

Special Section On Ethics in Management Research: Norms, Identity, and Community in the 21st Century

BENSON HONIG
McMaster University, Canada

JOSEPH LAMPEL
University of Manchester, United Kingdom

DON SIEGEL
Arizona State University, Phoenix, Arizona

PAUL DRNEVICH
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Growth in research on management has been accompanied by awareness of ethical problems that pose a serious threat to the integrity of our publication process, and the soundness of our knowledge base. This Special Section in AMLE analyzes the forces that give rise to research practices that violate espoused research norms and presents remedies that can curtail these practices. In this opening article, we review key points raised by the articles in this Special Section, but also explore some of them in greater depth. We open with a discussion of how escalating competition for scarce publication space is shaping ethical choices, creating an environment in which many researchers believe that the playing field is tilted against them. We then examine how growth exacerbates competitive pressures, leading to weakening of community cohesion. This in turn undermines research norms, with adverse impact on professional identity. Our attention next turns to the ethical challenges confronting editors and reviewers. We argue that these gatekeepers also experience pressures that constrain their ability to oversee the publication process diligently and fairly. We conclude with a summary of the four articles that make up the Special Section.

The study of management, a research and teaching area usually located within business schools, is one of the most popular and successful fields of study in universities worldwide. While scholars in the arts and science fields have had to contend with declining enrollments and reduced academic positions in the past few decades, many business schools have enjoyed seemingly limitless growth during the same period. In numerical terms, the community of management scholars is now larger than ever, extending beyond its origins in North America and Europe to Australasia, Latin America, and Africa. Membership in the

Academy of Management has grown from less than 10,000 in the year 2000 to over 20,000 in 2016, with a concomitant substantial increase in management publications.

Although it is exciting to have more scholars in our community, growth in the volume of management research has been accompanied by a growing awareness of ethical problems that pose a serious threat to the integrity of our publication process, and the soundness of our knowledge base. Research by Honig and Bedi (2012), Honig, Lampel, Siegel, and Drnevich (2014), and Martin (2013) provides evidence

of numerous ethical transgressions in both the production and dissemination management research. Such transgressions can range from unintentional under- (or over-) citation and borderline plagiarism (or self-plagiarism), to hypothesis selection issues, analyses reporting omissions, outright data fabrication, and in some instances, completely fraudulent research (Bettis, 2012; Martin, 2013; Honig et al., 2014). Problems with the content of publications are compounded by institutional practices, such as coercive citation and collusion among authors, reviewers, and journal editors that promote or exclude certain types of research to enhance their own, or the journal's, impact factor.

Broadly speaking, these types of ethical transgressions are grouped by the authors in this Special Section (and others) under terms such as "Questionable Research Practices, (QRPs)," "Covert Research Practices (CRPs)," and "Noncredible Research Practices (NCRPs)," or as a spectrum of misconduct with "Little Lies" on the lower end of what is not permissible ethically, to outright fabrication, falsification and plagiarism (FFPs) that constitute "Big Lies" (Butler, Delaney, & Spoelstra, 2017; Byington & Felps, 2017; Schwab & Starbuck, 2017; all this issue).

The call for this Special Section of AMLE titled, "Research Ethics in the 21st Century: Institutional Failure or Individual Fallibility?" is an effort to shed further light on how these practices challenge our ethics and damage our legitimacy. In particular, we asked researchers to submit work that dealt with how competition, collaboration, and collusion created conditions that led to ethical misconduct. Our call yielded a substantial number of submissions, culminating in four excellent articles (see Table 1 for an overview). These articles approach our professional ethical dilemmas from several different angles, ranging from professional assessments of questionable ethical behavior (Butler, Delaney, & Spoelstra, 2017), to tests for detecting empirical anomalies that serve as "red flags" for unethical research practices (Bergh, Sharp, & Li, 2017). They include suggestions for turning such practices into "helpful tools" for improving knowledge production (Schwab & Starbuck, 2017), to recommendations regarding how we can systemically encourage better professional conduct to solve the "credibility crisis" in management research (Byington & Felps, 2017).

