

The researcher's formation and the ethical construction of academic works in Administration, the perception of students and lecturers/professors from a Graduate Program

A formação do pesquisador e a construção ética de trabalhos acadêmicos em Administração, a percepção de alunos e professores de um Programa de Pós-Graduação

Sílvio Luiz de Paula*, **Suiane Valença Brandão**, **Claudinete de Fátima Silva Oliveira Santos**
Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, PE, Brazil

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to analyze teachers' and students' perception from a postgraduate program in the perspective of the ethical construction of academic works, verifying practices of creation and dissemination of academic knowledge aimed at the researcher's training. The ethical elements involved in the process of scientific construction, the plagiarism and the various ways in which it is presented, focus the discussion on the practices of plagiarism, self-plagiarism, self-citation, cross-citation and over-citation. Using a mixed approach, data were collected with teachers and students from the Graduate Program in Administration of UFPE. The collection occurred in July 2015 through an electronic form provided by Google tool. Data analysis was performed using descriptive statistics and content analysis techniques. Regarding the results, it was noticed the need to broaden the discussions about the research topic and it was also noticed that in the process researcher's formation it is necessary a greater instrumentalization and reflection on the ethical elements in research, since there were identified differences and different interpretations among the groups (teachers and students) surveyed.

KEYWORDS: Knowledge construction; Academic production; Ethical violation; Plagiarism; Research training.

RESUMO

Este artigo tem como objetivo analisar a percepção de docentes e discentes de um programa de pós-graduação sobre a construção ética de trabalhos acadêmicos, verificando práticas de criação e disseminação do saber acadêmico voltadas à formação do pesquisador. Buscando atender ao objetivo proposto, discute-se, no referencial, a formação do pesquisador em Administração, os elementos éticos envolvidos no processo de construção científica, o plágio e as várias formas pelas quais se apresenta, focando a discussão nas práticas de plágio, autoplágio, *self-citation*, *cross-citation* e *over-citation*. Utilizando uma abordagem mista, foram coletados dados com docentes e discentes do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração da UFPE. A coleta ocorreu no mês de julho de 2015 por meio de formulário eletrônico disponibilizado por ferramenta do Google. Na análise dos dados foram utilizadas técnicas de estatística descritiva e análise de conteúdo. Quanto aos resultados, percebeu-se a necessidade de ampliar as discussões sobre a temática investigada e percebeu-se ainda que, no processo de formação do pesquisador, faz-se necessária uma maior instrumentalização e reflexão acerca dos elementos éticos em pesquisa, uma vez que foram identificadas divergências e diferentes interpretações dentre os grupos (professores e alunos) pesquisados.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Construção do saber; Produção acadêmica; Violação ética; Plágio; Formação do pesquisador.

Submission: December 14, 2017

Approval: December 27, 2017

*Sílvio Luiz de Paula

PhD student in Business Administration from Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (UFPE). Professor at the Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (UFPE). Address: Depto de Ciência da Informação - Centro de Artes e Comunicação - Av. da Arquitetura s/n, CEP 50740-550, Campus Universitário, Recife, PE, Brazil. E-mail: silviodepaula1@gmail.com

Suiane Valença Brandão

PhD student in Business Administration from Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (UFPE). Professor at the Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco (UFRPE). E-mail: suiane@yahoo.com.br

Claudinete de Fátima Silva Oliveira Santos

PhD student in Business Administration from Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (UFPE). E-mail: claudineteosantos@hotmail.com

1 INTRODUCTION

Despite the strong relationship that permeates the knowledge, communication and action triad, the ethical importance that must be given to the process of its construction is undeniable, especially when one considers the dynamics of the cognoscent subject's interpretive world (Gomes, 2011). With regard to scientific works' construction, academy guides its agents to adopt an ethical and conscious perspective. However, many actions do not fit this practice.

Most people learn ethical norms and behaviors in the environments of their social life from childhood, but moral development happens throughout life and individuals go through several stages until they reach a satisfactory level of maturity. Ethical norms and practices are so ambiguous that one can overlap with another from common sense (Resnik, 2013).

Based on a qualitative perspective, this study seeks to verify practices of creation and dissemination of academic knowledge aimed at the researcher in Administration training, based on the perception of a postgraduate program's students and teachers from a higher education federal institution in the State of Pernambuco. This objective aims to answer the question of research: "How common sense in the study environment has orientated the academic practices in an ethical perspective in the *stricto sensu* scope of the Post Graduation in Administration?" The methodological strategy is anchored in the application of semistructured questionnaires to academic community directly involved for later content analysis.

The researcher routinely faces the challenge of self-reflection and critical exercise about his / her objects of study, as well as with regard to the references he has previously produced and their relationship with these factors. This challenge also invites researchers to reflect on the impacts of socially constructed knowledge and potential knowledge (Gomes, 2011). In this perspective, this study is justified by the latent need to expand scientific discussions of the factors that permeate this self-reflection of the theory critical application.

The theoretical relevance of this research is associated to the contribution that its results can subsidize the unfolding of the ethics in academic practices directed to the formation of the researcher in Administration, starting from the common sense understanding directed to epistemological actions, as well as to the amplification of the scientific discussion of some technical terms inherent to knowledge construction, registration and publication acquired during this training.

From the pragmatic point of view, the relevance of the study is anchored in the possibility of promoting and reflective extension of paradigmatic discussions that contribute to a greater understanding and ontological incorporation of ethics into academic practices, especially during the researcher's training process.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Researcher's training

When we analyze the social role of higher education institutions, we identify as basic functions teaching, research and extension (Paula & Mendonça, 2014). If, on one hand, research appears as an essential activity to fulfill the need for knowledge creation and dissemination, on the other, we can see several gaps in the researcher training process.

According to Pardo (2011), research favors the generation of new knowledge and the elaboration of scientifically based technologies that, in essence, must respond to the needs of several areas of human performance. Unlike graduation courses which, by essence, form professionals, the function of training researchers flat in *stricto sensu* post graduation. Such proposition is corroborated by Pinto and Martins (2009, p.1) when they affirm that "the greatest purpose of Mastering and Doctoral Programs in Brazil is the researcher training". According to Gatti (1987), *stricto sensu* postgraduate courses were created in the 80's, however, there was at the time no structure that supported or even human capital sufficient and prepared to train researchers.

