

PREVENTING “NEGATIVE RESPONSES” TO SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATION POLICIES

Argo Pambudi^{1*}

¹Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*E-mail: argo_pambudi@uny.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper aims to reveal the facts about the many “negative responses” to the scientific publication policies of universities in Indonesia in particular, and in developing countries in general. The purpose of the policy is very noble, to improve the performance of academics, to improve the performance of higher education institutions, to ensure the quality of education, and to protect the public from disgraceful practices in the administration of higher education. However, empirical facts and facts from previous research show symptoms that the negative response to the publication policy has damaged the academic order and degraded the reputation of higher education academics in general (Demir, 2018d; Macháček & Srholec, 2021; Kurt, 2018; Simón, 2016; Lukic et al., 2014; Xia, Harmon, Connolly, Donnelly, Anderson, Howard, 2014; Xia, 2015; Knudson, 2014; Gasparyan, Yessirkepov, Diyanova, & Kitas, 2015). This problem does not only occur in the national scope of one country but also occurs in many countries. It even involves international networks in many of these countries. Furthermore, until now there has been no action from the governments in the relevant countries that has countered this negative response. Let alone lost, the negative response of the community is increasing and causing material and non-material losses that are not small. The most worrying result is the damage to the reputation of universities and their products. The initial idea of writing this paper was triggered by many of these problems. Even if there is already a policy from the government to counteract these problems, its implementation has not resulted in improvements as expected.

2. METHODOLOGY

This is a literature study that is equipped with a storytelling method about the experience involved in the process of publishing scientific papers. Selected literature in the form of research articles that are relevant to the topic of this study.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The education policy of the government is very much needed. Through these government policies, directly or indirectly, the government is very powerful in determining the fate of the universities it regulates. The implementation of government policies is expected to be effective in achieving its goals, but the fact is that it often creates new problems that damage the productivity of universities themselves. Since not all government policies are in line with academic ideas and strategies to achieve them in each university. On the other hand, there are community groups, including some from the academic community itself who respond to the government's policy as a business opportunity that exploits the weakness of the government's

policy for their economic gain, without caring that their actions are illegal, violate the law, violate academic ethics, and cause harm. college academic reputation. In the eyes of those who matter, bring huge economic benefits through “fake” academic work. In addition, the issue of legality and legal sanctions is only effective in the scope of one country. Facing the issue of the policy implications of this scientific publication that spreads beyond national borders and becomes an international problem, legal sanctions are powerless.

There are research results which show that the factors causing the negative implications of government policies – in this case, publication policies in universities – are because they are contaminated with neo-liberal values, such as privatization and new public management adopted by many governments in various countries, governance movements, and the rise of international institutions and transnational corporations. Therefore, the interests of academic idealists tend to be neglected, at least not getting the highest priority (Bellamy & Palumbo, 2010; Hambrick, 2002, & Behn, 2001). These are all reasons why government policies tend to be pro-liberal. Behn (2001) argues that government regulations that are considered good in the scope of the bureaucracy tend to be static, do not change from time to time, and are not necessarily compatible when applied in the field (higher education). There is a possibility that it becomes irrelevant because it is eroded by changing times, technological changes, changes in values that develop in society, and various other contributing factors. This is what happens in the implementation of the publication policy of teaching staff and researchers in universities in general.

Publication policy is part of the government's education policy. This policy is a priority because it has broad implications for all lines of higher education management, such as improving the quality of teaching and learning, increasing the quality and quantity of research, and improving the quality of community service. In Indonesia, the Indonesian Ministry of National Education uses data from research publications in reputable international journals to measure the productivity of academic staff and make university rankings. Scientific works published in international journals are also used as a requirement for academic promotions, as an eligibility requirement to obtain research funds from the government and are used for various other purposes. Producing scientific papers published in the indexed international journals of reputable institutions such as Scopus is an absolute obligation among the teaching staff of Indonesian universities. Indonesia is not alone. In Turkey, there is a policy of Ex-post Funding System (EPFS) in academic publishing in 2015. Apart from Indonesia and Turkey, least there are India, Nigeria, Iran, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia that implement a similar publication policy. The question is whether the policy that requires all researchers in universities to publish their scientific work results in improving the quality of higher education? Not always.

Empirically seen, in addition to the expected impact, there is also an unexpected impact. Among the unexpected impacts are the emergence of a negative public response that threatens the reputation, the decline in the professionalism of researchers, and the emergence of derivative problems which of course are counter-productive for the world of education. The results of many studies show that many predatory journals – fake journals – have sprung up en masse to accommodate researchers who have difficulty publishing their research. The results of research by Macháček and Srholec (2021), Serhat Kurt (2018), Demir (2018d) on predatory journals or fake journals may be evidence. At the same time, the results of these studies prove a decline in the quality of the author's academic professionalism. What are the forms of counterfeiting?

