



Evaluation of Scientific Outputs with a Focus on Mass Communication – A Case Study from Slovakia

Extended Book Review/Discussion Paper

Andrej Škol kay

The School of Communication and Media in Bratislava

askolkay@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-8445-0580

ABSTRACT

The analytical-polemical extended book review loosely follows the earlier polemic initiated in the Czech journal *Filosofický časopis* and complements the descriptive contribution published in the Slovak journal *Otázky žurnalistiky*. In this way the issue of evaluating scientific outputs is being transferred in the form of a *pars pro toto* analysis to the field of journalism and mass media research, or mass communication. The main issues of the original discussion, which is relevant globally, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe, were: who is responsible for (in many cases) the problematic current state of sciences, in particular, social sciences, and how should we evaluate (and categorise) the outputs of scientists. This contribution argues that the root of the problem is not neo-liberalism (or, for that matter, its twin – capitalism), but the often dysfunctional and, in many cases, largely formal system of (self-)evaluation of scientific outputs. Therefore, the solution lies in carrying out any chosen method of evaluating scientific outputs in a meaningful way. This also means application of a combination of assessment of academic outputs (i.e. use at least two of many appropriate assessment approaches simultaneously). Using the example of output from the field of mass media or mass communication, it is shown that only quantitative reporting of academic outputs ('metrics') is not sufficient. Moreover, only in the qualitative evaluation there is present the criterion of the usefulness of scientific outputs for society that should be taken into account. At the same time, in this way the statistical method of reporting scientific activity retrospectively is verified. In the end, this combined approach will also answer whether it makes sense for the society to finance any research or publication activity down to the level of a particular researcher. In this context, the contribution points to the problematic scientific and pedagogical value, and generally low social value, of a specific

output in the field of the philosophy of communication, claimed to be a ‘scientific monograph’ originally intended as a theoretical guide for scientific research in the given area.

KEYWORDS

communication, ethics, research, neoliberalism, output assessment

The Czech philosopher Jaroslav Peregrin (2022) initiated a short but important discussion with his book review in the Czech journal *Filosofický časopis* (Journal of Philosophy) about the methods and significance of evaluating scientific outputs, not only in philosophy. The Czech philosopher Martin Profant (2023) and the Slovak philosopher Emil Višňovský (2023) also participated in the discussion in *Filosofický časopis*. The discussion had two basic motives – first, whether neo-liberalism is responsible for, or at least negatively affects, the current state of science by creating pressure to perform (publish or perish imperative). Second, the discussion naturally focused on how we should evaluate the output of scientists. Peregrin mentioned three basic approaches: the evaluation of scientists by other scientists, the use of external criteria considering the usefulness of science to society, and statistical or quantitative indicators. Of course, there are significantly more approaches to evaluating scientific outputs (c.f. Hudecová, 2022).

This discussion paper, an extended book review, attempts to build on this debate in the context of journalism and media communication research. The discussion on this topic further tackles one of the parameters of the evaluation of science, which the discussant Profant found problematic in practical usage. Namely, the question whether it is possible and appropriate to take into account the utility of science for society, especially when considering its perspective funding based on past or recent performance (outcome). This question will (also) be answered by this extended book review.

The discussed topic also follows and expands on the contribution by lecturer in journalism, Ján Hacek (2022). His contribution was published in journal *Otázky žurnalistiky* (Journalism Issues) and focused on the education of journalists-to-be (students of journalism) in Slovakia. His paper summarised the institutions of higher education that are involved in education of students of journalism and mass communication in Slovakia. Although this is useful overview, it is clear that education is closely related to, and in fact depends on, the quality of information and knowledge produced or used by teachers. However, this important aspect was missing in Hacek’s (2022) study.

This analytical-polemical discussion, primarily based on a review of an allegedly scientific monograph focused on the philosophy of (mass) communication, will show that the solution to the problem is actually simple: to carry out any chosen method of evaluating scientific outputs meaningfully—professionally, seriously, and ultimately ethically. Since this approach is not always possible, and cannot be guaranteed in all contexts, it is ultimately necessary to apply a combination of the assessment methods for academic outputs as suggested by Peregrin (2022)—that is, to use at least two of the several available approaches simultaneously.

