

Convergence Education Review

Research Ethics Regulations

Established: April 1, 2016 (Regulation No. 1)

Revised: January 30, 2024 (Regulation No. 1)

Revised: January 30, 2025 (Regulation No. 1)

Preamble

The publication of a professional academic journal that features the scholarly research outcomes of convergence education studies is one of the most important undertakings of our research institute. To contribute to the advancement of convergence education research through the publication of a high-quality academic journal, it is necessary to establish ethical regulations to be observed by the authors of research papers, as well as by the editorial board members and reviewers of the journal.

These *Convergence Education Review* Research Ethics Regulations (hereafter "Ethics Regulations") stipulate the principles and standards that contributors, editorial board members (and the committee), and reviewers must adhere to in the conduct of research. By complying with research ethics when conducting scholarly research and publishing research papers, contributors, editorial board members (and the committee), and reviewers must mutually acknowledge the value of the research and share the research findings. This is essential for the true academic development of convergence education research.

Chapter 1: Research-Related Ethical Regulations

Section 1: Ethical Regulations for Authors

Article 1 (Scope of Research Misconduct)

The scope of research misconduct is defined as follows, and any researcher who commits the following acts shall be subject to an investigation for research misconduct.

- (1) Fabrication: The act of creating false data or research results that do not exist.
- (2) Falsification: The act of distorting research content or results by artificially manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or by arbitrarily modifying or deleting data.
- (3) Plagiarism: The act of appropriating the ideas, research content, or results of others without proper approval or citation.
- (4) Improper Authorship: The act of not granting authorship to a person who has made a scientific or technical contribution to the research content or results without a justifiable reason, or granting authorship to a person who has not made a scientific or technical contribution for reasons of gratitude or courtesy.
- (5) The act of intentionally obstructing an investigation into suspected misconduct by oneself or others, or causing harm to an informant.
- (6) Any other act that seriously deviates from the norms commonly accepted in the academic field.

Article 2 (Publication Achievements)

- (1) An author bears responsibility only for the research they have actually conducted or contributed to, and is recognized for such achievements.
- (2) Authorship should be determined based on participation in the following four areas: 1) Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; 2) Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; 3) Final approval of the version to be published; 4) Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved. An author must meet all four conditions. Each author must be responsible for their respective part of the manuscript and should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for other specific parts. Individuals who do not meet these four criteria should be acknowledged as contributors, not authors. Securing funding, collecting data, or providing general advice does not justify authorship.
- (3) If there are two or more authors, a Corresponding Author must be designated. The corresponding author is primarily responsible for all matters raised by editors and readers, and any opinion of the corresponding author is considered the opinion of all co-authors.
- (4) The designation of a co-first author or co-corresponding author is permitted only when it is determined that the authors have made equivalent contributions to the research.
- (5) The order of authors (or translators) must accurately reflect the degree of their contribution

to the research, regardless of their relative status. Simply holding a certain position does not justify authorship or credit as the first author. Conversely, failing to be listed as a co-author (or co-translator) or co-researcher despite having contributed to the research or writing (translation) is also not justifiable. Minor contributions should be appropriately acknowledged in footnotes, a preface, or acknowledgments.

(6) Even if the source is cited, quoting a volume that exceeds the commonly accepted scope of citation (e.g., several pages) requires the permission of the original author. Failure to do so, while not plagiarism, is an infringement of the author's rights and is not permissible.

(7) In the case of a co-authored work, submitting or publishing it as one's own independent work without the consent of all co-authors is not permissible

.

Article 3 (Duplicate Publication or Double Submission)

An author shall not publish (or submit) or attempt to publish their own previously published research (including works scheduled for publication or under review), either domestically or internationally, as if it were a new work. When seeking to publish using previously published research, the author must provide information about the prior publication to the editor of the target journal and confirm whether it constitutes duplicate or double publication. However, papers presented at academic conferences are not subject to this regulation.

Article 4 (Citations and References)

(1) When citing publicly available academic materials, an effort must be made to describe them accurately, and their sources must be clearly identified unless the material is common knowledge. In the case of data obtained through the evaluation of papers or research proposals, or through personal contact, it can only be cited after obtaining the consent of the researcher who provided the information.

(2) When quoting another person's writing or borrowing their ideas (for reference), the citation or reference must be acknowledged through a footnote. This notation must make it clear to the reader which parts are the results of previous research and which are the author's own original thoughts, claims, or interpretations.

Article 5 (Revision of the Manuscript)

The author must make every effort to accommodate the opinions of the editorial committee and reviewers presented during the evaluation process and reflect them in the manuscript. If the author does not agree with their opinions, they must provide a detailed rationale and reasoning

to the editorial committee.

