

Brazil or Beyond: Exploring Why Brazilian Management Professors Choose to Study Abroad for a Ph.D.

Autoria: Eric Ford Travis, Sergio Bulgacov

ABSTRACT

This article was produced from research about foreign influence in graduate management programs at Brazilian public universities. The study was inductive in nature, inspired by Applied and Interpretive Anthropology, intending to contribute to educational policy. One aspect of the research sought to determine why some professors opt to pursue their Ph.D.s at foreign universities, while others stay in Brazil. The results concerning this particular aspect offer an extension and example of Structuration Theory with substantive significance. The study used inductive and exploratory Grounded Theory (GT), with in-depth interviews being the primary method of gathering data, in addition to participant observation and document analysis. GT precludes the use of a theoretical framework to initiate a study; instead results emerge directly from the gathered data. Highly rigorous data collection is a key aspect of this approach, and the interviews were exhaustive and detailed; over 160 free-response questions, lasting from 1-6 hours each. 54 interviews were done between August and November of 2009; and 42 transcribed and analyzed, resulting in 322 discrete codes, 57 broad concepts and 11 categories. The eight programs analyzed are quite different in history, nature, and culture. Likewise, their faculty bodies displayed varied origins, linkages, and levels of endogamy. The programs were: UFRGS [Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul], UFPR [Universidade Federal do Paraná], USP [Universidade de São Paulo], UFRJ [Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro], UFMG [Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais], UFBA [Universidade Federal da Bahia], UFPE [Universidade Federal de Pernambuco], UNB [Universidade de Brasília]. These were chosen because they are public, among the best graduate management programs in Brazil based upon reputation and CAPES evaluation, offer Ph.D.'s, and are similar in nature, enhancing comparability. There are a handful of top-quality private programs, FGV-EAESP foremost among them, but they are significantly different in their freedom of operations, hiring, and admissions. Most professors chose their Ph.D. based upon opportunities stemming from personal and professional connections, such as having advisors who had studied abroad. Exchange programs are facilitators for study abroad, with some universities having entrenched linkages with specific countries. The nature of decisions made concerning study abroad was directly relevant to personal aspects of risk aversion. In this study, Structuration Theory is most pertinent to how professors and their networks influence students' decisions of where to obtain a Ph.D. Advisors are intent on directing students to the best Ph.D. program in their opinion, surely influenced by where the advisor went to school. Students have intent: some want security, new experiences, or have specific research interests. All actor-agents are reflective, making informed decisions based upon consideration, affecting their environments and altering the institutions where they study or work through reflexive feedback. Some unintended consequences were also apparent, such as marginalization of Brazilian academic journals.

INTRODUCTION

This article stems from research into foreign influence in graduate management programs at Brazilian public universities. The overall study was inductive in nature, inspired by Applied and Interpretive Anthropology, with the intent of impacting educational policy. One specific aspect of the research, presented in this article, sought to determine why some Brazilian professors opt to pursue Ph.D.'s at foreign universities, while others choose Brazilian institutions: it offers an extension of Structuration Theory with substantive significance. The motivation for this study was a need to understand professors' roles in foreign influence, and how foreign influence affects Brazilian students' choices of graduate education. Influence comes from professors, advisors, study abroad and exchange programs, and contact with foreign researchers. It can also be found in classroom literature and expectations of intellectual production, both of which require a command of English. Such research can help Brazilian management programs and government determine the most effective way of maintaining academic sovereignty, and at the same time develop a critical mass of professors that are qualified and capable of disseminating their own knowledge as both teachers and researchers. With a limited number of graduate management programs in Brazil, foreign programs inevitably factor in the equation.

The study used Grounded Theory (GT) as its approach, with in-depth interviews being the primary method of gathering data, in addition to participant observation, and document analysis. Grounded Theory, a form of inductive analysis using the constant comparative method, precludes the use of a theoretical framework to initiate a study, as it can prejudice the results. Thus, the literature review is focused more on determining originality, rather than developing a theoretical framework. GT instead allows results to emerge directly from the gathered data: delivering a theory, or an extension, revision or refinement of a theory. Highly rigorous primary data collection is the bedrock of GT. However, the intent of GT is not to describe, but to develop concepts; even though the results can still be highly descriptive, as was the case in this research.

The eight graduate programs analyzed are each quite different in history, nature, and culture. Likewise, the composition of their faculty bodies displayed varied origins, linkages, and levels of endogamy. The programs were: UFRGS [*Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul*], UFPR [*Universidade Federal do Paraná*], USP [*Universidade de São Paulo*], UFRJ [*Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro*], UFMG [*Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais*], UFBA [*Universidade Federal da Bahia*], UFPE [*Universidade Federal de Pernambuco*], UNB [*Universidade de Brasília*]. These were chosen because they are public, among the best graduate management programs in Brazil, offer doctorate degrees, and are similar in nature. In addition, at the beginning of this research, in 2009, all but UNB were rated 5 or higher by CAPES; however, as of the 2010 evaluation, a few were rated lower. The CAPES evaluations are performed every three years, so data from the 2007 evaluation was used during the research design.

There are a handful of private universities and institutions that are on the same level in terms of quality, including FGV-EAESP, FGV-RJ, PUC-RJ, and PUC-PR. Several others are more professional in orientation, without academic M.S. and Ph.D., such as Insper (formerly IBMEC), and Fundação Dom Cabral. However, these private schools do not operate under the same rules and restrictions as public schools in terms of hiring, admissions, fund-raising, etc. A comparison of these universities, based upon their CAPES ratings and evaluations as of 2009, along with the years their M.S. and Ph.D. programs were established, can be seen in Table 1.

	UFBA	UFMG	UFPE	UFPR	UFRGS	UFRJ	UNB	USP	FGVSP	PUCRJ
Rating	5	5	5	5	6	5	4	6	6	5

Program Structure	VG	Good	Good	Good	VG	VG	VG	VG	VG	Good
Faculty	VG	VG	VG	Good	VG	Good	VG	VG	VG	VG
Students	Good	VG	VG	VG	VG	VG	Good	VG	VG	Good
Research	VG	VG	VG	VG	VG	VG	Good	VG	VG	VG
Outreach	VG	VG	VG	Good	VG	VG	Good	VG	VG	VG
M.S.	1983	1973	1995	1992	1972	1973	1976	1975	1974	1972
Ph.D.	1993	1995	2000	2004	1994	1976	2006	1975	1976	1997

Table 1: CAPES evaluations for respective programs (CAPES, 2007); VG=Very Good

Due to this being an inductive Grounded Theory study, it does not follow the same research design as a traditional deductive study modeled after the scientific method. Similarly, the research is more easily understood when presented in a slightly different manner. Therefore, after this introduction is an explanation of research methods, followed by a section concerning the historical context of management education in Brazil. A presentation and analysis of results come next, leading to an analysis of Structuration Theory, and finally ending in conclusions.

RESEARCH METHODS

Grounded exploratory research is definitely appropriate for a topic which has not been researched enough to have a strong theoretical basis (Selden, 2005). In order for this approach to be effective, there must be high levels of rigor at all stages of the research, especially in the data collection and coding. In addition, when researching a relatively unknown or uninvestigated phenomenon, it is possible and beneficial to allow the theory to arise from the data itself. Glaserian Grounded Theory regards rigidity of other methods as forcing, rather than allowing for materialization of theory: “in grounded theory we do not know, until it emerges” (Douglas, 2006, p. 259). Grounded Theory methodology consists of the observation of a society within its natural environment before seeking to discover patterns of behavior which can subsequently be used to construct a theory. Basic guidelines for grounded research were adhered to (Dick, 2005).

Data was gathered from numerous sources and with multiple methods: most notably exhaustive interviews between August and November of 2009 (each 1-6 hours, with over 160 questions), but also participant observation, publically available information, and field observations. The research tried to understand the phenomenon from an *emic* perspective (the perspective of those being studied). The author was a Ph.D. student at one of the Brazilian federal universities included in this study. Units of observation were the professors, but the research was essentially multilevel, gathering information about the individuals, universities and university system. Data was coded using the QDA (Qualitative Data Analysis) software Atlas.ti: this study resulted in 322 discrete codes, 57 concepts and 11 categories. This software was not used for any other purpose: all coding, conceptualization and categorization were manually performed; the software only stored and organized the data. Results were constantly compared to existing codes and emerging concepts, refining the process until cogent categories existed.

Virtually all of the data was primary in nature; most prominently the interviews, which were recorded directly into digital files on a laptop before transcription. Notes were taken during and after interviews to record impressions and ideas. Secondary data was gathered through document analysis of CAPES data, university websites, existing literature and professor’s CVs. This data was high quality, as it came from the professors and universities themselves.

One week was spent at each of the seven universities to conduct interviews, which also allowed for non-participant observation. Considerably more time was spent at the home university in participant observation. The units of observation were the professors as individuals, and the unit of analysis was management professors as a general population. Selection consisted mostly of purposeful sampling, for a balance between foreign and domestically educated professors at the targeted universities. In addition, there was theoretical sampling in the later, more informed stages, to specifically include key informants.

54 interviews were performed for a recorded total of 6130 minutes, or 102.5 hours. The interviews followed a script of questions, but were definitely semi-structured. Every professor was allowed to diverge as needed to obtain a well-rounded response; the interviewer did the same. The script evolved over time as questions were constantly reviewed; an important aspect of Grounded Theory. Some questions became apparent as irrelevant or unimportant and were removed from the script, while others were added as new concepts became apparent. Due to reaching saturation, not all interviews that were recorded were transcribed. “Saturation” in Grounded Theory means discovery of new information is minimal, in that virtually all new data is duplicative of data already gathered. Transcription of the interviews was ordered to balance between foreign and domestic Ph.D.’s before saturation, resulting in: 4 transcriptions at UFRJ, 5 each at UFBA, UNB, UFPE and USP, 6 at UFMG, and 10 at UFRGS, as well as 2 at UFPR. The percentage of the faculty analyzed at each university ranged from 6-22%; the percentage of foreign Ph.D.s analyzed ranged from 8-50%. The study was limited to only graduate professors with teaching and/or advising responsibilities. The only exception was one undergraduate professor who was an important figure in program administration. A balance was sought between foreign and domestic Ph.D.’s, but in some universities this was difficult, such as at USP, due to a lack of foreign degrees.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

It is especially important to understand everything in context, not just the phenomenon being studied, but also the way it is studied. In addition, the researcher must be cognizant of path dependency (historical influences), especially in regard to culture and institutions. Depending upon the historical basis, phenomena can have multiple explanations. “Reciprocal typifications of actions are built up in the course of a shared history. They cannot be created instantaneously. Institutions always have a history, of which they are the products. It is impossible to understand an institution adequately without an understanding of the historical process in which it was produced.” (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 70) Historical influences on choice of doctoral program became evident in this research in several areas: exchange programs, endogamy levels among faculty, student advising, and professors’ legacies.

Brazil has a long history of sending students abroad to pursue higher education. The governmental education organizations of CAPES (*Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Superior Nível*) and CNPq (*O Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico*), both founded in 1951, contributed to this phenomenon, and continue to do so. CAPES and CNPq study abroad scholarships have been mostly concentrated in a handful of Brazilian federal universities and USP, and the student destinations were likewise concentrated. In 2002, for example, between the two organizations, a total of 2,239 study abroad scholarships were issued. Of these students, over half went to just three countries: the USA with 738, France with 520, and the UK with 293. (Laus & Morosini, 2005).

These scholarship efforts have generally been focused on graduate level studies, specifically for Master's and Doctorate degrees. They have coincided with other programs since the very beginning, such as those administered by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations (Castro, 2000), and the US Government's USAID and Point Four plan, all of which had declared and undeclared political, social, and economic motives (Caldas & Alcadipani, 2003; Chaves, 2009). These agendas initially began with the Cold War; the USA was determined to preempt any other foreign influence in Latin America, especially Brazil. Training the political, military and business leaders of foreign countries was of paramount importance. As Robert McNamara, former US Defense Secretary and World Bank President, said of former foreign students [*albeit in military academies*] that returned to their countries: "They are the new leaders. I don't need to expatiate on the value of having in leadership positions men who have previously become closely acquainted with how we Americans think and do things" (Galeano, 1973, p. 273).

Higher education in Brazil is a relatively recent phenomenon (Trindade, 2005): all of the nation's universities are less than 80 years old (as universities), and fewer than 10 are older than 50 years (Panizzi, 2003; Mollis, 2007; Schwartzman, 2007). Management programs are an even more recent arrival. The first management program in the country was FGV-EAESP (Fundação Getulio Vargas - Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo); a private undergraduate program founded in 1954 with the aid of Michigan State University of the USA (Wood & Paes de Paula, 2004). This endeavor was supported by the American government at the invitation of the Brazilian government. Part of the motivation was a need for trained managers to work in the multinational corporations in São Paulo, overwhelmingly from the USA.

The first generation of Brazilian business Master's and Ph.D.'s were trained in the USA. Subsequently, a few more business schools were established at existing Brazilian universities, both private and public: UFBA, UFRGS, FGV-EBAPE (FGV-Rio de Janeiro), and PUC-RJ (Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro). FGV-EAESP initiated a graduate management program in 1958, training professors to teach at the other Brazilian schools (Wood & Paes de Paula, 2003). Most of the business professors in Brazil during the 1960's and 1970's received their graduate education in the USA. From the 1990's onwards, a number of professors have sought their education in Europe, mostly in France and England. (Bertero & Keinert, 1994).

In the earlier years, there were only a handful of domestic options for a Ph.D. in management (FGV, USP, UFRJ), which meant that most had to study abroad. Only in the last 15-20 years have there been more universities offering Ph.D.'s. Today, there are less than 20 Ph.D. programs in management in Brazil, and the most respected are concentrated at the public universities, with the few exceptions previously mentioned. M.S. and Ph.D.'s are only a small percentage of total students. At public universities, up to 40% of students are in *strictu senso* (academic as opposed to practical) graduate programs, while at private universities, this percentage can be lower than 1% (Lucchesi & Malanga, 2010). As a result, it is still difficult to gain admittance for a Ph.D. in Brazil. Each university is quite distinct in relation to the proportion of professors holding foreign Ph.D.'s, ranging from less than 8% at USP to more than 44% at UFRGS. Likewise, the countries endowing these Ph.D.'s are varied. For example, at UFRGS over 25% of the professors have Ph.D.'s from France but less than 4% have a Ph.D. from England; at UFRJ over 14% have a Ph.D. from England, none hold a Ph.D. from France.

These professors bring with them their experiences and education. Their teaching methods are likely to be different, including the classroom literature they choose to distribute to students, depending upon the location of their education. Also, depending upon where they studied, they will have learned different languages, at different levels of proficiency. During

their studies, they will have established professional and educational networks. All of this together signifies that they represent both an extension and conduit of the overall foreign influence in Brazilian management education.

This foreign influence has come about through the overtures of foreign countries, especially the USA, and at the beckoning of Brazilian government and industry (Caldas & Alcadipani, 2003). However, this article does not make any value judgment, but rather takes the view that it is important to understand the nature of such influence, starting with the professors. By better understanding their role, policy can be developed to manage the further evolution of management education in Brazil; policy that can minimize negative or hegemonic influence, while at the same time maximizing the benefits that can stem from internationalization. Also, access to graduate management programs is still quite limited in Brazil, especially at public universities and top level private ones, meaning that there is an extra reason for including foreign universities as an option for the education of qualified faculty in management.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Selected quotations from the interviews are presented as they were recorded and as they were transcribed, as well as translated to English from Portuguese. Comments and questions made by the interviewer during the professors' responses are shown as: [*comments*]. In addition, the responses were transcribed showing the actual vocabulary and phrasing of the professors, so many of the responses are not grammatically correct or fluid, but are natural to dialogue, this is especially true when professors wanted to respond in English. Keep this in mind when reading the article, as these are not translation errors or from a lack of proofreading, but actual direct quotes. Professors' identities were protected through a code of three digits, with a letter designating order. The first digit represents the university: 1) UFBA, 2) UFMG, 3) UFPE, 4) UFRGS, 5) UFRJ, 6) UNB, 7) USP, and 8) UFPR. The second digit represents either: 1) female, or 2) male. The third digit represents either: 1) Brazilian Ph.D., or 2) Foreign Ph.D., with a letter (a,b,c) at the end designating order of interviews to differentiate between individuals of a group.

Of the 42 professors analyzed for this study, 21 had Foreign Ph.D.s. In addition, one of the professors with a domestic Ph.D. possessed two Master's from foreign universities, and another had a foreign MBA. Each professor was questioned and gave detailed answers as to why they chose both their Master's and Ph.D. programs. The responses were analyzed and divided into categories, with some professors citing multiple reasons for their decision. This article focuses on reasons voiced by professors for choosing Ph.D. programs. Contextual elements that must be considered, but without room for in-depth explanation, are program cultures, endogamy/exogamy at respective universities, and professors acting as academic advisors; all of which have a direct and strong influence on students' decision making. The excerpts from various interviews that best demonstrate professor motivations will be shown, as it is impossible to include in this brief article the "Thick Description" in its entirety.

Domestic Ph.D.s: Of the professors with a domestic Ph.D., by far the most commonly found explanation for choosing a Brazilian university was a broad category that was labeled "convenience" for lack of a better term, which also corresponded in many ways to risk avoidance and was also directly influenced by aspects of endogamy particular to each program. Over half of the professors acknowledged that their decision was affected by their career at the time; many were already adult professionals. Several professors claimed their family situation prevented them from studying abroad. Only a few cited financial difficulties that kept them from pursuing foreign studies. Some professors did not say financial problems *prevented* them from going but

did say they received financial support from Brazilian universities, which could be considered an incentive to stay in Brazil. About half of the professors specifically stated that they never even considered studying in another country; some said they did not have the opportunity.

Convenience: Even though professor 511a has had significant international, as well as professional, experience in her life, her choice of a Ph.D. program was definitely influenced by convenience. At first she did consider going abroad, but decided it would not be worth the effort, especially since she already had foreign exposure. Her story, as stated during the interview: “Well I was considering going abroad. But it would be too much of a change at the time I made up my mind, I made the decision...I did all of my university level studies here in UFRJ.” What really interested her was that the new program was modeled after the US system and schools. “She told me about the plans of having a Ph.D. program patterned on U.S. schools, U.S. programs, and I was very interested and I applied.” She was a bit unique in that she already had prior international experience and foreign language abilities, thus she just did not believe there was enough of a reward in doing the full-time Ph.D. outside of Rio, much less abroad. “It's not because I was afraid of living abroad, or because of languages are anything or anything [*It was just more convenient?*] Yeah! And I didn't *need* to go out to learn. Which is one of the reasons to go abroad, because it's a way of really immersing into a culture, and I didn't need that” (511a).

Another professor from UFRJ also specifically cited convenience. The combination of the convenience factor with his existing career left him unmotivated to even consider a foreign Ph.D. “I didn't look to go abroad mainly because of the question of convenience. I wanted to obtain my Ph.D. soon and didn't want to leave my research group here” (521a). Part of his response hinted at a need for security, by saying that life in Brazil is precarious, including the academic world. “You should have an idea of the Brazilian university, everything is very precarious. Sometimes you don't have the scholarship to go abroad, the scholarship is slow to come. If you are engaged in a research group that is generating income at the same time as you are studying, this is ideal”. He also had a fear of losing out on opportunities: “...you think twice if it is worth it to go abroad and stay four or five years...I don't know if you have seen the *Planet of the Apes?* When Charlton Heston finds the Statue of Liberty buried? That could happen...Things will happen while you are abroad, and I didn't want to lose any opportunities” (521a). This viewpoint is strikingly similar to an argument made by professor 722a from USP, who said that Brazilians do not study abroad due to opportunity costs; mainly losing out on their career and being left out of networks.

One individual from UNB only decided to actually pursue the Ph.D. when she lost the opportunity to work, apparently after moving for her husband's career. “I wasn't going to just do nothing, so I would do a Ph.D.” (611a). Even the choice of academic area for her Ph.D. was one of sequential elimination to find one related to her past career. “I said: Ok, let's go see the departments of social psychology of work, anthropology or sociology, which were the three at that time with this line of research. I went to each of them and opted for the psychology of work” (611a). Another, a professor at USP, accepted the opportunity to stay for his Ph.D. after his MS. “...when I finished in 1980 a professor here (USP) with a MS from here was automatically admitted to the doctoral program, you didn't have to take a test, to prove anything...” (721b).

Another professor with a Ph.D. from USP (621b) took advantage of an endogamous path to pursue a Ph.D., this time with some help from academic advisors. “I chose USP because there was a selection process called “Advisors' right to choose”, and I knew one of the advisors in Sociology at USP...” As with several other professors, personal connections helped facilitate both the decision and the entry itself. This same professor could have studied abroad for his

Ph.D., but didn't even try, opting instead for a shorter exchange. "I could have, but I didn't try. I started the doctoral program at USP with a desire to do a period abroad" (621b).

A few others also had the opportunity to study in another country and did not take advantage of the opportunity. One, a professor at UFRGS, stayed because she was offered a relatively easy avenue: she could pass directly into the Ph.D. program from the MS. "...I was making contact with a professor in Spain to do it there, but after the program at Pernambuco offered me the chance to "upgrade", not defend my MS thesis and pass directly into the Ph.D., I decided to stay there and do it. I stayed there because I thought it was a very good opportunity to shorten the time to degree" (411b). It needs to be pointed out that this professor has nationalistic sentiments, and studies many topics specifically oriented towards the Brazilian reality, but what mostly influenced her decision to stay at UFPE was the time to degree and her age.

Career: Along with convenience, and also overlapping it, an important factor that made a significant difference in choosing whether to study domestically or abroad for a Ph.D. was having an existing career, specifically in academia. Of the professors with Brazilian Ph.D.'s, ten of them were already professors before they obtained their Ph.D.'s; most at the same university where they were pursuing doctoral studies. Another two professors from this group worked at a university in an academic capacity but were not actual professors at the time of obtaining their Ph.D.s. To counterpoint this, only five of the twenty-one professors with a foreign Ph.D. were professors before obtaining a Ph.D. Another three had some form of job in academia. Those with domestic Ph.D.'s were much more likely than foreign Ph.D.'s to be a professor before obtaining their Ph.D. (55.55% vs. 23.81%), and usually were part of an endogamous cycle. Differences in endogamy between programs are significant enough to warrant further research.

One from UFRGS stated even though he had the opportunity to study abroad, his existing work was partially responsible for him not taking advantage. "I had the opportunity...I had already developed other professional activities. I always worked in companies, private companies, public companies, and parallel to this I developed my teaching activities..." (421c). Another at UFRJ was also working as a professor, and the fact that he did not want to leave his research center was the primary reason for not studying abroad: "Mainly to not leave my research activities at the center, that I was quite involved in teaching and research and consulting..." (521b). He did, however, take six months off later to fit in a *Ph.D. sanduíche* [*sanduíche* is *transient visiting status at a foreign university*] in the USA. Professor 721b from USP also had an existing career at the age of 23: "I was already at this stage a professor, a renowned consultant, I already had a career, made good money, so it didn't make sense for me to do a Ph.D. or a Post-Ph.D. abroad" (721b). His colleague at USP was also busy with a career: "No, I didn't have the conditions, I had to work, it wouldn't do to go abroad" (711a).

Family: Family and personal life affected around a third of the domestic Ph.D.s. This seemed to limit some of them into not considering a foreign Ph.D. Strikingly, several of the professors who did opt to study abroad cited family as one of the primary reasons for doing so! Some were quite specific: "To leave here and go to another country, it was possible, but a bit too difficult, due to family ties, a son in high school, and these kinds of things. Therefore, I decided to do it here" (421c). One professor actually started his Ph.D. in Florida, cited family reasons as one motive for desisting: "I started to do my Ph.D. in the USA, but for family reasons I thought it wasn't worth it to continue" (821a).

Foreign Ph.D.s: Foreign Ph.D.'s voiced multiple reasons for making the decision to study abroad. The most common by far was simply the desire and will. Another common one was family, and yet another was the desire to learn English. A minority of professors, less than

10%, wanted to leave Brazil for a specific country because the destination was a “core” country for the research area they were interested in. About half of the professors also reported that either foreigners or Brazilians with foreign experience had significant influence on their experience, either in making the decision or in facilitating the connections and process. It is important that even though some professors chose to do their PhD’s abroad, it does not mean that they too did not benefit from convenience. Most of those with foreign PhD’s had people helping them, such as friends, family, and professors. Many also took advantage of established study abroad programs. However, the decision to actually study in another country cannot qualify as “convenient”, no matter how much they benefitted from “convenience” along the way.

Desire to study abroad: It seemed that the desire for exposure to another country, another culture, and new learning opportunities was a key to deciding to pursue a foreign Ph.D. Indeed, it was the most cited reason. Out of the twenty-one professors who held foreign Ph.D.’s, sixteen announced they had sincere desires to study abroad. Most cited a desire for cultural experience and the opportunity to learn English, for new and stimulating experiences to enable growth. Professor 112b of UFBA had a desire to experience life abroad: “I would be able to experience the reality of an international awakening...that is what interested me the most and the doctorate was a consequence”. Another from UFBA, 122a, wanted to study abroad, but only in France: “First I had the possibility to go to Canada to work with a professor, but I didn’t want to go to North America, I really wanted to go to Europe...I really thought Paris was very interesting”.

222a, from UFMG, had already lived abroad, but desired to leave Brazil again in order to do his Ph.D. “I had already lived abroad, and I wanted to live abroad again...to do a Ph.D. abroad, and the truth is that I wanted to go abroad because I had already done my undergraduate and Master’s at UFMG, and I thought it was important to be in another place, talk to other people, study with other people...” Also from UFMG, 222c chose England for language, enrichment and cultural reasons. “I needed to look for a something different abroad and so I applied to some universities. I applied to universities in the USA and England, because I also wanted to strengthen my English.” 322b chose England specifically because of the language and culture: “It is a question of culture, and I had three children, my children influenced it.” He further expressed his desire for an expansive and educational cultural environment. “The experience abroad is important to open up culturally; this is something that I wanted...in addition I did this challenge because I didn’t know English.”

Professor 422d, from UFRGS, always had a dream of studying abroad, England being his first choice, but virtually anywhere would have been acceptable. “I had a dream of living, of knowing the world, of leaving Brazil to know other countries...” His desire to experience other countries motivated his search for a foreign Ph.D. Similarly, 412a also desired to study abroad for her Ph.D., as she had already received her MS from an American university and enjoyed the experience. One who wanted only France was 412b: “I wanted France...because I identified with the culture, the language. I didn’t want to go to Paris, I wanted to go to the countryside because I had a small child and since we had an exchange with Grenoble I applied there.” He benefitted from an established exchange program at UFRGS, as did many other professors there.

Another (112a) who wanted to go abroad did so because she had already exhausted the opportunities for growth at UFBA. “I had already been a Master’s student and worked here as a researcher...thus I knew all of the professors, as people, as professors...I didn’t want to be a student again with the same people...I mean, I already knew them, how they thought, their education, the literature they brought, so this didn’t entice me.” She took advantage of an exchange program and a connection with a Spanish professor to study in Spain. Another reason

she wanted to leave was to specifically avoid further endogamy in her education: I didn't want to [stay here] because of the question of endogamy..." (112a).

Some from this category could be paralleled with the "convenient" category for domestic Ph.D.'s, even though studying abroad is never truly convenient. That is because many, if not most, of the professors who went to other countries for Ph.D.'s did so through existing exchange programs or had specific opportunities offered to them. In one way, this is convenient, and minimizes risk, but other professors who also were offered similar opportunities did not take advantage. So why the difference? It seems to be a convergence of factors: personality, existing career, family, age, era of Ph.D. But it seems that risk propensity can either facilitate an already easy decision, or overcome difficult obstacles, such as a lack of finances or having a family.

Scholarships and financial support were definitely a consideration for most, if not all, professors undertaking study abroad. The cost factors and living expenses in most countries considered by the individuals in this study are, and were, significantly higher than the costs found here in Brazil. Some specifically said that they had a scholarship to study abroad, which helped them make the decision; while others who did not get financial support decided to stay in Brazil, as has been demonstrated. Noteworthy among all was 112a, from UFBA, who initially went abroad for her Ph.D. without a scholarship or financial support, and only gained one later during her studies in Spain. Scholarships in general are not interesting as a causal factor. However, the origin and nature of the scholarship is more important, as some were obtained through CAPES, the Brazilian agency, and others came from foreign government agencies.

Risk Taking Orientation: There was a definite difference between the professors with domestic Ph.D.'s and those with foreign Ph.D.'s in regards to their responses to: "What characteristics do you have as an entrepreneur?" Some professors did not think they were entrepreneurial at all, but most gave some kind of answer. Most common among both groups were statements referring to having vision, being innovative, and being fond of challenges. However, not a single person from the domestic Ph.D. group mentioned they are risk takers, while this was one of the most prevalent responses from the group of professors with foreign Ph.D.'s. There is more risk involved in studying abroad, especially considering the possible losses (existing careers, friends, networks) and language and adaptation difficulties.

Family: Exactly a third of the professors with foreign Ph.D.s offered family as either a reason for going abroad, or for choosing the location. Some of these considered it beneficial for their children to be able to live abroad in order to experience a foreign culture and learn a foreign language. A few had spouses who had either studied abroad or were studying abroad, and who ended up influencing the decision as to whether and where to study. From UFRGS, professor 422d chose Germany based upon his wife's opportunities for education. "I was already a candidate for England...I received a scholarship for England...she received a scholarship for Germany...and this is why I ended up in Germany, but my first choice would have been England". Another, 422b, was influenced by his wife studying at Michigan State University.

Professor 512a was married with children, similar to some of the previous professors mentioned. However, this time it was her husband and children, rather than wife, who affected the decision making process. She chose Canada for both academic and family reasons: "[Why not Brazil?] That is the question I got when I applied for a scholarship, in Brazil, we have other schools here, yes, but for me with family it would be harder to justify for my family to move to another state and change everybody's life so I could do my Ph.D. So if we had to move it would be difficult, if we had to stay nearby, and everybody, my family is doing what they used to do and I wouldn't be able to concentrate as I wanted to do for my Ph.D. so I thought I should move

where my family would have some opportunities to develop.” Her reasoning is thought provocative. She specifically states that moving to another state would be just as difficult, but would not allow her family to have the growth opportunities available in another country. This particular professor also advised of the need to pay more attention to entrepreneurial aspects. When it was mentioned to her that many professors used family as an excuse for not studying abroad, she actually replied that they were not entrepreneurs!

Negative aspects to a foreign Ph.D.: Overall, there were only a few ways foreign Ph.D.s were considered negative. The responses were evenly distributed between professors with foreign and domestic Ph.D.’s. Most of these answers had to do with difficulties in coming back to Brazil due to the loss of an academic network. A few brought up that they had experienced professional jealousy from professors with Brazilian Ph.D.’s. Several mentioned there were no negatives as long as the foreign university was of high quality. Some, however, responded with concerns about the time and experience abroad itself.

Most common were comments about difficulties in reintegration. One such was a professor at UFPE: “Very difficult, it was very difficult, I had moments of exasperation. There wasn’t any interest at all here in the department about my Ph.D., about my dissertation, about the topics that I had researched!” (322b). Another from UFRJ said: “It is pretty much like executives who go abroad” (512a), referring to the repatriation process of expatriates, who go through a form of culture shock after having lived abroad for a period of time. There was also the suggestion that there might be more of a problem for students who leave Brazil without having a linkage with a university here in Brazil, which could help with reintegration.

A few specifically mentioned jealousy causing problems, even to the point of discrimination. Beyond even the normal conflict found in management departments, it seems that things are even worse for you if you have a foreign Ph.D. “For the other persons looking at someone who had a foreign Ph.D., it’s the culture that the people bring to the university. It is a counterculture; the Brazilian Ph.D.’s try to fight you! They think that she thinks she knows better because she has a foreign Ph.D.” (812a). High levels of endogamy at USP might contribute to more conflict between professors with a Ph.D. from USP and those without. Even if it is just rivalry, or ostracism, one professor felt it stemmed from jealousy, and that it has had a definite impact on his career. “Jealous...Very much. How would you say prejudicatio? [*Discriminated...in what way?*] Every way!” (722a).

There seems to be opportunity costs associated with pursuing foreign education. “I think it’s the cost of opportunity. They lose money if they go out” (722a). Professor 512a brought up the issue of recognition of a foreign degree, which is difficult, has costs associated with the time and effort involved: “Yes, it takes a long time to get your degree here recognized, so you lose money [*you lose money because it takes time?*] it took me a year or so, to get promoted” (512a). Careers can also be delayed. “Personally, the time lag is too long compared to people who stayed in Brazil. Which means that people have developed their careers, their networks, and you just were not there during 4-5 years. This means that you return to Brazil and it means they have 5 years experience and you have nothing. Really negative point I believe” (812a).

In addition to the need for adaptation when going abroad, and to re-adaption to Brazil upon returning, several professors cautioned about the need to also adapt what was learned abroad. Professors find that when they return to Brazil and try to apply much of what they learned, it is out of context. Something as simple as the definition of what is a “small business” can be different: “I want to say, you have to be a little careful to make an adaptation...Small business [*abroad*] is a company with \$10 million...Our small business is *really* small!” (412a). A

different aspect of adaptation includes the need for adapting to language differences. There are definitely losses in translation: “Language in class...you don’t have the local language to exchange with students. When you are used to saying things in English and translate to Portuguese you can lose something in translation, because business language is different.” (812a)

The professors from UFRJ seemed surprised that there could be any negative aspects to having a foreign Ph.D. “Not at all I think it’s very good...No! At COPPEAD on the contrary, that is what we want. The problem is a different one. The problem is that when the guy goes there and does the Ph.D. there, what we can offer him is not competitive...they hardly ever come back!...It is the other way around...we would love it!” (511a) A few others echoed the sentiment that some students leave for their Ph.D. and don’t return to Brazil, which is bad for the country.

Who influences the decisions: The decision to undertake graduate studies in a foreign country is a complex one. Many of those interviewed responded that they were influenced by diverse people, and that various connections with both Brazilians who had foreign experience and with foreigners themselves helped make the decision and act upon it. It is important to note that of the several professors who had the opportunity to study abroad and didn’t, the opportunity they declined came through contact with foreigners or with Brazilians having foreign experience. Even the established exchange programs some Brazilian management departments have generally came about and are maintained by interpersonal connections, which are integral in facilitating access to foreign programs. Similarly, many of the professors with domestic Ph.D.s said they were influenced to not study abroad by people at their universities during their earlier degrees.

The three most important categories of people for foreign Ph.D.’s seemed to be: 1) advisors, 2) Brazilians with foreign experience, and 3) foreigners themselves, especially foreigners that study Brazil (so called Brazilianists). The first brings the aspects of power and authority into question. The second adds the idea of legitimacy. Relationships between the first two and the third explain why some universities are more associated with sending students to a particular country, for example UFMG with England and UFRGS with France. Once established, these networks seem to be self-reinforcing. A few subjects interviewed stated that their Master’s advisors had no influence at all on their decision, but most acknowledged they played a role.

A few domestic Ph.D.’s did partake of Ph.D. sandwiches, helped by having either foreign contacts, or advisors with such contacts. One was 711a, from USP: “It was an invitation. I already was doing a MS and the University was also interested in attracting Brazilian students to do courses there.” Another was from UNB, with a Ph.D. from USP: “I did it in England...Because my advisor had contacts” (621b). Worth noting is that this was not one of the established programs at USP, but a personal connection made through his Ph.D. advisor in particular. “In reality this wasn’t an Exchange program with USP, but a very personal contact of my advisor” (621b). UFRJ has arguably the most internationalized program in Brazil, and its professors and students have contacts worldwide. They also have visiting professors on many occasions, which one student at UFRJ took advantage of to establish a relationship to help him go the USA for a sanduíche: “...when he came to give a speech I met him” (521b).

The advisor seems to hold an important position of influence over academic decisions, at least for many of those interviewed. Even some advisors without foreign experience push their charges to go abroad for experience and development. 112’s advisor said: “...if you stay here you won’t grow, you will stay average”. The role of advisor is emphasized by the comments of professor 422f. He personally claimed responsibility for sending numerous students to other countries. “The advisor is someone who is going to take students from here to there...I know that I influenced them” (422f). He himself had studied in France and developed a network there,

which helps students go to France. “Yes, I take people there: send them for the Ph.D., undergraduate exchange, graduate exchange, Ph.D., all by me.” His prediction that UFRGS will continue sending students to France is irrefutable evidence of path dependency. “I think yes because the things we are linking and doing, they are constantly stronger.”

One who did his Ph.D. in France was influenced by several of his professors. “Grenoble, because two or three of the professors in my Master’s degree came from there. I wanted to go to the USA but the application forms were difficult to fulfill.” (422c) So even though his desire was the USA, he chose France because it was easier, possibly because of the help and aid his professors provided. As previously state, UFRGS also has had long standing exchange programs with French universities, which had to have been established by individuals: universities do not establish exchange programs, individuals within universities do. 412a at UFRGS was vehement about the need for exogamy, and demands that her MS students go abroad for Ph.D.’s. 812a said that she herself was urged to go abroad, specifically to the USA, by her advisor.

Even if the advisor does not directly influence the decision, they can still be responsible for opening up doors and establishing connections for the student. “...she did contribute much through her network...she really opened doors...she was a person who greatly contributed to the internationalization of this program” (122a). One subject interviewed said it wasn’t his personal advisor, but rather a professor who taught him at UFMG who helped him on his way. This woman, Suzana Braga, was spoken about by many at UFMG during their interviews and outside of the interviews. She was not his advisor, but his education would have been very different if not for her: “...she opened the opportunity” (222b).

During this study, Suzana was encountered in person at a lecture sponsored by a private university. She was hosting John Childs, a well-known British researcher. Suzana herself obtained a Ph.D. in England; thus her extensive experience and associations with English academics. “She really was a good reference for Cambridge, she sent a lot of students there” (222c). Her efforts at internationalization of Brazilian education are widespread, especially at UFMG, and have influenced and assisted numerous students. One was 222a: “...she told me: “Look, you will work with me...later you can go do a Ph.D. abroad with John.”” He also thought that he would have stayed in Brazil if not for her, and he is continuing the tradition of sending his students abroad. “...Suzana pushed me abroad and I want to push my students abroad” (222a).

Having a professor with a personal connection and firsthand experience is valuable in convincing a student to follow in their footsteps. It again might be related to risk avoidance characteristics on the part of Brazilians. According to a professor from UFMG: “If someone tells you that it is good there, you believe them much more if they share with you their vision, their experience...” (222c). A professor at UFRGS pointed out that he was definitely worried about the risk factor. Due to this, he limited his decision to the university where some of his professors had obtained their education. “I wanted to minimize the risk of going abroad...Some of my professors here at undergraduate were students at Michigan State so I was saying, well, I will go to a place where my professors have been and that was basically it” (422b). Generally, not just with deciding on a graduate program, the more information one has, the less risk there is in making any given decision. However, some professors are less wary of risk than others.

STRUCTURATION THEORY

Given that this study was approached from Glaser defined grounded theory, the literature review prior to development was oriented mostly towards asserting originality. It is important to keep in mind that the research design can influence the interpretation of collected data. Thus,

neither a hypothetical or theoretical construct was established prior to, or during, the data gathering, coding, and conceptualization. Several “embryonic” diagrams representing agents, structure, relationships, and effects were created and discarded throughout the evolution of the project. During the conceptualization and analysis of the interviews, it became apparent that Structuration Theory offers viable explanatory power for the dynamics involved behind Brazilian students’ decisions to either study in Brazil or abroad for their Ph.D.’s, and a new theory or hypothesis was unnecessary.

When a Structurationist perspective is adopted, strategy is defined as interactions among multiple agents, with both intended and unintended consequences. Structurationist arguments are similar to Institutional ones, but decrease the deterministic role of institutional forces, increasing the importance of agents’ actions and perceptions. The idea of recursiveness and duality is enhanced and reinforced: “Structuration theory, then, conceptualizes agents and structures as mutually constitutive yet ontologically distinct entities. Each is in some sense an effect of the other; they are “co-determined”. Social structures are the result of the intended and unintended consequences of human action, just as those actions presuppose or are mediated by an irreducible structural context.” (Wendt, 1987, p. 360)

An even more important concept is that agents are reflective: able to observe, understand, and act on their environment in meaningful ways, resulting in change. (Pozzebon, 2004) This is extremely important in regards to why some professors choose to pursue degrees at foreign universities and others at domestic universities. Structure, habits, relationships and power distribution are embedded in institutions and in institutionalized practices. They are accepted as norms, constraining individuals and groups in a complex manner, but individuals constantly alter these through discourse and action; part of the reflexive feedback pattern.

For Structurationists, power is an important concept, inextricably linked with intentionality (Machado da Silva, Silva da Fonseca, & Crubellate, 2005). To be an agent is to act with purpose and meaning: power without intentionality can result in unintended consequences. An agent with no power has no consequence. Likewise, an isolated agent is by definition powerless: power and agency are social concepts that require more than one actor. Institutions offer the conditions for the development of social structure and for the exercise of power and influence. Management programs are the settings for agency, cooperation and conflict; much of which can stem from individual professor’s educational history: theoretical leanings, pedagogy, research methodology, visions for departmental strategy, and ideas about academic prestige.

In this study, it became apparent that Structuration Theory offers explanatory power as to how professors and their networks influence students’ decisions of where to obtain a Ph.D. There is definitely a power difference between a student and professor or advisor. Advisors are intent on directing students to the best Ph.D. program in their opinion; this is surely influenced by where the advisor went to school. Students have intent: some want security, some new experiences, others have specific research interests. All of the actor-agents (students, professors and others) are reflective and affect and alter their environments in a reflexive feedback cycle.

For virtually all of the subjects, there was important interaction between themselves, their advisors and colleagues that helped them choose a Ph.D. program. Specifically, from the perspective of Structuration Theory, pressures come from other individuals within institutions, as well as from institutional environments and structures. Also important in Structuration Theory is the relationship between prestige and power. With more prestige comes more power, and with more power necessarily comes more influence. Historically USP has been the most prestigious domestic program, along with FGV-EAESP. It has consistently received the highest CAPES

rankings, at times with FGV and UFRGS, but during the most recent three-year cycle it became the first program to ever receive a score of 7, the maximum possible. During the interviews, all but one of the professors responded that USP was the most reputable in Brazil. Even so, its professors are worried about maintaining their status. “Strategically it is a question of maintaining the prestige, we are very proud to be part of USP and maintain its prestige” (711a). This concern with prestige also leads programs to adopt methods and structure from foreign programs, most often from the USA, such as UFRJ/COPPEA: “Yes, because the U.S. is the most prestigious...They [*students*] know they are studying the very same materials that students in other prestigious schools that are certified like us are studying.” (511a)

Furthermore, just like endogamy, prestige and power can be self-reinforcing. For example, if the institution focuses on publishing in foreign journals, then foreign educated professors might fare better. If they fare better, they will gain more prestige and power, and then have more influence in the future. Thus, they will be able to affect the structure of their respective institutions, as well as other institutions like CAPES and CNPq, more than professors with domestic Ph.D.’s. In the long run, it is a distinct possibility that this will lead to a very real devaluation of both Brazilian Ph.D.’s and Brazilian academic journals. “In a certain way it devalues, for example the people that study here...because the goal is internationalization, to have a high evaluation” (711b). The reflective nature of Structuration Theory embraces the idea that agents make informed decisions; such as some choosing to study abroad for whatever reason, such as gaining prestige and an advantage in the chance of getting published, while others stay domestic, for career, security, family, etc.

The regulative nature of management education has led to the establishment of certain norms of behavior and program character. In most graduate programs the paramount issue is production: publication, particularly in foreign journals. The need to qualify individually and as a program have led to schools demanding ever more production from their faculty, specifically in English language journals. “Totally and only in English. All other journals even if they are good in their own countries...if I publish in the best French journals no one cares! (422c)” Agents are also aware of where other members stand, both at program and individual levels, reinforcing hierarchy: “We know the system, you have CNPQ researchers, we know the number of PQ researchers and different schools” (511a). All of this seems to favor foreign Ph.D.s, especially those from an English speaking country.

Each Brazilian graduate program requires English proficiency for admission. These normative and coercive pressures for learning English, specifically to be published in international journals, lead Brazilian researchers to seek methods to satisfy them. The most effective method discovered in this research was choosing to study abroad. Another effective method, which frequently is related to and dependent upon study abroad, is establishing research networks with foreign academics. English is necessary even for this: “In order to make contacts abroad...it [*English*] is fundamental” (311a); and “If he wants to interact with American researchers English is important” (411b). The need for foreign research partners introduces the idea of legitimacy, as many professors in Brazil voiced the opinion that in order for their work to be considered legitimate by a foreign journal, they must partner with a foreign academic. Additional environmental pressure promotes study abroad due to the fact that there are relatively few openings in the Ph.D. programs here in Brazil. On a parting note, professors who studied abroad were much more aware of limitations their students have with English language literature in class, which is integral to effective pedagogy. Most domestic Ph.D.’s believed graduate students understand most, or all, English literature; foreign Ph.D.’s believed the contrary.

