

## *REGULATIONS*

*Ensuring ethical practices in scientific/scholarly research and publication at the Doctoral School of Linguistics, University of Szeged*

### **1. Scope of the regulations**

1.1. These regulations apply to work carried out by students and doctoral candidates of the Doctoral School of Linguistics (DSL) at the University of Szeged in connection with their doctoral studies, as well as to written and oral performances related to materials submitted as applications for scholarships, and research proposals. These include, in particular:

- course-related papers or presentations;
- proposals and presentations submitted for comprehensive examinations;
- scientific/scholarly publications, conference presentations;
- dissertations;
- research and scholarship applications, proposals, and research reports.

1.2. The regulations also cover written and/or oral performance in courses run by the Doctoral School of Linguistics, University of Szeged, regardless of which faculty of the University of Szeged the course participant is enrolled in.

### **2. General provisions**

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

2.2. The aim of the DSL is to prepare its students for the correct and ethical practice of scientific/scholarly research and publication, to draw attention to any improper practices, and to help correct them.

2.3. A doctoral student/doctoral candidate violates the ethical principles of scientific/scholarly research and publication if their practices are contrary to the principles laid down in the Code of Scientific Ethics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences,<sup>1</sup> in particular, but not exclusively, if they:

- publish fabricated, unfounded data and/or results (fabrication);
- unjustifiably alter, manipulate, or conceal data or results (falsification);
- present the work or ideas of others as their own (plagiarism);
- influence the data collection, evaluation of results, or publication process by violating the human dignity of others or by exploiting their position (personal influence).

2.4. In connection with the non-public work of the doctoral student/doctoral candidate (e.g., as submitted for a course, comprehensive exam, or sent to the supervisor for review) the instructor responsible for the given course or acting as the student's supervisor, assumes that any violation of the principles of scientific research and publication was unintentional, unless proven otherwise. The primary goal in this case is not to hold the student accountable, but to draw their attention to the improper practice and teach them the correct practice. However,

---

1

the given task is assessed as failing (unsatisfactory or insufficient) even if the violation of scientific/scholarly ethics principles was unintentional.

2.5. When students present their work to the scientific community (especially in conference presentations, publications, and dissertations), they are expected to understand that their work must not violate the ethical principles of scientific/scholarly research and publication. In such cases, violations of scientific ethics may be intentional or the result of the student's negligence.

2.6. Intentional violation or negligent treatment of the ethical principles of scientific/scholarly research and publication constitutes a breach of scientific ethics. In addition to a failing (unsatisfactory or insufficient) evaluation of the task in question, this may result in sanctions or, in egregious cases, disciplinary/ethical proceedings in accordance with the University's Student Disciplinary and Compensation Regulations and Code of Ethics.

2.7. The Ethics Review Board of the Doctoral School of Linguistics (DSLERB) may act as a scientific ethics committee in relation to the research activities of doctoral students.

### **3. Rules for obtaining ethical approval**

3.1. Doctoral students/doctoral candidates may apply to the DSLERB for preliminary ethical approval in connection with their dissertation-related research. If the Board finds the parts of the research plan relating to empirical data collection and data processing to be appropriate, it will issue a certificate to the student.

3.2. How to obtain approval. The doctoral student shall send the completed application form (see Appendix 1) together with all the necessary attachments to the chair of the DSLERB, who shall have it reviewed by the members of the committee. Following the review, the original, signed copy of the ethical approval can be picked up in person at the DSL office (6722 Szeged, Egyetem u. 2., Ms. Éva Gábor).

3.3. The purpose of the approval is to verify that the submitted research plan complies with the ethical principles of research on humans in the social sciences, i.e.:

- a) Respect for the personal rights of participants is ensured.
- b) Data is treated confidentially, i.e., information provided by participants is not disclosed, and participants cannot be identified by third parties.
- c) Subjects' participation in the study is voluntary and takes place with their informed consent.
- d) The study does not harm their physical or mental health.
- e) The data will be used exclusively for research purposes.

3.4. The DSLERB has five members: the chair; two members nominated by the chair; and, ex officio, the secretary and director of the DSL. The head of the DSL proposes the chairperson. The chairperson of the DSLERB proposes two members from among the DSL supervisors. The composition of the Board is approved by the DSL Council.

