

Management Research and Managerial Practice: A Complex and Controversial Relationship

R. DUANE IRELAND
Texas A&M University

The relationship between management research and managerial practice is an issue that for many years has commanded attention from diverse parties such as business writers, students, and faculty members themselves. The results of the analyses of this relationship are controversial in that at least some members of some groups continue to hold different views. In their work, Pearce and Huang support the perspective that management research should inform managerial practice. However, they argue that the amount of "actionable research" (research that teachers can effectively use in their classrooms) that is being published in two prestigious journals (Academy of Management Journal and Administrative Science Quarterly) is declining. Pearce and Huang speculate as to why this is the case and propose solutions to deal with the issue. Herein, I speak to the context and framing of the Pearce and Huang study, offering an alternative definition of actionable research in the process of doing so. Using Pearce and Huang's results and the perspectives included here, I close with a set of recommendations about future work that might be completed as a foundation for continuing the dialogue about the relationship between management research and managerial practice.

The extent to which management scholarship does inform and should inform managerial practice are questions that have received considerable attention over the years. One conclusion that can be drawn from this body of work, including Pearce and Huang's study (2012, this issue), is that the answers to these questions remain uncertain. In general though, we can note that researchers studying the relationship between "research and practice" commonly conclude that there is a gap between these two phenomena (Burke & Rau, 2010). This gap, which some argue may be reduced by enhancements to the art and practice of "teaching" (Burke & Sadler-Smith, 2006), can be viewed as dichotomous (i.e., the gap exists or it doesn't) or in a continuous manner (i.e., the gap varies from positions of "relatively insignificant" to "highly significant"). And, as Bansal, Bertels, Ewart, MacConachie, and O'Brien (2012) note, this gap has been identified and discussed in multiple venues including addresses by presidents of the Academy of Management; research published in special issues

of journals that are devoted to the topic; and opinion-based commentaries appearing in business magazines, and increasingly today, in business-related blogs.

Early in their article, Pearce and Huang note that a long-term expectation associated with the work of academic faculty is that the best teachers are also scholars, meaning that creating and distributing knowledge are complementary activities (Becker & Kennedy, 2005). As Pearce and Huang observe, "This tells us how scholars are expected to approach their teaching: Scholars know the latest knowledge, seek to contribute new knowledge, and are always learning" (Pearce & Huang, 2012). What specifically concerns Pearce and Huang, though, is the possibility that the work management researchers are producing today is less actionable and hence potentially less useful to those we teach. Indeed, their study focuses on the conclusion that management scholarship is increasingly less useful to the teaching of management. In turn, less actionable and useful research may be

one factor contributing to the gap among management research, teaching, and managerial practice. Of additional and primary concern to Pearce and Huang is their proposal that a shift to less actionable research being published in the management field's most prestigious journals contributes significantly to the problem around which their study is framed. In fact, a core objective of their study is to determine if the "proportion of actionable research [published in two of the management field's most prestigious journals] has changed over time" (Pearce & Huang, 2012).

Regularly evaluating our academic work is the path through which the management field advances (Hitt, 2009), largely as a result of the actions we take to enhance the quality of our research and teaching. These improvements are also the foundation for efforts to address criticisms of our work and the outcomes of those efforts. Thus, Pearce and Huang's call to examine ourselves in terms of our research and its usefulness is certainly appropriate.

When examining our work though, we want to recall its nature. Devinney and Siegel (2012) for example, argue that because the management discipline is a product of integrating four social sciences disciplines—psychology, sociology, economics, and to a lesser degree political science—management research is complex. In turn, it may be that such complexity challenges our efforts as teachers to interpret the results of our research in ways that demonstrate its value and potential usefulness to managerial practice.

[I]t may be that such complexity challenges our efforts as teachers to interpret the results of our research in ways that demonstrate its value and potential usefulness to managerial practice.

