

**REVISTA MOVIMENTO: ANALYSIS OF THE MEANINGS AND
REPERCUSSIONS OF A JOURNAL THAT “BUILDS ITSELF” IN THE FIELD OF
BRAZILIAN PHYSICAL EDUCATION**

Marco Paulo Stigger *
Maitê Vênuto de Freitas **
Solange Rydz ***
Mauro Myskiw ****

Abstract: Identifying the journal Movimento as an institution linked to the history of the School of Physical Education of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, this article intends to understand how the process occurred in its production/impact, from the moment in which it specialized as a physical education journal in interface with the human and social sciences (2003-2010). The responses linked to this objective were obtained from analysis of semi-structured interviews with editors and former editors of the journal, as well as people highlighted in the academic/scientific context of Brazilian Physical Education; documents related to periodic production in general, to the journal Movimento in particular, were also analyzed. It can be concluded that the specialization process of the journal is linked to the tension in the academic/scientific field of Brazilian Physical Education. The meaning of this journal is not reducible to the *socialization* of knowledge, but it also includes a meaning of *representativeness* and *evaluation/classification* in the field, with deep ties to the graduate program, with which it has a *visceral overlap*. This was part of a process that propels itself at the time of its specialization and other efforts related to the logic of the scientific field. The journal Movimento is thus a result and product of its development and of the development of the sociocultural subfield, where it is established as a *capital*.

Keywords: Journals as the subject. History. Physical Education. Sociology.

1 INTRODUCTION

At a moment when the School of Physical Education of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS) celebrates its 70 years of existence, there are many reasons to celebrate. There are also many reasons to try to understand – In the context of this history – the role that this institution has played in Brazilian Physical Education, through its various forms of participation.

One of its interventions in this universe was the creation of the journal Movimento, which, immediately, on its first issue in 1994, showed its intention to induce the physical education community to think about their specificities. This spirit was already present there in

* Professor of the School of Physical Education and of the Graduate Studies Program in Human Movement Science of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil. E-mail: stigger@adufgrs.ufrgs.br

** Student of the Undergraduate Studies Program in Physical Education of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil. E-mail: venutodefretas@gmail.com

*** Student of the Undergraduate Studies Program in Physical Education of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil. E-mail: solesef@gmail.com

**** Professor of the State University of West Paraná, Marechal Cândido Rondon, PR; student of the Graduate Studies Program in Human Movement Science of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil. E-mail: mmyskiw@hotmail.com

the “controversial issues” section, where renowned intellectuals of the area were asked to answer a provocative question: “What is Physical Education?” At once this issue caused great impact, affecting not only replies and rejoinders in the body of the journal itself, but also within the community, in different contexts and situations.

Having emerged as a multidisciplinary journal in 2003, when it completed nine years of existence, *Movimento* underwent a process of “specialization” and began to publish only articles of the sociocultural and pedagogical area. This happened for two reasons: first, the new demands on evaluation of journals, “umbrella-type” journals were criticized, while specialized journals were valued; second, through the response from the community, which “elected” it as a social area journal. This was identified in a survey which showed that more than 75% of the papers published in it until that time originated in the sociocultural and educational areas and that most of the “critical mass” that intended to publish in *Movimento* (doctors and professors of graduate courses) was made of researchers linked to this universe¹.

Based on these aspects, the journal became specialized and has been occupying a specific place in the academic and scientific field of Brazilian Physical Education, i.e. it has become a place where authors and readers of this particular area are able to post and read articles about topics alike.

However, this space is not only for the dissemination of specific knowledge. As its editors considered in the Editorial of its volume 15, issue 2 (EDITORIAL, 2009b, p. 8), “[...] scientific journals are not just knowledge carriers, but also *agents* that end up influencing an entire way of thinking about and *working* on a given knowledge area, with reflections on intervention related to that area.” It is in this regard that the journal *Movimento* has sheltered researchers in the sociocultural area (with its productions), also influencing graduate courses of physical education in Brazil – an aspect which will be explored throughout this text.

It is around this matter that this article gravitates. In it, we seek to understand how the production/impact process of the journal *Movimento* happened, as from the moment in which it was specialized as a physical education journal in the interface with the human and social sciences (2003-2010). This was developed from the point of view of science sociology, especially based on the *field* concept, from the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu.

¹ Further details on this and other aspects of the history of the journal can be found in the Editorial of volume 15, issue 3 (EDITORIAL, 2009a).

2 A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON SCIENCE AND THE PLACE OF JOURNALS

In an article entitled “The Legacy of Thomas Kuhn: The Right Text at the Right Time”, Clifford Geertz (2001) provides some comments on the impact of “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions”. Among other merits considered, Geertz points to the fact that Kuhn’s work was able to apply what became known as the *sociology of knowledge* – an effort to relate different forms of knowledge construction in the social context, where they are historically and culturally located and collectively produced – to what would be “[...] the most prestigious, threatening and [...] important intellectual activity of all – natural sciences” (Geertz, 2001, p. 144). According to the author, this was achieved by removing an *externalist* view of science – interested in its effects and institutional rules – for an *internalist* view, guided by the scientific practices, with their shapes and interests that relate to a particular community. Kuhn would, thus, separate science seen as an intellectual activity (a way of knowing), from science as a social phenomenon (a way of acting), to, then, debunk the scientific authority and include it in time and in society.

Even though there have been predecessors when it comes to trying to understand social relations in which the production of scientific knowledge is inserted, it is difficult to attribute to Kuhn the recognition of having brought up the idea that science consists of a social convincing process and that the product of scientific work is done less in the relation of the researcher with nature, but more with the community he or she belongs to. Perhaps more than for the diffusion of the concept of “paradigm”, the importance of this work is linked to opening doors to a perspective that leads to asking how scientific communities *work*, with regard to relations between individuals making up the universe and how these contexts relate to other dimensions of social life, in what regards the production of knowledge.

This point of view is quite different from the view that scientific knowledge – and its changes in particular – takes place marked by a logic sustained solely on reason, such as, for example, Popper (1975) would want, based on “critical rationalism”. Even if this view comes closer to Kuhn’s, in the meaning that both agree that progress in science does not occur by a cumulative process, but that new knowledge comes from the overthrow of the former ones, through discussions, in the context of a community, there is an important difference between them. To Popper, a theory would be considered valid until it was *falsified* by contrary

arguments; to Kuhn a paradigm would be replaced by another one as from the moment a community considered it was not giving any more answers to the problems it proposes to solve. If, at first sight, there seems to be more similarities than differences between them, it is crucial to note that, to Popper, the rational (logical) processes are crucial to the legitimacy or falsification of a theory; whereas to Kuhn, it is the (social) persuasive processes about a paradigm that lead to its downfall or not.

Despite this necessary² simplification about the thought of these authors, what we intend to highlight is that from the point of view of Sociology of Science, the focus is to understand how social processes occur and how these universes interfere with the acceptance (or not) of certain truths in different scientific areas.

In this direction Pierre Bourdieu's (1983a, 2004a, 2008a) ideas are developed, the renowned French sociologist who studied, among other things, the social universe of science. Even with differences and even criticisms toward Kuhn, Bourdieu (2008a) acknowledges that this author deeply transformed the space of *science of science* scholars, among other aspects, by pointing that there is a gap between thinking about scientific methods through rational logics and how they happen in scientific practice. The prospect of Bourdieu's thinking resembles Kuhn's point of view, especially in regard to the idea of *scientific community* and its role in legitimizing (or not) certain ways of thinking scientifically. According to Bourdieu (2008a), Kuhn introduced the concept of autonomy of the scientific world, but did not develop it as such. And this is what he is trying to develop from the "Theory of Fields" and the specificity of what he called "Scientific Field".

In Bourdieu's meaning³, modern societies are composed of strength relations and processes that regulate them, through the mediations that take place between social actors and that same society. In his point of view, this can be analyzed by considering the idea of "fields", identified as structured spaces of positions that have certain structural characteristics. Even if a certain field has its specific features – i.e. it defines itself through its objects of dispute and the specific interests of its own field –, all fields have laws and properties expressed in them, establishing the positions of each individual in these spaces. Therefore, the understanding of a field (the field of art, for example) provides useful information for understanding others.

² Imposed by the limits of an article.

