


BETWEEN WORDS AND ACTIONS – THE KNOWLEDGE OF PAULO FREIRE'S "PEDAGOGY OF AUTONOMY" TO TRANSFORM TEACHING INTO LIVING PRACTICE

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n2-135>

Submitted on: 11/01/2025

Publication date: 11/02/2025

**Antonio Nacílio Sousa dos Santos¹, Waldyr Barcellos Júnior², Carlos Rigor Neves³,
Edimar Fonseca da Fonseca⁴, Andréa Gracio Coimbra⁵, Francisco Antonio Machado
Araújo⁶, Jean Lucas Oliveira de Almeida⁷, Érika da Silva Bezerra⁸, Alessandra Sagica
Gonçalves⁹,**

¹ Doctor student in Social Sciences
Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES)
Horizonte, Ceará – Brazil.
E-mail: naciliosantos23@gmail.com

² Master in Teaching
Fluminense Federal University (UFF)
Miracema, Rio de Janeiro – Brazil.
E-mail: waldyr_barcellos@hotmail.com

³ Master's student in Educational Sciences
Universidad Autónoma de Asunción (UAA)
Macapá, Amapá – Brazil.
E-mail: profcarlosrigor@gmail.com

⁴ Doctor in Science Education.
Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS)
Caçapava do Sul, Rio Grande do Sul – Brazil.
E-mail: fonseca.edimar@gmail.com

⁵ Master in Biogeochemistry
Fluminense Federal University (UFF)
Niterói, Rio de Janeiro – Brazil.
E-mail: andreagracio@gmail.com

⁶ Doctor of Education
Federal University of Piauí (UFPI)
Teresina, Piauí – Brazil.
Email: chiquinhophb@gmail.com

⁷ Master's student in Letters
Federal University of Pará (UFPA)
Belém, Pará – Brazil.
Email: geo71586@gmail.com

⁸ Master in Emerging Technologies in Education
Metropolitan University of Science and Technology (MUST)
Iguatu, Ceará – Brazil.
E-mail: erikasilva.b@hotmail.com

⁹ Master in Education
Federal University of Pará (UFPA)
Belém, Pará – Brazil.
E-mail: alessandrasagicaa@gmail.com

Adnalnye da Silva Guimarães Teles¹⁰, Juliana de Paula Iennaco¹¹, José Carlos da Costa¹², Débora Michele Sales de Lima¹³, Maria Adriana Torqueti Rodrigues¹⁴ and Eric Murilo de Souza Andrade Santos¹⁵

ABSTRACT

Throughout his educational trajectory, Paulo Freire highlighted that certain "knowledges" are essential to transform teaching into a practice that transcends the logic of capital, the "objectification" of knowledge and "banking education". For Freire, it is not enough to hold knowledge; it is essential to mobilize it in a critical and dialogical way, enabling an emancipatory education that fosters the autonomy and active participation of the subjects in the teaching-learning process. In view of this, we ask: how can the knowledge of Paulo Freire's "Pedagogy of Autonomy" be effectively incorporated into the daily life of school teaching, in order to transform the classroom into a space of praxis and critical emancipation? To answer this question, we based ourselves on the works of Paulo Freire, whose reflections have always guided his educational work, as well as on other authors whose works dialogue with his pedagogical conceptions. Methodologically, the research adopts a qualitative approach based on Minayo (2016), based on bibliographic analysis according to Gil (1999) and on the comprehensive analytical perspective of Weber (2009). The findings indicate that the incorporation of Freire's knowledge into the school routine requires a pedagogical practice centered on dialogicity, on the recognition of students as historical subjects and on the overcoming of hierarchical structures that reproduce educational oppression. The research shows that the "Pedagogy of Autonomy" is only fully realized when the teacher recognizes himself as a mediator of knowledge and an agent of social transformation, resignifying teaching as a living and liberating practice.

Keywords: Pedagogy of Autonomy. Dialogic Education. Educational Praxis. Emancipatory Teaching.

¹⁰ Master in Educational Sciences
Inter-American Faculty of Social Sciences (FICS)
Caucaia, Ceará – Brazil
E-mail: adnalneteles@gmail.com

¹¹ Doctor student in Political Science
Federal University of Viçosa (UFV)
Itamarati de Minas, Minas Gerais – Brazil.
Email: Juliana.iennaco@ufv.br

¹² Master in Physics Teaching
Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Alagoas (IFAL/Campus Santana do Ipanema).
Santana do Ipanema, Alagoas – Brazil.
Email: jose.carlos@ifal.edu.br

¹³ Master's Degree in Education.
Federal University of Paraíba (UFPB)
João Pessoa, Paraíba – Brazil.
E-mail: profdebora4@gmail.com

¹⁴ Doctor student in Education
University of Salamanca/Spain (USAL)
Dourados, Mato Grosso do Sul – Brazil.
E-mail: adritorque@gmail.com

¹⁵ Graduated in Pedagogy
The Mantense College of the General Valleys (Intervale)
Petrolina, Pernambuco – Brazil.
Email: ericmuriloandrade89@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

TEACHING PRACTICE AND TEACHING IN PAULO FREIRE'S VIEW

Brazilian education, historically structured under the traditional model, has operated as an instrument for the reproduction of dominant values, perpetuating a teaching based on the mechanical transmission of knowledge and the passivity of the student. The banking model of education¹⁶, conceptualized by Paulo Freire, is characterized by the unilateral transfer of information, in which the teacher occupies the central position of knowledge and the student assumes the role of mere receiver. As Freire points out, this logic "[...] it maintains and still reinforces the contradictions through the following practices and attitudes, which reflect the oppressive society as a whole: the teacher teaches, the students are taught; the teacher knows everything, the students know nothing; the teacher thinks for himself and for the students" (1979, p. 52). In addition, he emphasizes that this model promotes a mechanical and alienating teaching, because "[...] education becomes 'the act of depositing', in which the students are the deposits and the teacher the one who deposits" (Freire, 1979, p. 53).

Banking education, which for some is the answer to the demand for knowledge, is, in fact, nothing more than an instrument for the domestication of consciences. The educator, instead of encouraging dialogue and critical reflection, deposits ready-made content in the students, who receive them passively. Such a practice reinforces alienation and prevents the development of an active and questioning posture on the part of students. Thus, instead of preparing students for the transformation of the world, this education conditions them to adapt to it, maintaining the current structure of domination (Freire, 1974, p. 79).

Thus, the curricular contents, in turn, reflect the interests of foreign capital and political and economic groups that instrumentalize education to meet the needs of the market. As Freire points out, "[...] by depoliticizing education and reducing it to the training of skills, neoliberal ideology and policy end up generating an educational practice that contradicts or hinders one of the fundamental requirements of technological advancement

¹⁶ The banking model of education, a concept widely developed by Paulo Freire, refers to a conception of teaching in which the educator deposits content in the students, treating them as passive recipients, devoid of criticality and autonomy. In this model, knowledge is reduced to a commodity, and teaching becomes a mechanical and alienating practice, which reinforces the hierarchy between those who "know" (the teacher) and those who "don't know" (the student). Freire (1987) criticizes this approach, arguing that it "[...] it nullifies the creativity of the students, stimulates their passivity and distances them from the concrete reality in which they live. Banking education makes individuals accommodating and prevents them from perceiving themselves as historical subjects capable of transforming the world" (p. 79). In opposition to this conception, Freire proposes problem-solving education, based on dialogue and the active participation of students in the process of knowledge construction. See: FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 17. Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.

itself" (Freire, 2000, p. 67). In addition, he denounces that this logic transforms teaching into a training mechanism, because "[...] without dream and without utopia, without denunciation and without announcement, all that remains is the technical training to which education is reduced" (Freire, 2000, p. 69).

The relationship between education and the capitalist socio-economic structure is effective in a class society, expressing more and more clearly the antagonistic interests that are at stake. The basic conflict between capital and labor coexists in all social relations and therefore permeates educational practice as a whole. The relation of production and use of knowledge reveals itself as a relation of classes. What the society of capital seeks is to establish a certain level of schooling and a type of education or training, historically adjusted to changes in the means and instruments of production. Thus, as much as capital tries to expropriate the worker of knowledge, it cannot do so completely, because the origin of this knowledge is something intrinsic to the worker and his class. This process translates into the production of knowledge in 'knowledge packages', transmitted in a programmed and fragmented way, guaranteeing the functionality of education for the logic of the market and not for the emancipation of the subjects (Frigotto, 2001, p. 25).

