

DOSSIÊ

Educação Especial: diferenças, currículo e processos de ensino e aprendizagem

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas

Revista acadêmica, avaliada por pares,
independente, de acesso aberto, e multilíngüe



aapae | epaa

Arizona State University

Volume 22 Number 80

Agust 11th, 2014

ISSN 1068-2341

Curriculum and school knowledge in contemporary society: challenges for the education of people with disabilities

Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes

Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (UDESC)



Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva

Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS)

Brasil

Citation: Mendes, G. M. L. & Silva, F. de C. T. (2014). Curriculum and school knowledge in contemporary society: challenges for the education of people with disabilities (Translated version. Originally published as: Mendes, G. M. L. & Silva, F. de C. T. (2014). Currículo e conhecimento escolar na contemporaneidade: desafios para a escolarização de sujeitos com deficiência. *Arquivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas*, 22(80). Dossiê *Educação Especial: diferenças, currículo e processos de ensino e aprendizagem*. Editoras convidadas: Márcia Denise Pletsch & Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n80.2014>

Abstract: Contemporary studies of the curriculum challenge the social and scientific legitimacy of the knowledge taught. Confronting this historic challenge of curriculum studies appears crucial when taken together with the search for understanding the processes of schooling for individuals with disabilities. Imbued with that challenge, this paper presents a set of reflections resulting from research carried out by the Research and Studies Group – School Culture Monitoring (OCE) and the Centre of School Practices (OPE). Those observations aim to clarify some of the evidence that is taken as a motto for analyzing the relationship between curriculum and school knowledge in contemporary society and its implications for the education of people

Página web: <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/>

Facebook: /EPAAA

Twitter: @epaa_aape

Artigo recebido: 28/02/2014

Revisões recebidas: 7/04/2014

Aceito: 28/05/2014

with disabilities. In this context, our research agenda seeks to reconfigure the ongoing investigation of school practices and discourses and their relationship with knowledge.

Keywords: Curriculum; School knowledge; Schooling; people with disabilities.

Curriculum y conocimiento de la escuela en la sociedad contemporánea: los retos de la educación de las personas con discapacidad

Resumen: Los desafíos contemporáneos interrogan el currículum, en particular, acerca de la validez social y científica de los conocimientos a la enseñanza. Frente a este reto de la historia de los estudios curriculares parece ser crucial cuando se agrega con él, tratamos de entender los procesos de escolarización de las personas con discapacidad. Imbuido de este reto, en este trabajo se presenta un conjunto de reflexiones que surgen de la investigación desarrollada en el marco del Equipos de Estudio e Investigación Observatorio de la Cultura Escolar (OCE) y el Observatorio de Prácticas Escolares (OPE). Estas reflexiones objetivan aclarar algunas evidencias que se toman como tema para promover el estudio de la relación entre el currículum y el conocimiento escolar en la sociedad contemporánea y sus implicaciones para la educación de las personas con discapacidad. En este contexto, nuestras investigaciones siguen, en todo momento, la reconfiguración de la necesidad continua de las prácticas de investigación y discursos de/en el trabajo escolar con el conocimiento.

Palabras clave: Currículum; escolarización; personas con discapacidad.

Resumo: Os desafios contemporâneos interrogam o currículo, em especial, acerca da validade social e científica do conhecimento a ser ensinado. Enfrentar esse histórico desafio dos estudos curriculares parece ser fulcral quando, agregada a ele, buscamos entender os processos de escolarização de sujeitos com deficiência. Imbuídos desse desafio, o presente texto apresenta um conjunto de reflexões decorrentes de pesquisas desenvolvidas ao abrigo dos Grupos de Estudos e Pesquisas Observatório de Cultura Escolar (OCE) e o Observatório de Práticas Escolares (OPE). Tais reflexões objetivam explicitar algumas evidências que são tomadas como mote para promover análises sobre as relações entre currículo e conhecimento escolar na contemporaneidade e suas implicações para a escolarização de sujeitos com deficiência. Nesse contexto, nossas agendas de pesquisas seguem, em todo o momento, reconfigurando a permanente necessidade da investigação das práticas e dos discursos da/na escola no trabalho com o conhecimento.

Palavras-Chave: Currículo; Conhecimento escolar; Escolarização; Sujeitos com deficiência.

Introductory Notes

The fact that certain traditions and the ‘normative’ content are constructed with school knowledge is irrefutable evidence of their legitimacy (Apple, 2006, p. 83).

Using an inter-institutional perspective, under the umbrella of the Research and Studies Group – School Culture Monitoring (*Grupos de Estudos e Pesquisas, Observatório de Cultura Escolar - OCE*) and the Centre of School Practices (*Observatório de Práticas Escolares - OPE*), in recent years, studies and research have been carried out guided by different objects and procedures. All determined by the same theoretical and methodological reference: the Marxist legacy and referential critics of the curriculum, distinction perspectives, and the recontextualization which has pursued relations between the socio-historical field, curriculum and school practices, and their possible contributions to school inclusion.

This framework of analysis brings us to the perspective of the curriculum as a territory organized through regulations, orientation, professional interest and learning, based on the assumption of the entirety of educational action, curricular differentiation/flexibility, and the integration of educational activities. It also brings us to the finding that the debate about which knowledge should be ‘taught’ in school is at the same time influenced by contexts, practices,

subjects, and policies, and by the actual demands of contemporaneity. In the specific case of the schooling of individuals with disabilities, this debate still needs to be faced.

Our aim is thus through the evidence created by the investigative work of these two groups to share in this text a set of reflections, which by looking at the curriculum through the discussion of school knowledge as an object of study, will contribute to the school inclusion process in the policy proposition area and the contexts of practices.

