

INFORMATION SYSTEMS RESEARCH BEHAVIORS: WHAT ARE THE NORMATIVE STANDARDS?

Gove N. Allen, Nicholas L. Ball

Marriot School of Management, Brigham Young University, 783 Tanner Building,
Provo, UT 84602 U.S.A. {gove@byu.edu} {nick_ball@byu.edu}

H. Jeff Smith

Department of Decision Sciences and MIS, Farmer School of Business, Miami University,
3095 FSB, Oxford, OH 45056 U.S.A. {jeff.smith@muohio.edu}

Appendix A

Survey Scenarios and Measures

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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)¹ 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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.

¹Note: The IRB is sometimes called the Human Subjects Committee.

13. 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) 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.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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).

19. 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-blind² review policy, Sidney accepted the assignment without reporting to the AE that the author's identity was known.

20. Sidney completed a very positive review. The next year, while the manuscript was with the authors for revision, Sidney attended a reception at 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.

²Note: In a double-blind review, authors' and reviewers' identities are withheld from each other.

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.

21. 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.

22. 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.

23. 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.

24. Later, on a different manuscript, Sidney invited three individuals to serve as reviewers. Each accepted. Subsequently, one reviewer (Dr. Rosen) e-mailed 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.

25. 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.

26. 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.

27. 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.

28. 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.

29. 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.

For each of the 29 scenarios, the survey requested respondents to make the following six judgments. In each, the "behavior" references the portion of the scenarios shown in boldface above. Each measure is on a scale of one to seven.

1. Assessment of the inappropriateness (1 = clearly appropriate; 4 = neutral; 7 = very inappropriate)

Measures two through six are frequency estimates (1 = never; 7 = often).

2. I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behavior.
3. I have engaged in similar behavior.
4. Colleagues in my discipline with whose behavior I am personally familiar engage in similar behavior.
5. In general, I believe that researchers in my discipline engage in similar behavior.
6. When facing similar situations in the future, I would likely engage in similar behavior.

Appendix B

Means and Standard Deviations for All 29 Scenarios Across All 6 Measures

Scenario	Means						Standard Deviations					
	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6
1. Drop a colleague as an author	6.65	1.56	1.14	2.22	2.85	1.18	0.80	1.23	0.53	1.56	1.43	0.65
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	4.90	2.87	2.44	3.65	4.00	2.70	1.55	1.91	1.69	1.87	1.70	1.65
3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure	5.37	2.41	1.84	3.21	3.79	2.14	1.52	1.83	1.47	1.98	1.80	1.51
4. Author order other than contribution	5.80	2.43	1.87	3.20	3.80	1.89	1.53	1.84	1.45	1.92	1.84	1.34
5. Skip IRB for survey	5.56	2.32	2.01	2.90	3.37	2.12	1.58	1.81	1.63	1.94	1.86	1.62
6. Skip IRB for experiment	6.15	1.69	1.43	2.18	2.70	1.64	1.39	1.37	1.15	1.62	1.68	1.30
7. Violate anonymity of subjects	5.98	1.56	1.47	2.14	2.82	1.68	1.34	1.24	1.09	1.51	1.62	1.30
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	5.31	2.10	1.70	2.78	3.59	1.98	1.51	1.65	1.25	1.82	1.79	1.38
9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication	6.14	1.67	1.33	2.26	3.25	1.60	1.22	1.36	0.84	1.64	1.74	1.10
10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions	6.52	1.62	1.30	2.21	3.04	1.36	0.96	1.36	0.82	1.64	1.70	0.85
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	6.76	1.31	1.12	1.74	2.32	1.14	0.81	1.00	0.54	1.36	1.52	0.59
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	3.33	2.69	2.80	3.71	4.48	3.58	1.95	2.00	1.96	2.00	1.82	2.10
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	3.60	2.51	2.47	3.41	4.26	3.30	2.02	1.93	1.89	1.98	1.81	2.01
14. Self plagiarism	5.79	2.24	1.92	3.15	3.82	1.94	1.50	1.73	1.39	1.95	1.91	1.41
15. Citing without reading	5.35	2.60	2.60	3.64	4.35	2.48	1.49	1.88	1.61	1.96	1.88	1.58
16. Classical plagiarism	6.83	1.33	1.14	1.88	2.60	1.13	0.78	0.99	0.58	1.46	1.57	0.61
17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process	3.08	2.04	2.44	3.08	3.68	3.39	2.04	1.62	1.76	1.86	1.76	2.03
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	5.73	1.47	1.34	2.14	2.94	1.58	1.52	1.15	0.99	1.61	1.71	1.23
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	4.69	1.86	2.09	2.97	3.78	2.53	1.75	1.56	1.65	1.87	1.79	1.80
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	5.53	1.58	1.56	2.53	3.20	1.78	1.56	1.22	1.16	1.70	1.70	1.25
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	5.39	1.75	1.64	2.62	3.44	2.02	1.69	1.48	1.34	1.82	1.80	1.52
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	4.40	1.84	2.60	3.14	3.92	2.83	1.65	1.51	1.82	1.92	1.82	1.79
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	3.15	2.04	2.04	3.15	4.20	3.60	1.84	1.69	1.70	1.97	1.77	1.90
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	5.60	1.51	1.45	2.29	3.08	1.88	1.72	1.19	1.16	1.70	1.81	1.53
25. Choosing easy reviewers	5.27	1.64	1.51	2.48	3.51	2.15	1.63	1.33	1.19	1.77	1.86	1.55
26. Choosing hard reviewers	5.66	1.59	1.43	2.40	3.41	1.82	1.52	1.29	1.10	1.80	1.86	1.35
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	5.00	1.42	1.34	2.20	3.26	2.18	1.78	1.08	0.92	1.61	1.68	1.58
28. Delaying a review through neglect	5.89	1.82	1.88	3.19	4.30	1.93	1.25	1.54	1.41	1.95	1.81	1.23
29. Delaying a review for self interest	6.76	1.39	1.15	1.98	3.08	1.25	0.82	1.13	0.59	1.56	1.82	0.73

M1: judgment of appropriateness; M2: felt pressure; M3: past engagement; M4: colleagues' past engagement; M5: community past engagement; M6: expected future engagement

Appendix C

Frequency Distribution for Measures 1 and 4

Table C1. Frequency Distribution for Judgments of Appropriateness (Measure 1)

Scenario	1 = clearly appropriate; 4 = neutral; 7 = very inappropriate						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Drop a colleague as an author	1%	0%	0%	1%	3%	20%	75%
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	2%	7%	10%	20%	20%	25%	16%
3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure	2%	4%	7%	13%	18%	28%	28%
4. Author order other than contribution	3%	2%	3%	11%	10%	24%	46%
5. Skip IRB for survey	2%	3%	6%	13%	15%	21%	40%
6. Skip IRB for experiment	2%	1%	2%	8%	9%	17%	61%
7. Violate anonymity of subjects	2%	2%	2%	9%	13%	25%	48%
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	2%	4%	5%	18%	20%	23%	28%
9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication	0%	2%	1%	8%	11%	23%	55%
10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions	1%	0%	1%	2%	6%	19%	71%
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	1%	0%	0%	3%	1%	8%	88%
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	23%	21%	10%	20%	9%	8%	9%
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	20%	19%	10%	16%	13%	11%	11%
14. Self plagiarism	2%	4%	3%	9%	14%	26%	43%
15. Citing without reading	2%	3%	8%	12%	21%	28%	26%
16. Classical plagiarism	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	5%	92%
17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process	32%	20%	8%	15%	8%	9%	9%
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	3%	3%	2%	12%	14%	24%	43%
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	6%	9%	6%	24%	18%	19%	18%
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	2%	4%	3%	16%	17%	20%	38%
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	4%	5%	3%	15%	15%	22%	35%
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	7%	7%	8%	35%	16%	15%	13%
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	24%	22%	13%	20%	8%	6%	7%
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	4%	5%	4%	10%	9%	25%	42%
25. Choosing easy reviewers	3%	4%	8%	15%	18%	23%	30%
26. Choosing hard reviewers	3%	2%	5%	11%	15%	26%	39%
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	5%	7%	4%	23%	15%	18%	28%
28. Delaying a review through neglect	1%	2%	2%	9%	18%	28%	41%
29. Delaying a review for self interest	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	9%	87%

