

Interview with Professor Dermeval Saviani: Curricular Policies for Teacher Education – Is There a Future for Teaching in Brazil?

Dermeval Saviani ^I  

Luiz Gustavo Tiroli ^{II}  

Adriana Regina de Jesus Santos ^{III}  

Abstract

In the interview given to *Revista Educação em Análise*, Professor Dermeval Saviani critically discusses curricular policies for teacher education in Brazil, situating them within the context of historical transformations in national education and the disputes surrounding the roles of the State, the market, and public schooling. The conversation examines continuities and ruptures in educational policies since the period of redemocratization, highlighting the effects of fragmentation, discontinuity, and the commodification of teacher education. Saviani analyzes the impacts of the BNCC, the BNC-Formação, and recent regulatory changes, contrasting them with the foundations of Historical-Critical Pedagogy and the defense of a form of education grounded in systematized knowledge, the articulation between theory and practice, and the valorization of the teaching profession. The interview also addresses the challenges posed by the expansion of distance education, structural inequalities, and neoliberal logic, as well as perspectives for the future of teaching in Brazil, linked to the need for a national development project that places education as a strategic axis for democracy, human rights, and social transformation.

Keywords: interview; educational policies; Historical-Critical Pedagogy; BNCC.

^I PhD in Philosophy of Education from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). Full Professor in the Graduate Program in Education at UNICAMP. Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil.
Email: dermeval.saviani.2013@gmail.com

^{II} PhD candidate in Education at the State University of Londrina (UEL). Bachelor of Law from the State University of Londrina (UEL). Londrina, Paraná, Brazil.
Email: tiroli@uel.br.

^{III} PhD in Education from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). Professor at the State University of Londrina (UEL). Londrina, Paraná, Brazil.
Email: adrianar@uel.br

Entrevista com o professor Dr. Dermeval Saviani: Políticas Curriculares para a Formação Docente – Existe Futuro para a Docência no Brasil?

Resumo

Na entrevista concedida à Revista Educação em Análise, o Professor Dermeval Saviani discute criticamente as políticas curriculares para a formação docente no Brasil, situando-as no contexto das transformações históricas da educação nacional e das disputas em torno do papel do Estado, do mercado e da escola pública. A conversa percorre a análise das continuidades e rupturas nas políticas educacionais desde o período da redemocratização, com destaque para os efeitos da fragmentação, da descontinuidade e da mercantilização da formação de professores. Saviani examina os impactos da BNCC, da BNC-Formação e das recentes mudanças normativas, contrapondo-as aos fundamentos da Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica e à defesa de uma formação baseada no conhecimento sistematizado, na articulação entre teoria e prática e na valorização da carreira docente. Além disso, são abordados os desafios impostos pela expansão da educação a distância, pelas desigualdades estruturais e pela lógica neoliberal, assim como as perspectivas para o futuro da docência no Brasil, articuladas à necessidade de um projeto nacional de desenvolvimento que tenha a educação como eixo estratégico para a democracia, os direitos humanos e a transformação social.

Palavras-chave: entrevista; formação de professores; políticas educacionais; Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica; BNCC.



Entrevista con el Profesor Dermeval Saviani: Políticas Curriculares para la Formación Docente – ¿Existe Futuro para la Docencia en Brasil?

Resumen

En la entrevista concedida a la Revista Educação em Análise, el profesor Dermeval Saviani discute de manera crítica las políticas curriculares para la formación docente en Brasil, situándolas en el contexto de las transformaciones históricas de la educación nacional y de las disputas en torno al papel del Estado, el mercado y la escuela pública. La conversación recorre el análisis de las continuidades y rupturas en las políticas educativas desde el período de la redemocratización, destacando los efectos de la fragmentación, la discontinuidad y la mercantilización de la formación del profesorado. Saviani examina los impactos de la BNCC, de la BNC-Formación y de los cambios normativos recientes, contraponiéndolos a los fundamentos de la Pedagogía Histórico-Crítica y a la defensa de una formación basada en el conocimiento sistematizado, en la articulación entre teoría y práctica y en la valorización de la carrera docente. Asimismo, se abordan los desafíos impuestos por la expansión de la educación a distancia, las desigualdades estructurales y la lógica neoliberal, así como las perspectivas para el futuro de la docencia en Brasil, articuladas a la necesidad de un proyecto nacional de desarrollo que tenga a la educación como eje estratégico para la democracia, los derechos humanos y la transformación social.

Palabras clave: entrevista; políticas educativas; Pedagogía Histórico-Crítica; BNCC.