Analyzing the objects, documents, and practices which are our sources of investigation, we created three hypotheses around which we organized our research: namely, that the effect of education policies on curricular organization, defined at the macro level, do not express the necessary correspondence to the practices instituted at the meso and micro levels; the discussion of school knowledge needs to be recontextualized based on contemporary demands and specificities; it is impossible to think of a research agenda about the education of the individuals with disabilities, in relation to special education, without taking into account the question of the school knowledge made available to all students, irrespective of their disabilities.

Taking these hypotheses into account, our argument is built around two central cores: the first highlights some of the current tensions which involve the definition of school knowledge is validated, while in the second seek to elucidate the relations between curriculum and knowledge, analyzed in the research of the groups mentioned above. Finally, these findings support some considerations about the implications of all these questions for the education process of disabled individuals.

What Curriculum and which knowledge in the contemporary school?

What is the important knowledge which students should be capable of acquiring in school? If, as specialists in the curriculum, we cannot answer this question, those who can will remain undefined and it is more probable that this question will be left to the pragmatic and ideological decision of administrators and politicians (YOUNG, 2013, p.13).

In a paper given in Brazil, and afterwards published as a book chapter, Michael Young, argued about why the role of curricular studies in the definition of school knowledge needs to be studied and learned in school. Looking at the classic questions which were – and continue to be – the subject of the sociology of education, such as ‘What is school knowledge?’ ‘Who does it serve?’ ‘How is it produced and transmitted?’, he analyzed the curricular reforms underway in various countries, especially England, highlighting why these questions continued to be emergent in this field.

Responding to the criticisms raised by different perspectives, especially post-modernism and post-structuralism, about the theorizations constructed under the auspices of sociology of the curriculum and school knowledge, Young constructs very provocative theories. These have a particular meaning when the subject is the role of school when working with knowledge of the current day.

Facing these questions necessarily involves discussing what should be learned and taught in schools which see themselves as contemporaneous. Focusing on knowledge, selected and learned in school, instead of methodological aspects (such as how something is done) which are always in evidence, is the challenge of our research efforts.

According to Young (2013) these questions throw light on the crisis in Curricular Studies. The loss of confidence in the potentially emancipatory role of the school, associated with an idea that “knowledge in itself has no intrinsic meaning or value” (p.17), assisted the construction of proposals which hyper-valorize students as subjects of learning and constructors of knowledge, to the extent that in a society in which knowledge is everywhere, teachers are no longer the principal subjects in the teaching and learning process. Refuting these perspectives, Young states:

Teachers cannot escape the instructional element of their role. Parents send their children to school expecting that they will acquire the specialized knowledge that there is no access to at home (...) Through proper pedagogy, which involves the commitment of the student, knowledge can have opposite consequences – it can liberate students to have new thoughts and even to think what ‘has not yet been thought.’ (...) curricular studies should start not from the student as a learner, but from the right of the student or his access to knowledge (Young, 2013, p.17/18).

The crisis of cultural authority (Dussel, 2013) which the school curriculum is facing reconfigures the subjects of the teaching and learning process in new roles. According to Dussel (2013a), digital culture and the logic of the *do it yourself* (DIY) curriculum, have impugned the modern curriculum. It is interesting to note how much of a disharmony exists between the clamors of school inclusion for disabled individuals: more school, more education, more knowledge, at the same time that we are becoming aware of the incapacity of modern massified schooling to fulfill its legacy.

The numerous criticisms about students who do not dominate basic operations, the proper use of language, and who have incipient scientific learning reverberate especially in fundamental teaching, although it is also related to secondary education, and culminate in the proposition of numerous policies which try to find, via different paths, what we call the ‘updating of the school curriculum’ and obvious fundamental teaching itself. From the point of view of ‘what to teach?’, once again it appears that there has been a ‘right turn,’ as Apple would say, with an emphasis on basic content linked to the performance of learning assessments centered on student results. It appears that the question ‘what does the individual receive as schooling?’ matters little and the emphasis has been moved to methodologies, resources, and assessment. In other, the eminently modern idea that the school is an important place to socialize knowledge which deserves to be learned, seems to have given way to other demands. Among them the need for digital inclusion.

It is important to highlight that, unlike in the past when technological innovations reached the school solely and exclusively through policies, currently in addition to policies they come from students. If students, ‘immersive readers’, as Santaella (2011) aptly describes them, are connected to their portable devices the whole time, this portability also interferes in the daily life of school. The impacts of this have been very varied.

Nevertheless, from the point of view of curricular policies, the massive distribution of technological equipment for the ‘updating of the school curriculum,’ has been studied constantly by the Center of School Practices (Lunardi-Mendes; Gaspar da Silva; Sossai, 2013) and is part of the role of concerns and reflections such as the following:

“For those who make the decisions to buy and deploy computers in schools, it is now time to examine the assumptions propelling reform through technology. It is now time to ask: how do these monies help us achieve our larger social and civic goals? In what ways can teachers use technology to create better communities and build powerful citizens? The answers to these questions, as I have argued, are in the minds and hands not only of teachers but of policymakers, public officials, corporate elites, and parents who set the educational agenda. Without attention to workplace conditions in which teachers labor and without respect for expertise they bring to the task, there is little hope that new technologies will have more than a minimal impact on teaching and learning. And without a broader vision of the social and civic role that schools perform in a democratic society, our current excessive focus on technology use in schools runs the danger of trivializing our nation’s core ideals. (Cuban, 2001, p. 197).

