RCA Revista de Ciências da Administração
Revista de Ciências da Administração, Florianópolis, Editorial v.28 n.68
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. ISSN 2175-8077
UFSC CAD DEPARTAMENTO DE CIÊNCIAS DA ADMINISTRAÇÃO

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-8077.2026.e103069

EDITORIAL

THE NEW ERA OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: INTEGRITY AND ETHICS IN SCIENTIFIC PRODUCTION AND EDITORIAL PRACTICE

Editorial v.28 n.68

Rosalia Lavarda

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC)
rosalia.lavarda@ufsc.br
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1093-4486

Leandro Dorneles dos Santos

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC)
leandro.dorneles@ufsc.br
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3448-1020

The State of Science in 2026

As we begin this volume of the Revista de Ciências da Administração (RCA) in 2026, we observe the consolidation of a movement associated with a sociomaterial perspective in scientific production, in which Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) becomes structurally embedded in research, writing, and academic evaluation practices. This movement expands the operational tools available to researchers and reconfigures epistemological assumptions related to authorship, originality, and knowledge validation.

GAI, previously confined to experimental uses, now plays an active role in mediating scientific practices, influencing everything from the formulation of research problems to the discursive organization of results. This scenario enhances the capacity for information processing and synthesis and redefines the boundaries between technical support and intellectual production.

In this context, the focus shifts to the governance of technology use, requiring explicit criteria for responsibility, traceability, and validation. RCA understands this moment as an inflection point that calls for a clear institu-

tional stance, aligned with international best practices and the specificities of the field of Management in Brazil.

This editorial aims to define RCA's position in relation to this transformation, reaffirming that the incorporation of GAI must be guided by principles of scientific integrity, authorial responsibility, and procedural transparency, preserving the centrality of human agency in knowledge construction.

Ethics: Curation and Autonomy

The incorporation of AI in Management research requires the systematic exercise of what Cardoso and Gammarano (2025) define as Critical Curation. This concept establishes that the use of generative systems entails active evaluation, selection, and validation by the researcher, shifting the focus from the tool itself to the quality of human judgment in interacting with such systems.

Critical curation involves iterative processes of semantic verification, theoretical coherence, and methodological consistency, ensuring alignment between generated content and the analytical objectives of the study. This practice reinforces the distinction between technological assistance and intellectual production, safeguarding the integrity of the scientific argument.

At the same time, the researcher's cognitive autonomy constitutes a structuring principle of scientific production. Maintaining this autonomy requires recognizing artificial intelligence as a support tool whose use presupposes prior conceptual mastery, independent analytical capacity, and the continuous exercise of critical curation (Cardoso & Gammarano, 2025). In this sense, scientific knowledge production results from the articulation between specialized knowledge and situated judgment developed within epistemic communities (Collins & Evans, 2007).

This understanding reinforces that the incorporation of AI into the research process requires active intellectual supervision, in which the researcher evaluates, validates, and contextualizes generated outputs. In alignment with the three-dimensional transparency model proposed by Cardoso and Gammarano (2025), this practice involves explicitly stating the extent of AI use, the tools employed, and the human validation procedures adopted. Thus, the use of AI-based systems constitutes an assistive practice guided by rigor and reflexivity, whose effectiveness depends on the researcher's ability to formulate relevant problems, mobilize consistent theoretical frameworks, and interpret evidence rigorously.

In this regard, RCA adopts the three-dimensional transparency model proposed by Cardoso and Gammarano (2025), institutionalizing the requirement to explicitly disclose the use of AI in submitted manuscripts. Authors must declare the extent of use, the tools employed, and the human validation procedures in a systematic and verifiable manner.

Transparency operates as a mechanism of scientific accountability, enabling the traceability of methodological decisions and strengthening trust among authors, reviewers, and readers. This guideline contributes to the consolidation of shared ethical standards within the academic community.

Institutional Guidelines and Regulatory Frameworks

RCA's editorial position is grounded in national and international regulatory frameworks that guide integrity in scientific activity. Ordinance No. 2,664/2026 of CNPq establishes guidelines assigning full and non-transferable responsibility to authors for published content, regardless of the instruments used in its development.

This guidance reinforces the understanding that technological mediation does not alter the nature of scientific responsibility, maintaining the researcher as the central agent in the validation and communication of knowledge: "Artificial intelligence is a means of enhancing human capabilities, but ethical, legal, and scientific responsibility for the knowledge produced rests exclusively with the researcher" (CNPq, 2026).

The ANPAD Manual of Good Practices in Scientific Publishing (2025) had already advanced this understanding by encouraging transparent practices and the explicit identification of human and technological contributions in manuscripts. Additionally, the guidelines of the Revista de Administração Contemporânea (RAC) provide a relevant framework for the responsible adoption of artificial intelligence tools. RAC establishes that the use of AI is acceptable in support activities such as language revision, translation, and text organization, provided it is properly disclosed. When applied to substantive stages of research, such as literature review, data analysis, or content generation, its use must be described in detail, including the tool, version, and purpose.

These guidelines reinforce the need for transparency protocols that ensure reproducibility and reliability of results, contributing to the standardization of emerging practices in the field of Management. Operationally, such protocols require the systematic disclosure of the stages in which AI tools are employed throughout the research process, including their analytical function, usage parameters, and human validation criteria.

This formalization enhances the traceability of methodological decisions and strengthens the internal consistency of studies by enabling other researchers to understand, evaluate, and, when appropriate, reproduce the procedures adopted. In alignment with RAC guidelines, transparency assumes a procedural and documentary character, requiring that AI use be reported clearly and contextually, especially when integrated into substantive stages of the investigation.

