

From Editor

Currently, we are witnessing a number of processes that demonstrate significant changes in the nature of the scientific community. In particular, I would like to discuss standardization, which is increasingly permeating various aspects of scientific activity. First, this concerns the ways in which scientific results are presented—primarily through articles in scientific journals. There is the so-called AIMRADC model (an acronym for annotation, introduction, methods and materials—the word “materials” is often added when the acronym is expanded—results, discussion, and conclusion). Articles presenting the results of very specific empirical studies were selected as examples. The general idea is to bring the formatting of articles up to the standard of patents. Subjective (i.e., human) elements are gradually disappearing. As a rule, when the relevant requirements are strictly followed, the style also turns out to be quite standard. Which, incidentally, in today’s environment makes it significantly easier for scammers who use AI to write articles. Second, there are a number of requirements that turn the defense of a dissertation into a process that, as a rule, has virtually nothing to do with science. Instead of discussing the scientific results obtained, the discussion centers on the pseudo-problems of whether the work corresponds to a specific scientific discipline and the requirements of that discipline’s guidelines, etc. Incidentally, it is well known that many interesting scientific results have been obtained at the intersection of disciplines. But with this approach, they cannot automatically be defended. Third, at some point, a requirement arose that the number of tasks correspond to the number of novelty points, and that the number of these points correspond to the number of propositions put forward in the defense. The very distinction between novelty points and propositions put forward in the defense is absurd. It is obvious that what is defended is the result obtained through research, and this, in theory, is precisely some new knowledge. Why should the formulation of novelty differ from the formulation of a proposition put forward for defense? And if an interesting scientific result has been obtained, why must it be broken down into separate propositions in accordance with the research questions? A single truly novel scientific result is entirely sufficient for a dissertation. However, several research tasks may have been necessary to obtain it, including an analysis of the existing scientific literature, a refinement of the problem—which may require

the introduction of new concepts or the clarification of existing ones—a rethinking of the subject area, and so on. Fourth, the very fact that all texts are required to undergo plagiarism checks demonstrates the academic community’s persistent suspicion of its own corruption. Yet while the author of a dissertation that contains a significant amount of borrowed text is stripped of their academic degree, authors of articles caught plagiarizing remain fully accepted members of the academic community. Consequently, this community is becoming increasingly corrupt. Fifth, the growing use of AI-powered bots, starting in school, is leading students to get used to passing off AI-generated texts as their own. Of course, such observations are entirely subjective, but they raise questions that compel us to reflect on the future of the scientific community.

