Management and Organization Review

Management and Organization Review 7:3 433–446
doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2011.00228.x

Maximizing Your Data or Data Slicing? Recommendations for Managing Multiple Submissions from the Same Dataset

Bradley L. Kirkman[1] **and Gilad Chen**[2]

[1]*Texas A&M, USA and* [2]*University of Maryland, USA*

ABSTRACT Researchers who are fortunate enough to collect large datasets sometimes wish to publish multiple papers using the same dataset. Unfortunately, there are few guidelines that authors can follow in managing these multiple papers. In this article, we address three main questions including: (i) how do authors know if they have a dataset truly worthy of multiple papers; (ii) what procedures do authors follow when they are ready to submit multiple papers from a single dataset to top tier journals; and (iii) what are the main issues when attempting to publish multiple papers from a single dataset? We provide a set of concrete recommendations for authors who wish to maximize their data collection efforts with multiple papers.

KEYWORDS data maximizing, data slicing, ethics, publishing, single dataset

INTRODUCTION

It is no secret that the academic publishing process in management and organizational psychology journals is more difficult today than ever before. While scholars aspire to publish in leading journals [e.g., *Academy of Management Journal* (*AMJ*), *Journal of Applied Psychology* (*JAP*)], acceptance rates at these journals continue to decline. The primary reason for declining acceptance rates has been the soaring number of submissions received by these journals while the number of issues and space available for articles has remained rather stable.

For example, in 1999, the *JAP* received 507 submissions but accepted only 84 of them for publication (an acceptance rate of approximately 17 percent). Ten years later, *JAP* received 902 submissions, but accepted only 86 of them (an acceptance rate of approximately 10 percent). A similar phenomenon has occurred over the same time period at the *AMJ*, where acceptance rates have fallen from over 10 percent to around 6–7 percent.

With these incredible numbers as a backdrop, it is no wonder that management and organizational psychology scholars are feeling tremendous pressure to find

ways to publish in the leading journals of our field. One strategy to increase the chance of publishing success is to write two or more individual papers using a single dataset. Rather than focusing on only one potential contribution, crafting two or more papers from a (hopefully) large dataset can magnify one's chances of successfully publishing an article in a leading journal.

However, publishing multiple papers from a single dataset may also limit the unique contribution a paper makes (hence reducing a paper's chances of being published in top journals), and in some cases may even violate ethical standards adopted by journals. For example, *AMJ* requires authors who submit new manuscripts to '[a]ttest that the manuscript reports empirical results that have not been published previously' (Academy of Management, 2010). The American Psychological Association, which oversees *JAP* and other top psychology journals, has a similar strict ethical guideline, which, among other requirements, states that authors 'do not publish, as original data, data that have been previously published' (American Psychological Association, 2010).

Despite existing guidelines regarding using the same data in multiple papers, many scholars have questions about just what kinds of data can support multiple papers. For example, how much overlap is allowed between the papers? Do all the variables have to be different or can some variables appear in both papers (and, if so, which ones)? What obligation does an author have to the editors of the multiple journals to which papers are submitted? Are there any cases in which it is permissible not to alert the editor to the existence of multiple papers from the same dataset? How can an author discern if the papers make unique theoretical added value contributions? These are just a few of the questions we have heard over the years from discussions with our colleagues at various conferences and professional meetings.

We should note at this point, that, as authors ourselves, we have both published more than one paper from a single dataset several times. And, when we have asked each other these questions over the years, interestingly, we have not always agreed on what the correct answer might be. Publishing multiple papers from a single dataset represents a relatively unclear area (Lee & Mitchell, 2011). Not all journals have clear guidelines to help authors (and, even when journals have clear guidelines, different editors and associate editors may sometimes enact and enforce these guidelines somewhat differently). Indeed, as a former associate editor at *AMJ* (the first author) and a current associate editor at *JAP* (the second author), we have also faced these issues on the editorial side of the publishing process in addition to our roles as authors. With such myriad problems regarding this issue, the purpose of this article is to answer the questions we posed above thereby providing clearer guidance to authors who wish to make unique theoretical and empirical contributions with multiple papers from a single dataset. We admit from the outset that what we offer here are our own personal opinions, based on both our author and editorial experiences working for top tier management and organizational psychol-

ogy journals. Note that our advice below does not constitute the policy of *AMJ*, *JAP* (see the websites in the Reference list for more formal policies of these journals), or that of any other journal in our field; rather, our advice is merely shaped by our work with these journals. However, we do hope that authors will find our recommendations helpful as they navigate the sometimes unclear waters of the scholarly publishing process.

