

EDITORIAL

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020140201>

The release of the SciELO Citation Index impact factor has implications for *RAE*, which has an important regional role. Now we have an objective indicator of our local relevance, complementary to the *Journal Citation Reports (JCR)* impact factor, an index that basically takes into account journals published in English and does not include in its collection the Brazilian publications that most cite or are cited by *RAE*. Because it does not contain our regional reference database, the calculation of the *RAE* impact factor on *JCR* carries a bias of a high percentage of self-citations, and, on the other hand, national journals cited by *RAE* end having an underestimated impact, because they are not in the same database.

We thus gain a new alternative for impact evaluation, which joins the H Index, Scimago and other indicators produced, however, exclusively from journals that are part of these databases. In order to enter these closed groups, it is necessary to proceed into a long process and to have tenacity. In this scenario, with a variety of formal impact evaluations and high barriers of entry in more consolidated bases, some journals have included alternative indicators – such as Google Scholar and Universal Impact Factor – in their self-promotion strategies. If, on one hand, this movement has the benefit of being able to signal impact by means of more inclusive indicators, it can also have the opposite effect by not allowing us to check the rigor for including journals in these new databases or even to check more precisely how calculations are made.

Some journals, including those from prestigious publishing houses, have the indexers in which they are found listed on their websites. Among those indexers, we can find Qualis (CAPES), which is curious, because its classification depends, in great part, on the *JCR* and/or Scopus classification. Therefore, among indexers of lesser reach and international coverage, we can have a redundancy in the evaluation process, even having different indicators.

On the national scope, our system uses this variety of indicators and evaluates researchers by means of their capacity to publish in high impact journals, but not necessarily by the contribution of their papers, the true results of their intellectual creation. Given that the evaluation is made by looking at the short term and that the half-life of our articles has a much longer time horizon, this model most probably

evaluates our expected impact and not the impact it actually produces. Therefore, we are rewarded for publishing in journals that receive many citations, even if our papers in those journals are not necessarily the most cited.

In this issue of the *RAE*, we publish seven papers. “Novas tecnologias e desempenho operacional: um estudo internacional comparativo” investigates the influence of anticipating new technologies in the performance at 337 manufacturing companies in 11 countries. “Organizing resistance movements: contribution of the political discourse theory” analyzes how political discourse and organizational studies have been employed in studies on resistance movements. “Uma escola norte-americana no Ultramar? Uma historiografia da EAESP” evaluates how EAESP has not become a copy of North American schools in the context of the Americanization in teaching Business Administration after World War II. “Conhecimento compartilhado, recursos de TI e desempenho de processos de negócios” investigates the effects of resources and capacities associated with Information Technology and shared knowledge among managers in operational alignment and in business process performance. “Multilevel and multidimensional scale for online trust” is a study with 372 Internet bank operation users in Spain, with an analysis of consumer confidence in relation to the financial institution’s electronic channel. “Governança tecnológica e cooperabilidade nas multinacionais brasileiras” is a field study evaluating how much technological governance affects the dynamic capacity of Brazilian multinational innovation and cooperation. In “Juegos Olímpicos y Paralímpicos en Brasil: aprendiendo de Barcelona y Sydney”, the authors study tourism goals tied to Olympics and Paralympics in Brazil, considering their legacy potential and the opening of senior and handicapped accessible tourism.

This issue also includes the essay “Estetização do marketing”, signed by Ricardo Teixeira Veiga, André Torres Urdan and Celso Augusto de Matos; a book review of the book by professors Howard C. Kunreuther, Mark V. Pauly and Stacey McMorrow; and the book recommendations in reference to the use of images in social science research and entrepreneurship, innovation and funding.

Pleasant reading!

EDUARDO DINIZ | EDITOR-IN-CHIEF