ARTICLE

Intellectual piracy in management research practices

Marcelo de Souza Bispo [1] [2]
Almir Martins Vieira [3]

[1] Universidade Federal da Paraíba (UFPB) / Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração, João Pessoa – PB, Brazil
[2] Universidade Federal da Paraíba (UFPB) / Programa de Pós-Graduação em Sociologia, João Pessoa – PB, Brazil
[3] Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie (UPM) / Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração de Empresas, São Paulo – SP, Brazil

Abstract

This essay presents the concept of Intellectual Piracy and its ethical-legal and formative consequences in the academic field of Administration. This is an essay on a practice identified by the authors but little discussed in academia. Intellectual piracy is a subtle form of plagiarism usually not identified by software. It is the practice of copying a theoretical systematization or idea produced by another person without citing it. This practice becomes evident not by copying words or phrases but by using a set of authors (even citations) used in another work as if the choices and theoretical systematization were original. Our contribution is to offer a concept capable of defining a practice of plagiarism that is not yet present in the literature on the subject in question. We conclude that intellectual piracy is an ethical-legal problem and a reflection of deficiencies in training researchers concerning aspects such as authorship, originality, theorization, and theory in scientific practice.

Keywords: Intellectual piracy. Plagiarism. Academic misconduct. Questionable research practices. Training of researchers..

Pirataria intelectual nas práticas de pesquisa em Administração

Resumo

O objetivo deste artigo é apresentar o conceito de pirataria intelectual e suas consequências de caráter ético-legal e formativo no campo acadêmico da Administração. Trata-se de um ensaio sobre uma prática identificada pelos autores, mas pouco discutida no meio acadêmico. A pirataria intelectual é uma modalidade sutil de plágio que normalmente não é identificada por *softwares*. Consiste na prática de copiar uma sistematização teórica ou ideia produzida por outra pessoa, sem citá-la. Tal prática torna-se evidente não pela cópia de palavras ou frases, mas pelo emprego de um conjunto de autores, até mesmo citações, utilizados em outro trabalho, sob a aparência de que as escolhas e a sistematização teórica são originais. Nossa contribuição está em oferecer um conceito que seja capaz de definir uma prática de plágio que ainda não está presente na literatura sobre o tema em questão. Concluímos que a pirataria intelectual não se trata apenas de um problema ético-legal, mas é também reflexo de deficiências na formação de pesquisadores em relação a aspectos como autoria, originalidade, teorização e teoria no fazer científico.

Palavras-chave: Pirataria intelectual. Plágio. Má conduta acadêmica. Práticas questionáveis de pesquisa. Formação de pesquisadores.

Piratería intelectual en prácticas de investigación en administración

Resumen

Este artículo tiene como objetivo presentar el concepto de Piratería Intelectual y sus consecuencias ético-jurídicas y formativas en el campo académico de la Administración. Este es un ensayo sobre una práctica identificada por los autores, pero poco discutida en la academia. La piratería intelectual es una forma sutil de plagio generalmente no identificada por softwares. Es la práctica de copiar una sistematización teórica o idea producida por otra persona sin citarla. Dicha práctica se hace evidente no al copiar palabras o frases sino al utilizar un conjunto de autores (incluso citas) utilizados en otro trabajo, como si las elecciones y la sistematización teórica fueran originales. Nuestra contribución es ofrecer un concepto capaz de definir una práctica de plagio que aún no está presente en la literatura sobre el tema en cuestión. Concluimos que la Piratería Intelectual no es sólo un problema ético-jurídico, sino también un reflejo de las deficiencias en la formación de los investigadores en aspectos como la autoría, la originalidad, la teorización y la teoría en la práctica científica.

Palabras clave: Piratería intelectual. Plagio. Mala conducta académica. Prácticas de investigación cuestionables. Formación de investigadores.

INTRODUCTION

Integrity and academic misconduct are always present in debates in the scientific field (Bettaieb et al., 2022; Caldwell, 2010; Fanelli et al., 2015; Fraser et al., 2018; Harley et al., 2014; Patel, 2022). Falsified research through data fabrication and distortion of results, publication of articles with the same database as another study, false authorship and multiple forms of plagiarism make up the broad spectrum of what can be considered questionable research practices or misconduct (Harley et al., 2014; Krokoscz, 2015; Tourish & Craig, 2020). Despite long-standing and extensive debates about questionable research practices and academic misconduct (Caldwell, 2010), the topic continues to deserve reflection and creates opportunities for new perspectives.

In this text, our focus is on plagiarism practice, which can be understood, in general, as the act of copying someone else's ideas or words and presenting them as one's own, without giving credit to the original source (Berlinck, 2011; Krokoscz, 2015; Bettaieb et al., 2022). Plagiarism is a harmful practice, especially in the academic context, in which researchers seek to advance knowledge by appropriating works from other colleagues (Lewis et al., 2011). This practice, however, also reaches other spheres of social life. For instance, anti-science speeches call into question scientific knowledge and life in society itself in movements such as anti-vaccine. This occurs because plagiarism ends up serving as a justifying element for discredit of science (Fernandes et al., 2022; Fonseca et.al., 2023).

