

# PRESENTATION

## THE AFFINITY BETWEEN LOGIC AND ETHICS

*“Everyone is aware of the kinship between logical and ethical norms. Logic is the morality of thought just as morality is the logic of action”.*  
(Piaget, 1932, p. 404)

The presentation of this issue aims to reflect on the professional, research and publishing schemes in which we are immersed in the guidelines and imperatives of the time, centered on a neoliberal form of thought that has sometimes led people and institutions acting without the necessary discernments so that their actions would not be based on the principle of the common good. The first part contains the object of such reflection, and the articles in the second part of this issue have, inadvertently, the resonance of a logical-ethical blend.

The actual standard knowledge is on the side of a truth accepted by the community, at least as long as it is not questioned. However the pursuit of truth is one of the objectives of science, so with this we clearly see the connection between logic and ethics. This search requires an honest attitude, in which a method is used to arrive at results, always emphasizing in it the search for the knowledge. It entails acting in a rigorous way, following the designed plan, which follows a logic in accordance with the established method and does not force the results or make them up, which also requires a discipline in thinking, bound with facts and data, open to debate, about the distortion of human speculations.

Although we often tend to idealize the scientists, hoping that at least in this field honesty is preserved and the consequent guarantee of a reliable research process which does not seek to deceive the academic community and always put science at the service of solving the problems that affect the world and society, today several scandals have sprinkled to the point that some authors express their skepticism against what today is published. (Nuijten, Hartgerink, van Assen, Epskamp, & Wicherts, 2016; Schmidt, & Oh, 2016; Torres Fonseca, Barragán Meijueiro y Nava Ramírez, 2011). Without denying that the majority of researchers are working for a reliable and trustworthy endeavor, some are tempted to put forward their dominance, personal interests and scientific adventures, which in turn putting in question the credibility of science itself upon publishing articles with biases and more so creating alterations in the results, false and fraudulent data (Trikalinos, Evangelou, & Ioannidis, 2008), plagiarism, autoplagerism, redundant publications, duplicate articles and problems related to research ethics (Table 1).

**Table 1**

*Comparison studies of retracted articles*

No. of retracted articles (range for years)	Browsier / (Topic)	Reasons for retraction*	Source of study
1.373 (1959-2015)	PubMed / (Biomedicine)	<b>33,9% unintentional errors</b> (32,8% accepted error, 1,1% error of editors) <b>55,9% ethical fraud</b> (23,7% plagiarism or autoplágium, 19,7% falsificación or fabricación of data, 4,6% irregularities in data and bad conduct, 2,8% authors' influence, 2,3% bioethical mistakes, 1,6% fictitious authors, 1,2% conflict among authors) <b>10,2% undetermined reasons</b>	Gutiérrez et al., 2016
235 (1966-1997)	Medline / (Medicine)	<b>38,7% unintentional errors</b> (scientific errors in methodology or in analysis, in examples or in data) <b>52,8% ethical fraud</b> (in research, unable to replicate) <b>8,5% undetermined reasons</b>	Budd, Sievert, & Schultz, 1998
110* (1995-2016)	Medline, EMBASE and Cochrane Library / (Orthopedics)	<b>12,4% unintentional errors</b> <b>85% ethical fraud</b> (25,4% fraud, 21,9% plagiarism, 17,5% duplication, 7,1% manipulation of the process in the revision, 6,1% without ethical approval 4,4% others, 2,6% conflict on authorship and rights of the author) <b>2,6% undetermined reasons</b>	Yan et al., 2016
97+ (1995-2017)	Medline and EMBASE / (Neurosurgery)	<b>14,4% unintentional errors</b> (10,6% error in data, 3,8% others) <b>72,1% ethical fraud</b> (25% duplication, 21,2% plagiarism, 12,5% fraudulent data, 6,7% errors on author's attribution, 6,7% manipulation in the revision by the examiner) <b>13,5% undetermined reasons</b>	Wang, Ku, Alotaibi, & Rutka, 2017
742* (2000-2010)	PubMed / (Medicine)	<b>31,4% unintentional errors</b> (scientific errors, errors of the magazine) <b>61,3% ethical fraud</b> (fabricación, falsificación of data, duplication of publication, plagiarism, ethical violations) <b>7,3% undetermined reasons</b>	Steen, 2011
134 (January 2000 – December 2015)	BioMed Central / (Biomedicine)	<b>12,8% unintentional errors</b> (non-reliable data, publication with errors) <b>76,1% ethical fraud</b> (manipulation of examiners upon revision, plagiarism, duplication of publication, falsificación or fabricación of data, duplication of images) <b>11,1% undetermined reasons</b>	Moylan, & Kowalczyk, 2016
184 (2005-2015)	Emerald, JSTOR, Sage, SpringerLink, ScienceDirect, Taylor, & Francis Online, Wiley Online Library / (Administration, trade, economy)	<b>12% unintentional errors</b> (4% statistic errors, 5% datos problemáticos, 1% author's administrative error, 2% editorial errors) <b>80% ethical fraud</b> (26% fabricación of data, 23% plagiarism, 15% autoplágium, 7% false inspector, 7% duplicación, 1% ethical problems, 1% falsificación of data) <b>8% undetermined reasons</b>	Karabag, & Berggren, 2016