Note: Some percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table C2. Frequency Distribution for Knowledge of Colleagues' Behavior (Measure 4)

Scenario	1 =never; 7 = often						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Drop a colleague as an author	48%	21%	11%	8%	7%	3%	2%
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	18%	16%	14%	14%	20%	14%	5%
3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure	31%	12%	14%	13%	15%	8%	8%
4. Author order other than contribution	28%	16%	12%	16%	13%	9%	6%
5. Skip IRB for survey	37%	15%	10%	13%	12%	7%	6%
6. Skip IRB for experiment	54%	16%	6%	12%	7%	3%	2%
7. Violate anonymity of subjects	52%	16%	9%	13%	5%	2%	1%
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	37%	15%	12%	15%	11%	5%	4%
9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication	50%	18%	8%	13%	5%	3%	3%
10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions	51%	19%	9%	10%	4%	4%	3%
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	69%	13%	4%	9%	3%	2%	1%
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	23%	10%	11%	19%	14%	14%	9%
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	27%	12%	10%	22%	10%	11%	8%
14. Self plagiarism	31%	15%	12%	14%	14%	8%	7%
15. Citing without reading	19%	15%	14%	15%	14%	12%	9%
16. Classical plagiarism	63%	16%	4%	10%	3%	2%	2%
17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process	30%	15%	12%	19%	11%	7%	5%
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	57%	13%	6%	15%	5%	3%	2%
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	34%	14%	10%	20%	10%	6%	5%
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	43%	16%	10%	18%	7%	3%	3%
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	43%	15%	9%	17%	7%	4%	5%
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	31%	12%	12%	20%	10%	7%	7%
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	34%	9%	11%	19%	12%	8%	6%
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	53%	11%	8%	17%	4%	3%	3%
25. Choosing easy reviewers	46%	15%	9%	15%	6%	3%	4%
26. Choosing hard reviewers	50%	15%	7%	13%	5%	4%	5%
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	55%	12%	6%	18%	5%	2%	2%
28. Delaying a review through neglect	31%	13%	12%	16%	14%	8%	7%
29. Delaying a review for self interest	63%	10%	7%	12%	3%	2%	3%

Note: Some percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Appendix D

Nonresponse Bias

In total, we asked six questions about each of the 29 scenarios. Following Sivo et al. (2006), we examined each of these measures for non-response bias by splitting the sample into quartiles based on the time that elapsed between our first invitation to participate and when each respondent began the survey. Respondents in the first quartile completed the questionnaire after our first invitation to participate. Respondents in the last quartile completed the questionnaire after our subsequent invitations. This is in harmony with the recommendation of Sivo, et al. (2006), that response bias be examined across rather than within waves of responses. We used ANOVA to check for significant differences between the first and fourth quartiles for each of the six measures across the 29 scenarios. Of the six, we found a significant difference only for one measure (measure 2: I have felt pressure from others to engage in similar behaviors). In examining all pair-wise comparisons of the mean responses on this measure, we observed that only four of the 29 scenarios exhibit significant differences (Scenarios 1, 4, 11, 25). In each case, late responders reported feeling more pressure than earlier responders. Any potential nonresponse bias is limited to only 4 of 174 items (2.3 percent of the data collected). More importantly, this report does not rely on the affected measure for any analysis or insight.

Reference

Sivo, S. A., Saunders, C., Chang, Q. and Jiang, J. 2006. "How Low Should You Go? Low Response Rates and the Validity of Inference in IS Questionnaire Research," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (7:6), Article 17.

Appendix E

Careers and Judgments

Looking back at Table 3 (and Table E1 in this Appendix), the first 16 behaviors all deal with the process of creating research, while the latter 13 deal with refereeing research. It is interesting to note that of these 16 behaviors where the average judgment score was five or greater, none are predicted by the percentage of time that an individual spends on research. This is somewhat comforting; it means that the amount of time an individual spends on research does not appear to influence his or her judgments about the behaviors in the research creation process the field judges most strictly.

We conducted additional analysis to determine if other aspects of respondents' careers could also yield insight into their judgments. We conducted similar regression and ANOVA analyses to determine the effect of experience (years since Ph.D., years as reviewer, and whether the respondent has been an editor) on our respondents' judgments. The results of these analyses are also reported in Table E1.

Experience also appears to be a reliable predictor of judgments. Of the behaviors where there is a significant relationship between years since Ph.D. or years as a reviewer and judgment, most exhibit a positive regression coefficient. This means that more experienced respondents tend to view the behaviors more strictly than do less experienced respondents. The relationship between editorial experience and judgment is less compelling. Only five of the 29 behaviors exhibit significant differences between those respondents who have been an editor and those who have not been. Of the five, those who have not been an editor judge the behaviors more strictly than those who have been an editor on three behaviors. Interestingly, all three are related to reviewing or editing a manuscript. Apparently, individuals develop a more nuanced view of these behaviors as a result of editorial experience. Overall, we conclude that experience is associated with stricter judgments of the behaviors.

Table E1. Experience and Respondent Attitudes

Behavior	Percent Research	Years Since Ph.D.	Years as Reviewer	Editor
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	+ (0.027)			
3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure		+ (< 0.001)	+ (0.034)	Ed (0.024)
6. Skip IRB for experiment		+ (0.001)		
7. Violate anonymity of subjects				
9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication		+ (0.010)	+ (0.021)	
10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions		+ (0.002)	+ (0.027)	
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size		+ (0.031)		
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	- (0.012)			
14. Self plagiarism		+ (0.034)		
15. Citing without reading			- (0.045)	
16. Classical plagiarism				
17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process				NE (0.005)
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	- (< 0.001)			
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	- (< 0.001)			
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer				
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review				NE (0.009)
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor			- (0.040)	
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	- (0.045)	+ (0.015)	+ (0.024)	Ed (0.028)
25. Choosing easy reviewers	- (0.028)		+ (0.047)	
26. Choosing hard reviewers	- (0.017)			
28. Delaying a review through neglect		- (< 0.001)	- (< 0.001)	NE (< 0.001)

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are listed in parentheses). A "+" sign denotes a significant positive relationship between the judgment of appropriateness of the behavior and the career focus item. A "-" sign denotes a significant negative relationship between the strictness of the judgment and the career focus item. "Ed" represents a significant difference between editors and non-editors where editors report stricter judgment scores. "NE" represents a significant difference between editors and non-editors where non-editors report stricter judgment scores.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 1. Drop a colleague as an author; 4. Author order other than contribution; 5. Skip IRB for survey; 8. Not test statistical model assumptions; 12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature; 21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor; 27. Handling a paper for an enemy; and 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Appendix F

