

REGULATION
Ensuring ethical practices in scientific research and publication
at the SZTE Doctoral School of Economics

1. Scope of the Regulations

1.1 These regulations apply to the written and oral work of students and doctoral candidates of the SZTE Doctoral School of Economics (DSE) in connection with their doctoral studies, as well as to other written and oral contributions to scholarships, academic papers, and proposals submitted in response to calls for proposals. In particular:

- course-related essays or presentations;
- essays and presentations submitted to a research forum;
- scientific publications, conference presentations;
- a dissertation;
- scientific thesis, research and grant proposals, research report.

1.2. The regulations also apply to written and/or oral performances in courses offered by the SZTE Doctoral School of Economics, regardless of the faculty of the SZTE.

2. General provisions

2.1. Doctoral students are expected to fully comply with the principles of scientific ethics and the provisions for the protection of intellectual property.

2.2 The aim of the DSE is to train its students in the good practice of scientific research and publication, to draw attention to possible misconduct and to help to correct it.

2.3 A doctoral student/candidate is in breach of the ethical principles of scientific research and publication if his/her practice is contrary to the principles set out in the Code of Ethics for Research and Publication (Hungarian Academy of Sciences)¹, in particular, but not exclusively, if:

- publishing fabricated, unsubstantiated data and/or results (fabrication);
- unjustifiably altering, manipulating or concealing data or results (falsification);
- impersonates the work or ideas of others (plagiarism);
- influences the collection of data, the critique of results or the publication process by violating the human dignity or position of others (personal influence).

2.4 In the case of non-public work (e.g. submitted to a course, research forum, submitted for supervisor review) by a doctoral student/doctoral candidate, the instructor responsible for the course or the instructor acting as the student's supervisor shall assume, unless proven otherwise, that any violation of ethical principles of scientific research and publication is unintentional. The primary objective in this case is not to hold the student accountable, but to make the student aware of the misconduct and to teach him/her good practice. The assessment of the assignment is unsatisfactory (or not acceptable) even if the breach of ethical principles was unintentional.

2.5 At the stage of doctoral training when the student presents his/her work to the scientific public (especially in the context of conference presentations, scientific publications and the dissertation), he/she

¹ https://mta.hu/data/dokumentumok/egyeb_dokumentumok/2024/Tudomanyetikai_Kodex_2024_VEGLEGES.pdf

is expected to understand that his/her work may violate ethical principles of scientific research and publication. Thus, in these cases, the violation of scientific ethics may be intentional or negligent.

2.6 Intentional or negligent violation of ethical principles in scientific research and publication is a scientific ethics offence. In addition to an unsatisfactory (or unacceptable) assessment of the assignment, this may result in sanctions, and in extreme cases, disciplinary/ethical action, as set out in the University's Student Disciplinary and Compensation Policy and Code of Ethics.

2.7. The Council of the Doctoral School (CDS) may act as a scientific ethics committee in relation to the research activities of doctoral students.

3. Preliminary ethical evaluation

3.1 A doctoral student/candidate may refer his/her dissertation research to the CDS for a preliminary ethical evaluation. If the CDS finds the research design (in particular the parts concerning empirical data collection and data processing) to be adequate, it will issue a certificate to the student. It must be attached to the student's application:

- the research design, in particular the details of the planned empirical data collection and the processing of the data collected;
- any documents related to the planned primary data collection (e.g. research prospectus, draft questionnaire, interview guide, participant consent form);
- if the applicant is conducting primary data collection from vulnerable groups, or conducting experiments involving human and/or animal subjects, or if the applicant plans to process sensitive personal data (e.g. health data), a detailed description of the ethical challenges involved and how they will be addressed;
- the opinion of the supervisor.

3.2 The student/doctoral candidate must request a prior ethical review if it is related to dissertation research:

- conducts primary data collection from vulnerable groups (e.g. children, people with disabilities, vulnerable people in any way);
- conducts experiments involving humans and/or animals;
- plans to handle sensitive personal data (e.g. health data).

3.3 During the preliminary ethical review, the CDS may invite experts in the field to provide their views. The invited expert(s) will have a PhD degree and expertise in relevant research methods. During the preliminary ethical evaluation, the CDS may request additional documentation from the applicant or invite the applicant and/or his/her supervisor to a CDS meeting to clarify any questions that may arise.

3.4 The CDS will take a decision within two months of the submission of the application. Possible decision of the CDS:

- the proposed research is in accordance with the principles of scientific ethics;
- parts of the proposed research need to be modified (in which case the applicant will receive specific proposals for the necessary modifications as part of the decision);
- the proposed research is not recommended.

3.5 If the student/doctoral candidate has requested a preliminary ethical review, he/she may proceed with the planned research only if the review has concluded that the draft is 'in accordance with the principles of scientific ethics'. If the student/doctoral candidate attempts to conduct the research in the

event of a different assessment, he/she will be guilty of an ethical breach. An aggravating circumstance in relation to the misdemeanour is if the proposed activities include those listed in point 3.2.

4. Procedure for the investigation of a scientific ethics violation

4.1 In the case of suspected academic misconduct, the instructor responsible for the course, or the instructor who consulted the student or assessed the student in the course of the work, or the supervisor of the topic, or any other relevant instructor or assessor of the Doctoral School, shall report the suspicion to the Head of the Doctoral School. The Head of the Doctoral School shall refer the matter to the next meeting of the CDS and inform the student concerned.

4.2 The CDS will decide whether the suspicion of academic misconduct is justified and what action it proposes to take. The student/doctoral candidate concerned shall be heard and given the opportunity to present any evidence in support of his/her allegations. The student concerned will be notified of the CDS's decision.