In this scenario, students are not recognized as active subjects in the elaboration of knowledge. Technical teaching¹⁷, predominant in educational policies, reduces learning to a set of operational skills and discourages critical reflection. The imposition of content decontextualized from the students' reality disregards their cultural and social baggage, resulting in a dehumanized and alienating teaching. As Freire warns, "[...] Literacy and awareness are never separated. All learning must be closely associated with becoming aware of the real situation experienced by the student" (1967, p. 101). From this perspective, he emphasizes that education should be an emancipatory practice, because "[...] the school method of adult education will never propose to students to consider reality in a critical way" (1979, p. 45).

Based on the assumption of scientific neutrality and inspired by the principles of rationality, efficiency and productivity, this pedagogy advocates the reordering of the educational process in order to make it objective and operational. In a similar way to what happened in factory work, the objectification of pedagogical work is intended. In fact, if in handicrafts work was subjective, that is, the instruments of work were arranged according to the worker and he disposed of them according to his

¹⁷ Technical education is an educational approach that emphasizes the training of individuals to meet the demands of the labor market, prioritizing efficiency, standardization, and the instrumentalization of knowledge. This model, influenced by positivism and by the conceptions of education as training for productive performance, disregards the critical and humanizing dimensions of the educational process. According to Saviani (2007), "[...] By reducing the function of the school to the transmission of previously defined techniques and contents, educational technicism reinforces a mechanistic conception of teaching, in which the role of the teacher is limited to the execution of pre-established guidelines, with no room for reflection or problematization" (p. 39). This perspective, predominant in various periods of the history of Brazilian education, ignores the sociocultural character of learning and restricts the formation of subjects to a merely reproductive and alienating model. See: SAVIANI, Dermeval. *History of pedagogical ideas in Brazil*. Campinas: Associated Authors, 2007.

designs, in factory production this relationship is inverted. (...) The concurrence of the actions of different subjects thus produces a result with which none of the subjects identifies, and which, on the contrary, is alien to them. (...) Hence the proliferation of pedagogical proposals such as the systemic approach, micro-teaching, tele-teaching, programmed instruction, teaching machines, etc. Hence, also, the fragmentation of the pedagogical work with the specialization of functions, postulating the introduction into the teaching system of techniques of the most different shades (Frigotto, 2001, p. 28).

That said, the educational structure imposed by the technicist model perpetuates the alienation of students, as it prioritizes the formation of individuals adaptable to the market, to the detriment of the development of critical and reflective subjects. As Freire denounces, "[...] reduced to the memorization of fragmented contents, education becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the educator the depositor" (1974, p. 78). Furthermore, he points out that "[...] the banking conception of education does not recognize men as historical beings, because it treats them as unfinished and passive beings" (1974, p. 80).

Flexible learning emerges as one of the expressions of the pedagogical project of flexible accumulation, whose logic continues to be the unequal distribution of education, but with a differentiated form. Thus, the discourse of flexible accumulation on education points to the need for the training of flexible professionals, who follow the technological changes resulting from the dynamics of contemporary scientific-technological production, instead of rigid professionals, who repeat memorized or recreated procedures through experience. In order for this flexible training to be possible, it is necessary to replace the specialized training, acquired in vocational courses focused on partial occupations and, generally, of short duration, complemented by on-the-job training, by general training acquired through extended schooling, which covers at least basic education, to be made available to all workers (Antunes & Pinto, 2002, p. 95).

Paulo Freire, in opposition to this structure, proposes an emancipatory pedagogy, in which teaching is understood as a political and liberating act. In his conception, education should be problematizing, allowing students not only to understand their reality, but to become agents of its transformation. He emphasizes that "[...] the progressive educator teaches the contents of his discipline with rigor and rigorously demands the production of the students, but does not hide his political option in the impossible neutrality of his doing"¹⁸

¹⁸ Throughout his work, Paulo Freire created and resignified words to express fundamental concepts of his pedagogy, including *quehacer* (Portugueseized as *quefazer*), *unpublished viable* and *banking education*. These linguistic creations reflect his concern with the construction of critical and dialogical thinking, breaking with rigid and mechanistic structures of language. The term *quefazer*, for example, represents the inseparability between theory and practice, emphasizing that the act of teaching and learning must be linked to the action that transforms reality. As Freire (1996) points out, "[...] There is no doing without a dream, just as there is no dream without a dream. What to do implies a practice committed to change, to the reinvention of the world and of existence itself" (p. 45). In this way, the creation of words in his work is not a mere linguistic artifice, but an

(Freire, 2000, p. 72). For Freire, education should be a space of liberation, because "[...] the educational practice that denies critical reflection leads to the maintenance of the *status quo* and the adaptation of students to the oppressive reality" (1979, p. 57).

Education must provide men with an integral development. All the needs of man must emerge in the educational process, such as the search for survival, pleasure, creation and enjoyment of culture, participation in social life, interaction with other men, self-realization and self-creation. This profound transformation of educational objectives requires, among other things, a profound transformation of the social division of labor, which, with the abolition of the division between mental and manual labor, will lead to a rapprochement between science and production. On the contrary, the bourgeois school professes ideals of the integral development of man that can be summarized in educating for consumption, for citizenship in the bourgeois democratic molds, which are already known as extremely authoritarian and exclusionary (Marx & Engels, 2010, p. 38).

In view of this panorama, this study has as its object of analysis the application of the knowledge of Paulo Freire's "Pedagogy of Autonomy" in teaching in the school context, aiming to understand how education can be resignified beyond a technicist and market logic. The objective of this research is to investigate how the teaching practice can appropriate Freire's principles to transform the classroom into a space for dialogue, critical reflection and social emancipation. The question that guides this study is: How can the knowledge of Paulo Freire's "Pedagogy of Autonomy" be incorporated into the daily life of school teaching, in order to transform education into a living and liberating practice?

Thus, the importance of this research extends beyond the academic field, reaching educators, managers and educational policy makers. By promoting a critical reflection on the structure of teaching, this study contributes to the strengthening of pedagogical practices that value the autonomy of the student and the construction of a less unequal society. As Freire points out, "[...] What I mean is that education is neither an unbeatable force at the service of the transformation of society, because I want it to be, nor is it the perpetuation of the *status quo*, because the dominant decrees it" (2011, p. 34). Thus, this investigation seeks to broaden the debate on the need for an education committed to the integral formation of human beings, fostering their capacity to intervene in the world.

essential resource to express his emancipatory conception of education. See: FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Autonomy: knowledge necessary for educational practice*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH: INTERTWINING QUALITATIVE, BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESEARCH AND COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS IN THE INVESTIGATION OF FREIRE'S KNOWLEDGE

The qualitative research presented itself as a fundamental methodological approach to investigate how the knowledge of Paulo Freire's "Pedagogy of Autonomy" can be effectively incorporated into the school routine. This perspective allowed a deep understanding of the meanings attributed by the subjects to their educational practice, respecting their experiences and historical contexts. As Minayo (2007) emphasizes, "[...] qualitative research is concerned with a level of reality that cannot be quantified, working with the universe of meanings, motives, aspirations, beliefs, values and attitudes" (p. 21). Thus, the choice of this approach is justified by the objective of understanding how teachers and students should experience and resignify Freirean knowledge in the classroom. Minayo (2007: 21) states that:

Qualitative research answers very particular questions. In the Social Sciences, it is concerned with a level of reality that cannot or should not be quantified [...]. This set of human phenomena is understood here as part of social reality, as the human being is distinguished not only by acting, but by thinking about what he does and by interpreting his actions within and from the reality lived and shared with his fellow human beings. The universe of human production, which can be summarized in the world of relations, representations and intentionality and is the object of qualitative research, can hardly be translated into numbers and quantitative indicators.

In addition, the qualitative research enabled an in-depth analysis of the educational processes, going beyond the mere description of the phenomena to seek their critical interpretation. As Gil (2008) points out, "[...] qualitative research is characterized by obtaining descriptive data, with attention to the meanings that people attribute to their experiences and to the phenomena that involve them" (p. 50). In the context of the "Pedagogy of Autonomy", this approach allows capturing the perceptions of educators about their teaching practice, identifying challenges, potentialities and strategies to promote an emancipatory and dialogical education. Minayo (2006) states that:

In qualitative research, interpretation assumes a central focus, since 'it is the starting point (because it begins with the actors' own interpretations) and it is the point of arrival (because it is the interpretation of interpretations)'. [...] Thus, when analyzing and interpreting information generated by qualitative research, we must move both in the direction of what is homogeneous and what is different within the same social environment. [...] The important thing is that the interpretation of the data goes beyond mere description, seeking to understand the meanings of the speeches and actions, promoting a critical reflection on the phenomena investigated (p. 79).