In this perspective, we have worked in the way indicated by Sancho (2009), in which in

many policies the insertion of new technologies in school is understood as a ‘Trojan horse,’ capable ‘in itself’ of bearing the capacity for change and innovation. Nevertheless, we understand that investigating the curricular movements present here is fundamental to thinking about the question of school knowledge. In relation to the latter, we identify with what Dussel stated (2013b, p. 20):

... the importance and hierarchy of academic content in the school space is something that has been discussed since the introduction of Information and Communication Technology, and with antecedents in the debates about skill v content, academic knowledge v training for life, intellectual education v holistic education, amongst many others. These debates speak about the struggles over the curriculum which have in some cases lasted for more than a century (cf. Kliebard, 1986). This has gained strength today, when a displacement of knowledge and academic-scientific legitimation in the public sphere is visible, which also affects schools. The role of academic knowledge, which is defined by being systematic and rigorous, submitted to the proof of verification and with public and coded validation criteria, is being questioned in society in general, which tends to impose a system of opinion whose arguments are validated by criteria of celebrity (which states it) and the value of emotional authenticity which grants it (cf. Bolstanki and Thévenot, 2006). These questions raise challenges that are transcendent to democratic life, which is based on agreements about the truth and justice which transcend sentimentalism and the charisma of the class; and indicate that caution is needed in the celebration of new measures and the reign of ‘I believe – I feel – I think.’”

The same care which the author highlights by identifying the current tensions imposed by new technologies of knowledge, also deserves to be addressed at the ideas of the transformation of the classroom into the most interesting space possible, using digital tools which merge it with the environments in which students are inserted in the virtual universe, such as virtual 3D worlds and social medias.

Some research results¹ have shown that these activities present new difficulties for thematic expansion and the construction of knowledge. They are dressed with a ‘didacticization’ which does not help school practices advance. The class seems to become ‘empty’ of content and rich in activities, with students not clearly identifying with the difference between the space of leisure, sociability, and the place for working with knowledge.

As Young explains (2010, p.180):

The current tension between the two curricular models, which is not resolved, gives rise, in the best of hypotheses, to practical modifications of the ‘curriculum of the past.’ These alterations avoid establishing new specialist networks which can take into account global economic changes, without losing the crucial autonomy allowed by the old disciplines.

Research carried out to investigate similar programs in Latin America points in the same direction. Some analyses carried out by the Equally Connecting Program² in Argentina show that teachers used netbooks to look for information and to a lesser extent to ask for collaborative texts (Dussel, 2012). The assessment of the Ceibal Plan³ in Uruguayan primary schools also points to similar data: according to the information collected, teachers make a limited use of netbooks and do not take advantage of the possibilities of new technologies. As Dussel points

¹ We will look at most especially here results of the research entitled “Connected Classes: curricular changes and collaborative learning in PROUCA schools in Santa Catarina” carried out with CNPq funding, and the initial results of the research project “Tablets, Computers, and Laptops: policies, infrastructure, and pedagogical aspects of the insertion of new technologies in school,” funded by OBEDUC/CAPES.

² For greater information, see: <http://portales.educacion.gov.ar/conectarigualdad/>.

³ For more information about the Ceibal Plan, see: <http://www.ceibal.edu.uy>.

out (2012, p. 213):

The most common school uses are not relevant in terms of knowledge, and do not expand use by people, which focus on entertainment and the logic of quick searches, without more complex criteria about the quality of information and the production and circulation of texts.

Our research, especially in the education research groups,⁴ has been trying to deal with these questions, also reflecting how this impacts on the schooling of individuals with disabilities. If “the struggle for teaching was always a struggle for knowledge” (Young, 2013, p. 27), how is this situation configured for individuals with intellectual disabilities?

Is the contemporary curriculum, with its crisis of cultural authority, capable of promoting inclusion? For what school knowledge is it worth continuing fighting for? These are questions which are far from being answered and which are alive in our research agendas.

The analyzes produced by the Education Research Groups: the relationship between curriculum and knowledge

The idea that the school is primordially a cultural agent of transmission or knowledge, leads us to the question ‘What knowledge?’ and, in particular, questions what type of knowledge is the school responsible for transmitting. Accepting that schools have this role, it is implicit that the types of knowledge are differentiated. In other words, for educational purposes some types of knowledge are more valuable than others, and differences form the foundations of the differentiation between curricular or school knowledge and non-school knowledge. In school knowledge there is something which allows the acquisition of some types of knowledge. Therefore, my answer to the question ‘What are schools for?’ is that they train or can train young people to acquire knowledge which for most of them cannot be acquired at home or in their communities, and for adult in their work places (Young, 2007, p. 1293-1294).

The research carried out and/or underway was/is delineated, being concerned with, on the one hand, proposals, references and/or curricular directives organized by teaching networks and, on the other, school disciplines, school books and the organization of space and time in the perspective of the history of the curriculum practiced, organized by a school institution in particular.

In this context, we seek to identify and construct analyses about (official and/or academic) discourses addressed to practice, as well as practices that may or may not be organized on the basis of these discourses, with the aim of understanding the nature and the specific organization of the processes through which the school curriculum is/was configured and developed.

We thus defined the curriculum as a set of means, objects, and artifacts which were/are specifically prepared to facilitate the development of educational processes in schools and classrooms. Therefore, “it starts from a selective tradition, resulting from the selection of someone, from the vision of some group about what legitimate knowledge is” (Apple, 1995, p. 59).

When dealing with investigations with curricular proposals, references, and directives organized by teaching networks, we focus on the writing of a particular curricular history, in other words, of specific teaching networks – state and municipal – in a region of Brazil – and

⁴ Especially the Tablet, Computer, and Laptop Group and the network research group coordinated by Prof. Márcia Denise Pletsch, which involves UFRRJ, UDESC and UNIVALI, called Education of Students with Disabilities: Public Policies, Cognitive Processes, and the Assessment of Learning.

particularly of a stage in base education: fundamental education.

This writing was linked to the study of the interpretations chosen/implemented in a set of curricular documents,⁵ which allowed the understanding of the role the prescribed curriculum played or plays in the social construction of knowledge. In fact, the existence of a curricular mentality in teaching networks, understood as awareness of the system in which it is inserted and the choices which orientate it, as well as the model which conveys it, on which the actions carried out are based, institutionalizes, according to Nóvoa, “various elements which can be contradictory at times” (1991, p. 52), in other words, aspects which lead to a reinforcement of state power and, simultaneously, “technology which mediates the distribution of power” (1991, p. 53).

