

**Editorial**

**Cómo citar:** Canchola-González, J.A., Medina-Zuta, P., & Baron Velandía, B. (2023). Scientific Integrity in Educational Research Processes. *PRA*, 23(35), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.26620/uniminuto.praxis.23.35.2023.1-4>

**ISSN:** 0124-1494

**eISSN:** 2590-8200

**Editorial:** Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios - UNIMINUTO

**Recibido:** 5 enero 2023

**Aceptado:** 10 febrero 2023

**Publicado:** 2 agosto 2023

**Conflicto de intereses:** los autores han declarado que no existen intereses en competencia.

**José Antonio Canchola González**

Tecnológico de Monterrey  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2964-6097>  
antonio.canchola.ed@gmail.com  
México

**Patricia Medina Zuta**

Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola.  
Lima, Perú.  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6315-9356>  
patricia.medina@epg.usil.pe  
Perú

**Benjamín Barón-Velandía**

Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios - UNIMINUTO  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4968-6336>  
bbaron@uniminuto.edu  
Colombia



# Scientific Integrity in Educational Research Processes

## Scientific Integrity in Educational Research Processes

The academic and scientific community must conduct research with the accountability, ethics, truthfulness, integrity, and respect that is necessary. The omission or lack of academic integrity on the part of researchers is influenced by several variables: key abilities, such as those required for finding, choosing, and validating trustworthy sources of information to enable the creation of scientific articles.

On the other hand, educational institutions and research-related organizations can have an impact on the development or destruction of academic integrity through a variety of incentive programs for scientific output that support the concept of "publish or perish." They make it quite evident that in the research endeavors of thousands of scholars around the world, academic integrity is simply theoretical and unapplied.

The ease with which scientific articles may now be reviewed, analyzed, and compared to other digital databases allows for the detection of similarities and the absence of references or citations in any work. In order to establish academic integrity among the numerous academic actors participating in research, it is crucial to teach the next generation of researchers and reaffirm with the more seasoned ones the principles, regulations, and resources that are available.

Internationally, the public discussion surrounding academic integrity and ethics in educational research has been prominent in several European nations like Germany, France, and England but has received less attention from other groups of academics, particularly in the Latin American region. In Latin America, incidents of plagiarism, academic dishonesty, or unrecognized similarities in theses, research papers, or documents written by public figures like lawmakers, prime ministers, or even presidents are becoming more and more common.

Given the foregoing, it is necessary to investigate all instances, types, influences, consequences, methods, and recurring practices that support or consolidate academic integrity among those involved in research and scientific production within the Latin American scientific environment. To enhance educational research procedures, a systematic observation with outcomes and proof is required.

## **Moving Toward a Joint Scientific Construction and Transhumanizing Ethic**

The editorial that is being given argues in favor of a general framework that regards ethics as a key tenet of effective investigation. To achieve this goal, it is important to highlight key elements of ethical integrity that are closely related to bioethics as the universality of the common good (UNESCO, 2015), which is pursued through morality's critical role in scientific pursuits.

Based on this assumption, the text emphasizes the need of viewing the creation of knowledge as a means of establishing new theories and bolstering or consolidating those that already exist. This approach entails facing new and indefinite circumstances, seeking to align the logic of integrity with the realization of behaviors and practices geared towards understanding how to be and coexist amid a changing and uncertain context.

As a result of this, the paradox of technological advancement gives rise to the idea of transhumanism (Zuria, 2023) which broadens and calls into question the necessity of a co-construction science based on respect for the subjectivity and individuality of epistemic colleagues. To provide more dependable and consistent answers to the current configurations of innovation, collaborative action is required.

The ethical conundrums that can violate human rights and exacerbate social, political, and economic inequities are getting worse as scientific development develops quickly and quickly (UNESCO, 2019). Power-hungry individuals foster individuality and centralism, which are incompatible with a transhumanizing ethic and obfuscate community consciousness.

Ethics that are transhumanized imply a desire to advance humanity until it has been completely transformed. It recognizes that advancement in science and research has assumed the form of economic hegemony. In other words, a venture whose investors prioritize making a profit over supporting initiatives that benefit the species as a whole (Diéguez, 2017). The moral conundrum encompasses grave repercussions that put humanity's future in jeopardy. Here, the necessity for bioethics becomes urgent.

The challenge for humanity is to improve technologically and scientifically through research without losing its character and nature. Surpassing human capabilities, particularly in the mental and physical realms, is necessary for transhumanism. But what about the benefit that empathy and sensitivity toward others have by their very nature, being able to let go of individualism? As new scientific and technological knowledge is incorporated, the repertoire

of human intelligence becomes broader and more efficient. However, this does not always align with the realm of ethics and consideration for others.