Source: originally elaborated as a result from the articles analyzed in this paper.

Notes: A regrouping of the data contributed by the authors of the articles is made in three broad categories: **unintentional errors**, this refers to those that can happen in any process, without intention to deceive, **ethical faults** and **indeterminate reasons**, in order to make a more homogeneous reading and but not biased of them.

\*Articles in which the absolute frequencies are assumed and become relative cumulative.

+ There is an inconsistency in that study when in the summary it states that they included 98 articles; however in the results and in Figure 1 (Study selection flow diagram as per the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses [PRISMA]) report 97. For this reason the latter is taken as reference data.

It should be noted that the studies in Table 1 are centered on the reasons why articles from high-impact journals have been retracted, that means 100% correspond to articles that have the retraction notes and the respective reasons mentioned for the said process. Accordingly, on average, ethical failures reported in these studies represent 69%. This shows a certain fraud in science and of the incentives given to the researchers to be published, which in part explain the mentioned behaviors, which we insist are not the most frequent, which does not prevent from asking about their appearance and their tendency to increase (Steen, 2011).

There are many articles retracted according to these studies and in the areas where they are most reported are in medicine and life sciences<sup>1</sup>. When comparisons are made with the social sciences, there are few retractions, however, there are possibly malicious data, since in reviewing some journals from which articles have been retracted, there are several inconsistencies, especially in digital versions: some just erase the table of content of the article and do not leave any note of retraction; in its platform the article is not found but if you look in the Systems of Indexation and Summary (SIREs) there appears without any footnote, as if it were valid information for the science. This aspect also speaks ill of the journals themselves when in fact there are protocols clearly defined by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), by Scielo, Redalyc, etc., in case when aspects are found in the articles that deserve their retraction. If there are plagiarism, autoplagiarism, duplication, falsification of data, publishers have the duty to communicate it to their readers, record the fact in the table of contents using the preceding [RETRACTED ARTICLE] and a note on the reasons for the action taken. As far as possible, the procedure that was carried out must be recorded and the should article not be removed neither the magazine nor the SIREs, instead, must have a mark (in water or color) indicating its retraction in diagonal form in the whole article itself. It is the expected procedure for the correction of the scientific literature necessary so that society continue its trust in researchers and in the integrity of science (Gutiérrez et al., 2016, p 569).

Omitting these recommendations and doing as if nothing had happened is another ethical blunder on the part of magazines, as if they were telling the world: there is no problem with that article, it can be consulted, quoted and taken as truthful. Somehow it causes embarrassment to assume a mistake in a process where many are involved: authors, reviewers, editors, editorial committees, among others, but worse still is to assume the silence and leave in free circulation articles with some types of fault like indicated earlier. As Piaget (1932) puts it, there is a kinship between logic and ethics, thanks to which we can contemplate the consequences of our actions. The omission of one note per duplicate article, for example, would be telling readers: "This is an original article, as we promised; it is an investigation that has not been released and that is making a new contribution to knowledge," which would prove to be a lie, a deception. For this reason, it

<sup>1</sup> Due to "a retracted article for every 2.117 articles of free access published in 2013" (Gutiérrez et al., 2016, p. 577).

is necessary to insist, at the moment when a publisher, director or reader of a magazine detects an anomaly, a due process must be done to clarify the situation and if it proves that there is an ethical fault, a report of the retraction of the article must be executed.