A published so-called scientific monograph in the field as an example, it will be shown that this combined assessment approach also considers the criterion of the usefulness of scientific outputs for society. At the same time, the statistical method of reporting scientific activity is verified. In the final analysis, this approach will also determine whether it makes sense for society (including private legal entities) to finance any research or publication activity, down

to the level of a specific researcher. This *pars pro toto* proof will be conducted on the review of the publication *Filozofické kontexty komunikácie* (Philosophic Contexts of Communication) (2021b) written by Ľudovít Hajduk. Ľudovít Hajduk is a professor, and guarantor of studies at a university, so he should produce the highest quality in the field of science or publish otherwise useful manuals for students. At the same time, the chosen topic of the peer-reviewed article fits into the focus of the academic journal. This, in turn, allows a specific audience to expertly assess the objections raised against the peer-reviewed publication.

Before I proceed to provide a proof, it should be specified that Martin Profant questioned the meaningfulness of self-evaluation of scientific achievements by scientists themselves only in the specific case of using such outputs for “reasonable administrative decision-making about which fields and research teams to give more or less money to” (Profant, 2023, p. 170). Profant did not question the importance of mutual self-evaluation of scientific outputs within the scientific community. However, as I have already stated, such an assessment can be very useful, and in some cases even necessary, for administrative decision-making regarding the allocation of resources.

In the case of statistics, according to Profant, “Metrics represent an extremely important information source that has multiple uses. However, it is precisely in assessment linked to the allocation of public support or career advancement that their use requires great prudence” (Profant, 2023, p. 171). Indeed, I will show with examples that “metrics” can be useful, but sometimes they are also very misleading. That is why it is necessary to combine two approaches in the evaluation of scientific outputs—at least until proper self-regulation takes place. It is also important that the mutual, meaningful evaluation of academic outputs by scientists is used and subsequently considered not only in the funding of science and scientists, but also in their career advancements. The opposite approach leads to the inflation of redundant (qualitatively equal or even better publications already exist) and/or low-quality publications (e.g., publications that are inappropriately structured or contain inaccurate, false, or outdated information/knowledge). But let us first discuss why all this matters.

The importance of quality science

It is generally accepted that the purpose of science, succinctly and positively stated, is to produce new or updated knowledge as accurately as possible. Negatively stated, the mission of reviewers and editors is to prevent imprecise and untrue statements from being disseminated as scientific knowledge. It is therefore obvious that critical reviews are an essential part of the process of producing and verifying scientific knowledge. In this context, it is noteworthy that the editors of both philosophy journals (*Filozofia*, *Filosofický časopis*), as well as the editors of *Otázky žurnalistiky*, refused to publish earlier versions of this extended book review. The reasons were “the text is too subjective” (*Otázky žurnalistiky*), “the discussion was closed” (*Filosofický časopis*), and, perhaps most surprisingly (considering the journal’s focus) no reason was given (*Filozofia*).

Since one line of discussion in the *Filosofický časopis* considered the way, purpose, and possibility of evaluating the usefulness of intellectual outputs for society, it is appropriate first to point out that education and creativity are the key to competitiveness in a globalized world (Chan, 2023). There still seems to be room for improvement, especially within the social sciences. For example, according to the Intelligence Capital Index (ICI), Slovakia was ranked 37th out of 128 countries. All of Slovakia’s neighbors performed better, except for Ukraine (Chan, 2023). Yet it is questionable to what extent these data reflect reality, since they must necessarily have been based on quantitative data. As mentioned, quantitative data may be misleading. Be that as

it may, it is obvious that the abundance of dubious publications does not contribute to education or creativity, or knowledge in general. For example, it is questionable how someone can publish dozens of scientific papers each year (Horák, 2023). The overall weak qualitative level of Slovak sciences is also indicated by the official reports (ÚHP MF SR & IVP MŠVVaŠ SR, 2017). In principle, states the 2017 official report: “Performance funding criteria, (on which depends) distribution of majority resources, poorly distinguish the quality of outputs” (p. 47, see more at pp. 46–49). The latest government analytical and evaluation report recommends, among other measures, more intensive publication in prestigious journals and remuneration (which should be indeed a standard) for achieved results (Kollár, Rimegová, & Siekierzynska, 2023). In this context, a reasonable expectation arises – that society (and the state) should require scientists also to take into account the meaningfulness and efficiency of their activities. In other words, for knowledge we need reliable analyses, which at the same time should not be unnecessarily duplicated or redundant. This has both economic and ethical dimensions. We will see that, in practice we find unreliable (low-quality) analyses, which also discuss issues that have been addressed many times by various authors over the past decades. Moreover, these issues or topics, as presented in the next paragraph, hardly can be seen as the key theories or methodologies used in researching philosophy of communication, or for communication research in general.

