



Scan to know paper details and  
author's profile

# Critical Didactics: An Opportunity of Resistance to Pedagogical Practices Instituted by Neoliberal Policies

*FRANCO, Maria Amélia Santoro*

*Catholic University of Santos*

## ABSTRACT

This text analyzes the impacts of neoliberal policies on Didactics and proposes that the following guiding questions: How can Didactics resist the impact of neoliberal policies that have invaded pedagogical practices, taking away their meaning and autonomy? How to reverse the distortion in the epistemological consideration of Pedagogy and Didactics? How to organize resistance practices? The methodology used derives from action research undertaken with the Observatory of Teaching Practices and analyzed using critical hermeneutics in dialogues with a group of teachers from a public education network. After collective analysis based on critical theory and recent research, the creation of Renewed Critical Didactics (DCR) is indicated using the theoretical assumptions that underlie Critical Pedagogy.

*Keywords:* didactics; critical didactics; renewed critical didactics.

*Classification:* LCC Code: LB1025-1050.75

*Language:* English



Great Britain  
Journals Press

LJP Copyright ID: 573383  
Print ISSN: 2515-5786  
Online ISSN: 2515-5792

London Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences

Volume 24 | Issue 8 | Compilation 1.0



© 2024. FRANCO, Maria Amélia Santoro. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncom-mercial 4.0 Unported License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>, permitting all noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



# Critical Didactics: An Opportunity of Resistance to Pedagogical Practices Instituted by Neoliberal Policies

FRANCO, Maria Amélia Santoro

## SUMMARY

*This text analyzes the impacts of neoliberal policies on Didactics and proposes that the following guiding questions: How can Didactics resist the impact of neoliberal policies that have invaded pedagogical practices, taking away their meaning and autonomy? How to reverse the distortion in the epistemological consideration of Pedagogy and Didactics? How to organize resistance practices? The methodology used derives from action research undertaken with the Observatory of Teaching Practices and analyzed using critical hermeneutics in dialogues with a group of teachers from a public education network. After collective analysis based on critical theory and recent research, the creation of Renewed Critical Didactics (DCR) is indicated using the theoretical assumptions that underlie Critical Pedagogy.*

**Keywords:** didactics; critical didactics; renewed critical didactics.

**Author:** Researcher/fullprofessor at Universidade Católica de Santos/SP/Brasil.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The paralysis of reflection on the field of organization of pedagogical work in the classroom, in its constitutive categories (the so-called “field of didactics”), produced the necessary space for it to be gradually occupied by those proposals that aimed to introduce improvements in the school traditional, whether through the new school or technicalism, or through a combination of these, which ended up helping to reinvigorate, more recently, conceptions of education and school that we

considered, at least theoretically, to be outdated (FREITAS, 2014, p. 1087).

The consolidation of neoliberal policies in Brazil has produced incalculable tensions in the practice of pedagogy, teaching and established knowledge. More than the restructuring of the economic, political and social spheres, what comes to the fore is the redefinition and re-elaboration of the ways of meaning, representing and valuing the world. Gentili (1995, p. 244) highlights that neoliberalism needs, among other things, to depoliticize education, giving it the meaning of a commodity to guarantee the triumph of its mercantilizing strategies and the necessary consensus around them.

This depoliticization is one of the main ruptures that undermine the pedagogical (critical) rationality of education. Paulo Freire, long ago, was already outraged by this process and stated: “Perhaps never has so much been done to depoliticize education as today” (Freire, 2000, p. 95).

The science of education in its history has already seen that it does not work to offer the educator theories about facts and observed norms for the teacher to apply in their practice; however, it is essential to help the educator “to understand the demands of each concrete educational situation, in such a way that he becomes able to carry them out autonomously” (SCHMIED-KOWARZIK, 1983, p. 50).

What is highlighted is the necessary training of the teacher, the pedagogue, for autonomous, critical thinking, since this position, on the reflection of the educator's responsibility, must be the core of pedagogical science.

Educational practices, if carried out in a purely tutorial way, organized from the outside in, mechanically reproduced, assuming neutral practices, without commitments to the subject and their circumstances, are unfeasible, corresponding to meaningless actions, which do not function as pedagogical practices. Therefore, I consider that all pedagogy must become a pedagogy for the oppressed, in the sense of bringing the subject to dialogue, reflection and commitment to training.

It is never too much to highlight that when we talk about the politicality of pedagogical practices, we want to state that this does not mean pedagogical indoctrination or pedagogical domestication. On the contrary, the teacher's critical thinking is the greatest weapon against doctrinal proselytism. Politicality is exercised from a Freirean perspective, suggesting that:

Understanding the limits of educational practice undoubtedly demands political clarity from educators in relation to their project. It demands that the educator assume the politics of their practice. It is not enough to say that education is a political act, just as it is not enough to say that the political act is also educational. It is necessary to really take on education policy (FREIRE, 1993, p. 46-47).

