

EDITORIAL

Academic plagiarism and piracy: from Mizner to the Brazilian Criminal Code

PH.D. HÉLIO ARTHUR REIS IRIGARAY ¹¹ FUNDAÇÃO GETULIO VARGAS / BRAZILIAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, RIO DE JANEIRO – RJ, BRAZIL

The American playwright Wilson Mizner once said: “if you steal from one author, it’s plagiarism; if you steal from many, it’s research” (BRAINY QUOTES, 2020). For the Brazilian Criminal Code, regardless of the number of sources, plagiarism is a crime. Stealing an idea is stealing an asset.

Throughout my professional life in academia, one of the biggest challenges I have faced is judging and evaluating students’ and peers’ lack of referencing in academic research. Is this phenomenon a case of bad faith or a mere lack of knowledge of academic norms?

The similarity of textual content without due reference is an occurrence no longer limited to works prepared in undergraduate courses or final papers required in graduate specialization programs. Unfortunately, it has occurred in theses, papers submitted to journals, and even in Ph.D. dissertations. The ease of access to information, especially information available through the Internet, facilitates its improper copy without the due authorial citations, characterizing plagiarism (GALVÃO, 2014).

Plagiarism occurs in multiple forms in different areas of knowledge. Full plagiarism is a direct copy of parts of a work without citation or reference. Partial plagiarism is a hodgepodge of parts of texts or phrases by one or more authors without specifying the source. Conceptual plagiarism is the use of ideas or rewriting without proper citation and reference to the original content. Finally, self-plagiarism is very common among authors of academic articles, and master and doctoral students, who use their previous studies, in whole or in part, to produce new research and content without referencing these works (GALVÃO, 2014).

Plagiarism damages the integrity of the scientific community, violates the institutions’ codes of conduct and jeopardizes the credibility of journals. Despite extensive awareness campaigns and prevention strategies, educational institutions and journals still witness illegal copying of texts, charts, and ideas (GASPARYAN, 2016).

As a professor, advisor, member of examination boards, I have frequently found works without correct reference. The same has happened as editor-in-chief of this journal. I believe this phenomenon happens because of the expansion of open access and to the increased coverage of journals through global bibliographic databases.

In order to identify “plagiarism” and curb its practice, tools such as Turnitin, Ithenticate, Plagiarism Detector, Plagius, Ephorus, Iplag, Scribber, NewJester and Plagiarism Sniff have been developed and are commonly used.

I used quotation marks for “plagiarism” on purpose, and I would like to use this editorial to invite you to reflect on what this word means. More than that, I invite you to join me in rethinking our role as editors, reviewers, and professors.

In recent years, as editor-in-chief of Cadernos EBAPE.BR, I came across four articles that could be considered plagiarism, if only considering the similarity index presented by Ithenticate. However, they were the work of renowned researchers, with a relevant contribution in their fields. What had happened?

Plagiarism is associated with a) presenting a work produced by someone else as yours, b) copying someone else's words, charts, or ideas without due credit, c) failure to quote the source directly or indirectly, d) providing incorrect information about a reference source, or e) the modification of words maintaining the text structure, without crediting the source (LOOI, WONG, and KOH, 2015). The practice can be categorized into seven different categories, a) total, b) paraphrased, c) literal, d) mosaic, e) phantom, f) self-plagiarism, and g) ignorant.

Total plagiarism is the appropriation of work produced by third parties. There are two possibilities here. The first, known as ghost-writing, concerns text ordered through a commercial transaction. The second case is a group production, when, in fact, one (or more) of the co-authors contributed nothing.

Total plagiarism is the most serious of all, as it reveals bad intent and lack of ethics for everyone involved. How can you identify if the student actually produced the work? How can you make sure that all participants in a group effectively authored a research work? This is challenging for all of us. In my view, these cases should be reported, those involved made criminally accountable, and severely punished.

Paraphrased plagiarism occurs when the author rewrites other's texts in their own words – including translating from other languages – failing to cite the source. In this case, it is worth considering: was there a genuine effort to be original, or was it just copying?

I want to believe that, in most cases, a junior researcher paraphrases in an attempt to be original, believing that it is enough to use their own words. However, it is possible that the author was ill-intentioned and paraphrased, trying to circumvent anti-plagiarism software, a practice that should obviously be punished.