3.5. Approval process.

a) The procedure begins with the submission of an application for ethical approval and a research proposal, which must be sent electronically to the chair of the DSLERB. The chair of the DSLERB approves or rejects the application after involving the members of the Board

in the decision-making process. The final decision is issued to the applicant in a printed document with an original signature and identification number.

b) In addition to the ethical analysis of specific research proposals, any DSL supervisor may request ethical advice on research conducted at the DSL. It is possible to request ethical approval for a specific publication.

c) The DSLERB has 15 days to review the application, which the Committee may extend by an additional 15 days if further information or additional opinions are required for the review.

d) Decisions are made by simple majority. The approval is signed by the chair of the DSLERB and sent by the Head to the DSL office. The applicant is notified by the DSL secretary.

e) If any member of the DSLERB is involved in supervising the research proposal, the procedure shall be conducted with the temporary exclusion of the member concerned. If the chair of the DSLERB is involved, the procedure shall be conducted and the approval shall be signed by the secretary of the DSL, or the head of the DSL, or the member acting as temporary chair.

f) If the application is rejected, the applicant may request a review of the decision within 15 days of receiving the printed document of rejection.

g) Ethical approval may be used as proof of consent when publishing the data.

### 3.6. General rules for informed consent in social science research

The method of obtaining informed consent is influenced by the age of the person and the method of data collection:

a) If the subject is a child under the age of 3, the description of the study must be provided to the parent/guardian in writing, and they may sign to give their consent on behalf of the child. The document containing the description of the study and the consent form must be submitted with the ethics application.

b) If the subject is a child between the ages of 3 and 14, the parent/guardian provides written consent in the manner described above, and the child being studied provides verbal consent. The document intended for the parent/guardian, the consent form, and the content of the verbal or written information intended for the child must be submitted.

c) If the subject is a minor between the ages of 14 and 18, the written information must be provided to both the subject and the parent/guardian, and both must sign the consent form. If the child's name is not included in the research, the passive consent of the parent/guardian is sufficient (their consent can be presumed if, having read the written information, they do not object to their child's participation). The documents indicated above (description of the study, consent form) must be submitted. Participation is always voluntary, which must be stated in the information provided to the participants.

d) Online data collection:

The purpose of the data collection and a brief description of the study must be stated at the beginning of the questionnaire, and it must be stated that participation is voluntary and anonymous. The first question should then ask whether the participant has read and understood the information about participation in the research and agrees with it.

## 4. Procedure for investigating scientific/scholarly misconduct

4.1. In the event of suspected scientific/scholarly misconduct, the instructor responsible for the course, or the instructor consulting with the student during the given work, or the instructor evaluating the student, or the supervisor, or any instructor involved in the Doctoral School, or any contributor invited to review the work, shall report their suspicion to the head of the Doctoral Program. The head of the Doctoral Program shall inform the head of the Doctoral School and the chair of the DSLERB of the fact, then investigate the matter within

their own jurisdiction, submit the results of the investigation to the next meeting of the DSLERB, and notify the student concerned.

4.2. The DSLERB shall decide whether the suspicion of scientific/scholarly misconduct is well-founded and what steps it recommends. During the investigation, the student/doctoral candidate concerned shall be heard and given the opportunity to submit any evidence supporting their claims. The student concerned shall be notified of the DSLERB's decision.

4.3. Based on the steps recommended by the DSLERB, the head of the Doctoral School may request that the dean initiate disciplinary/ethical proceedings.

4.4. If the student/doctoral candidate does not agree with the charge of scientific misconduct, they may submit an appeal to the Doctoral Council of the Scientific Field (in Hungarian: Tudományterületi Doktori Tanács, or TDT) or to the student appeal bodies specified in other regulations of the University of Szeged, simultaneously submitting any evidence supporting their claims.

4.5. If a suspicion of scientific/scholarly misconduct arises in connection with a doctoral dissertation submitted for public defense, the NYDIEB shall discuss the matter as soon as possible, thus ensuring that, in the event of an unfounded suspicion or a successful appeal initiated by the doctoral candidate, the defense proceedings are not prolonged to such an extent that it could cause significant damage to the doctoral candidate's interests.

## **5. Special provisions regarding plagiarism**

5.1. Plagiarism is the presentation of someone else's work or ideas as one's own, regardless of whether this is done with or without consent.

