

Short case study 1:

Choosing the right journal to submit your article

Source: Freely inspired by the experience of a PhD student

Depuis ses études supérieures, Sophie Stické se passionne pour le marketing. Son master de marketing en poche, elle décide de poursuivre en thèse sur la thématique du marketing digital et propose naturellement son sujet à son professeur de marketing digital rencontré durant son année de Master, Gérard Menvussat (GM), qui accepte volontiers. En revanche, étant à un an de la retraite, GM propose à Sophie une co-direction avec jeune maître de conférences brillant, Alain Ternette (AT), un de ses anciens doctorants, qui prépare son HDR.

Sophie est ravie de pouvoir bénéficier des conseils et du regard de ces deux spécialistes de marketing digital. Elle débute sa thèse avec beaucoup d'enthousiasme. Ses directeurs de thèse échangent avec elle régulièrement, informellement en se croisant au labo (surtout avec AT), ou plus formellement lorsque Sophie suscite un rendez-vous de thèse. Au cours de sa deuxième année, Sophie entame sa collecte de données. Son sujet de recherche est original, ses données sont inédites, son cadre théorique a peu été mobilisé en marketing jusqu'ici : ses directeurs de thèse l'encouragent vivement à soumettre un premier papier à une conférence internationale organisée cette année-là en France.

Sophie se met au travail et fait relire une première version de son papier à ses directeurs de thèse qui lui suggèrent une série de pistes d'amélioration. Sophie comprend alors que tous deux considèrent être co-auteurs du papier. Une fois retouchée, la version de l'article est acceptée au Congrès International de Marketing Digital, avec Sophie comme premier auteur, AT en second auteur et GM en troisième auteur. La présentation au congrès, assurée par Sophie, se passe fort bien : les retours sont positifs et constructifs. A la fin du Congrès, l'un des organisateurs, un collègue français qui connaît GM de longue date, suggère que le papier soit soumis à la revue à laquelle est adossé le congrès, la RIMD (Revue Internationale de Marketing Digital) dont il est rédacteur en chef. Sophie est flattée de cette proposition, ses directeurs sont emballés, et Sophie envoie quasiment sur le champ l'article à cette revue. En revanche, elle est fort déçue lorsqu'elle découvre que cette revue n'est classée qu'en rang 4 par la FNEGE (et non classée par le CNRS). Sa déception se transforme en frustration lorsque, à l'occasion du séminaire publications du CEFAG, plusieurs intervenants soulignent le grand potentiel de son papier et l'incitent à le soumettre à une revue beaucoup plus prestigieuse.

De retour du CEFAG, elle rencontre ses directeurs de thèse qui se montrent très peu ouverts à la discussion. Ils argumentent : la RIMD est une bonne revue, peu importe le rang, et ils se sont engagés envers leur collègue rédacteur en chef ; par ailleurs, soumettre à une revue de rang 1 serait risqué et conduirait à des délais très longs de révision et de publication éventuelle, ce qui ne serait pas bon pour Sophie.

Sophie se sent désemparée...

Que peut faire Sophie ? Que lui conseillez-vous ? Quels enseignements tirer de cette expérience ?

Short case study 2:

Putting Social advocacy Before the Data

Source: Freely adapted from RCR Casebook: Social Responsibility (Office of Research Integrity)

Mary is a junior faculty member in a famous French Business School. As part of her faculty responsibilities, she is required to teach HRM (esp. gender-related issues), Corporate Social Responsibility, and mentor students in research methodology.

Two of her doctoral students, Kate and Susan, want to conduct a large survey of women's experience of workplace bullying and violence. Susan is in charge of the survey though Kate will help with the analysis. Before initiating her PhD in Management, Kate was herself a victim of workplace bullying when she was a marketing manager in a large company. Part of her zeal to do the research and ultimately design service programs to help women who are victims of bullying and discrimination comes from her strong conviction that society tends to blame the victims and hence fails to provide necessary resources. She also believes that women tend to under-report their experience of bullying, and that, until society understands the sense of powerlessness, shame, and humiliation that such victims experience, the problems will not be addressed effectively. Kate finds it rewarding to do the in-depth interviews with those who indicated on the survey some experience with workplace bullying or violence.