HOW DO YOU KNOW IF YOU HAVE A MULTIPLE PAPER DATASET?

As authors who have published multiple articles at the team level of analysis, we have both had experiences collecting a very large dataset, oftentimes from multiple organizations. As teams and leadership researchers, in order to have a sufficient number of teams and leaders to conduct appropriate statistical analyses, we have often sought to collect data from over 100 teams and their leaders with individual sample sizes greater than 1,000 respondents (e.g., Kirkman & Rosen, 1999). As a result, the data collection process for team-level research is difficult and extremely time consuming as it is for any research requiring a large number of respondents. Because of the challenges encountered in such efforts, we have often sought to generate multiple papers from a single dataset. Note here that we are discussing a single data collection effort, but one that might be aimed at gathering very different sets of variables for very different studies. And, thus, we have asked ourselves, how do we know if we have a dataset worthy of legitimately supporting multiple distinct papers?

In trying to answer this important question, we have both approached a multiple paper publishing strategy by analysing each potential contribution with regard to the various elements of each paper including: the research question, theories used, the constructs/variables included, and the theoretical and managerial implications. We have both found it helpful to actually construct a table containing these elements to guide our analysis. First, the columns in our table represent the different papers we hope to publish from the dataset. Second, the rows in our table constitute the various elements of each paper as listed above. In each cell of the table, we describe the content of each paper and by doing so, we can better assess the uniqueness of the contribution from each paper. Indeed, we refer to such a practice as a uniqueness analysis.

Table 1 shows an example of such a uniqueness analysis using Kirkman and Rosen's (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Kirkman, Tesluk, & Rosen, 2001, 2004) research on team empowerment. In the mid-1990s, we embarked on a stream of research designed to better understand the team empowerment construct. Building on research on individual empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), we defined team empowerment as increased task motivation due to members' collective, positive assessments of their tasks within an organizational

Table 1. An example of a uniqueness analysis of multiple articles published from the same dataset

	Kirkman and Rosen (1999; Academy of Management Journal)	*Kirkman et al. (2001; Personnel Psychology)*	*Kirkman et al. (2004; Group & Organization Management)*
Research question	Is team empowerment multidimensional, what are its antecedents and consequences, and does team empowerment mediate between the antecedents and consequences?	What is the best method to measure team-level constructs like team empowerment?	How do demographic diversity and team leader-team demographic fit affect team empowerment and team effectiveness and does team empowerment mediate the team diversity-team effectiveness relationships?
Theories used	Intrinsic motivation, self-management, leadership, human resources, social cognitive theory, autonomy, and the job characteristics model.	Social information processing, social cognitive theory, and theories of team process.	Social identity and categorization theories; social cognitive theory; 'similar-to-me' phenomenon; leader-member exchange theory.
Constructs/variables	External team leader behaviour, production/service responsibilities, team-based human resource policies, social structure, team empowerment, team productivity, team proactivity, team customer service, team job satisfaction, team organizational commitment, and team commitment.	Team empowerment, team productivity, team customer service, team organizational citizenship behaviour, and team proactivity.	Team diversity on race, gender, age, organizational tenure, and team tenure; team leader-team demographic fit on race, gender, age, organizational tenure, and team tenure; team empowerment; and team effectiveness.
Theoretical implications	Team empowerment is multidimensional, motivational construct that explains significant variance in team outcomes; team empowerment is a much broader and impactful construct than self-management, which may help to explain the previous mixed findings for self-managing work teams.	Measuring team-level variables using consensus aligns the units of measurement, data analysis, and theory at the team level; the consensus method of collecting and analysing team-level data showed stronger predictive power than the aggregation method, supporting social information processing theory; and previous research using aggregation may have underestimated effects.	Findings supported the theoretical tenets of social categorization and identity theories; finding team empowerment as a mediator helps to shed light on black box of organizational demography; diversity can negatively affect the motivational states of teams; and findings for team leader-team demographic fit support the tenets of the similar-to-me phenomenon and LMX theory.
Managerial implications	More empowered teams are more effective than less empowered teams on a variety of team performance and attitudinal outcomes; managers can enhance team empowerment through external team leader behaviours, increasing production/service responsibilities, using team-based human resource policies, altering teams' social structure.	Managers collecting team-level data should be encouraged to use team consensus ratings because they have stronger predictive power than aggregated ratings; however, managers should use aggregated ratings when: cost concerns prevent co-location; dysfunctional conflict may result; items are especially sensitive; responses are needed immediately; and teams are relatively new.	To reduce problems associated with team race diversity, managers should: (i) train team members in negotiation, conflict resolution, and team building skills; (ii) engage team members in frequent self-evaluation of team processes and functioning; (iii) increase goal clarity and facilitate communication; and (iv) allow enough time to pass until demographic diversity becomes less important to team members.