Literal plagiarism, also known as “copy and paste,” is characterized by the copying of a (fragment of) text, without referencing it. Here, if the structure or most words are reproduced verbatim, there is a crime. When quoting directly, quotation marks are obligatory and, of course, referencing the original source.

The fourth type is the mosaic plagiarism. It is observed when texts, phrases, excerpts, or ideas from different sources are combined to form an apparently original text, failing to properly cite the sources. This case includes the use of small paraphrases even if there is an original central structure in the excerpt. Fortunately, the software can easily detect this type of crime. I understand that, in these cases, the author(s) does not always have a bad intention and, when this occurs, as editor-in-chief, professor, or reviewer, I request that the passage be rewritten.

It is important to mention that good academic work is much more than proper referencing. Even though citing correctly, the practice of name-dropping when presenting a theoretical framework, for example, must be avoided. This section is not about combining infinite citations; authors must present a discussion and trend of thought. Therefore, we, professors, advisors, and reviewers, should focus on the author's critical reflections and debates, considering that issues of formatting are easily corrected.

The fifth and sixth categories are **phantom** and **self-plagiarism**. The first refers to the inclusion of texts that were not consulted during the research (ARÉVALO, 2020), while self-plagiarism brings a sensitive question: how can we judge when an author reproduces excerpts or ideas from one or more works that they have already submitted for publication?

There are those who defend self-plagiarism as a practice inherent in the scientific research process, arguing that authors such as Berger, Luckmann, Bauman, Arendt, revisited their own works, ideas, and theories to deepen their arguments. On the other hand, much of the academy advocates that this practice is dishonest since part of the text is not original.

I understand that both arguments may be correct, depending on the circumstance. For example, we can say that there is bad faith when a student submits the same work in different courses, or an author submits articles that carry similar arguments, methodological procedures, and results, differentiating them only through paraphrases. However, when we reuse our own already published research to deepen the debate, to bring new evidence, or even contradicting ourselves, then we are collaborating with the advancement of the field. Here, there is a genuine academic contribution. This fine line between the laudable and the reprehensible requires educational institutions, associations, and scientific journals to formulate specific policies that clarify how much and when self-quotation is acceptable.

The seven and last category is **ignorant plagiarism**, which occurs when the author does not inform themselves of the rules of the academy or is negligent, which occurs when not all the necessary information about the source used is provided.

I find this type of error in undergraduate and even graduate programs understandable. However, it is unacceptable to see it in an end-of-course work, at any level, because when it occurs, it reveals the negligence of the advisor, who must be held responsible. This occurrence is not as serious in manuscripts submitted to journals. In these cases, it is up to the editor to require the necessary adjustments.

These seven categories of plagiarism, in all their different degrees of severity, represent challenges. However, there is an invisible threat, much greater, much more serious, that has been little discussed: intellectual piracy. This is not easy to detect using software, and it demands from editors, reviewers, and professors, a very close look at the text, focusing on the object discussed.

An intellectual pirate is cunning enough to produce an apparently genuine text. There are no paraphrases, and the quotes are well done. The similarity index of the work is low. So, where would the crime be?

The author appropriates what is most relevant in a study: the idea, the logical sequence, the chain of reasoning. There is a real copyright violation.

In the Brazilian legal system, plagiarism is dealt with in the Federal Constitution, in the Copyright Law 9610/98, in the Computer Programs Law 9609/98, in Law 6533/78 providing on the profession of artists. It is also addressed in the New Civil Code Law 10406/02, in decrees 75699/75 and 76905/75 (which promulgated the Berne and Geneva International Conventions, and in decree 1355/94 (which issued the Treaty on Aspects of Industrial Property Rights, providing on trading activities) (ABRÃO, 2014; COSTA, 2016).

Therefore, we must be alert to fight plagiarism and particularly prepared to deal with intellectual piracy since not even the most powerful of all software can recognize and identify this crime.

There is no escape. The elephant is in the room, and it is useless to pretend that we do not see it. It is time for us to debate the origins, methods, and consequences of these dishonest practices. We cannot allow corporatist practices; otherwise, we are risking the credibility of academia and science as a whole.

Despite the thorny theme of this editorial, I have good news: the articles published in this issue are original and thought-provoking. They invite us to reflect on the most diverse areas of administration and to come up with challenging insights.