I want to highlight the issue of seeking the politics of your practice. This search, this task is eminently pedagogical. As Freire (1993p. 22, emphasis added) insists, education is permanent, it is political, not because a certain ideological line or a certain political position or a certain economic interest decided so. "Education is permanent in the reason, on the one hand, of the finiteness of the human being, on the other, of the awareness that he has of his finitude". And more, it becomes political, through the ontological movement of man in the world, since, throughout history, this man incorporated into his nature, not only the feeling of knowing that he lived, " but knowing that he knew and, thus , knowing that I could know more."

This basic politicality is inherent to the pedagogical act' that is' the teacher aware of his social role as

an educator, knowing for and against what he is acting, perceiving and recognizing himself as a subject is the one who gives direction to his being – world, as consciousness and as commitment.

In this way, one can perceive the inadequacy that invades teaching processes when they become excessively technical, planned and evaluated from the outside in, in a merely regulatory and oppressive way and also, focused only on their final products and when the teacher's voice is silenced, not only by the fragility of her initial training, the precarious conditions of permanent training that are offered to her and the precarious conditions for exercising her professionalism, in a world controlled by the market and which, in order to survive, depersonalizes and despises humanity, silences the political questions of practice; silences the subjects.

Highlighting the depoliticization that results from processes that technify practices, we remember FREIRE again:

*"The technicalist view of education, which reduces it to pure technique, even more so, neutral, works towards the instrumental training of the student, considers that there is no longer antagonism in interests that everything is more or less equal, for it what really matters It is purely technical training, the standardization of content, the transmission of a well-behaved wisdom of results"* (Freire, 2000 b, p. 79). (my emphasis)

Kincheloe (1997, p. 55) reinforces this position, when recalling the inadequacy of teaching processes linked to technical logic, referring to educational positivists, he understands that they try to produce exact forms of empirical evidence, for concepts and for practices, which are not empirical in nature. And so it asks: *How should we empirically and precisely measure a student's emancipation or liberation from discourses of power?*

Education takes place in process, in dialogues, in the multiple contradictions that are inexorable between subjects and nature that mutually transform each other. Measuring only learning results and products, as a way of evaluating

teaching, can be, and has been, a major fallacy and produces irrecoverable damage to pedagogical practice.

I consider that this “intervention” in pedagogical work at school has been produced in a planned and continuous manner, with a view to removing the possibilities of criticism and dialogue from everyday practices. The excessive regulation of practices, in the form of external assessments, curricula frozen in official documents, lack of conditions for the school to self-direct its projects and practices, has produced the impossibility of reflective, critical and even creative practices, producing a cornerstone of didactics and the exhaustion of pedagogical rationality, which gives it ground and meaning.

All of us, whether as people, as educators or as protagonists or participants in current social and educational practices, in particular, are seeking to understand the consequences of a world dominated by capital, trying to breathe and find ways in the face of so many imposed transformations. to our ways of living and making sense of the world. Like everyone, we are feeling displaced from our perspective on the world and seeking to understand the impact of the configurations of processes resulting from “supposed” education reformers, on the dynamics of school practices, teacher training and the meanings that are now attributed to Pedagogy and Didactics.

This is what we want to discuss in this text: how can we resist the impact of neoliberal policies that have invaded pedagogical practices, taking away their meaning and autonomy? How can we say no to so much neoliberal obscenity? How to reject and not be led by so many corporate agreements? How to reverse the distortion in the epistemological consideration of Pedagogy and Didactics; How can we make the results of education research that we conduct in thousands of educator research groups?

Following Nóvoa , this is how we will go in the text: “It’s time to say no. No to the degradation of public schools. No to teacher mobility. No to a country without a future. As Sophia Mello Breyner

said: 'Forgive them, GOD, because they know what they do.’<sup>1</sup>

It is time to deepen, rectify, expand the density of Critical Didactics, starting with the recommendation of critical theory: elaborate a critical diagnosis and build resistance practices. It's time to say no! It's time to build resistance! Let's start by highlighting elements that support a critical diagnosis: recovering the meaning of Critical Pedagogy and, next, that of Critical Didactics.

## II. CRITICAL DIAGNOSIS/CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

The challenge of critical theory consists in being able to renew its diagnoses in order to make it possible for us to continue formulating a perspective, from which obstacles to emancipation or emancipatory potentials, when present in a given society, are considered and analyzed in a critical way (MELO, 2011, p. 249).

In a 1937 text, entitled *Critical Theory and Traditional Theory* , Max Horkheimer presented for the first time the concept of “Critical Theory”, where he indicates the criticism of different forms of domination and the interest in the emancipatory conditions present in social reality. One cannot ignore the context in which the Frankfurt School's thought emerged: the rise of fascism, Nazism and Stalinism, the decline of left-wing workers' movements in Western Europe and the collapse of left-wing parties in Germany.

