

JOSÉ AUGUSTO PACHECO & NANCY PEREIRA

## GLOBALIZATION AND EDUCATIONAL IDENTITIES

### INTRODUCTION

Globalization and identity are two words of different meaning which have never been so close, especially if used for the definition of social, economic and cultural politics. Even if affecting people in their identities, developed in the context to which they belong, the occurring changes are global and act in dimensions which are commonly characterized by the narrowing of space and the creation of identity logics which frame an economic rationality, although globalization is mainly political, technological and cultural (Giddens, 2000).

Therefore, globalization contributes to the reconfiguration of personal, professional, national and supranational identities whereas identity imposes a scale of new rules and procedures for the resolution of problems that exist within knowledge society (Hargreaves, 2004), which is obviously linked to neoliberalism, to the new communication technologies and to the world of information within informational capitalism (Castells, 2000a).

Once connected in a web (Castells, 2000b), globalization contributes to the definition of macropolitics (Ball, 1997), in the basis of which lie technical rationalities and behaviour models which lead to the recontextualisation of educational politics. Once accepting that globalization is a dominant ideology imposed and regulated by the market logic for the creation of new identities, in this text we are to analyse in which way globalization contributes, on the one hand, to the adoption of a common pattern in educational terms (the curriculum europeanisation is an example, for it conforms to a regionalisation of national identities according to a supranational identity as far as economic and social politics and politics of education and training are concerned) and, on the other hand, to the homogenisation of school practices while discourses are legitimated by the notion of decentralisation and by the enlargement of school autonomy concerning their educative and curricular projects.

We last intend to approach the role of Portuguese teachers in the context of the European supranational regionalisation in order to raise the following issue: if one

takes the homogenisation imposed by the globalization into account, since politics of professional identity not always conform to the legitimating identity derived from the domination established by the national and supranational power, is their action mostly characterised by resistance identities or by project identities? Nevertheless, the identity of resistance does not mean that teachers or educative agents belong to a community, for it is patent, according to empirical studies which recently took place in Portugal, that the concepts of autonomy, participation, community, project and decentralisation can be mainly found in regulations and documents of political orientation of the Central Administration and not in collaboration or sharing practices.

#### GLOBALIZATION

In a time of meaningful changes globalization brings about new arguments for the debate about school, aiming at establishing a “worldwide pedagogy” (Kress, 2003) which is a reedition of Comenio’s ideas but which now intends to teach one and all, in a worldwide basis, competences of information and communication technologies. That is why, according to Willinsky (2003, p. 99), “the curriculum has become more global.”

As we are in a time of change, Kress (2003) identifies the following factors which label school nowadays: switch of power from the State to the market; change of citizens into consumers; switch from a monocultural society to a multicultural society; switch from the secondary and tertiary industry to an industry of information/knowledge; change in the forms of knowledge authority (from text to image).

As these are factors which are the basis of the construction of knowledge society (Touraine, 1994; Hargreaves, 2004), school is now discussed as one of its fundamental pillars, since the reason for its existence is knowledge itself in its diverse approaches and it is recognised as a “worldwide cultural institution” (Ladwig, 2003, p. 266). It is a basic priority for macropolitics’ specialists that students master scholastic knowledge, for it is essential that school works on the knowledge sections which constitute the core of the curriculum for the training of globalised students and citizens.

In practice, this knowledge comes to a more pragmatic perspective in which the knowledge of certain subject fields, for which the symbolic meaning is meaningful, and of essentially technicist orientations is cherished and students are given a utilitarian vision of school. Ladwig wonders (2003, p. 283) then “why students begin to see this form of knowledge (and the required abilities and skills to make this knowledge public) as absolutely precious and desirable.”

Due to globalization and to the practices which are associated with it, it is necessary to implement politics which give privilege to the improvement of education quality in order to guarantee the training of qualified workmanship which may be a trump card in international competition then framed in regional contexts of growing importance. In this case, in the geographic region that corresponds to the European Union, the educational globalization solely means training registers that are centred in the acquisition of skills related to Sciences, Mathematics, English and Information and Communication Technologies towards the edification of a Europe of knowledge.

Even if talking about local, about identity, about decentralisation and about autonomy, the issue of the uniformity of schools is still a reality and it is to be accepted that the State will insist “on the uniformity of practices, values, knowledge and dispositions” (Kress, 2003, p. 120) and on the carrying out of a globalised educational agenda. The member-states of the European Union have nowadays common politics according to what Santos (2001, p. 93) calls “globalization of low intensity” and Teodoro (2003, p. 56) labels as “globally structured agenda.” It is then predictable that its effects on national politics tend to homogeneity and uniformity in prejudice of diversity and multiplicity.