In all the scientific journals we require that the authors declare the originality of the manuscript and the non-presentation of one work simultaneously in another publication. Accordingly, we act according to the principle of good faith towards our contributors; it happens that sometimes they sign a declaration only to deceive the entire editorial team. Today, with the use of anti-plagiarism software, this work is facilitated, but it is not infallible either.

At the end of March we noticed an article duplicated in Vol. 4, Issue 2, and immediately we began the process established by the COPE requesting the explanation about who signed the article and the declaration of these conditions (what is curious there is the no-simultaneous presentation) . After verifying that this was indeed a duplicate publication, a note and a respective clarification were introduced as a prelude to the article.

All journals, both academic and scientific, have a huge responsibility as to what is published, which is why we must be meticulous with regards to the contents and editorial processes, including aspects such as correct citation, spelling and grammar and, of course, questions which are key as to whether the material being evaluated is contributing to epistemic research, or if we are dealing with an original product that contributes to an aspect of the areas of the declared discipline.

In line with the link between logic and ethics, this second issue of 2017 opens with an editorial on the social responsibility of universities in a world in which to study a career and to do a postgraduate course has become imperative and a sign of “social progress”, sometimes creating an oversupply of professionals who then have no access to a job corresponding with their preparation and expectations of quality of life. It is valid to entertain the questions asked by Juan José Martí Noguera, Isabel Cristina Puerta Lopera and Piedad Rojas Román about how universities adapt to the current environment and also look at how society respond to the imperatives of the time.

The selection of articles for this number points to the underlying ethics of the various disciplines, with careful research in the statement of their results or reflections. They share from their specific line of discipline and without intending to do so, a series of questions and concerns about political issues and practical dilemmas that derive from ethical thinking in the media of communication, hospitals, Spanish rural schools and Colombian universities, and finally Latin American countries.

The first article studies the iconography of Gustavo Rojas Pinilla. In the presence of an image there is no innocence; the image can be manipulated, used for strategic or ideological purposes, as in fact Ana Lucia Garcia Villamarín reveals it when referring to the contracts signed by the dictator with the political propaganda and public relation agencies and the management that was made of his image in the different media of communication.

Continuing with the study of the media of communication, but in the written format, the article by Carolina Robledo Silvestre and Eva Patricia Velásquez Upegui makes a critical analysis of the speech of two Mexican newspapers during the first three months of the news of the disappearance of 43 students in Ayotzinapa, to unveil the discursive strategies employed and the corresponding intentions.

In the setting of the Hospital de Especialidades–La Raza Medical Center in Mexico, researchers Jose Luis Jiménez-López, Jesús Arenas-Osuna and Ulises Ángeles-Garay investigate the correlation between empathy and ethics in a sample of 65 resident doctors who are candidates to be specialists, comparing them according to especialization and gender. With studies like this one is intended to educate in a more humanized medical care with an effective construction of the doctor-patient relationship.

On the other hand, Jacqueline Espinoza-Ibacache and Lupicinio Íñiguez-Rueda explore 18 norms and Chilean laws to identify from discursive practices the place given to women who have exercised prostitution and the guidelines for the social control of their bodies, which extend implicitly as a normative guide of what is accepted and prohibited in female behavior.

Rural schools have the challenge to promote high-quality and equitable education, especially in developing countries. Noelia Morales Romo explores the role of these schools in Spain from the perspective of the “new rurality”, as a response to globalization and the need for sustainable development in territories abandoned by the State, with transportation difficulties and shortage of resources of infrastructure and materials for the exercise of the teacher’s profession.

The quality of primary and secondary education is the guarantee of the abilities and competences that a student should have in his university formation; perhaps one of the most essential is the competence to learn, which molds the autonomy of the student in his learning process. This is the competence used by Lida Cruz Jerónimo Arango and Concepción Yániz to measure in students who start and finish undergraduate and graduate programs in four Colombian universities, to make comparisons according to the level of training and development of this competence, which is fundamental to establish differences between technical and technological studies.