³ Several works, including Bourdieu (1983b, 1987, 1998 e 2008b).

In this explaining context “the ‘pure’ universe of the most ‘pure’ science is a social field like any other, with its relationships of strengths and monopolies, its struggles and strategies, and its interests and profits, but where all these *invariants* overlay specific forms” (BOURDIEU, 1983a, p. 122). Thus, Sociology of Science rests on the idea that the product of scientific truth relates to the product of social relations of its production, i.e. in the structure and functioning of the scientific field (BOURDIEU, 1983a).

Understanding that “[...] the [scientific] truth is the set of representations considered true for being produced according to the rules that define the production of truth [...]” (BOURDIEU, 2008a, p. 101), the author is opposed to any form of understanding of the science world that does not take into account the concept that science is the field that determines, to every researcher, their (political and scientific) problems, with its methods and strategies. He goes even further, stating that there is no scientific choice (method, place of publication, moment of publication) that is not a political strategy – an investment – turned to scientific profit that, ultimately, is the achievement of recognition of peers (BOURDIEU, 1983a).

Diverting from the idea of *scientific community* in a homogeneous, peaceful, consensual meaning, Bourdieu (1983a, p. 122-123) states that:

[...] the scientific field, as a system of objective relations among positions acquired (in previous fights), is the place, the game space, of a competitive struggle. What is specifically at stake in this fight is the monopoly of *scientific authority*, defined, inseparably, as technical capacity and social power; or, if we want the monopoly of *scientific competence*, understood as the ability to speak and act legitimately (i.e. in an authorized and authoritative way), which is socially granted to a particular agent.

The situation below, referred to by Bourdieu based on Fred Reif’s ideas, draws the attention to the competitive dimension of the scientific field:

A scientist tries to do the research that he or she considers important. But *intrinsic satisfaction and interest are not their only motivation*. This emerges when we observe what happens when a researcher discovers a publication with the results he or she was almost achieving: he or she gets upset, even though the *intrinsic interest* of his or her work has not been affected. This happens because the work *is*

probably not interesting for him or her, but must also be important to others (BOURDIEU, 1983a, p. 125).

By showing how difficult it is to separate properly scientific determinations from those which are properly social, this passage draws attention to the relevance of the publications, seen – in addition to their role in communication and dissemination of knowledge – as a way of accumulation of scientific capital, the latter achieved only by recognizing not only the discoveries achieved, but also their authors. Although there are other accumulated *capitals*⁴ (such as their institution of origin, having worked with a renowned researcher, their ability to obtain resources, recommendations they get from colleagues and institutions, and their *visibility*), the criteria that distinguish the researchers include quantity and quality of papers they may publish. It is no coincidence that once a work is completed, the first step is to make it public through a journal recognized by the community itself. It is not by chance either that there are numerous institutions devoted to evaluation and classification of journals, determining their “quality” through impact analysis and other forms of categorization.

3 SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS AND THE FIELD OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN BRAZIL

Within any scientific community, it is commonplace that communication among researchers and the dissemination of the results of their work happen, largely, through journals. However, the importance given to production in journals and their impact in the evaluation of researchers who work in graduate courses has caused much controversy in the Brazilian case.⁵ Whether by their said-to-be quantitativist logics (KUENZER; MORAES, 2005), their alleged devaluation of other attributes of a researcher (MOREIRA; HORTALE; HARTZ, 2004), or their homogenized conception of science that would support them (KERR-PONTES et al., 2005), the truth is that there are many demonstrations that criticize the central role that publications have on the evaluation of a researcher. But it is also true that there are

⁴ “To accumulate capital is to make a ‘name’, an own name, a known and recognized name” (BOURDIEU, 1983a, p. 132).

⁵ This debate also happens internationally. Aspects of this can be observed in a recent article (01/24/2011) of the newspaper *Le Monde*, entitled “Researchers are caught in a rush to publication” (http://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2011/01/21/les-chercheurs-sont-prisonniers-d-une-course-a-la-publication_1468155_3232.html)

many arguments that reinforce this logic, and it is that evaluation of researchers and graduate courses that has persisted for some time.

In the context of Brazilian Physical Education, this subject is also a matter for many debates. There are few papers that – reflecting the influence of centrality in the evaluation of the graduate course – cast doubts on its effectiveness. One point of this criticism refers to the academic characteristics of physical education in Brazil, through analysis of the subareas that comprise the programs of graduate studies in this field.

Edison Manoel and Yara Carvalho (2011) discuss this theme, considering that the generic term *physical education* is preferred when referring to most programs, even though they share different subareas: biodynamic and sociocultural/pedagogical ones. According to them, biodynamics stands out when one considers the number of teachers per area and the number of research lines, which are reflected as hegemony that ultimately privileges research oriented by natural sciences over the human and social ones. Besides this form of construction of hegemony, they argue that the shift in the national evaluation system of the graduate program has – since 1998 – reflected on the paths of graduate courses in Physical Education. They believe the system started to overemphasize the intellectual production published in scientific journal articles, emphasizing the indexing of journals, with reference to impact analysis of journals, obtained by the methodology arising from the information science developed by the Institute of Scientific Information (ISI). As the number of journals indexed in the ISI is greater in areas that make up the so-called natural sciences, their impact is far greater than journals of human and social sciences. Thus, this form of assessment would allow for more space and better conditions for biodynamics in detriment of other areas, given that their production is more easily disseminated in journals of the ISI base due to the nature of their investigations. As a consequence, the assessment of biodynamics is improved and, in parallel, based on a homogenized conception of science, other areas are under pressure to follow the logic of natural sciences.

In an article that discusses a publication policy in Physical Education aiming at the quality of journals, Go Tani (2007) also points to the dimensions of the tension in this field and believes that a major problem is the non-definition of the epistemological basis of physical education. Thus, the author acknowledges the difficulties of those who publish in the social areas and agree that the picture is more encouraging in the biological area. Even proposing a reflection on the feasibility of using international databases for evaluation of

graduate programs in Brazil, he ends up seeing them in a positive way and expresses that these discussions should continue composing the agenda on publication quality. However, he points out that: “[...] one must be careful so they are not confused with ‘flexibilization’ of criteria, which invariably results in ‘substandardness’” (TANI, 2007, p. 14).

This debate is not limited to that mentioned above, and there are many authors who, in recent years, have dealt with it, from different biases⁶. But in most cases, these discussions revolve around the tension in the field, one that is guided by the differences between physical education viewed by natural science and the one analyzed from the social sciences. To us, it is worth mentioning that Movimento – object of our analysis – is constituted in the relation with the tensions that occur in the field of graduate studies in physical education in Brazil, with conflicts about different conceptions of science that exist in this universe, and the repercussions in the debate about the quality of journals and researchers.

It is in this context that this work is inserted. In it, it is worth reinforcing that we tried to understand how the process of production and impact of the journal Movimento happened, from the moment it was specialized. Considering that this decision put this journal *against the tide* of a hegemony that seems to exist in Brazilian Physical Education, we try to understand how this is impacting this particular universe.

Based on data gathered through semi-structured interviews with editors and former editors of the journal⁷, as well as people in focus (and influence) in the academic/scientific context of Brazilian Physical Education⁸ and also from documents linked to the journal, we attempted to answer the questions: what are the meanings of scientific journals (in particular, Movimento) *in the relationship* with the academic/scientific field of physical education and with its graduate programs? How does the journal Movimento “occur” in the academic/scientific field of physical education?

⁶ We suggest reading Kokobun (2003), Daolio (2007), and Lovisolo (2007), among others.

⁷ We interviewed Vicente Molina Neto (former editor), Silvana Goellner (former editor and current member of the Evaluation Committee of Area 21 of the CAPES), Alex Branco Fraga (editor), Ivone Job (editor). It is noteworthy that the first three are professors of the Graduate Studies Program in Human Movement Science of the UFRGS and the last is a student of such program.

⁸ We had no opportunity to interview other people who might have extended the discussions proposed here. Therefore, taking advantage of the presence, in our institution, of researchers who stand out for roles in decision-making bodies of graduate courses, we interviewed: Go Tani (professor of the Graduate Studies Program in Physical Education of the USP, also a representative of the area in the CAPES and CNPq); Juarez Vieira do Nascimento (professor of the Graduate Studies Program in Physical Education of the UFSC, current Assistant Coordinator of Area 21 of the CAPES), Valter Bracht (professor of the Graduate Studies Program in Physical Education of the UFES, also a representative of the Area in the CAPES).

4 MEANINGS OF JOURNALS – MEANINGS OF REVISTA MOVIMENTO

In this topic, we will reflect on the *meanings* of the journals for physical education and its graduate programs. These *meanings* will be interpreted through the concept of *interest* or *illusio*⁹, i.e. the prompt adherence to the needs of the academic and scientific *field* derived from the correspondence between the structure objectified in the regarded field and the one incorporated by agents. The concept of *Illusio* is treated as “being stuck to the game, stuck by the game, believing that the game is worth it or, to put it more simply, it is worth playing.” (BOURDIEU, 2004, p. 139). We try to specifically address the concerns for those journals, first *in relation* to the area of knowledge and, then, *in relation* to graduate programs.

4.1 In relation to the area of knowledge: socialization, evaluation, and representation

There is little debate that scientific journals, whether printed or *online*, find *meaning* in their expectation of disclosure, dissemination, or “socialization”¹⁰ of the knowledge produced by a given field. It is in this meaning that the following statements by Go Tani and Juarez Vieira do Nascimento, about the role of journals, correspond to the structure of objective relations of the academic *field*:

Those who produce knowledge intend to disseminate it and need to do so. There are several tools for dissemination and one of the most classic, and probably the main one, is still the journals. So, journals are essential tools for the dissemination of what is done in terms of science, research, and, of course, Physical Education as an area of knowledge properly placed within the context of the University; it has to have dissemination mechanisms that are not simply the undergraduate course and professional training or extension courses. So, journals are obviously essential and will continue to be (TANI, 2010).

You have access to some articles on the website, but I see the print edition as the one with critical importance for professional intervention, mainly to support our intervention as well as improve the quality of initial training (NASCIMENTO, 2010).

The meaning related to the diffusion of knowledge concerning journals is so recurrent and naturalized that, during the interviews, it did not deserve many demands in search of insights. But insofar as the questions regarding the degree to which journals began to include

⁹ About this concept, see Bourdieu (2004b, p. 139-140; 2008b, p. 97-106; 2009, p. 108-109).

¹⁰ This expression is used here as Area 21 “native” meaning of *dissemination*, as it is often treated in the field. Other native terms were and will be posted in quotes, because they are often repeated by field agents, not only those who were interviewed by us.

their relationship with the Coordination of Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), with specificities of the area of physical education and the graduate programs, other meanings assigned to the journals start emerging, such as: their place in the evaluation and classification of the strength of areas and subareas of knowledge and their characterization as spaces representing subareas, institutions, groups, and/or people.

According to the position of our interlocutors, the knowledge produced in different areas of knowledge and spread through the scientific journals is involved in academic education and/or professional/pedagogical intervention and works as an “[...] important tool for institutional evaluation, knowledge area evaluation, department evaluation, University evaluation, and teaching performance evaluation” (TANI, 2010). Based on this account, it is clear that the (academic) area had a reason to celebrate¹¹, in the last two years, the international indexing¹² of its journals on the ISI Web of Knowledge¹³ (Movimento; Motriz, by the UNESP) and in *SciELO Brazil*¹⁴ (*Motriz; Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte; Revista Brasileira de Educação Física e Esportes*).

In addition to this growing number of journals indexed in the international scene, the increase of publications in international journals is also easily taken as progress/development in the area of Physical Education, i.e. a “better” rating for the area, representing the progress of the strength of its academic production. In this regard, it is worth mentioning an excerpt from the interview with Juarez Nascimento, in which he emphasizes this growth and relates it to the development in the area:

In terms of impact indexes of our production on international reference bases, we have increased 300% in high-impact journals. If we were to compare it with the performance observed in the past three years, the impact factor of our journals has increased considerably. This means that the area has sought the impacting journals, i.e. in major indexing databases, which was not a characteristic of our area in the previous triennium [...]. So this has contributed greatly to the development of our area.

¹¹ There were many messages circulating on the web when this indexing occurred.

¹² Indexers are understood here as database institutions/companies that offer services to [1] index and disclose scientific production (enhancing aspects such as visibility, access, citations) and to [2] measure or evaluate publications (constituting stratifications and through hierarchies through information systems that formulate/calculate indexes or impact factors). To appear in the indexes and remain as part of them, journals need to comply with some rules, such as regularity, periodicity, peer review, number of original articles, training, and representation of publishers, among others.

¹³ The ISI Web of Knowledge is an electronic platform and includes an important index in the setting of cataloging, dissemination, access and evaluation of international scientific production (THOMSON REUTERS, 2010).

¹⁴ SciELO (Scientific Electronic Library Online) Brazil is “[...] an electronic library covering a selected collection of Brazilian scientific journals” (SCIELO, 2010).

Since the production in journals is an important way to evaluate the production of knowledge and international journals are the ones that have relevance in relation to local/national ones, there is an interest in internationally indexed journals, especially those with *the index H* or *impact factor*¹⁵. To national journals that want to “improve”, “progress”, the indexing in international databases puts them in the “same level of evaluation and standardization”. This kind of “conquest”, in turn, in the operating logic of the academic field, indicates the progress of the field. In this logic of progress, says Go Tani (2010), not all researchers are seeking international journals and we do not have to think that the national ones will die out either, because

[...] there will be a normal distribution also in terms of scientific production: at one end, the local newspapers, a laboratory, a study group, etc.; at the other end, a journal with high impact and strong international insertion, and production of each one of us will be in it. There is no other way, this is how it is (TANI, 2011).

This representation of the progress of the area, related to the publications’ spaces and their indexes, implies the existence of a socially structured academic-scientific space – a *scientific field* – In which researchers, journals and areas of knowledge compete for positions. This considered field has active properties, immanent rules that act as objective forces (reviewers and classifiers) inscribed in the everyday actions, routines of the agents, institutions and areas of expertise involved. With all these entangled, it is believed that it is worth playing this game: there is the *belief* that we must publish in refereed impacting journals, which should be indexed and well ranked in the *Qualis-Periódicos*¹⁶ of the CAPES.

If Go Tani advocates this position, Valter Bracht takes a critical stance toward the situation. When asked about the search of journals for indexing and better ranking, this researcher states:

I think we (the field) should be able to operate with greater autonomy relating to the CAPES and in relation to these indexing institutes, for example, a bit like the area of Education does. I have heard that one of the candidates of the area of Physical Education in the CAPES has the idea of asking the community, “what are our best journals in our area?” “These are them”. “Very well, they are ranked up.” If they are ISI, X or Y, at this moment, we will say that, it is secondary; we can even aspire to

¹⁵ Two evaluations of the journals considered important (used as references by QUALIS-CAPES) are the “j” *Factor* of Journal Citation Reports – ISI Web of Knowledge (a parameter to indicate the relevance of production/journals in the scientific scene, based on the citation index of articles) and the “h” *Index* of SCOPUS (a parameter to indicate the productivity of researchers – individuals or groups – offering features such as identifying authors and affiliations, citation analysis, and publication analysis) (PERIÓDICOS CAPES, 2010).

¹⁶ The CAPES Qualis-Periódicos includes stratification (A1, A2, B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, and C) of journals, by area, with the aim of assessing the Graduate Studies Programs, since each layer corresponds to a score. This stratification is based strongly on the indexes and impact factors of journals in which tutors and students of public programs publish (see CAPES, 2010a).

that, but what is important is to raise the qualification of journals that the community considers important. The subject, who for other reasons can put the journal in a good position, turns out to be overvalued at the expense of one who has impacted a much larger area. So, I see this process with skepticism. I wish the area could have more autonomy, both in relation to the CAPES and to these indexing institutes (BRACHT, 2010).

It is here where the legitimacy of the *Qualis-livro*¹⁷ seems to be meaningful and identified as an aspect that *relates to the rating and evaluating meaning* of journals in the *field* of physical education. It is the result of an internal dispute of the academic field to validate other types of *capital* and balance settings (relative positions) that, also in case of physical education, involve disputes among researchers, groups, programs, institutions, etc.

Go Tani, Juarez Nascimento and Silvana Goellner, when commenting on this issue, say the evaluation of books finds meaning in physical education and its institutional legitimacy is important:

[...] this appreciation of publications as books, book chapters, was exactly meant to contemplate what is inherent to us in terms of academic and scientific characteristics, and also to absorb some disputes I do not see much reason for. This dispute on whether Physical Education is biological or sociocultural, Physical Education, like it or not, is all that [...]. (TANI, 2010).

Another aspect that is noteworthy in relation to scientific journals is that not only the intellectual production of journals is important to the area, but also scientific production conveyed in scientific books and book chapters (NASCIMENTO, 2010).

[...] Movimento impacted production as well as book chapters, which was another political fight within the area so that there was recognition of books and book chapters (GOELLNER, 2010).

We do not want to discuss here the division or fragmentation of physical education, nor put the journals and books as the only positioning forms in the academic field. However, having made clear that “publish or perish”¹⁸ is a rule in this universe, the goal of bringing the discussion about validation of books and book chapters regarding the validation of journal articles, was to place elements to augment our argument that periodicals occupy an hegemonic place in the *evaluations* and *ratings* that are established in the area, with regard to disputes among its various groups.

In this direction, it drew our attention to another direction of scientific journals, that of representativeness. Whereas journals are spaces for “socialization” of produced knowledge

¹⁷ The CAPES Qualis--Livro is also a form of evaluation of graduate programs, considering the production of teachers and students, operated by the stratification of their works published in a book form (see CAPES, 2010b).

¹⁸ This is an axiom systematically referred to in the corridors of graduate courses in general and in Physical Education in particular. About its repercussions, see Lovisolo (2007)

and enter into the calculations of the evaluation and rating of its producers, they can also function as *representation spaces* of groups or subareas that, in a more or less deliberate way, deal with building and strengthening their qualified production space, with regard to the legitimacy of the academic field. One example of this effect is attributed to journals is *Movimento* – cited by Valter Bracht – which, after its specialization, became an important place of publication (thus, evaluation and rating) of a group of researchers in the field (or subarea) called sociocultural in relation to biodynamics researchers:

[...] Physical Education as an academic area is a severed area, a divided area. There is a strong tendency, in my view, of growth of what is conventionally called biodynamic area – it is actually the production of knowledge that is more focused on natural sciences – in detriment of the area that came to be called sociocultural. That, according to the rules that are posted, the rules are clearly in favor of a certain view of doing science, discourages a large Physical Education group. So, some journals, particularly in Brazil, try to qualify, as in the case of the journal *Movimento*, and privilege the production of knowledge within the area we will call sociocultural (BRACHT, 2010).

Bracht's words agree with what Go Tani refers to, highlighted in a previous excerpt, regarding the identification of a dispute among the areas in the internal context of physical education. However, it is also possible to see that there is no understanding in another matter: whereas Go Tani believes there is no meaning in some disputes, “[...] Physical Education, like it or not, is all that [...]” (TANI, 2010), Bracht believes that some “[...] rules are favorable to a certain view of doing science, which discourages a large group of Physical Education” (BRACHT, 2010). In Bracht's point of view, what seems to be at stake is not merely the fact that there are different areas in the field and all are part of physical education. He points to the fact that there is hegemony of one of them, crossed by these distinctive and different conceptions of science and physical education. And that is what ends up determining what, in this universe, *good science* and *good physical education* are.

We can thus say that internal disputes in the area of physical education went/go through journals, were/are mediated/updated by them, and somehow make them up. It is no wonder that in his interview, Go Tani (2010), giving great importance to the functioning logic of the academic-scientific *field*, asserts, in a negative tone, that the Brazilian Sports Science College (RBCE) journal “[...] was used as an instrument of ideological, political, socio-political disputes, and so forth” and that, about the same journal, Valter Bracht (2010), giving importance to the concept of pedagogical intervention, states that, in a positive tone, the journals had “[...] a huge political importance and was a resistance center to a particular view of science that had been installed in the field.”

This leads us to think about the emergence and institutional (*representative*) investment of several generalist journals (*Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte; Revista Paulista de Educação Física*, currently *Revista Brasileira de Educação Física e Esporte; Revista Motriz; Revista da Educação Física da UEM*, among others), but also specialized periodicals (*Movimento; Revista Brasileira de Cineantropometria & Desempenho Humano, Revista Brasileira de Medicina do Esporte; Licere; Pensar a Prática; Motrivivência*, among others). This information collaborates with our reasoning that – in addition to dissemination of knowledge – scientific journals comprise an important form of *representation* of the area of physical education, subareas, universities, graduate programs, scientific associations, etc.

The fact that journals take over this *representativeness meaning* at the same time as the *evaluation/classification* and knowledge/production *socialization* – which are surpassed by the disputes of the *field* of physical education – shows us the size of the *power* of journals, specifically, the editors, its committees and editorial boards, in the *mediation* they do in view of the *development* of the area and/or the journal itself.

4.2 IN RELATION TO GRADUATE PROGRAMS: A VISCERAL OVERLAP

In the area of physical education (and in others, of course) journals and *strictu sensu* graduate (master's and doctoral) programs establish a close relationship: graduate programs, as an “important” space for scientific knowledge production and periodicals as an “important” space for knowledge disclosure and “socialization”, as well as *evaluation, rating and representation* of agents and their programs. In this scenario, it is worth remembering the CAPES¹⁹ and CNPq²⁰, which are “important” government bodies to encourage research and training, as well as to evaluate (control; regulate) agents and programs.

As we have seen, the *interest* for publication in a journal is a way to *socialize, be evaluated, rated and recognized* in the field. It refers to a way of being in the academic field of physical education, to “[...] participate and admit, therefore, that the game is worth playing and that targets engendered by the fact of playing deserve to be persecuted; it means acknowledging the game and acknowledging the targets” (BOURDIEU, 2004b, p. 139). That

¹⁹ The CAPES, in its corporate presentation, classifies its purpose as the “[...] key role in the expansion and consolidation of graduate (master's and doctoral) studies in all states of the Federation” (CAPES, 2010c).

²⁰ The National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) is an agency of the Ministry of Science and Technology (MCT) “[...] for the promotion of scientific and technological research and training of human resources for research in the country” (CNPq, 2011).

is what makes engineers, teachers and students of graduate programs see in journals a chance for “development” of the area, the program, and the curriculum. On the other hand, journals, with their *interests*, rely on submission of papers produced under the graduate programs, to “complete” their issues with “quality”, hence the need for efforts to be “well evaluated”, for those who have *interest* in publishing also look to the journal rating, since, a well rated journal not only disseminates information, but also rates the author, his or her program, institution, and area.

Our emphasis in this *rating meaning* of journals in relation to graduate courses is not unreasonable. It assumes such proportions that the use of terms such as “production logic” and “*Lattes* generation” are often used to refer to the fact that the “usefulness” of knowledge produced and published may not appear as the first criterion for choosing a journal. Valter Bracht and Go Tani refer to this aspect with a tone of concern for the area:

[...] this is a bit of the commercial logic that graduate courses have been taking, which is transmitted to the tenders, etc., which makes the subject, before publishing, not ask who will read it and what impact it will have; this impact being the intervention and use, shall we say, of this knowledge, the usefulness this knowledge may have and, yes, what is the position of the journal in *Qualis* (BRACHT, 2010).

Another caveat that I see, which is directly linked to the issue of national and international journals, is what I have named the “*Lattes* generation”. These people – the *Lattes* generation – could not care less about the specific area of knowledge; they do not care about anything, what are they simply looking for? Individual academic *status* (TANI, 2010).

In the backstage of the journal *Movimento*, this effect may be noticed when one observes that in the last two years – especially after it was indexed in the ISI Web of Knowledge and following stratification as B1 in the *Qualis-Periódicos* of the area – there was an increased number of submissions from outside its scope²¹. In 2010, these submissions equal 22%; i.e. 52 articles from a total of 236 submissions were sent without proper adjustment. This number may indicate that, in several cases, the most relevant information for the decision making of the submission is not the scope of the journal, but their rating and indexing. Silvana Goellner, in a critical tone, reinforces this logic exists:

Today, I have to reach three hundred points with some locks, but I can do this by spraying my publication to multiple layers: from B4, B5 until A1 [...]. Well, I know there's a journal that is worth five points, but I can have three [journals]. I will already have fifteen [points]. That is because they have locks, B1 to B5, I can have three. So, fifteen points already help me. I add more points here, then it is a

²¹ The home page of the Electronic Platform of Revista *Movimento* states that it “aims to publish scientific research on topics related to Physical Education in the interface between Human and Social Sciences in its pedagogical, historical, political and cultural aspects”.

mathematical calculation and journals, how much they're worth, how much they weigh. I see a movement that might be happening: first, I send it to a heavier journal [...]; if it does not go there, I send it to a B2. And if it does not, I'll keep going down, but trying to publish this text – I am not – but people are trying to make that move (GOELLNER, 2010).

In this setting of “strata”, “score” and “calculation” in which journals are indexed, it is not surprising that we have received a request made by an author whose work was approved by the journal *Movimento*, but needed to know when it would be published, once they depended on the “points” related to that publication to be accredited at the graduate program.

From this perspective of scoring teachers to meet the criteria to be admitted and stay in the graduate programs²², Silvana Goellner refers to the “weight” of *Movimento* in the ratings, when it reached stratum B1, where an article starts to account for 60 points. To this teacher/researcher, this journal, “worth this score”, occupied a central place in the evaluation of teachers tied to sociocultural research, which has specific modes of production, different from the biomedical sciences. According to her, not infrequently, researchers/teachers of social and cultural areas were/are considered unproductive, “pulling down the program” in the CAPES concept. In this meaning, the *recognition* of *Movimento* was related to the *recognition* of research in the interface with the human and social sciences in graduate school. This dimension consists of Silvana Goellner and Vicente Molina Neto’s speech, when they state that:

[...] I have clearly realized, in the latest assessment, [...] how *Movimento* helped to boost the various graduate programs and, more than that, to cut off the possibility that some teachers and some research lines would be extinct, mainly those related to the areas of humanities, which is the great contest that is still attached; milder, but still attached (GOELLNER, 2010).

[...] I think *Movimento* was one of those [...] which have contributed significantly to solidify the human and social sciences in Brazilian Physical Education [...]. This is what happens: we started to sell our productions to two journals in Brazil, since we could not publish outside of the country by a series of prejudices, misunderstandings, and other things. We had two chances of publication in Brazil: RBCE and *Movimento*. So, it helped to solidify us, the research lines related to physical education, and social representations of human movement (MOLINA NETO, 2010).

This condition of the journal *Movimento* brought us to examine, even if only briefly, what we call a *visceral overlap* between journals and graduate programs, in which the “development” of the journal reflects the “development” of the area and vice versa.

A first aspect of this condition involves the *researcher/reviewer*. If researchers of sociocultural areas are sheltered by journals with this scope, they not only cooperate “socializing” their work in journals, but also are invited to participate as reviewers of the journals, to engage in *peer* review of submitted manuscripts, qualifying the journal in this

²² They are criteria known and recognized in the field, over which discoursing is not necessary.

meaning as well. According to Juarez Vieira do Nascimento, this qualification was also a demand of indexers, because

[...] journals need to improve their quality in order to get indexed in major international reference databases. So, to meet these indexing requirements, they had to seek support from graduate course teachers, especially in issuing reviews. [...] Participation of teachers ensured a certain level of quality in the analysis of the articles, resulting in greater stringency in terms of publications (NASCIMENTO, 2010).

The result is that, at least in the case of Movimento, most of the reviewers are or were linked to graduate programs as teachers/researchers or students/researchers²³; i.e. the works are evaluated by peers in the area and programs. With the “development” of researchers who are also specialized reviewers, scrutiny qualification of papers to be published in journals happened, as Neto Vicente Molina explained, referring to Movimento

[...] suddenly, as it [Movimento] specialized itself, articles began to be rejected. The history of graduate courses in physical education or in the history of physical education, it did it – I’ll use a phrase which I think is quite interesting, which defines it well – it built *pampered* and *dainty* beings [...]. So, as the journal goes on being qualified, these *pampered* and *dainty* beings begin to have articles rejected and there is a whole process of pressure, “No, look... but how come my article has been rejected? Who is this reviewer?” (MOLINA NETO, 2010).

Another aspect of the “development” of graduate programs that we can relate to the rating of journals – this quantity – is the increase in the production of articles. Most submissions come from graduate programs, where teachers and students are *induced* to publish²⁴. More than that, they are induced to “publish well”, which means placing the “result of their production” in a “high quality” journal, which, in turn, “qualifies” the production, the scholar, the program, and the institution. Some excerpts from the interview with Juarez Vieira do Nascimento collaborate to this explanation of the *interest* for “good publications” and how this has been reflected in the production of the graduate programs in physical education:

I see that the quality of journals is impacting the training quality of graduate students, because they are also publishing, since a criterion for program evaluation – and it is part of one of the defining criteria of the grade of a program – is the quality of theses and dissertations, which are linked to their results, their products; and their products are their publications, i.e. their intellectual production: articles, books, and book chapters (NASCIMENTO, 2010).

He also referred to the impact of the institutionalization of an “alternative model” for dissertation and thesis – the *collection of articles* – a change in the evaluation of the

²³ Former students have their training as part of graduate programs and, thus, are included in the scientific field.

²⁴ We considered it unnecessary to sustain it empirically.

production of students and their advisors, occurred, also (or only), under the scientific journals:

We have adopted an alternative thesis and dissertation model based on a set of articles to be published. [...] It is the most frequent strategy in graduate programs of the area to meet this growing demand for qualified scientific production. Most programs adopt the monographic model and, as an option, the alternate model that comprises a collection of articles (NASCIMENTO, 2010).

If we can say there is a growing *interest in* publications in journals (and with meaning), it is foolhardy to quickly conclude that a *quantitative* increase in the number of submissions led to a *classification* of journals – in that logic that, with many submissions, it is possible to select the best and incorporate them in installments. Of course, having a large number of submissions in this universe of journals is a sign of *recognition* of the area. However, in consideration of the rejection rate of papers (65%), the publishing process of Movimento has led the editors to consider that “[...] in quantitative terms, it seems we have had too much work for very little production” (EDITORIAL, 2010C, p. 8). This is an indicator that the *interest to be evaluated and graded* is on the authors/researchers’ agenda, with regard to the assertion of Go Tani that the increased volume of submissions does not necessarily mean “good work” – hence, according to him, the need to invest in *some journals to represent* the area; Alex Branco Fraga also refers to it when considering that – in some cases – there is the search for publications only so that authors remain in the programs:

We cannot predict a substantial increase, in the near future, in the volume of articles that will be circulating around journals in order to improve quality so to speak. It can improve quantity, not quality. And we know that, as research is quality, it is useless to do research that is not quality, and quality criteria are internally established criteria. We are the ones to establish that. It is the reviewer who will say if an article may be published or not (TANI, 2010).

There are several examples in which we had to say “no” to the authors [...] which we know are in graduate programs that are in line to exclude people from social sciences. They are in line to disqualify colleagues who are in these areas, but at the same time we see they are, some of them, publishing and thinking about staying in the program, which brings down the quality of the article (FRAGA, 2010).

Another aspect that tells us about the *visceral overlap* between the journals and Graduate Programs is a characterization that Schneider *et al.* (2009, p. 77) made of the circulation of the authors in Movimento, claiming that, considering the articles published by it – mostly coming from the South and Southeast regions – it was possible to identify a “geographical endogeneity”. If, on the one hand, this term may be negative in relation to the indexers’ criteria, observing more closely, we notice that this is related to the graduate programs. The authors who produced this interpretation ultimately recognize that this

relationship is crucial, and this is reported by Silvana Goellner and Ivone Job: “[...] this is a movement of graduate studies, not of Movimento [...]. It is the movement of production in our area [...]. Those who are producing come from the South and Southeast and this is not specific to Movimento, but to any journal of the area” (GOELLNER, 2010);

He says we have copyright endogeny by region and that we have many authors in the South region. I disagree a little, because in fact endogeny here is not endogeny. Endogeny occurs when you produce something for yourself. In a scientific publication, an endogenic journal is a journal that is made for their editors and community to write [...]. So, the South region has many physical education institutions and if you look through them, there are other journals too, even if headquartered in São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro. There is more endogeny in the South and Southeast regions. So I do not see [Movimento] as an endogenic journal [...] (JOB, 2010).

In summary, these issues were presented to demonstrate how journals work closely affiliated to graduate courses in physical education, with a visceral overlap established among them and related to teachers and students: most of those who “take graduate courses” also “make the journals”; most of those who “make the journals” also “take graduate courses.”

5 MOVIMENTO: A JOURNAL THAT “BUILDS ITSELF”

If, on the one hand, this *recognition* of Movimento within the CAPES and graduate programs in the area of physical education, the legitimate one as a *representative* space “of research/sociocultural lines”, on the other hand, it also strengthens the very internal operating dynamics of the journal: it starts to receive the greatest number of submissions, drawing the attention of supervisors and supervisees; it can count on the interest of “good” reviewers; it can participate in funding bids, among other things. For these reasons there is also the *interest* of Movimento (and others) to occupy this *position in the field*.

The assumption is that Movimento (and its agents) obtains *legitimate meaning* in a *field* of disputes, investing capital acquired/incorporated in previous actions, further strategies, thus *a journal that “builds itself”*²⁵. This reference to the dispute so the journal was/is *recognized* in the physical education *field* (and this *in relation* to others) is present in the discourse of editors and former editors and permeates the production background of the

²⁵ “Build itself” here has the meaning of a *strategy* given in a *practical reason* space, which is in of disputes, of games: a “[...] permanent and indispensable invention for position taking in the social space” (BOURDIEU, 1990, p. 81).

journal. In this context, the following statement/claim of former editor Vincent Molina Neto, enjoys the full meaning:

[...] we always had to fight a lot for Movimento, by its statement, either with the CAPES reviewers or with CNPq, or with the “hard” sciences [life sciences] staff. We always had to fight hard to convince people that our journal was a high-quality journal, because every now and then they created a mechanism to get us “out of scene”. They are, let us say, the hegemony, the *establishment* of physical education (MOLINA NETO, 2010).

It is this direction that we believe there is certain *journal capital*²⁶ which forms the basis of this *placement*, which were and still are sought by the Movimento editors²⁷. One is its *specialized scope*. The interlocutor Vicente Molina Neto commented on the decision of specialization of the journal, saying that it

[...] helped to give identity to the journal [...], consolidated the journal logo and brand and began to have appeal to the scientific community [...], people from the area of human sciences could not publish in the Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte. They had no place to publish and, with the specialization of Movimento, they now have another place, so we started to have a demand in this area [...] (MOLINA NETO, 2010).

About that, when speaking of the strengths of this journal, Juarez Vieira do Nascimento said he meets “[...] not its own or UFRGS demands, but the emerging demand of the area.” The guidance for the studies and knowledge in the sociocultural context, according to Valter Bracht, “[...] should be highlighted and should be applauded [...]” for its impact on balance (of power) among the subareas of education physics.

But the *symbolic capital* (recognition) of a journal also depends considerably on the extent of the *relatively durable* network of external relations that it can mobilize the *academic capital* linked to this network. In this respect, producing a journal means enlisting collaborators “appropriate to” the operation logic of the *field*, which, in the production of the journal Movimento, was reflected in the constant effort to select “good” authors/works and add “good” evaluators/reviewers, to then compose their work with issues that can draw attention to subjects that need to be addressed. This was Valter Bracht’s opinion when talking about the importance of the journal and also doing a critique:

²⁶ Not having found a better expression, what we call journal capital refers to specific properties active in the academic field, specific to the journals – in this case, of physical education journals. This interpretive analysis is also based on Pierre Bourdieu’s work, which treats capital as a kind of social energy, determining gain probabilities, contributing to the position taken in the field for the maintenance or transformation of the structure of social space (BOURDIEU, 1998, 2004b).

²⁷ We will quote and review some of the capital (the specialized focus of the scope; the social network of evaluators; and recognized authors, indexers and databases), but others are also relevant and could not be handled by the limits of an article.

I've seen in many undergraduate courses that discussion about what physical education is, or even on high performance sports at school being an object, and the texts of those controversies²⁸ being debated in undergraduate courses. So it seemed like a pretty interesting strategy, but I think that mainly due to the pressure to take on the characteristics of a, said-to-be, scientific journal, this strategy was left aside in a way (BRACHT, 2010).

However, despite the absence of the *Controversial Issues* section, the concept of “works which can draw the attention to necessary topics” remains a landmark in the selection of items that will be incorporated to the journal. This is observed, for example, in the concern of editor Alex Branco Fraga, when dealing with conversations with reviewers to guide them regarding the commendation of rejection: “[...] would the article be allowed to be cited by others? Would it be an article that would contribute to a discussion, to another article? Would it be quoted by other authors? Would it add to the discussion area?”

In these issues presented by the editor to the reviewer, we note that, in addition to drawing attention to issues, there is concern about the concept of reference work for others. This indicator was also mentioned by researcher and former editor Silvana Goellner, to say that the quality of Movimento is not reducible to its various indexers, because, besides this, its texts stand out:

[...] The texts of Movimento serve as references, for example, to the gender issue, which is an issue that I work on a little more. The journal Movimento is the one which has published most articles related to this subject and they are texts that are references from my master's and doctoral students. (GOELLNER, 2010)

To have this recognition, publishers count on the cooperation of reviewers and their opinions regarding the acceptance (or not) of works. That does not mean “outsourcing decision” (FRAGA, 2010), but counting on consulting a specialized agent (who is recognized within the work field) and assigned to this task. The collaboration, under *Bourdieuian* terms, portrays a kind of social capital mobilized to select, *with authority*, the works that will be part of the issues, but also *to recognize* the legitimacy of the editorial decision, based on substantiated reviews. It is for this reason that there are rare times when three, four and even five reviewers are appointed to review a paper, so that the selection is made more “appropriate”, i.e. “ratified” by peers and “mediated” by the editors.

Depending on the demand for such ratings, the body of reviewers also embodies the *symbolic capital* of the journal, since the field not only ranks the articles, but also those which have authority to classify them. In the case of Movimento, there are over 300 registered

people, primarily PhD teachers and researchers. Many of these agents were recruited after their specialization (especially in the context of *stricto sensu* graduate studies), so there was a change in the editorial body, i.e. “[...] composing a group of people who could be reviewers and think of a political journal with a very strong density in the social and human sciences” (GOELLNER, 2010). And, as the editorial staff was specialized, “[...] the levels of demand [for publication] started to increase” (NETO MOLINA, 2010), which, within the operation logic of the academic field, also cooperates with the recognition²⁸.

In view of this *recognition* and the *interest* of the physical education journals, which, within Area 21, seek to improve their relative position in the journal field, a tense dispute ends up existing, because “[...] there are several journals and several editors who crave for this place, to be a journal of excellence and have a rank higher within the CAPES (G, 2010). In this dispute, the chances of national and specific journals to the area appear in the “best” ratings (strata A1, A2, and B1) are still rather low, because they depend on international indexing and “impact factors” – aspects (capital) that only recently became part of the agenda of national journal editors.

There is also what Juarez Nascimento named an “inflation” in the *Qualis-Periódicos* of the area, derived from the involvement of researchers in physiology or biochemistry, for example, in graduate programs in physical education and which publish in international journals “out of the area”, but which are considered in the *Qualis* rating. We add to this the fact that there is a “lock” standard in the number of journals in each of these “best” strata²⁹, which sets limits for “gaps” The result is that most of the top ranked journals are international and “out of the area”. An excerpt from the interview with Juarez Nascimento helps explain this issue:

[...] [There are programs that have] a significant number of teachers who are historically linked to physical education, with basic and continuing training in this area [...]. Now, there are other programs with teachers who are not historically involved in our area. They come mainly from biological areas, mainly in basic areas. And, as they publish in journals of basic areas, they will want to publish in journals in consolidated, high-impact areas. This situation inflates the cutoff area of *Qualis*, limiting the percentage that we will have in a particular stratum. In three years, we had few specific journals in the area of physical education in stratum A1,

²⁸ Rejecting about 70% of articles submitted and still manage to publish 60 papers per year (in 4 issues) embodies, besides a technical/selective dimension, the symbolic value and the recognition of the journal Movimento (linked to its ability to socialize, review/rate, and represent).

²⁹ According to Official Memorandum 049/2009/PR/CAPES, “the sum of journals in strata A1 and A2 shall not exceed 26% of the total number of stratified journals, and the sum of journals in strata A1, A2, and B1 shall not exceed 50% of the total of stratified journals” (CAPES, 2010a, p. 3).

as well as in stratum A2. Most journals that are specific to our area and have a very important contribution were stratified into B1, because their index impact on indexing databases are still considered low [...].

Given the low *representativeness* of national and specific journals in the “best” segments of the area itself, in a meeting of the Forum of Program Coordinators of Graduate Studies and Journal Editors, held in 2009, in Florianópolis, it was decided that journals considered *representative* of the best production in the area would be included. In this effort to “enhance” journals to boost the “development” of the area, the journals Movimento (UFRGS) and Motriz (UNESP) had been recently indexed in the ISI Web of Knowledge – are now rated B1, along with Revista Brasileira de Medicina do Esporte, although their “impact factors” was not published. This did not happen without disputes and *persuasion* strategies, as explained by Silvana Goellner when dealing with the relationship between graduate programs and journals of the area:

So we clearly saw that the area sometimes did not recognize Movimento and that, through the most literal thing, the most literal criterion of the impact index, of the indexer, either one or another, it is related to it. If the journal also had this rating, it was because of its editors and the political movement that publishers have made alongside Area 21 and together with physical education, especially when the journal went into *Lilacs* – if I remember correctly it was the first indexer – and then in the ISI, because the fact of entering the ISI, according to some authors and colleagues, was not a guarantee that it already had a high concept, because it has no impact index, since the criteria adopted are those ones. So it was always a tense relationship and a way to also show that the journal was crucial to the area and that failure to conceptualize the journal with what it deserves, and what it has reached for, would undermine an entire area. So I think that first move we made was in 2005 or 2006, when the journal was not known after having its first *plus*, with a better score within Area 21 itself, so there was an entire political movement that eventually impacted the area and there was this first time to improve the area, but to the point of arriving at a meeting of a forum for engineers and electing which journals should be boosted. Movimento was considered the journal in our area that should be improved, but we see a number of things that happened: other journals enter *SciELO* and Movement does not, or journals that meet the minimum criteria that *SciELO* apparently requires. So, it is a power struggle in the area, exactly for the repercussions it has in terms of financing of the journal itself, in terms of academic status for their publishers, and institutions which they are linked to (GOELLNER, 2001).

The situation of Movimento reflects something not restricted to meeting the criteria of indexers or the CAPES, but fundamentally the *recognition* of what would be the “development” of an area of knowledge within the graduate programs in physical education – the “sociocultural and pedagogical” studies.

Currently, Movimento is indexed in four major institutions that provide such services (*Scopus*, ISI Web of Knowledge; *Latindex*; *Lilacs*), is present in four databases (*SPORTDiscus*; *Redalyc*; *Laproc*; CAPES journals) and appears with the B1

concept on the *Qualis-Periódicos* CAPES rating in the area of physical education. However, if on the one hand the presence of the journal in indexers and databases is “desirable” and a reason for celebration, on the other hand, they are seen with suspicion by the respondents. Valter Bracht has positioned himself in a critical way in face of these elements, arguing about the distance from the actual problems of intervention in physical education, when journals begin to operate only under the logic of the scientific *field* or of graduate programs. Citing examples of changes in physical education journals to meet the demands of indexers, Bracht uses the phrase “falling into a common grave” when dealing with the references of indexers. Thus, this researcher complains about a production of journals focused on themselves and not on the important needs of this field of pedagogical intervention. The position of this interlocutor alerts to the fact that this capital *is not specific* of the *field* of physical education, but ends up being extremely active in it, though relatively *converted* or *mediated* by the logics of this field.

In this criticism, Bracht also mentions the journal *Movimento*, when dealing with the absence of the *Controversial Issues* section, left aside, according to this researcher, in the face of pressure to “take on so-called scientific characteristics.” This was somewhat confirmed by the former editor of the journal, Vicente Molina Neto, stating that “[...] when the CAPES became interested in journals, it had guidelines that said “*Controversial Issues* are not good for the journal because they are opinion-based articles, so they are not worth it.” This corroborates the fact that the indexers are exhaustive regarding imperious predominance of original articles resulting from research.

This criticism by Valter Bracht helps us understand that there is a *dominant* mode of operating this *conversion game*, and there is also a degree of *valid* capital that, even with strong influence in the field, is not always recognized as arbitrary. The structure of the academic field works according to these rules and *Movimento* is not out of this *game*.

6 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This study aimed to understand how the production/impact process of the journal *Movimento* happened from the moment when it was specialized as a physical education journal in the interface with the human and social sciences. Based on that, we sought answers to questions related to the meaning of scientific journals in relation to the academic/scientific field of physical education and its graduate programs and about the meaning of *Movimento* in this context. These answers were reached based on data obtained through semi-structured

interviews and document analysis, the latter articulated with the look of science sociology and theory of the scientific field, based on Pierre Bourdieu's perspective.

Initially, it was possible to notice that the journal *Movimento* is building itself in an important tension context that exists in the field, one that is guided by the differences between physical education seen by natural sciences and that observed from social sciences. Its position as a specialized journal has its place, because it emerged at a moment when the field of physical education reinforced the sociocultural debate about its activities and knowledge; and at the same time, *Movimento* established its place because it helped to consolidate the participation (or placement) of a subarea of knowledge in this field – in some ways, it has helped to level the disputes and divisions in the field.

It then assumes a *meaning of representativeness and evaluation/classification*, in addition to knowledge *socialization*, with deep ties with graduate courses, with which it has a *visceral overlap*: if, on the one hand, researchers of *social sciences* are the ones who work in graduate courses that make up the journal *Movimento*, on the other hand, it is *Movimento* that – by providing space for *social science* publications – contributes for these researchers (and their lines) to remain in graduate courses.

This has not happened in a preposterous way, but is part of a process that – even though not done in a planned way – is boosted at the moment of its specialization and comprises other efforts, such as the structuring of a specialized team; fundraising of external resources; online publication in English and Spanish; demand for a specialized body of reviewers; and the search for indexers (meeting its criteria).

Although some of these efforts suggest that *Movimento* is undergoing a dominant logic, recognizing and working within objective forces operating in the academic field, it is emphasized that this is both the product and result of its development and the development of the subarea of sociocultural sciences. Based on statements by our interlocutors, we sought to show that the effective participation in the *game* was a key aspect to its consolidation. That is because, even though we often hear that “the CAPES (and Physical Education) is us”, “us” has not proven to be homogeneous and is deeply composed of conflicts and power relations, which ultimately reflect on the legitimacy of what “a good journal” is.

Thus, *Movimento*, within the academic field of physical education, was not only an intermediate, where “articles pass by”. More than that – especially for its decision of

specializing its scope and the editorial policy adopted – it became a mediator in a process that simultaneously constituted it. And, in this meaning, it established itself as important *academic capital* in the field of Brazilian Physical Education.

Revista Movimento: análise dos sentidos e da repercussão de um periódico que "se faz" no campo da Educação Física brasileira

Resumo: Identificando a revista Movimento como uma instituição vinculada à história da Escola de Educação Física da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, nesse artigo buscamos compreender como ocorreu o processo da sua produção/repercussão, a partir do momento em que se especializou como um periódico da educação física em interface com as ciências humanas e sociais (2003-2010). As respostas vinculadas a esse objetivo foram obtidas a partir de análises de entrevistas semi-estruturadas realizadas com editores e ex-editores do periódico, assim como com pessoas em destaque no contexto da acadêmico/científico da Educação Física Brasileira; também foram analisados documentos vinculados à produção periódica em geral à revista Movimento em particular. Pode-se concluir que o processo de especialização da revista se vinculou à tensão existente no campo acadêmico/científico da Educação Física Brasileira. O sentido deste periódico não é redutível à *socialização* do conhecimento, mas engloba, também, um sentido de *representatividade* e de *avaliação/classificação* no campo, com profundos vínculos com a pós-graduação, com quem tem uma *imbricação visceral*. Isto fez parte de um processo que se impulsiona no momento de sua especialização e outros esforços vinculados às lógicas do campo científico. A revista Movimento é, assim, produto e resultado do seu desenvolvimento e do desenvolvimento da subárea das socioculturais, onde se consolida como um *capital*.

