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***ABSTRACT***

*RESEARCH IN EDUCATION: FROM THE INDIVIDUAL TO THE INTERNATIONAL GROUP/NETWORK. NOTES ON ORIGINS AND PERSPECTIVES*

This article aims to recover some aspects of the initial steps of the organization of what is considered the embryo of the transition from individual research to group research towards the current research networks, with the "Institutional Internationalization Program" (CAPES/PrInt) as its most striking current initiative”. The initial focus is the "Regional Centers for Educational Research (CRPEs)" (1950-1960) and the "Exchange Program" (1981-1992), initiatives induced by public policies. Subsequently, we present CAPES/PrInt as the most expressive current policy of transitioning from research groups to networks. The methodology consisted of a literature survey, document analysis, and interviews. We highlight the use of statements by Bernardete Gatti, one of the protagonists involved in organizing and implementing the "Exchange Programs" and a leading figure in Brazilian educational research. In general, the research allows us to affirm that a group culture/research network is created with the potential to transition from induction to embodied praxis from the mix of these pedagogical experiences and formal requirements.

**Keywords**: Research Group/Network; Graduate Studies and Research; CAPES/PrInt.

***RESUMO***

Neste artigo tem-se como objetivo resgatar alguns aspectos dos passos iniciais da organização daquilo que é considerado o embrião da passagem da pesquisa individual para a pesquisa de grupos, em direção às atuais redes de pesquisa, tendo no “Programa Institucional de Internacionalização” (CAPES/PrInt) a sua iniciativa atual mais vistosa. O foco, inicialmente, são os “Centros Regionais de Pesquisas Educacionais (CRPEs)” (1950-1960) e o “Programa de Intercâmbios” (1981-1992), iniciativas induzidas por políticas públicas. Num segundo momento, apresenta-se o CAPES/PrInt, como a política atual mais expressiva da passagem do grupo para as redes de pesquisa. Para isso, em termos metodológicos, lança-se mão de levantamento de literatura, análise de documentos e entrevistas. Destaca-se a utilização de manifestações de Bernardete Gatti, uma das protagonistas envolvidas na organização e implementação do “Programa de Intercâmbio” e figura de proa na pesquisa educacional brasileira. Em linhas gerais, a pesquisa permite afirmar que, do mix dessas experiências pedagógicas e exigências formais, foi/vai se criando uma cultura de grupo/rede de pesquisa com potencial de passar da indução para a práxis incorporada.

**Palavras-chave**: Grupo/rede de Pesquisa; Pós-graduação e Pesquisa; CAPES/*PrInt*;

***RESUMEN***

*INVESTIGACIÓN EN EDUCACIÓN: DESDE EL INDIVIDUO AL GRUPO/RED INTERNACIONAL. NOTAS SOBRE ORÍGENES Y PERSPECTIVAS****.***

En este artículo el objetivo es abordar algunos aspectos de los pasos iniciales en la organización de lo que se considera el embrión de la transición de la investigación individual a la investigación grupal, hacia las actuales redes de investigación, que es el “Programa de Internacionalización Institucional” (CAPES/PrInt) a su más atractiva iniciativa actual. El foco, inicialmente, fueron los “Centros Regionales de Investigación Educativa (CRPEs)” (1950-1960) y el “Programa de Intercambio” (1981-1992), iniciativas inducidas por políticas públicas. En un segundo momento, CAPES/PrInt se presenta como la política actual más significativa en la transición del grupo hacia redes de investigación. Para lograrlo, en términos metodológicos, se utiliza un mapeo bibliográfico, análisis de documentos y entrevistas. Se destaca el uso de declaraciones de Bernardete Gatti, una de las protagonistas involucradas en la organización e implementación del “Programa de Intercambio” y figura destacada de la investigación educativa brasileña. En los últimos años, las investigaciones permiten afirmar que, al mezclar experiencias pedagógicas y requerimientos formales, se creó una cultura de grupo/red de investigación con potencial para pasar de la inducción a la praxis incorporada.

**Palabras clave**: Grupo/red de investigación; Postgrado e Investigación;Capes/*PrInt*.

***Introduction[[3]](#footnote-3)***

The central theme of this article is the training of researchers in the field of Education in Brazil. It results from a set of recent studies conducted in recent years with the support of the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq). Thus, we present a section of the analysis aiming at recovering some aspects of the initial steps of organizing what is considered the embryo of the transition from individual research to group research, towards the current research networks and the perspective of internationalization of Graduate Studies induced by the "Institutional Program for Internationalization - Capes (CAPES-*PrInt*). The methodologies used include document analysis and the analysis of recent research data on the training and performance of thesis and dissertation advisors from the perspective of seizing the process from individual, spontaneous, unsystematic, and intuitive advising to collective advising towards a recommended “pedagogy/didactics of advising” (Walker, Thomson, 2010; Peelo, 2011), bringing the elements related to the creation of research groups and the organization of research in education in Brazil. In addition to the literature review, we conducted participant observation, developed a focus group with three consolidated research groups from the South, Southeast, and Northeast regions, and interviewed their leaders. We applied a questionnaire to 1971 research group leaders registered in the CNPq Research Group Directory, with 562 leaders answering the questionnaire. We also interviewed Dermeval Saviani and Bernardete Gatti in 2016, considering their wide recognition in the country's educational community. Both are included in the collection “Perfis da Educação”, as can be seen in Vidal (2011) and Garcia (2010).

Considering the above, the focus will initially be on pioneering experiences that fostered research groups/networks. We used period documents, articles written by Gatti (1982, 2001, 2005, 2017), the work of Garcia (2010), and her interview in December 2016 to analyze the "Centers” and "Project".

In the second part of this text, we follow the creation of the Internationalization Program (*PrInt*) as a kind of 'destination point'. This program, funded by CAPES, aims to deepen the internationalization of higher education by creating research networks.

***The Brazilian Center for Educational Research and the INEP Educational Research Centers***

From 1955 to the early 1960s, the Brazilian Center for Educational Research (CBPE in Portuguese) and the Regional Centers for Educational Research (CRPEs in Portuguese) were created as part of the organizational structure of the Anísio Teixeira National Institute for Educational Studies and Research (INEP in Portuguese), linked to the Ministry of Education and Culture. According to Ferreira (2008, p. 279, our translation), this initiative “represented an important stimulus to the development of social science research on issues related to Brazilian education”. According to the author, this aspect occurred “through hiring researchers trained in this field of knowledge to integrate their permanent staff and financing projects in social sciences developed outside these institutions”.

This is considered the first government initiative aimed at organizing, systematizing, and encouraging research that would evaluate, subsidize, and promote investigations aimed at mapping the educational situation in the country. A strong point of the initiative was the funding offered to researchers and institutions to conduct this research.

The relationship between education and the possibility of development of the country (Cunha, 1975) was very strong during this period. It became necessary to diagnose the educational situation that would allow the development of strategies for implementing and stimulating Educational Research. According to Ferreira (2008, p. 282, our translation), “the Brazilian Center and the CRPEs, created under the management of Anísio Teixeira at INEP, came into operation in the 1950s, a time of economic and social development promoted by the State”. According to the author, its purpose was “to promote research in social sciences on the relationships between education and the processes of change to an urban-industrial society, being established, at different rates, in the various regions of the country”.

Brazil was experiencing significant economic, social, and educational enthusiasm in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Regarding education, the Law of Guidelines and Bases is in the process of finalization and enactment (LDB 4024/61) after a lengthy discussion that lasted for over a decade in a scenario of fierce disputes between Catholics and liberals[[4]](#footnote-4) (Cury, 1978).

CBPE and CRPEs are created and are in operation in this context. The Brazilian Center was headquartered in Rio de Janeiro, the federal capital, and the Regional Centers were created in São Paulo, Belo Horizonte, Salvador, Recife, and Porto Alegre. The Centers were conceived to implement initiatives launched by Anísio Teixeira (1900-1971), among other intellectuals, in previous years when INEP was created in the 1930s. In a document that presents the proposal for the creation of the Centers, Teixeira (1956) reaffirms the commitment to make INEP the primary instrument for coordination and control of Brazilian educational expansion, understanding that the Centers should promote educational research throughout the country and provide pedagogical assistance to the states by developing and applying instruments that would allow objective and revealing data on education and stimulate the exchange of information and clarification. In the same document, it was emphasized that the Centers would aim at “contributing so that the government can exercise stimulating and creative leadership in the framework of administrative decentralization of education, to be regulated by the Law of Guidelines and Bases, then voting in Congress” (Teixeira, 1956, p. 1, our translation). The Centers were energized by researchers mentored and incentivized by Lourenço Filho (1897-1970), Anísio Teixeira, Darcy Ribeiro (1922-1997), Florestan Fernandes (1920-1995), Luís Pereira (1933-1985) and many other educators and sociologists.

These Centers have become essential for creating a researcher *ethos*. They were organized and operated in the various regions of Brazil. They were also crucial in triggering the discussion of research theory and methodology and research entry into the University[[5]](#footnote-5).

Many initiatives were abandoned, suppressed, or started to function with other demands with the coup of 1964. The Center activities, although redirected, were maintained until, in 1970, the INEP Educational Research Centers were extinguished. However, research was being organized in the country. It would gradually begin to emerge at an opportune moment, now with other institutional protagonists but with the novelty of fostering and involving research groups for their affirmation. This later led to the formation of networks of national and international researchers. Among these entities are individuals and groups within the universities, especially with the creation and expansion of *stricto sensu* graduate studies, formally from Opinion No. 977/65 and the creation of Associations, as was the case of ANPEd in the mid-1970s. Among the protagonists and inductions[[6]](#footnote-6)- of individuals, groups, associations, and government funding and evaluation bodies - the history of Educational Research in Brazil is increasingly outlined. The next item shows one more of the steps in this direction.

***The Exchange Program (1981-1992)***

In an interview with Walter Garcia, Prof. Bernardete Gatti*[[7]](#footnote-7)* describes the numerous educational fronts she was involved in as a protagonist. She thus manifests herself: “My participation in the conception, with other researchers, of the exchange project between Education Researchers, for CNPq, FINEP, ANPEd, INEP, and CAPES, in the 1980s, hosted by the Carlos Chagas Foundation and which I went on to coordinate until its completion, eight years later, was highly enriching” (Garcia, 2010, our translation). In this interview, she also references an article published in the *Revista Brasileira de Educação* (n. 30/2005), in which she expands on the information and analysis of this initiative. We also bring elements of this text (Gatti, 2005) concerning the Exchange Project, a tax initiative of the research activities developed by the Federal and Regional Centers for Educational Research.

According to Prof. Bernardete, research was developed "sparsely in universities and autonomous institutions, public or private” in the early 1980s from nuclei with different material and human conditions. According to the author, “The material difficulties, due to the distance between the various Centers and the lack of tradition of scientific communication in the field of education research, which was beginning to take shape, resulted in the relative isolation of these researchers”, which generated a situation in which “they ceased to benefit from the contribution and criticism of their peers to and about their work”.

The professor analyzes that the need to create "conditions to encourage communication and the qualitative improvement of the resulting work began to impose itself". At this moment, the proposal, prepared by the committees and the funding agencies, of “an exchange program in the field of educational research, along the lines of what was already in the health field” appears. The idea was to open “the range of contacts of researchers and the institutions to which they belonged” through specific resources. The objective was to improve "the quality of educational research in the country by improving the professionals involved, the exchange of information, and the research work in cooperation". The means would be "a systematic exchange with the face-to-face work of researchers from the various institutions involved and by advising emerging groups by more solidly established groups in the field”. For Gatti, when analyzing the documents of the time, it is possible to assess that the expected result was “the improvement in the theoretical elaboration of research, the improvement and diversification of the methodological treatment, and the creation of conditions for conducting comparative research or joint research work” (Gatti, 2005, p. 124-5, our translation).

The Program was supported by agencies such as CNPq, INEP, CAPES, FINEP, and the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Education (ANPEd), created in 1978.

Researchers formed the committee responsible for the exchanges from institutions with recognized research trajectories and regional representation. Thus, in 1981, representatives of six universities (UFMT, UFPA, UFRGS, UFSC, UFC, UFPB) and the Carlos Chagas Foundation (FCC) participated in the first meeting to define the program's directions[[8]](#footnote-8). In 1983, their evaluation was conducted with more representatives involving other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). One of the conclusions was that the “internship” format proposed in the Program achieved the best results within the objectives proposed for the Program. Gatti (2005, p. 127, our translation), referring to an ANPEd document in which the intentions and format of the internship are defined, explains what these “internships" namely consisted of:

An internship in the Exchange Program is understood as a situation in which a researcher from a Center responsible for or participating in ongoing research moves to another Center for a specific time and comes into contact with another researcher involved in research on the same issue conducted with the same methodology, or interested in the same theory for the exchange of experiences and ideas in a working situation. What is intended with this type of action is: a) that researchers involved in analogous research have direct personal contact and that this contact focuses on the concrete issues of the research in which they are involved; b) that the exchange of information, experiences, and ideas conducted in the function of common interests represent reciprocal support and stimulation for researchers and that this direct contact is continued in other manners, regardless of the Program; c) that interest develops in other forms of collaboration between researchers and between centers once this exchange is established, such as conducting comparative or collaborative research (ANPEd, 1984, p. 3, *apud* Gatti, 2005, p. 127).

These internships, through which more experienced researchers from more consolidated institutions collaborated with researchers and institutions where research was still incipient, focused on research themes that gradually strengthened and gave rise to ANPEd working groups (WG). This aspect gained such space that it was defined that the “Internship Program” would be extended to all current Graduate Programs in Education at the 10th ANPEd Annual Meeting, held in 1987. We can state that the “Internships” conducted in close coordination with ANPEd WGs favored achieving the primary objective of the Exchange Program. In other words, to bring experienced researchers closer to beginners and experienced researchers to discuss research problems considered cutting-edge. When evaluating this perspective of "Internships”, Gatti states that its extension to all Graduate Programs in Education and its link with ANPEd "gave a new perspective to the work" (2005, p. 130, our translation). According to the author, after discussion and guidance from the 11th ANPEd Annual Meeting in 1988, “the organization of exchanges was definitively transferred to the working groups, which, supported by the management of the Association, began to propose and organize future meetings according to the evolution of the WGs and their needs”. When analyzing the importance of the Exchange Program, and within it, of the "internships", for the development of research in education, the author points out that

the participants in the first meetings of the expansion have consolidated themselves as key researchers in their subfields for their research, works, and publications and for their role in the formation of new generations of researchers through the supervision of Master's and Doctoral degrees and the institutionalization of reference nuclei in their institutions (Gatti, 2005, p. 132).

The evaluations conducted regarding the impact of the “internships” were very positive, either by pointing out the gains the strategy guaranteed or showing aspects that required observation and supplies. Overall, it is agreed that its implementation has filled a gap in researching and socializing it to create a research culture. Both individual researchers and research groups had the possibility of creating the “habit of exchange”, ensuring the “flow of exchanges” (Gatti, 2005, p. 131). In Gatti's analysis, the enthusiasm present in the evaluations is perhaps because it is the “first time that specific resources were explicitly allocated to exchange activities in the field of research in education by those involved, in a systematic and planned manner”. The author states this meant “an investment in the medium and long term, something rare in the perspectives of our institutions” (Gatti, 2005, p. 132).

Due to this exchange initiative to disseminate the research culture, similar initiatives have been taken on other fronts[[9]](#footnote-9). The next sub-item will mention this.

***The constitution of research groups in the field of Education***

In this sub-item, we focus on Prof. Gatti's manifestations from the interview she gave us at the end of 2016. Her speeches indicate the paths of research in education and the need for researchers to organize themselves into groups and researcher networks.

During the interview, the first indications concerning the constitution of research groups in the field of education were references to the work done by Professor Aparecida Joly Gouveia (1919-1998) and other colleagues who worked at FCC. For Gatti, the genesis of research groups is there:

So when I came here to the Carlos Chagas Foundation, as soon as I did my doctorate, I found the idea of a research group. We were five researchers who started the Department here, but we had the right to have a group; we had grants and had to establish a group depending on the projects to be developed. So, I established a group in the field of professor training. [...]. The idea of a research group was at the origin of our work at the FCC, inspired by Aparecida Joly Gouveia and José Pastore from USP, who were consultants, with support from the Ford Foundation, to establish this department. They proposed forming groups with a coordinating researcher and others in training because they realized that it was impossible to advance in the world of research in education without nuclear, in an individualistic way as it predominated in the university system at the time (Gatti, 2016, n.p., our translation).

When considering the current moment, she refers to research in education and the formation of research groups in the late 1970s and early 1980s. For Gatti, the current moment is a destination point of previous initiatives linked to government agencies, as was the pioneering case of INEP.

Gatti continues addressing her insertion in CNPq as an evaluator of research projects. This experience showed that the demands of the researchers from their projects were predominantly individual. And she points out: “It is to this day!” She continues reporting on her trajectory in this research promotion body, indicating that a group that worked in the CNPq sector focused on "social development”*.* This group sought to act within a proposal to organize collective research projects that covered supra-disciplinary themes: “It was in this integration that a project emerged that I think provoked the formation of research groups in the field of education”.

Subsequently, professor Bernadete makes a lengthy statement about the gains, the consolidation of research groups, and the losses resulting from the discontinuities of public policy Programs:

It seems to me that this seed in the 1980s was essential. [...] The Social Development sector followed with the idea that we would need to form our research groups better. [...] About the Exchange Program, the meetings were held here in São Paulo because we could offer space and support. So we'd do it here, preferably. I would bring the groups and offer the space. So, the person who led the meeting was one of the research professors experienced in the subject. I attended several of the meetings because I was here. The president of ANPEd and representatives of the Association attended the meetings. It was a very interesting thing. This later passed to ANPEd and gave rise to WGs, and the groups are working[[10]](#footnote-10). But now I think there is a lack of articulation among the researchers. We lost that articulation thing. And the networks. Then, groups began to emerge in other ways. Some researchers are constituting national networks, and each one works in isolation (Gatti, 2016, n.p., our translation)

In concluding her statement, Professor Bernardete reinforces the need for theoretical deepening in research. The exchanges provided by research groups can help strengthen this aspect, which was necessary in the 1980s and even more so today.

Upon reaching the present day, looking back shows numerous gains for the field of Education, which was not even constituted as such in the CNPq classification until the early 1980s, when it was added to the field of Psychology. There was a significant expansion of Master's and Doctorate degrees, with restructuring and organization of Graduate Programs in Education around research lines, aiming to adapt to the objective of training researchers[[11]](#footnote-11). Funding initiatives such as the "exchanges" were created[[12]](#footnote-12) with the creation of the Education Advisory Committee[[13]](#footnote-13). More scientific initiation, master's, and doctoral scholarships were awarded, in addition to the increase in scholarships by CAPES and the research support foundations of the states. Budget allocations were made to induce/support research projects of individual researchers and research groups, aiming at structuring national and international research networks[[14]](#footnote-14). "Idea that will run through the eighties that research is learned by doing, in working with competent teams..." (Gatti, 2017, p. 160, our translation) is present in these efforts, with demonstrations on numerous fronts today.

However, if there is much to celebrate in terms of achievements, it is noteworthy that the most expressive tend towards the quantitative, with the adequacy of evaluations more affected by data, classifications, and rankings. This leads to sacrificing or seconding the formative character that initiatives should take on and that evaluations should promote.

In the next sub-item, we make a historic leap to focus on an inductive public policy of action and training of researchers from the perspective of the internationalization of higher education via graduate studies: the "Institutional Program for Internationalization - *Capes-PrInt*.” Thus, we intend to raise the following reflection: to what extent is what is being proposed and executed tributary of previous public policies, representing a thickening, a higher qualitative level in the spiral of concerns and initiatives aimed at the training of researchers, the execution of research, and the creation of networks?

***CAPES-PrInt: a network of researchers***

One of the objectives of the *Capes-PrInt* Program, launched at the end of 2017 through Ordinance No. 220 of November 4th, 2017 (MEC/CAPES, 2017), is to stimulate the formation of international research networks. As we can see, it is a recent Program that limits the possibility of access to monitoring data and analytical densification.

In this sub-item, we indicate some advances in the Program's research to analyze the policy of training researchers and encouraging research groups/networks in the current situation. The sub-item is organized into three subdivisions based on elements that we consider essential to understanding the creation and implementation of this Program: 1. *Capes-PrInt*: background and characterization; 2. *Capes-PrInt* and the stimulus to forming networks: 'internationalize networks’ or 'networks to internationalize'?; and 3. Networks, researchers, and internationalization.

***Capes-PrInt*: background and characterization**

In terms of origin, the *Capes-PrInt* is preceded by the Science Without Borders Program (2012-2017) (CsF in Portuguese), whose objective was to promote the consolidation, expansion, and internationalization of Brazilian science, technology, innovation, and competitiveness. According to Leal (2020), *PrInt* is elaborated based on criticisms of the CsF, as stated in the report of the CAPES International Relations Directorate on the state of knowledge of ‘internationalization’ in Brazilian universities (MEC/CAPES, 2017b).

The scenario in which both Programs are launched is one of the substantial changes in the paradigm of higher education at the global level, with growing pressure for the internationalization of higher education and strengthening the competitiveness of/between countries, blocs, and universities - to respond to market demands and ensure insertion in the so-called “knowledge/economy society”[[15]](#footnote-15). According to Morosini et al. (2023, p. 14, our translation):

The Internationalization policies of Higher Education accompany the movement of updating the concept since implementing policies, plans, strategies, actions, and indicators becomes necessary as internationalization acquires greater importance in the context of HEIs. This is because “internationalization is no longer an issue beyond academic life. It should be within the framework of the policies and strategic decisions of the higher institutional councils. It ceases to be an option and becomes a goal to be achieved for obvious reasons (*apud* Stallivieri, 2017, p. 19).

The objective of the program is to collaborate with the implementation of the internationalization of higher education from the construction of “a more solid process, focused on institutions that already had an institutional policy aimed at internationalization and that demonstrated potential for the development of this type of program” (Morosini et al., 2023, p. 15, our translation). In this context, *PrInt “*stimulates institutional advancement in the internationalization of Brazilian Higher Education Institutions", aiming for “the **competitiveness and visibility of scientific production** in the country” (INFOCAPES, 2018, n.p, emphasis added, our translation). The objectives of *PrInt* are to foster the construction, implementation, and consolidation of strategic plans for the internationalization of institutions in prioritized fields of knowledge; to stimulate the formation of international research networks; to expand actions to support the internationalization of graduate studies; to promote the mobility of professors and students; and to cause transformations of participating institutions in an international environment.

The following actions planned and financed via public notices stand out: work missions abroad; scholarships abroad; junior visiting professor; senior visiting professor; and scholarships in the country: young talent, postdoctoral, among other possibilities.

To compete for the selection of *PrInt*, the HEIs must present an internationalization plan in two languages – Portuguese and English; have at least four (4) programs (two doctorates) recommended by CAPES, with a minimum score of 4; define a series of instruments for “monitoring and evaluation of the internationalization project”, which has included regular visits by CAPES to the selected HEIs and meetings/*workshops* promoted by the body and its partners to address issues related to the Program; establish goals for improving the quality of graduate education, with strategic partnerships and well-defined counterparts, providing for the strengthening of research groups in international collaboration (INFOCAPES, 2018).

Thus, the consolidation of a ‘competitive notice policy' is perceived[[16]](#footnote-16), and the construction of a Program is more focused on the internationalization of the institutional scope of HEIs than effectively of individuals, as occurred with the CsF. Leal (2020, p. 154) also highlights other differences from *CAPES-PrInt* concerning CsF: the exclusivity in graduate studies[[17]](#footnote-17) and the possibility of more autonomous and active action of universities since the management committees begin to manage funding and the HEIs themselves must outline their strategic projects and choose international partners.

Concerning resource allocation, the *PrInt* materializes the trend of deepening institutional differentiation from the concentration of funds in some institutions with the potential to become ‘excellent’ from a competitive base regime.

The explanation of these differences from *PrInt* concerning the CsF makes evident that the program materializes/expresses tendencies to subsidize the internationalization of higher education since it contains the characteristics of the World-Class University (WCU) model (Salmi, 2009).

As stated by Leal (2020, p. 154, our translation):

CAPES seeks to invest in behavioral change in a specific number of institutions – those that "have [... make the most of the opportunities offered [...] [and that, therefore,] allow a broad action [...]" (CAPES, 2017a, p. 43, our translation) – to transform them into ‘world-class universities': research institutions that present themselves as more productive from the perspective of resource capitalization and that occupy significant positions in university student *rankings*

Thus, "the focus occurs on what the higher education system and the selected HEIs have ‘better’, that is, what is more ‘marketable’ from the perspective of resource capitalization in the context of the ‘global knowledge economy’" (Leal, 2020, p. 159, our translation).

The result of the first public notice corroborates these arguments since it included 36 HEIs, most from the South and Southeast regions. Only six are from the Northeast region. No HEI in the Northern region was contemplated with funding, and no Graduate Program with a score of 4.

In general terms, the differentiation deepened by the Program induces the creation of poles, both operating in favor of the market. This implies differentiation in the offer of higher education, reinforcing an exclusionary logic masked by the false democratization of access and meritocracy.

Interinstitutional differentiations are also enhanced since the focus on research to the detriment of other functions of the university circumscribes its reach to graduate programs with greater potential to raise the positioning of HEI in global university rankings through high-impact scientific publications, among other aspects.

A similar process occurs regarding the choice of partners for international cooperation. Annex 1 of the *PrInt* notice (CAPES, 2017c) lists the 26 countries[[18]](#footnote-18) home to the institutions to which at least 70% of the partnership resources should be allocated. The other 30% of the resources can be allocated to partnerships with institutions in countries that are not part of the most developed countries.

The selection of priority countries for network cooperation makes explicit the conception of hegemonic and colonial internationalization that instrumentalizes the Program, leaving a narrow margin for constructing relations guided by other conceptions of scientific sharing.

Regarding management, the apparent de-bureaucratization of financing, disguised as the “autonomy” of HEI groups, deepens accountability for efficiency and expands the presence of mechanisms for monitoring results. In other words, it implies greater structural intervention within the university institution to undermine the autonomy regarding the forms of interacting internationally.

***Capes-PrInt* and the stimulus to forming networks: 'internationalize networks’ or 'networks to internationalize'?**

Among the objectives of *PrInt*, we highlight those related to stimulating the formation of international research networks. Thus, if the experiences of the Regional Centers for Educational Research (CRPEs) (1950-1960) and the “Exchange Program” (1981-1992) presented earlier show the structuring and consolidation of research in education and the formation of researchers from the creation of regional and national research groups, the current movement with *PrInt* is oriented towards the internationalization of these groups from the dynamics of research networks. Such networks are presented as forms to” improve the quality of academic production linked to graduate studies" (MEC/CAPES, 2017a, p. 1, our translation).

However, the need to create international research networks was already signaled in other educational policy documents and science and technology documents from 2000 (Thiengo, 2018; Leal, 2020). In the National Education Plan (PNE 2014-2020), for example, internationalization appears as an expectation, notably in the consolidation strategies of programs, projects, and actions with a scope aligned with the internationalization of research and GS, encouraging networking, strengthening research groups, and promoting national and international scientific and technological exchange. The launch of *PrInt* expresses the materialization of this internationalization logic via research networks in graduate studies (Leal, 2020; Thiengo, 2018).

According to Knight (2012), the existence of international networks, associations, and projects is one dimension of the internationalization process, as is academic mobility (students/professors) and the inclusion of an international/intercultural and/or global dimension in the curriculum and the teaching-learning process.

Concerning the Program, on the official CAPES information page (INFOCAPES, 2018, n.p., our translation), the general GS coordinator of Mackenzie University, one of the five private HEIs selected to be part of the Program, states: "The *PrInt* met our attempt to get closer, in collaborative projects, to countries that have a much greater impact on science". Also, according to the interviewee, “the program will give more visibility and worldwide projection to Brazil”.

