

And the network was created: technical, political and epistemological aspects involved in the creation and development of the CEDES network

*Fernando Augusto Starepravo**
*Leoncio José de Almeida Reis***
*Fernando Renato Cavichioli****
*Wanderley Marchi Jr.*****

Abstract: This study examines technical, political and epistemological aspects related to the appearance and development of the Cedes Network in Brazil, based on documents, publications and interviews with managers involved in the Network. The analysis ultimately led us to advance in understanding the logical operation of two distinct social spaces – the political/bureaucratic and scientific/academic fields – that start interacting as a result of an action by the Brazilian federal government.

Keywords: Sports. Leisure. Public policies. Cedes network.

*Professor at the Department of Physical Education, State University of Maringá (UEM) e the Associate Graduate Program in Physical Education UEM-UEL, Maringá, PR, Brazil. E-mail: fernando.starepravo@hotmail.com

**Professor at the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR Litoral), Matinhos, PR, Brazil. E-mail: leojar_edf@yahoo.com.br

***Professor at the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), Curitiba, PR, Brazil. E-mail: cavicca@ufpr.br

****Professor at the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), Curitiba, PR, Brazil. E-mail: marchijr@ufpr.br

1 INTRODUCTION

Ordinance 179 of Brazil's Ministry of Sports, of October 20, 2011, established the most recent public call for selection of research projects to be developed within the Cedes Network, "in order to encourage production of knowledge based on social research and to improve public policies for sports and leisure" (BRASIL, 2011a). This initiative ended up generating a whole mobilization in Brazil's Physical Education academic environment, particularly for people linked to the "academic scientific subfield of public policy for sports and leisure" (STAREPRAVO, 2011, p. 28).

The Cedes Network is a programmatic action by the Ministry of Sports. Its studies are guided by theoretical frameworks originating in the humanities and social sciences and through dialogue with research groups consolidated and/or in process of consolidation – linked to higher education institutions and/or research institutes and scientific societies. The Network seeks to establish new research groups and encourage existing ones to produce and disseminate knowledge aimed at assessing and improving the management of public policies for sports and leisure (BRASIL, 2009).¹

Operating intermittently since its creation in 2003, the Cedes Network provided support to numerous studies and publications in the areas of sports, leisure and public policy.² Given its importance for research in the scientific/academic subfield of public policy for sports and leisure, scholars still pay little attention to the mechanisms of creation and development of the Network. The exception is the balance of the Cedes Network produced by a group of researchers associated to UNESP at Rio Claro (SCHWARTZ *et al.*, 2010). It was conducted as a study commissioned by the Ministry of Sports

¹BRASIL. Ministério do Esporte. Rede CEDES. Available at: <<http://portal.esporte.gov.br/sndel/esporteLazer/cedes/redeCedes.jsp>>. Accessed on: August 10, 2009.

²More information can be found at the Cedes Network Institutional Repository (available at: <<http://www.labomidia.ufsc.br/redecedes/>>) and also in the work assessing the Cedes Network (SCHWARTZ *et al.*, 2010).

to “meet the Ministry of Sports’ demand regarding organization, systematization and management of data related to research projects funded by the Cedes Network” (SCHWARTZ *et al*, 2010, p. 23). However, despite a series of contributions to the understanding of the Network, the work mentioned above does not cover the political and epistemological aspects underlying its creation and development. This case is symptomatic of a more general process taking place in scientific production within the scientific/academic subfield of public policy for sports and leisure. Works on public policies for sports and leisure that address the dimension of the political arena in Brazil are scarce (AMARAL; PEREIRA, 2009).

Therefore, this study aims to examine technical, political and epistemological aspects related to the emergence and development of the Cedes Network in Brazil. Its methodology included direct and indirect procedures. Direct procedures include semi-structured interviews with management agents of the Ministry of Sports directly related to the creation, implementation and development of the Cedes Network who occupied second and third-level positions within the Ministry’s administrative structure. To ensure anonymity of research subjects, their names have been replaced with codes. Indirect procedures, in turn, included document analysis of some documents available on the Ministry’s website. Data analysis was done through discourse analysis (BOURDIEU, 1983, 2000, 2003, 2008)³ and content analysis (BARDIN, 1977).

The theoretical reference used here is Pierre Bourdieu’s Field Theory. For the author, the study of social contexts should be related to the notion of field – intermediate universes with their own logics and dynamics. Those social spaces are constituted according to the presence of agents who share and perpetuate certain habitus and relate strategically as a result of common objects of dispute.

³According to Bourdieu, analyzing discourses and ideologies by emphasizing only statements, without considering the constitution of the field and its relationship with the broader social space, which encompasses social positions and processes, is superficial. He underscores the need to base all discourse analysis on the construction of the field, within which that discourse is produced and received, and to observe the distinctive organizations and their schemes of production, reproduction and perception.

2 CREATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF A NETWORK OF SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH: THE CASE OF THE CEDES NETWORK

At least three aspects need to be considered when we discuss the emergence and development of the Cedes Network: the technical, the political and the epistemological aspects. All of them are obviously related and it is difficult to determine which was more important when the network was created. However, we will seek to explain them in order to break away from the formality of the documents and enter agents' space of relationship and interests.

For a basic understanding of the technical aspect of the Cedes Network's creation, we need to refer to the process of formulation of Program Sport and Recreation in the City (*Programa Esporte e Lazer da Cidade*, PELC), whose actions include the Cedes Network. According to PELC's creators, its preparation was neither random nor guided merely by empiricism – recurrent practices in “political/bureaucratic subfield of sports and leisure” (STAREPRAVO, 2011, p. 24). The initiative was based on principles and concepts from the social space formerly occupied by some agents of the Ministry – the scientific/academic field. “We thought about what an umbrella program, from the standpoint of actions, would have to cover in order to be an effective policy aimed at the universal right of access to sports and leisure”.⁴ Under the logic of government planning and budget, the National Department of Sports and Leisure Development (SNDEL), then in charge of the program,⁵ should propose a large program (called “umbrella” by the manager) that would include virtually all actions of the department. Then, that large program was configured according to situational analysis and based on the procedures of a renowned author of the academic field.

⁴MANAGER D. Interview conducted by the author on November 29, 2010.

⁵Today, PELC and Cedes Network are – in theory – under the responsibility of the National Department of Sports, Education, Leisure and Social Inclusion, created later, when the Ministry of Sports underwent administrative restructuring in 2011.

At that moment our action was based a lot on one author [...] from the field of planning, called Carlos Matus [...]. He is the precursor of what is called situational strategic planning. Strategic planning within the government field. So we used to deal well with the term “knots”, which he used. What are the “knots” that we have to untie to ensure [...] universal access to sports and leisure?⁶

The “knots” pointed out by the team were mainly related to lack of spaces to practice sports and leisure; when there were such spaces, they sometimes had little maintenance and were in really bad shape. Another “knot” detected was the lack of trained professionals to work with sports and leisure public policy. “So what did we think? That a program, besides developing, delivering, maintaining spaces, building spaces, would have to include people capable of acting in those spaces”.⁷ Then the PELC emerged as a program with a view to overcoming the “knots” detected, seeking to provide availability of spaces, offer practices and encourage reflection and production of scientific literature on sports and leisure.

Back to the Cedes Network, the technical aspect of its creation is related to the detection of a “knot” on the development of sports and leisure public policies. That is the lack of training in the area and the resulting lack of trained professionals to work in that field.

[...] There is no specific training in Brazil for that. Colleges, Physical Education schools, which might be the place for it to happen, it does not happen there. Our whole education is focused on sports, on sports aimed at high performance. Leisure sports, although they are covered by the Pelé Law, [...] when it is seen, it is seen in a distorted or devalued form, even at universities.⁸

⁶MANAGER D. Interview conducted by the author on November 29, 2010.

⁷MANAGER D. Interview conducted by the author on November 29, 2010.

⁸MANAGER D. Interview conducted by the author on November 29, 2010.

Therefore, PELC actions should include something related to knowledge production and training of qualified personnel to work with the PELC Social Project.⁹ The Cedes Network would be one of the actions with such purposes, as well as Cedime (Centre of Documentation and Information of the Ministry of Sports) and the Brazil Award for Sports and Leisure for Social Inclusion. Indeed, even before the creation of the Cedes Network, the transfer of that attribution to Cenesp Network¹⁰ was considered, which would require reformulation to expand its scope:

Then we thought about a training area. And we thought that this part would be provided, subsidized by the Cenesp Network. Why? Because it was already structured within the ministry, which had already given resources to the university, but only to the biological area or the high-performance area. It was either a debate on quality of life from the biological point of view or the high performance part, with a predominance in the physiological and biomechanical area. That was what we saw at the Cenesp Network. We thought that this other part of staff training and preparation of events to conduct the debate could come within it and be encompassed by the Cenesp Network.¹¹

After a few meetings, the Cenesp Network said no, since it understood that such insertion would change its characteristics. In the political game set at the time between Communist Party of Brazil (PCdoB) and the Workers' Party (PT),¹² and in the competition for legitimacy between the SNDEL group (whose references

⁹Note that the PELC emerged as a kind of SNDEL's umbrella program covering several actions, including Functioning of PELC Centers, which will be referred to in this text as "PELC Social Project".

¹⁰The Cenesp Network consists of development centers for scientific and technological research in sports, training and improvement of athletes. Formed by physical and administrative structures, human and material resources from Higher Education Institutions, the Centers for Sports Excellence aim to detect, select and develop sports talent especially in Olympic and Paralympic sports (BRASIL, 2008).

¹¹MANAGER D. Interview conducted by the author on November 29, 2010.

¹²Note that since the Ministry of Sports was created in 2003, its administration has included two distinct political parties – PCdoB and PT. While the former held most offices and departments of the Ministry, the latter only managed SNDEL.

were the Social Sciences) and the Cenesp Network (oriented to Biological Sciences), those who were already established in the field (Cenesp Network) and those with higher “power potential” (ELIAS, 2005) at the moment (PCdoB) prevailed. As a result, the Cenesp Network was no longer linked to SNDEL’s Department of Science and Technology and started reporting to SNEAR (National Department of High Performance Sports). According to one of the managers interviewed, that would be related to fears of a balance on Cenesp Network’s actions so far:

[...] I wanted to do an assessment of what that Network had produced so far, since there was a certain amount of resources set aside for it since the Cardoso administration, from the moment of its creation until that point, and we had found no document explaining the destination of those resources, the results of studies. That cause [members of the Cenesp Network] to organize and come to the Minister demanding that I did not lead that instance. And that decision was made [...] without our consent, my team’s consent.¹³

This supposedly arbitrary stance towards changing the Cenesp Network’s position in the structure of the Ministry would have been a response to the creation of the Cedes Network. That is the epistemological but also political motivation for the new network. If the group of SNDEL agents passively accepted that situation, they would again show weakness in the clash within the Ministry of Sports and in their search for legitimacy (BOURDIEU, 1983) in the field.

[...] If we are not getting the [Cenesp] Network, it might even be less of a problem; we’ll create our own network. We’ll create another network. [...] It will be a network to focus on issues linked to recreational sports and leisure. How are we going to do that? We’ll create a network of centers to develop sports and leisure. [...] We’ll be the Cedes Network.¹⁴

¹³MANAGER C. Interview conducted by the author on October 27, 2010.

¹⁴MANAGER D. Interview conducted by the author on November 29, 2010.

The above might suggest certain personalism in public actions, since the Cedes Network is treated as a possession of a group – “our” network as opposed to “theirs”, the Cenesp Network. However, data are not enough to categorically assert such a phenomenon, which is discussed by Codato (2002) and Gomes Neto (2009) among others. Another agent interviewed points in the same direction:

If sporting excellence, high performance went there, then we’ll develop a Science and Technology logic directed to studies of sports, sports management and recreation policy, other than that based on high performance. But the high performance logic also brings us the high-performance management logic, because the Cenesp Network conducts studies on theory and practice of sports training, not of sports management. And we developed the Cedes Network within the November Discussion of the PPA, the Multi-Year Plan.¹⁵

The political dispute between the actors of Cedes Network and Cenesp Network extrapolated even the boundaries of the Ministry of Sports, extending to some higher education institutions.

[...] The Cedes Network arrives at universities also as a strong political element to counter the Cenesp Network, because the Cenesp network gave its group higher status in university agencies. The Cedes Network established a balance of political forces. That gets very clear at [University A], for example, between the Cenesp Network and the Cedes Network. The Cedes Network at [University A] emerges in large part because of that logic [...]¹⁶

The political aspect of the creation of the Cedes Network was not mentioned by respondents. However, it is still a strategy in support of the SNDEL group at the Ministry of Sports. The group was primarily comprised of agents coming from the

¹⁵MANAGER C. Interview conducted by the author on October 27, 2010.

¹⁶MANAGER C. Interview conducted by the author on October 27, 2010.

scientific/academic¹⁷ field with little or no presence in the political/bureaucratic field.¹⁸ Therefore, the creation of the Cedes Network would provide a basis and support to a group of newcomers with little “political capital” and who had not yet internalized the “habitus” typical of that social space (BOURDIEU, 1983), as mentioned by one of the managers:

I’ve never seen myself as a professional of politics. I’ve never wanted political office. And in fact, in the four years I spent in Brasília, in this very first government, the question many people asked me was how I went four years without having this partisan connection in political groups, which is what does it, what somehow supports people within a government framework. I’ve had and have no political godfathers to back me.¹⁹

The answer to that question might be the support given by the agents’ original social space – the scientific/academic field – especially through the Cedes Network, since conquest of space and permanence in strategic positions in the political/bureaucratic field are directly related to established social networks and the possession of capital, especially political and cultural capital (BOURDIEU, 2007b).

In sum, and back to Bourdieu’s (1983) contributions, the characterization of the field (here the Ministry of Sports – a structure pertaining to the political/bureaucratic subfield of sports and leisure) – is given by the definition of the social space where

¹⁷“Although Hey (2008) understands the field as academic rather than scientific, since the idea of academy is more common in Brazil, with each knowledge area being a kind of scientific society with its own members but a common global ethos, the field is assumed here as inextricably academic and scientific, since production is scientific and the environment where it is produced is academic. The scientific/academic field is then understood as the locus where institutionalized practices of knowledge production take place, which involves mainly the idea of university” (STAREPRAVO, 2011, p. 59).

¹⁸A space that implies dissociation between the position and its occupant, the function and the functionary, public interest and private interests, but which paradoxically works as a power metafield, even because the genesis of public order is accompanied by the appearance and accumulation of a “public capital” (BOURDIEU, 2005). Each area within the political/bureaucratic field, in turn, can be understood as a political/bureaucratic subfield where the specifics of the area of State action delimit the social space where agents related to it operate.

¹⁹MANAGER C. Interview conducted by the author on October 27, 2010.

positions are located, and social agents act towards achievements, in addition to their object of dispute and their specific interests. In other words, the field is defined as “the locus where a competitive struggle is fought among actors on specific interests that characterize the area in question” (ORTIZ, 1994, p. 19). These disputes, in turn, are established “[...] through the targets of the struggles between dominant actors and aspirants; the issues because of which they clash also depend on the state of legitimate problems” (BOURDIEU, 2007a, p. 64). Disputes over space and the establishment of a public policy agenda for sports and leisure within the Ministry of Sports, which included actions involving intellectuals of the area, were guided, as we pointed out, by partisan, political and epistemological disputes. Actors moved and acted in the social space in order to accumulate capital towards stability in the occupation of spaces. All this intense political movement pervaded the process of making and implementing public policies for sports and leisure during the first decade of the twentieth century and led, among other “political products”, to the very Cedes Network which will be detailed in the next section.

3 PHASES OF A RESEARCH-SUPPORTING NETWORK: FROM INDUCTION TO DEMOCRATIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE

Once it was established, the Cedes Network’s formal definition in 2011 was:

Cedes Network – general name for a group of Higher Education Institutions that, through social research, conducts studies to improve public policies for sports and leisure towards social inclusion. The Network, promoted by the General Coordination for Science, Technology and Innovation under the Department of Strategic Planning and Management of the Executive Secretariat of the Ministry of Sports, aims to generate, coordinate and spread scientific and technological actions in the field of sports and leisure (BRASIL, 2011b).

The Cedes Network – an action that is part of PELC – was

established as programmatic action of the Ministry of Sports, managed by the Department of Science and Technology of Sports, previously under SNDEL and later under the National Department of Sports, Education, Leisure and Social Inclusion. This network included both public and private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) that are nuclei of the network. They may be composed of groups from the same institution or from different institutions. The Cedes Network aims to encourage these groups to produce and disseminate knowledge aimed at improving and enhancing projects, programs and public policies for recreational sports and leisure, by producing and spreading knowledge based on references derived from the Social Sciences and Humanities (BRASIL, 2011c).

According to the Ministry of Sports, it can be said that the Cedes Network experienced four relevant moments. The first one was marked by the establishment of partnerships with research groups from Physical Education schools in Brazilian public universities; the second one was the expansion of support to further development and consolidation of research that enhance the country's sports and leisure policies, also extending the possibility of partnerships to groups of studies from private HEIs. The third moment was marked by the creation, in 2007, of an annual public call to select projects to be funded; the fourth moment was marked by the expansion of funding for social research on public policies for sports and leisure and by investment in management of knowledge produced by the Cedes Network as well as its systematization and socialization (BRASIL, 2011c). In the Cedes Network's first moment, what prevailed was the demand addressed to research groups already established or in the process of consolidation whose object of study was public policies for sports and leisure.

Cedes Networks resources would be allocated according to directed demand, directed by us, and then our 30 years in the academic world, developing studies, doing research that helped improving public management in the field of recreational sports and leisure would prevail.²⁰

²⁰MANAGER C. Interview conducted by the author on October 27, 2010.

The content of the research, in turn, would be commissioned in accordance with SNDEL's management's own demands:

For what we missed or had trouble managing, for that which lacked references, we'd map existing groups already established, we'd identify those with a critical mass to do what we wanted, and then we'd commission it, we'd establish contact to say: "Look, we found a critical mass to develop a study and we need that study. If you agree, then write the project, tell me how much you need, and we'll fund your work".²¹

Induction can be interpreted in different ways. According to managers interviewed, that practice would be related to the effectiveness of the network itself, since there was a need for management and the urge for rapid responses would trigger induction to groups already able to carry out research and provide return on that demand.

We induced what we considered to have little accumulation within the university, but it was crucial for developing a policy. For example, what had we detected? That the media talked a lot about the issue of funding, sports funding. But there was not a single study published in any database about sports funding in Brazil. There was no article, perhaps a study. Then people were talking about sports funding [...] but there was no study on it. So what did we do? [...] We have no data to say how much Brazil needs to invest in sports. [...] Now, if there was nothing, I'd have to induce it. Because nobody in the university was interested in discussing funding. It was not a pressing issue for leading people. [...] We have to have people who think about it, who write about it, who discuss it seriously. So funding is one of the topics we'll induce.²²

This being the motivation of induction, the initiative seems praiseworthy, since it breaks away from empiricism and lack of

²¹MANAGER C. Interview conducted by the author on October 27, 2010.

²²MANAGER D. Interview conducted by the author on November 29, 2010.

specialization in conducting public policies for sports and leisure, a widely accepted practice in this political/bureaucratic subfield (STAREPRAVO, 2011) in search of scientific references for action. Another important condition for induction would have been budget constraint. The few resources would be directed at the groups in which the risk of having no return on investment was lower.

[...] In 2004 we made the first public call for projects within of Cedes Network. That was when we struggled to obtain the resources because it was not available yet. We went there and challenged the Minister, and the Minister released a million *reais* for us, of which we managed to use 600 mil.²³

For a program of such importance and given the scale of management needs, the resources released in the first year of operation of Cedes Network can be considered negligible. However, induction can be seen as a means used by the group of SNDEL agents to demonstrate power in their relation to the scientific/academic field, in an “oligarchic” way²⁴ (ELIAS, 2005). That was because SNDEL was in a privileged position regarding research groups – i.e., in the “correlation of forces” (BOURDIEU, 1993) in the academic/scientific field – supported mainly by the economic capital involved.

We have always made that clear. I mean, we did not want to compete with CNPQ. The academic world that wanted to develop its research, its studies based on its own interests would have to resort to CNPQ at national level and to state and local development agencies for resources.²⁵

And by the scientific/academic capital of SNDEL agents coming from the scientific/academic field, which gave them legitimacy.

²³In a more oligarchic situation, according to Elias (2005), the balance of power in favor of the higher level is very disproportionate, rigid and stable.

²⁴MANAGER C. Interview conducted by the author on October 27, 2010.

²⁵MANAGER C. Interview conducted by the author on October 27, 2010.

Therefore, we had political ability, legitimacy in the academic world to conduct a high quality dialogue. [...] We had legitimacy to “challenge” some disputes for space, because we wanted resources to do what we considered right. ‘No, this is directed demand. That project of yours may be interesting, but it’s not interesting for us. Go get the funds at CNPQ if it’s the case.’²⁶

In turn, the scientific/academic subfield of public policy for sports and leisure, still weak at that moment, seems to have accepted the demands for research, probably due to lack of a research agenda (REIS, 2003) in the area, even giving up part of its autonomy. Note that Cedes Network’s funds at that time were exclusively aimed at public research institutions.

[...] we had something like: public funding is for public entities. One of the first things that [the manager who succeeded him at SNDEL] did was to broaden the range [...] So those criteria about public money for public institutions were gone.²⁷

That is, the second moment of the Cedes Network, with the inclusion of private institutions in it, was also when the SNDEL group left. The group was strongly linked to scientific/academic subfield, which had been present since President Lula’s transitional administration in the sports area. The group came to be replaced by another one, led by SNDEL’s second National Secretary. She had been Porto Alegre’s municipal secretary for sports and leisure for three consecutive terms, as well as president of the National Association of Municipal Sports and Leisure (Asmel), and she was a member of PT’s Sports and Leisure Sector.²⁸ This transition occurred during 2006 as a result of alleged political arrangements and internal tensions at SNDEL and PT. “[...] there were internal

²⁶MANAGER D. Interview conducted by the author on November 29, 2010.

²⁷Sectors are structures provided for in PT’s regulations. They are composed by members who act in a certain specific area in order to carry out the Party’s intervention in organized social movements. Sectors can be organized at local, state or national level, under permission by corresponding governing bodies. PT’s Sports and Leisure Sector is linked to the Popular Movements Department.

²⁸MANAGER C. Interview conducted by the author on October 27, 2010.

problems of relationship and competition for political space. In those four years we had, I would say, at least some political struggle for political space within PT, within the Sector [...]”.²⁹

The fragile relationship between the group linked to PT and the group of agents from PCdoB, which at that time was also undergoing some redesign, with a change of minister, would have also contributed to the changes in SNDEL:

Because with [Minister of Sports at the time], we used to enjoy autonomy. And when [new Minister] took office and called us to talk, when [former Minister] leaves to run for the Senate of the Federal District [...], then [new Minister] calls us and says: ‘Look, this autonomy thing is no good for me. From now on it will be like this: I’m quite a Stalinist’ – he used exactly that phrase. ‘In this matter I’m quite a Stalinist, people have to be disciplined. I mean, if the Minister says something, it has to be done.’ [...] And I said ‘no problem’. [...] But we kept acting the same way. Of course the minister got mad after a while.³⁰

All that led the new Minister of Sports to bring to SNDEL agents supposedly more aligned to his way of working.

[...] That ended up causing, after nearly four years, the Minister – at that point it was already [the new Minister] – to take advantage of that to appoint to the Department of Development of Sports and Leisure a person he had more affinity with and who was, say, closer to him in terms of his interests.³¹

That stance was partly corroborated by one of the agents who was a member of that new group ahead of SNDEL:

Of course the party appointed people, and the Minister accepted them [...] So in popular

²⁹MANAGER D. Interview conducted by the author on November 29, 2010.

³⁰MANAGER D. Interview conducted by the author on November 29, 2010.

³¹MANAGER B. Interview conducted by the author on March 26, 2010.

democratic governments public space is not occupied by appointment or friendship, it's based on a number of factors, including people's activism. Not necessarily party activism, but also activism in their work at the government.³²

The Cedes Network's third moment began when, in 2007, the ministry starts selecting research and groups from a public call, partially abandoning the practice of invitation to research groups. This procedure seems to be an advancement in the treatment given by the Ministry of Sports to the scientific/academic subfield, since it enables new actors and institutions to compete with those already established in the subfield, allegedly under technical criteria, and it restores part of the autonomy of researchers and research groups, which gain more flexibility to propose their research.

The call allows doing the registration at the same time, at the same moment, it allows comparative and hierarchic selection. [...] It also demanded that proponents themselves did better projects, because they had to compete. It was more than just arriving there, presenting a project and getting the money. From the moment you have to compete, if the other's is better than yours and the call is serious and fair, you might be my best friend, but you're not getting it. [...] I think it guarantees a level of transparency in public affairs, with its funds, also credibility for research, and seeking improvement for researchers, seeking to do good projects, improving their projects.³³

However, such calls are not fully open, since SNDEL defined lines of research under which the projects submitted should fit. That would be justified once again by the Secretariat's budget constraint and the need for scientific subsidies for policymaking in the area.

Since we have no way to guarantee [funding for] any research in the sense that all research is worthy, and [...] since we are not a development

³²MANAGER B. Interview conducted by the author on March 26, 2010.

³³MANAGER A. Interview conducted by the author on March 25, 2010.

agency. We are, say, helping in this regard. Our research lines are more applicable in public policy for sports and leisure. When you define those lines, you already make the needs clear to people. What will be used later, soon. Because we need it, otherwise we wouldn't be commissioning these studies.

Research lines, in turn, were defined by the very researchers who already participated in the Network (KAWAGUTI, 2010), which raises questions about the possibility of equal conditions among candidates to be Network nuclei and those already established in society. Furthermore, direct induction of research was not abolished from the Cedes Network, as pointed out by one of the managers:

Research studies are commissioned under two models: they are either semi-induced by a call that sets the lines to be presented, which will guide the proposal of projects, or they are induced. What does 'induced' mean? The Secretary, upon selection by the call, she does the balance: which demands are presented by the National Policy that were not included in the call? Then we will invite universities to act on those demands.³⁴

Despite the technical justification, the new group of SNDEL agents incurs in what was seen as a limit regarding the group that preceded them – induction that may cast doubt on the selection criteria for the Network's nuclei as well as hurt the autonomy of the scientific/academic subfield to enforce its research agenda. Research with indigenous communities and studies on men's Football World Cup would be examples of induction (KAWAGUTI, 2010) as well as the effectiveness of so-called Statute of Football Fans.

Another novelty that emerged during the development of the Cedes Network was the consortium of research groups. "[...] The call advanced when researchers themselves created its categories, and it was possible to write as a research group only, as a consortium of

³⁴MANAGER A. Interview conducted by the author on March 25, 2010.

groups, in partnership with larger institutions”.³⁵ Thus, institutions from different parts of the country could establish partnerships and conduct joint research. According to officials interviewed, that initiative provided good results to the network. The categories of the 2009 call, for example, were established according to the amount of money requested for the research, which increased according to the involvement of different researchers, groups and institutions in order to privilege the collective in research being conducted.³⁶ As for the fourth moment of the Cedes Network – of balance and publicizing of scientific research – an important initiative was dissemination and democratization of knowledge. Their action strategies included the creation of an online information network called Cedes Network Institutional Repository, which brings together institutions, research groups and scientific societies that share the Network’s actions, allowing extensive exchange of information and knowledge produced by digital means. Projects, reports and scientific production from all projects funded by the Cedes Network are included in the system, which is an important tool for spreading knowledge (NAZÁRIO, 2010). The creation of the Repository would also be related to knowledge dissemination and appropriation by agents of the political/bureaucratic subfield of sports and leisure.

So we are creating the digital repository, which will be available, open to public access. And several other mechanisms so that it comes back to social programs, to society as a whole, in order to improve those practices.³⁷

However, it is worth noting that the mere provision of online content will not solve the problem of publicizing and incorporating knowledge. It must be articulated to a set of actions involving basic

³⁵Nota inexistente no original.

³⁶Category 1 – Research up to R\$ 25 thousand, submitted by a researcher; Category 2 – Research up to R\$ 60 thousand, submitted by a Nucleus of the Network, i. e., for more than one study group from the same applicant institution; Category 3 – Research up to R\$ 100 thousand, coordinated by an applicant institution, involving partnership between study groups from at least two different higher education institutions (BRASIL, 2009).

³⁷MANAGER A. Interview conducted by the author on March 25, 2010.

and continuing training of actors, distribution of printed material, as well as other means that are more accessible to those who have been conducting and implementing sports and leisure public policies in the country.

In summary, the Cedes Network has been mobilizing research groups in several regions of the country to study topics related to public policies for sports and leisure, either by inducing them or through public tenders, involving researchers, students and technicians. Furthermore, research results have been published in different scientific media, which so far does not seem to have secured democratization of knowledge, since circulation of knowledge produced within the Network seems to have been quite endogenous.

At this point in the text, when we shift the focus from politics to policy,³⁸ the analysis acquires a more technical character, based on documents, statements and analysis already undertaken on the Cedes Network. But let us not forget that the concrete actions for implementation and development of the Network are guided and pervaded by the dynamics of that social space, which then involved, among other structures, the Ministry of Sports and their managers, universities and their researchers, as well as research funding agencies such as CNPq. Therefore, at that point we refer to a social space of intersection, established from the creation of the Cedes Network, involving two distinct social spaces – the political/bureaucratic subfield of sports and leisure and the scientific/academic subfield of public policy for sports and leisure – each with its own logics, dynamics and disputed objects. As a summary of that relationship between social spaces, we have the (re) configuration of the Cedes Network, expressing, among other points, extension or focus of public funding, restriction or expansion of the possibilities to enter the Network, a guarantee or

³⁸The Portuguese word *política* can have different connotations, which basically refer to different stages of the political process. In English, there is differentiation through polity, politics and policy. In short, the first term designates political institutions; the second one means the political processes; and the last one means politics' contents (FREY, 2000).

not of autonomy for researchers to establish a research agenda³⁹ for the area, and the possibility of establishing networks for research and dissemination of knowledge.

These issues, expressed in the different stages of the Cedes Network, departed from directions initially drawn by the agents who established the Network. This is because “nothing is more difficult and even impossible to ‘manipulate’ than a field” (BOURDIEU, 2004, p. 25). However high the weight of the agent inside the field, it is difficult to think, from a Machiavellian perspective on the process, that a single agent would be able to manipulate and shape the field or its processes exclusively according to his or her will. This is subject to the rules of the field in which these interests are re-signified and may generate unintended consequences. In Elias’s (2005) view, as the moves of many interdependent players cross, no isolated player or group of players acting by themselves will be able to determine the course of the game. That phenomenon is characterized by Elias (2005) as the blind process or opacity of configuration (or field in Bourdieu’s conception).

4 FINAL REMARKS

According to Kawaguti’s (2010) balance of projects funded by the Cedes Network, 129 agreements were signed involving 208 studies, which mobilized more than 1,000 researchers and received over 500 subsidies in the form of research grants. On the other hand, it says that it was not possible to identify the total amount granted by the Cedes Network and the values of counterpart contribution offered by institutions as well as the exact number of researchers involved, given the inconsistency of data on official reports. In any case, the data show the dimension and importance of that network, which has also had immeasurable political and symbolic repercussions.

³⁹Understanding the term as “a work program that defines a scientific community” (REIS, 2003, p. 12).

Therefore, this study sought to examine technical, political and epistemological aspects related to the emergence and development of the Cedes Network in Brazil, based on documents, publications and interviews with managers involved with it. We observed that the emergence of the Network took place amid an intense political movement, especially within the Ministry of Sports, but it also reflected in the universities involved in the Network. There were also technical reasons relating to deficiencies observed in the political/bureaucratic subfield of sports and leisure as well as epistemological clashes related to the national field of physical education. The development of the Cedes Network, in turn, is characterized by distinct and non-linear stages of improvement, which reverberated interests and wills of managers and researchers involved in the Network.

Nevertheless, the analysis of the emergence and development of the Cedes Network ultimately leads to further understanding the logical operation of two distinct social spaces – the political/bureaucratic and the scientific/academic fields – which now relate as a result of an action by the Brazilian federal government.

Despite gains by individuals and groups linked to the network, it should be noted that the relationship between the fields can serve to qualify research and action in public policies for sports and leisure in Brazil, still lacking in quality and references. Therefore, it is up to everyone involved in Cedes Network to work and demand its improvement, especially with regard to overcoming the discontinuity of actions and the immediate release of funds reserved by the Sports Ministry in 2011 for the Cedes Network's call for projects. Note the mobilization of a group of researchers from the Cedes Network and the Brazilian Association of Sports Science (CBCE), which have been working since early 2012 with the Ministry of Sports in order to re-discuss and re-structure the Network, suggesting that the academic community and the Ministry of Sports recognize the importance of maintaining and expanding the Network.

REFERENCES

AMARAL, S. C. F; PEREIRA, A. P. C. Reflexões sobre a produção em políticas públicas de Educação Física, esporte e lazer. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 31, no. 1, pp. 41-56, 2009.

BARDIN, L. **Análise de conteúdo**. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1977.

BOURDIEU, P. Da casa do rei à razão de Estado: um modelo da gênese do campo burocrático. In: WACQUANT, L. **O mistério do ministério – Pierre Bourdieu e a política democrática**. Loïc Wacquant (Ed.) – Rio de Janeiro: Revan, pp. 41-70, 2005.

BOURDIEU, P. **O campo econômico**: a dimensão simbólica da dominação. Trans. by Roberto Leal Ferreira; technical review by Daniel Lins. Campinas: Papirus, 2000.

BOURDIEU, P. **A distinção**: crítica social do julgamento. São Paulo: Edusp, 2008.

BOURDIEU, P. Espíritos de Estado: gênese e estrutura do campo burocrático. In: BOURDIEU, P. **Razões práticas**: sobre a teoria da ação. Trans. by Mariza Corrêa. Campinas: Papirus, pp. 91-135, 2007b.

BOURDIEU, P. Por uma ciência das obras. In: BOURDIEU, P. **Razões práticas**: sobre a teoria da ação. Trans. by Mariza Corrêa. Campinas: Papirus, pp. 53-90, 2007a.

BOURDIEU, P. **Questões de sociologia**. Rio de Janeiro: Marco Zero, 1983.

BOURDIEU, P. **Os usos sociais da ciência**: por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico. Text reviewed by the author in collaboration with Patrick Champagne and Etienne Landais; Trans. by Denice Barbara Catani. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2004.

BOURDIEU, P. (Ed.). **Miséria do mundo**. 5th ed. Trans. by Mateus S. Soares Azevedo. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2003.

BRASIL. Ministério do Esporte. **Portaria nº 179**, de 20 de outubro de 2011. Brasília, 2011a.

BRASIL. Ministério do Esporte. **Seleção para apoio a projetos de pesquisa com vistas ao desenvolvimento do esporte e do lazer**. Brasília, 2011b.

BRASIL. Ministério do Esporte. **Rede CEDES**. Available at: <<http://portal.esporte.gov.br/sndel/esporteLazer/cedes/redeCedes.jsp>>. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2009.

BRASIL. Ministério do Esporte. Portal da Copa. **Apresentação**. Available at: <<http://www.esporte.gov.br/sndel/esporteLazer/cedes/apresentacao.jsp>>. Accessed on: Apr. 4, 2011.

BRASIL. Ministério do Esporte. Portal da Copa. **[Rede CENESP]**. Available at: <<http://portal.esporte.gov.br/snear/cenesp/default.jsp>>. Accessed on: Aug. 30, 2008.

CODATO, E. Personalismo político nos anos cinquenta. **Revista de História Regional**, Ponta Grossa, v. 7, no. 1, pp. 9-45, 2002.

ELIAS, N. **Introdução à sociologia**. São Paulo: Edições 70, 2005.

FREY, K. Políticas públicas: um debate conceitual e reflexões referentes à prática da análise de políticas públicas no Brasil. **Planejamento e Políticas Públicas**, Brasília, no. 21, pp. 211-259, Jun. 2000.

GOMES NETO, J. M. W. Instituições e accountability na teoria democrática contemporânea. **Revista de Estudos Constitucionais, Hermenêutica e Teoria do Direito**, São Leopoldo - RS, v. 1, no. 1, pp. 56-64, 2009.

HEY, A. P. **Esboço de uma sociologia do campo acadêmico**: A educação superior no Brasil. São Carlos - SP: EdUFSCar, 2008.

KAWAGUTI, C. N. Análise dos projetos financiados pela Rede Cedes. In: SCHWARTZ, G. M. et al. **Gestão da informação sobre esporte recreativo e lazer**: balanço da Rede Cedes. Várzea Paulista: Fontoura, 2010.

NAZÁRIO, M. E. dos S. Contextualização histórica da Rede Cedes. In: SCHWARTZ, G. M. et al. **Gestão da informação sobre esporte recreativo e lazer**: balanço da Rede Cedes. Várzea Paulista: Fontoura, 2010.

ORTIZ, R. **Pierre Bourdieu**. São Paulo: Ática, 1994.

REIS, E. P. Reflexões legais para a formulação de uma agenda de pesquisa em políticas públicas. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais**, São Paulo, v.18, no. 51, pp. 11-14, Feb. 2003.

SCHWARTZ, G. M. et al. **Gestão da informação sobre esporte recreativo e lazer**: balanço da Rede Cedes. Várzea Paulista: Fontoura, 2010.

STAREPRAVO, F. A. **Políticas públicas de esporte e lazer no Brasil**: aproximações, intersecções, rupturas e distanciamentos entre os subcampos político/burocrático e científico/acadêmico. Doctoral Thesis in Physical Education – Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, 2011.

Correspondence address:

Fernando Augusto Starepravo
Universidade Estadual de Maringá
Departamento de Educação Física
Avenida Colombo, 5.790, Campus Universitário
Fone: (044) 3011-4315
CEP 87.020-900 Maringá-PR

Received on: June 1, 2012

Approved on: April 29, 2013