The plagiarism we deal with here is subtle in nature and usually goes unnoticed by researchers, editors, and reviewers, as it may not be easily identified in plagiarism detection programs. This is what Irigaray (2020) called intellectual piracy, which involves plagiarizing subtle elements related to both the logical sequence and the chain of reasoning of an author, without citing them.

It is possible to note that intellectual piracy does not consist of grotesque plagiarism, but fine-grained plagiarism. Contrary to what many academics tend to argue, this is not plagiarism committed by students or exclusive to them. Fine-grained plagiarism is usually committed or led by senior researchers (Honig & Bedi, 2012). The justifications for plagiarism in general, including intellectual piracy, are diverse and cover factors that range from individual aspects of character to elements related to cultural and institutional aspects, such as lack of rigor, lack of attention, lack of knowledge about adequate citation, the extreme pressure that researchers face to publish high-quality articles for academic promotions or research funding as well as lack of fear regarding possible consequences (Mehregan, 2021).

Given some clues presented by Irigaray (2020), in his editorial about this type of plagiarism, we aim to present a conceptualization of intellectual piracy as well as its implications for the academic world. The motivation for writing this text is to shed light on a common practice of plagiarism among academics. It is noteworthy that many of them are not aware of the fact that this practice is a form of plagiarism and research misconduct. Added to this is the demonstration that intellectual piracy also highlights, to some extent, a gap in the education of researchers who often receive training characterized more by the achievement of academic results and less by reflection on research practices that involve such achievement.

Our experience as researchers has given rise to the perception of an increased incidence of works (articles, dissertations, and theses) that use theoretical and conceptual structures previously presented by other academics. We observed the incorporation of textual excerpts and the adoption of organization of ideas in the same way as originally used by a given author, without mentioning them, who had already systematized such a set of concepts and ideas. One of the authors of this article has already identified intellectual piracy of his work during peer reviews for events and journals and even in a doctoral thesis, when he was invited to participate in the qualification – when he identified plagiarism. Subsequently, he did not receive an invitation to the final defense of the work, which still showed plagiarism.

Debate on intellectual piracy is important because it reinforces that credit is essential not only for an author's most obvious concepts or ideas, but also for efforts to intellectually structure a theoretical body of knowledge on a given subject. Such theoretical constructions demand a lot of knowledge and reflection. They serve as a basis for beginners in a given theoretical field to be able to understand it and, consequently, develop their research consistently. Furthermore, intellectual piracy can be used as a justification (possibly not the only one) for a recurring complaint from Brazilian researchers in the field of

administration – it refers to the infrequent practice of citation among them. In the case of intellectual piracy, researchers base their works on the text of a Brazilian author, but only cite the texts used by that author, without mentioning the original text(s) of the research.

Our central contribution is to offer a concept that is capable of defining a plagiarism practice that is not yet present in literature, demanding reflection, debate and actions to combat it, due to the harmful consequences it causes in the academic world.

We initially sought to understand what questionable research practices and academic misconduct mean, in order to point out plagiarism as arising from these debates. We also highlighted what we found in the literature on these topics (especially in administration/management journals). Subsequently, we sought to delve deeper into the notion of intellectual piracy, its characteristics, and implications for academia. In the end, we formulated some reflections on the topic, seeking to offer some practical ways to mitigate this problem.

QUESTIONABLE RESEARCH PRACTICES AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Questionable research practices do not necessarily mean academic misconduct (Kaiser et al., 2022). These practices are more related to unintentional actions by authors, while academic misconduct is the result of intentional actions (Vrieze, 2021), although there are authors who prefer not to make this distinction (Bouter, 2023).

A questionable research practice, for instance, is the initiative of inviting co-authors to submit texts to journals and scientific events just because of minimal participation in study preparation (sometimes constituting a mere theoretical or methodological suggestion), even if the main author considers this participation fundamental in the final version of the material. In the Brazilian academic context, this practice usually occurs after the defense of dissertations and theses. This situation occurs due to comments and suggestions made during the defense. Consequently, some supervisors and master's and doctoral students end up inviting committee members to participate as co-authors in articles arising from dissertation and thesis work. Cases like this fit into the debate on scientific authorship (Domingues, 2013; Fleming, 2021; Krokoscz, 2015; Rossoni, 2018) and, eventually, questionable research practices. However, it is worth noting that not all invitations to co-authorship in situations like this constitute questionable research practices. Participating in a master's or doctoral committee, effectively collaborating in writing the text and organizing ideas, makes the authorship issue evident.