TABLE 1
Overview of Special-Section Articles

Paper	Topic	Category	Contributions
Butler, Delaney, & Spoelstra	Questionable Research Practices	Competition	Identifies competition driven causes of QRPs (<i>methods training, publication pressure / incentives, editorial demands / expectations</i>).
Bergh, Sharp, & Li	Identifying Empirical Problems	Collusion	Offers three tests (<i>congruence of test statistics, simulation verification of significance, matrix-based model reverification</i>) for identifying reporting anomalies (uncovering collusive QRP and FFP practices) in most empirical research.
Schwab & Starbuck	Covert Practices As Helpful Tools	Collaboration	Explains implications of three common "Little Lies" in empirical research (<i>selective reporting, HARKing, p-Hacking</i>); explains how they can be turned into collaborative tools to improve research practices.
Byington & Felps	Solutions to the Credibility Crisis	Collaboration	Explains misconduct as a "public goods" social dilemma where individual scholar / journal incentives for engaging in NCRPs undermine collective credibility. Offers a detailed reverse causal chain analysis of the root causes; collaborative solutions for the (research ethics driven) credibility crisis in management.

As editors, we are very pleased with the outcome, and hope that the readers of this Special Section share our view that these articles represent a significant contribution to current discussions on how we, in our various roles as authors, reviewers, and editors, should tackle problems of research integrity. What is particularly noteworthy about the articles is that they not only analyze the current problems we confront, but also propose remedies that emerge from realistic analysis of the forces that give rise to research misconduct. In this opening essay, we bring together many of the points they raise in their analyses, and add some of our observations. As is customary in a Special Section, we also summarize the articles and conclude with a note about the new challenges that are beginning to confront research integrity in the 21st century.

THE PERSISTENCE OF ETHICAL ISSUES IN MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

As management scholars, we are comfortable with competition; it often plays a central role in what we study. However, we are less comfortable with discussing how competition for recognition and professional rewards shape the research and publication process. As a starting point, it is necessary to acknowledge that rising competition for scarce publication space has, in the past several decades, exercised an increasingly strong influence on how scholars make research choices, both good and bad. Scholars face competitive pressures as they confront rising expectations on the part of business schools worldwide for faculty to publish in "A" listed top-tier journals, and at the same time, they struggle to meet these expectations in an environment of ever-increasing selectivity and relentlessly rising rejection rates. These escalating levels of competition are putting historically unprecedented stress on the lives of scholars (Day, 2011), and editors (who must process an increasing number of submissions). In some instances, such stresses may lead scholars to take shortcuts in their research practices because they are unable to cope, but also, we would argue, many scholars take ethical shortcuts because they perceive the publication process to be biased and unfair (Harley, Faems, & Corbett, 2014).

Researchers accept that the reality of competition rarely measures up to the ideal description of the process as described, for example, by Robert K. Merton (1973) in his highly influential essay, "The Normative Structure of Science." However, competition has ways of creating its own hierarchies and zones of influence. Equality of access and impartial evaluation of effort may be the ideal, but the process generates insiders

and outsiders: individuals that use their gained status unfairly, and institutional hierarchies that bias evaluation of work by scholars who come from institutions of lesser prestige. Researchers are also aware that other biases may arise from factors such as editorial carelessness, reviewers that do not carefully read the paper they are assigned, or who even use their position (and power) to block ideas they do not agree with. These factors have always existed at the margin, and arguably, much effort has been invested in controlling them. But as journal rejection rates increase to 90%, and in some cases even higher, it is not entirely surprising that authors begin to suspect that a considerable gap exists between espoused research norms and actual practice, and that "others" may be commonly engaging in covert (or sometime overt) practices to increase their research productivity and publication success.

Once researchers begin to suspect that the playing field is tilted against them, they may be tempted to improve the odds by engaging in questionable practices. Byington and Felps, in their accompanying article, "Solutions to the Credibility Crisis in Management Science," point out that when this situation arises, researchers are often caught between furthering their career, and using what they call "noncredible research practices (NCRPs)." Using NCRPs may be good for the career; it gets them published, but it is bad for the field to which they are contributing. This sets up a public-goods social dilemma: The researcher is rewarded for getting away with NCRPs, but the field suffers as research results that are questionable are accepted and cited. It is of course the job of gatekeepers, reviewers, but particularly editors, to deter and filter out NCRPs, but editors are also in a public-goods social dilemma: Placing additional demands on submissions runs the risk of driving publications by high-visibility authors to competing journals. This, in turn, may decrease their "impact factor"—a key measure by which they are judged.

"Once researchers begin to suspect that the playing field is tilted against them, they may be tempted to improve the odds by engaging in questionable practices."

PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY AND COMMUNITY COHESION

The balance between competition and collaboration is essential for positive community dynamics—our

colleagues are also our competitors, but if we believe that we are engaged in a zero-sum game, (i.e., their success comes at our expense), we may begin to take an antagonistic attitude toward their research production. Such thinking can have a corrosive effect on the convictions of researchers who may otherwise sincerely wish to abide by our community's espoused norms. The disillusionment and cynicism that sometimes follows may lead to seeing ethical violations as a pragmatic move that can improve the odds in a competitive elimination contest. The result is to pit professional advancement against our sense of community, challenging an important component of scientific progress: forgetting that while science is an institution energized by competition, it is held together by collaboration that functions effectively only if it is protected by scientific norms.