In recent decades it has been common in discourses about school education and the school to point out that the curriculum is not an innocent and neutral element for the disinterested transmission of social knowledge. Rather it is strongly determined by the relations of powers which unequally distribute opportunities for school success among different socio-cultural groups.

Curricular documents create and recreate places, producing an educational, economic, and social world through an organized set of meanings and practices which are related to a central effective and dominant process of these meanings, values, and actions which are experienced in knowledge, and through access to it.

It is through these set of meanings and practices that the unequal economic and cultural control of schools becomes possible. Schools are also responsible for the preparation of knowledge, legitimating what should be taught, performing an ideological and cultural function of a tradition which is selective.

In curricular studies, versatility, competence, and practical importance of knowledge has served as the justification for a new curriculum which is validated by the values of emancipation, integration, social relevance, and the updating of knowledge. It is in the framework of these ideas that we conceive knowledge, schools, and their professionals, as active agents in the processed which make the curriculum richer, more rigorous, and more reflexive.

Nevertheless, we understand that the production and distribution of knowledge occurs only through the localization of the domination of the dominated, not by the decolonization of the knowledge that creates/created this condition. We understand that curricular documents produce a specific culture, with the organization and selection of types of symbols, which are directly related to the types of students and manner in which they use this type of knowledge, which is socially stratified and represent conflicts. Through these conflicts it is possible to understand the economic and cultural functions of educational institutions.

Furthermore, we understand that the role of social agents (administrators, teachers, and students), who to a certain extent are the protagonists of the current school system, should reflect the knowledge which is materialized in a form of documents and thus consciously selected.

Our analyses show that the set of curricular documents appears to be conceived solely as guides, to orient teaching, frequently belittling the debate of ‘why do something’ due to the emphasis on ‘how to do it.’ Nonetheless, these documents profess the idea of progress and intend to be innovative and institute a new logic of school organization and access to school knowledge.

⁵ A set of five local curricular documents, of which **three** were published by the municipal teaching network between 2000 and 2008, entitled *Sequência Didática* (2000); *Diretrizes Curriculares para o ensino fundamental* (2003); and, *Referencial Curricular para o ensino de 9 anos* (2008) and **two** by the state network in 2000, *Escola Guaicuru – vivendo uma nova lição* and in 2007 *Referencial Curricular da Educação Básica* (Ensino Fundamental).

Curricular documents are part of this legitimation as they are prepared on the basis of intentionalities existing in the distribution of knowledge. How society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits, and assesses formal knowledge reflects the distribution of power and the principles of social control (Bernstein, 1996, p. 149).

The discussions which question curricular preparation allow the curriculum to be thought of as both a clash and political negotiation resulting not in a consensual preparation space, but one of projects, albeit provisional or instable, disputing hegemony in an constant struggle to establish meaning.

The selection of knowledge is the greatest ally in this establishment of meanings, since it meets the interests of various groups, mostly contradictory, but which have in their contents common principles. According to Santos (2009, p. 13), the content can be divided into four blocks, namely:

1. Content must have social relevance, attract interest, and allow student development;
2. Content must provide opportunities for the construction of essential skills and abilities for daily life in society;
3. Content must allow students a critical and citizen-based education, so that students can question, argue, and detect and resolve problems;
4. Content must stimulate creativity and the involvement of cultural production which allow students to learn to deal with difference, understanding and respecting each other.

The investigation of school knowledge involves the determinations of specific social groups in their legitimation, which according to Young (2007) can be defined as 'powerful knowledge' and 'knowledge of the powerful.' The idea of 'knowledge of the powerful' is linked to the fact that determined knowledge has historically been accessed by those with greater power in society. Powerful knowledge is defined as specialized knowledge, seen as capable of offering new forms of thinking about the world. This knowledge justifies the investment of families in school education, since offering access to specialization is an aim of schooling.

In relation to our research objects, in other words curricular documents, relationship with knowledge has a strong tendency to planning and a lesser tendency towards 'researching the different nuances of its content, which leads to a permanent decision making process on the part of teachers, revealing a set of aspects which induce experience, ideas, values, intentions, purposes, and aims, in the ordering of 'personhood.' Not only an educational question is involved, but rather one that is intrinsically ideological and political.

Open and hidden knowledge in school environments and the principles of the selection, organization, and assessment of this knowledge, are governed by value and come from a much broader universe of knowledge that can be selected. Therefore, they should not be accepted as data, but rather problematized – placed between brackets if you prefer – in such a way that the social and economic ideologies and the institutionally standardized meanings which are behind them can be carefully examined (Apple, 2006, p. 83).

The explanation for this fact appears to be in the production of discourses operated in the official re-contextualizing field by its 're-contextualizing agents.' In this field there is a tug of war between the different agents who dispute the definition of orientations around the inclusive school. These agents seek to influence the official re-contextualizing field in order to guarantee their interests in the curriculum, including in the defense of the inclusive school, because it is democratic, and links citizenship, culture, difference, and social inclusion, the supposed elucidative principles of its capacity to be for all.

In light of this knowledge protagonizes different belongings in specific academic

disciplines, which at the limits of our analyses, can be understood as encouraging practices anchored on traditional skills at the level of reading and writing, expanded by the need to locate it in a space-time which moves from the 'participation dimension' to the emergence of a type of subject educated by 'new type of education,' open to an also new set of values.

The uniformization of school knowledge through isolated disciplines means that content appears fragmented, preventing students from establishing relations with their reality. In this context, knowledge comes to be a form of the production-reproduction of a new school morality, in which individuals play a leading position in the socialization and reproduction process of values, since it is an efficient space in the production and conception of a discipline of equality, not to mention of homogeneity.