According to Marcos Nobre (2004, p. 32), "the orientation towards emancipation is the *first* fundamental principle" of critical theory, in addition to critical behavior in relation to knowledge produced under capitalist social conditions and the social reality itself that this knowledge intends to grasp . These principles also support the perspective of the critical theory of education based on Adorno (1985; 1995),

<sup>1</sup>Speech by Antonio Nóvoa as rector of the University of Lisbon. 2013. <https://www.publico.pt/2013/05/03/sociedade/noticia/antonio-novoa-exorta-profesores-a-dizer-nao-1593260> . Accessed on 07/12/2018.



especially in his reflections in the texts of the *Theory of Semi-formation* and in the essays that make up the work *Education and Emancipation*.

Vilela (2007) is very precise in stating that *semi-training*, so present in contemporary educational practices, is something that can be overcome, through the transformation of social relations that can occur in the educational process. From this perspective, I highlight the need for Critical Didactics, which, through the possibility of training critical thinking, in students and future teachers, can unbalance the orchestrated game of oppression built by supposed education reformers.

As Schmied-Kowarzik highlights, *emiformation* is a process of systematic domination and we must denounce it and not condone it:

Semi-formation “cannot be explained in itself, because it is the result of a process of systematic domination by mechanisms of dominant political-economic relations” (SCHMIED-KOWARZIK, 1983, p. 114).

Reporting and not complying does not mean sterile criticism of doing nothing. Habermas himself criticizes the theorists of the Frankfurt School, warning of the need to overcome the weaknesses of a dead-end diagnosis, the result of a “performative contradiction of totalized criticism”.<sup>2</sup>

Different authors linked to critical theory come together to formulate a blunt confrontation with capitalism and its different forms of oppression, without neglecting to reflect on real and concrete barriers that exist for the construction of a new social order (BENHABIB, 1986).

*S emiformation*, contrary to the ideal of training, which aims to be a process of emancipation of individuals as subjects of social praxis, produces the accommodation of these subjects to the situation of domination to which they are subjected. Hence the need for critical pedagogy, which will boost Critical Didactics.

<sup>2</sup> (PINZANI, A, *Habermas*, Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2009, p.70).

Moving further into the current century, it is important to highlight the essays by Santos (2000; 2007) who warn of the need to also reinvent emancipation, since the way it was formulated by modern critical theories no longer responds to the needs of the present. But, for him, it is not just an update of critical theory for the present time. It's more than this. Because he considers that, in its classic formulation, critical theory remained restricted to the context of its creation, Western Europe and the USA, ignoring the rest of the world, as well as the problems that concerned it, such as colonialism. By ignoring, along with dominant science, the rest of the world, critical theory contributed to making irrelevant what was done and what was thought outside its original context.

Santos (2000; 2007) suggests that the waste of experiences and the marginalization of non-scientific and non-Western knowledge concern not only regulatory knowledge, but also modern critical theory. A fact that, in its conception, contributed to weakening modern critical theory, which from knowledge-emancipation ended up becoming part of knowledge-regulation, thus losing a large part of its emancipatory potential. Thus, he considers that, to reconstruct critical theory and reinvent social emancipation, it is necessary to break with ethnocentrism and scientism in both traditional theory (knowledge-regulation) and modern critical theory (knowledge-emancipation).

Saviani (2008, p. 69), has long been highlighting that a critical pedagogy, articulated with popular interests, will value the school, and I say, the public, secular, quality school, and this pedagogy must be attentive to what occurs within it; will be committed to functioning well, therefore, will be interested in effective teaching methods. “Such methods will go beyond traditional and new methods, incorporating the contributions of both”. These will be methods that stimulate students' activity and initiative without giving up the teacher's initiative.

*[...] will encourage dialogue between students among themselves and with the teacher, but without ceasing to value dialogue with historically accumulated culture; will take into*

*account the students' interests, learning rhythms and psychological development, but without losing sight of the logical systematization of knowledge, its ordering and gradation for the purposes of the process of transmission-assimilation of cognitive contents* (SAVIANI, 2008, p. 69).

I also add and highlight that critical pedagogy, as such, must insist on projects of emancipation of the popular class, discussing with them the meanings of this emancipation and must insist on the reflexivity/politicity of educational contexts and invest in collective, collaborative learning, integrated into a ecology of knowledge according to Santos (1991) and mobilized by the dynamics of a pedagogy of the oppressed (FREIRE, 1975).