In relation to academic misconduct, we referred to any action that puts at risk what authors such as Devine and Chin (2018) and Summers et al. (2021) call academic integrity. It consists of ethical behavior based on honest and trustworthy actions during research and educational activities. In an editorial published in the Journal of Management Studies, Harley et al. (2014) criticizes practices of data manipulation or distortion of research results with the aim of "erasing" data that are "without significance" or that compromise the presentation of results. The authors not only condemn activities of this nature, but also list actions that are part of the journal's strategy to solve such practices. The journal, in addition to ensuring quality texts that contribute to dissemination of knowledge, must stipulate editorial mechanisms that identify risks to academic integrity.

Different authors use different terms to indicate actions that fall under both questionable research practice and academic misconduct, such as fraud, cheating, cheating contract, bribery, fabrication, ghost writing, dishonest practices, transgressive intertextuality, falsification, distortion, self-plagiarism, plagiarism, among other terms (Drach & Slobodianiuk, 2020; Foltýnek & Králíková, 2018; Tindall et al., 2021; Vaccino-Salvadore & Hall Buck, 2021). An aspect that also deserves mention refers to works that deal with the issue of students. The results indicate that high percentages of students admit having participated in some questionable or dishonest practice in relation to academic activities (Birks et al., 2018; McCabe et al., 2017; Oliveira et al., 2014; Summers et al. 2021).

As pointed out by authors from different areas, plagiarism must be considered a complex phenomenon (Jereb et al., 2018; Tran et al., 2022). Its explanation is not reductionist, since several factors influence individuals to adopt such behavior. McCabe et al. (2001) list academic pressure, insufficient deadlines, similar practices carried out by peers and the minimal possibility of punishment.

For Foltýnek and Králíková (2018), plagiarism occurs when someone uses a certain source, regardless of how it was obtained (digital repositories, printed materials, etc.), without giving credit to its authorship or adequate recognition. This is a growing global academic-pedagogical problem (Birks et al., 2020). Zejno (2018) highlights that, in this scenario, knowledge is (also) considered a commodity.

Plagiarism occurs intentionally, motivated by personal advantages, saving time, or accidentally, when an author is unaware that they are violating norms (Gullyfer & Tyson, 2010; Sousa-Silva, 2014; Tran et al., 2022). However, according to Tran et al. (2022), within the scope of graduate studies, it is assumed that the level of training and the academic trajectory provide people with sufficient skills to conduct their academic career fully, whether by expressing their ideas or by relating them to texts and proposals from other authors. This assumption, however, does not find correspondence in scientific research and writing practices. There are even researchers who consider plagiarism to be just an error, which is a worrying fact, as it enables the perpetuation of this vision in the mentor-apprentice relationship, generating direct impacts on future researchers' education (Vasconcelos et al., 2022).

It manifests itself in the *ipsis litteris* appropriation of excerpts from published material or in paraphrases of ideas, arguments, or theoretical structure of an original text. Detecting fine-grained plagiarism becomes more difficult, since not even plagiarism detection software is capable of identifying misappropriation (Krokoscz, 2022). This arises from the fact that the words and terms used in plagiarized text are different from those in the original. However, not only the idea, but also the argument based on a given conceptual field are the same.

Recently, advances in artificial intelligence (AI) technologies have expanded the possibilities for refining plagiarism. Chatbots are technologies developed by AI that directly impact scientific research and writing practice. These technologies are large language models (LLM), a system that learns autonomously from data and can produce sophisticated, seemingly intelligent text after training on an extensive set of text data (van Dis et al., 2023). When using AI for academic writing through chatbots, attention needs to be paid to the way texts are produced. Chatbots collect data available on the internet; also, they do not provide the sources used – something similar to "analog" intellectual piracy – and their information is generally inaccurate, outdated or even erroneous (Elali & Rachid, 2023). In other words, with regard to scientific writing, chatbots' operating logic so far is worrying. It is worth noting, however, that these tools seem promising in relation to other research activities, such as carrying out literature reviews (Salvagno et al., 2023).

INTELLECTUAL PIRACY

Intellectual piracy consists of copying the theoretical organization produced by someone, involving some type of conceptual or literature review. Therefore, it is not a question of copying a sequence of words, but rather of organizing a thought on a theoretical body. According to Irigaray (2020):

> [A]n intellectual pirate is cunning enough to produce an apparently genuine text; that is, there are no paraphrases, citations are well done, the similarity index of their work is low. So where was the crime? It appropriates what is most relevant in a study: the idea, the logical sequence, the chain of reasoning. Then there is the true violation of copyright (Irigaray, 2020, p. 3, own translation).

The understanding of some author, theory or theoretical field is often complex. This requires many researchers to develop their own organization and/or systematization to offer a chain of reasoning that is capable of optimizing or facilitating the understanding of an author, a theory or even a theoretical field. In other words, the researcher's systematization of a scientific body is the result of an original intellectual production, even if the topic addressed, eventually, is not. In practice, systematization represents the researcher's choices and intellectual constructions that represent a form of thought. In intellectual piracy, the pirate – plagiarist – does not copy the words, but the systematization developed by another person, without mentioning the original work.