context (Kirkman & Rosen, 2000), and we conceptualized team empowerment as four dimensions including: (i) *potency*, the collective belief of members that they can be effective; (ii) *meaningfulness*, the extent to which members feel an intrinsic caring for their tasks and activities; (iii) *autonomy*, the degree to which members believe that they have freedom to make decisions; and (iv) *impact*, the extent to which members feel that their tasks make significant organizational contributions (Kirkman & Rosen, 1997). We collected data from 112 teams in four organizations consisting of over 1,000 individual team member responses over a 6 month long period.

One of the most important things we did to make a multiple paper publishing strategy a success was to intentionally craft and design three separate papers *from the inception of the project*. We realize that some authors may approach this differently; i.e., at the completion of submitting a first paper from a single data collection effort, authors may ask themselves: what else can we publish from this dataset? We strongly believe that one's chances of successfully publishing multiple papers from a single dataset process go up exponentially if these papers are conceived at the very beginning of a project. That way, authors will have the 'roadmap' they need to effectively collect the appropriate data for multiple papers from the very beginning. Also, if authors do not identify these multiple ideas and papers before conducting the research and collecting the data, they may run the risk of tailoring the research question to fit the data already collected (see Leung, 2011, for a discussion of the problem of post hoc hypothesizing).

Regarding the team empowerment project, while we knew we wanted to publish a book chapter containing the theoretical description of our model (Kirkman & Rosen, 1997) and a practitioner article that we hoped would be widely read by managers (Kirkman & Rosen, 2000), we had three empirical projects in mind. First, we wanted to establish the team empowerment construct and determine its antecedents and consequences in our initial paper (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999). Second, we wanted to use the team empowerment construct as a means of examining two different methods for collecting team-level data including the aggregation of individual survey responses vs. the team interview consensus method (Kirkman et al., 2001). Finally, we wanted to examine the impact of the demographic composition of our teams to determine the extent of the effects of demographic diversity on team empowerment and team effectiveness (Kirkman et al., 2004).

As Table 1 shows, we developed each of these three empirical papers based on a uniqueness analysis of the contributions of each paper with respect to the research question, theories used, constructs/variables included, and the theoretical and managerial implications. Note that each paper had a unique and clearly defined research question. While Kirkman and Rosen (1999) was designed to first empirically establish the team empowerment construct by examining antecedents and consequences (and the mediating role of team empowerment), Kirkman et al. (2001) was designed as a methods paper in an attempt to answer the question of

what is the best way to measure team-level constructs. And, Kirkman et al. (2004) was designed to determine whether or not team demographic diversity and team leader-team demographic fit influenced team empowerment and effectiveness in an attempt to shed light on the black box of organizational demography. If one cannot generate highly distinct research questions for each paper, attempts to publish multiple papers from a single dataset will likely be thwarted.

Similarly, Table 1 shows that while there is some overlap with regard to theories used (i.e., social cognitive theory), most of the theories were used uniquely in each paper. This should not be surprising, as unique research questions should constitute the use of different theoretical explanations for phenomena. With regard to variables used, there is more overlap here than in the other categories listed in Table 1. This might be expected given team empowerment and its outcomes formed the basis for much of the measurement strategy in each of the three papers. With different research questions and theories used, perhaps it was deemed less problematic to use some level of variable overlap in answering the research questions. However, to the extent possible, researchers should attempt to minimize variable overlap when crafting different papers from a single dataset to help ensure that unique theoretical and empirical contributions are achieved (Lee & Mitchell, 2011). Finally, with regard to theoretical and managerial implications, Table 1 shows that both scholars and managers should take different sets of implications away when reading these three papers. If the implications are too similar across the papers, journal editors and reviewers will quickly question the uniqueness of publishing multiple papers using the same dataset.

