

GOVERNANÇA E JUSTIÇA LINGUÍSTICA NO ENSINO SUPERIOR: UM ESTUDO COMPARATIVO DE CURRÍCULOS DE TURISMO

GOVERNANCE AND LINGUISTIC JUSTICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TOURISM CURRICULA

ETHEL NATALIA REVELLO BAROVERO

UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE TIERRA DEL FUEGO, ANTÁRTIDA E ISLAS DEL ATLÉNTICO SUR (UNTDF)

GIOVANA GORETTI FELJÓ ALMEIDA

INSTITUTO POLITÉCNICO DE LEIRIA

JOSÉ PEREIRA

INSTITUTO POLITÉCNICO DE LEIRIA - LEIRIA - PORTUGAL

Comunicação:

O XIII SINGEP foi realizado em conjunto com a 13th Conferência Internacional do CIK (CYRUS Institute of Knowledge), em formato híbrido, com sede presencial na UNINOVE - Universidade Nove de Julho, no Brasil.

Agradecimento à órgão de fomento:

UNTDF, Politécnico de Leira.

GOVERNANÇA E JUSTIÇA LINGUÍSTICA NO ENSINO SUPERIOR: UM ESTUDO COMPARATIVO DE CURRÍCULOS DE TURISMO

Objetivo do estudo

O objeto de estudo é a relação entre governança universitária e justiça linguística no ensino superior, especificamente no contexto dos programas de turismo na Argentina, Brasil e Portugal.

Relevância/originalidade

A relevância e a originalidade deste artigo residem em sua abordagem interdisciplinar e comparativa, que conecta três eixos pouco explorados: governança universitária, justiça linguística e educação em turismo. A combinação de governança institucional, política linguística e treinamento em turismo é uma abordagem.

Metodologia/abordagem

Abordagem metodológica mista, através de um tipo de investigação multimétodo que combina métodos qualitativos e quantitativos, com predomínio do qualitativo (CUAL-cuan), e um desenho metodológico transformativo sequencial (DITRAS), com uma fase inicial qualitativa seguida de uma quantitativa.

Principais resultados

O ensino de línguas é uma competência técnica para aceder ao conhecimento. Existe uma ligação entre a formação em turismo e os desafios ecológicos e sociais contemporâneos. As decisões institucionais e as políticas educativas determinam o seu lugar.

Contribuições teóricas/metodológicas

A governança institucional, a política linguística e o turismo são combinados com uma perspectiva comparativa entre três países, permitindo a identificação de padrões e divergências estruturais. É proporcionada uma perspectiva crítica e transformadora ao abordar as línguas como uma questão de justiça.

Contribuições sociais/para a gestão

Foi revelada uma tensão entre os discursos de internacionalização e as práticas curriculares reais. Os resultados podem ser explorados noutros sistemas educativos que enfrentam desafios semelhantes na integração de competências multilíngues.

Palavras-chave: Quadros Curriculares, Foco do Programa de Treinamento, Acesso ao conhecimento, Governança Universitária, Ensino Superior

GOVERNANCE AND LINGUISTIC JUSTICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TOURISM CURRICULA

Study purpose

Estabelecer as semelhanças e/ou diferenças entre as habilidades comunicativas em línguas estrangeiras exigidas pelo(s) órgão(s) regulador(es) e os currículos de turismo na Argentina, Brasil e Portugal Aborda a aprendizagem de línguas como uma questão de justiça, poder e acesso ao conhecimento.

Relevance / originality

O artigo aborda como o ensino de línguas em programas de turismo é frequentemente marginalizado, apesar de ser fundamental para a integração profissional em contextos globalizados. Isso revela uma tensão entre os discursos de internacionalização e as práticas curriculares reais.

Methodology / approach

Abordagem metodológica mista, através de um tipo de investigação multimétodo que combina métodos qualitativos e quantitativos, com uma fase inicial qualitativa seguida de uma quantitativa. Este artigo mostra a comparação da análise documental.

Main results

O ensino de línguas é uma competência técnica para aceder ao conhecimento. Existe uma ligação entre a formação em turismo e os desafios ecológicos e sociais contemporâneos. As decisões institucionais e as políticas educativas determinam o seu lugar.