In these analyses the crucial question resides in the way curricular experiences are organized and the implicit knowledge in them, in such a way that curricular documents are singularized in expressions of schemes of meaning, which operate with homogenous logic, though often dressed as distinct ones.

Each conception, whether referring to school, knowledge, students, teaching, amongst others, in the documents analyzed, requires differentiated attention, since its ultimate objective is to place in evidence didactic work. If we consider that didactic work is something dynamic, structured around a high level of unpredictability which to a good extent has to be assumed as an inherent component in this process, then we are facing an abstraction.

Moreover, this abstraction is useful to understand the determinants of a didactic work which is built to meet the expectations of disciplinary knowledge, instead of seeking a significant integration between experience and knowledge, which seems to be treated as a currency of exchange in a context of accumulation. Stated otherwise, curricular knowledge is dominated by an ideological consensus in which both daily experience and this knowledge encourage messages of normative and cognitive consensus.

The cognitive dimension therefore appears to be inseparable from interpretative curricular schemes, which leads us to the understanding that the curriculum acquires meaning in the practices of difference and not by differentiating practices, resulting from the cultural mediation powers of administrators and teachers in relation to the imposition and/or proposition of trajectories already legitimated as ideal.

From this order there emerges the structuration and legitimation of the process and the product of didactic work, irrespective of whether or not they cross with daily experiences. Understanding this occurrence as mechanical and immediate, it can be seen that changes in the sense of de-stratifying or re-stratifying knowledge can be more an object of social resistance to possible threats to socially privileged values, standards, powers, and privileges, than an attempt to make more accessible or even transpose the demarcations of knowledge.

Final notes: curriculum, knowledge, schooling of subjects with disabilities, and the updating of research agendas

The idea of a 'curriculum of the future' continues to be this – a tendency and an idea which is difficult to find in any institutional form. It is undeniable that it still has a long path to follow in relation to the establishment of a basis of trust which demonstrates that it is a manner to encourage high level learning. If we want to fulfil the promises which are made in its name, it will be necessary to create new forms of association and trust and new types of specialists (Young, 2010, p. 180).

The work of the Educational Research Groups aim to achieve what is understood by the 'curricularization' of the discussion of the schooling process of individuals with disabilities (Lunardi-Mendes, 2011). If the focus of the school inclusion process is the schooling insertion/success of individuals with disabilities, discussion of schooling knowledge needs to be

at the center of the debate.

What defence should we make of a curriculum which is valid for individuals with disabilities? What knowledge has to be taught? As we have highlighted here, we have identified from the point of view of curricular documents a homogenization of discourse. In other words, curricular knowledge is dominated by an ideological consensus in which both daily experience and the consensus itself encourages normative and cognitive messages. As a result experiences of curricular differentiation, whether in relation to discourse or practices, are difficult to encounter.

This difficulty is worsened by the interpretation that curricular differentiation /flexibility should occur through immediate, unreflecting, adherence in which school agents stop being subjects in a learning process determined by the configuration of meanings and behaviours which are prepared in a particular form, induced by a context that is more or less stimulated by fragmentary schemes of thought and actions, loaded with myths and prejudice, on which interpretations of reality will be based.

Here the principle of school reality in force is the principle of performance, which makes subjects involve themselves with pedagogical work and alienating educational relations. Educational work is only justified by its utility, losing completely its potential for self-reflection and criticality, consequently educational relations become reified and depersonalized. One of the characteristics of this reification is it remains restricted to itself, together with its own weakness, seeking to justify itself at any cost.

As a result the relationship of the individual with learning takes place through the incapacity of thought to impose itself, since it is can already be found, lurking, in the need to fit in and subordination to the authority of scientific knowledge. "People believe they are safe when they guide themselves by scientific rules obeying a scientific ritual, and surround themselves with science" (Adorno, 1995, p. 70).

Individuals with disabilities study until their learning possibilities are exhausted, since the actual educational dynamic solicits results which can only be achieved by presenting a model considered normative. School inclusion, therefore, cannot be reduced simply the placement in the class of historically differentiated and stigmatized individuals in relation to a curriculum which presents serious quality problems expressed in the low levels of learning and the resulting high level of repeating and evasion. For this fact to materialize, the school needs to emphasize reflection and dialogue, determined by knowledge and clarification, in other words, by everything which culture establishes as true in the struggle against myths.

The actual characteristics of contemporaneity raise questions for the work of schools with knowledge. As Gabriel points out (2013, p. 57):

'Post' times in which the condition of the school is 'under suspicion' can equally signify that the extent of its responsibility in the construction of a project of a modernity which has already shown signs of being exhausted has not yet been demonstrated, but this does not authorize us to radically deny the potential of this institution in signifying and action in and on the world.

For this reason, we identified the relevance of the questions: what is the role of curricular policies, of teaching institutions and school/academic disciplines in relation to access and appropriation of socially available knowledge? Any response to this question can only be constructed if we adopt as a reference the accumulated balance of knowledge which our epoch possesses. From this perspective, perhaps, we can advance in the preparation of 'knowledge policies' which take into consideration the 'critique of interested parties involved in the existing curriculum' which guarantees access to 'powerful knowledge' by part of the most disadvantaged social groups (Young, 2010, p. 175).

Furthermore, looking at the school public in a general manner, the need for the 'updating of the school curriculum' through the insertion of digital technologies in the school and the

transformation of this into a 'digitally' interesting space is seen to be very problematic in relation to knowledge work.

In this sense, Prensky (2010), amongst others, using the idea of 'digital natives,' contributes with his belief in the transformation of the classroom into 'the most attractive possible place' for an 'uninterested generation.' What appears here to be important is the 'pedagogical use' teachers make of technology, which indicates the necessity for them to be trained to make school and its classes 'adapt' to the characteristics of this generation. The search for the transformation of the school into a 'cool' place identical to the spaces used by this new generation adheres to a celebratory vision of digital medias.