Introduction

This interview with Professor Dermeval Saviani, one of the most prominent theorists in Brazilian education and a central figure in historical-critical pedagogy, is grounded in his extensive academic and intellectual trajectory dedicated to analyzing the relationships between education, politics, and society in Brazil. Renowned for seminal works such as *Escola e Democracia* (School and Democracy) and *Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica: Primeiras Aproximações* (Historical-Critical Pedagogy: First Approximations), Saviani constructs a rigorous reflection on the historical determinants of educational policies, the dilemmas of teacher education, and the effects of commodification and neoliberalism on public schooling.

His work is characterized by the defense of a public, secular, free, and socially-referenced education, guided by the centrality of systematized knowledge and the articulation between theory and practice as the foundations of a critical and emancipatory education. Throughout his production, the author emphasizes the strategic role of education in the national development project and the realization of human rights, understanding the school as a privileged space for formation towards democracy and social transformation.

This interview proposes a dialogue on the theme “Curricular policies for teacher education and the future of teaching in Brazil,” seeking to understand the challenges imposed by recent reforms, the expansion of distance learning, the precarization of teaching labor, and the disputes surrounding the roles of the State and the market in education. Drawing from Professor Saviani’s reflections, counter-hegemonic perspectives are explored for the construction of teacher education committed to the appreciation of the profession, the social quality of public schools, and the establishment of a democratic project for society.

In a context marked by structural inequalities, political tensions, and reconfigurations of the world of work, how can education assert itself as a



strategic axis of development, and how can the teaching profession regain its central place in building an effectively inclusive and socially just democracy?

Questions

Theme: *Teacher Education and Labor in Brazil: Historical Determinants and Struggles for Appreciation*

Question 1: Professor Saviani, considering your trajectory of critical analysis regarding teacher education and labor in Brazil, we would like you to outline an overview of the curricular policies aimed at teacher education in recent decades. How do you interpret the movements of continuity and rupture that have marked these policies? What implications do these changes bring to education and teaching working conditions in the Brazilian public school?

R.: In my analyses of Brazilian educational policy during the post-military dictatorship redemocratization period, I briefly reached the following conclusion: Brazilian educational policy from the end of the dictatorship (1985) to the present day presents characteristics condensed into the following words: philanthropy, procrastination, fragmentation, and improvisation.

Philanthropy refers to the State's withdrawal in consonance with the idea of the "minimal State," which translates into a tendency to consider education a problem of society as a whole rather than strictly a responsibility of the State—that is, of governments. The impression is that, instead of the constitutional principle stating that education is a right for all and a duty of the State, the opposite guideline is adopted: education becomes a duty of all and a right of the State. Effectively, the State remains the regulator—the one who controls education through evaluation—but transfers the responsibilities for its maintenance and quality assurance to "society." Take, for example, the Fernando Henrique Cardoso (FHC) administration's slogan "Wake up Brazil, it's school time" (*Acorda Brasil. Está na hora da escola*), and the Lula administration's "All for Education Commitment" (*Compromisso Todos pela Educação*), the preamble of the decree that established the PDE (Education Development Plan).



Procrastination signifies the constant postponement of addressing problems. Let us take the example of two points established by Article 60 of the Transitional Provisions of the Constitution: the elimination of illiteracy and the universalization of primary education. The Constitution set a 10-year deadline to meet this goal: 1998. The “Education for All” Decennial Plan of 1993 also set 10 years: 2003. FUNDEF, in 1996, also 10 years: 2006. FUNDEB, in 2007, 14 years: 2021. The PDE, in 2007, 15 years: 2022. The PNE (National Education Plan), in 2014, 10 years: 2024. And this deadline has already expired without the goal being reached.

Fragmentation is evidenced by the numerous measures that succeed and overlap one another, perpetuating the phrase from the 1932 *Manifesto dos Pioneiros da Educação Nova* (Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education): “all our efforts, lacking unity of plan and a spirit of continuity, have not yet succeeded in creating a system of school organization” commensurate with the country’s needs.

Improvisation manifests in the fact that for every point raised as important, there is an immediate rush to approve a constitutional amendment, a law, or to issue a decree or ordinance without considering its actual necessity or its juxtaposition with other related measures of equivalent effect. Take, for example, the case of the 9-year primary education. This was a demand from municipalities since FUNDEF forced states and municipalities to invest the majority of their constitutional resources for education into primary education (*Ensino Fundamental*). Thus, municipalities, facing difficulties in meeting their priority commitment regarding early childhood education, demanded the start of primary education at six years of age so that they could serve this age group with FUNDEF resources. Consequently, Law No. 11.274 was approved on February 6, 2006, amending Article 32 of the LDB (National Education Guidelines and Bases Law), making it mandatory to start primary education at six years old. This created a certain confusion between a nine-year primary education program that still functioned with eight grades. However, this was unnecessary



because at the end of that same year, 2006, the replacement of FUNDEF by FUNDEB was approved on December 19, whose resources began to encompass all of basic education, thus covering early childhood, primary, and secondary education.

