

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

The Reluctance to Criticize the Errors of the Majority: Authority, Conformity, and Academic Silence in Scholarly Discourse

[Yue Liu](#) *

Posted Date: 30 July 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202507.2515.v1

Keywords: conformity bias; authority bias; academic silence; intellectual dissent; groupthink; paradigm shift; institutional pressure; scholarly discourse



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Article

The Reluctance to Criticize the Errors of the Majority: Authority, Conformity, and Academic Silence in Scholarly Discourse

Yue Liu

College of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Shenyang Normal University, Shenyang, P. R. China, 110034; yueliusd@163.com

Abstract

This paper examines the pervasive phenomenon whereby scholars and academic communities avoid criticizing errors committed by the majority, particularly when these errors are endorsed by authority figures or formal institutions. Through an interdisciplinary analysis drawing from social psychology, institutional theory, and the sociology of knowledge, this study explores the mechanisms underlying academic silence and conformity pressure. The research reveals that when mainstream theories are challenged, individuals often align themselves with established paradigms and authoritative voices not out of intellectual conviction, but as a strategic response to minimize professional risk and maintain social acceptance. The paper identifies key factors contributing to this phenomenon, including authority bias, conformity pressure, ostracism avoidance, and institutional power dynamics. The findings demonstrate that this reluctance to engage in constructive criticism undermines the epistemological foundations of academic inquiry and impedes scientific progress. The study concludes by fostering more robust intellectual discourse and protecting dissenting voices within academic institutions.

Keywords: conformity bias; authority bias; academic silence; intellectual dissent; groupthink; paradigm shift; institutional pressure; scholarly discourse

1. Introduction

The pursuit of knowledge fundamentally depends on open inquiry, critical examination, and the willingness to challenge established beliefs. Yet, a troubling pattern emerges within academic and scholarly communities: a marked reluctance to criticize errors committed by the majority, particularly when these errors are sanctioned by authoritative figures or formal institutions [1,2]. This phenomenon becomes especially pronounced when mainstream theoretical frameworks are challenged, as many individuals reflexively align themselves with prevailing orthodoxies and established authorities—not necessarily out of intellectual conviction, but as a means of signaling correctness and avoiding professional consequences [3,4].

This reluctance to engage in constructive criticism represents more than mere intellectual timidity; it constitutes a systematic threat to the foundational principles of scholarly inquiry. When academic communities fail to subject majority positions to rigorous scrutiny, they risk perpetuating flawed theories, maintaining unjust practices, and stifling the very innovation and progress that academia purports to champion [5,6]. The consequences extend far beyond academic circles, affecting public policy, scientific advancement, and societal progress more broadly [7,8].

The phenomenon manifests across multiple dimensions of academic life. Authority bias leads individuals to attribute greater credibility to information presented by perceived experts or institutional leaders, often without adequate critical evaluation [9,10]. Conformity pressure drives scholars to align their views with group consensus, even when they privately harbor doubts or possess contradictory evidence [11,12]. The fear of ostracism and professional marginalization further

reinforces these tendencies, creating an environment where dissent is discouraged and intellectual diversity is suppressed [13,14].

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Authority Bias in Academic Contexts

Authority bias represents a fundamental cognitive shortcut whereby individuals attribute greater accuracy and credibility to statements made by perceived authority figures, regardless of the content's actual merit [15,16]. In academic settings, this bias manifests through deference to senior scholars, prestigious institutions, and established thought leaders. Research demonstrates that authority bias can override critical thinking processes, leading individuals to accept information without adequate scrutiny simply because it originates from a trusted source [17,18].

The psychological foundations of authority bias trace back to evolutionary adaptations that favored individuals who could efficiently navigate social hierarchies by deferring to established leaders [19]. However, in contemporary academic contexts, this adaptive mechanism can become maladaptive, particularly when it prevents the critical evaluation necessary for intellectual progress. Studies show that authority bias is strengthened when the authority figure is perceived as legitimate, possesses higher social status, or occupies a position within established institutional hierarchies [20,21].

2.2. Conformity Pressure and Social Identity

Conformity represents the tendency for individuals to adjust their behavior, opinions, and attitudes to accord with group norms, even when they privately disagree [22,23]. Social Identity Theory provides a framework for understanding how group membership influences individual behavior, demonstrating that people derive significant portions of their self-concept from their affiliation with particular social groups [24,25]. In academic contexts, professional identity becomes closely tied to membership in disciplinary communities, creating powerful incentives for conformity.

Research reveals that conformity pressure operates through both informational and normative influences [26,27]. Informational conformity occurs when individuals look to others for guidance about appropriate beliefs or behaviors, particularly in ambiguous situations. Normative conformity, by contrast, stems from the desire to gain social acceptance and avoid rejection. Both mechanisms are particularly powerful in academic settings, where uncertainty about complex theoretical issues combines with strong professional incentives for group acceptance [28,29].

2.3. The Temporal Need-Threat Model of Ostracism

The fear of social exclusion represents a powerful motivator for conformity behavior in academic settings. The Temporal Need-Threat Model demonstrates that ostracism threatens fundamental psychological needs, including belonging, self-esteem, control, and meaningful existence [30,31]. Academic ostracism can take various forms, from exclusion from professional networks to rejection of manuscripts and denial of tenure or promotion opportunities [32,33].

