

PAULO FREIRE AND THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM – FROM THE DAILY PRACTICE OF STUDENTS TO OVERCOMING "BANKING EDUCATION"



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n1-205>

Submitted on: 12/27/2024

Publication date: 01/27/2025

**Antonio Nacílio Sousa dos Santos¹, Carlos Rigor Neves², Everaldo Costa Santana³,
Peterson Ayres Cabelleira⁴, Joner Ney Vieira da Silva⁵, Uanderson da Silva Lima⁶,
Rafael Aranha de Sousa⁷, Gabriel Alves da Silva⁸, Caio Oliveira Di Migueli⁹,**

¹ Doctorate student in Social Sciences
Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES)
Horizonte, Ceará – Brazil.

E-mail: naciliosantos23@gmail.com

² Master's student in Educational Sciences
Autonomous University of Asunción (UAA)
Macapá, Amapá – Brazil.

E-mail: profcarlosrigor@gmail.com

³ Doctorate student in Agroecology and Territorial Development
Federal Rural University of Pernambuco (UFRPE)
Recife, Pernambuco – Brazil.

E-mail: everaldocostas@gmail.com

⁴ Doctor of Science Education: Chemistry of Life and Health
Federal University of Pampa (UNIPAMPA).
São Borja, Rio Grande do Sul – Brazil.

E-mail: petersoncabelleira@hotmail.com

⁵ Master in Physics Teaching
Federal University of Pará (UFPA)
Mãe do Rio, Pará – Brazil.

E-mail: jonerney@gmail.com

⁶ Master in Teaching (PPGEnsino)
University of Vale do Taquari (UNIVATES)
Lucas do Rio Verde, Mato Grosso – Brazil.
Email: uanderson.lima@universo.univates.br

⁷ Master's student in Letters
University of Santa Cruz do Sul (UNISC)
Imperatriz, Maranhão – Brazil.
E-mail: rafael10@mx2.unisc.br

⁸ Master's student in Letters
University of Santa Cruz do Sul (UNISC)
Imperatriz, Maranhão – Brazil.
E-mail: gabriel12@mx2.unisc.br

⁹ Master in Ecology
State University of Campinas (UNICAMP)
Lábrea, Amazonas – Brazil.
E-mail: caiomigueli@gmail.com

Sonái Maria da Silva¹⁰, Wagner Roberto Batista¹¹, Victor Emanuel do Nascimento Silva¹², Dálcio Rosário Alves¹³, Bruna Gonzaga de Farias¹⁴ and Cristiana Silva dos Reis¹⁵.

ABSTRACT

In the daily exercise of school practice, it is frequent that decisions are made without proper listening to the students. This distancing implies the imminent risk that the content worked in the classroom is disconnected from the reality experienced by the subjects. This disconnection is aggravated by a hierarchical relationship between educator and student, often marked by the unilateral transmission of knowledge, as if students were mere "deposits" in which educators deposit their ideas. Although this practice is not always intentional, it reflects and reproduces forces of domination widely present in the daily life of Brazilian society. In view of this reality, the following central question arises: in a society as heterogeneous as the Brazilian one, how to implement a school curriculum that dialogues with the desires and needs of the students? To reflect on this challenge, we took as a theoretical axis the work "Pedagogy of the Oppressed", by Paulo Freire, as well as authors such as Mészáros (2002), Frigotto (2010), Saviani (2011), Tonet (2016) and Laval (2019), authors who contribute to the understanding of emancipatory educational practice. In this sense, we discuss the importance of considering the daily experiences of students as a starting point to overcome school curricula that are alien to their realities and sociocultural contexts. Methodologically, we adopted a qualitative approach based on Minayo (2007), based on a bibliographic and descriptive research according to the studies of Gil (2008). In addition, we used the analytical-comprehensive bias with the theoretical support of Weber (1969). The results indicate that the disconnection between the school curriculum and the reality of the students harms teaching-learning, perpetuating inequalities and asymmetric power relations. Decontextualized curricula devalue students' experiences, while pedagogical practices that incorporate their realities promote greater engagement and critical autonomy, aligning with Paulo Freire's proposal of dialogic education. For this, it is

¹⁰ Doctorate student in Educational Sciences
Inter-American Faculty of Social Sciences (FICS)
Três Rios, Rio de Janeiro – Brazil.
Email: sonaim@gmail.com

¹¹ Dr. in Agronomy/Energy in Agriculture.
Federal University of Triângulo Mineiro (UFMT)
Uberaba, Minas Gerais – Brazil.
Email: wagner.batista@uftm.edu.br

¹² Undergraduate Nursing Student
Vale do Acaraú State University (UVA)
Sobral, Ceará – Brazil.
E-mail: enfvictoremanuel@gmail.com

¹³ Doctorate student in Education
University of Uberaba (Uniube)
Palmas, Tocantins – Brazil
Email: dalciorosario@gmail.com

¹⁴ Specialist in Neuropsychopedagogy
Metropolitan College of the State of São Paulo (FAMEESP)
São Paulo, São Paulo – Brazil.
E-mail: brunagfarias@gmail.com

¹⁵ Master's student in Humanities, Cultures and Arts.
Unigranrio University, Afya College.
Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro – Brazil.
E-mail: cristianareis2020@gmail.com

necessary to break with banking pedagogy and train teachers for critical and contextualized methodologies, ensuring an inclusive curriculum that fosters both learning and social transformation.

Keywords: Paulo Freire. School Curriculum. Emancipatory Education. Educational Practice.

INTRODUCTION

CRITICAL EDUCATION AND EMANCIPATION – OVERCOMING BANKING PEDAGOGY AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Education, from the perspective of capital¹⁶, assumes a utilitarian character¹⁷, reducing the training process to an instrument to meet the demands of the market. In this context, the subject is no longer seen as a transforming agent to be molded as a productive resource. Laval (2019) highlights that "[...] the school is treated as a company, in which the principles of competitiveness and efficiency are prioritized, reducing education to a product to be consumed" (p. 29). This perspective transforms the educational space into a place for the reproduction of inequalities, instead of promoting emancipation. Education fails to consider the human and cultural needs of the students, subordinating itself to the demands of the neoliberal economy¹⁸, which privileges the logic of profit and productivity.

It is in this context that the 'theory of human capital' is developed, a form of ideological reproduction that conceives pedagogy from the utilitarian and neoliberal economy. [...] The workforce, the enthusiasts of this current proclaim, would have ceased to be just a homogeneous capacity to operate equipment and perform tasks. It comprises a set of specific know-how, skills, skills, theoretical and practical knowledge that can and should be previously developed by workers in order to be applied and consumed productively by those who buy them, that is, the employers, owners of capital (Antunes & Pinto, 2017, p. 102).

¹⁶ The perspective of capital, as a structuring system of contemporary society, is marked by the logic of accumulation, profit and exploitation, configuring itself as a model that prioritizes the interests of the market to the detriment of human needs. According to Mészáros (2002), "[...] Under capitalist social relations, education functions predominantly as a system for the internalization of knowledge, values and culture functional to the reproduction of the (dis)order of the social metabolism of capital". This perspective shows that capital, by naturalizing its own logic, shapes social and educational relations, transforming education into a tool for the perpetuation of structural inequalities, rather than a means of human emancipation.

See: MÉSZÁROS, I. *Education beyond capital*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2002.

¹⁷ Utilitarian education is that aimed mainly at meeting the demands of the market and the reproduction of the capitalist system, prioritizing the technical and instrumental training of individuals, to the detriment of integral and critical development. This educational model fragments knowledge and limits the autonomy of subjects, adjusting them to the needs of capital. As Antunes and Pinto (2017) point out, "[...] Fordist utilitarian education sought to meet the demands of capital, fragmenting knowledge and alienating subjects". Thus, education, from this point of view, ceases to be a space for reflection and social transformation to become a tool for adapting to productivist logics. See: ANTUNES, R.; PINTO, G. A. *The factory of education: from Taylorist specialization to Toyotist flexibilization*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2017.

