

## Chapter 2. Strategic approaches to co-authoring

*By Duke Debrah Afrane, Joanna Kossykowska, Akanksha Lohmore, Edi Oliveira and Kevin Paul Corbett*

This chapter explains different approaches to co-authoring presenting readers with various strategic approaches that can ensure fruitful and productive output. The chapter explains how the social construction of knowledge can be elevated when multiple authors are involved and draws on bricolage as a theory within the business domain to help explain this. The chapter also alludes to international cross cultural and contextual issues that might influence co-authoring.

## 2.1 Co-authoring as a strategy (Duke Debrah Afrane)

Writing is a long and complex process where an author put several ideas together into a document that could be published in an academic journal (Ragins, 2015; Tucker, Parker, & Merchant, 2016). The long and complexity of the writing process results from the originality and clarity of ideas that is inherent and required throughout the writing process. Co-authoring (more than one author) is an effective way of simplifying the process of writing as it enables resources to be put together during writing (Bozeman & Youtie, 2015; NOËL & ROBERT, 2004). Tucker et al. (2016); Mark & Clyde (1996), therefore, identified a co-author as an individual who has made some form of contribution in a written document that has been published in a journal. Such collaboration among authors has been shown to be enjoyable (Tucker et al., 2016), ensured the quality of the manuscript (Bozeman & Youtie, 2015; Tucker et al., 2016) and an opportunity for authors to learn from each other (Mark & Clyde, 1996). However, the process of co-authoring is not without challenges and problems (Bozeman & Youtie, 2015; Frassl et al., 2018; Tucker et al., 2016); these challenges include: determining the relevance of author contributions, avoiding potential conflicts among authors and other unethical practices (author trading, hierarchy pressures and son on). To overcome these challenges, Frassl et al. (2018); Bozeman & Youtie (2015) identified certain strategies as essential. These strategies have been broadly classified into role allocation, co-authorship guidelines, writing team selection and leadership.

First is the allocation of roles to co-authors. This allocation includes deciding on co-author selection, responsibilities of each author and how to maintain or enhance relationships with them (Frassl et al., 2018; Tucker et al., 2016). Frassl et al. (2018) stated that such allocations must be done early in the writing process. In so doing, not only will timelines be met by the co-authors, but also, review feedbacks can be assigned to the respective authors whose roles within the manuscript have been specified. Again, crediting roles of authors is that straightforward (Bozeman & Youtie, 2015). This is because there might be other people in the background playing significant roles in the process, but may not be considered as co-authors. This reality has been acknowledged through the existence of author trading (make me an author in yours and I will make an author in mine) and hierarchical authority (using power to become a co-author) within the publishing space. Due to this, authors must agree on the co-authorship guidelines so as to streamline the writing process (Frassl et al., 2018). Co-authorship guidelines can be the document that highlight the roles of each author and establish those contributions of authors that deserves credit in a journal (Bozeman & Youtie, 2015; Mark & Clyde, 1996). Any form of author trading and hierarchical pressures has to be highlighted in this guideline. According to Bozeman & Youtie (2015) this guideline is referred to as contributorship policy and is an effective way of establishing the order of authors (either first or second author) on the published

manuscript; current developments suggest attaching this policy to the manuscript when submitting to a business journal (Bozeman & Youtie, 2015). See Figure 1 for a summary of the strategies.



**Figure 1: Co-authoring strategies**

Writing for publication in a journal is a craft that requires skills and effort from the authors (Ragins, 2012; Tucker et al., 2016), but, the existence of multiple authors might suggest different writing styles (especially when the research is multi-disciplinary). As a result, Frassl et al. (2018) intimated the need for the writing team to be wisely chosen. Ideally, one principal writer will be required to coordinate the research activities of the co-authors (such roles should also be highlighted in the guidelines). For example, Bozeman & Youtie (2015) established a situation where diverse range of contributions are received from co-authors (research, experience, and data analysis); the principal writer will now put these contributions together in a way that fit the requirements of the journal. Apart from ensuring fit with journal, adopting a principal writer will ensure that one language runs through the entire manuscript (Bozeman & Youtie, 2015). Underlying these already established co-authoring strategies, is, leadership by the principal author (Frassl et al., 2018). This is because there exist a social exchange relationship between authors and quality of published manuscript (Tucker et al., 2016). That is, the efforts authors put in the development process of a manuscript will determine its overall quality. Leadership, is therefore, required to build trust among co-authors (Frassl et al., 2018) and ensure that every co-author understands their responsibilities required under the exchange process (Tucker et al., 2016). Exhibition of such leadership should not only be limited to the principal author (leader), but also, co-authors must show their leadership through commitment to their roles and the passion with

which they pursue these roles. Tucker et al. (2016) stated that, doing this, will enhance the exchange relationship between authors and the quality of the manuscripts presented to journals.