Article 6 (Research Involving Human Subjects)

For research involving human subjects, authors must obtain approval from their institution's Institutional Review Board (IRB) and comply with the ethical standards set forth in the Declaration of Helsinki. For animal experiments, authors must obtain approval from their institution's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) for the care and use of animals. Research on pathogens requiring a high level of biosafety must also be reviewed by the relevant committee (IBC). Approval for these matters must be described in the "Experimental Methods" section of the manuscript. In the event of misconduct related to manuscript preparation, the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, <http://publicationethics.org/>) shall be followed for resolution.

Article 7 (Conflict of Interest)

(1) The corresponding author of the manuscript must disclose on the title page any potential conflict of interest that could influence the interpretation of the research results. Such conflicts may arise from financial support, relationships with sponsors, or pressure from interest groups. Even if confident that the manuscript was not influenced, any potential for conflict of interest should be disclosed. All sources of funding for the research must also be specified.

(2) Authors must strive to reduce or eliminate the possibility of private conflicts of interest arising from the research participation of minors (under 18) or family members (spouse, children, etc., within four degrees of kinship). When submitting a paper or presenting research involving such special relationships, the author must report the details of the special relationship to the academic society in advance. If a research presentation or paper involving a special relationship is to be used for college admissions or employment of the related person, the author must report this to the society, which will then notify the relevant institutions.

Article 8 (Gender Innovation Policy Submission Guidelines)

(1) Manuscripts submitted to the journal must faithfully adhere to the guidelines recommended by the Gendered Innovations policy (<http://gister.re.kr/>).

(2) In research papers involving human subjects, the terms sex (biological sex) and gender (socially constructed sex) should be used distinguishably.

(3) It is recommended that studies include both men and women as research subjects and compare and analyze the results.

(4) If a study targets a single sex, a valid academic justification for doing so is recommended.

Article 9 (Participation in Ongoing Research Ethics Education)

(1) Authors of papers submitted to or published in Convergence Education Review have a duty to participate in ongoing research ethics education.

(2) It is strongly recommended that all authors, upon submitting a paper, regularly complete 'Research Ethics Education' provided by the Convergence Education Research Institute, their home institution, the National Research Foundation of Korea's Research Ethics Education Portal, or the Korea Foundation for the Advancement of Science and Creativity.

(3) Submitters selected for research and development projects under the Ministry of Education are strongly encouraged to complete research ethics education from a designated institution in accordance with the agreement, based on the Ministry of Education Directive No. 449, 'Guidelines for Securing Research Ethics'.

Article 10 (Ethical Regulations on the Use of Generative AI)

(1) Generative AI tools are not recognized as authors. If a generative AI tool is used in the preparation of a manuscript, the author must clearly disclose this.

(2) Images generated using generative AI tools cannot be published in this journal. All images must be based on actual research results or be free of copyright issues.

(3) The use of generative AI tools to create and use false statistical data or interview content is prohibited. All research data used in papers in this journal must be collected through actual research activities.

(4) The final responsibility for the use of generative AI tools lies with the author. The author is responsible for any errors, biases, or ethical issues in AI-generated content and must assume responsibility for all problems that arise from it.

(5) All submitters must comply with these ethics regulations. If a violation is discovered, the Editorial Board may refuse to publish the paper or retract a published paper.

Section 2: Ethical Regulations for the Editorial Board (Committee)

Article 1

The Editorial Board (Committee) is fully responsible for deciding on the publication of submitted

manuscripts and must respect the author's personality and independence as a scholar.

Article 2

The Editorial Board (Committee) must treat all manuscripts submitted for publication impartially, based solely on the quality of the paper and the submission guidelines, without regard to the author's gender, age, institutional affiliation, or any personal biases or relationships.

Article 3

The Editorial Board (Committee) must entrust the review of submitted manuscripts to reviewers with professional knowledge and fair judgment in the relevant field. When commissioning a review, efforts should be made to ensure an objective evaluation by avoiding reviewers who are either too close to or overly hostile towards the author. However, if there is a significant discrepancy in the evaluations of the same paper between reviewers, advice may be sought from a third expert in the field.

Article 4

The Editorial Board members must not disclose information about the author or the content of the manuscript to anyone other than the reviewers until the manuscript is accepted for publication.

Article 5

If an Editorial Board member is a submitter, the Editor-in-Chief must exclude that member from the review process of their own submitted paper. That is, the editorial member cannot participate in any part of the review process, including reviewer selection, discussion of review opinions, and the final publication decision. Additionally, the Editor-in-Chief must not disclose the submission fact of the said editorial member to other editorial members until the review is complete.

