

Ethics and Integrity in the Publishing Process: Myths, Facts, and a Roadmap

Marshall Schminke¹ and Maureen L. Ambrose¹

¹*University of Central Florida, USA*

ABSTRACT Integrity provides the foundation for most scholarly endeavours, including research and publishing. Authors, reviewers, and editors share responsibility for creating and maintaining the system in which we conduct and publish our work. However, research and publishing are complicated processes. A single research effort may involve multiple authors, hundreds of participants, and a variety of skills and tools that play out over the course of months or even years. Ethical challenges may arise at any point along the way, so it is not surprising that both new and experienced scholars often struggle to understand and maintain the ethical standards expected of them. This article highlights some of the main challenges scholars face and provides initial guidance for seeking solutions. But most importantly, it sets the stage for this Special Editors' Forum on research and publishing ethics.

KEYWORDS ethics, integrity, professionalism, publishing, research ethics

INTRODUCTION

We recently completed a three-year term on the Ethics Education Committee of the Academy of Management (AoM), a professional organization comprised primarily of management researchers and doctoral students preparing to become researchers of management. The committee's mission was to assess and improve the level of awareness of professional ethics among members of the AoM. We were surprised by what we learned.

During our term, we spent countless hours speaking with groups of new members, doctoral students, junior faculty, division chairs, editorial team members, and senior-level leaders in the profession, both through the AoM and through affiliated organizations like the International Association of Chinese Management Research (IACMR). Each time we participated in one of these meetings we encountered a barrage of stories, concerns, and ideas related to professional ethics, in particular, research and publishing ethics. Each of these encounters brought to light serious concerns. But these concerns were coupled with a level of

commitment to – and excitement about – research ethics, which are of the utmost importance for a healthy field, one dedicated to the discovery of true or valid knowledge about management and organizations.

Our goal for this Special Editors' Forum is to provide practical, actionable advice, from leaders in the profession, on how to deal with a variety of ethical pressures and situations researchers may encounter. We have not tackled concerns that reside at a more systemic level. We do not, for example, attempt to explain why ethical violations might surface to begin with, such as the structure of our incentive systems, the value of our work to external constituencies, or the lack of punishment for violators. Rather, we hope to prompt increased and improved conversations about the challenges we face and clarify what is expected of a research professional. In all, we hope to follow in the footsteps of our colleagues in disciplines like psychology and sociology in providing a clearer picture of how important these challenges are and what we can do about them.

Our purpose in this introductory essay, therefore, is to shine light on several ethical challenges that arise in the research and publishing process and to discuss some of the myths that surround them. We do so on four fronts. First, we present some observations about the (sometimes surprising) way our system works. Second, we provide specific information regarding professional codes of ethics and standards with respect to research, drawing on examples of such codes from both the AoM and the IACMR. Third, we present some real-world insights gathered from journal editors, which highlight the ethical challenges that sometimes arise as our work reaches the journal submission and publication stage. Finally, we address several myths regarding publishing ethics that seem to permeate some corners of our profession. Through these formal and informal examples, our hope is to better illustrate the challenges scholars face in our research and publishing activities, and how to minimize ethical problems related to them.

FRAMING THE ISSUES

We begin with an observation: Our profession has no formal, regular, auditing process. In particular, our research and publishing activities are not monitored by a formal audit process. In most every other profession, including medical, legal, engineering, and also business fields like accounting and finance, the processes by which one does his or her work and the outcome are subject to external examination. We refer here not to the quality of our work output. We have that, in the form of the peer review process. And in many cases, we have an external evaluation of the design and intent of the studies, in the form of the Institutional Review Board's (and related structures) policies. Rather, we refer here to an audit of the actual building blocks of our work. How we craft our theory. How we build our models. Right down to our data. We have no independent audit process for any of this. As scholars, we are alone out there, guided – and perhaps more importantly,

protected – only by our understanding of, and compliance with, our professional ethics.

For example, in more than 25 years of publishing, neither of us have ever once been asked – either by an editor or by a reviewer – to see our data, much less the records involved in collecting, assembling, and analyzing those data. In our tenures as associate editors at the *Academy of Management Journal* and *Business Ethics Quarterly*, we have served as stewards for nearly 1,000 manuscripts. Yet, we have never asked an author for access to, or documentation of, his or her raw data. Further, those 1,000 manuscripts involved more than 3,000 reviews. And we have never had even a single reviewer request access to data or documentation regarding the data.