Overall, co-authored papers suggest that members with diverse backgrounds, values and experiences come together to produce new knowledge (Frassl et al., 2018; Ragins, 2015). However, the quality of this new knowledge is inherent in the sought of interactions (communication, recognition, task allocation and commitment to task) that occur among the co-authors. Tucker et al. (2016) identifies such interactions as an exchange relationship existing between co-authors and quality of manuscripts. As a result, laying down rules and guidelines through which author contributions can be made is an essential way of enabling flow of information in an environment that is safe and understanding and also help prevent potential conflicts among the authors (Frassl et al., 2018).

## References

- Bozeman, B., & Youtie, J. (2015). Trouble in Paradise: Problems in Academic Research Co-authoring. *Science and engineering ethics*, 22(6), 1717-1743. doi:10.1007/s11948-015-9722-5
- Frassl, M. A., Hamilton, D. P., Denfeld, B. A., de Eyto, E., Hampton, S. E., Keller, P. S., . . . Catalán, N. (2018). Ten simple rules for collaboratively writing a multi-authored paper. *PLoS computational biology*, 14(11), 1-8. doi:doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006508
- Mark, C. W. F., & Clyde, J. A. (1996). Co-Authoring: Composing Through Conversation. *Language arts*, 73(8), 587-596.
- NOËL, S., & ROBERT, J.-M. (2004). Empirical Study on Collaborative Writing: What Do Co-authors Do, Use, and Like? . *Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 13, 63-89.
- Ragins, B. R. (2012). Editor's Comments: Reflections on the Craft of Clear Writing *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 493-501. doi:dx.doi.org/10.1056/amr.2012.0165
- Ragins, B. R. (2015). Editor's Comments: Developing our Authors *Academy of Management Review*, 40(1), 1-8. doi:dx.doi.org/10.1056/amr.2014.0477
- Tucker, B. P., Parker, L. D., & Merchant, K. A. (2016). With a little help from our friends: An empirical investigation of co-authoring in accounting research. *The British accounting review*, 48(2), 185-205. doi:10.1016/j.bar.2015.10.001

## 2.2 Co-authoring to improve productivity (Joanna Koszykowska)

Researchers have published their studies for a variety of reasons. They may wish to advise policy, increase debate amongst colleagues and provide input to participants. The main reason to publish is to share the results of a study so that others can learn from it. The secondary reasons include job expectations and issues of tenure and promotion for academic faculty. Publications are increasingly crucial of a university academic's career, despite discipline, specialization, or country. In response to this demand, academics are engaged in collaboration as a natural catalyst to increase the quality and quantity of publications produced (Zutshi et al., 2012). Collaborative writing outcomes can lead to a variety of outputs, such as conference papers, journal articles or grant and funding applications, as all are likely to be positive outputs from the collaborative process. Co-authorship presents many opportunities and challenges; nevertheless, joint authorship is a helpful way for young scholars to get started in publishing. Key ideas related to choosing and working effectively with co-authors and essential qualities in a co-author are discussed in this article. Further, the paper explores the positives and negatives of writing in collaboration and concludes by recommending co-authoring as an essential supportive and collaborative practice for professional development.

By definition, collaborative writing can be conceived as writing undertaken by groups of people of different disciplines (interdisciplinary collaboration), either belonging to the same country or to more than one state (international) (Katsouyanni, 2008). Collaboration offers a means of sharing knowledge, resources, expertise, and data, and is seen as a means of expediting research performance. A further driver that has prompted enhanced levels of collaboration is the desire for broader intellectual contribution to research questions and interpretative discussion. As Melin (2000) has pointed out, it is assumed that at a more personal level, people, by nature, are social beings, and naturally looking for interaction with others for collaborative endeavours and personal rewards.

Co-authoring in journal articles is not uncommon (Yeo & Lewis, 2019), and academics across the disciplines are engaging in this practice. There are various reasons for collaboration. When people share overlapping interests and experiences, and a combination of complementary skills, more often, the collaboration arises. Hyland (2016) argue that authors who have similar interests and experiences may want to collaborate as the process often leads to "synergistic creativity". Also, a co-author may serve as a "critical friend", challenging assumptions and pointing out shortcomings (Yeo & Lewis, 2019). For a more extensive publication, collaboration is an alternative which allows authors to share the burden and submit the task in a shorter time frame.

One of the best reasons to collaborate is simply that collaboration enhances effectiveness. There is strong indication that "co-authorship" is a systematic determinant of scientific productivity. The co-authored scientific papers are more likely to be accepted for publication to higher impact journals than sole-authored articles. Wuchty, Jones and Uzzi (2007) find that papers with more than one authors garner more citations and research by Gaughan and Ponomariov (2008) echoes those findings. Other significant benefits of collaborative writing are the potential contribution to the creation of academic knowledge (Katsouyanni, 2008). Early career researchers can reap benefits through collaborative publishing with mentors or supervisors, developing networks with academics, and contributing to the faculty's research output. Moreover, the literature on co-authoring lists a range of benefits ranging from practical to affective. For example, Hart (2000) provides a list of the benefits of collaboration. They included: improved quality of article; useful expertise of co-author; having better ideas; having a different perspective; the division of labour; a chance to learn from the co-authors; greater frequency of publication. What is interesting, the literature emphasizes mainly pragmatic reasons for co-authoring with a production of a final manuscript for publication seeing as the primary goal. Moreover, Smith and Lewis (2018) valued the process itself and recommended co-authoring as a valuable form of professional development and academic collaboration.