Palavras-chave: Publicações periódicas como assunto. História. Educação Física. Sociologia.

Revista Movimento: análisis de los sentidos y de la repercusión de un periódico que "se realiza" en el campo de la Educación Física brasileira

Resumen: Identificando la revista Movimento como una institución vinculada a la historia de la Escuela de Educación Física de la Universidad Federal de Rio Grande do Sul, en este artículo tratamos de comprender cómo ocurrió el proceso de su producción/repercusión, a partir del momento en que se especializó como un periódico de la educación física en interfaz con las ciencias humanas y sociales (2003-2010). Las respuestas vinculadas a ese objetivo se obtuvieron a partir de análisis de entrevistas semiestructuradas realizadas con editores y ex-editores del periódico, así como con personas en destaque en el contexto académico/científico de la Educación Física Brasileña; se analizaron también documentos vinculados a la producción periódica en general a la revista Movimento en particular. Es posible concluir que el proceso de especialización de la revista se vinculó a la tensión existente en el campo académico/científico de la Educación Física Brasileña. El sentido de este periódico no se reduce a la *socialización* del conocimiento, sino engloba también, un sentido de *representatividad* y de *evaluación/clasificación* en el campo, con profundos vínculos con el postgrado, con quien tiene una *imbricación visceral*. Esto forma parte de un proceso que se impulsa en el momento de su especialización y otros esfuerzos vinculados a las lógicas del campo científico. La revista Movimento es, por lo tanto, producto y resultado de su desarrollo y del desarrollo de la subárea sociocultural, donde se consolida como un *capital*.

Palabras clave: Publicaciones periódicas como asunto. Historial. Educación Física. Sociología.

REFERENCES

- BOURDIEU, P. O campo científico. In: ORTIZ, R. **Pierre Bourdieu: sociologia**. São Paulo: Ática, 1983a.
- _____. Algumas propriedades dos campos. In: BOURDIEU, P. **Questões de sociologia**. Rio de Janeiro: Marco Zero, 1983b.
- _____. **Economia das trocas simbólicas**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1987.
- _____. **Coisas ditas**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1990.
- _____. **O poder simbólico**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 1998.
- _____. **Os usos sociais da ciência: por uma sociologia crítica do campo científico**. São Paulo: UNESP, 2004a.
- _____. **Razões práticas: sobre a teoria da ação**. 5. ed. Campinas: Papyrus, 2004b.
- _____. **Para uma sociologia da ciência**. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2008a.
- _____. **Economia das trocas lingüísticas: o que falar quer dizer**. 2. ed., 1. reimp. São Paulo: Edusp, 2008b.
- _____. **O senso prático**. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 2009.
- CAPES. COORDENAÇÃO DE APERFEIÇOAMENTO DE PESSOAL DE NÍVEL SUPERIOR. **Documento de área 2009**. Available at: <<http://www.capes.gov.br/sobre-a-capes/historia-e-missao>>. Retrieved: December 20, 2010a.
- _____. **Roteiro para classificação de livros: avaliação dos Programas de Pós-Graduação**. Available at: http://www.capes.gov.br/images/stories/download/avaliacao/Roteiro_livros_Trienio2007_2009.pdf. Retrieved: December 20, 2010b.
- _____. **História e missão**. Available at: <<http://www.capes.gov.br/sobre-a-capes/historia-e-missao>>. Retrieved: December 20, 2010c.
- CNPQ. CONSELHO NACIONAL DE DESENVOLVIMENTO CIENTÍFICO E TECNOLÓGICO. **O CNPq: apresentação**. Available at: <<http://www.cnpq.br/cnpq/index.htm>>. Retrieved: December 20, 2010.
- DAOLIO, J. O ser e o tempo da pesquisa sociocultural em educação física. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 29, n. 1, p. 49-60, set., 2007.
- EDITORIAL. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 15, n. 3, p. 7-10, 2009a.
- EDITORIAL. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 15, n. 2, p. 7-10, 2009b.
- EDITORIAL. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 16, n. 3, p. 7-8, 2010c.
- GEERTZ, C. **Nova luz sobre a antropologia**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2001.
- KERR-PONTES, L. R. S. *et al.* Uma Reflexão sobre o Processo de Avaliação das Pós-graduações Brasileiras com Ênfase na Área de Saúde Coletiva. **Physis: Revista de Saúde Coletiva**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 15, n.1, p.83- 94, January/June, 2005.
- KOKOBUN, E. Pós-Graduação em Educação Física no Brasil: indicadores objetivos dos desafios e das perspectivas. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 24, n. 2, p. 9-26, January, 2003.

KUENZER, A. Z.; MORAES, M. C. M. de. Temas e tramas na Pós-Graduação em Educação. **Educação & Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 26, n. 93, p. 1341-1362, September/December, 2005.

LOVISOLO, H. R. “Levantando o sarrafo ou dando tiro no pé”: critérios de avaliação e qualis das pós-graduações em Educação Física. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 29, n. 1, p. 23-33, September, 2007.

MANOEL, de J. E.; CARVALHO, M. Y. Pós-Graduação na Educação Física Brasileira: A atração (fatal) para a biodinâmica. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 37, n. 2, May/August, 2011.

MOREIRA, C. O. F.; HORTALE, V. A.; HARTZ, Z. de A. Avaliação da pós-graduação: buscando consenso. **Revista Brasileira de Pós-Graduação**, Brasília, DF, n. 1, p. 26-40, July, 2004.

MOVIMENTO. Revista da Escola de Educação Física da UFRGS. **Capa**. Available at: <<http://seer.ufrgs.br/Movimento/index>>. Retrieved: December 20, 2010.

PERIÓDICOS CAPES. Acervo. **Coleções**. Available at <http://www.periodicos.capes.gov.br/?option=com_pcollection&mn=70&smn=79> Retrieved: 27 dez. 2010.

POPPER, K. R. **Conhecimento objetivo**: uma abordagem revolucionária. Belo Horizonte: Itatiaia; São Paulo: EdUSP, 1975.

SCHNEIDER, Omar *et al.* Arqueologia das práticas editoriais: 15 anos de um impresso em Movimento. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 15, n. 3, p. 57-85, 2009.

SCIELO. Scientific Electronic Library Online. **SciELO**. Available at: <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_home&lng=pt&nrm=iso> Retrieved: December 27, 2010.

TANI, G. Educação Física: por uma política de publicação visando à qualidade dos periódicos. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 29, n. 1, p. 9-22, September., 2007.

THOMSON REUTERS. Products & Services. **Products A-Z**. Available at: <http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/science_products/a-z/> Retrieved: December 27, 2010.

INTERVIEW

BRACHT, Valter. Revista Movimento: testimony [October 18, 2010]. Porto Alegre: Escola de Educação Física – UFRGS. Interview given to Mauro Myskiw.

FRAGA, Alex Branco. Revista Movimento: testimony [September 17, 2010]. Porto Alegre: Escola de Educação Física – UFRGS. Interview given to Mauro Myskiw e Maitê Venuto de Freitas.

GOELLNER, Silvana. Revista Movimento: testimony [September 21, 2010]. Porto Alegre: Escola de Educação Física – UFRGS. Interview given to Mauro Myskiw e Maitê Venuto de Freitas.

JOB, Ivone. Revista Movimento: testimony [September 8,, 2010]. Porto Alegre: Escola de Educação Física – UFRGS. Interview given to Mauro Myskiw.

MOLINA NETO, Vicente. Revista Movimento: testimony [September 3, 2010]. Porto Alegre: Escola de Educação Física – UFRGS. Interview given to Mauro Myskiw and Maitê Venuto de Freitas.

NASCIMENTO, Juarez Vieira do. Revista Movimento: testimony [September 29, 2010]. Porto Alegre: Escola de Educação Física – UFRGS. Interview given to Marco Paulo Stigger and Mauro Myskiw.

TANI, Go. Revista Movimento: testimony [September 30, 2010]. Porto Alegre: Escola de Educação Física – UFRGS. Interview given to Marco Paulo Stigger and Mauro Myskiw.