¹⁸ Education, when submitted to the logic of the neoliberal economy, is shaped to meet the demands of the market, promoting the adaptation of subjects to productivist and competitive dynamics, instead of fostering critical thinking and social emancipation. Under this paradigm, the school is treated as a company, and educational training is reduced to the preparation of labor, disregarding the complexity and integrality of the human being. Laval (2019) observes that "[...] the market colonization of education reinforces inequalities and prevents the development of emancipatory pedagogical practices". Thus, neoliberal education reinforces social inequalities and subordinates the school to economic interests, making it a space for the reproduction of dominant logics. See: LAVAL, C. *The school is not a company: neoliberalism in attack on public education*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2019.

This educational model reflects the banking pedagogy criticized by Paulo Freire, who describes traditional education as an act of "depositing" content in students, without dialogue or meaningful interaction. Freire (2013) argues that "[...] the educator becomes a donor of content and the learner becomes a passive container to be filled" (p. 72). This approach dehumanizes the subjects, reinforcing hierarchical and oppressive relations that are aligned with the interests of the dominant classes. By silencing the voice of students, banking education perpetuates cultural and political domination, consolidating a system that inhibits critical autonomy and reflective thinking. Rather than promoting awareness and transformation, this practice reinforces a culture of passivity and conformism, alienating individuals from their ability to intervene in the world.

The narration, of which the educator is the subject, leads the students to the mechanical memorization of the narrated content. Moreover, the narration transforms them into 'vessels', into containers to be 'filled' by the educator. The more he 'fills' the containers with his 'deposits', the better educator he will be. The more they allow themselves to be meekly 'filled', the better learners they will be. In this way, education becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the educator, the depositor. Instead of communicating, the educator makes 'announcements' and deposits that the students, mere incidences, patiently receive, memorize and repeat (Freire, 2013, p. 72).

To break with this logic, it is essential to deconstruct the hierarchies that permeate the decision-making process in the school and reflect on the importance of the school curriculum as an expression of educational identity. Saviani (2011) points out that "[...] education must be the act of producing, directly and intentionally, the humanity that is historically constructed by the group of men" (p. 35). However, a decontextualized curriculum, aligned with the demands of capital, tends to fragment this construction, distancing the educational practice from the reality of the subjects. The creation of a meaningful curriculum, based on the experiences of students, is indispensable for education to cease to be a mechanism of social reproduction and become an instrument of transformation. This challenge requires teacher training committed to critical and dialogical methodologies, which promote the protagonism of students and the strengthening of a humanizing education.

Thus, it can be seen that the existence of the school is not enough for the existence of systematized knowledge. It is necessary to enable the conditions for its transmission and assimilation. This implies dosing and sequencing it so that the child gradually passes from his non-domain to his domain. Now, the knowledge dosed and sequenced for the purposes of its transmission-assimilation in the school space, over a given time, is what we conventionally call 'school knowledge'. [...] A

curriculum is, therefore, a functioning school, that is, a school performing its proper function (Saviani, 2011, p. 17).

Banking pedagogy, as described by Paulo Freire, represents an educational model in which the educator is perceived as the holder of knowledge, while the learner assumes a passive role, receiving information in a mechanical and decontextualized way. Freire (2013) describes this approach as a practice that "[...] it transforms students into containers to be filled with the knowledge that the teacher considers relevant" (p. 72). This method reflects the structures of domination present in society, where the hierarchy between the educator and the learner mirrors the power relations that perpetuate alienation¹⁹. The consequence for education, in this model, is the reproduction of an oppressive logic that inhibits critical thinking and dialogue, essential for the construction of an emancipatory educational practice (Santos, *et. al.*, 2024).

Thus, the adoption of the "banking approach", according to Santos, *et. al.* (2024), results in a dehumanizing education, which neglects the ability of students to be active agents in the learning process. For Freire, "[...] no education that intends to be liberating can disregard dialogicity as the basis of its practice" (Freire, 2013, p. 89). The impact of this pedagogy is felt in the limitation of the transformative potential of education, by restricting the ability of students to reflect critically on the world and their experiences. Rather than encouraging intellectual autonomy, banking education reinforces a culture of obedience and conformism, perpetuating the social structures that Freire seeks to challenge.

In fact, what the oppressors want "is to transform the mentality of the oppressed and not the situation that oppresses them", and this so that, by better adapting them to this situation, they can better dominate them. To this end, they make use of the 'banking' conception and practice of education, to which they add a whole social action of a paternalistic nature, in which the oppressed receive the sympathetic name of 'assisted' (Freire, 2013, p. 74).

¹⁹ In the Marxist view, alienation is a process resulting from the division of labor and the relations of production in the capitalist system, where the worker is separated from the means of production, from the product of his labor and, consequently, from his own essence as a human being. Marx describes that, in this context, the worker "[...] he does not assert himself in his work, but he denies himself, he does not feel at ease, but unhappy, he does not develop a free physical and mental energy, but mortifies his body and ruins his spirit" (Marx, 2010, p. 114). Alienation, therefore, is a form of dehumanization that prevents the individual from fully realizing himself, subjecting him to the demands of capital and the relations of exploitation, while perpetuating the domination of one class over another. See: MARX, K. *Economic-philosophical manuscripts*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2010.

For the student, the consequences are even more profound, as he is removed from his condition as a historical subject and reduced to a mere reproducer of content. Freire argues that "[...] when the student is not an active part in the educational process, his ability to intervene in reality is diminished" (2013, p. 94). This not only harms learning, but also compromises the formation of a critical consciousness capable of questioning and transforming society. Thus, the student is deprived of his agency, his creativity and his potential to act as the protagonist of his own story (Santos et. *al.*, 2024).

Thus, breaking with hierarchies in the educational process requires a conscious effort to deconstruct the centralization of decisions and promote an environment of dialogue and active participation. Saviani (2011) points out that "[...] education is an act of producing, in an intentional way, the humanity that is collectively constructed" (p. 35). This implies the need for a curriculum that is not just a list of contents, but a dynamic representation of the experiences, cultures and histories of the learners. Thereby

In the 'banking' view of education, 'knowledge' is a donation from those who think they are wise to those who think they know nothing. [...] The more passivity is imposed on them, the more naively, instead of transforming, they tend to adapt themselves to the world, to the reality partialized in the deposits received. To the extent that this 'banking' vision annuls the creative power of the students or minimizes it, stimulating their naivety and not their criticality, it satisfies the interests of the oppressors: for them, the fundamental thing is not the denudation of the world, its transformation (Freire, 2013, p. 74).

The importance of the school curriculum goes beyond its organizing function; it is the expression of the identity of educational practice. Antunes and Pinto (2017) state that "[...] the curriculum must be aligned with the concrete realities of the subjects, allowing it to be an instrument of social transformation" (p. 77). In this sense, overcoming hierarchies also requires teacher training that favors critical reflection on educational practices and encourages methodologies that promote student autonomy. This is a fundamental step to break with the oppressive logic of traditional pedagogy and create a truly inclusive and transformative educational space.

Thus, this research has as its main objective to investigate the limits and possibilities of building a school curriculum that dialogues with the reality of students and promotes emancipatory practices. Its relevance lies in the potential to contribute to the school community, offering subsidies for the implementation of pedagogical methodologies that consider the experiences and cultural contexts of students. According to Mészáros (2002), "[...] education must always be continuous and permanent, oriented to transform

dehumanizing social structures" (p. 19). Thus, the research seeks to propose strategies that articulate theory and practice in order to consolidate a critical and dialogical education.

The contribution of this research to the education of students is to promote a worldview that values critical awareness and the ability to intervene in reality. As Freire (2013) emphasizes, "[...] liberating education begins with the recognition of the learner as an active and transforming subject" (p. 98). In addition, it provides educators with tools to overcome the challenges posed by rigid and decontextualized curricula, allowing for a more inclusive and meaningful pedagogical practice.