Theoretical / methodological contributions

A governação institucional, a política linguística e o turismo são combinados com uma perspectiva comparativa entre três países, permitindo a identificação de padrões e divergências estruturais. É proporcionada uma perspectiva crítica e transformadora ao abordar as línguas como uma questão de justiça.

Social / management contributions

Ao ligar a justiça ao acesso epistémico, o texto demonstra como as decisões de governação afectam directamente a inclusão e a mobilidade académica dos estudantes. Apresenta evidências empíricas e análises teóricas sobre a internacionalização, a sustentabilidade e a reforma curricular no ensino.

Keywords: Curricular Frameworks, Training Programme Focus, Access to knowledge, University Governance, Higher Education

Governance and Linguistic Justice in Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Tourism Curricula

1 Introduction

In an increasingly globalized academic landscape, the intersection of governance and linguistic justice has emerged as a critical axis for evaluating equity and inclusion in higher education. Nowhere is this more evident than in tourism studies; a field inherently transnational, intercultural, and multilingual. Yet, despite its global orientation, tourism education often reflects deeply localized governance structures and uneven language policies that shape students' epistemic access and professional mobility.

This article explores how institutional design and curricular frameworks in Argentina, Brazil, and Portugal influence the integration of foreign language education within tourism programs. Drawing on qualitative case studies; including the matrix-based governance model of the Universidad Nacional de Tierra del Fuego, Antártida e Islas del Atlántico Sur (UNTDF), the decentralized regulatory landscape of Brazilian federal universities, and the structured accreditation system of Portuguese Polytechnics, this comparative analysis reveals how language instruction is positioned within broader academic priorities and how .

By examining the role of language units, accreditation bodies, and national education laws, the study interrogates the marginalization of multilingual competencies in tourism curricula. It argues that linguistic justice is not merely a pedagogical concern but a governance issue, one that demands strategic integration of language education into the core of academic planning. Through this lens, the article contributes to ongoing debates about internationalization, curricular equity, and the transformative potential of multilingualism in higher education.

2 Theoretical Frameworks on Governance in Higher Education

Effective governance depends on aligning structural complexity with environmental demands, such as regional development, internationalization, interdisciplinary research, and sustainability. University governance plays a pivotal role in shaping institutional priorities, curricular structures, and the distribution of academic authority. Theoretical models of governance, ranging from centralized to decentralized systems, offer insight into how universities organize themselves to balance efficiency, autonomy, and academic diversity (Clark, 1991; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1986).

Centralized governance models typically consolidate administrative, financial, and legal functions within a central authority, such as a rectorate or executive board. This structure can streamline decision-making and reduce operational redundancies, but may also limit the autonomy of individual academic units. In contrast, decentralized models distribute authority across faculties, departments, or institutes, fostering greater disciplinary independence and responsiveness to local academic needs. However, such fragmentation can lead to increased costs and coordination challenges.

Lawrence and Lorsch (1986) argue that organizational structures reflect the degree of differentiation and integration required by an institution's environment. In higher education, this means that universities must navigate the tension between specialized academic units and the need for cohesive institutional strategy. Their framework suggests that effective governance depends on aligning structural complexity with environmental demands, such as regional development, internationalization, or interdisciplinary research.

Clark (1991) expands on this by examining the “small worlds” of academic disciplines and the “different worlds” of institutional administration. He emphasizes that:

[...] the degree of interdependence in the structure of faculties strongly influences the possibilities for curricular reform. A university composed of specialized faculties is a setting that is not conducive to general education. Historically based on the premises that students receive a sufficient general education in secondary school and that higher education fulfills the purpose of specialization (p. 21).

This insight underscores how governance structures can either facilitate or hinder curricular innovation, particularly in fields like tourism that demand interdisciplinary and multilingual competencies.

This duality is particularly evident in models like the one adopted by the UNTDF, which organizes its academic work through thematic institutes rather than traditional faculties. Such a configuration promotes interdisciplinary collaboration and regional relevance, while also reflecting ideological commitments to equity and epistemic pluralism.

Governance structures directly influence curricular design by determining which units have authority over academic programming, resource allocation, and strategic planning. In centralized models, curricular decisions may align closely with institutional goals, such as sustainability or internationalization. In decentralized systems, curricula often reflect the priorities of individual departments, which can lead to variation in language education, research focus, and community engagement. Ultimately, the governance model adopted by a university shapes not only its internal operations but also its capacity to respond to broader societal and educational challenges.