The empirically observable result is the general precarization of education throughout the country, visible in the physical infrastructure, equipment, working conditions, and salaries of education professionals, in the pedagogical theories of teaching and learning, in curricula, in the evaluation of results and, consequently, also in teacher education policies.

Theme: *Curricular policies for teacher education in Brazil*

Question 2: Professor Saviani, curricular policies for teacher education in Brazil have been the object of intense disputes in recent years, especially after the approval of the BNC-Formação (2019) and the BNC-Formação Continuada (2020), which were criticized by various academic sectors for subjecting teacher education to a prescriptive and technocratic logic aligned with instrumental competencies. Recently, these frameworks were revoked and replaced by Resolution CNE/CP 04/2024, which proposes to redefine the parameters of initial and continuing teacher education in dialogue with the country's social and educational demands. In this scenario, how do you evaluate these changes in curricular policies? To what extent can the new resolution signify an advancement or, conversely, a risk to the construction of a teacher education project committed to social transformation and a democratic public school?

R.: Regarding teacher education, I have expressed my views on several occasions, including having developed a research project on this theme at Italian universities. During that time, I detected the existence of two opposing models of teacher education, which I termed the “cognitive cultural content model,” dominant in universities and higher education institutions in general, and the “pedagogical-didactic model,” characteristic of the *escolas normais*



(teacher training schools). In the Brazilian case, I concluded that the policy of teacher education fundamentally poses the following challenges:

- a) Fragmentation and dispersion of initiatives, justified by the so-called “diversification of models of higher education organization”;
- b) Discontinuity of educational policies;
- c) Bureaucratization of the organization and functioning of courses, in which the formalism of complying with legal norms prevails over the mastery of the knowledge necessary for the exercise of the teaching profession;
- d) Separation between training institutions and the functioning of schools within the educational systems;
- e) The pedagogical paradox, expressed in the opposition between theory and practice, between content and form, and between disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical-didactic knowledge (cf. Chapter IX of the book *A pedagogia no Brasil: história e teoria*, SAVIANI, 3rd ed., 2021, pp. 103-106);
- f) Precarious working hours and low salaries.

Addressing these challenges implies opening new perspectives, whose characteristics are symmetrically opposed to the aforementioned challenges:

- a) Against fragmentation and dispersion, I propose an organic conception of teacher education centered on the university standard and on Faculties of Education as the privileged locus of teacher education.
- b) Against the discontinuity of educational policies, I advocate for a long-term educational policy that prioritizes the formation of cultured teachers through long-duration courses.
- c) Against the bureaucratization of courses, I advocate for the transformation of Faculties of Education into spaces of teaching and research that can receive young candidates for the teaching profession, placing them in an environment of intense and demanding intellectual stimulation.
- d) Against the separation between training institutions and schools, I propose a strong articulation between training courses and the functioning of schools, considering two aspects: taking the way schools function as the starting point for organizing the training process and resizing internships as an instrument that places the administration of educational systems, basic education schools, and faculties of education acting jointly in a collaborative regime for the training of new teachers.



e) Against the various forms of manifestation of the pedagogical paradox, we understand that its solution demands a theoretical formulation that overcomes exclusionary oppositions and succeeds in articulating theory and practice, content and form, as well as teacher and student, in a comprehensive unity of these two poles that, by opposing each other, dynamize and set pedagogical work in motion. This new theoretical formulation was the task proposed by historical-critical pedagogy. It is believed that the methodological orientation set in motion by historical-critical pedagogy recovers the unity of educational activity within social practice, articulating its theoretical and practical aspects which are systematized in pedagogy conceived simultaneously as the theory and practice of education. Thus, the dilemma inherent to the two major contemporary pedagogical trends—the traditional conception and the reformist (renovadora) conception—is overcome (cf. *A pedagogia no Brasil: história e teoria*, Chapter X, pp. 107-113 and Conclusion, pp. 127-137, SAVIANI, 3rd ed., 2021).

f) Finally, in contrast to precarious working hours and low salaries, it must be taken into account that education will not succeed without related measures regarding the career and working conditions that value the teacher, involving two aspects: a full-time workday in a single school with time for classes, lesson preparation, student study guidance, participation in school management and collegiate meetings, and community service; and decent salaries that, by socially valuing the teaching profession, will attract candidates willing to invest time and resources in long-duration training.

In conclusion, I state that recent curricular proposals such as the BNCC and BNC-Formação do indeed constitute a regression, as they accentuate neoliberal economic determination through the adoption of proposals governed by the so-called “pedagogy of competencies.” Therefore, they do not respond to the challenges I have listed; on the contrary, they exacerbate them.

