



## Reconfiguring Power in Portuguese Higher Education

*António Magalhães*

University of Porto/Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES)



*Amélia Veiga*

University of Porto /Centre for Research and Intervention in Education (CIIE) /  
Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES)



*Pedro Videira*

Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES)  
Portugal

**Citation:** Magalhães, A., Veiga, A., & Videira, P. (2018). Reconfiguring power in Portuguese higher education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(135). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3600> This article is part of the special issue, *Management and management policies in Lusophone countries. Critical perspectives on the new public management and the post-bureaucracy in education*, guest edited by Almerindo Janela Afonso and Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes.

**Abstract:** This paper aims to analyse the shift in the internal power balance between managerial and academic self-governance as reflected in the perceptions of teaching and non-teaching staff on the tendencies, decision-making processes and actor's roles in these processes. The empirical data used in this paper were gathered on the basis of an on-line survey, distributed throughout 2014 and 2015 in all Portuguese higher education institutions. Responses were interpreted taking into account the influence of governance

narratives on the development of *boardism*, i.e., a decrease of academic self-governance reflecting the decline of the power of teaching staff in HEIs' governance; an increase of managerial governance as reflected in the reinforcement of hierarchies and organisational top-down decision-making; and the influence of external stakeholders. The analysis contributes to dig into the complexity of the governance arrangements challenging the prevailing influence of the NPM governance narrative while underlining the internal dynamics of HEIs, where Portuguese teaching staff continue to play a key role.

**Keywords:** governance; decision-making power; *boardism*

### **Reconfiguración de poder en la educación superior en Portugal**

**Resumen:** El propósito de este artículo es analizar los cambios en el equilibrio de poder interna entre la administración y el poder académico, reflejados en las percepciones de los profesores y personal no docente de las instituciones portuguesas de educación superior sobre las tendencias, los procesos de toma de decisiones y el papel de los actores en esos procesos. Los datos empíricos utilizados en este estudio fueron recogidos a través de una encuesta en línea, distribuidos en 2014 y 2015, en todas las instituciones portuguesas de educación superior. Las respuestas fueron interpretadas teniendo en cuenta la influencia de las narrativas de la gobernanza en el desarrollo del *boardismo*, o sea, la disminución de la gobernanza académica, reflejando la disminución del poder de los docentes en la gobernanza de las instituciones de educación superior; el aumento del poder de la gestión, reflejado en el refuerzo de jerarquías y en la toma de decisiones organizacionales de arriba abajo; y la influencia de los *stakeholders* externos. El análisis contribuye a profundizar el conocimiento sobre las configuraciones de la gobernanza en la educación superior, desafiando la influencia predominante de la narrativa de la Nueva Gestión Pública, mientras enfatiza la dinámica interna de las instituciones de educación superior, donde el cuerpo docente sigue desempeñando un papel fundamental en la gestión y gobernanza.

**Palabras-clave:** gobernanza; poder de toma de decisión; *boardismo*

### **Reconfigurando o poder no ensino superior em Portugal**

**Resumo:** O objetivo deste artigo é analisar as mudanças nos equilíbrios de poder interno entre o poder da gestão e o poder da governação académica, refletidas nas perceções dos docentes e não-docentes das instituições de ensino superior portuguesas sobre as tendências, processos de tomada de decisão e o papel dos atores nesses processos. Os dados empíricos utilizados neste trabalho foram recolhidos com base num inquérito on-line, distribuído ao longo de 2014 e 2015, em todas as instituições de ensino superior portuguesas. As respostas foram interpretadas levando-se em conta a influência das narrativas da governação no desenvolvimento do *boardismo*, ou seja, a diminuição da governação académica, refletindo a diminuição do poder dos docentes na governação das instituições de ensino superior; o aumento do poder da gestão, refletido no reforço de hierarquias e na tomada de decisões organizacionais de cima para baixo; e a influência de *stakeholders* externos. A análise contribui para aprofundar o conhecimento sobre as configurações da governação no ensino superior, desafiando a influência predominante da narrativa da Nova Gestão Política, enquanto enfatiza a dinâmica interna das instituições de ensino superior, onde o corpo docente continua a desempenhar um papel fundamental na sua gestão e governação.

**Palavras-chave:** governação; poder de tomada de decisão; *boardismo*

## Introduction

This paper aims to analyse the shift in the internal power balance between managerial and academic self-governance as reflected in the decision-making processes in Portuguese higher education institutions. Since the 1980s reforms of public administration across Europe have driven governance reforms in higher education. The driver of governance reforms stems from the shift from governing to governance, and the idea of the urgent need to change political steering of public institutions emerged hand-in-hand with the notion that bureaucratic and state-centred regulation was not effective and efficient. Actually, institutions, thereupon conceived as organizations, were assumed to steadily respond to the environmental changes based on their autonomy. In European higher education, boards became central in the governance of higher education systems and institutions, giving rise to what we have termed in previous work as *boardism*. It refers to the decrease of academic self-governance and the decline of the power of academics in university decision-making processes (Veiga, Magalhães & Amaral, 2015). Another key element of *boardism* is the assumption of influence of external stakeholders in governance structures and processes in higher education institutions. This assumption might reflect either a normative or an instrumental approach to the role of external stakeholders in institutional governance (Mainardes, Alves & Raposo, 2011). The normative approach refers to how universities should operate on the basis of social and political values and principles. The instrumental approach refers to the attainment of institutional goals and objectives through management of the core academic activities. While the normative stance underlines the assumption that external stakeholders make organizations more responsive to their external environment, the instrumental stance tends to focus on the expertise and links with the social and economic fabric they might bring into institutional governance. These features indicate a shift in the internal power balance between managerial and academic self-governance with an impact on decision-making processes. *Boardism* in higher education governance reforms is affecting the power relationship between academics and managers in organisational governance, triggering tensions. These make the issues of power, interests and conflicts relevant for explaining institutional governance and managerial processes.

In Europe, under this influence, higher education systems and institutions reshaped their organizational structures to meet the requirements of increased organizational accountability, and to address performance indicators. Following from Afonso (2009), accountability through articulating dimensions such as evaluation and responsibility promotes education discourses focusing on the relevance of what is measurable and comparable.

