

(IM)POSSIBLE EDUCATION IN THE ORDER OF CAPITAL – BNCC, INTEGRAL EDUCATION AND THE CHALLENGES FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n2-307>

Submitted on: 01/27/2025

Publication date: 02/27/2025

Antonio Nacílio Sousa dos Santos¹, José Neto de Oliveira Felipe², Gabriel dos Santos Kehler³, Edimar Fonseca da Fonseca⁴, Peterson Ayres Cabelleira⁵, Carlos Lopatiuk⁶, Joana Darque Ribeiro Ozório⁷, José Carlos da Costa⁸, Karlla Cristina Trindade⁹, Vanessa Soares Matos¹⁰, Cláudia Romaneli Nogueira¹¹,

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

² PhD student in Teaching of Exact Sciences (UNIVATES)
Faculty of Caldas Novas (UNICALDAS)
Caldas Novas, Goiás – Brazil.
Email: profnetomatfis@gmail.com

³ Doctor of Education
Federal University of Pampa (UNIPAMPA)
Itaqui, Rio Grande do Sul – Brazil
E-mail: gabrielkehler@unipampa.edu.br

⁴ Doctor of 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 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

⁶ Dr. in Social Sciences
State University of Ponta Grossa (UEPG)
Guarapuava, Paraná – Brazil
E-mail: carloslopatiuk@yahoo.com.br

⁷ Master's student in Food Science and Technology
Federal University of Pelotas (UFPEL)
Dom Pedrito, Rio Grande do Sul – Brazil.
E-mail: joanaozorio@gmail.com

⁸ Master in Physics Teaching
Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Alagoas (IFAL)
Santana do Ipanema, Alagoas – Brazil.
E-mail: jose.carlos@ifal.edu.br

⁹ Dr. student in Educational Sciences
Inter-American Faculty of Social Sciences (FICS)
Serra, Espírito Santo – Brazil.
E-mail: karllatrindade@gmail.com

¹⁰ Dr. student in Education
Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro (UNIRIO)
Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro – Brazil.
E-mail: vanessas2matos@gmail.com

¹¹ Master in Geography
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ)
Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro – Brazil.
Email: romanelibr@gmail.com

Denis de Oliveira Tavares¹², Luiz Carlos Martins¹³, Cintia Gomes da Silva Manoel Pinto¹⁴, Byanca Talarico de Araújo¹⁵ and Carlos Augusto Marinho de Sousa¹⁶.

ABSTRACT

The National Common Curricular Base (BNCC), while proposing a comprehensive education of the student, reinforces a technicist perspective aligned with market demands, limiting teacher autonomy and the construction of a critical practice. In the context of neoliberalism, Integral Education is emptied of its transformative potential and converted into a mechanism for adapting to the world of work, prioritizing instrumental competencies and skills to the detriment of humanistic training. That said, we ask: In what way do the BNCC and the conception of Integral Education, within the neoliberal logic, favor the adaptation of students to the demands of the market to the detriment of a critical and emancipatory education? With this question, we anchored ourselves in the theoretical contribution of Laval (2019), Antunes (2018), Frigotto (2010), Tonet (2016), Castanho & Mancini (2016), Laval & Dardot (2016), Gadotti (2009), Antunes & Pinto (2017), Apple (2001), Manacorda (2007), Marx & Engels (2011), Lombardi (2010), Mészáros (2008), Saviani (2013), Freire (2014) and the National Common Curricular Base (BNCC), among others. That said, the research is qualitative from Minayo (2006), descriptive and bibliographic (Gil, 2008) and with a comprehensive analytical bias from Weber (1964). The findings of the research indicate that the BNCC, by emphasizing competencies and skills aligned with the market, reduces teacher autonomy and the critical training of students, consolidating a logic of adaptation to the world of work. The conception of Integral Education, within the neoliberal model, prioritizes employability to the detriment of full human development, emptying its emancipatory potential. In addition, there is a curricular standardization that restricts contextualized and transformative pedagogical approaches. The study also points out the influence of LDB guidelines in the legitimization of this model, reinforcing the commodification of education.