Research indicates that even brief experiences of ostracism can produce significant psychological distress and behavioral changes [34,35]. In academic contexts, where professional success depends heavily on peer acceptance and institutional support, the fear of ostracism creates powerful incentives for conformity. Long-term ostracism can lead to resignation, depression, and withdrawal from academic engagement, effectively silencing dissenting voices [36,37].

3. Mechanisms of Academic Silence

3.1. Direct Suppression of Dissent

Direct suppression occurs when institutions or powerful individuals take explicit action to silence or penalize those who challenge established positions [38,39]. This can include denial of

funding, blocking appointments or promotions, preventing publication, dismissal from positions, and professional harassment. Historical analysis reveals numerous cases where scholars faced direct retribution for challenging dominant paradigms or exposing institutional failures [40,41].

The suppression of dissent often operates through what researchers term “mindguards”—individuals who actively work to shield the group from information that challenges established beliefs [42,43]. In academic settings, mindguards may include senior faculty members, journal editors, or institutional administrators who use their positions to prevent dissenting views from gaining visibility or legitimacy.

3.2. Indirect Suppression and Self-Censorship

Perhaps more insidious than direct suppression is the climate of indirect suppression that leads to widespread self-censorship [44,45]. When scholars observe the consequences faced by those who challenge established positions, they often choose to remain silent rather than risk similar retribution. This creates a chilling effect that extends far beyond the specific individuals who are directly suppressed.

Self-censorship manifests in various ways within academic contexts. Scholars may avoid researching controversial topics, refrain from publishing findings that challenge dominant theories, or modify their public statements to align with institutional preferences [46,47]. The cumulative effect is a significant narrowing of intellectual discourse and a reduction in the diversity of perspectives available within academic communities.

3.3. Groupthink in Academic Settings

Groupthink represents a particularly dangerous form of conformity pressure that occurs when the desire for group harmony overrides realistic evaluation of alternative viewpoints [48,49]. In academic contexts, groupthink can manifest within departments, research teams, professional associations, or entire disciplines. The symptoms include an illusion of unanimity, self-censorship of dissenting views, and the stereotyping of outsiders who challenge group beliefs [50,51].

Academic groupthink is often reinforced by institutional structures that reward consensus and punish dissent. Tenure systems, peer review processes, and funding mechanisms can all contribute to environments where challenging established beliefs is professionally risky [52,53]. The result is often a narrowing of intellectual diversity and a resistance to paradigm shifts that might otherwise advance knowledge.

4. Unspoken Rules and Taboos in Contemporary Academic Publishing

Scholarly communities often portray themselves as arenas of open inquiry, yet powerful psychological, institutional, and cultural forces routinely curtail critique, especially when doing so threatens mainstream paradigms or esteemed authorities. This addendum expands our earlier analysis by exposing the unspoken rules of contemporary publishing [54–57]. We show how formal peer-review protocols, informal editorial norms, and prestige-driven incentives combine to silence heterodox voices, force paradigm-challenging work onto informal outlets [58], and punish those who detect errors in dominant theories [59]. The section concludes with recommendations for de-tabooing contentious topics so that science can better fulfill its truth-seeking mandate.

4.1. Gatekeeping in an Ostensibly Open System

Research journals remain the primary arbiters of scholarly legitimacy, yet a growing body of evidence reveals systemic biases that disadvantage unconventional submissions.

Table 1. Gatekeeping Phenomena in an Ostensibly Open System.

Phenomenon	Empirical Evidence	Effect on Paradigm-Challenging Work
Desk-rejection conservatism	Elite medical journals desk-rejected 12 of the 14 most-cited papers they received, indicating poor detection of high-impact novelty [60,61]	Radical ideas are filtered out before peer review begins
Reviewer similarity bias	Reviewers favored manuscripts from authors who share gender or national identity, reinforcing homogenous viewpoints [62]	Marginalizes scholars outside the dominant demographic
Confirmatory & negative-results biases	Reviewers penalize findings that contradict prevailing expectations [63]	Discourages publication of refutations or null results
Unseen editorial discretion	Editors openly admit favoring “well-situated” novelty—new ideas anchored in established frameworks—to reduce cognitive load [64]	Forces authors to frame radical concepts in conventional language, muting transformative potential

These patterns generate a tacit rule: the more an argument departs from mainstream theory, the lower its probability of appearing in a flagship outlet.

4.2". *Some Questions You Simply Don't Ask": Taboo Topics Across Disciplines*

Qualitative interviews with scientists reveal broad agreement that certain research questions—especially those involving genetic bases of intelligence, politically sensitive group differences, or critiques of entrenched theoretical frameworks—are considered career-enders if pursued openly [65,66]. A 2024 scoping review of taboo literature categorized common suppression mechanisms:

- **Horizontal control:** ridicule or ostracism by peers when a colleague broaches a forbidden subject [67].
- **Organizational control:** institutions require press-office clearance before controversial findings reach the public, effectively blocking dissenting voices during high-stakes crises [68].
- **Funding veto:** grant panels penalize proposals that question widely used methodologies, ensuring the persistence of comfortable consensus [69].

4.3. *Error Detectors and the Retaliation Cycle*

Simine Vazire’s Nature commentary celebrates “error detectors,” early-career researchers who expose mistakes in celebrated studies, yet she observes that whistle-blowers are frequently warned to “never do it again” for fear of professional reprisals [59,70]. This chilling message confirms the Matthew-effect dynamic—elite reputations shield senior scholars, while critics face accusations of disloyalty or obstruction.