Because our research today is so strongly shaped by the need to publish, it is easy to overlook the fact that both our scholarly community and our professional identity are ultimately norms based. Our scientific institutions grew out of the enlightenment, when empiricism led scientific authority to replace religious authority, creating the type of professional academics that we now take for granted. Modern scientific norms are therefore the product of the enlightenment's values that find their highest expression in the idea of science as a community that is secular, democratic, and egalitarian. This ideal was easier to sustain in the past when the number of scientists in each field was relatively small. In 1903, for example, there were only 4,000 scientists in the United States (de Solla Price, 1986). Even at that time, however, science was divided into specialties, which meant that most fields consisted of a few hundred researchers. By the turn of the 21st century, most fields were many thousands strong, with the Academy of Management alone counting over 20,000 members.

When the number of scholars in a community reaches such a level, it becomes difficult to speak of a scholarly "community" in the traditional sense of the term. But scale in terms of sheer numbers is not the only challenge to our sense of community. We also face the challenge of considerable expansion in the cultural and geographic scope of management research, with potentially important implications to our assumptions that norms of research that are Eurocentric are universally accepted. Well into the 20th century, scientific communities meant American and European science, a geographic area that dominated the field of management throughout

the 21st century. By the turn of the 21st century, science, including management research, became global. Although there is no overt rejection of core values in research communities that have emerged more recently, growing globalization brings new perspectives and new understanding regarding the values of management research that we cannot ignore (Murphy & Zhu, 2012).

Globalization poses a challenge to sustaining core values, but arguably it also brings new approaches and new ideas. The same cannot be said for rising levels of inequality within management as a research career. Over the past decade, the corrosive effects of economic inequality on social cohesion has become an issue of considerable concern to social scientists (Piketty, 2014; Salverda et al., 2014). Inequalities of opportunities and rewards may also be eroding cohesion within our research community, with possible ill effects on normative behavior. Inequality is an acute challenge to institutional norms when the distribution of rewards is highly skewed toward a minority at the top end. Management research is situated primarily in business schools, and business schools are big business. For example, international students contribute over 27 billion dollars to the U.S. economy, and business education is the largest academic major (Guillotin & Mangematin, 2015). We tend to discuss management research as though it is completely distinct from the business school business, but this is surely an illusion. Tenured professors in research universities enjoy six-figure salaries, relatively light teaching loads, and considerable perquisites (Kolata, 2016). Leading business schools generate significant revenue from book and case publication, as well as delivering executive training to blue chip companies. At the opposite end of the scale are scholars and adjuncts with temporary contracts, low salaries, and heavy teaching loads. The separation between the two groups is so great it is hard to see how they can be considered as one community. At the level of the individual scholar, the incentives, resources, and scholarly environment of a "leading" business school provide vastly different incentives and research resources than those lower in prestige, irrespective of an academic's individual accomplishments.

More generally, the hierarchical character of the research community has made common values and ethical norms more difficult to uphold. Scholars who occupy prestigious editorial positions and chairs at top universities have little in common with scholars in small schools in their own country, let alone in

countries in the periphery of the global economic system. It is hardly surprising that many editors no longer bother to write editorial explanations as to why they reject papers. They simply forward reviewers' comments, or may desk reject with a simple sentence or two. After all, from their point of view, the effort is not worth it: They are not likely to meet the authors of the paper they are editing, nor are they likely to know anybody who collaborates or works with these authors. In effect, they are not in the same community as many of the authors they edit.

Thus, pontificating about scientific norms may appear increasingly hollow to many authors at the fringes of our community. Their suspicion that the game is rigged may not be wholly justified, but it is perhaps understandable when they experience procedural injustice at the hands of reviewers and editors, or even collaborators (Clair, 2015). Asking these researchers to abide by community research norms without exception may fail to persuade. The unfortunate reality is that appeals to "slippery slope" arguments, and potential disrepute to the community, are probably no more persuasive under these circumstances than they would be on Wall Street. Not surprisingly, when the effectiveness of persuasion seems uncertain, there is a tendency to call for more controls and ask for mechanisms that sanction unethical behavior. However, relying on these measures as the main solution ignores the extent to which we ultimately depend on the power of professional identity: our self-image of who we are, shaped by what we do (Pratt, Rockmann, & Kaufmann, 2006).