That said, the adoption of qualitative research is also justified by the fact that education is an eminently human and relational field, in which social interactions and discourses play a central role. Weber (2009) points out that "[...] the understanding of social phenomena requires an interpretative analysis of the subjective meanings that individuals attribute to their actions and relationships" (p. 75). Thus, by investigating how Freire's knowledge is incorporated into pedagogical practice, qualitative research allows revealing the intentions, challenges and contradictions experienced by teachers and students in the construction of a liberating teaching.

In addition, another relevant aspect of the qualitative approach is its methodological flexibility, which allows for continuous deepening throughout the investigation. Minayo (2007) emphasizes that "[...] qualitative research is not reduced to a fixed set of methodological rules, as it is guided by a posture of discovery and interpretation of social reality" (p. 32). This flexibility allows the research to adjust to the specificities of the investigated context, ensuring greater coherence with Freire's principles of critical and problem-solving education.

Thus, this perspective was essential for the construction of knowledge that goes beyond the quantitative and instrumentalizing logic of traditional education, contributing to a critical and transformative reflection on teaching. As Gil (2008) points out, "[...] more than testing hypotheses, qualitative research aims to understand the complexity of social phenomena, interpreting them from their contexts and meanings" (p. 54). Thus, by adopting this approach, this study enabled an in-depth analysis of how the principles of the "Pedagogy of Autonomy" can be implemented in educational practice, promoting a more democratic, participatory and humanizing teaching.

Bibliographic research, in turn, constitutes one of the fundamental pillars for academic research, especially when seeking to understand the application of Freire's knowledge in the educational context. It allowed the critical and systematic analysis of theoretical references that underpinned the construction of knowledge, offering a broad overview of the state of the art throughout the research. As Gil (2008) emphasizes, "[...] The bibliographic research is developed from material already prepared, consisting mainly of books and scientific articles. [...] The main advantage of bibliographic research lies in the fact that it allows the researcher to cover a much wider range of phenomena than he could research directly" (p. 50). Thus, this methodology proved to be essential to deepen the

reflections on the "Pedagogy of Autonomy", ensuring a solid theoretical basis for the investigation. Gil (2008) states that:

Bibliographic research is also indispensable in historical studies. In many situations, there is no other way to know past events than on the basis of secondary data. These advantages of literature search have, however, a counterpart that can greatly compromise the quality of the research. Secondary sources often present data collected or processed in the wrong way. Thus, a work based on these sources will tend to reproduce or even amplify their errors. To reduce this possibility, it is convenient for researchers to be sure of the conditions under which the data were obtained, to analyze each piece of information in depth to discover possible inconsistencies or contradictions, and to use different sources, carefully comparing themselves (p. 51).

In addition to broadening the understanding of a given topic, the bibliographic research made it possible to confront different perspectives, allowing a critical analysis of the existing theoretical contributions. This process is essential to avoid reductionist interpretations and contribute to the formulation of a consistent analytical framework. According to Minayo (2006), "[...] Disciplined, critical, and broad bibliographic research is essential for a scientific study. [...] A reflective dialogue must be established between the theories and the studies already carried out, ensuring a comparative analysis that allows a better delimitation of the research proposal" (p. 36). In the context of the present investigation, this approach enabled the articulation between Freire's principles and other pedagogical conceptions that dialogue with critical and emancipatory education. Gil (2008) states that:

To interpret the results, the researcher needs to go beyond reading the data, with a view to integrating them into a broader universe in which they may have some sense. This universe is that of the theoretical foundations of the research and that of the knowledge already accumulated around the issues addressed. Hence the importance of reviewing the literature, still in the research planning stage. This baggage of information, which contributed to the researcher formulating and delimiting the problem and constructing the hypotheses, is what helps him in the analysis and interpretation stage to give meaning to the data (p. 179).

In this way, bibliographic research also stood out for its ability to support investigations whose direct access to the object of study becomes challenging. In the case of education, in which the formative processes occur in multiple spaces and contexts, the analysis of secondary sources allowed the researcher to understand how different authors approach the role of the school in the formation of the subjects. According to Gil (2008), "[...] 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).

Within the scope of this research, this proved to be fundamental to understand the trajectory and applicability of the principles of the "Pedagogy of Autonomy" over time.

That said, another relevant aspect of bibliographic research is its function in the foundation of the research problem and in the formulation of investigative objectives. From the analysis of existing scientific productions, it is possible to delimit the central question of the study with greater precision, as well as to identify gaps in knowledge that can be filled. Minayo (2006) points out that "[...] The formulation of the problem requires a preliminary literature review. The researcher needs to come into contact with a certain number of books and journal articles so that he can formulate a viable problem" (p. 73). In the present study, this stage was essential to structure the investigation on the incorporation of Freire's knowledge in the school routine and to define the methodological paths adopted. Gil (2008) states that:

The first procedure adopted in a bibliographic research, as in any other type of research, consists of the formulation of the problem that one wishes to investigate. [...] Choosing a subject alone is not enough to start a literature search. It is necessary that this subject be put in terms of a problem to be solved. This problematization, in turn, is not a simple task. It requires experience, reading, reflection and debate. [...] Strictly speaking, for the proper formulation of the problem, a preliminary bibliographic review is required. The researcher needs to come into contact with a certain number of books and journal articles in order to formulate a viable problem. It may even happen that the researcher has to go through successive reformulations – and bibliographic revisions – so that he can have a problem in a position to be researched (p. 73).

Thus, bibliographic research played a crucial role in the construction of critical and systematized knowledge, ensuring that the study is developed from theoretical references validated by the scientific community. This structuring character is essential to ensure the credibility and consistency of the research findings. As Gil (2008) states, "[...] More than testing hypotheses, bibliographic research aims to understand the complexity of social phenomena, interpreting them from their contexts and meanings" (p. 54). Thus, the use of this methodology in the present investigation enables an in-depth analysis of the principles of the "Pedagogy of Autonomy", allowing its resignification in the contemporary educational context.

Added to this, Weber's comprehensive analysis presented itself as an essential methodological reference to understand how the knowledge of the "Pedagogy of Autonomy" can be incorporated into the school routine. This approach allowed us to investigate the meaning attributed by the subjects to their actions in the educational

process, valuing subjectivity and individual experiences. Weber (1969) states that "[...] It includes all human behavior as the actor assigns subjective meaning to it. Comprehension, in turn, refers to the meaning subjectively aimed at by actors, in the course of a concrete activity" (p. 110). Thus, this perspective allowed us to capture how educators and students perceive and interpret the pedagogical practice based on Freirean principles. Weber (1969) states that:

The basic idea of comprehensive analysis is that of action, in which, according to its famous definition, 'all human behavior is included as the actor attributes subjective meaning to it'. Comprehension, in turn, refers to the meaning subjectively aimed at by actors, in the course of a concrete activity. [...] It also distinguishes between actual understanding and explanatory understanding. One understands in the first way, for example, the meaning of the behavior of a hunter who aims his rifle. In the second way, for example, the sense of the behavior of the hunter who indulges in this sport for health reasons. Both forms of understanding can be rational or irrational. [...] However, all these forms of understanding imply capturing the evidence of the meaning of an activity (p. 110).

The subjective interpretation of the actions of teachers and students becomes a central element for the analysis of critical pedagogical practice. Weber distinguishes two types of understanding: the current one, which captures the immediate meaning of the action, and the explanatory one, which seeks the deeper motives that guide the subjects' decisions. Weber (1949) argues that "[...] it is important for social scientists to grasp the social world without eliminating the subjective integrity of the actors who attribute meaning" (p. 90). This distinction was fundamental for the present research, as it allowed us to analyze both the visible pedagogical practices and the meanings underlying the adoption of a dialogical and emancipatory education.

In addition, the comprehensive analysis contributed to identify the challenges and limitations in the implementation of Freire's knowledge, allowing us to understand how teachers interpret their role as mediators of knowledge. Weber (1969) states that "[...] all these forms of understanding imply capturing the evidence of the meaning of an activity" (p. 110). In the context of this research, this approach makes it possible to explore the tensions between the autonomy of students and the institutional norms that still reproduce a traditional teaching model.