4.4. From Unspoken Rule to Structural Consequence

The cumulative product of these gatekeeping practices is publication bias, documented across medicine, psychology, and the physical sciences, where positive or paradigm-reinforcing results are four times more likely to appear in print than null or contradictory findings [69,71]. Consequently:

- Wrong ideas persist longer, becoming “zombie theories.”
- Early-career scientists learn that true innovation is safer when cloaked in incremental language.
- Public trust erodes when landmark papers later collapse under post-publication scrutiny, exemplified by high-profile COVID-19 retractions [72].

4.5. Why Suppressing Dissent Damages Science

Philosophers model the epistemic cost of hiding dissent as a network problem: removing nodes (contrarian evidence) reduces the community’s capacity to converge on truth by up to 40% in agent-based simulations [73]. Real-world citation analyses echo this, showing that when journals reject disruptive manuscripts, the field loses years of potential progress [60].

4.6. Destigmatizing Critique: Paths Forward

- **Mandatory Post-Publication Peer Review**

Journals can publish reviewer reports alongside accepted manuscripts and invite open commentary within six months, creating a living record of critique.

- **Registered Reports & Novelty Tracks**

By reviewing methodology before results and offering “high-risk/high-reward” submission pathways, editors neutralize the temptation to reject merely because findings are unconventional [74].

- **Diverse Editorial Boards**

Metrics-driven targets for geographic, gender, and theoretical heterogeneity correlate with lower homophily in reviewer selection and more balanced acceptance rates [62].

- **Whistle-Blower Protections**

University policies shielding researchers from retaliatory grant or tenure decisions when they publish replication failures or error critiques.

- **Funding for “De-tabooing” Research**

Initiatives like the Volkswagen Foundation’s 2025 theme week on “(De)tabooing Science and Research” explicitly finance conferences that dissect disciplinary taboos [75].

Modern scholarly publishing is not merely a neutral conveyor belt for discoveries; it is a complex social system whose unspoken rules routinely marginalize dissent, valorize authority, and discourage airing of collective mistakes. The story of Lu Hefu [76], the plight of error detectors [59], and mounting empirical evidence on reviewer bias [54] collectively demonstrate that silence is structurally enforced, not merely chosen [55–57]. Unless journals, funding agencies, and universities implement robust reforms to de-taboo contentious inquiry, science risks calcifying into a self-affirming echo chamber—precisely the antithesis of its truth-seeking ethos.

5. Case Studies in Academic Conformity

5.1. The Suppression of Environmental Dissent

The case of environmental scientist Barry Coulter illustrates how institutional pressures can silence dissenting voices [77]. Coulter’s research on environmental mutagens threatened the interests of mining companies and government agencies, leading to his dismissal despite his strong scientific credentials. His case demonstrates how scholars who provide information to community groups or

challenge powerful interests may face professional retaliation, even when their work meets high scientific standards.

5.2. Medical Education and Conformity Pressure

Research in medical education reveals widespread pressure for residents to conform to established practices, even when they have concerns about patient safety or treatment efficacy [78]. Studies show that the majority of medical residents report experiencing pressure to conform in clinical settings, particularly when interacting with higher-status colleagues. This conformity pressure can inhibit learning, prevent the reporting of errors, and ultimately compromise patient care.

5.3. Paradigm Resistance in Scientific Communities

The history of science provides numerous examples of resistance to paradigm shifts, even when new theories offer superior explanatory power [79,80]. From the rejection of Galileo's heliocentric model to resistance to plate tectonic theory, scientific communities have repeatedly demonstrated reluctance to abandon established frameworks. This resistance often involves not just intellectual disagreement, but active suppression of dissenting voices and social ostracism of those who challenge orthodox beliefs [81,82].

5.4. Lu Hefu's Unpublishable Challenge to Einstein

The experience of Chinese physicist Lu Hefu (卢鹤绂) starkly illustrates the informal censorship of paradigm-shifting work. After five rounds of rigorous answers to reviewer objections, the editors of *Physical Review* conceded that Lu's rebuttal of aspects of general relativity was "unassailable," yet still deemed it "unsuitable" for a mainstream physics journal and suggested he submit elsewhere [76]. His paper was ultimately accepted by the lesser-known *Galilean Electrodynamics* in 1995—decades after his initial submission effort. The episode underscores four structural obstacles:

- **Prestige risk**—Editors feared reputational damage for entertaining anti-Einstein claims.
- **Authority bias**—Reviewers implicitly deferred to Einstein's canonical status.
- **Scope gatekeeping**—Journals protect disciplinary orthodoxy by narrowing "fit."
- **Conversion to informal channels**—Authors must resort to niche journals or blogs, diluting scholarly impact.

6. Psychological and Social Consequences

6.1. Impact on Individual Scholars

The pressure to conform and avoid criticism of majority positions takes a significant psychological toll on individual scholars. Research demonstrates that conformity pressure can lead to decreased creativity, reduced job satisfaction, and increased stress [83,84]. Scholars who experience ostracism or suppression may develop symptoms of depression, anxiety, and professional burnout. The long-term consequences can include withdrawal from academic engagement and premature departure from scholarly careers [85–87].