Changes in political environments of higher education have induced transformations in higher education governance, shifting from collegial models and loosely coupled organization to more managerial and tightly coupled forms, mostly inspired by New Public Management (NPM). However, these developments have shown ‘mixed signs and symptoms’ (Paradeise, Reale, Bleiklie & Ferlie, 2009) of NPM and Network Governance (NG). Further research also identified the influence of bureaucratic, New Governance (NewG) and collegial governance narratives (Magalhães & Veiga, 2012). This suggests that there is an interaction between reform narratives and institutional contexts and identities as the reform trend has assumed different tones according to national and institutional cultures and ethos. The objective of this paper is to analyse institutional processes of decision-making as reflecting governance narratives, which in turn pervade and influence *boardism*. The paper aims to respond to the following question: how do the perceptions of institutional actors on tendencies at their institutions and decision-making reflect the influence of governance narratives and how it influences the features of *boardism*?

On the basis of an on-line survey, distributed throughout 2014 and 2015 in all Portuguese higher education institutions, we have selected a set of topics to which academics and non-academics were asked to indicate, on a five-point Likert scale, their views on institutions' decision-making processes. The responses were interpreted taking into account the features of *boardism*: a decrease of academic self-governance reflecting the decline of the power of academics in HEIs decision-making structures and processes; an increase of managerial governance referring to the reinforcement of hierarchies and organisational top-down decision-making; the influence of external stakeholders in strategizing processes shedding light on the actual influence they possess. The analysis assumes that governance narratives play a mediating role in legitimating and justifying the configuration of *boardism*.

In this paper, by looking at the shift in the internal power balance between managerial and academic self-governance with an impact on the decision-making processes, we start by emphasizing the role played by governance narratives in legitimating and justifying governance reforms in higher education institutions and their influence on *boardism*. Then, the analysis focuses on the perceptions of Portuguese higher education professionals as these perceptions reflect the redistribution of the decision-making power as mediated by governance narratives. Additionally, the analysis compared the perceptions of different groups of respondents according to higher education sector (public or private), subsystem (polytechnic or university) and professional characteristics (such as teaching or non-teaching staff, the respondents influence in decision-making processes and number of years working at the institution).

## Governance Narratives and Higher Education Governance Reform

Narratives are concepts of social epistemology and social ontology and it is through narrativity that we come to know, understand and make sense of the social world; i.e., "it is through narratives and narrativity that we constitute our social identities" (Somers & Gibson, 1994, p. 59) and provide meaning to choices and justify (legitimate) decisions taken. In this paper, narratives are assumed as policy and management stories aimed at making sense of policy and action. Governance is about political management of rule systems, both formal and informal, that drive values and norms affecting behaviours and attitudes of actors and constellations of actors (Hall & Taylor, 1996; Kjaer, 2010). These rules and system values are made narratively coherent and influence the environment of actors, structures and processes. The rise of governance as opposed to governing has challenged the need for formal authority and legitimacy, central to traditional settings of government. Autonomy, accountability and quality assessment became key-words in the last decades of policy making and governance arrangements in higher education (Magalhães, 2004), reflecting the influence of prevailing governance narratives such as NPM. As pointed out by Ferlie, Musselin and Andresani (2009) governance narratives meld normative/ideological ingredients with technical elements. In each country they "can be linked to specific conceptions and theories regarding the relationship between the state and the society" (Ferlie, Musselin & Andresani, 2009, p. 13).

Paradeise, Reale, Gostellec and Bleiklie (2009) compared higher education governing and governance changes in several European countries and examined the impact of NPM and NG narratives on the political steering of higher education systems and institutions. The results of the study challenged the isomorphic influence of NPM showing "a mix of signs and symptoms of NPM and NG" (Paradeise, Reale, Gostellec & Bleiklie, 2009, p. 245). Elements of other governance narratives (e.g., NG, collegial governance) were identified, for instance, in the Portuguese context (Magalhães, Veiga, Amaral, Sousa & Ribeiro, 2013).

The NPM narrative is organised around elements such as the stimulation of competition for students between HEIs; the hardening of soft budgetary constraints; the vertical steering of the system through setting explicit targets and performance contracts; the market based research funding; the development of a "management must manage" perspective; the emphasis on stronger managerial roles of rectors, deans, heads of department; the focus on efficiency and value for money; the development of strong rectorates; the reduction in the representation of faculty in HE management; and the increased participation of external stakeholders in the governing bodies, assuming that the role attributed to external stakeholders is closely linked to the managerial concerns of efficiency and effectiveness ultimately with an eye on value for money.

In turn, the NG narrative elements are the development of networks designed with the explicit goal of joint problem recognition and solving; the development of networks between HEIs; networks as playing a significant role in the governance of the HE system; softer leadership; external control systems taking the form of 'light touch' systems. While emphasising the collaborative features of 'third-party government', the NewG narrative focuses on the networks within which actors develop their action rather than on the internal workings of public organizations. Following Salamon (2002) "the collaborative nature relies on a wide array of third parties in addition to government to address public problems and pursue public purposes" (Salamon, 2002b). The recognition of collaborative features by NewG narrative underlines: a) a shift from public vs. private to public + private; b) a focus on networks rather than on hierarchy; c) a shift from command and control to negotiation and persuasion; d) a shift from management skills to enablement skills. The shift from public versus private to public + private encompasses collaboration as a consequence of important complementarities that exist between sectors. NewG sees this interaction between public and private as a source of opportunities. From the perspective of the stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984), this interaction is better seen as a set of relationships established between 'any group or individual that can affect or be affected by the realization of an organization's purpose' (Freeman, Harrison, Hicks, Parmar & De Colle, 2010, p. 26). Hence, stakeholders influence decision-making processes to make them consistent with their needs and priorities. Under NewG, the role attributed to external stakeholders in higher education governance is subsumed to the third-party arrangements and subsumed to governance goals. As pointed out by Salamon (2002a),

'third-party government' brings forward dilemmas challenging management, accountability and governance legitimacy. Management dilemmas arise from the shift from management skills to enablement skills, meaning: the ability to bring multiple stakeholders with partially independent sources of power and influence to the table to share resources for a common end in a situation of extensive interdependence (p. 608).