4.3 In order to prepare the decision, the CDS may ask a committee of three persons to investigate the case, the head of which must be a member of the Doctoral School. The appointed committee must deliver its opinion to the CDS within 14 days.

4.4 The Head of the Doctoral School may initiate disciplinary/ethical proceedings with the Dean of the School in the light of the action recommended by the CDS.

4.5 If the student/doctoral candidate concerned disagrees with the finding of academic misconduct, he/she may submit a request for redress to the Disciplinary Doctoral Council or to the student redress bodies specified in other regulations of the University of Szeged, together with any evidence supporting his/her allegations.

4.6 If a suspicion of scientific ethical misconduct arises in connection with a doctoral thesis submitted for public discussion, the CDS shall discuss the matter as soon as possible in an extraordinary CDS meeting, thus ensuring that, in the case of an unfounded suspicion or a successful appeal by the doctoral candidate, the act of defending the thesis is not delayed to such an extent that it could cause significant damage to the doctoral candidate's interests.

5. Special provisions on plagiarism

5.1 Plagiarism is the impersonation of someone else's work or idea, whether or not with consent.

5.2 Plagiarism is the use of any content taken from another author (regardless of the language of the content taken), the source of which is not clearly indicated in the written or oral work by the author of that work. Such content may be from another author:

- handwritten, Internet, electronic, oral, words or ideas stored in any kind of data storage medium, or taken from other sources;
- ideas, statements, conclusions, opinions, deductions, observations;
- formula, model;
- data, series of figures or data, statistics, solution;
- figure, graph, picture, photograph.

5.3 It is also plagiarism to claim as one's own a work of which another is the author (e.g. copying of complete papers, other works, any written or oral material prepared in return for payment). The author

of the original work need not be acknowledged only if the author is unknown, but the fact that he is unknown must be indicated.

5.4 It is not necessary to cite (1) generally accepted ideas (which are contained in many credible sources); (2) generally accepted or observable facts; (3) original, new ideas or the expression of one's own experience and opinions.

5.5 Plagiarism may occur:

- intentionally: the perpetrator of plagiarism was aware that he or she was violating the rules on plagiarism;
- negligently: the plagiarist realised, or could have been expected to realise, that his or her work could breach the rules on plagiarism, but did not take steps to avoid plagiarism;
- unintentional: lack of knowledge about plagiarism, incorrect/insufficient practices in the preparation of the work led to plagiarism.

5.6 In assessing the work, the fact of plagiarism should be taken into account whether or not it was intentional. Plagiarism, whether intentional or negligent, is an academic offence.

5.7 In the case of a verbatim quotation, if the author refers to the source but omits the quotation marks, or in the case of a verbatim quotation, if the reference is missing but the quotation marks are present, this is not plagiarism but a citation anomaly.

5.8 In independent work, the student may be responsible for using content created by others, but in all cases these should be clearly referenced. If a student does not cite a source in accordance with the rules of the discipline, but makes a formal error, his/her action is not considered plagiarism, but should be taken into account when assessing his/her work.

5.9 A person commits the offence of plagiarism if he or she violates Article 12(1) and (2) of Act LXXVI of 1999 on Copyright and Article 385(1) of Act C of 2012 on the Criminal Code, which is punishable by imprisonment of up to two years.

6. Use of artificial intelligence

6.1 The following activities are permitted when working with AI tools:

- Translation assistance, linguistic checking, stylistic correction.
- - Organising ideas.
- - Demonstration of the capabilities of AI tools, its analysis allowed in the written materials. In this case, the method of verbatim citation should be used, where both the question (prompt) and the answer should be documented, if necessary, even in an appendix if this has a significant impact on the size of the body text.
- - The use of AI-based applications that do not affect the technical content of the work being assessed (e.g. applications that convert sound files into text files, typing applications, AI-based software for people with disabilities).

6.2 Students may use AI tools as a tool to support learning and professional development. It is important that:

- AI should not replace independent thinking and critical analysis.
- References from AI should be carefully checked after searching for and analysing sources. Only sources that the student has actually read and understood the content of should be included in the literature used.

- The student is responsible for the content of the material produced, including the accuracy and authenticity of the content generated by the MI.

6.3 The fact and method of using the AI must be clearly documented:

- AI-generated professional content should not be credited as proprietary and should always be properly referenced.
- The text generated by the use of MI must comply with the requirements of the plagiarism regulations.
- The doctoral candidate shall declare the use of AI-based tools in a separate section of the dissertation. This declaration should be included after the content of the dissertation, before the bibliography. In the declaration, the doctoral candidate shall indicate in detail which tools have been used for what purpose in the preparation of the dissertation or indicate that no AI-based tools have been used. For example, I, the undersigned [NAME], declare that in the course of preparing my dissertation (1) I did not use any AI-based tools/services; (2) I used [INSTRUMENT/NO SERVICE] for the purpose of [REASON FOR USE]. I have reviewed and edited the content as appropriate following the use of the tool/service and therefore take full responsibility for the content of the dissertation.

6.4 Any violation of the above principles regarding the use of the AI is a violation of ethical principles of scientific research and publication. If done intentionally or in a negligent manner, it is considered a scientific ethics misconduct.

6.5 In the case of suspected improper use of AI, the Doctoral School may check the thesis using the software tools at its disposal. However, the results provided by the AI-detection software cannot be considered as evidence in itself, but only in combination with other evidence to confirm the suspicion of scientific misconduct.

Szeged, 12 May 2025