What does this say about us and our work? A sceptic may say we are extraordinarily naïve people. A cynic may say our work has no real value and is therefore not worth auditing. But more fundamentally, it says our work rests on a foundation of individual professionalism and responsibility. The result is that ethics, not audits, serve as the primary assurance of integrity and fairness in our research process and the quality of the products that emerge from it.

Finding Guidance is Easy

Our conversations with journal editors, division chairs, and other professional leaders quickly reveal that a great many of them have multiple stories of blatant violations of research and publishing ethics standards. And the most common explanation from violators includes some form of ‘I didn’t know’, which suggests our formal training efforts (e.g., graduate programs) have proven insufficient. However, with the easy and instant access to information available today, that is an unacceptable reply. Answers exist, but when they encounter an ethically questionable situation, scholars must know where to look for answers before they become problems.

For example, the Academy of Management Code of Ethics identifies both general principles and specific standards of conduct for individuals involved in AoM activities. (The full Code of Ethics may be viewed at: <http://www.aomonline.org/aom.asp?id=268>.)

Three general principles serve as a guide for AoM members’ professional activities. These include responsibility, integrity, and respect for people’s rights and dignity. The Code of Ethics outlines how these general principles relate to our commitments to our students, our profession, the AoM, practising managers, and the larger communities in which we live and work. In addition, the Code provides explicit standards of conduct spanning five specific areas, one of which is Research and Publication. These are the issues most relevant to this Special Forum.

The AoM is not alone in its emphasis on publishing ethics. The IACMR is also very proactive in its positions. A visit to the IACMR website

(<http://www.iacmr.org/>) and a click on the 'Our Commitments' link makes this abundantly clear. The formal Commitment to Excellence document identifies eight specific responsibilities that provide the foundation for research excellence. Each one reflects strong ethical standards and these standards are sent to all new and renewed IACMR members. In addition, the Commitment to Excellence document is followed by a formal Research Code of Ethics, which identifies a variety of more specific ethical responsibilities of IACMR members as well. These responsibilities include research integrity, adherence to journal submission policies, respect for research participants, editor and reviewer responsibilities, professional interaction and exchange, conference participation, and general responsibilities of IACMR members. Although much younger and smaller than the Academy of Management, this ethical focus of the IACMR is truly remarkable.

Learning from the Editors

One would think with all of this easy access to high quality guidance, violations of research ethics would be rare. Unfortunately, violations are not uncommon. We recently informally polled 16 former editors of top-tier management journals. We asked them to recall one or two instances in which they were forced to confront a potential or apparent ethical violation at their journal. While nearly half were unable to recall even a single instance of ethically questionable behaviour, slightly more than half had no difficulty whatsoever in identifying a serious ethical breach.

The events described by the editors reflected multiple themes. The most common of these involved authors who submit very similar manuscripts to two different journals or authors who resubmit rejected manuscripts to the same journal. Such papers often reflect only minor changes in theorizing, hypothesizing, data, and/or analyses.

A second theme reflects the significant role luck plays in identifying problematic manuscripts. In nearly every case in which a questionable paper was identified, it was not a systemic audit of previous submissions or search of the broader literature that revealed the problem. It was the careful eye and sharp memory of a reviewer. Top journals often compete for the best reviewers in a research area. Therefore, it is not uncommon for a paper to attract one or more of the same reviewers as it moves from journal to journal or gets resubmitted to a new editorial team at the same journal.

The third theme permeating editors' comments reflects the regularity with which violations are committed by experienced authors. Most ethical violations do not appear in the work of junior scholars who do not know or understand the rules. Nor are they a result of junior scholars running 'ethical yellow lights' due to pressures imposed by tenure timelines. Perhaps even more troubling, in many cases the more experienced authors did not take personal responsibility for their actions. Rather, they explained the problem resulted from mistakes on the part of junior colleagues or graduate students.

Of course, it is impossible to know where the truth lies in such explanations. At best, they imply a lack of care by some senior authors in managing their manuscripts. At worst, these authors may be guilty not only of violating publishing ethics, but also of adding the violation of blaming a junior colleague or student for the action.