In line with this, accountability challenges hierarchical and top-down decision-making and governance legitimacy, as third-party arrangements operate in new arenas and contribute to a fragmentation of governance arrangements.

Collegial governance underlines the representation of the institutional constituencies in governance bodies and is based on the authority of academic groups organised around disciplinary areas. The power of the academic groups deals with research and teaching, including the management of research contracts, the appointment of academic staff, and the selection and recruitment of students (Shattock, 2006). The collegial governance narrative is organised around elements underlying the managerial centrality of academics and academic activities' self-regulation. Under the collegial governance narrative, external stakeholders appear as 'imaginary friends' (Magalhães, Veiga & Amaral, 2016) as they are not supposed to interfere in the

governance of higher education institutions defined as an academic area of action. Decision-making structures and processes assume legitimacy on the basis of disciplinary and peer-review vigilance and authority. At different paces and rates, countries seem to have converged on the need to implement a managerial approach induced by NPM (Paradeise et al., 2009). In Portugal, the managerial approach and the NPM governance narrative and practices have assumed a central role in public policies, higher education included. To this, one could add the centrality of the technical-instrumental rationality which, according to Lima (2012), enhances the organizational control features. This reflects the already mentioned mixed signs of governance narratives promoting hybridization of elements stemming from bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic discourses (Barroso, 2006).

In 2007 a new legal framework (RJIES) for higher education institutions was passed, redesigning their governance processes and structures. The Law 62/2007 was elaborated under NPM's influence (Moreira, 2008) displaying its political and managerial assumptions on governance. This legal framework resulted in an increasing centralisation of power at the institutional top and the suppression (or weakening) of the collegial decision-making bodies (Magalhães et al., 2013). To these one must add the possibility for institutions to adopt the foundational model, the use of output-based contracts and the emphasis on accountability, individual responsibility and performance. However, the law itself assumes a hybrid character. For instance, NPM characteristics related to nomination and co-option coexist with the collegial election principle. Furthermore, the Portuguese governance reform appeared to indicate NewG and NG elements visible in networking of structures and processes, and the emphasis on the key role played by academics at the institutional level (Magalhães et al., 2013). Nonetheless, RJIES overtly displays its core political and managerial assumptions on governance: increase of managerial governance; decrease of academic self-governance and enhancement of external stakeholders' roles in decision-making bodies (Magalhães et al., 2013).

The mediating role of narratives in featuring *boardism* is based on discursive elements that influence the decision-making processes. Actually, the NPM elements focusing on the vertical steering of the institution under the assumption that "management must manage" and the emphasis on stronger managerial roles of rectors, deans and heads of department strengthen the increase of managerial governance. In turn, the NG elements focusing on the development of institutional networks as playing a significant role in decision-making and, consequently, inducing a softer leadership by means of 'light touch' control systems induce the enhancement of academic self-governance. The elements of the NewG narrative which underline a shift from command and control to negotiation to persuasion based on the development of enablement skills rather than on management skills encourage academic self-governance. In turn, elements of the collegial governance narrative based on the authority of academic groups promote decision-making structures and processes based on the disciplinary and peer-review vigilance and authority. The elements from these narratives shape the perspectives on the role of external stakeholders in higher education governance.

Their presence on the boards suggested that NPM had an impact on university decision-making. The actual role that external stakeholders play in the Portuguese higher education context is mediated by the influence of the NPM narrative while the prevalence of an instrumental stance reflects the tension between the drivers of academic self-governance and managerial governance.

## Questioning the Data

The empirical data used in this paper were gathered on the basis of an on-line survey, distributed throughout 2014 and 2015 in all Portuguese higher education institutions and targeting the entire population of the teaching staff and the non-teaching staff (in the case of the latter, those working at the level of ‘qualified technician’ or similar). This survey was administered in the course of a wider project aiming to understand how Portuguese higher education institutions are responding to the challenges facing higher education. For the purposes of this paper we have selected a set of topics concerning institutional governance to which professionals were asked to indicate, on a five-point Likert scale, their perceptions on institutional decision-making processes, the participation of external stakeholders and tendencies occurring in recent years in the governance processes of their institutions.

The answers from the 2,060 higher education professionals who responded to the questionnaire (1,661 from the teaching staff which corresponds roughly to 5% of the population and 399 from members of the non-teaching staff) were analysed resorting to statistical techniques. The sample’s characterization can be found in Table 1. Descriptive statistics (mean, median, mode and standard deviation) were computed to reveal respondents’ perceptions on the selected variables. Non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney) were run to explore the influence of selected institutional and individual factors on professionals’ perceptions.

The responses were interpreted taking into account the features of *boardism*: a decrease of academic self-governance reflecting the decline of the power of academics in HEIs’ decision-making structures and processes; an increase of managerial governance referring to the reinforcement of hierarchies and organisational top-down decision-making; the influence of external stakeholders in decision-making processes shedding light on the actual influence they possess. The extent to which institutional governance reflects *boardism* is to be looked at, taking into account the features of the Portuguese higher education system; namely the divides between polytechnics and universities and between public and private institutions. Additionally, to identify the internal dynamics of power relationships at the institutions, data were analysed on the basis of the differences between teaching and non-teaching staff, the respondents’ own role in the decision-making processes at the institutions and the fact that they have or have not been working at their institutions since before the implementation of the 2007 law.

Table 1  
*Sample’s characterization*

		N	%
Professional Group	Teaching staff	1661	80.6
	Non-teaching staff	399	19.4
		Total	2060
		Missing	-
HE’s subsector	Public	1576	79.1
	Private	417	20.9
		Total	1993
		Missing	67
HE’s subsystem	University	1036	52.0
	Polytechnic	957	48.0
		Total	1993
		Missing	67



Table 1 (Cont'd.)  
*Sample's characterization*

		N	%
Years at the institution	After 2007	555	27.8
	Before 2007	1439	72.2
Total		1994	100
Missing		66	-
Current role in decision-making	Lower influence in decision-making.	1705	84.9
	Higher influence in decision-making.	304	15.1
Total		2009	100
Missing		51	-

### Professionals' Perceptions on Tendencies at Their Institutions

The analysis revealed that the professionals' perceptions on institutional governance reflect the influence of the NPM narrative on the features assumed by *boardism* in Portuguese higher education institutions. These perceptions are mediated by discursive elements stemming from the NPM governance narrative related with the perspective that "management must manage" and that of strong rectorates or central administrations. Actually, the influence of the NPM governance narrative appears to be confirmed by the perceptions that in respondents' institutions there is a tendency for *the most important decisions to be taken by the central management and an increase of administrative workload* (Table 2).