Career Stage and the Effect of AIS Membership on Judgments

Behavior	All Faculty	Students	Assistants	Tenured
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	N (0.002)			
3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure	N (0.017)			
4. Author order other than contribution	N (0.043)			
6. Skip IRB for experiment				M (0.043)
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	N (< 0.001)			N (< 0.002)
10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions			N (0.031)	
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size				M (0.009)
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	M (0.001)			M (0.003)
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	N (< 0.001)			N (< 0.001)
15. Citing without reading				M (0.005)
17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process				N (0.049)
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	N (< 0.001)			N (< 0.001)
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	M (0.002)			M (0.008)
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	M (0.002)			M (0.004)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	M (0.007)			M (0.008)
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor		M (0.049)		
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	M (0.040)			M (0.002)
25. Choosing easy reviewers				M (0.005)
26. Choosing hard reviewers	M (0.002)			N (< 0.001)
27. Handling a paper for an enemy		N (0.042)		M (0.035)
28. Delaying a review through neglect	M (0.003)			M (0.016)

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are listed in parentheses). M represents a significant difference where respondents who have been AIS members report stricter judgment scores. N represents a significant difference where respondents who have not been members of the AIS report stricter judgment scores.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 1. Drop a colleague as an author; 5. Skip IRB for survey; 7. Violate anonymity of subjects; 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication; 14. Self plagiarism; 16. Classical plagiarism; 20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer; 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Appendix G

Past Engagement Versus Expected Future Engagement: Are Responses Absolute or Relative? XXXXXXXXXX

Notwithstanding that our questionnaire was designed to elicit relative assessments of both past and expected future engagement in the 29 behaviors we studied, we attempted to determine whether reported expectations to engage in these behaviors more in the future than in the past was a function of respondents giving absolute estimates rather than relative estimates. If respondents were largely at early states in their careers and considered the question in absolute terms, it is possible that this alone could account for the increased future expectation.

To examine this possibility, we considered the elapsed number of years since receiving a Ph.D. reported by respondents. The median of this variable is just 10. Given that academic careers tend to exceed 20 years, we acknowledge that respondents tended to have more career ahead of them than they had behind them. If respondents interpreted the questions in such a way as to render absolute responses rather than relative ones, we would expect a particular pattern for behavior where expected future engagement was higher than reported past behavior. For these, years since Ph.D. should have a consistent negative relationship with expected future engagement. In other words, the more time since receiving a Ph.D., the more time and experience is summarized by reported past behavior and the less time is left for speculation about possible future engagement. This would be consistent with the argument that there is a constant base rate for engaging in the behaviors for reported past engagement and expected future engagement, that the significant difference appears as a result of their being, on average, more time in the future than in the past. The results of this regression analysis are presented in Table G1.

Of the 22 behaviors where expected future engagement is higher than reported past engagement, only 10 follow the expected pattern that would suggest respondents reported absolute rather than relative frequencies. Because it is not reasonable to expect respondents to have read the questions to have solicited relative frequencies in some cases and absolute frequencies in others, we reject the possibility that such measurement error (a systematic misinterpretation of the questionnaire by our respondents) has led to spurious results. Moreover, we know from analysis reported in the body of the paper that respondents with tenure tend to take a stricter view of these behaviors than do untenured respondents. In fact, this is the case for most of the behaviors where years since Ph.D. was a potential explanation for the fact that expected future engagement exceeds reported past engagement: [3] add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure, [6] skip IRB for experiment, [7] violate anonymity of subjects, [9] not report discovery of error subsequent to publication, [10] not report violations of a statistical model assumptions, [24] excluding a review from the AE report.

Table G1. Does Years Since Ph.D. Predict Expected Future Engagement?

Behavior	Expected Future Engagement > Reported past engagement	Years Since PhD & Expected Engagement
1. Drop a colleague as an author		
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	✓	
3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure	✓	– (< 0.001)
4. Author order other than contribution		– (0.024)
5. Skip IRB for survey	✓	– (0.048)
6. Skip IRB for experiment	✓	– (0.009)
7. Violate anonymity of subjects	✓	– (0.002)
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	✓	– (0.021)
9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication	✓	– (0.001)
10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions	✓	– (0.001)
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size		– (0.007)
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	✓	
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	✓	
14. Self plagiarism		– (0.001)
15. Citing without reading		
16. Classical plagiarism		
17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process	✓	
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	✓	
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	✓	
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	✓	
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	✓	
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	✓	– (0.039)
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	✓	
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	✓	– (0.004)
25. Choosing easy reviewers	✓	
26. Choosing hard reviewers	✓	
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	✓	
28. Delaying a review through neglect		+ (0.021)
29. Delaying a review for self interest	✓	– (0.034)

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). A "+" sign denotes those behaviors with a significant positive relationship between "Years since Ph.D." and the listed survey measure. A "–" sign denotes those behaviors with a significant negative relationship between "Years since Ph.D." and the listed survey measure.

Appendix H

Western and Non-Western Cultures

To examine the possibility of cultural bias in the study, we analyzed whether respondents educated in Western cultures exhibit differences in their responses when compared to their counterparts from non-Western cultures for each of the scenarios. Our data identify the countries of the respondents' early childhood education (Table H1) and their highest earned degree (Table H2).

We appealed to the geographic divisions used by United Nations (UN 2009) for insights in categorizing the countries for our analysis. The UN divides the world geographically into Macro-Regions that correspond roughly to the major continents. The six Macro-Regions used in this study are Africa, Asia, Europe, Northern America, Oceania, and Latin America. Based on ideological influences in the various regions,

Table H1. Frequency of Early Childhood Education Country

Country	Frequency	Country	Frequency
Albania	1 (.17%)	Korea, Republic of	9 (1.53%)*
Argentina	1 (.17%)	Kuwait	2 (.34%)
Australia	26 (4.41%)*	Malaysia	4 (.68%)
Austria	4 (.68%)	Mexico	2 (.34%)
Bangladesh	1 (.17%)	Morocco	1 (.17%)
Belgium	6 (1.02%)*	Netherlands	8 (1.36%)*
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2 (.34%)	New Zealand	3 (.51%)
Brazil	10 (1.70%)*	Nigeria	1 (.17%)
Canada	35 (5.94%)*	Norway	6 (1.02%)*
Chile	1 (.17%)	Pakistan	1 (.17%)
China	33 (5.60%)*	Philippines	1 (.17%)
Colombia	1 (.17%)	Poland	1 (.17%)
Cuba	1 (.17%)	Portugal	3 (.51%)
Czech Republic	1 (.17%)	Romania	2 (.34%)
Denmark	2 (.34%)	Russian Federation	3 (.51%)
Egypt	2 (.34%)	Saint Kitts and Nevis	1 (.17%)
Finland	10 (1.70%)*	Singapore	5 (.85%)
France	3 (.51%)	Slovenia	1 (.17%)
Germany	22 (3.74%)*	South Africa	2 (.34%)
Greece	6 (1.02%)*	Spain	6 (1.02%)*
Guatemala	1 (.17%)	Sri Lanka	1 (.17%)
India	36 (6.11%)*	Sudan	1 (.17%)
Indonesia	2 (.34%)	Sweden	9 (1.53%)*
Iran, Islamic Republic of	5 (.85%)	Switzerland	3 (.51%)
Iraq	1 (.17%)	Taiwan, Republic of China	17 (2.89%)*
Ireland	1 (.17%)	Thailand	1 (.17%)
Israel	5 (.85%)	Tunisia	2 (.34%)
Italy	10 (1.70%)*	Turkey	3 (.51%)
Jamaica	2 (.34%)	United Kingdom	23 (3.90%)*
Japan	4 (.68%)	United States	231 (39.22%)*
Jordan	1 (.17%)		

*Country accounts for more than 1% of the total sample.