3. Methodology

This research adopts a mixed methodological approach, through a type of multi-method research that combines qualitative and quantitative methods, with a predominance of the qualitative (CUAL-cuan), and a sequential transformative methodological design (DITRAS), with an initial qualitative phase followed by a quantitative one, whose central purpose is to serve the theoretical perspective of the study, taking into account the opinions and voices of all participants. The study is grounded in documental analysis of legal and academic materials, including institutions from three different countries: Brasil, Portugal, and Argentina.

The Argentinean university chosen is Universidad Nacional de Tierra del Fuego, Antártida e Islas del Atlántico Sur -UNTDF. The documents that have been analyzed are

Argentina’s Higher Education Law (Law No. 24.521), the founding legislation of UNTDF (Law No. 26.559), its Provisional Statute (Resolution R.O. No. 15/12), the official curricula and planning documents of the Tourism programme offered by IDEI. Furthermore, institutional documents detailing the mission and functions of UNTDF’s EDI were examined to assess the role of language policy in academic programming.

To broaden the scope and contextualize UNTDF’s academic and linguistic orientation, the study includes a comparative analysis with the higher education legislation and tourism curricula in Brazil and Portugal. Brazilian references include the Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional and selected curricula from federal universities offering tourism degrees. Portuguese legal and curricular frameworks were drawn from the Lei de Bases do Sistema Educativo and publicly available tourism programs from polytechnic institutions and universities. This comparative lens provides insight into how different national models position tourism education, institutional governance, sustainability, and foreign language training, highlighting structural divergences and common challenges in epistemic access and multilingual integration.

4. Results

Argentina’s public universities offer diverse and regionally grounded approaches to tourism education, each reflecting unique academic priorities and territorial contexts. The UNTDF, located in Ushuaia, delivers a five-year program focused on sustainability, environmental impact, and cultural preservation, with fieldwork in Fuegian and Antarctic regions. Its interdisciplinary structure, organized around thematic institutes, promotes applied research and policy development, though foreign language instruction remains peripheral and managed by an auxiliary unit. The Universidad Provincial de Ezeiza emphasizes creativity, innovation, and problem-solving through a four-year program that includes elective activities and an academic credit system, preparing students for dynamic roles in tourism services. Meanwhile, the Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata offers a five-year degree centered on economic planning and public-private management, integrating subjects like global tourist spaces and public sector organization. The Universidad Nacional de La Plata provides a four-year program with a strong foundation in tourist geography, policy analysis, and project evaluation, requiring seminars and a final thesis. Together, these institutions illustrate Argentina’s commitment to accessible, context-sensitive tourism education, while also revealing a shared challenge: the strategic integration of multilingual competencies within their curricula. In Table 1 a comparative chart shows the focus and key subjects of each program.

Table 1. Comparative Chart of university programs in Argentina

University	Duration	Focus including sustainability	Key Subjects
------------	----------	--------------------------------	--------------

UNTDF	5 years	Sustainability, environmental impact, and cultural preservation. Includes fieldwork in Fuegian and Antarctic areas.	Physical and Human Geography, Ecology and Conservation, Tourism Policy, Tourism Research, Antarctic Tourism.
Universidad Provincial de Ezeiza	4 years	Creativity, innovation, and problem-solving. Includes academic credit system and elective activities.	Tourism Economics, Quality Management in Tourism Organizations, Heritage Conservation, Sustainable Local Development, Tourism Research
Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata	5 years	Economics, administration, and tourism planning. Offers specialization in public, private, and environmental sectors.	Global and American Tourist Spaces, Research Methodology, Public Tourism Management, Public Sector Economics and Organization, Tourism Projects
Universidad Nacional de La Plata	4 years	Tourist geography, tourism policy, and human resource management. Requires seminars and a final thesis.	Argentine and Global Tourist Geography, Micro and Macro Tourism Economics, Tourism Marketing, Tourism Policies, Project Formulation and Evaluation