That said, the question that guides this investigation is: in a society marked by inequality and cultural diversity, how to build a school curriculum that is aligned with the needs and expectations of students, promoting a critical and emancipatory education? This question reflects the commitment to explore the possibilities of an educational model that transcends the banking and mercantile logic, proposing a path for a transformative pedagogical practice.

DIALOGIC AND INTERPRETATIVE METHODOLOGY: ARTICULATING QUALITATIVE, DESCRIPTIVE, BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESEARCH AND COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS IN EDUCATIONAL STUDY

Qualitative research is essential in the field of education because it allows understanding the experiences, perceptions and practices of educational subjects in their complexity and depth. According to Minayo (2007), "[...] social research is done by approximation, but, as it progresses, it elaborates increasingly precise criteria of orientation" (p. 13). This characteristic is fundamental to investigate the pedagogical and curricular processes, considering that educational relations involve subjectivities and specific contexts. In the case of the present study, which seeks to analyze the school curriculum from the perspective of Paulo Freire, the qualitative approach makes it possible to capture how the subjects experience and perceive the disconnection between the school and their daily realities.

Qualitative social research uses methods that allow us to understand complex and dynamic phenomena in their multiple dimensions. This approach works with the experiences, meanings, relationships and contexts in which the subjects are inserted. As Minayao states, 'language, symbols, practices, relationships and things are inseparable. If we start from one of these elements, we have to reach the others, but they all pass through human subjectivity (Minayo, 2006, p. 23).

In addition, the qualitative research is aligned with the objectives of the study, which include overcoming banking education and the construction of emancipatory pedagogical practices. According to Gil (2008), "[...] qualitative research is not only concerned with quantifying the phenomena, but also with interpreting the relationships and meanings they have for the subjects" (p. 20). In the educational context, this approach allows for a critical analysis of school curricula, identifying how pedagogical structures reflect or break with the power relations present in society. Thus, qualitative research provides a theoretical and methodological basis to understand the challenges and propose changes that consider the concrete experiences of the students.

In this way, qualitative research enables a dialogue between theory and practice, essential for the analysis of school curricula. Minayo (2007) emphasizes that "[...] the methodology simultaneously includes the theory of the approach, the instruments for operationalizing knowledge and the creativity of the researcher" (p. 14). In this sense, by investigating the school curriculum through this approach, the study articulates the foundations of Freire's pedagogy with the reality experienced by the students, promoting a deep understanding of educational relations and pointing out ways for the construction of a transformative pedagogical practice.

Descriptive research, in turn, plays a fundamental role in education, as it allows the analysis and description of educational phenomena in their complexity. According to Gil (2008), "[...] descriptive research has as its primary objective the description of the characteristics of a given population or phenomenon or the establishment of relationships between variables" (p. 51). This approach is indispensable to understand the relationship between the school curriculum and the reality of the students, providing detailed information about the practices and perceptions present in the school routine, essential elements to support contextualized pedagogical proposals.

Descriptive research has as its primary objective the description of the characteristics of a given population or phenomenon or the establishment of relationships between variables. There are numerous studies that can be classified under this title and one of its most significant characteristics is the use of standardized data collection techniques. Among the descriptive researches, those that aim to study the characteristics of a group stand out: its distribution by age, sex, origin, level of education, income level, state of physical and mental health, etc. (Gil, 2008, p. 28).

On the other hand, bibliographic research is an indispensable tool to support educational studies, offering a wide range of information organized in a systematic way. Gil

(2008) states that "[...] the main advantage of bibliographic research lies in the fact that it allows the researcher to cover a much wider range of phenomena than that which he could research directly" (p. 51). In the case of the study on the school curriculum from the perspective of Paulo Freire, this approach makes it possible to access the theoretical reflections of several authors, such as Mészáros, Frigotto and Laval, enriching the analysis and strengthening the arguments presented.

The main advantage of literature search lies in the fact that it allows the researcher to cover a much wider range of phenomena than he could research directly. This advantage becomes particularly important when the research problem requires data that is widely dispersed throughout space. For example, it would be impossible for a researcher to travel the entire Brazilian territory in search of data on population or per capita income; However, if you have an adequate bibliography at your disposal, you will not have any major obstacles to having the required information. Bibliographic research is also indispensable in historical studies. In many situations, there is no other way to know past facts than based on secondary data (Gil, 2008, p. 51).

In addition, the integration between descriptive and bibliographic research is essential in qualitative studies, as it allows relating empirical data with educational theories. Gil (2008) points out that "[...] Bibliographic research is also indispensable in historical studies. In many situations, there is no other way to know past facts than on the basis of secondary data" (p. 51). In the educational context, this approach enables the analysis of pedagogical practices over time and their relationship with social structures, contributing to the development of a school curriculum that values the daily experiences of students and promotes a critical and transformative education.

The comprehensive analysis, according to Max Weber, was fundamental for the research, as it provided us with the interpretation of the meanings attributed to the actions by the subjects themselves in their social context. For Weber, "[...] comprehension refers to the meaning subjectively aimed at by actors, in the course of a concrete activity" (Weber, 1969, p. 110). This is crucial in education, since pedagogical processes involve subjective experiences and meanings attributed by students and educators, which makes it essential to capture the subjective dimension of these interactions in order to understand the impact of educational practices on human development.

In addition, Weber points out that comprehensive analysis requires an empathetic apprehension of social actions, going beyond a merely external observation. According to him, "[...] this procedure that he calls comprehension involves a reconstruction in the original subjective sense of the action and the recognition of the partiality of the observer's

vision" (Weber, 1969, p. 110). In the educational context, this means interpreting pedagogical practices considering the intentions and meanings attributed by the subjects, making it possible to identify how curricular dynamics influence the critical formation of students and the strengthening of their autonomy.

Thus, the comprehensive analysis allowed the articulation of theory and practice when investigating educational interactions, providing a deeper reading of the power structures and meanings attributed by social actors. Weber emphasizes the importance of using "ideal types" as scientific instruments to order and interpret social reality, which implies synthesizing concrete phenomena and their subjective meanings (Weber, 1949, p. 90). This method is essential in research on school curricula, as it allows us to understand how specific practices reflect or challenge broader social structures, offering ideas for the construction of a more inclusive and emancipatory education.

FROM THE DAILY PRACTICE OF STUDENTS TO OVERCOMING "BANKING EDUCATION": THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM

The reality of Brazilian public schools reflects the country's structural inequalities, worsening in historically marginalized regions such as the North, Northeast and Midwest. In these areas, the physical and material conditions of the schools are precarious, with frequent lack of chairs, books, teaching materials and, in some cases, even adequate spaces for classes, says Santos, *et. al.* (2024). Christian Laval points out that inequality in teaching conditions is linked to "[...] a dynamic of segregation, where resources are unevenly distributed, reinforcing the exclusion of already marginalized groups" (Laval, 2019, p. 189). This precariousness is a concrete manifestation of the social inequalities that permeate Brazilian society, compromising not only student learning, but also the motivation of teachers who work in these contexts.

In addition, the absence of adequate infrastructure makes it difficult to create environments conducive to the integral development of students. Freire (2013) observes that "[...] the lack of minimum conditions for educational practice is one of the forms of oppression that prevents the student from perceiving himself as a subject of his history" (p. 74). Under these conditions, the school space is unable to fulfill its transformative function, acting more as a reproducer of existing inequalities than as an instrument for overcoming these barriers. The impact of this is especially visible in peripheral communities, where

students face economic, social, and cultural challenges that make learning an even more arduous task.

The scarcity of resources, the lack of teachers, the overcrowding of classes, although they reveal a logic of impoverishment of public services, are also due to an old tradition of the economic and political elites, who, when it comes to the education of children from the popular classes, are generous in their speeches and stingy in their financial resources (Laval, 2019, p. 21).

