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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
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