Your answers to this survey will provide our field with important insights about how the codes of conduct of our professional associations have been internalized. **We have taken the survey** and urge you to make time to complete it thoughtfully.
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Dear Academic Researcher:

This survey seeks your opinion of the appropriateness of various behaviors that arise in the process of conducting and refereeing academic research. We seek to understand how individuals at different points in their careers as researchers might act when faced with decisions where the "right" choice may be unclear.

You will be presented with a series of brief scenarios where individuals faced choices; each describes a behavior that was chosen. We ask that you thoughtfully respond to the six questions shown with each scenario. We know that there are many demands on your time and we hope that you will be able to take approximately 30-45 minutes to share your opinion with our field.

To assure your anonymity, we collect no personally identifying data. For extra peace of mind, our survey is designed to work with anonymous proxy servers such as the one provided by the Rollins Center for eBusiness (see link below).

Respectfully:

Gove Allen  
gove@byu.edu  
Nicholas Ball  
nick_ball@byu.edu
Returning users
enter code here:

or go to proxy.academicsurvey.org for an extra anonymity layer.
Survey on Academic Conduct

Where did you get your childhood education?
Select Country

Highest degree earned:
- Ph. D.
- Master's
- Bachelor's
- Other: 

What year was highest degree earned?
Select Year

Where did you earn your highest degree?
Select Country

Service as an academic referee:
- Reviewer Years:
- Associate Editor Years:
- Senior Editor Years:
- Editor-in-Chief Years:

To which of these associations have you belonged (past or present)?
- ACM (Ass'n for Computing Machinery)
- IEEE Computer Society
- AIS (Ass'n for Information Systems)
- AOM (Academy of Management)

Are you currently a student in a Ph.D. program?
- Yes
- No

What kind of researcher are you?
- Information Systems
- Computer Science
- Other:
- I'm not a researcher

Your most recent academic article:

Approximately how many academic articles have you published?
Select Range

In answering the following questions, please consider the academic assignment that is most representative of your academic career.

Your typical yearly teaching load:
Select Semester courses of 

Your department's typical yearly teaching load:
Select Semester courses of 

Does your department grant Doctoral Degrees?
- Yes
- No

In your college (e.g. business school), do other departments grant Doctoral Degrees?
- Yes
- No

What is your professional time allocation?
- % for research
- % for teaching
- % for service
- % for other activities

Next
Reese (an assistant professor) and Morgan (a full professor) are colleagues in the same department at a major university. They were almost ready to submit a manuscript they had written with Bailey (a doctoral student) to a respected journal when they learned of Bailey’s decision to discontinue doctoral studies and pursue full-time employment. They knew that Bailey’s new career would not be advanced through academic publication.

Reese and Morgan removed Bailey’s name from the manuscript before submitting it to the journal even though Bailey had made a substantial contribution.
Reese and Morgan were excited about a new research project. They formed hypotheses and designed a project to gather data to test their hypotheses. They considered adding a coauthor. Pat was a valued colleague in their department who would go up for tenure in two years. Pat's research record was weak and it was clear that Pat could provide no more than token assistance on the project.

Morgan and Reese included Pat on their project solely to improve Pat’s tenure case.

**Situation 2 of 29**

**Judgment:**

This behavior* is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clearly Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have engaged in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Behavior" refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

**Prior**

**Next**

**Save & Continue Later** will allow you continue from where you left off at a later time or place.
Suppose that Reese and Morgan had not invited Pat and instead considered Quinn, a senior colleague in their department, and chair of the promotion and tenure committee for their college. Reese would also go up for tenure in the next three years. Reese thought that including Quinn as a coauthor on the paper would provide Quinn an opportunity to see firsthand the quality of Reese's research, improving the likelihood of a favorable tenure review. Quinn would do little more than read the manuscript and make editorial comments.

Morgan and Reese included Quinn as a coauthor on the paper to improve Reese's outlook for a favorable tenure review.
Reese and Morgan held several discussions about authorship order. Reese had done most of the actual work for the project and composed the initial draft. Morgan had also contributed substantially but felt that they could leverage Quinn’s substantial name recognition by listing it first.

Morgan and Reese listed Quinn as first author even though Reese had made the most substantial contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation 4 of 29</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Survey on Academic Conduct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Judgment:</strong></th>
<th>Clearly Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This behavior* is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I have felt pressure</strong> from others to engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I have engaged</strong> in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am <strong>personally familiar</strong> engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, <strong>I believe that researchers in my discipline</strong> engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When facing similar situations <strong>in the future</strong>, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior

"Behavior" refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

Next

Save & Continue Later will allow you continue from where you left off at a later time or place.
Reese and Morgan wanted to complete their study as soon as possible. There were very clear university policies about obtaining formal approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to collect any data from human subjects. The IRB at their university routinely granted exemption to studies using surveys similar to the one they would administer.