Researcher's formation is a complex and rigorous process and, according to Pinto and Martins (2009), something continuous, because it is an investigation of a complex social practice that requires permanent interlocution with sciences' advances. In Management, we also see the discussion about science's scientificity and rigor in knowledge construction, which reverberates directly in the process of researcher training in Management area. In the process of scientific knowledge construction in Management, Cardoso (2015, p.100) points out the "need for alignment between researchers and revisors regarding the criteria of evaluation of academic production considering the quality, consistency, coherence and relevance of theoretical contributions and practices".

Returning to researcher training process, actions are identified as responsible for postgraduate programs' evaluation in a regulatory institution such as the Coordination Foundation for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES). However, this effort is based on extremely quantitative elements for research production measurement.

The activity of measuring science production's quality in Management area is not a simple task. In this perspective, we highlight the paper carried out by Bertero, Caldas and Wood (1999), which analyzed production in several Management subareas. The study shows the fragility that exists in national production with a cult of foreignness, low originality and few practical contributions. The authors indicate that one of the possible causes for these quality problems in the construction of knowledge in Management is the origin of such material, from graduate programs *stricto sensu*, including failures in their structures and calendars.

When analyzing the researcher training Management in scientific process and seeks to overcome difficulties in the quality of knowledge generated in it, Cardoso (2015) identifies seven research problems, which are associated with: 1) mismatch between quality and quantity, 2) methodological issues, 3) functionalist epistemological basis, 4) predominance of exploratory and descriptive studies, 5) predominance of foreign literature, 6) regional concentration and 7) reduced co-authoring between student and lecturer. Regarding research weaknesses, these are associated with: 1) reduced practical contributions, 2) papers that do not become reference for the area, 3) differences in priorities, 4) relegating the Brazilian empirical reality as a source of research, 5) difficulty of creating paradigmatic lines with Brazilian tradition, 6) difficulty in revealing detailed literary review and 7) reduced originality.

From a more instrumental perspective, from the problems and weaknesses mapping identified in the works analyzed on the quality of knowledge generation and the training of the researcher in Management, Cardoso (2015) suggests that the main initiatives that can be adopted to improve the research development through the training of the researcher are: methodological rigor, paradigmatic enlargement, explanatory studies, use of local literature, extension of research groups and alignment of theory-practice.

For the purposes of this research, to the mentioned initiatives, it must be added the need to include ethical elements. Considering that ethical assumptions influence all initiatives for scientific process development, a new box will not be included, but must be considered in each of the identified initiatives.

2.2 Scientific research *versus* ethical issues

Discussions on ethical issues in the scientific production of Management Science and related areas, although they are still very small in Brazil, have been spurred on punctually and gradually in *stricto sensu* postgraduate programs throughout the Country (Russo, 2014).

Such demands have arisen from the normative void aimed at the absence of registration that specifically regulates the conduct of ethical behavior of individuals in the academic environment and they increase as practices of ethics' violation occur in this environment, and, as a result, expand the debates about the conduct that researchers must undertake in developing and disseminating their scientific output in publication format (Russo, 2014).

In this sense, although they became a concern in the world a few decades ago, the discussions on ethical issues in scientific production in Brazil were stimulated with a foundation in the publication

of the code of ethics and scientific conduct presented in 2012 by the Foundation for State Research Support (FAPESP) and accompanied by the publication of the Report of the Research Integrity Commission of the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPQ) at congresses held in Brazil in 2011 and 2012 (Russo, 2014).

The term "ethical violation" in scientific research can be approached from at least two aspects: non-compliance with copyright in a broader sense; and plagiarism, in a narrower sense. Although there is often confusion or conflict in the interpretation and conceptualization of these expressions, there is a distinction between them, but both are considered constitutive elements of violation of ethics in academic production (Sharp, 2003).

Copyright is a legal concept aimed at protecting original works of authorship, in a tangible way, whose intention is to encourage the production of works and, at the same time, to limit such rights to allow the free flow of ideas, in order to contribute to the development of society (Committee of Publication Ethics [COPE], 2012). Copyright infringements are, therefore, legal offenses whose punishments are foreseen and determined according to the specific legislation (Law 9.610, 1998). Such an offense was already provided for in article 184 of the Brazilian Penal Code, which provides for civil sanctions (public reparation and pecuniary compensation) and penal sanctions (from fines, up to four years imprisonment) (Brazil, 2011).

Plagiarism, in turn, is considered an offense under the aforementioned legal scope, that is, it is considered as one of the ramifications of copyright infringement and can generate, in addition to the sanctions described, administrative punishments, resulting in disapproval and even termination of the teaching institution, for the condition of students and, in the categories of teacher and researcher, the individual may be dismissed (Brazil, 2011). The guidelines for administrative sanctions are generally determined by the academic community and punishments for infractions may vary according to the standards of each academic institution (Sharp, 2003).

Overlapping of publications is another practice that often becomes problematic for publishers of scientific journals to solve and can be classified into four categories: duplicate submission (simultaneous submission of the same article in more than one periodical), duplicate publication (secondary publication of the same article in other journal), competing submissions (same research, same article, different results) (Gollogly & Momen, 2006). There are also sister publications (also known as 'salamiscience', which relates to related works, results divided into several manuscripts, submitted to distinct journals, but with no cross citation). All these practices do not fit with ethical precepts that must be associated with research and have been widely debated around the world (Gollogly & Momen, 2006).

In addition, ethical violations in the academic environment are associated with dubious practices, such as: a) referencing and using published questionnaires or information from the internet without the author's permission; b) publish articles and take all credits without mentioning the other participants; or c) copy paragraphs of publications without mentioning the appropriate sources. Such practices are directly related to what is known as plagiarism.

The violation of ethics in academy can also be related to the criteria of institutional evaluation and professional teaching of the universities established by the Brazilian Ministry of Education, whose performance is associated, among other factors, to the level of scientific production developed in terms of quantity.