Hermeneutics and phenomenology as a systematic review of the philosophy of communication?

The title of Professor Hajduk’s publication *Philosophical contexts of communication* (2021b) is so all-encompassing that it can cover almost everything within philosophy and communication. At the same time, the physical scope of the publication excludes any deeper descriptive, pedagogical, or analytical scope. The author states that he will deal with “philosophical contexts of communication research” (Hajduk, 2021, p. 4). The author refined and expanded this assignment later on, stating the intention to “systematise basic philosophical and theoretical knowledge in the preparation and reflection of one’s own communication research” (Hajduk, 2021, p. 6). Unfortunately, as we shall see, this ambitious goal was not achieved.

The brochure—PDF—has approximately 50 pages. Officially, 66 pages are listed, which formally fulfills the local criteria of a scientific (mini)monograph. However, I believe that this minimum scope of the monograph was originally intended or topics that require such brevity—such as some natural sciences. For social sciences and humanities, 60 pages for a scientific monograph is in principle not enough. After all, even a doctoral thesis (PhD) must be several times larger in scope. This is the first fundamental problem with the publication. An expert is aware that it is not possible, without compromising in sometimes necessary details, to systematize basic philosophical and theoretical knowledge in the chosen field in 60 pages. As will be shown further, we have identified and cited publications in this field that are a few hundred pages in length.

The text is divided into *Introduction, Philosophical foundations of communication, Hermeneutics as a method of philosophy, Discursive-ethical challenge of philosophy, Phenomenological context of communication, Conclusion and List of bibliographic references*.

Under the title *Philosophical foundations of communication* the author includes only hermeneutics. That’s a very narrow focus. Individual philosophical schools are missing, for example: structuralism and semiology (F. de Saussure, respectively C.S. Peirce), discourse theory (M. Foucault), sign theory (U. Eco), deconstructivism (J. Derrida), speech act theory (J.L. Austin), communicative intention from the point of view of language and the later theory of communicative maxims (H.P. Grice), or the theory of linguistic expression (J. Searle).

Habermas is mentioned later, but in the context of hermeneutics.

Professor Hajduk (or any other author) could and possibly should also mention Vilém Flusser, a media scholar/philosopher originally from Czechoslovakia. Flusser was discussed locally by, for example, Miroslav Marcelli (n.d.), or Kateřina Krtilová (n.d.). Flusser's book was published in the Slovak language already in 2002 – although, obviously, posthumously. Similarly, among Slovak authors, it would be appropriate to mention Ivan Stadtrucker and his *Theory of Mass Media (Dis)communication* (2007), or translation of work by Polish autor Karol Jakubowicz—*New Media Ecology* (2013)—published locally (in Slovakia) in the year of his death.

Other interesting names and theories from the perspective of the philosophy of communication can be found in the anthology edited by Bystřický (2014), the special issue *Media and method* of the journal *Teorie vědy* (2003, no. 2), and in no. 2 *Teorie vědy* from the 2004 year (topic *Archeology of Interactivity*).

The limited scope of the reviewed publication continues again with hermeneutics in the chapter “Hermeneutics as a method of philosophy.” Habermas's “critical theory” is also mentioned in two sentences in this part (p. 26). Later, in the section “Discursive-ethical challenge of philosophy”, the author also returns to Habermas, whom he considers to be the founder and creator of discursive ethics as well as the creator of the “theory of communicative action” (p. 30).

Derrida is also briefly mentioned in the chapter *Hermeneutics as a method of philosophy*, but still in the context of hermeneutics (p. 28). One can wonder why, for example, articles in the magazine *Kritika & Kontext* (3/4, 1999), some of which sharply criticize Derrida's philosophy, were not mentioned here (see <https://kritika.sk>). Moreover, several surprisingly brief studies (including book reviews) on the topic of hermeneutics were also published in the magazine *Filozofia*: by Šíp (2010), Fridmanová (2007), Gadamer (2000), Novosád (1979, 1994), Bilasová (1986). Be that as it may, the basic systematic overview promised by the author is missing. It is not logically and economically justified why it was necessary (given the omission of other topics – theories or schools and theorists) to discuss in so much detail only hermeneutics, when there are numerous local and certainly more developed works on this topic. For example, there is a well-developed 12-page *Methodology sheet for teaching selected philosophical topics through problems* by Branislav Malík (n.d.) or a book publication by Nemeč (2016). These publications are not mentioned by Professor Hajduk.