I highlighted in a recent article (FRANCO, 2017) that all of Freire's work was always constituted as critical pedagogy, and his perspective was always at the heart of further studies on this issue, since his work is structured around founding principles of logic of critical pedagogy, among which I highlight:

- a. The purpose of education is to form subjects who are aware of their place in the world; subjects who, in the educational process, learn to give name and meaning to the world; never depersonalized subjects and objects at the mercy of a process that is foreign to them; the big question will always be that teaching is indeed educating, in a symbiosis that gives it meaning and direction;
- b. Education will always be an act of resistance to the rationalization of educational practice as a pretext for enhancing economic development; education can never be carried out from a marketing perspective, seen as a disposable and dehumanized commodity and product. The logic of education does not align with neoliberal logic.
- c. The construction of knowledge will take place in dialogical practice; in the critical experience of the tension between theory and practice and never as a transmission of information without connection to the reality of students or educators; which implies the construction/reinvention of a critical didactics

that has as its presuppositions the emancipatory processes and the oppressor/oppressed dialectic;

- d. The emancipation of the subjects of practice must organize all pedagogical practice, in a continuous process of struggle and social commitment, where the foundations of a democratic and critical practice are woven. This process will never be carried out from the perspective of indoctrination/domestication of subjects. The voice of the oppressed will be needed to lead and signify the desired emancipation.

### III CRITICAL DIDACTICS

Veiga (1992, p. 39-40), when carrying out an important study of the historical retrospective of Didactics, emphasizes that this, when placed in the perspective of critical pedagogy, starts to have as its central issue the formation of man, especially the man who belongs to the most disadvantaged sections of society, establishing itself as a space of denial of domination. Thus, the focus of Didactics, based on the assumptions of Critical Pedagogy, will be to “work towards going beyond methods and techniques, seeking to associate school-society, teaching-research, teacher-student” (1992, p. 39). From this perspective, Didactics is committed to the politicization of the teacher, seeking, among other aspects, to “combat the demobilizing orientation of technicalism and recover the specifically pedagogical tasks discredited through reproductive discourses”.

Let us remember that Critical Didactics recommends the following ingredients as necessary practices: the politicality of teaching, with a view to the contextualization and historicity of content; consideration of the multidimensionality of teaching; the dialogicity of practices; the use of investigative methods in the classroom; in addition to the presupposed active intellectual participation of students.

But what are the pedagogical tasks discredited by the current speeches of supposed education reformers? In a collective synthesis with the Observatory teachers (FRANCO, 2018), it was

possible to categorize some practices judged by the group as practices of resistance, which are based on some principles critical statements :

### 3.1 *There is no linearity between teaching and learning*<sup>3</sup>

Pedagogy and its practices are of the order of praxis; This occurs in the midst of processes that structure life and existence. Pedagogy moves between cultures and subjectivities; subjects and practices. Walks around the school, but precedes it, accompanies it and walks beyond it. Didactics has a smaller scope, more focused on school processes within classrooms. Pedagogy places intentions, broad projects; didactics undertakes to account for what has been established to be called school knowledge. The logic of didactics is the logic of the production of learning (in students), based on previously planned teaching processes. The practice of didactics is, therefore, a pedagogical practice. Pedagogical practice includes didactics and transcends it.

Faced with this unpredictability, it is difficult to determine a priori the paths of a *teaching-learning process* ; the pedagogical educator knows that it will only be possible to plan activities that perhaps lead to learning!

This is why Critical Didactics works from the perspective of weightlessness: the teacher knows that each pedagogical situation is unique and must be prepared to adapt procedures and methods that best adapt to the circumstances of the moment. In this way, the learning that supposed education reformers want to produce can only be configured as training in ready-made responses. Mere teachings that do not necessarily produce learning.

A good teacher knows that it is impossible to control the learning that will result from a given teaching situation. This teacher, from the perspective of Critical Didactics, knows that learning is paths constructed by subjects based on their interpretations and experiences in different spheres of life.

<sup>3</sup> Part of this text has already been discussed in FRANCO (2015).

Teaching is planned with the intention of the student's future learning. However, the great challenge of teaching has been the impossibility of controlling or predicting the quality and specificity of learning that arises from certain teaching situations.

Teaching planning, no matter how efficient it is, cannot control the immensity of possible learning possibilities that surround a student. How to know what the student learned? How to plan the next step in your learning? We need, as recommended by Didactics from a critical perspective, critical and dialogical monitoring of students' training processes. As F, Freire always reminded us, it is through teaching that education takes place.

The contradiction is always present in educational processes: teaching only takes shape in the learning it produces! And learning, in its broadest sense and well studied by cognitive pedagogues, results from interpretative syntheses carried out in the subject's dialectical relationships with their environment. They are not immediate, they are not predictable, they occur through the interpretation of the subject, the meanings created, current and former circumstances, in short: there is no direct correlation between teaching and learning . It can almost be said that learning always occurs beyond, or below, what was planned; they occur in the tortuous, slow, dynamic paths of the subjects' trajectories. Radicalizing this position, Deleuze states that it will never be possible to know and control how someone learns (2006, p. 237).

*Teaching-learning* attempts occur through pedagogical practices. These are living, existential in nature, interactive and impactful. Pedagogical practices are those practices that are organized to achieve certain educational expectations. These are practices loaded with intentionality and this occurs because the very meaning of praxis is configured through the establishment of an intentionality, which directs and gives meaning to the action, requesting a planned and scientific intervention on the object, with a view to transforming social reality. Such practices, no matter how planned they are, are unpredictable



because in them, “neither theory nor practice has precedence, each continually modifies and revises the other” (CARR, 1996, p. 101).