Jesús Redondo Pacheco et al. established the prevalence of cyberbullying in a sample of students of the Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana, knowing its psychological impact of both victims and aggressors, including the comparison of the gender variable and the psychological symptoms they manifest. This is one of the few studies that in our country has examined the phenomenon in university students.

The lyrics of several popular Latin American songs are eloquent about different problems that we live as brother-countries. Laura Paniagua Arguedas chooses to analyze a sample of well-known songs from the beginning of the 21st century that have as a theme migration, to account of the political role—whether they like it or not—of the artists when it comes to making condemnations, resistance and memory.

In the same way, to review the connection between art, memory and politics, Juan David Villa Gómez and Manuela Avendaño Ramírez carry out a review of 161 texts, mostly research, that establish a relationship between memory and art, to preserve and express subordinate and resistant memories in contexts of political violence as a possibility to reestablish the social fabric.

We thank our readers for their attention and hope that this number will be useful for their investigative and practical work.

**Sonia Natalia Cogollo-Ospina, PhD**

Director/Editor

Colombian Journal on Social Sciences

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6814-0531>

## REFERENCES

- Budd, J. M., Sievert, M. E., & Schultz, T. R. (July 15<sup>th</sup>, 1998). Phenomena of retraction: Reasons for retraction and citations to the publications. *JAMA*, 280(3), 296-297. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.280.3.296>
- Gutiérrez, S. A., Barbosa, H. J., Cuero, M. S., Duarte, E. J., Gaitán, F. E., Lozano, J. L., ... Vallejo, G. A. (octubre-diciembre, 2016). La retractación y la corrección de la literatura científica para conservar la integridad y la confianza en la ciencia: un análisis de retractaciones de publicaciones biomédicas de libre acceso en PubMed, 1959-2015. *Revista de la Academia Colombiana de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales*, 40(157), 568-579. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18257/raccefyn.399>
- Karabag, S. F., & Berggren, C. (2016). Misconduct, marginality and editorial practices in Management, Business and Economics Journals. *PLoS ONE*, 11(7), e0159492. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0159492>
- Moylan, E. C., & Kowalczyk, M. K. (2016). Why articles are retracted: A retrospective cross-sectional study of retraction notices at BioMed Central. *BMJ Open*, 6, e012047. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012047>
- Nuijten, M. B., Hartgerink, C. H. J., van Assen, M. A. L. M., Epskamp, S., & Wicherts, J. M. (December, 2016). The prevalence of statistical reporting errors in psychology (1985-2013). *Behavior Research Methods*, 48(4), 1205-1226. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0664-2>
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The Moral Judgement of the Child*. Illinois: The Free Press. Retrieved from <https://ia800205.us.archive.org/5/items/moraljudgmentoft005613mbp/moraljudgmentoft005613mbp.pdf>
- Schmidt, F. L., & Oh, I-S. (June, 2016). The crisis of confidence in research findings in Psychology: Is lack of replication the real problem? Or is it something else? *Archives of Scientific Psychology*, 4(1), 32-37. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/arc0000029>
- Steen, R. G. (2011). Retractions in the scientific literature: is the incidence of research fraud increasing? *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 37, 249-253. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jme.2010.040923>

- Torres Fonseca, A., Barragán Meijueiro, M. de las M. y Nava Ramírez, V. (octubre-diciembre, 2011). ¿En la actualidad la ciencia tiene credibilidad? *Revista de Especialidades Médico-Quirúrgicas*, 16(4), 191-192. Recuperado de <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=47321154001>
- Trikalinos, N. A., Evangelou, E., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (May, 2008). Falsified papers in high-impact journals were slow to retract and indistinguishable from nonfraudulent papers. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 61(5), 464-470. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.019>
- Wang, J., Ku, J., Alotaibi, N. M., & Rutka, J. T. (In press, accepted manuscript). (April, 2017). Retraction of Neurosurgical publications: A systematic review. *World Neurosurgery*. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2017.04.014>
- Yan, J., MacDonald, A., Baisi, L.-P., Evaniew, N., Bhandari, M., & Ghert, M. (June, 2016). Retractions in orthopaedic research. A systematic review. *Bone & Joint Research*, 5(6), 263-268. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1302/2046-3758.56.BJR-2016-0047>