Theme: Historical-Critical Pedagogy in teacher education

Question 3: Professor Saviani, Historical-Critical Pedagogy, through the centrality of systematized knowledge, proposes a critical and transformative formation for both students and teachers. In this sense, how do you evaluate the presence — or absence — of these foundations in current curricular policies



for teacher education in Brazil? What contributions can your pedagogical proposal still offer in the face of the challenges that public schools face today?

R.: I believe that the contribution of Historical-Critical Pedagogy (HCP) toward addressing the challenges faced by public schools lies in line with the responses to the challenges I indicated at the end of the previous question. Furthermore, it should be noted that, obviously, Historical-Critical Pedagogy is entirely absent from current curricular policies which, as I have indicated, are dominated by the “pedagogy of competencies,” whereas HCP is a counter-hegemonic proposal. However, this does not prevent us from seeking, based on HCP, to guide pedagogical actions that point toward raising awareness about the need for structural changes to reach a form of society that effectively meets the needs and aspirations of our population as a whole. Indeed, as I pointed out at the end of the third chapter of the book *Escola e Democracia* (School and Democracy), the pedagogical proposition presented points toward a new society, but it was designed to be implemented under the conditions of current Brazilian society. And, effectively, there are several initiatives being implemented in different situations using historical-critical pedagogy as a reference, including in the field of teacher education.

Theme: *Teacher education and the challenges of neoliberalism and commodification*

Question 4: You have warned about the effects of neoliberal logic and commodification on teacher education and labor, expressed in policies that flexibilize, fragment, and instrumentalize the training process. Given this scenario, how do you perceive the risks and the possibilities of resistance within training institutions? What would be necessary to reverse this process and strengthen a teacher education committed to a collective project of education?

R.: We must resist this situation with a strong mobilization to advance the public character of education as a State responsibility, adopting the principle long-demanded by educators’ movements: “public resources exclusively for



public schools,” and prohibiting private for-profit companies from operating in education. It is, therefore, imperative to veto the participation of for-profit companies in teaching. I propose the revocation of authorization for private for-profit entities to operate in the field of education. Note that our legal apparatus, both in the Constitution and in the LDB, has always allowed private sector participation in education. However, this participation was always regulated and limited to non-profit entities, which implied that the resources obtained from tuition fees had to be reinvested into the core activity itself. Nevertheless, the FHC administration, while monitoring the project of the new LDB, introduced the possibility for for-profit companies to also operate in the field of education. Consequently, we find ourselves in a situation where national networks—whether for-profit or non-profit—are being acquired by international business complexes that are extending their tentacles over education, initially at the higher education level and already expanding into basic education. With shares on the Stock Exchange, they transform education into a commodity to be exploited, basically aiming for increased profits, which implies cost reduction and an inevitable decline in quality. This enormously affects even public education, since practically all teachers in the public basic education networks are trained by these private entities, predominantly through distance learning courses, forcing down the quality of teaching in public schools. It is thus essential to return to the requirement that private sector participation in education be limited to non-profit entities.

It is also necessary to distance [public education] from a certain commitment to private entities that, operating in the field of education, have been harassing public teaching bodies—whether to influence educational policies toward their own interests, to sell their products to public school networks, or even to take over the management of public schools and networks through so-called public-private partnerships and “Social Organizations” (*Organizações Sociais*), to which the management of public school networks is being transferred by some states and municipalities. Thus, it is expected that the



current administration of the MEC (Ministry of Education) does not allow itself to be swayed by appeals for partnerships with institutions and movements such as the Lemann Foundation, *Todos pela Educação*, the Ayrton Senna Institute, and the like.

Finally, as an antidote to the low-level training provided by private higher education institutions, I propose the creation of a Public Network for Teacher Training for Basic Education anchored in public universities. In articulation with this higher-quality training, it is necessary to establish a career path for basic education teaching under a full-time regime in a single school, with half of the time dedicated to classes and the other half to lesson preparation, monitoring students with greater difficulties, and participating in school management boards.

Theme: *Teacher education and the democratic school*

Question 5: Professor Saviani, in your classic work *Escola e Democracia* (School and Democracy), you argue that the public school must be a space for critical formation for citizenship and democracy—a role directly linked to the quality and the political project of teacher education. How do you view the relationship between this perspective and the current challenges of teacher education, especially regarding the effective inclusion of Human Rights Education in Brazilian curricula and pedagogical practices? What paths would be necessary to ensure that teacher education contributes to a truly democratic school committed to human rights?

R.: Education for citizenship has been heralded as the purpose of education since the bourgeoisie consolidated itself as the dominant class, having been verbally reinforced with the adjective “critical.” Hence the general objective of critical formation for citizenship tends to be proclaimed in various countries as well as in the documents of international agencies.