Another ethical breach practice concerns the researcher being tempted to create data for "surprising discoveries," publishing results, and impressing other researchers in the field (Roberts, 2002). In research on ethics and integrity in science, it was found that such a criterion of productivity became the guiding factor of the advantages in terms of academic promotion, including the acquisition of funding for research. This competitiveness of quantity of production among researchers for the acquisition of research funding influenced academic behavior over a short period of time, promoting detrimental results to the academic ethical aspect (Russo, 2014). As a result, committees and integrity files and codes of ethics have been established in universities around the world, whose existence in institutions is a prerequisite for the achievement of research funding. However, such practices have

not yet been sufficient to resolve actions that are not suitable for scientific ethical conduct, and doubts about the subject often persist.

Frauds in production and intellectual publishing environment are dated long ago, but they were considered as isolated acts. However, dishonest behavior was facilitated by media technological advancement, and consequently, by the progress of search engines available on the internet (Johnson & Martin, 2005; Sanchez & Innarelli, 2012).

In addition, Chen, Mocker, Preston and Teubner (2010), when studying the perception that undergraduates have about ethical violations, confirm that there is a relation between student cognition and levels of teachers' and their peers' ethical violation, the agents that influence students' academic ethical behavior. In this sense, Russo (2014) brings the discussion of responsibility as one of the values to be adopted in scientific research, whose collectivity of researchers should assume it and involve society in the discussions' promotion about ethics violation in academic environment, with a view to such practices generate immediate negative impact on the social environment.

With regard to ethical values, these are associated with established ideals or patterns to direct individuals' behavior (Lombardo, 2009). In this perspective, in addition to responsibility, other values can be associated with ethical behavior in research such as anti-corruption, information security, intellectual property, self-control, justice, integrity, honesty, authenticity, truth, among others.

Lombardo (2009) presents some key values and key virtues aimed at academic formation, namely: learning, the act of thinking, integrity, honesty, growth and excellence. Thus, if added, they would result in values that characterize ethical practice favorable to trainees' conduct. The author suggests that educators, regardless of academic level for which they render their services, encourage their students to possess and develop these key values and key virtues well.

There are key values and key virtues that, if presented and practiced by academics, will result in excellence and success. Self-responsibility, accountability, truth, honesty, integrity and authenticity, justice, love of learning, thought and knowledge, curiosity, discipline and determination, optimism, social conscience and mutual respect, wisdom and ethical application of life knowledge (Lombardo, 2009).

2.3 Plagiarism and its ramifications

From the 1980s, the measure of research institutions' productivity has taken on a more quantitative approach using the number of publications such as academic promotion indicator and obtaining financing for research. This has led to an obsession with scientific production's quantitative evaluation and, as a consequence, the increasing fragmentation of scientific publications and the ruin of ethical behavior among researchers. Fraud is not only the result of pressure on researchers, but also the academic environment in which it is favorable, according to Russian (2012, p.194) due to concerns as "fear of scandal, the protection of powerful, game social protection networks shared by the collectivity, "bringing an imbalance to those who do not agree with this social convention, which makes them system disruptive.

Questions arise about the academy's very control efficiency related to integrity of their research and the conduct of its researchers, attributing to young researchers, still in the socialization process of academic standards, the large number of fraud cases in papers published in periodicals around the world; however, this problem is faced at different levels and types of researchers (Martin, 2013). Ethical discussions related to scientific research in Brazil had a priori health issues, more precisely the well-being of research subjects (people and animals).

Recently, Brazilian development agencies, such as CNPQ and CAPES, have been worrying about good scientific practices and the verification of frauds from the manufacturing, falsifying and plagiarizing triad (FFP) (Instituto Bioética, 2016; Pithan & Oliveira, 2013). This FFP triad is based on: Manufacturing by inventing the research items; the falsification by the act of modifying the data, arranging them to adapt to the needs of the researcher and the assurance of his hypothesis; and Plagiarism from the act of copying without reference to the source consulted (Russo, 2012).

FFP occurs with recurrence due to the absence of quality indicators in the construction of the intellectual product written through quotations from other authors, such as scientific rigor, language and technical norms, and institutional orientation (HHL Gonçalves, Noldin, & CCO Gonçalves, 2011). According to Brazilian Association of Technical Standards (ABNT) (2002, p.1), citation is the "mention of information extracted from another source", which can be direct (with textual repetition of part of the work consulted) and indirect from the understanding of the ideas written by author consulted).

In general, text citations are free, that is, the author develops the text from his judgment of relevance to the subject and alignment with the idea's originality; However, Martin (2013) calls attention to an abusive practice of some periodical editors: coercive citation, which is the requirement of editors, to the paper's effective publication, so that authors make references to works published in their journals. Periodicals, thus increasing the magazine's performance and notoriety.

Other aspects are questionable in citation practice. The first is cross-citation, in which the text writer quotes works by fellow authors with some kind of interest to ensure better performance for both. Cross-citations seem to exist in the intention of favoring journals, since their definition is related to the common practice of the scientific journal A citing journal B and vice versa in the intention to increase their impact factors. The second is called over citation, which is the construction of a text with paragraphs with many references simultaneously, giving the idea that all authors fully share the contents or ideas developed.

In addition to these, the self-citation or practice of an author is noted with great intensity in academic environment to refer to his previous works. Some authors argue that there are very few differences between authors' motivations to cite their own works and to cite third-party works, and they complement that there are intellectual motives that justify such differences (Bonzi & Snyder, 1991). Self-citation is justified by some authors as instruments of theoretical improvement, avoiding that repetitions are made unnecessarily, in order to enlarge, modify or correct previously published findings (Tagliacozzo, 1977).

However, this type of citation often seeks not only the theoretical improvement of the work but also the promotion of the author's scientific production in academic events and definitive publications in specialized journals. In this sense, self-citation is also used as an intermediary between arguments by the same author in different publications, but can be considered problematic in ethical terms (Hyland, 2003). The occurrence of such a practice in an excessive way is interpreted by the international academy as an unethical and unethical behavior, influencing non-positively new researchers when it shows that such practice is common and accepted (CPE, 2012). However, despite being considered an ethical violation, self-citation is different from the fraud of plagiarism, because in it there is the reference of authorship in the quoted text; already in plagiarism, this does not occur.