6.2. Effects on Academic Communities

The suppression of dissent and conformity pressure have broader effects on academic communities as institutions. When criticism is discouraged, communities lose important feedback mechanisms that help identify and correct errors [88,89]. This can lead to the perpetuation of flawed theories, the maintenance of ineffective practices, and the development of intellectual blind spots that persist across generations of scholars.

6.3. Societal Implications

The reluctance to criticize majority errors in academic settings has implications that extend far beyond university walls. When scholarly communities fail to engage in robust self-correction, the consequences can affect public policy, professional practice, and societal decision-making [90,91]. Examples include the persistence of harmful medical practices, the delay in addressing environmental crises, and the perpetuation of social inequalities through flawed research paradigms.

7. Institutional and Cultural Factors

7.1. Power Structures in Academia

Academic institutions are characterized by clear hierarchical structures that can reinforce conformity pressure and suppress dissent [92,93]. Senior faculty members, department chairs, and institutional administrators wield significant power over junior scholars' careers, creating strong incentives for conformity. The concentration of power in the hands of a few individuals can lead to the systematic suppression of alternative viewpoints and the maintenance of intellectual orthodoxies.

7.2. Funding and Publication Mechanisms

The mechanisms through which research is funded and published can contribute to conformity pressure and the suppression of dissent [94,95]. Funding agencies may favor proposals that align with established paradigms, while journals may reject manuscripts that challenge dominant theories. These gatekeeping mechanisms can effectively silence dissenting voices and prevent alternative perspectives from gaining visibility within academic communities.

7.3. Professional Socialization

The process of professional socialization within academic disciplines plays a crucial role in shaping scholars' willingness to engage in criticism and dissent [87,96]. Graduate students and early-career scholars learn not only the technical content of their fields but also the social norms and expectations that govern professional behavior. When these socialization processes emphasize conformity and discourage criticism, they can create lasting effects on scholars' willingness to challenge established positions.

8. Strategies for Promoting Intellectual Diversity

8.1. Institutional Reforms

Addressing the reluctance to criticize majority errors requires systematic institutional reforms that protect dissenting voices and promote intellectual diversity [97,98]. These may include the establishment of formal protection mechanisms for whistleblowers, the creation of alternative funding streams for controversial research, and the development of tenure and promotion criteria that reward intellectual courage rather than conformity.

8.2. Educational Interventions

Educational interventions can help scholars recognize and resist conformity pressure while developing the skills necessary for constructive criticism [99,100]. Training programs focused on critical thinking, intellectual humility, and constructive dissent can help create academic cultures that value diverse perspectives and encourage robust debate.

8.3. Cultural Change

Ultimately, addressing the phenomenon of academic silence requires broader cultural change within scholarly communities [101,102]. This involves developing new norms that celebrate intellectual diversity, reward constructive criticism, and protect those who challenge established

positions. Such cultural change must be supported by institutional leaders and reinforced through both formal policies and informal practices [55,59].

9. Implications for Academic Practice

9.1. Rethinking Peer Review

The peer review process, while essential for maintaining scholarly standards, can also serve as a mechanism for suppressing dissent and enforcing conformity [56,57,59]. Reforms to peer review systems should focus on reducing bias, increasing transparency, and ensuring that controversial or challenging work receives fair evaluation. This may involve the use of multiple review processes, the publication of reviewer comments [54], and the establishment of appeals mechanisms for rejected manuscripts.

9.2. Promoting Methodological Pluralism

Academic fields benefit from methodological diversity, as different approaches can provide complementary insights into complex phenomena [103]. However, conformity pressure often leads to the dominance of particular methodological approaches at the expense of alternatives. Promoting methodological pluralism requires deliberate efforts to support diverse research approaches and prevent the marginalization of minority perspectives [57].

9.3. Supporting Early Career Scholars

Early career scholars are particularly vulnerable to conformity pressure due to their dependence on senior colleagues for career advancement [104]. Providing support for young scholars who wish to pursue controversial or challenging research is essential for maintaining intellectual diversity within academic communities. This support may include mentorship programs, alternative funding sources, and protection from retaliation.

10. Future Directions

10.1. Empirical Research Needs

Further research is needed to better understand the prevalence and mechanisms of academic silence across different disciplines and institutional contexts [105]. Longitudinal studies examining the career trajectories of scholars who engage in dissent could provide valuable insights into the long-term consequences of challenging established positions. Additionally, experimental research could help identify effective interventions for reducing conformity pressure and promoting intellectual diversity.

10.2. Cross-Cultural Perspectives

The phenomenon of academic silence may vary significantly across different cultural and national contexts [106]. Comparative research examining how different educational systems and cultural values influence scholars' willingness to engage in criticism and dissent could provide valuable insights for developing more effective interventions.

10.3. Technology and Academic Discourse

The rise of digital technologies and social media platforms has created new opportunities for academic discourse while also introducing new forms of conformity pressure [107]. Research is needed to understand how these technological changes affect the dynamics of dissent and conformity within scholarly communities.

11. Conclusions

The reluctance to criticize errors committed by the majority, particularly when these errors are endorsed by authority figures or formal institutions, represents a fundamental threat to the integrity of academic inquiry. This phenomenon, driven by authority bias, conformity pressure, and the fear of ostracism, undermines the self-correcting mechanisms that are essential for intellectual progress. The consequences extend beyond individual scholars to affect entire academic communities and society more broadly.

