

**How and what do they measure us for?**  
**Critical reflection on the Publindex measurement process - Colciencias**  
**for scientific journals in Colombia**

**Editorial**

Yuliana Gómez Zapata\*  
Editorial Director

In the midst of multiple academic discussions, we have shared positions and opinions regarding the measurement process carried out by the Administrative Department of Science, Technology and Innovation - Colciencias through the National Bibliographic Index - IBN Publindex, therefore, some journals that generate knowledge and peripheral science We find it harmful to the institutional interests of dissemination of scientific knowledge.

Publicly questioning the measurement method of scientific journals in Colombia is not a new or “impact” issue for the generation of science in Colombia, but it does warn of a sociologically pathogenic behavior regarding the interests of scientific groups that propose thinking from our context and under the resolution of our own problems (Gómez, 2017, p.42), by privileging bibliometric logic over the public utility of knowledge.

Like Professor Yuri Jack Gómez (2018), I believe that there is a very deep misunderstanding in the country about the processes of measurement of quality indicators that support the model proposed by Colciencias for the categorization of scientific journals in Colombia, because “(...) Formulates science policies whose social and cultural consequences are overlooked by confusing the indicator with policy goals” (p.273).

---

\* Editorial Director of the journal In-Context. Public accountant and MSc. in Accounting. Member of the Colombian network of editors and accounting Journals – REDITORES. Research professor of Tecnológico de Antioquia, Medellín – Colombia.  
ygomezza@tdea.edu.co  
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4134-4056>

This form of measurement that privileges the number of citations the written text has instead of the contribution that is written for the communities that support the discussion regarding the social appropriation of scientific knowledge<sup>2</sup>, from social innovations, the generation of organizational improvements, the transfer of technology for the resolution of own problems, among others. We are a bit stuck in the dynamics of academic productivity, not necessarily of quality, but with good impact indicators.

There are academic-scientific journals in our country and, particularly, in Economic Sciences that have excellent editorial quality processes, which have defined editorial management models worthy of being visible and replicated by other editorial projects, which have self-critically assumed their place and that have developed improvement plans so that their publication is visible, transparent, ethical and reliable - possibly even without having “quality” criteria - and, in the best case, to become part of the Creole academic elite.

However, these processes of continuous improvement, linking in Latin American public<sup>3</sup> recognition databases, compliance with the times in the publication, the elimination of inbreeding, cooperation with other publishing and research centers for the strengthening of the committees publishers and others, do not reach for the SNCTI in Colombia to recognize the journals for their value and contribution to the scientific communities with which they work, but for the number of times they cite them, when this, in concrete terms, says nothing

We want to publish in top-level journals known as Q1 and Q2 of Web of Science or SCOPUS, we want to have the recognition capacity in those communities without having the cultural and symbolic capital that is required for those communities to assign you a space. The problem is not to publish in these journals - not even more - the problem is to believe that those that are not “at their level” have no quality and worse, that you can not participate in the cake arranged by who directs the policy public of science and technology in Colombia.

Calling attention to this issue is of vital importance, since the editorial boards of the journals and the institutional directives wear out all the administrative and financial time to have quality academic and scientific products that will help someone to solve their specific problems, but also so that this work is recognized for the national policy guidelines on which we work innocuously.

<sup>2</sup> Intentionality of the Colciencias model for the measurement of research groups and researchers.

<sup>3</sup> We are talking about editorial developments located and contextualized.

We have an enormous commitment from the directions of these editorial processes, where we are able to recognize our contribution to the construction of a nation, of scientific knowledge, with difficulties and successes, but with academic dignity. This editorial is an invitation to recognize our work from scientific journals, to strengthen our actions for the sake of public and open knowledge, and to understand that the guidelines for national measurement of scientific journals are wrong, since the way in which the bottom line, the indicator cannot be more important than the policy.

## References

Gómez, Y. (2017). La investigación y las publicaciones: un reto para el presupuesto nacional. *En-Contexto*, 5(7), 41-43.

Gómez-Morales, Y. (2018). Abuso de las medidas y medidas abusivas. Crítica al pensamiento bibliométrico hegemónico. *Anuario Colombiano de Historia Social y de la Cultura*, 45(1), 269-290.

## To cite this article:

Gómez-Zapata, Y. (2019). How and what do they measure us for? Critical reflection on the Publindex measurement process - Colciencias for scientific journals in Colombia. *En-Contexto*, 7(11), 39-41.

