

CODE OF GOOD PRACTICE FOR RESEARCH WORK AT THE NEW INSTITUTE

PREAMBLE

The success of the collaborative fellow work at THE NEW INSTITUTE will depend on collaborative trust so that each individual fellow feels encouraged to share ideas even if they are still in a preliminary stage. Therefore, each fellow group starts its collaborative work with a discussion of this “Code of Good Practice”¹. All fellows joining THE NEW INSTITUTE will be made aware of it independently of their social sector.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF SCHOLARLY WORK

All work carried out by fellows at THE NEW INSTITUTE must be in accordance with the accepted standards of the respective disciplines for attaining, selecting, using, documenting, and long-term securing of data and other findings. All of one’s own findings need to be challenged consistently.

FACT-ORIENTATION

Any misrepresentation of facts, forging or distorting of data, for example by selecting and rejecting undesirable results without declaring them, or by manipulating illustrations or images, is unacceptable. This also includes information about sources.

RESPECT OF AUTHORSHIP, ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, AND CULTURE OF TRUST

There needs to be strict honesty with regard to the contributions of partners, competitors, and predecessors. Unauthorised utilisation by presumption of authorship (plagiarism), exploitation of research approaches and ideas,

¹ The code relies on existing codes, in particular the „Good Research Practice“ by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft:

https://www.dfg.de/en/research_funding/principles_dfg_funding/good_scientific_practice/index.html

presumption or unsubstantiated appropriation of scientific authorship or co-authorship is not permissible. Ideas articulated by others in discussions within THE NEW INSTITUTE may not be used by third parties unless by explicit permission of the author and by citing the source. This also applies to the respective communication via the social media.

SCHOLARLY SOLIDITY²

All the work carried out at THE NEW INSTITUTE should meet the standards of clarity in expression, consistency and rigour in argument, familiarity with the relevant sources, adequacy of the evidence to support claims made, thoroughness and fairness in the treatment of existing literature on the topic, honesty and civility in the consideration of rival views, care in quotation and citation, mastery of the methods.

WELL-CHOSEN PROBLEM

Is the problem significant and can the fellow explain why, preferably in terms that make sense also to scholars outside that specialty as well as to a non-academic audience?

CRITICAL STANCE

Criticism in the humanities and social sciences proceeds at many levels: most obviously and superficially, criticism of the claims and interpretations of other scholars, but also criticism of methods and sources, of prevailing assumptions, of forms of argument, and of the topics that dominate research. Criticism that spots errors is useful; criticism that exposes heretofore unsuspected limitations, invaluable. At its best, the latter form of criticism opens new vistas for research, either supplementing what is already known or transforming it.

ORIGINALITY

Originality should shed light beyond its own focus, both backwards (previous scholarship must be rethought) and forwards (subsequent scholarship will probably change direction). Authors should make clear not only what is new but also what is at stake beyond their own topic.

As a breeding ground for new ideas, THE NEW INSTITUTE attempts to provide adequate conditions for establishing a high-trust culture of creativity.

² Starting with “Solidity”, the points are adapted from a paper by Lorraine Daston and Wilhelm Krull, “What is Intellectual Quality in the Humanities? Some Guidelines”, 2014.