

Transglobality, cosmopolitanism and innovation as school languages in times of crisis¹

*José Augusto Pacheco*²

*Ila Beatriz Maia*³

ABSTRACT

Blowing up globalized winds of contradiction to make society more common, in the process of multiple uniformities, cosmopolitanism emerged as a principle that can contribute to the thinking and acting of subjects in education and training institutions, from kindergarten to higher education. Hence, in an analysis of the languages that coexist today in the school environment, mention should be made of the cosmopolitan teaching attitude (PACHECO, 2018), oriented towards inclusion, diversity, and equity, in which subjectivity is something that does not make education a mere process of acquisition of knowledge, capacities, and attitudes, but a project of personal fulfillment, in the exploration of Dewey's ideas (1902/2002). In order to achieve this cosmopolitan attitude, the language of innovation, along with others, in the case of digital technologies, is well present in educational policies. However, it has been more focused on the search for a curricular alignment with improvement processes (FULLAN, 2015) that in the register of an event (ŽIŽEK, 2017), which becomes unique, spontaneous and not susceptible to being transformed into rules, which have fed the grammar of the school, that is, a school in crisis by the common organizational, curricular and pedagogical have been marked in the last two centuries (LABAREE, 2012; TYACK; CUBAN, 1995).

KEYWORDS: Transglobality. Cosmopolitanism. Innovation.

¹ English version by Ivan Fortunato. *E-mail:* ivanftr@yahoo.com.br.

² Researcher at the Center for Research in Education (CIEd), University of Minho (UMinho), Braga, Portugal. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4623-6898>. *E-mail:* jpacheco@ie.uminho.pt.

³ PhD student in Educational Sciences, Curriculum Development specialty, Institute of Education, University of Minho (UMinho), Braga, Portugal; PhD Scholarship from the Foundation for Science and Technology. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5740-8232>. *E-mail:* ib.maia@hotmail.com.

Transglobalidade, cosmopolitismo e inovação como linguagens da escola em tempo de crise

RESUMO

Soprando ventos globalizados de contradição, com o objetivo de tornar mais comum a sociedade, num processo de múltiplas uniformidades, o cosmopolitismo surge como princípio que pode contribuir para o pensar e o agir dos sujeitos em instituições de educação e formação, desde a educação infantil até ao ensino superior. Daí que, numa análise das linguagens que hoje coexistem no ambiente das escolas, seja referida a atitude cosmopolita docente (PACHECO, 2018), orientada para a inclusão, a diversidade e a equidade, em que a subjetividade é algo que não faz da educação um mero processo de aquisição de conhecimentos, capacidades e atitudes, mas um projeto de realização pessoal, na exploração das ideias de Dewey (1902/2002). Para se conseguir esta atitude cosmopolita, a linguagem da inovação, juntamente com outras, caso das tecnologias digitais, está bem presente nas políticas educacionais, ainda que tenha sido perspectivada mais na procura de um alinhamento curricular com processos de melhoria (FULLAN, 2015) do que no registo de um acontecimento (ŽIŽEK, 2017), que se torna único, espontâneo e não suscetível de ser transformado em regras, que têm alimentado a gramática da escola, isto é, uma escola em crise pelos comuns organizacional, curricular e pedagógico que têm sido marcantes nos últimos dois séculos (LABAREE, 2012; TYACK; CUBAN, 1995).

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Transglobalidade. Cosmopolitismo. Inovação.

Transglobalidad, cosmopolitismo e innovación como lenguas escolares en tiempos de crisis

RESUMEN

Soplando vientos globalizados de contradicción, con el objetivo de hacer que la sociedad sea más común, en un proceso de múltiples uniformidades, el cosmopolitismo emerge como un principio que puede contribuir al pensamiento y la actuación de los sujetos en las instituciones educativas y de formación, desde la educación de la primera infancia hasta la enseñanza

superior. Por lo tanto, en un análisis de los idiomas que actualmente coexisten en el entorno escolar, se menciona la actitud docente cosmopolita (PACHECO, 2018), orientada hacia la inclusión, la diversidad y la equidad, en la que la subjetividad es algo que no hace de la educación un mero proceso de adquirir conocimientos, habilidades y actitudes, pero un proyecto de realización personal, explorando las ideas de Dewey (1902/2002). Para lograr esta actitud cosmopolita, el lenguaje de la innovación, junto con otros, como las tecnologías digitales, está muy presente en las políticas educativas, aunque se ha visto más en la búsqueda de una alineación curricular con los procesos de mejora (FULLAN, 2015) que en el registro de un evento (ŽIŽEK, 2017), que se vuelve único, espontáneo y no susceptible de transformarse en reglas, que han alimentado la gramática escolar, es decir, una escuela en crisis debido al común organizacional, curricular y pedagógico, que han sido notables en los últimos dos siglos (LABAREE, 2012; TYACK; CUBAN, 1995).