Living in a racist, elitist and paternalistic country accentuates the symbolic oppression²⁰ experienced by students from the lower classes, says Santos, *et. al.* (2024). In schools, the curriculum is often structured in a way that makes cultural diversity and the real needs of learners invisible, reflecting the power dynamics that prevail in society. Paulo Freire denounces that "[...] the curricula imposed from top to bottom disregard the experiences of the students, reducing them to spectators of a system that reinforces alienation" (Freire, 2013, p. 89). This structure reinforces symbolic oppression, in which the student is molded to passively accept the norms and values of a society that excludes him.

Education as a practice of domination, which has been the object of this criticism, maintaining the naivety of the students, what it intends, in its ideological framework (not always perceived by many of those who carry it out), is to indoctrinate them in the sense of their accommodation to the world of oppression. [...] Our objective is to draw the attention of true humanists to the fact that they cannot, in the search for liberation, make use of the 'banking' conception, at the risk of contradicting themselves in their search (Freire, 2013, p. 94).

The analysis of the text of Paulo Freire's statement about education as a practice of domination requires an in-depth look at how the educational system, on many occasions, reproduces the power relations existing in society. Banking pedagogy, central to Freire's critique, is a model that subordinates students, transforming them into passive receptacles of contents defined by an intellectual or political elite. Freire (2013) points out that "[...] the narration, of which the educator is the subject, leads the students to the mechanical memorization of the narrated content" (p. 72). This method dehumanizes the subjects,

²⁰ Symbolic oppression in school hierarchical structures is manifested in the way power is distributed and exercised within the educational environment, reinforcing inequalities and perpetuating relations of domination. Pedagogical practices, curricula and disciplinary norms often reproduce mechanisms that naturalize the subordination of certain social groups, promoting adaptation to the existing social order instead of questioning it. As Bourdieu (2014) states, "[...] symbolic violence is a form of imposition that works through the adhesion that the dominated manage to build from perception schemes that are inculcated in them". In school, this violence is exercised through an institutional culture that privileges legitimized knowledge and devalues popular knowledge, consolidating social hierarchies in the educational space. See: BOURDIEU, P. *Reproduction: elements for a theory of the education system*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2014.

preventing them from developing a critical understanding of reality and reproducing a culture of alienation.

In this way, the accommodation of students to the world of oppression, mentioned by Freire, is rooted in curricula and pedagogical practices that privilege the interests of the dominant classes. According to Laval (2019), "[...] the neoliberal education model transforms learning into a commodity and the student into a client, reinforcing the logic of competitiveness and the market" (p. 189). This approach not only disregards cultural diversity and students' experiences, but also conditions them to passively accept a social structure that perpetuates inequalities.

On the other hand, Freire warns of the danger of humanist educators contradicting themselves by adopting banking practices in the name of liberation. He states that "[...] no education that intends to be liberating can disregard dialogicity as the basis of its practice" (Freire, 2013, p. 89). This highlights the need to break with the traditional hierarchy in the educational process, promoting horizontal relationships between educator and student. Banking pedagogy, by reinforcing the idea that the teacher is the only holder of knowledge, prevents the collective construction of knowledge, which is essential for the emancipation of the subjects.

In addition, Freire's criticism goes beyond the classroom and questions the relationship between education and society. For Mészáros (2002), "[...] under capitalist social relations, education functions, dominantly, as a system of internalization of knowledge, values and culture functional to the reproduction of the (dis)order of the social metabolism of capital" (p. 19). This perspective broadens Freire's understanding, demonstrating how banking education is intrinsically linked to the logic of capital, which seeks to reproduce the conditions of domination and exploitation.

In contrast, Freire's liberating pedagogy proposes an educational model that values dialogue, active participation, and the collective construction of knowledge. This model seeks to transform education into an instrument of awareness and social transformation, where students perceive themselves as historical subjects capable of intervening in reality. As Freire (2013) states, "[...] dialogue is a meeting of subjects, mediated by the world, to transform it" (p. 107). In this way, overcoming banking pedagogy is a fundamental step to break with the practices of domination and build a truly emancipatory education.

This reality is perpetuated by the power relations that permeate the design and implementation of school curricula. Dermeval Saviani emphasizes that "[...] the curriculum,

when detached from the realities of the students, becomes an instrument for the perpetuation of social and cultural inequalities" (Saviani, 2011, p. 35). This is evident in schools where decisions are made centrally, without the effective participation of teachers, students or communities. This centralization not only ignores local demands, but also reinforces the hierarchy that marginalizes oppressed subjects.

The school exists, therefore, to provide the acquisition of the instruments that enable access to elaborated knowledge (science), as well as access to the rudiments of this knowledge. The activities of the basic school should be organized based on this issue. If we call this curriculum, then we can affirm that it is from systematized knowledge that the elementary school curriculum is structured. Now, systematized knowledge, erudite culture, is a literate culture. Hence, the first requirement for access to this type of knowledge is to learn to read and write. In addition, it is also necessary to know the language of numbers, the language of nature and the language of society. This is the fundamental content of elementary school: reading, writing, counting, the rudiments of the natural sciences and the social sciences (history and geography) (Saviani, 2011, p. 13).

This fragment reflects the centrality of formal education in access to erudite culture and science. This approach underlines the importance of the school as a mediator between students and the knowledge accumulated by humanity. Saviani (2011) states that "[...] the elementary school curriculum must be based on access to the fundamental languages: reading, writing, counting, and the rudiments of the natural and social sciences" (p. 13). However, this perspective, by emphasizing the erudite character of knowledge, can neglect cultural diversity and the concrete experiences of students, especially in contexts of social inequality.

Systematized knowledge, when detached from the local realities of the students, runs the risk of perpetuating a homogeneous and elitist view of the curriculum, ignoring the cultural and social specificities of the school communities. As Freire (2013) points out, "[...] the curricula imposed from top to bottom disregard the experiences of the students, reducing them to spectators of a system that reinforces alienation" (p. 89). This decontextualization reinforces exclusion and makes it difficult for students to engage, who are unable to recognize in school content a direct connection with their lives and realities.

In addition, the centralization of curricular decisions, often carried out without the effective participation of educators and school communities, aggravates this disconnection. Saviani (2011) observes that "[...] when the curriculum is organized without considering local demands, it reinforces existing hierarchies and distances the school from its emancipatory social function" (p. 35). This practice not only limits the pedagogical

autonomy of teachers, but also transforms the curriculum into an instrument for the reproduction of social inequalities, instead of being a tool for transformation.

Saviani's view of the role of the school in accessing elaborated knowledge is relevant, but it should be expanded to include a more critical and dialogical approach. This requires that the curriculum be built in a participatory way, involving educators, students and communities, so that local experiences are incorporated into the educational process. As Freire (2013) emphasizes, "[...] dialogue is essential in the construction of knowledge, as it allows educator and student to recognize each other as historical subjects in search of social transformation" (p. 107). Thus, the school can fulfill its function of mediating systematized knowledge, without losing sight of the diversity and the real needs of the students.

Overcoming this logic involves breaking with banking pedagogy, which crystallizes the contradiction between educator and student. Freire states that "[...] liberating education must overcome the educator-learner dichotomy, promoting a dialogical relationship in which both are subjects of the learning process" (Freire, 2013, p. 81). This change requires the collective construction of the content to be worked on in the classroom, based on the experiences and needs of the students, so that knowledge becomes meaningful and transformative.

Authentic education, let us repeat, is not made of A to B or of A on B, but of A to B, mediated by the world. A world that impresses and challenges both of them, giving rise to visions or points of view about it. Visions impregnated with anxieties, doubts, hopes or despairs that imply significant themes, based on which the programmatic content of education will be constituted. One of the mistakes of a naïve conception of humanism is that, in the eagerness to embody an ideal model of the 'good man', it forgets the concrete, existential, present situation of men themselves (Freire, 2013, p. 90).

The analysis of Paulo Freire's statement about authentic education reveals his profound criticism of the hierarchical and authoritarian relationship that often characterizes the educational process. By stating that education should not be "[...] from A to B or from A to B, but from A to B, mediated by the world", Freire (2013) emphasizes the need for a dialogical relationship between educator and student, in which both are active subjects in the process of knowledge construction (p. 90). This perspective breaks with banking pedagogy, which dehumanizes students by treating them as receptacles of knowledge. Instead, it proposes a humanizing education, which values the experiences of the subjects in their concrete situation.