My purpose herein is to advance positions, viewpoints, and perspectives regarding Pearce and Huang's arguments and recommendations. In doing so, I seek to continue the dialogue about the issues Pearce and Huang address. Of course, the matter of the degree to which management research (as broadly defined) informs (or should inform) management education is complicated and belies a simple resolution. Over time, additional discussions and evaluations (beyond those offered by Pearce and Huang as well as mine here) in which contrarian arguments are introduced into the dia-

logue for the purpose of expanding the scope of the analyses of the issue at hand will be the path through which we enhance our understanding of the complex relationship being studied.

I proceed as follows. First, I consider the context and framing of Pearce and Huang's arguments and the work they completed to examine them. Using this discussion as a backdrop, the final two sections deal with the nature of the Pearce and Huang study and recommendations to continue the scholarly dialogue about using management research to meaningfully inform management education, and subsequently, managerial practice.

THE CONTEXT AND FRAMING OF PEARCE AND HUANG'S WORK

Context is important to efforts to understand a phenomenon of interest (Bamberger & Pratt, 2010). With respect to the Pearce and Huang arguments, two parties—teachers and their students—are contextually involved with the processes through which management research informs management teaching and managerial practice. In my opinion, effective educational pursuits occur through a process of reciprocal task interdependence (Thompson, 1967), through which learning takes place as students and teachers simultaneously work together to achieve desired results.

In a related manner, issues regarding the framing of the questions Pearce and Huang chose to examine can be considered. Important to Pearce and Huang's analysis is the view that students expect to learn as a result of participating in our courses. With this position as a baseline, and in a fashion that is consistent with a long-established tradition and belief, Pearce and Huang then argue that management research should inform management teaching and managerial practice as paths to student learning. More specifically, Pearce and Huang (2012, this issue) suggest that students should learn from actionable research. In their view, research is actionable "if any individual could take or alter his or her own actions based on its findings." When examining research published in prestigious journals, Pearce and Huang focus on the degree to which research results inform instrumental and conceptual knowledge. Students/practitioners apply instrumental knowledge "in a direct way to address a specific practical problem" and "use research conceptually when it aids in their general understanding of a phenomenon, even if that understanding does not immediately influence their actions."

There are two issues regarding the framing of the Pearce and Huang study that I want to surface.



UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DA PARAÍBA
CENTRO DE EDUCAÇÃO – CENTRO DE CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS E APLICADAS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM GESTÃO NAS ORGANIZAÇÕES APRENDENTES

Processo Seletivo – Turma 15 – 2023

Cartão de Respostas: Prova de Conhecimentos em Língua Estrangeira - Inglês



TEXTO DE REFERÊNCIA:

Ireland, R. D. Management research and managerial practice: A complex and controversial relationship. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, v. 11, n. 2, p. 263-271, 2012.
Disponível em: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amle.2012.0090>. Acesso em: 13 jun. 2023.

QUESTÃO 1

O trecho “*researchers studying the relationship between research and practice commonly conclude that there is a gap between these two phenomena*” significa que:

- a) a pesquisa acadêmica e a prática profissional estão próximas uma da outra
- b) a pesquisa acadêmica e a prática profissional estão separadas uma da outra
- c) a pesquisa acadêmica e a prática profissional têm relacionamento com outros dois fenômenos
- d) há dois fenômenos intrigantes na pesquisa acadêmica e na prática profissional
- e) a pesquisa acadêmica e a prática profissional se relacionam de duas formas fenomenológicas

QUESTÃO 2

No texto, a palavra “*scholars*” refere-se a:

- a) escolas
- b) nível de escolaridade
- c) instituições de ensino e pesquisa
- d) pesquisadores acadêmicos
- e) profissionais da indústria

QUESTÃO 3

No trecho “*(...) work management researchers are producing today is less actionable and hence potentially less useful to those we teach*”, a ideia é:

- a) trabalhadores de hoje produzem menos do que antes
- b) trabalhadores do conhecimento têm potencial para atuarem no ensino
- c) a pesquisa sobre gestão do trabalho é menos aplicável na prática e menos útil para os alunos
- d) a gestão do trabalho e a absorção de conhecimento por parte dos alunos é interesse atual em pesquisa acadêmica
- e) pesquisadores da área de gestão têm investido em novas interações com seus alunos