The first article, "**Accumulation of technological capabilities in the defense industry in emerging economies: the experience of the REMAX and TORC30 projects in the Brazilian Army,**" by Luiz Henrique Abreu Dal Bello, Paulo N. Figueiredo, and Thainá Ballero dos Anjos de Almeida examine the process of accumulation of technological capabilities for innovation and the role of the underlying processes of technological learning in the context of the projects REMAX and TORC30 (Brazilian Army's weapons system) between 1999 and 2016.

In "**Aligning academic research and Science, Technology, and Innovation (ST&I): a proposal using Design Science,**" Donizeti Leandro de Souza, Thais Assis de Souza, and Andre Luiz Zambalde present a theoretical essay that reflects on the use of Design Science as an approach capable of contributing to an approximation of academic research with the activities of Science, Technology, and Innovation (ST&I), aligning the efforts of the academy to the needs of society.

Then, Adonai José Lacruz presents "**Theoretical considerations on corporate governance in the third sector in the agency theory perspective,**" revisiting the literature on corporate governance in non-governmental organizations (NGOs). He adopts an analytical perspective of agency theory, especially aligning the concepts to the context of the Brazilian third sector and to the agency relationship in which the donor (principal) 'hires' the NGO (agent) for the development of a project through providing the funds to conduct the activities.

The fourth article, written by Cristina Tauaf Ribeiro, focuses on the "**Agenda-setting in public policies: the strategy for financial education in Brazil through the lens of the multiple streams model.**" The author analyzes the trajectory that led to the establishment of the National Strategy for Financial Education (ENEF) in Brazil.

In “**Substantive and instrumental rationality in public bidding: gains and losses in the selection of the most advantageous bid**,” authors Vanilson Viana Cardoso and Airton Adelar Mueller seek to identify elements in the public administration’s bidding processes that are related to instrumental and substantive rationality.

Jeovan Assis da Silva and Tomas Aquino Guimarães promote a discussion on the main tensions between the executive and the judiciary branches of government in decisions about the regulatory activity. In the article “**Regulatory agencies and courts: interactions between administration and justice**,” the authors present the main theoretical lenses and the previous studies addressing the issue.

In the seventh article, “**Study of citizen engagement in the participation of elective mandate actions in the Brazilian Legislature: analysis of the use of political techs**,” Jessica Natalia Souza Pavan, Luis Hernan Contreras Pinochet, Gabriela de Breláz, Durval Lucas dos Santos Júnior, and Daielly Melina Nassif Mantovani Ribeiro, use a multivariate method of structural equation modeling, with the application of a face-to-face survey of a sample of 467 university students. They present a theoretical model that allows citizens to analyze and participate in decisions regarding the execution of the government budget by using political techs, promoting citizen engagement.

In “**Influence of management control systems and creativity on job performance**,” Itzhak David Simão Kaveski and Ilse Maria Beuren analyze the influence of management control systems (MCS) on job performance, mediated by individual creativity.

Bruno Felix argues that voice and silence are social and functional behaviors present in everyday interactions at work. In his article “**The (un)speaking self: an identity-based model for employee voice and silence**,” he draws on social identity theory to propose an identity-based model of employee voice and silence. The author discusses how individuals can preserve or restructure their sense of self in the face of identity threats.

On the same line, Julice Salvagni advances the discussion about identities in “**Female truck driver: a journey of gender, work, and identity discussions**.” The author approaches work through the understanding of hierarchies, powers, and sexist divisions, emphasizing motherhood as the main obstacle for female truck drivers to continue their occupation.

The research “**Female prison system: a case study of public security policies**,” also addressed a gender issue. Authors Bruna Rios Martins Santos and Vânia Aparecida Rezende suggest that gender specificities in female incarceration influence experiences resulting from various types of violence that definitely mark the lives of women, highlighting the relationship with motherhood, identified as the main source of suffering.

From prisons to the US National Football League. What correlation can we draw and what debates to promote between the two articles mentioned before and the study by Bruno Melo Moura and André Luiz Maranhão de Souza-Leão, “**Cultural identity in the consumption of the National Football League by Brazilian fans**”? In this research, the authors suggest the existence of three identity categories: nationalism, as a way of projecting an idealized image of a nation; localism, as a demarcation of the tensions of differences existing in the country; and social minorities related to gender and sexual orientation. They reveal tensions and conformities in the social construction of these positions. By pointing out identities strongly related to the notion of place and to different representations of the hetero-masculine, such findings show a particular version of the core values of the sport itself in its country of origin.

