Psychological comments

Intelligence, differences, explanations, and other perplexing matters

Thursday, 14 November 2013

My letter to Scientific Dishonesty Minister

Dear Minister Morten Østergaard

I write to you in some alarm, hearing that in Denmark there is a procedure in which your Ministry establishes committees which judge whether a researcher is behaving in a scientifically proper manner, and that these committees may demand the recall of published papers.

The usual practice is to debate these matters in scientific journals, in which critics make their points and the author can make their replies. As part of this process authors may alter their views, correct errors, and provide further explanations and data. Critics may concede that they have misunderstood a point, may alter their criticisms, or may reserve judgment until the finding has been replicated. This may require many exchanges of views, many publications, and many years. As part of this process other researchers gradually come to their own conclusions as to which findings can be relied upon. Typically, arguments about major issues in social science may last for decades.

It is unusual in academic circles for one scholar to accuse another of scientific dishonesty. There is a strong preference for testing one argument against another, and assessing the arguments without attacking the person. When much of what we research is uncertain and subject to different interpretations we need to be respectful of different opinions, particularly when those opinions are opposed to our own preferences and beliefs. We want scientific debates, not religious ones.

Sadly, there are occasions when a researcher fabricates results. When this is suspected then a most careful academic enquiry is carried out, excluding any persons who are known to be involved in arguments with the scholar, and with the accused person being given every opportunity to explain themselves. It is usual for them to have legal representation, and a right of appeal if they can find procedural or evidential flaws in the decision. If such fundamental dishonesty is proved then it is usual for the Journal to withdraw the paper. Their University or Institution may then decide to take disciplinary action against the dishonest author.

In summary, both Journals and Universities have procedures to deal with the rare cases of scientific dishonesty.

Appointing a Committee in a national Ministry seems an unwise and potentially dangerous precedent. Ministers will have to ensure that they appoint experts of very high standing in the very many fields of academic endeavor for which there are scientific journals. That will not be an easy task for any national Ministry since research is now international, and many fields of research are extremely specialized. There is also the problem of ensuring that the committee members are not compromised by prior disagreements and conflicts. Journals usually draw upon an editorial board and a set of agreed reviewers, setting aside any who are known to have an adversarial history as regards the scholar in question. The accused person must have legal representation, and there must be recourse to appeal for procedural and evidential shortcomings.

I now turn to the specific case of Professor Emeritus Helmuth Nyborg. I have not been able to read the conclusions of the committee in your Ministry, because it is published in Danish. Of course, a Danish criminal court would publish its judgment in Danish, but this is an example of the problems which arise when a political and



Search This Blog

Loading...

Follow by Email

Followers

Blog Archive

- **2013** (155)
 - November (10)
 My letter to Scientific Dishonesty Minister
 - Helmuth Nyborg gets Watson'd
 - Crack cocaine and American dreams
 - Is young Woodley down for the count?
 - Have we given the Chinese the keys to the castle?
 - Special Issue of Intelligence: The Flynn Effect Re...
 - Reporters and researchers on crack cocaine
 - IQ and GCSE results in England r=0.81

Bad reporting generates bad arguments

- Flynn effect as a retesting, rulebased gain
- October (20)
- September (17)
- August (23)
- **July** (27)
- ▶ June (12)

legal process is used in science. English is now the language of science. Professor Nyborg publishes in English to an international audience. At the very least, given the impact on international science of your committee, you should have an English language version of the judgment available for all scholars to read. I hope you will be able to provide an official translation promptly. I am particularly interested in finding out how you took evidence and evaluated it, and whom you called to participate in the process. I would have been willing to give evidence.

I have read Professor Nyborg's replies and explanations and although I do not have access to an English version of the conclusions, the judgment of the committee seems extremely strange to me. The authorship issue has been explained by Professor Nyborg. A colleague did not want to be a co-author. This happens. Even more common is a colleague who demands to be a co-author, despite having contributed little apart from access to some data. As you will be aware, there are often disputes about the order of precedence of authors. His disputed reference is to the correct data set, but did not add a simple birth rate calculation which has now been referenced. The Nyborg case is that he did not explicitly state a correction he had applied to birth rate calculations. That can be handled by a published clarification, which has already been done. This happens all the time, and improves our research.

If these judgments were to be applied to research in Denmark and internationally, few scholars would be able to avoid appearing before your committee.

Contrast this with a case in Holland in which a researcher fabricated his results. He was dishonest. Under the usual procedures the university and the journals made that fact known to the academic community. His papers have been investigated and are no longer relied upon by scholars.

I hope you will abandon your current structure, withdraw these inappropriate interventions, and not determine scholastic debates by recourse to Ministerial committees.



1 comment:

Andrew Sabisky 14 November 2013 11:40

My version read as follows:

Dear Minister Østergaard

I am writing to protest the treatment of Dr Helmuth Nyborg by one of your department's committees for scientific dishonesty. It is abundantly clear that Dr Nyborg is being repeatedly raked over the coals not for any scientific dishonesty or even any serious unwitting errors - he is patently guilty of neither - but for his right-wing political views and research into unpopular topics such as dysgenics.

Academics should be free to sort out their disputes in the relevant forums, such the renowned journals in which Dr Nyborg frequently publishes. If he is demonstrably mistaken about the empirical questions that he addresses in his research, the scientific community will swiftly make this known. State committees reminiscent of the Inquisition should play no part in this process. Such disgraceful nonsense leaves Denmark's reputation as a nation of liberty severely damaged and casts a shadow over ever-threatened academic freedom worldwide.

I ask that the condemnation of Dr Nyborg be published in English and promptly reconsidered by your department. I also ask that in future such fraudulent investigations of researchers cease, and that the scientific process be allowed to function as it normally does. State direction of research is sure precursor of intellectual sterility and death, if history is anything to go by.

Yours sincerely,

- May (20)
- April (11)
- March (7)
- ► February (3)
- January (5)
- 2012 (12)
- 2009 (4)

About Me



View my complete profile

8 James Thompson

Share It

Popular Posts

Flynn effect as a retesting, rule-based gain

It is very good to see a paper which takes a large scale effect, the secular rise in intelligence test results, and links it to an intriguin...



All you ever wanted to know about intelligence (but were too bright to ask) Part 1

There is a recently published Primer in Current Biology on Intelligence written by Ian Deary, which is hidden behind a paywall, lest it...



Are girls too normal? Sex differences in intelligence

Here is a snapshot from Ian Deary's lecture "Ten Quite Interesting

Things About Intelligence Test Scores" (Teaching Intelligence http://...

Bad reporting generates bad arguments

The Sunday Times gets 3.5 million readers a week. Anything mentioned in it has a chance of influencing public understanding and opinion i...

Give me a child until he is seven, and I will give you the man

(This nostrum, attributed to St. Francis Xavier, also works for girls and women, though separate equations are required, because of int...

Heritability estimates and the analysis of variance

Psycl

ological comments: My letter to Scientific Dishonesty Minister	
Andrew Sabisky Reply	This is a note about heritability estimates and the analysis of variance, but if you want the inessential background, Dominic Cummings has
Add comment	Genetics made very simple There is a code which, properly interpreted and implemented, serves as a blueprint for living things, and is required for all living, reprod All you ever wanted to know about intelligence (but were too bright to
	ask) Part 4 final Finally, Deary goes on to discuss the "so-named Flynn effect, whereby the absolute scores on intelligence tests have been rising since te
Comment as:	England r=0.81 A reader (Panjoomby) commenting on the previous post asked a
	Have we given the Chinese the keys to the castle? http://www.isironline.org/meeting/
	I hope we know what we are doing. The genetic material of several hundred highly intelligent people in t
Home Old Subscribe to: Post Comments (Atom)	er Post
Popular Posts Flynn effect as a retesting, rule-based gain It is very good to see a paper which takes a large scale effect, the secular rise in int	telligence test results, and links it to an intriguin
All you ever wanted to know about intelligence (but were too bright the paywall, lest it	o ask) Part 1
Jason Richwine and a bottle of Rich Wine One of the pleasures of taking a break in France is that when you "French Google	" (an enquiry after meaning, not a sexual position) the
Are girls too normal? Sex differences in intelligence Here is a snapshot from Ian Deary's lecture "Ten Quite Interesting" Intelligence http://	Things About Intelligence Test Scores" (Teaching
Give me a child until he is seven, and I will give you the man (This nostrum, attributed to St. Francis Xavier, also works for girls and women, t	though separate equations are required, because of int
ORIGINAL PAPER: "A response to Prof Rabbitt – The Victorians were still cleverer than us" by Woodley, te Nijenhuis and Murphy A response to Prof Rabbitt – The Victorians were still cleverer than us By Michael Woodley, Jan te Nijenhuis, and Raegan Murphy Prof	
Jason Richwine, and an unclaimed bottle of rich wine Unaccountably, no-one has taken up my challenge issued on 10th May of this yea	ar. "So here is the challenge: a bottle of fine French win

ORIGINAL PAPER: Strong genetic influence on a UK nationwide test of educational achievement at the end of compulsory education at age 16

Yesterday I was able to post an item, "We mustn't label children, or educationalists" about a particular piece of research on the heritab...

Maths is a man thing*

We have talked about greater male variability before, http://drjamesthompson.blogspot.co.uk/2013/09/are-girls-too-normal-sex-

Psychological comments: My letter to Scientific Dishonesty Minister