The chapter “The Discursive-Ethical Challenge of Philosophy” is almost entirely devoted to Habermas's ideas. This chapter ends with reflections on communitarianism.

The section *The Phenomenological Context of Communication* primarily addresses Husserl's interpretation of phenomenology and the theory of intentionality. Again, what is the point of this extensive section when dozens of articles and books on this topic are available in Slovak, Czech, or other languages? One can mention Vydrová's textbook (2020), which is freely available on the Internet, or her more extensive monograph from 2010(a). Both publications not only systematically analyse Husserl's ideas, but also provide numerous references to related literature.

The magazine *Kritika & Kontext* devoted an entire issue (no. 58) to Husserl's ideas (see [https://kritika.sk/#document\(58\)](https://kritika.sk/#document(58))). The magazine *Filozofia* published reflections and analyses on this topic by Leško (2021), Sivák (2020), Vydrová (2010b) and more than 20 (!) other contributions. *Filosofický časopis* devoted himself to Husserl's phenomenological method already in 1965 (!) (vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 214–227). More recently, the Czech author Pechar wrote a book of more than 400 pages on this topic in 2007. Professor Hajduk did not mention other domestic works directly related to the topic, such as Gálik's hundred-page publication *Philosophy and Media* (2012) or Sámelová's contribution (2014). Is it really acceptable that the author doesn't review what Czech and Slovak authors have already written on the given topic? Or is it really sufficient to

mention a more generalist publication *History of philosophy* by V. Leško, F. Mihina, et al. (Iris, Bratislava, 1999) in the bibliography? Or does science, but also the creation of textbooks, rather function (should function) on the principle of critical evaluation of previous knowledge? It is true that sometimes we find these sources in less known publications (see e.g. Gregušová, 2005). I also realize that the chosen scope (size of the monograph) precluded either a more detailed analysis or a thorough overview. But the author set such a goal for himself. It is of little surprise that Professor Hajduk also ignored more recent relevant foreign monographs on this topic, e.g. by Krämer (2015), Hassan and Sutherland (2017) as well as, for example, their bibliographical selection in Bencherki and Cooren (2019). It goes without saying that attention should also have been paid to newer works on the relationship between philosophy and social media, such as those by Qi, Monod, Binxing, and Deng (2018), or on philosophy and AI, such as by Schiaffonati (2003) and Coeckelbergh (2022).

Publication aimed for statistical reporting – or what happens when metrics/statistics dominate the evaluation of scientific output

The reviewed publication primarily discusses hermeneutics, followed by Habermas' and Husserl's ideas, i.e. mainly phenomenology. This reflects how Professor Hajduk narrowly understands the philosophical contexts of communication. It is evident that he did not fulfill his own goal to systematize basic philosophical and theoretical knowledge in the preparation and reflection of communication research. It is also important to state, and this is a deep paradox, that neither hermeneutics nor phenomenology are rarely, if ever, used under these labels in contemporary scientific communication research. This can be proven by examining the use of key categories of communication research methodologies through summary (overview) studies using bibliometrics. In this case, bibliometrics is a useful tool. For example, one bibliometric study divided applied methodology within professional communication journals into qualitative and quantitative approaches only (Castillo & Carretón, 2010). Another bibliometric study used four criteria for the basic division of methodologies within professional journals focused on communication: comparative, 'descriptive, applied and theoretical' (Catillo-Esparcia, Rubio-Moraga, & Almansa-Martínez, 2012). It is evident that neither hermeneutics nor phenomenology are referenced here.

All the findings related to the writing, quasi-publication (the publication does not exist as a hard copy) and *de facto* non-availability of this e-brochure (e-brochure is banned from dissemination) (as well as at least one other so-called scientific monograph) to the professional public lead to the conclusion that the sole purpose of the peer-reviewed publication was to fulfill the maximum goal with the least possible effort—to formally produce a so-called scientific monograph. The quality, originality, usefulness, and potential further pedagogical or scientific use were obviously unimportant parameters. This is documented by the minimal scope of the publication, the identified typos, and the general and limited content, where the promised systematization of the basic philosophical and theoretical knowledge necessary for the preparation and reflection of communication research is completely absent. As already mentioned, the publication lacks more recent or—with exceptions—older relevant locally published works. The latest world trends, theories, and findings are completely missing. In the case of some works listed in the list of references—such as “Benco, J., *Metodológia vedeckého výskumu (Methodology of scientific research)*, Bratislava: IRIS, 2001, 194 p.”, or “Holina, V., *Zmeny mediálneho prostredia (sociologický aspekt) (Changes in the media environment (sociological aspect))*, Bratislava: NCMK, 1998”—we do not find specific citations or acknowledged paraphrasing of these (and some other) works. How can this be interpreted? Did the author list them only formally?