Learning occurs among the multiple teachings that are inevitably present in people's lives and that compete with or enhance school teaching. There are always teaching concomitants. Therein lies the challenge of Didactics today: to make school teaching as desirable and vigorous as other “teachings” that invade students’ lives.

As teachers and practitioners of Critical Didactics, we must demystify the direct relationship between teaching and learning. This relationship diminishes the learning processes, making us believe that only what is taught is learned and belittling the student's capacity for intellectual autonomy and the possibilities of “pedagogical improvisations” on the part of teachers. From the knowledge of the complexity of the pedagogical practices of teaching and learning, it is now known that the task of teaching is much more retroactive, which accompanies the student's existential process, than imposing, from the perspective of having to learn like this and now. You cannot learn by decree, nor by pre-programmed itineraries; we learn through dialogicity, through the negotiation of meanings.

### 3.2 Teaching is formative praxis: teaching is always forming subjects

I have seen many students repeat the phrase that is very common on social media: “educating is for families and teaching is the job of schools”.

I see this as a big mistake. I cannot conceive of teaching outside the perspective of training!

In a 2013 film, *Monsieur Lazhar*<sup>4</sup>, here translated as *He Who Brings Good News*, this issue appears, when parents pressure the Algerian teacher, telling him: “you were hired to teach and not to educate”.

I believe it is impossible to separate teaching and consider it a merely transmissible and neutral action of information. Despite Paulo Freire's

statement that education is always a political act being so well known and repeated, we still see many teachers considering that their mission is simply to transmit information, without contextualization, without criticism and almost always without dialogicity.

I consider that the relationships between teacher, student, curriculum and school are relationships that impose a tensional and contradictory coexistence between the subject who learns and the teacher who organizes himself and prepares the conditions to teach. The teacher can find ways to experience the dissonance of resistance and resignations posed by the student, either by acting as a trigger for learning processes; or as an “accompanyer” of the multiple possibilities of return for your action.

Like life, what results from the action of good teaching will always be imponderable situations!

The important thing is to monitor, monitor, recompose and readjust the initial plan. This dynamic, which goes from triggering challenging, intriguing, demanding situations in students, to the feedback that students produce, mixing life, current experience and interpretations of the challenges posed, is the hallmark of the identity of the teaching-learning process, seen in its complexity and amplitude.

I consider that pedagogical practices should be structured as critical instances of educational practices, from the perspective of collective transformation of the meanings and meanings of learning.

The teacher, in the exercise of his teaching practice, may or may not exercise himself pedagogically. In other words, your teaching practice, to transform into a pedagogical practice, requires at least two movements: that of critical reflection on your practice and that of awareness of the intentions that govern your practices. The naive awareness of his work (FREIRE, 1979) prevents him from walking through the intricacies of contradictions and, furthermore, makes it impossible for him to become a critical professional.

<sup>4</sup>Directed by Philippe Falardeau.

True educational action can only be seen as praxis that integrates, according to Kosik (1995), two aspects - the labor and the existential - and manifests itself both in the transformative action of man and in the formation of human subjectivity. When the existential side is no longer considered, praxis is lost as meaning and allows it to be used as manipulation (FRANCO, 2001).

Understanding praxis is an eminently pedagogical task. Kosik (1995, p. 222) highlights that praxis is the sphere of the human being, therefore, it is not a practical activity opposed to theory, but praxis "is the determination of existence as an elaboration of reality". A pedagogical intervention as an instrument of emancipation considers praxis as a form of reflective action that can transform the theory that determines it, as well as transform the practice that implements it.

Thus, I reaffirm that teaching, transformed merely into the practice of passing on content, in the form of information, is *semi-training* and cannot be considered a training practice, but if it does not mobilize the subject's participation and involvement, it will simply be a practice of manipulation.

I turn again to Adorno, 1985 to highlight the importance of the concept of cultural industry, expressed in the *Dialectic of Enlightenment* to refer to culture intentionally produced and systematized by the market, which functions as a privileged arm at the service of the capitalist system as a powerful instrument of domination of consciences.

The statement that teaching is just "getting the point across" greatly favors this industry, weakening the subject's training. I consider that acting critically against *semi-formation* requires excellent training work, continuous and persistent work, from the perspective of criticism and dialogue with these circumstances. This dynamic of counter-hegemony, presupposed by Critical Didactics, could, perhaps, lead to practices of resistance and emancipation from the neoliberal practices that have invaded educational practices.

It is really the challenge of those who believe that teaching needs a critical logic to survive. The

authors Bandeira and Oliveira (2012, p. 231) put it this way:

The great challenge facing us in the educational sphere today, in the light of Adorno's thought, is the critique of semi-education, as it presents itself not only in the macrosocial context, but in the space of the classroom itself, seeking to capture, in a critical way, , its intrinsic tendencies. Only through this path will it be possible to emerge a cultural formation that will contribute to the expansion of individuals' horizons, to the emergence of subjects aware of their potential and artisans of their own history.