Intellectual piracy often manifests itself in subtle ways. It is usually perceived by the creators of the work or by individuals well versed in their work. On the other hand, systems created to identify similarity between academic works may not be effective. In intellectual piracy, similarities are often observed in the following aspects: a) choice of citation sources; b) selection of direct and/or indirect citations; c) concepts chosen for work development; d) order of presentation of ideas and/or concepts. It is important to highlight that these elements, which will be discussed in more detail below, emerged inductively throughout our experience with intellectual piracy. Therefore, it is not a categorization that is intended to be universal or definitive, but a proposition that aims to collaborate in intellectual piracy conceptualization and identification.

Similarity in the choice of citation sources seems to be the most frequent case of intellectual piracy. Plagiarized work usually has a significant similarity in the set of authors mentioned in the original work. At first, it is possible to imagine that this is a mere coincidence or that a certain field of research has a limited number of citable authors. However, upon closer reading of a plagiarist's work, it is possible to notice that the coincidence is a copy of the original author's choices. It is observed that a plagiarist did not carry out the work of choosing the cited authors nor organized them logically in the text.

Another aspect derived from the first is the **selection of direct and/or indirect citations** in a plagiarist's text, similar to those in the original text. With the exception of some classic passages by a recognized author in a given field of research, there is no coincidence in the case of direct and indirect citations in the same pattern as the original text, sometimes even in the same order. A closer look at the plagiarized text shows that, despite the citations from classic or famous authors, text organization is based on who systematized that set of authors and ideas, and not on the authors cited. Depending on the level of plagiarism, it is possible to notice that the plagiarist did not read or did not understand the texts cited by the original author, in order to make it even more evident that it is a particular reading and/or understanding of the text and/or author plagiarized. In short, a plagiarist cites texts about which they know little or nothing, reproducing the organization and interpretation of the author and/or plagiarized text, including biases and inconsistencies present in the original.

Concepts chosen for work development can be copies of another work, with a view to presenting a line of reasoning and supporting a thesis. When a plagiarist chooses the same set of concepts without citing those who initially presented that organization, they ignore that the systematization carried out originates from their own intellectual construction. Even if the concepts used are not original and are part of the repertoire of other researchers, the way in which they are elaborated and presented is part of a construction that involves choices based on a proposal for intellectual work.

As a result of the previous point, we have a **copy of the order in which ideas and/or concepts are presented**. In addition to selecting the same concepts from the plagiarized work, a plagiarist often uses a similar order of presentation and "articulation" of concepts. Even if concepts are not new, whenever someone systematizes a set of concepts in a scientific work, they are presenting, at the very least, a chain of reasoning that took a long time to build. It is an authorship process (Costa et al., 2017; Krokoscz, 2015; Rossoni, 2018; Volpato, 2016) that must be recognized (cited) and not ignored.

MOTIVATORS OF INTELLECTUAL PIRACY

We think it is important to offer some reflection on the reasons that lead to the occurrence of intellectual piracy. Certainly, a first idea is to relate intellectual piracy to the pressure for publication in academia and observe how much a researcher's career is linked to this issue (Lewis et al., 2011; Magnin et al., 2020; Mendes-da-Silva & Leal, 2021; Pfleegor et al., 2019; Severiano et al., 2021; Silva, 2019). However, the notion of publish or perish is not sufficient to explain intellectual piracy in isolation. We will focus on other elements that are rarely present in the literature on management education or management ethics and which are associated with intellectual piracy. We have: a) the complexity of scientific thinking; b) understanding texts in other languages; c) lack of an academic writing pedagogy; and d) the role of supervisors in the academic writing process. Each of these elements emerged in our reflection on other factors that would explain intellectual piracy.

The **complexity of scientific thought** is an element little considered among academics in a publish or perish context. Producing a scientific text is not trivial and demands a set of knowledge and skills that develop over time. The author's ability to understand studies already produced in academia represents a first step towards being able to write a consistent scientific text. In other words, in addition to reading the texts, they need to assimilate the contents. Naturally, this is not a simple task, since most scientific texts are hermetic and require a high level of abstraction. The lack of understanding of some texts, especially the classics, makes many academics turn to critics and commentators to understand someone's thoughts or even a concept's meaning. This lack of understanding of the original texts leads countless authors to write about a specific author or concept without based on the original, but rather on another author and/or text that presents a "simplified" or even personalized explanation of the original. This situation can lead to intellectual piracy due to the lack of ability to understand original texts. It should be added that, in some way, platforms like ChatGPT, Bard and Baidu increase the chances of intellectual piracy. These tools scan the internet to construct texts without presenting the sources (Elali & Rachid, 2023; Salvagno et al., 2023; van Dis et al., 2023). Concern about plagiarism is one of the main points of debate in using AI (Elali & Rachid, 2023; Salvagno et al., 2023; van Dis et al., 2023).