Or did he not bother quoting or paraphrasing these works? Both possible alternatives present an ethical problem. At the time of writing the first version of this contribution (April 2023), the publication's futility is also evidenced by its physical unavailability (despite the reported 100 hard copies issued) either in the publisher's library (which, paradoxically, was also in charge of the "distribution" of this output), or in the Slovak National Library (which by law must receive a copy). This was about two years after its official-formal publication announcement. As mentioned, the electronic version (PDF) may not be officially distributed without the prior consent of the author.

Indeed, we face similar ethical and professional challenges in some of Professor Hajduk's other publications. For example, there is an equally, if not more, problematic publication by Hajduk from the same year, 2021(a). Moreover, there are two publications claimed to be published in Serbia (Hajduk, 2015a, 2015b). In fact, there is a Slovak ISBN, and the alleged Serbian publisher Visoka škola zdravstva i socijalnog rada Svete Elizabete is actually a 'consultation center' of Slovak Higher Educational and Social Work Institute of Saint Elisabeth (Vysoká škola zdravotníctva a sociálnej práce sv. Alžbety) in Bratislava (where the author worked about that time). It can be assumed that we would encounter similar problematic findings in a number of other works, especially the so-called scientific monographs, produced by Professor Hajduk.

Is neo-liberalism really to blame for everything?

These findings lead us to address the question raised by the discussion in the *Filosofický časopis*: what is the impact of neoliberalism (or capitalism) on science in the Czech Republic and Slovakia and elsewhere. At first glance, the mentioned findings support the thesis about the negative impact of neoliberalism/capitalism on science in the examined case. However, there is a different situation in the Czech Republic (and other countries with prevailing neo-liberalism/capitalism, e.g., in the USA), where real scientific monographs are published in the field.

Ultimately, even occasional criticism (with frequency being an important parameter) raised by Peregrin (2022) suggests that the problem is not caused by neoliberalism or capitalism. Even within Slovakia, we find opinions such as "Our academics have a comfortable life" (professor Bátora in Folentová, 2016).

The problem lies in the damaged scientific and ethical integrity of an individual (or several individuals, including reviewers and editors) and the missing or dysfunctional system of quality control of academic outputs at the Pan-European University (and perhaps in Slovakia as a whole, though probably less so in the Czech Republic). Given that Professor Hajduk announces (directly in the introduction of his publications) that he is the so-called guarantor of education at the Faculty of Mass Media at the Pan-European University and has worked as vice-rector for research, science, and grant policy, as well as chairman of the specialised committee (in his field), guarantor for doctoral studies, and overseer of habilitation and appointment procedures in the field of Media and Communication Studies at the Faculty of Mass Media of the Pan-European University, the identified situation takes on a vicious cycle and absurd dimension (see <https://www.paneurouni.com/kontakty-masmedii/doc-phdr-ludovit-hajduk-phd-3>).

As I already mentioned, the discussion in the *Filosofický časopis* also touched on another topic—the method of evaluating science. Indeed, it turns out that solely quantitative assessment of academic outputs, without adequate internalized ethics and/or effective external or internal publication quality control, can lead to the inflation of dubious and ultimately useless publication outputs.

It is worthy citing Peregrin (2022, 609) who wrote: "Let's imagine that someone told us that somewhere there is a research institute, the results of which are publications that it publishes itself

and that it itself evaluates as excellent. We would probably doubt the meaning of this institute very much.” This is essentially the case with more than one peer-reviewed publication: the author publishes them through his employer, and one of the two reviewers is his colleague.

Conclusion – possible solutions

Problems have been identified, and possible solutions follow from them. Academics, officials, and academic supervisory bodies can and should show adequate activity. However, we cannot solely blame the state and demand intervention only from the state. The state has initiated significant activities towards the evaluation of creative outputs of universities in recent years. We also have the first results from the planned periodic evaluations of Slovak public universities, including in the field of mass media and communication sciences, for the years 2014–2019 (MŠ, 2023). Considering the findings here, one can doubt their representativeness, respectively their validity and reliability. In any case, it is a mistake for private colleges to remain out of the picture. A legitimate question then is, how do other responsible persons (individuals or institutions) fulfill their obligations? For example, what does the scientific council of a faculty or university do (what functions does it perform)? How seriously did the reviewers evaluate the reviewed publication? How closely do colleagues monitor the production of their ‘guarantor’? We observe a violation of the basic principles established in the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity: reliability, honesty, respect and responsibility.