Section 3: Ethical Regulations for Reviewers

Article 1

Reviewers must diligently evaluate the manuscripts commissioned by the journal's Editorial

Board (Committee) within the period specified by the review regulations and report the evaluation results to the Editorial Board (Committee). If a reviewer determines that they are not qualified to evaluate the content of a manuscript, they must promptly notify the Editorial Board (Committee) of this fact.

Article 2

Reviewers must evaluate manuscripts fairly based on objective criteria, setting aside personal academic beliefs or private relationships with the author. A manuscript should not be rejected without providing sufficient grounds, nor should it be rejected simply because it conflicts with the reviewer's own perspective or interpretation. A manuscript should not be evaluated without having been read thoroughly.

Article 3

Reviewers must respect the author's personality and independence as a professional intellectual. The review report should state the reviewer's judgment of the manuscript, and for parts that are deemed to require improvement, the reasons should be explained in detail. Polite and gentle language should be used, and expressions that belittle or insult the author should be avoided.

Article 4

Reviewers must maintain the confidentiality of the manuscript under review. It is not advisable to show the manuscript to others or discuss its contents with others, except when specifically seeking advice for the evaluation. Furthermore, the content of the manuscript should not be cited without the author's consent before the journal in which it is published is released.

Chapter 2: Guidelines for the Implementation of Ethical Regulations

Article 1 (Pledge to Comply with Ethical Regulations)

Contributors to Convergence Education Review must pledge to comply with these "Ethical Regulations."

Article 2 (Reporting Violations of Ethical Regulations)

If an Editorial Board member (or the committee) or a reviewer becomes aware of a violation of the "Ethical Regulations," they should endeavor to correct the problem by reminding the contributor of the "Ethical Regulations." However, if the problem is not corrected or if a clear case of violation of the "Ethical Regulations" is revealed, it can be reported to the Ethics Committee. The identity of the person who reported the violation must not be disclosed.

Article 3 (Composition of the Ethics Committee)

(1) The Ethics Committee (hereafter "the Committee") shall be composed of three or more ethics members (hereafter "members"), including a chairperson (hereafter "the Chairperson"), with a term of two years, which is renewable. However, a member may be dismissed before the expiration of their term if an issue of research ethics concerning the member arises, if the member's attendance rate at Committee meetings is significantly low, or if other reasons make it difficult for the member to continue their activities.

(2) Members shall be appointed by the Director of the Convergence Education Research Institute upon the recommendation of the Chairperson from among members who are recognized as being able to conduct deliberations for the protection and enhancement of research ethics fairly and independently.

(3) The Committee shall be composed in such a way that the academic fields and home institutions of the members are not excessively biased, to ensure the neutrality and fairness of its judgments.

Article 4 (Functions of the Ethics Committee)

The Committee shall deliberate and decide on the following matters:

(1) Matters concerning the establishment and operation of systems related to research ethics and integrity.

(2) Matters concerning the protection of persons involved in an investigation and the restoration of the honor of the person under investigation.

(3) Matters concerning the handling of the results of research integrity verification and subsequent measures.

(4) Matters concerning the establishment and operation of a research ethics education system.

(5) Matters concerning the reporting of misconduct allegations and methods for preliminary investigation.

(6) The initiation of an investigation and the approval of the investigation results.

(7) Matters concerning the approval of the public disclosure of the investigation report after a decision has been made.

(8) Matters concerning the approval of requests for external institutions to conduct a research ethics investigation.

Article 5 (Operation of the Ethics Committee)

(1) The Chairperson may convene a meeting upon the request of a member of the society, a report, or a referral from the Editorial Board to deliberate on an issue and decide on regulatory measures.

(2) A meeting requires the attendance of at least half of the registered members, and decisions are made by a majority vote of the attending members.

(3) The Chairperson may substitute a written review for a meeting if the matter under consideration is deemed minor.

(4) The Committee may require relevant parties to attend and give their opinions if deemed necessary.

(5) Meetings shall be held in private in principle.

Article 6 (Disqualification, Challenge, and Recusal of Members)

(1) A member may not be involved in a case if any of the following apply:

1) The member is or was a relative of the informant or the person under investigation according to Article 777 of the Civil Code.

2) The member is or was in a teacher-student relationship with the informant or the person under investigation, or has conducted or is conducting joint research with them.

3) It is judged that there is a risk of compromising the fairness of the investigation for other reasons.

(2) The Chairperson must inform the informant of the list of members according to Article 19, Paragraph 1, before the investigation begins. If the informant requests the challenge of a member with just cause, this must be accepted. However, this does not apply if the informant cannot be contacted due to their circumstances, in which case the relevant details must be included in the investigation report.