We use another of our own examples to demonstrate the importance of making two unique theoretical value added contributions using the same dataset with Chen's (Chen, 2005; Chen & Klimoski, 2003) work on newcomer adaptation in teams. As shown in Table 2, this research project was aimed at understanding two broad questions: (i) how do individual difference (i.e., attributes of a newcomer) and contextual factors (i.e., attributes of the team, the work assigned to the newcomer, and newcomer-team exchanges) combine to influence newcomer effectiveness in teams; and (ii) how long does it take newcomers to perform effectively in teams, and what factors influence – and are influenced by – newcomer adaptation?

The original intent was to study both research questions regarding newcomers in teams as part of a doctoral dissertation. However, during the prestudy dissertation proposal process, it became clear that these two questions were too broad for a single study to address. At the same time, commitments were secured from three large information-technology firms to allow access to exceptionally unique and difficult-to-obtain data, which would allow for examining both research questions with a single dataset. Specifically, ongoing project teams were accessed, each of which had to integrate one new team member. Each organization allowed the sampling of one newcomer to the team and his or her team (including two teammates working most closely with the newcomer, and the team's leader) at four

Table 2. A second example of a uniqueness analysis of multiple articles published from the same dataset

	Chen and Klimoski (2003; Academy of Management Journal)	*Chen (2005; Academy of Management Journal)*
Research question	How and why do motivational and interpersonal factors influence overall newcomer performance?	What are the antecedents and outcomes of newcomer adaptation, as reflected by newcomer performance change?
Theories used	Interpersonal leadership (Pygmalion effect and LMX); work characteristics model; newcomer socialization; psychological empowerment theory.	Newcomer socialization; dynamic performance and skill acquisition; theories of team effectiveness.
Constructs/variables	Newcomer experience (Time 1); newcomer general self-efficacy (Time 1); newcomer expectations (Time 1); team expectations (Time 1); work characteristics (Time 2); social exchanges (Time 2); newcomer empowerment (Time 2); newcomer performance (Time 3).	Team expectations (Time 1); team performance (Times 1 and 4); newcomer empowerment (Times 2 and 4); initial newcomer performance (Time 2); changes in newcomer performance (change between Times 2, 3 and 4); newcomer turnover intentions (Time 4).
Theoretical implications	Newcomer and team performance expectations promote newcomer performance through quality of social exchanges, the work assigned to the newcomer, and newcomer sense of empowerment.	Newcomers improve their performance more quickly when joining better performing teams; the rate of newcomer performance improvement positively relates to subsequent team performance; different antecedents and outcomes explain initial newcomer performance vs. newcomer performance improvement.
Managerial implications	Firms can enhance newcomers' effectiveness by: (i) selection of more confident and experienced newcomers; (ii) assignment of more challenging work to the newcomer; and (iii) developing more positive relationships between the newcomer and his or her team.	The rate at which newcomer performance improves over time influences team effectiveness; newcomers are more likely to quickly improve their performance when they join more effective teams, who have more resources and stronger productivity norms.

points in time immediately following newcomer entry to the team. As such, the decision was made to collect the data in such a way that would allow for a focus on the dissertation for the first research question (which led to Chen & Klimoski, 2003), while at the same time to collect additional data that would allow for the addressing of the second research question (which led to Chen, 2005).

As Table 2 shows, although there was some overlap in the variables examined in the two studies, the two studies also included a considerable number of unique variables and led to different results, and different theoretical and practical implications. For example, the key criterion in Chen and Klimoski (2003) was newcomer overall performance at a time at which newcomers were expected to be well adjusted in the team. However, in Chen (2005), the focus was on how and why newcomers differ in how quickly they learn to perform well in the team, and how such differences might affect newcomer and team outcomes (such as subsequent team performance). Collectively, these two articles provided a richer understanding of phenomena related to newcomer adaption in teams, beyond what either study alone would have provided.