PALABRAS CLAVE: Transglobalidad. Cosmopolitismo. Innovación.

* * *

Introduction

In a conceptual-empirical study, Libâneo and Freitas (2018, p.15) present elements “for a critical understanding of the advance of internationalized neoliberal political practices into public schools, which drastically reduce the possibilities of democratization of public schools in Brazil.”

This reality is not unique and will certainly apply to many other education and training systems, especially when guided by an economic vision that affects the internal functioning of schools in organizational, curricular and pedagogical aspects. It is common to say that, in the search for causal relationships, the factors that most contribute to this educational reality concern globalization but neoliberalism and accountability (MAIA, 2019), contributing significantly to the growing presence of economics in approaches of school, including the curricular market theory, which views education as a product and a marketable good (PACHECO, 2018). In addition to the processes of globalization or transglobality, we approach, in

this article, the cosmopolitan attitude of teachers and innovation, especially when the latter is seen as a salvific language of the school, which is allegedly always in crisis, especially when innovation is sought as the solution. urgent for all the problems of society. Hence, the term innovation is the most used nowadays, in association with efficiency practices.

Transglobality

According to the ideas expressed by Foucault in “Birth of Biopolitics”, economic rationality has been established in a matrix of organization of social reality. At the same time, it becomes necessary to deconstruct the principles of neoliberalism applied to education, especially when it is compared to a value subject to the rules of competitiveness of any tradable product. In fact, the ideas that move from transnational organizations to national governments and install themselves as absolute truths in social reality are based on the presumption of the definitive victory of the market and its rules for the reform of education.

In fact, the traveling reforms affect each country as if the economic had subjugated the political, making us believe that there are only market subjects. However, if the market and the State are two sides of the same reality, that is, two “inseparable poles”, it will be recognized that “politics is increasingly pure economic policy” (ANSELM, 2006, p. 153), emphasizing the urgency of criticizing the market as a mandatory matrix for reading education, especially from the impact and effects of globalization and neoliberalism in the structuring of education and training systems.

The presence and absence of the State in education is a duality that makes sense when thought of in terms of an economic logic based on the maxim “less cost and better benefit”, that is, less investment by the State and better school results. However, the State's retreat, in the current education and training policies at the EU (European Union) level, does not

mean the loss of curricular and pedagogical control, only the recentralization of powers, placing itself in schools, however understood as organizational centers of management and administration of results, a significant spirit of enterprise.

In this case, the school builds quality through evaluation processes reported to external references, namely institutional evaluation, with an impact on the domain of school results, the evaluation of teaching performance, within the framework of markedly bureaucratic factors and disconnected from the classroom, and the assessment of learning, shaped by internal and external tests. It is concluded, therefore, that the efficient logic, which floods the documents of transnational and supranational organizations, with emphasis on the IDB (Inter-American Development Bank), BM (World Bank), ODCE (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) and EU, appeals to key concepts that are appropriated by the market logic (CHOO, 2018; BALL, 2014; CHARLOT, 2013).

In this way, economic relations are global and seek uniformities that mark trends in the lives of subjects in all their dimensions, even more so with the imposition of the influential system of technology, in its “non-geographic, decentralized model, guided by databases”. and networks and subject to network effects and exponential growth” (BARTLETT, 2018, p. 4). In this process of multiple uniformities, which coexist in globalization and neoliberalism (SLOBODIAN, 2018), the concept of transglobality (PREYER; SUSSMAN, 2016), through which the different perspectives of looking at the hybridity of the multiplicities that characterize the processes of globalization are expressed, despite the growing existence of a certain similarity between countries in terms of policies, in the context of a society of societies that cannot be reduced to standardization, since uniformity is not the same as homogeneity (BAYLY, 2004). vocal at a social level, resulting from culture, politics and economy (RITZER, 2007), the intersection of spaces and times gives

rise to multiplicities that open up other possibilities not only to what is different, but also to what is not susceptible to being entangled in a mere game. economic, because not everything is numbers and people's lives are more than a mere algorithm.

