

## The globalization of research in Social Sciences: The case of Communication Studies in the Ibero-American and Lusophone Space

Isabel Ferin Cunha <sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

In this paper we discuss, within an Eurocentric perspective, the changes brought by globalization in the context of research in Social Sciences (Appadurai, 2001; Meneses e Santos, 2011). Then we reflect on the epistemological challenges arising from these changes, focusing on the field of Communication Science in Ibero-American and Lusophone space (Melo, 2011; Barros, 2011). We also discussed the hegemony of a unique thought in Communication Studies established inside the Western research, and questioned its capacity to interpret and offer “solutions” to local and regional challenges.

**Keywords:** research, Social Sciences, globalization, Communication, epistemology, ibero-american and lusophone space

---

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor with aggregation of the University of Coimbra. Post-Doc at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) in Paris, France. E-mail: barone.ferin@gmail.com.

## INTRODUCTION

We are in 2012 and what in European perspective, we had imagined as globalization in the late nineties, has radically transformed. From the beginning of the millennium we have seen the decline of Western presence in the international scene and the emergence of new global and regional powers.

In 2007, before the outbreak of the financial crisis that affected Europe in particular exposed to toxic waste of U.S. banks, Anthony Giddens has published a book entitled *Europe in the Global Age*. This work, resulting from a report commissioned by the European Commission to the Policy Network platform aimed to design new economic and social policies. Giddens focused its analysis on the so-called European Social Model (ESM), which he considered to be the European greatest contribution to the modern globalization, as it pointed to the universalization of full citizenship and social and economic rights. In this report have been listed the main problems that Europe is facing: demography (aging and low birth rates); productivity and competitiveness (due to corporate blockages); common macroeconomic policies; decreasing inability to innovate. The outbreak of the crisis in international markets in 2008, after the bankruptcy of U.S. bank Lehman Brothers, worsened many of these problems in a European Union political and economic enlarged (twenty seven countries and about 500 million people) where the South Countries found themselves over financial bailout. Then, the year of 2010 marks the progressive retreat of MSE not only in those countries, but generally of all European countries, with direct impacts on indicators such as health, social protection and education, affecting the capacity to scientific and entrepreneurial innovation.<sup>2</sup>

The sense of gradual European demobilization facing the challenges of globalization, may be observed in a Boaventura de Sousa Santos interview to the Portuguese Journal of Social Analysis (2012):

“Because working part of the year in the United States, I can tell you that in the field of social sciences new ideas are increasingly rare. The new ideas that arise in sociology departments often come from the experiences of students from Latin America, Africa, and Asia, which later are harnessed and developed to the paroxysms of complexity or detail (Santos in Jerónimo e Neves , 2012: 692)”.

The deepening financial crisis between 2010 and 2012 that struck particularly called peripheral European countries - Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain and Italy - and demanded

---

<sup>2</sup> Cfr: Despite successive plans to support entrepreneurial innovation the average of the OECD countries does not exceed 39% (Eurostat, 2010).

active solidarities of the core countries - France, Germany, England - had increased the debates on the future of Europe by opening in these countries currents of political thinking and complementary alternative to European integration.

The new direction of globalization reflected, in turn, in G8 and G20 meetings, where European and U.S. supremacy is facing a growing challenge, which means not the will of emerging countries sharing responsibilities in the conduct of worldwide destinations, but also a struggle for alternative models: economic, political and symbolic.

All these elements have had as a consequence narratives about the world with new centralities, both national - particularly in countries like China, India and Brazil - and regional - Latin America - yielding renewed and reinvigorated geopolitical configurations, in which may include Ibero-American and Lusophone Space. We stress that within this geostrategic reconfiguration several countries are raising on the international scene: Brazil and Mexico, as emerging countries in the globalization; Angola with increasing regional affirmation.

As regards Jose Marcio Barros (2011:149 -158) globalization has strengthened and upgraded "the narrative models and their qualifiers" that reinforces the similarities between peoples, regions and countries, but also came to favor of new geometries and differences of interests.

In this paradox of diversity, we rebuild and strengthen narratives of ethnic bases, as well as community and traditional...But also updated models of reading the history, reconstructing the meanings of borders and flows that previously constituted the processes of colonization and today are reconfigured as an expression of principles and practices of cooperation (Barros, 2011: 149).