In other cases, authors claimed either ignorance or innocence. In rare instances, such explanations may be effective. However, editors are a lot like teachers or parents or police officers, in that they have 'heard them all' and are not often swayed by such accounts. This is especially true in cases in which the actions were obviously deliberate.

The editors generated other examples of ethical violations as well. One recalled an author who failed to respond to an invitation to revise and resubmit. A few months later, the paper appeared in another journal. Apparently, after receiving the revise and resubmit invitation from the original journal, the author had resubmitted the manuscript to another journal, while keeping the revise and resubmit invitation active as a backup. Only after the paper had been accepted elsewhere did the author formally withdraw from the original journal's system. (This case was discussed in Chen, 2011, in this issue also.) Many top journals consider a manuscript to be active in their system until formally withdrawn. In such cases, submitting to a second journal before declining the offer to revise is equivalent to having the paper under review at two journals at once. It is important, therefore, that authors understand the policy of journals to which they submit their work, so as not to violate dual submission practices like this.

In all, the editors recounted a wide variety of unethical actions, but different as they were, these actions shared a single attribute. That is, each was a clear violation of professional ethics. There was no reason for ignorance, however. The rules, the principles, the standards, are out there and easy to find. And if a scholar has questions that the codes do not seem to address explicitly, both the AoM (through its ethics ombudsperson) and the IACMR (through its research committee) can help clear them up. Further, authors can consult directly with the editor of the journal to which they submit their papers, and student authors may consult the faculty advisor or the PhD program coordinator.

The Mythology of Publishing Ethics

Until recently, these issues have not received much formalized attention in doctoral training, venues aimed at junior faculty development, and so on. As a result, a number of misleading and potentially harmful myths seem to have grown up around publishing ethics and integrity. Here are a few, and our replies to each.

Myth 1: But everyone does it!

Reply: Not true. Some do. But most scholars play by the rules and let their talents alone take them as far as they are able. If we hear someone say, 'but

everyone does it', we should be sceptical. If we hear an advisor or a co-author say it, we should be more than sceptical; we should be very nervous.

Myth 2: But nobody really gets hurt!

Reply: Not true. Cutting corners on research integrity and ethics is stealing. Authors who do so are stealing credit they do not deserve. They may steal a job from someone who has earned it honourably. They are stealing truth, the only real currency our profession deals in. Their resulting article may get published. But they are not just harming their own integrity; they are stealing from the integrity of every member of our profession.

Myth 3: But nobody ever really finds out!

Reply: Sometimes true, but often not. We suspect many readers of this Special Forum know – or strongly suspect they know – of one or more highly published, high profile scholars who have knowingly engaged in unethical research practices. We cannot imagine how uncomfortable it must be for those who cut ethical corners to meet face-to-face with honourable scholars in various professional settings, knowing that others know of their habits. People do find out; they know. And that is no way to live.

Myth 4: But cheating seems to work!

Reply: Sometimes it might. It may work, in that a researcher may cut corners and may not get caught and may get published. He or she may get hired. He or she may get promoted, and may even become famous in our little domain. But that is not real success. No honourable person can truly thrive as a professional – or a person – by living off false, unearned success. Success achieved by cheating is no success at all.

THE SPECIAL EDITORS' FORUM ON RESEARCH AND PUBLISHING ETHICS

This special Editors' Forum deals with the issues we have identified above. We have been extraordinarily fortunate to assemble a panel of experts with significant experience as editors of the top journals in our field, many of whom have also served as leaders in our most impactful professional organizations. In the essays that follow, each has tackled an important issue related to research and publishing ethics. We encourage you to dive deeply into these works. They offer a unique opportunity for students, junior researchers, and senior scholars to peek inside the minds of these outstanding leaders, to understand more about this critical – and perhaps career-defining – topic. To our knowledge, no similar collection has ever been assembled.