Thus, another fundamental aspect of Weber's comprehensive analysis is the construction of ideal types, which serve as a reference for the analysis of social phenomena. Weber (1949) explains that an ideal type "[...] it is formed by the unilateral accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a large number of

individual, diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete phenomena, which are organized according to the unilaterally accentuated points of view in an accentuated analytical construction" (p. 90). For this research, the ideal types were not used to identify different forms of appropriation of Freirean principles in educational practice, contrasting conservative and transformative models of teaching.

That said, the adoption of comprehensive analysis in the present study enabled a broader and more in-depth approach to the relationships between teachers, students and pedagogical knowledge. This perspective recognizes that education cannot be reduced to a simple transmission of knowledge, but must be understood as a socially constructed process. As Weber (1949) points out, "[...] the understanding of social phenomena requires an interpretative analysis of the subjective meanings that individuals attribute to their actions and relationships" (p. 90). In this way, the research seeks to reveal how the knowledge of the "Pedagogy of Autonomy" is re-signified in teaching practice, promoting a more humanizing and participatory education.

TRANSFORMING TEACHING INTO PRACTICE BASED ON PAULO FREIRE'S "PEDAGOGY OF AUTONOMY"

Teaching practice requires from the educator not only a commitment to the transmission of content, but also to the formation of critical and autonomous subjects. For this, methodical rigor becomes an essential principle in the teaching-learning process, as it ensures that the educational approach is not reduced to the mechanical reproduction of information. As Freire points out, "[...] The democratic educator cannot deny himself the duty to, in his teaching practice, reinforce the critical capacity of the student, his curiosity, his insubmission. One of their primary tasks is to work with the students on the methodical rigor with which they must 'approach' the knowable objects" (2011, p. 29). He adds that "[...] these conditions imply or require the presence of educators and students who are creative, instigators, restless, rigorously curious, humble and persistent" (2011, p. 19).

And this methodical rigor has nothing to do with the 'banking' discourse that merely transfers the profile of the object or the content. It is precisely in this sense that teaching is not limited to the 'treatment' of the object or content, superficially done, but extends to the production of the conditions in which critical learning is possible. And these conditions imply or require the presence of educators and students who are creative, instigators, restless, rigorously curious, humble and persistent. It is part of the conditions in which critical learning is possible for students to presuppose that the educator has already had or continues to have experience in the production of certain knowledge and that these cannot simply be transferred to them, the students, (Freire, 2011, p. 29).

In addition to methodical rigor, teaching requires research, as teaching cannot be detached from the continuous process of seeking knowledge. For Freire, research is not a secondary element, but an intrinsic component of educational practice. He states that "[...] There is no teaching without research and research without teaching. These things are found in each other's bodies. While I teach, I continue to seek, to search" (Freire, 2011, p. 32). The author also reinforces that "[...] I research to know what I do not yet know and to communicate or announce the novelty" (2011, p. 20).

I research to verify, verifying, I intervene, intervening, I educate and I educate myself. I research to know what I don't know yet and communicate or announce the news. Thinking right, in critical terms, is a demand that the moments of the gnosiological cycle place on curiosity that, becoming more and more methodically rigorous, moves from naivety to what I have been calling 'epistemological curiosity' (Freire, 2011, p. 32).

Thus, another essential principle in teaching is respect for the knowledge of students. Valuing students' experiences and prior knowledge allows education to become meaningful and emancipatory. As Freire points out, "[...] Thinking right places on the teacher or, more broadly, on the school, the duty not only to respect the knowledge with which students, especially those from the popular classes, come to it – knowledge socially constructed in community practice" (2011, p. 21). He also argues that "[...] Why not discuss with the students the concrete reality to which the discipline whose content is taught should be associated?" (2011, p. 22).

That said, criticality is another central element in teaching practice, as it allows students to understand the world not only as something given, but as a reality in constant transformation. Freire emphasizes that "[...] one of the main tasks of progressive-educational practice is precisely the development of critical, unsatisfied, indocile curiosity" (2011, p. 37). He also adds that "[...] the promotion of naivety to criticality does not occur automatically, and a pedagogical intervention that instigates curiosity is necessary" (2011, p. 22).

Indeed, the ethical dimension of teaching cannot be neglected either. Teaching requires an ethical and aesthetic posture that humanizes the relationships between educators and students. As Freire argues, "[...] to transform the educational experience into pure technical training is to belittle what is fundamentally human in the educational

exercise: its formative character" (2011, p. 40). In addition, he reinforces that "[...] it is not possible to think of human beings far from ethics, let alone outside of it" (2011, p. 23).

The necessary promotion of naivety to criticality cannot or should not be done at a distance from a rigorous ethical training alongside aesthetics. Decency and handsomeness hand in hand. I am more and more convinced that, awakened to the possibility of going astray from puritanism, educational practice must be, in itself, a rigorous witness of decency and purity. A permanent criticism of the easy detours with which we are tempted, sometimes or almost always, to leave the difficulties that true paths can pose us. Women and men, historical-social beings, we have become capable of comparing, of valuing, of intervening, of choosing, of deciding, of breaking, for all this, we have become ethical beings. We are only because we are being. To be being is the condition, among us, to be. It is not possible to think of human beings even far from ethics, let alone outside of it. Being far away or, worse, out of ethics, among us, women and men, is a transgression. That is why transforming the educational experience into pure technical training is to belittle what is fundamentally human in the educational exercise: its formative character (Freire, 2011, p. 23).

In addition, teaching requires the teacher to be a living example of the values and principles he intends to transmit. Coherence between discourse and practice is essential for building a relationship of trust and respect in the classroom. Freire observes that "[...] those who think right are tired of knowing that words that lack the corporeality of example are of little or almost no value. To think right is to do right" (2011, p. 42). He also warns that "[...] the teacher who really teaches denies, as false, the pharisaical formula of 'do as I tell you and not as I do'" (2011, p. 24).

Furthermore, as the theorist states, teaching also requires the willingness to face challenges and innovate, rejecting crystallized pedagogical practices that do not dialogue with the needs of students. He adds that "[...] Thinking right demands depth and not superficiality in the understanding and interpretation of facts" (2011, p. 25).

The teacher who really teaches, that is, who works the contents within the framework of the rigorosity of right thinking, denies, as false, the pharisaical formula of 'do as I tell you and not as I do'. Those who think right are tired of knowing that words that lack the corporeality of example are of little or almost no value. To think right is to do right. What can serious students think of a professor who, two semesters ago, spoke almost ardently about the need to fight for the autonomy of the popular classes and today, saying that he has not changed, makes a pragmatic speech against dreams and practices the transfer of knowledge from the teacher to the student?! What can be said of the professor who, from the left yesterday, defended the formation of the working class and who, pragmatic today, is satisfied, bowed to neoliberal fatalism, with the pure training of the worker, insisting, however, that she is progressive? There is no right thinking outside of a testimonial practice that resays it instead of unsaying it (Freire, 2011, p. 24).

As the fragment of the text above points out, critical reflection on practice is another necessary element for a teaching committed to social transformation. Self-criticism and continuous evaluation of pedagogical strategies allow teachers to improve their performance and contribute to more effective teaching. Freire points out that "[...] That is why, in the permanent training of teachers, the fundamental moment is that of critical reflection on practice" (2011, p. 47). In addition, he emphasizes that "[...] it is by thinking critically about the practice of today or yesterday that one can improve the next practice" (Freire, 2011, p. 26).

Thus, the recognition and appreciation of the cultural identity of students are essential aspects for teaching that respects diversity and promotes inclusion. Freire emphasizes that "[...] one of the most important tasks of critical educational practice is to provide the conditions in which students in their relationships with each other and all with the teacher rehearse the profound experience of coming out" (Freire, 2011, p. 49). He also points out that "[...] to assume oneself as a social and historical being¹⁹, as a thinking, communicating, transforming, creative, dream-making being" is part of the process of critical formation (Freire, 2011, p. 27).

One of the most important tasks of critical educational practice is to provide the conditions in which learners, in their relationships with each other and all with the teacher, rehearse the profound experience of coming out. To assume oneself as a social and historical being, as a thinking being, communicating, transforming, creative, fulfilling dreams. The more, in the exercise of their practices, the students assume themselves, the more they are obliged to respect the cultural identity of others, their options, their tastes, their beliefs. Respect for cultural identity and its critical assumption by students are part of the process of critical formation that I have been talking about. For this very reason, in the educational-progressive practice, the educator cannot, under the pretext of teaching the contents, deny or diminish the importance of the assumption of the cultural identity of the students (Freire, 2011, p. 49).

