

Internationalization of the training and production of Brazilian Graduate Programs of Political Science¹

Abstract

This article analyzes the internationalization strategies of the teaching careers of Brazilian political scientists. Internationalization will be measured in two dimensions: publications and academic training of the teachers. Are the central countries the main destinations of Brazilian political scientists? In the field of Brazilian political science, do the central programs monopolize internationalization or is it also accessible to more recent programs? The hypothesis tested is that internationalization would be linked to the central countries and that core programs would be largely over-represented. The study analyzed 360 researchers linked to political science programs. The hypothesis was only partially confirmed. It was concluded that the peripheral programs also have space in the internationalization of the academic training and in the publication of papers abroad. The main difference found between internationalization dynamics concerns the country of destination for academic training and for paper publication. Academic training is basically concentrated in central countries (US, England and France). Although it is absent in academic training Latin America has an important presence as a focus of the international publication of the researchers examined.

Key words: academic careers; internationalization; disciplinary field; academic journals; academic training.

Rafael Machado Madeira, Pontificia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.
E-mail: rafael.madeira@pucrs.br

Introduction

This article's main objective is to analyze the dynamics of internationalization of faculty linked to graduate programs in political science in Brazil. Internationalization will be examined along two specific dimensions: training (full doctorate abroad, doctoral internship abroad and post-doctorate abroad) and production (articles published in international journals) by faculty. It is important to highlight that this analysis does not encompass the entire universe of political science professors given that there is a significant number of political scientists who lecture in graduate programs in social sciences,

¹ Capes scholarship holder (Proc. no. 7304/14-5). This research originated during my post-doctoral studies at École des Hautes Études en Science Sociales - EHESS (Paris), in 2015. A previous version of this study was presented at the Ninth Alacip Congress (Latin American Political Science Association), held in Montevideo in 2017. I thank the RMCPS reviewers for their important suggestions. I also thank Capes for funding the English translation of the manuscript (AUXPE/ PROEX/1196/2023).

sociology, history, public policies, international relations, etc. Therefore, the conclusions of this study are limited to the scope of professors linked to graduate programs in political science and cannot be generalized to the entire universe of Brazilian political scientists. Internationalization will not be conceived as something static, but as a dynamic phenomenon that follows different patterns of interaction depending on the characteristics of each “international collaborator” (country of origin, language and institution to which each program, journal or researcher is linked). In addition to the relative position of each involved agent, the dynamics of internationalization changes depending on the type of internationalization being regarded. The internationalization of academic training does not follow the same patterns of internationalization as the academic production.

This text is structured as follows. The introduction presents the main references used to link this study to the academic debate on internationalization and political science. The second part focus on an analysis of internationalization dynamics linked to doctoral training (full doctorate abroad and doctoral internship abroad – “*sandwich*”) and post-doctoral training. Internationalization of the academic production by faculty is also analyzed. Finally, in the final considerations, the main findings are discussed in light of the contributions brought by the literature.

How important is internationalization for faculty linked to Brazilian graduate programs in political science? What are its flows? How what is understood as “internationalization” is impacted by the relative position (more central or more peripheral) of a given disciplinary field in a given graduate program and in a given country? Throughout this article, these questions are addressed based on the literature considered herein.

For the specific analysis of the Brazilian case, the answers to these questions necessarily involve analyzing the inductive role played by the different Assessment Areas of Capes. The Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (Capes) is the government agency (under the Ministry of Education) in charge of assessing and financing the Brazilian graduate system. In each assessment cycle, a score (ranging between two and seven) is assigned to each program. Grade six and seven programs are considered to be of international excellence, have greater recognition and have access to considerably more funds than other PPGs (Graduate Programs). For an analysis on the role attributed to internationalization, see the report by the Special Monitoring Committee of the PNPG (National Graduate Plan) 2011-2020 (Capes, 2020). For an analysis on the inducing role of the agency within the scope of Brazilian political science, see Marengo (2015).

An analysis of the documents produced within the scope of such areas² (mainly the “Area Document”, the “Assessment Form” and the “Assessment Report”) is essential for identifying the most valued types of internationalization in each period, as well as for a greater understanding of the internationalization strategies promoted by the PPGs (Graduate Programs). Furthermore, in order to measure the importance attributed by each area to internationalization: this is the dimension that usually differentiates “nationally consolidated” programs (score five) from “international excellence” programs (scores six and seven), as can be seen in two important documents produced by the Area of Political Science and International Relations (Capes, 2017: 81; Capes, 2019: 14):

Increasing the internationalization of the Area depends on the institutional consolidation of the Graduate Programs and the actions developed, especially by Programs of excellence, and their capacity to adopt international quality standards. Programs of excellence are characterized by (i) international projection, visibility and **impact of their scientific production, training of researchers** and interinstitutional cooperation, and (ii) advanced institutional consolidation and academic and scientific leadership position. (our emphasis).

Internationalization has been a distinguishing factor for Programs of excellence and will continue to be so. Among the initiatives that contribute to internationalization, stands out the intellectual production disseminated by publications in international journals, and academic exchange at various levels with foreign institutions, including faculty, students or even professionals with academic background for the benefit of exchanging knowledge, experiences and technology. (our emphasis).

By defining internationalization as the central dimension of assessment, especially for defining what is considered programs of excellence, Capes exerts significant pressure on programs and their faculty. In this context, the international circulation of professors and their articles becomes a fundamental asset of PPGs, guiding their strategies of training and production of scientific knowledge.