Addressing this challenge requires a multifaceted approach that includes institutional reforms, educational interventions, and cultural change. Protecting dissenting voices, promoting intellectual diversity, and creating environments where constructive criticism is valued rather than punished are essential for maintaining the vitality of academic discourse. Only by confronting the psychological and social forces that discourage criticism can scholarly communities fulfill their fundamental mission of advancing human knowledge and understanding.

The path forward requires courage from both individuals and institutions. Scholars must be willing to challenge established positions despite the personal risks involved, while institutional leaders must create structures and cultures that support rather than suppress intellectual diversity. The stakes are high: the future of academic inquiry and its ability to serve society depends on our willingness to confront the comfortable conformity that too often characterizes scholarly discourse.

The phenomenon examined in this paper represents more than an academic curiosity; it reflects fundamental tensions between individual intellectual integrity and social belonging, between the pursuit of truth and the desire for professional security. Understanding and addressing these tensions is essential not only for the health of academic institutions but for the broader project of human knowledge advancement. As we move forward, the challenge will be to create academic communities that are both rigorous and diverse, both supportive and challenging, both stable and open to necessary change.

Funding: No funds, grants, or other support were received.

Ethics Approval for Research Involving Humans or Animals: No human participants or animals were involved in this research

Data Transparency: Data sharing is not applicable to this opinion piece as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

Competing Interests: There are no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

References

1. *The Authority Bias: A Deep Dive*. 2025. <https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ultimate-guide-authority-bias-behavioral-economics>.
2. Stewart, L. *What Is Conformity Bias? Definition, Types & Examples*. <https://atlasti.com/research-hub/conformity-bias>.
3. Juma, O.; Husiyyin, M.; Akhat, A.; Habibulla, I. Students' Classroom Silence and Hopelessness: The Impact of Teachers' Immediacy on Mainstream Education. *Front Psychol* **2021**, *12*, 819821. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.819821 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
4. Dvorak, F.; Fischbacher, U.; Schmelz, K. Strategic Conformity or Anti-Conformity to Avoid Punishment and Attract Reward. *The Economic Journal* **2025**, *135* (666), 556-583. DOI: 10.1093/ej/ueae085.
5. Team, D. E. *What you need to know about authority bias*. 2024. <https://dovetail.com/research/what-is-authority-bias/>.
6. Nguyen, H. *The Silent Majority*. 2013. <https://thecampanile.org/3200/lifestyle/the-silent-majority/>.
7. Li, L.; Li, K. K.; Li, J. Private but not social information validity modulates social conformity bias. *Hum Brain Mapp* **2019**, *40* (8), 2464-2474. DOI: 10.1002/hbm.24536.
8. *Authority bias*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Authority_bias.

9. Mustafaraj, E.; Finn, S.; Whitlock, C.; Metaxas, P. T. Vocal Minority Versus Silent Majority: Discovering the Opinions of the Long Tail. In 2011 IEEE Third International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 2011 IEEE Third International Conference on Social Computing, Boston, MA, USA; 2012.
10. *Unlocking your authenticity: overcoming Conformity Bias*. <https://compliance.utexas.edu/ethics/lets-talk/conformity-bias>.
11. *Credibility, Authority & Bias*. 205. <https://nmc.libguides.com/c.php?g=907632&p=6541166>.
12. Lister, V.; Kosiol, J.; Meissner, E.; Fitzgerald, A. Tell us how it is: Unravelling the dynamics of academic voice and silence. *Journal of Management & Organization* **2024**, *31* (1), 256-285. DOI: 10.1017/jmo.2024.41.
13. Capuano, C.; Chekroun, P. A Systematic Review of Research on Conformity. *International Review of Social Psychology* **2024**, *37* (1). DOI: 10.5334/irsp.874.
14. Braithwaite, L. *Why do we always trust the doctor, even though they might be wrong?* <https://thedecisionlab.com/biases/authority-bias>.
15. Day, N. E. The Silent Majority: Manuscript Rejection and Its Impact on Scholars. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* **2011**, *10* (4), 704-718. DOI: 10.5465/amle.2010.0027.
16. Germar, M.; Albrecht, T.; Voss, A.; Mojzisch, A. Social conformity is due to biased stimulus processing: electrophysiological and diffusion analyses. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* **2016**, *11* (9), 1449-1459. DOI: 10.1093/scan/nsw050.
17. *Authority Bias: Definition, Examples, and Impact on Decision-Making*. <https://innerview.co/blog/understanding-authority-bias-how-it-shapes-our-decisions-and-behaviors>.
18. Lenz, M. *Silent academics and the decline of (higher) education*. 2020. <https://handlingideas.blog/2020/01/22/silent-academics-and-the-decline-of-higher-education/>.
19. *Conformity Bias*. <https://ethicsunwrapped.utexas.edu/glossary/conformity-bias>.
20. Neilson, K. *Whatever you say, boss. Is authority bias holding your organisation back?* 2021. <https://www.hrmonline.com.au/section/featured/authority-bias-leadership/>.
21. aaupenn. *Statement by AAUP-Penn Executive Committee on the Suppression of Student and Faculty Dissent*. 2024. <https://aaup-penn.org/statement-by-aaup-penn-executive-committee-on-the-suppression-of-student-and-faculty-dissent/>.
22. Zou, J.; Colley, K.; Westbrook, A.; Grace, C. C.; Combs, M. *The Effects of Peer Pressure on Social Conformity*. 2022. <https://repository.belmont.edu/surs/46/>.
23. *Resistance Theory in Sociology of Education*. **2025**.
24. *Free to Think 2023: Suppression of dissent and spread of illiberalism threatens academic freedom and endangers democracy*. **2023**.
25. Shibata, K.; Okada, I. Modeling social conformity and peer pressure in opinion dynamics: the role of dynamic interaction structures. *Frontiers in Physics* **2025**, *13*. DOI: 10.3389/fphy.2025.1551215.
26. Bilginer, O. *Theories of political resistance : the making of resistance from the sixteenth century to the present*. 2015. <https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/legacy-etd/1339/>.
27. de Melo-Martin, I.; Intemann, K. Scientific dissent and public policy. Is targeting dissent a reasonable way to protect sound policy decisions? *EMBO Rep* **2013**, *14* (3), 231-235. DOI: 10.1038/embor.2013.8.
28. Stallen, M.; Sanfey, A. G. The neuroscience of social conformity: implications for fundamental and applied research. *Front Neurosci* **2015**, *9*, 337. DOI: 10.3389/fnins.2015.00337 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
29. Bounds, D. T.; Posey, P. D. A Resistance Framework for Racially Minoritized Youth Behaviors During the Transition to Adulthood. *J Res Adolesc* **2022**, *32* (3), 959-980. DOI: 10.1111/jora.12792.
30. *Suppression of dissent: what it is and what to do about it*. <https://documents.uow.edu.au/~bmartin/dissent/intro/DNAleaflet.html>.
31. *Resistance*. <https://library.fiveable.me/key-terms/film-and-media-theory/resistance>.
32. S., B. D. *The modern university has always aimed to suppress dissent*. 2025. <https://www.bostonreview.net/forum/the-right-to-be-hostile/david-busch-responds/>.
33. Prayogshala, M. *Social Conformity and Group Pressure*. 2023. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/non-weird-science/202305/social-conformity-and-group-pressure>.