Research suggests that people may resist extensive cheating, because this may create identity dissonance (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996). However, when merit and contribution are weakly correlated with hierarchies of reward, there is a tendency for the positive side of professional identity to grow weaker. Indeed, self-concept maintenance may disappear altogether, and the individual may abandon the ethical constraints that accompany professional identity, seeing the situation in a purely economic or status sense. This is a particular form of professional alienation that may lead a researcher to argue that committing minor or major fraud is merely a question of risks and benefits. Indeed, research shows that people can make the transition to this mind-set while maintaining a positive self-view (Mazar, Amir, & Ariely, 2008). The key to rationalization is often the magnitude of temptation. For business faculty, lucrative prestigious jobs at high salaries have only grown in recent years.

Schwab and Starbuck (2017) as well as Bergh, Sharp, and Li (2017), allude to many of these professional identity issues in their discussion of examples of several high-profile ethical transgressions that, for a time, resulted in substantial career benefits for the scholars involved.

"This is a particular form of professional alienation that may lead a researcher to argue that committing minor or major fraud is merely a question of risks and benefits."

Complicating professional identity is the reality that our institutions now focus almost exclusively on supposedly objective measurements, such as journal lists, rankings, citation counts, and *H* factors. Measures that used to preoccupy only hiring-and-tenure committees are now also of great significance to editors and reviewers. Thus, a vicious circle has been created where reviewers, editors, and institutions demand citability, and authors increasingly respond by shaping their research toward those ends. Practices such as citation cartels, where authors informally collude in citing each other, or coercive citations, where reviewers or editors direct authors to cite tangentially relevant (at best) research, primarily for the purposes of enhancing the reputations of the reviewer or the journal (Wilhite & Fong, 2012), emerge and spread.

"A vicious circle has been created where reviewers, editors, and institutions demand citability, and authors increasingly respond by shaping their research toward those ends."

Further challenging perceptions of fairness are the long publication delays imposed by high rejection rates. These delays have the unintended consequences of authors finding their ideas rejected by one journal only to see similar ideas published by other authors in another journal, without appropriate credit going to the original authors. Even worse, given the long and arduous path toward publication, authors may find themselves in the position of having papers rejected because another paper with similar findings has appeared while they are stuck

in the system. The fear of losing priority leads authors to increasingly hesitate sharing insights with colleagues, and concern that they may be "scooped" by conference attendees who have more resources, or are faster in moving forward, sometimes leads to holding back presentation of innovative approaches at conferences. Faced with this reality some researchers adapt, seeing it as part of the "game," but it is hard for us to see how these experiences do not produce cynicism and disillusionment—not only in individuals, but also in the field as a whole.

THE ETHICAL CHALLENGES OF REVIEWING AND EDITING

Ethical problems, however, are not confined to authors: They also extend to reviewers and editors. The sheer volume of publication entering the reviewing system is putting pressure on the collegial altruism that underpins the peer-review system. In principle, reviewers should be collaborative in their approach to the text with which they are charged. In other words, they should try to understand the point of view of the authors, examine the inadequacies of the argument, data, methods, and so forth, and (most important) provide suggestions, and recommend rejection or revision based on the likelihood that the manuscript can be realistically improved within the scope of the revision and resubmission process. In practice, reviewing, as we noted earlier, is increasingly antagonistic rather than collaborative. When antagonistic reviewing is followed by manuscript rejection, this has the unfortunate effect of further reinforcing the perceptions of many scholars that they operate in a system that is capricious and unfair to those who lack privileged access.

Safeguarding research integrity and maintaining high standards of quality is primarily the task of editors. They may not be the gatekeepers directly in contact with authors, but they are in charge of the gatekeeping system. Arguably, they should be proactive in preventing the unfair reading of manuscripts by reviewers. Regrettably, however, many editors seem to be more concerned with administering the reviewing process than with active collaborative involvement in helping to improve the knowledge product and the advancement of credible management science. Thus, it is rare to find editors who will go against reviewers, because they believe that the reviews are unfair or superficial, and even less common to see editors willing to fight for controversial ideas in the face of reviewing bias.

In defense of editors, it is important to note that in most management journals, academics serving in an editorial capacity (e.g., editor or associate editor) receive limited, if any compensation. Some publishers have even reduced or eliminated editorial compensation, notwithstanding the increasing volume of manuscripts. Even the Academy of Management, which used to pay editors and associate editors of its journals (*AMR*, *AMJ*, *AMLE*, and *AMP*) a small editorial stipend, decided to suspend the practice in 2014. Thus, oddly enough, the success of journals in increasing circulation and citation does not lead to more resources. In the absence of additional resources, editors are cautious about overruling recommendations of reviewers, aware that this may limit their access to the relatively small pool of qualified referees. Editors have to take into account that the publishing process relies on a model of voluntary and free labor: reviewers spending valuable time and effort reviewing manuscripts, and who may therefore withdraw their support of the journal if their opinions are ignored. Editors' responses to reviews may also be influenced by implicit social pressure. Many editors may find it difficult to challenge or overrule reviewers whom they have known personally for many years (as colleagues and/or collaborators) or those they will likely interact with and rely on for many years to come.