This question leads us to think about the validity of the term of universalization of education: have we universalized education or have we just universalized the spaces where children are placed in a supposed school, which does not teach or teaches little?

### 3.3 The construction of resistance practices

In the introduction I called for Nóvoa's cry: " *It's time to say no*". And then Nóvoa says and I follow him: *No to the degradation of public schools. No to teacher mobility. No to a country without a future. As Sophia de Mello Breyner said: 'Forgive them, Lord, because they know what they do'*".<sup>5</sup>

I see that this issue is globalized! And I come across the anguish in Gomes' writing (2015, p. 3), when he finds strange the paths of Pedagogy in Portugal and in the world and when he suggests the thesis that it is possible to disturb the founding matrix of thinking about education, accepting its history, its accidents and the risk of *other thoughts* about pedagogy:

Today, in Portugal, we, teachers and educators (and mothers), are facing a new cycle of returning to basics , through a broad and heterogeneous set of political measures. I would just like to highlight here: the increase in the number of students per class and per

<sup>5</sup> Speech by António Nóvoa: <https://www.publico.pt/2013/05/03/sociedade/noticia/antonio-no-voa-exorta-professores-a-dizer-nao-1593260> Accessed: July 6, 2018.

school and the reduction of learning to what is objectively measurable.

This return to basics is seen by the author as the intention of educational policies to control and normalize teachers' work, in an attempt to suffocate the human and pedagogical dimensions of teaching work.

What is called a return to basics, as if it were a return to fundamental, canonical and indisputable knowledge, is, above all, a reinforcement of the submission of childhood and everything that is childish in the pedagogical relationship (GOMES, 2015, p. 3).

According to the author, we must, as pedagogues and education professionals, resist the return of this basic proposed by education reformers. After all, we had already moved in another direction and, as I wrote in the initial epigraph: imagine that even today, supposed business reforms in education are based on conceptions of education and school that we considered, at least theoretically, to be outdated (FREITAS, 2014, p. 1087).

Gomes (2015) finds that the globalization of economies, markets and workers has produced errors in the pedagogical conceptions of schools and education processes. Referring to the reality of Portugal, he states that school *rankings*, along with instruments for national and international regulation of schooling results, promote the entry of mercantile logic into education processes. He highlights: "the aim is for education and the work of schools and teachers to be more measurable and comparable and for the vectors of distinction and differentiation to be mechanized and see their effectiveness bureaucratically controlled and certified" (GOMES, 2015, p. two).

This neoconservative movement had already been analyzed by Apple (1989, p.129-130) and also highlighted by Sacristán (1998, p. 162) when stating that:

[...] the criticism of the school, its practices and the knowledge they teach is made from the point of view of production. The so-called

"back to basics" *that* this conservative discourse advocates involves focusing on the most immediately profitable learning, criticizing any other "cultural distraction" in the curriculum...[...] regression to methods efficient, the emphasis on stricter control of the curriculum...[...].

policies remove pedagogical specificities, naturalizing simplistic teaching and learning practices, making people believe that it is enough to copy/paste/repeat and give correct answers for education to take place. How can we break this logic so present in educational practices and policies? I believe in counter-hegemonic practices, produced by Critical Didactics, practices that produce in students and future teachers the awareness of the need to resist these supposed facilities proposed by the reforms. The revolutionary action of critical practices is necessary, which are based on reflexivity, politicized and dialogue as the basis of the method. More than ever, Critical Didactics can be a path forward.

### 3.4 Failure to use BUSINESS CONCEPTS

Why do we bow down and not say no when our convictions invade? Why do we assume concepts that distort the meaning of education? For example: why do we accept talking about tutors or teaching agents replacing the concept of teaching? Why do we accept and reproduce the word *protagonism* at school, replacing the concept that is so dear to us, of intellectual autonomy? Why did we accept the replacement of educational counselors and today we have life and work tutors in full-time schools in the state of São Paulo? There are many other examples, but the important thing is that we must resist propagating and giving credibility to these strategic concepts. Are we managers, administrators or are we school directors, or administrators of the educational conditions in schools?

Rank schools? Why do we attach so much importance to this? Do the measures that supported this ranking represent your conception of education? Do these rankings say anything about good training, autonomy/emancipation?

Why should we assume that we develop pre-made projects in our schools that mean nothing to the participants of this school?

These mechanisms for changing the names of already established concepts tend to produce “common sense” in society in favor of these formulations. We must resist these traits of naive interpretation of these nomenclature substitutions. It's not just a semantic issue; It is a form of colonization of educational culture by business logic.

#### IV. FINAL REFLECTIONS

According to Hill (2003, p. 24), Glenn Rikowski, develops a Marxist analysis based on the study of the workforce. Referring to education, he suggests that teachers are the most dangerous of workers because they have a special role in the formation, development and strength of the only commodity on which the capitalist system depends: labor power .

