

EDITORIAL

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020140401>

We recently learned that Zigmunt Bauman, respected Polish intellectual, creator of the “liquid modernity” concept, reacted to the accusation of plagiarism stating that prestigious intellectuals can ignore the rules of scientific publication and disregard, for example, the citation criteria demanded by academic journal manuals. The accusation was based on a denunciation made by a PhD student who, analyzing Bauman’s latest book, found several passages that are, in reality, copies from the Internet, especially Wikipedia. Although he mentioned the sources, Bauman did not use any of the basic rules to indicate the texts were not originally his.

This episode highlights an important debate in the academic world. Many complain of excessive rules demanded by the journals, and some authors argue they are cramped in their right of free expression of thought. We can organize this discussion at different levels to better understand the problem.

At the most critical level, we have situations similar to the aforementioned Bauman case. Citations are important for the readers to identify – and check – the sources used by authors and, thus, better evaluate the bases on which a given line of reasoning was developed. Regardless of the ethical issue, the correct citation is, therefore, an instrument for the reader, and the author should obey it out of respect for those to whom he is informing his arguments. At the ethical limit, driven by the pressure for production, some just want to “fatten” their texts with foreign arguments, as if they were their own. In *RAE*, we have tested tools for identifying plagiarism, and the results have not been very positive for the authors. In short, no text will enter the evaluation process without this automatic check, by now conducted informally today by the scientific editors and referees.

At a less critical level, several authors – frequently the most prestigious – complain of the journals’ rigidity, requiring word limits for a text to enter the evaluation process. These authors base themselves on the principle that their ideas cannot be expressed just in part and that size limitations constrain their thoughts. At no moment these authors are considering the fact that the reader is not necessarily interested in reading long texts, generally filled with stylistic hyperbole, unnecessary for those who want to cut to the chase. At *RAE*, we have some flexibility, accepting a 10% size variation; nevertheless, those who complain feel we are too strict. They believe that due to their broad experience in the field, they should enter the category of exceptions; after all, they are different from the rest.

Other authors question some demands they find odd, such as entering tables at the end of the text or vetoing footnotes. We recently conducted a survey at *RAE* and we confirmed that 70% of the authors who did not observe these rules – explained in the Writer’s Manual – are rejected in the desk review, that is, there is a strong relationship between the quality of the submitted text and attention to formal criteria. Since we receive more than 600 papers per year, this screening by format is indispensable for making the internal evaluation work more efficient,

separating those who provide relevant content from those who only want to be published, regardless of presenting any contribution or not for the scientific community. In this case, formal rules serve to separate the authors who read our Manual from those who have yet to learn the basic rules for scientific publication. Since all of this means an onerous cost for the entire evaluation process, rejecting papers of less quality in the initial phases makes it possible for the editorial team to dedicate more effort to those that truly have publication potential.

In summary, many authors do not understand that a journal works for the readers. It is a channel that permits communicating with those readers, and they deserve to receive original and quality material. For those with much experience or for those just beginning, the rules should be the same, on behalf of quality and out of respect for the reader. May the Bauman case serve as an example for all of us.

In this issue of *RAE*, we published eight original articles. “What is the use of a single-case study in management research?” advocates the use of a single case study as a research method in the management area. “O marketing social e a promoção de mudanças estruturais no aleitamento materno” investigates breastfeeding from the Ecological Model perspective. “O papel do Balanced Scorecard na gestão da inovação” relates the BSC to the innovation process of 121 companies. “Satisfacción: determinante de la familiaridad del destino turístico” verifies if tourist satisfaction is a consequence of the functional, hedonic, and symbolic benefit obtained at the destination. “Otimização de portfólios: análise de eficiência” evaluates the behavior of an assets portfolio chosen through Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), optimized by the Sharpe approach. “Compartilhando conhecimento em projeto automotivo: o EcoSport da Ford do Brasil” is a case study about sharing knowledge and its effectiveness in the development of a project. “Imersão social na cadeia de suprimentos e seu efeito paradoxal no desempenho operacional” analyzes the impact of relational and structural immersion in the operational performance of companies, measured in terms of productivity and quality gains. “Valores relativos ao trabalho de pesquisadores em uma organização brasileira” addresses the values relating to the work of researchers in a Brazilian R&D company by defining their axiological labor priorities.

This issue is completed with the essay “The social impact of research in business and public administration: a proposal for a model of analysis”, signed by Giovanna de Moura Rocha Lima and Thomaz Wood Jr; a review on the book “O que o dinheiro não compra: os limites morais do mercado”, by Michael J. Sandel; and book recommendations on the the social history of sports and soccer from the perspective of social sciences.

Pleasant reading!

EDUARDO DINIZ | EDITOR-IN-CHIEF