Thus, while editors may have considerable power, they face conflicting pressures as well. Schwab and Starbuck in their accompanying article, "*A Call for Openness in Research Reporting: How to Turn Covert Practices Into Helpful Tools*," examine how editorial power and well-intentioned interventions during the reviewing process foster practices that are ethically questionable. They suggest that the best solution is for editors and journals to encourage authors to be more open and honest regarding parts of their study that are edited out of the final version. If authors are encouraged to report more data, this opens the way for editors to use in-house resources to run checks that will filter out research that is methodologically flawed, or ethically suspect. In their article, "*Tests for Identifying Red Flags in Empirical Findings: Demonstration and Recommendations for Authors, Reviewers, and Editors*," Bergh, Sharp, and Li suggest relatively inexpensive and easy methods to implement statistical and practical measures that journal editors and reviewers (and arguably also authors) might incorporate to enhance the accuracy and validity of our scientific endeavors.

PERSPECTIVES ON ADDRESSING ETHICS ISSUES IN MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

In the remainder of this introductory article, we briefly discuss the contributions of the selected articles, to facilitate relevant discussion and debate for interested readers. We emphasize that these summaries are meant to be descriptive, and therefore, encourage our readers to examine and interpret them through their own experience. We provide Table 1 to assist the reader with the subject and contributions of the special section.

QUESTIONABLE RESEARCH PRACTICES IN THE BUSINESS SCHOOL

In their article, "The Grey Zone: Questionable Research Practices in the Business School," Butler, Delaney, and Spoelstra (2017) explore a paradox that they maintain is intrinsic to the positivistic research: The more researchers try to live up to the "positivistic image of 'pure science' that appears in academic journals... [the more] they find themselves—ironically—transgressing this very ideal." The transgressions may not involve outright fraud and may not cross into territory that is universally seen as gross research misconduct. Instead, they consist of "questionable research practices" (QRPs), "less flagrant, more subtle" types of ethical misconduct that are practiced in the "grey zone" between good research practice and clear transgressions of what is allowed (Steneck, 2006). Common examples they provide for such practices include "...changing hypotheses after the fact, falsely attributing authorship, omitting outliers and salami-slicing data" (Butler et al., 2017). Using interview data from business school scholars, they identify three underlying causes of QRPs in the areas of (1) methods training; (2) competitive pressures and incentives to publish in top-tier journals; and (3) demands and expectations of editors and reviewers in top-tier journals. To constructively address these issues, they argue, it is important to move beyond an exclusive "atomism" that sees the individual scholar as the sole moral agent, to recognition that our systems and institutions also play an important role in deliberately or inadvertently creating and promoting QRPs.

IDENTIFYING "RED FLAGS" IN EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

A common problem with most proposed remedies for filtering and deterring research misconduct is that they are either unrealistic or very demanding.

They are unrealistic when they require authors to make their raw data that was gathered at great expense, publicly available without a suitable waiting period. They are also very demanding when they require journals that lack adequate resources to engage in reanalysis of the findings. In their article, "Tests for Identifying Red Flags in Empirical Findings: Demonstration and Recommendations for Authors, Reviewers, and Editors," Bergh, Sharp, and Li (2017) offer non-intrusive and relatively inexpensive tools for uncovering reporting anomalies which may indicate possible collusive and unethical empirical QRP or FFP practices. These three tests apply to most empirical research and include (1) congruence of test statistics, (2) simulation verification of significance, and (3) matrix-based model reverification. They demonstrate the effectiveness of these tests on a recently retracted article and offer suggestions for how authors, reviewers, and editors may more effectively protect the credibility of management research through more commonplace use of these tools.