It is emphasized once more that bioethics must place a strong emphasis on treating all members of the human species fairly. However, how can research and technological advancement be properly linked in a transhumanizing culture? How is this possible given that the conceptualization of investigative action still has problems?

## **What is the purpose of scientific publication?**

The advancement of research as well as scientific methods is currently facing difficulties. Unfortunately, everything is frequently limited to the idea of a product, the outcome, which narrows the scope of productivity. The progressive spread of our scientific breakthroughs, as well as modest and important contributions to knowledge, problem-solving, innovation, and creative and cultural productions, should all be considered productive in the genuine meaning of the word.

We are at a fork in the road as researchers because we must face the inevitability of developing knowledge under these circumstances. On the one hand, we can keep up with the regular cycles of scientific investigation and work with local groups to progressively advance new understanding. On the other side, we might be inclined to continue the never-ending dynamic of faster production, which would lead to more erratic and ephemeral study findings. Market demands and measuring indicators that, rather than being merely measures, have assumed the role of judges, deciding what should be explored and what should not, what is seen as science and what is not, are the driving forces behind these outcomes.

In this context, where knowledge production is characterized by speed and impermanence, there are evaluation and accreditation systems that become true transformers of institutional identities. Institutions are coerced into adopting standardized, uniform identities, disregarding their unique processes of maturation and research approaches that have shaped their history and essence.

Going deeper into this notion, the construction of measurement, parameterization, and standardization scenarios, devoid of human considerations and failing to recognize the natural dynamics of intellectual outputs in research, leads researchers to "unethical research practices" as they strive to secure a place in the competitive field of research (Artigas, Et al, 2023). These practices emerge because of foreign phenomena lacking human consciousness and scientific integrity (Torres, 2006).

In parallel with these "unethical research practices," the scientific community has seen new modalities and approaches arise to address imposed limitations and the commercialization of knowledge. The term "Fake Science" has gained popularity, and it describes the production of "scientific" results to serve commercial objectives or manipulate circumstances. Researchers' minds and souls have been captured by this deceptive science, which

has caused them to reverse the goals and purposes of their work and lose sight of the genuine motivations for their efforts.

This "Fake Science" alters people's consciences, led by the Machiavellian notion that "the end justifies the means," leading to unethical research behaviors and acts. For example, the fabrication of fraudulent data, predatory publications, journals, events, misleading indicators, and identity theft, among other behaviors, sell themselves as the solution to tackle the system's issues. Combating these new transgressions inside research collectives is a difficult endeavor, demanding the establishment of support measures to protect the players involved in the research process.

There is a depressing environment in the research community both globally and in Colombia, which is fueling actions and processes that obstruct and muddle the fundamental goal of science, which is to better teaching-learning procedures and living situations. Instead, science is becoming more and more commercialized, reduced to empirical findings, and frequently ignores the core beliefs of research teams or organizations. This is not to argue that research that focuses on outcomes or goods isn't worthwhile. The idea that all science must be limited to a single result or that science's teleology should only center on measurements and metrics, on the other hand, is problematic. These indicators are important because they represent, signal, mark, distinguish, or improve processes, but they shouldn't be taken as the end all be all scientific inquiry (Velandia, 2015).

## Referencias

- Artigas, W., Díaz-Chieng, L. Y., Gómez Arévalos, J. A., Camero Gutiérrez, J. S., & Barón Velandia, B. (2023). Habits of research: five practical contributions to research training. *PRA*, 23(34), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.26620/uniminuto.praxis.23.34.2023.1-9>
- Diéguez, A. (2017). *Transhumanismo: La búsqueda tecnológica del mejoramiento humano*. Herder. Barcelona.
- Zuria, K. (2023). *Transhumanismo y realidades paralelas. Interpelaciones desde la filosofía y la teología*. Universidad Politécnica Salesiana. Quito, Ecuador.
- Unesco (2019). *Normas pioneras para los desafíos éticos de la ciencia, la tecnología y la innovación: liderazgo mundial en la esfera de la bioética y la ética de la ciencia y la tecnología*. [https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000372350\\_spa?posInSet=16&queryId=bbfad4a9-96d3-4a5c-b22c-dbc387574452](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000372350_spa?posInSet=16&queryId=bbfad4a9-96d3-4a5c-b22c-dbc387574452)
- Unesco (2015). *Replantear la educación ¿Hacia un bien común mundial?* <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232697>
- Velandia, B. B. (2015). *Impregnar de nuevos sentidos vitales la educación*. *Praxis Pedagógica*, 15(16), 129-133. <https://doi.org/10.26620/uniminuto.praxis.15.16.2015.129-133>