While the benefits of collaboration are evidential, an array of problems can arise. These apply primarily to credit decisions, co-author attitudes and co-author relationships (Bozeman & Youtie, 2016). A common complaint is that collaborators may exclude deserving participants and undeserving ones included. Problems can also arise in the naming order on the publication, in other words, whether the author name is at the first, middle or last position. Research by Noel and Robert (2004) revealed a list of negative aspects of collaborative writing. The most negative aspect was making the task more difficult because of different writing styles, following by difficulties with managing schedule; unequal division of work; more difficult coordination; managing people's emotions, and conflicts between members. One participant wrote: "Handling reams of successive handwritten changes is no fun, but handling emailfuls (sic) of successive electronic documents is no easier (...)" (Noel & Robert, 2004, p. 73).

The author of this article does not have a personal experience of co-authoring. However, the roundtable meeting with peers gives her the opportunity of identifying the process of co-authoring in publications. The discussion brought the importance of the acceptance of a diversity of writing styles and the need for consistent communication. It comes for attention that miscommunication and inappropriate tools or lack of leadership can lead to frustration, delay of publication, or even the

termination of a project. One of the participants mentioned that more often, the provision of fair credit through authorship or acknowledgements are the main challenges faced by the joint authors. However, most journals have established ethical guidelines that regulate co-authorship, to avoid different types of ethical misconduct. The quote of Foucault (1969): "*Authors are writers, but not all writers are authors*" might be appropriate in this place.

To conclude, studies showed that co-authoring would continue to grow (Conn et al., 2015). The benefits presented by engaging in co-authorship generally outweigh the challenges. Co-authorship, like other skills, takes practice and is not always a perfect process. Learning intentional planning, effective communication, and having clear expectations will help avoid many of the challenges. When issues arise, the authors should remember that research dissemination and manuscript publication are worthy goals and engaging in co-authorship is often part of the process. Learning from the wisdom of more experienced authors and intentional planning will promote successful endeavours in co-authorship.

#### **References:**

- Bozeman, B., & Youtie, J. (2016). Trouble in paradise: Problems in academic research co-authoring. *Science and engineering ethics*, 22(6), 1717-1743.
- Conn, V. S., Ward, S., Herrick, L., Topp, R., Alexander, G. L., Anderson, C. M., ...& Larson, J. L. (2015). Managing opportunities and challenges of co-authorship. *Western journal of nursing research*, 37(2), 134-163.
- Foucault, M. (1969). What is an author?. In D. F Bouchard. *Language, counter-memory, practice*, 124-127.
- Gaughan, M., & Ponomariov, B. (2008). Faculty publication productivity, collaboration, and grants velocity: using curricula vitae to compare center-affiliated and unaffiliated scientists. *Research Evaluation*, 17(2), 103-110.
- Hart, R. L. (2000). Co-authorship in the academic library literature: A survey of attitudes and behaviors. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 26(5), 339-345.
- Hyland, K. (2016). *Academic Publishing: Issues and Challenges in the Construction of Knowledge-Oxford Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Katsouyanni, K. (2008). Collaborative research: accomplishments & potential. *Environmental Health*, 7(1), 3.
- Melin, G. (2000). Pragmatism and self-organization: Research collaboration on the individual level. *Research policy*, 29(1), 31-40.
- Noël, S., & Robert, J. M. (2004). Empirical study on collaborative writing: What do co-authors do, use, and like?. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 13(1), 63-89.
- Smith, M. K., & Lewis, M. (2017). *Supporting the professional development of English language teachers: facilitative mentoring*. Routledge.
- Wuchty, S., Jones, B. F., & Uzzi, B. (2007). The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge. *Science*, 316(5827), 1036-1039.

- Yeo, M., & Lewis, M. (2019). Co-Authoring in Action: Practice, Problems and Possibilities. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 7(3 (Special Issue)), 109-123.
- Zutshi, A., McDonald, G., & Kalejs, L. (2012). Challenges in collaborative writing: addressing authorship attribution. *European Business Review*.



## 2.3 Constructing co-authorship (Akanksha Lohmore)

Knowledge is a result of social construction, especially in the social sciences. The benefits of having (more) coauthors are many, including the expanding stock of knowledge and increasing specialization in research require researchers from varying disciplines to collaborate in order to achieve intellectual diversity and innovation (Barnett et al., 1988; Katz & Martin, 1997; McDowell & Melvin, 1983). Collaboration in academic research to produce knowledge has been proven to be an effective strategy in all disciplines, and more so in the social sciences and business studies. Macro level analysis in management studies confirm the existence of clear upward trends in the average number of authors per publication in management and adjacent fields (Acedo et al., 2006; Manton & English, 2007; Smucker & Grappendorf, 2004, Liu et al., 2016). To address this upward trend of co-authorship, this paper seeks to summarise about what co-authoring or collaboration refer to in the business research landscape, the benefits and motivation of collaborative research and co-authorship, patterns in authorship in business and management research and the need to include the gender dimension in the conversation of co-authorship.