CALL FOR OPENNESS IN RESEARCH REPORTING

In their article, "A Call for Openness in Research Reporting: How to Turn Covert Practices Into Helpful Tools," Schwab and Starbuck (2017) list how editors' interventions in theory formulation and statistical testing can distort the research process, often to the point of setting up an ethical "slippery slope" that many authors are unable to resist. Perhaps the most insidious editorial influence that Schwab and Starbuck (2017) highlight is the critical scrutiny by editors (and reviewers one may add) that suggests that nothing short of a "perfect article" will do. Some researchers strive for this perfection by inventing data and engaging in other "big lies," most however, engage in "small lies," manipulating data, tinkering with their analyses, and generally misrepresenting how they went about their study. Schwab and Starbuck (2017) focus on two practices in particular: HARKing (hypothesizing after the results are known), and *p*-Hacking (or data mining), running multiple statistical tests, but reporting only some of these tests. They discuss the standard objections to these practices, and intriguingly suggest that these practices can be very useful and even legitimate under certain conditions, but that their adverse effects can only be neutralized if they are openly practiced and honestly reported. Rather than penalizing authors for engaging these practices, editors should accept their use by encouraging

openness and transparency. An interesting experiment of openness and transparency in the management field is an initiative launched by Connie Helfat of the Tuck School at Dartmouth and the late Steve Klepper of Carnegie Mellon, called the "Firm and Industry Evolution and Entrepreneurship" or the FIVE Project (Helfat & Klepper, 2007). The FIVE Project website houses detailed, extremely rich data sets on a variety of industries (e.g., the chemical, shipbuilding, workstation, photolithography, and brewery industries) that have been analyzed in past publications by leading scholars of industry evolution and entrepreneurship and makes these data freely available to any researcher.

SOLUTIONS TO THE CREDIBILITY CRISIS IN MANAGEMENT SCIENCE

In their article "Solutions to the Credibility Crisis in Management Science," Byington and Felps (2017) argue that we take a step back from a predominately prescriptive approach to the problem of research integrity, and see the situation from a public-goods and social-dilemma perspective. The public-goods social dilemma is the result of collusion between researchers who engage in "noncredible research practices (NCRPs), and journal editors who are loath to expose practices that might negatively influence their journal's "impact factor." Competition among journals, as much as competition among researchers, encourages unethical practices that erode our confidence in the accuracy and veracity of the research that gets published. In a study that should be unsettling to most of us, Bedeian et al. (2010) report that 92% of management professors do not trust what they read. Byington and Felps (2017) suggest that we approach solutions to current research integrity problems as a collective action problem (Gulati, 2007; Olson, 1965). The list of remedies they propose—encouraging more replication, enabling robustness checks via in-house analysis, adopting badges that indicate articles that use credibility-supporting practices—are sensible and well known. However, they point out that implementing these measures requires solutions employing collective action. In particular, journals should make pledges to adopt credibility supporting journal practices that are conditional on a sufficient number of peer journals making the same pledges. To motivate journals to make this commitment, they further suggest that reviewers boycott journals that refuse to sign such pledges. This is a radical program, which may not be popular, but perhaps the field is in need of radical solutions.

IN CONCLUSION

Searching for New Professional Norms in the Midst of a Perfect Storm

In this Special Section, we, and the accompanying contributors, examine some of the adverse ethical and scientific consequences presented by the potentially pernicious combination of increasing competition, collusion, and high expectations necessary to satisfy a contemporary scholarly career. These forces often operate in the background of our work as scholars and in our communal deliberations, and sometimes they manifest their influence in episodes that highlight the issues that this Special Section explores. Highly publicized cases of scientific misconduct are often cited as examples of how research integrity is compromised. But discussions of these cases deal almost exclusively with institutional factors that are internal to the research community. What we tend to ignore is the power of our audiences and the way that they can exert influence, not only politically as Merton feared, but through their market power—especially now that scholars can disseminate their results directly through the Internet. The publication and subsequent popularity of the concept of "power posing," in spite of serious scientific questions, illustrates how this can occur.

First published in 2010, (Carney, Cuddy, & Yap), *power posing* asserts that by assuming short 1-minute postures asserting power displays, a person can elevate testosterone and decrease cortisol, resulting in important psychological and physiological changes (Cuddy, Wilmoth, & Carney, 2012; Yap et al., 2013). Amy Cuddy, an HBS associate professor, delivered a TED talk with 38 million views (the second-most widely viewed Ted talk ever), and a new best-selling book, *Presence: Bringing Your Boldest Self to Your Biggest Challenges*, is based on this research (Cuddy, 2015). As the power-pose concept was catching the public's imagination, doubts began to emerge about the methodological soundness of the research that underpins it. A second team attempting to replicate the study with a larger sample failed to support the physiological outcomes (Ranehill et al., 2015). In a recent scholarly web discussion, Joe Simmons and Uri Simonsohn, who reviewed the data, concluded that "either power-posing overall has no effect, or the effect is too small for the existing samples to have meaningfully studied it" (Simmons & Simonsohn, 2016). Dana Carney, the lead author of the initial study, was more forthright in her rejection of the power pose research: "As evidence has come in over these past

2+ years, my views have [been] updated to reflect the evidence. As such, I do not believe that 'power pose' effects are real" (Carney, 2016).