Mary is pleased when her students ask her to sponsor a panel that they wish to organize at a nationwide professional meeting. Their panel proposal is submitted and accepted. Her two students plan to begin the panel with a general review of the literature, then Susan will present the results of their survey, and finally Kate will describe her interviews.

Mary's sense of pride turns to dismay as she listens to her students' presentations. First, Susan reports finding a far higher incidence of workplace bullying and violence than is reported in the general literature. Then, Kate takes center stage and gives a moving, dramatic account of some of the more evocative interviews of women who had given slight indication on their survey of some rough treatment in the workplace. Kate explains that, in the safe environment of the interviews and the respect that she conveyed to participants, many women broke down and revealed that they had endured years of harassing treatment but were too afraid to do anything about it, and were convinced that social services would not be there to serve or protect them. Although Kate concludes with a ringing denouncement of HR managers (and policy makers), some of the experts in the audience question the strength of her findings.

Afterwards, Mary immediately asks to go over the raw data again with both Susan and Kate to make sure their analysis is correct before they publicize it any further. That's when Kate says, "Well, I modified the data a little for the presentation." Mary is stunned. She proceeds to press Kate regarding the extent of her altering the data, and Kate says, "I know that bullying and violence in the workplace is under-reported, so I wanted my report to reflect the way I know it really is. It is important to wake people up to the truth about how professional abuse forces women to keep their mouths shut. I don't want to be a party to that."

What should Mary do?

Role Play 1:

Is Theft of Authorship About to Occur?

Source: Freely adapted from RCR Casebook: Authorship and Publication (Office of Research Integrity)

Overview of Role Play

*This role play involves **Mark**, an Assistant Professor who believes a Principal Investigator (**Helen**) he is collaborating with, is going to deny authorship and access to the project's data when Helen notifies him that she is leaving the university. **Chris** is one of Mark's most trusted colleagues and is contacted by Mark to give him some advice.*

Character Description: Mark, the Assistant Professor

You are a young assistant professor of HRM, coming up for promotion next year by the National University Committee. You do not have a grant of your own and were invited to work on a major funded project about HR practices in a context of corporate downsizing: the project is of great professional interest to you and relevant to your career trajectory. You carved out an important piece of work and spent two years designing your studies and gathering the data which are eminently publishable and which you expect will be helpful for your career advancement.

However, the Principal Investigator who invited you to work with her has turned out to be a dishonest bully. She was enraged at you when, at a research meeting, you pointed out that some of her untrained and unqualified research assistants were fudging data to agree with the hypotheses stated in her research proposal. You did not realize what you were getting into when you agreed to work with her, and were simply attracted to the importance of the project.

You conducted qualitative research and supervised interviews with HR managers, first-line managers and employees in three large corporations in a context of downsizing. You ensured that they were accurate and consistent, and took responsibility for the analysis. In addition to supervising the qualitative data collection and analysis, you developed a typology of workplaces and HR downsizing practices which functioned as a major basis for the interventions.

Just as you complete a manuscript to be sent off for publication in *M@n@gement* based on the data analysis you have completed, Helen asks for a copy of the manuscript and the final version of the data. She then informs you that she is leaving, effective the next week, for a new job at another university. John, a colleague of yours, warns you that you'd better do something immediately to be sure that Helen doesn't try to steal your publication, change the study's data or control access to the data.

Character Description: Helen, the Principal Investigator

You are an experienced and very ambitious associate professor who has been struggling to create a research program that you hope will ensure you to become a full professor soon. The purpose of your current € 500,000-funded project is to develop a workplace intervention. To your dismay, you have found that your students do not seem to key in on critical information you are seeking, so you have had to tell them how to direct the interviews to get the kinds of data you need. You also warn them that if they can't get the kind of information you seek in the interviews, then you will not be able to use them or pay them to help you do the research.

In addition, you have hired a young assistant professor, Mark, as a research associate whose role is to conduct qualitative research on the project. He has just completed those interviews and cleaned the data. At a recent retreat, Mark had the audacity to accuse you of urging some of your undergraduate research assistants to fudge data to agree with the hypotheses stated in your research proposal.

Largely on the basis of your current research grant and presentations you have made about how your findings can improve workplace conditions, employees' well-being and organizational efficiency in a context of downsizing, you have landed a new appointment as a full professor at a well-known university. Much of your future hangs in the balance as you seek to complete and publish your project. Obviously, you cannot trust your research colleague to support the kinds of arguments you wish to make based on your data. Even though Mark has just finished cleaning the data and has even written the project's first manuscript for publication, you plan to take the project with you to your new university and analyze and publish it yourself. Mark gets word of your plans to leave your current university and confronts you about the manuscript, plans for publication, and project ownership.

Character Description: Chris, the Trusted Colleague

You are the assistant professor's former mentor (PhD supervisor) and became a highly trusted colleague and friend. You have been contacted by Mark, the assistant professor who believes that he will be denied authorship on a paper he wrote when the project's Principal Investigator (PI), Helen, leaves for a new job. Mark has also indicated concerns that Helen may have fabricated data. You, as the former PhD supervisor and now trusted friend, have to provide advice on how Mark should handle the situation. You have been at the university for a while and know of previous instances where Helen has bullied other researchers, and you believe that Mark needs to act immediately but cautiously to ensure that the work he did is not stolen by Helen. You are afraid that once the data leave the university, they could be altered to best fit the PI's hypotheses.

Role Play 2: Mysteriously Similar Articles

Source: Freely adapted from RCR Casebook: Peer Review (Office of Research Integrity)

Overview of Role Play

*This role play involves **Tom**, a peer reviewer who receives two papers from different journals to review. The papers are remarkably similar: they have the same preliminary data and nearly identical references listed. Tom decides to phone **Nat**, the editor for whom he regularly reviews. And Nat then phones the lead author of the article, **Louise**.*

Character Description: Tom, Peer Reviewer

You are well known in your research field and provide manuscript reviews for various journals in your discipline. You have received an article to review for *Org. Studies*. As you begin reading, you realize that its nearly identical to an article you just reviewed for another journal (*JMS* - *Journal of Management Studies*)— that you recommended accepting with minor revisions.

Although the titles and formatting are slightly different the references of each are nearly identical and the data presented are very similar. You do not know who the authors are. Still, you ask yourself: are these by the same author and s/he is it blatantly trying to get away with publishing duplicative material in two different journals? Or are there two different authors who are racing to be the first to write up the paper and perhaps to claim sole or first authorship? Or is it just a misunderstanding about who was to submit the article for publication and where? You decide to give a call to Nat, the Chief Editor.

Character Description: Louise, Lead Author

You are a researcher at a famous French business school in Paris. You recently submitted an article to *Org. Studies* with the findings from your latest Young Researcher ANR grant. The article has 6 co-authors—a co-investigator from another French Business School and several junior colleagues from different institutions in France and abroad. It was recently conditionally accepted with minor changes required. You are pleased and plan on completing the revisions this week. You get a call from Nat, the journal editor, stating that he was informed that a reviewer has read a paper just like yours, submitted to the *JMS*. You know nothing of this and are very upset. When Nat suggests that your article be put “on hold” while things are clarified, you become distressed: You need this paper for your next grant and future promotion.

Character Description: Nat, Journal Editor

You are the editor of *Org Studies*. You recently accepted an article for publication with only minor revisions required. You would like to include the article in the next issue, and have requested the author to expedite revisions. Then, out of the blue, you get a phone call from Tom, one of the reviewers describing a troubling situation.