



ETHICS IN THE PUBLICATION PROCESS AT JIBS: Policy, Practice and Consequences

**Lorraine Eden
Editor-in-Chief**

Journal of International Business Studies

*Ethics in the Publication Process: All-Academy Theme Symposium
Academy of Management Annual Meetings, Montreal, Canada, August 8, 2010*

OUTLINE: PUBLICATION ETHICS

I. Policy

- I. JIBS Code of Ethics, 2007-present
- II. COPE

II. Practice: Samples of Violations

III. Consequences: Steps JIBS Takes When Violation Found

IV. Conclusion

OUTLINE: PUBLICATION ETHICS

I. Policy

I. JIBS Code of Ethics, 2007-present

II. COPE

II. **Practice:** Samples of Violations

III. **Consequences:** Steps JIBS Takes When Violation Found

IV. **Conclusion**

JIBS CODE OF ETHICS

- Developed and adopted in 2007.
- Modeled on ethics codes developed by associations of editors of medical and science journals.
- (To my knowledge) is the first code of ethics for a scholarly business journal.
- Three sections: authors, editors and reviewers.
- Available at <http://www.jibs.net>

I. Policy: JIBS CODE OF ETHICS - AUTHORS

1. **Accuracy:** Authors are obligated to present an accurate account of the research performed as well as an objective discussion of the significance of the research.
2. **Originality:**
 - The manuscript must be an original work. The manuscript must not have been previously published or accepted for publication elsewhere, either in whole or in part.
 - If the manuscript contains materials that overlap with work that is previously published, that is in press, or that is under consideration for publication elsewhere, the Author must cite this work.
 - The manuscript should identify the origin, and originality, of any proprietary, non-standard datasets used in the paper.
 - While self-citation is encouraged, Authors should avoid excessively citing their earlier works in order to inflate their citation count.
 - Authors should not submit a manuscript to JIBS that was previously submitted to and rejected by a JIBS Editor.

I. JIBS CODE OF ETHICS – AUTHORS

3. **Co-Authorship:** All Co-Authors of papers should have made significant contributions to the work and share accountability for the results.
4. **Conflicts of Interest:** A conflict of interest is some fact known to a participant in the publication process that if revealed later, would make a reasonable reader feel misled or deceived. All such interests (or their absence) should be declared in writing by Authors upon submission of the manuscript.
 - Authors should disclose in the manuscript's Acknowledgements any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript.
 - When submitting a manuscript to JIBS, the Corresponding Author should recommend an Editor and up to four possible Reviewers for the manuscript. Authors should avoid any possible conflict of interest, or appearance of conflict of interest, in these selections.

I. JIBS CODE OF ETHICS – AUTHORS

5. **Human Subjects:** Authors have a responsibility to preserve and protect the privacy, dignity, well-being and freedom of human subjects and research participants.
5. **Double-Blind Review:** JIBS follows a double-blind review process, whereby Authors do not know Reviewers and vice versa. Authors should respect the confidentiality of the review process and should not reveal themselves to Reviewers, and vice versa.
6. **Copyright Law:** Authors should check their manuscripts for possible breaches of copyright law (e.g., where permissions are needed for quotations, artwork or tables taken from other publications) and secure the necessary permissions before submission.
7. **Timeliness:** Authors should be prompt with their manuscript revisions.

I. JIBS CODE OF ETHICS – AUTHORS

8. Plagiarism:

- All work in the manuscript should be free of any plagiarism, falsification, fabrications, or omission of significant material. Plagiarism takes many forms, from "passing off" another's paper as the Author's own paper, to copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper without attribution, to claiming results from research conducted by others.
- *Self-plagiarism (complementarity)* is also unacceptable publishing behavior. Self-plagiarism can occur in at least two ways:
 - (1) Authors recycle portions of their previous writings by using identical or nearly identical sentences or paragraphs from earlier writings in subsequent research papers, without quotation or acknowledgement; or
 - (2) Authors create multiple papers that are slight variations on each other, which are submitted for publication in different journals but without acknowledgement of the other papers.

I. JIBS CODE OF ETHICS – EDITORS

1. **Independence:** JIBS Editors must maintain their editorial independence and work to ensure that Authors have editorial freedom.
2. **Unbiased:** Editors should exercise their position of privilege in a confidential, unbiased, prompt, constructive and sensitive manner.
3. **Decision Quality:** Editors have a responsibility to provide the Author with an explanation of the editorial decision on a manuscript. Editors should write high-quality editorial letters that integrate reviewer comments and offer additional suggestions to the Author.

I. JIBS CODE OF ETHICS – EDITORS

4. **Conflict of Interest** : Editors should avoid any practice that gives rise to a conflict of interest or the reasonable appearance of one.
 - the Editor-in-Chief should not publish in the Journal except for materials that are clearly identifiable or identified as non-refereed or single-blind refereed.
 - Editors should excuse themselves from considering a manuscript in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, financial or other relationships or connections with any of the Authors, companies or institutions connected to the manuscript.