Apparently, neo-liberalism or capitalism as such is not a problem either. It would be sufficient to produce less, but of high quality. For example, instead of two ostensibly “scientific” and ostensibly (formally) “monographs” produced annually, the goal could be to produce one useful monograph of several hundred pages once every three to four years. Alternatively, it would sometimes be completely sufficient to use foreign publications (especially in Czech, either originals or translations, for example a book by McChesney (2009), or directly in English, for example a reader by Changa and Butchart (2012), or produce their translations into local language. Today, artificial intelligence (AI) (e.g., DeepL) can do the translation in a fraction of the time. The final editing of such a text, requiring the cooperation of an expert in Slovak and the given topic, would no longer be very demanding in terms of time and expertise. Even today, with the help of AI, we should already be able to write a 60-page “scientific monograph” in the style of Professor Hajduk in a few days (in parts, with a subsequent expert check, and with the addition of extra sentences either formally recognized or with the help of ‘informal’ links to used sources). The result would perhaps have fewer errors, a better structure, and a larger number of current sources than in Professor Hajduk’s monographic works (c.f. Hosseini, Rasmussen, & Resnik, 2023; Herbold, Hautli-Janisz, Heuer, Kikteva, & Trautsch, 2023). The first local experiments proved that this is possible to achieve (c.f. Hoferek, 2024).

The so-called real socialism brought the ideologization of science—the so-called ‘scientific communism’. At the same time, as in other areas, performance could not always be compared to less ideological and less egalitarian politico-economic systems. Liberal democracy enabled the de-ideologization of science, and the market economy opened up space for performance-based evaluation. However, in the absence of the required level of ethics (or due to the diversity of characters, or due to human nature), there is a lack of functional supervision. This is not a call for extremely strict evaluation always and everywhere. Someone can research something new, and unfortunately, it doesn’t work out. That can happen, and it can be accepted (especially in the natural sciences). In this sense, real science is similar to business, also with an uncertain outcome. But it is obvious that we have to evaluate the student’s output in one way, and the professor—the guarantor—in another way. We see that ‘metrics’ or statistics, and not even some reviewers

or editors, always represent a suitable tool for evaluating scientific outputs. It is also true that the dominant position of some guarantors and professors (in some environments) worsens the functioning of the higher education system.

As Peregrin (2022, p. 612) puts it: “I think that the scientific environment can really prosper only if it is open, i.e., accessible to new ideas and new people, which in turn assumes that those who do not do real science will not stay in it.”

In summary, we found that the guarantor of the study program produced the so-called scientific monograph that is not practically available to the professional public or to students. This monograph does not exist in the form of a printed book, despite a public promise. With effort and luck (the librarian had prior knowledge of the given output), the interested party (especially the reviewer) can obtain an electronic version, which is otherwise officially not allowed to be distributed. At the same time, the monograph does not bring anything new in terms of content – the main topics presented have been researched or rather discussed many times over the decades in both domestic and foreign environments. The author does not consider nearly all these previous texts in his output.

The latest trends/schools and research results are not included at all. The content of the produced text does not correspond to the ambitious task at all. The two key topics discussed in the text (hermeneutics and phenomenology) are not utilized in the basic categorization of research methodologies used in the research of either the philosophy of communication (perhaps only within Slovakia, and a sub-category of philosophers), or mass or mass media communication in general. The author’s other outputs also raise legitimate doubts about ethical behavior and genuine scientific activity. It is obvious that the creation of textbooks or the production of truly scientific works in the field of communication, should be done differently and with other people.

