

Ethics: Before, During, and After Review

Karen A. Hegtvedt
Professor and Chair, Sociology
Coeditor, *Social Psychology Quarterly*

Emory University

PSI 600, August 2013

Micro Processes, Macro Consequences

- Ethics: right and wrong behavior (moving from idea, to study, to manuscript, to published article)
- Micro level: focus on relationships and dynamics among parties
 - Investigator, Study participants, Editor, Reviewers, Audience members
- Macro level: focus on trustworthiness of the journal, the discipline, and scholarly community

Ethical Considerations...

BEFORE Review

- Data sources
 - Contact with study participants
 - Reliability/confidentiality of existing data sources
- Credit sources for arguments
- Analyses: “leave no stone unturned”
- Collaboration
 - Division of labor
 - Dynamics
 - Authorship

Ethical Considerations...

DURING Review

- In the abstract...
 - Form of generalized exchange
 - Governed by procedural & interactional justice
 - Neutrality, consistency, representativeness
 - Respect, honesty
 - Generation of trust & confidence
- On the concrete level...
 - Roles & behavior of different “actors”

DURING Review: Authors Should...

- Submit to only one journal at a time
- “Blind” papers
- “Comply” with journal rules
- List only a few “preferred reviewers” who:
 - Have not seen the paper
 - Have no connection to author

DURING Review: Editors Should...

- “Listen” to authors’ concerns/preferences
- Treat submissions in consistent ways
- Find relevant, informed, neutral reviewers
- Communicate respectfully with authors & reviewers
- Navigate disrespectful reviews for authors

DURING Review: Reviewers Should...

- Accept reasonable requests...
 - Ok to decline, but suggest other reviewers
- Remain open-minded & objective
- Offer critical, yet respectful, **feedback**
 - Consider issues of theory, methods, analyses
 - Ask: “When I am an author, what helps me improve my papers?”
- Maintain confidentiality

Ethical Considerations...

AFTER Review

- Editors
 - Provide account for decision
 - Rationale for rejection
 - Advice for revision
 - Indicate intentions for reviews of revised papers
 - Consider opportunities for scholarly debate
 - Deal with ethical violations
- Authors indicate ways critiques addressed

Ethical Considerations Throughout Review

- Promote responsible conduct of research
- Ensure integrity in professional scholarship
- Maintain the public's trust in your discipline