7-1-2009

Journal Self-Citation XII: The Ethics of Forced Journal Citations

Janna Crews
University of Nevada, Reno, jcrews@unr.edu

Alexander McLeod
University of Nevada, Reno

Mark G. Simkin
University of Nevada, Reno

Follow this and additional works at: https://aisel.aisnet.org/cais

Journal Self-Citation XII: The Ethics of Forced Journal Citations

Janna M. Crews

Department of Accounting and Information Systems, University of Nevada, Reno

jcrews@unr.edu

Alexander McLeod

Department of Accounting and Information Systems, University of Nevada, Reno

Mark G. Simkin

Department of Accounting and Information Systems, University of Nevada, Reno

Abstract:

A recent and controversial issue in the academic publishing process is "forced journal self-citations"—i.e., the requirement that the author(s) include a minimum number of references to a journal as a condition of publication. This paper uses stakeholder theory to model the positions of both authors and journal representatives. We also used two empirical surveys to answer the questions (1) how ethical are such requests, and (2) how common are they? Our initial, stakeholder analysis suggests that neither an author nor the IS profession at large is likely to consider such requests ethical. Our empirical surveys suggest that, although about one-third of the respondents had encountered such requests, most agreed that such requests are unethical.

Keywords: academic publishing, journal review process, forced citations, citation analysis, ethics, codes of conduct

I. INTRODUCTION

Ethical issues have long been associated with published works. Early, "journalistic matters" include the importance of distinguishing fact from opinion in articles claiming to be objective narratives, the need to report all relevant facts rather than only those favorable to one side of a controversial matter, and the protection of confidential sources of important information [Harrower 2007]. In an earlier time, most newspapers and magazines published articles written by employees or contractors on a fee for service basis. The link between the publisher and the author(s) was therefore direct and the relationship between the writer and the distributor was clear.

Journals that publish the scholarly works of university writers or other experts add a layer of complexity to the publication mix. In such instances, for example, the author typically speaks with an independent voice, has no employment relationship with the publisher, and usually receives no compensation for his or her work. In some cases, in fact, just the opposite is the case: the writer (or his/her institution) pays the publisher a flat or per page fee instead of the other way around.[1]

The unique relationship between the writer and his or her academic journal representative(s) sometimes also raises new and often important ethical issues.[2] Examples include: the need to establish the authenticity, validity, and originality of any given work submitted for publication; questions regarding the inclusion or exclusion of the names of potential contributors to a given work (especially if they did not help in the writing of the piece); the reasonableness in the choice of "blind" reviewers who might actually know the author; and, of course, the importance of assessing the merits of the work itself [Clarke 2007].

Our goal is not to examine all of these matters in detail. Instead, we focus our attention on a relatively new activity—the requirement by some journal representatives that authors include in their own works a minimum number of citations to other articles in the same journal as a condition of publication. Is such a forced citation ethical? This question was recently the topic of a lively and ongoing debate within the AIS professional community initiated by a posting by Paul Gray on AISWorld [Gray 2009]. The main portion of his original statement read:

> "I received the following e-mail from a Springer journal on whose editorial board I serve: 'The EICs
> are requesting that henceforth all articles that are accepted for publication to <journal x> should cite
> at least five <journal x> articles. This is common practice for all top journals.' I would appreciate
> input from my colleagues about this message."

What prior work has already been done in this area and what does it say about this matter? How ethical is this and also how common is it? The next section of this paper addresses this first question, while Section III reports the results of two surveys performed to answer the ethics question empirically.

II. ETHICS AND STAKEHOLDER THEORY

Ethical issues are often best addressed using a formal framework. Although several structures are available for this task, the authors used the "stakeholder framework" outlined in Brooks [2004] for their analysis. This framework required us to identify the major stakeholders involved in this issue, and to examine the impact of forced citations on each of them. In our opinion, the three major stakeholders are:

(1) The authors of the articles who are required to add citations to their works,

(2) The journal representatives requesting such efforts, and

(3) The professional discipline within which such activities take place.

We examine this controversy for each stakeholder in this section.

---

[1] This payment is usually referred to as a 'page charge.'
[2] We use the term 'journal representative' as a shorthand for editor, reviewer, or publisher.