Table 2  
*Professionals' perceptions on tendencies at their institutions in recent years*

In recent years there has been a tendency in my institution for:	N	Mean	Median	Mode	S-D
The most important decisions to be taken by the central management.	1816	3.96	4	4	.828
The loss of influence of collegial bodies in decision-making processes.	1707	3.45	3	4	1.035
The institution to be guided towards the achievement of objectives.	1805	3.61	4	4	.893
An increase of administrative workload.	1845	4.07	4	5	.888
An increase in the central management's control over the employees.	1795	3.75	4	4	.943
An increase in the external stakeholders' participation.	1550	2.91	3	3	.916
The growth of the support structures for academic (teaching, research and extension) and non-academic activities.	1833	2.67	3	3	1.043



Professionals showed a very high level of agreement that there has been a tendency in recent years for *the most important decisions to be taken by the central management* and for *the loss of influence of collegial bodies in decision-making*. At the same time, there was a perception of a marked *increase in the control exerted by the central management over the employees*, which is enacted and also visible in the perceptions on an *increase of administrative workload*. Research has pointed out that procedural mechanisms pervaded the control over academic work (Neave, 2012) promoted by the digital bureaucracy (Lima, 2012). Concurrently, there was also a view on the tendency of the institutions *to be guided towards the achievement of objectives*. The definition of measurable objectives and outputs reflects discursive elements pertaining to the NPM narrative. However, the influence of the NPM narrative regarding *the increase in the external stakeholders' participation*, to which professionals showed a moderate disagreement, underlines the influence of discursive elements of other governance narratives. Thus, even though the influence of the NPM narrative reinforced the mandate of external stakeholders in the institutions' boards, elements of other governance narratives, namely the collegial governance narrative and the NG narrative, also appeared.

The prevalence of the NPM narrative is not evenly perceived by all groups of respondents (see Table 3) whether because they work in different types of institutions (in which both institutional characteristics and historical legacy may influence the enactment of the recent reforms) or because their own professional roles (namely if they belong to the teaching or non-teaching staff, the length of their professional career at the institution or their own role in institutional decision-making processes) may led them to perceive the features and changes occurring in their institutions' governance differently. While the influence of the NPM governance narrative regarding the tendencies for *the most important decisions to be taken by the central management* and for *the increase in the central management's control over their employees* generated a high consensus among different groups of respondents (although it is more highly felt by respondents with lower influence in decision-making processes), *the loss of influence of collegial bodies in decision-making processes* and *the increase of administrative workload* appears to be more highly perceived by respondents from the public sector, the teaching staff and those who have been working at their institutions since before the implementation of the 2007 law.

Table 3

*Differences in professionals' perceptions on tendencies at their institutions in recent years*

	HEI's subsector	HEI's subsystem	Professional group	Years at HEI	Role in D-M*
The most important decisions to be taken by the central management.	$p=.826$	$p=.352$	$p=.352$	$p=.162$	<b><math>p=.000</math></b> (<Influence)
The loss of influence of collegial bodies in decision-making processes.	<b><math>p=.000</math></b> (Public)	$p=.922$	$p=.005$ (Teaching)	<b><math>p=.000</math></b> (before 2007)	<b><math>p=.000</math></b> (<Influence)
The institution to be guided towards the achievement of objectives.	$p=.101$	<b><math>p=.000</math></b> (Univ.)	$p=.523$	<b><math>p=.000</math></b> (after 2007)	$p=.126$
An increase of administrative workload.	<b><math>p=.000</math></b> (Public)	$p=.230$	<b><math>p=.005</math></b> (Teaching)	<b><math>p=.000</math></b> (before 2007)	$p=.325$
An increase in the central management's control over the employees.	<b><math>p=.000</math></b> (Public)	$p=.103$	$p=.060$	$p=.125$	<b><math>p=.001</math></b> (<Influence)

Table 3 (Cont'd.)

*Differences in professionals' perceptions on tendencies at their institutions in recent years*

	HEI's subsector	HEI's subsystem	Professional group	Years at HEI	Role in D-M*
An increase in the external stakeholders' participation.	<b><i>p</i>=.038 (Private)</b>	<i>p</i> =.299	<b><i>p</i>=.021 (N- teaching)</b>	<b><i>p</i>=.000 (after 2007)</b>	<b><i>p</i>=.012 (&gt;Influence)</b>
The growth of the support structures for academic (teaching, research and extension) and non-academic activities.	<b><i>p</i>=.000 (Private)</b>	<b><i>p</i>=.026 (Univ.)</b>	<b><i>p</i>=.000 (N- teaching)</b>	<b><i>p</i>=.001 (after 2007)</b>	<b><i>p</i>=.007 (&gt;Influence)</b>

*Note:* Data were analysed through Mann-Whitney tests for a .05 significance level. The group that perceives the item considered to a higher extent is noted (in bold).

### Perceptions on Decision-making Processes and Actors' Roles

The influence of the NPM narrative in institutions' decision-making processes is visible not only in that they are significantly centralised, as we had seen before, but that they have been progressing in recent years towards that pronounced centralisation (see Table 4). The NPM governance narrative also appears to be relevant in the professionals' perceptions on the concentration of power at the top management of institutions regarding decision-making processes. Respondents perceived to a very high extent that in their institutions *the power to decide about academic and non-academic issues relies mostly on the central management or central services* and that *their institutions have very hierarchical structures*. Inversely, professionals tended to only moderately agree with the statement that *there is a high degree of teaching staffs' participation in decision-making processes in academic issues* and to disagree with the existence of *a high degree of participation of the non-teaching staff in non-academic issues*. These perceptions reflect a high level of concentration of decision-making power at the top management of the institutions, challenging the power relationships between teaching and non-teaching staff.