Confident that such an exemption would have been granted in their case, they collected their data without applying for the IRB approval.

note: the IRB is sometimes called the "Human Subjects Committee"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment:</th>
<th>Clearly Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This behavior* is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have engaged in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior * "Behavior" refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

Save & Continue Later will allow you continue from where you left off at a later time or place.
Suppose the situation were different and the study involved an experiment. The IRB at their university rarely granted exemptions for experiments and a full review could take as long as 60 days. Reese and Morgan felt that there was virtually no risk to subjects participating in the study.

They conducted their experiment without applying for IRB approval.

**Situation 6 of 29**

Judgment: Clearly Appropriate Neutral Inappropriate

This behavior* is: Never Often

I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:

I have engaged in similar behavior*:

Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:

In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:

When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:

Prior * “Behavior” refers to portion of situation shown in bold. Next

Save & Continue Later will allow you continue from where you left off at a later time or place.
In the data collection process, Reese and Morgan asked a research assistant to compile their records into a single database. The subjects had been promised anonymity, but many were friends of the research assistant. Although it was possible for Reese and Morgan to obscure the identity of the subjects in the compilation process, it would have required additional effort. The survey was not of a sensitive nature.

Reese and Morgan turned over their records to the research assistant without obscuring subjects' identities.
While Reese and Morgan were analyzing their data, they became aware of another study examining the same issue. They knew the other researchers were just completing their data collection. Reese and Morgan felt the need to get a manuscript submitted soon and were pleased to find p-values of 0.05 or lower for each hypothesis. Normally, they would have performed tests to verify their data conformed to the statistical model's assumptions, but they felt that every day that passed before their submission mattered. They submitted their manuscript without testing the assumptions of their statistical model.
The manuscript was accepted for publication. After it came out in print, Reese reanalyzed their data for a different paper and discovered that the assumptions of the original statistical models were violated. Using another technique to analyze their data, Reese found that many of the relationships in their initial publication were not actually significant. Reese told Morgan of the problems with the original analysis.

They decided to not report the problems with their original analysis.

**Judgment:**
- Clearly Appropriate
- Neutral
- Very Inappropriate

This behavior* is:  

- I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:
- I have engaged in similar behavior*:
- Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:
- In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:
- When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:

* "Behavior" refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

**Situation 9 of 29**

**Comment**

**Save & Continue Later** will allow you continue from where you left off at a later time or place.
Suppose that the situation had been slightly different. Reese and Morgan did conduct a thorough analysis of the data prior to drafting the manuscript. They discovered that some of the assumptions of their statistical model had been violated.

In their manuscript, they did not report that their statistical model’s assumption had been violated.
Suppose Reese and Morgan took a different approach. They were confident that their initial theory and hypotheses were sound even though their hypothesis tests were not quite significant. They knew that if they collected additional data, the increased sample size would have led to support for their hypotheses. To gain significance, they randomly duplicated records within their current data set to increase their sample size.

**Situation 11 of 29**

**Survey on Academic Conduct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment: Clearly Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This behavior* is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have engaged in similar behavior*:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Behavior" refers to portion of situation shown in bold.
Suppose the situation were different. Reese and Morgan were astonished to find that not only did the data not confirm their hypotheses, but the relationships in the data were directly counter to their expectations. In trying to understand their results they searched the literature in a related discipline. It became apparent that the unexpected results were supported by an established theory in the related discipline.

They reformulated their hypotheses and wrote the paper based on the new theoretical insight, showing that the newly constructed hypotheses were supported by the tests.
Suppose the situation were slightly different. Reese and Morgan could not find theoretical support for the unexpected findings. However, their results were compelling enough to suggest a new theory. They were faced with two options: (1) report the research study as designed, highlighting that the results suggest a new theoretical perspective or (2) to propose a new theory that is consistent with the insights gained from the data collection, adjusting the hypotheses accordingly.

They proposed the new theory and presented the paper as a test of the new theoretical perspective.

### Situation 13 of 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Clearly Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This behavior* is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have engaged in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Behavior" refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

---

**Prior**  
This behavior* is:  
**Next**  
This behavior* is:

---

*These questions are part of a survey on academic conduct.*
Again, suppose that the situation were different. Reese and Morgan found that most of their original hypotheses were supported by significant statistical relationships in the data. Encouraged by their findings, they were anxious to complete a manuscript. Morgan had previously written a paper that used the same theoretical perspective. To save time, they liberally reused sections from Morgan’s former paper without ever citing it.