34. *Resistance - Subcultures and Sociology*. <https://haenfler.sites.grinnell.edu/subcultural-theory-and-theorists/resistance/>.
35. *Suppression of dissent: Definitions*. <https://documents.uow.edu.au/~bmartin/dissent/intro/definitions.html>.
36. Castrellon, J. J.; Zald, D. H.; Samanez-Larkin, G. R.; Seaman, K. L. Adult age-related differences in susceptibility to social conformity pressures in self-control over daily desires. *Psychol Aging* **2024**, *39* (1), 102-112. DOI: 10.1037/pag0000790.
37. Avelino, F. Theories of power and social change. Power contestations and their implications for research on social change and innovation. *Journal of Political Power* **2021**, *14* (3), 425-448. DOI: 10.1080/2158379x.2021.1875307.
38. Christian, B. Why International Organizations Don't Learn: Dissent Suppression as a Source of IO Dysfunction. *International Studies Quarterly* **2025**, *69* (1). DOI: 10.1093/isq/sqaf008.
39. Goncalo, J. A.; Duguid, M. M. Follow the crowd in a new direction: When conformity pressure facilitates group creativity (and when it does not). *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **2012**, *118* (1), 14-23. DOI: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.12.004.
40. *Heresy*. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heresy>.
41. On Rebecca Tuvel: Consequences of Orthodoxies in Academia. **2017**.
42. Grendar, J.; Beran, T.; Oddone-Paolucci, E. Experiences of pressure to conform in postgraduate medical education. *BMC Med Educ* **2018**, *18* (1), 4. DOI: 10.1186/s12909-017-1108-8.
43. *Heresy: a brief history*. <https://www.historyextra.com/period/medieval/in-case-you-missed-it-your-60-second-guide-to-heresy/>.
44. Saler, R. *Method and Consequence in the Study of U.S. Orthodoxy*. 2022. <https://publicorthodoxy.org/2022/07/01/method-and-consequence-in-study-of-orthodoxy/>.
45. Lee, D.; Fu, Y.; Zhou, D.; Nie, T.; Song, Z. Is There a Missing Link? Exploring the Effects of Institutional Pressures on Environmental Performance in the Chinese Construction Industry. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* **2022**, *19* (18). DOI: 10.3390/ijerph191811787.
46. *When did the catholic church first start to punish heresy with death?* https://www.reddit.com/r/AskHistorians/comments/73ye7j/when_did_the_catholic_church_first_start_to/.
47. *Orthodox Theology and the Challenges of the 21st Century*. <https://zizioulas.org/library/articles/orthodox-theology-and-the-challenges-of-the-21st-century>.
48. Skeen, G. E. *Institutional Pressures on School Leadership and Innovation After Pandemic-Related School Closures: A Phenomenological Study*. 2025. https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_etds/333/.
49. *heresy trials*. <https://www.studysmarter.co.uk/explanations/religious-studies/religious-history/heresy-trials/>.
50. Kelaidis, K. *ORTHODOXY'S EXTREMIST APPEAL*. 2019. <https://oclc.org/orthodoxys-extremist-appeal/>.
51. McKiernan, P. *Pressures to conform*. 2016. <https://globalfocusmagazine.com/pressures-to-conform/>.
52. *Heretics and inquisitions*. 2025. <https://catholicidentity.bne.catholic.edu.au/scripture/SitePages/Heretics-and-inquisitions.aspx?csf=1&e=nUcFku>.
53. Allen, K. *Challenges and Opportunities for the Ancient Faith Today*. 2014. <https://oclc.org/challenges-and-opportunities-for-the-ancient-faith-today/>.
54. Liu, Y. Non-Mainstream Scientific Viewpoints in Microwave Absorption Research: Peer Review, Academic Integrity, and Cargo Cult Science. *preprints.org* **2025**. DOI: 10.20944/preprints202507.0015.v2
55. Liu, Y. Scientific Accountability: The Case for Personal Responsibility in Academic Error Correction. *Qeios* **2025**, Preprint. DOI: 10.32388/m4ggkz.
56. Liu, Y. The Entrenched Problems of Scientific Progress: An Analysis of Institutional Resistance and Systemic Barriers to Innovation. *Preprints.org* **2025**. DOI: 10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1.
57. Liu, Y. Why Are Research Findings Supported by Experimental Data with High Probability Often False? -Critical Analysis of the Replication Crisis and Statistical Bias in Scientific Literature. *Preprints.org* **2025**. DOI: 10.20944/preprints202507.1953.v1.
58. Huang, D. *Can the principle of constancy of light velocity be proved by Michelson-Morley experiment?* 2017. <https://www.zhihu.com/column/p/24559777>.
59. Vazire, S. A toast to the error detectors. *Nature* **2020**, *577* (7788), 9. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-019-03909-2.