5.2. Plagiarism is defined as the use of any content taken from another author (regardless of the language of the content) without the author of the written or oral work clearly indicating the source in the work in question. Such content may be:

- words and ideas taken from publications, handwritten, internet-based, electronic, verbal sources, or stored on any data storage device;
- ideas, statements, conclusions, opinions, observations;
- data, data series, statistics, example sentences;
- figures, graphics, images, and photographs.

5.3. Plagiarism also includes presenting someone else's work as one's own (e.g., copying entire papers or other works, or any written or oral material prepared in exchange for compensation). The author of the original work does not need to be indicated only if the person is unknown, but this fact must also be indicated.

5.4. It is not necessary to provide references for (1) well-known ideas (which are contained in numerous credible sources); (2) generally accepted or observable facts; (3) one's own original, new ideas, or the presentation of one's own experiences and opinions.

5.5. Plagiarism can occur:

- Intentionally: the perpetrator of plagiarism was aware that they were violating the rules on plagiarism;
- Negligently: the perpetrator of plagiarism realized or should have realized that their work could violate the rules on plagiarism, yet failed to take steps to avoid plagiarism;

- Unintentionally: a lack of knowledge about plagiarism or incorrect/inadequate practices used in the preparation of the work led to plagiarism.

5.6. When evaluating the work, the fact of plagiarism must be taken into account regardless of whether it was intentional or not. Plagiarism committed intentionally or through negligence is a violation of scientific/scholarly ethics.

5.7. If, in the case of a verbatim quotation, the author refers to its source but fails to use quotation marks, or in the case of a verbatim quotation, the reference is missing but quotation marks are used, this is not considered plagiarism but a reference anomaly.

5.8. In the course of independent work, students may use content created by others, but in all cases, these must be accompanied by clear references. If, in the course of their work, students fail to provide references to a source in accordance with the rules of the given field, they are only committing a formal error, in which case their action does not constitute plagiarism, but this must be taken into account when evaluating their work.

5.9. Plagiarism is committed by anyone who violates Section 12 (1) and (2) of Act LXXVI of 1999 on Copyright, as well as Section 385 (1) of Act C of 2012 on the Criminal Code, which is punishable by up to two years' imprisonment.

## **6. Use of artificial intelligence**

6.1. When working with AI tools, the following activities are permitted:

- Language checking (spelling and punctuation).
- Organizing ideas.
- Use of AI-based applications that do not affect the professional content of the work being evaluated (e.g., applications that convert audio files into text files, typing assistance applications, AI-based software that assists people with disabilities).

6.2. AI tools may not be used when writing or presenting (e.g., in an oral presentation) academic work:

- To write the text of the work (including summarizing the literature).
- To translate the material of the work into the target language.

6.3. Students may use AI tools as aids to learning and professional development. It is important to note that:

- AI cannot replace independent thinking and critical analysis.
- After searching for and analyzing sources, students must thoroughly check the references provided by AI. Only sources that the student has actually read and familiarized themselves with may be included in the bibliography.
- Students are responsible for the content of the completed material.

6.4. The fact and manner of AI use must be clearly documented:

- Professional content generated by AI cannot be presented as one's own and requires appropriate source references in all cases.
- Text created using AI must comply with the provisions of the plagiarism policy.
- As part of their dissertation, doctoral candidates must declare their use of AI-based tools in a statement on plagiarism and AI use. This statement must appear at the beginning of the dissertation (see Appendix 2). In the statement, the doctoral candidate shall describe in detail

what tools were used for what purpose during the preparation of the dissertation, or indicate that no AI-based tools were used.

6.5. Violation of the above principles regarding the use of AI constitutes a violation of the ethical principles of scientific/scholarly research and publication. If this is intentional or negligent, it constitutes a violation of scientific/scholarly ethics.

6.6. In the event of suspected improper use of AI, the Doctoral School may check the paper using the software tools at its disposal. However, the results provided by AI detector software cannot be considered evidence in themselves; they can only confirm the suspicion of a breach of scientific ethics in conjunction with other evidence.

Szeged, January 15, 2026.