Table 4

*Professionals' perceptions on decision-making processes and external stakeholders' participation in Portuguese HEI's*

To what extent do you agree with the following statements:	N	Mean	Median	Mode	S-D
In my institution, there is a high degree of teaching staffs' participation in decision-making processes in academic issues.	1879	3.20	3.00	4.00	1.149
In my institution there is a high degree of non-teaching staffs' participation in decision-making processes in non-academic issues.	1684	2.74	3.00	3.00	1.030
In my institution, the power to decide about academic issues relies mostly on the central management or central services.	1877	3.73	4.00	4.00	1.066
In my institution, the power to decide about non-academic issues relies mostly on the central management or central services.	1771	3.94	4.00	4.00	.943
My institution has a very hierarchical structure.	1916	3.77	4.00	4.00	1.038

Table 4 (Cont'd.)

*Professionals' perceptions on decision-making processes and external stakeholders' participation in Portuguese HEI's*

To what extent do you agree with the following statements:	N	Mean	Median	Mode	S-D
The decision-making processes at my institution take into account the opinions of external stakeholders.	1568	3.07	3.00	3.00	.978
How influential were the external stakeholders in the creation of an organizational performance management system?	1499	2.88	3.00	3.00	.958
How important were the external stakeholders for the development of the internal quality assurance practices at your institution?	1234	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.053

With regard to the perceptions on the increase of external stakeholders' participation in decision-making processes, the tendency was perceived to a very moderate extent (see Table 2). When looking at the participation of external stakeholders in decision-making processes, respondents tended to perceive their role more clearly in *the creation of an organizational performance management system* and in *the development of the internal quality assurance practices at the institutional level*. This appears to echo the dimensions of accountability as reflected in the articulation between evaluation and responsibility (Afonso, 2009). The influence of elements of other governance narratives contributes to mitigating the instrumental stance towards the role of external stakeholders.

The analysis of the perceptions on decision-making processes and actors' roles showed that respondents from universities and those with lower influence in the institutional decision-making processes tended to agree more than other groups of respondents that *the power to decide about academic and non-academic issues mostly relies on the central management or central services* (Table 5). The perception that *my institution has a very hierarchical structure* gathered higher agreement from respondents from the public sector, from universities, from non-teaching staff and from those also having lower influence in decision-making, echoing the vertical steering and the development of stronger managerial roles of rectors, deans, heads of departments.

Table 5

*Differences in professionals' perceptions on decision-making processes in Portuguese HEI's*

	HEI's subsector	HEI's subsystem	Professional group	Years at HEI	Role in D-M*
In my institution, there is a high degree of teaching staffs' participation in decision-making processes in academic issues.	$p=.232$	$p=.234$	$p=.000$ (N-Teaching)	$p=.104$	$p=.000$ (>Influence)
In my institution there is a high degree of non-teaching staffs' participation in decision-making processes in non-academic issues.	$p=.000$ (Private)	$p=.006$ (Polytech.)	$p=.000$ (Teaching)	$p=.033$ (after 2007)	$.000$ (>Influence)

Table 5 (Cont'd.)

*Differences in professionals' perceptions on decision-making processes in Portuguese HEI's*

	HEI's subsector	HEI's subsystem	Professional group	Years at HEI	Role in D-M*
In my institution, the power to decide about academic issues relies mostly on the central management or central services.	$p=.446$	$p=.015$ (Univ.)	$p=.328$	$p=.508$	$p=.000$ (<Influence)
In my institution, the power to decide about non-academic issues relies mostly on the central management or central services.	$p=.457$	$p=.011$ (Univ.)	$p=.915$	$p=.091$	$p=.008$ (<Influence)
My institution has a very hierarchical structure.	.000 (Public)	.000 (Univ.)	.000 (N- Teaching)	$p=.620$	$p=.000$ (<Influence)
The decision-making processes at my institution take into account the opinions of external stakeholders.	$p=.000$ (Private)	$p=.208$	$p=.351$	$p=.000$ (after 2007)	$p=.000$ (>Influence)
How influential were the external stakeholders in the creation of an organizational performance management system?	$p=.000$ (Private)	$p=.011$ (Polytech.)	$p=.001$ (N- teaching)	$p=.000$ (after 2007)	$p=.239$
How important were the external stakeholders for the development of the internal quality assurance practices at your institution?	$p=.000$ (Private)	$p=.136$	$p=.000$ (N- teaching)	$p=.000$ (after 2007)	$p=.343$

Note: Data were analysed through Mann-Whitney tests for a .05 significance level. The group that perceives the item considered to a higher extent is noted (in bold).

Respondents from the private sector, from polytechnics, the teaching staff, those who started their professional careers at the institution after 2007 and professionals with higher levels of influence in decision-making processes tended to agree more with the statement that *in my institution there is a high degree of non-teaching staffs' participation in decision-making processes in non-academic issues*. Additionally, the statement that in their institutions *there is a high degree of teaching staffs' participation in decision-making processes in academic issues* seems to be more split, with only professionals from the non-teaching staff and again those with higher levels of influence in decision-making showing significantly higher levels of agreement with it. Regarding the participation of the external stakeholders in the institution, while their influence was perceived to a very moderate extent, their effective role is nevertheless more highly perceived by respondents from private institutions, non-teaching staff and those who have started their professional careers at the institution after the implementation of the 2007 law, reflecting the higher influence of NPM discursive elements linked to the managerial concerns of efficiency and effectiveness. These groups of respondents, as well as respondents with higher influence in decision-making processes, are

likewise those who perceived to a higher extent that in their institutions there has been a tendency towards *an increase in the external stakeholders' participation* and towards *the growth of the support structures for academic and non-academic activities*.