Historical-Critical Pedagogy undertakes a critique of this phenomenon, noting that its fundamental determination stems from the structure of current society, which is divided into two fundamental social classes: the owners of



the means of production concentrated in the form of capital – the bourgeoisie as the dominant class; and the workers who were expropriated of all their means of production, being reduced to their labor power, which is nothing other than their own body – the proletariat as the dominated class. Under these conditions, education also appears divided, whereby, at first, school education was reserved only for the dominant class, while education in its practical form remained for the dominated class, carried out, in general, within the labor process itself. As society became urbanized and industrialized, however, it became necessary to extend elementary instruction to the entire population as a means for their participation in a society that generalized writing and also to exercise the right of citizenship by electing their rulers. But there emerges the paradox of the bourgeois concept of citizenship which, as Marx shows us in “On the Jewish Question,” opposes the abstract citizen to the real citizen. The autonomous citizen, a subject of rights and duties, an active participant in the life of society, is the abstract man, the “true” man. The real citizen is the man in his sensible existence, the “egoistic” individual, who is adapted and submissive to the existing order. It is understood, then, why the universal, free, compulsory, and secular public primary school, idealized and implemented by the bourgeoisie to convert subjects into citizens, was nothing more than an instrument at the service of political emancipation, understood as “the reduction of man, on the one hand, to a member of bourgeois society, to an egoistic, independent individual, and, on the other, to a citizen of the State, a moral person” (Marx, On the Jewish Question). While the traditional version of the liberal conception of education placed the emphasis on the formation of the moral person, that is, the citizen of the bourgeois State, the modern version (*Escolanova*/New School) placed the emphasis on the formation of the independent egoistic individual, an adjusted member of bourgeois society. This is the basic, general, and common education that the bourgeoisie was capable of providing to humanity as a whole. It is evident, then, that the notion



of basic, general, and common education conceals the division between the “independent egoistic individual” and the “moral person, citizen of the State.”

Consequently, the education that the bourgeoisie conceived and implemented on the basis of common primary schooling was nothing more than the division of men into two large fields: that of manual professions, which required a practical formation limited to the execution of more or less delimited tasks; and that of intellectual professions, for which a broad theoretical mastery was required in order to prepare the elites to act in the different sectors of society. This separation was translated either into the dualist proposal of vocational schools for workers and schools of sciences and humanities for future leaders, or into the proposal of a differentiated unified school (*escola única*) that internally carried out the distribution of students according to the social functions for which they were destined, in accordance with the characteristics stemming from their social origin. This counterposition between an education for the elites and another for the workers is camouflaged by the proposal of a unified school which, nevertheless, through its internal differentiations, reinforces the class contradiction by dissimulation.

Obviously, overcoming this situation implies overcoming class society by building, through revolutionary action, a socialist society. And education plays a specific role in this process with a view to fulfilling the subjective conditions regarding the consciousness of the situation to be transformed, in light of the objective conditions already fulfilled due to the current crisis, of a terminal character, of the capitalist social form still in force. This is the basic condition for human rights to come into force in their fullness. In the current situation, we see that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed by the UN contains 30 articles, and it is in Article 26 that reference is made to the right to education, referred to there in the restrictive form of the right to instruction. However, it is important to highlight that education is not only a right but also the condition for the exercise of all other rights. This can be evidenced through the school question since, although education is not reduced to the school form, this is, in



current society, the main and dominant form of education. And as I explained in the first chapter of the book *Historical-Critical Pedagogy: First Approximations*, in which I dealt with the nature and specificity of education, the school has to do with the problem of science. Indeed, science is exactly methodical, systematized knowledge. In this regard, the way the Greeks considered this issue is illustrative. In Greek, we have three words referring to the phenomenon of knowledge: *doxa*, *sophia*, and *episteme*. *Doxa* means opinion, that is, the knowledge proper to common sense, spontaneous knowledge directly linked to everyday experience, a chiaroscuro, a mixture of truth and error. *Sophia* is wisdom founded on a long experience of life. It is in this sense that it is said that the elderly are wise and that the young should listen to their advice. Finally, *episteme* means science, that is, methodical and systematized knowledge. Consequently, if from the point of view of *sophia* an old man is always wiser than a young man, from the point of view of *episteme* a young man can be wiser than an old man.

Now, opinion, the knowledge that produces hunches, does not justify the existence of the school. Similarly, wisdom based on life experience dispenses with and even disdains the school experience, which has even crystallized in popular sayings such as: “practice is worth more than grammar” and “children learn despite the school.” It is the demand for the appropriation of systematized knowledge by the new generations that makes the existence of the school necessary. And it is from there, from the mastery of systematized knowledge, that the consciousness is acquired that the full realization of human rights implies a social organization in which all human beings coexist harmoniously in full equality of fact and of right.