Country	Frequency	Country	Frequency
Australia	31 (5.26%)*	Korea, Republic of	1 (.17%)
Austria	4 (.68%)	Malaysia	1 (.17%)
Belgium	6 (1.02%)*	Netherlands	8 (1.36%)*
Brazil	4 (.68%)	New Zealand	4 (.68%)
Cambodia	1 (.17%)	Norway	5 (.85%)
Canada	29 (4.92%)*	Portugal	3 (.51%)
China	10 (1.70%)*	Russian Federation	3 (.51%)
Czech Republic	1 (.17%)	Serbia and Montenegro	1 (.17%)
Denmark	1 (.17%)	Singapore	3 (.51%)
Finland	11 (1.87%)*	Slovakia	1 (.17%)
France	5 (.85%)	South Africa	2 (.34%)
Germany	15 (2.55%)*	Spain	6 (1.02%)*
Greece	2 (.34%)	Sweden	9 (1.53%)*
Hong Kong	4 (.68%)	Switzerland	4 (.68%)
India	4 (.68%)	Taiwan, Province of China	1 (.17%)
Ireland	1 (.17%)	Taiwan, Republic of China	9 (1.53%)*
Israel	4 (.68%)	Turkey	1 (.17%)
Italy	9 (1.53%)*	United Kingdom	30 (5.09%)*
Japan	6 (1.02%)*	United States	349 (59.25%)*

*Country accounts for more than 1% of the total sample.

we classified respondents who received their childhood education in Europe, Northern America, Oceania, and Latin America as “Western” and those from Africa and Asia as “Non-Western.”

We then conducted a series of t-tests to examine if there are differences in the judgments of our respondents based on this grouping. Table H3 outlines the results of this analysis. Of the 29 scenarios, 21 exhibit no significant difference based on where respondents received their childhood education. For the eight scenarios where there is a significant difference, half of the behaviors are judged more strictly by respondents educated in Western cultures and half are judged more strictly by respondents from non-Western cultures. This analysis reveals no evidence of a systematic cultural bias. We conducted a similar analysis based on country of highest degree earned and found a consistent pattern. Of the 29 scenarios, 24 exhibit no significant difference in judgments. Those educated in Western cultures hold stricter judgments for three of the five scenarios with significant differences in judgments.

We also conducted a series of analyses at the country level. We classified respondents according to geographical sub regions as defined by the United Nations (UN 2009). Table H4 reports the differences by macro region. Subregion differences based on area of early childhood education are reported in Tables H5a through H5m, and the differences based on area of highest degree earned are reported in Table H6.

Clearly, the relationship between culture and judgment is complex. For example, one of the reviewers for this paper pointed out that authorship is viewed very differently in China than it is in the United States: “I personally know supervisors who expect to be the first author of a paper to which they have made no contribution! From a Western perspective, this may be unconscionable; nevertheless it is a common practice in China.” Other localized perspectives, no doubt, influence our findings. Accordingly, although there are many differences in judgment between different macro regions and different subregions, there is little indication of a systematic cultural bias. The general perception that there are widespread, systematic, culturally based differences may merely be anecdotal and have no basis in fact.

Reference

UN. 2009. “United Nations Macro Regions and Components,” <http://www.un.org/depts/dhl/maplib/worldregions.htm> (accessed October 6, 2009).

Table H3. Western Versus Non-Western Cultures	
Behavior	Cultural Differences
4. Author order other than contribution	Non-Western > Western (.0016)
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	Non-Western > Western (<.0001)
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	Western > Non-Western (.0210)
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	Western > Non-Western (.0117)
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	Western > Non-Western (.0253)
26. Choosing hard reviewers	Non-Western > Western (.0435)
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	Western > Non-Western (.0139)
28. Delaying a review through neglect	Non-Western > Western (.0204)

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Comparison: cultural groups on left of ">" reports a stricter judgment of the behavior than the one on the right.

Scenarios with no observed significant cultural differences: 1. Drop a colleague as an author; 2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure; 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 5. Skip IRB for survey; 6. Skip IRB for experiment; 7. Violate anonymity of subjects; 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature; 14. Self plagiarism; 15. Citing without reading; 16. Classical plagiarism; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 18. Re-reviewing a manuscript; 20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer; 21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor; 22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review; 23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor; 24. Excluding a review from the AE report; 25. Choosing easy reviewers; and 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Table H4. Differences in Responses by Macro-Region

Behavior	Early Education Differences	Degree Differences
1. Drop a colleague as an author		Eu > As (0.0425)
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	LA > {As (0.0168), NA (0.0094)}	
3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure	Eu > NA (0.0139)	Eu > NA (0.0382)
4. Author order other than contribution	{As (0.0001), Eu (0.0008), Oc (0.048)} > NA	As > {NA (0.0012), Oc (0.0394)}; Eu > NA (0.0061)
5. Skip IRB for survey	{As (0.0024), Eu (0.0251), LA (0.0039), NA (0.0012), Oc (0.0019)} > Af; NA > Eu (0.0049)	NA > Eu (0.003)
6. Skip IRB for experiment	NA > {As (0.0127), Eu (0.0011)}	NA > {As (0.0132), Eu (0.0046)}
7. Violate anonymity of subjects		NA > Eu (0.003)
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	As > {Eu (0.013), LA (0.0154), NA (0.0001), Oc (0.0224)}; Eu > NA (0.0084)	As > {Eu (0.0001), NA (0.0001), Oc (0.0001)}
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	NA > {As (0.0007), Eu (0.0071)}	NA > Eu (0.0059)
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	{Eu (0.028), NA (0.0246), Oc (0.0323)} > Af	
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	Eu > As (0.003)	Eu > NA (0.031)
14. Self plagiarism	As > Eu (0.011)	NA > Eu (0.0048)
15. Citing without reading	LA > {Af (0.0311), NA (0.0391)}; Oc > {Af (0.0395), NA (0.0429)}	
16. Classical plagiarism	NA > As (0.0105)	NA > {As (0.0009), Eu (0.0377)}
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	NA > {As (0.0341), Eu (0.0154)}; Oc > {As (0.0446), Eu (0.0209)}	Oc > As (0.0458)
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	NA > As (0.0187); Oc > {As (0.0034), Eu (0.0073)}	Oc > Eu (0.0309)
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	LA > {Eu (0.0415), Oc (0.0431)}	
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	{As (0.0121), Eu (0.0112), LA (0.0153), NA (0.0046), Oc (0.0001)} > Af; Oc > {As (0.022), Eu (0.0065), NA (0.0175)}	{NA (0.0224), Oc (0.0109)} > Eu
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	{As (0.0041), LA (0.0136), NA (0.0001), Oc (0.0138)} > Eu	{As (0.0314), NA (0.0003)} > Eu
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	Oc > {Eu (0.0392), NA (0.0339)}	
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	NA > {As (0.0307), LA (0.0452)}; Eu > LA (0.0146)	
25. Choosing easy reviewers	LA > {Eu (0.0336), NA (0.0143), Oc (0.0125)}	
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	{NA (0.0082), Oc (0.0109)} > As; Oc > Eu (0.0233)	{NA (0.0043), Oc (0.0184)} > As; NA > Eu (0.0111)
28. Delaying a review through neglect	As > NA (0.029)	

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Af = Africa, As = Asia, Eu = Europe, LA = Latin America, NA = North America, Oc = Oceania. Macro-regions on left of ">" report stricter judgment of the behavior than those on the right.