It is believed that, freed from the weight of traditional institutions, individuals can create content without restraint, access the knowledge that interests them, and be subjected to the criticism of their peers, which in itself is sufficient to produce valid knowledge. This ignores the multiple mediations which now run search engines, social networks, and content sites such as Wikipedia (the only new media 'giant' which is still collaborative and non-profit making), which organize and prioritize content and shape our interaction with the world.

On the other hand, this downgrading of academic knowledge, as mentioned above, is more wide-ranging and recognizes other sources and directions. Some curricular and didactic shifts, which have been occurring for at least 30 years, have to be acknowledged: from the appeal to abstraction to the prioritization of the local and concrete, to the vertical and horizontal pedagogies (Bernstein, 1999), from privileging the domain of a heteronomous code to the search for more personal and original forms of expression. According to Bernstein, these shifts point to a tendency of official curriculums to be less academic to the extent that schools seek to become more socially inclusive. This tension between elitist academic content and inclusive social content is something to be deepened (Dussel, 2013b, p. 35).

In the wake of Dussel's reasoning, by propagating of school inclusion discourse, especially among individuals with disabilities, and in parallel establishing the 'substitution' of elitist academic knowledge by social and inclusive knowledge, are we contributing to the modification of the school knowledge to be taught, neutralizing the very process of school education to which these individuals are being exposed?

Our research agendas continue, always reconfiguring the permanent need to investigate school practices and discourses when working with knowledge.

References

- Adorno, T.(1995). *Educação e Emancipação*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Apple, M. W. (2006). *Ideologia e Currículo*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 3 ed.
- _____. (1995). A política do conhecimento oficial: faz sentido a idéia de currículo nacional? In: Moreira, Antonio Flavio; Silva, Tomaz Tadeu da. *Currículo, Cultura e Sociedade*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *A estruturação do discurso pedagógico: classe, códigos e controle*. Tradução: Tomaz Tadeu da Silva e Luís Fernando Gonçalves Pereira. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Campo Grande. (2000). Secretaria Municipal de Educação. *Seqüência Didática*. Campo Grande: Prefeitura Municipal de Campo Grande.
- Campo Grande. (2003). *Diretrizes Curriculares do Ensino Fundamental*. Campo Grande: Prefeitura Municipal.
- Campo Grande. (2008). *Referencial Curricular da Rede Municipal de Ensino do 1º ao 9º ano*. Campo Grande: Prefeitura Municipal.

- Cuban, L. (2001). *Oversold and underused: computers in the classroom*. USA: Harvard University Press.
- Dussel, I. (2013 a) Curriculum y autoridad cultural. In: Morgado, J. C. Et all.(org.) *Estudios Curriculares: um debate contemporâneo*. Curitiba: CRV ed.
- _____ (2013 b). *Uso pedagógico de Tecnologias na formação de professores*. Argentina: OEI (mimeo).
- _____ (2012) La formación docente y la cultura digital: Métodos y saberes para una nueva época, en: Birgin, A. (Comp.), *Más allá de la capacitación*. Debates acerca de la formación de los docentes en ejercicio, Buenos Aires, Ed. Paidós (p. 203-232).
- Gabriel, C. T. (2013). Teorias do Currículo e pós-fundacionismo: essencialismo em questão. In: Morgado, J. C. Et all.(org.) *Estudios Curriculares: um debate contemporâneo*. Curitiba: CRV ed.
- Lunardi-Mendes, G. M. (2011). As Práticas Curriculares nos Cadernos Escolares: Registros de Inclusão?. In: Pletsch, M. D.; Damasceno, A. (Org.). *Educação Especial e inclusão escolar: reflexões sobre o fazer pedagógico*. 1. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Edur (v. 256, p. 137-148).
- Lunardi-Mendes, G. M.; Gaspar da Silva, V. L. & Sossai, F. C. (2013). Do Observatório de Cultura Escolar para o Observatório de Práticas Escolares: Currículo e Novas Tecnologias em Foco. In: SILVA, F. de C. T. & Pereira, M. V. M. (Orgs.). *Observatório de Cultura Escolar: estudos e pesquisas sobre escola, currículo e cultura escolar*. Campo Grande / MS: Editora UFMS.
- Mato Grosso do Sul. (2000). Secretaria de Estado da Educação. *Escola Guaicuru – vivendo uma nova lição*. Mato Grosso do Sul: Gráfica Oficial do Estado de MS.
- Mato Grosso do Sul. (2007). *Referencial Curricular da Educação Básica (Ensino Fundamental)*. Mato Grosso do Sul: Gráfica Oficial do Estado de MS.
- Nóvoa, A. (1991). Concepções e práticas da formação contínua de professores: In: Nóvoa A. (Org.). *Formação contínua de professores: realidade e perspectivas*. Portugal: Universidade de Aveiro.
- Prensky, M. (2010). “*Não me atrapalhe, mãe - Eu estou aprendendo!*”: como videogames estão preparando nossos filhos para o sucesso no século XXI - e como você pode ajudar!. São Paulo: Phorte Editora.
- Santaella, L.; Lemos, R. (2011). *Redes Sociais Digitais a Cognição conectiva do Twitter*. São Paulo: Paulus Editora.
- Santos, L. L. de C. P. (2009). A construção do currículo: a seleção do conhecimento escolar. In: Mec/Seed. *Currículo: Conhecimento e cultura*. Ano XIX, n. 1, Abril, p. 10-14.
- Sancho, J.(2009). Entrevista. In: *Revista Linhas*. Florianópolis: UDESC.
- Young, M. (2010). *Conhecimento e Currículo: do Socioconstrutivismo ao realismo social na Sociologia da Educação*. Porto: Porto Editora.
- Young, M. (2007). Para que servem as escolas? *Educação & Sociedade*, Campinas, v. 28, n. 101, p. 1287-1302, set./dez.
- _____. (2013). A superação da crise em estudos curriculares: uma abordagem baseada no conhecimento. Favacho, A. Et. All(org.) *Currículo: conhecimento e avaliação. Divergências e tensões*. Curitiba: CRV ed. 2013.