Based on from these initial milestones, the objective of this article is to analyze the degree of internationalization of academic careers within the Brazilian political science field. Previous analyzes demonstrate how concepts such as “science” and “internationalization” and how categories such as “center”, “periphery” and “circulation” are multifaceted and are used in literature to cover various themes, focuses, approaches, etc.

²Currently, there are 49 Assessment Areas, divided into nine Major Areas and three Schools. The graduate programs in political science examined here are in the Area of Political Science and International Relations, which is included in the Major Area of Human Sciences of the School of Humanities. <https://www.gov.br/capes/pt-br/acao-a-informacao/acoes-e-programas/avaliacao/sobre-a-avaliacao/areas-avaliacao/sobre-as-areas-de-avaliacao/sobre-as-areas-de-avaliacao> (accessed on 09/07/2023).

(Norris, 1997; Heilbron, 2008 and 2012; Beigel, 2015 e Beigel e Digiampietri 2022). Following the approach proposed here, this analysis prioritizes the presentation and discussion of empirical data regarding two of the dimensions that have more often been the subject of internationalization promotion policies: academic training and publication of articles in foreign journals.

Regarding academic training, it is worth mentioning the process of autonomization of the subject in the country (measured as an increase in the offer of doctoral programs) and the changes in policies to promote the internationalization of training, instituted by Capes, which are summarized as follows: as shown below, the substitution of offers of full doctorate scholarships abroad with offers of doctoral exchange and post-doctoral scholarships abroad. This finding demonstrates the relationship between the stage of development of the subjects, scientific promotion policies and the emphasis on different types of internationalization of the academic training of researchers over time.

This study revisits some of the main issues analyzed by Altman (2012), but with a significantly different treatment and choice of variables to measure the production and training of faculty. Evidence found by Ramos (2018) attests to the central role that the internationalization of training and production has in the evaluation of programs in general and, particularly, of the best evaluated programs in the country (scores six and seven).

As a rule, analyzes of internationalization processes are greatly impacted by a conception of international cooperation based on the export of themes, theoretical perspectives, texts, concepts and legitimate problematics, given that they come from central countries (mainly the USA), to peripheral countries (Heilbron, 2008 and 2012; Beigel, 2012 and 2017). And the process of “universalization” of bibliometry as a basic tool for evaluating science (Ràfols, 2019) plays a significant role in consolidating this worldview according to which what is original and strictly “scientific” flows from the center to the peripheries (Beigel, 2013a: 122).

[...] scientometrics, built based on ISI, Scopus or other databases created in its image and likeness, does not reflect the production of knowledge on an international scale, but only a portion of these investigations, those published in English, under the rules of a knowledge hierarchization device, conducted by these publishing companies and dominated by a few “centers of excellence”. As we have seen, this is not a neutral instrument for measuring universal scientific prestige, but the main tool of an international structure of resources and research capabilities that are increasingly unequal, manifested in the volume of scientific production, in the flows of qualified population migration, in the universalization of publishing standards and the overwhelming supremacy of English as an international lingua franca.

Since our purpose is to analyze all articles published in foreign journals by Brazilian professors, this analysis prioritizes the identification of the name of the journal, the year of each publication and the country of origin of each journal, regardless of its impact factor and whether it is not indexed. Instead of the impact factor, this analysis will take into account a native classification, produced under the scope of Capes' own assessment areas. Qualis/Capes is the mechanism developed by Capes to prioritize all journals (national or foreign) in which professors linked to Brazilian graduate programs publish their articles (Beigel and Digiampietri 2022). Currently, one of the main struggles within the Capes Assessment Areas is related precisely to the debate about how much Qualis/Capes should be more linked to indicators such as ISI or Scopus (there are arguments even advocating for the extinction of Qualis/Capes and its replacement by such indicators). Santin et al. (2016) identify three dimensions of the internationalization of academic articles: diffusion (where the article is published), collaboration (existence of a foreign researcher as co-author) and impact (reach of citations to the article). In this article, we give priority to an analysis of the first dimension.

In this way, the analysis of the country of destination and the reputation of the foreign journal in which the articles were published is not burdened by the bias identified by Altman (2012) for overrepresentation of English and North American journals in bibliometric indexes commonly used as references. For the purposes of this article, that would represent an unsolvable problem, since one of the main objectives is to measure how much the Brazilian international production is distributed between three main regions: Latin America, Europe and USA.

The analysis of the internationalization flows carried out based on the country of destination of the articles allows us to identify whether there are different routes for circulation, or whether the publication of such articles is concentrated in one or a few countries. Is such production only intended for central countries (USA, France and England)? Is there a significant interaction between peripheries (Beigel, 2019)? What is the weight of Latin America as a destination for articles ("regional internationalization" - Beigel, 2019)? As previously stated, according to the criteria established herein, the inclusion of articles published abroad in this study's database depended on the possibility of identifying four crucial pieces of information about each publication: the name of the journal, the journal's classification (Qualis/Capes), the year of publication and the journal's host country.

The procedure adopted to construct this database was the following: 1) obtaining, from the PPGs' and Capes' websites, lists of professors linked to each graduate program and; 2) collecting and analyzing data about the academic training and international publications of each professor throughout their academic careers. Such data were manually extracted from the CVs maintained by all Brazilian professors on the Lattes Platform (<https://lattes.cnpq.br/>) and systematized in a database in the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) program. This database, with information on 360 professors, was created in March 2015 and updated between June and July 2017 and September 2023. This

analysis includes all types of academic training and all articles published in foreign journals by professors linked to graduate programs in political science until December 2022.