In time, teaching requires sensitivity to understand the complexity of human relations in the school space. Small gestures and attitudes can have a significant impact on the

¹⁹ For Paulo Freire, the human being is a social and historical being, as it is constituted in the relationship with others and in the historical context in which it is inserted. Unlike animals, whose existence is marked by instinct and passive adaptation to the environment, human beings have the ability to reflect, intervene and transform reality. This characteristic makes him the subject of his own history, capable of reinventing himself and transforming the world as he understands the structures that condition it. Freire (1996) points out that "[...] Human beings are because they are being. Its inconclusion is inherent to its nature. And it is precisely through the incompleteness of the being that one knows as such that education is founded as a permanent process" (p. 54). Thus, education should be conceived as a continuous act of humanization, in which the student is encouraged to take an active role in the construction of his own history and in the transformation of society. See: FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Autonomy: knowledge necessary for educational practice*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

education of students. Freire states that "[...] this knowledge, that of the importance of these gestures that multiply daily in the plots of the school space, is something on which we would have to reflect seriously" (Freire, 2011, p. 51). He also reinforces that "[...] the teacher who thinks right makes it clear to the students that one of the beauties of our way of being in the world and with the world, as historical beings, is the ability to, intervening in the world, know the world" (p. 28).

Sometimes, one can hardly imagine what a simple gesture by the teacher can come to represent in the life of a student. What can an apparently insignificant gesture be worth as a formative force or as a contribution to the assumption of the learner by himself. I never forget, in the long history of my memory, one of those gestures of a teacher that I had in my remote adolescence. A gesture whose deepest meaning perhaps went unnoticed by him, the teacher, and which had an important influence on me. I was then being an insecure teenager, seeing myself as an angular and ugly body, perceiving myself less capable than the others, strongly uncertain of my possibilities. He was much more grumpy than appeased with life. I easily bristled. Any consideration made by a rich classmate already seemed to me to be a reminder of my weaknesses, my insecurity. The teacher had brought our schoolwork from home and, calling us one by one, returned it with his judgment. At a certain point he calls me and, looking at or re-looking at my text, without saying a word, shakes his head in a demonstration of respect and consideration. The teacher's gesture was worth more than the very ten he gave to my essay. The teacher's gesture brought me a confidence that was still obviously suspicious that it was possible to work and produce. That it was possible to trust me, but that it would be as wrong to trust beyond the limits as it was to not trust. The best proof of the importance of that gesture is that I speak of it now as if it had been witnessed today. And it has been, in fact, a long time since it occurred (Freire, 2011, p. 29).

According to Freire's confessional fragment, the relationship between teacher and student transcends the mere transmission of content, being a space for the construction of subjectivities and strengthening of self-esteem. Small gestures, such as a look of approval or a word of encouragement, can have significant impacts on student development. Enguita (1989) points out that "[...] the student is constantly evaluated not only in terms of what he learns, but also by the behavior he demonstrates in the face of the methods imposed, being trained to passively accept his place in the school system and, by extension, in the world of work" (p. 173). As Mészáros (2005) reinforces, "[...] the educational system within capitalism seeks to structure adaptable subjectivities, maintaining obedience as the main pillar of schooling" (p. 64).

The school is often structured as an environment that limits the creativity and autonomy of students, reducing them to mere receivers of information. According to Saviani (2007), "[...] education has historically served as an instrument for the reproduction of social relations, transmitting values and knowledge that reinforce the current structure"

(p. 122). Education, therefore, when focused exclusively on adapting to the productive system²⁰, distances itself from its formative function, as Gentili (2000) argues: "[...] the school, by becoming a space of mere adaptation, loses its power of social and critical transformation" (p. 49).

Thus, the role of the teacher should not only be that of transmitter of content, but also that of mediator and encourager of learning. As Foucault (1987) points out, "[...] the school, by adopting a rigid disciplinary structure, defines the bodies and behaviors of the students, imposing a normativity that conditions them from an early age to a model of obedience" (p. 119). In this sense, Marx and Engels (2010) reinforce that "[...] education, when linked to the social division of labor²¹, perpetuates inequalities and naturalizes class differences, instead of questioning them" (p. 38).

That said, the formation of students' identity also depends on the way they are treated in the school environment. Frigotto (2001) warns that "[...] the expropriation of workers' knowledge and its replacement by a model of instrumentalized education only serves to reinforce alienation and limit their ability to transform reality" (p. 25). Thus, this perspective is reiterated by Manacorda (2007), who states that "[...] education needs to be understood within its historicity, because its current format is not neutral, but a construction that can and should be transformed" (p. 38).

According to Freire, the educational process must consider the experiences of students, respecting their histories and social contexts. As Marx and Engels (2010) point out, "[...] the modern school, for the most part, only confirms the existing social divisions,

²⁰ For Paulo Freire, the productive system is not only a set of economic relations, but a space of ideological reproduction that directly influences the education and training of subjects. The productive structure, organized within the logic of capital, tends to shape education as an instrument of adaptation and conformation of individuals to the demands of the market, perpetuating alienation and social exclusion. Freire (1997) criticizes this perspective when he states that "[...] Education cannot be reduced to training for work, to technical training focused on the productive system. This type of teaching castrates creativity, denies the autonomy of students and transforms them into mere instruments of capital" (p. 99). In this way, Freire's pedagogy proposes a critical and liberating education, capable of breaking with the productivist logic and forming conscious subjects, capable of intervening in reality and transforming it in an emancipatory way. See: FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Hope: a reencounter with the pedagogy of the oppressed*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1997.

²¹ For Paulo Freire, the social division of labor exerts a strong influence on education, as it structures society in a hierarchical way, separating those who hold knowledge and power from those who are destined to subordinate functions. This model of social organization is reflected in the school, which often becomes a space for the reproduction of inequalities, preparing students to fit into predefined positions in the productive system. Freire (1997) states that "[...] traditional education, instead of stimulating the critical consciousness of students, tends to adapt them to the demands of the social division of labor, naturalizing differences and preventing the understanding of the mechanisms that generate oppression" (p. 85). Thus, he proposes a liberating pedagogy that breaks with this logic, promoting an education that allows subjects to question their reality and act in the transformation of social structures. See; FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Hope: a reencounter with the pedagogy of the oppressed*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1997.

instead of challenging them" (p. 38). Thus, the teacher who values the cultural repertoire of the students expands the possibilities of meaningful and emancipatory learning.

Thus, education cannot be limited to a training process for the labor market, but must be a space for the integral formation of subjects. Engels (2010) states that "[...] knowledge cannot be treated as a commodity to be acquired by students, but rather as a fundamental right for the development of critical awareness and social participation" (p. 38). In this way, the school should be an environment for the production of critical thinking and not a mere space for the reproduction of information disconnected from reality.

Valuing the student as a subject of learning requires a commitment from the teacher to a pedagogical practice that goes beyond the simple reproduction of content. As Fernández Enguita (1993) observes, "[...] control over the learning process is removed from the students and centralized in the figure of the teacher, which reinforces a relationship of dependence and submission" (p. 23). This teaching structure contributes to a limited education, which does not encourage the intellectual autonomy of students.

In time, the affection and recognition of the student as an active subject in the educational process are essential for a truly liberating education. As Mészáros (2005) argues, "[...] the school, by operating within the logic of capital, tends to reinforce social inequality, preparing students to adapt to the productive system instead of questioning it" (p. 64). On the other hand, teaching that respects individuality and promotes critical thinking enables more authentic and transformative learning.

In this sense, the impact of human relations in education extends beyond the school space, directly influencing the way students perceive themselves in the world. As Gentili (2000) points out, "[...] educational exclusion is not only due to the lack of access to school, but also due to the denial of the cultural and symbolic rights²² of students within the school environment itself" (p. 49). Education, in this sense, should be understood as a right that transcends formal education and also encompasses the social and cultural formation of individuals.