### **Collaboration, Co-authorship & Benefits**

Katz and Martin (1997) suggest that collaboration is commonly known as the working together of individuals towards a common goal. Thus, a 'research collaboration' could be defined as the working together of researchers to achieve the common goal of producing new scientific knowledge. However, they point to the complexity of collaboration and the difficulty of defining of this social activity. Partly, because of the notion of a research 'collaboration' being largely a matter of social convention among scientists. It is difficult to achieve consensus as to whether which degree of formality of links between researchers and scholars deems fit to be called as collaboration. What constitutes a collaboration therefore varies across institutions, fields, sectors and countries, and very probably changes over time as well . Whereas co-authorship is a form of collaboration in which collaborators publish their research outcomes through paper or electronic media, not all collaborators publish an article together ([Katz and Martin, 1997](#)). That is, co-authorship is an “explicit product” of scientific collaboration (He et al., 2012).

### **Motivation of Co-authorship**

With a wide increase in complexity of research problems and interdisciplinarity of knowledge, co-authorship has become a necessity if not a norm. A variety of scholars have argued that interdisciplinary science has a positive influence on knowledge production and innovation (e.g. [Gibbons et al., 1994](#), [Schmickl and Kieser, 2008](#)). Today, interdisciplinarity is also stimulated by a

variety of funding instruments, on the university level ([Sa, 2008](#)), on the national level ([Lepori et al., 2007](#)), and on the international level (Bruce et al., 2004). The goal of many of these programs is to stimulate collaboration among individual researchers as a means to promote interdisciplinarity. Studies have shown that research collaboration can bring co-authors greater research productivity ([Katz and Martin, 1997](#), [Lee and Bozeman, 2005](#)) and research impact (Gazni and Didegah, 2011, [Sooryamoorthy, 2009](#)).

### **Motivation to Collaborate**

Among the factors which motivate collaboration are funding agencies' need to save money, the growing availability and falling (real) cost of transport and communication, the desire for intellectual inter- actions with other scientists, the need for a division of labour in more specialised or capital-intensive areas of science, the requirements of interdisciplinary research, and government encouragement of international and cross-sectoral collaboration.

The steady increase in the number of co-authors in management may partly be due to the productivity explanation (growing complexity of research) and the network explanation (increasing ease of collaborating). However, Liu et al. (2018) suggest that the strategic explanation (motivations unrelated to research quality) also contributes to this trend. Besides increasing research efficiency and bringing in new skills as main reasons for collaborating, many are motivated to collaborate purely for instrumental reasons for co-authoring, such as increasing the likelihood of having their manuscripts accepted for publication. Yet another instrumental reason might include adding someone to a manuscript as a favor that may later be reciprocated, thereby increasing the publication counts for both parties (Liu et al., 2018).

### **Patterns in Co-authorship**

Liu et al. (2018), also found preferences for adding co-authors to a paper depend on the number of authors currently on that paper, whereas one's authorship position seems to matter less, except in the unique case of a dual-authored paper: there we found that being second author significantly decreases willingness to add co-authors (relative to being first author). Researchers in Entrepreneurship and Organizational Behavior are significantly more open to adding co-authors to an existing manuscript than their peers in other subfields of management. It may be that in certain subfields like Entrepreneurship and Organizational Behavior, the threshold for adding co-authors is lower and/or that hiring and tenure evaluations penalize many-authored publications to a lesser extent than in other subfields.

Li et al., (2013) also suggest that identifying structural position in relevant academic networks via collaboration with colleagues from different research groups. A scholar can identify his or her structural position in the network and formulate a co-authorship strategy according to the future position where he or she wants to be (Li et al., 2013). Nevertheless, one caveat is that collaborating with too many different scholars might put a researcher at risk of being distrusted by prolific scholars and losing chances to co-author with them.

Rijnsoever & Hessels (2011) confirm that female scientists are more engaged in interdisciplinary research collaborations. Further, a scientist's years of research experience are positively related with both types of collaboration. Work experience in firms or governmental organizations increases the propensity of interdisciplinary collaborations, but decreases that of disciplinary collaborations. Disciplinary collaborations occur more frequent in basic disciplines; interdisciplinary collaborations more in strategic disciplines. We also found that in both types of disciplines, disciplinary collaborations contribute more to career development than interdisciplinary collaborations.

### **Women and Co-authorship Patterns**

Co-authorship trends also have implications for female academics. Research has documented widespread evidence of gender biases in academia (Brown & Goh, 2016). For example, Budden et al. (2008) found that after a certain journal in 2001 introduced a blind review process, articles with female first authors were much more likely to be rejected prior to 2001 than after 2001. Literature also points that women are less likely to be in the most prestigious author positions (Caplar, Tacchella, & Birrer, 2016; West, Jacquet, King, Correll, & Bergstrom, 2013) and that papers with female lead authors are less likely to be cited (Brown & Goh, 2016; QuiñonesVidal et al., 2004). Most recently, Sarsons (2015) found that female authors receive less credit for published work than their male co-authors on the same paper. The analysis of the scientific production of Italian academics shows that women researchers register a greater capacity to collaborate in all the forms analyzed, with the exception of international collaboration, where there is still a gap in comparison to male colleagues.