Internationalization of the training and production of faculty in Political Science PPGs

Faculty training (doctorate)

Who trained our professors? Is the late expansion of doctoral programs in political science in Brazil (Marenco, 2014; Author and Co-author, 2016) reflected in a high proportion of professors with full doctorates abroad? Or with a doctorate in Brazil, but in related subjects?

A fundamental dimension in the analysis of faculty recruitment concerns the place/institution of origin of the components of each program. This first approach to the data indicates the academic training (doctorate) of the professors examined here. Such analysis allows us to: 1) examine the percentage of professors with full doctorates abroad in relation to professors with national training; 2) identify the proportion of the main countries among professors with full doctorates abroad; and 3) measure the importance of each Brazilian university in the training of faculty in all political science programs.

Graph 1 - Here

Source: own elaboration (CNPq/Lattes)

The first data to be highlighted is the ratio of professors with full doctorates abroad. No less than one in five professors completed a full doctorate abroad. This finding is in agreement with the recent expansion of the offer of this degree in Brazil. Even considering that an important share (25.6%) of the faculty who completed doctorates in Brazilian universities did so in programs in Sociology, Social Sciences, History, Economics, Philosophy, etc., the oldest doctoral programs (USP and Iesp) clearly stand out from the others given that until the mid-90s, they were the only Brazilian universities to offer a doctoral degree in political science. The three universities (USP, Iuperj/Iesp and Unicamp) with the largest number of degrees comprised approximately half of the universe researched. It is no surprise that the training is concentrated on the Rio/São Paulo axis, but the level of concentration identified is worth noting. In addition to this aspect, the distance

to the second group of institutions, comprised by UFMG, UFRGS and UnB, is also very significant.

The occurrence of full doctorates abroad is basically concentrated in the USA (26), France (15) and England (12), with Germany (5), Spain (5) and Italy (3) behind, which confirms the insignificant participation of Latin America in the training of Brazilian teachers (Author and Co-author, 2016). In other words: the flow of the internationalization of faculty training clearly favors central countries (USA, England and France). Regarding the internationalization of training, no South/South dialog is identified in the trajectories and strategies of international circulation of the professors in question. Among the two types of internationalization examined here, this is the one that is most clearly characterized as a one-way street (flowing from the periphery to the central countries: mainly USA, France and England).

This finding also indicates how much the promotion policies implemented by Capes play a central role in establishing the direction and dynamics of the actions and strategies of professors (and their respective programs). As the Quadrennial Assessment Report cited above shows (Capes, 2017: 82):

[...] the consideration about the degree of internationalization of graduate programs must **take into account the profile of the international partners** in partnership or mobility actions: institutions of **reference and global excellence** or institutions of **regional prestige and influence**. [...] Programs with scores 6 and 7 must present a set of actions in research networks and partnerships with **institutions of international excellence and reference**, which translate recognition, visibility and parity in relation to the main global centers in the Area. Programs with score 5 need to demonstrate regional leadership status, translated into actions and initiatives that express collaboration and partnerships with **foreign institutions** and the respective impact of their activities. (our emphasis).

The significant increase in the internationalization of training and production from 2013 onwards

This study is conducted in two stages. In the first, we seek to continue the analysis performed by Author and Co-author (2016), examining the internationalization experiences of professors throughout their respective academic trajectories. Experiences that occurred before the professors entered their respective program will be also taken into account, allowing us to measure the accumulation of investments in internationalization made by professors over time. In a second step, the data will be broken down by triennium/quadrennium³ and by PPG, which will allow us to identify how successful

³ Capes has two main functions which are the promotion and periodic evaluation of the Brazilian graduate system. Such assessment took place every three years until 2012 but, since then, it has taken place every four

strategies of internationalization of academic production are distributed over the last decade and among the different programs investigated here.

It is important to alert the reader to the fact that professors who terminated their employment in 2014 (or before) are not included in the database. Thus, all the experiences of internationalization in the training and production of faculty who worked in the programs examined here, but who were no longer employed at the time the data collection began (2015) were not included in the database.

Table 1 – Here

Source: own elaboration (CNPq/Lattes)

The significant expansion that the subject has experienced since 2005 is undeniable. From this period onwards, the subject shows indicators of consolidation with an increase in the supply of PhDs trained in Brazilian programs and with internationalization in the types of doctoral exchange abroad (“*sandwich* doctorate”) and post-doctorate abroad. The data presented above corroborate the scenario already identified and debated in the recent literature regarding the growth of several indicators related to the subject in the last decade. As highlighted (Author and Co-author, 2016: 47-48):

Indicators for this process can be found in the recent literature on the topic. Marengo (2015), for example, presents the continuous evolution of the budget of the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (Capes), the main organism for the promotion of graduate studies of the Brazilian government, which grew from 0.22 billion dollars in 2004 to 2.03 billion dollars in 2013. Nicolau and Oliveira (2013) found a continuous increase in the number of articles published annually by Brazilian political scientists. Amorim Neto and Santos (2015), in turn, point out an increase in graduate programs between 2005 and 2014 and the expansion of the Brazilian Association of Political Science (ABCP) as necessary (although not sufficient) processes for a greater institutionalization of the subject in the country. Summarizing this point, significant advances have already been mapped in the literature across the dimensions that Codato and Leite (2013) highlight as necessary for the institutionalization of the subject, with an increase: 1) in the number of Programs; 2) of the number of masters and doctors trained;

years. After a first approximation to the data covering a longer period, mainly the first two four-year periods (2013/2016 and 2017/2020) and half of the current four-year period (2021 and 2022) will be taken as reference, thus covering a period that marks the significant expansion and subsequent consolidation of the Brazilian graduate system and PPGs in political science.

3) of the number of specialized journals; 4) of the creation of academic representation organizations and events.

More than the growth, the accelerated pace of growth stands out in all the internationalization strategies examined, with emphasis on post-doctoral studies and articles published in foreign journals. By comparing data from PhD and doctoral exchange (*sandwich*) programs it is possible to identify the timing of the replacement of one type by the other. Until 1984, seven professors had completed their doctorates abroad. This pattern was repeated in the following two decades, as only a minority of professors (1/14 and 6/26) concluded a doctoral exchange (*sandwich*) abroad. This pattern was only reversed in the mid-2000s, when 26 doctoral exchange (*sandwich*) cases and 11 full doctorate cases abroad were identified. If the database had included professors whose employment was terminated before 2014, it is reasonable to assume that the prevalence of full doctorates abroad would be even greater in the first decades analyzed.

The data above also allows us to identify that the publication in foreign journals is the internationalization dimension that grew the most over this period. Author and Co-author (2016) prioritize the mapping of the destination (country) of the articles, the distribution of the articles in the universe of professors analyzed and the timing of the publication of the articles throughout the period of analysis. In order to complement this analysis, we seek to map two other aspects of the publications: the classification of this academic production according to the Qualis of the Area of Political Science and International Relations and the distribution of these articles based on the institutional relationship of their respective authors. The use of Qualis-Capes is justified here, since such classification is not exogenous to the field of Brazilian political science. Furthermore, this stratification has had a very strong inductive role in defining the journals to which manuscripts are submitted (Leite and Codato, 2013).

Different analyzes point to a two-sided movement when examining the internationalization of journals. On the one hand, it is clear that researchers from peripheral (and even non-peripheral) countries find little openness to publish in some of the most prestigious journals in central countries (Norris, 1997). On the other hand, the literature identifies a growing movement of international cooperation among researchers (identified, for example, in co-authorship). Even with this growing movement towards the internationalization of most journals, there are still many reasons to take their nationality into consideration (Heilbron, 2008). When analyzing cooperation within the borders of Europe and the USA, Heilbron (2012: 304) states that:

Although the submission of articles to journals is independent of the nationality of the authors, virtually all major journals remain national, in the sense that most editors work

in one country. In this sense, one can also speak of British, German or American journals.

Graph 2 shows the percentage of articles published according to the assessment status (Qualis) of their respective journals. All articles published in foreign journals until 2022 by the 360 professors analyzed were included in this analysis. The first group (journals with “qualified” Qualis) comprises articles published in journals ranked in the four most important strata of the current classification (Qualis A1, A2, A3, and A4). The second group comprises articles published in journals ranked in the other (and less important) Qualis strata (B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, and C).

Graph 2 - Here

Source: own elaboration (CNPq/Lattes)

The distribution of articles shows a significant concentration of production in the first group. Approximately seven out of every ten articles were published in foreign journals considered to be the most prestigious by the political science area in Brazil. In addition to international inequalities, the academic field is permeated by national inequalities. This allows us to raise a question about the degree of concentration of publications in top-rated journals among the faculty from the most consolidated programs in the country.

Based on this general mapping, we now seek to identify how this production is distributed according to two aspects: a. in the different programs to which the professors are affiliated and b. over time. It makes sense to say that the older a program is, the more time it had to develop academic careers. Programs with faculty with longer careers would have had a higher probability of accumulating academic production overall and, consequently, articles published in foreign journals. And an analysis of the whole set of international articles will allow us to identify something that we could refer to as the accumulation of international insertion of each program.

It is also plausible to assume that programs that were recently created will only accrue a significant production if we consider in the analysis the (possible) production that took place before the professor joined their respective PPG. In that regard, if a professor with broad internationalization joins a newly created program, this accumulation becomes an “asset” of the program, and will then be mapped.

The distribution of internationalization by program and over time, therefore, aims to answer the following questions: do professors affiliated with the oldest and more central

programs in the political science subject tend to have a larger number of articles published abroad? Do they tend to concentrate the production that is best ranked by the Qualis-Capes assessment?

Graph 3 - Here

Source: own elaboration (CNPq/Lattes)

When examining the stock⁴ of articles published in foreign journals by professors linked to their respective programs, two distinct groups are clearly identified. Regarding total production, USP and Iesp occupy the front line with more than 130 articles each institution. They are closely followed by UnB, UFRGS, UFMG, UFPR, Unicamp, and UFPE with production ranging between 90 and 110 articles. As expected, all of the oldest programs in the area are included in these two groups. Among the younger programs, two subgroups can also be identified: UFG, UFSCar, and UFF with production ranging between 35 and 50 articles and Unirio, Unieuro, Ufpa, Ufpi and UFPEI, with an international production that is still incipient (between 13 and 24 articles). It is important to highlight that the younger program (Unirio) was founded in 2017, having only been in existence for half a decade.

Another relevant finding is the fact that all programs with international production have qualified production. Furthermore, virtually all programs mostly publish in top-ranked journals. The hypothesis that central programs would concentrate their production in the most prestigious journals in the field more than more recent programs was refuted. Even programs with small international production also demonstrate an insertion through the most prestigious journals according to the Capes Political Science and International Relations Area. Finally, it can be seen that the publication profiles of programs with international insertion do not differ significantly from the overall average distribution of articles in the strata, identified in the corresponding figure.

Two caveats are critical when interpreting the figure above: 1) the data cannot be interpreted as representative of the total production of the programs. As previously stated, the production of professors who worked in the 80s, 90s and 2000s and left their respective PPGs before 2015 is not included in the database, thus potentially underestimating the production of older programs; 2) as the data includes all international articles published by each professor, it is plausible to assume that a fraction (a minority, as will be seen below) of the articles were published before the professor joined the current program, which tends

⁴ The analysis of absolute numbers aims to identify the stock/accumulation of articles published by all the professors of each program (which tends to increase the performance of PPGs with a larger number of professors). Such graphs cannot, therefore, be considered as indicators of the average productivity level of the professors in each program. Average productivity will be analyzed below, in graphs five and six.

to overestimate the production of programs that were joined by professors that already had an internationalized production until 2015.

Since our objective is to measure the stock and/or accumulation of international production of each program, whenever an article is published in co-authorship, it is included in the analysis according to the number of co-authors affiliated with the program, while if an article is published in co-authorship with professors from different programs, it counts once for each program.

The objective now is to stratify by program only the production published in the last decade examined in this study. Therefore, all production published up to 2012 is removed from the analysis. This reduces the total production previously identified in the oldest programs, since these are the ones that have production prior to the period of reference. In addition to this, all production published before the three-year period in which the professors joined the program was disregarded, which lowers the number of articles published in foreign journals in almost all programs.

As previously stated, this analysis does not take into account the production of professors who worked in different programs and retired until 2014 (the three waves of data collection occurred in 2015, 2018, and 2023). But from this year onwards, the analysis becomes more precise as it now covers all professors linked to their respective programs. In this sense, the analysis of the last two four-year periods (and half of the current four-year period) presents a more accurate scenario of the international production of the programs in question.

Graph 4 - Here

Source: own elaboration (CNPq/Lattes)

The fact that it does not take into account differences in size between programs makes it impossible to compare performance. The data above should, therefore, be interpreted not as a comparison between programs, but as a comparison of the performance of each program in the three cycles under analysis. The graph above also allows us to identify the participation of each program in publications in the international journals of the subject as a whole in the different assessment periods.

The general map of publications presented in the graph is essential for providing a better understanding of the analysis of the academic production of each program. Nicolau and Oliveira (2013) identify a gap in this item that is already being addressed with analyzes that focus on national production. One of the main objectives of this study is to contribute to this debate by continuing the analysis of the main characteristics of the international

production of the professors of the area. The graph above attests to the consolidation of UFPR's international production in the last two assessment cycles; and demonstrates that this trend tends to continue in the current cycle. It is worth noting a very similar pattern of production between the two institutions that most published in foreign journals in recent years: Iesp and UFPR. USP, UFPE and UFMG, coming second, demonstrated (proportionally) a slowdown in the stock of international articles after the first quadrennium in question. UnB, UFRGS, UFG and Unicamp make up the third group of programs. In this group, the most recent production of UFG stands out (one of the programs with the largest number of articles in the first half of the current quadrennium). Among the most recent programs, data indicates that UFF, UFPA, and UFPI also already have an important stock (proportionally) of articles published in the first two years of the current cycle.

The existence of at least one researcher who clearly increases the publication of their PPG in all universities with significant international production is a common occurrence in the programs. In almost all programs, at least one author with consolidated international production is identified (more than ten articles published in international journals). The difference between the programs appears in the degree of participation of other professors: while Unieuro is characterized by an important concentration of its total production in just one researcher, programs like UFMG present a production that is significantly less concentrated and better distributed among all professors linked to the program.

The study also identified that these data collected by program hide significantly different production dynamics. The data reveal that there are at least two aspects that must be examined regarding the way in which the articles published internationally are produced (a logic that can and should also be used in the analysis of national production): the degree of concentration of production and the frequency of articles written in co-authorship with: 1) colleagues in the same program; 2) colleagues from other national programs; and 3) colleagues from foreign universities.

A (still) low incidence of co-authored articles was identified. When found, co-authorship presents mostly a "domestic" pattern, given the low frequency of collaboration either with other national programs or with researchers affiliated with foreign universities. It is worth noting though that Codato et al. (2017) identify a growing number of co-authored articles in the Brazilian political science field. This data attests to a phenomenon attributed as one of the causes of either parochialism or the still low international visibility of Brazilian production (Marenco, 2014; Amorim Neto and Santos, 2015). An exception could be the production of UFPE and UFPR, given the frequency of articles co-authored with researchers internal and external to the program.

In addition to having existed for longer, central programs tend (Iesp is a case that deviates from this pattern) to have a larger number of faculty, which gives them an additional advantage in relation to newly-created programs. However, even central programs still have a significant number of professors without international production.

Whether this is due to the recent hiring of professors at the beginning of their careers (and who, therefore, would need time to internationalize their production), or to a decision of prioritizing publication in national journals, only a case-by-case analysis could show. What can be seen is that such a contingent of professors allows us to glimpse at a possibility of a significant advancement of international production in the near future.

The data analyzed so far allows us to map the overall scenario, in absolute numbers, of the internationalization of Brazilian production in journals. However, in order to improve the understanding of how different programs have been successful in responding to this question (internationalization), we will now analyze the per capita production of international articles by program in the quadrenniums 2013/2016 and 2017/2020. The lack of data on professors who left the programs before these periods would make it impossible to calculate the per capita production of the programs for previous periods.

Graph 5 - Here

Source: own elaboration (CNPq/Lattes)

The prominent position of UFMG and UFPE in absolute numbers in the 2013-2016 quadrennium is confirmed when the data are weighted by the size of each program. Iesp and Unicamp comprise the second group, with production slightly higher than one article per professor. UFPR also stands out with per capita production practically identical to that of USP. UFRGS, UFG, and UnB comprise the fourth group, with just over half an article per professor in this quadrennium. Perhaps because it was the program with the largest number of professors during this period, UnB had a significant impact on its relative position in the evaluation of per capita production. Unirio is not included in the graph above because it was created in 2017, but it will be included in the analysis of the next four-year period.

Graph 6 - Here

Source: own elaboration (CNPq/Lattes)

The per capita analysis of the 2017/220 quadrennium confirms the trend of continuous increase in publication of international articles by the faculty analyzed. The score of the best performing program between 2013 and 2016 was lower than the average number of foreign publications between 2017 and 2020. In addition to this finding, a comparison between the average performance of the programs confirms two trends

indicated by previous data: the leadership position of Iesp and the consolidation of UFPR as a leading institution in the internationalization of article production. Another fact that stands out is the progress made by UnB in the last assessment cycle: compared to the previous cycle, this institution not only increased the absolute number of articles published but also reduced the number of permanent professors linked to the program, significantly impacting the performance of this program between 2017 and 2020. Capes' assessment cycles only take into account the production of permanent professors in each program. Collaborating professors are not included. Due to this aspect, highly-productive collaborating professors tend to become permanent professors; and permanent professors who are not as productive tend to become collaborating professors. In other words: Given the impact of the rules of the assessment process, programs establish strategies to maximize gains (hiring/maintaining productive professors as permanent professors) and reduce losses (maintaining/transforming less productive professors into collaborating professors).

In this last evaluation cycle, professors from all programs were successful in publishing articles in foreign journals. Furthermore, the average of younger programs shows a slight improvement compared to the previous quadrennium. This finding confirms that the trend towards increased internationalization of production is not occurring only in the most consolidated institutions. On the other hand, in the last quadrennium, there was an important relative increase in the distance between the group of programs with a higher degree of internationalization and programs with a lower degree of internationalization in the publication of articles.

The data analyzed so far presents an x-ray of the dynamics of internationalization of article production in recent years. This analysis will be concluded with an examination of the priority destination of such productions. We saw that universities located in Latin America have a lower participation as centers of academic training of professors. However, when analyzing the country of destination of the international production of articles by these professors, the presence of countries of this region is significant. Based on different approaches, Author and Co-author (2016) point out that a third of this production has a Latin American country as its destination. This finding is corroborated when analyzing the country with which each of the 233 professors who published at least one article in foreign journals has the strongest connection.⁵

Graph 7 - Here

Source: own elaboration (CNPq/Lattes)

The graph above shows the percentage of professors who have each of the listed countries as the main destination of their production. The identification of the country that

⁵By connection we mean the country that is the main destination for each professor's international articles.

constitutes the main destination is not surprising: 22% of professors have the USA as the main focus of their internationalization strategies. On the other hand, European countries as a whole constitute the main destination for no less than half of the professors analyzed. Finally, the presence of Latin America is notable given that Argentina and Chile are very well placed in the intermediate group. By adding the percentages of these two countries with the percentages of other countries in the region, it is identified that one in four professors has a Latin American country as the main destination of their international production. In summary: out of every ten professors with internationalized production, five have a European country, three have a Latin American country and two have the USA as the main destination of their articles.

Such data also brings us closer to Carpiuc's (2013) conclusions about the degree of "Americanization" of the political science field in the region. It is interesting to note that the studies are based on very different data. In this study, neither the research methods nor the theoretical influences of the articles are analyzed. And precisely for the Brazilian case, the author does not rule out, but neither does she confirm the thesis of "Americanization" of the subject. The analysis of the destination of the articles identifies that, despite the strong presence of the USA, countries in Europe and Latin America are also important destinations for the Brazilian international production. This important flow of articles leaving Brazil to be published in countries in the region shows that "internationalization" does not have a single meaning. There is certainly a predominant collaboration with central countries, but the data demonstrate that there is also a significant international collaboration within the region, which can be described as "regionalized" internationalization (Beigel and Salantino, 2015; Salantino, 2017; Beigel, 2019).

In an analysis of open access journals in Latin America, Beigel et al. (2024), highlight the complexity of this issue by identifying trends that point in different directions: on the one hand, an internationalization process that tends to go "outside the region" and increasingly favor the English language; and on the other hand, the maintenance of an important national production (which is beyond the scope of this analysis). The data analyzed herein corroborate this interpretation. Parallel to the weight of the English language and of countries such as the USA and England, an important share of the international production is published in Portuguese and specially in Spanish, with Latin America and the Iberian peninsula also being important destinations for the international production of the professors examined in this study.

In addition to this point, an analysis of the professors with the largest number of articles published in foreign journals demonstrates that the individual production of these authors is marked by a significant plurality of journals, countries and languages. It is very common for professors to publish in different national contexts, maintaining links and flows of academic collaboration with countries in different continents, languages and relative positions within the international scope of the field. In summary, the data analyzed here is in line with the conclusions of Beigel and Bringel (2022) in their support of the existence of flows and cross-pressures that constrain (but do not determine) the behavior

and strategies of the authors analyzed. This finding highlights the difference identified by this study between the two dimensions of internationalization examined. Unlike academic training, the publication of articles is not a one-way street, as not only programs but individuals are successful in following different internationalization routes simultaneously.

Conclusions

Regarding the training of professors linked to political science PPGs in Brazil, it was identified that there is still a pattern today that divides doctors into basically three groups: trained at USP, IUPERJ/IESP and foreign universities. The substitution of full doctorates abroad by doctorate exchange programs (sandwich) and post-doctoral positions confirms that significant changes took place in the way in which training abroad is impacted, on the other hand, the influence exerted by foreign universities (basically in the USA and Europe) in the training of Brazilian professors is still maintained.

Regarding the publication of international articles, an analysis of the configuration of the Brazilian political science field indicate that the low international visibility of the production of political scientists constitutes one of the main barriers to be overcome towards a greater institutionalization of the discipline (Marengo, 2014; Amorim Neto and Santos, 2015). Even without taking into account the impact factor of the articles, the data presented here allow us to glimpse at a promising movement towards overcoming this barrier. Firstly, the rapid growth of the international production of the subject in the periods of 2013/2016 and, mainly, 2017/2020, stands out.

In addition to a quantitative increase, the fact that a significant percentage of this production is published in prestigious journals in the area shows that this increase is accompanied by a noteworthy standard of academic quality and rigor that permeates consolidated programs and recently-created programs.

Another relevant finding is that this increase is accompanied by a significant geographic dispersion between programs. The advancement of the international production of programs located in different regions of the country (UFPE, UFPR, UnB, and UFG, specially) in the quadrenniums 2013-2016 and 2017/2020, accompanied by the success of older programs in maintaining their production, indicates that the entire area advanced, responding to the incentives of the assessment and development agencies towards internationalization and contributing to the crucial process (Neto and Santos, 2015), of nationalizing the reach (geographical distribution) of the subject in the country.

If the origin of the articles is disseminated across a significant number of programs, their destination is also characterized by an important dispersion across different countries and continents. This demonstrates that there are open channels to advance a dialog with

researchers from different national contexts and different theoretical and methodological traditions. This finding reinforces Beigel's (2019) argument about the existence of an important and long-lasting relationship of academic collaboration within Latin America. These flows do not appear on the measurements of the main international indexes.

The data reveal a significant capacity for dialog in the Brazilian political science area as a whole, given that articles are being published in various disciplinary contexts (in central and peripheral countries), demonstrating capillarity and serving as an indicator of a contemporary manifestation of what Beigel (2013a) calls a regional academic circuit.

It is identified, however, that such capillarity does not manifest itself when considering the internationalization of the academic training of these same professors, which is concentrated in central countries: USA, France and England.

In summary: the direction (destination country) of internationalization of production is not equal to the direction of internationalization of academic training. This corroborates the existence of significant differences in the flows of the several types of internationalization of the academic careers examined in this study. Such findings indicate the role and the place of the Brazilian political science area as a "peripheral center" (Beigel, 2013b) in the context of international circulation of the subject.

Finally, the discussion presented herein points to the need to seek to denaturalize "internationalization" as something that is clearly defined, cohesive and that refers to the same dynamics and the same patterns of relationship, collaboration and exchange between scholars, given that they are inserted in different countries and institutions, with varying degrees of recognition, with unequal possibilities of access to funding and which, therefore, are more or less "attractive" to colleagues who will seek to establish international academic collaboration relationships.

When what is at stake are the possibilities of internationalization, doors tend to close or open depending on who is seeking internationalization, who is the target of such internationalization and what type (or dimension) of internationalization is being pursued by this initiative of academic collaboration.

References

Altman, David (2012) "Where is knowledge generated? On the productivity and impact of political science departments in Latin America" *European Political Science*, 11: 71-87.

Beigel, Fernanda (2013a) "Centro y periferias en la circulación internacional del conocimiento" *Nueva Sociedad*, 245: 110-123.

Beigel, Fernanda (2013b) “David y Goliath. El sistema acadêmico mundial y las perspectivas del conocimiento producido en la periferia” *Pensamiento Universitario*, 15: 15-34.

Beigel, Fernanda (2017) “Peripheral scientists between Ariel and Caliban. Institutional know-how and Circuits of Recognition in Argentina. The “Career-best Publications” of the Researchers at CONICET” *Dados – Revista de Ciências Sociais*, 60 (3): 63-102.

Beigel, Fernanda (2019) “Indicadores de circulación: una perspectiva multi-escalar para medir la producción científico-tecnológica latinoamericana” *Ciencia, Tecnología y Política*, 2 (3): 53-63.

Beigel, Fernanda; Saladino, Maximiliano (2015) “Circuitos segmentados de consagración académica: las revistas de Ciencias Sociales y Humanas en la Argentina” *Información, Cultura y Sociedad*. 32: 7-32.

Beigel, Fernanda. Digiampietri, Luciano (2022) “The battle of the languages in national publishing A comparative study of the publishing performance by cnpq (Brazil) and Conicet (Argentina)” *Tempo Social*, 34 (3): 231-251.

Beigel Fernanda. Bringel, Breno (2022) “Circulación situada e idiomas de publicación de las élites académicas del Cono Sur” *Tempo Social*, 34 (3): 153-180.

Beigel, Fernanda; Packer, Abel; Gallardo, Osvaldo; Salatino, Maximiliano (2024) “OLIVA: La Producción Científica Indexada en América Latina. *Diversidad Disciplinar*, Colaboración Institucional y Multilingüismo en SciELO y Redalyc (1995-2018)” *Dados*, 67 (1): 1-42, e20210174.

Bulcourn, Pablo; Marques, Henrique e Cardozo, Nelson (2015) “Historia y desarrollo de la ciencia política em América Latina: reflexiones sobre la constitución del campo de estudios” *Revista de Ciencia Política*, 35 (1): 179-99.

Capes (2017) *Relatório da Avaliação Quadrienal 2017 – Ciência Política e Relações Internacionais*. Disponível em: <https://www.gov.br/capes/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/20122017-cienciapolitica-relatoriodeavaliacao-quadrienal2017-final-pdf>. Accessed on: September 25 3032.

Capes (2019) *Documento de Área – Área 30: Ciência Política e Relações Internacionais*. Disponível em: <https://www.gov.br/capes/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/ciencia-politica-rel-internacionais-pdf>. Accessed on: September 25 3032.

Capes (2020) *Proposta de Aprimoramento da Avaliação da Pós-Graduação Brasileira para o quadriênio 2021-2024 – Modelo Multidimensional*. Disponível em: <https://www.gov.br/capes/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/25052020-relatorio-final-2019-comissao-pnpg-pdf>. Accessed on: September 25, 2023.

Carpiuc, Cecília (2013) “¿Hacia una hegemonía del modelo mainstream norteamericano? Enfoques de la ciencia política en América Latina (2000-2012)” Clacso. Disponível em: <http://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/clacso/becas/20131021110757/rocha_informefinal.pdf> Accessed n: June 19, 2018.

Codato, Adriano; Leite, Fernando (2013) “Autonomização e institucionalização da ciência política brasileira: o papel do sistema Qualis-Capes” *Revista de Discentes de Ciência Política da UFSCAR*, 1 (1): 1-21.

Codato, Adriano; Horochovski, Rodrigo; Massimo, Lucas; Camargo, Neilor (2017) “A colaboração na Ciência Política brasileira: um estudo exploratório do padrão de coautorias em periódicos nacionais” In: Nono Congresso da Associação Latino-Americana de Ciência Política. Montevideú, Uruguai.

Daza, Ravier (2013) “Tres momentos de la institucionalización de la enseñanza de la Ciencia Política en Colombia, 1968-2012” in Botero, Santiago (coord.) *La Ciencia Política en Colombia: ¿una disciplina en institucionalización?* Medellín, Colciencias, Asociación Colombiana de Ciencia Política, Centro de Análisis Político - Universidad Eafit pp. 57-100.

Heilbron, Johan (2008) “Qu'est-ce qu'une tradition nationale en sciences sociales?” *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines*, 18: 3-16.

Heilbron, Johan (2012) “A ciência social europeia como campo transnacional de pesquisa” *Maná*, 18 (2): 289-307.

Leite, Fernando. (2015), *O campo de produção da ciência política brasileira contemporânea: uma análise histórico-estrutural de seus princípios de divisão a partir de periódicos, áreas e abordagens*. Curitiba, Brasil. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Sociologia, Universidade Federal do Paraná. Tese de doutorado.

Author and Co-author, 2016.

Marenco, André (2014) “The three Achilles’ heels of Brazilian political science” *Brazilian Political Science Review*, 8 (3): 3-38.

Marenco, André (2015) “When institutions matter: Capes and political science in Brazil” *Revista de Ciencia Política*, 35 (1): 33-46.

Neto, Octavio; Santos, Fabiano (2005) “La ciencia política en el Brasil: el desafío de la expansión” *Revista de Ciencia Política*, 25 (1): 101-110.

Neto, Octavio; Santos, Fabiano (2015) “La ciencia política en Brasil en la última década: la nacionalización y la lenta superación del parroquialismo” *Revista de Ciencia Política*, 35 (1): 19-31.

Nicolau, Jairo; Oliveira, Lilian (2013) “A produção da ciência política brasileira: uma análise dos artigos acadêmicos” *37 Encontro Anual da Anpocs*. Caxambu, Brasil.

Norris, Pipa (1997) “Towards a more cosmopolitan political science?” *European Journal of Political Research*, 30 (1): 17-34.

Ramos, Milena Yumi (2018) “Internacionalização da pós-graduação no Brasil: lógica e mecanismos” *Educação e Pesquisa*, 44: 1-22 e161579 Doi: 10.1590/S1517-9702201706161579.

Ràfols, Ismael (2019) “S&T Indicators in the Wild. Contextualization and Participation for Responsible Metrics” *Research Evaluation*, 28 (1): 7-22, DOI: 10.1093/reseval/rvy030.

Rocha, Cecília (2013) “¿Hacia una hegemonía del modelo mainstream norteamericano? Enfoques de la ciencia política en América Latina (2000-2012)” *Clacso*. Disponível em: <http://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/clacso/becas/20131021110757/rocha_informefinal.pdf> Accessed on: June 19, 2018.

Saladino, Maximiliano (2017) “La circulación de la ciencia política en América Latina. Revistas, indexadores y circuitos de publicación” *Anuario Latinoamericano Ciencias Políticas y Relaciones Internacionales*. 5: 207–230.

Santin, Dirce; Vanz, Samile; Stumpf, Ida (2016) “Internacionalização da produção científica brasileira: políticas, estratégias e medidas de avaliação” *Revista Brasileira de Pós-Graduação*, 13 (30): 81-100.