### **Conclusion: The Influence of NPM Narrative on Boardism**

The analysis of the perceptions of institutional actors on the tendencies influencing institutional governance and the decision-making processes and actors' roles allowed for identifying the features of *boardism* in the Portuguese context reflected in the power relationships between teaching staff and non-teaching staff. The analysis contributed to dig into the complexity of the governance arrangements, challenging a straightforward causality relating the influence of managerialism to the governance reforms of Portuguese higher education institutions. Even though the dominance of managerial governance over academic self-governance is visible, its effects on *boardism* appear not fully developed. Actually, one can hardly find in the analysis of the perceptions of the respondents a clear-cut tendency towards hard versions of NPM. Previous research has shown the mixed influence of governance narratives and practices in the actors' perceptions (Magalhães et al., 2013). Additionally, contextual factors such as the higher education subsector and subsystem, and the internal dynamics of higher education institutions—an arena where Portuguese academic staff continue to play a key role—condition the influence of NPM drivers, convening elements stemming also from post-bureaucratic discourses (Barroso, 2006).

The analysis points to the decrease of academic self-governance and the increase of the managerial governance in the institutions surveyed. When comparing the perceptions between higher education subsystems and subsectors, the analysis showed that respondents from universities and from the public sector tended to acknowledge to a higher extent the influence of the NPM narrative elements driving the vertical steering of their institutions. Public universities were the most rooted in the collegial modes of governance and it is thus understandable that these are the ones where respondents felt a higher impact of the managerial-driven reforms. For the same reasons, the teaching staff and respondents who have been working at the institutions since before the implementation of the 2007 law felt to a higher extent the loss of influence of the collegial bodies and the increased administrative workload. Lastly, these changes are challenging the power relationships between teaching and non-teaching staff. Respondents with lower influence in decision-making processes consistently perceived to a much higher extent the influence of the NPM narrative on institutional governance. This suggests that rather than a defeat of academics' professional power, we are seeing a reconfiguration of power relationships in which some academics, namely those in tenured positions or those who are managerial leaders, may maintain or even increase their power and influence while others, particularly in more precarious contractual arrangements, may be more affected by the reforms and increasingly subject to managerial control (Musselin, 2013), reflecting the centrality of the technical-instrumental rationality (Lima, 2012).

These features of the relationships between managerial governance and academic self-governance echo the perceptions on the role of external stakeholders in institutional governance, as institutional actors viewed their influence to some extent confirming their role as non-interfering friends in academic issues, as argued elsewhere (Magalhães, Veiga, & Amaral, 2016). This article opens avenues for further research as, on the one hand, it underlines *boardism* as an analytical tool, and, on the other hand, the analysis illuminates the importance of contexts in understanding education reforms, not to mention governance reforms. Actually, the nature and circumstances of the Portuguese case aims to bring forward the issues that drive the comparative approaches.

## Acknowledgments

This work was funded by the FEDER funds through the Operational Competitiveness Programme – COMPETE (EXCL/IVC-PEC/0789/2012) and by national funds through FCT – Foundation for Science and Technology (UID/CED/UIO757/2013).

## References

- Afonso, A. J. (2009). Nem tudo o que conta em educação é mensurável e comparável. Crítica à *accountability* baseada em testes estandardizados e rankings escolares. *Revista Lusófona de Educação*, 13(13), 13-29.
- Barroso, J. (2006). A Investigação sobre a regulação das políticas públicas de educação em Portugal. In: J. Barroso, *A Regulação das políticas de Educação: Espaços, dinâmicas e atores*. (pp. 9-34). Lisboa: Educa/Unidade de I&D de Ciências da Educação.
- Ferlie, E., Musselin, C., & Andresani, G. (2009). The Governance of Higher Education Systems: a public management perspective. In: C. Paradeise, E. Reale, I. Bleiklie, & E. Ferlie (Eds.), *University Governance: Western European Comparative Perspective* (pp. 1-19). Dordrecht: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9515-3\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9515-3_1)
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Freeman, R., Harrison, J., Hicks, A., Parmar, B., & De Colle, S. (2010). *Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.263511>.
- Hall, P. A., & Taylor, R. C. R. (1996). Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms. *Political Studies*, 44(5), 936-957. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb00343.x>
- Lima, L. (2012). Elementos de hiperburocratização da administração educacional. In: C. Lucena & J. R. Silva Junior (Orgs.). *Trabalho e educação no século XXI: Experiências internacionais*. (pp. 129-158). São Paulo: EJR Xamã Editora.
- Magalhães, A. (2004). *A Identidade do Ensino Superior: política, conhecimento e educação numa época de transição*. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Magalhães, A., Veiga, A., & Amaral, A. (2016). The changing role of external stakeholders: from imaginary friends to effective actors or non-interfering friends. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(4), 737-743. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1196354>
- Magalhães, A., Veiga, A., Amaral, A., Sousa, S., and Ribeiro, F. (2013). Governance of governance in higher education: practices and lessons drawn from the Portuguese case. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 67(3), 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12021>
- Magalhães, A., Veiga, A., & Videira, P. (2017). Hard and Soft Managerialism in Portuguese Higher Education Governance. In: R. Deem & H. Eggins (Eds.), *The University as a Critical Institution. Higher Education Research in the 21st Century Series*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6351-116-2\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6351-116-2_3)
- Musselin, C. (2013). Redefinition of the relationships between academics and their university. *Higher Education*, 65(1), 25-37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9579-3>
- Mainardes, E. W., Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2011). Stakeholder theory: Issues to resolve. *Management Decision*, 49(2), 226-252. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741111109133>
- Moreira, V. (2008). O Estatuto Legal das Instituições de Ensino Superior. In: A. Amaral (Ed.), *Políticas de Ensino Superior – quatro temas em debate*. (pp. 123-139). Lisbon: Conselho Nacional de Educação.