Authors

Although the initial request for additional citations is typically made by a journal editor, the ultimate decision whether or not to comply rests with the writer. As independent agents, authors are free to reject any mandated citation requirement and resubmit their articles elsewhere (a point noted in a response to Paul Gray's survey). At face value, therefore, a request to make particular revisions to an article would seem innocuous and of little ethical consequence.

In our opinion, this argument ignores the fact that many researching faculty are under pressure to publish as a condition of employment at their institutions and that "publishing" is a requirement for tenure. Hence, the very familiar adage, "publish or perish." As a result, untenured authors may be more vulnerable to undue influence of such requests because of the importance of the timely publication of their work on their careers and tenure cases at their respective universities. In such circumstances, faculty members/authors may not feel that they can afford to refuse a request to cite additional papers from a reviewing journal—i.e., due to outside career pressures they do not posses real "freedom of choice" in the editor-author relationship [Kock and Davison 2003]. Thus, even though authors have the right to accept or reject conditions imposed by an editor or other journal representative, they may not feel they have the option to do so. In this situation, the author may be much more likely to accept (or bend to) conditions imposed by the editor and/or reviewers. This potential for coercion, whether intentional or not, is unethical in our view.

Independent of whether or not an author has tenure, the further along in the review process a request for additional citations occurs, the more it costs the author in lost time to reject and opt instead for a new submission. For example, if a paper is returned almost immediately after submission with such a request, it is relatively "inexpensive" (although not entirely without cost) in lost time to resubmit a paper to a different journal. However, this same decision becomes more expensive to make in terms of time and effort at the later, "conditional acceptance" stage in the review process. It is easy to guess that editors who understand the benefit/cost relationship may exploit this opportunity, waiting until the last minute to make requests for "forced citations."

Journal Representatives

Journal representatives include paper reviewers, editors, and the publishers themselves. While all such parties may not necessarily agree on any particular issue, we assume that they all adhere to the stated policies of a particular journal. We therefore treat them collectively as a second stakeholder.

For several legitimate reasons journal representatives may want authors to include additional citations to a given research paper. Examples are:

(1) Identifying work relevant to the current research,

(2) Recognizing the contribution of previous papers to the current submission,

(3) Indicating how the current work builds on previous knowledge,

(4) Illustrating how the submitted paper fits into a given stream of knowledge, and

(5) Signaling that the current article is also likely to be of interest to the readers of the submission journal [Diamond 1986; Kock and Davison 2003; Clarke 2006].

These justifications seem both reasonable and ethical. In these instances, there is reason to believe that the added citations would serve an important support function in research efforts. We note, however, that these justifications assume content-based initiatives—i.e., we assume that the request for additional citations stems from the content of the article itself, and that the citations are germane to the subject matter of the paper and are thus *knowledge centric*.

Other, less legitimate reasons why journal representatives might want authors to include additional citations include:

(1) Citing the work of someone with whom the journal representative has a personal relationship, and

(2) Increasing the number of citations to other works published in the journal.

Under these circumstances, we believe that mandated citation requirements are unethical. In the first case, an editor requires an author to cite works that are not directly relevant to the author's research paper, but are in the editor's personal interest, directly or indirectly [Davison et al. 2004]. In the second case, a request appears to stem mostly from an editor's or publisher's interest in improving the impact factor of his or her journal. In both of these

cases, the journal representative would be using his/her position to the personal advantage of him/herself or the journal represented; thus the request is *journal centric.*

Furthermore, based on the Association of Information Systems (AIS) Code of Conduct,[3] there is no ethical rationale for requiring a *specific number of journal self-citations*. This seems especially true when a journal's official Web site contains no such policy. At best, an editor requiring additional journal self-citations could lead authors to find interesting works that inform their own work, even though they were not originally contributing works. At worst, adding citations to largely irrelevant works could be considered a form of fabricating or falsifying data, research procedures, and/or data analysis—activities defined as unethical behavior by category one of the code [Davison et al., 2004]. In such instances, an editor mandating a set number of additional journal self-citations potentially coerces an author into unethical behavior.