Another very common aspect among researchers is the difficulty in **understanding texts in other languages**. As a result, the easiest way to understand a given subject would be to read texts in the researcher's language with explanatory content about the original texts (in another language). In this case, the problem regarding intellectual piracy lies in the fact that these researchers do not admit that they did not read the original (or that they did not understand it well) and do not cite the text that helped them understand a certain subject. They act as if they had read the original directly, without the help of any critic or commentator. In addition to limiting access and understanding of a particular author or idea, this results in the reproduction of the systematization made by others about the author or idea as if it were a representation of the original.

The lack of an academic writing pedagogy in the process of training researchers also contributes to intellectual piracy, since most people end up learning to write a scientific text through mimicry and heuristics. In this learning model, little or nothing is presented so that students can understand the importance of original knowledge, recognize an original thought and, most importantly, construct an original thought (Bispo, 2022). More than approaching a new or interesting topic, it is necessary to develop an original thought on that topic. The lack of pedagogical concern in this regard leads to the copying of theoretical systematizations constructed by other scholars. Here, again, AI platforms, when misused, can lead people to create texts lacking originality and with elements of intellectual piracy.

The role of supervisors in the academic writing process is also fundamental for future researchers in the development of their work. Supervisors perform a dual function: the first concerns the development of knowledge and skills in academic writing itself, which involves special attention to the process of constructing an original work, in order to facilitate the path to dialogue in a given academic field (Bruno, 2019; Falaster et al., 2017; Viana & Veiga, 2010). The second function generally neglected (Honig & Bedi, 2012), consists of guiding future researchers within ethical standards, both in research and scientific writing. Supervisors must act as the first filter for intellectual piracy, identifying the problem during the training process and helping to overcome it. Many supervisors tend not to carefully read their students' work (Paulino, 2023), nor the articles in which their names appear and which may contain intellectual piracy. Once, when one of the authors of this essay found intellectual piracy in a doctoral thesis, the supervisor, when notified, minimized the problem and suggested as a "solution" the removal of the text from the institution's thesis repository. In addition to not having taken any rigorous action regarding the problem, he suggested "hiding" it as a solution by removing the thesis from the institutional repository. Postures like this reinforce the problem of intellectual piracy and plagiarism as a whole (Berlinck, 2011; Honig & Bedi, 2012).

A SIDE EFFECT OF INTELLECTUAL PIRACY IN THE FIELD OF ADMINISTRATION IN BRAZIL

Non-citation practice among Brazilian academics can be considered a side effect of intellectual piracy in the Brazilian context of the administration field. In this area, as in much of global science, publications in English figure prominently. Likewise, the majority of authors used in the construction of academic works work in universities in the global North (with a predominance of Anglo-Saxon countries) and the most cited articles are from journals with an editorial board with the same characteristics. It is difficult to find scientific works in administration in which the theoretical construction is predominantly by Brazilian authors or those from the global South (Alcadipani et al., 2012).

We understand that this context is fertile for intellectual piracy. The characteristics and motivating factors mentioned in the previous topics help us to understand, in part, this phenomenon. This is because the overvaluation of production from the global North (Barros & Alcadipani, 2022), added to the difficulties of the complexity of scientific texts and language barriers, leads several Brazilian researchers to texts by fellow citizens recognized as knowledgeable about a certain author, approach, or theory, aiming to understand the phenomenon they are studying. However, the same recognition is not present in the citations of these texts. This inevitably leads to intellectual piracy, since texts by authors from the global North are cited by Brazilian plagiarists in the same theoretical systematization created by the fellow author considered a reference. Certainly, this aspect should not represent the only reason why Brazilians are not usually cited by each other, but it is relevant within intellectual piracy.

CONCLUSION

In this final part of the text, it is worth presenting some reflections in addition to those already much debated about plagiarism, which deal with legal, originality and reputation issues (Gullyfer & Tyson, 2010; Sousa-Silva, 2014; Tran et al., 2022). We understand that intellectual piracy also involves other aspects, which receive little attention in academic debates. For instance, supervisors' responsibility in training future academics (Bruno, 2019; Falaster et al., 2017; Paulino, 2023; Viana & Veiga, 2010), the deficiency in recognizing theoretical systematization as an authorial process, the need for development of pedagogies that promote authorial role and the development of new theorizations and theories. The need for recognition and appreciation of national production as a means of strengthening rather than subordination to international and Eurocentric production must also be included (Alcadipani et al., 2012; Barros & Alcadipani, 2022).

Intellectual piracy, therefore, more than an ethical-legal problem, also represents a deficiency in academic-scientific training. It exposes the weaknesses of a graduate training system oriented towards technicality and operationalization of theories, methods and – even more regrettable – ideas, with a view to achieving goals oriented towards academic productivism. In practice, this can be represented by the diploma, title, publishing or research productivity grants, as the ultimate ends of scientific research and intellectual construction.