Rikowski, according to Hill (2003, p. 25), argues that the State needs to control this process for two reasons.

First, to try to ensure that it occurs. Second, to try to ensure that the types of pedagogy opposed to the production of labor power do not and cannot exist. Especially, as is clear from this analysis, the capitalist state will attempt to destroy any form of pedagogy that attempts to educate students about their true predicament – the creation of a consciousness of their own as a future workforce and the support of this consciousness with a critical vision that seeks to undermine the peaceful functioning of the social production of labor power. This fear implies rigid control, for example, of the curriculum for teacher training and training, teaching, and research in education. ( my emphasis )

Paulo Freire left us his legacy that is linked to the necessary politicality of education. From this comes the understanding that, to learn, the student needs to become a subject, cover himself with humanity and construct meanings: become a

subject who sees himself in the world and who can call himself the author of that world. Paulo Freire taught us: depersonalized, we are oppressed and mute!

Paulo Freire also highlights that to become an educator and pedagogue it is essential to be in the world, with the world and make your practice that which consolidates your theory and your theory that which continually readjusts and concretizes the practice.

Once again, I want to highlight that pedagogical rationality, which underpins Critical Didactics, requires the praxis of reflection; of dialogue and politicity (being and being in the world consciously) and that this rationality has been put aside in the contemporary world, due to the force with which neoliberal policies have destroyed our pedagogical culture. As a result, it is clear that contemporary society has moved away from this critical rationality in favor of the neoliberal logic that simplifies and technifies pedagogical processes, depersonalizing the subjects of practice, whether students or teachers.

I believe that Freire, Habermas and Adorno have important signs to put pressure on oppressive school practices and support a true paradigmatic break with the school as an ideological apparatus of the state. I highlighted in this text that current studies indicate that only in part, schools and their practices reproduce the mechanisms of domination; There are predicted and unforeseen mechanisms that produce the counter-hegemony of reproductive processes. Therefore, there is always hope, there is always critical resistance.

Focusing on these possibilities, with the idea of strengthening the fruitfulness of dialogue, based on Freire; of communicative action, based on Habermas and awareness and critical reading of the impacts of the cultural industry, with warnings from Adorno and reflections from Freire, it will perhaps be reasonable to delve into the intricacies of practices, reinventing processes of resistance and transformation.

The classroom, the school spaces, are totalities where the multiple determinations arising from the chain of pedagogical practices that surround it



occur. I believe that to resist and emancipate, we need to look at these practices from the perspective of totality, in order to enhance the dynamics of historical contradictions, as highlighted by Lukács:

*The category of totality means (...) on the one hand, that objective reality is a coherent whole in which each element is, in one way or another, in relation to each element and, on the other hand, that these relations they form, in objective reality itself, concrete correlations, sets, units, linked together in completely different ways, but always determined ... (LUKÁCS, 1967, p.240)*

This whole is made up of parts, laws, logics mediated among themselves and when they become disconnected, they produce disarticulations that harm the original meaning they had.

Paulo Freire comforts us when he states, referring to pedagogical practices as resistance: “ *my hope is necessary, but it is not sufficient. Alone she does not win the fight, but without her the fight weakens and falters* . (FREIRE, 2008, p.15).

I believe that these reconnections, with emancipatory meanings, can be organized from the perspective of a pedagogy that deepens other ways of experiencing school and training processes, thinking and acting with the complexity that the issue involves, as FREIRE reminds us, (2008, p.15)

*Thinking that hope alone transforms the world and acting driven by such naivety is an excellent way of falling into hopelessness, fatalism, pessimism...(...) doing without hope which is also based on truth as an ethical quality of the struggle , is to deny it one of its fundamental supports. The essential thing (..) is that it (hope) as an ontological necessity, needs to be anchored in practice. (my emphasis). FREIRE, (2008, p.15).*

I consider that the present time, dark and difficult times, requires in-depth analyses, which recover the point of view of totality and historicity, creating new relationships of meaning between theoretical knowledge and pedagogical practices:

it is necessary to think about new dynamics of teacher training so that the reproduction of alienating mechanisms, produced by the subjects who participate in school practices, are reviewed and reinterpreted: it is necessary that curiosity, critical thinking, investigation of practice, dialogic forms are finally incorporated into school culture .