Theme: Distance Teacher Training

Question 6: According to data from the Higher Education Census, in 2010, only 31% of teachers who graduated from teaching degree programs (*licenciatura*) had completed their degrees through distance learning. By 2023,



approximately 67% of teaching degree students were enrolled in distance education (EaD) courses. During this period, a shift in teacher training from in-person courses to the distance modality is observed. Given the growing expansion of EaD and the pressures for a more pragmatic and expedited formation, what are the main implications of this context for teacher training and the quality of Brazilian education?

R.: It must be clear that, by its very nature, education can only be in-person. As an activity of the order of non-material production in which the product is inseparable from the act of production, education necessarily constitutes an interpersonal relationship, implying, therefore, the simultaneous presence of the two educational agents: the teacher with their students. And it is known that one of the main functions of education is the socialization of children and youth, which cannot be done through remote or distance learning, and much less through so-called domestic education (*homeschooling*).

It is important, therefore, to distinguish, on the one hand, between the resources used in the teaching process and, on the other hand, teaching itself. As we know, in teaching, we teachers utilize different resources such as books, magazines, and newspapers, and may also make use of films, recorded television programs, and now also videos and other means provided by the generalization of internet access. In short, available resources have expanded significantly with new technologies. But teaching proper occurs in the direct relationship with students. Therefore, a lesson is produced and consumed at the same time: produced by the teacher and consumed by the students. In this case, there is no interval between production and consumption, as occurs in that modality of non-material production represented by arts such as painting, sculpture, music, and literature, for example, where a painting is produced by the painter, a statuette by the sculptor, a sonata or a song by the musician, a book by the writer, and later these objects enter the sphere of consumption through the mediation of commercial capital.

It is, therefore, of fundamental importance to distinguish between the resources used for the production of a lesson and the lesson itself. A teacher can,



undoubtedly, convert their lesson, a teaching unit, or even the entire discipline they teach into a book, a series of videos, etc. But the lesson proper occurs in the in-person relationship between the teacher and the students. This is the reason why, in distance education, the presence of a tutor is required at the reception post where students watch the videos produced by researchers working at universities. Why is the presence of the “tutor” necessary? Because those watching the videos, in their condition as students, require the assistance of a teacher to better understand the content, to have aspects they did not understand explained to them, and to clarify eventual doubts. In this case, then, if we can speak of teaching in the proper sense, it refers to the in-person relationship between the tutor and the students. But then, since the true teacher is the one operating at the reception post performing the pedagogical relationship, they should have completed a full teaching degree and receive a salary equivalent to that of university professors. However, they are called tutors to imply that they are not the teachers, but rather the authors of the videos are. Consequently, they do not need specific training for higher education teaching and, therefore, their salaries should not be equalized with those of the university career. It is in this way, therefore, at the price of de-characterizing the proper meaning of teaching and lowering its quality, that cost reduction is achieved and, consequently, an increase in profits in the process of reducing education to a commodity like any other that enters the exchange relationship characteristic of capitalist society.

It is necessary to conclude, therefore, that new technologies with the advent of the internet, as advanced as they may be, including the emergence of so-called artificial intelligence, do not justify the replacement of in-person teaching with remote, hybrid, or even distance learning (EaD). Moreover, technology, since the origin of the human being, is nothing other than an extension of human arms aimed at facilitating their work. And today, with the advent of automation, all of humanity could live comfortably with a few hours of daily work, freeing up available time for the cultivation of the spirit, which exactly includes the teacher-student pedagogical relationship in a rich integral education of full possibilities,



besides opening itself to aesthetic forms—that is, to the appreciation of things and people for what they are in themselves, with no other objective than to relate to them. What prevents the generalization of this stage is the private appropriation of the means of production, causing technology—from a means of liberating individuals from heavy labor and reducing socially necessary labor time—to be converted into an instrument for the submission of labor power to a time without limits, leading it to exhaustion. This is what happened in the Industrial Revolution with the introduction of machinery, which led workers to destroy the machines. But the machines were meant to facilitate their work and, therefore, were not their enemies. Their enemies were the owners of the machines who used them to impose a hallucinatory pace on the workers' activity. It is this situation that manifests now with new technologies, expressing itself in the phenomenon of the uberization of labor which, at the end of the pandemic, tended to worsen as companies made use of technological advancement to exponentially increase the exploitation of workers in various modalities of economic production.

Finally, it is necessary to proclaim, without hesitation, the indispensability of the in-person form in education, in general, and specifically in higher education institutions. And, for an even greater reason, the in-person form is indispensable in the specific case of teacher training.

Theme: Pé-de-Meia Licenciaturas

Question 7: Created by Decree No. 12,358/2025, the *Mais Professores para o Brasil* program emerged as a way to recognize the fundamental importance of teachers in student learning and the effectiveness of educational policies. Among the strategies adopted by the Federal Government, the *Pé-de-Meia Licenciaturas* axis stands out, consisting of financial aid of R\$ 1,050.00 intended for students with good performance in the National High School Exam (ENEM) who opt for in-person teaching degree programs (*licenciatura*). What is your position regarding teacher training policies such as this one proposed by the current government?