The essays in this forum are as varied as they are interesting. Aguinis and Vaschetto's (2011) 'Editorial Responsibility: Managing the Publishing Process to Do Good and Do Well' deals with pressures faced by journal editors, who often face a difficult dilemma. Hours spent as an editor are hours *not* spent focusing on

one's own work, or the work of one's students. Thus, conscientious editorial efforts are good for the profession but not always good for one's personal performance. In considering this dilemma, Aguinis and Vaschetto apply a 'triple bottom line' (economic, social, and environmental performance) perspective to understanding the responsibilities editors face, and the rewards they might reap, from their citizenship efforts. In doing so, they underscore how critical it is to our research and publishing system that editors themselves uphold strong ethical standards.

Chen's (2011) article, 'Author Ethical Dilemmas in the Research Publication Process', notes that, although editors and their editorial teams play an important role in the research and publishing process, an even greater responsibility falls on the shoulders of the authors. Chen discusses the dilemmas authors face on a number of fronts, such as the ethics of reporting data, managing relationships with co-authors, selecting friendly reviewers, and dealing with the review process. And perhaps as importantly, she outlines actionable solutions to these and other challenges as well.

In 'Maximizing Your Data or Data Slicing? Recommendations for Managing Multiple Submissions from the Same Dataset', Kirkman and Chen (2011) address the issue of publishing multiple studies from single datasets. Scholars who assemble or work from large datasets often wish to publish multiple papers using that dataset. This article provides guidelines for doing so. It helps authors to know whether their dataset is worthy of multiple papers, what procedures to follow when submitting multiple papers from a single dataset, and what other issues may arise when attempting to publish multiple papers from a single dataset. The authors provide concrete insights and solutions to these challenging issues.

A Chinese saying notes that 'beyond one high mountain lies yet a higher mountain'. This metaphor speaks squarely to our research process. It reflects well the extra effort in which today's researchers engage in order to meet the field's increasing standards for high-quality research. In Kulik's (2011) 'Climbing the Higher Mountain: The Challenges of Multi-level, Multi-source, and Longitudinal Research Designs' readers will be treated to a series of insights on how to embrace fully that push to summit the next, higher, research mountain. Kulik identifies barriers researchers might encounter in seeking to climb the higher mountains of multi-level, multi-source, longitudinal designs, such as the challenges to anonymity that may be present in longitudinal studies, questions of data ownership in multi-source studies, problems in motivating participants over the course of multi-phase studies (and where motivation begins to resemble coercion), and so on. The article then provides insightful suggestions for overcoming these barriers.

Many successful scholars work in teams. But working in and with teams presents its own unique ethical challenges. In 'Working in Research Teams: Lessons from Personal Experiences', Lee and Mitchell (2011) discuss these challenges based on

their experience of working with each other, junior scholars, and doctoral students, for more than twenty years. They describe the unique ethical challenges that may occur, by posing a series of key questions – and answers – about managing team processes and procedures in an ethical fashion.

Leung (2011) addresses one of the most pressing ethical issues facing our field. In ‘Presenting Post Hoc Hypotheses as A Priori: Ethical and Theoretical Issues’ he describes the problem of researchers presenting hypotheses based on empirical findings as if they had been developed *a priori*. This paper takes a close look at the multiple causes of such actions on the part of authors. Further, it outlines a series of specific remedies that might lessen the occurrence of such activity. These solutions include a stronger recognition of replication, a larger role for descriptive research, an improved tolerance for rejected and post-hoc hypotheses, and critical tests of competing hypotheses.

Rupp’s (2011) essay, ‘Ethical Issues Faced by Editors and Reviewers’ outlines some of the most critical ethical challenges that come with the role of editor and reviewers. The broad scholarly approach embraced in management research requires the perspectives and methodologies of many traditional disciplines, such as sociology, psychology, and economics. With different approaches, perspectives, and methods, however, varying normative standards with respect to research ethics often emerge. This situation makes it doubly important that the field agrees upon a set of ethical considerations to govern research practices, including the reviewing and editing of manuscripts. This paper represents a step forward in doing so.

Research is not an individual sport. Even sole-authored papers depend on a diverse set of stakeholders as a researcher moves from idea to study to publication. In ‘And Justice for All: Our Research Participants Considered as Valued Stakeholders’, Wright (2011) explores the importance of these various stakeholder groups. He suggests that one reason for the lack of relevance and meaning in so much management research is our failure to be responsive to *all* potential research stakeholders. Adopting the committed-to-participant research (CPR) perspective, he offers suggestions for how both editors and researchers can meaningfully include our research participants as valued stakeholders of the research process.