The standardization of these protocols fosters the development of shared references in the field, contributing to the consolidation of good practices and the reduction of asymmetries in scientific evaluation. In this context, transparency functions as a structuring mechanism of scientific integrity, sustaining trust among authors, reviewers, and readers and preserving the cumulative quality of knowledge production.

Editorial Practices: Authorship and the Defense of the Commons

Within editorial management, RCA reaffirms that scientific authorship presupposes responsibility, intentionality, and accountability, attributes that remain exclusively human, as established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, 2023).

RCA also establishes clear guidelines for the peer review process. Reviewers may use AI tools only for auxiliary tasks, such as assessing textual clarity, while retaining full responsibility for critical judgment regarding scientific quality, originality, and methodological rigor.

Editors may use AI in administrative tasks, such as initial screening or similarity checks, while preserving editorial decision-making as an exclusively human responsibility. Any use of AI in the editorial process must be transparent and communicated to the Editor-in-Chief, in line with RAC recommendations.

RCA explicitly prohibits practices that compromise the integrity of the editorial process, including the insertion of hidden instructions or undisclosed prompts in manuscripts or reviews. Such practices undermine trust in the evaluation system and weaken mechanisms of scientific validation.

Inspired by Fournier (2013), editorial practices are understood as part of a system of production and maintenance of the knowledge commons. The peer review process constitutes a collective space for constructing and validating knowledge, sustained by qualified human interactions. Preserving this space requires strengthening critical judgment, interpretive diversity, and reflexivity, ensuring that technological advancement contributes to the improvement, rather than the homogenization, of scientific production.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Through this editorial, the Revista de Ciências da Administração consolidates a position that articulates technological innovation and ethical rigor, recognizing Generative Artificial Intelligence as a component of the contemporary scientific ecosystem.

Excellence in research in 2026 requires analytical competence, ethical responsibility, and the capacity to govern the use of emerging technologies. The researcher acts as a mediator between these digital tools and knowledge production, ensuring coherence, originality, and scientific validity.

In this sense, RCA reaffirms its commitment to transparent editorial practices aligned with open access principles, strengthening knowledge sharing and collaboration among researchers, professors, students, and professionals in the field of Management.

We invite the academic community to engage actively and responsibly in this process, contributing to the development of a robust, ethical, and intellectually diverse scientific environment capable of addressing contemporary challenges in the production and dissemination of knowledge in Management.

RCA Guidelines for the Use of AI

In alignment with the editorial position presented in this issue, the Revista de Ciências da Administração (RCA) establishes the following guidelines to ensure that the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in scientific production and editorial processes remains consistent with principles of scientific integrity, authorial responsibility, and procedural transparency.

These guidelines are grounded in the understanding that AI constitutes a supportive and assistive practice, whose validity depends on active human supervision, critical evaluation, and contextualized interpretation, as outlined in the three-dimensional transparency model adopted by RCA.

Guidelines for RCA

a) AI cannot be listed as an author;
b) The use of AI must be explicitly disclosed;
c) Substantive applications must be described in the methods section;
d) Tool, version, and purpose must be specified;
e) Human validation must be explicitly stated;
f) Reviewers and editors may **not** use AI for article evaluation tasks or tasks that utilize article content; AI may only be used for auxiliary tasks, such as improving the writing of the review or email messages;
g) The use of AI in the editorial process must be transparent and, when applicable, communicated to the Editor-in-Chief through the "Declaration of AI Use by Reviewers" (mandatory document from 2026);
h) The insertion of hidden prompts or instructions in manuscripts or reviews is prohibited;
i) The submission of AI-generated content as if it were authored by humans is prohibited, with authors being fully responsible for the final content, including any plagiarism or inaccuracies generated by AI;
j) The insertion of third-party research projects into AI tools for the preparation of scientific reviews is prohibited;
k) To be fully responsible for the final content of the research, including any plagiarism or inaccuracies generated by AI.

These guidelines operationalize transparency as a structuring mechanism of scientific integrity, enabling the traceability of methodological decisions and strengthening trust among authors, reviewers, and readers. By standardizing reporting practices, RCA contributes to the consolidation of shared ethical parameters and to the cumulative quality of knowledge production in the field of Management.

REFERENCES

ANPAD. (2025). *Manual de boas práticas da publicação científica da ANPAD*. Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Administração. https://anpad.blob.core.windows.net/files/2025_Boas_Praticas.pdf

Cardoso, A. S., & Gammarano, I. D. L. (2025). Guia para o uso ético e responsável da inteligência artificial generativa no âmbito acadêmico. *Revista de Ciências da Administração*, 27(67). https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-8077.2025.e109536

Collins, H., & Evans, R. (2007). *Rethinking Expertise*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226113623.001.0001

CNPq. (2026). Portaria nº 2.664/2026: *Estabelece a política de integridade na atividade científica do Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico*. Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação. http://www.cnpq.br/web/guest/view/-/journal_content/56_INSTANCE_0oED/10157/23142775

Committee on Publication Ethics. (2023). *Authorship and AI tools: COPE position statement*. https://doi.org/10.24318/cCVRZBms

Fournier, V. (2013). Commoning: On the social organisation of the commons. In M. Parker, G. Cheney, V. Fournier, & C. Land (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to alternative organization* (pp.433-453). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.3917/mana.164.0433

Statement on the Use of Artificial Intelligence

This editorial was prepared by the editorial team, with contributions from the associate editor and the editor-in-chief. Generative artificial intelligence tools (ChatGPT, free version) were used in support stages related to language revision and textual organization. All content was fully evaluated, validated, and approved by the authors, who assume full responsibility for its accuracy, integrity, and originality.