R.: This initiative by the federal government to create incentive mechanisms and measures to improve the conditions for training and the exercise of the teaching profession in basic education is nonetheless commendable. However, such measures are not sufficient, as they do not address the main problem derived from the current LDB (Law of Directives and Bases of National Education), which I will seek to demonstrate below.

The LDB in force proposed, in Art. 62, the higher institutes of education, regulated by Art. 63 to train basic education teachers, in addition to including the Higher Normal Course (*Curso Normal Superior*) to train teachers for early childhood education and the first grades of elementary school. But neither the higher normal school nor the higher institutes of education were implemented, turning these provisions of the LDB into a dead letter. The result was that the entire issue of teacher training fell predominantly upon the Pedagogy Course. And, as I already noted in the answer to question number 4, the FHC government ended up including in the new LDB the possibility for for-profit companies to operate in the field of education. Consequently, private national complexes emerged, which were subsequently acquired by international complexes, opening pedagogy and other teaching degree courses predominantly through distance learning to train basic education teachers. And, as private institutions aim for profit, the demand to lower costs prevails, which necessarily implies a drop in quality. We are, therefore, in a situation where, if, on the one hand, the pedagogy courses of these private institutions are of very low quality, on the other hand, we are also having difficulty raising the level of pedagogy courses in public universities. This situation has had a strong impact on the low quality of the training of practically all teachers working in the public basic education of our country.

In view of this situation, I have suggested that we should return to the state where only non-profit private institutions can operate in the field of education. Furthermore, I have proposed the creation of a public teacher training network for basic education centered in public universities to rescue public basic



education from its condition as a hostage to low-quality private institutions that train practically all of its teachers. Obviously, this measure must be articulated with the placement of full-time teachers in a single school, allocating half of the time for classes and the other half for lesson preparation, grading student work, and monitoring students with greater learning difficulties. Without these measures, the “*Mais Professores para o Brasil Program*,” instituted by Decree No. 12,358 of January 14, 2025, is doomed to failure.

Theme: *The Future of the Teaching Profession in Brazil*

Question 8: Professor Saviani, according to data from the Anísio Teixeira National Institute for Educational Studies and Research (INEP), only 3% of 15-year-old students want to be teachers. On the other hand, the number of teachers aged 50 or older grew by 109% between 2009 and 2021. With the lack of interest among young people in teaching degrees and the pronounced aging process of the teaching staff, the following question remains: Is there a future for the teaching profession in Brazil?

R.: In response to this question, I bring forth an argument that I previously developed and later included as the final chapter, Chapter 12, titled “The Importance of Education in the Country’s Development Project” in the book *O Lunar de Sepé: paixão, dilemas e perspectivas na educação* (SAVIANI, 2013, p. 161-174). It concerns a view expressed by most people, especially political leaders, saying that we live in the so-called knowledge society and that, in this type of society, education is the key to the solution of all problems. In view of this, I decided to construct an “*ad hominem*” argument—that is, to take the very positions of my adversaries to propose something they never contemplate. I considered, then, that if the First Industrial Revolution promoted the transfer of manual functions to machines, what is occurring today is the transfer of intellectual operations themselves to machines. For this reason, it is also said that we are living in the “era of intelligent machines,” which begins to demand the raising of the level of general qualification as a counterpart to the elimination of specific intellectual qualifications.



In this context, the productive process becomes increasingly dependent on the mastery of forms of thought acquired through systematic school-type educational procedures, a phenomenon that has been translated through the expression “knowledge society,” which is demanding a new model of economic development. Therefore, it is imperative to promote a change in the economic development model. Until now, the model’s axis has been the automobile, as evidenced in Fordism, formulated in the early 20th century in association with Taylorism. From then on, world economic development has had the automobile as its flagship, around which other activities revolve—not only those directly linked to it, such as the auto parts industry and primary inputs for its production, but also the civil construction industry, urban planning, transport infrastructure, etc. And when the Fordist pattern entered a crisis in the second half of the 20th century, it was necessary to seek another reference, which was found in Toyotism; this represented an internal alteration to the same model which, as evidenced by its very name, remained centered on the automobile, with all the negative side effects resulting therefrom: the verticalization of cities, traffic congestion, environmental pollution, global warming, in addition to its income-concentrating character with the deepening of social inequalities.

Shifting this axis to education will allow for development with a greater distribution of income and as a stimulant of social equality and, besides not presenting negative side effects, it already brings with it the antidote to negative effects, as observed in environmental education, traffic education, etc.