Carney goes on to indicate that she believes the erroneous findings were due to the *p*-Hacking procedures they employed. So, in one sense, this is a textbook case of poor methodology resulting in bad research that was later examined and found wanting. But at a deeper level, one can ask why a concept so counterintuitive was not greeted immediately with the Popperian skepticism it deserved? The answer can be found on the webpage of every business school where the latest research of the faculty is trumpeted: Our research is now no longer only ideas and findings that we submit to our colleagues for critical examination, but products that can be marketed to a wider public (Nedeva & Boden, 2006). So, in addition to competition both driving and distorting research within our research community, we can add competition for attention and resources that extends to external audiences.

Addressing increasing competition, as well as emerging economic and market challenges, requires new approaches to scholarship. We must learn to encourage new perspectives, radical approaches, and creative research practices. The roles of editors and reviewers are central to innovation. Journal editors and reviewers are the essential gatekeepers and validity guarantors of our current system of publication. We need to develop more systematic methods of training, selecting, monitoring, and evaluating their roles (House of Commons, 2011). Currently, we have a "wild west" model of editorial policies. Board members and advisory boards have loosely applied roles and appointments. There is little if any oversight, and power is often wielded with little thought of the consequences.

Max Planck (1949: 33–34), the German physicist, remarked in his scientific autobiography that "a new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it." Something similar can be said about normative change. We cannot expect any change to our scholarly culture without specific attention to research training of new scholars in general, and doctoral education in particular. Doctoral education is the origin of our ethical practices (or lack thereof), and if scholars are not obtaining training in the ethical application of research methods in the first place, we cannot assume they will abide by ethical norms, or pass them on to the next generation of scholars they may train. As we

become more global as a profession, the importance of having a shared set of research norms increases, which in turn means that we need to support research and doctoral training globally—not only to promote sharing of knowledge and expertise, but also to diffuse greater ethical responsibility.

REFERENCES

- Bedeian, A. G., Taylor, S. G., & Miller, A. N. 2010. Management science on the credibility bubble: Cardinal sins and various misdemeanors. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(4): 715–725.
- Bergh, D., Sharp, B., & Li, M. 2017. Tests for identifying red flags in empirical findings: Demonstration and recommendations for authors, reviewers, and editors. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(1): 110–124.
- Bettis, R. A. 2012. The search for asterisks: Compromised statistical tests and flawed theory. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33: 108–113.
- Butler, N., Delaney, H., & Spoelstra, S. 2017. The grey zone: Questionable research practices in the business school. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(1): 94–109.
- Byington, E., & Felps, W. 2017. Solutions to the credibility crisis in management science. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(1): 142–162.
- Carney, D. 2016. My position on power poses, regarding: Carney, Cuddy & Yap (2010). Retrieved from: http://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/dana_carney/pdf_My%20position%20on%20power%20poses.pdf. Viewed, Jan, 10, 2017.
- Carney, D. R., Cuddy, A. J., & Yap, A. J. 2010. Power posing brief nonverbal displays affect neuroendocrine levels and risk tolerance. *Psychological Science*, 21(10): 1363–1368.
- Clair, J. A. 2015. Procedural injustice in the system of peer review and scientific misconduct. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(2): 159–172.
- Cuddy, A. 2015. *Presence: Bringing your boldest self to your biggest challenges*. UK: Hachette.
- Cuddy, A. J., Wilmuth, C. A., & Carney, D. R. 2012. The benefit of power posing before a high-stakes social evaluation. *Harvard Business School Working Paper*, No. 13-027.
- Day, N. E. 2011. The silent majority: Manuscript rejection and its impact on scholars. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(4): 704–718.
- de Solla Price, D. J. 1986. *Little science, big science... and beyond*: 301. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. 1996. Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the *Business Week* rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(3): 442–476.
- Guillotin, B., & Mangematin, V. 2015. Internationalization strategies of business schools: How flat is the world? *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 57(5): 343–357.
- Gulati, R. 2007. Tent poles, tribalism, and boundary spanning: The rigor-relevance debate in management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 775–782.