Freire criticizes the naïve conception of humanism that disregards the material and existential conditions of the students. This view, according to him, tends to create idealized models of "good man" that do not dialogue with people's concrete realities. "To educate is to impregnate with meaning what we do at every moment [...]", Freire emphasizes, indicating that the construction of knowledge must start from the real conditions and concerns of the students (Freire, 2013, p. 90) In this way, the programmatic content of education must be built from significant themes, extracted from the social, cultural and political conditions of the students, allowing them to recognize the world as something that can be understood and transformed.

This approach requires a dynamic and participatory curriculum, which incorporates the experiences of the subjects and invites them to critically reflect on their reality. As Saviani (2011) points out, "[...] the curriculum must express the totality of the social and cultural relations that involve the educational process, enabling the integral formation of the students" (p. 35). This type of curriculum not only promotes the learning of academic content, but also prepares students to intervene in their reality, breaking with structures of oppression. Education, thus conceived, becomes a political act of transformation, in which dialogue and critical action are indispensable for subjects to perceive themselves as historical agents.

Therefore, Freire challenges us to abandon pedagogical models that reinforce the passivity and alienation of students, in favor of educational practices that promote autonomy and emancipation. The relationship between "A and B, mediated by the world [...]" is not only a pedagogical technique, but an ethical and political posture that transforms education into a space of resistance and construction of a fairer future. This is the essence of an authentic education: one that recognizes the student as a historical subject and protagonist of his own history.

The dialogical relationship in the construction of content is central to an emancipated education. Freire points out that "[...] dialogue is a meeting of subjects, mediated by the world, to transform it" (Freire, 2013, p. 107) In this sense, the creation of the curriculum must consider the generating themes, which emerge from the concrete reality of the students and allow the syllabus to be aligned with their experiences and aspirations. These themes, according to Freire, are "[...] the basic contradictions of reality that challenge students and educators to a reflective and transformative action" (Freire, 2013, p. 105).

It will be from the present, existential, concrete situation, reflecting the set of aspirations of the people, that we will be able to organize the programmatic content of education or political action. What we have to do, in fact, is to propose to the people, through certain basic contradictions, their existential, concrete, present situation, as a problem that, in turn, challenges them and thus demands a response, not only at the intellectual level, but at the level of action. [...] Our role is not to talk to the people about our vision of the world, or to try to impose it on them, but to dialogue with them about yours and ours (Freire, 2013, p. 105).

Paulo Freire's statement highlights his conception of an education that is based on the concrete and existential reality of the students, connecting their aspirations, contradictions and challenges to pedagogical practices. Freire (2013) emphasizes that "[...] it will be from the present, existential, concrete situation, reflecting the set of aspirations of the people, that we will be able to organize the programmatic content of education or political action" (p. 105) This approach breaks with teaching models that impose ready-made and decontextualized content, promoting a curriculum that emerges from the experiences and contradictions of the local reality. Thus, dialogue becomes the basis for the construction of meaningful and transformative learning, integrating the experiences of students in the educational process.

Freire's proposal to use basic contradictions as a starting point for the construction of the curriculum demonstrates the commitment to the formation of critical and active subjects. He argues that "[...] what we have to do, in fact, is to propose to the people, through certain basic contradictions, their existential, concrete, present situation, as a problem that, in turn, challenges them and, thus, demands a response, not only at the intellectual level, but at the level of action" (Freire, 2013, p. 105). This perspective transforms education into a political act, where the curriculum not only reflects the world, but also questions the structural conditions of inequality and oppression that permeate society.

In addition, Freire refutes the idea that the educator should impose his worldview on the students. He proposes that the educational process be dialogical, in which educator and students share and confront their perceptions of the world. He states that "[...] our role is not to talk to the people about our vision of the world, or to try to impose it on them, but to dialogue with them about yours and ours" (Freire, 2013, p. 105). This approach reinforces the horizontality of pedagogical relationships, essential to build an education that recognizes and values the diversity of perspectives.

This conception of curriculum and dialogue challenges traditional educational practices, which often ignore the living conditions and local knowledge of the students. As

Saviani (2011) points out, "[...] when the curriculum is detached from the realities of the students, it ceases to be a tool for social transformation and starts to perpetuate cultural and social inequalities" (p. 35). In this sense, Freire's proposal goes beyond a methodological change, proposing a radical transformation in the way education is conceived and practiced.

That said, Paulo Freire states that the generating themes are, therefore, fundamental for the construction of a curriculum that reflects the realities of the students and invites them to actively participate in the educational process. Saviani observes that "[...] the curriculum, as an expression of the educational identity, must be built from the concrete experience of the subjects, allowing education to play its emancipatory role" (Saviani, 2011, p. 37)

The moment of this search is what inaugurates the dialogue of education as a practice of freedom. It is the moment in which the investigation of what we call the thematic universe of the people or the set of its generating themes is carried out. This research necessarily implies a methodology that cannot contradict the dialogicity of liberating education. Hence it is equally dialogical. Hence, it also provides awareness, at the same time, the apprehension of the 'generating themes' and the awareness of individuals around them (Freire, 2013, p. 105)

The generating themes, as defined by Paulo Freire, are central elements for the construction of a curriculum that dialogues with the concrete realities of the students. They emerge from the existential, social and cultural conditions of the subjects involved in the educational process and serve as a starting point for critical reflection and transformative action. Freire (2013) states that "[...] the investigation of what we call the thematic universe of the people or the set of its generating themes [...] implies a methodology that cannot contradict the dialogicity of liberating education" (p. 105). These themes are identified through a process of participatory investigation, in which the educator, in dialogue with the students, seeks to understand the contradictions and challenges experienced by them in their daily lives.

Thus, in order to put into practice the identification of the generating themes, it is essential that the educator adopts a dialogical and investigative posture. This means holding discussions, conversation circles, observations of the students' daily lives and even visits to their communities to understand the social contexts that surround them. Freire points out that "[...] dialogue is not an exchange of ideas between subjects who close themselves in their individual universe, but a search, to which educators and students surrender, animated by a critical hope" (Freire, 2013, p. 108) For example, in a rural

community, issues such as the lack of access to drinking water or the difficulty in school transportation can emerge as significant issues, that directly reflect the living conditions of the students. These themes, once identified, not only connect the curriculum to the local reality, but also create opportunities to develop interdisciplinary content, such as science, geography and ethics, says Santos, *et. al.* (2024).

After identifying the generating themes, it is up to the educator to incorporate them in a critical way into the school curriculum, transforming them into tools for the development of meaningful and emancipatory learning. Saviani (2011) points out that "[...] the curriculum, as an expression of educational identity, must be built from the concrete experience of the subjects, allowing education to play its emancipatory role" (p. 37) For example, when working on the theme of the lack of school transportation, the educator can encourage the analysis of cost graphs in the context of mathematics, the study of public policies related to transportation in geography and the writing of persuasive texts in Portuguese, proposing concrete actions for transformation. In this way, the generating themes are no longer just matters of reflection and become an active part of the pedagogical process, promoting the integration between school knowledge and social reality.

In view of this, awareness, as a result of the methodology of the generating themes, is essential for the construction of a dialogical and liberating curriculum. Paulo Freire points out that,

[...] The investigation of the thematic universe of the people or the set of its generating themes implies a methodology that cannot contradict the dialogicity of liberating education. Hence it is equally dialogical. Hence, it also provides awareness, at the same time, the apprehension of the 'generating themes' and the awareness of individuals around them (2013, p. 105)

This process of awareness begins with the identification and problematization of the generating themes, which emerge from the experiences and aspirations of the students. Freire emphasizes that awareness should prepare individuals to act on reality, and not be limited to mere passive reflection. He states that "[...] awareness, of course, does not stop, stoically, at the pure, subjective recognition of the situation, but, on the contrary, that it prepares men, at the level of action, to fight against the obstacles to their humanization" (Freire, 2013, p. 106) Thus, awareness not only reveals the contradictions of reality, but also encourages students to act in a critical and transformative way, contributing to the construction of a curriculum that reflects their needs and realities.