The whole problem is summarized, then, in the question of the country’s development strategy. If we truly want to promote Brazil’s development, it is necessary to define the strategic factor from which all the nation’s energies will be mobilized.

Let us consider the consensual recognition that we live in the knowledge society; that in this type of society, formal education is the key to success in all sectors of social life. This discourse is in the mouths of most people. Let us assume, then, this consensus, which will imply electing education as the



strategic factor for the country's development. That is: the starting point of development will be massive investment in education, which implies channeling all available resources toward it.

By proceeding in this manner, we will see that it is not a matter of placing resources for education in competition with other needy areas such as health, security, roads, poverty, social security, the fight against hunger and unemployment, housing, energy infrastructure, environmental preservation, etc. On the contrary, education will be the chosen path to tackle all these problems head-on and simultaneously.

Indeed, if we expand the number of schools, making them capable of absorbing the entire school-age population at various levels and modalities of teaching, the civil construction industry, with all its substitutes, such as the furniture production industries, sanitary appliances, etc., will be dynamized. If we staff these schools with all the professionals they need—especially with full-time and well-paid teachers—we will be attacking the problem of unemployment directly, as millions of jobs will be created. We will be attacking the security problem, as we will be removing all children and youth from the streets and from the harassment of trafficking. But, mainly, we will be attacking all other problems, as we will promote economic development. How? Well, what will these millions of people working in schools and receiving high salaries do with the money they receive? Evidently, they will not put it under the mattress. This money will not be withdrawn from the economic process. On the other hand, it will move the wheel of the economy through consumption, which will activate commerce, which, in turn, will activate the productive sector (industry and agriculture), which will produce more and hire more people. Of course, it is likely that part of these resources will be saved. But even in this case, these savings will not be kept at home. By incorporating into various financial application mechanisms, such savings will also activate the economy, composing a diversified basket of resources that will finance the most different enterprises listed in the country's development project, such as housing programs and infrastructure works, in



addition to the various credit mechanisms used by companies and individuals to finance their production and consumption initiatives.

The implementation of this new development model will cause an exponential growth in tax collection. With them, the State will be able to solve infrastructure problems not only in transport, but also in energy, supply, environment, sanitation, etc., and bear the social programs intended for the now reduced groups of those not included in this broad process of general development of the country. And, of course, the problem of the quality of education will also be solved: with teaching transformed into a socially attractive profession due to the significant improvement in salary and working conditions, many young people will be attracted to it, willing to invest their resources, time, and energies in a high qualification obtained in long-duration undergraduate and postgraduate courses. With a staff of highly qualified teachers, we will form the much-vaunted conscious, critical, creative, enlightened, and technically competent citizens to occupy the positions in the bustling labor market of a country that will be recovering its productive capacity at full steam. Thus, the much-desired virtuous circle of development would be created.

The adoption of education as the axis of the national development project thus leaves the terrain of utopia to become, under current conditions, an objective requirement of the economic development process itself, in view of the current stage reached by the advancement of productive forces.

It is only through this path that we will ensure the interest of young people in becoming teachers, thus being able to respond resolutely: Yes. There is a future for the teaching profession in Brazil.

Obviously, this implies the overcoming of capitalism by socialism. Indeed, in this capitalist social order in which the primacy of profit over human needs prevails, there is no place for the centrality of education required by the high degree of development of the productive forces that has led us to this “era of intelligent machines.” Finally, these are the considerations that occur to me in response to the questions formulated.





How to quote this article

SAVIANI, Dermeval; TIROLI, Luiz Gustavo; SANTOS, Adriana Regina de Jesus. Entrevista Com O Professor Dermeval Saviani: Políticas Curriculares Para A Formação Docente – Existe Futuro Para A Docência No Brasil?. **Educação em Análise**, Londrina, v. 11, p. 1–25, 2026. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5433/1984-7939.2026.v11.54573>.

Submitted on: September 26, 2025

Accepted on: December 12, 2025

Published on: February 02, 2026

CRediT

Acknowledgments:	We would like to thank Professor Dermeval Saviani for granting us this interview.
Funding:	Fundação Araucária (FA) and Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES).
Conflict of Interest:	The authors certify that they have no commercial or associative interests that represent a conflict of interest in relation to the manuscript.
Ethical Approval:	Não se aplica
Author Contributions:	SAVIANI, D.: conceptualization, data curation, and formal analysis; TIROLI, L. G.: elaboration of questions, data transcription, organization of information, and text revision; SANTOS, A. R. de J.: data curation, formal analysis, and text revision.



Editorial Team

Section Editor:	Quenzia Vieira Lopes
Production Team Member:	Junior Peres de Araújo
Editorial Assistant:	Giovanna Martins Capaci Rodrigues
Layout and Typesetting:	Carolina Motter Pizoni - Escritório de Apoio ao Editor Científico