About the Authors

Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes is a professor at Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (UDESC), teaching in both the graduate (masters and doctorate) and undergraduate programs. She started her studies with Special Education at Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC) in 1994, followed by a masters in education (2000) from the same institution, and got a Ph.D. from Pontificia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC-SP) also in Education (2005) with a sandwich period at Universidade do Minho- Portugal (2004). Her major focus of interest and experience is Education, focusing on special education, curriculum, and new technologies. Contact: geolunardi@gmail.com

Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva is a researcher professor at both undergraduate and graduate (masters and doctorate) programs in education at Universidade Federal do Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS). Her research projects focus on Comparative Studies (Method), Curriculum (History, policies, and documents), Schools, and school culture. She holds a Ph.D in Education from Pontificia Universidade de São Paulo (PUC-SP) with a doctoral internship at the School of Psychology and Educational Sciences at the Universidade do Porto (Portugal). She is coordinator of the Group of studies and research at the Centre of School Culture (OCE). Contact: fabiany@uol.com.br

Guest Editors

Márcia Denise Pletsch is a professor at the graduate program in Education, Contemporary Contexts and Popular Demands (PPGEduc), a researcher in the field of Contemporary Studies and Educational Practices, and a member of the Department of Education at Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro Janeiro. She is a researcher in the area of Special Education, specifically on teacher and new researchers' education. She is the coordinator of the Research Group (CNPq) *Observatory of Special Education and School Inclusion: curricular practices and teaching-learning processes*. Through an inter-institutional agreement between UFRRJ and the Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), she is the coordinator of the research group *Inclusion and learning of students with special educational needs: teaching practices, school culture, and psychosocial aspects*. Currently, she coordinates the Observatory Program of Education CAPES with research network projects in the field of intellectual disability involving the Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (UDESC), Universidade do Vale do Itajaí (UNIVALI); and also coordinates a research funded by FAPERJ in the area of multiple disabilities. She is the author of the book "Rethinking school inclusion: policy guidelines, curriculum practices, and intellectual disability" and in collaboration with Rosana Glat, she is also the author of "School inclusion of students with special needs". In partnership with other researchers, she produced, among other literature production, the books: "Different educational strategies for students with special needs" and "Special Education and school inclusion: reflections on pedagogical practice". She has over twenty articles published in national and international scientific journals.

Contact marciadenisepletsch@gmail.com

Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes is a Professor at the Graduate Program in Education and at the Pedagogy Department of the University of Santa Catarina State (PGE-UDESC). She is a researcher in the area of Special Education and Curriculum Studies. She holds a Postdoctoral from Universidad of San Andres Buenos Aires

(Argentina) and from Ashland University(United States) in the area of Curriculum and New Technologies. She is the research coordinator of many projects and participates as a guest researcher in national and international initiatives. Her research and literary productions have been pointed towards the area of Curriculum and school practices, in particular the issues on changes, new technologies and innovations in school curricula, and also curricular practices regarding the inclusion of individuals with disabilities. She is currently the National Coordinator of the program "Education and Diversity" by CAPES-FIPSE International Cooperation, involving the Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (Brazil) Georgetown College (USA), Ashland University (USA), and Brigham Young University (USA). She is the coordinator of the research project Connected Classes: curriculum changes and collaborative learning in PROUCA schools in Santa Catarina, funded by CNPq and School Practices Observatory Project with funding by FAPESC. She is the coordinator of the Graduate Program in Education, MA, PhD, of FAED, UDESC and coordinates the Education Observatory: Tablets, Computers and Laptops, OBEDUC/CAPES. Among her current productions is the book entitled "Pedagogical Objects: an inclusive experience in Art workshops" in partnership with two other authors and the production of the book "Disability and Schooling: new analytical perspectives", released in its second edition. She has authored numerous chapters and journal articles.

Contact: geolunardi@gmail.com

DOSSIÊ

Educação Especial: diferenças, currículo e processos de ensino e aprendizagem

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas

Volume 22 Number 80 August 11th, 2014

ISSN 1068-2341



O Copyright é retido pelo/a o autor/a (ou primeiro co-autor) que outorga o direito da primeira publicação à revista **Arquivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas**. Más informação da licença de Creative Commons encontram-se em

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5>. Qualquer outro uso deve ser aprovado em conjunto pelo/s autor/es e por AAPE/EPAA. AAPE/EPAA é publicada por *Mary Lou Fulton Institute Teachers College da Arizona State University*. Os textos publicados em **AAPE** são indexados por CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Espanha) DIALNET (Espanha), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), EBSCO Education Research Complete, , ERIC, , QUALIS A2 (Brasil), SCImago Journal Rank; SCOPUS, Socolar (China). Contribua com comentários e sugestões a <http://epaa.info/wordpress/> ou para Gustavo E. Fischman fischman@asu.edu.

Curta a nossa comunidade EPAA's Facebook <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> e Twitter feed @epaa_aape.