In this social context, we place the school (and its curriculum), teachers (and their training), students (and their learning) and community actors (and their commitments), although this text essentially talks about the teacher. Therefore, transglobality expresses the plurality of globalization processes that occur in a multiplicity of practices, rhythms and different contexts, even if the dominant tendency is towards uniformity. However, transglobality translates into multiple paths that flow in a plurality of meanings, without it being possible to establish a point of support to leverage definitive solutions. In his analysis of globalization, from a historical perspective, Conrad (2019, p. 75) uses, for example, the concepts of transnationality (mobility, circulation and transference) and multiple modernities, which coexist as a plurality of paths, “between , on the one hand, individual lives and local contexts, and, on the other, anonymous processes on a global scale.” It is in this conjugation of spaces that the micro-histories of the global are observed, since “the global processes were experienced and constituted by local constellations.” (Ibid., p. 163).

A text on teachers needs to be situated in several contexts, where transnational regulation is just a global process that helps to understand the changes introduced in educational policies, in general, and in teacher training, in particular. If globalization imposes patterns of structural reforms, changes in teacher education policies and practices reflect normative perspectives at the national level and unique perspectives at the personal level. It is not possible to understand the reality of schools only from reforms that seek excellence in results, without considering the actors that are part of this reality.

Cosmopolitanism

Being at school implies sharing personal meanings in different places, in the recognition of subjectivity, multiplicity and singularity. In a word, to recognize cosmopolitanism, which emerges as a principle that can contribute to the thinking and acting of subjects in education and training institutions, from early childhood education to higher education.

Thus, different perspectives on the teacher coexist, especially if he is considered a fundamental actor in the curriculum development process (PACHECO; ROLDÃO; ESTRELA, 2018). In this sense, we follow the ideas of Schwab (1969), who, in the identification of commonplaces in the curriculum, places the teacher in a prominent place, before the contents, the student and the context. In another writing, Schwab (1983) argues that the curriculum development process must be based on diversity and locality through the arts of practice, that is, prudence and decision. The teacher actively and deliberately participates in the construction of the curriculum, in the assumption of a cosmopolitan attitude, that is, in the construction of the singular and of diversity, not at the level of the surface of the curriculum, but in the deepest and most personal aspects of learning in any given space. curriculum project.

Despite a multiplicity of perspectives, Lipovetsky and Serroy's (2010, p. 15) conceptual approach has the merit of critically analyzing the hypermodern times in which education, in general, and the school and the teacher, in particular, are intertwined. in a “globalized world system” and “in a world-culture”, that is, “world-culture spreads across the globe the culture of technoscience, the market, the media, consumption and the individual, and with it a whole series of of new problems, not only global in scope ... but also existential.” Such an approach becomes an interrogation that cannot be compatible with maximalist analyzes of curricular engineering, as if the teacher were dependent, in a more particular way, on the implementation of a results-oriented school culture. This vision was

dreamed up in the early 20th century and has periodically been renewed by the social efficiency movement. In this way, the universal administration of the school, the scientific management of the curriculum and the technical training of teachers, culminating, in the beginning of the 2nd half of the 20th century, with the conceptual construction of the Tylerian rationality, that is, of a technical, bureaucratic and linear for the entire education and training project based on these four principles: objectives, contents, activity and evaluation (TYLER, 1949).

Such a paradigm is a response from the postulates of Descartes (1637/1997), with a logical process for the construction of curricular proposals, which is also a process of standardization that are even more present in the processes of globalization. Hence, as Lipovetsky and Serroy (2010, p. 12) postulate, culture has become “a world whose circumference has become everywhere and the center nowhere,” with predominant space for technical solutions regulated transnationally.

The teacher is a central actor in the education and training process (PRIESTLEY; BIESTA; ROBINSON, 2015; BIESTA, 2013), and the diversity of the contexts in which they intervene and, even more, the uniqueness of the learning situations in which they are involved must be recognized. linked by the pedagogical interaction with the students. If, in a context of superdiversity, the teacher is faced with a transnational regulation of his curricular action, it is also true that, in this process of comprehensive change, there is a cosmopolitan teaching attitude, within the various meanings that the term can have, from citizenship and multiculturalism to the point of difference and appreciation of the personal and the singular (APPIAH, 2007).