Scenarios with no observed significant cultural differences: 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; and 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Table H5. Early Education Subregion Differences on Respondents' Judgments of Appropriateness

Table H5a. Differences Between the Africa Subregion and Other Subregions	
Item	Differences Detected
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	Af > Ea As (0.039)
5. Skip IRB for survey	{Au&NZ (0.0019), Ce Am (0.0367), Ea As (0.0017), No Am (0.0012), No Eu (0.0006), So Am (0.006), So Ce As (0.0048), So Ea As (0.0048)} > Af
6. Skip IRB for experiment	So Ea As > Af (0.0058)
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	Ea As > Af (0.0126)
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	{Au&NZ (0.0323), Ea Eu (0.049), No Am (0.0246), No Eu (0.0246), So Ce As (0.03)} > Af
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	No Eu > Af (0.0255)
14. Self plagiarism	So Ce As > Af (0.0288)
15. Citing without reading	{Au&NZ (0.0395), No Eu (0.0225), So Am (0.0126)} > Af
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	{Au&NZ (0.0001), Ea As (0.0138), No Am > Af (0.0046) No Eu (0.0033), So Am (0.009), So Ce As (0.0384), We As (0.044), We Eu (0.0266)} > Af
<p>Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.</p> <p>Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 1. Drop a colleague as an author; 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 4. Author order other than contribution; 7. Violate anonymity of subjects; 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication, 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size; 16. Classical plagiarism; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 18. Re-reviewing a manuscript; 19. Double blind review where author's identity is known; 20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer; 22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review; 23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor; 24. Excluding a review from the AE report; 25. Choosing easy reviewers; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; 27. Handling a paper for an enemy; 28. Delaying a review through neglect; 29. Delaying a review for self interest.</p>	
Table H5b. Differences Between the Australia and New Zealand Subregion and Other Subregions	
Item	Differences Detected
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	So Am > Au&NZ (0.0464)
4. Author order other than contribution	Au&NZ > No Am (0.048)
5. Skip IRB for survey	Au&NZ > {Af (0.0019), So Eu (0.0246), We Eu (0.0346)}
6. Skip IRB for experiment	So Ea As > Au&NZ (0.0394) Au&NZ > {Ea As (0.014), So Eu (0.0133), We As (0.0257), We Eu (0.0359)}
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	Ea As > Au&NZ (0.0007)
9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication	Au&NZ > We As (0.007)
10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions	Au&NZ > Ea Eu (0.0342)
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	Au&NZ > We As (0.0291)
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	Au&NZ > {Af (0.0323), We As (0.0226)}
14. Self plagiarism	So Ce As > Au&NZ (0.035)
15. Citing without reading	Au&NZ > {Af (0.0395), No Am (0.0429)}
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	Au&NZ > {Ea As (0.0096), So Eu (0.0175), We As (0.0435), We Eu (0.0428)}
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	Au&NZ > {Ea As (0.0046), So Ce As (0.0042), So Eu (0.0012), We As (0.0463), We Eu (0.0137)}
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	So Am > Au&NZ (0.0375) So Ea As > Au&NZ (0.028)

21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	Au&NZ > {Af (0.0001), Ce Am (0.0089), Ea As (0.0332), No Am (0.0175), So Ce As (0.0357), So Ea As (0.0168), So Eu (0.0012), We Eu (0.0027)}
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	Au&NZ > {So Eu (0.0137), We As (0.0177), We Eu (0.0002)}
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	Au&NZ > {No Am (0.0339), So Ce As (0.0303), We As (0.0248)}
25. Choosing easy reviewers	So Am > Au&NZ (0.0036)
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	Au&NZ > {Ea As (0.0116), So Ce As (0.0264), We Eu (0.0038)}

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 1. Drop a colleague as an author; 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 7. Violate anonymity of subjects; 13. Reformulate hypothesis; show results as supporting new theory; 16. Classical plagiarism; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 24. Excluding a review from the AE report; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; 28. Delaying a review through neglect; 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Table H5c. Differences Between the Central America Subregion and Other Subregions

Item	Differences Detected
1. Drop a colleague as an author	So Ea As > Ce Am (0.0442)
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	So Am > Ce Am (0.0352)
5. Skip IRB for survey	Ce Am > Af (0.0367)
6. Skip IRB for experiment	So Ea As > Ce Am (0.0079)
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	{Ea As (0.0004), So Ea As (0.02), We Eu (0.0166)} > Ca Am
9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication	Ce Am > We As (0.0324)
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	{No Am (0.0045), No Eu (0.0254)} > Ca Am
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	Ce Am > We As (0.0363)
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	Ce Am > {So Eu (0.0399), We As (0.0256)}
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	Ce Am > {Ea As (0.0271), So Ce As (0.0311), So Eu (0.0139), We Eu (0.0368)}
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	Au&NZ > Ce Am (0.0089)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	Ce Am > We Eu (0.014)
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	Ce Am > We As (0.0406)
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	No Eu > Ce Am (0.0075)
29. Delaying a review for self interest	{No Am (0.0197), We Eu (0.0442)} > Ca Am

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 4. Author order other than contribution; 7. Violate anonymity of subjects; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 14. Self plagiarism; 15. Citing without reading; 16. Classical plagiarism; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 18. Re-reviewing a manuscript; 20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer; 25. Choosing easy reviewers; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; 27. Handling a paper for an enemy; 28. Delaying a review through neglect.

Table H5d. Differences Between the Eastern Asia Subregion and other Subregions

Item	Differences Detected
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	{Af (0.039), So Am (0.001)} > Ea As
4. Author order other than contribution	Ea As > No Am (0.0009)
5. Skip IRB for survey	Ea As > {Af (0.0017), So Eu (0.0141), We Eu (0.0244)}
6. Skip IRB for experiment	{Au&NZ (0.014), No Am (0.0003), No Eu (0.0358), So Ce As (0.0164), So Ea As (0.0029)} > Ea As

8. Not test statistical model assumptions	Ea As > {Af (0.0126), Au&NZ (0.0007), Ce Am (0.0004), Ea Eu (0.0367), No Am (0.0001), No Eu (0.0008), So Ce As (0.0047), So Eu (0.0135), We As (0.0476), We Eu (0.0153)}
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	No Am > Ea As (0.0025)
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	{No Eu (0.0002), We Eu (0.0243)} > Ea As
14. Self plagiarism	Ea As > {So Ea As (0.0018), We Eu (0.0008)}
15. Citing without reading	{No Eu (0.0444), So Am (0.048)} > Ea As
16. Classical plagiarism	{No Am (0.0125), No Eu (0.0045)} > Ea As
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	{Au&NZ (0.0096), No Am (0.0061)} > Ea As
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	{Au&NZ (0.0046), Ce Am (0.0271)} > Ea As
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	So Ea As > Ea As (0.0378)
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	Ea As > Af (0.0138); Au&NZ > Ea As (0.0332)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	Ea As > {So Eu (0.0109), We As (0.0149), We Eu (0.0001)}
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	Ea As > {No Am (0.0094), So Ce As (0.013), So Eu (0.0305), We As (0.0168)}
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	{No Am (0.0019), No Eu (0.0005)} > Ea As
25. Choosing easy reviewers	So Am > Ea As (0.0105)
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	{Au&NZ (0.0116), No Am (0.0446)} > Ea As
29. Delaying a review for self interest	{Af (0.039), So Am (0.001)} > Ea As
<p>Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.</p> <p>Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 1. Drop a colleague as an author; 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 7. Violate anonymity of subjects; 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; 28. Delaying a review through neglect.</p>	
Table H5e. Differences Between the Eastern Europe Subregion and Other Subregions	
Item	Differences Detected
1. Drop a colleague as an author	So Ea As > Ea Eu (0.0152)
6. Skip IRB for experiment	So Ea As > Ea Eu (0.0043)
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	Ea As > Ea Eu (0.0367)
10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions	{Au&NZ (0.0342), So Am (0.0344)} > Ea Eu
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	Ea Eu > {Af (0.049), We As (0.0188)}
14. Self plagiarism	So Ce As > Ea Eu (0.0265)
15. Citing without reading	{No Eu (0.0382), So Am (0.0339)} > Ea Eu
16. Classical plagiarism	{No Am (0.0011), No Eu (0.0018), So Ce As (0.0263), We Eu (0.0122)} > Ea Eu
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	{So Am (0.0463), So Ea As (0.0421)} > Ea Eu
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	No Eu > Ea Eu (0.049)
25. Choosing easy reviewers	So Am > Ea Eu (0.0486)
<p>Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.</p> <p>Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure; 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 4. Author order other than contribution; 5. Skip IRB for survey; 7. Violate anonymity of subjects; 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication; 11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size; 13. Reformulate hypothesis; show results as supporting new theory; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 18. Re-reviewing a manuscript; 19. Double blind review where</p>	

author's identity is known; 21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor; 22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review; 23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; 27. Handling a paper for an enemy; 28. Delaying a review through neglect; 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Table H5f. Differences Between the North America Subregion and Other Subregions

Item	Differences Detected
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	So Am > No Am (0.0018)
3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure	No Eu > No Am (0.0091)
4. Author order other than contribution	{Au&NZ (0.048), Ea As (0.0009), No Eu (0.043), So Ce As (0.0039), We Eu (0.0202)} > No Am
5. Skip IRB for survey	No Am > {Af (0.0012), So Eu (0.0018), We As (0.0426), We Eu (0.0027)}
6. Skip IRB for experiment	No Am > {Ea As (0.0003), So Eu (0.0007), We As (0.031), We Eu (0.0088)}
7. Violate anonymity of subjects	No Am > {So Eu (0.0492), We Eu (0.0196)}
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	{Ea As (0.0001), So Ea As (0.0159), We Eu (0.0129)} > No Am
9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication	No Am > We As (0.0168)
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	No Am > {Ce Am (0.0045), Ea As (0.0025), So Eu (0.0085), We As (0.0004), We Eu (0.0019)}
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	No Am > {Af (0.0246), We As (0.0233)}
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	No Eu > No Am (0.0024)
14. Self plagiarism	So Ce As > No Am (0.0124); No Am > {So Ea As (0.0139), We Eu (0.0094)}
15. Citing without reading	{Au&NZ (0.0429), No Eu (0.0035), So Am (0.0184)} > No Am
16. Classical plagiarism	No Am > {Ea As (0.0125), Ea Eu (0.0011), So Eu (0.0054), We As (0.0214)}
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	No Am > {Ea As (0.0061), So Eu (0.0448), We As (0.047)}
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	No Am > So Eu (0.042)
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	So Ea As > No Am (0.0454)
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	No Am > Af (0.0046); Au&NZ > No Am (0.0175)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	No Am > {So Eu (0.007), We As (0.0128), We Eu (0.0001)}
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	{Au&NZ (0.0339), Ea As (0.0094), So Ea As (0.0141)} > No Am
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	No Am > {Ea As (0.0019), So Eu (0.0307)}
25. Choosing easy reviewers	So Am > No Am (0.0085)
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	No Am > {Ea As (0.0446), So Ce As (0.0442), We Eu (0.0072)}

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 1. Drop a colleague as an author; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; 28. Delaying a review through neglect; 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Table H5g. Differences Between the Northern Europe Subregion and Other Subregions

Item	Differences Detected
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	So Am > No Eu (0.024)
3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure	No Eu > No Am (0.0091)
4. Author order other than contribution	No Eu > No Am (0.043)
5. Skip IRB for survey	No Eu > {Af (0.0006), So Eu (0.006), We As (0.0346), We Eu (0.0088)}
6. Skip IRB for experiment	No Eu > {Ea As (0.0358), So Eu (0.0274)}; So Ea As > No Eu (0.0429)
7. Violate anonymity of subjects	No Eu > {So Eu (0.0327), We Eu (0.0308)}
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	Ea As > No Eu (0.0008)

9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication	No Eu > We As (0.0117)
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	No Eu > {Ce Am (0.0254), We As (0.0085)}
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	No Eu > {Af (0.0246), We As (0.0186)}
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	No Eu > {Af (0.0255), Ea As (0.0002), No Am (0.0024), So Ce As (0.0228), So Eu (0.0006), We As (0.0015)}
14. Self plagiarism	So Ce As > No Eu (0.0123); No Eu > So Ea As (0.0378)
15. Citing without reading	No Eu > {Af (0.0225), Ea As (0.0444), Ea Eu (0.0382), No Am (0.0035), So Eu (0.0177), We Eu (0.0119)}
16. Classical plagiarism	No Eu > {Ea As (0.0045), Ea Eu (0.0018), So Eu (0.0249), We As (0.0216)}
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	So Am > No Eu (0.0278); So Ea As > No Eu (0.019)
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	No Eu > Af (0.0033)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	No Eu > We Eu (0.0023)
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	So Ea As > No Eu (0.0299)
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	No Eu > {Ce Am (0.0075), Ea As (0.0005), Ea Eu (0.049), So Am (0.0092), So Eu (0.0039)}
26. Choosing hard reviewers	No Eu > So Eu (0.0391)

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 1. Drop a colleague as an author; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 18. Re-reviewing a manuscript; 19. Double blind review where author's identity is known; 25. Choosing easy reviewers; 27. Handling a paper for an enemy; 28. Delaying a review through neglect; 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Table H5h. Differences Between the South America Subregion and Other Subregions

Item	Differences Detected
1. Drop a colleague as an author	So Am > So Eu (0.0477)
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	So Am > {Au&NZ (0.0464), Ce Am (0.0352), Ea As (0.001), No Am (0.0018), No Eu (0.024), So Ce As (0.0193), So Ea As (0.0239), So Eu (0.0105), We As (0.005), We Eu (0.0069)}
5. Skip IRB for survey	So Am > {Af (0.006), So Eu (0.0324), We Eu (0.0317)}
10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions	So Am > Ea Eu (0.0344)
15. Citing without reading	So Am > {Af (0.0126), Ea As (0.048), Ea Eu (0.0339), No Am (0.0184), So Ea As (0.0144), So Eu (0.032), We Eu (0.0236)}
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	So Am > {Au&NZ (0.0375), Ea Eu (0.0463), No Eu (0.0278)}
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	So Am > Af (0.009)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	So Am > {So Eu (0.043), We Eu (0.0036)}
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	No Eu > So Am (0.0092)
25. Choosing easy reviewers	So Am > {Au&NZ (0.0036), Ea As (0.0105), Ea Eu (0.0486), No Am (0.0085), So Ce As (0.0433), So Eu (0.0106), We Eu (0.0173)}

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 4. Author order other than contribution; 6. Skip IRB for experiment; 7. Violate anonymity of subjects; 8. Not test statistical model assumptions; 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication; 11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size; 12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature; 13. Reformulate hypothesis; show results as supporting new theory; 14. Self plagiarism; 16. Classical plagiarism; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 18. Re-reviewing a manuscript; 19. Double blind review where author's identity is known; 23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; 27. Handling a paper for an enemy; 28. Delaying a review through neglect; 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Table H5i. Differences Between the South-Central Asia Subregion and Other Subregions	
Item	Differences Detected
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	So Am > So Ce As (0.0193)
4. Author order other than contribution	So Ce As > No Am (0.0039)
5. Skip IRB for survey	So Ce As > {Af (0.0048), So Eu (0.0311), We Eu (0.0484)}
6. Skip IRB for experiment	So Ce As > {Ea As (0.0164), So Eu (0.0148)}
7. Violate anonymity of subjects	So Ce As > {So Eu (0.0171), We Eu (0.0181)}
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	Ea As > So Ce As (0.0047)
9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication	So Ce As > We As (0.0017)
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	So Ce As > {Af (0.03), We As (0.0227)}
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	No Eu > So Ce As (0.0228)
14. Self plagiarism	So Ce As > {Af (0.0288), Au&NZ (0.035), Ea Eu (0.0265), No Am (0.0124), No Eu (0.0123), So Ea As (0.0003), So Eu (0.0322), We As (0.0189), We Eu (0.0001)}
16. Classical plagiarism	So Ce As > Ea Eu (0.0263)
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	{Au&NZ (0.0042), Ce Am (0.0311)} > So Ce As
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	So Ce As > Af (0.0384); Au&NZ > So Ce As (0.0357)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	So Ce As > {So Eu (0.0364), We As (0.0333), We Eu (0.0007)}
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	{Au&NZ (0.0303), Ea As (0.013), So Ea As (0.0137)} > So Ce As
25. Choosing easy reviewers	So Am > So Ce As (0.0433)
26. Choosing hard reviewers	So Ce As > So Eu (0.0335)
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	{Au&NZ (0.0264), No Am (0.0442)} > So Ce As
<p>Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.</p> <p>Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 1. Drop a colleague as an author; 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size; 15. Citing without reading; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 18. Re-reviewing a manuscript; 20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer; 24. Excluding a review from the AE report; 28. Delaying a review through neglect; 29. Delaying a review for self interest.</p>	
Table H5j. Differences Between the Southeast Asia Subregion and Other Subregions	
Item	Differences Detected
1. Drop a colleague as an author	So Ea As > {Ce Am (0.0442), Ea Eu (0.0152), So Eu (0.0161), We As (0.0225), We Eu (0.0371)}
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	So Am > So Ea As (0.0239)
5. Skip IRB for survey	So Ea As > {Af (0.0048), So Eu (0.0211), We As (0.0497), We Eu (0.0179)}
6. Skip IRB for experiment	So Ea As > {Af (0.0058), Au&NZ (0.0394), Ce Am (0.0079), Ea As (0.0029), Ea Eu (0.0043), No Eu (0.0429), So Eu (0.0061), We As (0.0036), We Eu (0.0045)}
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	So Ea As > {Ce Am (0.02), No Am (0.0159)}
14. Self plagiarism	{Ea As (0.0018), No Am (0.0139), No Eu (0.0378), So Ce As (0.0003)} > So Ea As
15. Citing without reading	So Am > So Ea As (0.0144)
20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer	So Ea As > {Au&NZ (0.028), Ea As (0.0378), Ea Eu (0.0421), No Am (0.0454), No Eu (0.019)}
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	Au&NZ > So Ea As (0.0168)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	So Ea As > {So Eu (0.0309), We As (0.0362), We Eu (0.0022)}
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	So Ea As > {No Am (0.0141), No Eu (0.0299), So Ce As (0.0137), So Eu (0.0197), We As (0.0076), We Eu (0.0295)}

28. Delaying a review through neglect	So Ea As > {No Am (0.0325), No Eu (0.0232), We As (0.028)}
29. Delaying a review for self interest	So Ea As > Ea Eu (0.0231)

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the “>” sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 4. Author order other than contribution; 7. Violate anonymity of subjects; 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size; 12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature; 13. Reformulate hypothesis; show results as supporting new theory; 16. Classical plagiarism; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 18. Re-reviewing a manuscript; 19. Double blind review where author’s identity is known; 24. Excluding a review from the AE report; 25. Choosing easy reviewers; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; 27. Handling a paper for an enemy.

Table H5k. Differences Between the Southern Europe Subregion and Other Subregions

Item	Differences Detected
1. Drop a colleague as an author	{So Am (0.0477), So Ea As (0.0161)} > So Eu
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor’s chance at tenure	So Am > So Eu (0.0105)
5. Skip IRB for survey	{Au&NZ (0.0246), Ea As (0.0141), No Am (0.0018), No Eu (0.006), So Am (0.0324), So Ce As (0.0311), So Ea As (0.0211)} > So Eu
6. Skip IRB for experiment	{Au&NZ (0.0133), No Am (0.0007), No Eu (0.0274), So Ce As (0.0148), So Ea As (0.0061)} > So Eu
7. Violate anonymity of subjects	{No Am (0.0492), No Eu (0.0327), So Ce As (0.0171)} > So Eu
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	Ea As > So Eu (0.0135)
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	No Am > So Eu (0.0085)
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	{Ce Am (0.0399), No Eu (0.0006), We Eu (0.0209)} > So Eu
14. Self plagiarism	So Ce As > So Eu (0.0322)
15. Citing without reading	{No Eu (0.0177), So Am (0.032)} > So Eu
16. Classical plagiarism	{No Am (0.0054), No Eu (0.0249)} > So Eu
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	{Au&NZ (0.0175), No Am (0.0448)} > So Eu
19. Double blind review where author’s identity is known	{Au&NZ (0.0012), Ce Am (0.0139), No Am (0.042)} > So Eu
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	Au&NZ > So Eu (0.0012)
22. Searching for an author’s identity in a double-blind review	{Au&NZ (0.0137), Ea As (0.0109), No Am (0.007), So Am (0.043), So Ce As (0.0364), So Ea As (0.0309)} > So Eu
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	{Ea As (0.0305), So Ea As (0.0197)} > So Eu
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	{No Am (0.0307), No Eu (0.0039)} > So Eu
25. Choosing easy reviewers	So Am > So Eu (0.0106)
26. Choosing hard reviewers	{No Eu (0.0391), So Ce As (0.0335)} > So Eu

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the “>” sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 4. Author order other than contribution; 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer; 27. Handling a paper for an enemy; 28. Delaying a review through neglect; 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Table H5l. Differences Between the Western Asia Subregion and Other Subregions

Item	Differences Detected
1. Drop a colleague as an author	So Ea As > We As (0.0225)
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor’s chance at tenure	So Am > We As (0.005)
5. Skip IRB for survey	{No Am (0.0426), No Eu (0.0346), So Ea As (0.0497)} > We As

6. Skip IRB for experiment	{Au&NZ, (0.0257), No Am (0.031), So Ea As (0.0036)} > We As
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	Ea As > We As (0.0476)
9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication	{Au&NZ, (0.007), Ce Am (0.0324), No Am (0.0168), No Eu (0.0117), So Ce As (0.0017)} > We As
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	{Au&NZ (0.0291), No Am (0.0004), No Eu (0.0085)} > We As
12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature	{Au&NZ (0.0226), Ce Am (0.0363), Ea Eu (0.0188), No Am (0.0233), No Eu (0.0186), So Ce As (0.0227)} > We As
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	{Ce Am (0.0256), No Eu (0.0015), We Eu (0.0148)} > We As
14. Self plagiarism	So Ce As > We As (0.0189)
16. Classical plagiarism	{No Am (0.0214), No Eu (0.0216)} > We As
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	{Au&NZ (0.0435), No Am (0.047)} > We As
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	Au&NZ > We As (0.0463)
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	We As > Af (0.044)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	{Au&NZ (0.0177), We As (0.0149), We As (0.0128), So Ce As (0.0333), So Ea As (0.0362)} > We As
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	{Au&NZ (0.0248), Ce Am (0.0406), We As (0.0168), So Ea As (0.0076)} > We As
28. Delaying a review through neglect	{So Ce As (0.0384), So Ea As (0.028)} > We As

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 4. Author order other than contribution; 7. Violate anonymity of subjects; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 15. Citing without reading; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer; 24. Excluding a review from the AE report; 25. Choosing easy reviewers; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; 27. Handling a paper for an enemy; 29. Delaying a review for self interest.

Table H5m. Differences Between the Western Europe Subregion and Other Subregions

Item	Differences Detected
1. Drop a colleague as an author	So Ea As > We Eu (0.0371)
2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure	So Am > We Eu (0.0069)
4. Author order other than contribution	We Eu > No Am (0.0202)
5. Skip IRB for survey	{Au&NZ (0.0346), Ea As (0.0244), No Am (0.0027), No Eu (0.0088), So Am (0.0317), So Ce As (0.0484), So Ea As (0.0179)} > We Eu
6. Skip IRB for experiment	{Au&NZ (0.0359), No Am (0.0088), So Ea As (0.0045)} > We Eu
7. Violate anonymity of subjects	{No Am (0.0196), No Eu (0.0308), So Ce As (0.0181)} > We Eu
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	We Eu > {Ce Am (0.0166), No Am (0.0129)}; Ea As > We Eu (0.0153)
11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size	No Am > We Eu (0.0019)
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	We Eu > {Ea As (0.0243), So Eu (0.0209), We As (0.0148)}
14. Self plagiarism	{Ea As (0.0008), No Am (0.0094), So Ce As (0.0001)} > We Eu
15. Citing without reading	{No Eu (0.0119), So Am (0.0236)} > We Eu
16. Classical plagiarism	We Eu > Ea Eu (0.0122)
18. Re-reviewing a manuscript	Au&NZ > We Eu (0.0428)
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	{Au&NZ (0.0137), Ce Am (0.0368)} > We Eu
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	We Eu > Af (0.0266); Au&NZ > We Eu (0.0027)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	{Au&NZ (0.0002), Ce Am (0.014), Ea As (0.0001), No Am (0.0001), No Eu (0.0023), So Am (0.0036), So Ce As (0.0007), So Ea As (0.0022)} > We Eu
23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor	So Ea As > We Eu (0.0295)

25. Choosing easy reviewers	So Am > We Eu (0.0173)
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	{Au&NZ (0.0038), No Am (0.0072)} > We Eu
29. Delaying a review for self interest	We Eu > {Ce Am (0.0442), Ea Eu (0.0018)}

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Af = Africa, Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ce Am = Central America, Ea As = Eastern Asia, Ea Eu = Eastern Europe, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Am = South America, So Ce As = South-Central Asia, So Ea As = Southeast Asia, So Eu = Southern Europe, We As = Western Asia, We Eu = Western Europe.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer; 24. Excluding a review from the AE report; 26. Choosing hard reviewers; 28. Delaying a review through neglect

Table H6. Degree Subregion Differences on Respondents' Judgments

Item	Differences Detected
1. Drop a colleague as an author	No Eu > Ea As (0.0439)
4. Author order other than contribution	{Ea As (0.0099), So Eu (0.033), We Eu (0.0362)} > No Am
5. Skip IRB for survey	No Am > {So Eu (0.025), We Eu (0.0288)}
6. Skip IRB for experiment	No Am > {Ea As (0.0024), We Eu (0.0092)}
7. Violate anonymity of subjects	No Am (0.0006), No Eu (0.0214) > We Eu
8. Not test statistical model assumptions	Ea As > {Au&NZ (0.0004), No Am (0.0001), No Eu (0.0003), We Eu (0.0016)}; So Eu > {Au&NZ (0.0189), No Am (0.0092), No Eu (0.0173)}
13. Reformulate hypothesis, show results as supporting new theory	No Eu > {No Am (0.0175), So Eu (0.0206)}; We Eu > So Eu (0.0389)
14. Self plagiarism	{Au&NZ (0.0199), Ea As (0.021), No Am (0.0002), No Eu (0.0083)} > We Eu
16. Classical plagiarism	No Am > {Ea As (0.0041), So Eu (0.026)}
19. Double blind review where author's identity is known	Au&NZ > {So Eu (0.0332), We Eu (0.0406)}
21. Reviewing for a recent coauthor	{Au&NZ (0.0009), Ea As (0.0284), No Am (0.0109), No Eu (0.0407)} > So Eu; Au&NZ > We Eu (0.0197)
22. Searching for an author's identity in a double-blind review	{Au&NZ (0.0163), Ea As (0.0169), No Am (0.003)} > So Eu; No Am > We Eu (0.0095)
24. Excluding a review from the AE report	No Am > {Ea As (0.0478), So Eu (0.0062)}; No Eu > {Ea As (0.0304), So Eu (0.007)}
27. Handling a paper for an enemy	Au&NZ > {Ea As (0.0341), We Eu (0.0446)}; No Am > {Ea As (0.0164), We Eu (0.0219)}
28. Delaying a review through neglect	Au&NZ > No Eu (0.0271)
29. Delaying a review for self interest	{No Am (0.0066), We Eu (0.0039)} > Ea As

Only results significant at $\alpha < .05$ are reported (p-values are reported in parentheses). Respondents from the subregion on the left of the ">" sign judge the behavior more strictly. Au&NZ = Australia and New Zealand, Ea As = Eastern Asia, No Am = North America, No Eu = Northern Europe, So Eu = Southern Europe, We Eu = Western Europe.

Scenarios with no observed significant differences: 2. Add a coauthor to improve coauthor's chance at tenure; 3. Add a coauthor to improve own chance at tenure; 9. Not report discovery of error subsequent to publication; 10. Not report violations of statistical model assumptions; 11. Randomly duplicate data to increase sample size; 12. Reformulate hypotheses based on existing literature; 15. Citing without reading; 17. Referee circulating a manuscript outside of the review process; 18. Re-reviewing a manuscript; 20. An individual revealing that he or she was a reviewer; 23. Handling a paper for a recent coauthor; 25. Choosing easy reviewers; 26. Choosing hard reviewers.