We observe, then, that the formation of research networks does not express the central objective of *PrInt. Still, it* presents itself as a dimension of promoting the internationalization of Higher Education. Therefore, it is an inductive policy in the sense of promoting partnerships with international groups and researchers, partnership publications, and internationalization of the curriculum, stimulating the offer of courses in English, among other issues that appear explicitly in the Program Notice and the set of guidelines for the preparation of institutional projects according to guidelines available on the *Capes-PrInt* website.

In a recent study on the internationalization strategies of institutions that are part of the *PrInt*, Morosini et al. (2023, p. 13, our translation) highlight that “it is from this network model that internationalized technical-scientific production is consolidated in Brazilian HEIs that participate in the CAPES/*PrInt* Program”. An important question regarding the induction of networks concerns Brazil's place and interests in the organization of international research networks.

Although any statement and generalization regarding what the research networks, organized via *PrInt*, promote in qualitative terms is very premature*,* it should be noted that international organizations (IOs) understand the dynamics of networks as an alternative for less developed countries. According to documents organized by Unesco and the World Bank (WB), countries that do not make up the dynamic axis of capital can use networks “to build sufficient strength in selected fields to promote participation in global science[[19]](#footnote-19)" (Sadlak; Cai, 2009, p. 66, our translation). Thus, "[...] in the global economy, small means you must be focused and agile, find a niche, and work with partners” (*Id.*, p. 185, our translation).

In this sense, we perceive that the creation of international research networks around priority areas has also been the dynamic adopted by the European Union within the framework of the *Horizon 2020 Programme*, released in 2014, and by the *BRICS Network University*, released in 2015 (Thiengo, 2018). Both movements indicate the search for academic and scientific excellence based on the formation of networks between universities from different member countries, the centrality of research, and, within the scope of GS, the promotion of academic mobility, policies for attracting talent, establishing strategic areas, interaction with the productive sector.

Therefore, it seems to us that the same consideration made in previous research on the Programs mentioned above can be used for *PrInt*:

Introducing excellence-promoting programs based on financial differentiation, awards, mergers, and selections tends to create a scenario with few winners and many losers, which can trigger a demobilizing effect for most institutions. Another possible development closely related to scientific research issues is the privilege granted to some of the dimensions of HEI activity, in this case, induced research. Thus, promoting certain types of excellence may be detrimental to the quality observed in other dimensions, perhaps less valued in terms of political and institutional priorities (Thiengo, 2018, p. 182, our translation).

We do not wish to say that research networks do not have potential in terms of scientific development. On the contrary:

The heterogeneity of the group components makes the research process challenging and provides originality and solidity to the results, allowing monitoring to detect errors or inconsistencies in the data found. In the case of undergraduate and graduate students, the networks provide access to different approaches to knowledge and specificities of other territories regarding a specific theme (Morosini et al., 2023, p. 13, our translation).

However, as we indicated earlier, it is necessary to highlight that internationalization policies at the global and local levels induce behavioral changes in a small number of universities, potentially contributing to the country's insertion into the global market more competitively. In addition, they increase intra-and inter-HEI competitiveness and tend to stimulate the incorporation of an internationalized *ethos* in place of the notion of quality or even “narrow” the notion of quality itself.

**Networks, researchers, and internationalization**

The CAPES/*PrInt* notice is explicit that the effectiveness of international research networks also aims to attract international faculty. The issue is directly related to the intention to make the dynamics of international mobility established with the CsF Program more active. Morosini et al. (2023) identify that creating and strengthening collaborative networks are central to the internationalization strategies of HEIs that are part of the *PrInt*. This occurs through missions and technical visits, encouraging the attraction of international researchers, promoting the creation of projects with the participation of international professors, researchers, and institutions, or strengthening the Professorship Program.

In this sense, we understand that the *PrInt* materializes orientations of the ‘world-class' logic, according to which “the first, and perhaps the most important determinant of excellence, is the presence of a critical mass of first-class students and professors” (Salmi, 2009, p. 6). This position converges with a publication organized by Unesco (Sadlak; Cai, 2009), in which the difficulties of transforming ‘excellent research’ into marketable products or services are pointed out. For Unesco, "there is growing evidence that economic developments increasingly depend on talented and highly skilled workers, particularly those who possess the necessary scientific and engineering skills.” As an offshoot, countries are interested in attracting ‘world-class' scientists, who “may have bright ideas or are ready to invest in new projects” (Sadlak; Cai, 2009, p. 63, our translation). In this context, research networks, including institutions from different countries and the private sector, are encouraged to become increasingly useful.

This does not concern any professor. According to the World Bank document on the UCMs, professors “must be aware of their international essence” (Altbach; Salmi 2011, p. 20, our translation). This means collaborating with colleagues from different countries, participating in international events and publications, and even being available for geographical changes. Another relevant orientation is the need for knowledge of the English language since one of the primary hallmarks of research universities is their international character. The format via the International Research Network presented by *PrInt* is oriented in this perspective.

Thus, despite the diversity and theoretical and methodological enrichment that the exchange of professors from other countries/academic cultures can promote with Graduate Programs and Brazilian HEIs, it is worth asking: What are the consequences of this dynamic for research in qualitative terms? And for the constitution and functioning of research groups/networks? What are the repercussions of this dynamic for the faculty linked to Graduate Programs and HEIs? What does the compulsory development of subjects and exchanges in English mean for professors and students? How can we be in terms of equanimity when the prevailing global relations follow the (uni) north-south direction? And regarding the specificity of the Social Sciences and Humanities, particularly the field of Education, we ask: What is the place of Research in Education in the *CAPES-PrInt*? How many Graduate Programs in Education are part of the Projects under development? What kind of qualitative advancement does the Program promote for training researchers in the field? And concerning Brazil, how can we ensure that this Program is no longer a victim of administrative discontinuity and/or the redirection of priorities, (re) formatted by and for the market, in which the humanities do not fit or, when inserted, will marginally fit?

Although it is still premature to raise these questions, given the history of the financing policies previously presented, it is necessary to list them.

In this context, it is worth resuming the research by Leal (2020) on the internationalization scenario in Brazil, including the *PrInt.* For the author, the induction to creating research networks tends to dichotomize university individuals/groups into ‘internationalized’ and ‘non-internationalized’, institutionalizing a hierarchy between professors and groups to legitimize an 'academic elite'. The induction of some centers/groups of excellence in research via *PrInt* coexists with the logic of productivity and scientific competitiveness – when it does not induce it! -, guided by quantitative-classificatory forms of evaluation that, in parallel with the advantages they bring, intensify the work process and interfere with the dynamics of the university's training process, which should be guided by criteria other than those of the market.

**Final Remarks**

The concern with training researchers in Education in Brazil is a constant one that has developed/modified throughout the consolidation and expansion of the higher education system in Brazil. In turn, it is articulated to a broader process of changes in global capitalist dynamics.

As we saw in the first part of the text, the experiences of the “Regional Centers for Educational Research (CRPEs)” (1950-1960) and especially of the “Exchange Program” (1981-1992) concerned the qualification of researchers and theoretically-methodologically qualified research. Thus, the articulation from research groups assumed a formative character despite different strategies to consolidate scientific production in the area. A more in-depth analysis would allow us to understand that the formation and performance of current research groups and networks and the organization of ANPEd itself in working groups (WGs) - based on the performance of researchers and research groups - are tributaries of these previous initiatives.

In this sense, we discuss the intentions of the *PrInt* and what elements underlie the dynamics of international research networks when considering these seminal experiences. Considering a significant time gap between the proposals analyzed, the choice of CAPES/*PrInt* occurred from the understanding that this Program expresses the place of the University, graduate studies, and research in the current conjuncture in a more advanced and updated manner.

As we inferred earlier, the recent and ongoing condition of the Program raises caution in our analyses. Nevertheless, we can affirm that the constitution of researcher networks primarily aims at internationalization and not vice versa, reinforcing a deterministic and reductionist philosophy behind the idea of ‘internationalization as imperative’. Thus, the university community members are conceived as instruments for the effectiveness of a certain ‘internationalization’ required to adjust to a supposed 'global need'.

In this same sense, we can affirm that the internationalization perspective adopted by CAPES/*PrInt* is hegemonic and "immersed in the cultural matrix of colonial power, which reinforces unequal geographies of power, knowledge, and being”, promoting the “recurrence of a mimetic and reproductive bias, which denies the locus of regional insertion and reinforces the North-South dichotomous idea, with all the colonial ills it entails” (Leal, 2020, p. 148, our translation). Such considerations point to questions such as: Who does this internationalization serve? What effectively promotes networking? What does the priority interaction with certain types of knowledge/countries mean regarding training?

Thus, if, in retrospect, we viewed the consolidation of research in education from 1950-60 and more forcefully in the 1980s from the emergence of research groups, although with some contradictions, today, would we be following a qualitative leap with the creation of internationalized networks? Or would this fragmentation of research in the field be due to the lack of international ‘priority’ or ‘merit’?
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18. They are Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and the United States of America. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. One of the chapters of the document produced by Unesco (Sadlak; Cai, 2009) aims to discuss the role of small nations and their universities in the global knowledge economy and examine strategic alternatives for decision-makers in these countries to adapt to the *rankings* since we must consider “the inability of small nations and their universities to compete on equal terms in the recruitment and continued provision of resources to attract and develop researchers with high citation rates or winners of important awards” (Sadlak; Cai, 2009, p. 187, our translation). [↑](#footnote-ref-19)