Other researchers who also examine the reasons why many researchers publish their work in this predatory journal are Lukic et al. (2014), Xia, Harmon, Connolly, Donnelly, Anderson, Howard (2014), Xia (2015), Knudson (2014), and Gasparyan, Yessirkepov, Diyanova, and Kitas (2015). They found the fact that the results of the study have the same pattern. The essence of the conclusion is that predatory journals present themselves as highly scientific publications and utilize an open access system. This journal promises fast peer review with a short waiting time for publication. But they tend to have fake management agencies or addresses, fake editors, and peer reviews as well. It was clearly stated by the researchers that the managers of these journals took financial benefits under pretenses, they were frauds and polluted this field of science. The reputation of these predatory journals is so bad that it creates the impression to some that all open access journals are of lower quality than paid journals, but not all of them are. Furthermore, the predatory journal claims that they are indexed by a prestigious indexing agency and have a high impact factor. They put up the Scopus and Scimagojr logos. This predatory journal also publishes all kinds of studies – including non-universal scientific studies – to make a big profit, and they pay little attention to scientific problems. There is no specialization in one journal. What's worse is that many researchers are interested and tend to publish their work in this journal. In fact, as Gasparyan et al. (2015) warned, contributions to this predatory journal can jeopardize their professional standing and their affiliated institutions.

Demir (2018d) examines the reasons why many researchers tend to publish their research in predatory journals or fake journals. Turkey, for example, is one of the countries where many researchers publish their research in this predatory journal because they must publish their work in an indexed journal – regardless of quality. Demir's research proves that these countries are ranked in the top ten owners of publications in this predatory journal. Demir's research also shows that most predatory journals are in developing countries. In more detail, Demir examined 735 predatory journals located in 52 countries. The location of most predatory journals in India, followed by the United States, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. After reviewing the overall journals, 82.3% of journals are in developing countries. In 2017, the highest number of researchers who published their work in predatory journals came from India, Nigeria, and Turkey. This result at least supports the results of Simón's (2016) study, which found that the highest number of researchers who published their work in predatory journals – apart from coming from India – also came from Nigeria, followed by Turkey, Botswana, Jordan, Malaysia, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. Demir's study revealed that in 2017, 15.85% of publications in predatory journals were written by researchers from developed countries, and the remaining 84.15% were written by researchers from developing countries. The Turkish researchers interviewed sent their work to predatory journal publishers to pursue academic promotion quickly. The incentive system encourages researchers to publish their work in this predatory journal. Pressure from institutions and the researchers' ignorance – about the procedure for submitting articles to be published – are other potential factors that also encourage these researchers to publish their work in the predatory journal. This is the result of Demir's research (2018d).

Macháček & Srholec (2021) show that during the period 2015 – 2017 it was found that around 17% of articles from Kazakhstan and Indonesia were published in this predatory category journal. Furthermore, Kurt (2018) reveals that one of the many reasons that often cause publications in Scopus indexed journals to be fake is the high pressure from their workplace institutions to publish their scientific works. Threats to researchers are the main

factors that influence the decision of why researchers publish their works in this predatory journal. There are many instant "advantages" for these researchers, but very dangerous for the academic world.

4. CONCLUSION

The results of the study and discussion above can be concluded as follows:

- The policy of publishing scientific papers from the government has a negative response which in turn fosters academic criminal behavior, violates academic ethics, reduces academic professionalism, and endangers the future of the academic world.
- The study found that the negative response to the government's scientific publication policy mostly occurs in developing countries and needs serious attention from influential world-class scientists.
- Because the motivation to gain profits by illegal means is visible, thus ethical, moral issues and the implementation of legal sanctions must be put forward effectively.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author is very grateful to previous researchers who have written reference articles for this study. Also, the authors are very grateful to the committee of the 8th International Conference on Public Policy and Social Science (ICoPS) 2021 for accepting this paper for presentation.

6. REFERENCES

- Behn, R.D. (2001). *Rethinking democratic accountability*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press.
- Bellamy, R., & Palumbo, A. (2010). *Political accountability*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Demir, S. B. (2018b). A mixed-methods study of ex-post funding incentive policy for scholarly publications. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 49(4), 453–476.
- Demir, S. B. (2018a). Scholarly databases under scrutiny. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 1–11.
- Gasparyan, A. Y., Yessirkepov, M., Diyanova, S. N., & Kitars, G. D. (2015). Publishing ethics and predatory practices: A dilemma for all stakeholders of science communication. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 30(8), 1010–1016.
- Hambrick, R. (2002). Rethinking democratic accountability. *Public Integrity*, 4(3), 269–272.
- Knudson, D. (2014). Characteristics of English-language traditional and open access kinesiology and sports journals. *Medicina Sportiva*, 18, 179–184.
- Kurt, S. (2018). Why do authors publish in predatory journals? *Learned Publishing*, 31(2), 141–147.
- Lukić, T., Blesić, I., Basarin, B., Ivanović, B. L., Milošević, D., & Sakulski, D. (2014). Predatory and fake scientific journals/publishers: A global outbreak with the rising trend: A review. *Geographica Pannonica*, 18(3), 69–81.
- Macháček, V., & Srholec, M. (2021). Predatory publishing in Scopus: Evidence on cross-country differences. *Scientometrics*.

- Simón, A. (2016). Pitfalls of predatory journals. *Comprehensive Psychology*, 5, 216522281663169.
- Xia, J. (2015). Predatory journals and their article publishing charges. *Learned Publishing*, 28(1), 69–74.
- Xia, J., Harmon, J. L., Connolly, K. G., Donnelly, R. M., Anderson, M. R., & Howard, H. A. (2014). Who publishes in “predatory” journals? *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(7), 1406–1417.