5. **Double-Blind Review**: JIBS follows a double-blind review process, whereby Authors do not know Reviewers and vice versa. Where articles appear in the Journal that were not double-blind reviewed, the standard of review should be clearly stated in the printed Acknowledgements accompanying the article.

I. JIBS CODE OF ETHICS – REVIEWERS

1. **Reciprocity:** Scholars who submit manuscripts to JIBS are normally expected to reciprocate by accepting an invitation to review for the Journal.
2. **Right of Refusal:** Refusals to review a manuscript are from time to time necessary.
3. **Double-Blind Review:** JIBS has a double-blind review process. Reviewers should refuse to review manuscripts where they have provided written comments on the manuscript or an earlier version to the Author. If a Reviewer knows the identity of an Author or Co-Author, this would normally be grounds for refusal to review. Reviewers also have a responsibility to avoid writing, doing or saying anything that could identify them to an Author.

I. JIBS CODE OF ETHICS – REVIEWERS

4. **Conflict of Interest:** Reviewers should refuse to review manuscripts in which they have any conflicts of interest resulting from collaborative, financial, institutional, personal, or other relationships or connections with any companies, institutions or people connected to the papers.
5. **Unbiased:** Reviewers should evaluate manuscripts objectively, fairly and professionally. Reviewers should avoid personal biases in their comments and judgments.
6. **Confidentiality:** Reviewers should respect the confidentiality of the review process. The manuscript is confidential.
7. **Accuracy:** In evaluating the manuscript and crafting comments to the Author(s), Reviewers should always keep in mind that their review captures their scholarly judgment about the manuscript.
8. **Timeliness:** Reviewers should be prompt with their reviews.

OUTLINE: PUBLICATION ETHICS

I. Policy

I. JIBS Code of Ethics, 2007-present

- Authors
- Editors
- Reviewers

II. COPE

- II. **Practice:** Samples of Violations
- III. **Consequences:** Steps JIBS Takes When Violation Found
- IV. Conclusion

II – COPE

JIBS has joined COPE, the **Committee on Publication Ethics**, <http://www.publicationethics.org>. COPE was founded 12 years ago by a group of medical journal editors concerned about publication misconduct (e.g., plagiarism, attempted or actual redundant [self-plagiarizing] publication, attempts to pass off fraudulent data, unethical research, breaches of confidentiality, etc.). Many publishers, including Palgrave (our publisher), have signed up all of their journals as COPE members.

Second, JIBS is now in the process of rewriting the JIBS Code of Ethics to link it more closely with the COPE Code of Conduct.

Third, the JIBS Editors are now following the general structure for handling ethical violations, outlined in the COPE templates. (The COPE templates can be downloaded here: <http://publicationethics.org/flowcharts>.)

II – COPE

In 2009, JIBS joined COPE, the Committee on Publication Ethics. COPE was founded 12 years ago by a group of medical journal editors concerned about publication misconduct (e.g., plagiarism, attempted or actual redundant [self-plagiarizing] publication, attempts to pass off fraudulent data, unethical research, breaches of confidentiality, etc.). Many publishers, including Palgrave (our publisher), have signed up all of their journals as COPE members.

JIBS has rewritten its Code of Ethics to link it more closely with the COPE Code of Conduct. The JIBS Editors are now following the general structure for handling ethical violations, outlined in the COPE templates.

COPE: <http://www.publicationethics.org>

COPE templates: <http://publicationethics.org/flowcharts>

OUTLINE: PUBLICATION ETHICS

I. Policy

I. JIBS Code of Ethics, 2007-present

- Authors
- Editors
- Reviewers

II. COPE

II. Practice: Samples of Violations

III. **Consequences:** Steps JIBS Takes When Violation Found

IV. **Conclusion**

II – SAMPLES OF RECENT VIOLATIONS

1. **Redundancy/Self-Plagiarism** - multiple paragraphs are identical in two papers, one of which is the JIBS submission; the other could be an existing published paper or a paper under review at another journal.

Examples:

- (1) An author submitted a paper to JIBS, having already published much of the same paper (multiple whole paragraphs) in another journal.
- (2) An author submitted a paper to JIBS with multiple paragraphs of the JIBS paper also appearing in a submission under review at another journal.

II – SAMPLES OF RECENT VIOLATIONS

- 2. Failure to cross-reference (“slicing and dicing”)** – cutting up a research project into multiple papers and not clearly identifying in each paper what exactly is new in that paper relative to other manuscripts by the same authors. Some examples: (1) A manuscript was under review at JIBS when a similar manuscript by the same author appeared in print in another journal. Comparison of the two manuscripts showed that the theory, primary dataset, and some of the hypotheses were identical in the two papers so the originality of the JIBS submission was significantly reduced. (2) A manuscript was under review at JIBS and a similar manuscript by the same author was under review at another journal. A reviewer of both submissions identified significant overlap in the primary dataset, hypotheses and tables.