In explaining the concept, Beck (2016, p. 112) states that “the cosmopolitan aspect consists, above all, in this obligation of the culturally other, which applies to everyone, throughout the world;” this “other as equal and different” (Ibid., p. 114) that takes place in a changing society and in a scenario of world risk, that is, “a new understanding of nature and its

relationship with society, as well as a another understanding of ourselves and others, of social rationality, freedom, democracy and legitimation – including the individual.” (Ibid., p. 43).

This other, equal and different, causes the teacher to change radically, never supported by a logic of professional development anchored in the interests of those who teach, but based on those who learn, with the student being the subject of a practice that does not have a pedagogy of transmission, determined by the external logic of a given knowledge, situated between saying and doing (MEIRIEU, 2008). This means that “the era of hierarchical orders dominated by the figure of a Master has ended: we are entering a new universe of multiplicity, of lateral dynamic connections, of molecular self-organizations that do not need to be totalized.” (ŽIŽEK, 2017, p. 216).

Being a moment, and also a “political and personal issue” (MOREIRA; CÂMARA, 2008, p.31), cosmopolitanism, on its critical side, is based on an “open process by which the social world becomes intelligible; must be seen as the expansion of new ideas, as the opening of spaces, of discourse, as the identification of possibilities for translation and construction of the social world.” (Ibid., p. 31). In this case, Santos (2017, p. 52) writes that “cosmopolitanism has always been a privilege only within the reach of a few”, with “two ways of revisiting the concept: one is to ask who can afford the luxury of it”. to have, another is to ask who needs it”.

Even so, and recognizing differences, identities and subjectivities deconstructed in the ideas of postmodernity by the subject without the existence of canons or standards to follow, the author emphasizes, in the expression subaltern cosmopolitanism, the idea of not silencing voices and identities, giving the subject the ability to assume a critical attitude, in fact in the continuity of a posture of critical surveillance, proposed by Horkheimer (1937/2000), one of the most renowned representatives of the Frankfurt School.

Such subaltern cosmopolitanism is another form of globalization, since neoliberal globalization is not the only one that exists. All over the world, there are social groups, networks, initiatives, organizations and

movements of a local, national and transnational type, which have shown themselves to be active in the effort to face neoliberal globalization and to oppose it with alternatives (SANTOS, 2017).

Both the teaching action and the process of (de)construction of the curriculum translate the understanding of the subject in taking care of himself. In the expression of Foucault (2011, p. 35), the subject is situated in a historical context, situated between the structures of power, whose hermeneutics is a principle for the care of the self, which is “a kind of sting that must be implanted in the flesh of men, embedded in their existence, and constitutes a principle of agitation, a principle of movement, a principle of permanent restlessness in the course of existence.”

This agitation is in the way of taking care of oneself and not taking care of others, in the use of Foucauldian concepts, with the curriculum being the moment that emphasizes the values of innovation, flexibility, international cooperation and sensitivity (MOREIRA; CÂMARA, 2008), through a cosmopolitan attitude of the teacher. This attitude, in addition to recognizing identities, subjectivities and intrinsic ways of thinking and acting, is manifested by a sensitivity that is expressed through creativity, translating into a complex (PINAR, 2017; 2007) and deliberative (HENDERSON, 2015) curricular conversation.).

It is a conversation that values the subject and critically analyzes the tylerian rationality. This, now, presents itself resignified by concepts and procedures of accountability and responsibility, situated in a culture of evaluation, in the sense of a school as a business and a school without ideology, as if it were possible the political utopia of a school without beliefs, attitudes and behaviors, stripped of values and based on aseptic knowledge. In the words of Dewey (1902/2002), the educational process must be seen in terms of a conflict that involves traveling a road with a series of steps, having as an obstacle what it is necessary to learn, and having all the knowledge in the world and losing one's person is a terrible fate of education, for the goal is not knowledge or information, but personal fulfillment.

If the curriculum is a complex and deliberative conversation, the cosmopolitan teaching attitude implies the recognition of creativity, considering that the subject in education is on a path of human formation and not on a circuit of competition. Thus, the obsession around results is not only inscribed in a pragmatic perspective of looking at teacher education and training, but also in a vision of teacher education and training that causes curricular dysfunction, casting a fog over schools and teachers. . Even more: this fog makes the supremacy of a transnational regulation prevail in the way of being of the teacher and in the process of curriculum development, in the face of a cosmopolitan teaching attitude, only possible if education is something that recognizes difference and singularity.

It is, in effect, to apply the pragmatist method to teaching action in the curriculum development process, which “consists of treating ideas no longer as forms, but as a function, we no longer need to ask what the idea is, but rather what she does” (LAPOUJADE, 2017, p. 51). The curriculum-function, effective and lasting over time due to the valorization of doing, is something that is strongly constructed by the processes of transnational regulation, in which the teacher performs an activity oriented towards results. In this case, the curriculum development process follows a “universalist” logic, in fact defended by progressive authors, as is the case of Zeichner (2013, p. 177), when he speaks of globally competent teachers: “there is a need to establish a vision of global competence in teaching that is more realistic and achievable for beginning teachers, rather than simply presenting ideal goals that are likely out of reach for most beginning teachers.”

Indeed, it is the notion of competence used in the most general sense, to characterize a professional, and not in its particular and specific sense, according to the distinction of Esteves (2016, p. 27): “In this [more general] sense , competence is taken as a global trait inherent to the action of the individual or the professional group, a trait on which it is possible to make a value judgment.”

For this, teachers must have a “sociocultural awareness of global subjects” (ZEICHNER, 2013, p. 180). This places them in a different reality from the one in which teachers are considered technicians for preparing their students for the results, in which “punitive modes of accountability were brought to teacher training.” (Ibid., p. 30) due, in large part, to accountability and accountability policies. Such policies are, in their connection to the market, knowledge sharing policies (STEINER-KHAMSI, 2012), in which education and training systems differ little or nothing from each other, such is the language of uniformity and standardization originated by the organizations transnational.

Thus, educational policies, and all decisions on the curriculum and teaching work, coming from transnational organizations, carry “a vision of a school in which the social mission overlaps with the pedagogical mission”. In this sense, the curriculum and the school are “instruments to solve social or economic problems [and] to minimize the undesirable effects of poverty in relation to market interests” (LIBÂNEO, 2013, p. 61). Being a teacher in these times of enormous uncertainty (MORGADO, 2018; 2016), is to be sure that your pedagogical action tends to be strongly regulated either by centralizing and flexible norms, or by discourses that praise innovative schools and teachers.

Innovation

To achieve this cosmopolitan attitude, the language of innovation, along with others, such as digital technologies, is very present in educational policies. The word innovation has become almost magical, as if it were the contemporary solution for improving schools and school results and for the school crisis, in terms of mastery of knowledge and democratization, to be fully resolved at an international level. Hence, innovation transports into the school a language of the future, allegedly

explored as a problem that should lead to better results, in the search for an alignment with improvement processes (FULLAN, 2015).

When studying innovation as a practice, inserted in processes and policies, it is often asked how teachers position themselves in the face of school change. Due to their professional nature, teachers are open to change, in which continuous contact with students requires a continuous commitment, in what Viaud (2015) calls silent innovators, even if they share a feeling of alienation in the face of the cascade of fragmented initiatives. and decided externally.

Despite the teaching grammar (TYACK; CUBAN, 1995), the “ordinary” school (LABAREE, 2012) and the similarity of curricular practices, that is, an invariant structure at the classroom level, it is undoubted that teachers think the future creatively. Teachers implement, in the context of their practices, various facets of creativity that student learning requires, not only due to the pressure of digital technologies, but also due to the search for improved results, even if there is a tendency to repeat innovation initiatives. . However, it is an innovation that is a feature of contingency in the structure, which gives it the idea of an event, because in the affirmation of the teacher as the subject of his action, he is not subsumed under any structural determinism. As universal as there may be, the innovation that is typical of teachers is a decision in singularity, in a deconstruction of structures that make it more difficult and inoperative, which is why it tends to be more of an event than a process.

In this regard, Hargreaves and Fink (2007, p. 20) speak of the “repetitive change syndrome that has two components: initiative overload and change-related chaos”. Likewise, Labaree (2012) recognizes that reforms allow schools to change continuously, while keeping much more of the same, which fits into the organizational, curricular and pedagogical “common” of the school. For Hargreaves and Fink (2007, p. 273), “most educational theories and practices do not give any place to the past.

The arrow of change points only to the future,” so to promote change and innovation in the school, and to paraphrase these authors, the teacher needs not only a windshield, but also a rear-view mirror, with the purpose of valuing the past and considering it in their professional action. This position does not mean that teachers are conservative, although the weight of informal rules formed by the school may contribute to the assumption of some conservative ideas, based on the following assumption: “What exists already deserves to exist; changes have, as a rule, more drawbacks than advantages. Conservatives favor, if not immobility, at least slowness.” (TODOROV, 2005, p. 21).

However, this possible slowness in changing on the part of teachers and schools is counteracted on two fronts: first, by the changes observed in curricular practices, which “are clearly influenced by the colossal changes that are currently taking place in the global economy” (GOODSON, 2008, p. 26), with the repositioning of the teacher's role and its questioning in the construction of a present in which the public school is criticized as a historical legacy and a social good; second, by the changes caused by the use of digital technologies, which at the same time generate enormous possibilities and profound inequalities (LUNARDI, 2015), in addition to many uncertainties (FERREIRA; CARVALHO; LEMBRUGER, 2019).

Indeed, and in terms of substantive changes, teachers are committed: i) to the future, but not obliterating the past and present circumstances that make the school journey difficult for many students; ii) with the real learning of students, and not merely with the achievement of results in standardized tests, learning that is not hurried, but profound, in the integration of key knowledge that is summoned for its realization - collaboration, creativity, thinking critical, citizenship, character and communication, for Fullan, Quinn and Mceachen (2018); iii) with personalized learning, associated with digital technologies, while being critical as to whether these technologies are contributing to a hurried, available, but not reflected knowledge.

On the other hand, digital technologies have a strong impact on the way of learning, with exponential changes provided by artificial intelligence, which will allow for amplified learning to unimaginable levels, in what is called recursive superintelligence (Leonhard, 2017), and which will result from the fusion person-machine, whose cognitive capacity could exceed the most admirable of human intellects in all of history, for example, by implanting “cognitive stimulation devices in the brain to increase our performance.” (Ibid., p. 59).

There is no doubt that digital technologies are changing ways of teaching and learning, with radical changes in the domain of cognitive skills and in the construction of knowledge networks, contributing to the personalization of learning, as promoted by global companies such as Google (PANE). ET AL, 2017).

However, the supposed individuality has an intrinsically collective existence, in the context of a digital obesity, emphasizing the network, the wisdom of the masses, collaboration and uniformity more than identity and diversity. In fact, as Leonhard (2017, p. 215) also mentions, the weight of digital technologies in people's daily lives, and especially when technology is synonymous with efficiency, forces us to ask these two questions: i) “does the idea of total efficiency whether it will become the great point of balance, forcing us to behave more uniformly?”; ii) “will the obsession with technology and its absolute efficiency and consistency end up nullifying the tacit acceptance of difference and human inefficiency?”.

And in this case, innovation is just a process of ensuring effectiveness, being a concept that is strongly associated with accountability and accountability policies.

Conclusion

Among the various languages of the school, which serve both to criticize it and to value it, the school will always be between these two tensions, like a pendulum that oscillates between two extremes; globalization and cosmopolitanism. Globalization, understood as transglobality, means a multiplicity of trends, since uniformity is not homogenization, which are observed at all levels of the subjects' lives, defining parameters and marking trends in thought and action, even more so with the advent of the post-modern society. -truth, in which untruth is no longer a denial of reality, just a way of legitimizing certain perspectives of domination and control of the other, in disregard of basic rules of personal and social coexistence. Following a conceptual perspective of valuing identities and differences, in a heterogeneous society of ideas and ways of looking at the singular, cosmopolitanism allows us to see innovation as an event, and not as mere efficiency, which can mean non-alignment with established rules. by transnational organisms, seeking, on the contrary, to be a unique and spontaneous moment. It is rightly said that teachers are silent innovators in their pedagogical work.

References

- ANSELM, J. *As aventuras da mercadoria*. Para uma nova crítica do valor. Lisboa, Antígona, 2006.
- APPIAH, K.A. *Cosmopolitanism*. Ethics in a world of strangers. London, Penguin Books, 2007.
- BALL, S. J. *Educação global S. A*. Novas redes políticas e o imaginário neoliberal. Ponta Grossa, Editora UEPG, 2014.
- BARTLETT, J. *The people Vs Tech*. How the internet is killing democracy (and how we save it). London: Ebury Press, 2018.
- BAYLY, C.A. *The birth of the modern world 1780:1914*. Global connections and comparisons. London, Wiley-Blackwell, 2004.

BECK, U. *Sociedade de risco mundial*. Em busca da segurança perdida. Lisboa, Edições 70, 2016.

BIESTA, G. *Para além da aprendizagem*. Educação democrática para um futuro humano. Belo Horizonte, Autêntica, 2013.

CHARLOT, B. *Da relação com o saber às práticas educativas*. São Paulo, Cortez Editora, 2013.

CHOO, S.S. Approaching twenty-first century education from a cosmopolitan perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, v. 50, n. 2, p. 162-181, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2017.1313316>.

CONRAD, S. *O que é a história global?* Lisboa: Edições 70, 2019.

DESCARTES, R. *Discurso do método*. 3ª ed. Lisboa, Guimarães Editores, 1637/1997.

DEWEY, J. *A escola e a sociedade*. A criança e o currículo. Lisboa, Relógio D'Água, 1902/2002.

ESTEVES, M. Construção e desenvolvimento de competências profissionais dos professores em contextos de aprendizagem em rede. IN: PRYJMA, M. F.; OLIVEIRA, O. S. (Org.). *O desenvolvimento profissional em questão*. Curitiba, Editora UTFPR, 2016, p.23-46.

FERREIRA, G. M.; CARVALHO, J. S.; LEMBRUGER, M. S. Tecnologias digitais: a máquina, o humano e os espaços de resistência. *Revista Educação & Cultura Contemporânea*, v. 16, n. 43, p. 1-10, 2019.

FOUCAULT, M. *A Hermenêutica do sujeito*. São Paulo, Editora WMF Martins Fontes Ltda, 2011.

FOUCAULT, M. *Nascimento da biopolítica*. Lisboa, Edições 70, 2010.

FULLAN, M. *The new meaning of Educational change*. 5th ed. New York, Teachers College Press, 2015.

FULLAN, M.; QUINN, J.; MCEACHEN, J. *Deep learning*. Engage the world change the world. Thousand Oaks, California, Corwin, 2018.

GOODSON, I. *As políticas de currículo e de escolarização*. Petrópolis, Editora Vozes, 2008.

HARGREAVES, A.; FINK, D. *Liderança sustentável*. Porto, Porto Editora, 2007.

HENDERSON, J.G. A new curriculum development: inspiration and rationale. In: HENDERSON, J. G. et al (Ed.). *Reconceptualizing curriculum development*. Inspiring and informing action. New York, Routledge, 2015, p. 1-34.

HORKHEIMER, M. *Teoría tradicional y teoría crítica*. Barcelona, Paidós, 1937/2000.

LABAREE, D. F. School syndrome: understanding the USA's magical belief that schooling can somehow improve society, promote access, and preserve advantage. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, v. 44, n. 2, p.143-163, 2012.

LAPOUJADE, D. William James, a construção da experiência. São Paulo, n-1 edições, 2017.

LEONHARD, G. *Tecnologia versus humanidade*. O confronto futuro entre a máquina e o homem. Lisboa, Gradiva, 2017.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Internacionalização das políticas educacionais e repercussões no funcionamento curricular e pedagógico das escolas. In: LIBÂNEO, J. C.; SUANNO, M. V.; LIMONTA, S. V. (Org.). *Qualidade da escola pública*. Políticas educacionais, didática e formação de professores. Goiânia, CEPED, 2013, p. 13-46.

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; FREITAS, R. (Org.). *Políticas educacionais neoliberais e escola pública*. Uma qualidade restrita de educação escolar. Goiânia, Editora Espaço Acadêmico, 2018.

LIPOVESTSKY, G.; SERROY, J. *A cultura-mundo: resposta a uma sociedade desorientada*. Lisboa, Edições 70, 2010.

LUNARDI, G. Tecnologia é a resposta, mas qual era a questão?: sobre políticas de inserção de tecnologias nas escolas e mudanças curriculares. In: MORGADO, J. C.; LUNARDI, G.; MOREIRA, A. F.; PACHECO, J. A. (Org.). *Currículo, internacionalização e cosmopolitismo*. Desafios contemporâneos. Santo Tirso, De Facto, 2015, p. 321-332.

MAIA, I. B. *Globalização e políticas de accountability: um estudo exploratório no contexto da Avaliação Externa das Escolas*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Ciências da Educação – Desenvolvimento Curricular e Avaliação) – Instituto de Educação, Universidade do Minho, Braga, p. 158. 2019.

MEIRIEU, P. *Pedagogia entre o dizer e o fazer*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2008.

MOREIRA, A. F.; CÂMARA, M. J. Reflexões sobre currículo e identidade: implicações para a prática pedagógica. In: MOREIRA, A. F.; CANDAU, V. M. (Org.). *Multiculturalismo*. Diferenças culturais e práticas pedagógicas. Petrópolis, Editora Vozes, 2008, p. 38-66.

MORGADO, J. C. O papel do professor no desenvolvimento do currículo: conformidade ou mudança? In: PRYJMA, M. F.; OLIVEIRA, O. S. (Org.). *O desenvolvimento profissional em questão*. Curitiba, Editora UTFPR, 2016, p. 47-62.

MORGADO, J. C. Currículo e políticas educacionais contemporâneas: que papel para o professor? In: AGUIAR, M. A.; MOREIRA, A. F.; PACHECO, J. A. (Org.). *Currículo: entre o comum e o singular* (pp. 63-84). Recife, ANPAE, Disponível em: <http://www.anpae.org.br/BibliotecaVirtual/coloquiocurriculo2016.html#fane7-tab>. Acesso em: 31 agosto 2018.

OCDE. *The future of education and skills*, Education, 2030. Paris, OECD, 2018.

PACHECO, J. A. Para uma teoria curricular de mercado. In: PACHECO, J. A.; ROLDÃO, M. C.; ESTRELA, M. T. (Org.). *Estudos de currículo*. Porto, Porto Editora, 2018, p. 57-88.

PACHECO, J. A.; ROLDÃO, M. C.; ESTRELA, M. T. (Org.). *Estudos de currículo*. Porto, Porto Editora, 2018.

PANE, J. F. et al. *Informing progress: insights on personalized learning implementation and effects*. Disponível em: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2042.html. Acesso em: 23 julho 2018.

PINAR, W. F. *O que é a teoria curricular?* Porto, Porto Editora, 2007.

PINAR, W. F. Working from within, together. In: M. A. DOLL (Ed.). *The reconceptualization of curriculum studies*. A festschrift in honor of William F. Pinar. New York, Routledge, 2017, p. 194-205.

PREYER, G.; SUSSMAN, M. *Varieties of multiple modernities: new research design*, Leiden: Brill, 2016.

PRIESTLEY, M.;BIESTA, G. ROBINSON, S. (2015). *Teacher agency: An ecological approach*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

RITZER, G. *The globalization of nothing 2*. London: Pine Forge Press, 2007.

SANTOS, B. S. *As bifurcações da ordem*. Revolução, cidade, campo e indignação. Coimbra, Almedina, 2017.

SCHWAB, J. *The practical: a language for curriculum*. School Review, v.78, n.11, p. 1-23, 1969.

SCHWAB, J. *The practical 4: something for curriculum professors to do*. Curriculum Inquiry, v.13, n.3, p. 239-265, 1983.

SLOBODIAN, Q. *Globalists: the end of empire and the birth of neoliberalism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2018.

STEINER-KHAMSI, G. Understanding policy borrowing and lending. Building comparative policy studies. In: STEINER-KKAMSI, G.; WALDOW, F. (Eds.), *World yearbook of education 2012*. Policy borrowing and lending in education. London, Routledge, 2012, p. 5-17.

TODOROV, T. *O jardim imperfeito*. São Paulo, EDUSP, 2005.

TYACK, D.; CUBAN, L. *Tinkering toward utopia*. A century of public school reform. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1995.

TYLER, R. *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1949.

VIAUD, M. *Les innovateurs silencieux*. Histoire des pratiques d'enseignement à l'université depuis 1950. Grenoble, Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, 2015.

ZEICHNER, K. M. *Políticas de formação de professores nos Estados Unidos*. Como e por que elas afetam vários países do mundo. Belo Horizonte, Autêntica, 2013.

ŽIŽEK, S. *Acontecimento*. Uma viagem filosófica através de um conceito. Rio de Janeiro, Zahar, 2017.

Received in April 2022.

Approved in July 2022.