**Situation 14 of 29**

Again, suppose that the situation were different. Reese and Morgan found that most of their original hypotheses were supported by significant statistical relationships in the data. Encouraged by their findings, they were anxious to complete a manuscript. Morgan had previously written a paper that used the same theoretical perspective. To save time, they liberally reused sections from Morgan’s former paper without ever citing it.
In addition to the review that Morgan had already completed, Reese found a well-written doctoral dissertation that had reviewed the literature related to their theoretical perspective. The dissertation cited a number of papers that were not part of the literature they reviewed in the formulation of their hypotheses. It was evident that most of these "new" papers were in harmony with the literature they had already read. Therefore, Reese and Morgan did not feel it necessary to read these papers. However, they felt that including these "new" citations would strengthen their paper.

They cited these "new" papers in their own manuscript without reading the text of the papers.
Reese and Morgan were able to quickly write most of the paper although there was one concept that was particularly difficult to describe. They were aware of a little-known publication that had artfully dealt with exactly what Reese and Morgan were struggling to communicate.

In writing their manuscript, they used the text from the little-known publication without citing it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment:</th>
<th>Clearly Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This behavior* is:</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:

I have engaged in similar behavior*:

Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:

In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:

When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:

* "Behavior" refers to portion of situation shown in bold.
Sidney was a prolific researcher with a reputation for providing thoughtful reviews. On one review, Sidney thought the authors of the manuscript had made a fundamental error in their interpretation of the modeling notation used in their experimental treatments. Sidney was familiar with the modeling notation but was not an expert and sought additional advice from a recognized expert.

Sidney sent the manuscript to an expert on the modeling notation with a note asking about the meaning of particular portions of the experimental treatments.
Survey on Academic Conduct

Situation 18 of 29

With the expert's response, Sidney was comfortable writing the review and recommended that the paper be rejected, which it was. About three months later, Sidney received a request to review a manuscript on the same topic from another journal and was surprised to see that it was the same paper. Sidney thought, "this will be an easy review to write."

Accepting the referee assignment, Sidney did not disclose having previously reviewed the manuscript to the associate editor (AE).

Judgment: Clearly Appropriate Neutral Very Inappropriate

This behavior* is:

I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:

I have engaged in similar behavior*:

Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:

In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:

When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:

Prior

* "Behavior" refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

Next

Save & Continue Later

will allow you continue from where you left off at a later time or place.
On a separate occasion, Sidney received a request to review a paper that was on a topic of personal interest. Upon reading the abstract, Sidney realized that this was the manuscript from a conference presentation made earlier that year. Sidney had been at the presentation and was impressed with the research. There was no doubt that the conference presentation and the manuscript were both reports of the same research activity.

Although the journal had a double-blind review policy, Sidney accepted the assignment without reporting to the AE that the author's identity was known.

note: in a double-blind review, authors' and reviewers' identities are withheld from each other
Sidney completed a very positive review. The next year, while the manuscript was with the authors for revision, Sidney attended the reception of another conference and bumped into the manuscript’s author. The two began to talk about the research presentation Sidney had attended the prior year. Recalling the review, Sidney wanted to let the author know who the reviewer had been, but was uncomfortable just saying it.

Sidney quoted a very supportive line from the review written a few months earlier, leaving the author with no question that Sidney had been a reviewer.

Judgment:

This behavior* is:  

- Clearly Appropriate
- Neutral
- Very Inappropriate

I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:

- Never
- Often

I have engaged in similar behavior*:

Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:

- Never
- Often

In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:

- Never
- Often

When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:

- Never
- Often

Prior  

* “Behavior” refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

Save & Continue Later will allow you continue from where you left off at a later time or place.
Sidney was surprised to receive a request to review a paper that was authored by a recent coauthor. Sidney had never been asked to review a coauthor's work and was uncertain what to do. After reading the journal's review policy and finding nothing about reviewing a coauthor's work, Sidney accepted the review assignment and reviewed the manuscript written by a recent coauthor without informing the AE of the coauthor relationship.

**Situation 21 of 29**

** Judgment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clearly Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This behavior is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** I have engaged in similar behavior:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior * “Behavior” refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

Next
Situation 22 of 29

While reviewing a blinded manuscript, Sidney was relatively certain of the author's identity.