Plagiarism, which has its origin linked to the old Roman law referring to the crime of kidnapping of people for slavery, was later associated with the presentation of other people's work as their own (Manso, 1987; Krokoszcz, 2011), indicating the violation of copyright from an act of bad intention which compromises the guarantee of intellectual property and economic rights over the resulting products and services (Gonçalves, 2011).

Plagiarism is defined as the integral or partial reproduction of an intellectual and / or artistic property, assuming authorship for others' work (Barbasfano & Souza, 2007). For Martin (2013), plagiarism is the individual or combined copy of ideas, data or text without prior authorization or knowledge, being the most common of substantial parts or sections of the work. Pithan and Oliveira (2013) make a conceptual rescue on plagiarism, having as background for intellectual appropriation the plagiarism of ideas falsified or inappropriately appropriated by others. The authors bring the definition of plagiarism adopted by American research funding institutions, such as the National Academy of Science, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institute of Health: appropriating ideas, procedures, results or words of another person without giving due credit.

European institutions, such as the Inter Academy Panel on International Issues, the European Science Foundation, the UK's Universities and UK's Research Councils, understand plagiarism to be misappropriation or use of material (idea, result, word or expression), intellectual property or work

(written, printed or digital), without, however, giving due credit, knowledge or permission of its author (Instituto Bioética, 2016; Pithan & Oliveira, 2013).

In Brazil, in its Basic Guidelines for Scientific Integrity of 2011, which initials are CNPQ (2015, p.4) plagiarism is defined as:

Text presentation by anyone who submits it as if it were its authorship, from results or conclusions previously obtained by another author, as well as full texts or a substantial part of other texts without the care detailed in the Guidelines. It is also plagiarism that uses ideas or data obtained in analyzes of projects or unpublished manuscripts to which he or she had access as a consultant, reviewer, editor or something similar.

Meuschke and Gipp (2013) do not characterize plagiarism as literary robbery or deliberate misappropriation, since it may be unintentional, failing, for example, to properly recognize a source, or to be auto-plagiarism, as the plagiarizer may also have the text's author consent, in a collaborative work, and not to make due citation of its authorship. In his theoretical argument, Krokosz (2011) brings the following approaches to understanding the practice of plagiarism: the intuitive ability to diagnose it; psychoanalysis aimed at plagiarist's identity (intellectual kleptomania); their inability or personal limitation to produce their own texts; and the absence of ethics, being related to intellectual and virtual property.

Regarding ethics absence, the debate proposed by HHL Gonçalves, Noldin and CCO Gonçalves (2011) involving the issue of plagiarism from the legislative point of view regarding the criminalization of plagiarism and copyright infringement should be highlighted. In addition to ethical aspects, analysis of antecedent factors that influence the attitude related to plagiarism perpasses by individual moral position, by subjective social norms, by situational aspects, such as the possibility of punishment; the non-conceptual understanding of plagiarism; the ease of use of virtual information access tools; the pressure on the student for results and academic production; the expectation of positive value with gains from the practice of plagiarism (Inarelli, Sanches, Cappellozza, & Albertin, 2011). Other situational aspects: the absence of ideological and textual criticism; the low value of students in relation to their own work; the confusion over the ownership of content on the internet; the indirect incentive to plagiarism as a research "cut and paste" of figures from newspapers and magazines in elementary school; ease of access to language translation programs; ignorance of existing laws and regulations; and the writing and paraphrasing shortcomings (Barbasfano & Souza, 2007).

In practice, many doubts circulate about what is actually plagiarism, especially among young researchers who often treat content from the internet as "free" without any need for authorship, once their consultation is public and open (HHL Gonçalves et al., 2011). Figure 1 presents some usual definitions and types of plagiarism.

Type	Definition	Authors
Literal Plagiarism	Full text copy from another source.	McCuen (2008)
		Inarelli et al. (2011, p.4)
Self-Plagiarism	"When an individual uses, for publication or for the delivery of a work, a study already used previously, but that was only written in another form".	McCuen (2008)
		Inarelli et al. (2011, p.4)
	"Copy of passages or entire texts of the researcher himself (author) who, after making the disclosure of his material in a specialized journal, with the character of scientific dissemination, is self-conscious".	H. H. L. Gonçalves, Noldin, & C. C. O. Gonçalves (2011, p.5)
	An author's practice to reproduce the same text, idea, data, results and others in another article of equal authorship.	Martin (2013)
	Full or partial use of published own texts, whether original or updated.	Meuschke e Gipp (2013)

	"It consists of the total or partial presentation of texts already published by the same author, without due references to previous works".	CNPQ (2015, p.4)
Double Publication	Work papers of similar textual content submitted or published in different journals.	McCuen (2008) Inarelli et al. (2011, p.4)
Disguised plagiarism	Hide the text with: minor adjustments to give coherence (change of words, synonyms, add or delete words of "filling"), paraphrase (intentional rewriting without recognition of the source) or exploitation of the weaknesses of detection techniques, making plagiarized content undetectable.	Meuschke e Gipp (2013)
Translation Plagiarism	Text conversion from the original language to another by deleting the source.	Meuschke e Gipp (2013)
Plagiarism of conception	Use of broader concepts, approaches, argumentative structures.	Meuschke e Gipp (2013)
Data Fragmentation	Salami publishing or division of a larger study (database, research, experience, project, etc.) into publishable units (effective articles).	Martin (2013)
Ghost Author	By including the name of an individual in a working paper without he or she has significantly contributed to its development, being rewarded effortlessly.	McCuen (2008) Inarelli et al. (2011, p.4)

Figure 1- Types and definitions of Plagiarism

Plagiarism can manifest itself as salami publishing or fragmentation of a larger study to increase the amount of manuscripts in definitive publications (Martin, 2013). Definitive publication in scientific journals has credibility because it is a file that contains the complete testimony about an observation, thought or invention (Vasconcelos, Leta, Costa, Pinto, & Sorenson, 2009, Instituto Bioética, 2016 and Pithan & Oliveira, 2013).

Often, the fragmentation of a study results in redundancy or duplication of publications, since this is the existence of published works, simultaneous or otherwise, by the same author. And this redundancy can lead to self-replication by an author's practice to reproduce the same material in other works, without giving due reference to the original work, putting in check the originality and the novelty of the most recent work (Martin, 2013).