- Harley, B., Faems, D., & Corbett, A. 2014. A few bad apples or the tip of an iceberg? Academic misconduct in publishing. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(8): 1361–1363.
- Helfat, C. E., & Klepper, S. 2007. Firm and industry evolution and entrepreneurship (FIVE Project): Data overview, 2007 *Kauffman Symposium on Entrepreneurship and Innovation Data*. Kansas City, MO, Available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1022116>.
- Honig, B., & Bedi, A. 2012. The fox in the hen house: A critical examination of plagiarism among members of the Academy of Management. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(1): 101–123.
- Honig, B., Lampel, J., Siegel, D., & Drnevich, P. 2014. Ethics in the production and dissemination of management research: Institutional failure or individual fallibility? *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(1): 118–142.
- House of Commons. 2011. *Peer review in scientific publications*. Science and Technology Committee. London: The Stationery Office Limited.
- Kolata, G. 2016, July 14. So many research scientists, so few openings as professors. *New York Times*.
- Martin, B. R. 2013. Whither research integrity? Plagiarism, self-plagiarism and coercive citation in an age of research assessment. *Research Policy*, 42(5): 1005–1014.
- Mazar, N., Amir, O., & Ariely, D. 2008. The dishonesty of honest people: A theory of self-concept maintenance. *JMR, Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(6): 633–644.
- Merton, R. 1973. The normative structure of science. In Norman W. Storer (Ed.), *The sociology of science theoretical and empirical investigations*: 267–278. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Murphy, J., & Zhu, J. 2012. Neo-colonialism in the academy? Anglo-American domination in management journals. *Organization*, 19(6): 915–927.
- Nedeva, M., & Boden, R. 2006. Changing science: The advent of neo-liberalism. *Prometheus*, 24(3): 269–281.
- Olson, M. 1965. *The logic of collective action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Piketty, T. 2014. *Capital in the 21st century*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Planck, M. 1949. *Scientific autobiography and other papers*. Gaynor, F. (trans.). New York: Philosophical Library.
- Pratt, M. G., Rockmann, K. W., & Kaufmann, J. B. 2006. Constructing professional identity: The role of work and identity learning cycles in the customization of identity among medical residents. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2): 235–262.
- Ranehill, E., Dreber, A., Johannesson, M., Leiberg, S., Sul, S., & Weber, R. A. 2015. Assessing the robustness of power posing no effect on hormones and risk tolerance in a large sample of men and women. *Psychological Science*, 26(5): 653–656.
- Salverda, W., et al. (Eds.) 2014. *Changing inequalities in rich countries: Analytical and comparative perspectives*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Schwab, A., & Starbuck, W. H. 2017. A call for openness in research reporting: How to turn covert practices into helpful tools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(1): 125–141.
- Simmons, J. P., & Simonsohn, U. 2016. In press. Power posing: P-curving the evidence. *Psychological Science*.
- Simmons, J. P., & Simonsohn, U. 2015. Datacolada: Thinking about evidence and vice versa. [37] Power Posing: Reassessing the Evidence Behind the Most Popular TED Talk. Retrieved from: <http://datacolada.org/37>; accessed Jan. 10, 2017.
- Steneck, N. 2006. Fostering integrity in research: Definition, current knowledge, and future directions. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 12(1): 53–74.
- Wilhite, A., & Fong, E. 2012. Coercive citation in academic publishing. *Science*, 335(6068): 542–543.
- Yap, A. J., Wazlawek, A. S., Lucas, B. J., Cuddy, A. J., & Carney, D. R. 2013. The ergonomics of dishonesty: The effect of incidental posture on stealing, cheating, and traffic violations. *Psychological Science*, 24(11): 2281–2289.

Benson Honig (PhD, Stanford University) is the Teresa Cascioli Chair in Entrepreneurial Leadership, DeGroote School of Business, McMaster University, Canada. His research includes over 80 articles on business planning, nascent, transnational, and social entrepreneurship, social capital, and scholarly ethics. Past chair of AOM's Ethics Education Committee, he also blogs for AOM's ethicist.

Joseph Lampel (PhD, McGill University) is Eddie Davies Professor of Enterprise and Innovation Management at the Manchester Institute of Innovation Research, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester. His research focuses primarily on strategy and innovation, but he also maintains long-standing interest in exploring the social and historical foundations of management research.

Donald Siegel is professor and director of the School of Public Affairs at Arizona State University. He is a fellow of the Academy of Management. Don is an editor of the *Journal of Management Studies* and the *Journal of Technology Transfer* and a former co-editor of *Academy of Management Perspectives*.

Paul Drnevich (PhD, Purdue University) is an associate professor of management, University of Alabama. Research interests: (1) capabilities, value creation, appropriation, IT and firm performance; (2) Management education/ethics. He has published in SMJ, MISQ, JMS, AMLE, JSBM, is a member of the BPS division EC, and SMJ, JSBM, AMLE editorial boards.