The contribution of awareness to the creation of a dialogic curriculum is especially significant because it transforms the relationship between educator and student. Instead of being a vertical process, in which knowledge is imposed in a unidirectional way, awareness creates a horizontal space, in which both collaborate in the definition and construction of the syllabus. This curriculum, according to Freire, should "[...] to be born from the dialogue between educators and students, reflecting their desires and hopes" (Freire, 2013, p. 105). By recognizing the importance of the concrete reality of students, the curriculum becomes an instrument of transformation, allowing education to be a true political act of liberation and humanization.

The more men assume an active stance in the investigation of their theme, the more they deepen their awareness of reality and, by making their significant theme explicit, appropriate it. [...] Themes, in fact, exist in men, in their relations with the world, referred to concrete facts. The same objective fact can provoke, in one epochal subunit, a set of generating themes, and in another, not necessarily the same. There is, therefore, a relationship between the objective fact, the perception that men have of it, and the generating themes (Freire, 2013, p. 115)

THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM AS A MIRROR OF THE DAILY REALITY OF STUDENTS – THE VISION OF PAULO FREIRE AND HIS INTERLOCUTORS

An ideal school curriculum for Paulo Freire is centered on dialogic practice and the collective construction of knowledge. Freire emphasizes that "[...] dialogue is not a tactical moment, but the essence of education as a practice of freedom" (Freire, 2013, p. 96). In this sense, the curriculum should start from the "generating themes", that is, from the concrete experiences of the students, to enable a critical reading of the world and the transformation of reality. These themes, as Freire describes, emerge from the relationship between subjects and the world, reflecting the social contradictions that need to be problematized in order to promote effective awareness.

It will be from the present, existential, concrete situation, reflecting the set of aspirations of the people, that we will be able to organize the programmatic content of education or political action. What we have to do, in fact, is to propose to the people, through certain basic contradictions, their existential, concrete, present situation, as a problem that, in turn, challenges them and thus demands a response, not only at the intellectual level, but at the level of action. [...] Our role is not to talk to the people about our vision of the world, or to try to impose it on them, but to dialogue with them about yours and ours (Freire, 2013, p. 62)

Paulo Freire, by highlighting that the syllabus must start from the concrete existential situation, reflects the essence of his proposal for a problematizing education. This perspective considers that "[...] there is no more or less important knowledge; all

knowledge is significant when mediated by practice" (Freire, 2013, p. 121). The central idea that the contradictions of reality should be presented as problems to be solved dialogues with the construction of a school curriculum that is based on the critical reading of the world, promoting not only the acquisition of content, but social transformation.

In this sense, the curriculum should be a space for dialogue and collective construction. As Mészáros points out, "[...] education cannot be enclosed in the strict terrain of pedagogy, but must go out into the streets, into public spaces, and open up to the world" (Mészáros, 2002, p. 19) This openness implies overcoming a traditional approach, in which the contents are transmitted in a linear way, to a dialogical approach, in which students are challenged to reflect on their conditions of existence and to act to transform them.

Dermeval Saviani's historical-critical pedagogy²¹ reinforces this perspective by proposing that education "[...] it is the act of producing, directly and intentionally, in each singular individual, the humanity that is historically and collectively produced by the set of men" (Saviani, 2011, p. 31) This conception highlights that the curriculum cannot be neutral, but must be thought of as a means to overcome historical inequalities, ensuring that students understand their role in the construction of a more just society.

Thus, the relationship between the generating themes and the ideal curriculum, as stated by Freire, implies recognizing that "[...] our role is not to tell the people about our vision of the world, or to try to impose it on them, but to dialogue with them about yours and ours" (Freire, 2013, p. 62). At this point, he challenges traditional pedagogical practices that center the teacher as the sole holder of knowledge, promoting, on the contrary, co-authorship in the process of knowledge construction, where students and their experiences are valued.

If the educator is the one who knows, if the students are the ones who know nothing, it is up to the educator to give, deliver, take, transmit his knowledge to the latter. [...] The more passivity is imposed on them, the more naively, instead of transforming, they tend to adapt themselves to the world, to the reality partialized in the deposits received. [...] To the extent that this 'banking' view annuls the creative power of the learners or minimizes it, [...] it satisfies the interests of the oppressors (Freire, 2013, p. 73).

²¹ Historical-critical pedagogy, developed by Dermeval Saviani, is an educational approach based on historical-dialectical materialism, which understands education as an intentional act of mediation between subjects and social reality for the overcoming of inequalities and the transformation of society. For Saviani, "[...] education is the act of producing, directly and intentionally, in each singular individual, the humanity that is historically and collectively produced by the group of men" (Saviani, 2011, p. 31). This pedagogy criticizes the neutrality of the educational process, emphasizing that the school should be a space for critical and emancipatory education, in which systematized knowledge is used as a tool to understand and intervene in social contradictions. See: SAVIANI, D. *Historical-critical pedagogy: first approximations*. 11. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2011.

Ivo Tonet contributes to this discussion by stating that "[...] full human formation requires an education that goes beyond the reproduction of capitalist values, allowing the construction of a critical consciousness that challenges dominant structures" (Tonet, 2016, p. 45). The curriculum, inspired by Freire's pedagogy, should be a space of resistance and emancipation, where the contents are chosen and organized to enable the transformation of social relations.

On the other hand, Christian Laval's criticism of the commodification of education reinforces the importance of Freire's proposal. Laval observes that "[...] the direct submission of the school to economic interests reinforces inequalities and limits the capacity for social transformation" (Laval, 2019, p. 165). Paulo Freire, by proposing dialogue and questioning social contradictions, offers a radically opposite alternative, which seeks to prepare subjects for autonomy and critical citizenship.

Freire also points out that the construction of the curriculum must be based on the dialogue between different types of knowledge. He states that "[...] liberating education requires educators to recognize the previous knowledge of students as starting points for the construction of knowledge" (Freire, 2013, p. 102). This means that the curriculum must include and value popular and traditional knowledge, recognizing its relevance for the critical understanding of reality.

That said, the centrality of dialogue in Freire's proposal reflects the idea that "[...] no one educates anyone, no one educates himself; men educate themselves in communion, mediated by the world" (Freire, 2013, p. 80). This means that the ideal curriculum is built collectively, with the active participation of educators and students, as co-authors of the educational process and agents of social transformation.

We simply cannot reach the workers, urban or peasants, who, in general, are immersed in a colonial context almost umbilically linked to the world of nature of which they feel themselves more parts than transformers, in order to, in the manner of the 'banking' conception, deliver 'knowledge' to them or impose on them a model of the good man, contained in the program whose content we ourselves organize. For the educator-learner²² (*emphasis added*), dialogical, problematizing, the

²² For Paulo Freire, in a transformative education, which enables a horizontal curriculum, it is necessary that the educator and the student be in the same position, without hierarchies: "[...] In fact, it would not be possible for problem-solving education, which breaks with the vertical schemes characteristic of banking education, to realize itself as a practice of freedom, without overcoming the contradiction between the educator and the students. Nor would it be possible for him to do so outside the dialogue. It is through this that the overcoming takes place, which results in a new term: no longer educator of the learner, no longer educating of the educator, but educator-learner with learner-educator. In this way, the educator is no longer the one who only educates, but the one who, while educating, is educated, in dialogue with the learner who, by being educated, also educates. Both, thus, become subjects of the process in which they grow together and in which the 'arguments of authority' are no longer valid" (Freire, 2013, p. 80). See references.

programmatic content of education is not a donation or an imposition – a set of reports to be deposited in the students – but the organized, systematized and added return to the people of those elements that they have given to them in an unstructured way (Freire, 2013, p. 123)

Dermeval Saviani, when addressing historical-critical pedagogy, adds that the curriculum must be guided by educational intentionality, seeking to develop in the student the human capacities produced historically and collectively. He states that "[...] education is the act of producing, directly and intentionally, in each singular individual, the humanity that is historically and collectively produced by the group of men" (Saviani, 2011, p. 31). In this way, the Freirean curriculum could not be neutral or alien to the concrete living conditions of the students, but should be planned as a response to historical and social inequalities.