In addition to convincing editors and reviewers that a second paper from a single dataset makes a unique contribution beyond the first in one's communication with these entities, it is also important to make sure that eventual readers of the second paper are also clear with regard to the key differences (Lee & Mitchell, 2011). Chen (2005) took several steps in the text of the second paper to indicate how it differed from Chen and Klimoski (2003). For example, in the introduction of the second paper, a sentence reads, 'Accordingly, capitalizing on data collected from Chen and Klimoski's (2003) sample, the present study extended their work in three important ways' (Chen, 2005: 101), and then these differences were described in more detail. In addition, the first sentence under the sample section reads, 'This study used the same sample examined in Chen and Klimoski (2003), though several different measures and different analyses were used here' (Chen, 2005: 105). Finally, in the Discussion section, Chen (2005) highlighted the various ways that the second paper added unique theoretical and empirical value beyond Chen and Klimoski (2003). As this example hopefully reiterates, authors' work is not done once a second paper from the same dataset has been accepted for publication. On the contrary, information for readers of the second paper needs to be clear about the value added contribution beyond the first paper.

If authors are targeting top-tier journals in management or organizational psychology, the uniqueness analysis is especially critical for the theoretical implications of the papers. Perhaps not surprisingly, journals such as *AMJ* and *JAP* have very high theoretical thresholds. The factors that must be considered when making a substantive theoretical contribution in top-tier journals have been covered sufficiently elsewhere (see, e.g., Sutton & Staw, 1995; Whetten, 1989). However, in our roles as associate editors, we frequently ask our authors to provide clear and compelling answers to such questions as what theory or theories are supported,

altered, or refuted by one's findings and how should readers think differently about this area of research after reading one's paper? Thus, when submitting to top-tier journals, one must make substantive theoretical value added contributions with each paper.

In summary, as the two examples highlighted above show, the question of how do you know you have a multiple paper dataset is best answered by, a priori, conducting a 'uniqueness analysis'. This is achieved by comparing the research questions, theories used, constructs/variables included, and theoretical and managerial implications across the different intended papers. If submitting multiple papers to top-tier journals, making distinct and substantive *theoretical* contributions are imperative. Of course, this requires a great deal of thinking and planning *before* actually conducting any empirical research. Such planning will pay dividends by dramatically increasing the chances of successfully crafting multiple, unique, theoretically compelling papers from a single dataset. We now turn to the question of how authors should manage submitting multiple papers from a single dataset.

WHAT DO YOU DO WHEN YOU ARE READY TO SUBMIT MULTIPLE PAPERS FROM A SINGLE DATASET?

So, you have conducted your uniqueness analysis and determined that there are two (or more) possible papers that could be written from a single dataset. You have collected and analysed the data, written multiple papers, and are ready to submit them to journals. The best advice we can give, based on our experience as authors of multiple papers from a single dataset and as action editors reviewing such work for *AMJ* and *JAP*, is to *always err on the side of transparency*. Nothing bad will ever happen to you as an author by providing too much information when submitting your research to journals.

Knowing exactly what to do when submitting multiple research papers from the same dataset will be determined, in part, by the sequence authors use to submit their research. Sometimes, authors choose to create a complete draft of one paper, submit it to a journal, and then wait for the outcome before submitting a second paper from the same dataset. If the first paper is under review or accepted before a second one is completed or submitted, we strongly encourage authors to alert the editor receiving the second paper about the existence of the first paper (Chen, 2011). An author could simply do this in a cover letter or an email to the editor and then let the editor decide how she or he wants to handle the second submission. It is certainly the editor's right to ask for a copy of the published paper and either: (i) share a copy with the action editor who will make the decision on the second paper (if that person is different from the editor); or (ii) send a copy of the paper to the actual reviewers who will be making recommendations on the second paper.

Of course, if the paper has already appeared in print, reviewers will be able to identify at least some of the authors of the second paper, thereby omitting one 'side' of the double-blind review process. Regarding (ii) above, some editors feel that an informed decision, particularly with regard to the theoretical added value contribution of paper, cannot be adequately made without reviewers being able to consult the published paper, and we generally agree with this assertion. In fact, some editors send published papers along with a second paper to reviewers to enhance their decision-making ability. Some of the second papers were ultimately published and some were not. Yet other editors require that authors cite prior work from the same dataset, and clarify explicitly how the subsequent paper contributes above and beyond the prior papers.

Clearly, sacrificing the double-blind review process will be considered controversial by some researchers. Double-blind review has been critical to the reduction of potential bias inherent in any peer-review process, and we certainly do not wish to diminish the importance of this system of review. Again, we simply suggest that it is the editor's discretion as to the exact procedure used, but regardless, authors must at least make these papers available to editors so that the latter entities can make this decision (Chen, 2011). Unfortunately, both of us have received papers that used a dataset published in another paper without the authors identifying the existence of the first paper. While we cannot ascertain the intent of authors who did this, the attribution made by such behaviour is almost always negative and can really hurt the reputation of authors who operate in a field that is still remarkably small.