²² For Paulo Freire, the denial of cultural and symbolic rights is a form of oppression that prevents individuals from recognizing themselves as historical and participatory subjects in the construction of knowledge and society. When popular culture is devalued and the symbols that represent the identity of a people are marginalized, a process of alienation is consolidated that strengthens domination. Freire (1996) warns that "[...] To deny students the right to their culture and their symbols is also to deny them the right to be subjects of their own history. Banking education contributes to this denial by imposing a knowledge that is decontextualized and alien to the reality of the oppressed" (p. 32). Thus, its pedagogy proposes an education that values the knowledge and culture of students, guaranteeing them the right to express themselves and actively participate in the construction of a more just and democratic society. See: FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Autonomy: knowledge necessary for educational practice*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

Educational practice must be a testimony of the teacher's ethical and pedagogical commitment. Teaching requires the educator to experience the values he transmits, because his words will only have a real impact if they are reflected in his attitudes. Freire (2011) warns that "[...] those who think right are tired of knowing that words that lack the corporeality of example are of little or almost no value. To think right is to do right" (p. 42). In this way, the educator cannot limit himself to discourses about justice, democracy and respect; He must embody these principles in everyday school life. As Freire reinforces, "[...] teaching requires the educator to become a living example, a testimony of the coherence between what he says and what he does" (2011, p. 39).

As we can denote, teaching, therefore, requires the teacher to be an agent of transformation, willing to take risks and challenge conservative structures that perpetuate inequality and exclusion. This means being open to innovation and breaking paradigms that limit educational potential. Freire (2011) states that "[...] it is characteristic of right thinking to be willing to take risks, to accept the new that cannot be denied or accepted just because it is new, just as the criterion for refusing the old is not only chronological" (p. 45). As the author adds, "[...] teaching requires courage to break with the old structures and reinvent educational practice" (2011, p. 47).

The transformation of education cannot occur without a rupture with the mechanisms that link it to the reproduction of social inequality. A truly emancipatory pedagogy must consciously confront and rectify structured socioeconomic relations, overcoming the culture of inequality that permeates social consciousness. This requires not only innovation in the syllabus, but a radical change in pedagogical practices and in the relationships between educators and students (Mészáros, 2005, p. 64).

In this sense, accepting the new also implies rejecting all forms of discrimination and oppression within the educational space. The teacher's commitment must be to create a school environment that values diversity and combats exclusionary practices. As Freire (2011) emphasizes, "[...] the prejudiced practice of race, class, gender offends the substantivity of the human being and radically denies democracy" (p. 46). In addition, "[...] rejecting any form of discrimination also implies creating spaces for dialogue that respect the multiple voices of learners" (2011, p. 48).

For this transformation to occur, it is essential that the teacher develops a constant critical reflection on his own practice. Education cannot be a mechanical and repetitive activity; It should be a continuous process of investigation and questioning about the methods and impacts of teaching action. As Freire (2011) points out, "[...] it is by thinking

critically about the practice of today or yesterday that one can improve the next practice" (p. 50). He also adds: "[...] the act of teaching requires a reflective posture that does not settle for the repetition of what has already been done, but that opens up to the unprecedentedly viable" (2011, p. 51).

Educational exclusion is not only a matter of lack of access to school, but also of a continuous process of marginalization within the school space itself. Students from the lower classes not only face economic barriers, but are also subjected to curricula that devalue their knowledge and reinforce their condition of subordination. As a result, the school becomes a mechanism that, instead of promoting equality, perpetuates social inequalities. The traditional school model operates within a logic of reproduction of exclusion, limiting the possibility of social transformation and consolidating education as an instrument for maintaining the established order (Gentili, 2000, p. 67).

In addition, this reflection should include a recognition of the social and cultural conditions of students, respecting their knowledge and life experiences (Santos, *et. al.*, 2024). Learning only becomes meaningful when it dialogues with the reality of the students, allowing them to feel active subjects in the educational process. Freire (2011) emphasizes that "[...] one of the most important tasks of critical educational practice is to provide the conditions in which learners, in their relationships with each other and with the teacher, rehearse the profound experience of coming out" (p. 49). He also reinforces that "[...] valuing the experience of the learner is an act of recognition of his humanity and his ability to learn" (2011, p. 52).

This recognition of the cultural identity of students must be accompanied by an appreciation of popular knowledge and historically marginalized knowledge (Santos, *et. al.*, 2024). The school cannot be an environment that reproduces only the values of the dominant elite, but must be open to the diversity of perspectives and forms of knowledge. As Freire (2011) points out, "[...] not only to respect the knowledge with which the students arrive at school, but also to discuss with them the reason for the existence of some of this knowledge in relation to the teaching of the contents" (p. 33). He adds that "[...] To educate is to allow the learner to perceive his culture as a fundamental part of the process of knowledge construction" (2011, p. 54). For Miranda (2021: 61):

[...] Educating implies the assumption of the cultural dimension in the process of social transformation, rooted in the culture of the peoples. An activity that requires the interaction of the educator and a decision, a choice. Either continue to follow what the classes that hold the hegemony of society define as knowledge to be treated in school – in a colonizing logic – or decide to follow another path and unmask the situation of domination and subjugation of part of the population, their

bodies, their histories, memories and cultures, in the sense of human and social emancipation. Educating would thus be an eminently political act.

However, this educational perspective requires the teacher to assume a posture of humility and willingness to learn from students, recognizing that teaching is a two-way process. The relationship between educator and student must be dialogical²³, avoiding the unilateral imposition of knowledge disconnected from the students' reality. Freire (2011) points out that "[...] teaching does not exist without learning and vice versa, and it was by learning socially that, historically, women and men discovered that it was possible to teach" (p. 39). For him, "[...] mutual learning strengthens the educational experience and promotes respect for the diversity of knowledge" (2011, p. 56).

In this way, valuing the identity and culture of students also implies the construction of a more humanized school, which does not reduce education to technical training for the labor market. The integral formation of the human being must be the central objective of teaching practice, ensuring that education is not limited to the reproduction of content dissociated from social reality. Freire (2011) points out that "[...] to teach is to cultivate the humanization of the educational process, and not to reduce the student to a mere reproducer of information" (p. 58).

The forms and methods of the educational process in force today, says Widmar²⁴, seem incapable of this task of forming the integral man; the demand for a "massive" education is in contrast to the demand for an individualistic education; one tends to create standardized men, the other to accentuate the division between men. And, in addition, the help of the modern techniques that the educational process can have today – audiovisual media, cybernetics, information theory with teaching machines – allows greater possibilities in the field of information, but this help can inform an integral education. These are sharp and exact observations. But it seems to us that,

²³ For Paulo Freire, dialogic is the fundamental principle of a liberating education, based on interaction, mutual respect and the collective construction of knowledge. Unlike banking education, which imposes unilateral knowledge, dialogic practice recognizes students as active subjects in the educational process, promoting the problematization of reality and the development of critical awareness. Freire (1987) states that "without a dialogical thought, without an authentic communicative relationship between educator and student, there is no liberating education. Dialogicity is not a method, but the very essence of education as a practice of freedom" (p. 78). In this way, dialogic is not limited to discourse, but manifests itself in pedagogical practice, active listening and the participation of subjects, allowing for meaningful and transformative learning. See: FREIRE, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 17. Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.

²⁴ Widmar, as cited by Manacorda (2007), criticizes the contradictions of the contemporary educational system, highlighting the tension between the need for mass education and the search for individualized education. He points out that the former tends to create standardized subjects, while the latter accentuates inequalities and social divisions. In addition, Widmar recognizes the potential of new educational technologies, such as audiovisual media and cybernetics, to expand access to information, but questions whether these advances actually guarantee an integral education of individuals. For Manacorda (2007), these reflections are pertinent, as they show that a truly emancipatory education must be promoted throughout life, both in the school space and in free time, as a way to overcome the structural limitations imposed by the divided society (p. 186). See: MANACORDA, Mario Alighiero. *Marx and modern pedagogy*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2007.

in reality, this integral education – the one, at least, that our divided society needs – has to be offered, in some way, during school and in free time, to everyone and for life (Manacorda, 2007, p. 186).

In this way, the pedagogy of autonomy defended by Freire proposes a teaching based on freedom, dialogue, and ethical commitment to the construction of a more just and democratic world. The school, far from being a space for the reproduction of alienation, must become a place of resistance and social transformation. As Freire (2011) endorses, "[...] we cannot assume ourselves as subjects of the search, of the decision, of the rupture, of the option, as historical, transforming subjects, except by assuming ourselves as ethical subjects" (p. 56). He concludes that "[...] transformative education requires educators and students to recognize themselves as historical subjects in permanent construction" (2011, p. 60).