In their paper, Bretag and Mahmud (2009) discuss self-replication and distinguish the convenience of reusing texts in publications, arguing that there is no clear consensus on what constitutes an original investigation. Many authors understand that large sections copied from their own text, including identical results and conclusions, without proper reference to the publication, is a fraud.

Others believe that this practice is acceptable, provided the author is transparent and exposes the absence of original work, and may be submitted to two or three academic events, in order to seek at least two definitive publications in periodicals. It is interesting for Bretag and Mahmud (2009) that there be guidelines that differentiate legitimate textual reuse and self-plagiarism, such as the use of up to 10% of already published text, encompassing a new idea and systematic revision of the text, since new analysis results in another original article. Remembering that, in order to be configured as self-replication, it is necessary to have a publication considered "definitive", in periodicals and books, since the simple rewriting of self-written textual fragments, applied to researches with similar themes or that follow the same way of thinking, does not configure plagiarism without effective publication (HHL Gonçalves et al., 2011).

As a way of combating plagiarism, Krokosz (2011) proposed measures from the following groupings: institutional, preventive, diagnostic and corrective measures. The institutional measures are hot site and institutional policy with content on plagiarism, disclosure of rules and norms, provision of guides, manuals and / or official documents on the subject, and academic integrity commission, disciplinary committee, syndication and others.

The related preventive measures are guidelines for clarifying ethical aspects in the academic community and the poor qualification of professionals who practice these dishonest actions. Also, material and links on topics, instrumental training (courses, activities, exercises, disciplinary approach, elaboration and orientation for academic works), ethical values training and dissemination

of rules, including the introduction of the subject of copyright in the disciplines related to research methodology teaching and final project, change in evaluation processes by the final paper construction, with greater detail in the correction of the document parts, from the records to the identification of the textual patterns' variations (Barbasfano & Souza, 2007; Krokosc, 2011, Veludo-De-Oliveira, Aguiar, Queiroz, & Barrichello, 2014). The established forms of diagnosis are the availability and use of plagiarism detection websites and software. Finally, corrective measures go through the description of plagiarism in institutional codes of honor or ethics, and penalization (warning, suspension, expulsion, and others) (Barbasfano & Souza, 2007, Krokosc, 2011, Veludo-De-Oliveira et al, 2014).

3 METHODOLOGY

This research is characterized by mixed approach, since the objectives of the research are based on both quantitative and qualitative methods. This research is also characterized as descriptive and interpretive (Vergara, 2009; Lopes, 2006). According to Godoy (1995), the descriptive nature makes possible a detailed account of a social phenomenon, involving the configuration, the structure, the activities and the relationship with other phenomena. For Denzin and Lincoln (2000) all research is interpretive. In the interpretative nature, we seek to find patterns in the empirical data collected in the field and to develop categories that make it possible to relate, illustrate, confirm or oppose assumptions.

P. A. Adler and P. Adler (1994) proposed that the first task of field research is to select the environment. Regarding the place and subjects, this study has as limit for its application the Graduate Program in Administration (PROPAD) of the Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE). PROPAD is composed of 30 teachers and approximately 120 students. For purposes of this research, the administrative support team was not accounted for. It was used the accessibility criterion for the data collection, being considered, therefore, a non-probabilistic sample, since it was not based on statistical procedures for the subjects' choice (Vergara & Ferreira, 2005; Vergara, 2009). The invitation to respond to the survey was sent by e-mail by the researchers and contained, in addition to basic information, the link to the electronic form made available through a GOOGLE search tool. In total, 47 forms were obtained, three of which were answered by teachers and the other 44 by students, representing 10% of teachers and 37% of students.

In the data tabulation, for analysis purposes, each respondent was identified by the letter R followed by an ordinal number assigned according to the response order. In data interpretation we used descriptive statistics, predominating for most of the questions the data content analysis, grouping recurrent themes according to their similarity and meaning. According to Godoy (1995), this is one of the most used techniques for codification, which can be applied to different discourses and to various forms of communication.

4 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Sociodemographic Profile

The survey was conducted online, in the month of July 2015 and obtained a total of 47 respondents. For sociodemographic profile, 82% of the respondents are between 20-40 years old, as shown in Table 1. Among the respondents, only 20% do not have a Master's degree, denoting that the majority of the respondents have a post-graduate *stricto sensu* course and, consequently, a prior knowledge of research methods.

Table 1 - Sociodemographic Data – Age group and formation

Options	Quantity	%	Options	Quantity	%
Between 20 and 30 years old	19	41%	University graduate	6	14%
Between 30 and 40 years old	19	41%	Specialization	3	6%
Between 40 and 50 years old	6	14%	Master	34	74%
Between 50 and 60 years old	2	4%	PHD degree	3	6%
Total	46		Total	46	
*empty	1		*empty	1	

When analyzing the respondents' gender, we perceive a balanced distribution, in which 59% are male and 41% female (Table 2). Regarding the type of respondents in the Graduate Program in Administration from PROPAD / UFPE, the highest concentration was composed of students with 94% against 6% of teachers. From the student universe, 74% are PHD students and 20% are masters students, which shows for the purposes of this analysis, greater maturity in research processes and knowledge creation.

Table 2 – Sociodemographic Data – Gender and Position

Options	Quantity	%	Options	Quantity	%
Male	27	59%	Lecturers	3	6%
Female	19	41%	Masters students	9	20%
			PHD students	34	74%
Total	46		Total	46	
*empty			*empty		

4.2 Ethics in researched teaching institution environment

Regarding the questioning of ethical importance in academic environment and how to make it practiced, it was identified that 17% did not respond, which shows a possible ignorance of the investigated ones and / or a lack of comfort or reflection to approach the subject. There is a consensus among respondents related to the relevance of ethics observance associated to actions' performance in academic environment, broadening their claims for correlation and overlapping of all social life dimensions.

We address the importance of ethics in research, in ensuring the integrity of participants and receivers, and in direct and indirect gains that socially acceptable behaviors can bring to a community. How to practice it is placed as something difficult, multifaceted and complex to structure.