Besides defining globalization, it is necessary to observe its effects on scholastic and curricular practices and investigate how it influences the curricular view. In fact, it interests us, as Gough (2003, p. 148) suggests, to get to know the way globalization works and what it does, but not what it is, and analyse the meaning of the curricular practices of teachers and other social agents: “I am interest in what curriculum workers (teachers, administrators, academics, researchers) do, and do not do, with the meanings that we exchange under the sign of globalization, and in working towards a defensible position on the meanings we should attempt to select, generate and reproduce through our curriculum practices.”

Such effects are recognised in the structuring of the form as well as of the content of the curriculum, that is to say, in the formatting of the levels of high education, of which the Bologna process is a reliable indicator, and in the definition of “good curricular practices” for the fundamental and medium teaching. In these teaching levels, which belong to a logic of formatting at the level of cycles and of the tendency to choose the 12<sup>th</sup> grade as compulsory schooling as well, uniformity happens through knowledge, method and evaluation, connected to students, and through teacher education.

Having as a basis uniform politics of knowledge, schools follow a curricular plan arranged into subjects whose syllabus—particularly those of the more structuring ones—tends to a worldwide similarity. This curricular sense is potentialised by the

existence of international assessment studies, such as PISA or OCDE (Organisation for the Economic Cooperation and Development), which contribute to the implementation of common educational patterns, placing knowledge in the centre of the scholastic debate.

One cannot ignore the issue of the educational patterns in schools and must highlight that there is a basic knowledge within what one may call *structuring literacies* which, for the performance of social roles, must be mastered by students. However, it is also fundamental that the reasons for the existence of these patterns be discussed as well as their contribution for the quality of the learning processes without ignoring the models of technical rationalities which justify them.

Through this worldwide agenda around knowledge, school reinforces its homogeneous structure of domain for the several fields of knowledge that tend more and more to be seen according to the logic of skills (Pacheco, 2005). As education itself cannot be called into question, but only the ways that make it happen, Hallak (2001, p. 43) writes that globalization has as a consequence the emergence of societies open to knowledge, where the notions of appropriate forms and contents for educating are widely shared by a growing number of countries through the “international agencies of cooperation in education and of exchange of experiences concerning politic matters.”

Whereas nowadays globalization works within scholastic and curricular practices through the discussion of knowledge, in the 1980’s and 1990’s it comprised approaches which could be characterised by the arising of a critical awareness in students about transnational thematics of, for instance, personal and social training, of the development paradigm and of life styles (Gough, 2003). Beginning as an initial alert, globalization turns into a set of practices which reinforce school’s most uniforming side, along which one has to admit that school has always—since its genesis and in its functioning structure—contained principles of homogenisation. According to Mercês Sampaio (1998, p. 248), as part of the world of bureaucratic organisations and due to its predominant manner of regulation and exertion of power, schools have established rules and power, where “the curriculum becomes normative through rules and documents from the central and regional organs which control its operationalisation and execution in schools.”

Accordingly, globalization becomes an identity which legitimates (Castells, 2000a) geographic areas that are more and more transnational and supranational and reinforce the role of the transmission of knowledge that school has performed having well defined criteria as a basis. Even knowing that the changes concerning scholastic practices are not meaningful, for it is also possible to argue that there is in schools an invariable structure connected to teachers’ thought and action

(Pacheco, 1995), the educational politics related to globalization reconceptualise the curriculum as follows (Martinand, 2001): valuing the scholastic and professional orientation not in terms of its psychological components but of its contribution for the construction of very objective representations of the technical contents and contexts of work; approach to the technicist world; presentation of the artificial world (contents, instruments, resources, places and rhythms) as a machine-like kingdom which replaces the natural kingdoms (mineral, vegetal, animal); appropriation of the information and communication techniques; promotion of a pedagogy of action.

#### IDENTITY

In times marked by globalization and subjected to changes at all levels, including changes of mentalities, in which way is it possible to talk about identity as expression of a plurality of senses centred in the subject?

The main issue is to know which kind of identity underlies the concept of globalization. According to Hall’s typology (2003), it is expected to correspond more to the illuminist and sociologic subject than to the post-modern one. The point is essentially to create a culture of responsibility, identified by words such as “quality,” “efficiency,” “efficacy” and only possible through “a strong flexibility” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 33) and through the exaltation of individualism in the Neo-Darwinist perspective. The educational competitiveness, which depends on the subjects, is a condition for the quality of the scholastic domain, and is materialised through successive extern assessment which leads to comparability and claims the subjects’ responsibility for failure.

Contrarily to the politics of fragmentation of the subject that are part of the so-called post-modern and post-structuralist approaches, the scholastic identities correspond, when analysing the educational and curricular politics, to decentralisation politics which aim at recentralising the practices, even if the uniformity derives from changes which have “autonomy,” the “political-pedagogical project,” the “educative project,” the “curricular project,” “participation,” “community” or the “educative territory” as a symbol.

In this sense, we argue that globalization preserves the normative face of State politics and its forms of power because we may observe that the curricular politics are decentralised in terms of discourse but recentralised in terms of practices. Whereas, in the sense of recognition of power, which is diffuse and does not have its origin in the top, the Foucaultian forms of micro-power constitute the underground of schools in several aspects of their organisation and informal decisions, the macro-decisions, located in the State and in the globalised organisms, regulate the

substance of the curriculum, that is to say, the way it is organised (form), which knowledge is taught (contents) and how it should be controlled (assessment).

The strong flexibility that globalization allows, and which brings her close to post-modernity, is not more than a process to hold the subjects responsible, whose identities have to be limited by commitments, goals to be achieved and results to be accomplished. In practice, homogenisation is nourished nowadays by transnational and supranational organisms that enforce agendas concerning social and educative politics centred in efficiency and quality, trying to combine culture and economy.

As a result, “as it allows the combination of the economic expansion and the improvement of the means of communication, [globalization] favours a greater homogenisation of cultural values and seems to draw the possibility of patterning individuals. It is not without reasons that globalization allows individuals in the most diverse regions of the world to consume the same products and adhere to similar cultural values” (Gugliano, 2000, p. 65).

As the State continues having a determinant role in the configuration of centralist educational politics, a process occurs in schools of emergence of local identities, whose affirmation depends on a wider sense of claim and is expressed by Bourdieu (2001) through the return to the *collective agents*, and happens, according to Touraine (1994, p. 14), through history and through the organisations in an atmosphere of uncertainty and in an interdependence between system and action, for we are dealing not only with “a social agent but also with a citizen for whom his personal development is inseparable from social progress. The individual’s freedom and his collective participation come into sight as undividable.”

Nonetheless, if one supposes that there is no total prescription and that all politics are defective and that practice is sophisticated, complex and instable, according to Ball’s model of micropolitics (1997) schools are power structures which arrange themselves in informal webs of decision of discursive practices that intervene in an active way in curricular decisions. In this context, school is always a place of construction and affirmation of identities.

The contribution of Cultural Studies towards the understanding of this reality is very important, whose way of seeing globalization—as a homogenising process nurtured by the Neoliberal ideology—makes it possible to identify the *subaltern proliferation of difference*, that is to say, emergent tendencies that escape from hyper-control, characterised by Hall as follows (2003, p. 60): “Together with the homogenising tendencies of globalization there is the subaltern proliferation of difference. The fact that, culturally, things seem to be more or less similar to each other is a paradox of contemporaneous globalization (...) Concomitantly, there is a proliferation of the *differences*. The *vertical* axle of cultural, economic

and technological power seems to be always marked and compensated by lateral connexions and this produces a world vision that is composed of many *local* differences.”

The emergence of these local cultures, which once analysed by the logic of globalization are not more than system disfunctionalities, is, a propos, one of the main vectors of post-colonial studies, especially when one recognises in the formal and/or informal organisational contexts room for the construction of identities marked by social, cultural and ideological dynamics and by multicultural dimensions. Even if there is plenty of unity in a national State, it is obvious that its population is culturally heterogeneous and that the multiplicity of cultural forms of life, the ethnic groups, the religious confessions and the different views of the world grow more and more every day” (Habermas, 2002, p. 34).

From these local approaches which are connected to specific situations derives the idea of hybrid, that is to say, the mixture of various languages that constitute a “world of intersections and cultural interpretations that refers to an epistemological dimension when it indicates a certain contextuality from which enunciations begin; a heuristic dimension as an analytic key for the understanding of contemporaneous cultural processes; a political dimension which breaks with the patterning essentialisms” (Costa, 2002, p. 4).

It can be accepted, thus, that there is no totalising globalization which comprehends the whole scope with the same intensity, for there is no culture able to reproduce itself totally; there is no rational unified subject who associates himself to the bureaucratic functioning of schools; (Ladwig, 2003, p. 277) and “whereas, on the one hand, economic globalization acts over the cultural sphere with its homogenising potential, on the other hand, it shows its incapability of uniformising the totality of culture. As a result, not only central countries but also the ones of the periphery are provided with a situation of cultural hybridisation” (Moreira & Macedo, 1999, p. 20).