TEACHING REQUIRES MULTIPLE ELEMENTS ON THE PART OF THE EDUCATOR: PAULO FREIRE AND INTERLOCUTORS

Educational practice requires, above all, the critical apprehension of reality. Teaching cannot be an alienated process, disconnected from the social and historical context in which it occurs. As Saviani (2007) points out, "[...] the school, as a social institution, is not neutral: it reflects and reproduces the power relations existing in society, but it can also be a space of resistance and transformation" (p. 98). In this sense, it is up to the educator to make the school an environment that fosters critical reflection and student autonomy. To this end, it is essential to respect the autonomy of the student, because, as Freire (1996) argues, "[...] Teaching requires respect for the autonomy of the student's being. Of the child, young person or adult student" (p. 40). For Frigotto (2010, p. 27):

The school, in the capitalist mode of production, is simultaneously a space for the reproduction of dominant social relations and a space for dispute and resistance. Although it is inserted in a context that reinforces the ideology of the dominant class, education can be an instrument of criticism and social transformation. The challenge is to overcome the instrumental vision of the school and build an educational project that contributes to the formation of historical, critical, and active subjects. This perspective requires the valorization of scientific knowledge, but also the recognition of students' experiences and knowledge as fundamental elements of the educational process.

In addition, teaching cannot be reduced to a mechanical and demotivating practice, since the educational act is intrinsically linked to hope. The belief in the possibility of change drives the desire for an education that goes beyond simply adapting to the *status*

quo. As Gentili (2000) emphasizes, "[...] Education needs to be a space of possibilities and not of mere adaptation to the *status quo*. Hope, as a pedagogical element, enhances the struggle for a more democratic and inclusive school" (p. 112). From this perspective, Freire (1996) adds that "[...] There is a relationship between the joy necessary for educational activity and hope. The hope that teacher and students together can learn, teach, worry, produce and together equally resist the obstacles to our joy" (p. 48).

The school cannot be seen only as a space for the reproduction of the current order but must be a place of resistance and the construction of new possibilities. Hope in the educational process is fundamental because, without it, learning becomes a mechanical act devoid of meaning. Education should be a space where students can not only acquire knowledge but also develop the ability to question, imagine alternatives, and transform the reality in which they are inserted. Education cannot be reduced to a mechanism of adaptation to the world as it is but must constitute itself as an active process of liberation and construction of the new. This is the essence of a critical and emancipatory pedagogy (Tonet, 2005, p. 80).

The conviction that change is possible must always be present in pedagogical practice because, without this belief, education loses its emancipatory character. According to Mészáros (2005), "[...] education cannot be conceived as a means of conforming to the current system, but as a space of resistance and construction of new forms of sociability" (p. 134). Thus, it is up to the teacher to foster in students a critical and active posture in the face of reality, helping them to understand that social transformation is not only possible but also necessary. In line with this perspective, Freire (1996) states that "[...] teaching requires the conviction that change is possible" (p. 67). Tonet (2005: 63) states that:

History shows us that all forms of domination were sustained by a certain type of education, just as every form of social emancipation was linked to educational processes aimed at the liberation of the subjects. Therefore, education must be committed to social change, enabling individuals to appropriate their history and transform the reality that surrounds them. Education cannot be reduced to a process of passive reproduction of the current order but must be a space of criticism, resistance, and transformation. [...] The overcoming of capital and the establishment of an authentic human community, called communism, which is also another name for human emancipation, is a real possibility. [...] The construction of this form of society will imply a hard and complex process of struggles of the proletariat and its allies against the bourgeoisie and also its allies.

For this transformation to occur, it is essential to stimulate the curiosity of students, because without it there is no investigation, discovery, or collaboration of knowledge. The school, therefore, must be a dynamic space, where questioning and restlessness are encouraged. Manacorda (2007) corroborates this idea by highlighting that "[...] Curiosity is the driving force of education. When the school inhibits the natural curiosity of the students,

it ceases to fulfill its formative function and becomes only an instrument of control" (p. 87). Thus, as Freire (1996) points out, "[...] Teaching requires curiosity. Naïve curiosity, which indisputably results in a certain knowledge, no matter how methodically inrigorous, is what characterizes common sense" (p. 69). Frigotto (2001) states that:

Curiosity is the engine of learning. Without it, knowledge is reduced to a passive accumulation of information, disconnected from reality and human needs. Stimulating curiosity is, therefore, promoting research, reflection, and intellectual autonomy, ensuring that the educational process is truly formative.

However, teaching is not simply transmitting ready-made content, but creating conditions for the student to build his knowledge in an active and participatory way. As Marx and Engels (2010) point out, "[...] education, in capitalist society, tends to be a mere reproduction of dominant knowledge, preventing the development of a critical consciousness in workers" (p. 76). In this way, it is the teacher's role to act as a mediator of learning, stimulating the intellectual autonomy of students. Freire (1996) reinforces this conception when he states that "[...] teaching is not transferring knowledge, but creating the possibilities for its production or construction" (p. 25). Saviani (2007) states that:

Education is seen as mediation within global social practice. Practice is the starting point and the point of arrival. This mediation is made explicit through those three moments that in the text I called Problematization, instrumentation, and catharsis. [...] If education is mediation within the global social practice, and if humanity develops historically, this means that a given generation inherits from the previous one a mode of production with its respective means of production and relations of production. The new generation, in turn, imposes on itself the task of developing and transforming the relationships inherited from previous generations (p. 121).

Furthermore, understanding that learning is a continuous and dynamic process is essential for both teachers and students to perceive themselves as unfinished beings, always in transformation. Frigotto (2001) points out that "[...] education cannot be seen as a finished product, but as a dynamic process of construction and reconstruction of knowledge" (p. 142). Along the same lines, Freire (1996) argues that "[...] it is in the incompleteness of being, which is known as such, that education is founded as a permanent process" (p. 39).

In addition to recognizing human endlessness, it is essential to understand that, although conditioned by society, subjects are not determined by it. Thus, education must enable the perception of the social structures that limit us, but without naturalizing them as immutable. Enguita (1993) points out that "[...] the modern school often reinforces the

dominant ideology by naturalizing inequalities, but it can also be a space for questioning and resistance" (p. 129). Following this line of thought, Freire (1996) points out that "[...] Teaching requires respect for the autonomy of the student's being. Of the child, young person or adult student" (p. 40). Mészáros (2005) states that:

The only force capable of contributing positively to the new process of transformation is education itself, thereby fulfilling its role as a social organ, as mentioned above, by which mutually beneficial reciprocity between individuals and their society becomes real. Nothing can be imposed here in advance (as a pre-established norm) or as a restrictive purpose. We see in the positively unlimited reproductive process of the alternative hegemonic order the manifestation of a genuine interaction. Through education, the productive force of individuals extends and accentuates, simultaneously extending and making more emancipatory the general reproductive force of their society as a whole (p. 6).

Thus, respecting this autonomy also means ensuring that students actively participate in the educational process. Mészáros (2005) emphasizes that "[...] emancipatory education can only occur when individuals cease to be passive objects of teaching and become critical subjects of their formation" (p. 148). Thus, Freire (1996) corroborates this perspective when he states that "[...] teaching requires freedom and authority" (p. 83). Frigotto (2001) states that:

If the very experience of the social relations of production of the existence of the student child of the worker is the object of the school content – an experience that is translated by the place where one lives, how one lives, where or how much one works, what one perceives, the access to economic and cultural goods and, finally, by a way and a history of life of the worker and his class – methodologically the active dimension will be introduced in the learning process, the instruction-education nexus and the social and political dimension of this process. When we refer to the student's own experience, we are, in the final analysis, referring, as Gramsci points out, to the social relations that produced him historically (p. 207).

Thus, teaching requires common sense and commitment to the integral formation of the student. The teacher must be attentive to the needs of the students, understanding that teaching goes beyond the simple transmission of content, as it involves an ethical and political dimension. Saviani (2007) points out that "[...] the teacher needs to be attentive to the needs of the students and to the particularities of the educational context, making decisions that favor the learning and development of the students" (p. 154). Corroborating this idea, Freire (1996) states that "[...] teaching requires commitment" (p. 84).

That said, teaching is a political, ethical, and humanizing act, which requires from the educator not only technical knowledge but also sensitivity, humility, and willingness to dialogue. Without this attitude, education becomes a mere instrument for the reproduction

of inequalities, instead of a space for transformation. As Freire (1996) points out, "[...] teaching requires knowing how to listen" (p. 86). Thus, it is through attentive listening and dialogical practice that the teacher can contribute to the formation of critical, reflective subjects capable of intervening in reality.