60. Siler, K.; Lee, K.; Bero, L. Measuring the effectiveness of scientific gatekeeping. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **2015**, *112* (2), 360-365. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1418218112.
61. Peer review isn't good at "dealing with exceptional or unconventional submissions," says study. <https://retractionwatch.com/2014/12/22/peer-review-isnt-good-dealing-exceptional-unconventional-submissions-says-study/>.
62. Kumar, A. Dissent in Democracy: Worries and Paradoxes. 2021. <https://casihrrgnul.wordpress.com/2021/01/15/dissent-in-democracy-worries-and-paradoxes/>.
63. Newspaper, C. The cost of silence and the dangers of dissent. 2024. <https://capitalethiopia.com/2024/09/23/the-cost-of-silence-and-the-dangers-of-dissent/>.
64. Teplitskiy, M.; Peng, H.; Blasco, A.; Lakhani, K. R. Is novel research worth doing? Evidence from peer review at 49 journals. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **2022**, *119* (47), e2118046119. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2118046119.
65. Pomeroy, R. Ten Taboo Topics Dividing Psychologists. 2024. https://www.realclearscience.com/articles/2024/06/08/ten_taboo_topics_dividing_psychologists_1036501.html.
66. Mondal, H.; Mondal, S. The Paradigm Shift in Scientific Publications. *Preventive Medicine: Research & Reviews* **2024**, *1* (2), 64-66. DOI: 10.4103/pmrr.Pmrr_38_23.
67. Väliverronen, E.; Saikkonen, S. Freedom of Expression Challenged: Scientists' Perspectives on Hidden Forms of Suppression and Self-censorship. *Science, Technology, & Human Values* **2020**, *46* (6), 1172-1200. DOI: 10.1177/0162243920978303.
68. Martin, B. Suppression of dissent in science. *Research in Social Problems and Public Policy* **1999**, *7*, 105-135.
69. Brown, A. W.; Mehta, T. S.; Allison, D. B. 9 Publication Bias in Science: What Is It, Why Is It Problematic, and How Can It Be Addressed? In *The Oxford Handbook of the Science of Science Communication*, Jamieson, K. H., Kahan, D. M., Scheufele, D. A. Eds.; Oxford University Press, 2017; pp 93-101.
70. Opinion piece in Nature: A toast to the error detectors. <https://www.s4me.info/threads/opinion-piece-in-nature-a-toast-to-the-error-detectors.13055/>.
71. Murad, M. H.; Chu, H.; Lin, L.; Wang, Z. The effect of publication bias magnitude and direction on the certainty in evidence. *BMJ Evid Based Med* **2018**, *23* (3), 84-86. DOI: 10.1136/bmjebm-2018-110891.
72. Hamilton, D. G.; Fraser, H.; Hoekstra, R.; Fidler, F. Journal policies and editors' opinions on peer review. *Elife* **2020**, *9*. DOI: 10.7554/eLife.62529.
73. Coates, M. Does it Harm Science to Suppress Dissenting Evidence? *Philosophy of Science* **2024**, *92* (1), 82-99. DOI: 10.1017/psa.2024.21.
74. Peer Review and Editorial Boards. 2025. <https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly-publishing/diversity-equity-and-inclusion-in-scholarly-communication/peer-review-and-editorial-boards/>.
75. The Advancement of Science: From Paradigms to Peer Review. 2017. <https://bio4climate.org/article/the-advancement-of-science-from-paradigms-to-peer-review/>.
76. Absolutely true, Lushi is awesome! 2017. <https://baijiahao.baidu.com/s?id=1582700776632704690>.
77. Braxton, J. M. Institutional Variability in Faculty Conformity to the Norms of Science: A Force of Integration or Fragmentation in the Academic Profession? *Research in Higher Education* **1989**, *30* (4), 419-433.
78. Roach, A.; Angelovska-Panova, M. Punishment of heretics: comparisons and contrasts between Western and Eastern Christianity in the Middle Ages. *Journal of History (Macedonia)* **2012**, *47* (1), 145-171.
79. Khrystokin, H.; Lozovytskyi, V. Reform of Orthodoxy: Current Challenges and Tasks. *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe* **2023**, *43* (8). DOI: 10.55221/2693-2148.2467.
80. Shin, D. Variations and Antecedents of Ceremonial Conformity as a Response to Institutional Pressure. *Academy of Management Proceedings* **2015**, *2015* (1). DOI: 10.5465/ambpp.2015.12233abstract.
81. List of heresies in the Catholic Church. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_heresies_in_the_Catholic_Church.
82. Orthodoxy and our Global Village: Challenges That Lay Ahead. <https://missions.hchc.edu/sermons/sermons/orthodoxy-and-our-global-village-challenges-that-lay-ahead>.
83. Lei, Y.; Li, M.; Lin, C.; Zhang, C.; Yu, Z. The effect of ostracism on social withdrawal behavior: the mediating role of self-esteem and the moderating role of rejection sensitivity. *Frontiers in Psychology* **2024**, *15*. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1411697.