The article “**Me, my place, and I: exploring consumer-place attachment in Brazil’s Northeast region**” is another invitation for reflection and insights. The authors Vitor Moura Lima, Rafael Cuba Mancebo, Luís Alexandre Grubits de Paula Pessôa, and Alessandra de Sá Mello da Costa discuss how subjects, such as consumers connect their identity to places (more or less consciously) to give meaning to their lives. They challenge us to grasp the process by which consumers make the connection between their identity and commercial environments, based on the theory of extended self and place attachment.

The final article, “**The disengagement of artisan work and the paths of the new generation in the community of Alto do Moura-PE**” by Denise Clementino de Souza, Jessica Rani Ferreira de Sousa, Marcio Gomes de Sá, and Bárbara Tayna Leal, analyzes the conditions and disengagement modes, by the new generation of the artisan community of Alto do Moura, in Pernambuco. The authors investigate the triggers that encourage individuals to take a different path from

that of the traditional artisan, as well as the main dispositional demands for changes in the inheritance incorporated in their artisan condition.

The final work is a book review by André Luis Nogueira da Silva. The author presents Agranoff's work *Collaborating to manage: a primer for the public sector*, highlighting Agranoff's perspective on the dualism between the fields of administration and public administration. André synthesizes the books' main lesson in one phrase: "collaboration is the only way!"

We wish you a pleasant read!

Ph.D. Hélio Arthur Reis Irigaray

Editor-in-Chief

REFERENCES

- ABRÃO, E. Y. **Direitos de autor e direitos conexos**. 2. ed. rev. e ampl. São Paulo: Migalhas, 2014.
- ARÉVALO, J. A. O que é plágio e como detectá-lo? **Blog PPEC**, Campinas, v. 4, e020001, fev. 2020. Available at: <<https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/blog/index.php/2020/02/17/arevalo/>>. Accessed on: July 30, 2020.
- BRAINY QUOTES. **Wilson Mizner Quotes**. Available at: <<https://www.brainyquote.com/authors/wilson-mizner-quotes/>>. Accessed on: Aug. 02, 2020
- COSTA, R. M. C. D. Plágio acadêmico: a responsabilidade das associações Científicas. **Intercom – RBCC**, São Paulo, v. 39, n. 3, p. 187-200, Sept./Dec. 2016.
- LOOI, L. M.; WONG L. X.; KOH, C. C. Scientific misconduct encountered by APAME journals: an online survey. **The Malaysian Journal of Pathology**, v. 37, n. 3, p. 213-218, 2015.
- GALVÃO, M. T. G. Plágio na construção de trabalhos científicos. Editorial. **Rev Rene**, v. 15, n. 2, p. 187-188, Mar./Apr. 2014.
- GASPARYAN, A. Y. et al. The pressure to publish more and the scope of predatory publishing activities. **Journal of Korean Medicinal Science**, v. 31, n. 12, p. 1874-1878, 2016.

We would like to welcome the new Editorial Board members

It is with great pride and satisfaction that we welcome professors Gazi Islam and Russell Belk to our editorial board.

Professor Gazi Islam, of Turkish-American descent, lives in France. He holds a Ph.D. in Organizational Behavior from Tulane University. His research focuses on organizational identity, voice, and power relations.

He is currently a professor of Business Administration at Grenoble École de Management. His work has been published in journals such as Organization Studies, The Leadership Quarterly, Organization, Human Relations, The American Journal of Public Health, Journal of Business Ethics, and American Psychologist.

Russell Belk is a professor of Marketing at the Schulich School of Business, York University, Toronto, Canada. Kraft Foods Canada Chair in Marketing, his studies explore possessions, collections, gifts, sharing, and materialism, based on a cultural, qualitative, and interpretive perspective.

Gazi and Russ, thank you so much for joining us!

Ph.D. Hélio Arthur Reis Irigaray

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9580-7859>

Ph.D. from FGV EAESP; Master's in business administration from PUC-Rio; Bachelor degree in economics from the University of Northern Iowa, USA; Adjunct professor at FGV EBAPE and the Corporate International Master Program (CIM), Georgetown University, Washington, USA; Leader of the theme 'diversity and labor relations' in the line of research 'work management' (ANPAD). E-mail: helio.irigaray@fgv.br