These findings pose a serious dilemma for female authors: on one hand, they may want to invite co-authors (especially male co-authors; see McDowell & Smith, 1992) to counteract a gender bias that seems to penalize papers authored by women (Brown & Goh, 2016; Budden et al., 2008; Caplar et al., 2016; Lariviere et al., 2013), in order to increase their chances of publishing and being cited. They also risk receiving less credit for their work if male co-authors are added (Sarsons, 2015; West et al., 2013).

This latter concern may discourage female first-authors from inviting (or allowing) co-authors to join a research project. Liu et al. (2018) reflect on the dilemma facing female authors, which pits a desire to publish and be cited (and thus to add male co-authors as a means to counter the gender bias) against a desire to receive proper credit for their published research (and thus to avoid adding male co-authors).

## Conclusion

Previous literature has established the benefits of co-authorship are undeniable. Building onto that, this paper summarises what co-authorship in management looks like, common patterns reported and the dimension of gender in these patterns. The literature on co-authorship in management is can be used to inform early stage researchers to make informed decisions about co-authoring strategies.

## References

- Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Murgia, G. (2013). Gender differences in research collaboration. *Journal of Informetrics*, 7(4), 811-822.
- Acedo, F. J., Barroso, C., Casanueva, C., & Galán, J. L. (2006). Co- Authorship in Management and Organizational Studies: An Empirical and Network Analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(5), 957-983.
- Barnett, A. H., Ault, R. W., & Kaserman, D. L. (1988). The rising incidence of co-authorship in economics: Further evidence. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 70(3), 539-543.
- Brown, A. J., & Goh, J. X. (2016). Some Evidence for a Gender Gap in Personality and Social Psychology. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 7(5), 437-443.
- Bruce, A., Lyall, C., Tait, J., & Williams, R. (2004). Interdisciplinary integration in Europe: the case of the Fifth Framework programme. *Futures*, 36(4), 457-470.
- Budden, A. E., Tregenza, T., Aarssen, L. W., Koricheva, J., Leimu, R., & Lortie, C. J. (2008). Doubleblind review favours increased representation of female authors. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 23(1), 4-6.
- Caplar, N., Tacchella, S., & Birrer, S. (2016). Quantitative evaluation of gender bias in astronomical publications from citation counts. Working paper. ETH Zurich.
- Caplar, N., Tacchella, S., & Birrer, S. (2017). Quantitative evaluation of gender bias in astronomical publications from citation counts. *Nature Astronomy*, 1(6), 1-5.
- Gazni, A., & Didegah, F. (2011). Investigating different types of research collaboration and citation impact: a case study of Harvard University's publications. *Scientometrics*, 87(2), 251-265.
- He, B., Ding, Y., & Yan, E. (2012). Mining patterns of author orders in scientific publications. *Journal of Informetrics*, 6(3), 359-367.
- Katz, J. S., & Martin, B. R. (1997). What is research collaboration? *Research Policy*, 26(1), 1-18.
- Lariviere, V., Ni, C., Gingras, Y., Cronin, B., & Sugimoto, C. R. (2013). Global gender disparities in science. *Nature*, 504(7479), 211-213.
- Lee, S., & Bozeman, B. (2005). The impact of research collaboration on scientific productivity. *Social studies of science*, 35(5), 673-702.

- Lepori, B., Van den Besselaar, P., Dinges, M., Potì, B., Reale, E., Slipersæter, S., & Van der Meulen, B. (2007). Comparing the evolution of national research policies: what patterns of change?. *Science and Public Policy*, 34(6), 372-388.
- Li, E. Y., Liao, C. H., & Yen, H. R. (2013). Co-authorship networks and research impact: A social capital perspective. *Research Policy*, 42(9), 1515-1530.
- M. Gibbons, C. Limoges, H. Nowotny, S. Schawartzman, P. Scott, M. Trow. *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies* Sage, London (1994).
- Manton, E. J., & English, D. E. (2007). The trend toward multiple authorship in business journals. *Journal of Education for Business*, 82(3), 164-168.
- McDowell, J. M., & Melvin, M. (1983). The determinants of co-authorship: An analysis of the economics literature. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 155-160
- McDowell, J. M., & Melvin, M. (1983). The determinants of co-authorship: An analysis of the economics literature. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 155-160.
- Quiñones-Vidal, E., Loópez-García, J. J., Peñaranda-Ortega, M., & Tortosa-Gil, F. (2004). The nature of social and personality psychology as reflected in JPSP, 1965-2000. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(3), 435-452.
- Sá, C. M. (2008). 'Interdisciplinary strategies' in US research universities. *Higher Education*, 55(5), 537-552.
- Sarsons, H., Gërkhani, K., Reuben, E., & Schram, A. (2015). Gender differences in recognition for group work.
- Schmickl, C., & Kieser, A. (2008). How much do specialists have to learn from each other when they jointly develop radical product innovations?. *Research Policy*, 37(3), 473-491.
- Smucker, M., & Grappendorf, H. (2004). A Content analysis of sport management faculty collaboration: Single versus multiple authorship. *The SMART Journal*, 75(4), 47-57.
- Sooryamoorthy, R. (2009). Do types of collaboration change citation? Collaboration and citation patterns of South African science publications. *Scientometrics*, 81(1), 177-193.
- Van Rijnsoever, F. J., & Hessels, L. K. (2011). Factors associated with disciplinary and interdisciplinary research collaboration. *Research policy*, 40(3), 463-472.
- West, J. D., Jacquet, J., King, M. M., Correll, S. J., & Bergstrom, C. T. (2013). The role of gender in scholarly authorship. *PLoS ONE*, 8(7), e66212