Among them, reflections on acceptable behavior in research, reflection on the uses of research results and what groups such research represent: the effects of research results' impacts; inclusion the debate in curricular structures disciplines that discuss ethical values in research; guarantee of secrecy and confidentiality; and attitude based on the example of teacher behavior and, moreover, in the interaction of classmates with one another. For those who do not act under the aegis of ethical elements, breaking with accepted standards, the respondents suggested actions such as: punishment to inhibit practices; the creation of control mechanisms to identify ethical deviations; and cases' exposure.

On the other hand, 94% of respondents agree that teaching practices influence students' ethical behavior, and 90% agree that the academic environment also influences student ethics, with 5% disagreement and 5% indifference to such an assertion. Regarding the level of influence of technology in fraud process in academic production, 68% considered the influence high, 6% low and 23% indifferent, 2% did not respond.

4.3 Practices in scientific manuscripts development

Regarding questionable aspects related to textual citation practice and their authorship in manuscripts, considering the public that participated in the research, more assertive answers on the expression 'cross citation' were expected, since 47% of respondents stated that they did not know or understand the expression, considering the fact that a teacher participated in this percentage, and 22% gave incipient answers, such as R24: "a means of taking advantage"; and (R39): "natural nowadays."

It should be pointed out that two respondents confused cross-citation with self-plagiarism in their statements and only four students constructed in their answers a certain definition of the expression, represented by the affirmative of R42: "it is the practice of favors' exchange in which two or more people refer to each other in order to increase their representativeness in academic world. I think it's an attitude that hurts ethical principles in academia".

When we correlated the answers regarding the understanding or opinion of the participants in relation to cross-citation and the exemplification of their practices of manuscripts' textual construction, we noticed that, although a good part of the respondents did not know what the expression meant, 55% of the respondents said they had the practice of doing it, while 43% said they used to not perform that practice, and 2% did not respond.

Regarding over-citation, another aspect discussed in theoretical framework, 80% of the respondents said they did not know this expression. Among the ten most related answers, one confuses the expression with self-plagiarism, another tries to develop a certain explanation, as in: "I imagine the term refers to the use of too many quotations in a single work. I believe that any non-pertinent citation is dispensable" (R25). Three respondents in their answers indicate questions about whether the theoretical depth and the robustness of the work should be evaluated by the excess of citations in the text. Even though they didn't know the expression, in questioning about the exemplification of over citation practice, which mentions the use of many quotations from different authors, joining the author's ideas in the same paragraph, 51% of the respondents reported using many quotations from different authors, joining the ideas at the end of the same paragraph.

Regarding the practice of self-citation, we asked if, during the manuscripts' elaboration, they use in the references other works of their own authorship already published. According to the answers, 70% reported that they perform this practice, in agreement with the precepts of Tagliacozzo (1977) and Hyland (2003), against 30% who reported not using excerpts from their already published works, referencing them normatively in new papers, which supports the assumption of the Committee of Publication Ethics (2012).

When questioned about their understanding of plagiarism, participants' responses were balanced between the act or practice of plagiarism itself and the misappropriation of ideas or manuscripts. Fifty-three (53%) of the responses focused on practices related to plagiarism, how to use, copy, reproduce and quote parts of texts, according to the assumptions of Barbasfano and Souza (2007). This is seen in students' responses R23 and R29, respectively: "deliberate and deliberate copying of some of their own or others' ideas without proper reference" and "use of texts and / or reflections of other authors without giving due recognition to author who originated knowledge".

It is important to emphasize the two responses of teachers who corroborated this statement: "literal copy of another person's idea or text without citing the source" (R35) and "use of parts of thought or results of studies without due citation" (R45). Already 47% of respondents referred to plagiarism as a process of misappropriation (robbery) of intellectual property of idea or work without giving credit to its authorship. This type of reference is in line with the understanding of Barbasfano and Souza (2007), Bioethics Institute (2016), Pithan and Oliveira (2013), Martin (2013), and the 2011 Basic Guidelines for Scientific Integrity of the CNPQ (2015).

Regarding the types of plagiarism, the first one to be investigated was the self-plagiarism. When analyzing the responses that dealt with the respondents' opinions regarding the use of excerpts from texts written by them in different works, 55% considered it to be self-plagiarism against 30% who disagreed, and 13% of indifferent. When confronted with the question that exemplifies the practice

of copying excerpts from texts produced and published without reference to them, it was noticed that 70% of the respondents do not perform such practice, against 30% who said they did it.

As regards salami publishing, Martin (2013) explains that the fragmentation of a study can result in a duplication of publications and, consequently, in possible manifestation of plagiarism, however, only six respondents based their answers on this assumption and 60% of the respondents, including two teachers, agree with this practice in relation to more complex works such as theses and dissertations. This was largely justified by the need to disseminate the ideas, since these works have a large number of pages that must be reduced to meet the editorial standards of journals. The six respondents who do not agree with the fragmentation of the larger study justify the non-agreement based on the argument that the use of the same theoretical framework and the impoverishment of the scientific production with a view to productivism to the detriment of quality in research is not justified. Another pertinent aspect is that most respondents consider plagiarism to translate texts into other languages and publish them without reference to original authorship, as directed by Meuschke and Gipp (2013); only one respondent denied this statement.

In relation to the tools for the theoretical reference construction, when asked about the means for capturing material to be used in the construction of the theoretical reference during the elaboration of an article, 72% reported using virtual search engines, line was pointed out as a theoretical reference building tool by 89%. Physical library appeared as an option for 53%, 66% reported using at least three tools, the most used being online journals (89%), virtual search engines (72%) and virtual libraries (51%). The least used option was printed newspapers (34%).

Other responses were based on marketing channels with empirical discussion about the proposed theme, peers and colleagues in the researched area, as well as tabulations, articulation of ideas and historical maps. Participants were asked about the practice of checking the originality and the novelty of the idea when making a manuscript and 68% answered that they do the verification, which is a good practice to reduce possible plagiarism.

From those who reported performing this verification, 30% use specialized sites, 53% search engines and 15% specialized software. Among the search engines the most used is Google; it is also worth mentioning the use of sites such as Spell, Periodicos Capes, Google Scholar, SciELO, Proquest, Propensity Score Matching, EBSCO. 71% of the respondents reported not doing so, and from the respondents who protect it, their most common form is sharing with members of research groups (60%), 40% of respondents reported that they use as another form of protection the intentional non-disclosure of the manuscript they are developing.

