

[Defendant]

*Sent via e-Boks*

## DECISION

By email of 25 August 2017, [the complainant] (hereinafter the Complainant) filed a complaint to the practice committee at [university] against [the defendant] (hereinafter the Defendant), alleging that the Defendant had committed research misconduct. The Complainant asserted that the Defendant had plagiarised in his book [the reported product]. By email of 22 September 2017, [university] forwarded this case to the Danish Committee on Research Misconduct.

The Defendant contends that he has not committed research misconduct.

### The Committee's findings

At its meeting on 7 June 2018, the Danish Committee on Research Misconduct decided to reject further examination of the case as it is not covered by the Committee's authority, cf. section 13(1)(i) of the act on research misconduct (hereinafter the Act).

The decision was made unanimously by High Court Judge, Professor Jens Hartig Danielsen, LLD, (Chair); Professor Hanne Andersen, PhD; Director of Research Ole Kirk, PhD; Professor Helle Bødker Madsen, LLD; Professor Jørn Hounsgaard, MD; Professor Dorte Hammershøi, PhD; Professor Anne-Mette Hvas, MD; Senior Adviser Anders Smith, PhD; and Professor Lotte Jensen, PhD in Political Science.

The grounds for the Committee's decision are given below.

### The complaint on research misconduct and the Defendant's comments

In support of the complaint, the Complainant has argued that he received a text file from the Head of [department] [university], [name], in which excerpts from the Defendant's book, were compared to texts published by others through an online anti-plagiarism tool,. According to the Complainant, the text file demonstrates that there are several matches between the book's first 30-plus pages and other published sources. The Complainant has also argued that he has not had the resources to do a systematic examination of the entire book, but for good measure he has done his own check of a subsequent section and found worrying coincidences here as well. The Complainant has thus argued that the chapter on [xxx] in wording, structure and even headlines closely resembles The Global Information Technology Report 2014 from The World Economic Forum.

### The Danish Committee on Research Misconduct

13 September 2018 The Danish Committee on Research Misconduct can be reached via:

The Secretariat for the Danish Committee on Research Misconduct  
Nvu@ufm.dk

The Danish Agency for Science and Higher Education

Bredgade 40  
1260 Copenhagen K,  
Denmark  
Tel.: +45 3544 6200  
Fax +45 3544 6201  
sfu@ufm.dk  
www.ufm.dk

CVR no. 1991 8440

Ref. no.  
17/056352-14

The Complainant also argues that “references are made in a few notes”, but that it is not made clear how imitative the product is, and that this far exceeds the limit of what would be considered cheating in a student assignment. Finally, the Complainant has argued that parts of the text in the book also appear in the Defendant’s book [xxx].

The Defendant has argued that “the five listed excerpts” - like the rest of the text - include source references, and that the book contains detailed notes, and that there is full access to checking every source. The Defendant has also argued that the publication was put on [xxx] by mistake as it is only a working paper, and that he has subsequently withdrawn the publication. The book is part of a larger project on the historical and current development of the relationship between business and technology, and due to receiving a grant he was forced to abort his work on the book. The Defendant has also argued that the complaint focuses exclusively on specific parts of the book, but that these parts only carry meaning through the synthesis and overall view that the Defendant argues is the point of the book. Finally, the Defendant contends that the claim of plagiarism is a result of a different and indeed manipulative academic opinion, and that the Complainant has been harassing the Defendant for years.

**The Danish Committee on  
Research Misconduct**

### **Legal basis**

The complaint has been processed under the Danish act on research misconduct etc., cf. act no. 383 of 26 April 2017.

The authority of The Danish Committee on Research Misconduct is described in section 4(1) of the Act:

**“Section 4.** The Danish Committee on Research Misconduct shall process cases concerning research misconduct in scientific products.”

The definition of a scientific product can be read in section 3(1)(vi) of the Act:

“(vi) Scientific product shall mean: “A product generated by means of scientific methods applied in research, including applications for research funding.”

The following appears from the explanatory notes to section 3(1)(vi) of the Act on the assessment of what constitutes a scientific product:

“The definition suggested closely follows DCRM’s practice in the field, in which a scientific product is characterised by being produced in the course of research work by using scientific methods in contrast to e.g. publications of a more popular nature, which do not have a similar scientific approach. The assessment of whether a product can be deemed a scientific product depends on a content-related assessment of the product’s scientific character in which scientific articles, Ph.D. theses and the like are the core area for this definition. One element in the assessment of whether the product is a scientific product within the meaning of the act will therefore often be whether the product in question is submitted for, or is intended to be submitted for, peer review.”

The Committee may reject further examination of a case under section 13 of the Act:

**“Section 13.** The Danish Committee on Research Misconduct may reject further examination of cases under the following circumstances:

- 1) The case is not covered by the Committee’s authority.
- 2) The case is deemed to be manifestly ungrounded, or it is assessed that the case will not result in the conclusion that research misconduct has occurred.
- 3) The costs of processing the case are disproportionate in relation to the significance of the case.
- 4) The case has very little connection with Denmark.”

Under section 3(1)(v) of the Act, the meaning of questionable research practice in the Act is:

“Violation of generally accepted standards for responsible research practices, including the standards in The Danish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity and other applicable institutional, national and international practices and guidelines for research integrity.”

**The Danish Committee on  
Research Misconduct**

#### **The Committee’s assessment of the case**

In its assessment of the case, the Committee finds that the book concerned in the complaint is self-published and, according to the information given, has not been submitted for peer review or editing by a publisher. The Committee also finds that the book does not include a clear account of the work’s scientific purpose or results achieved. Furthermore, the Committee finds that the book does not contain a proper description of methodology to explain which scientific method(s) the Defendant has applied in his production of the book. Finally, the Committee has taken into account that the Defendant’s institutional affiliations and academic position are not stated in the book.

Against this background it is the Committee’s overall assessment that the book in its form does not appear as a scientific work, and that the book is therefore not a scientific product under section 3(1)(vi) of the Act.

Therefore, the complaint is not covered by the Committee’s authority, cf. section 4(1) of the Act, and the Committee therefore rejects further examination of the case, cf. section 13(1)(i) of the Act.

#### **Appeals procedure**

This decision is final and cannot be appealed to another administrative authority. A copy of the decision has been sent to the Complainant and [University].

Sincerely



Jens Hartig Danielsen  
Chair of the Danish Committee on Research Misconduct