To close the forum, Mowday (2011) provides a series of insights about the future of professional and research ethics in our field. In ‘Elevating the Dialogue on Professional Ethics to the Next Level: Reflections on the Experience of the Academy of Management’ he looks back on his experiences both as editor of the *Academy of Management Journal*, and President of the AoM, to put some perspective on what might be the most fertile ground for ensuring the profession’s ethical status into the future. He emphasizes the need to push the discussion of ethics down to the level of university doctoral programs, and the AoM’s role in facilitating this process by developing quality materials and resources for doing so.

DISCUSSION

We opened this essay by noting the absence of a formal, institutionalized audit process at work in our profession. We noted the enormous pressure that places on professional ethics to ensure the integrity of a system like ours. But the situation is actually even more extreme than that.

Research integrity is not just an important component of our profession; it is the cornerstone of our profession. Each of us depends on the integrity of the system in which we research, write, and publish to ensure our own personal professional integrity. Each of us depends on the system to support the integrity of our own work. Therefore, even a *very* few bad apples have the potential to harm the reputation of the system and in turn, each one of us working within it. Consider the fallout from recent scandals involving a small but influential group of global warming scholars, whose email conversations sparked accusations of misrepresentation and lack of transparency. Irrespective of where one sits with regard to that issue, it is clear that even the appearance of impropriety in one's methods has the potential to harm not only the participants' personal reputation for integrity, but the reputation of the vast majority of professionals in the area who play strictly by the rules.

We are among the most fortunate labourers in the world. We hold perhaps the best job in the world. We work hard, we study things we care about, we study things that interest us. We do so while making a comfortable living, and while surrounding ourselves with some of the nicest, smartest, kindest, most interesting people in the world. In exchange, all the profession asks is that we do ourselves, our colleagues, and our profession a favour by reading those Codes of Ethics and adhering to the standards they spell out.

CONCLUSION

In all, we believe this Special Editor' Forum represents a major step forward in addressing some of the most critical – and complex – ethical issues facing nascent and experienced scholars alike. These essays comprise a *tour de force* regarding research and publication ethics, not simply because they are written by some of the top scholars in our field, but more importantly because they are written by some of the top citizens of our field. Every one is a true role model for us to look up to. We hope you find some valuable insights from their writing and share our gratitude for their efforts.

REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H., & Vaschetto, S. J. 2011. Editorial responsibility: Managing the publishing process to do good and do well. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(3): 407–422.
- Chen, X.-P. 2011. Author ethical dilemmas in the research publication process. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(3): 423–432.

- Kirkman, B. L., & Chen, G. 2011. Maximizing your data or data slicing? Recommendations for managing multiple submissions from the same dataset. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(3): 433–446.
- Kulik, C. T. 2011. Climbing the higher mountain: The challenges of multilevel, multisource, and longitudinal research designs. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(3): 447–460.
- Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. 2011. Working in research teams: Lessons from personal experiences. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(3): 461–469.
- Leung, K. 2011. Presenting post hoc hypotheses as a priori: Ethical and theoretical issues. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(3): 471–479.
- Mowday, R. T. 2011. Elevating the dialogue on professional ethics to the next level: Reflections on the experience of the Academy of Management. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(3): 505–509.
- Rupp, D. E. 2011. Ethical issues faced by editors and reviewers. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(3): 481–493.
- Wright, T. A. 2011. And justice for all: Our research participants considered as valued stakeholders. *Management and Organization Review*, 7(3): 495–503.

Marshall Schminke (mschminke@bus.ucf.edu) is the BB&T Professor of Business Ethics at the University of Central Florida. His research interests include ethical work climate, ethical decision making, and organizational fairness. He has served as associate editor at the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Management*, and *Business Ethics Quarterly*.

Maureen L. Ambrose (mambrose@bus.ucf.edu) is the Gordon J. Barnett Professor of Business Ethics at the University of Central Florida. She is a Fellow of the Academy of Management and the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Her research interests include organizational fairness, ethics, and workplace deviance.

Manuscript received: May 3, 2011
Final version accepted: June 10, 2011
Accepted by: Anne S. Tsui