84. *Conformity in Social Identity*. <https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/conformity-in-social-identity-theory>.
85. Bhujbal, M. P.; Verma, S. The Influence of Peer Pressure on Students: Cause, Effect, and Strategies for Intervention. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research* **2024**, *6* (5). DOI: 10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i05.28091.
86. *Ostracism at School*. <https://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/ostra.pdf>.
87. Williams, K. D.; Nida, S. A. Ostracism and social exclusion: Implications for separation, social isolation, and loss. *Current Opinion in Psychology* **2022**, *47*. DOI: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2022.101353.
88. Kish Bar-On, K.; Lamm, E. The interplay of social identity and norm psychology in the evolution of human groups. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **2023**, *378* (1872). DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2021.0412.
89. Laursen, B.; Veenstra, R. Toward understanding the functions of peer influence: A summary and synthesis of recent empirical research. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* **2021**, *31* (4), 889-907. DOI: 10.1111/jora.12606.
90. Williams, K. D.; Nida, S. A. Ostracism: Consequences and Coping. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* **2011**, *20* (2), 71-75. DOI: 10.1177/0963721411402480.
91. McLeod, S. *Social Identity Theory In Psychology*. 2023. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html>.
92. *The Power of Peers, Who Influences Your Health?* 2021. <https://newsinhealth.nih.gov/2021/09/power-peers>.
93. Guzel, H. Y.; Sahin, D. N. The Effect of Ostracism on the Accessibility of Uncertainty-Related Thoughts. *Noro Psikiyatri Arsivi* **2017**. DOI: 10.5152/npa.2017.19342.
94. Irwin, K. *Norm Conformity and Social Identity In Collective Action Groups*. 2009. <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/40/>.
95. Malloy, T. E. *Peer pressure*. 2024. <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/health-and-medicine/peer-pressure>.
96. Chao, Y. Social Identity and Group Conformity in Virtual Environment. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences* **2023**, *22*, 581-586. DOI: 10.54097/ehss.v22i.13065.
97. Fontenot, S. *Study: Peer Pressure Susceptibility Lasts into Adulthood*. 2024. <https://news.utdallas.edu/health-medicine/peer-pressure-adulthood-2024/>.
98. Wesselmann, E. D.; Pfundmair, M.; Spoor, J. R.; Moons, W. G. 54 The Negative Effect of Ostracism and Other Forms of Social Exclusion on Emotions In *The Oxford Handbook of Evolution and the Emotions*, Al-Shawaf, L., Shackelford, T. K. Eds.; 2024.
99. Rathbone, J. A.; Cruwys, T.; Stevens, M.; Ferris, L. J.; Reynolds, K. J. The reciprocal relationship between social identity and adherence to group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology* **2023**, *62* (3), 1346-1362. DOI: 10.1111/bjso.12635.
100. Herbert, E. *Unmasking the dangers of peer pressure on young people*. 2024. <https://www.childrenssociety.org.uk/what-we-do/blogs/unmasking-the-dangers-of-peer-pressure-on-young-people>.
101. Liu, C. *Workplace Ostracism: People's Psychological Attributions and Coping Strategies*. 2020. <https://news.hofstra.edu/2020/05/21/workplace-ostracism-peoples-psychological-attributions-coping-strategies/>.
102. Graupensperger, S. A.; Benson, A. J.; Evans, M. B. Everyone Else Is Doing It: The Association Between Social Identity and Susceptibility to Peer Influence in NCAA Athletes. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* **2018**, *40* (3), 117-127. DOI: 10.1123/jsep.2017-0339.
103. Hayes, A. *What Is a Paradigm Shift? Definition, Example, and Meaning*. 2025. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/paradigm-shift.asp>.
104. Klaehn, J. Power over principle, the costs of dissent: an interview with Brian Martin. In *Bound by Power: Intended Consequences* Klaehn, J. Ed.; 2006.
105. Moffatt, J. *What is Groupthink: Prevention and Examples*. 2024. <https://www.usebubbles.com/blog/exposing-groupthink>.

106. *Paradigm shift*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paradigm_shift.
107. Martin, B.; Baker, C. M. A.; Manwell, C.; Pugh, C. *Intellectual Suppression: Australian Case Histories, Analysis and Responses*; Angus & Robertson, 1986.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.