We understand that mitigating intellectual piracy must happen in two ways. The first sense demands an increase in complaints when the problem is identified. Such complaints must be investigated and punished rigorously by supervisors (first filter), scientific journals and academic associations. Reporting channels and protocols for forwarding complaints are essential to ensure that intellectual piracy does not go unpunished. The second meaning involves the need for greater reflection on the role of graduate studies, such as taking over the role of training researchers, understanding it as prior to carrying out research (Bispo, 2020). This role requires the development of pedagogies that enable critical thinking and, especially, the capacity for authorial (original) construction through theoretical systematizations, theorizations and theories.

The two paths, reporting and academic training, once combined, can contribute to overcoming this practice, which appears as dishonest in some cases, and, in others, as a limitation of academic training.

In part, dishonesty and poor academic training also cause, as a side effect, non-citation of works among Brazilians. From the perspective of dishonesty, non-citation among Brazilians reflects the intention of demarcating non-existent ground, neglecting national works already published due to production overvaluation in the Global North. Added to this is the use of Brazilian works as an instrument for understanding a certain author, theory or method as well as the creation of a text as if its writer had read and understood the originals without having gone through the Brazilian author or work. From the perspective of poor training, young researchers, due to the lack of guidance on authorship and originality, end up copying a theoretical systematization and presenting it as their own elaboration.

Intellectual piracy is a practice that brings to light problems present in everyday academia that are rarely discussed and without due legal and training treatment so that the problem can be overcome. With the advent of chatbots (ChatGPT, Bard, Baidu), new reflections on intellectual piracy and actions to mitigate it will be necessary.

REFERENCES

Alcadipani, R., Khan, F. R., Gantman, E., & Nkomo, S. (2012). Southern voices in management and organization knowledge. *Organization*, *19*(2), 131-143. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508411431910

Barros, A., & Alcadipani, R. (2022). Decolonizing journals in management and organizations? Epistemological colonial encounters and the double translation. *Management Learning*, *54*(4), 576-586. https://doi.org/10.1177/13505076221083204

Berlinck, R. G. S. (2011). The academic plagiarism and its punishments - a review. *Revista Brasileira de Farmacognosia*, *21*(3), 365-372. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-695X2011005000099

Bettaieb, D. M., Alawad, A. A., & Malek, R. B. (2022). Visual plagiarism in interior design: is it easy to recognise? *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *18*(7), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00101-4

Birks, M., Mills, J., Allen, S., & Tee, S. (2020). Managing the mutations: academic misconduct in Australia, New Zealand and the UK. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *16*(6), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00055-5

Birks, M., Smithson, J., Antney, J., Zhao, L., & Burkot, C. (2018). Exploring the paradox: A cross-sectional study of academic dishonesty among Australian nursing students. *Nurse Education Today*, *65*, 96-101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2018.02.040

Bispo, M. S. (2022). Em defesa da teoria e da contribuição teórica original em Administração. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, *26*(6), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2022220158.por

Bispo, M. S. (2020). Contradições da pós-graduação em Administração brasileira. *Revista Eletrônica de Ciência Administrativa*, *19*(2), 169-180. https://doi.org/10.21529/RECADM.2020007

Bouter, L. (2023). Research misconduct and questionable research practices form a continuum. *Accountability in Research: Ethics, Integrity and Policy*. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2185141

Bruno, A. R. (2019). Processos de investigação: trilhas e ideias sobre ser orientando/a e ser orientador/a. *Educação em Foco*, *24*(1), 23-40. https://doi.org/10.34019/2447-5246.2019.v23.26027

Caldwell, C. (2010). A Ten-Step Model for Academic Integrity: A Positive Approach for Business Schools. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *92*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0144-7

Costa, F. J., Sousa, S. C. T., & Muzzio, H. (2017). Uma Reflexão sobre Autoria Acadêmica. *Teoria e Prática em Administração*, *7*(1), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.21714/2238-104X2017v7i1-32534

Devine, C. A., & Chin, E. D. (2018). Integrity in nursing students: A concept analysis. *Nurse Education Today*, *60*, 133-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2017.10.005

Domingues, E. (2013). Autoria em tempos de "produtivismo acadêmico". *Psicologia em Estudo*, *18*(2), 195-198. https://www.scielo.br/j/pe/a/K5z5wWHp6wFNGkGsxz8rb6q/

Drach, I., & Slobodianiuk, O. (2020). Building a Culture of Academic Integrity in the Student Environment Case of Vinnytsia National Technical University (Ukraine). *Creative Education*, *11*, 1442-1461. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2020.118105

Elali, F. R., & Rachid, L. N. (2023). AI-generated research paper fabrication and plagiarism in the scientific community. *Patterns*, *4*(3), 100706. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100706.