## 2.4 Bricolage as a framework for interdisciplinary writing collaboration (Edi Oliveira)

Co-authorship has been growing steadily within the social sciences in the last 50 years or so (Acedo et al., 2006). Liu et al. (2017) stated that the need for more interdisciplinary research within management is one of the reasons for increased co-authorship. The combination of discipline expertise allows the emergence of new knowledge that would not be possible otherwise. Similarly, interdisciplinary research is heralded for focusing in solving real-world problems (Manathunga et al., 2006). However, Forman and Markus (2005) highlighted that not all interdisciplinary collaboration results in co-authorship due to the narrow focus of academic journals. Other challenges presented by them relate to the need to make a compromise as researchers from distinct disciplinary orientations may interpret the same data differently. In response to such claims, this paper presents bricolage as a framework to facilitate interdisciplinary writing collaboration as a synergistic partnership.

Bricolage is a term used across different disciplines and is not unknown to business scholars. Here, by applying an interdisciplinary approach, different scientific fields are brought together in this creative dialogue (Montuori, 2005). Borrowing the use of the term from Lévi-Strauss (1966), Baker and Nelson (2005) defined bricolage as “making do with “whatever is at hand”” (p.330). Similarly, Patton (2015) explained the concept as “combining old things in new ways” (p.154). Based on the definition of the bricoleur as a quilt maker, Kincheloe (2001) suggested bricolage as the possibility to transcend limitations imposed by disciplinary boundaries, and “naïve over-specialization” (p.683). The role of the bricoleur then is to engage in boundary work, questioning established disciplinary assumptions as she or he moves through unknown territory.

From a phenomenological hermeneutics perspective, bricolage implies establishing a Gadamerian fusion of horizons (Gadamer, 1975) as an agreed understanding in-between different perspectives. For Gadamer, when differing viewpoints are brought together, the fusion of horizons is less about finding an accepted common understanding by assimilation of traditions (e.g. disciplinary assumptions). It is rather superseding what was there before. A new knowledge does not negate tradition, but it consists of a deeper appreciation in the very act of questioning it. For Mazzei and Jackson (2012), that is what “writing between-the-two in the threshold” (p.541) represents. The threshold embodies the space in-between the subjectivities of two (or more) authors (or the boundaries of two disciplines) which is articulated as a space of becoming. The “in-between-becoming-I” (p.457) is characterised as a process of deterritorialisation. This can be interpreted as the loss of subjectivity and the certainties granted by keeping within disciplinary boundaries. Hence, the

interdisciplinary writing collaboration will force authors to re-interpret what they thought to be known. For Gadamer (1975), that is what the fusion of the horizons consists.

The narrative of Forman and Markus's (2005) interdisciplinary collaboration fits the definition given by Mazzei and Jackson (2012) on writing in the threshold. The uncertainties brought about from their differing perspectives and interpretations of the data made them question their disciplinary assumptions. Consequently, this opened space for the construction of new knowledge. However, contradictorily as it may be, because they were cognisant of the challenges to publish the research results as co-authors, they decided it was more strategic to part ways (the paper cited here is about the process of their collaboration, rather than the research findings).

Kincheloe (2001) attributed the resistance of journals to publish interdisciplinary research to the fact that reviewers cannot establish an agreed measurement for research quality. He also acknowledged that the argument of superficiality against interdisciplinarity is fairly endorsed. It may take a lifetime to master the tenets of one discipline alone. However, he also pointed out that the question is not whether to surpass discipline boundaries, as by the turn of the 21st century it is a reality. The question is how to assure research rigour within an inquiry that adopts multiple methods and diverse theoretical and philosophical positions. As articulated further (Kincheloe, 2005), quality within interdisciplinary collaboration is the measure in which research uncovers new and relevant insights that are directly connected to specific contexts. The bricoleur is guided by an epistemology of complexity, rather than "certified processes of logical analysis" (p.324). Quality is achieved whether the research methodology and epistemology served its intent (i.e. research problem) and whether findings allowed a new understanding fit-for-purpose (i.e. relevancy). Specifically regarding the quality of a co-authored paper, within bricolage it can be understood as a narrative process that must account for the complexity of social phenomenon. It should consider the multiplicity of social reality, the embeddedness and intersection of contexts, the discourses that shape social ontologies, and knowledge as interpretive artefacts (Kincheloe, 2005). In the articulation of a novel understanding of a common problem, bricolage allows researchers to be guided by "whatever is at hand" (i.e. the own research purpose; Baker & Nelson, 2005) in order to combine old things in new ways (Patton, 2015).