In Argentina, the UNTDF, established under Law No. 26.559 in 2009, is the southernmost public national university regulated by Argentina's framework for higher education institutions. Its academic structure is built around specialized institutes focused on teaching, research, and providing services to the community. Notably, the Instituto de Desarrollo Económico e Innovación (IDEI) -Institute for Economic Development and Innovation-; Instituto de Ciencias Polares, Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (ICPA) - Institute of Polar Sciences, Environment and Natural Resources-; and Instituto de la Educación y del Conocimiento (IEC) -Institute of Education and Knowledge. This institutional model contrasts with the more traditional organizational forms of rectorates, faculties, and schools used by other national universities, which often decentralize administrative and legal functions, contributing to increased operational costs. UNTDF follows a more centralized model that consolidates administrative, legal, and financial processes within the rectorate, improving efficiency. This design is not only strategic but also ideological, as it reflects a thematic and interdisciplinary approach to academic work, modeled after Universidad Nacional General Sarmiento (UNGS) - National University of General Sarmiento-, which was consulted during UNTDF's founding (CONEAU report, 2010).

CONEAU stands for Comisión Nacional de Evaluación y Acreditación -National Commission for Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation-. It is a decentralized public body in Argentina tasked with evaluating and accrediting the quality of university education across the country. Although it operates under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education, CONEAU functions autonomously in its evaluations and recommendations. Its primary objective is to ensure that both undergraduate and postgraduate academic programs meet rigorous quality standards. To achieve this, CONEAU carries out external assessments of institutions and degree programs, accrediting undergraduate courses, particularly those subject to state regulation, and all postgraduate offerings, including specializations, master's degrees, and doctorates. Accreditation through CONEAU not only validates the academic integrity of degree programs nationally but also enables international recognition, fostering global mobility for graduates. Beyond its national role, CONEAU actively participates in international initiatives aimed at strengthening higher education quality assurance and advises other countries on institutional evaluation frameworks. Ultimately, its work is central to promoting continuous improvement, academic excellence, and the professional competency of university graduates throughout Argentina.

According to Lawrence and Lorsch (1986), organizational structures reflect institutional priorities and power distribution. Clark (1991) emphasizes the tension between disciplines and physical establishments, which shape a matrix-like structure within academic institutions. From this perspective, UNTDF's institute-based organization helps group academic work around regional and thematic issues, promoting the figure of the teacher-researcher and fostering governance practices that are both contextually relevant and epistemically plural. UNTDF operates under an administrative and academic framework organized through a matrix-based structure composed of interconnected institutes. The university was founded with the mission to ensure that all residents and inhabitants of the province can access, participate in, and benefit from academic activities, a commitment clearly articulated in Article 1 of Section I of its Provisional Statute (Resolution R.O. No. 15/12), under "Purposes and Foundational Missions" (p. 3). Article 3 of the same section elaborates on the academic organization, describing the institutes as an "interdisciplinary configuration (...) centered around comprehensive issues" and designating them as "the principal academic units of the University's structure," since they host its core activities. These activities are defined as "research, teaching, training, and community service" (p. 5), highlighting the integrative and socially engaged nature of the institutional model.

Although the Escuela de Idiomas (EDI) -School of Languages, at UNTDF plays a critical role in promoting multilingual competencies, its institutional positioning reflects broader patterns of linguistic marginalization. The EDI operates under the Subsecretariat for Academic Articulation and assists the Academic Secretariat in implementing the university's language policy. Its main functions include offering language courses for students and staff, certifying competencies in other languages, supporting international academic communication, and translating documents linked to institutional collaborations. However, despite this wide-ranging scope, the unit lacks formal representation in UNTDF's governance structures, such as the Superior Council or Institute Councils, underscoring the limited influence of language policy in strategic decision-making. The absence of EDI from decision-making bodies reinforces the findings of Varela (2019) and Baum (2022), who argue that language education, and particularly the teaching of English, must be approached not only as a technical skill but as a politically and culturally charged practice. In UNTDF's case,

the governance gap reveals a policy framework driven more by operational support than strategic integration, raising questions about the role of multilingual justice within institutional design.

The analysis of Brazilian regulations reveals an extensive and decentralized framework for tourism education, both at undergraduate and postgraduate levels (Brasil, 2004; MEC, 2025). The *Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional* (LDB – Law No. 9.394/1996) and the *Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais* (DCNs) specific to the Tourism program (Resolution CNE/CES No. 13/2006) guide the curricular structure, graduate profile, and desired competencies. However, there are no explicit guidelines that integrate foreign language instruction as a mandatory component in undergraduate programs, resulting in its curricular marginalization.