Thus, when submitting a second paper with a dataset used in a first paper that has already been published, state this explicitly in your cover letter and, even more proactively, attach the published paper with your submission, and consider citing the previous paper (while noting how the current paper *uniquely extends* the previous paper). Again, we recognize that sharing prior papers with the reviewers, and citing prior papers from the same dataset in the paper, may jeopardize the double-blind review process. However, doing so can help ensure that the follow-up paper clearly contributes uniquely, relative to other paper(s) from the same dataset. Further, to maintain your confidentiality, you may also provide an appendix in the second paper submitted from the same dataset, which clarifies how the prior paper utilized the data vs. how the present paper utilizes the same dataset differently. Of course, doing so can also alleviate any concerns editors, reviewers, and readers of the journal may have regarding any ethical misconduct on your part. Given that the ultimate goal of science is to *build* and *advance* our knowledge base, clarifying how papers from the same database uniquely contribute to our literature is clearly important.

Another possible scenario is that at the time you submit a second paper to a journal from the same dataset, the first paper has been accepted for publication but has not yet appeared in print. With lag times at many journals being 1 year or

more, this is not an uncommon occurrence. We would urge authors to follow the same procedures as outlined above and err on the side of transparency. The good news is that the editor may decide to send both papers to reviewers together, but all author-identifying information can be removed from both so that the double-blind review process is maintained. As noted above, you can also maintain confidentiality by including an appendix (without author identification) that clarifies how your prior and current work using the same dataset differ from each other.

Yet another situation that may arise is when authors submit a second paper from the same dataset, but the status of the first paper is unknown because it has not completed its cycle through the review process. Or, authors choose to submit multiple papers to different journals simultaneously. In this situation, what is your obligation to the editors receiving your various papers? We believe that there is actually very little difference between the scenarios described above and the current one. That is, the editor may choose to send the first and second papers together to reviewers, while again using a blind copy of both papers to maintain the double-blind review process.

What else can authors do to assist editors in understanding the potentially unique contributions of multiple papers from the same dataset besides indicating this situation in a cover letter and sending other papers along with a new submission? We recommend that authors use our uniqueness analysis in the form of a table at the outset of a submission process (cf. Tables 1,2). Journal editors will typically be very receptive to making their job a bit easier because you will have already argued for the value added contribution of the paper you are submitting. While an editor may not necessarily send your paper out for review (if judging that the papers lack uniqueness), providing such information up front will again be viewed as a very positive and proactive step on the authors' part. Before concluding, we next discuss a few more of the questions and issues we have encountered over the years as authors and editors dealing with multiple papers from a single dataset.

OTHER ISSUES IN PUBLISHING MULTIPLE PAPERS FROM A SINGLE DATASET

We hope that we have provided some clarity above regarding how to determine the unique value added contributions of multiple papers from the same dataset and the procedure authors should follow when submitting these papers. However, we recognize that there are still gray areas when it comes to this issue. Indeed, having been involved in many doctoral and junior faculty consortia as well as editorial panels at our professional meetings, we have been on the receiving end of many of these types of questions over the years.

For example, we have been asked, 'Do I still have to inform the editor of other papers from the same dataset when:

- the multiple papers are radically different, particularly with regard to theory?'
- I am submitting multiple papers to journals that are not in the same field or area?'
- there is absolutely no overlap in the variables between the various papers?'
- the editor/reviewers might reject my paper as a result of any mentioned overlap?'

Again, in response to these questions, we reiterate the suggestions we made in the other scenarios above: err on the side of transparency and always inform the editor of any other papers in existence using the same dataset. In our experience, when reviewers or editors find out (or even suspect!) that submitted papers have any overlap with prior papers, and they see no mention of that in the paper, they tend to react quite negatively. Thus, again, it is far better to be up front and proactive about any overlap in data rather than hide (or at least neglect to indicate) such information.