In Ivo Tonet's perspective, critical education can only be effective if it breaks with the alienating logics imposed by capital, promoting human emancipation. For him, "[...] full human formation requires an education that goes beyond the reproduction of capitalist values, allowing the construction of a critical consciousness that challenges dominant structures" (Tonet, 2016, p. 45) This dialogues directly with Freire, who understands the curriculum as a tool for liberation, and not for adaptation to the oppressive system. In this context, the curriculum should prioritize practices that problematize power relations and the role of education in the reproduction of inequalities.

In addition, Mészáros argues that a transformative curriculum must overcome the mercantile logic of education. He states that "[...] education cannot be seen as a commodity, but as a process that prepares subjects for life and social transformation" (Mészáros, 2002, p. 19) This view reinforces the need for a curriculum aimed at the integral formation of the human being, articulating ethical, social and political dimensions. In a Freirean curriculum, this means including content that problematizes the relationship between the subjects and the social context, valuing the active participation of students in the educational process.

Christian Laval, in criticizing neoliberalism in education, points out that the submission of the school to the demands of the market destroys the critical potential of the curriculum. For him, "[...] the market colonization of education reinforces inequalities and prevents the development of emancipatory pedagogical practices" (Laval, 2019, p. 165) This warning is echoed in Freire's pedagogy, which proposes a curriculum aimed at overcoming social contradictions, through a liberating education that challenges the logics of the market and promotes equity. That said, Freire states:

The education that is required of those who are truly committed to liberation cannot be based on an understanding of men as empty beings whom the world 'fills' with content; it cannot be based on a specialized, mechanically compartmentalized consciousness, but on men as 'conscious bodies' and on consciousness as consciousness intended for the world. It cannot be that of the deposit of contents, but that of the problematization of men in their relations with the world (2013, p. 81).

Another fundamental aspect of Freire's curriculum is the valorization of the dialogue between popular and academic knowledge. Freire points out that "[...] there is no more or less important knowledge; all knowledge is significant when mediated by practice" (2013, p. 121) This implies including in the curriculum content that dialogues with local cultures, traditional knowledge and the daily practices of students, in order to recognize and value their experiences as an essential part of the educational process.

Gaudêncio Frigotto reinforces this view by highlighting that the curriculum must consider the contradictions of the world of work and prepare subjects to act critically in this context. He states that "[...] education should not only train for the market, but also train for life, articulating work, culture and politics" (Frigotto, 2010, p. 23) In a Freirean curriculum, this means promoting training that is not limited to technical qualification, but that stimulates reflection on working conditions and the possibilities of social transformation.

It is not surprising, therefore, that in this 'banking' view of education, men are seen as beings of adaptation, of adjustment. The more students exercise themselves in archiving the deposits made to them, the less they will develop in themselves the critical awareness that would result from their insertion in the world, as its transformers. As subjects. The more passivity is imposed on them, the more naively, instead of transforming, they tend to adapt to the world, to reality (Freire, 2013, p. 81)

Paulo Freire's criticism of banking education, expressed in the quoted excerpt, denounces the traditional educational practice that treats students as passive receptacles of knowledge, molded for adaptation and adjustment to existing conditions. Freire argues that "[...] the more passivity is imposed on them, the more naively, instead of transforming, they tend to adapt to the world, to reality" (Freire, 2013, p. 81) This perspective is particularly relevant to the debate on the school curriculum, as it questions the role of education in the reproduction of social and economic structures that perpetuate inequalities.

Freire proposes a problem-solving education, which allows students to develop a critical consciousness, becoming active subjects in the transformation of the world. He states that "[...] the education that is required of those who are truly committed to liberation

cannot be based on an understanding of men as empty beings whom the world 'fills' with content; cannot be based on a specialized, mechanically compartmentalized consciousness, but on men as 'conscious bodies' and on consciousness as consciousness intended for the world" (Freire, 2013, p. 81). This model of education requires a curriculum that values the interaction between educators and students, promoting a dialogue in which both learn and teach.

In this way, the centrality of dialogue in Freire's pedagogy challenges the traditional hierarchy between teacher and student. Freire points out that "[...] no longer educator of the learner, no longer educating of the educator, but educator-learner with learner-educator. In this way, the educator is no longer the one who only educates, but the one who, while educating, is educated, in dialogue with the learner who, by being educated, also educates" (2013, p. 80) This approach requires a collectively constructed curriculum, which starts from the concrete experiences of the learners and connects them to academic knowledge in a critical and contextualized way.

The theorist also argues that the syllabus of the curriculum should reflect the interests and aspirations of the students, considering their social and historical realities. He writes that "[...] the programmatic content of education is not a donation or an imposition – a set of reports to be deposited in the students – but the organized, systematized and added return to the people of those elements that they have given to them in an unstructured way" (Freire, 2013, p. 123) This view emphasizes the importance of including generating themes in the curriculum, extracted from the reality of the students, so that education is meaningful and transformative.

A school curriculum inspired by Freire's pedagogy is not limited to the transmission of technical or instrumental content. On the contrary, it seeks to develop in learners a critical understanding of the social and economic conditions that shape their lives. Freire explains that "[...] our role is not to talk to the people about our vision of the world, or to try to impose it on them, but to dialogue with them about yours and ours" (Freire, 2013, p. 62) This dialogue is essential for students to recognize their own capacities to transform reality.

The rejection of banking education proposed by Freire also implies a criticism of the teaching model focused exclusively on the labor market. He points out that "[...] it would not be possible for problem-solving education, which breaks with the vertical schemes characteristic of banking education, to realize itself as a practice of freedom, without overcoming the contradiction between the educator and the students" (Freire, 2013, p. 80).

A liberating curriculum must, therefore, overcome this instrumental logic and prioritize the integral formation of students, connecting learning to social transformation.

In addition, the theorist endorses that education should be a process of awareness, in which students understand the contradictions of reality and prepare themselves to act on them. He states that "[...] Awareness is a historic commitment. It is born from the confrontation of men with reality and of men with each other, in their task of unveiling it, in order to change it" (Freire, 2013, p. 45) Thus, the curriculum must be designed to develop this critical awareness, promoting an education that goes beyond mere adaptation.

Thus, Freire's critique of the passivity imposed by banking education calls us to rethink the role of the curriculum in the formation of autonomous and critical subjects. Through a dialogued and problematizing approach, the curriculum can become a powerful tool for social emancipation and the construction of a less unjust society. Pedagogical practice, in this sense, must be profoundly political, committed to the transformation of structures that generate oppression and exclusion. Freire concludes that "[...] the dialogue begins in the search for the syllabus" (2013, p. 101), reaffirming the centrality of this approach in the construction of a truly liberating curriculum.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of a school curriculum that dialogues with the desires and needs of students, especially in a society as heterogeneous as the Brazilian one, requires a definitive break with the traditional teaching models guided by banking education, as criticized by Paulo Freire. Educational practice, often characterized by the unilateral transmission of knowledge, treats students as passive recipients, which disconnects them from their own sociocultural reality. Freire (2013) states that "[...] the education that is required of those who are truly committed to liberation cannot be based on an understanding of men as empty beings whom the world 'fills' with contents" (p. 81). This logic needs to be replaced by a curriculum that values dialogue, problematization and contextualization.