- Neave, G. (2012). *The Evaluative State, Institutional Autonomy and Re-engineering Higher Education in Western Europe: The Prince and His Pleasure*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.  
<https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230370227>
- Paradeise, C., Reale, E., Bleiklie, I., & Ferlie, E. (2009). *University Governance: Western European Comparative Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9515-3>
- Salamon, L. (2002a). Conclusion and Implications. In: L. Salamon (Ed.), *The Tools of Government: a Guide to the New Governance* (pp. 600-610). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salamon, L. (2002b). The New Governance and the Tools of Public Action: an Introduction. In: L. Salamon (Ed.), *The Tools of Government: a Guide to the New Governance* (pp. 1-47). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shattock, M. (2006). *Good Governance in Higher Education*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Somers, M., & Gibson, G. D. (1996). Reclaiming the Epistemological "Other": Narrative and the Social Construction of Identity. In: C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Veiga, A., Magalhães, A., & Amaral, A. (2015). From Collegial Governance to *Boardism*: Reconfiguring Governance in Higher Education. In: J. Huisman, H. de Boer, D. D. Dill, & M. Souto-Otero (Eds.), *The Palgrave International Handbook of Higher Education Policy and Governance* (pp. 398-416). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-45617-5\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-45617-5_22).

## About the Authors

### **António Magalhães**

University of Porto, Portugal

Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES)

[antonio@fpce.up.pt](mailto:antonio@fpce.up.pt)

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2979-2358>

António Magalhães is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences at the University of Porto, Portugal, where he acts as Head of Department of Education Sciences. He is also senior researcher at the Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES). His academic interests focus on education policy analysis, namely on the relationship between the state and higher education systems and institutions and on European higher education governance. He has been developing national and international projects in the field of research on higher education. He has written and coedited numerous books and published articles in major journals in the field including *Higher Education Policy*, *Higher Education* and *Studies in Higher Education*.

### **Amélia Veiga**

University of Porto, Portugal

Centre for Research and Intervention in Education (CIIE)

Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES)

[aveiga@fpce.up.pt](mailto:aveiga@fpce.up.pt)

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5220-4019>

Amélia Veiga is an Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences at the University of Porto, Portugal, and researcher at the Centre for Research and Intervention in Education (CIIE) and at the Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES). Her academic interests focus on education policy analysis, namely on the Bologna process and higher education governance in areas such as internationalisation, globalisation and quality assurance. She



has been involved in national and international projects. She has written book chapters, coedited books, and published articles on European integration and higher education governance in key journals such as *Higher Education*, *Studies in Higher Education* and *Higher Education Quarterly*.

### **Pedro Videira**

Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES)

[pvideira1@gmail.com](mailto:pvideira1@gmail.com)

Pedro Videira is a researcher at the Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES). His main research interests lie in higher education and science policies, namely changes to the academic profession, individual and institutional knowledge transfer processes and scientific mobility.

## **About the Guest Editors**

### **Almerindo Janela Afonso**

Universidade do Minho – Uminho

[ajafonso@ie.uminho.pt](mailto:ajafonso@ie.uminho.pt)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9879-5814>

Sociólogo, Doutor em Educação, Professor Associado (com tenure) da Universidade do Minho/Portugal e pesquisador do Centro de Investigação em Educação (CIEE). É coordenador da especialidade de Sociologia da Educação e Política Educativa do doutoramento em Ciências da Educação, foi diretor do Departamento de Ciências Sociais da Educação, membro do Conselho Nacional de Educação e Presidente da Sociedade Portuguesa de Ciências da Educação.

### **Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes**

Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina

[geolunardi@gmail.com](mailto:geolunardi@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8848-7436>

Professora Titular do Programa de Pós-graduação em Educação, do Centro de Ciências Humanas e da Educação da Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (UDESC). É vice-presidente da Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-graduação em Educação (ANPED). É editora associada da Revista Brasileira de Educação, da Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial e da Arquivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas.

**SPECIAL ISSUE**  
**Management and Management Policies in Lusophone Countries**

education policy analysis archives

Volume 26 Number 135

October 15, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or **EPAA**. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A1 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank; SCOPUS, SOCOLAR (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at [Audrey.beardsley@asu.edu](mailto:Audrey.beardsley@asu.edu)

Join **EPAA's Facebook community** at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> and **Twitter feed** @epaa\_aape.

education policy analysis archives  
editorial board

Lead Editor: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University)

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

Associate Editors: **David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Molly Ott  
Scott Marley, Iveta Silova** (Arizona State University)