Bibliography

- Bencherki, N., & Cooren, F. (2019). *Philosophy of Communication*. Oxford Bibliographies. <https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780199756841-0123>
- Bilasová, V. (1986). Súčasná filozofická hermeneutika. *Filozofia*, 41(5), 627–629.
- Bystřický, J. et al. (2014). *Mediální moderna: Studie k soudobým formám de-abstrakce a mediality*. Červený Kostelec: Publisher Pavel Mervant.
- Castillo, A., & Carretón, C. (2010). Investigación en Comunicación. Estudio bibliométrico de las Revistas de Comunicación en España. *Comunicación Y Sociedad*, XXIII(2), 289–327.
- Catillo-Esparcia, A., Rubio-Moraga, Á., & Almansa-Martínez, A. (2012). Communication Research. Bibliometric analysis of the most-cited ISI-indexed Journals. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, 067, 247–267.
- Chan, K. L. (2023). *Intelligence Capital Index*. Retrieved June 14, 2023, from http://www.kailchan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/KC_Intelligence-Capital-Index-full-results-and-methodology_Apr-2017_v2.pdf
- Chang, B., & Butchart, G. C. (Eds.). (2012). *Philosophy of Communication*. MIT Press.
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2022). *The Political Philosophy of AI. An Introduction*. Wiley.
- Flusser, V. (2022). *Komunikológia*. Bratislava: Mediálny inštitút.
- Folentová, V. (2016). Nový profesor Bátora: V medzinárodnom výskumnom tíme sú naši vedci intelektuálni otroci. *Denník N*. Retrieved from https://dennikn.sk/467835/novy-profesor-batora-polovicu-vysokych-skol-nas-treba-zrusit/?ref=inc&_ga=2.140315956.644190868.1682483334-586288445.1678200163
- Fridmanová, M. (2007). Hermeneutika živého, A. Kliková – K. Kleisner (eds.), rec. *Filozofia*, 62(7), 645–648.
- Gadamer, H. G. (2000). Sémantika a hermeneutika. *Filozofia*, 55(4), 347–353.
- Gálik, S. (2012). *Filozofia a médiá: k filozofickej reflexii vplyvu médií na utváranie (súčasnej) kultúry*. Bratislava: IRIS.

- Gregušová, S. (2005). Infotainmentizácia mediálneho spravodajstva. *Slovenské divadlo*, 53(4), 315–422.
- Hacek, J. (2022). Vzdelávanie žurnalistov v oblasti médií na Slovensku. *Otázky žurnalistiky*, 65(3–4), 12–20.
- Hajduk, L. (2015a). Between liberal and communitarian understanding of media. In *Media and society [elektronický zdroj]: scientific papers* (pp. 45–49). Bački Petrovac (Serbia): Visoka škola zdravstva i socijalnog rada Svete Elizabete.
- Hajduk, L. (2015b). A contemporary media philosophy. In *Media and society [elektronický zdroj]: scientific papers* (pp. 13–21). Bački Petrovac (Serbia): Visoka škola zdravstva i socijalnog rada Svete Elizabete.
- Hajduk, L. (2021a). *Communication and Media Research*. Bratislava: Paneurópska vysoká škola.
- Hajduk, L. (2021b). *Filozofické kontexty komunikácie*. Bratislava: Paneurópska vysoká škola.
- Hassan, R., & Sutherland, T. (2017). *Philosophy of Media. A Short History of Ideas and Innovations from Socrates to Social Media*. Routledge.
- Herbold, S., Hautli-Janisz, A., Heuer, U., Kikteva, Z., & Trautsch, A. (2023, 24 April). AI, write an essay for me: A large-scale comparison of human-written versus ChatGPT-generated essays. arXiv:2304.14276v1 [cs.CL]. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.14276>
- Hoferek, S. (2024, March 14). Ako som napísal knižku s pomocou umelej inteligencie. [Blog Post]. Retrieved from <https://dennikn.sk/blog/3882145/ako-som-napisal-knizku-s-pomocou-umelej-inteligencie>
- Horák, O. (2023, May 19). Vedeckú prácu vydal každé štyri dni. Podozrenie z plagiátu Mariána Brestiča prešetří etická komisia. *Denník N*. Retrieved June 14, 2023, from <https://dennikn.sk/3371473/vedecku-pracu-vydal-kazde-styri-dni-podozrenie-z-plagiatu-mariana-brestica-presetri-eticka-komisia/?ref=list>
- Hosseini, M., Rasmussen, L. M., & Resnik, D. B. (2023). Using AI to write scholarly publications. *Accountability in Research*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2168535>
- Hudecová, S. (2022). *Hodnotenie vedy a výskumu – viditeľnosť vedy*. Bratislava: CVTISR.
- Jakubowicz, K. (2013). *Nová ekologie médií – Konvergence a mediamorfóza*. VeRBuM.
- Kollár, R., Rimegová, K., & Siekierzynska, O. (2023). *Prečo slovenské vysoké školy zaostávajú v svetových rebríčkoch*. Úrad vlády Slovenskej republiky.
- Krämer, S. (2015). *Medium, Messenger, Transmission. An Approach to Media Philosophy*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Krtilová, K. (n.d.). *Filosofie médií a změna paradigmat / Medienphilosophie und Paradigmenwechsel*. Retrieved June 14, 2023, from <http://www.flusserstudies.net/sites/www.flusserstudies.net/files/media/attachments/filosofie-paradigmat.pdf>
- Leško, V. (2021). Fenomenológia ducha – Jednota filozofie a dejín filozofie. *Filozofia*, 76(5), 364–376. <https://doi.org/10.31577/filozofia.2021.76.5.4>
- Malík, B. (n.d.). *Hermeneutika. Metodický list k výučbe vybraných filozofických tém cez problémy*. Retrieved June 14, 2023, from <https://www.statpedu.sk/files/sk/metodicky-portal/metodicke-podnety/socialna-filozofia-metodicky-list.pdf>
- Marcelli, M. (n.d.). *Flusser a metafyzika*. Retrieved June 14, 2023, from <http://www.flusserstudies.net/archive/flusser-studies-05-november-2007-special-czech-issue>
- McChesney, R. W. (2009). *Problém médií. Jak uvažovat o dnešních médiích*. Grimmus.
- MŠ SR (2023). *Výsledky periodického hodnotenia*. Retrieved from <https://ver.cvtisr.sk/vysledky>
- Nemec, R. (2016). *Úvodné state z filozofickej hermeneutiky II*. Trnava: Dobrá kniha.
- Novosád, F. (1979). Hermeneutika a výklad historického diania. *Filozofia*, 34(2), 218–230.
- Novosád, F. (1994). Hermeneutika pozadia. *Filozofia*, 49(2), 65–71.
- Pechar, J. (2007). *Problémy fenomenologie. Od Husserla k Derridovi*. Praha: Filosofia.
- Peregrin, J. (2022). Recenze: Marek Hrubec – Martin Kopecký (eds.): *Nová vědecká éra? Od byrokratické komerce ke kreativě ve veřejném zájmu*. Praha, Nakladatelství Epoque 2021, p. 160. *Filosofický časopis*, 70(3), 607–613.
- Profant, M. (2023). Kritéria místo politiky? Odpověď Jaroslavu Peregrinovi. *Filosofický časopis*, 71(1), 169–173.
- Qi, J., Monod, E., Fang B., & Deng, S. (2018). Theories of Social Media: Philosophical Foundations. *Engineering*, 4(1), 94–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eng.2018.02.009>