Through this idea of hybridness, “a term used to describe the ways through which certain people carry with them various forms of identity, of subjectivities, if you wish, ways that are themselves defined with respect to several sets of historical social relations” (Ladwig, 2003, p. 275) within “a process of cultural interpretation” (Hall, 2003, p. 74), it is possible to contradict the legitimating identities, recognising, on the contrary, that there is always place for the construction of identities by collectively committed subjects with a certain training project.

Going back to the idea of spaces and their relationship with the problem of power production which origins the production of identities, and according to Popkewitz (2001, p. 37) as well, “schools are not only physical places, confined to a localised

geography, which go through a process of normalisation, but also discursive places, constituted by the system of ideas, distinctions and separations that are used to confine the student to certain normalisations.” Therefore, “from this point of view, the curriculum becomes part of a discursive space in which the teaching subjects (the teacher and the child) are differentiatedly constructed as individuals for them to auto-regulate themselves, auto-discipline themselves and reflect on themselves as members of a community/society” (*Idem, Ibidem*, p. 38).

As another space which is not totally defined and agglutinated by globalization, identity refers to very diverse issues, such as the common compulsory schooling, the cultural patterning that derives from supranational<sup>1</sup> and national curricula, the diversified management of the curriculum and the definition of contents managed in a scholastic domain.

So that one may talk about a “new multicultural political logic” it is fundamental to mention the expansion of democratic practices (Hall, 2003, p. 89) through the recognition that political agents (specialists, governors, teachers, students, parents and so on) have in the configuration of educative projects, with special highlight on teachers and students when one thinks about diversity as a means of “minding different necessities and ways of learning, different cultural orientations and different aspirations concerning work and life style represented by the diverse population of students in public schools” (Burbules, 2003, p. 161).

Even though curricular autonomy is limited, particularly in centralised systems, whether in the shape of curricular plans and programmes or in the shape of objectives and competences, “the management of the curriculum (which is made possible by the practice of relative autonomy by the teacher) is an important project, potentially interesting, but that simultaneously implies certain risks (...) The simultaneous mastering of knowledge about students, their necessities and interests, of the profound knowledge of curriculum characteristics, of the awareness built through the experience of the little autonomy allowed in his/her job—all this makes it possible for the curriculum to recontextualise the elected knowledge fields as important” (Cortêsão & Stoer, 2003, pp. 201–202).

It is the tension between the cultural homogenisation, aiming at patterning the learning contents as well as the teaching methods and the assessment forms and leading to the curricular ‘retaylorisation,’ and diversity which has deeply marked the educational reforms of the last decades, as if it were possible to combine equality of cultural opportunities with the inequalities which are produced by the logics of schooling. In line with Popkewitz (2001, p. 21) one can then conclude that a common schooling originates an equitable and fairer teaching, but that the diverse educative agents have a faulty understanding of the way their scholastic practices

act to produce the unequal soil education is<sup>2</sup>. In this sense, innovative curricular strategies are not the fairest socially, since, as Moreira (2005, p. 12) claims, “they may, paradoxically, create a discursive space in which children of popular strata are segregated, reducing their possibility of autonomy in society in comparison to children of privileged groups.”

In view of the inequalities that exist in school and that become even stronger through the uniformising tendency of the curriculum and of the organising projects, once schools tend to be more and more similar to each other, globalization, if not recognised as something unavoidable and that institutionalises a worldwide pedagogy<sup>3</sup>, may contribute to the emergence of an identity of resistance, that is to say, it may contribute to the creation of a sense of connection to the educational project by the educative agents in which the concepts of autonomy, participation, community and project are not to be found in the discursiveness of regulations and other documents of political orientation of the Central Administration (Pereira & Pacheco, 2005), but in the centre of school itself. More than be for the critical choir against globalization and denounce its misfortunes, as Willinsky says (2003, p. 103), “we should specify projects of educational intervention and explore the potentialities that exist inside schools.” In order to achieve that we also have to recognise globalization as *depoliticisation politics*, which to Bourdieu (2001, p. 60) “are the effect not of an economic fatality but of conscious and deliberate politics, which are, however, chiefly unconscious of their consequences.”

