When pride replaces dignity: the dark side of academia

Author
Lake Forest College
Lake Forest, Illinois 60045

The world of academia is often celebrated for its pioneering pursuit of knowledge. Respected for its desire to uncover the truth, scholastic endeavors provide a mystifying image of purity. However, a field driven by human curiosity is inevitably vulnerable to mortal imperfections. Wherever pride is perceived to lay at risk, it is expected to witness the unraveling of even the most dignified characters. Whereas Achilles suffered the fragility of his healing, academia suffers from the fragility of scholars with weakened morality. The consequence bears not the fallen statue of a Greek hero but the disillusionment of an institution that took a similar transcendent façade. While deception has not been absent from fields of scholarship, only recently has its occurrence been sensationalized in the popular media. A recent revelation holds Harvard's Francesca Gino and Stanford's Marc Tessier-Lavigne as the leading figureheads.

Within the past year, these celebrated academics have faced accusations that charge them accountable for supervising studies that have published fraudulent data. If accurate, Gino and Tessier-Lavigne's contributions to the study of behavioral psychology and neuroscience, respectively, would signify a damning fracture within these fields. Any assumption to the contrary would be naive, as their service inside such prestigious higher education establishments would naturally deem them influential. At the time of these accusations, Gino held a teaching position at Harvard Business School to polish already impressive resumes. In contrast, Tessier-Lavigne sat as Stanford University's eleventh president. Currently, Gino, "the tenured professor, was placed on a two-year, unpaid leave" (Carter, 2023). Alternatively, Tessier-Levigne "will relinquish the presidency at the end of August but remain at the university as a tenured professor of biology" (Saul, 2023). Needless to say, like a Shakespearean tragedy, the mighty hath fallen.

In granting these disgraced professionals the gift of brief biographical context, one must first outline their rise to academic fame. Gino gained international recognition for curious revelations on human behavior. The four publications that have been called into question hardly mystify the nature of her sensationalizing findings: [1] Signing at the Beginning Makes Ethics Salient and Decreases Dishonest Self-Reports in Comparison to Signing at the End" (Shu et al., 2012), [2] "Evil Genius? How Dishonesty Can Lead to Greater Creativity" (Gino et al., 2014), [3] "The Mortal Virtue of Authenticity: How Inauthenticity Produces Feelings of Immorality and Impurity" (Gino et al., 2015), and [4] "Why Connect? Moral Consequences of Networking with a Promotion or Prevention Focus" (Gino et al., 2020). In the case of Tessier-Lavigne, his academic acclaim entailed an accumulation of his studious and professional accomplishments. His educational career saw him attend McGill University (B.Sc.), Oxford University as a Rhodes Scholar (B.A), and University College London (Ph.D.). His interests, spanning the fields of physics, politics, and physiology, prepared him for a vibrant professional career that would allow him numerous research positions from universities interested in his research expertise. Therefore, the question remains in identifying what led these accomplished individuals astray.

Acclaim remains the simple answer. Despite the eye-catching nature of their work, hesitancies in Gino and Tessier-Levigne's work only came to fruition after years of speculation. Only when doubts proved well within reason did fellow researchers investigate those in question. For the HBS researcher, this search was pursued by fellow behavioral psychologists, "Lief Nelson, Joe Simmons, and Uri Simonson – who uncovered enormous discrepancies in the data backing [the] four papers on human behavior that Gina co-authored. A forensic investigation commissioned by Harvard found the same discrepancies that the independent researchers did. Harvard has sought a retraction of the papers" (Piper, 2023). For the Stanford ex-president, the university's "panel's 89-page report, based on more than 50 interviews and a review of more than 50,000 documents, concluded that members of Dr. Tessier-Lavigne's labs engaged in inappropriate manipulation of research data or deficient scientific practices, resulting in significant flaws in five papers that lister Dr. Tessier-Lavigne as the principal author" (Saul, 2023). Therefore, the odds of redemption appear fiercely in their favor.

In defiance of this fact, Gino is pursuing a $25 lawsuit against her accusers, while Tessier-Lavigne avoids admitting wrongdoing despite relinquishing his post. Gina "took to her LinkedIn…to announce that she was suing Harvard University, Harvard Business School Dean Srikant Datar, and the three authors of Data Colada – the blog that brought the allegations to light" (Bleizeffer, 2023). Despite being found outright guilty of purposeful wrongdoing, her counterpart has recognized the weighted impact of this allegation. The resigned president has reasoned his abdication in the belief that "Stanford 'needs a president whose leadership is not hampered' by discussions of problems with his research" (Rasmussen, 2023). Therefore, the problem is not in recognizing fraudulence's presence in research. Regardless of fighting their innocence, both researchers appear to understand their implications in academia, if true. Rather, the problem lies in the process that has led to this point.

Why has their indictment taken so long? Given the awareness of malpractice within academia, it would appear reasonable for greater safeguards to exist. Perhaps this is the wrong question. What has stopped safeguards from being created? This institutional problem may have its fundamental practice of trust to blame. This once common practice may now have to be rethought. Untested trust allows for the publication of falsified research as a consequence of deceit. Let the cases of Gino and Tessier-Levigne be a fair warning to prior inconsistencies and future possibilities of manipulation. The solution will prove difficult but undoubtedly necessary. The foundations must be rebuilt as the pedestal that holds academia so high begins to crumble.

Works Cited

Bleizeffer, K. (2023). What Francesca Gino's Harvard Lawsuit Says About Data Colada's Fraud Allegations. Poets&Quants. https://poetsandquants.com/2023/08/04/what-francesca-ginos-harvard-lawsuit-says-about-data-coladas-fraud-allegations/

Carter, S. (2023). Harvard Business School May Struggle to Beat Professor's Lawsuit. Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2023/08/12/harvard-business-school-may-struggle-to-beat-francesca-gino-s-lawsuit/60be25be-390b-11ee-ac4e-e707870e43db_story.html

Piper, K. (2023). A disgraced Harvard professor sued them for millions. Their recourse: GoFundMe. Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/23841742/francesca-gino-data-colada-lawsuit-gofundme-science-culture-transparency-academic-fraud-dishonesty

Rasmussen, L. M. (2023, July 21). Stanford President Marc Tessier-Lavigne and the new standards of scientific conduct. STAT. https://www.statnews.com/2023/07/21/marc-tessier-lavigne-stanford-president-scientific-misconduct/

Saul, S. (2023). Stanford President Will Resign After Report Found Flaws in His Research—the New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/07/19/us/stanford-president-resigns-tessier-lavigne.html