4.4 Combating plagiarism in the researched teaching institution

Although many authors such as Barbasfano and Souza (2007), Krokosc (2011) and Veludo-De-Oliveira, Aguiar, Queiroz, & Barrichello (2014) preach the importance of combating plagiarism, 75% of respondents stated that they did not know any types of practices and measures aimed at the same in the educational institution of which they are part as students and teachers. According to the groupings proposed by Krokosc (2011), 19% who responded positively listed the measures to combat plagiarism that can be adopted, presented in Table 4.

Table 4 – Measures to combat plagiarism suggested by respondents

Kind	Measures	Quant.	%
Institutional	Providing guides, manuals or codes of ethics on the subject.	5	11%
	Action through academic integrity committee.	2	4%
Preventive	Clarification on ethical values in the academic community.	4	9%
	Clarification about poor qualification of professionals who practice dishonest actions.	1	2%
	Promotion of anti-personnel instrumental training (courses, activities, exercises, disciplinary approach, preparation and orientation for academic work).	1	2%
Diagnostic	Encouraging the use of plagiarism detection sites or software.	1	2%
Corrective	Correction for penalty / punishment of proven plagiarism.	4	9%

We observed suggestions of institutional measures to combat plagiarism with 11% of responses, followed by preventive measures, based on clarification of ethical values in the academic community and correction for penalization or punishment of proven plagiarism, both with 9% of the responses wishes.

Also, we realize that preventive and diagnostic measures are not widely known, such as clarifying ethical values, poor professional qualification, and encouraging the use of plagiarism detection sites or software. An institutional measure that may be better publicized is the action of the committee on academic integrity or ethics in research, as well as the preventive measure related to the evaluation of dishonest practices by the process of construction of the final work, which was not selected by the respondents.

5 CONCLUSIONS

This research sought to verify practices of creation and dissemination of academic knowledge aimed at the training of the researcher in Administration, based on the perception of students and professors from a prestigious postgraduate program of a higher education federal institution, in the State of Pernambuco. From the objective reached, it was possible to answer the question of research: "How common sense in the study environment has orientated the academic practices in an ethical perspective within the scope *stricto sensu* of the Post-Graduation in Administration?"

In this sense, the findings revealed that even some students and teachers having a *stricto sensu* experience, there is a distinction between their statements related to definitions and opinions about the theme, and their effective practices of developing academic texts, for not knowing the variations in the typology of plagiarism or in the absence of implementation of new measures to combat it and/or in the dissemination of those already practiced in the research institution.

In this way, the results allowed to infer that common sense oriented to ethical guidelines for the construction, registration and publication of knowledge acquired during the researcher's formation is still in the process of production, demanding, therefore, more academic discussions focused on ethical practices that contribute for its maturation and that consolidate it culturally in the analyzed environment.

It was also found that there is awareness of the need and importance of acting ethically, but no real examples of how to practice have been seen. In addition, it was confirmed that academic environment directly influences veiled practices and researcher's training. In this sense, such discussions should narrow between teachers and students of all academic levels training and extend beyond the institutional walls. This means that the debates should be encouraged and disseminated among academics, evaluators and editors of scientific journals, in order to define the universal ethical guidelines for good research practice, since some actions are carried out and accepted by academics naturally, without that the critical sense has attacked possible applications of unethical conduct, such as, for example, overlapping of publications involving duplicate submissions and publications, competing submissions and sister publications.

It is necessary, in the researched teaching institution, a greater preoccupation with the dissemination of concepts and capacities related to fraud modalities in research such as self-citation, cross-citation, over-citation, besides plagiarism, its typologies and unfolding. As well as the creation of mechanisms to protect the ideas and works of those who are part of the program. Academic-scientific development must always override the pressures imposed by the institutional evaluation system, which encourages the growing increase in publications and other quantitative indicators so that institutions can obtain satisfactory assessments, often secondarily to the quality of services provided and the results obtained.

The exercise of instilling in the agents of academic development the values and virtues inherent in ethical practices, which were treated in this study, is already part of the first step so that the reality of academic production is modified from an ethical perspective. The second step is to disseminate good practices guided by such values and institutionalize them, in order to generate a positive impact on the researcher's training process.

In addition to the above considerations, this manuscript also presented as a contribution, the epistemological extension of the ethical conduct that the researcher must assume, when addressing topics that exist in pragmatism, but that are not brought to debate by the academic community, as is the case of cross-citation and over-citation.

6 LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR NEW RESEARCH

Like most robust qualitative research, this study had limitations. The first one was the fact that few teachers belonging to the studied universe answered the questionnaire. More answers were expected so that the results could be confronted more assertively between teachers and students and suddenly so that other situations could also be addressed in the categorizations made from the feedbacks. The second limitation concerns the design of the path through which the theoretical framework and the underlying discussions have been pursued, since many sub-themes are associated with ethical violations. The topic allows for numerous discussions, but that does not fit only in a manuscript, due to the restriction of words and pages.

For future research, we suggest the inclusion of reviewers and editors of journals in this investigative process, as well as other academic communities distinct from the analyzed one, in order to verify the perception of a larger universe regarding the studied subject. It is possible for other practices and realities to be visualized and, therefore, to help define accepted and ethical practices for the construction, registration and publication of acquired knowledge and greater ontological incorporation of ethics into academic activities.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Hand book of qualitative research*. Londres: SAGE, 377-392.
- Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas. (2002). *NBR 10520:2002*. Informação e documentação - Citações em documentos - Apresentação.
- Barbasfano, R. G., & Souza, C. G. (2007). Percepção do conceito de plágio acadêmico entre alunos de engenharia de produção e ações para sua redução. *Revista Produção Online*, Edição Especial dez.
- Bertero, C. O., Caldas, M. P., & Wood, T. Jr. (1999, jan./abr.). Produção científica em administração de empresas: Provocações, insinuações e contribuições para um debate local. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 3(1), 147-178.
- Bonzi, S., & Snyder, H. W. (1991). Motivations for citation: A comparison of self-citation and citation to others. *Scientometrics*, 21(2), 245-254.
- Brasil. (2011). *Plágio Acadêmico: Conhecer para combater*. In Ministério de Saúde (Org.). Rio de Janeiro: INCA.
- Bretag, T., & Mahmud, S. (2009). Self-plagiarism or appropriate textual re-use? *Journal Academy Ethics*, (7), 193-205.
- Cardoso, A. L. J. (2015). Processo científico: A formação do pesquisador em Administração. *Pretexto*, 6(1), 99-116.
- Chen, D., Mocker, M., Preston, D. S., & Teubner, A. (2010). Information systems strategy: Reconceptualization, measurement, and implications. *MIS Quarterly*, 34(2), 233-259.

- Committee of Publication Ethics. (2012). *Citation manipulation*. Concordia Library: Texas. Recuperado de: [http://publicationethics.org/files/u661/Forum discussion topic_final.pdf](http://publicationethics.org/files/u661/Forum%20discussion%20topic_final.pdf)
- Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico. (2015). *Diretrizes Básicas para a Integridade Científica de 2011*. Recuperado de <http://www.cnpq.br/documents/10157/a8927840-2b8f-43b9-8962-5a2ccfa74dda>
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Gatti, B. A. (1987). Formar professores ou pesquisadores no Mestrado em Educação. *Boletim Anped*, (1), 31-34.
- Godoy, A. S. (1995). Pesquisa qualitativa: Tipos fundamentais. *Revista de Administração de Empresas (RAE)*, 35(3), 20-29, São Paulo.
- Gollogly, L., & Momen, H. (2006). Ethical dilemmas in scientific publication: Pitfalls and solutions for editors. *Revista Saúde Pública*, 40(esp.), 24-29.
- Gomes, H. F. (2011). Ética e informação na construção do conhecimento e a perspectiva Bachelardiana dos obstáculos epistemológicos na formação do espírito científico. *Revista de Asociación de Educación e Investigación en Ciencia de La Información de Iberoamericana y El Caribe*, 1(1).
- Gonçalves, H. H. L., Noldin, P. H. P., & Gonçalves, C. C. O. (2011). Recurso do plágio em trabalhos acadêmico-científicos: Um tema em questão. *Revista da UNIFEFE*, (9), jul./dez.
- Hyland, K. (2003). Self-citation and self-reference: Credibility and promotion in academic publication. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 54(3), 251-259.
- Inarelli, P. B., Sanches, O. P., Cappelozza, A., & Albertin, A. L. (2011). Fatores antecedentes na atitude de alunos de graduação frente ao plágio. In XXXV Encontro da Associação Nacional de Pós-graduação e Pesquisa em Administração, *Anais...*, Rio de Janeiro.
- Instituto Bioética. (2016). Recuperado de <http://anis.org.br/>
- Johnson, S., & Martin, M. (2005). Academic dishonesty: A new twist to an old problem. *Athletic Therapy Today*, 10(4), 48-50.
- Krokosz, M. (2011). Abordagem do plágio nas três melhores universidades de cada um dos cinco continentes e do Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 16(48), set./dez.
- Lei n. 9.610, de 19 de fevereiro de 1998*. Altera, atualiza e consolida a legislação sobre direitos autorais e dá outras providências. Recuperado de http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L9610.htm
- Lombardo, T. (2009). Understanding and teaching future consciousness. *On the Horizon*, 17(2), 85-97.
- Lopes, J. (2006). *O fazer do trabalho científico em ciências sociais*. Recife: Universitária.
- Manso, E. J. V. (1987). *O que é direito autoral*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

- Martin, B. R. (2013). Whither research integrity? Plagiarism, self-plagiarism and coercive citation in an age of research assessment. *Research Policy*, 42, 1005-1014.
- McCuen, R. H. (2008). The plagiarism decision process: The role of pressure and rationalization. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 51(2), 52-56.
- Meuschke, N., & Gipp, B. (2013). State-of-the-art in detecting academic plagiarism. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 9(1), 50-71.
- Pardo, M. B. L. (2011). Formação do pesquisador: Resultados de cursos de pós-graduação em educação. *Paidéia*, 21(49), 237-246.
- Paula, S. L., & Mendonça, J. R. (2014). A construção de uma impressão socialmente responsável: Um estudo em instituições de ensino superior a partir da comunicação organizacional. *Revista de Negócios*, 19, 44-69.
- Pinto, N. B., & Martins, P. L. O. (2009). Práticas de formação de pesquisadores da Educação. *Rev. Diálogo Educ.*, Curitiba, 9(26), 103-118.
- Pithan, L. V., & Oliveira, A. P. (2013). Ética e integridade na pesquisa: O plágio nas publicações científicas. *Revista da Associação Médica do Rio Grande do Sul*, 57(3), 240-245.
- Resnik, D. B. (2013). *What is Ethics in Research & Why is it Important?* National Institute of Environment Health Sciences.
- Roberts, E. (2002). Strategies for promoting academic integrity in CS Courses. *Frontiers in Education* (32nd. Annual). IEEE, v. 2, p F3G-14-F3G19.
- Russo, M. (2014). Ética e integridade na ciência: Da responsabilidade do cientista à responsabilidade coletiva. *Estudos Avançados*, 28(80), 189-198.
- Sanchez, O. P., & Innarelli, P. B. (2012). Desonestidade acadêmica, plágio e ética. *GV Executivo*, 11(1), jan/jun.
- Sharp, M. (2003). *Intellectual property legal alert*.
- Tagliacozzo, R. (1977). Self-citations in scientific literature. *Journal of Documentation*, 33(4), 265-272.
- Vasconcelos, S., Leta, J., Costa, L., Pinto, A., & Sorenson, M. M. (2009) Discussing plagiarism in Latin American science. *European Molecular Biology Organization Reports*, 10(7), 677-682.
- Veludo-De-Oliveira, T. M., Aguiar, F. H. O., 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, jan./fev.
- Vergara, S. C. (2009). *Projetos e relatórios de pesquisa em administração*. São Paulo: Atlas.
- Vergara, S. C., & Ferreira, V. C. P. (2005). A representação social de ONGs segundo formadores de opinião do Município do Rio de Janeiro. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 39(5), 1138-1159.