#### CURRICULUM: IDENTITY AND PROJECT

In this process of planetary change, individuals tend to have the same cultural identity, not only in terms of product consumption, as exalting what Bourdieu (1998, p. 38) calls “the market and consumer absolute kingdom, a commercial substitute for the citizen,” but also in terms of education, that is to say, of the patterning imposed by school. Therefore, curriculum as a fact (Goodson, 2001), elaborated and concretised in a closed perspective of administrative control (Doll, 2004), is legitimated at the level of scholastic practices by globalization and is not seen anymore as a complex conversation, that is to say, as anything that is constructed by subjects according to their identities (Pinar, 2004). In this case, the existence of a europeanised curriculum contradicts this notion of curriculum and privileges a vision of the educative problems anchored in the valuing of products and in the rejection of perspectives which are inserted in what Kincheloe (2004) labels as “critical constructivism,” which raises the following questions: what is the purpose of schools? how do we organise them for maximum learning? what is the

curriculum and how do we conceptualise it? how do we understand the relationship between schools and society?

Therefore, if understood as complex organisations, endowed with formal and informal rules, schools are nowadays, once analysed within the context of decentralised politics, a place for the construction of local identities of educative agents through the elaboration, execution and assessment of educative and curricular projects. However, globalization reinforces the uniforming practices in school, stresses the formal and administrative side of the curriculum and simultaneously creates discourses of autonomy, of identities and of projects.

The empirical data we will present from a qualitative study which had as corpus of analysis various projects of the Portuguese school system allow us to assert that the desired identities are political discourses which hold schools responsible and not documents which aim at orienting the planning of pedagogical practices of teachers and students (Pereira, 2006).

More than the recognition of project and professional identities, if following Castells' typology (2000a), globalization brings with itself a legitimating identity that, as a cultural phenomenon<sup>4</sup>, is introduced by the dominant institutions of society with the purpose of expanding and rationalising its domination in relation to the social agents.

The supranational regulation of educative politics in the European Union (the Declaration of Bologna for higher education is a good example) is a way of legitimating processes and decision practices that were proposed around a homogeneous, uniforming and convergent identity.

In this case, the curriculum europeanisation, which comprises all teaching levels, even though it mainly aims at higher education in form and at primary and secondary teaching in content, is based upon the centrality of knowledge and upon the adoption of more efficient social politics and emphasises the control of education and training systems.

Such a process of regional globalization imposes a legitimating identity through referentials connected to the definition of key competences, particularly for Technologies of Information and Communication and literacy, to the temporal establishment of expected learning results and to the configuration and organisation of training cycles (Pacheco & Vieira, 2006).

When belonging to an agenda of scholastic performance and management and of curricular standardisation, the legitimating identity origins the enterprising identity at the level of work context of teachers which Sachs (2003) associates to "efficient, responsible and reliable teachers, who demonstrate submission to political imperatives externally imposed and who own a high quality learning, which is

assessed according to an external set of competence indicators. This identity may be characterised as individualist, competitive, controlling and regulative, externally defined and standard-oriented."<sup>5</sup>

In which way, though, can teachers reject this legitimating and enterprising identity which imposes homogenised practices on them?

As the opposite of it Sachs (2003) presents the activist identity, which means action that undertakes responsibility for the improvement of students' learning conditions and rejects not only the individualist and isolated teaching but also the proposals of technical instrumentalism of educative and curricular reforms.

The collaboration between teachers, and also between the former and other educative agents, is a vital condition for the construction of an identity of resistance or of project, which are defined by Castells (2000a) as producing, respectively, the visibility of these agents, who are in positions/conditions which are underestimated and/or stigmatised by domination logics, and the appearance of agents who are able to redefine their position in society.

As identity in general is formed historically and socially, according to Day's arguments (2006) the creation of identities connected to professional contexts such as teaching contexts is more powerfully marked by technical aspects (classroom management, subject knowledge, tests' results) than by personal, professional, social and emotional aspects. For the most part teaching contexts produce technical identities because in a context of education homogenising politics teachers are assessed and held responsible mainly through students' results and not through their personal action or through the way they manage learning processes.

The idea of teachers' resistance is essentially marked not by the construction of alternatives or by the rising of a resistance culture, but by the adoption of a survival strategy, which includes what Lacey (1997, p. 72) names strategic submission, that is to say "the subject agrees with the definition of the image of authority and with the situation constraints while personally deeming some details." Such a strategy can be seen in the distance teachers keep between themselves and the curricular reforms (Pacheco et al., 1996) and in the way they reshape their curricular practices.

In an empirical study carried out by Pereira (2006), educative projects—as well as school and class curricular projects, one may say—do not follow, in practice, the orientations which are on the basis of their elaboration, for teachers accept them as documents of scholastic ritualisation. In fact, contrarily to what can be expected, school projects are not the result of several educative agents' action, not the result of teachers' and students' action, but the sum of concrete educative politics with a strong normative identity. Such a situation is linked to an excessive regulation and to the existence of numerous incongruences between the regulation and action,

for the dominant logic is that of hierarchical control and of regulation production, whereas politics of autonomy reinforcement imply a working logic which should be centred on rendered support services.

In the same study (Pereira, 2006) it is concluded that in Portugal teachers are still in a resistance situation before measures which aim at improving the quality of service rendered by schools which are then to have greater autonomy. This reductive conception of teachers' activity is one of the greatest enemies of the implementation of autonomy in schools, in the sense that this autonomy demands openness, cooperation, innovation and participation in collective organs and team activities by teachers or other peers. According to Nóvoa, cited by Teodoro (1994, p. 23), in order to invert this situation teachers have to be convinced that they should assume a different posture and abandon "the defensive behaviour which characterises clerks and not true professionals". This vision should be faced as a mentality which we have to bring to evolution by exemplarily demonstrating the benefits of an assumed autonomy, escorted by proper continuous training and by connected stimuli such as career progression. We also consider that this evolution is a useful challenge for teachers, schools and political power, for teachers' "isolationism" hides itself in corporativist positions that aim at having teachers protecting school from control.

In another study, Roldão (2005, p. 69) underlines the bureaucratic real overload and the scarce efficacy these documents originate, as they are only seen as written texts which produce a conformity logic, which according to teachers' view are difficult to articulate among themselves, and which are of a usefulness that—within the school's culture and the profession they are linked to—is at least doubtful."

Scholastic bureaucracy is a major parameter for the adoption of a survival strategy by teachers, for its practices are not altered through regulations and remain conformed to a tradition which is based on uniform practices. In this sense, in the assessment of school projects "a rhetoric nature of the documents seems to stand out, which does not only come from teachers' somewhat "following" view, which, as a matter of fact, is historically explainable, but also from the effects of that same history and its instituting mechanisms that concern the whole system and all its administration agents, for they all have, as well as teachers, deeply rooted bureaucratic cultures that cannot, precisely, be transformed through this same bureaucracy" (Roldão, 2005, p. 67). As we are dealing with the construction of a passive resistance, before administrative demands teachers become themselves normative, as numerous studies confirm.

In Roldão's study (2005, p. 59) concerning compulsory schooling in Portugal, "a set of unmistakable contradictions was confirmed once more in the atmosphere

and culture of teachers, of school and of the system, which leads teachers to the development of an attitude inclined to regulation."

In Costa, Dias and Ventura's study (2005, p. 117), in the context of curricular reorganisation teachers' behaviour "seemed to be more reactive, more oriented by the necessity of following the best they could what legal regulation determines."

The project's identity, a synonym for the proposal of change of the instituted practices, is, therefore, something that exists within a legitimating identity and that tries to impose change and innovation through regulation without having practices changed in their substantial aspect. Along with empirical studies which took place in Portugal (Pacheco, 2002), it can be verified that the concepts of autonomy, participation, community, project and decentralisation, as well as other concepts, are to be mainly found in the discursivity of regulation and other documents of political orientation of the Central Administration and not, as it were to be expected, in teachers' practices.

#### CONCLUSION

In a time of globalization, the regulation of education is generally made in supranational contexts, where, on the one hand, a common pattern for thinking about students' training and for organising the curriculum is imposed and, on the other hand, homogeneous curricular practices which are oriented to the efficiency of learning results are inflicted. School's curricular identity and autonomy are aspects which tend to be cherished in political discourses but that are easily contradicted and dispraised by school practices. If we take all studies which took place in Portugal into account, it becomes simple to conclude the following: the Europeanisation of the curriculum is connected to the imposition of key skills and to the uniforming of the education cycles, in a way that favours an enterprising identity; teachers conform to a logic of fulfilment of administration norms and elaborate the projects which were to provide them with autonomy and identity as if they were barely ritualising procedures. Teachers' reactive behaviour against normative imposition, without any change of the curricular practices, allows us to conclude that their scholastic decisions in the domain of school projects' construction is not marked by the project's identity, but by the identity of passive resistance. Teachers, therefore, understand and accept new rules concerning curricular making without having it meaning an effective change. For that reason, compulsory schooling teachers in Portugal face a curricular change that does not mean any meaningful shift in their practices, except for the adoption of a terminology which is enriched with new meanings.

In this sense, the projects elaborated in school are documents that contribute to the reinforcement of the national and supranational curriculum. One can argue, thus, that globalization not only confines to the scholastic scope of construction of curricular identities, but it also tends to legitimate uniform school practices, transforms the curriculum into a fact, into an episode that leads to efficiency in students' learning results and underestimates aspects that are fundamental to their global training.

NOTES

- 1 Concerning this and in line with documents of the European Union related to education politics, we have noticed what we may call the emergence of the European curriculum not only in form (mainly with respect to college studies) but also for the medium education (fundamental and medium teaching)—cf. José Pacheco & Ana Paula Vieira, 2006.
- 2 In line with this: “What do we know about the effort to make schools fairer?” (Ladwig, 2003, p. 265). One must admit that progressivist theories have failed in this aspect as they aimed at looking for the production of equitable educational results, as Muller refers (2003, p. 315): “Since nowadays knowledge presents itself in such an intense manner before us, as it might always have happened, is it not the appropriate moment to adopt post-progressivist politics and pedagogical methods which should be less romantic, more efficacious and socially fairer?”
- 3 A possible study which may be included in the agenda of a research around economic and educational politics is to know whether a worldwide economy of market corresponds to a worldwide school system.
- 4 Globalization favours the patterning of the worldwide culture, so analysed by Marco Nogueira (2001, p. 138) starting from the idea that economy becomes a cultural issue: “The production of consumption goods is now a cultural phenomenon: people buy the product because of its look as well as because of its immediate utility.”
- 5 Cited by Christopher Day (2006, p. 89).

REFERENCES

Ball, S. (1997). *The micro-politics of the school*. London: Methuen.  
 Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Questions de sociologie*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.  
 Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Contrafogos 2. Para um movimento social europeu*. Oeiras: Celta Editora.  
 Burbules, N. (2003). Uma gramática da diferença: algumas formas de repensar a diferença e a diversidade como tópicos educacionais. In R. L. Garcia & A. F. Moreira (orgs.) *Curriculo na contemporaneidade. Incertezas e desafios*. São Paulo: Cortez, 159–188.  
 Castells, M. (2000a). *Fim de milênio. A era da informação, economia, sociedade e cultura*, vol III. S. Paulo: Paz e Terra.  
 Castells, M. (2000b). *A sociedade em rede. A era da informação, economia, sociedade e cultura*, vol I. S. Paulo: Paz e Terra.  
 Castells, M. (2000c). *O poder e a identidade. A era da informação, economia, sociedade e cultura*, vol III. S. Paulo: Paz e Terra.

Cortezão, L. & Stoer, S. (2003). A interface de educação intercultural e a gestão de diversidade na sala de aula. In R. L. Garcia & A. F. Moreira (orgs.) *Curriculo na contemporaneidade. Incertezas e desafios*. São Paulo: Cortez, 189–208.  
 Costa, J. A., Dias, C. & Ventura, A. (2005). *Reorganização curricular do ensino básico. Projecto, decreto e práticas nas escolas*. Aveiro: Universidade de Aveiro.  
 Costa, S. (2002). Teoria social, cosmopolitismo e as sociedades pós-nacionais. In I. Scherer-Warren & F. Ferreira (orgs.) *Transformações sociais e dilemas da globalização. Um diálogo Brasil/Portugal*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 23–46.  
 Day, C. (2006). *A paixão pelo ensino*. Porto: Porto Editora.  
 Doll, W. (2004). Currículo e controlo. *Revista de Estudos Curriculares*, 2(1), 7–41.  
 Garcia, R. & Moreira, A. (2003). *Curriculo na contemporaneidade. Incertezas e desafios*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.  
 Giddens, A. (2000). *O mundo na era da globalização*. Lisboa: Editorial Presença.  
 Gimeno, J. (2003). O significado e a função da educação na sociedade e na cultura globalizadas. In R. Garcia & A. Moreira (orgs.) *Curiculo na contemporaneidade: incertezas e desafios*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 41–80.  
 Goodson, I. (2001). *O curriculo em mudança*. Porto: Porto Editora.  
 Gough, N. (2003). Globalization and school curriculum change. In S. David (Ed.) *Curriculum studies*. London: Routledge, IV Vol., 148–162.  
 Gugliano, A. (2000). Nas costas da globalização: as perspectivas dos países periféricos frente às transformações da economia internacional. In M. Ferreira & A. Gugliano (orgs.) *Fragments da globalização na educação*. Porto Alegre: ArtMed., 63–76.  
 Habermas, J. (2002). *Inclusão do outro. Estudos de teoria política*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.  
 Hall, S. (2003). *Da diáspora. Identidades e mediações culturais*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG.  
 Hallak, J. (2001). Politiques éducatives et contenus d'enseignement dans les pays en développement. In C. Carpentier (coord.) *Contenus d'enseignement dans un monde en mutation*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 31–52.  
 Hargreaves, A. (2004). *O ensino na era do conhecimento*. Porto: Porto Editora.  
 Kincheloe, J. (2004). *Critical constructivism*. New York: Peter Lang Primer.  
 Kress, G. (2003). O ensino na era da informação: entre a instabilidade e a integração. In R. L. Garcia & A. F. Moreira (orgs.) *Curriculo na contemporaneidade. Incertezas e desafios*. São Paulo: Cortez, 114–138.  
 Lacey, C. (1977). *The socialization of teachers*. London: Methuen and Co.  
 Ladwig, J. (2003). Primeiras aproximações a uma pedagogia mundial. In R. L. Garcia & A. F. Moreira (orgs.) *Curriculo na contemporaneidade. Incertezas e desafios*. São Paulo: Cortez, 265–292.  
 Martinand, J. (2001). Matrices disciplinaires et matrices curriculaires: le cas de l'éducation technologique en France. In C. Carpentier (coord.) *Contenus d'enseignement dans un monde en mutation*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 249–269.  
 Moreira, A. F. (2005). Porquê ter medo dos conteúdos? In M. Z. Pereira & A. P. Mour (orgs.) *Políticas e práticas curriculares. Impasses, tendências e perspectivas*. João Pessoa: Ideia, 11–42.  
 Muller, J. (2003). Revisitando o progressivismo: ethos, política, pathos. In R. L. Garcia & A. F. Moreira (orgs.) *Curriculo na contemporaneidade. Incertezas e desafios*. São Paulo: Cortez, 293–318.  
 Nogueira, M. (2001). *Em defesa da política*. São Paulo: Senac.  
 Pacheco, J. (1995). *O pensamento e acção do professor*. Porto: Porto Editora.  
 Pacheco, J. (2002). Notas para uma síntese de uma década de consolidação dos estudos curriculares. *Investigar em Educação*, 1(1), 227–273.



- Pacheco, J. (2005). *Estudos Curriculares. Para uma compreensão crítica da educação*. Porto: Porto Editora.
- Pacheco, J. & Vieira, A. P. (2006). Europeização do currículo. Para uma análise das políticas educativas e curriculares. In A. F. Moreira & J.A. Pacheco (orgs.) *Globalização e educação. Desafios para as políticas e práticas*. Porto: Porto Editora, 87–126.
- Pacheco, J. et al. (1996). *O impacto da reforma curricular no pensamento e na acção dos professores*. Braga: Universidade do Minho.
- Pereira, N. (2006). *Projecto educativo de escola: Um desafio à organização escolar*. Dissertação de mestrado. Porto: Universidade Portucalense (documento policopiado).
- Pereira, N. & Pacheco, J. (2005). Projecto Educativo. Um estudo sobre as representações de professores do 1º ciclo do Ensino Básico. In B. Silva & L. Almeida (orgs.) *Actas do VIII Congresso Galaico-Português de Psicopedagogia*. Braga: CIEd, 3323–3333.
- Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Popkewitz, T. (2001). *Lutando em defesa da alma. A política do ensino e a construção do professor*. Porto Alegre: ArtMed.
- Roldão, M. C. (coord.) (2005). *Formação e práticas de gestão curricular. Crenças e equívocos*. Porto: Edições Asa.
- Sachs, J. (2003). *The activist teaching profession*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Sampaio, M. (1998). *Um gosto amargo de escola*. São Paulo: Educ.
- Santos, B. (2001). Processos de globalização. In B. S. Santos (org), *A sociedade portuguesa perante os desafios da globalização: modernização económica, social e cultural*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento, 31–106.
- Teodoro, A. (1994). *Política educativa em Portugal: Educação, desenvolvimento e participação política dos professores*. Lisboa: Bertrand Editora.
- Teodoro, A. (2003). *Globalização e educação*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento.
- Touraine, A. (1984). *Le retour de l'acteur. Essai sur sociologie*. Paris: Fayard.
- Willinsky, J. (2003). O Estado-Nação após o globalismo. In R. L. Garcia & A. F. Moreira (orgs.) *Currículo na contemporaneidade. Incertezas e desafios*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 81–114.

#### AFFILIATIONS

*José Augusto Pacheco*  
*University of Minho, Portugal*

*Nancy Pereira*  
*University of Minho, Portugal*