The composition of the DSLERB:

Dr. Anna Fenyvesi, head ([fenyvesi@lit.u-szeged.hu](mailto:fenyvesi@lit.u-szeged.hu))

Dr. Katalin Sipőcz, member

Dr. Lívía Ivaskó, member

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Form for ethical approval

Appendix 2: Declaration on the use of AI

**Appendix 1**  
**FORM FOR ETHICAL PERMISSION**

**APPLICATION FORM**

1. Title of the research project:

--

2. Participants of the research project:

Name/Role (PI/researcher)	Affiliation	Contact/E-mail address

3. Main goal and description of the research project (max. 20 lines):

--

4. Time schedule of the research project:

Start date:	
Expected end date:	

5. Financial resources, grants, scholarships:

--

--

6. Questions regarding data collection:

6.1. Sample size:	
6.2. Description of the participants (age, gender, socioeconomic status, geographical area):	
6.3. Methods of data collection (e.g., participant observation, survey, experiment, etc.):	
6.4. Mode of data collection (personal, self-completed, online, etc.):	
6.5. How do you contact the participants?	
6.6. Is the participation voluntary? If not, why not?	
6.7. Do the participants get financial compensation?	
6.8.a. Does the data collection involve possibility of the participants' identification? (pl. video recording, audio recording, photograph)? 6.8.b. If yes, will you get informed written consent of the participants to get these?	
6.9. Among the participants, are there unhealthy or handicapped persons?	

7. Questions regarding the procedure of informed consent:

7.1. How do you plan to manage to get informed consent from the participants?	
7.2. Is it necessary to get written consent from each participant?	
7.3. Among the participants, are there children under the age of 18? If yes, how do you plan to get the informed consent from the parents?*	

8. Questions regarding data processing:

8.1. Is data collection anonymous or registered by name/code?	
8.2. If the latter one, is it guaranteed that data cannot be identified without the permission of the PI of the research project?	

8.3. How would you manage the separated storage of personal data and research results?	
8.4. How do you plan to publish the results of the research project?	

9. Questions regarding risks and threats:

9.1. May data collection have an impact on the participants' physical health?	
9.2. May data collection have an impact on the participants' mental health?	
9.3. May data collection cause somatic or psychological pain, injury, unpleasant situation, shortage of needs, or other unpleasant stimulus?	
9.4. Do you plan to use medication or psychoactive drugs or other influences on the participants' mind?	
9.5. Does data collection include questions that may be sensitive to the participants? (e.g., questions on sexuality, drug use, identity, race, income or religion)? If yes, how would you manage this situation?	
9.6. May the participants experience other types of damage during data collection?	

10. Supplement:

<p>1. If the research project have a reference to medical and clinical experiments the researchers should meet the criteria of the WMA Declaration of Helsinki - Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects (<a href="http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/">http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/</a>). In this case, please contact the Regional Ethical Committee for Human Biomedical Research.</p> <p>2. If the research project have a reference to animal experiments, please get a permission of the above mentioned ethical committee.</p> <p>3. Permission filled out by the IRB of the Doctoral School of Education is getting to be complete with the permission of the Local Committee of the country in which data collection will be happening. This procedure may guarantee that the research project meet all the additional criteria of the concerned country.</p>
--

Date

Signature

Signature of supervisor  
(If the applicants is a PhD student)

\*Please be aware of the following:

- If the participants are children under the age of 14 years: written informed consent of the parents is necessary to collect data

- If the participants are children aged between 14 and 18 years: written informed consent of both the parents and the children is necessary to collect data
- If the participants are above the age of 18, only their informed consent is necessary.

## Appendix 2

### Declaration on plagiarism and the use of generative artificial intelligence

I, the undersigned ..... (Neptun code: .....)  
(1) hereby declare, in full awareness of my criminal liability, and certify with my signature that my dissertation entitled

---

**is my own, independent work**; the use of printed and electronic literature referenced therein has been in accordance with international copyright rules.

(2) I acknowledge that in the case of a dissertation, the following constitutes plagiarism:

- quoting verbatim without quotation marks and reference;
- quoting content without reference;
- presenting the ideas of others as my own;
- inappropriate use of generative artificial intelligence (violating the regulations of the university and the Doctoral School).

(3) I declare that I am familiar with the concept of plagiarism and I acknowledge that in the event of plagiarism, my dissertation will be rejected by the doctoral school.

(4) I declare that I have/have not used (underline as appropriate) artificial intelligence (AI) in the preparation of my dissertation.

If *not used*, nothing else needs to be filled in on the declaration, only the date and signature are required.

If AI has been *used*, the following details must be provided accurately and in detail:

(i) the exact name, version, and date of use of each generative AI tool used

(ii) what the AI tool has been used for (with a list of prompts)

(iii) how the final results were checked.

Date:

Signature: