

Polítólogos on the Run: Contrasting Paths to Internationalization of Southern Cone Political Scientists

Flavia Freidenberg
Andrés Malamud

ABSTRACT

Political scientists from the Southern Cone have enriched the discipline with pioneering work. Many of them went into exile for political reasons, and thus produced part of their work abroad. Although Latin American political science has professionalized since the 1980s, many scholars still emigrate for study and employment. Argentines most numerous seek academic careers abroad, while Brazil has many more domestic doctorates and returns home after doctoral studies abroad. Uruguayans emigrate in proportionally high numbers and tend to settle in Latin American countries, while the number of Chileans and Paraguayans abroad is minimal. These contrasting patterns are explained by reference to factors such as the availability of high-quality doctoral courses, financing for post-graduate studies, and the absorptive capacity of national academic markets. Paradoxically, the size and performance of the diasporas may increase rather than reduce the visibility and impact of national political science communities.

THE PUZZLE

On August 8, 2008, the Latin American Association of Political Science met in San José, Costa Rica, and renewed its Executive Council. Five Argentines, three Brazilians, and two Uruguayans were elected to the 24-member body. Remarkably, four of the Argentines and one Uruguayan lived abroad, while all the Brazilians resided in their home country. Something similar had happened in Hamburg in May of that year, at the launching of the project to found the *Journal of Politics in Latin America*: while the five Argentines and the only Uruguayan participant lived abroad, all the Brazilians were living in Brazil.

These are not isolated facts; instead, they reflect a pattern: be it in terms of university positions, publication record, attendance at international congresses, or participation in professional associations, political scientists from Argentina who live abroad far outnumber émigré Brazilian political scientists, whose number is akin to that of Uruguayan political scientists outside their country of origin. This is unexpected, considering the demographic differences, the size of the national

Flavia Freidenberg is a professor and director of the Ibero-American Institute, University of Salamanca. flavia@usal.es. Andrés Malamud is a research fellow of the Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon. amalamud@ics.ul.pt.

academic communities, and the general rate of emigration of the three countries. At the other extreme, the number of Chilean and Paraguayan political scientists who live abroad is minimal and nonexistent, respectively.

This article takes an exploratory look at this issue and suggests explanatory hypotheses based on 50 questionnaires administered to émigré political scientists. It leaves the door open to similar research about other countries and other social science communities. Here, we analyze the incentives that led the émigré Southern Cone political scientists to adopt divergent career paths, and the consequences of their choices for the development of the discipline in their national academic communities.

The article is divided into four parts. The first presents the phenomenon and specifies the methodological criteria. The second defines the universe analyzed and describes its main characteristics, including the origins, destinations, formative trajectories, areas of specialization, and publication record, in order to highlight the areas of work (geographical and professional) and the impact of these diasporas. The third part explores a series of hypotheses that can explain why these political scientists left and did not return to their countries of origin. Finally, the article looks at the consequences of these career patterns for their national political science communities and for the discipline in general.

METHODOLOGICAL CLARIFICATIONS

The universe covered by this research consists of the political scientists with doctorates, regardless of their nationality, who undertook part of their university studies in the Southern Cone (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay) and who hold permanent or semipermanent academic positions in another country. We define a political scientist as someone who has obtained a graduate or postgraduate diploma in political science or who occupies a university position in a department of political science or, exceptionally, who has published articles in journals with a recognized impact on the discipline.

These criteria were relaxed only in exceptional conditions. Because the focus is on the job market, the aim is to analyze contemporary academic emigration as a job option and not as a function of political exile. For that reason, we decided that only people born in 1960 or afterward could be included in the database. This excludes political scientists who emigrated before the most recent transitions to democracy, who generally left their countries for reasons more pressing than the pursuit of an academic career.¹ Thus, recognized figures such as Monica Hirst, Ernesto Laclau, or Francisco Panizza were not included, even though they developed their careers—and indeed still work—abroad, and have contributed to the internationalization of Latin American social sciences.

Table 1 presents information about three of the countries under analysis.² The intention is to offer an overview of general demographic and productivity ratios in order to show how political science migration deviates from them. For comparative purposes, the Uruguayans are considered constant with base 1, and the other two national groups are measured relative to that base. The data presented are divided into three categories: demography, academic output, and emigration. Demographically, Brazil is 53 times and Argentina 11 times larger than Uruguay. This means that Brazil outstrips Argentina 5 to 1. As regards academic output, which is estimated on the basis of articles published in journals included in the

Table 1. Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay: General Statistics

	Argentina		Brazil		Uruguay	
Population 2005 (millions)	38.4	(11.6)	176.6	(53.5)	3.3	(1)
ISI Publications: political science and international relations, 1975–2005	96	(9.6)	172	(17.2)	10	(1)
ISI Publications: SSCI (social sciences), 1975–2005	2,977	(13.5)	9,728	(44.2)	220	(1)
ISI Publications: SCI (sciences), 1975–2005	88,942	(17.2)	106,710	(20.6)	5,163	(1)
Total expatriates in OECD countries, 2000	266,070	(3.8)	351,878	(6.7)	70,093	(1)
Qualified expatriates in OECD countries, 2000	104,631	(5.0)	140,358	(6.7)	20,866	(1)
University students in OECD countries, 2004	9,562		19,023		ND	
Diaspora political scientists, August 2012 ^a	62	(7.7)	10	(1.2)	8	(1)

Notes: The ratio of each category appears in parentheses, with Uruguay considered base 1. ND = no data available.

^aThe complete list appears in the appendix. The total is 81: one Chilean is added to those featured in this table.

Sources: Lines 1–4 based on Altman 2006; lines 5–6 on Albornoz et al. 2007; line 7 on Luchilo 2010a; line 8 prepared by the authors. The original dates and data were maintained for the sake of consistency.

ISI database (now renamed Thomson Reuters), in 2006 Brazilians published 17 to 44 times more than Uruguayans and 1.2 to 3 times more than Argentines.

If one considers students enrolled in countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), there are consistently twice as many Brazilians as Argentines in any year of the last decade; the proportion is exactly the same for doctoral students who graduated from U.S. universities between 1997 and 2005 (Luchilo 2010a, 23–24). There are six times more Brazilian than Uruguayan expatriates living in OECD countries (excluding Mexico), although Brazilians only slightly outpace the number of Argentines, and the numbers are even closer for both countries when it comes to qualified emigrants.

To summarize, the variation between one category and another is high, but the pattern is immutable: the Brazilian numbers are always higher than the Uruguayan and the Argentine ones—in the first instance by a lot. However, the data collected for this article show that this proportion is inverted for political scientists: the number of expatriate Argentine political scientists far outstrips (by six times) that of Brazilians, and the latter's meager ranks are only just superior to those of the Uruguayans. When comparing Argentina with Uruguay, the proportion is within the range of the expected. The inversion of the tendency between Argentina and Brazil is consistent with a more general fact: from the beginning of the decade starting in 2000, about 55 percent of Argentines stayed in the United

States after obtaining their doctorates there, while the comparable percentage for Brazil was no higher than 30 percent (Finn 2007). Even so, this latter proportion is lower than that found for political science.

These data pose an initial descriptive task: to define the profile of émigré political scientists and to verify whether Brazilians emigrate less or return more than Argentines and Uruguayans. We show that many political scientists of the Southern Cone move abroad to further their training, but that when they decide where to advance their academic or professional careers, more Argentines and Uruguayans than Brazilians opt to stay abroad despite their initial hopes of returning home. The second task is explanatory: to determine the causes of this contrast.

The data collection began with a preliminary listing of prominent Southern Cone political scientists with permanent (tenured or similar) or semipermanent (tenure-track or other kinds of long-term contract) positions outside their countries of origin. The database was then broadened to include individuals not personally known by the authors, either via personal networks or as a result of snowball sampling.³ A brief questionnaire was subsequently issued to each person, which inquired into their professional trajectories and the reasons for their decision to study and work abroad. Almost two-thirds (50 out of 81 people) responded.

To test the plausibility of our hypotheses, we also administered the questionnaire to an additional dozen scholars: half of them were resident in their home countries, while the rest were living abroad but did not hold a semipermanent position. In any case, the number of observations does not permit a statistical treatment but is sufficient to sketch tendencies and allows us to engage in a qualitative analysis of motivations and expectations. We also assessed the visibility and influence of the diaspora by looking at professional positions and publication impact.

THE UNIVERSE: “YOUNG” SOUTHERN CONE POLITICAL SCIENTISTS WITH LONG-TERM CONTRACTS ABROAD

We built up a database of 81 political scientists who met the abovementioned criteria. The sample includes 62 Argentines, 10 Brazilians, 8 Uruguayans, and one Chilean (see appendix). The Argentines are more or less evenly distributed between North America (excluding Mexico) (27), Europe (16), and Latin America (19), the latter mainly in Mexico. The Brazilians are almost exclusively concentrated in North America (9), with only one in Europe. In contrast, almost all the Uruguayans live in Latin America but, unlike the Argentines, they are concentrated in the Southern Cone. The only Chilean in the database lives in Europe (table 2).

The professional impact of the diaspora can be inferred initially from the prestige of the universities in which these scholars work. Among them are four Ivy League institutions: Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Princeton, plus American, California, Chicago, Florida, Houston, Illinois, Maryland, Miami, Michigan, and Pittsburgh in the United States; Carleton, Montreal, Toronto, and York in Canada; Aberdeen, Bath, Glasgow, Southampton, and the London School of Economics in the UK; Hamburg and Erfurt in Germany; Complutense and Salamanca in Spain; Zurich in Switzerland; and Lisbon in Portugal. In Latin America, the pre-

Table 2. Southern Cone Political Scientists Hired Abroad,
by Destination and Origin

Resident in		Argentina	Brazil	Uruguay	Chile	Total
North America	United States	24	8	—	—	32
	Canada	3	1	—	—	4
	Total	27	9	0	0	36
Europe	United Kingdom	6	—	—	1	7
	Spain	7	—	—	—	7
	Germany	1	1	—	—	2
	Italy	—	—	1	—	1
	Portugal	1	—	—	—	1
	Switzerland	1	—	—	—	1
	Total	16	1	1	1	19
Latin America	Mexico	11	—	1	—	12
	Brazil	4	—	2	—	6
	Chile	3	—	2	—	5
	Argentina	—	—	2	—	2
	Colombia	1	—	—	—	1
	Total	19	0	7	0	26
Total all countries		62	10	8	1	81

Source: Prepared by the authors using the database created for this project (see appendix).

dominant destinations are FLACSO, the Autonomous University of the State of Mexico, the Monterrey Technological and Higher Studies Institute, and CIDE in Mexico; the Catholic University in Chile; and the National University of General San Martín in Argentina (see appendix).

The doctoral trajectories are quite varied, but most undergraduate degrees were undertaken in three large universities: Buenos Aires University (33 of the 62 Argentines), Salvador University (another 10), and the University of the Republic (for the 8 Uruguayans).⁴ The situation of the Brazilians is more diverse: Brasília holds a slightly dominant position, although there is convergence at the University Institute for Research of Rio de Janeiro (IUPERJ, currently the Institute of Social and Political Studies, IESP/UERJ), further along the career path, where various scholars undertook their master's in political science before studying for a doctorate abroad.

The preferred destination for doctoral studies is the United States: half of the Uruguayans, almost half of the Argentines, and two-thirds of the Brazilians picked this country. The UK emerges as a distant second (for the Argentines only), followed by Mexico, Spain, and Brazil, the latter three being preferred by Argentines and Uruguayans (table 3).

The areas of specialization do not vary much at all: most opt for comparative politics. The exception is the Brazilians who study international relations: 3 individuals, who account for nearly a third of the national group, chose this field of study. Although 11 Argentines work in this area, the proportion compared to their

Table 3. Doctoral Degree Countries of the Southern Cone Diaspora

Doctorate from		Argentina	Brazil	Uruguay	Chile	Total
North America	United States	30	7	4	—	41
	Canada	4	—	—	—	4
	Total	34	7	4	0	45
Europe	United Kingdom	10	—	—	—	10
	Spain	6	—	1	—	7
	Italy	2	—	—	—	2
	Germany	—	1	—	1	2
	Switzerland	—	1	—	—	1
	Total	18	2	1	1	22
Latin America	Mexico	6	—	2	—	8
	Brazil	3	1	1	—	5
	Argentina	1	—	—	—	1
	Total	10	1	3	0	14
Total all countries		62	10	8	1	81

Source: Prepared by the authors using the database created for this project (see appendix).

émigré community is half that of the Brazilians. The remaining subdisciplines attract smaller minorities in either country case (table 4).

The impact of the Southern Cone diaspora measured through *Publish or Perish* is uneven (table 5).⁵ As of August 2012, the range is 0–1,600 citations for the Argentine political scientists, with 4 individuals getting more than 1,000 citations, 7 between 500 and 1,000, 16 between 100 and 500, and the rest getting fewer than 100 citations. In the case of the Uruguayans, the range is 15–325, with none cited more than 500 times, and 4 cited between 100 and 500 times. The individual peak for the Brazilians is 3,200 citations, 1 between 500 and 1,000, and 2 between 100 and 500. In summary, there were 11 Argentine but only 2 Brazilian political scientists abroad who had been cited more than 500 times.⁶

Despite the high performance of one of the Brazilians, the Portuguese-speaking diaspora clearly has had a relatively lesser impact than those of the Río de la Plata. In order to assess the performance of the diasporas as compared to their corresponding native academic communities instead of relative to one another, we tallied the citations of the most prominent political scientists in the same age group who live in their home countries. The exercise shows that only one Argentine has more than 1,000 citations; another has been cited between 500 and 1,000 times, and the rest fewer than 500 times. As regards the Brazilians, four have been cited more than 1,000 times (and one of them more than 6,000!), and two Uruguayans are cited more than 500 times.⁷ This suggests that most Brazilian political science is produced by people who live in Brazil, while the reverse is true for Argentina. The Uruguayan situation is more ambiguous: there are various political scientists who live at home and are cited more than 300 times, which suggests that the impact of domestic political science is not inferior to the one produced by those working abroad.

Table 4. Main Areas of Specialization of the Southern Cone Diaspora

	Com- parative Politics	Inter- national Relations	Public Admin- istration	Political Theory	Political Sociology	Political Economy	Public Opinion	Total
Argentina	28	11	7	4	6	4	2	62
Brazil	5	3	—	—	—	1	1	10
Uruguay	5	1	1	1	—	—	—	8
Chile	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1
Total	38	15	8	6	6	5	3	81

Source: Prepared by the authors using the database created for this project (see appendix).

The performance of the expatriates can be measured more accurately by looking at the impact of the journals in which they publish. Again, the results are uneven: of the 81 people included in the sample, five Argentines, one Brazilian, and one Uruguayan had ten or more publications that were indexed in the *Social Sciences Citation Index* as of August 2012.⁸

The visibility of the diaspora can also be appraised by its professional service. Several individuals in our database hold leading positions in university departments and institutes, or participate in managing organs of professional associations, among them the Section of Political Institutions (LAPIS) of the Latin American Studies Association (LASA), the Spanish Political Science Association (AECPA), the Section on Democratization of the American Political Science Association (APSA) and various of its academic committees, the Council of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), the Executive Commission of the Latin American Association of Political Science (ALACIP), the directorship of the Ibero-American Institute of the University of Salamanca (USAL), and the Regional Directorate for Latin America of the Center for Research on Direct Democracy (ZDA) of the University of Zurich.

Members of the group have also been directors or members of the editorial boards of journals such as the *American Journal of Political Science*, the *Journal of Politics*, *Foreign Affairs* (Spanish edition), the *Journal of Democracy* (Spanish version), *Foreign Policy*, the *Latin American Research Review*, the *Journal of Ibero-American Studies*, *Latin American Politics and Society*, and *Contemporary Politics* (USA); the *Journal of Politics in Latin America* (Germany); *Política y Gobierno* (Mexico); *América Latina Hoy*, the *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, and the *Revista Española de Ciencia Política* (Spain); the *Revista de Ciencia Política* (Chile); and the *Revista Latinoamericana de Política Comparada* (Ecuador), among many others.

THE CAUSES OF DEPARTURE

With two exceptions, one Brazilian and one Argentine, the émigré political scientists of the Southern Cone undertook their doctoral studies abroad, even though four did so in a Southern Cone country different from home. The reasons for their departure are clear from the questionnaires the respondents filled in. We divide these into five categories: scientific-academic, financial, work-related or profes-

Table 5. Citations in *Google Scholar* for Political Scientists in the Analyzed Age Group, August 2012

	Diaspora: X>1000	Residents: X>1000	Diaspora: 1000>X>500	Residents: 1000>X>500	Diaspora: 500>X>100	Residents: 500>X>100
Argentina	4	1	7	1	16	ND
Brazil	1	4	1	1	2	ND
Uruguay	—	—	—	2	4	ND
Total	5	5	8	4	22	ND

Notes: X = Number of citations. The absence of data (ND) is due to the difficulty of undertaking an exhaustive search for people in that group.

Source: Prepared by the authors, based on refined searches in *Publish or Perish* (Harzing 2010), August 2012.

sional, personal and family, and circumstantial, the latter mostly related to economic crises (table 6).

1. Academic: among the most often cited were the absence of courses in the country of origin, the need for theoretical and methodological specialization in thematic areas that were underdeveloped in the country of origin, and the higher quality of courses abroad.⁹
2. Financial: funding for studying abroad was available through grants in the native or host country.¹⁰
3. Job, professional: dim career prospects in the country of origin, added to the desire for better opportunities in the future, with greater openings in the international job market.¹¹
4. Personal, family: the search for new life experiences or the decision to support a partner who chose to study abroad.
5. Circumstantial: the difficulty of finding a stable job because of the economic crisis favored the idea of going abroad to further a course of study.

The possibility of getting a grant to cover the costs of study abroad is a key to the decision to leave. Most of the Argentines we interviewed had grants that were part of programs they entered in the host country, either from their host universities (19) or from government foundations or agencies. The latter included the program for Coordination of Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) in Brazil; the National Science Foundation, the Fund for the Improvement of Education, and the U.S. Department of Education; and the Carolina Foundation and the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation for Development in Spain.

A small minority (seven) received Argentine grants from public bodies, such as the Ministry of Education or the National Council for Scientific and Technical Research (CONICET), sometimes with the support of international institutions, such as the World Bank and the Organization of American States, or foundations (Antorchas and Estenssoro-YPF) in collaboration with the Ministry of Education or funding bodies from the host country (such as the British Council in the UK and DAAD in Germany). Very few received full grants from international bodies

Table 6. Motivation for Doctoral Studies Abroad

Category	Reasons	Argentina	Brazil	Uruguay
Academic	No or low-quality doctoral programs at home	32.14% (13)	25% (1)	71.43% (5)
	High academic quality of institutions abroad	45.95% (17)	50% (2)	57.14% (4)
	To learn techniques and acquire theoretical and methodological tools undeveloped at home	10.81% (4)		
Circumstantial	Economic crisis	5.41% (2)		
Financial	The possibility of a grant that permitted full-time study	24.32% (9)	25% (1)	42.86% (3)
Job, profession	Posteducation job opportunities better in the host country	5.41% (2)		14.29% (1)
	Bad job conditions at home after graduation	5.41% (2)		
Personal, family	Interest in travelling and getting to know other realities	29.73% (11)	25% (1)	28.57% (2)
	To support one's partner	2.70% (1)		

Note: Respondents could give different answers to the question, "If you studied abroad, why did you decide to do so?"

Source: Prepared by the authors using the 50 questionnaires filled out for this project.

or foundations that were not directed at a particular country (such as the World Bank or the Ford Foundation).

None of the Uruguayan respondents had national government or foundation grants; instead, they received grants from the host country universities or governments (such as the Fulbright Scholar Program, the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, or the Mexican Secretariat of Foreign Relations) to take courses that were not available at home.¹² In contrast with these two groups, the majority of Brazilian respondents (six out of seven) received national funding, from the Ministry of Education or from the CAPES program. Only one of the respondents was funded by the host university abroad. We conclude that national policies to support training abroad had a lesser relative impact in Argentina than in Brazil, and no impact at all in Uruguay.

REASONS FOR REMAINING ABROAD

The reasons that the émigrés chose to remain abroad are similar to those that led them to study abroad in the first place (table 7). It should be noted that of the 50 respondents, only 9 Argentines and 1 Uruguayan stated that they never intended to return. The rest can be divided into three groups: those who quickly gave up the idea of getting back; those who still wanted to return home; and those who

Table 7. Reasons for Staying Abroad

Category	Reasons	Argentina	Brazil	Uruguay
Personal, family	Personal (adapted to host country, personal challenge) and family (finding a partner in host country)	37.84% (14)	25% (1)	42.86% (3)
Circumstantial	Financial crisis	13.51% (5)		
Job, profession	Obtained a job abroad (more opportunities, job stability, higher pay)	37.84% (14)	25% (1)	71.43% (5)
	Better conditions for professional advancement abroad (more social recognition and financial resources)	40.54% (15)		57.14% (4)
Academic conditions in host country	Better research conditions (more bibliographical and financial resources, the possibility of living doing only research, scope for long-term research, an impersonal and meritocratic culture)	35.43% (12)	25% (1)	42.86% (3)
Academic conditions in home country	Seen as closed, inaccessible, antimeritocratic, low pay	27.03% (10)		28.57% (2)

Question: "If you did not return, state the main reasons why you chose to continue your career abroad." This question was answered by those who responded positively to the question, "Before or after you finished your doctorate, did you consider the possibility of returning to your country of origin?" We suggested that respondents give up to three reasons. Source: Prepared by the authors using the 50 questionnaires filled out by the respondents for this project.

did so, worked there for a few years, and then had to leave again. However, there is significant variation between countries across the following dimensions:

1. Academic: they regard the academic conditions at home (isolation from the international scholarly community, provincialism, the absence of a meritocratic culture, and the absence or distortion of incentives) as less favorable than competitive opportunities, incentives to improve output, the availability of financial and bibliographic resources, and conditions favorable for research and for planning long-term projects abroad.¹³
2. Job, professional: a specific job offer in the country where the doctorate was obtained or in another country where conditions were perceived as better than those available at home, the possibility of doing only research, and the perception that the profession garners greater respect in the host country.¹⁴ Respondents also mentioned the negative characteristics in the home country, such as difficult access to a career, the absence of job

market reincorporation programs, low pay, the absence of specific job offers and opportunities for professional development over time, and the difficulties experienced by colleagues who returned home.¹⁵

3. Personal, family: the possibility of maintaining family and community ties created during the educational trajectory.¹⁶ Also, the chance of working in more competitive environments, which present a greater personal challenge, and the incentives and rewards of advancement in consolidated academic contexts.¹⁷
4. Circumstantial: economic crisis at home, which often justifies remaining abroad.

It is interesting that most Brazilian political scientists who remain working abroad maintain an institutional affiliation in Brazil, be it as visiting professors or by going back for postdoctoral research (Interviews #4BRA, #5BRA, #7BRA). Ties with the local academic community are valued as a research resource, as a sign of professional prestige, and as a means to keeping the door open to returning, all of which was confirmed by the three people who returned between the beginning and end of this research project (who were also interviewed).¹⁸ The main drivers behind their return were family and personal factors, but they admitted that the final decision was based on attractive job offers in a growing academic market, which granted them institutional recognition and economic conditions to keep up with the global community of the discipline. In Argentina, by contrast, our findings confirm that for a significant number of professionals, doctoral studies are “precursors for emigration,” to use Luchilo’s apt words (2010b, 24).

CONSEQUENCES AND CONCLUSIONS

A caveat is in order. This study suffers from a methodological limitation, in that the cases are selected on the dependent variable. By focusing on the causes and characteristics of the diaspora, the trajectories and motivations of those who returned are less visible. We tried to control for this bias through tracking the most relevant resident political scientists, tallying their impact factor, and even interviewing some of those who returned, but the resulting picture of the resident communities is necessarily incomplete. For this reason, we would like to highlight what we do not claim: that all Brazilian political scientists who earn a Ph.D. abroad return home while most Argentines—and Uruguayans—remain abroad; on the contrary, the available data suggest that most *rioplatenses* also return home. What is notable is the high number of those who do not, particularly when contrasted with the small number of Brazilians who make the same choice. Therefore, the decision to examine the reasons invoked by those who stay abroad, and thus the adoption of a more ethnographic approach, which enabled us to understand their life experiences.

If weak institutional and academic development in their areas of study at home is one of the reasons invoked for undertaking doctoral studies abroad, scholars’ choice to remain abroad after they have obtained their doctorates further reinforces this weakness. It is worth highlighting that quantity is not quality: according to Altman (2005, 11), until recently, Argentina offered 45 percent of the doctoral programs in all of Latin America, while Brazil had only 18 percent. However, only one political scientist with a doctorate from an Argentine university is

teaching abroad; by contrast, several Brazilian doctoral programs are internationally competitive, and allow their graduates to enter the job markets of other countries. Analogously, various Brazilian—and Chilean—universities have prestigious foreign political scientists on their staff, a phenomenon that is rarely replicated in Argentina and Uruguay. Brazil, and increasingly Chile, stand out among their neighbors in terms of the existence of quality options at home, both to undertake doctoral studies and to work afterward.

A second distinguishing factor is public financing: funding from the state for citizens to study abroad generates legal or moral commitments that encourage people to return, and this practice is institutionalized in the Brazilian case (Hotta 2012). Argentines and Uruguayans have been funded mostly by host countries or institutions, and since necessity is the mother of all invention, this has promoted know-how about where and how to pursue funding after the doctorate has been obtained. By contrast, the Brazilian government has launched an innovative public policy: the “sandwich” doctorate. Instead of subsidizing students to undertake doctorates abroad, the program supports those who take their doctorates in Brazilian institutions, while allowing them to spend some time in universities abroad. In this way, future *doutores* who are trained at home gain international experience, and will be less inclined to leave later on. Experience suggests, and our respondents confirm, that the more time one lives abroad, the harder it is to go back.

In spite of the much-bemoaned consequences of professional emigration, national academic communities can be compensated by the so-called “brain gain,” as opposed to the better-known “brain drain” (Meyer and Brown 1999). Open migratory chains and the creation of networks among scholars who emigrate and those who stay home or return favor the circulation of information, the transfer of capacities, and access to funding (Solimano 2008). Multinational co-authorship and international application processes exemplify how the “diaspora option” can be as fruitful for the country of origin as the “return option.”

Our research confirms these developments, as the size and impact of the Argentine diaspora has rendered its professional output more visible, be it through the capacity to influence research agendas or by a stronger presence in international institutions and events. Clearly, this tendency predates the phenomenon under study here. It is no accident that the only Latin American included in Munck and Snyder’s 2007 volume of interviews of the main “North American” specialists in comparative politics is Guillermo O’Donnell, an Argentine—not to mention that Munck himself is an Argentine political scientist living abroad.

When policies to retain or repatriate professionals are missing, two additional mechanisms can still encourage the return to the country of origin or increase the potential benefits of the diaspora: the job market and family and community ties (Kuptsch and Pang 2006). In the case of Brazil, the three mechanisms work relatively well; in Argentina, public policies are weak and the job market is limited, albeit expanding, given the consolidation of departments of political science in private universities and the opening of departments in public universities, particularly in the Greater Buenos Aires area and the farthest provinces.

In the case of Uruguay, the absence of public policies is compounded by a small and saturated, albeit high-quality, academic job market, which only serves to heighten the impact of the third mechanism. The clearest sign that most *émigré* Uruguayans want to return is that most try to work as close to home as possible:

in Latin America (mostly in Chile, Argentina, and Brazil) rather than in the United States or Europe, even though the opportunity to go elsewhere is available to many of them. Home is where the heart is, and such intangible factors help to explain the trajectory, performance, and enduring influence of the diasporas on their native and host societies.

NOTES

A preliminary version of this article was published as “La diáspora rioplatense: presencia e impacto de los politólogos argentinos, brasileños y uruguayos en el exterior,” in *Más allá de la fuga de cerebros. Movilidad, migración y diásporas de argentinos calificados*, ed. Lucas Luchilo (Buenos Aires: EUDEBA, 2011, 297–316). We would like to thank our colleagues who responded to the questionnaire, as well as Manuel Alcántara, David Altman, Octavio Amorim Neto, Alexandra Barahona de Brito, María Laura Barreiro, María Paula Bertino, Daniel Buquet, Rossana Castiglioni, Daniel Chasquetti, Miguel De Luca, José del Tronco, Tomás Dosek, Marcelo Leiras, Lucas Luchilo, Juan Pablo Luna, Victoria Murillo, Patricio Navia, Andrea Oelsner, Fernando Pedrosa, Aníbal Pérez-Liñán, William C. Smith, Julieta Suárez Cao, Cesar Zucco, and the two reviewers for *LAPS* for comments and suggestions. We dedicate this work to Pablo Dreyfus, a companion of various diasporas, who was travelling on flight AF-447 when it fell into the Atlantic Ocean on June 1, 2009.

1. The last Argentine dictatorship ended in 1983, whereas the Brazilian and Uruguayan ended in 1985, the Paraguayan in 1989, and the Chilean in 1990.

2. Chile and Paraguay are not included because, as the appendix shows, their contribution to the universe under study is minimal and null, respectively.

3. This method allows us to study populations that are hard to locate (Goodman 1961), as each individual in the group is asked to nominate others; the assumption is that the unknown (to the researchers) members of the group do not live in isolation but are part of social networks through which it is possible to contact them. We moved ahead with this process until we reached a “saturation” point, when no new names emerged. Of course, the possibility remains that some individuals may have been missed, especially those working in non-mainstream areas, newly graduated, or recently hired.

4. This result coincides with that obtained in other studies of the migration of qualified Argentines. Thus, Luchilo (2010b, 19) finds that “almost half of people with doctorates resident abroad undertook their graduate studies at the University of Buenos Aires, while there is a more balanced territorial distribution for those who reside in the country.”

5. Available online, this software counts citations in *Google Scholar* (Harzing 2010).

6. Ernesto Calvo, Ernesto Dal Bó, Ana Dinerstein, Tullia Falletti, Flavia Freidenberg, Andrés Malamud, María Victoria Murillo, Gabriel Negretto, Aníbal Pérez-Liñán, Sebastián Saiegh, Héctor Schamis (Argentina), José Antonio Cheibub, and Mauro Porto (Brazil). Well-known academics such as David Altman (Uruguay) and Patricio Navia (Chile) are also ranked at this level, but they are excluded from the database because they were not educated at universities in their home countries.

7. Marcos Novaro (Argentina) and Octavio Amorim Neto, Fernando Limongi, Carlos Pereira, and Fabiano Santos (Brazil) have been cited more than 1,000 times, while Enrique Peruzzotti (Argentina), Lúcio Rennó (Brazil), Daniel Buquet, and Daniel Chasquetti (Uruguay) have been cited between 500 and 1,000 times.

8. They are Ernesto Calvo, Ernesto Dal Bó, María Victoria Murillo, Aníbal Pérez-Liñán, Sebastián Saiegh (Argentina), José Antonio Cheibub (Brazil), and Juan Pablo Luna (Uruguay).

9. "In Argentina there was no good doctoral program in politics. The University of Buenos Aires inaugurated a doctoral program in social sciences less than ten years ago. There was nothing at Di Tella, San Andrés, and San Martín universities" (Interviews #4ARG, #7ARG). "[I left] for various reasons: I wanted to have the experience of international study. In the country, at least in Buenos Aires, the course I wanted to follow did not exist. My husband also wanted to study abroad and the course he wanted to take only existed in England, Canada, and the United States" (Interview #2ARG). "There were no doctoral programs in Argentina that interested me. I had already started a master's degree and the level was worse than that of my undergraduate course. Moreover, I had always wanted to study in the United States" (Interview #33ARG). "On the one hand, there was the interest in getting to know another culture and other realities. On the other hand, there were no prestigious doctorates in political science in my country or that pleased me in terms of teachers, subjects, and focus" (Interview #37ARG).

10. "I always felt that completing a doctorate was only the start of an academic career. The resources to do research in the United States were infinitely greater than in Argentina, so that the prospects for advancement in my training and of having some kind of impact on the discipline were much greater" (Interviews #1ARG, #24ARG).

11. One of the most frequently voiced criticisms in the interviews with Argentines and Uruguayans was that working conditions were precarious and the criteria determining the distribution of resources and opportunities were not meritocratic (Interviews #24ARG, #27ARG, #3URU, #4URU, #6URU). "[I left] for three converging reasons: I wanted to experience living abroad; I wanted to carry on studying, and in Argentina I had begun to tire of working in very precarious conditions in different places for variable periods of time (at one point I actually counted seven jobs, including carrying out surveys, giving classes, doing research, and working in the graphic media), working very hard and being paid very little; and finally, a little before the 2001 crisis, my income became too low to cover my basic costs and I decided to try my luck elsewhere" (Interview #12ARG).

12. "[The institution where I studied] offered a program in Latin American comparative politics . . . with great financing opportunities, and it was very convenient for me economically (and emotionally) since my husband was studying at the same institution" (Interview #3URU). "[I left the country] because of the possibility of dedicating myself full-time to my studies thanks to the grant [and because] I did so in a different scholarly environment, with more opportunities for research and academic advancement" (Interview #6URU). "To study outside Uruguay I needed a grant. At that time, only the Spanish and Italian governments were giving postgraduate scholarships to Uruguayan students. Had there been a choice, I would have preferred to do my doctorate in England or France" (Interview #7URU).

13. "[I have] the perception that returning to Argentina means, in practical terms, isolation from the international political science community. No more conferences, no more interaction, no more high-level output. There is well-paid work [here], a community that permits one to improve one's work, in an atmosphere in which rigorous critique does not mean that doors close or that revenge is taken at some later date. [What's more], the absence of medium-term prospects to remain an academic without having to do other things that take up the bulk of one's time [led me to remain

abroad]" (Interview #24ARG). "[I stayed abroad] because of the possibility of working exclusively in teaching and research; because it was possible to participate in public competitions and give continuity to an academic career [and] live on a professor's salary" (Interview #9ARG; also #10ARG, #11ARG, #29ARG, and #2URU).

14. "Greater professional recognition" (Interview #20ARG). "Job conditions are not just about pay and teaching load but also about working in an environment in which all my colleagues are trained as I am, dedicated to research and teaching in the same conditions, we have institutional support to attend conferences and publish. The institutional context makes me feel that the work I do is valued" (Interview #28ARG). "[I am not going back] because the quantity and quality of job opportunities do not meet my expectations. I think that the general perception of those who studied abroad is more negative than positive" (Interview #19ARG). "[There are] specific professional opportunities for research and teaching. Better job, pay, and quality of life, and I like the local lifestyle" (Interview #6ARG). "The economic sustainability of my professional academic advancement; the scope to advance in my profession intellectually and in terms of research; the nature of the community of researchers and students itself, which is more cosmopolitan and less provincial" (Interviews #6URU, #8URU).

15. "In my opinion, conditions are not favorable for academics in Argentina, and I think it would be very difficult to find a full-time job that would allow me to dedicate myself both to teaching and research" (Interviews #8ARG, #15ARG). "Every time I go back to Argentina, I realize that my colleagues have usually had to work in various institutions to make ends meet. In other words, to get a stable job in only one institution seems a hard thing to obtain" (Interview #18ARG). "The structure of academic careers [at home] offers no scope for full-time teaching and research in exchange for decent pay and a clear, predictable, and merit-based career structure. I don't have the vocation to engage in radio or television analysis, business consultancy, or to work for the state, three areas that the colleagues who have stayed at home have to work in to complement their salaries" (Interview #4URU). "[The] system [is] blocked and antimeritocratic, with incentive structures that militate against what I like to do and what I believe we should do as a discipline" (Interview #4URU). "Uruguay did not offer me the conditions to carry out research [that I have here]: financing for trips, books, and technical equipment" (Interview #8URU). "Pay for teaching and research [in the host country] is better than in Argentina. What's more, there are many resources from international cooperation for research in political areas to which we researchers have access through consultancy or presenting projects to specific institutions, which allows a less 'bumpy' development of our research" (Interview #37ARG).

16. "I married an American woman who studied at the university. She had no professional interests in Brazil" (Interview #2BRA). "I adapted well to the country where I studied" (Interview #2URU). "Economic reasons (I earn a lot more than I would in Uruguay)" (Interview #3URU).

17. "I find the [host] job market more stimulating; it is more dynamic; and although it is tougher in terms of competition, it generates constant incentives. There is recognition, and that seems very important to me" (Interview #21ARG). "I would probably stay in [host country]. I really love the country, and university life is very interesting here (much more than in Spain and, I imagine, in Uruguay). There is a lot of interaction between the universities around the whole country, and my area is taking gigantic steps forward" (Interview #7URU).

18. Carlos Pereira, Lúcio Rennó, and Ana Paula Tostes.

REFERENCES

- Albornoz, Mario, Lucas Luchilo, and Patricia B. Flores. 2007. Fuentes de información y principales evidencias de movilidad y migración de profesionales argentinos. Documento de Proyecto no. 2, Centro Redes, Buenos Aires.
- Altman, David. 2005. La institucionalización de la ciencia política en Chile y América Latina: una mirada desde el sur. *Revista de Ciencia Política* 25, 1: 3–15.
- . 2006. From Fukuoka to Santiago: Institutionalization of Political Science in Latin America. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39, 1: 196–203.
- Finn, Michael G. 2007. *Stay Rates of Foreign Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities, 2005*. Oak Ridge: Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education. <http://blogs.knoxnews.com/munger/030508stay.pdf>. Accessed June 8, 2010.
- Goodman, Leo. 1961. Snowball Sampling. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 32, 1: 148–70.
- Google Scholar*. n.d. Online search engine. <http://scholar.google.com>.
- Harzing, Anne-Wil. 2010. *Publish or Perish*, version 3. Online search software. www.harzing.com/pop.htm.
- Hotta, Carlos. 2012. Brain drain: o ralo é mais embaixo. http://scienceblogs.com.br/brontossauros/2012/05/brain_drain. Accessed July 24, 2012.
- Kuption, Christiane, and Eng Fong Pang, eds. 2006. *Competing for Global Talent*. Geneva: International Labor Office.
- Luchilo, Lucas. 2010a. América Latina: los tiempos de la fuga de cerebros, los exilios y la globalización. Working Paper no. 1, Centro Redes Project. Buenos Aires: CIDESAL.
- . 2010b. Argentina: elementos para un patrón de movilidad y migración calificada. Working Paper no. 2, Centro Redes Project. Buenos Aires: CIDESAL.
- Meyer, Jean-Baptiste, and Mercy Brown. 1999. Scientific Diasporas: A New Approach to the Brain Drain. Paper prepared for the World Conference on Science UNESCO-ICSU, Budapest, June 26–July 1. www.unesco.org/most/meyer.htm. Accessed June 8, 2010.
- Munck, Gerardo L., and Richard Snyder, eds. 2007. *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Various dates. *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2012-en>
- Solimano, Andrés. 2008. *The International Mobility of Talent: Types, Causes, and Development Impact*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX: *POLÍTÓLOGOS ABROAD*

The table on pages 17–21 lists political scientists with a doctorate who undertook part of their university studies in a Southern Cone country and have permanent or semipermanent jobs abroad, who were born after 1960, and who were identified in August 2012.

Table 8. Southern Cone Political Scientists Abroad

	Current Affiliation	Undergraduate University	Doctoral University
Argentina			
Aibar Gaete, Julio Alberto	FLACSO (Mexico)	National University of Tucumán	FLACSO (Mexico)
Alcañiz, Isabella	University of Maryland	University of Belgrano	Northwestern University
Ansolabehere, Karina	FLACSO (Mexico)	University of Buenos Aires (Sociology)	FLACSO (Mexico)
Armony, Ariel	University of Miami	University of Buenos Aires (Philosophy)	University of Pittsburgh
Arzuaga, Javier	Autonomous University of the State of Mexico	Salvador University	Metropolitan Autonomous University (Mexico)
Astiz, María Fernanda	Canisius College	University of Buenos Aires	Pennsylvania State University
Aureano, Guillermo	University of Montreal	University of Buenos Aires	University of Montréal
Battle, Margarita	Externado University (Colombia)	University of Buenos Aires	University of Salamanca
Berardo, Ramiro	University of Arizona	Catholic University of Córdoba	Florida State University
Calvo, Ernesto	University of Maryland	University of Buenos Aires	Northwestern University
Carrera, Leandro	London School of Economics	University of Buenos Aires	University of Arizona
Castagnola, Andrea	FLACSO (Mexico)	Torcuato Di Tella University	University of Pittsburgh
Dal Bó, Ernesto	University of California, Berkeley	University of Buenos Aires (Economics)	University of Oxford
Del Tronco, José	FLACSO (Mexico)	Salvador University	National Autonomous University (Mexico)
Dinerstein, Ana	University of Bath	University of Buenos Aires	University of Warwick
Falletti, Tullia	University of Pennsylvania	University of Buenos Aires (Sociology)	Northwestern University
Feldman M., Eduardo	Autonomous University of Barcelona	University of Buenos Aires (Sociology)	University of North Carolina
Ferraro, Agustín	University of Salamanca	University of Buenos Aires (Law and Philosophy)	UBA/Goethe University

Table 8. (continued)

	Current Affiliation	Undergraduate University	Doctoral University
Franzé, Javier	Complutense University of Madrid	National University of Lomas of Zamora (Communications)	Complutense University of Madrid
Freidenberg, Flavia	University of Salamanca	University of Belgrano	University of Salamanca
Garay, Candelaria	Harvard University	University of Buenos Aires (Sociology)	University of California, Berkeley
Garriga, Ana Carolina	GIDE	Catholic University of Córdoba	University of Pittsburgh
Ginieniewicz, Jorge	University of Toronto	University of Buenos Aires	University of Toronto
Giraudy, Agustina	American University	Torcuato Di Tella University	University of North Carolina
Gómez-Mera, Laura	University of Miami	University of San Andrés	University of Oxford
Iaryczower, Matías	Princeton University	University of Buenos Aires (Economics)	University of California, Los Angeles
Jacovkis, Natalia	Xavier University	University of Buenos Aires	University of Florida
Kolesas, Mara	University of California, Davis	University of Buenos Aires	The New School
Langer, Ana Inés	University of Glasgow	University of Buenos Aires	London School of Economics
Linares, Sebastián	University of Salamanca	National University of La Plata (Law)	University of Salamanca
Llanos, Mariana	German Institute of Global and Area Studies	Salvador University	University of Oxford
Lopreite, Débora	Carleton University	University of Buenos Aires	Carleton University
Malamud, Andrés	University of Lisbon	University of Buenos Aires	European University Institute
Marenghi, Patricia	University of Salamanca	National University of Córdoba (Communications)	University of Salamanca
Margheritis, Ana	University of Florida	Catholic University of La Plata	University of Toronto
Maskivker, Julia	Rollins College	Torcuato di Tella University	Columbia University
Micozzi, Juan Pablo	University of New Mexico	University of Buenos Aires	Rice University
Milanese, Juan Pablo	ICESI University (Colombia)	University of Buenos Aires	University of Bologna
Murillo, María Victoria	Columbia University	University of Buenos Aires	Harvard University

Table 8. (continued)

	Current Affiliation	Undergraduate University	Doctoral University
Negretto, Gabriel	CIDE	University of Buenos Aires (Law)	Columbia University
Oelsner, Andrea	University of Aberdeen	University of Buenos Aires	London School of Economics
Palanza, Valeria	Catholic University (Chile)	Salvador University	Princeton University
Pérez-Liñán, Aníbal	University of Pittsburgh	Salvador University	University of Notre Dame
Pinto, Pablo	Columbia University	National University of La Plata	University of California, San Diego
Riggiozzi, María Pía	University of Southampton	Salvador University	University of Warwick
Rodríguez Medina, Leandro	University of the Americas, Puebla	University of Belgrano	Cambridge University
Rojas, Gonzalo	Federal University of Campina Grande	University of Buenos Aires	University of São Paulo
Rossello, Diego	Catholic University (Chile)	University of Buenos Aires	Northwestern University
Ruiz Valerio, José	Technological Institute of Monterrey	Salvador University	Complutense University of Madrid
Saiegh, Sebastián M.	University of California, San Diego	University of Buenos Aires	New York University
Schamis, Héctor	American University	University of Buenos Aires (Sociology)	Columbia University
Sin, Gisela	University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Salvador University	University of Michigan
Suárez Cao, Julieta	Catholic University (Chile)	University of Buenos Aires	Northwestern University
Szwarcberg, Mariela	Reed College	Torcuato di Tella University	University of Chicago
Tedesco, Laura	Saint Louis University (Spain)	Argentine Catholic University	University of Warwick
Titunik, Rocío	University of Michigan	University of Buenos Aires (Economics)	University of California, Berkeley
Vadell, Javier Alberto	Catholic University of Minas Gerais	National University of Rosario (International Relations)	State University of Campinas
Valle, Valeria Marina	Technological Institute of Monterrey	University of Salvador	National Autonomous University (Mexico)

Table 8. (continued)

	Current Affiliation	Undergraduate University	Doctoral University
Vitullo, Gabriel	Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte	University of Buenos Aires	Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul
Vivares, Ernesto	FLACSO (Ecuador)	National University of Cuyo (Sociology)	University of Sheffield
Welp, Yanina	University of Zurich	University of Buenos Aires	Pompeu Fabra University
Zaremberg, Gisela	FLACSO (Mexico)	University of Buenos Aires (Sociology)	FLACSO (Mexico)
Brazil			
Bohn, Simone	York University (Canada)	University of São Paulo	University of São Paulo
Campello, Daniela	Princeton University	Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (MA IUPERJ)	University of California, Los Angeles
Cheibub, José Antonio	University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Fluminense University (History—MA IUPERJ)	University of Chicago
Dar, Luciana	University of California, Riverside	Federal University of Minas Gerais (Economics)	University of California, Los Angeles
Garcia, Denise	Northeastern University	University of Brasília	University of Geneva
Machado, Fabiana	Inter-American Development Bank	University of Brasília	University of Rochester
Porto, Mauro	Tulane University	University of Brasília	University of California, San Diego
Ribeiro Hoffmann, Andrea	Erfurt University	Catholic University, Rio de Janeiro	Tübingen University
Rodrigues, Maria	College of the Holy Cross (Massachusetts)	Cândido Mendes University (Law—MA IUPERJ)	Boston University
Guadalupe Moog	Rutgers University	Federal University of Santa Catarina (Law—MA IUPERJ)	University of California, Los Angeles
Zucco, Cesar, Jr.			

Table 8. (continued)

	Current Affiliation	Undergraduate University	Doctoral University
Uruguay			
Borsani, Hugo	State University of North Fluminense	University of the Republic (Sociology)	IUPERJ
Carassale, Santiago	FLACSO (Mexico)	University of the Republic (Sociology)	FLACSO (Mexico)
Castiglioni, Rossana	Diego Portales University	University of the Republic (Sociology)	University of Notre Dame
Katz, Gabriel	IMT Institute for Advanced Studies, Lucca	University of the Republic (Economics)	California Institute of Technology
Lissidini, Alicia	General San Martín National University	University of the Republic (Sociology)	FLACSO (Mexico)
Luna, Juan Pablo	Catholic University (Chile)	University of the Republic (Sociology)	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Rodríguez Gustá, Ana Laura	General San Martín National University	University of the Republic (Sociology)	University of Notre Dame
Salomón, Mónica	Federal University of Santa Catarina	University of the Republic (Languages)—AUB (Spain)	Autonomous University of Barcelona
Chile			
Rovira Kaltwasser, Cristóbal	University of Sussex	Catholic University (Sociology)	Humboldt University of Berlin

Source: Based on public information from the Internet and corroborated by the individuals cited whenever possible.