

EDITORIAL

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020150401>

We shall shortly get to know the new Qualis list. The last time we dealt with this subject in an editorial (*RAE*, 52(3), 279), we were celebrating the positive result of the Brazilian journals on the list and related this general improvement to the evolution “both in the quality of the review process as well as the standardization of editorial criteria, with the adoption of operational and ethical practices that are internationally recognized”. We also commented on the fact that some national journals had been evaluated because of their relevance to our community and been “ranked at a level above that established merely by objective criteria”. We also stressed the “responsibility that those that have been awarded, like *RAE*”, had to “evolve even more” towards internationalization.

Three years is perhaps not enough for coming up with a definitive assessment but, generally speaking, we have evolved less over these last few years than in the period between Qualis 2008 and Qualis 2012, particularly regarding the internationalization of our better ranked journals. Several measures are used for evaluating the progress made in internationalization, like submissions from outside Brazil or the publication of papers by authors from foreign institutions, but we are only going to consider participation in the two most emblematic indexes, Scopus and Web of Science, which are, not coincidentally, the main references for Qualis list.

Since Qualis 2012, no Brazilian journal in the Administration area entered the small group of those that were already part of one of these two indexes, a group mostly indexed after Qualis 2008. Far from blaming the journals for this situation, because several of them tried unsuccessfully to get on to these indexes the fact is that we did not manage to evolve as we had hoped. Repeating what we have already said on many other occasions, the problem does not relate to one or another journal individually, but to all Brazilian journals, because the impact of each one depends on the citations it receives from the others. While there are few of our journals in these indexes, we shall continue to remain of little relevance on these databases, because no one cites us more than our Brazilian peers.

It remains for us to discuss collectively a solution for the problem of our international relevance. This comes back to the question of the publication structure we have at the disposal of our scientific journals, which is generally precarious and amateurish, albeit often heroic, for competing with powerful and very much better structured multinationals, despite being based on closed business models, in contrast to our Brazilian open access model. If we are going to pursue a solution it is better to draw our inspiration from some initiative that successfully confronted the large publishing houses that dominate our market.

Led by Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Administração (ANPAD), we have already proposed and constructed

Scientific Periodicals Electronic Library (SPELL), which, while it has unfortunately not yet managed to establish itself to the point of being considered by Qualis, has at least proved itself to be operationally effective and should shortly begin producing the necessary indicators to serve as a benchmark for our community. Another example that can have an inspirational effect is the Public Library of Science (PLOS), an open access publishing house that started with a group of renowned and award-winning Californian scientists. Resolved to face up to the domination of the large scientific publishing houses, they formed a group in the health area that today publishes some 10 journals, based on the principle of spreading scientific knowledge widely and freely. To do so they signed up to a business model that is still taboo in our community, by which authors pay for readers to have free access to scientific content.

Regardless of the model we eventually adopt, it is not to believe that we can get out of this stagnation, in which we count each journal exclusively by its own capacity. Whatever the solution, it is only going to happen when we are actually working together collectively to make our publication infrastructure more robust, while preserving the individual identity of each journal in its process of scientific certification. When we have managed to achieve this then Qualis is going to reflect the relevance of our journals, considering their true contribution to science in Brazil.

In this issue we publish the “Social Businesses” international forum. The article entitled “Social entrepreneurship and social business: Retrospective and prospective research”, written by the forum’s organizers, provides a panorama of research being done in the Social Business area and presents the three papers that were approved in the review process. In addition to the forum there are four previously unpublished articles: “Um outro olhar sobre a eficiência dos mercados: O caso das bolsas de apostas de tênis” investigates efficiency in the sporting material betting markets; “Brand equity of Lahore Fort as a tourism destination brand” uses the customer-based brand equity model to measure the brand value of a tourist destination in Pakistan; “The international growth of a social business: A case study” discusses the influence of the results of social businesses in three developing countries; and “Strategic decisions of family firms on cash accumulation” analyzes the impact that decisions in family firms have on the financial sustainability of their business.

Completing this issue are the essay “Garantias governamentais e competitividade no setor financeiro”, signed by Professor Rafael Schiozer; and book recommendation for “Collective Action and Public Action” and “Business and Managing Corporate Aspects”.

Enjoy your read!

EDUARDO DINIZ | EDITOR-IN-CHIEF