Diamond [1986] suggests that estimating the value of a citation to an individual author is difficult, depends on many variables, and is subject to many interpretations. He claims that the marginal value of an initial citation can be as much as $1,300 (in 1986 dollars) to a first author. Furthermore, he states, "…citations are indeed a positive and significant determinant of earnings……even when other measures of quality, such as number of articles published and IQ, are controlled" [Diamond 1986, p. 362]. In non monetary terms, a citation may also provide prestige and recognition to researchers for research endeavors, serve as a proxy for the quality/impact of the research and the researcher, and influence tenure decisions [Seglen 1997; Kostoff 1998]. Forced citations, therefore, can have both monetary and non monetary rewards to authors.

Finally, we note that citations may directly provide value to the publishing journal and its editor. Possible perceived benefits include:

(1) A higher "impact score" for a journal, thereby indicating a higher-quality publication,

(2) Greater prestige to the editor due to the higher perceived quality of his/her journal, and

(3) Perhaps, higher reward to the editor due to this increased prestige.

However, it is difficult for the authors to understand how a request for a set number of additional, self-citations is not a conflict of interest for the editor. In such instances, we conclude that such actions ethically violate the AIS code by using editorial powers inappropriately.[4]

The Profession

Perhaps the most important stakeholder in the issue of mandated citations is the IS profession, which we interpret to include journal readers and both the professional and academic members of the IS community at large. The ethics of any given act or behavior is often defined by the professional societies active in the discipline.

Such professional societies as the Association of Computer Machinery (ACM) have spent years developing codes of conduct for its members. They are therefore particularly concerned with the ethical behavior of its members, as well as individuals in the discipline at large. A formalized, professional code of ethics can guide and govern the members of the profession by developing common professional practices, defining ethical behaviors, identifying and discouraging unethical behaviors, and establishing methods to resolve or adjudicate disagreements and claims of unethical behaviors [Frankel 1989; Borkowski and Welsh 1998]. Consequently, AIS developed a code of conduct to guide its members [Davison et al., 2004].

Finally, the IS profession should be interested in forced citations because they affect subsequent citation analyses - a methodology used to determine journal rankings or the relevance of individual research [Clark and Warren 2006]. Forced citations affect any subsequent citation analyses, and therefore can result in false measures of the influence or impact of a journal or any individual research article [Kostoff 1998, Straub and Anderson 2009].

---

[3] In December 2003, AIS Research Conduct Committee developed (and AIS Council approved) the association's first professional code of conduct. The AIS Code of Research Conduct (the Code) codifies a set of ethical principles/guidelines designed to guide its members regarding "ethically desirable behavior" in scholarly activities and pursuits [Davison et al. 2004; Avison 2008; Avison 2009]. The Code is divided into two categories: Category One codes are mandatory ("must always be adhered to"), while Category Two codes are "recommended ethical behavior" [Davison et al., 2004].
[4] Category two, part five of the Code states: "Do not abuse the authority and responsibility you have been given as an editor, reviewer or supervisor, and take care to ensure that no personal relationship will result in a situation that might interfere with your objective judgment" [Davison et al. 2004].

III. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

To the extent that ethical behavior is sometimes also determined by a consensus of society members, the ethics of any act or concept can be informed empirically. As noted in Section I, we were interested in answering two questions:

> (1) How ethical is it to force citations in research articles?
>
> (2) How common is it?

Accordingly, we relied on the responses to two independent surveys, both of which were conducted in the early part of 2009, to help us answer these questions:

> (1) The informal poll conducted by Paul Gray on the AISWorld Listserve, and
>
> (2) A more formal, but also voluntary, survey that we conducted online.

Paul Gray's Inquiry

Gray received a total of 126 responses to his inquiry, which asked three basic questions: (1) Is this a common practice?, (2) Is it appropriate to reference the publishing journal over and over, whether it is necessary to the paper or not?, and (3) Is it ethical? Table 1 summarizes the results of this inquiry.

Table 1 suggests that the majority of the respondents to Gray's inquiry (1) did not feel that "mandated citations" were a common practice, (2) did not feel that this was appropriate behavior, and (3) did not feel the practice was ethical.

