

EDITORIAL

We were recently surprised by the news that Brazilian journals were suspended from the Journal Citation Reports (JCR), which publishes one of the most important impact indicators of scientific journals. The argument on which this suspension was based was the presence in these journals of “anomalous citation standards” that were distorting their “true” impact factors. This suspension had an immediate effect on our scientific community, with several public and private manifestations on behalf of ethics and good practices that, supposedly, the punished journals had violated.

Without entering the discussion on the merit of these journals having benefited or not from unethical practices (self-citation and cross-citation, for example), the lack of transparency of the entire process that ended up in their punishment deserves concern. Those who appreciate the state of right tend to valorize the space for defense before the announcement of any punishment. How can the evaluation of this possible misconduct distinguish fraud, which would justify punishment, from the mere unintentional nonobservance of rules or from a different academic reality of most journals found in the JCR database, as claimed - in self-defense - by one of the punished journals' editor? Would this be the case for a warning prior to any punishment?

Since *RAE* is part of the JCR, we are concerned about the possibility of also being judged by criteria that are not clear to us. Even though we rigorously follow ethical practices, we do not know the level of “acceptable” self-citation in JCR, for example, and how this measure would be considered in our case.

In order to understand the state of apprehension in which the lack of rules transparency leaves us, it is sufficient to know that *RAE* has a much higher rate of self-citation in the JCR than the punished journals. This situation could be explained by the low presence of other journals from our area in this indexer, and worse: in January 2013, we published the Forum, “Brazilian scientific production in Business Administration in the 2000s”, and, historically, these reviews only increase self-citation in journals of major impact. Could we be running the risk of being punished because we have strived to present a panorama of Brazilian academic production? Could we need to defend ourselves, explaining that this type of review, despite affecting the impact factor, also interests our scientific community and that was the action's precise intention?

We support the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (available at <http://am.ascb.org/dana>), which stands for reducing the emphasis of impact factor measures as a promotional tool, but we know how *RAE*'s visibility abroad increased after we began to be included in JCR. Since we have an internationalization project underway, we cannot ignore that the impact factor is still an

important international reference for differentiating journals, even if it is far from being the only one.

At present, we want to help other Brazilian journals to enter the JCR and we know that this will thus contribute towards positively influencing our impact factor. Could it be that in some office where there is little understanding of Brazilian reality, this attitude of ours may be considered slightly unethical? In short, what concerns us is not the noteworthy defense of ethics and good practices, but the lack of information and transparency in the punishment processes carried out in these cases.

In this issue of *RAE*, we published six original articles. The first, “Focusing illusion in satisfaction with life among college students living in Brazil”, explores the relation between aspects of life and the perceptions of happiness. The second article, presented in the VI ENAPEGS in 2012, “Cadeia reversa do óleo de cozinha: coordenação, estrutura e aspectos relacionais”, analyzes the reverse supply chain of the product in question and its coordination. The third and fourth articles were presented in the XV SIMPOI, in 2012. “Clusters e APL'S: análise bibliométrica das publicações nacionais no período de 2000 a 2011” investigates scientific publications in periodicals classified by the Qualis system on clusters and local productive arrangements (LPAs) in Brazil, for over a decade, and “Estilos de aprendizagem Felder-Silverman e o aprendizado com jogos de empresa” deals with the learning differences between students of a Planning and Production Control course. The two remaining articles were presented in ENANPAD 2013. “Avaliação de desempenho organizacional: um estudo aplicado em hospitais filantrópicos” develops a model for evaluating the performance of philanthropic hospitals and compares their efficiency; “Confiança organizacional e compartilhamento e uso do conhecimento tácito” investigates the influence of organizational trust in the desire to use and share tacit knowledge, based on assumptions about the relationship between ability, benevolence, and integrity.

This issue is completed with the essay “Modernización y gerencia pública”, signed by Mexican Senator Salvador Vega Casillas and Ernesto González Cancino, Senior Officer of the Mexican Government; a review of the book “Pragmatic strategy: eastern wisdom, global success”, written by Professor Belmiro Nascimento João; and bibliographical indications on management of professional services companies, by Professor Marcelo P. Binder, and economic law and mergers of companies, by Professor Clayton Vinicius Pegoraro de Araujo.

Have a pleasant reading!

EDUARDO DINIZ | EDITOR-IN-CHIEF