Sidney conducted an Internet search to confirm the author's identity.

**Judgment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clearly Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This behavior* is:

* "Behavior" refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have engaged in similar behavior*:

| ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ |

Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:

| ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ |

In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:

| ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ |

When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:

| ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ |

Prior

Next

Save & Continue Later will allow you continue from where you left off at a later time or place.
Sidney was flattered at the invitation to serve the academic community as an AE of one of the field’s most respected research outlets. Not long after beginning service, Sidney received a request to handle a manuscript that came with the following note from the senior editor (SE): "Sidney, one of the four authors on this paper had a publication with you last year. Under normal circumstances I would not ask you handle this paper, but you are the only one on our editorial board with any experience on this topic. Please do your best with this paper; I'm sure that you can be objective and select a qualified set of reviewers."

Sidney decided to handle the paper.
Later, on a different manuscript, Sidney invited three individuals to serve as reviewers. Each accepted. Subsequently, one reviewer (Dr. Rosen) emailed indicating a family emergency and asked to be released from the review. Sidney agreed and invited another referee. Shortly before the reviews were due, Sidney received a review from Dr. Rosen, making four in all. Two of the reviews, including the one from Dr. Rosen, concurred with Sidney’s own opinion that the manuscript should be rejected. One recommended acceptance with minor revisions and one recommended major revision, Sidney decided to ignore the review recommending minor revisions and prepared the AE report using only the other three reviews.

Judgment: Clearly Appropriate Neutral Inappropriate
This behavior* is: Never Often

I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior*:

I have engaged in similar behavior*:

Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior*:

In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior*:

When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:

Prior * “Behavior” refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

Next
Survey on Academic Conduct

Situation 25 of 29

With several years’ experience as an AE, Sidney received a truly outstanding manuscript. With a strong theoretical foundation, comprehensive literature review, novel experimental procedures, solid statistical analysis, and compelling recommendations, Sidney knew the paper would be published but thought "the sooner the better."

In selecting referees, Sidney considered only those who had a history of being "easy" on authors in order to reduce the time before the paper’s publication.

**Judgment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clearly Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This behavior* is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I have felt pressure** from others to engage in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I have engaged** in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am **personally familiar** engage in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, I **believe that researchers in my discipline** engage in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When facing similar situations **in the future**, I would likely engage in similar behavior*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior * "Behavior" refers to portion of situation shown in bold.

Save & Continue Later will allow you continue from where you left off at a later time or place.
A short time later, Sidney received a manuscript that had little chance of being improved enough to meet the journal’s standard for publication; however, it was not a clear candidate for a desk rejection.

In selecting referees, Sidney considered only those who had a history of being "hard" on authors to increase the probability of the paper receiving negative reviews.

note: in a desk rejection, the AE recommends rejection without sending the manuscript to reviewers.
Many years later, Sidney received an assignment to handle a manuscript authored by Robin Albinson. Sidney remembered the many painful interactions with Dr. Albinson back in that first doctoral seminar and about hearing (second hand) that Dr. Albinson had tried to have Sidney dismissed from the doctoral program after the first-year examinations. Although more than 15 years had passed, Sidney still felt resentment over the events of that first year and wondered if an old grudge would prevent a fair disposition of the manuscript now under consideration.

Sidney decided to accept the assignment to handle the manuscript.
Once, Sidney reluctantly accepted an assignment to handle a manuscript. The topic was a familiar one, but Sidney was no expert and had difficulty selecting appropriate reviewers. Weeks turned into months and the manuscript still had not been sent out for review. Finally, referees were selected and the manuscript went out for review. However, one referee was late in returning a report. Again many weeks elapsed. Several times Sidney thought of sending a message to the delinquent referee; however, other urgencies always seemed to take precedence. At last the final review arrived and after another delay, Sidney wrote the AE report and the paper was rejected.

Through Sidney’s neglect, the review process took over eight months—twice the time stated by the journal’s review policy.
Although the responsibilities of being an AE took considerable time, Sidney continued collaborating with several coauthors as they moved their own research forward. Sidney and one coauthor were pleased with a paper they had recently submitted to a respected outlet. Not long after submission, Sidney was assigned to handle a paper on the same topic. Upon reading the manuscript, worry set in. Not only did the paper address the same topic, but it was clearly superior in almost every regard. Sidney was certain that the manuscript would be published and feared that if were published too soon it would reduce the likelihood that Sidney’s own work would be accepted.

In handling the manuscript, Sidney extended the review process by recommending a “major revision” of the manuscript knowing that a “conditional acceptance” was more appropriate.