**Cristina Alfaro** San Diego State  
University

**Gary Anderson** New York  
University

**Michael W. Apple** University of  
Wisconsin, Madison

**Jeff Bale** OISE, University of  
Toronto, Canada

**Aaron Bevanot** SUNY Albany

**David C. Berliner** Arizona  
State University

**Henry Braun** Boston College

**Casey Cobb** University of  
Connecticut

**Arnold Danzig** San Jose State  
University

**Linda Darling-Hammond**  
Stanford University

**Elizabeth H. DeBray** University of  
Georgia

**Chad d'Entremont** Rennie Center  
for Education Research & Policy

**John Diamond** University of  
Wisconsin, Madison

**Matthew Di Carlo** Albert Shanker  
Institute

**Sherman Dorn** Arizona State  
University

**Michael J. Dumas** University of  
California, Berkeley

**Kathy Escamilla** University of  
Colorado, Boulder

**Melissa Lynn Freeman** Adams  
State College

**Rachael Gabriel**  
University of Connecticut

**Amy Garrett Dikkers** University  
of North Carolina, Wilmington

**Gene V Glass** Arizona  
State University

**Ronald Glass** University of  
California, Santa Cruz

**Jacob P. K. Gross** University of  
Louisville

**Eric M. Haas** WestEd

**Julian Vasquez Heilig** California  
State University, Sacramento

**Kimberly Kappler Hewitt** University  
of North Carolina Greensboro

**Aimee Howley** Ohio University

**Steve Klees** University of Maryland

**Jaekyung Lee**  
SUNY Buffalo

**Jessica Nina Lester**  
Indiana University

**Amanda E. Lewis** University of  
Illinois, Chicago

**Chad R. Lochmiller** Indiana  
University

**Christopher Lubienski** Indiana  
University

**Sarah Lubienski** Indiana University

**William J. Mathis** University of  
Colorado, Boulder

**Michele S. Moses** University of  
Colorado, Boulder

**Julianne Moss** Deakin  
University, Australia

**Sharon Nichols** University of Texas,  
San Antonio

**Eric Parsons** University of  
Missouri-Columbia

**Amanda U. Potterton**  
University of Kentucky

**Susan L. Robertson** Bristol  
University, UK

**Gloria M. Rodriguez**  
University of California, Davis

**R. Anthony Rolle** University of  
Houston

**A. G. Rud** Washington State  
University

**Patricia Sánchez** University of  
University of Texas, San Antonio

**Janelle Scott** University of  
California, Berkeley

**Jack Schneider** University of  
Massachusetts, Lowell

**Noah Sobe** Loyola University

**Nelly P. Stromquist** University of  
Maryland

**Benjamin Superfine** University of  
Illinois, Chicago

**Adai Tefera** Virginia  
Commonwealth University

**Tina Trujillo** University of  
California, Berkeley

**Federico R. Waitoller** University of  
Illinois, Chicago

**Larisa Warhol**  
University of Connecticut

**John Weathers** University of  
Colorado, Colorado Springs

**Kevin Welner** University of  
Colorado, Boulder

**Terrence G. Wiley** Center  
for Applied Linguistics

**John Willinsky**  
Stanford University

**Jennifer R. Wolgemuth** University of  
South Florida

**Kyo Yamashiro** Claremont Graduate  
University

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas  
consejo editorial

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

Editores Asociados: **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Jason Beech** (Universidad de San Andrés), **Ezequiel Gomez Caride** (Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina), **Antonio Luzon** (Universidad de Granada), **Angelica Buendia** (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **José Luis Ramírez** (Universidad de Sonora), **Paula Razquin** (Universidad de San Andrés)

**Claudio Almonacid**

Universidad Metropolitana de  
Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

**Miguel Ángel Arias Ortega**

Universidad Autónoma de la  
Ciudad de México

**Xavier Besalú Costa**

Universitat de Girona, España

**Xavier Bonal Sarro** Universidad  
Autónoma de Barcelona, España

**Antonio Bolívar Boitia**

Universidad de Granada, España

**José Joaquín Brunner** Universidad  
Diego Portales, Chile

**Damián Canales Sánchez**

Instituto Nacional para la  
Evaluación de la Educación,  
México

**Gabriela de la Cruz Flores**

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de  
México

**Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes**

Universidad Iberoamericana,  
México

**Inés Dussel**, DIE-CINVESTAV,  
México

**Pedro Flores Crespo** Universidad  
Iberoamericana, México

**Ana María García de Fanelli**

Centro de Estudios de Estado y  
Sociedad (CEDES) CONICET,  
Argentina

**Juan Carlos González Faraco**

Universidad de Huelva, España

**María Clemente Linuesa**

Universidad de Salamanca, España

**Jaume Martínez Bonafé**

Universitat de València, España

**Alejandro Márquez Jiménez**

Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la  
Universidad y la Educación,  
UNAM, México

**María Guadalupe Olivier Tellez**,  
Universidad Pedagógica Nacional,  
México

**Miguel Pereyra** Universidad de  
Granada, España

**Mónica Pini** Universidad Nacional  
de San Martín, Argentina

**Omar Orlando Pulido Chaves**

Instituto para la Investigación  
Educativa y el Desarrollo  
Pedagógico (IDEP)

**José Ignacio Rivas Flores**

Universidad de Málaga, España

**Miriam Rodríguez Vargas**

Universidad Autónoma de  
Tamaulipas, México

**José Gregorio Rodríguez**

Universidad Nacional de Colombia,  
Colombia

**Mario Rueda Beltrán** Instituto de  
Investigaciones sobre la Universidad  
y la Educación, UNAM, México

**José Luis San Fabián Maroto**

Universidad de Oviedo,  
España

**Jurjo Torres Santomé**, Universidad  
de la Coruña, España

**Yengny Marisol Silva Laya**

Universidad Iberoamericana,  
México

**Ernesto Treviño Ronzón**

Universidad Veracruzana, México

**Ernesto Treviño Villarreal**

Universidad Diego Portales  
Santiago, Chile

**Antoni Verger Planells**

Universidad Autónoma de  
Barcelona, España

**Catalina Wainerman**

Universidad de San Andrés,  
Argentina

**Juan Carlos Yáñez Velazco**

Universidad de Colima, México

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas  
conselho editorial

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

Editoras Associadas: **Kaizo Iwakami Beltrao**, (Brazilian School of Public and Private Management - EBAPE/FGV, Brazil), **Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes** (Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina), **Gilberto José Miranda**, (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brazil), **Marcia Pletsch, Sandra Regina Sales** (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

**Almerindo Afonso**

Universidade do Minho  
Portugal

**Alexandre Fernandez Vaz**

Universidade Federal de Santa  
Catarina, Brasil

**José Augusto Pacheco**

Universidade do Minho, Portugal

**Rosanna Maria Barros Sá**

Universidade do Algarve  
Portugal

**Regina Célia Linhares Hostins**

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí,  
Brasil

**Jane Paiva**

Universidade do Estado do Rio de  
Janeiro, Brasil

**Maria Helena Bonilla**

Universidade Federal da Bahia  
Brasil

**Alfredo Macedo Gomes**

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco  
Brasil

**Paulo Alberto Santos Vieira**

Universidade do Estado de Mato  
Grosso, Brasil

**Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer**

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande  
do Sul, Brasil

**Jefferson Mainardes**

Universidade Estadual de Ponta  
Grossa, Brasil

**Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva**

Universidade Federal do Mato  
Grosso do Sul, Brasil

**Alice Casimiro Lopes**

Universidade do Estado do Rio de  
Janeiro, Brasil

**Jader Janer Moreira Lopes**

Universidade Federal Fluminense e  
Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora,  
Brasil

**António Teodoro**

Universidade Lusófona  
Portugal

**Suzana Feldens Schwertner**

Centro Universitário Univates  
Brasil

**Debora Nunes**

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande  
do Norte, Brasil

**Lílian do Valle**

Universidade do Estado do Rio de  
Janeiro, Brasil

**Flávia Miller Naethe Motta**

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de  
Janeiro, Brasil

**Alda Junqueira Marin**

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de  
São Paulo, Brasil

**Alfredo Veiga-Neto**

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande  
do Sul, Brasil

**Dalila Andrade Oliveira**

Universidade Federal de Minas  
Gerais, Brasil