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

1. ADORNO, T. Education and emancipation . São Paulo: Peace and Land, 1995.
2. ADORNO, TW; HORKHEIMER, M. Dialectic of enlightenment : philosophical fragments. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1985
3. APPLE , Michael W. *Education and Power* . Porto Alegre: Medical Arts, 1989.
4. FLAG, BS; OLIVEIRA, AR Cultural training and semi-formation: contributions by Theodor Adorno to thinking about education today. Education , Porto Alegre, v. 35, no. 2, p. 225-232, May/Aug. 2012.
5. BENHABIB, S. Critique, norm and utopia: a study of the foundations of critical theory . New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
6. CARR, W. A theory for education: there is critical educational research . Madrid: Morata, 1996.
7. DELEUZE, G. Difference and repetition . Translated by Luiz Orlandi and Roberto Machado. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 2006.
8. FRANCO, MARS Pedagogy as a science of Education: between praxis and epistemology . Thesis (Doctorate in Education). University of Sao Paulo. São Paulo. 2001.
9. \_\_\_\_\_. Pedagogy and teaching practice . São Paulo. Cortez Ed.2012.
10. \_\_\_\_\_. Pedagogical practices in multiple social networks. In: LIBÂNEO, JC; ALVES, N. (Eds.) Twelve themes of Pedagogy: the contributions of thought in Curriculum and Didactics. São Paulo: Cortez Editores, 2012a, v.1, p. 169-189.
11. \_\_\_\_\_. Pedagogical teaching-learning practices: amidst resistance and resignation. Education and Research , São Paulo, v. 41, no. 3, p. 601-614. Jul./Sept. 2015.
12. FRANCO, MARS 2017: On the need/current nature of critical pedagogy: contributions



- from Paulo Freire. Reflection and Action Magazine . v. 25, no. 2 (2017).p152-171.
13. FRANCO, Maria Amélia. Observatory da Prática docente. Prática investigativa Coletiva. CNPQ. 2008-2024
14. FREIRE, P. Education as a practice of freedom . Rio de Janeiro: Peace and Land. 1975.
15. FREIRE, Paulo. The Pedagogy of the Oppressed . Rio de Janeiro: Peace and Land, 1979.
16. \_\_\_\_\_. Politics and education . São Paulo: Cortez.1993.
17. \_\_\_\_\_. Letters to Cristina . Rio de Janeiro: Peace and Land. 1996.
18. \_\_\_\_\_. Pedagogy of Indignation. Pedagogical Letters and
19. Other Writings . São Paulo, Editora UNESP.2000.
20. \_\_\_\_\_. In the Shadow of this Mango Tree . São Paulo, Olho d'Água (3rd ed.).2000b.
21. FREITAS, LC Business education reformers and the dispute for control of the school's pedagogical process. Education and Society , Campinas, v. 35, no. 129, p. 1085-1114, Oct./Dec. 2014.
22. GENTILI, P. The discourse of "quality" as a new conservative rhetoric in the educational field. In: GENTILI, PAA; SILVA, TT (Eds.) Neoliberalism, total quality and education. 2nd ed. Petrópolis: Voices, 1995.
23. GOMES, EX Who is afraid of pedagogy? Contributions of contemporary education theory to resist the "return to basics". Brazilian Journal of Education , v. 20, no. 63, p. 949-973, Oct./Dec. 2015.
24. HABERMAS, J. The inclusion of the other: studies in political theory . São Paulo: Loyola Editions. 2002.
25. HILL, D. Global Neoliberalism, Resistance and the Deformation of Education. Curriculum without Borders , [ online ], v. 3, no. 2, p. 24-59, Jul./Dec. 2003
26. HORKHEIMER, M. Traditional Theory and Critical Theory. In: BENJAMIN, W.; HORKHEIMER, M.; ADORNO, TW; HABERMAS, J. Selected Texts . Translations by José Lino Grünnewald [ et al. ]. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1980. (original published in 1937)
27. KINCHELOE, JL Teacher training as a political commitment: mapping the postmodern. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1997.
28. KOSIK, K. Dialectic of concrete . 6 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Peace and Land, 1995.
29. PINZANI, A, *Habermas* , Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2009
30. MELO, R. Critical theory and the meanings of emancipation. CRH Notebook , Salvador, v. 24, no. 62, p. 249-262, May/Aug. 2011.
31. NOBRE, M. Critical theory . Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2004.
32. SACRISTÁN, Gimeno; GÓMEZ, Pérez AI Understanding and transforming teaching . 4th ed. São Paulo: Artmed, 1998.
33. SANTOS, BS 1991. Subjectivity, Citizenship and Emancipation. Critical Journal of Social Sciences. June.1991. p.135-151. Coimbra. Portugal
34. SANTOS, BS Critique of indolent reason: against the waste of experience . São Paulo: Cortez Editora. 2000.
35. \_\_\_\_\_. Renew critical theory and reinvent social emancipation . São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2007.
36. SAVIANI, D. History of Pedagogical Ideas in Brazil. 2 ed. Campinas: Associated Authors, 2008.
37. SCHMIED-KOWARZIK, W. Dialectical Pedagogy - from Aristotle to Paulo Freire . São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1983.
38. VEIGA, 1992. VEIGA, Ilma Passos Alencastro (Org.). Rethinking Didactics . 25. ed. Campinas: Papirus, 1992.
39. VILELA, R. AT Criticisms and possibilities of education and school in contemporary times: lessons from Theodor Adorno for the curriculum. Education in Magazine , n. 45, Belo Horizonte, p. 223-248. June. 2007