In postgraduate programs (*stricto sensu*), regulated by CAPES (Decree No. 3.860/2001; Ordinances No. 34/2006 and No. 156/2014), there is a formal requirement for proficiency in one foreign language at the master's level and two at the doctoral level, as a criterion for admission or academic progression. This requirement, while relevant, does not translate into the offering of language courses within the programs, and is generally fulfilled through external exams or independent study. Thus, language training remains disconnected from the academic curriculum and pedagogical strategy of the programs.

Institutional governance of tourism programs is characterized by the autonomy of higher education institutions (HEIs), which develop their own *Pedagogical Course Projects* (PPCs).

This autonomy allows for significant variation among programs, both in terms of thematic content and inclusion of language components. The absence of a national language policy aligned with the goals of tourism education limits the development of intercultural and multilingual competencies, which are essential for professional practice in globalized tourism contexts. Although regulations encourage internationalization and the establishment of international agreements (such as MEC Ordinance No. 554/2013), their practical implementation depends on the initiative of each HEI. This scenario reinforces asymmetries in epistemic access and language training across institutions, regions, and student profiles.

Additionally, language instruction is generally offered by language centers or units that operate parallel to undergraduate programs, without formal representation in decision-making processes. When language proficiency is required, it is often linked to external exams or extracurricular activities, reinforcing its curricular marginality. This structure highlights a common challenge among Brazilian institutions: the difficulty of integrating language training as a transformative and strategic tool for professional practice in multilingual and globalized contexts.

The Portuguese model of higher education in tourism is structured by a set of regulations that govern the different levels of training (Technical Tourism Courses – CTeSP, Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctorate), based on the *Lei de Bases do Sistema Educativo* (Law No. 46/1986) and *Decree-Law No. 74/2006*, amended by *Decree-Law No. 65/2018*, which defines the legal regimes for degrees and diplomas. Tourism courses are offered by both universities and polytechnic institutes, with notable presence of the CTeSP programs, which

last two years and focus on employability. These programs aim to prepare students for professional roles in tourism, aligning with the hospitality and leisure sector.

Institutional governance is regulated by the *Agência de Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior* (A3ES, s.d.), responsible for course accreditation and quality assurance. Institutional autonomy allows for curricular variation, provided that programs adhere to standards defined by A3ES and the *Direção-Geral do Ensino Superior* (DGES, s.d.). Foreign language training is present in tourism bachelor's programs, with English often mandatory and additional options such as French and Spanish depending on the institution. While the offerings are significant, there are still variations in workload, mandatory status, and strategic integration with program objectives. In some cases, languages are treated as complementary components, without direct articulation with technical and scientific tourism training.

At the postgraduate level, master's and doctoral programs are regulated by policies such as *Ordinance No. 65/2022*, which requires affiliation with research centers recognized by the *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* (FCT, s.d.). The FCT has been the main funding body for scientific research in Portugal, including scholarships and support for doctoral programs. However, a major reform announced by the government in July 2025 includes the dissolution of the FCT, with its functions absorbed by a new *Agency for Research and Innovation*. This change is part of a broader restructuring of the Ministry of Education, Science, and Innovation aimed at streamlining public administration and improving coordination between education and research (Barral, 2025).

The dissolution of the FCT marks a significant shift in Portuguese scientific policy, with potential impacts on funding structures and the autonomy of postgraduate programs. Although the government has assured continued support for science, the transition to a new agency may affect the predictability and stability of research funding, especially in fields like tourism, which depend on strong links between education, territory, and innovation.

4. Discussion

Across these three contexts, a common tension emerges: the marginalization of foreign language education and the uneven integration of sustainability within tourism curricula, despite their critical roles in preparing students for globalized and ecologically responsible professional environments. This reveals distinct governance models and curricular priorities, yet all three systems grapple with the challenge of integrating foreign language education as a strategic, not peripheral, component. At the UNTDF, the Licenciatura in Tourism is embedded within a matrix structure that emphasizes interdisciplinary and regionally grounded learning. Despite its global orientation, foreign language instruction, primarily English, is managed by the auxiliary School of Languages (EDI), which lacks formal representation in governance bodies. This structural marginalization reflects Clark's (1991) assertion that specialized faculties often inhibit curricular reform, particularly in general education domains like language learning. Language proficiency is required for graduation, but students typically fulfill this through independent study or remedial courses, underscoring a disconnect between institutional design and multilingual justice.