## References

- Acedo, F. J., Barroso, C., Casanueva, C., & Galán, J. L. (2006). Co-authorship in management and organizational studies: An empirical and network analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(5), 957–983. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00625.x>
- Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. (2005). Creating something from nothing: resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 329–366. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2005.50.3.329>
- Forman, J., & Markus, M. L. (2005). Research on collaboration, business communication, and technology: Reflections on an interdisciplinary academic collaboration. *Journal of Business Communication*, 42(1), 78–102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943604271958>
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1975). *Truth and Method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall (trans.); 2nd, Revis ed.). Continuum.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). Describing the bricolage: Conceptualizing a new rigor in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), 679–692. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572259209359488>
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2005). On to the next level: Continuing the conceptualization of the bricolage. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(3), 323–350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405275056>
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The Savage Mind (La Pensée Sauvage)* (Weidefeld and Nicolson (trans.); Vol. 18). The Garden City Press Liomited. <https://doi.org/10.2307/588634>
- Liu, C., Olivola, C. Y., & Kovács, B. (2017). Coauthorship trends in the field of management: Facts and perceptions. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 16(4), 509–530. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2016.0080>
- Manathunga, C., Lant, P., & Mellick, G. (2006). Imagining an interdisciplinary doctoral pedagogy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(3), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680954>
- Mazzei, L. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2012). In the Threshold Writing Between-the-Two. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 5(4), 449–458.
- Montuori, A. (2005). Literature Review As Creative Inquiry: Reframing Scholarship As a Creative Process. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(4), 374–393. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344605279381>
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (Fourth Ed.). Sage Publications.



## 2.5 International and contextual approaches to co-authoring (Kevin Paul Corbett)

This researcher sourced four journal articles for this assignment. The first by Eisend & Schmidt (2014) investigates how business research scholars' internationalisation strategies influence their research performance and how this relationship is moderated by the availability of different knowledge-based resources. Smith (2014) explores the under-researched interface between entrepreneur and family business stories and in particular the form and structure of second-generation entrepreneur stories. Arbaugh, Asarta, Hwang, Fornaciari, Bento & Dean (2017) examine the productivity of business and management education (BME) scholars across multiple disciplinary areas (i.e., accounting, economics, finance, information systems, management, marketing, and operations/supply chain management). While Marcelin, Rabarison, & Rabarison (2019) evaluate the collaboration of the Centre for Disease Control and Prevention Research Centres (PRCs) on public health activities with Community Agencies and organisations. They do so by studying the relationships between co-authors from the PRCs and the Community Agencies that published at least one article together in the first year of their research programme.

According to Eisend & Schmidt (2014), business research is part of the social sciences and covers areas with different specialisations in terms of international focus (e.g., taxation has a more national focus than international business), as well as variations in method applications (e.g., conceptual papers and qualitative methods are more common in management research than more formal and analytical approaches which are seen primarily in operations research). Arbaugh *et al.* (2017) highlight the potential for mutual support and cross-fertilisation of ideas. They help identify key BME authors across different business disciplinary areas and therefore avoid the silo-based approach of studying BME research within a single disciplinary area. Arbaugh *et al.* (2017) believe BME researchers will benefit from the discovery of common BME topical interests across disciplines. Their hope in developing the first cross-disciplinary database of key journals, authors, and topics in BME research is that a holistic view of the field will benefit both current and prospective contributors, as pointed out in the implications section of their article. The writers assert that findings from studies similar to theirs should help retain and attract more scholars to BME research. By providing the field with the same metrics that are used to assess scholarly productivity in other disciplinary research areas will, they believe, have implications for decisions about merit pay, promotion, and tenure. Arbaugh *et al.* (2017) recommend that the programme encourages these influential authors to expand their efforts in facilitating collaborative activities among their colleagues in the network. They argue that to adopt this strategy in business research should lead to an increase in the number of collaborations between network members and hence, the number of co-authorships.

Eisend & Schmidt (2014) look at strategies of co-authors in the business research domain with a view to the international stage. Their results demonstrate that the augmentation of complementary knowledge resources (i.e., when researchers lack language skills and foreign market knowledge) positively influences the performance of a collaboration-based internationalisation strategy (i.e. collaborations with international researchers). The collaboration-based strategy also improves performance for less experienced researchers, but this advantage diminishes with increasing research experience. Citing both Kocher & Sutter, (2001) and Stremersch & Verhoef (2005), they report that the internationalisation of authorship in leading business journals traditionally published in the U.S. and dominated by U.S. authors has increased remarkably in recent years. For instance, authors from European countries, such as the Netherlands and Germany, have experienced high growth rates in terms of top economic journal publications (Cardoso, Guimaraes & Zimmermann, 2010). The share of articles in leading economic journals by European researchers has steadily increased in the period from 1991 to 2006 at the expense of publications by U.S. researchers. Their study investigates how scholars' various internationalisation strategies impact scholars' research performance. They investigate this issue by examining international business journal publications by German-speaking scholars. The findings support previous results regarding the effectiveness of collaboration in terms of research performance. However, collaboration does not always lead to enhanced productivity and output quality. It enhances research quality only under certain circumstances, such as, the writing of conceptual papers or due to researchers' lack of experience or market knowledge. It appears that business research scholars with a German affiliation do strongly benefit from international collaboration on conceptual papers because of language skills as a particular knowledge-based resource: The success of conceptual papers depends, more than many other types of papers, on fluent English proficiency (e.g., analytical and empirical). Kocher & Sutter's (2001) study presented in this paper provides interesting results for other countries with academic markets that strive for internationalisation.

Turning to the micro level, Smith (2014) discusses some very practical implications in relation to conflict resolution within family businesses. The storying process allows individuals the freedom to author their own stories and place in family and family business history. His paper highlights the contribution that an understanding of the interface between entrepreneur and family business stories can bring to understanding this complex dynamic. His literature review tells us more about strategies used by second-generation entrepreneurs in order to become entrepreneurs than about the way they tell their stories or build their identities. The main focus of the study contributes to the development

of theory. Smith (2014) summaries that more time and research is needed to develop theory which can then be tested through deductive methods, thereby contributing to practice. He thus states this paper makes an incremental contribution to the developing theory on the topic. His most telling statement is that both generations need to respect the stories each other tell, particularly in traditional small businesses where the business entity may often carry the name of the founder thus denying the second-generation a separate identity. Moreover, second-generation entrepreneur stories are less about overcoming disadvantage than they are about overcoming advantage. Smith (2014) comments that he brings interesting narrative elements into play such as the notion of second-generation entrepreneurs' stories and in particular how second-generation entrepreneurs use the overlapping stories to build their identity. He concludes that his paper makes an incremental contribution to the field of entrepreneurship and family business research because it directs the research focus away from the myth of the first-generation entrepreneur of humble origins to highlight an alternative social construction of the entrepreneur – namely second-generation entrepreneur stories.

Looking now at the paper by Marcelin *et al.* (2019), which evaluates the collaboration on public health activities by studying the working relationships between co-authors from the PRCs and community agencies. They discovered that just over 400 articles in this collaboration had over 1,800 individual authors and just under 8,000 co-authorship relationships (links) in over 200 peer-reviewed journals. Nevertheless, Marcelin *et al.* (2019) report network density to be low; only 0.5% of all potential co-authorships were realised with actual co-authorship much less than potential co-authorships. They found evidence of collaboration in the PRC co-authorship network but recommend room for improvement. The PRCs took minimal advantage of their collaborative potentials when compared with other health-related citation networks that had higher network densities. This report is the least encouraging of the papers by Eisend & Schmidt (2014) and Arbaugh *et al.* (2017) and this one concerning the success of co-authoring strategies. Marcelin *et al.* (2019) recommend that the current programme encourages what it terms 'these influential authors' to expand their efforts in facilitating collaborative activities among their colleagues in the network. Information brokers (authors with high closeness centrality) and co-authorship mediators should be encouraged to communicate more with each other to increase the number of collaborations between network members and hence, the number of co-authorships.

All four papers discussed here report, in the main, the advantages of co-authoring and three advise on how to improve such cooperation on the road to publication in business journals. The fourth paper by

Smith (2014) while discussing family businesses illustrates how second- generation entrepreneurs written stories can be co-authored to narrate an alternative entrepreneurial identity within a family business setting. From a review of this literature, co-authoring is favoured over single authorship for a variety of reasons, including increasing the performance levels of the writers (notably less experienced researchers) accompanied by a call for cross-fertilisation of ideas by avoiding the silo-based approach of studying BME research within a single disciplinary area.

#### **References:**

- Arbaugh, J.B., Asarta, C.J., Hwang, A., Fornaciari, C.J., Bento, R.F., & Dean, K.D. 2017. Key Authors in Business and Management Education Research: Productivity, Topics, and Future Directions *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education* Vol.15, No. 3, July
- Cardoso, A.R., Guimaraes, P., Zimmermann, K.F., 2010. Trends in economic research: an international perspective. *Kyklos* Vol. 63, 479–494.
- Eisend, M & Schmidt, S. 2014 The influence of knowledge-based resources and business scholars' internationalisation strategies on research performance *Research Policy*, No. 43, pp.48-59
- Kocher, M.G., Sutter, M., 2001. The institutional concentration of authors in top journals of economics during the last two decades. *Economic Journal* Vol. 111, F405–F421.
- Marcelin, R.A. Rabarison, K.M., & Rabarison, M.K. 2019. Co-authorship network analysis of prevention research centres: an exploratory study *Public Health Reports*, Vol.34, No.3 pp. 249-254
- Robert Smith, R.2014. Authoring second-generation entrepreneur and family business stories *Journal of Family Business Management* Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 149-170
- Stremersch, S., Verhoef, P.C., 2005. Globalization of authorship in the marketing discipline: does it help or hinder the field? *Marketing Science* Vol. 24, pp. 585–594.