The responses in Table 1 echo a recent statement by Davison [2009], who noted "…as we have seen on ISWORLD, it appears that some journals require authors to cite papers from the same journal as a condition of publication, irrespective of the relevance of the papers-to-be-cited to the accepted paper. This too is an instance of unethical behavior–on the part of the editor or publisher–and certainly not one that we would condone."

Table 1. Summary of Responses to Paul Gray's Inquiry								
	Yes	No	Maybe	Don't Know	Low	Questionable/ Debatable	Did not answer	Total
Q1: Common?	24.6%(31)	51.6%(65)	1.6%(2)	8.7%(11)	4.8%(6)		8.7%(11)	126
Q2: Appropriate?	4.8%(6)	79.4%(100)	4.8%(6)				11.1%(14)	126
Q3: Ethical?	2.5%(3)	79.5%(97)	4.9%(6)			3.3%(4)	9.8%(12)	126

Reprinted from Gray [2009]

A New Survey

The responses in Table 1 come from an informal and voluntary survey containing only three questions. For example, most of the respondents were members of the AISWorld Listserve, and the survey itself did not ascertain:

> (1) Whether the respondent was an author or an editor,
>
> (2) Where in the review process a request for additional citations occurred, or
>
> (3) Similar matters that might be relevant to understanding the process in general.

For these reasons, we developed a new survey, which we first pilot tested in our College of Business. Seventeen faculty members assisted us in establishing the content validity of our questions and we included their suggestions for improvements in the new, online survey shown in Appendix A. A posting on the AISWorld Listserve requested anonymous responses to the survey and by the submission deadline for this paper. We received a total of 76 usable responses. Respondents were able to skip items, and some items were branching (i.e., dependent on responses to previous items), resulting in varying response rates on items. Unlike some of the participants in Professor Gray's survey, all respondents answered anonymously. Table 2 identifies the respondents' disciplines. Most participants were from the target field of information systems.

Table 2. Respondent Discipline	
Computer Science	5.5% (3)
Decision Sciences	1.8% (1)
Information Systems	72.7% (40)
Management	3.6% (2)
Managerial Sciences	3.6% (2)
Marketing	1.8% (1)
Operations Management	1.8% (1)
Supply Chain Management	1.8% (1)
Other	7.3% (4)

We also asked our respondents to identify their academic rank (Table 3). The values in Table 3 suggest that the academic rank of our participants was fairly evenly divided among the four possible rank answers. Therefore, the answers to our survey questions provides overview of the issues from a broad rank perspective.

Finally, we asked our respondents to indicate their tenure classification. Table 4 shows the breakdown by tenure category. To our surprise, most of the respondents to our survey had tenure, with the remaining individuals somewhat evenly divided between those serving in tenure-track and non-tenure-track appointments.

Table 3. Academic Rank	
Full Professor	37.5% (24)
Associate Professor	25.0% (16)
Assistant Professor	18.8% (12)
Lecturer	18.8% (12)

Table 4. Tenure Type	
Tenured	59.4% (38)
Tenure Track	18.8% (12)
Non Tenure Track	21.9% (14)

The Author's Perspective

To separate the responses to our survey into authors versus journal representatives, Question 5 asked each participant to indicate the perspective from which he or she was responding. About two thirds (67.6 percent; 46/67) answered from an author's viewpoint, while the remaining one third (32.4 percent; 21/67) answered from a journal representative's perspective.

We realize that some authors voluntarily add target journal citations to their papers simply to increase their chances of acceptance. Question 6 of our survey asked authors about their motive for adding such citations prior to submitting. About half of our respondents (52.2 percent; 24/46) reported that they had done so. To keep the number of questions in our survey manageable and the survey itself on target, we did not ask additional questions about the ethics of such practice.

Next, we asked authors if a journal representative had ever asked them to add a minimum number of citations from the submission journal in their papers. A large majority (71.1 percent; 32/45) said that they had never encountered this request. However, almost a third (28.9 percent; 13/45) of our respondents said the opposite—i.e., that they had been requested to add a minimum number of citations. This result is consistent with the results of Gray's survey and suggests that such requests are not isolated incidents.