Falaster, C., Ferreira, M. P., & Gouvea, D. M. R. de G. (2017). O efeito da publicação científica do orientador na publicação dos seus orientados. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, *21*(4), 458-480. https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2017160118

Fanelli, D., Costas, R., & Larviere, V. (2015). Misconduct policies, academic culture and career stage, not gender or pressure to publish, affect scientific integrity. *PLoS ONE, 10*(6), e0127556. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127556

Fernandes, C. M., Oliveira, L. A., & Chaves, F. R. (2022). A negação da ciência na retórica populista antissistema. *Revista Mosaico – Revista de História*, *15*(1), 100-112. https://doi.org/10.18224/mos.v15i1.8975

Fleming, N. (2021). The authorship rows that sour scientific collaborations. *Nature*, *594*, 459-462. https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-01574-y

Foltýnek, T., & Králíková, V. (2018). Analysis of the contract cheating market in Czechia. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 14*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0027-8

Fonseca, C., Pettitt J., Woollard, A., Rutherford, A., Bickmore, W., Ferguson-Smith, A. … Hurst, L. D. (2023). People with more extreme attitudes towards science have self-confidence in their understanding of science, even if this is not justified. *PLoS Biol*, *21*(1), e3001915. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001915

Fraser, H., Parker, T., Nakagawa, S., Barnett, A., & Fidler, F. (2018). Questionable research practices in ecology and evolution. *PLoS ONE, 13*, e0200303.

Gullyfer, J., & Tyson, G. A. (2010). Exploring university students' perceptions of plagiarism: a focus group study. *Studies in Higher Education, 35*(4), 463–481.

Harley, B., Faems, D., & Corbett, A. (2014). A Few Bad Apples or the Tip of an Iceberg? Academic Misconduct in Publishing. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 51*(8), 1361-1363.

Honig, B., & Bedi, A. (2012). The Fox in the Hen House: A Critical Examination of Plagiarism Among Members of the Academy of Management. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(1), 101-123.

Irigaray, H. A. R. (2020). Plágio e pirataria na academia: entre Mizner e o Código Penal Brasileiro. *Cad. Ebape*, *18*(3), 1-6.

Jereb E., Urh, M., Jerebic, J., & Šprajc, P. (2018). Gender differences and the awareness of plagiarism in higher education. *Social Psychology of Education, 21*(2), 409-426.

Kaiser, M., Drivdal, L., Hjellbrekke, J. *et al.* (2022). Questionable Research Practices and Misconduct Among Norwegian Researchers. *Sci Eng Ethics 28*(2), 1-31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-021-00351-4

Krokoscz, M. (2015). Outras palavras sobre autoria e plágio. Atlas: Barueri.

Krokoscz, M. (2022). Eficiência de softwares nacionais e internacionais na detecção de similaridade e de plágio em manuscrito. *Em Questão*, *28*(4), 123123.

Lewis, B. R., Duchac, J. E., & Beets, S. D. (2011). An Academic Publisher's Response to Plagiarism. *Journal of Business Ethics, 102*, 489-506.

Magnin, L. S. L. T., Faria, J. H., Penteado, R. C., & Takahashi, A. R. W. (2020). Produtivismo na Pós-Graduação em Administração: Posicionamentos dos Pesquisadores Brasileiros, Estratégias de Produção e Desafios Enfrentados. *REAd. Revista Eletrônica de Administração*, *26*(2), 265-299.

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K., & Trevino, L. (2017). *Cheating in college*. Maryland, EUA: John Hopkins University Press.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., & Butterfield, K. (2001). Cheating in Academic Institutions: A Decade of Research. *Ethics & Behavior, 11*(3), 219-232.

Mehregan, M. (2021). How to Deal with Academic Plagiarism More Effectively. *Publishing Research Quaterly*, *37*, 53-54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-021-09786-w

Mendes-da-Silva, W., & Leal, C. C. (2021). *Salami Science* na Era do Open Data: *Déjà lu* e Accountability na Pesquisa em Gestão e Negócios. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, *25*(1), 1-12.

Oliveira, T. M. V., Aguiar, F. H., Queiroz, J. P., & Barrichello, A. (2014). Cola, plágio e outras práticas acadêmicas desonestas: um estudo quantitativo-descritivo sobre o comportamento de alunos de graduação e pós-graduação da área de negócios. *Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, *15*(1), 73-97.

Patel, J. (2022). Guest article: Research misconduct. *Committee on Publication Ethics - COPE*. Recuperado de https://publicationethics.org/news/research-misconduct-great-unknown Acesso em 9 de abril de 2022.

Paulino, B. B. (2023). A Prática de Orientação de Mestrandos e Doutorandos em Administração no Brasil [Dissertação de mestrado – não publicada], Universidade Federal da Paraíba, João Pessoa, Brasil.

Pfleegor, A. G., Katz, M., & Bowers, M. T. (2019). Publish, Perish, or Salami Slice? Authorship Ethics in an Emerging Field. *Journal of Business Ethics, 156*, 189-208.