In addition to these questions, we have also been asked about the incidence of self-plagiarism when writing papers using the same dataset. The most important question is: can authors plagiarize their own work? While some authors believe that cutting and pasting elements of one paper (e.g., a description of a sample, measurement strategy) into another does not constitute plagiarism because authors cannot plagiarize their own work, we strongly urge authors to avoid this practice at all costs. Just because an author wrote two or more papers with identical text does not mean that plagiarism has not occurred. While we are not suggesting that authors need to write certain sections in a radically different manner, a reasonable amount of rewriting is critical to avoid any potential accusations of plagiarism. Both the Academy of Management and the American Psychological Association (see relevant websites in the References) have strict ethical guidelines that define self-plagiarism and discuss how authors can work to avoid self-plagiarism.

CONCLUSION

While the publication of multiple papers from the same dataset can be a benefit to authors wishing to make unique contributions with very promising datasets, the process is truly an unclear one with little formal guidance available. We hope that providing a process by which authors can determine whether or not they have distinct theoretical value added contributions (i.e., a uniqueness analysis) will assist scholars in following a systematic strategy to determine the potential for success in publishing multiple papers. In addition, we hope that authors will always err on the side of transparency by alerting the editor to the existence of each paper and by proactively sharing their own uniqueness analysis to assist the editor in making an

informed decision about the papers. In the spirit of full disclosure, authors can avoid the normally negative attributions made when information about multiple papers is not provided in advance. As authors who have published multiple papers from the same dataset ourselves, we do not in any way want to discourage such a practice. However, authors must be careful to follow a process that provides editors with the information they need, which will enhance your own success in publishing these multiple papers.

REFERENCES

Academy of Management. 2010. Information for contributors. [Last accessed on 17 March 2011.] Available from URL: http://journals.aomonline.org/amj/information-for-contributors

American Psychological Association. 2010. Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. [Last accessed on 17 March 2011.] Available from URL: http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx

Chen, G. 2005. Newcomer adaptation in teams: Multilevel antecedents and outcomes. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 48(1): 101–116.

Chen, G., & Klimoski, R. J. 2003. The impact of expectations on newcomer performance in teams as mediated by work characteristics, social exchanges, and empowerment. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 46(5): 591–607.

Chen, X. P. 2011. Author ethical dilemmas in the research publication process. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 7(3): 423–432.

Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. 1997. A model of work team empowerment. In R. Woodman & W. Pasmore (Eds.), ***Research in organizational change and development*** (Vol. 10): 131–167. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. 1999. Beyond self-management: The antecedents and consequences of team empowerment. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 42(1): 58–74.

Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. 2000. Powering up teams. ***Organizational Dynamics,*** 28(3): 48–66.

Kirkman, B. L., Tesluk, P. E., & Rosen, B. 2001. Assessing the incremental validity of team consensus ratings over aggregation of individual-level data in predicting team effectiveness. ***Personnel Psychology,*** 54(3): 645–667.

Kirkman, B. L., Tesluk, P. E., & Rosen, B. 2004. The impact of demographic heterogeneity and team leader-team member demographic fit on team empowerment and effectiveness. ***Group & Organization Management,*** 29(3): 334–368.

Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. 2011. Working in research team: Lessons from Personal Experiences. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 7(3): 461–469.

Leung, K. Presenting post hoc hypotheses as a priori: Ethical and theoretical issues. ***Management and Organization Review,*** 7(3): 471–479.

Spreitzer, G. M. 1995. Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 38(5): 1442–1465.

Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. ***Administrative Science Quarterly,*** 40(3): 371–384.

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. 1990. Cognitive elements of empowerment: An 'interpretive' model of intrinsic task motivation. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 15(4): 666–681.

Whetten, D. 1989. What contributes a theoretical contribution? ***Academy of Management Review,*** 14(4): 490–495.

Bradley L. Kirkman (brad.kirkman@tamu.edu) is the Foreman R. and Ruby Bennett Chair of Business Administration in the Mays Business School at Texas A&M University. He received his Ph.D. in organizational behaviour from the Kenan-Flagler Business School at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. His research interests include international management, global virtual teams, work team effectiveness, and organizational leadership. **Gilad Chen** (giladchen@rhsmith.umd.edu) is a professor of management and organization at the University of Maryland's Robert H. Smith School of Business. He received his Ph.D. in industrial-organizational psychology from George Mason University. His research focuses on work motivation, adaptation, teams and leadership, with particular interest in understanding the complex interface between individuals and the socio-technical organizational context.

Manuscript received: November 3, 2010
Final version accepted: April 13, 2011
Accepted by: Maureen L. Ambrose and Marshall Schminke