(3) A member must request recusal if they have a conflict of interest with the research project

under investigation.

Article 7 (Deliberation Procedure)

- (1) The Committee must investigate whether research misconduct has occurred if there is a specific report or suspicion.
- (2) The Committee must deliberate, decide, and execute within 60 days from the initial receipt of the report.
- (3) The Committee shall, if the validity of the complaint or report regarding the suspected paper is recognized, conduct a detailed review and decide whether a violation of research ethics has occurred.
- (4) To ensure a fair and rigorous investigation, the Chairperson may appoint external experts as professional members.
- (5) The Committee may require the informant, the person under investigation, witnesses, and referees to attend for testimony. In this case, the person under investigation must comply.
- (6) The Committee may request the person under investigation to submit materials and may take measures to preserve evidence.
- (7) A contributor reported for violating the "Ethical Regulations" must cooperate with the investigation conducted by the Ethics Committee. Failure to cooperate is in itself a violation of the "Ethical Regulations."
- (8) A contributor reported for violating the "Ethical Regulations" must be given a sufficient opportunity to explain themselves.
- (9) If the Committee's deliberation finds a violation of research ethics, the result shall be immediately notified to the complainant and the respondent, and the respondent shall be given an opportunity to re-explain within 10 days.
- (10) If the Committee's deliberation finds the complaint or report to be inappropriate or the respondent's explanation to be valid, the respondent's innocence shall be immediately notified to the complainant or reporter and the respondent.
- (11) If there is no explanation from the respondent within the prescribed period or if the explanation is not deemed valid, the Committee shall make a final decision on the restrictions on future academic activities and announce this on the society's homepage.

Article 8 (Measures Following Deliberation Results)

(1) The Committee shall, with the attendance of a majority of the registered members and the approval of at least two-thirds of the attending members, make a decision confirming that the respondent's actions related to the deliberation constitute research misconduct.

(2) The Committee may revoke or suspend the membership of any person who, with intent or gross negligence, provides false information or disseminates false facts concerning the research ethics of this society.

(3) If a finding of research misconduct is confirmed, the following sanctions may be imposed, either individually or in combination:

- 1) Retraction of the fraudulent paper.
- 2) Public announcement of the retraction of the fraudulent paper.
- 3) Revocation or suspension of membership.
- 4) Suspension of submission eligibility.
- 5) Notification to relevant institutions.
- 6) Other appropriate measures.

(4) The "public announcement of the retraction of the fraudulent paper" mentioned in the preceding paragraph must include the author's name, the title of the paper, the volume and issue number in which the paper was published, the date of retraction, and the reason for retraction.

Article 9 (Confidentiality Obligation)

(1) Until a final disciplinary decision is made by the institute regarding a violation of the "Ethical Regulations," the members of the Ethics Committee must not disclose the identity of the contributor to outsiders.

(2) The Committee must strive to protect the informant and not unduly damage the reputation of the person under investigation.

(3) All matters related to reporting, investigation, and deliberation must be kept confidential. However, if there is a need for public disclosure, it may be done with the approval of the Committee.

(4) Members and those who have participated directly or indirectly in the investigation may not improperly disclose information obtained during the deliberation, decision-making, and other

investigation processes.

Article 10 (Independence and Neutrality of the Research Ethics Organization)

The independence and neutrality of the Ethics Committee established by these regulations are guaranteed.

Article 11 (Implementation of Research Ethics Education and Posting of Research Ethics Regulations)

- (1) The Committee may conduct online and offline research ethics education for contributors, editorial members, and reviewers of Convergence Education Review.
- (2) The Committee shall promote the dissemination of research ethics education by posting the Research Ethics Regulations on the homepage of the Convergence Education Research Institute (<https://ceri.knue.ac.kr/>) so that anyone can view them at any time.
- (3) The Committee shall promote the dissemination of research ethics education by publishing the Research Ethics Regulations in the booklet and PDF file of Convergence Education Review.
- (4) The Committee shall promote the dissemination of research ethics education by attaching the Research Ethics Regulations to the call for papers for Convergence Education Review and by introducing the research ethics education conducted by the National Research Foundation of Korea's Research Ethics Education Portal or the Korea Foundation for the Advancement of Science and Creativity.

Article 12 (Other Matters)

Matters not specified in these regulations shall be applied according to the decision of the Ethics Committee. If plagiarism is confirmed, subsequent measures will follow the recommendations of the National Research Foundation of Korea.

Bylaw

This regulation shall take effect from the date of its promulgation.