

# Business

[Business](#)



Section In Dr. Ferric Fang chief editor of Infection and Immunity discovered that his had doctored a lot of papers. Dr. Mori a journalist retracted six of his papers and a couple of scientific journals according to retraction watch dog (Smith, 2011). Dr. Fang teaming up with a fellow editor Dr. Arturo Casadevall found out the retraction was increasing at an alarming rate and was a manifestation of the dysfunctional in the scientific climate. According to the two editors science has become a game of perverse incentives that has led in some cases top scientists to commit acts of misconduct (Zimmer, 2012). In October 2011 the nature journal reported that retractions had increased so much over the last ten years while the number of published papers had just increased by 44%. Similarly in 2010 the medical ethics journal finds out that recent retractions are a mix of honest scientific mistakes and misconduct.

## Section 2

Dr. Fang argues that a lot of journals are online and a lot of wrong information is reaching the audience which might cause harm. A lot of scientists are also publishing a lot of journals in order to survive professionally and to get them into high profile journals. This has made them sometimes to commit misconducts acts in order for them to reach there. The publishing of more and new journal is leading to errors according to Dr. Fang and this could pose a huge harm to the audience of such journals (Zimmer, 2012). Paula Stephen a science economist at the University of Georgia brings forth the pyramid reflection of labs having incentives on lots of graduating students by accommodating them and allowing them to conduct research while neglecting the increasing number of PhD grandaunts produced by the same labs. This has a net effect of overcrowding of the scientific field leading <https://assignbuster.com/business-admission-essay-samples/>

to competition hence resulting in increased number of retractions.

Countries like China, Turkey and South Korea have even gone to an extent of offering cash rewards to scientists who get their papers on high profile journals. The fact that scientists depend on grants from the government and other sources has affected how their promotion takes place. Universities have also gone into debts by erecting better buildings to attract scientists expecting the grants to lay their debts off. All this has led to competition in the scientific world with grants being offered to a section of scientists only.

### Section 3

In order to reduce such competition and the greed portrayed by scientists the rules for rewards should change and Universities should deliberate when to offer prizes. The scientists should be concerned about proving their hypothesis rather than criticizing other scientific works. The grants provided by the government should be evenly distributed amongst the scientists to reduce the competition in the market while at the same time, more watch dogs and trackers should be introduced to put in check the quality and the originality of scientific journals submitted online in order to protect the consumer. The cash rewards offered by countries like China, Turkey and South Korea should be discouraged as they lead to increase in retraction and flooding in the scientific field.

### Works cited

Smith, J. (2011, October 12). Retraction Watch. Retrieved 2012, from Word Press: [www.retractionwatch.wordpress.com](http://www.retractionwatch.wordpress.com)

Zimmer, C. (2012, April 16). The New York Times (science). Retrieved 2012, from A sharp rise in retractions prompts calls for reforms: <http://www.nytimes.com>

<https://assignbuster.com/business-admission-essay-samples/>