

Authorship Guide

College of Human Development and Education

Statement of purpose

The College of Human Development and Education has seen continued growth in research productivity. In addition, successful doctoral and masters programs have added to the collaborative research opportunities and increased College research capacity. These facts, as well as increased expectations for successful research outcomes, highlight the need for clarifying the process of decision-making regarding co-authorship. This document provides general principles for deciding issues of authorship and recommends procedures for making and documenting these decisions. Further, samples of co-authorship agreements and background resources are provided. It is not intended that this document cover all contingencies for determining authorship. Rather, the purpose is to encourage dialog among collaborating researchers and between students and their advisors and to emphasize the need for these decisions to be made in a fair and ethical manner. Units within the college are encouraged to consider whether a specific policy within the unit would be useful. For example, a written agreement between the advisor and graduate student on authorship issues could be required as part of the disquisition proposal process. In all cases, faculty and students are encouraged to use these guidelines to facilitate authorship decisions and create an atmosphere for successful research outcomes and a positive research experience. These guidelines are put forth by the HDE Research and Technology Committee and are not official policy of the College.

General Principles:

- * Authorship should reflect the contributions of those participating in the research and writing process.
- * Authorship should be discussed at the initiation of a project, but ultimately be determined by the relative contribution of participants.
- * Individuals should remove themselves from authorship consideration if they have not made a substantive contribution to the project.
- * Substantive contributions include contributing key ideas for the research project or contributing substantially to the writing of an article. Supportive tasks such as a literature search, assisting in data collection, being a reviewer, or conducting simple statistical analyses are usually not considered substantive and thus not a basis for authorship.
- * Publishing and authorship expectations should be discussed between students and potential advisors prior to the final selection of an advisor.
- * Publications resulting from a student's disquisition should, under most circumstances, list that student as the lead author. Exceptions might be considered in the case where the student is using a faculty member's data.

Authorship on additional articles from the data based on new research questions and analysis should be determined based on relative contributions.

- * Individuals should make reasonable effort to document their contributions.
- * These guidelines should apply to all forms of research presentations (journal articles, abstracts, presentations, etc.). However, it is recognized that some venues require other arrangements for authorship. For example, some conferences require that the person presenting be listed as the first author.

Recommended Procedures:

At the initiation of a project, participants should discuss the expected contributions of each person and develop a written agreement on how those contributions will determine authorship on any resulting publications. Students in particular should be involved in a discussion about what contributions do or do not warrant authorship credit. A similar process should be used when new participants join an existing project.

This agreement should be reviewed periodically to discuss whether the agreed upon contributions were actually made by each participant, and how any differences in expected versus actual contributions affect authorship.

If participants cannot come to an agreement, the Head of the academic unit should help mediate decisions regarding authorship. In cases where the Head is a participant in the research, the Dean or Associate Dean should mediate the process.

Note: Grievances regarding authorship should follow the university grievance procedures.

Authorship Agreement Outline
College of Human Development and Education

Initial Agreement on Project Participation and Authorship

Project Title

Description

Expected outcomes (articles, books, presentations)

Roles of participants

Authorship expectations

Signatures

Date

Revisited Agreement on Project Participation and Authorship

Project Title

Changes in participant roles

Changes in authorship expectations

Signatures

Date

Authorship Agreement Sample

College of Human Development and Education

Initial Agreement on Project Participation and Authorship

Project Title:

The experience of snowbirds: A qualitative study.

Description:

This is a qualitative study of Midwestern snowbirds regarding their decisions and experiences with seasonal migration including changes over time, effects on family relations, and life style. The project is the dissertation of Kris Bjelde.

Expected outcomes (articles, books, presentations):

Article 1: The Experience of Midwestern Snowbirds

Article 2: Snowbird Intergenerational Family Relationships

Presentation: A Qualitative Study of Seasonal Migration—Gerontological Society of America

Roles of participants:

Kris Bjelde. Serve as lead researcher and writer. Conduct snowbird interviews and qualitative analysis.

Greg Sanders. Work in the capacity of major advisor. Serve as secondary writer, collaborate on decisions about methodology, and analysis.

Authorship expectations:

Kris will serve as first author and Greg as second author on outcomes listed above.

Kris will serve as first author Greg as second author on any additional outcomes derived directly from the written dissertation.

Authorship on any outcomes not derived directly from the dissertation (i.e., based on additional analyses of interviews, etc.) will be negotiated based on relative contributions.

In such a case, a new agreement will be established.

Signatures:

Date:

Resources

Co-authorship between Faculty and Graduate Students in Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania (1999). Retrieved December 7, 2006 from the World Wide Web:
<http://www.ssc.upenn.edu/soc/Graduate/authorshippolicy.html>

Fine, M. A., & Kurdek, L. A. (1993). Reflections on determining authorship credit and authorship order on faculty-student collaborations. *American Psychologist, 46*, 1141-1147.

Sokoloff, G. (2002). Who's on first? Issues of authorship in graduate school. Retrieved October 19, 2007 from the World Wide Web:
<http://www.apa.org/apags/profdev/authorship.html>

Murray, B. (1998). The authorship dilemma: Who gets credit for what? *APA Monitor, 29* (12). Retrieved October 19, 2007 from the World Wide Web:
<http://www.apa.org/monitor/dec98/credit.html>

American Psychological Association. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES OF PSYCHOLOGISTS AND CODE OF CONDUCT Retrieved October 19, 2007 from the World Wide Web:
http://www.apa.org/ethics/code2002.html#8_12