In a country marked by economic, cultural and regional inequalities, an emancipatory curriculum must be built from the concrete reality of the students. Freire's approach to "generating themes" offers a practical and theoretical path for this construction. These themes, as Freire describes, emerge from the experiences and contradictions experienced by the subjects in their daily lives and serve as a starting point

for the development of significant pedagogical practices. For Freire (2013), "[...] the generative themes are extracted from the existential situations that implicate individuals in the world" (p. 122). Thus, the curriculum should reflect the challenges and aspirations of learners, ensuring that learning is relevant and transformative.

The construction of an inclusive curriculum also requires overcoming the traditional hierarchy between educator and student, which often mirrors the power relations present in society. Freire (2013) proposes that "[...] educator and student, together, learn and teach, while dialoguing with the world" (p. 80). This horizontal relationship is essential to break with oppressive pedagogical practices and to create an environment in which students recognize themselves as active subjects of the educational process. In addition, the curriculum should recognize and value popular and community knowledge, often neglected by formal education, as a way to strengthen the cultural identity and self-esteem of students.

Teacher training plays a crucial role in this process. In order for the school curriculum to dialogue with the diversity of Brazilian society, it is necessary to train educators to adopt critical, dialogical and contextual methodologies. As Saviani (2011) points out, "[...] the role of the teacher is fundamental in the organization of pedagogical work, which must articulate the appropriation of systematized knowledge with the problematization of social reality" (p. 45). This training must go beyond the technical, including reflections on the social and economic conditions of students and on the political role of education in the construction of a more just society.

The research carried out shows that decontextualized curricula perpetuate inequalities and asymmetrical power relations. These practices devalue the students' experiences, reinforcing the idea that the school is distant from their realities. On the other hand, a curriculum that incorporates the experiences of learners promotes greater engagement, autonomy and a sense of belonging. As Weber (1969) points out, "[...] to understand social action means to interpret the meaning that individuals attribute to it" (p. 110). This reinforces that the construction of curricula needs to start from listening to and recognizing the subjectivities present in the school environment.

Furthermore, the integration between qualitative, descriptive and bibliographic research, as based on this study, allowed the articulation of Freire's theory with the pedagogical practices observed. This dialogue between theory and practice made it possible to understand the curricular dynamics and propose ways to overcome banking

education. As Gil (2008) points out, "[...] descriptive research offers detailed data that allow us to establish relationships between phenomena and understand their specific characteristics" (p. 51). In the field of education, this approach is indispensable to connect empirical reality to the theoretical construction of transformative practices.

We conclude that, in a society as plural as the Brazilian one, implementing an emancipatory school curriculum requires a commitment to the transformation of the social relations that cross the educational environment. It is necessary to build curricula that reflect the challenges, aspirations and potentialities of the students, breaking with oppressive and hierarchical models. Paulo Freire's proposal, by prioritizing dialogue and problematization, continues to be an indispensable reference to achieve an education that not only teaches, but emancipates, promoting social justice and equity in the formative process.

REFERENCES

1. Bourdieu, P. (2014). A reprodução: Elementos para uma teoria do sistema de ensino [Reproduction: Elements for a theory of the education system]. Petrópolis, Brazil: Vozes.
2. Frigotto, G. (2010). Educação e crise do trabalho: Perspectivas de final de século [Education and the crisis of work: Perspectives at the end of the century] (2nd ed.). Petrópolis, Brazil: Vozes.
3. Freire, P. (2013). Pedagogia do oprimido [Pedagogy of the oppressed] (50th ed.). Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Paz e Terra.
4. Gil, A. C. (2008). Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa social [Methods and techniques of social research] (6th ed.). São Paulo, Brazil: Atlas.
5. Laval, C. (2019). A escola não é uma empresa: O neoliberalismo em ataque ao ensino público [The school is not a company: Neoliberalism's attack on public education]. São Paulo, Brazil: Boitempo.
6. Mészáros, I. (2002). A educação para além do capital [Education beyond capital]. São Paulo, Brazil: Boitempo.
7. Minayo, M. C. S. (2007). Pesquisa social: Teoria, método e criatividade [Social research: Theory, method, and creativity] (26th ed.). Petrópolis, Brazil: Vozes.
8. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024a). "Consciência, autonomia e transformação": A educação como catalisador da transformação social e da consciência crítica na perspectiva de Paulo Freire ["Consciousness, autonomy, and transformation": Education as a catalyst for social transformation and critical consciousness in Paulo Freire's perspective]. Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana, 22(9), Article e6729. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n9-110>
9. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024b). Descolonizando saberes: A busca pela revolução contra-hegemônica da educação latino-americana no contexto contemporâneo [Decolonizing knowledge: The pursuit of a counter-hegemonic revolution in Latin American education in the contemporary context]. Cuadernos de Educación y Desarrollo, 16(6), Article e4636. <https://doi.org/10.55905/cuadv16n6-178>
10. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024c). "Ecoalfabetização ancestral": Por uma valorização dos saberes indígenas para um futuro sustentável na América Latina ["Ancestral eco-literacy": Valuing Indigenous knowledge for a sustainable future in Latin America]. Cuadernos de Educación y Desarrollo, 16(7), Article e4885. <https://doi.org/10.55905/cuadv16n7-107>

11. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024d). "Educação emergente": Enfrentando desafios contemporâneos e moldando o futuro com a perspectiva crítica e emancipadora ["Emerging education": Addressing contemporary challenges and shaping the future with a critical and emancipatory perspective]. *Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales*, 17(7), Article e8342. <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.17n.7-176>
12. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024e). Educação, arte e literatura: Entrelaçando saberes para uma educação emancipatória com Jacotot, libertária com Freire e revolucionária com Boal [Education, art, and literature: Interweaving knowledge for an emancipatory education with Jacotot, libertarian with Freire, and revolutionary with Boal]. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(10), Article e9021. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n10-130>
13. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024f). "O avesso da educação": A incorrigível lógica do neoliberalismo em ataque ao ensino público e seu impacto na educação ["The reverse of education": The incorrigible logic of neoliberalism attacking public education and its impact on education]. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(9), Article e6860. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n9-172>
14. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024g). Paulo Freire: Do educador ao gestor – transformações da secretaria de educação às escolas públicas populares da América Latina [Paulo Freire: From educator to manager – transformations from the education department to popular public schools in Latin America]. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(10), Article e9774. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n10-334>
15. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024h). Pedagogia dialógica – desafios e potencialidades da educação como prática da liberdade em Paulo Freire [Dialogical pedagogy – challenges and potentialities of education as a practice of freedom in Paulo Freire]. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(13), Article e12120. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n13-264>
16. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024i). Por uma educação escolar quilombola: Ressignificando o passado através da Lei 10.639/2003 e da renovação do currículo em direção à emancipação afro-brasileira [For a quilombola school education: Resignifying the past through Law 10.639/2003 and curriculum renewal toward Afro-Brazilian emancipation]. *Cuadernos de Educación y Desarrollo*, 16(6), Article e4554. <https://doi.org/10.55905/cuadv16n6-134>
17. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024j). "Semear diversidade na educação": A pedagogia de Paulo Freire como ponte da interculturalidade na educação infantil latino-americana ["Sowing diversity in education": Paulo Freire's pedagogy as a bridge to interculturality in Latin American early childhood education]. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(8), Article e6454. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n8-209>
18. Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2024k). "(Des)fabricando a educação": Entrelaçando saberes para transcender a visão utilitarista em direção a uma perspectiva humanitária da educação ["(Un)making education": Interweaving knowledge to transcend the utilitarian view toward a humanitarian perspective of education]. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(9), Article e6645. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n9-079>

19. Saviani, D. (2011). Pedagogia histórico-crítica: Primeiras aproximações [Historical-critical pedagogy: Initial approaches] (11th ed.). Campinas, Brazil: Autores Associados.
20. Tonet, I. (2016). Educação contra o capital: Por uma pedagogia socialista [Education against capital: For a socialist pedagogy]. Campinas, Brazil: Autores Associados.
21. Weber, M. (1969). Economia e sociedade: Fundamentos da sociologia compreensiva [Economy and society: Foundations of comprehensive sociology]. Brasília, Brazil: Editora UnB.