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas
conselho editorial

Editor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)
Editores Associados: **Rosa Maria Bueno Fisher** e **Luis A. Gandin**
(Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul)

Dalila Andrade de Oliveira Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brasil

Paulo Carrano Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil

Alicia Maria Catalano de Bonamino Pontifícia Universidade Católica-Rio, Brasil

Fabiana de Amorim Marcello Universidade Luterana do Brasil, Canoas, Brasil

Alexandre Fernandez Vaz Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brasil

Gaudêncio Frigotto Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Alfredo M Gomes Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brasil

Petronilha Beatriz Gonçalves e Silva Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Brasil

Nadja Herman Pontifícia Universidade Católica –Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

José Machado Pais Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

Wenceslao Machado de Oliveira Jr. Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Brasil

Jefferson Mainardes Universidade Estadual de Ponta Grossa, Brasil

Luciano Mendes de Faria Filho Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brasil

Lia Raquel Moreira Oliveira Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Belmira Oliveira Bueno Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil

António Teodoro Universidade Lusófona, Portugal

Pia L. Wong California State University Sacramento, U.S.A

Sandra Regina Sales Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Elba Siqueira Sá Barreto [Fundação Carlos Chagas](#), Brasil

Manuela Terrasêca Universidade do Porto, Portugal

Robert Verhine Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brasil

Antônio A. S. Zuin Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Brasil

education policy analysis archives
editorial board

Editor **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Associate Editors: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University), **Rick Mintrop**, (University of California,
Jeanne M. Powers (Arizona State University)

Jessica Allen University of Colorado, Boulder

Gary Anderson New York University

Michael W. Apple University of Wisconsin, Madison

Angela Arzubiaga Arizona State University

David C. Berliner Arizona State University

Robert Bickel Marshall University

Henry Braun Boston College

Eric Camburn University of Wisconsin, Madison

Wendy C. Chi* University of Colorado, Boulder

Casey Cobb University of Connecticut

Arnold Danzig Arizona State University

Antonia Darder University of Illinois, Urbana-
Champaign

Linda Darling-Hammond Stanford University

Chad d'Entremont Strategies for Children

John Diamond Harvard University

Tara Donahue Learning Point Associates

Sherman Dorn University of South Florida

Christopher Joseph Frey Bowling Green State
University

Melissa Lynn Freeman* Adams State College

Amy Garrett Dikkers University of Minnesota

Gene V Glass Arizona State University

Ronald Glass University of California, Santa Cruz

Harvey Goldstein Bristol University

Jacob P. K. Gross Indiana University

Eric M. Haas WestEd

Kimberly Joy Howard* University of Southern
California

Aimee Howley Ohio University

Craig Howley Ohio University

Steve Klees University of Maryland

Jaekyung Lee SUNY Buffalo

Christopher Lubienski University of Illinois, Urbana-
Champaign

Sarah Lubienski University of Illinois, Urbana-
Champaign

Samuel R. Lucas University of California, Berkeley

Maria Martinez-Coslo University of Texas, Arlington

William Mathis University of Colorado, Boulder

Tristan McCowan Institute of Education, London

Heinrich Mintrop University of California, Berkeley

Michele S. Moses University of Colorado, Boulder

Julianne Moss University of Melbourne

Sharon Nichols University of Texas, San Antonio

Noga O'Connor University of Iowa

João Paraskveva University of Massachusetts,
Dartmouth

Laurence Parker University of Illinois, Urbana-
Champaign

Susan L. Robertson Bristol University

John Rogers University of California, Los Angeles

A. G. Rud Purdue University

Felicia C. Sanders The Pennsylvania State University

Janelle Scott University of California, Berkeley

Kimberly Scott Arizona State University

Dorothy Shipps Baruch College/CUNY

Maria Teresa Tatto Michigan State University

Larisa Warhol University of Connecticut

Cally Waite Social Science Research Council

John Weathers University of Colorado, Colorado
Springs

Kevin Welner University of Colorado, Boulder

Ed Wiley University of Colorado, Boulder

Terrence G. Wiley Arizona State University

John Willinsky Stanford University

Kyo Yamashiro University of California, Los Angeles

* Members of the New Scholars Board

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas
consejo editorial

Editor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores. Asociados **Alejandro Canales** (UNAM) y **Jesús Romero Morante** (Universidad de Cantabria)

- Armando Alcántara Santuario** Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM México
- Claudio Almonacid** Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación, Chile
- Pilar Arnaiz Sánchez** Universidad de Murcia, España
- Xavier Besalú Costa** Universitat de Girona, España
- Jose Joaquin Brunner** Universidad Diego Portales, Chile
- Damián Canales Sánchez** Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación, México
- María Caridad García** Universidad Católica del Norte, Chile
- Raimundo Cuesta Fernández** IES Fray Luis de León, España
- Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes** Universidad Iberoamericana, México
- Inés Dussel** FLACSO, Argentina
- Rafael Feito Alonso** Universidad Complutense de Madrid, España
- Pedro Flores Crespo** Universidad Iberoamericana, México
- Verónica García Martínez** Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco, México
- Francisco F. García Pérez** Universidad de Sevilla, España
- Edna Luna Serrano** Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, México
- Alma Maldonado** Departamento de Investigaciones Educativas, Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados, México
- Alejandro Márquez Jiménez** Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM México
- José Felipe Martínez Fernández** University of California Los Angeles, USA
- Fanni Muñoz** Pontificia Universidad Católica de Perú
- Imanol Ordorika** Instituto de Investigaciones Economicas – UNAM, México
- Maria Cristina Parra Sandoval** Universidad de Zulia, Venezuela
- Miguel A. Pereyra** Universidad de Granada, España
- Monica Pini** Universidad Nacional de San Martín, Argentina
- Paula Razquin** UNESCO, Francia
- Ignacio Rivas Flores** Universidad de Málaga, España
- Daniel Schugurensky** Arizona State University
- Orlando Pulido Chaves** Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, Colombia
- José Gregorio Rodríguez** Universidad Nacional de Colombia
- Miriam Rodríguez Vargas** Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas, México
- Mario Rueda Beltrán** Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM México
- José Luis San Fabián Maroto** Universidad de Oviedo, España
- Yengny Marisol Silva Laya** Universidad Iberoamericana, México
- Aida Terrón Bañuelos** Universidad de Oviedo, España
- Jurjo Torres Santomé** Universidad de la Coruña, España
- Antoni Verger Planells** University of Amsterdam, Holanda
- Mario Yapu** Universidad Para la Investigación Estratégica, Bolivia