To those reporting they had been requested to add citations, we asked which journal representative made the request. Table 5 shows that "journal editors" were the most common journal representative requesting authors to add citations.

Table 5. Type of Journal Representative Requesting Forced Citations	
Editor	61.5% (8)
Member of Editorial Board	23.1% (3)
Reviewer	15.4% (2)

We then asked authors what was the maximum number of citations requested. More than half (7/12) of all responding authors reported that they received requests for five citations, and more than 80 percent (11/12) reported three or more. Table 6 shows the breakdown by number of citations requested.

The author's opinion concerning whether the request was reasonable was our next focus. We asked our respondents to use a Likert scale to answer this question. Table 7 shows the authors' responses, with more than half answering that the request was either completely or nearly "unreasonable."

Table 6. Maximum Number of Citations Requested	
One	0.0%
Two	8.3% (1)
Three	25.0% (3)
Four	8.3% (1)
Five	50.0% (6)
Six	0.0%
Seven	8.3% (1)

Table 7. Reasonableness of Request for Citations	
1 - Unreasonable	50.0% (6)
2	8.3% (1)
3	16.7% (2)
4	8.3% (1)
5	8.3% (1)
6	0.0%
7 - Reasonable	8.3% (1)

Given the investment of time in the review process, we wanted to know when editors or reviewers made a request for additional citations from authors. Table 8 shows that 83.4 percent (10/12) of these requests happened *after* review or *after* a conditional acceptance of the completed work—i.e., as noted earlier, at precisely the times when we believe authors are most likely to feel undue influence to comply with such requests.

Table 8. Stage of Submission When Request was Received	
Before Review	8.3% (1)
During Review	8.3% (1)
After Review	41.7% (5)
Conditional Acceptance	41.7% (5)

Finally, we wanted to know what outcomes occurred when authors received requests to add citations. Table 9 shows the results of this question—i.e., three quarters (9/12) of the responding authors said they complied with the request. *None* of the authors resubmitted their papers to another journal.

Table 9. What was the Outcome? (Reported by Authors)	
I complied and the journal published the paper	75.0% (9)
I complied but the journal did not publish the paper	16.7% (2)
I did not comply and the journal published the paper	8.3% (1)
I did not comply and moved the paper to a different journal	0.0%

The Journal Representative's Perspective

A total of 21 respondents completed the survey by selecting the "Journal Representative's Role." Table 10 reports on the "highest" roles of these respondents as journal representatives.

We also asked the journal representatives if they had ever requested an author to include a certain minimum number of citations to their journal. A large majority, 90.5 percent (19/21), reported that they had not requested a minimum number of journal self-citations, while 9.5 percent (2/21) reported doing so at least once.

Table 10. Journal Representative's Role	
Editor	40.9% (9)
Member of Editorial Board	40.9% (9)
Reviewer	18.2% (4)

We then asked those who had requested a minimum number of citations to their journal a few additional questions about such requests. Because a very small number fit this category (two editors), we hesitated reporting the results. We ultimately decided that their answers, though limited, were still interesting. Consequently, we caution readers to interpret the results with care and avoid generalizations. Also note that this question is fertile ground for further research.

First we asked for the maximum number of journal self-citations requested from an author, and then if such a request was reasonable. One editor reported requesting as many as four citations, while the other editor had requested as many as five. Interestingly, one of the editors reported that such a request was *unreasonable*. This appears to indicate a journal-centric motivation that was perhaps a journal policy rather than an editorial request. This interpretation is supported by the results in Table 12, which indicate "journal policy" as a motivator. The other editors chose not to answer this question.

We then asked the journal representatives at what stage in the submission/review process such requests were made, allowing respondents to select all applicable stages. Although authors reported getting over 83 percent (10/12) of such requests after review or upon conditional acceptance (Table 8), both responding editors reported making requests for citations either before or during the review process, not in later stages (Table 11). In addition to the small number of respondents, this discrepancy might be explained by response bias in those responding versus those not responding to this item/survey.

We feel the motivation for such requests is central to the ethical aspect, so we asked: "What motivated you to ask for citations to your journal?" In this case the respondents were asked to select all motivations that applied. Both editors specified that such requests had been made because a "body of knowledge was missing," or "citation indices." One also said that "journal policy" had been a motivator. Table 12 details these categories.

Table 11. Stage in the Review Process When a Journal Representative Made a Request (n=3 Respondents)	
Before Review	2
During Review	1
After Review	0
Conditional Acceptance	0

Table 12. Motivation for Citation Request (n=3 Respondents)	
Body of knowledge missing	2
Citation indices	2
Journal policy	1
Journal rankings	0
Poor literature review	0

The final question in our survey asked both authors and journal representatives, independent of their involvement, if they thought that requests for including a certain minimum number of journal self-citations were ethical. Table 13 summarizes our results and indicates that most view this as unethical (81.8 percent; 45/55) while a smaller number felt that such requests were ethical (18.2 percent; 10/55). These results mirror those from Gray's survey. Furthermore, a Chi-square test of the results indicates that there was no statistically significant difference between the opinions of the authors and journal representatives on this question (X^2=.395).

Table 13. Are Forced Citation Requests Ethical?			
Response	Authors	Journal Representatives	Combined
No - Not Ethical	85.3% (29)	76.2% (16)	81.8% (45)
Yes - Ethical	14.7% (5)	23.8% (5)	18.2% (10)

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The term "forced citations" describes a recent practice by some journal editors or publishers that requires authors to add a set number of citations to their papers as a condition of publication. Using a stakeholder model, we analyzed the theoretical merits of such requests and found that neither an author nor the IS profession is likely to consider such requests "ethical." Indeed, for authors, these requests can be both unproductive and untimely, while for the profession at large, such requests appear to:

(1) Violate professional codes of conduct, and

(2) Manipulate journal impact analyses that depend on citations for results.

Although journal reviewers or editors might reasonably ask authors to include additional citations to submitted papers, we also found that requests for a specific number of citations were most likely self serving and, therefore, an abuse of editorial power. This conclusion seems especially relevant when such requirements are not explicitly stated in the editorial policies posted on official journal Web sites.

Our theoretical analysis also motivated us to investigate this issue empirically. Gray's informal survey indicated that about one third of the respondents felt that such practice was common, while the remaining two thirds of the respondents found it both inappropriate and unethical. A more formal survey by the authors replicated these results. Some additional findings of potential interest from this second survey follow:

(1) "Five" appears to be the modal number of additional citations requested by journal editors.

(2) The most common time for such requests is after a review or as one of the conditions for final acceptance of a paper.

(3) Most authors are inclined to accede to such requests.

(4) Most authors and journal editors do not feel that such requests are ethical.

We encourage readers to interpret our empirical results with care. The participants in both of the surveys we used were volunteers, for example, and both sample sizes were relatively small. It is also possible that many of the same individuals who responded to Gray's first call for input also participated in our study, and that our two samples are not necessarily independent. We were not able to test for non response bias, but believe it may exist in our sample. Finally, we note that "ethical issues" are "sensitive issues." Thus, although our empirical results match what we expected from our analysis of the various stakeholders, we realize that a number of biases may have caused this outcome, including the previous responses posted on AISWorld.

REFERENCES

Editor's Note: The following reference list contains hyperlinks to World Wide Web pages. Readers who have the ability to access the Web directly from their word processor or are reading the paper on the Web can gain direct access to these linked references. Readers are warned, however, that:
1. These links existed as of the date of publication but are not guaranteed to be working thereafter.
2. The contents of Web pages may change over time. Where version information is provided in the References, different versions may not contain the information or the conclusions referenced.
3. The author(s) of the Web pages, not AIS, is (are) responsible for the accuracy of their content.
4. The author(s) of this article, not AIS, is (are) responsible for the accuracy of the URL and version information.

Borkowski, S. and M. Welsh (1998). "Ethics and the Accounting Publishing Process: Author, Reviewer and Editor Issues," *Journal of Business Ethics* 17(16), pp. 1785–1803.

Brooks, L. J. (2004). *Business & Professional Ethics for Directors, Executives, & Accountants* Mason, OH: Thomson Southwestern.

Communications of the Association for Information Systems

Clark, J. G. and J. Warren (2006). "In Search of the Primary Suppliers of IS Research: Who Are They and Where Did They Come From?," *The Communications of the Association for Information Systems* 18(15), pp. 1-36.

Clarke, R. (2006). "Plagiarism by Academics," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* 7(2), pp. 91-121.

Clarke, R. (2007). "An Exploratory Study of Information Systems Researcher Impact," *The Communications of the Association for Information Systems* 22(1), pp. 1.

Davison, R. A. (2009). "Spotlight on Research Ethics," *The AIS Insider* 1(6), p. 1.

Davison, R. A., M. Munro, and D. W. Straub (2004). "AIS Code of Research Conduct," *Communications of the AIS* 13(2), pp. 13.

Diamond, A. M. (1986). "What is a Citation Worth?," *Journal of Human Resources* 21(2), pp. 200-215.

Frankel, M. (1989). "Professional Codes: Why, How and with What Impact?," *Journal of Business Ethics* 8(2), pp. 109-115.

Gray, P. (2009) Journal Self-Citation I: Overview of the Journal Self-Citation Papers - The Wisdom of the IS Crowd. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 25(1), Article 1, pp. 1-10.

Harrower, T. (2007). *Inside Reporting: A Practical Guide to the Craft of Journalism* New York: McGraw Hill.

Kock, N. F. and R. M. Davison (2003). "Dealing with Plagiarism in the Information Systems Research Community: A Look at Factors that Drive Plagiarism and Ways to Address Them," *MIS Quarterly* 27(4), pp. 511-532.

Kostoff, R. N. (1998). "The Use and Misuse of Citation Analysis in Research Evaluation," *Scientometrics* 43(1), pp. 27-43.

Seglen, P. O. (1997). "Why the Impact Factor of Journals Should not be Used for Evaluating Research," *British Medical Journal* 314(7079), pp. 497.

Straub, D. W. and C. Anderson (2009) "Journal Self-Citation VI: Forced Journal Self-Citation - Common, Appropriate, Ethical?" *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 25(1), Article 6, pp. 57-66.

APPENDIX A: ONLINE SURVEY

Greetings

Information Sheet

University of Nevada – College of Business – Accounting & Information Systems Department

You are being asked to participate in a study that examines people's opinions and viewpoints concerning ethics in publishing and research. Answering this short survey will help researchers studying ethics understand concerns in this area.

When you answer the survey, we will not know who you are and your answers will be anonymous. We will not collect your IP address nor will we require a "cookie" to complete this survey. When this research is completed all answers will be destroyed and the data will be deleted.

Thank you for taking the time to answer our survey. If you have any questions or problems with the survey, please contact us.

1.   Do you agree to voluntarily participate?
   o   Yes
   o   No

Rank and tenure classification

2.   In general, which of the following discipline titles describes your area of research?
   o   Accounting
   o   Computer Science
   o   Decision Sciences
   o   Economics
   o   Finance

- o Information Systems
- o Management
- o Managerial Sciences
- o Marketing
- o Operations Management
- o Statistics
- o Supply Chair Management
- o Other (please specify)

3. What is your academic rank?
- o Full Professor – Tenured
- o Associate Professor
- o Assistant Professor
- o Lecturer

4. What is your tenure classification?
- o Tenured
- o Tenure Track
- o Non-tenure Track

5. From which perspective are you responding?
- o Representative of a journal (such as an editor or reviewer)
- o Submitting author (or coauthor)

Author perspective

6. As an author, have you ever added citations to a journal where you were submitting a paper solely because you thought it might improve the chances of acceptance?
- o Yes
- o No

Comments:

7. In what year did you last function as an author?

8. As an author, has a representative of a journal ever asked you to include a minimum number of citations from his or her journal in a paper you've submitted?
- o Yes
- o No

Comments:

Requested citations

9. Using the most extreme case that comes to mind, in what role was the journal's representative functioning at the time of the request?
- o Editor
- o Associate Editor
- o Assistant Editor
- o Reviewer

Comments:

10. Which journal(s) requested that you include citations to their publication?

Reasonable request?

11. In the most extreme case, how many citations were you requested to add? (select one)
- o 1
- o 2
- o 3

- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 or more

12. Did you feel that the journal representative's request was reasonable? (select one)
    - Unreasonable
    - 2
    - 3
    - 4
    - 5
    - 6
    - Reasonable

    Comments:

Author outcome

13. At what stage in the submission process was this request made?
    - Before review
    - During review
    - After review
    - Conditional acceptance

14. What was the outcome?
    - I complied and the journal published the paper.
    - I complied but the journal did not publish the paper.
    - I did not comply and the journal published the paper.
    - I did not comply and moved the paper to a different journal.

Representative perspective

15. With regard to this topic, what is/was your highest role as a representative for the journal?
    - Editor
    - Associate Editor
    - Assistant Editor
    - Reviewer

16. In what year did you last function as a journal representative?

17. As the representative of a journal, have you ever asked an author to include a certain number of citations to your journal?
    - Yes
    - No

    Comments:

Representative requested citations

18. Which were the most recent journal(s) you represented when you requested authors to include citations to that journal in their publication?
    1._____
    2. _____
    3. _____

19. In the most extreme case, how many citations have you requested authors to add? (select one)
    - 1
    - 2
    - 3
    - 4
    - 5

        ○ 6
        ○ 7 or more

<u>Representative reasonable request?</u>

20. Did you feel that this type of request was reasonable?
    ○ Unreasonable
    ○ 2
    ○ 3
    ○ 4
    ○ 5
    ○ 6
    ○ Reasonable

    Comments:

21. At what state in the submission/review process have you made such a request? (select all that apply)
    ○ Before review
    ○ During review
    ○ After review
    ○ Conditional acceptance

    Comments:

<u>Representative outcome</u>

22. What motivated you to ask for citations to your journal? (select all that apply)
    ○ Body of knowledge missing
    ○ Citation indices
    ○ Journal policy
    ○ Journal rankings
    ○ Poor literature review
    ○ Other (please specify) _____

23. Which of the following outcomes do you think occurs most frequently? (Select all that apply)
    ○ The authors complied and the journal published the paper.
    ○ The authors complied but the journal did not publish the paper.
    ○ The authors did not comply and the journal published the paper.
    ○ The authors did not comply and moved the paper to a different journal.

    Comments:

<u>Ethical opinion</u>

24. Independent of whether you have been involved in this Situation, do you think such a request is ethical?
    ○ Yes
    ○ No

    Comments:

<u>Conclusion</u>

Thank you for responding to this survey. If you would like a copy of the results, please add your email in the box below.

25. Add your email here to receive a copy of the results.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Janna M. Crews is an assistant professor of Information Systems at the University of Nevada, Reno. She earned her Ph.D. in Management Information Systems from the University of Arizona, and her BAcc and MAcc from the University of Oklahoma. Her research interests include design of technology supported learning systems, usability, research methodologies, and research ethics. Her research is published in *Journal of Management Information Systems (JMIS), The DATA BASE for Advances in Information Systems, MIS Quarterly Executive (MISQE), Journal of Cases in Information Technology*, and a number of other prestigious international journals and conferences.

Alexander McLeod is an assistant professor of Information Systems at the University of Nevada, Reno. He received his Ph.D. in Information Technology from the University of Texas at San Antonio. His research interests include individual and organizational performance involving enterprise systems, healthcare information systems, and information system security. His publications appear in *Communications of the Association of Information Systems,* the *International Journal of Business Information Systems, Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, International Journal of Electronic Healthcare, Journal of Information Systems Education,* and *International Journal of Healthcare Information Systems and Informatics.*

Mark G. Simkin is a professor of Information Systems at the University of Nevada, Reno. He earned his BA degree in mathematics from Brandeis University and his MBA and Ph.D. degrees from the University of California, Berkeley. He is the author or coauthor of 15 textbooks, including three on Visual Basic and 11 on accounting information systems. He is also the author or coauthor of over 100 research articles, some of which are published in *Decision Sciences, JASA, Communications of the ACM, International Journal of Information Management, Journal of Accountancy, Journal of Computer Information Systems, Interfaces,* and *Journal of Systems Management.*