Rossoni, L. (2018). Editorial: Produtivismo e Coautoria Cerimonial. *Revista Eletrônica de Ciência Administrativa – RECADM*, *17*(2), i-viii.

Salvagno, M., Taccone, F. S., & Gerli, A. G. Can artificial intelligence help for scientific writing? *Critical Care*, *27*(75). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-023-04380-2

Severiano Junior, E., Cunha, D. O., Zouain, D. M., & Gonçalves, C. P. (2021). Produtivismo Acadêmico e suas Consequências para a Produção Científica na Área de Administração. *Revista Eletrônica de Administração*, *27*(2), 343-374.

Silva, A. B. (2019). Produtivismo Acadêmico Multinível: Mercadoria Performativa na Pós-graduação em Administração. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *59*(5), 341-352.

Sousa-Silva, R. (2014). Investigating academic plagiarism: a forensic linguistics approach to plagiarism detection. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 10*(1), 31–41.

Summers, A., Wadsworth, D., Bratby, K., Hobbs, E., & Wood, D. (2021). The Experiences of Healthcare Students Who Have Been Accused of Breaching Academic Integrity: A Study Protocol. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 20*, 1-6.

Tindall, I. K., Fu, K.W., Tremayne, K., & Curtis, G. J. (2021). Can negative emotions increase students' plagiarism and cheating? *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 17*(25), 1-16.

Tourish, D., & Craig, R. (2020). Research Misconduct in Business and Management Studies: Causes, Consequences, and Possible Remedies. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 29*(2), 174-187.

Tran, M. N., Hogg, L., & Marshall, S. (2022). Understanding postgraduate students' perceptions of plagiarism: a case study of Vietnamese and local students in New Zealand. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 18*, 3.

Vaccino-Salvadore, S., & Hall Buck, R. (2021). Moving from plagiarism police to integrity coaches: assisting novice students in understanding the relationship between research and ownership. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 17*(20), 1-18.

van Dis, E. A. M., Bollen, J., Zuidema, W., van Rooij, R., & Bockting, C. L. (2023). ChatGPT: five priorities for research. *Nature*, *614*, 224-226. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00288-7

Vasconcelos, S. M. R., Masuda, H., Sorenson, M., Prosdocimi, F., Palácios, M., Watanabe, E., Pinto, J. C., Silva, J. R. L. e, Vieyra, A., Pinto, A., Mena-Chalco, J., Sant'Ana, M., & Roig, M. (2022). Perceptions of plagiarism among PhDs across the sciences, engineering, humanities, and arts: Results from a national survey in Brazil. *Accountability in Research: Ethics, Integrity and Policy*, *11*, 1-32. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2021.2018306

Viana, C. M. Q. Q. & Veiga, I. P. A. (2010). O diálogo acadêmico entre orientadores e orientandos. *Educação*, *33*(3), 222-226. https://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/faced/article/view/8079

Volpato, G. (2016). Autoria Científica: Por Que Tanta Polêmica? *Revista de Gestão e Secretariado*, *7*(2), 213-228. https://doi.org/10.7769/gesec.v7i2.597

Vrieze, J. (2021). Large survey finds questionable research practices are common. *Science*, *373*, 265-265. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.373.6552.265

Zejno, B. (2018). Plagiarism in academic writing among students of higher learning institutions in Malaysia: An Islamic perspective. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, *9*(3), 1-4. https://www.jesoc.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/KC9.3_2.pdf

Marcelo de Souza Bispo
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5817-8907

Ph.D. in Business Administration from Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie (UPM); Associate professor at Universidade Federal da Paraíba (UFPB) in the Graduate Programs in Administration and Graduate Programs in Sociology; Leader of the Research Center on Social Practices in Education and Organizations (PEO/CNPq). E-mail: marcelodesouzabispo@gmail.com

Almir Martins Vieira
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0523-3976

Ph.D. in Education from the Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP); Professor at Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie (UPM) in the Graduate Program in Business Administration. E-mail: almir.vieira@gmail.com

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Marcelo de Souza Bispo: Conceptualization (Lead); Investigation (Supporting); Writing- original draft (Lead); Writing- review & editing (Equal).

Almir Martins Vieira: Conceptualization (Supporting); Investigation (Lead); Writing- original draft (Supporting); Writing- review & editing (Equal).

DATA AVAILABILITY

The entire dataset supporting the results of this study was published in the article itself.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Hélio Arthur Reis Irigaray (Fundação Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro / RJ – Brazil). ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9580-7859

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Fabricio Stocker (Fundação Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro / RJ – Brazil). ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6340-9127

REVIEWERS

Regina Celi Machado Pires (Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Salvador / BA – Brazil). ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5538-035X

Three of the reviewers did not authorize the disclosure of their identities.

PEER REVIEW REPORT

The peer review report is available at this URL: https://periodicos.fgv.br/cadernosebape/article/view/90536/85321