – *individual study, project development, large group discussions*.

Time / activity: independent work, project development: approx. 50-60 min. per session, large group debates: approx. 40 min. per session, interactive lecture: approx. 30 min. per session, evaluation and synthesis approx. 30 min. per session.

MATERIALS AND MEANS:

Study, debates and work support, printed or in electronic version, list of supportive bibliography, multimedia presentations, PowerPoint presentations, computer, projector (provided by the faculty), e-group –yahoo groups– materials and information posted on the e-group designated to specific activities of seminars and projects.

LOCATION: course and seminar room, room for 20 students.

Planning / Schedule for meetings and verifications / Formative evaluation

C₁ – Introductory Course

There are presented the premises of designing the theme and the teaching approaches, major curricular options, course objectives, topics proposed, recommended literature, assessing methods and other organizational details. There are made clarifications related to working assignments.

C₂, C₃, C₄, C₅, C₆, C₇, C₈ – Debate-course for themes I-IV.

S₁ – S₄

The group of PhD candidates will present and debate 2-4 themes for each seminary, these being related to the issues presented during the course. The themes will be tackled individually or in small groups and they will be presented by using posters, PowerPoint slides, concise descriptions, case studies etc. It will be conducted a continuous assessment, having a formative and a training characteristic.

C₉, C₁₀, C₁₁ – Debate-course

Creating a compact summary, of approximately 25 minutes/ course for the themes V, VI, followed by applied exercises, individual activities, group activities, discussions and frontal evaluations.

S₅ – S₆

The group of PhD candidates will present and debate 2-4 themes for each seminary, these being related to the issues presented during the course. The themes will be tackled individually or in small groups and they will be presented by using posters, PowerPoint slides, concise descriptions, case studies etc. It will be conducted a continuous assessment, having a formative and a training characteristic.

Collective analysis of curricular assignments that were created. It will be conducted a continuous assessment, having a formative and a training characteristic.

C₁₂ – Debate-course

Organizing collective discussions, interactive activities for reinforcing and consolidating information, recapitulation, in order to complete research projects.

PhD candidates' responsibilities as regards courses and seminars

- Consult the recommended orientative bibliography and other bibliography sources identified individually
- Active and interactive participation in the practical teaching activities

STUDENTS' RESPONSABILITIES FOR COURSE AND SEMINAR:

- Participating in e-group messaging;
- Accessing and reviewing the course and seminar materials and the available bibliographic references;
- Making step by step the portfolio which will be discussed in the seminar / course and presentation of the final portfolio;
- Review the bibliography, enrich the bibliography;

ASSESSMENT FORMS

- Seminar / course portfolio, sequentially built (progress assessment) and final portfolio (Final assessment).
- Assessment in interactive or group activities during debates, workshops, etc.

The rating (*satisfactory, good and very good*) is based on the composite evaluation of three criteria:

- a) Quality and complexity of individual interventions and presentations at courses and seminars.
- b) Quality and complexity of the final portfolio.

ORGANIZATIONAL DETAILS, MANAGEMENT OF LEARNING SITUATIONS

Presence at courses and seminars: It is proposed and negotiated with the Ph.D. candidates a minimum number of attending courses and seminars, attendance that represents a condition for the access to the final assessment, as follows:

- between 8 and 10 attendances out of a total of 14 courses;
- between 4 and 5 attendances out of a total of 7 seminars;

Recuperation – there are no recuperation meetings for doctoral students who are absent. In such cases, PhD students have to fully retake their activities in the next year, with the approval of PhD coordinators and of the Doctoral Studies Institute.

Optional bibliography

The optional bibliography is decided by each doctoral student, with the support of the course responsible and of the doctorate coordinators, depending on the specific learning needs.

Cluj – Napoca
30th September 2018

Prof. PhD. Cristian Nicolae Stan