- Sámelová, A. (2014). Moderná racionalita a režimy pravdy v realite slovenských médií/Modern rationality and the regimes of truth in reality of the Slovak mass media. In L. Bohunická (Ed.), *Filozofia, veda, literatúra* (pp. 167–174). Bratislava: UK/Stimul.
- Schiaffonati, V. (2003). A Framework for the Foundation of the Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence. *Minds and Machines*, 13, 537–552. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026252817929>
- Sivák, J. (2020). Husserlova teória imaginácie a „nová fenomenológia“ M. Richira. *Filozofia*, 75(5), 401–417.
- Stadtrucker, I. (2007). *Teória masmediálnej (dis)komunikácie*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Spolku slovenských spisovateľov.
- Šíp, R. (2010). Hroch, Jaroslav: Filozofická, štruktúrlná a hlbinná hermeneutika. *Filozofia*, 65(9), 914–917.
- ÚHP MF SR a IVP MŠVVaŠ SR. (2017): *Revízia výdavkov na vzdelávanie. Záverečná správa*. Retrieved June 14, 2023, from <https://www.minedu.sk/data/att/14213.pdf>
- Višňovský, E. (2023). Filozofická reflexia akademického bytia. *Filosofický časopis*, 71(1), 159–167.
- Vydrová, J. (2010a). *Cesty fenomenológie: fenomenologická metóda neskorého Husserla*. Pusté Úľany: Schola Philosophica.
- Vydrová, J. (2010b). Hraničné fenomény. Radikalizovaná fenomenológia a proti-metóda. *Filozofia*, 65(1), 165–177.
- Vydrová, J. (2015). Fenomenológia a kubizmus – možnosti zblíženia. *Filozofia*, 70(10), 831–841.
- Vydrová, J. (2020). *Stručný úvod do fenomenológie. O fenoméne (vysokoškolská učebnica)*. Trnava: Filozofická fakulta TU v Trnave.