II – SAMPLES OF RECENT VIOLATIONS

- 3. Violation of the arm's length rule (“forum shopping”)** – the corresponding author nominates one or more editors and/or reviewers who are not at arm's length from all the authors of the manuscript. The motivation behind such nominations appears to be similar to “forum shopping”, that is, looking for a sympathetic forum (editor and/or reviewer) for the manuscript. Regularly, JIBS sees authors nominating individuals who are clearly not at arm's length. Some recent examples: (1) An author nominated as a reviewer an individual who was a co-author on another manuscript. (2) An author nominated as an editor one of his/her current co-authors. (3) An author nominated as a reviewer someone who was thanked in the Acknowledgements for providing comments on the paper.

OUTLINE: PUBLICATION ETHICS

I. **Policy**

- I. JIBS Code of Ethics, 2007-present
- II. COPE

II. **Practice:** Samples of Violations

III. **Consequences:** Steps JIBS Takes When Violation Found

IV. **Conclusion**

III – STEPS JIBS TAKES WHEN VIOLATION FOUND

- When an ethical violation occurs at JIBS, the authors are told there has been a violation of the JIBS Code of Ethics and presented with the facts
- The focus is the facts, not the motive or motives behind the actions; and each situation is treated in confidence.
- Once the authors have responded, a final editorial decision is made and the file is closed.
- For a minor violation this might involve simply rewriting part of the paper; for a major violation, the manuscript would normally be rejected from further review at the journal.

III – STEPS JIBS TAKES WHEN VIOLATION FOUND

JIBS TEMPLATE LETTER TO AUTHOR(S) OF SUBMISSION WITH MAJOR REDUNDANCY

Dear Professor XX:

After your JIBS submission was sent out for double-blind review, one of the reviewers contacted the JIBS Office, declining to review the manuscript on the grounds that much of the JIBS submission was identical to another manuscript [currently under review at / previously published in] [JOURNAL NAME]. The individual attached both manuscripts. I have now read through the two manuscripts and highlighted the identical sections in the two papers. Both highlighted papers are attached to this letter. Also attached also are copies of the JIBS Code of Ethics and your responses to the Originality Questions which you completed in your Manuscript Central submission. Your answers state that no part of your submission, in whole or in part, has been published, is in press or is under review elsewhere, and that you have read and followed the JIBS Code of Ethics. The Code is quite explicit regarding the requirements that every submission to JIBS must be an original work, with no part of the submission having been published, in press or under review at another journal.

III – STEPS JIBS TAKES WHEN VIOLATION FOUND

JIBS TEMPLATE LETTER TO AUTHOR(S) (Cont.)

JIBS is a member of COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics); <http://www.publicationethics.org>. The journal has adopted explicit policies based on the COPE Code of Conduct that apply in cases of violations of journal ethics. After examining all the relevant materials, I have concluded that there is substantial, exact overlap between the [JOURNAL NAME] submission and your JIBS submission. Multiple paragraphs are identical in the two manuscripts, which the COPE and JIBS codes refer to as major redundancy (“self-plagiarism”). As a result, the following policies will be applied to your manuscript:

1. I am rejecting your manuscript from further review at JIBS.
2. The Editor of the other journal has been informed of the redundancy.

III – STEPS JIBS TAKES WHEN VIOLATION FOUND

JIBS TEMPLATE LETTER TO AUTHOR(S) (Cont.)

3. You may continue to submit manuscripts to JIBS, but with the explicit understanding that the JIBS Code of Ethics for Authors must be followed in any new submission to JIBS.
4. Should there be a second violation of the Ethics Code, you will be banned from submitting to JIBS for a period between one and five years, with the term length to be set by the JIBS Editor-in-Chief.
5. This matter will be treated as confidential within the JIBS Editors. The reviewer has been asked, and has agreed, to also treat this matter as confidential.
6. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and your awareness of its terms and conditions.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Eden, JIBS Editor-in-Chief

Ethics in the JIBS Submission Process, ACM Montreal 2010

OUTLINE: PUBLICATION ETHICS

I. Policy

- I. JIBS Code of Ethics, 2007-present
- II. COPE

II. Practice: Samples of Violations

III. Consequences: Steps JIBS Takes When Violation Found

IV. Conclusion

IV – CONCLUSION

- 1. Know the Code.**
- 2. Walk the walk.**
- 3. Transparency is key.**
- 4. When in doubt, ASK – and err on the side of caution.**
- 5. A good metric – the Wall Street Journal test.**

ANY QUESTIONS?

JIBS: Our Business Is *International Business*

Thank you!

editor-in-chief@jibs.net