These changes were driven for two phenomena: human and media migrations. The first boosted by spontaneous movements — often organized by family, ethnic, and not infrequently criminal networks — that seek to respond to the legitimate aspirations of people who want to improve their lives. The second stems from the telecommunications expansion, the circulation of audiovisual content and generalization of internet which tends to strengthen contacts at local, national and transnational, based on share language and cultural imaginaries (Barker, 1997).

With these assumptions we propose a reflection on the globalization of Social and Human Sciences<sup>0</sup> with a focus on research in Communication Sciences at the Ibero-American and Lusophone Space.

## **GLOBAL RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Appadurai in the text on “Globalization”, published in 2001, points out that there are multiple challenges to global research in Social and Human Sciences, which causing anxiety in the West among the academic world and researchers. Between the factors that cause most anxiety are those that require constant flows of production, counteracting the time of reflection inherent to the research and discovery. The contamination of Social and Human Sciences for methodologies used in Applied Sciences, in recent decades, has been causing the industrialization of production, the criteria for results dissemination, the quality control and validation as well as science’s routines. This new procedures, altering substantially the routines of researchers and institutions in this area, have caused insecurity, in so far as the production is measured in terms of quantity and not quality. In this assessment indicators are individually and collectively evaluated using statistical methods and bibliometric tools, where the citations acquire great importance.

Associated with this aspect is the dissemination of results which, in the Social and Human Sciences has acquired new dimensions with the use of new technologies and academic marketing. If until the nineties of the last century, classes, seminars, conferences and subsequently books and articles were the major devices of communication, since then, the dissemination system has significantly changed. . On the one hand, emerge specialized sites located by internet global search that identify specific topics and authors, according to criteria not explained. On the other hand, public and private institutions - universities, research centers, publishers, etc. - invest heavily in advertising their professors and researchers, as well as the dissemination of their work in order to gain visibility and increase their capacity to attract students, researchers, readers, sponsors, etc. The increased variety of products resultant from research and the dissemination of outcomes generated the adoption of organizational and methodological standards for measuring the quality control within what might be called "dominant paradigm" in a perspective of "normal science", that is the consensual science. Simultaneous production routines are, in general, more and more agreed and buoyed to a consolidated science having difficulty in finding methods that can "circumscribe" a "new" phenomena or events. We refer, for example, the use of statistical and classificatory methods already used and the difficulties of "insert" in Social and Human Sciences circuit, innovative methodological aspects in order to grasp unexpected phenomena.

Furthermore the "growth and extension of knowledge market" is, in itself, a new anxiety factor in the global research. Globalization has allowed the entry of new geographical areas in the scientific, academic and university channels, increasing the number of actors and consumers involved. On the other hand, identified new objects and subjects of research and stimulated the emergence of new products with the potential for circulating globally. As technologies produce objects that are substituted and performances surpass in (a Hiphone 4 is replaced by a Hiphone5, which will probably be replaced by a Hihphone 6) market knowledge tends to elect as priority, with an increasing speed, new objects and subjects of research.

The expansion of this market on Social and Human Sciences generated in the West struggles for field domination (between regions, countries, institutions and academics). Simultaneously established privileges on the distribution of "dividends", among which are the references mainly focused on academics and researchers "from the center", what we must read as belonging to hegemonic institutions and countries that use the English language. The dominance of this group was concentrated, yet, in the scientific committees of the area and in the organization of events, having as a consequence the erasing of topics that are not related to the interests or concerns of this center. Even the post-colonial studies, whose root is British, arise from the reflection and opposition to the reality of the "center", the British Empire and the subsequent American hegemony. This reality was not shared by the Iberian colonialism which should be subject to a different reading. As is stated by Santos (2002) this "colonial" legacy differentiates the approach of the Ibero-African-American countries to the globalization, in order to create a counter-hegemonic identity.

These factors are themselves contradictory. On the one hand they generate a democratic dimension, promoting universal access to research and to searchable phenomena, questioning the traditional ways of doing and validate science. On the other hand they built a growing fragmentation and unequal distribution of resources in terms to educate, learning and cultural criticism skills. This dichotomy is valid at different levels - local and regional level, national level and between countries but also between regions and continents - which means that not all social scientists have access to the same resources and scientific and methodological devices. We should also remember that science is in general an activity that involves civil society and international community of individual and institutional actors, possessing a set of theories and practices highly hierarchical, structured and defined. This international civil society has an enormous physical and virtual mobility, which potentiates rethink new creative ways, new goals, objectives and directions of research.

As Appadurai highlights the entry of new players in the field of research in Social and Human Sciences has expanded the role of scientific imagination that encourages, jointly with new technologies, the border crossing and the dialogue between disciplines, in the meantime undermining the disciplinary epistemologies and proposing new forms of knowledge. The principle of self-knowledge and rupture against the consolidated practices and knowledge are therefore prized at a moment when coexist many “realities” and perspectives of a world in accelerated change.

The emergence of other countries and regions in international forums such as International Associations Research in specific fields of Social and Human Sciences has resulted in the opening of new sections, where are quartered themes of emerging countries, which act as "exhibitions" of new products and contents. In these global forums is well known the dominance of an Anglo-Saxon academic star system in permanent roadshow that regardless of the sharing of bureaucratic positions inside associations and research organizations retains the control of “prized” knowledge.

The academic and scientific knowledge is increasingly a part of the economy, identified as knowledge economy, feeding not only cultural, creative, information and communication industries, as well as parallel service industries, such as tourism. We emphasize that research on Social and Human Sciences is oriented to a market of sophisticated publication and dissemination, gradually incorporating new digital technology valences, while that supports a set of specific products targeted for academic research, such as qualitative, quantitative, image and online analysis software. The large scientific events such as conferences, seminars, national and international meetings move hundreds and thousands of people, that taking advantage of scientific content "exhibitions" and opportunities to establish contacts, for the maintenance or establishment of academic and research networks, enjoy enough purchasing power, and time available to boost global tourism.

The globalization of research in Social and Human Sciences require constant and continuous investments, while demand training teams, highly attuned to the dominant paradigm and consensual way of doing science, in the terminology of Kuhn would say in line with the procedures of normal science (Kuhn, 1972). We pointed out that science is also a social institution which is associated with contextual vicissitudes of history. In this sense, scientific

procedures, complying with standards and strict rules, are creating situations of unconformity and inability to answer facing new phenomena, leading crises and discontinuities in usual standards of interpretation and problem solving. Retrieving the discussion of Kuhn (1972) on idea of normal science, but also on the concept of paradigm (dominant, emerging and paradigm crisis) and the discontinuities of scientific revolutions, allows us to contextualize the process of knowledge production in a global world. For that author, normal science is defined as a research field whose foundations are accepted for a few generations, gathering followers and supporters. From a certain point, the paradigm - a set of explanatory beliefs, rules and practices - seems unable to explain the phenomena that emerged however in their field of study, resulting in the emergence of a new phase of science guided by findings (news relating to facts) and inventions (news relating to theory) that lead the crisis of the dominant paradigm, the rupture of normal science and the emergence of a scientific revolution (Kuhn, 1970). The understanding of science as an enterprise under construction and constantly update contributes to stimulate research inside the productivist and quantitative paradigm mentioned above. The same conception feeds also the productivist and bureaucratic mechanisms of administrative machine that are linked to universities and research centers, contributing to the consolidation of evaluation and benchmarking technologies, as well as the proliferation of specialists, evaluators and program managers, contests, applications, etc. This establishment in general extremely well paid, constitutes a structure that "parasite" on the research and assesses, often without ever having done research, skills and abilities inherent to the investigative work and to the researchers. The rating criteria are not always transparent, involve the evaluation of the relevance of research subjects, including the identification of "problems", "events" or facts that have the capacity to move and be consumed in the globalized academic world: the design of a state art, by analyzing a bibliography conveniently consensual; theoretical and conceptual frameworks within the area of research development.

The process we have described is unequal right from the start: not all countries have the same availability to allocate funds to these objectives and within neither the countries nor all regions have the same abilities. The economically weaker countries tend to allocate to science and research a smaller percentage of the budget, focusing on research that apparently results in competitive gains in economy and industry. Within countries there are neediest regions in economic and cultural capital. The Social and Human Sciences are invariably condemned to an

underfunding, both in the countries of the center or the periphery, but in a context of globalization these conditions acquire a geometric disparity. Moreover, funding of Social and Human Sciences is much more dependent on political and public funding agencies, resenting today, in all countries, particularly in Europe, the dominant political conservatism.

The globalization of research does not assign too instantaneously to all stakeholders the opportunity to put in the knowledge market phenomena which selects as object, subject of study. So both in terms of the market or the involved institutions, but also in relation to dominant actors we can identify a hierarchy of interests for facts worthy of generating knowledge, which implies lack of interest in specific phenomena that are considered inherent only to the periphery. The English language skills and proximity to the center countries "Anglo-Saxon" has been instrumental in the recognition of objects and research outcomes. At the same time, a theme of the periphery will tend to get into the global knowledge through center agents or actors which dominate the center routines of doing science.

In this sense, the globalization of research in Social and Human Sciences is linked to the dominant globalization, to the center of Anglo-Saxon expertise and industry, which is managed by this center. Research mobilities and networks, international assessments, huge international scientific meetings sponsored by globalized associations, tend to stress and endorse "good assimilation" and "good reproduction" of hegemonic Anglo-Saxon thinking in Social and Human Sciences, as well as on Communication Science, legitimizing the scientific and epistemological "unique thought".

A good example of this consensual domination, is the letter from the Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) in Portugal in the summer of 2012 specifying that it had commissioned to the "Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) at Leiden University, a bibliometric study on the institutions currently funded by FCT ". The goal was to "get a mapping of all scientific contributions resulting (outputs) of their funding at national level, through the analysis of the scientific production of each of the beneficiary institutions". This study would be based "including the areas of Social and Human sciences, the list of references included in WoS - Web of Science (and only those) ..."

The controversy followed by acceptance that brought around this type of assessment shows the instances and objectives of the process of dominant scientific research globalization, but



also the possible resistance that a small country like Portugal, can undertake. It is clear that Portuguese research centers in Social and Human Sciences, funded by FCT, countered this form of assessment, impugning the validity of bibliometric studies in this area of knowledge; the dominance of standards for measuring founded only in references inserted into the web of science; the irrelevance granted to other publications such as books and book chapters, even if published in prestigious publishers and using blind peer review; as well as the erasing that this type of evaluation makes in the publications that are reported on European Reference Index for Humanities. Despite the letter sent by research centers in Social and Human Sciences to FCT, incisively denounced the interests of the company Thomson Reuters that organizes WoS, which only includes publishers that are associated with, ignoring other publications with arbitration and indexing as SCImage and Scopus, the process followed its course.

It is at this context that we can understand the critical observation of Santos (in Jerónimo e Neves, 2012: 692) to the generality of Portuguese social scientists, accusing them of ignoring or denying the Portuguese situation of "semi peripheral and ambiguity" assuming behaviors of "First World", not taking advantage of the Portuguese condition "between worlds".

These reflections acquire special relevance in the Ibero-America and Lusophone Space in the area of Communication Studies that is, in the Social and Human Sciences, a field of study in transformation which constitutes a theoretical and methodological autonomous corpus, fundamentally grounded in classical social theory. These studies were structured around the Communication, polysemic and controversial concept that involves multiple approaches, which may come in the form of conceptual objects, social phenomena, complex interaction processes, technological devices or all of these elements in convergence. The validity of these studies as an autonomous field of knowledge find support on the fluidity and diversity of objects, in the plurality of knowledge (disciplines) and strategies (methodologies and methods), which can be mobilized in the act of knowing by the epistemological subject.

## **THE IBERO-AMERICAN AND LUSOPHONE SPACE OF COMMUNICATION**

In 2011, at the opening of CONFIBERCOM (Ibero-American Confederation of Scientific and Academic Associations of Communication), Professor José Marques de Melo, rewriting the history of the associations of scientists and researchers of communication and the struggles for dominance in the field and the primacy epistemological, refers that "after the fall of the Berlin Wall ... the matrices that constitute the Anglo-American thought became dominant in the globalized world, weakening multipolarity ... ". This hegemony and domain consented, derived in their view, on the one hand, from "inertia of the countries belonging to other

geocultural groups, which assimilate and reproduce the matrices of hegemonic thinking" legitimizing it as "unique thought" (Melo, 2011:10).

We recall that a scientific field is by its nature a field of forces and struggles in order to maintaining or transforming it and where the "structure of objective relations" between agents determines the decision making and the positions of these actors inside the field. To genuinely understand what is said in a certain field we need to identify the distribution of scientific capital and the place or position within that field, from which the agent, or the institutions position themselves (Bourdieu, 1997: 22-23). The speech of Marques de Melo can only be understood as a call to the concentration of efforts to empower thinking and research on Communication Science in Ibero-America and Lusophone Space, but this call should also be framed in the geography of the interests of these countries, not only in relation to each other, but mainly in the strategies that today they assume in response to globalization.

We highlight in this geography of interests that about 4.6% of world GDP speaks Portuguese and in all the Iberian-American countries this value rises to over 22%. In these ratings are increasing value the sector of Information Technology and Communication and Media (contents) (ES Research, Semanário Sol, 05/04/2012). Moreover, according to data presented by Barros (2011: 149-158) for the Ibero-American Space, comprising twenty-three countries, "Spain, Portugal, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and Chile have been responsible for 90% of scientific publications of Iberian American Space, producing between 2005 and 2009, "the discrepancy is accentuated in other indicators - for example, infrastructure, education and qualification of human capital - making it incomparable when the observation is extended to other countries of Lusophone Space, such as Angola, Mozambique or Cape Verde.

We also assume that the communication research in Ibero-America and Lusophone Space should be first and foremost "a political, economic and institutional project, which is updated constantly as action and representation" (Barros, 2011: 151), in comparison with other projects of the globalization.

In this sense this globalized research, like all research in globalized Social and Human Sciences, has a theoretical framework preferably rooted in social theory and in social history of classical thinking that since the nineteenth century, in the West and in the spaces in which

expanded its hegemony, grounded currents of thinking and forms of social organization, where has always shown a critical trend. These frameworks emphasize the contributions arising from the tension between modern values (science, reason and individual liberty) and traditional (institutions and social order) that leveraged theoretical and empirical imagination of European classical theorists such as Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber and Georg Simmel. Then we recall that elements of classical social theory, namely secularism and moral individualism, as well as specific aspects of the functioning of communities and groups, allow the work of George Mead and Robert Park and those that in the United States, have focused on issues of immigration, the role of ethnicity and ethnic relations. Without the foundation that classical social theory developed and provides social phenomena tend to be explained through ideas or principles that are rooted in the authority of institutions (eg, family, school, church, army, State, media ) with different degrees of legitimacy and power; in the tradition established on ancient traditions and customs; in common sense that sometimes includes, imbued, contradictions and prejudices and, finally, the so-called myths constructed by the media and journalism (Holton, 2002: 23-49).

However, this history of thinking about society which is the founding matrix of communication studies in the West, have been hybridizing with the Latin American contributions that follow a route predominantly inductive, starting from social phenomena to the explanation or theoretical innovation , appealing nevertheless to the theories, concepts and models of classical social theory. Meneses and Santos (2011) check this route in the book "Epistemologies of the South" where they try to confront the hegemonic scientific knowledge, originated in the "center", with other types of knowledge originating outside the field of Western science and culture. The produced reflection alerts to the difficulties of dialogue between knowledge as well as for the export of models, from the center. These once applied blindly and by way of "recipes epistemological recipes" in geo-cultural, political and social different context, leading to frequent misunderstandings. Expanding this line of reflection Santos notes that the Western world, which he calls the North, does not know "to communicate their ideas to the world unless in a universalizing way " and that all Eurocentric theories were built on "four European countries: Germany, Italy, France, UK ", in the nineteenth century, and in the late twentieth century in" the United States " ” (Santos in Jerónimo e Neves, 2012: 691).

We emphasize here, as did Appadurai (2001), Alasuutari (1998, 2009), Santos and Meneses (2011), Melo (2011) and Santos (in Jerónimo e Neves, 2012), that this statement does not stem from an attitude or principle of xenophobia, nor spite face the unquestionable competence of Western academic world, predominantly Anglo-Saxon. Our observation aims fundamentally claim a further democratization of communication studies in a geographical and discontinuous peripheral space to dominant globalization, as is the Ibero-American and Lusophone Space. With this goal we extrapolate the statements made by Appadurai and Meneses and Santos on the Social and Human Sciences, which they consider harmful the assimilation of paradigms and behaviors coming from an external reality, as well as the assumption of theoretical and methodological frameworks that lead to processes of "colonization" by the "science of the center countries" (Meneses e Santos, 2011).

In this context, new actors emerge, new geocultural areas, other producers of knowledge, introducing new themes, perspectives, concerns, forms of expression and language, which are contributing to the presentation of other research objects, causing the enlargement of the scientific imagination to geographic and symbolic spaces so far academically abandoned or relegated to a secondary position. These agents assume an attitude that maintaining the principle of objectivity cautioned by scientific methodologies enshrined in consensual science, introduces the competent rebelliousness (*rebeldia competente*) ie the ability of critical and analytical thinking that is able to consider alternatives and overcome the intellectual orthodoxy (political, economic and scientific) (Sousa in Jerónimo e Neves, 2012:687). At the same time, this attitude claims for a citizenship and global changes in the geography of knowledge in order to incorporate emerging countries and regional areas of globalization, proposing innovative strategies approaches and closer proximity relations - whether geographical and historical, or linguistic and cultural or inside a " common imaginary" - reinforcing shared elements but also respecting differences.

It is in this context that we can speak of the Ibero-American and Lusophone Space of Communication, taking into account that these geographies relate mainly to the ability to imagine regions and worlds from a history, culture and language not always harmoniously shared. The challenge lies on several levels, not only because there are colonial legacies and contentious to settle - Portugal and Spain were colonizing states but also peripheries of hegemonic Europe - as shared spaces to reestablish. In the latter aspect, the crisis and austerity

lived on the Iberian Peninsula (2010-2012) and the individual solutions for many of its citizens, who migrated to Latin America, have been contributing to this mental rebuilding. In the Latin American side migrations of the nineties and the first decade of the millennium also showed that this mental proximity boosted physical disposition of leaving your country, while "being at home" (Morley, 2001; Cunha 2008). Moreover, cyberspace and online devices came enlarge the public sphere, centered or in local or nation places, giving it a spatiality and temporality that promotes "nostalgic" encounters with memories of past, belongings and exiles until then unimaginable (Nacify, 1999).<sup>3</sup>

To this mental and memories approach adds a growing exchange of academic research experiences and the development and implementation of joint projects, as well as the ability to act strategically and in concert at "traditional forums, influencing the composition of its agenda and the critical understanding of socio-cultural phenomena "(Melo, 2011:11).

### **STRATEGIES FOR DIALOGUE AND DIVERSITY**

Deepening these issues, we emphasize the need to consolidate inside the Ibero-American and Lusophone Space of Communication, an epistemology that starting from a theoretical framework of various matrices (European, Iberian, American and Latin American) can contribute to the understanding of comparative phenomena of this geographic area. We corroborate the assertions of Alasuutari (1995:1-5) which believes that research as *bricolage*, a concept used by Lévi-Strauss in his anthropological studies, and he advises that the theoretical and methodologies principles used must be selected from objects or empirically phenomena, that we intend to analyze. Exploring this point of view, we assume that there are in this conception a considerable tendency for "social constructivism", in the sense that the objective of the research is not repeat the "consolidated truths" but put them in question, finding fresh angles that expand the scientific discourses about social phenomena identified in diverse geographies and contexts. So, we believe that doing joint research in the field of communication in the Ibero-American and Lusophone Space is doing research in theoretical and methodological border areas, where researchers and teams will learn to do research, doing research, which does not make it invalid, quite the contrary accentuates, the prerequisite for a solid theoretical and methodological training, increased by a constant self-reflection and reflection on the diversity of contexts, actors and phenomena.

In this sense constitute an approach factor of knowledge and experience sharing, the mobility of researchers, professors and students, disciplinary meetings and seminars, as well as

---

<sup>3</sup> Cfr: Anuário Internacional de Comunicação Lusófona, Coimbra: CECS Editor, 2011.

thematic and transversal projects. We emphasize the mobility engagements between Portuguese, Brazilian and African universities that allow students to exchange experiences on multiple university environments and similar agreements and protocols between these countries, Spain and Latin-American countries. In these modalities are associated efforts to organize postgraduate joint courses with double (or more) titration. This movement of a more institutional nature joins projects drawn from the meetings and thematic round tables, which had conferences like IBERCOM or LUSOCOM, as places of academic informal contact.

The languages, Portuguese (in its variants) and Spanish (in its variants) make easier the circulation of ideas, concepts and theories inside these geographic areas, despite the constraints promoted by the hegemony of Anglo-Saxon production. Simultaneously, an increase of bilingual publications print and online will tend, as is perceptible at this time, to improve the level of familiarity with both languages, among scientists and the general public. Another aspect that is crucial and has received renewed attention in recent times are the repositories of academic and scientific production in Spanish and Portuguese, this stems from the need to invest in creating bibliographic databases and others. While it has been a large effort is not yet accessible to a speaker of Portuguese in Brazil or in Portugal, have access to the production of Spain, Mexico or another Latin American country. For example, we pointed out that in Portugal the access to Spanish References in bookstores or online is scarce or none. The same is true in these countries for Portuguese or Spanish production.

The dialogue between scientists from these countries is for this reason disadvantaged, insofar as the bibliography identified by online search engines, of universal access, is in English and is dominated by large publishers of the globalized market. This is not to say that there are other constraints to put in this dialogue. For example in Portugal, the science "considered" by the FCT should speak English, and cited bibliography should be in that language. Looking at Portuguese publications we note that there are few references to Brazilian authors and even we can say, with some exceptions the Portuguese in Brazil's vast production.<sup>4</sup> Thus we have the same language but shortly we dialogue, still too little, even though increasingly publish Portuguese academic texts in Brazil<sup>5</sup> and Brazilian' academic texts in Portugal<sup>6</sup> and already we

---

<sup>4</sup> Cfr: Barbosa, Marialva. Nelson Traquina e a Pesquisa de Jornalismo no Brasil In: Cunha, Isabel Ferin; Cabrera, Ana e Sousa, Jorge Pedro. *Pesquisa em Media e Jornalismo: homenagem a Nelson Traquina*. Covilhã: Labcom: 12-26, 2012.

<sup>5</sup> Cfr. Estudos em Jornalismo e Media, UFSC, v. 9, nº 2 (2012) *Jornalismo e Mídia, aportes portuguesas* ([www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/jornalismo/issue/current](http://www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/jornalismo/issue/current))

<sup>6</sup> Cfr. For exemple: Revista Media e Jornalismo of Centro de Investigação Media e Jornalismo ([http://www.cimj.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=315:revista-media-a-jornalismo-no19&catid=7:numero-da-revista](http://www.cimj.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=315:revista-media-a-jornalismo-no19&catid=7:numero-da-revista))

are moving towards common publications<sup>7</sup>. If we consider the dialogue with Spain we conclude that it did, also progress in some areas, such as history of media, political marketing, political communication, organizational communication and digital media, but with the countries of Latin America, this relationship is almost nonexistent.

Crucial strategy approaches are the meetings focused on themes or objectives in order to build partnerships between people and institutions for the development of thematic projects in specific geo-cultural spaces.<sup>8</sup> These meetings allow the discussion of bibliographic material, conceptual and theoretical frameworks as well as benchmarking of methodologies, including those used experimentally in the observation of new phenomena and specific empirical studies. As regards Sumser (2002:6), the rules of observation determines what is called empirical research and this exists when the questions that are done can be more appropriately answered by observing the world, than through thinking about it. In this sense, the Ibero-American and Lusophone thematic projects, have contributed not only to the diversification of theoretical frameworks, and to the identification of research subjects, but also to the simultaneous "eyes training" through observation rules, based on systematized experiences. We are therefore facing the learning of comprehensive methodology, based on inductive practices, which generates an exploratory route, wherein the variables potential explanatory of the social functioning are placed in the context of discovery. This focus on sectorial and thematic meetings eliminates the dispersion of international mega events, forcing participants to actively intervene in the production and dissemination of results, as well as in production of their own methodologies. The creation of a database of profiles of institutions and researchers in the Ibero-American and Lusophone Space of Communication would bring huge benefits to identify partners and areas of interest, thereby helping the formation of partnerships, not only inside this geocultural space, but also abroad. It can be said, however, that the curricula platforms such as Brazilian Lattes and Portuguese DeGois represent a start for these profiling banks.

Another important factor in the globalization of academic research in Communication held in Ibero-America and Lusophone Space is their disclosure in English. We understand that production must be preferably in Spanish and Portuguese doing these Latin languages, languages of science.<sup>9</sup> But this issue does not invalidate the dissemination of the knowledge produced in the current international language, English. So we should collectively invest -

---

<sup>7</sup> Cfr. "Anuário Internacional de Comunicação Lusófona" ([www.lasics.uminho.pt/ojs/index.php/anuario](http://www.lasics.uminho.pt/ojs/index.php/anuario))

<sup>8</sup> For exemple the Project "Observatório da Ficção Ibero-Americana" (Obitel) which brings together eleven countries and about fifty active researchers. Cfr.( [www.eca.usp.br/cetvn/obitel.html](http://www.eca.usp.br/cetvn/obitel.html))

<sup>9</sup> Cfr: Observatório da Língua Portuguesa "Quanto vale a língua portuguesa" ([www.observatorio-lp.sapo.pt/](http://www.observatorio-lp.sapo.pt/))

reinforcing the experiences that already exist - in launching and in the quality of online publications, that constitute the showcase of our "knowledge industry" in Social and Human Sciences and particularly in the Communication Science, thereby promoting a gaze independently of the center, developing epistemologies appropriate for understanding our phenomena and agendas that mark our everyday life.

In conclusion, we believe that the globalization of research, particularly in the Communication Science, brought opportunities of theoretical and methodological assertion, extended to regional areas such as the Ibero-American and Lusophone Space. The way to go is complex and involves *competent rebelliousness* against the entrenched interests of the dominant science, not only in the identification of objects, subjects and phenomena to these specific spaces, but also in relation to methodological *bricolages* able to interpret them. The number and quality of players involved, the diversity and hybridity of its historical and cultural roots, but both the proximity of their imaginary allow thinking in a growing and innovative theoretical and methodological patrimony in Communication Science, oriented to the knowledge of our societies and the deepening of participatory citizenship. In this sense, Communication scientists should be *competent rebelliousness* and self-reflective, as proposed Boaventura Santos (in Jerónimo e Neves, 2012), learning from the mistakes of the past and the present, seeking objectivity, but not the neutral science, and engaging in alternative knowledge that can contribute to more equitable societies and for global citizenship.

## REFERENCES

- ALASUUTARI, Pertti. An invitation to social research. London: Sage, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Researching culture: qualitative method and cultural studies. London: Sage, 1995.
- APPADURAI, Arjun (coord.). Globalization. Durhan: Duke University Press, 2001.
- BARKER, Chris. Global television. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.
- BARROS, José Márcio. Diversidade cultural: algumas reflexões à luz do debate sobre o espaço ibero-americano. In: KUNSCH, Margarida Maria Krohling;
- MARQUES DE MELO, José. Comunicação ibero-americana: sistemas mediáticos, diversidade cultural, pesquisa e pós-graduação. São Paulo: ECA/CONFIBERCOM, 2012.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. Os usos sociais da ciência: por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico. São Paulo: Ed. Unesp, 1997. CUNHA, Isabel Ferin. Análise dos media. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade, 2012. \_\_\_\_\_ . Usos e consumos da televisão e da internet por imigrantes. Revista Comunicação & Cultura. n. 6, p. 81-103. Lisboa: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 2008.
- HOLTON, Robert J. Teoria Social Clássica. In: TURNER, Bryan Stanley. (Ed.). Teoria Social. p. 23-49. Lisboa: Difel, 2002. GIDDENS, Anthony. Europe in the global age. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
- KUHN, Thomas. The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University Press, 1972.
- MARQUES DE MELO, José. Prólogo. In: KUNSCH, Margarida Maria Krohling; MARQUES DE



MELO, José. Comunicação ibero-americana: sistemas mediáticos, diversidade cultural, pesquisa e pós-graduação. São Paulo: ECA/CONFIBERCOM, 2012.

MENESES, Maria Paula; SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. Epistemologias do Sul. Coimbra: Almedina, 2010.

MORLEY, David. Belongings: place, space and identity in a mediated world. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, Department of Film & Media Studies, 2001.

NAFICY, Hamid (ed.). Home, exile, homeland: film, media, and the politics of place. London: Routledge, 1999.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. Conhecimento prudente para um futuro decente: 'Um discurso sobre as ciências revisitado'. Porto: Afrontamento, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_.; JERÓNIMO, Helena M.; NEVES, José. O intelectual de retaguarda. *Análise Social*. V. XLVII (3º). v. 204, p. 685-711, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_. Between prospero and caliban: colonialism, postcolonialism and inter-identity. *Luso-Brazilian Review*, v. XXXIX. n. 24, p. 10-43. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 2002. SUMSER, Joseph. A guide to empirical research in communication. London: Sage, 2002.

**Endereços Eletrônicos:**

ALASUUTARI, Pertti. Universities are 'no innovation factories'. Academy of Finland, 2007. Disponível em: <<http://www.aka.fi/en-GB/A/Academy-of-Finland/Blogit/Pertti-Alasuutari-Universities-are-no-innovation-factories/>>. Acesso em: junho 2010 SERAFIM, Ana. 4,6% do PIB mundial fala português. *Jornal Sol*. Lisboa, 8 abril 2012. Disponível em: <[http://sol.sapo.pt/inicio/Economia/Interior.aspx?content\\_id=46181](http://sol.sapo.pt/inicio/Economia/Interior.aspx?content_id=46181)>. Acesso em: 13 abril 2013.

*This text was received at 1 February 2013 and accepted at 12 March 2013.*