In Brazil, the regulatory framework for tourism education is extensive yet decentralized. Undergraduate programs are governed by institutional autonomy, allowing

universities to design their own curricula. While postgraduate programs require language proficiency for admission, one foreign language for master's and two for doctoral studies, language instruction is rarely embedded within the curriculum itself. Instead, it is addressed through external exams or extracurricular offerings, often managed by language centers that operate outside formal academic governance. This fragmentation limits the development of intercultural competencies and reinforces epistemic asymmetries between institutions and student populations.

By contrast, Politécnico de Leiria in Portugal offers a more integrated model. Tourism programs at the undergraduate level typically include mandatory foreign language courses, with English as a core requirement and options for French, Spanish, or Mandarin depending on the institution. Although the depth and strategic alignment of language education vary, its curricular presence marks a step forward in recognizing multilingualism as essential to tourism training. However, even in Portugal, foreign languages are sometimes treated as complementary rather than central, and their integration with technical and scientific competencies remains uneven.

Across these three contexts, a common tension emerges: the marginalization of foreign language education within tourism curricula, despite its critical role in preparing students for globalized professional environments. Governance structures that treat language instruction as auxiliary or remedial fail to address the deeper issue of epistemic access, limiting students' ability to engage with international discourses, research, and mobility opportunities. Advancing multilingual justice in tourism education requires a shift in institutional priorities, embedding language policy into the core of academic planning and recognizing linguistic competencies as foundational to both professional formation and inclusive knowledge production.

5. Conclusion

The case of UNTDF reveals how institutional structure and curricular design shape not only academic priorities but also the conditions of linguistic access and equity. While the university's matrix-based organization allows for interdisciplinary exploration and regional relevance, especially within programs like the Bachelor's in Tourism, the marginal role of language education within its governance and curriculum underscores a broader tension between operational efficiency and inclusive knowledge production. The peripheral positioning of foreign languages, managed externally through the Language School (EDI) without representation in decision-making bodies, suggests a linguistic policy driven more by administrative necessity than by pedagogical strategy. As Varela (2019) and Baum (2022) argue, treating English as an "other language" demands recognizing its epistemic, cultural, and political implications, not merely its communicative utility. UNTDF's current approach offers a timely opportunity for institutional reflection: advancing multilingual justice requires integrating language education into the core of academic planning, not relegating it to the margins. Doing so would ensure that students are not only equipped for professional success but also empowered to participate equitably in global academic discourses.

In conclusion, Argentina's public universities demonstrate a rich and regionally responsive approach to tourism education, with each institution tailoring its curriculum to local needs, disciplinary strengths, and strategic priorities. The Universidad Nacional de

Tierra del Fuego (UNTDF) stands out for its interdisciplinary, matrix-based structure and its emphasis on sustainability and territorial specificity, particularly in the context of Fuegian and Antarctic tourism. However, despite its innovative academic model, UNTDF, like many of its counterparts, faces a persistent challenge: the marginalization of foreign language education. Across institutions, language instruction is often treated as a peripheral or technical requirement rather than a strategic component of professional and academic formation. This disconnect limits students' access to global discourses and undermines the potential for truly internationalized tourism training. To address this, universities must move beyond operational language policies and embrace multilingual education as a central pillar of curricular design, institutional governance, and epistemic inclusion. Only then can tourism programs fully prepare graduates to navigate the cultural, linguistic, and policy complexities of a globalized world.

The cases of Brazil and Portugal offer contrasting yet equally instructive perspectives on the integration of language education within tourism curricula. Brazil's higher education system is characterized by institutional autonomy and regulatory decentralization, which allows universities to design their own programs but often results in fragmented approaches to language instruction. While postgraduate programs formally require foreign language proficiency, this is typically fulfilled through external exams rather than integrated coursework, leaving language education disconnected from pedagogical strategy. At the undergraduate level, the absence of national guidelines mandating language training contributes to its curricular marginalization, limiting students' access to intercultural competencies essential for global tourism practice.