CONCLUSIONS

Most professors chose the location of their Ph.D. based upon opportunities that stem from personal and professional connections, whether they studied in Brazil or abroad. Advisor and professor influences are very strong, especially for those that studied outside of Brazil. Domestic Ph.D.'s were motivated by existing careers, endogamy, and more convenient universities. Foreign Ph.D.'s were motivated mostly by a desire to live and study outside Brazil, with exchange programs acting as facilitators. UFRGS has an established and entrenched relationship with French universities; and UFMG with British. A very strong sentiment was voiced that an English speaking country is highly desirable. The nature of decisions made was directly related to personal aspects of risk aversion. Most Foreign Ph.D.'s declared a propensity for risk taking, while no Domestic Ph.D. said the same. These general results can be seen in Table 2.

Ph.D. Location	Reason for choosing Ph.D. Location	Personal characteristics	Network established during Ph.D.	Origins of Influences
Foreign	Foreign experience, Learn foreign Language	Risk taker	Foreign: helps in publication and long-term career	Advisors, Exchange programs
Domestic	Convenience, Existing career, Endogamy	Risk averse	Domestic: initial career boost	Advisors, Colleagues

Table 2: Aspects related to Ph.D. location choice.

It seems that having foreign Ph.D.'s in Brazil is positive overall. They are more prepared to publish in international journals, either alone or with foreign researchers, and therefore reduce Brazil's trade deficit in intellectual production. They also have broader international networks, which benefit students they are advising, as well as their overall management programs. Thus, combined with the inability of domestic programs to fill the need for qualified academics, study abroad should be encouraged, facilitated, and supported, and repatriation processes managed. At the same time, attention must be focused on improving the quality of domestic journals and the international research insertion of domestic Ph.D.'s, all while maintaining academic sovereignty.

The scope of this research was quite broad, due to its nature as an emerging study. What was produced was a substantive example of Structuration Theory, with reflective agents affecting their environment in a recursive manner through reflexive feedback. There were some interesting results to help guide future research, which could include: the role of advisors in study abroad; differences in research productivity between foreign and domestic Ph.D.'s; risk taking/risk aversion and study abroad; Brazilian academic genealogy; and the nature of program endogamy.

References

- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *A Construção Social da Realidade*. Petropolis, RJ, Brasil: Editora Vozes.
- Bertero, C. O., & Keinert, T. M. (1994). A Evolução da Análise Organizacional no Brasil (1961-93). *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 34 (3), 81-90.
- Caldas, M. P., & Alcadiyani, R. (2003). Post-Colonialism In Latin American Management: The Genesis And Trail Of North American Reference In Brazilian Culture And Management. *3rd International Critical Management Studies Conference*. Lancaster: Lancaster University.
- Castro, C. d. (2000). Education: Way Behind but Trying to Catch Up. *Daedalus*, 129 (2), 291.

- Chaves, W. (2009). Democracy and Welfare According to Liberal and Democratic Militancy: the Gaither Report and the Ford Foundation's international policy agenda. *OIKOS* , 8 (2), 223-246.
- Dick, B. (2005). *Grounded theory: a thumbnail sketch*. Retrieved 5 8, 2007, from Resource Papers in Action Research: www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arp/grounded.html
- Douglas, D. (2006). Intransivities of Managerial Decisions: a grounded theory case. *Management Decision* , 44 (2), 259-275.
- Galeano, E. (1973). *Open Veins of Latin America*. (C. Belfrage, Trans.) New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Laus, S. P., & Morosini, M. C. (2005). Internationalization of Higher Education in Brazil. In H. De Wit, I. C. Jaramillo, J. Gacel-Ávila, & J. Knight (Eds.), *Higher Education in Latin America: The International Dimension* (pp. 111-147). Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Lucchesi, M. A., & Malanga, E. B. (2010). Perceptions of Higher Education in Brazil in the First Decade of the new Millenium. *US-China Education Review* , 7 (6), 31-44.
- Machado da Silva, C., Silva da Fonseca, V., & Crubellate, J. M. (2005). Unlocking the Institutionalization Process: Insights for an Institutionalizing Approach. *Brazilian Administrative Review* , 2 (1), 1-20.
- Mollis, M. (2007). Latin American University Transformations of the 1990's: Altered Identities? In J. J. Forest, & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International Handbook of Higher Education* (Vol. 1, pp. 503-515). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Mueller, S. P., & Vieira de Oliveira, H. (2003). Autonomia e Dependência na Produção da Ciência: uma base conceitual para estudar relações na comunicação científica. *Perspectivas em Ciência da Informação* , 8 (1), 58-65.
- Panizzi, W. M. (2003). Public Universities: A Benchmark for Higher Education in Brazil. *Journal of the Programme in Higher Education on Institutional Management: Higher Education Management and Policy* , 15 (1), 43-56.
- Pozzebon, M. (2004). The Influence of a Structurationist View on Strategic Management Research. *Journal of Management Studies* , 41 (2), 247-272.
- Schemo, D. J. (1998, July 16). The ABC's of Business in Brazil: Companies Pitch in Where Public Education Leaves Off. *The New York Times* .
- Schwartzman, S. (2007). Brazil's Leading University: between Intelligentsia, World Standards and Social Inclusion. In P. G. Altbach, & J. Balán (Eds.), *World Class Worldwide: Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America* (pp. 143-172). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Selden, L. (2005). On Grounded Theory-with Some Malice. *Journal of Documentation* , 61 (1), 114-129.
- Trindade, H. (2005). Social Sciences in Brazil in Perspective: Foundation, Consolidation, and Diversification. *Social Science Information* , 283-357.
- Wendt, A. E. (1987). The Agent Structure Problem in International Relations Theory. *International Organization* , 41 (3), 335-370.
- Wood Jr., T., & Paes de Paula, A. P. (2003). This is Not (Quite) an MBA! *Business Education and Emerging Market Economies: Trends and Prospects Conference*. Atlanta: Georgia Institute of Technology.
- Wood, T. J., & Paes de Paula, A. P. (2004). Business Education in Brasil: Hybridism and Tensions. In I. Alon, & J. R. McIntyre (Eds.), *Business Education in Emerging Market Economies* (pp. 79-96). New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers.