

Psychology Publications by Professors at Argentine Psychology Programs: 1958-1982

María Andrea Piñeda.¹

*Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET),
Universidad Nacional de San Luis (UNSL), Argentina*

Abstract

A description of the research and publications produced by Professors at Argentine National Universities during the foundational ages of Psychology Programs was made. The analysis included institutional, political and social issues. The work involved archives and bibliography tracing, and it focused on Professors' publications. Four Psychology Programs at National Universities were especially analyzed: University of Buenos Aires, National University of Cuyo / San Luis, National University of La Plata and National University of Córdoba. Their Professors' staffs in the period 1957 and 1982 were historically reconstructed, and their psychology publications (journal articles and books) between 1958 and 1982 were traced. Publications were analyzed with bibliometric approach to get a first description, taking into account: relation between Professors / authors, general productivity, publications features: language, nationality, publishing house, journals and publishing houses productivity, research areas and theoretical approaches.

Keywords: psychology program, research, publications, psychology education, bibliometrics

Publicaciones en psicología de docentes de la carrera de psicología en Argentina: 1958 – 1982

Resumen

Desde un punto de vista historiográfico se realizó una descripción de la investigación y publicaciones producida por docentes de los años fundacionales de las carreras de psicología en universidades nacionales argentinas. A partir de un trabajo archivístico y de relevamiento bibliográfico, se indagaron las condiciones institucionales, políticas y sociales de dichas carreras. En particular, se analizaron cuatro de las cinco primeras carreras en universidades nacionales: Universidad de Buenos Aires, Universidad Nacional de Cuyo / San Luis, Universidad Nacional de La Plata y Universidad Nacional de Córdoba. Se reconstruyeron historiográficamente sus planteles docentes en el período comprendido entre 1957 y 1982, y se rastrearon las publicaciones en psicología (artículos de revista y libros) entre 1958 y 1982, de tales autores. Las mismas se analizaron sociobibliométricamente para obtener una primera descripción, teniendo en cuenta: relación plantel docente / autores; rangos de productividad general; características de las publicaciones: idioma, nacionalidad, tipo de editorial, revistas y editoriales más productivas, áreas de investigación, y enfoque teórico.

Keywords: psychology program, research, publications, psychology education, bibliometrics

Since the First Argentine Congress of Psychology (1954), after which Psychology Programs began to be founded in Argentina, the “Boulder-Bogotá” model has inspired the design of Psychology Programs. Such a model defines Psychology as a *profession* as well as a science. Because of many different reasons, the education of researchers received little attention during the first decades when Psychology Programs were founded. As a result, there has been a lack of qualified researchers, which has probably had deep further consequences that have brought us to a problem, which is

still difficult to solve. Programs at Argentine universities have traditionally had a professional bias, and Psychology Programs have consequently suffered. On the one hand, in Psychology Programs, as well as in the rest of Social Sciences Programs, except for Sociology, there has hardly been a postgraduate education tradition, and only a few graduates succeeded in getting a Doctoral degree during the Programs' foundational period. As a consequence, there has been scarce research competitive training (Oteiza, 1992). On the other hand, the structure of Psychology Programs has seen insufficient development because of the political conditions that have limited them such as, military coups and their resulting interventions to public universities governments. For instance, in 1966, university profes-

¹ The author is a professor at the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Universidad Nacional de San Luis (UNSL), Argentina. Email: mapineda@unsl.edu.ar.

sors -especially those who worked for University of Buenos Aires (Universidad de Buenos Aires, UBA) and National University of La Plata (Universidad Nacional de La Plata, UNLP)- massively resigned as a form of social protest against the military coup which had got control of the university government. Another consequence of the coup was the decrease of university publishing houses and journals such as, “Editorial de la Universidad de Buenos Aires” (EUDEBA), or “*Revista de Psicología*” (UNLP). Then in the 1976 coup d'état, when Psychology Programs had not yet recovered universities were dismantled all over again through researchers dismissals and emigrations and also, as a result of the displacement of already scarce university research budgets. Economic support was given to new, smaller, and more controllable research institutes, which were independent from universities (Bekerman, 2009; Oteiza, 1992). This process weakened Psychology Programs even more than they had been at their starting point. Except for dictatorial ages when students' matriculation was forbidden or limited, students' overpopulation has always been the rule. Meanwhile, there was also a lack of Professors qualified for research and professional activities able to model a coherent and solid psychologist profile (Plotkin, 2006), to produce scientific knowledge, and to be competent to solve social problems. In fact, the question: “*What is a psychologist role?*” provided a popular point of debate in Argentine psychology during the sixties and the seventies. The Psychologists' role was popularly visualized as a psychoanalyst or, at some other times, as a psychosocial change agent (Klappenbach, 2006), but it was rarely socially recognized as a researcher. *Was there any kind of psychological research in the first decades of the Psychology Programs? What did Professors of Psychology Programs at National Universities publish by that time?*

In this article, we aim to analyze scientific education in Argentine Psychology Programs during their first quarter of a century, exploring its relationship with the research produced by Professors who had been educators at Psychology Programs. This problem will be outlined by analyzing only psychology publications (namely, books and scientific journal papers) during 1958 and 1982, by authors who had been Professors at University of Buenos Aires (Universidad de Buenos Aires, UBA), National University of La Plata (Universidad Nacional de La Plata, UNLP), National University of Córdoba (Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, UNC) and National University of Cuyo / National University of San Luis (Universidad Nacional de Cuyo / Universidad Nacional de San Luis, UNCy/UNSL) Psychology Programs at that time.

There are several reasons why we chose to analyze the publications of the professors from these universities. First, there are chronological and historical issues. Indeed, these Psychology Programs were four out of five of the first created at National universities. After the foundation of University of Litoral (Universidad del Litoral, UNL)'s Psychology Program in 1955, re-founded in 1956, the others consecutively began to open their doors, separated only by a few months: UBA by the end of 1957, and UNCy/UNSL, UNLP UNC successively in 1958 (Klappenbach, 2003). Therefore, they shared the same foundational framework. But at the same time, geographical, socio-cultural and economic factors provided them with very different features, differentiating their profiles. These facts make their comparative analysis very interesting.

On the one hand, UBA and UNLP are located by the River Plate shore, which flows to the Atlantic coast: UBA in Buenos Aires, the capital city of Argentina, and UNLP in La Plata, the capital of Buenos Aires Province. Hence, they both are in the major administrative, economic and cultural centre of the country, equally endowing them with easy access to material and human resources and also to national and international communication, which have helped to display them and gain international acknowledgement. The geographical proximity between UBA and UNLP has frequently made it possible for Psychology Programs to hire the same professors for their staffs. And, as we have already explained, both Psychology Programs suffered from the same political consequences during the period we are analyzing (Klappenbach, 2009; Leibovich de Duarte, 2008; Piñeda, 2010b; 2010c; Rossi, Falcone, Kirch, Rodríguez Sturla, Luque, Diamant, Sommer, 2001).

On the other hand, UNCy/UNSL and UNC are located in cities in the centre of Argentina. UNCy/UNSL Psychology Program was settled in San Luis, the Capital of San Luis Province, which is a small city founded as a post station in the middle of the bi-oceanic route between Mendoza and Córdoba. Livestock farming and agricultural work have traditionally supported San Luis' economy, and it has experienced an accelerated industry expansion only in the last thirty years. By the end of the thirties, population education possibilities gained a new status by the creation of UNCy in Mendoza, which established a Pedagogic Institute in San Luis. It was the starting point of university studies and scientific research in San Luis.

Surprisingly, UNC relies on a long academic tradition: it was the first Argentine university, founded by Jesuits in the 17th century. Moreover, Córdoba was already an industrial city, which was in its blossom by the time its Psychology Program was created.

Since the creation of the Psychology programs, and during their first quarter of a century, Psychology research at universities has undergone a slow process of development. UNCy's *Institute of Psychopedagogic Research* was created in 1956 by Plácido Horas (Piñeda, 2010), who was one of the main figures at the beginnings of Psychology Program in San Luis. Eva Borkowska de Mikusinski, Claribel Morales de Barbenza, Ángel Rodríguez Kauth, Emilio Alaggia, and Carmen Dagfal were some of the Professors who also conducted important research projects in the Program (Piñeda, 2010). From 1956 to 1972, the Faculty supported a journal, which was mainly used to publish the Institute Professors' research: *Anales del Instituto de Psicopedagogía*. In the sixties, UNCy/UNSL Psychology Professors were encouraged to get postgraduate education which improved research activity, due to the National Council of Scientific and Technical Research (Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, CONICET), Advisory Commission for the Promotion of Research (Comisión Asesora de Promoción de la Investigación, CAPI) and Organization of American States (Organización de Estados Americanos, OEA) economic assistance. Some of the researchers got their doctoral degrees abroad. For instance, Barbenza and Mikusinski studied in England (Piñeda, 2010), bringing to UNCy/UNSL their influence on behaviour studies, especially in personality assessment and basic processes. In the seventies, human resources education policies included postgraduate courses, often lectured by foreign Professors. Such is the case of Rubén Ardila, who stayed in San Luis during a semester in charge of "Experimental Analysis of Behaviour" postgraduate course, and "Clinical Psychology" undergraduate course (Author, 2010a). These policies gained for the San Luis Psychology Program an academic profile fostering research as a central activity.

The Faculty of Philosophy and Humanities at UNC created an *Institute of Psychology* in 1956. Carlos Laguinge planned it, but its first Director was Raúl Alberto Piérola, who also organized the Psychology Program in 1958 (Ferrero, 2008). There were poor attempts at publishing a Faculty journal of Psychology during the foundational period. In 1970 *Boletín de la Escuela de Psicología* was created and it lasted only one year, under the direction of Enrique Saforcada, Mercedes Mancusi and José María Infante. One year earlier, Saforcada and some other Professors and graduates from the Psychology Program (Horacio Gurvich, Perla Ducach, Diana Saal, Angelina Serrone, Estela M de Sucani, Julia Yuzuk, Hilda Marchiori) had privately published *Revista de Psicología* but it was also possible to support only one issue. In 1980, *Revista del Ateneo Psicoanalítico de Córdoba* was edited, and some UNC

Professors such as Gurvich and Yusuk took part in the project and published papers (Piñeda, 2009). There were several psychology research projects in the UNC's Psychology Program. The most prominent group of researchers was directed by Hermelinda Fogliatto, whose primary areas of research were thought processes and professional orientation. Fogliatto got her PhD at Loyola University (Chicago), under the direction of Horacio Rimoldi who, by that time, was the director of the Loyola Psychometric Laboratory. Rimoldi's influence in Córdoba was also printed in 1957, when the Psychology Program was setting its basis, and he lectured a course on Psychotechnology at the Faculty. Moreover, among his students there was Enrique Saforcada, one of the first graduates who had become a Professor, an outstanding researcher on Psychology Education and Health Care Psychology areas, and later was Associate Dean of the Faculty of Psychology of Universidad de Buenos Aires (Rimoldi, 1995).

UBA's *Psychology Department* at the Faculty of Philosophy was created in 1958 under the Direction of Marcos Victoria until 1960 when it began to be directed by Enrique Butelman. The latter was one of the founders of Paidós, a publishing house that edited several UBA Psychology Program Professors' books. After Butelman, Manuel Solari who was briefly in charge of the Department, and between 1961 and 1963, Telma Reca was the Director (Rossi et. al, 2001).

Some other psychological institutions at the Faculty were important for their professional activity and research in the beginnings of the Program such as, the *Department of Vocational Orientation* founded by Jaime Bernstein. Its second Director was Nuria Cortada de Cohan, and there were many contributors: Irene Orlando, Miguelina Guirao, Ricardo Malfé, Sara Slapak, Diana Aisenson, Rodolfo Bohoslavsky, Federico Kauffman, among others (Rossi et. al., 2001). In addition, Telma Reca organized the *Centre of Developmental Psychology and Psychopathology*, which was a link between Chairs and Institutes at the Faculty of Medical Sciences and the Faculty of Philosophy.

The Faculty of Philosophy or the Department of Psychology did not support any psychological journal during that period. *Logos and Cuadernos de Filosofía* were the only journals. The University used to publish *Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires* (RUBA) since 1904 (Babini, 1971), and in 1963 it dedicated two issues to Psychology ("Psicología, ciencia de nuestra época"), where some Psychology Program Professors wrote their articles, including José Itzigsohn, León Ostrov, León Pérez, Ricardo Musso, Telma Reca, Nicolás Tavella and Aída Aisenson de Kogan.

UNLP's Psychology Program was created at the Psychology Department of the Faculty of Humanities

and Educational Sciences. Since the beginnings of the Program and until 1973, there was an Institute of Psychology, which promoted psychological research and publications. Besides the Faculty journal, *Revista de Humanidades* (1922 – 1966), the Department supported a prestigious journal, *Revista de Psicología* (1964 – 1983), which was directed by outstanding scholars such as Luis María Ravagnan (1964; 1965), Juan Carlos Pizarro (1966; 1967; 1967; 1973), Luis Felipe García de Onrubia (1979), and Celia Paladino (1981; 1983) (Klappenbach, 2009).

The Institute of Psychology was initially directed by Ravagnan, and then for many years by Mauricio Knobel (1965 – 1972). During Knobel's period, the Institute was very prolific in research and in rendering services to the community such as courses, conferences, psychological assessment, and counselling. It also promoted the translation of classical psychological works and textbooks, and the publication of Professors' papers and books. A laboratory of psychology was organized as well. After the Institute expired, very little research had been subsequently produced by the Department of Psychology. The decay was not only in number but also in quality.

To summarize, these four universities have graduated 82% of the Argentine Psychology students who studied at public universities until 1999 (Alonso, M. 1999). For this reason, the historical analysis of publication profiles and research traditions would enlighten a crucial aspect of Argentine Psychologists Education.

Methodology

First, in order to make a reconstruction of the social, economic, and academic research conditions at Argentine Psychology Programs, and to construct a profile of the professorial staff, we drew on eight reports. They were selected because they were published between the period 1958 and 1982 by authors who had very different standpoints and political positions in Argentine Psychology Programs. Some of them were Argentine, and two of them were foreign. 1) Being a Professor at the University of Texas (USA), Carl Hereford's report (1966) showed a global view of Latin American psychology including information about Argentina. He conducted a poll in which ten Chiefs of Psychology Departments or Institutes, at both national and private universities, took part. 2) Combining a foreign point of view with vivid knowledge of Latin American and Argentine universities, Rubén Ardila's report (1975) presented a critical and stimulating approach. Indeed, being a Columbian psychologist who got his Psychology PhD at Nebraska University (USA), he was invited by the National University of Saint Louis (Argentina) to

be a Professor for several months during 1975. Among local authors, we included the following reports: 1) Enrique Saforcada (1969), who was one of the first graduated psychologists at National University of Cordoba, and who later became a Professor in this Program until 1976; 2) Félix Chaparro (1969), a psychologist who graduated from the University of Buenos Aires (UBA) and a member of Buenos Aires Psychologists Association; 3) Juan Azcoaga (1970), a Biology and Nervous System Physiology Professor at UBA Psychology Program; 4) Mauricio Knobel (1975), a psychiatrist and a psychoanalyst who also was a Professor at UBA and UNLP Psychology Programs, and who was, by that time, the Inter American Psychology Society (SIP) South America Vice-President (Alonso, 1999) as well; 5) Silvia Barrionuevo and Fermín García Marcos (1975), who were Medical Psychology Professors at the Medicine Faculty of UBA; 6) Plácido Horas (1981), who was a central figure organizing the psychology program at UNCy/UNSL, and was also SIP's Vice-President in 1963-1964 (Piñeda, 2010).

Secondly, we tried to describe the main features of psychology publications of Professors who taught at University of Buenos Aires, National University of La Plata -both of them from river Plate region-, National University of Cuyo / San Luis and National University of Cordoba, two smaller universities in the centre of Argentina. Our analysis was empirically based on archival work and data basis construction. Such a process allowed us to reconstruct the list of Professors who took part of the staffs between 1957 and 1982, and therefore to trace their books and journal articles published in the period 1958 and 1982. This research was conducted: 1) by on-line database searching: (Unified Data Basis of the Inter-university System-BDU, UBA Faculty of Psychology, UNLP Faculty of Humanities and Educational Sciences, Library and Information System of UBA-SISBI; Argentine National Library; Argentine National Congress; Teachers National Library; Education Ministry "Acceder" Catalogue, and also Worldcat, Google and some publishing houses catalogues; 2) by a thorough analysis of indexes of a non-probabilistic sample of Psychology and related areas journals which were in publication during the studied period.

The sample included ten Argentine journals: *Acta Psiquiátrica* (Acta Foundation) indexed by Psychinfo, uninterruptedly published during the whole studied period; *Revista de Psicoanálisis* (Argentine Psychoanalytic Association, APA), *Psicoanálisis* (Buenos Aires Psychologists Association, APdeBA), fostered by very well known institutions of the local psychoanalytic communities; *Revista de Psicoanálisis de Configuraciones Vinculares*, one of the first psychoanalytic journals devoted to group psychotherapy which has

Table 1

Argentine and foreign journals analyzed to trace articles published during 1958 and 1982 by authors who had been Professors at UBA, UNLP, UNCy/UNSL, UNC between 1957 and 1982

Argentine Journals
Acta Psiquiátrica
Revista de Psicoanálisis
Psicoanálisis
Revista de Psicoanálisis de Configuraciones Vinculares
Rorschach en la Argentina / Psicodiagnóstico de Rorschach y otras Técnicas Proyectivas
Revista Argentina de Psicología,
Revista de Psicología (UNLP)
Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Psicopedagógicas
Revista de Psicología (Córdoba)
Interdisciplinaria
Foreign Journals
Revista Interamericana de Psicología
Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología
Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada

been an important movement in Argentina; *Rorschach en la Argentina / Psicodiagnóstico de Rorschach y otras Técnicas Proyectivas* (Argentine Association of Rorschach Psycho diagnosis), which has represented another important group whose journal has been continuously published since 1969; *Revista Argentina de Psicología*, belonging to the Psychologists Association of Buenos Aires, regularly published in the period we studied; *Revista de Psicología* (UNLP), and *Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Psicopedagógicas* (Universidad Nacional de Cuyo), selected because, by that time, they were the only psychology journals edited by national universities; we included *Revista de Psicología* (Córdoba) as well, which has not been edited by a national university but was fostered by Professors of the National University of Córdoba; and finally, *Interdisciplinaria*, that although it had began to be published by the end of the period we analyzed, it has been edited by the Interdisciplinary Centre of Mathematic and Experimental Psychology Research (CIIPME) of the National Council of Scientific Research (CONICET) and it is indexed by Psychinfo and shows a different theoretical approach compared to several of the journals formerly quoted. Three foreign -but very well known in our country- journals were also included, because in previous studies we had found

several Argentine Professors publications (Piñeda, 2007; 2010): *Revista Interamericana de Psicología*, *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, and *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada*.

These traced and found publications were comparatively analyzed using the bibliometric approach, showing the proportion of authors among Professors; general productivity ranks; publications features: language, nationality, type of publishing house, journals and publishing houses productiveness, research areas and theoretical approach.

Results and Conclusions

Scientific Education at Argentine Psychology Programs

Ten years after the first Argentine Psychology Program was created (Rosario, 1955/1956), an American scholar named Carl Hereford (1966) described the situation of Latin American Psychology Programs. He demonstrated that they had homogeneous conditions, which Argentina also shared. Psychology Programs either depended on Arts, Humanities, Education or Medicine Faculties. They tended to last between four and seven years, and they had psychologist or Bachelor in Psychology certification. A few universities

offered the possibility to get the Doctoral Degree. In every Latin American country, except for Brazil, the professional practice was not yet legalized. Professor staffs were generally not composed of psychologists, but they were psychiatrists, physiologists, or educators. Just a few of them had studied abroad -typically in France, and hardly ever in the USA- to get their Doctoral Degree. The most prominent problems Herford found in Latin American Psychology Education were inadequate physical infrastructure (undersized buildings; tiny outdated libraries normally constituted by donated material and characterized by the lack of textbooks and journals subscriptions, outdated and poorly supplied laboratory and personality assessment materials), insufficient salaries and a shortage of full-time professors. As a result, universities were short of specialized human resources for supervision of professional training activities. Professors were rarely dedicated to research, which was scarcely supported by universities. Sometimes, international institutions such as OEA, UNESCO, etc., provided financial assistance for researchers' education, but they rarely provided support for research projects. Psychology institutes usually sponsored the research of students who were preparing their final dissertation. Professors' publications used to have modest and limited recognition, as they were mostly published in Faculty or professional associations' journals. Clinical Psychology and Psychoanalysis were the most popular and developed research areas. In second place was Educational Psychology, often devoted to counselling and personality assessment. Social psychology, Developmental Psychology, Personality Theories, Physiological Psychology, Industrial and Experimental Psychology were little-developed areas.

Enrique Saforcada (1969) reported that, for several reasons, psychologists graduated at national and private Argentine universities were not able to make substantial contributions to solve critical social problems of our country. First of all, Argentine psychologists were in need of a definition of their social role. Second, the State made an investment in psychologists' education but did not invest in creating services where their assistance was subsequently required, reinforcing role ambiguity. Thirdly, there was an absence of local basic and applied research. Foreign studies were transferred into Argentina, with a number of socio-cultural differences, which made those results unsuitable to solve local social problems. This was a greater dilemma in educational, social, professional orientation and industrial areas. Saforcada exemplified this topic by explaining that tests, such as Weschler-Bellvue, Rorschach or T.A.T, which were very popular in Argentina, were not properly standardized for rural population, showing invalid results.

Moreover, there were some other failures connected to Psychology Programs themselves. Students entering the university were rarely motivated by Psychology as a science or profession in itself, or by the Social Sciences. Professors and Psychology Schools Directors degrees hardly belonged to the Psychology field (for example, there were a large number of physicians with incomplete psychology education in their own Medical Programs or orthodox psychoanalysts who had a narrow psychological knowledge). Consequently, there was a disproportion between Psychology schools and qualified human resources to teach Psychology, and that situation has increased psychologists' poor professional self image and blurred their role. The content of Psychology Programs had serious problems of organization (for instance, absence of subjects such as, biology, neurophysiology, experimental psychology, history of psychology), as they were oriented to educating psychotherapists who were unaware of crucial topics (such as learning theories, intelligence, personality, social psychology, psycho-physics, psychophysiology or thought processes) related to healthy human beings problems. All these facts impoverished Argentine psychology, its vision of man, and its ability to provide with social solutions.

Felix Chaparro's (1969) view of the first six Psychology Programs at State universities was as pessimistic as the former and it was sustained on the basis of empirical and statistic proofs of financial and academic deficits. As a result of a shortage or misdistribution of the budgets, there were not enough full-time professors, they had inadequate qualifications, there was inefficient research and community services planning, the fellowship system was in disarray, and universities' buildings and equipment were obsolete. The organization of programs' contents was disharmonic, and there were several disparities between universities criteria to select them. In fact, there was no agreement about the core contents of a psychology education. Researchers' education was also a failure as some programs did not have specific methodology courses or the possibility to get a Doctoral degree.

Juan Azcoaga (1970) made a comparison between UBA, National University of Litoral, Rosario (Universidad Nacional del Litoral, UNL) and European Psychology Programs. He outlined modern Psychology challenges, which were dealt with internationally such as, language and learning problems, and the growth of compared psychology, psychopathology and psychophysiology. Azcoaga suggested that it was necessary for local Psychology Programs to include syllabi setting a solid basis for knowledge theories and epistemology, as well as psychological and biological basic processes. At the same time, he considered that

mathematic disciplines (out of which Statistics was only a small part) were essential powerful tools to achieve a scientific and technological revolution, and that they were imperative to formalize logic problems and the development of intelligence theories. He wished that future psychologists could be the best specialists in brain and nervous system functioning.

At the same time Rubén Ardila (1975) was celebrating Latin American Psychology developments, which had achieved a complete psychologist role definition, and in some cases, also its legalization. He regretted that in Argentina those goals had not been achieved. Unfortunately, in Argentina, Psychology emphasized ideological and political issues rather than scientific factors. Besides, it was almost exclusively inspired in a psychoanalytical model, ignoring experimental approaches. Taking into account the very well known Litvinoff & Gomel (1975) survey, Ardila reported that most graduates worked privately as psychoanalytic psychotherapists, and that psychiatrists and psychoanalysts were over proportionately represented on Professors staffs at Psychology Programs. For this reason, Freud-Kleinian psychoanalysts prevailed among chiefs of Psychology Departments, usually defining psychologists' role boundaries in order to discourage competition with the psychiatrist role (for instance, setting training limits, obstructing their professional activity, and assigning them a secondary role, after psychiatrists, to make competent diagnostic activities). Indeed, Ardila was convinced that they spread a subordinated-to-physician and reduced-to-psychoanalytical-interests psychology model. Therefore, psychology was identified with clinical psychology. That identification cut away industrial, educational and social areas, while possibilities to make valuable contributions to the socio-economic development of the country decreased.

According to Ardila's point of view, Psychological research had moved on from Piñero and Mouchet's age. Nevertheless, coherent and steady research policies were not developed due to radical political changes. Instead, there were isolated pioneer efforts, which were not enough to consolidate schools. Exceptionally, three groups of researchers were gaining strength, and curiously two of them did not belong to Psychology Programs: the School of Psychology of UNSL (Plácido Horas, Eva Mikusisnki, Claribel Barbenza, Ángel Rodríguez Kauth, etc.), the Laboratory of Sensorial Research at UBA Medical School (organized in 1967 by Miguelina Girao who had studied with S. Stevens in Harvard), and the Interdisciplinary Centre of Mathematical and Experimental Psychology Research (CI-IPME), (organized by Rimoldi in 1972 at UBA Exact Sciences School.)

Coincidentally, Mauricio Knobel (1975) sharply pointed out that, from the very beginning, Psychology Programs were organized regarding psychoanalytical psychotherapy. Hence, there were a great number of psychotherapists teaching at Psychology Programs and a few psychologists devoted to research and professional activities reserved to the Psychology degree, consequently it contributed to great misunderstanding of roles.

From a very different political standpoint, Barionuevo & García Marcos (1975) defended medical interests and, yet, they made a similar diagnosis of the Programs situation. They made a disapproving report about Argentine state and private Psychology Programs, suggesting that first, they should provide students with general theoretical and technical psychological knowledge, and secondly, with specialized professional and scientific training in different areas. They compared some local programs with foreign ones and concluded that Psychology education was oriented to encroach upon the medical field, confusing the role of the psychologists, and –according to Buenos Aires provincial legislation in vogue those days- making illegal exercise of Medicine. They considered it was a matter of deep concern that Programs allowed psychologists to perform clinical activity, only after five years of general training, having no specialization in the field. Nevertheless, they showed an exceeding number of clinical contents, and very poor reinforcement of industrial, educational or forensic areas. This lack of qualified training in those matters was the main cause of psychologists' unemployment.

Nearly twenty-five years after the creation of the first Psychology Program at Argentine universities, the situation seemed not to have changed significantly. Plácido Horas (1981) analyzed Psychology Programs and their professional training models. In agreement with the authors formerly summarized, Horas still warned of the need to achieve better training in different areas of professional practice and in research techniques, as clinical psychology was still the dominant area. This was due to the prevalence of psychiatrists and psychoanalysts among Professors staffs, who had left their imprint on the Programs profiles. From the very beginning, Horas was one of the driving forces of Argentine Psychology Programs. He took part in the commission at the First Argentine Psychology Congress (1954), which recommended Psychology Programs opening at national universities. So, big was his disappointment when he reported that Educational, Industrial and Forensic Psychology had not reached enough development yet, although there was a general agreement to foster those areas in every Argentine Psychology Program. Indeed, those areas were far away from being part of

the Argentine mainstream, regardless of social and industrial needs. Furthermore, Experimental Psychology, which also was agreed to be included in Programs, was openly rejected because of its proximity to academic rather than professional activity.

Professors' publications

To answer the question "What did professors of Psychology Programs at National Universities published in the first decades of such programs", we conducted a bibliometric analysis. First of all, we were interested in knowing in which proportion professors were authors of publications and who were the most productive ones. Secondly, we attempted to describe

some general features of their publications. In order to gather the potential foreign distribution of their work, we classified language of publication. Data about the publishing house was useful to understand distribution and knowledge validation processes as well, but also enlightened universities' policies of research and publication support, and the level of research activity that Institutes and Departments of Psychology had. We analyzed publishing houses and journals' productiveness to know more about authors' connections to professional associations, scientific societies and theoretical approaches. Finally, a classification of the areas of research provided empirical data to compare with the reports we previously analyzed.

	UBA	UNLP	UNCy/UNSL	UNC
Authors	66,07%	59,25%	47,5%	43,47%
Language of publication	Spanish (100%)	Spanish (99,54%)	Spanish (91,6%)	Spanish (93,62%)
Publications by local University Publishing house	5,76%	28,63%	34,88%	35,10%
Journal papers	75,11%	63,90%	89,53%	27,65%
Books publishing houses	Paidós (34,02%) Eudeba (11,80%)	Paidós (16,98%) Eudeba (15,09%) UNLP (13,20%)		UNC (74,7%) CIIPME (6,7%) Psychometric Laboratory of Loyola University (4%) National Academy of Sciences (2,7%)
Journals	Acta Psiquiátrica (F. Acta) (51,76%) Revista de Psicoanálisis (APA) (21,96%) RAP (APBA) (9,80%) Revista de Psicología (UNLP) (6,66%)	Revista de Psicoanálisis (APA) (28,75%) Revista de Psicología (UNLP) (28,12%) Acta Psiquiátrica (Fundación Acta) (20,62%) RAP (APBA) (6,87%)	Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología (30,30%) Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Psicopedagógicas (UNCy) (28,10%)	Revista de Psicología (Córdoba) (42,10%) Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología (15,80%) Revista Interamericana de Psicología (15,80%) Acta Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina (10,50%) Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada (5,30%) Ateneo Psicoanalítico de Córdoba (5,30%) Interdisciplinaria (5,30%).

Research areas	Clinical Psychology (37,09%) Basic Processes (10,02%) Epistemology, History of Psychology and Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Systems took the third place (9,2%) Developmental Psychology (8,2%) Educational Psychology (7,51%)	Clinical Psychology (32,86%) Basic Processes (13,14%) Developmental Psychology (10,32%), Introductions to Psychology and Methodology of Psychological research (6,57%), Educational Psychology (6,10%)	Social Psychology (19,76%) Personality assessment (18,60%) Basic Processes (17,44%) Developmental Psychology (13,95%) Educational psychology (4,65%) Psychoanalysis (4,65%) Clinical Psychology (4,65%) Psychological Theories (4,65%) Forensic Psychology (3,48%)	Professional Orientation (42,55%) Basic Processes (14,89%) Personality Assessment (11,70%) Research Methodology (8,51%)
-----------------------	--	--	--	--

Between 43% and 66% of the Professors from the analyzed Psychology Programs were authors of publications. The universities on the River Plate shore (UBA and UNLP) had larger staffs and better material conditions for research, and therefore they had greater proportions of authors among their professors. Indeed, UBA's Psychology Program had 66,07% of authors, similarly UNLP had 59,25%, and on the other hand, less than a half of the professors at central region Psychology Programs were authors of publications: UNCy/UNSL: 47,5% and UNC: 43,47%.

During the 1957 – 1982 period, the most productive authors at UBA were Guillermo Vidal, José Bleger, Jaime Bernstein, Mauricio Knobel and Nuria Cortada. In a second place, Juan Azcoaga, Telma Reza, Anny Speier, Enrique Butelman, José Itzigsohn; Nicolás Tavella, Inés Calvo, Antonio Caparrós, Ricardo Malfé, Felipe García de Onrubia, Ricardo Musso, Aida Aisenso, León Ostrov, Diego Outes and Hebe Friedenthal. They showed a great diversity of approaches and research areas. Some of them were the founders of the Psychology Program (Rossi et. al., 2001). On the other hand, it is necessary to make a distinction between the productivity of authors who published in the journal or publishing house they directed (for example, Vidal in *Acta Psiquiátrica*, or Jaime Bernstein and Enrique Butelman in *Paidós*) and the authors who regularly published in different journals (for instance, Knobel, Cortada and Reza).

At UNLP, again, Mauricio Knobel and Nuria Cortada were the most productive authors, as well as Edgardo Rolla, Juan Cuatrecasas, Luis María Ravagnan, and Ricardo Musso. Knobel was the director of the Institute of Psychology for many years, and he had been preceded by Ravagnan (Klappenbach, 2009).

At UNCy/UNSL, the most productive authors were Plácido Horas, Eva Mikusinski, Claribel Barbenza, Ángel Rodríguez Kauth and Elena Ossola. Hora was the main organizer of the Psychology Program. The rest of them were Horas' close colleagues who later directed their own projects. Mikusinski and Barbenza early got their doctor degrees in England gaining research training.

At UNC Hermelinda Fogliatto showed a remarkable number of publications. She had her research training in USA under the direction of Horacio Rimoldi. Subsequently in Córdoba, she directed a promissory group of young researchers who collaborated with her. They proved to be some of the most productive researchers of the Program: María Isabel Oberto, Livio Grasso, Emilia Rojo, Marta Bruno. In a second place, Franco Murat and Enrique Saforcada were also very productive. The bottom was an Italian professor of Methodology who had a previous trajectory teaching and researching in UNCy/UNSL, and the latter was one of the first graduates of the Program.

Nearly all the publications were written in Spanish language, except for a small number of papers signed by Knobel (UNLP), Fogliatto (UNC), Barbenza, Mikusinski and Horas (UNCy/UNSL). They all had connections to the Inter American Psychology Society (SIP) and they had postgraduate courses taken abroad.

Publications were mostly edited by extra-university publishing houses. However, in Córdoba and San Luis, where connections with the main professional associations, scientific societies and publishing houses were not easy due to the geographic and economic conditions, the universities were more supportive to professors' publications. UNC and UNCy/UNSL Faculties comparatively edited more publications than UNLP and

UBA (UNC: 35,10%, UNCy/UNSL: 34,88%, UNLP: 28,63%, UBA: 5,76%).

There were two kinds of publications: books and journal papers. UBA, UNLP and UNCy/UNSL's authors predominantly published journal papers (UNCy/UNSL: 89,53%, UBA: 75,11%, UNLP: 63,90%, UNC: 27,65%). Unsurprisingly, UNC Professors' publications were books edited by the Faculty, which in their great majority were devoted to professional orientation.

Paidós and Eudeba were undoubtedly the most productive publishing houses among UBA Professors' published books (45,82%). Eudeba was UBA's publishing house, and Paidós was the publishing house founded by Bernstein, who was one of the first Directors of UBA Psychology Department. As Klappenbach has analyzed, through Paidós, Bernstein has contributed to spread the clinical bias in Argentine Psychology Programs (Klappenbach, 2001). On the other side, the greater number of journal papers of UBA's authors were published by *Acta Psiquiátrica* (F. Acta) (51,76%) *Revista de Psicoanálisis* (APA) (21,96%) *RAP* (APBA) (9,80%) *Revista de Psicología* (UNLP) (6,66%), which were River Plate regional journals with a national reputation.

Since many of the professors of UNLP's staff also worked for UBA, it is not extraordinary to find out that UNLP Professors' publications distributed by the same publishing houses and journals than UBA did. However, they showed different priorities, also revealing the role of UNLP as a publishing house. Books were printed by Paidós (16,98%) Eudeba (15,09%) and UNLP itself (13,20%), and journal papers were published by *Revista de Psicoanálisis* (APA) (28,75%) *Revista de Psicología* (UNLP) (28,12%) *Acta Psiquiátrica* (Fundación Acta) (20,62%), and *RAP* (APBA) (6,87%).

In a different way, UNCy/UNSL's authors published their papers in foreign and national journals. Foreign publications progressively increased by the end of the sixties, and it became the exclusive way at the beginning of the eighties. Among the foreign journals, *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología* concentrated the greater part of the papers (30,30%). *Revista Interamericana de Psicología*, *Spanish Language Psychology*, *International Audiology*, *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, *British Acoustical Proceedings*, *Social Work*, also registered a group of papers (between 1% and 2% each one). Local *Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Psicopedagógicas* was a national journal concentrating the bigger proportion of papers (28,10%), and *Acta Psiquiátrica*, *Revista de Psicoanálisis*, *Psicoanálisis de las Configuraciones Vinculares* *Revista de Educación*, *Revista del Instituto de Investigaciones Educativas*, *Revista del Instituto de Estudios Políticos y Sociales*, *Revista de Derecho Penal y Criminología* published

between 1% and 3% of the papers each one. This pattern exposes the consolidation of the researchers. In some way, this process was possible because they were -or subsequently became- full time professors during the analyzed period, and most of them remained at the Faculty staff despite the changing politic situations.

Under the direction of Fogliatto, UNC published books were mostly edited by the University itself (74,7%), and a few of them by CIIPME (6,7%), Psychometric Laboratory of Loyola University (4%) and National Academy of Sciences (Academia Nacional de Ciencias) (2,7%). Also, the papers of her research group have been distributed in the following journals: *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología* (15,80%), *Revista Interamericana de Psicología* (15,80%), *Revista de Psicología General y Aplicada* (5,30%), and in the local *Interdisciplinaria* (5,30%). Authors of other groups published in national journals such as: *Revista de Psicología* (Córdoba) (42,10%); *Acta Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina* (10,50%); *Ateneo Psicoanalítico de Córdoba* (Córdoba) (5,30%);

According to the editorial line of main publishing houses, UBA and UNLP Professors' publications tended to be framed in a psychoanalytic approach, while UNCy/UNSL and UNC research followed a wide "Psychology as a Behaviour Science" model (Piñeda, 2007, 2009, 2010).

San Luis research comparatively had more international recognition than other university professors' publications. Indeed, it has been analyzed that a group of UNSL's Psychology Professors have been regular and productive contributors at *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, one of the most important and influent Spanish language journals, during the three first decades of the journal (López & Calvache, 1998).

In agreement with Litvinoff and Gomel's very well known study (Litvinoff & Gomel, 1975), Clinical Psychology has been registered as the prevalent area of research in UBA as in UNLP (37,09%, y 32,86% respectively). Secondly, General Psychology (basic processes) (10,02% UBA and 13,14% UNLP). At UBA, Epistemology, History of Psychology and Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Systems took the third place (9,2%), and afterwards, Developmental Psychology (8,2%) and Educational Psychology (7,51%). At UNLP, Developmental Psychology (10,32%), Introductions to Psychology and Methodology of Psychological research (6,57%), and Educational Psychology (6,10%) were minor areas of research.

Due to its peculiar policies of postgraduate education for human resources at the Program, mainly consisting in supporting courses out of the country, or employing professors from abroad (Piñeda, 2010), UNCy/UNSL followed a very atypical development of research.

Social Psychology (19,76%), personality assessment (18,60%), basic processes (17,44%) and Developmental Psychology (13,95%) were the areas with more publications. Educational psychology, Psychoanalysis, Clinical Psychology, Psychological Theories (4,65%), and Forensic Psychology (3,48%) were less developed research areas. Surprisingly, orthodox psychoanalysis was not the mainstream in San Luis, where psychology as a behavioural science prevailed. One of the reasons is that in San Luis there were not professors associated to the Argentine Psychoanalytic Association (APA) (Piñeda, 2007, 2010).

At UNC, Professional Orientation research has prevailed (42,55%), but there also was significant work on Basic Processes (14,89%), Personality Assessment (11,70%) and Research Methodology (8,51%). Those areas were mainly developed by Fogliatto's group.

Conclusions

Summarizing, during the period we have analyzed, Psychology Programs were created in a framework of economic and human resources limitations. The lack of adequate planning has left psychologists' social role without a solid and coherent profile, not only for professional activities, but also in research areas.

University policies on research and publication used to be weaker in deeper politic – institutional crisis when research at university was destabilized. In contrast, extra-university institutions (namely, professional and scientific associations) left their politic and intellectual prints into the Programs by defining contents and research projects, which professors willingly performed but with a small budget. Those interests stressed a clinical bias, leaving major research vacancy areas, and poor contributions to solve our country social and productive needs.

Professors' small amount of publications and also their clinical bias proved their limitations on their own scientific education.

On the other hand, Professors research used to be published by the same universities and professional associations they belonged to, and hardly ever published in foreign journals, reinforcing the reproduction of Psychologist profile we have described in this paper.

Future research should inquire if the psychologist profile defined in the foundational Psychology Programs period carried on after the early eighties, or if it is still in force.

References

Alonso, M. (1999). Psicología en Argentina. En Alonso, M. & Eagly, E. (Eds.). *Psicología en las Américas*. Caracas: SIP.

- Ardila, R. (1975). La Psicología en Argentina. Pasado, presente, futuro. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 11 (1), 71 – 91.
- Azcoaga, J. (1970). Acerca de la formación del psicólogo. Sobre los planes de estudio. *Revista Argentina de Psicología*, 2 (6), 130 – 135.
- Barrionuevo, M. & García Marcos, F. (1975). Carreras de psicología en universidades argentinas. *Psicología Médica*, 1, 84 - 110.
- Bekerman, F. (2009). Investigación científica bajo el signo militar (1976-1983): la bisagra entre el Conicet y la universidad. *Controversias y concurrencias latinoamericanas*, 2 (1), 189-206.
- Chaparro, F. (1969). Las carreras de psicología en las Universidades Nacionales. *Revista Argentina de Psicología*, 1 (2), 147 – 155.
- Ferrero, L. (2008). Antecedentes de la Psicología en Córdoba. Demandas de los sectores Industrial y Educativo que propiciaron la formación de la carrera. Tesis de Licenciatura en Psicología. Facultad de Psicología. Universidad de Córdoba. Mimeo.
- Hereford, C. (1966). Current status of psychology in Latin America. *Latin American Research Review*, 1 (2) 97.
- Horas, P. (1981). Current status of psychology in Argentina. *Spanish Language psychology*, 1, 357-364.
- Klappenbach, H. (2001). Dos editoriales en los comienzos de la profesionalización de la psicología en Argentina. *Memorandum*, 1, 61-71. Retirado do World Wide Web: <http://www.fafich.ufmg.br/~memorandum/artigos01/klappenbach01.htm>.
- Klappenbach, H. (2003). La globalización y la enseñanza de la psicología en Argentina. *Psicología em Estudo*, 8 (2), 3-18.
- Klappenbach, H. (2006). Periodización de la psicología en Argentina. *Revista de Historia de la Psicología*, 27 (1), 109-164. [Publicación de la Universitat de Valencia].
- Klappenbach, H. (2009). Estudio bibliométrico de la Revista de Psicología de la Universidad Nacional de La Plata. 1964-1983. *Revista de Psicología [Segunda época]*, 10, 13-65.
- Leibovich de Duarte, A. (Ed.) (2008). *Ayer y hoy, 50 años de enseñanza de la psicología*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- Litvinoff, N.; Gomel, S. (1975). *El psicólogo y su profesión*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Nueva Visión.
- López, W.; Calvache, O. (1998). La Psicología de habla hispana: 30 años de la Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 30 (3), 401-427.
- Knobel, M. (1975). Child Psychology in Argentina. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 4 (2), 7-9.
- Oteiza, E. (Ed.). (1992). *La política de investigación científica y tecnológica argentina. Historia y perspectivas*. Buenos Aires: Bibliotecas Universitarias – Centro Editor de América Latina.
- Plotkin, M. (2006). *La privatización de la educación superior y las ciencias sociales en Argentina. Un estudio de las carreras de Psicología y Economía*. Buenos Aires: Programa Regional de Becas, CLACSO, Argentina.
- Rimoldi, H. (1995). Testimonio autobiográfico. *Cuadernos Argentinos de Historia de la Psicología*, 1 (1/2), 275-300.
- Rossi, L. Falcone, R., Kirch, U., Rodríguez Sturla, P., Luque, E., Diamant, A, Sommer, V. (2001). *Psicología: su inscripción universitaria como profesión*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- Saforcada, E. (1969). Problemas y riesgos de la psicología en Argentina. *Revista de Psicología*, 1, 49-55.

Received 12/29/2011

Accepted: 03/15/2012

María Andrea Piñeda. Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Universidad Nacional de San Luis (UNSL), Argentina