Portugal, on the other hand, presents a more centralized and structured model, with clear regulatory frameworks governing tourism education across universities and polytechnic institutes. Foreign language instruction, particularly English, is commonly embedded in undergraduate programs, though its depth and strategic integration vary by institution. The presence of language courses reflects a more proactive stance toward multilingual preparation, yet challenges remain in aligning these offerings with the technical and scientific dimensions of tourism training. At the postgraduate level, Portugal's commitment to research excellence is evident in its linkage to recognized research centers, though recent reforms, such as the dissolution of the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT), introduce uncertainty into the future of scientific governance and internationalization.

Together, the Brazil and Portugal cases underscore a shared tension: the gap between the global demands of tourism education and the local realities of language policy implementation. While Portugal has made strides in curricular integration, both countries must confront the challenge of embedding multilingual education as a strategic and transformative element of tourism training. This requires not only regulatory reform but also institutional commitment to linguistic equity and intercultural engagement.

To address these gaps, universities must embrace multilingual and sustainability education as central pillars of curricular design, institutional governance, and epistemic inclusion.

References

Baum, G. (2021). Diseños de materiales decoloniales situados para la enseñanza como lengua otra. *Cuadernos de la ALFAL*. N°13 (2), 133-168. ISSN 2218-0761.

Clark, B. R. (1991). *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. Princeton University Press.

CONEAU. (2010). *Informe de evaluación institucional de la Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento*. Buenos Aires: Comisión Nacional de Evaluación y Acreditación Universitaria.

Congreso de la Nación Argentina. (2009). *Ley N° 26.559: Creación de la Universidad Nacional de Tierra del Fuego, Antártida e Islas del Atlántico Sur*. Boletín Oficial de la República Argentina.

https://www.untdf.edu.ar/uploads/archivos/Ley_26559_Creacion_de_la_Untdf_1663000476_16

Facultad de Ciencias Económicas, Universidad Nacional de La Plata. (s.f.). *Licenciatura en Turismo*. https://www.econo.unlp.edu.ar/licenciatura_en_turismo

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1986). *Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration*. Harvard Business School Press.

Obeide, O. (1998). *La estructura organizacional de las instituciones universitarias*. Revista de Educación Universitaria, 12(3), 45–62.

Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge University Press.

Universidad Nacional de Tierra del Fuego, Antártida e Islas del Atlántico Sur. (2012). *Estatuto Provisorio (Resolución R.O. N° 15/12)*. UNTDF.

https://www.untdf.edu.ar/uploads/documentos/reso_015-12_estatuto_1468617852.pdf

Universidad Nacional de Tierra del Fuego, Antártida e Islas del Atlántico Sur. (s.f.). *Licenciatura en Turismo*. Instituto de Desarrollo Económico e Innovación.

<https://www.untdf.edu.ar/institutos/idei/turismo>

Universidad Nacional de Tierra del Fuego, Antártida e Islas del Atlántico Sur. (2012).

Estatuto Provisorio (Resolución R.O. N.º 15/12). UNTDF.

Universidad Nacional de Tierra del Fuego, Antártida e Islas del Atlántico Sur. (2025). *Manual de Misiones y Funciones* (Resolución R.O. N.º 007/2025). UNTDF.

Varela, L. (2019). Políticas de lenguas y movilidad académica internacional en Argentina. *Revista Digital de Política Lingüística*, 11, 6-20.

Brasil (2004). Lei nº 10.861, de 14 de abril de 2004. Institui o Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior – SINAES e dá outras providências. Presidência da República.

https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2004-2006/2004/Lei/L10.861.htm

MEC. Ministério da Educação. (2025). Diretrizes Curriculares - Cursos de Graduação. Conselho Nacional de Educação.

<https://www.gov.br/mec/pt-br/cne/normas-classificadas-por-assunto/diretrizes-curriculares-cursos-de-graduacao>

A3ES. (n.d.). Agência de Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior. <https://a3es.pt/pt/>

DGES. (n.d.). Direção-Geral do Ensino Superior. <https://www.dges.gov.pt/pt>

FCT. (n.d.). Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia. <https://www.fct.pt/>

Barral, D. (2025, 7 de agosto). A extinção da FCT e o futuro da investigação em Portugal. Público.

<https://www.publico.pt/2025/08/07/ciencia/opiniao/extincao-fct-futuro-investigacao-portugal-2143088>.