QUESTÃO 4



No trecho *“I close with a set of recommendations about future work”*, o autor quer dizer que:

- a) a pesquisa acadêmica está fechando suas portas
 - b) a pesquisa acadêmica está fechando suas portas para novas recomendações
 - c) a pesquisa acadêmica está fechando suas portas para o futuro do trabalho
 - d) elaboram-se recomendações para trabalhos futuros
 - e) recomendações para trabalhos futuros estão se fechando
-

QUESTÃO 5

Por que o texto faz tantas referências a um artigo de Pearce e Huang?

- a) porque é um trabalho desconhecido, devendo ser trazido à tona
 - b) porque é um trabalho sobre complexidade e relacionamentos controversos entre membros organizacionais
 - c) porque é um trabalho sobre a relação entre pesquisa acadêmica e prática profissional na área de gestão
 - d) porque é um trabalho sobre a relação gerencial de pesquisadores e profissionais
 - e) porque é um trabalho sobre como organizações gerenciam internamente a pesquisa e a prática
-

QUESTÃO 6

No trecho *“Regularly evaluating our academic work is the path through which the management field advances”*, a ideia é:

- a) regular a pesquisa acadêmica é uma necessidade
 - b) regular o conhecimento gerencial é uma necessidade
 - c) avaliar a pesquisa acadêmica contribui para desenvolver o conhecimento gerencial
 - d) o trabalho acadêmico é um caminho para regular as práticas de gestão
 - e) a gestão regula o caminho do trabalho acadêmico
-

QUESTÃO 7

Em *“When examining our work, we want to recall its nature”*, a palavra *“nature”* refere-se a:

- a) natureza em termos gerais
- b) natureza humana
- c) natureza do trabalho de pesquisa



UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DA PARAÍBA
CENTRO DE EDUCAÇÃO – CENTRO DE CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS E APLICADAS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM GESTÃO NAS ORGANIZAÇÕES APRENDENTES

Processo Seletivo – Turma 15 – 2023

Cartão de Respostas: Prova de Conhecimentos em Língua Estrangeira - Inglês



- d) o quão natural é haver memórias de pesquisa
 - e) o quão natural é realizar pesquisas sobre o trabalho
-

QUESTÃO 8

O que o autor quer dizer com “*effective educational pursuits occur through a process of reciprocal task interdependence*”?

- a) efeitos educacionais reverberam de forma interdependente em tarefas recíprocas
 - b) efeitos educacionais dão origem a processos de busca por reciprocidade em tarefas independentes
 - c) objetivos educacionais efetivos se manifestam em processos de interdependência de tarefas
 - d) reciprocidade e interdependência caracterizam a educação por objetivos
 - e) educação efetiva ocorre na reciprocidade de processos
-

QUESTÃO 9

Em “*With this position as a baseline, and in a fashion that is consistent with a long-established tradition and belief, Pearce and Huang then argue that management research should inform management teaching and managerial practice as paths to student learning*”, a palavra “*fashion*” significa:

- a) modismo acadêmico
 - b) estilo de redação
 - c) raridade
 - d) controvérsia
 - e) maneira
-

QUESTÃO 10

Em “*research is actionable if any individual could take or alter his or her own actions based on its findings*”, a expressão “*his or her*” refere-se a:

- a) ações de homens ou mulheres
- b) ações que serão diferentes conforme a pessoa for homem ou mulher
- c) ações que não serão diferentes conforme a pessoa for homem ou mulher
- d) ações que só podem ser analisadas no nível individual, e não de grupo
- e) ações que não podem ser analisadas no nível individual

OPINION PAPER**ChatGPT and Publication Ethics**

Academic publishing is crucial for scientific communication, is governed by accepted ethical norms, and underpins the collective literature on basic science, and technological and medical principles and advances. In November 2022, the public and professional global communities, including the scientific community, witnessed the release of ChatGPT by OpenAI in San Francisco, California, USA. Excluding its public appeal and entertaining aspects but considering its diverse potential applications, some ethical concerns must be considered before establishing guidelines on using and including ChatGPT or similar platforms in scientific publishing. Some academic publishers and preprints have accepted manuscripts with ChatGPT listed as a “co-author”. Though excluding such platforms from scientific publishing may not be practicable with time, establishing ethical principles is essential before ChatGPT could become a “co-author” in any scientific, published manuscript. © 2023 Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social (IMSS). Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Introduction

November 2022 saw the release of ChatGPT by its developer, OpenAI, in San Francisco, California, USA. ChatGPT is an artificially intelligent chatbot dubbed “generative pretrained transformer.” The public attention to ChatGPT skyrocketed since its release, attracting more than 100 million users as of January 2023, making it the most popular chatbot released recently. ChatGPT uses a deep-learning platform and undergoes continuous learning and retraining by referring to the existing body of written text available on the internet. ChatGPT can generate high-quality, plausible, human-like written responses. It can also generate statistical analyses, lyrics, computer programs, and abstracts or introductions to scientific articles. Although the GPT-generated text may be plausible, it may not necessarily be factual. ChatGPT was reported to pass the United States Medical Licensing Examination with a 60% score (1). Some counter-sources, for example <https://gptzero.me/>, designed and purposed to detect plagiarism, claim to detect AI-generated text. However, they fail to assure that the tested text is devoid of AI input as they work probabilistically, i.e., “Your text is likely to be written entirely by a human.” Resources, including Copyleaks, DetectGPT, GPT-2 Output Detector, AI Detector Pro, Corrector AI-content detector, Content at Scale AI detector, Writer AI-content detector, Turnitin, Crossplag™, and finally AI Classifier (by the same developer as that of ChatGPT) may be used for the same purposes. Nevertheless, they may not have been tested thoroughly to assess their capabilities in de-

tecting artificially generated scientific content by ChatGPT or other AI content generators. While global enthusiasm about ChatGPT is increasing and its potential to contribute to authorship debated, we would like to discuss some basic ethical principles to consider regarding AI content generators.

Ethical considerations regarding ChatGPT contribution to academic publishing

AI tools based on large language models, such as ChatGPT, rely on a plethora of text already amassed on the internet; thus, establishing the originality, verifiability, and accuracy of their outputs will remain questionable and difficult, but not impossible. Additionally, these tools cannot inclusively embody the cumulative world-wide mass of text because they may presently be limited to the dominating languages they search and train on, using the internet. Also, they may only train and retrain on openly accessible text sources mainly those published before the present time. While ChatGPT fails to predict the immediate or distant future events or the news, according to OpenAI, “ChatGPT sometimes writes plausible-sounding but incorrect or nonsensical answers” (2). Implications of regurgitating plausible but nonfactual statements are wide-ranging, from basic science to medicine and human health. Translation of basic science to medical practice takes years of scrutiny by field experts, who are human. Use of ChatGPT to prepare a report on the efficacy of a hypothetical medication without proper human oversight and crosschecking will be most likely detrimental. Any bias, imprecision, or inaccuracy thus produced, promoted, or trusted may com-

Authors contributions: FR and ATBA contributed equally.

promise patient safety and health and mislead the public. This could potentially erode more the public trust to scientific enterprise. Invitations such as "Submit your case report written with the assistance of ChatGPT by February 28." implicate, encourage, and acknowledge the ChatGPT use among authors and publishers. Innovative claims written in acknowledgements of published articles such as "The authors would like to acknowledge the use of ChatGPT (OpenAI LP, OpenAI Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA) in accordance with the journal guidelines while preparing this manuscript" indicate that ChatGPT has entered and could potentially dominate the publishing field. Thus, revised policies and guidelines are required to right the inconsistent recognition of ChatGPT in the scientific publishing. Indeed, inviting authors to use ChatGPT in writing a manuscript (even partially or as a first draft) seems immature particularly because application of ChatGPT in such tasks is dubious and relevant consistent ethical guidelines are lacking. Double-checking always is necessary because the text may contain plagiarism, erroneous information, or incorrect citations. Expectedly, plagiarism rates in upcoming manuscripts will sharply increase because many authors may resort to ChatGPT. ChatGPT may be used for initial drafting of reports in research notes or manuscripts. ChatGPT may arguably be used as a writing aide by non-native English writers; however, ChatGPT should not be trusted so much as an English author or editor who is well-versed with nuances of the language, including syntax, grammar, logic, fact-finding, fact-checking, cohesion, and punctuation conventions. Extreme reliance on AI tools for content generation by non-native English writers and lack of proper editing may jeopardize the essential standard of writing expected of academic publishing. Editors and reviewers should use new tools to detect, identify, and highlight plagiarism and potential fallacies generated by AI tools. AI tools should be used cautiously, and all aspects of this technology should be clear and transparent when promoted in scientific publications. Universities and educational institutions are concerned about plagiarism introduced by AI tools in essays, assignments, assessments, and examinations, defying the essential purposes of education by critical thinking and problem-solving.

Although actual capability of ChatGPT to write scientific and technical papers is not extensively studied, some academics are impressed by how ChatGPT can produce an abstract, discussion, or introduction for a manuscript draft (3). A paper by O' Connor (4,5), used ChatGPT as a "co-author" initially; however, a corrigendum to the manuscript followed, removing ChatGPT (4,5). The journal explained that "The first author became aware that the second listed author, 'ChatGPT', does not qualify for authorship according to the journal's guide for authors and to Elsevier's Publishing Ethics Policies. 'ChatGPT' is, therefore, removed from the author list and is acknowledged as making a substantial contribution to the writing of the paper. After us-

ing this tool, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication." (4). This corrigendum highlights that scientific publishers must promptly and carefully revise their policies regarding ChatGPT and similar AI content generators. A different paper by Zhavoronkov still lists ChatGPT as an author (6). Our preliminary analysis show that 90% of analyzed papers submitted after November 2022 were somehow influenced by ChatGPT (unpublished). An important rationale underlying concerns about AI-generated contents is that they are difficult or impossible to detect easily; thus, many editors or peer-reviewers may be deceived or misled by AI-generated texts.

International guidelines about authorship, for example by the Committee on Publication Ethics and International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, stipulate that authors must have read and contributed substantially to a manuscript, critically revised the content, approved the published version, and taken responsibility for the integrity and accuracy of the published content, requirements that cannot be fulfilled by crediting authorship to ChatGPT or other AI tools as they are not legal entities. Publisher policies must thus consider that ChatGPT cannot satisfy scholarly and ethical responsibilities of a domain-expert human author. Accordingly, many international publishers or journals, for example, Springer Nature and Taylor & Francis (7-10), have prohibited applications of AI-generated content for safeguarding the integrity of upcoming literature and publication ethics.

Final remarks

Ultimate impact of emergence of ChatGPT on scientific publishing is not fully understood but it has diverse implications on the underpinnings of basic science and medicine. With improved versions of AI language models, their widespread application may become inevitable; thus, many manuscripts with AI input may emerge if scrutiny and peer-review fail to catch them. Infallible tools for detecting AI-generated content are needed to help editors and peer-reviewers in the immediate future. ChatGPT and other AI content generators may be both beneficial and detrimental without proper human intervention and without strategies to consider and use them appropriately, for example, in academic publishing. If anything, use and emergence of such tools should make academic authors, peer-reviewers, editors, and publishers attentive to content detail and the intricacies and interrelatedness of facts amassed and presented by basic science research, experimentation, fact-finding, and historical and future clinical evidence. Academic publishing is essential to advancement of science and medicine. Therefore, cautious and conservative consideration of ChatGPT becomes paramount. Barring the use of ChatGPT from scientific publishing may be impracticable; however, responsible sensibility is required before accept-

ing it as a "co-author" of a scientific paper. Many journals have already accepted papers "co-authored" by ChatGPT. Exclusively, human thinking, oversight, revision, experimentation, fact-checking, testing, and human written output remain as the core foundations supporting and evolving with progression, promotion, and communication of the humanity's collective knowledge.

Funding

None.

References

1. Kung TH, Cheatham M, Medenilla A, Sillos C, De Leon L, Elepaño C, et al. Performance of ChatGPT on USMLE: Potential for AI-assisted medical education using large language models. *PLoS Digit Health* 2023;2(2).
2. OpenAI. ChatGPT: Optimizing language models for dialogue [Internet]. OpenAI; 2022. [cited 2023]. Available from: <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>.
3. Macdonald C, Adeyoye D, Sheikh A, Rudan I. Can ChatGPT draft a research article? An example of population-level vaccine effectiveness analysis. *J Glob Health* 2023;13:01003.
4. O'Connor S. Corrigendum to "Open artificial intelligence platforms in nursing education: Tools for academic progress or abuse?". [*Nurse Educ Pract*. 66 (2023) 103537]. *Nurse Educ Pract* 2023;103572.
5. O'Connor S. ChatGpt. Open artificial intelligence platforms in nursing education: Tools for academic progress or abuse? *Nurse Educ Pract* 2023;66:103537.
6. ChatGPT Generative Pre-trained Transformer, Zhavoronkov A. Rapamycin in the context of Pascal's Wager: generative pre-trained transformer perspective. *Oncoscience* 2022;9:82–84.
7. Kitamura FC. ChatGPT Is Shaping the Future of Medical Writing but Still Requires Human Judgment. *Radiology* 2023;230:171.
8. Stokel-Walker C. ChatGPT listed as author on research papers: many scientists disapprove. *Nature* 2023;613(7945):620–621.
9. Stokel-Walker C, Van Noorden R. What ChatGPT and generative AI mean for science. *Nature* 2023;614(7947):214–216.
10. No author listed. Tools such as ChatGPT threaten transparent science; here are our ground rules for their use. *Nature* 2023;613(7945):612.

FARID RAHIMI

*Research School of Biology, The Australian National University,
Ngunnawal and Ngambri Country, Canberra, ACT, Australia*

AMIN TALEBI BEZMIN ABADI

*Department of Bacteriology, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Tarbiat
Modares University, Tehran, Iran*

Corresponding author: Amin Talebi Bezmin Abadi, PhD, Associate professor, Address: Room 8, First floor, Department of Bacteriology, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Tel: +9882884883

E-mail: amin.talebi@modares.ac.ir

Received for publication February 22, 2023; accepted March 7, 2023 (ARCMED-D-23-00158).



TEXTO DE REFERÊNCIA:

FARID, Rahimi; ABADI, Amin Talebi Bezmin. ChatGPT and Publication Ethics. *Archives of Medical Research*, v. 54, p. 272 – 274, Abril 2023. Disponível em: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0188440923000383?via%3Dihub>. Acesso em: 13 jun. 2023.

QUESTÃO 11

Indique a opção que melhor representa a tradução do título do artigo.

“ChatGPT and Publication Ethics”

- a) *ChatGPT* é ético na publicação.
- b) *ChatGPT* e ética editorial".
- c) *ChatGPT* e ética na publicação.
- d) *ChatGPT* e ética na Propagação.
- e) *ChatGPT* e publicação étnicas.

QUESTÃO 12

De acordo com o texto o que seria o *ChatGPT*?

- a) O *ChatGPT* é um *chatbot* com inteligência artificial, apelidado de 'transformador pré-treinado generativo'.
- b) O *ChatGPT* é um *chatbot* de dublagem com inteligência artificial, apelidado de 'transformador pré-treinado generativo'.
- c) O *ChatGPT* é um *chatbot* de dublagem com inteligência artificial, apelidado de 'transformador generativo pré-transformado'.
- d) O *ChatGPT* é um *chatbot* de dublagem com inteligência artificial, nomeado de 'transformador pré-treinado generativo'.
- e) Nenhuma das alternativas está correta.

QUESTÃO 13

De acordo com o texto, o que podemos afirmar que aconteceu no ano de 2022 em São Francisco?

- a) O relançamento da *OpenAI* pelo *ChatGPT*.
- b) O lançamento da *OpenAI*.



- c) O relançamento do *ChatGPT*.
- d) O lançamento do *ChatGPT*.
- e) As alternativas “b” e “c” estão corretas.

QUESTÃO 14

De acordo com texto, qual seria uma alegada funcionalidade dos seguintes produtos: *Copyleaks, DetectGPT, GPT-Output Detector, AI Detector Pro, e Corrector AI-content?*

- a) Gerar respostas escritas de alta qualidade, plausíveis e semelhantes às humanas.
- b) Contribuir para o debate sobre autoria.
- c) Detectar texto gerado por IA.
- d) Passar no Exame de Licenciamento Médico dos Estados Unidos.
- e) Nenhuma das alternativas está correta.

QUESTÃO 15

Com relação ao fragmento de texto a seguir apresentado, indique a tradução mais adequada para a palavra “*skyrocketed*”.

“The public attention to ChatGPT skyrocketed since its release, attracting more than 100 million users as of January 2023, making it the most popular chatbot released recently.”

- a) No fragmento de texto apresentado, “*skyrocketed*” é usado como uma metáfora para descrever um rápido e significativo aumento.
- b) No fragmento de texto apresentado, “*skyrocketed*” é usado para explicar que o céu é o limite e não 100 milhões de usuários.
- c) No fragmento de texto apresentado, “*skyrocketed*” é usado como uma metáfora para descrever algo de muito valor monetário.
- d) No fragmento de texto apresentado, “*skyrocketed*” é usado como uma metáfora para descrever um rápido e significativo decréscimo.
- e) Nenhuma das alternativas está correta.

QUESTÃO 16

De acordo com o texto apresentado, por que muitas editoras ou revistas internacionais, proibiram aplicações de conteúdo gerado por IA?

- a) Para manter o mercado editorial mais lucrativo, contudo ético.



- b) Para salvaguardar a integridade da literatura futura e da ética de publicação.
- c) Para prevenir ações judiciais.
- d) Para salvaguardar os usuários das ferramentas de IA.
- e) As alternativas “c” e “d” estão corretas.

QUESTÃO 17

Das alternativas apresentadas, qual seria a melhor tradução para o seguinte fragmento de texto?
"Extreme reliance on AI tools for content generation by non-native English writers and lack of proper editing may jeopardize the essential standard of writing expected of academic publishing."

- a) A dependência excessiva em ferramentas de IA para a geração de conteúdo por escritores cuja língua nativa é o inglês, combinada à falta de uma edição adequada, pode comprometer o padrão essencial de escrita exigido para publicações acadêmicas.
- b) A dependência excessiva em ferramentas de IA para a geração de conteúdo por escritores cuja língua nativa não é o inglês, combinada com uma edição adequada, pode comprometer o padrão essencial de escrita exigido para publicações acadêmicas.
- c) A dependência excessiva em ferramentas de IA para a geração de conteúdo por editores cuja língua nativa é o inglês, combinada à falta de uma edição adequada, pode comprometer o padrão essencial de escrita exigido para publicações acadêmicas.
- d) A dependência excessiva em ferramentas de IA para a geração de conteúdo por escritores cuja língua nativa não é o inglês, combinado à falta de uma edição adequada, pode comprometer o padrão essencial de escrita exigido para publicações acadêmicas.
- e) Nenhuma das alternativas apresenta uma tradução adequada.

QUESTÃO 18

De acordo com o texto, podemos afirmar que:

- a) Universidades e instituições educacionais não estão preocupadas no momento com o plágio introduzido por ferramentas de IA em dissertações, trabalhos, avaliações e exames, pois não desafiam os propósitos essenciais da educação como o pensamento crítico e a resolução de problemas.
- b) Ferramentas de IA baseadas em grandes modelos de linguagem, como o *ChatGPT*, dependem de uma infinidade de textos que já não estão na internet
- c) Uma razão importante por trás das preocupações sobre os conteúdos gerados por IA é que eles são difíceis ou impossíveis de detectar facilmente.



UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DA PARAÍBA
CENTRO DE EDUCAÇÃO – CENTRO DE CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS E APLICADAS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM GESTÃO NAS ORGANIZAÇÕES APRENDENTES

Processo Seletivo – Turma 15 – 2023

Cartão de Respostas: Prova de Conhecimentos em Língua Estrangeira - Inglês



d) Uma razão importante que tranquiliza sobre os conteúdos gerados por IA é que eles são fáceis de serem detectados.

e) As assertivas “b” e “c” estão corretas.

QUESTÃO 19

Qual seria a melhor tradução para o seguinte fragmento de texto?

" Although actual capability of ChatGPT to write scientific and technical papers is not extensively studied, some academics are impressed by how ChatGPT can produce an abstract, discussion, or introduction for a manuscript draft"

- a) Considerando que a capacidade virtual do *ChatGPT* para escrever artigos científicos e técnicos já foi extensivamente estudada, alguns acadêmicos não estão impressionados com a maneira como o *ChatGPT* pode produzir um resumo, discussão ou introdução para uma proposta de manuscrito.
- b) Embora a capacidade real do *ChatGPT* para escrever artigos científicos e técnicos não tenha sido extensivamente estudada, alguns acadêmicos estão impressionados com a maneira como o *ChatGPT* pode produzir um resumo, discussão ou introdução para um rascunho de manuscrito.
- c) Embora a capacidade real do *ChatGPT* para escrever artigos científicos e técnicos não tenha sido extensivamente estudada, alguns acadêmicos não estão impressionados com a maneira como o *ChatGPT* pode produzir um resumo, discussão ou introdução para um rascunho de manuscrito.
- d) A capacidade real do *ChatGPT* para escrever artigos científicos e técnicos foi extensivamente estudada, alguns acadêmicos estão impressionados com a maneira como o *ChatGPT* pode produzir um resumo, discussão ou introdução para um manuscrito.
- e) A capacidade virtual do *ChatGPT* para escrever artigos científicos e técnicos foi extensivamente estudada, alguns acadêmicos estão impressionados com a maneira como o *ChatGPT* pode produzir um resumo, discussão ou introdução para um rascunho de manuscrito.

QUESTÃO 20

De acordo com o texto, podemos afirmar que:

- a) Muitas editoras e periódicos científicos autorizam o uso de conteúdo gerado por inteligência artificial, visto que essas tecnologias expandem o intelecto humano.
- b) O impacto definitivo do surgimento do *ChatGPT* no âmbito da publicação científica ainda não é totalmente compreendido, mas possui diversas implicações para as bases da ciência fundamental e da medicina.



UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DA PARAÍBA
CENTRO DE EDUCAÇÃO – CENTRO DE CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS E APLICADAS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM GESTÃO NAS ORGANIZAÇÕES APRENDENTES

Processo Seletivo – Turma 15 – 2023

Cartão de Respostas: Prova de Conhecimentos em Língua Estrangeira - Inglês



-
- c) O impacto definitivo do surgimento do *ChatGPT* no âmbito da publicação científica já é totalmente compreendido, e possui diversas implicações para as bases da ciência fundamental e da medicina.
- d) Com versões aprimoradas de modelos de linguagem de IA, a aplicação generalizada do *ChatGPT* é inevitável;
- e) São necessárias ferramentas sérias para detectar conteúdo gerado por IA de modo a auxiliar editores e revisores em um futuro à longo prazo.