CONCLUSION

The incorporation of the knowledge of Paulo Freire's "Pedagogy of Autonomy" into school teaching requires a profound transformation in pedagogical practice, displacing the teacher from the position of mere transmitter of content to the role of mediator of knowledge. This change implies recognizing the student as a historical and active subject in the learning process, which demands a pedagogical approach based on dialogue, problematization, and overcoming the hierarchical structures that traditionally shape the teacher-student relationship. In this sense, for the classroom to become a space of praxis and critical emancipation, it is essential that teaching be conceived not only as an act of passing on information but as a collective construction of knowledge, where learning is a dynamic and continuous process.

Thus, one of the central principles of the "Pedagogy of Autonomy" is the appreciation of the experience of students and the knowledge they bring with them. Freire points out that teaching requires respect for the student's prior knowledge, as he is not a *tabula rasa*, but a subject who carries with him experiences, perceptions, and interpretations of the world. Incorporating this knowledge into the daily life of school teaching means promoting meaningful teaching, in which the contents dialogue with the concrete reality of the students, allowing them to develop critical and reflective thinking. This process, however, requires the teacher to abandon the logic of "banking education" and assume a dialogical role, committed to listening and the collective construction of knowledge.

In addition to valuing students' prior knowledge, emancipatory educational practice requires methodical rigor. Freire warns of the danger of superficial teaching, which only repeats formulas and concepts without problematizing them. To transform the classroom into a space of critical emancipation, the teacher must create conditions for learning to be an investigative experience, encouraging epistemological curiosity and the development of a questioning posture. This means that the contents must be presented not as absolute truths, but as historical and social constructions subject to debate and resignification.

In addition to this, another essential element for the effectiveness of Freire's knowledge in the school routine is the dialogical relationship between educator and student. Dialogue, understood as a horizontal process of knowledge construction, breaks with the traditional hierarchy that places the teacher as the absolute holder of knowledge. By establishing an environment of exchange and collaboration, the teacher encourages students to take a critical position in the face of knowledge and to understand their reality more broadly. This process strengthens the development of intellectual autonomy and the student's capacity for social intervention, transforming the school into a space for citizenship formation.

In this way, ethics and affectivity also play a crucial role in the "Pedagogy of Autonomy". Freire emphasizes that teaching is not only transmitting content but also forming human subjects. Thus, teaching practice must be guided by an ethical commitment to the dignity of the student, promoting a school environment that values respect, diversity, and recognition of the cultural identity of students. Small gestures of recognition and encouragement, as highlighted by Freire, can have a profound impact on students' self-esteem and education, making the school a space for welcome and growth.

However, for this transformation to occur, the teacher must be aware of his political role in education. The school, far from being a neutral space, reflects and reproduces the power relations of society. Thus, it is up to the educator to question the structures that perpetuate exclusion and inequality, promoting an education committed to social justice. This implies breaking with pedagogical practices that reinforce students' passivity and adopting methodologies that encourage active participation, creativity, and critical reflection.

Given this scenario, we can affirm that the incorporation of the knowledge of the "Pedagogy of Autonomy" into school teaching is a process that requires commitment, reflection, and continuous transformation. Educational praxis, understood as the articulation between theory and practice, is fundamental so that teaching is not reduced to a mechanical transmission of contents, but becomes an instrument of emancipation. For this, it is essential that the teacher perceives himself as an agent of change, capable of creating pedagogical strategies that favor the autonomy of students and enable the construction of truly liberating knowledge.

Thus, the answer to the central question of this study shows that the transformation of the classroom into a space of praxis and critical emancipation depends on the adoption

of a dialogical, problematizing, and ethical pedagogical posture. The "Pedagogy of Autonomy" is not just a set of abstract principles, but a commitment to an education that values the active participation of students in the construction of knowledge. It is therefore up to educators and school institutions to assume this responsibility, promoting teaching that goes beyond mere adaptation to the world and that enables students to transform it.

REFERENCES

1. Antunes, R., & Pinto, G. A. (2002). *The education factory: From Taylorist specialization to Toyotist flexibilization*. São Paulo: Cortez.
2. Engels, F. (2010). *The origin of the family, private property, and the State*. São Paulo: Boitempo.
3. Enguita, M. F. (1993). *The hidden face of the school: Education and work in capitalism*. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas.
4. Foucault, M. (1987). *Vigiar e punir: Nascimento da prisão*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
5. Frigotto, G. (2001). *The productivity of the unproductive school: A (re)examination of the relations between education and the capitalist economic-social structure*. São Paulo: Cortez.
6. Frigotto, G. (2010). *Educação e a crise do capitalismo real*. São Paulo: Cortez.
7. Freire, P. (1967). *Education as a practice of freedom*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
8. Freire, P. (1974). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
9. Freire, P. (1979). *Extension or communication?* Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
10. Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of hope: A reencounter with the pedagogy of the oppressed*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
11. Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of autonomy: Necessary knowledge for educational practice*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
12. Freire, P. (2011). *The importance of the act of reading: In three articles that complement each other*. São Paulo: Cortez.
13. Gentili, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of exclusion*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
14. Gil, A. C. (2008). *Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa social (6ª ed.)*. São Paulo: Atlas.
15. Manacorda, M. A. (2007). *Marx and modern pedagogy*. São Paulo: Cortez.
16. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2010). *Texts on education and teaching*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular.
17. Mézsáros, I. (2005). *Beyond capital*. São Paulo: Boitempo.
18. Minayo, M. C. de S. (2006). *Social research: Theory, method, and creativity*. Petrópolis: Vozes.

19. Santos, B. de S., & Meneses, M. P. (Orgs.). (2024). *Epistemologies of the South*. Coimbra: Almedina.
20. Saviani, D. (2007). *Historical-critical pedagogy: First approximations*. Campinas: Associated Authors.
21. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). "Ancestral eco-literacy": For an appreciation of Indigenous knowledge for a sustainable future in Latin America. *Cuadernos de Educación y Desarrollo*, 16(7), e4885. <https://doi.org/10.55905/cuadv16n7-107>
22. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). "Committed education": Critical, libertarian and engaged pedagogical praxis under the lens of Bell Hooks. *Pedagogical Notebook*, 21(10), e8633. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n10-043>
23. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). "For an intercultural education": Exploring the socio-formative approach for the construction of critical and sustainable citizens from a decolonial perspective. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(8), e6373. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n8-171>
24. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). "Sowing diversity in education": Paulo Freire's pedagogy as a bridge of interculturality in Latin American early childhood education. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(8), e6454. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n8-209>
25. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Decolonizing the curricula – Black protagonism in the transformation of knowledge and curricula in the process of Brazilian educational decolonization. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(11), e7980. <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n11-237>
26. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Decolonizing knowledge: The search for the counter-hegemonic revolution of Latin American education in the contemporary context. *Cuadernos de Educación y Desarrollo*, 16(6), E4636. <https://doi.org/10.55905/cuadv16n6-178>
27. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Decolonial education: Epistemic challenges and the struggle against Eurocentrism, patriarchy, and capitalism in contemporaneity. *Pedagogical Notebook*, 21(10), e9101. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n10-142>
28. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Between liberation and engagement – Paulo Freire's influence on Bell Hooks' transformative pedagogy. *Pedagogical Notebook*, 21(12), e10414. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cad-pedv21n12-075>
29. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Epistemology of the South, post-colonialism, and decoloniality: Exploring affinities and divergences under the eyes of Boaventura de Sousa Santos. *Pedagogical Notebook*, 21(10), e9586. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n10-277>
30. Dos Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2025). The convergence between the teachings of Paulo Freire and the principles of decolonial education: Paths to emancipation and

resistance to educational colonialism. ARACÊ, 7(2), 4914–4945.
<https://periodicos.newsciencepubl.com/arace/article/view/3131>

31. Dos Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2025). Paulo Freire and the school curriculum – From the daily practice of students to overcoming "banking education". ARACÊ, 7(1), 3428–3455. <https://periodicos.newsciencepubl.com/arace/article/view/2989>
32. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Paulo Freire: From educator to manager – Transformations from the Department of Education to popular public schools in Latin America. Pedagogical Notebook, 21(10), e9774. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n10-334>
33. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Dialogic pedagogy – Challenges and potentialities of education as a practice of freedom in Paulo Freire. Pedagogical Notebook, 21(13), e12120. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cad-pedv21n13-264>
34. Tonet, I. (2005). Education against capital. São Paulo: Expressão Popular.
35. Weber, M. (1949). Ensaio de sociologia. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
36. Weber, M. (1969). Economia e sociedade: Fundamentos da sociologia compreensiva. Brasília: Editora UnB.