Keywords: BNCC. Integral Education. Neoliberalism. Critical Training.

¹² Master's student in Mathematics (PROFMAT)

Federal University of Rondonópolis (UFR)

Primavera do Leste, Mato Grosso – Brazil.

E-mail: ddtavares90@gmail.com

¹³ Master in Geography

Federal University of Rondonópolis (UFR)

Primavera do Leste, Mato Grosso – Brazil.

E-mail: luiz.martins@edu.mt.gov.br

¹⁴ Master in Teaching

University of Cuiabá (UNIC)

Primavera do Leste, Mato Grosso – Brazil

Email: gomesdasilvamanoelpintocintia@gmail.com

¹⁵ Master in Professional and Technological Education

Federal Institute of Science and Technology of Southeast Minas Gerais, Rio Pomba Campus (IF Southeast MG)

Cataguases, Minas Gerais – Brazil.

Email: byanca.araujo@educacao.mg.gov.br

¹⁶ Specialising in Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching

Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS)

Umirim, Ceará – Brazil.

Email: carlos.marinho@ufms.br

INTRODUCTION

STANDARDIZED EDUCATION AND FRAGMENTED TRAINING: THE BNCC, INTEGRAL EDUCATION AND THE CHALLENGES OF PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE IN THE NEOLIBERAL LOGIC

The National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC)¹⁷ emerges as a regulatory framework in Brazilian education, with the purpose of establishing unified guidelines for basic education in the country. Its conception dates back to the need to standardize the contents and competencies to be developed by students, aiming to ensure a homogeneous education. However, this curricular standardization has been the target of criticism, because, by imposing a single model, it ends up limiting the pedagogical autonomy of schools and teachers. As Frigotto (2010, p. 56) observes, "[...] education, when reduced to an instrument of the market, loses its capacity to form critical and autonomous subjects". Mészáros (2008, p. 114) complements this view by stating that "[...] the educational system under the domination of capital does not aim at the emancipation of individuals, but at their conformity to the demands of production and consumption".

The programs change meaning and become manuals with dissected and explicit objectives, to the point of determining the duration of teaching corresponding to each objective and the various stages that each class must fulfill. [...] This method, which consists of thoroughly analyzing the teaching contents and translating them into 'competencies' and 'skills', is part of a pedagogical standardization that presumably constitutes a source of efficiency. [...] All these school tools subordinated to the category of competence, at the same time that they technicize, taylorize and bureaucratize education, also progressively and almost automatically establish a coherence with the world of companies based on the definition of job profiles and lists of competencies created to select, recruit and train the workforce (Laval, 2019, p. 83).

In Brazil, the proposal for a Common Curriculum Base began to gain strength in the 1990s, especially after the enactment of the Law of Guidelines and Bases of Education (LDB)¹⁸ in 1996, which provided for the definition of curricular parameters to guide teaching

¹⁷ The National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC) is a normative document that establishes guidelines for basic education in Brazil, with the objective of standardizing essential learning throughout the national territory. Its implementation aims to ensure a unified minimum curriculum, based on the development of competencies and skills, aligned with the contemporary demands of the labor market and society. However, the BNCC has been the target of criticism because, by emphasizing a technicist and standardized approach, it limits the pedagogical autonomy of schools and teachers, restricting the adaptation of content to local realities. As Dardot and Laval (2016) argue, this curricular logic reflects a neoliberal conception of education, in which teaching becomes an instrument for the formation of human capital to the detriment of the construction of a critical and emancipatory citizenship. Thus, the BNCC, while proposing a common national curriculum structure, reinforces the commodification of teaching and the subordination of education to the demands of the market. See: BRAZIL. National Common Curricular Base. Brasília: Ministry of Education, 2017. Available at: <http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br>.

¹⁸ The Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDB), instituted by Law No. 9,394/1996, establishes the general guidelines for the organization of education in Brazil, defining principles, objectives and responsibilities of the

in the country. With the BNCC, implemented in 2017, the idea of a mandatory national curriculum, structured based on competencies and skills, to the detriment of in-depth conceptual content, was consolidated. This change reflects a technicist conception¹⁹ of education, centered on efficiency and adaptation to the labor market. Apple (2001, p. 76) points out that "[...] The commodification of education transforms the school into a training space for the workforce, rather than an environment for the development of critical thinking." Laval (2019, p. 83) corroborates this criticism by stating that "[...] neoliberalism appropriates education as a mechanism for the reproduction of business logic, converting it into a commodity that must meet the demands of capital."

However, it cannot be ignored that Integral Education is presented as one of the guidelines of the BNCC, with the promise of developing the student in his multiple dimensions – intellectual, physical, social and emotional. This conception is aligned with a progressive perspective of teaching, which seeks to overcome the fragmentation of knowledge and integrate different areas of knowledge. However, the way in which this proposal has been operationalized in pedagogical practice reveals a mismatch between discourse and reality. Gadotti (2009, p. 42) argues that "[...] Integral education should expand the possibilities of human formation, but, inserted in the neoliberal context, it becomes an instrument of adaptation to the world of work". Freire (2014, p. 97) reinforces this view when he states that "[...] True education cannot be neutral: either it serves liberation or it becomes a mechanism of domestication."

different levels and modalities of education. Considered a milestone in the country's educational regulation, the LDB seeks to ensure the democratization of access to education and the appreciation of professionals in the area, in addition to guiding the preparation of school curricula. The law has undergone several updates, the most significant being Law No. 13,415/2017, which reformulated High School and introduced the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC) as a mandatory reference. However, critics point out that, over the years, the LDB has been progressively adjusted to meet market interests, reinforcing a logic of training focused on employability to the detriment of a critical and emancipatory education (Saviani, 2013). Thus, although the LDB represents an advance in the structuring of the Brazilian educational system, its impact depends on the public policies adopted for its implementation and the commitment to an education that transcends the utilitarian logic. See: BRAZIL. Law No. 9,394, of December 20, 1996. It establishes the guidelines and bases of national education. Diário Oficial da União, Brasília, DF, 23 Dec. 1996. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l9394.htm.

¹⁹ The technicist conception of education is characterized by an instrumental and pragmatic approach to teaching, in which the educational process is reduced to the transmission of content and the development of skills aimed at the training of qualified labor for the labor market. This view was consolidated especially after the educational reforms of the 1960s and 1970s, influenced by the productivist model and the Theory of Human Capital, which directly linked education to economic growth. As Saviani (2013) points out, educational technicism disregards the cultural, social and critical aspects of the teaching-learning process, reinforcing a logic of training that limits the autonomy of the student and the teacher. In the contemporary context, this conception is manifested in the emphasis given to competencies and skills in the National Common Curricular Base (BNCC), prioritizing the adaptation of students to the demands of the market to the detriment of a comprehensive and emancipatory education. In this way, technicist education not only restricts the role of the school to the training of the workforce, but also hinders the construction of a critical consciousness capable of questioning the current social and economic structures. See: Saviani, D. *History of pedagogical ideas in Brazil*. Campinas: Associated Authors, 2013.

Regardless of the length of the school day, the concept of integral education to which the BNCC is committed refers to the intentional construction of educational processes that promote learning in tune with the needs, possibilities and interests of students and also with the challenges of contemporary society. This presupposes considering the different childhoods and youths, the different youth cultures and their potential to create new ways of existing. [...] However, the implementation of this model faces structural challenges that compromise its emancipatory character, often being restricted to a technician format aimed at the formation of the workforce (BNCC, 2017, p. 16).

Thus, it is observed that Integral Education, instead of promoting a broad development of the subjects, has been resignified under the logic of the market. Current public educational policies emphasize the acquisition of skills aimed at employability, reducing the school to a space for the formation of human capital. Antunes (2018, p. 63) warns of this phenomenon when he states that "[...] education, by aligning itself with the productivist model, loses its formative character and becomes an appendix of the economic system". Saviani (2013, p. 112) adds, highlighting that "[...] the emptying of the critical content of education is a strategy of capital to maintain its hegemony and avoid questioning its power structures."

In addition, the advance of neoliberalism in education has imposed a growing privatization and commodification of education²⁰, expanding the influence of the business sector in the formulation of public policies. This is reflected in the emphasis given by the BNCC to socio-emotional skills and entrepreneurship, to the detriment of critical and reflective training. Lombardi (2010, p. 51) points out that "[...] The discourse of innovation and curricular flexibility often masks a process of dismantling public education, making room for its appropriation by the private sector." Dardot & Laval (2016, p. 127) add that "[...] neoliberalism redefines education as an individual investment, in which the student is seen as an entrepreneur of himself, responsible for his own success or failure." For Gentili (1998: 322):

²⁰ The advance of neoliberalism in education has imposed a growing privatization and commodification of education, transforming education into a commodity accessible only to those who can afford it. This process occurs through the reduction of the role of the State in the provision of public education, the expansion of partnerships with the private sector and the adoption of management models based on business logic. As Dardot and Laval (2016) point out, neoliberalism redefines education as an individual investment, in which students are encouraged to become "entrepreneurs of themselves", responsible for their own success or failure. In addition, the emphasis on standardized assessments and management by results reinforces competitiveness and the logic of performance, benefiting private institutions that profit from the provision of educational services, teaching materials and teaching technologies. In Brazil, this movement is reflected in the growing influence of foundations and companies in the formulation of educational policies, such as the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC), which prioritizes market-oriented skills to the detriment of critical and citizen education. In this way, the advance of neoliberalism in education compromises its public and democratic character, increasing inequalities and weakening the role of the school as a space for social transformation. See: Dardot, P.; Laval, C. *The new reason of the world: an essay on neoliberal society*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.

The privatization of education is not limited to the sale of educational institutions to the private sector, but advances in a more subtle and systemic way. Essential elements of educational policy, such as teacher training, curriculum design, and evaluation processes, are progressively transferred to the private sector. This phenomenon not only alters the administrative structure of schools, but also redefines the role of education, making it a commodity subordinated to the logic of the market. What neoliberal governments intend with their educational reforms is to 'transfer education from the sphere of politics to the sphere of the market', eliminating its social function and expanding its insertion in the game of capitalist competition.

Consequently, the BNCC not only standardizes the curriculum, but also redefines the role of the teacher, reducing his autonomy and transforming him into an executor of previously established guidelines. This process compromises the teacher's ability to contextualize teaching according to local realities and the needs of students. Tonet (2016, p. 89) points out that "[...] The training of critical and reflective teachers is essential for education to fulfill its emancipatory role, but the neoliberal model seeks to neutralize this possibility." Manacorda (2007, p. 73) goes further by stating that "[...] the imposition of a rigid and technicist curriculum prevents the school from fulfilling its function as a space for resistance and social transformation".

Nevertheless, the imposition of a single curricular model also directly impacts the cultural and social diversity of Brazil, disregarding regional specificities and the plurality of knowledge existing in the country. This centralizing movement reinforces a homogeneous view of education, moving away from pedagogical proposals that value local knowledge and contextualized teaching processes. Marx & Engels (2011, p. 118) point out that "[...] education must be anchored in the concrete reality of the subjects, because only then can it fulfill its role as an instrument of social emancipation". Castanho & Mancini (2016, p. 102) reiterate this idea by arguing that "[...] The recognition of diversity is fundamental for the school to act as a space for the democratic construction of knowledge".

Curricula focused on the scope of school practices and on the culture and knowledge produced by communities play a fundamental role. The unique environmental, cultural and historical characteristics of each municipality are evidenced through a curricular perspective that welcomes and values them. Thus, when managers point out the need for curricular programs that are appropriate to local realities, it is suggested that they also perceive the curriculum as a bundle of relationships, of welcoming diversity, of care, of protection and coexistence, of the knowledge of the territory and its people (Blasis, 2006, p. 63)

Therefore, the conception of Integral Education within the neoliberal model becomes contradictory, because, instead of promoting a broad and critical education, it submits to the demands of the market. Students are encouraged to develop skills and competencies

aimed at employability, while the humanistic and critical dimension of education is weakened. Antunes & Pinto (2017, p. 145) warn that "[...] education, when shaped by the interests of capital, is reduced to a process of preparation for work, alienating subjects from their transformative capacity". Frigotto (2001, p. 136) reinforces this criticism by endorsing that "[...] the school, instead of being a space of liberation, becomes an instance of reproduction of social inequalities".

In this way, the BNCC and the conception of Integral Education demonstrate how the neoliberal logic reorganizes education according to the demands of the market, emptying it of its critical potential. Curricular standardization, the loss of teacher autonomy and the valorization of market skills configure a scenario in which the education of students is increasingly distant from an emancipatory perspective. Laval (2019, p. 215) summarizes this panorama by stating that "[...] Control over education is one of the pillars of the neoliberal project, as the perpetuation of its hegemony depends on it." Mészáros (2008, p. 192) concludes that "[...] A truly transformative education cannot be limited to training individuals for the market, but must enable them to question and overcome the oppressive structures of society."

The current neoliberalism did not come to transform the school overnight. From very early on, many authors dedicated themselves to defining and building a school that coincided point by point with the 'spirit of capitalism'. The present mutation is only the actualization, at a more mature stage of market society, of a trend that has been active for a long time. [...] If we want schools to teach useful things, they must obey the demand, and not the conformism of the corporation or the whim of superiors. The market is the best stimulus for the zeal of bosses, as it allows their interests to be confused with their duties (Laval, 2019, p. 215).

That said, the implementation of the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC) and Integral Education in Brazil presents significant contradictions, especially with regard to its proposal of integral education and the reality of pedagogical practice. The BNCC seeks to ensure a homogeneous set of essential learning, emphasizing the need to develop skills aligned with the demands of the labor market. However, this standardization ends up reducing the diversity of pedagogical approaches and weakening the autonomy of educators. As Laval (2019, p. 83) points out, "[...] neoliberalism redefines education as a mechanism for the reproduction of business logic, converting it into a commodity that must meet the demands of capital."

Consequently, the conception of Integral Education in the BNCC distances itself from its emancipatory potential by prioritizing instrumental and technical competencies.

Although the BNCC affirms its commitment to an education focused on the global development of students, its practical application reveals a logic centered on adaptation to the market. According to the official document, "[...] the BNCC proposes to overcome the radically disciplinary fragmentation of knowledge, to encourage its application in real life, the importance of the context to give meaning to what is learned, and the student's role in their learning" (BNCC, 2017, p. 14). However, this guideline often translates into training focused on employability, as Mészáros (2008, p. 114) points out.

In addition, the curricular centralization imposed by the BNCC directly impacts teacher autonomy, transforming teachers into mere executors of pre-established guidelines. The requirement to comply with a homogeneous curriculum restricts the ability of educators to adapt teaching to local specificities and the needs of students. According to Castanho & Mancini (2016, p. 102), "[...] The recognition of diversity is fundamental for the school to act as a space for the democratic construction of knowledge". However, the BNCC emphasizes standardization as a means of ensuring efficiency and control over teaching processes, as Apple (2001, p. 76) points out.

The recent changes in the LDB, due to Law No. 13,415/2017, replace the single model of High School curriculum with a diversified and flexible model. [...] However, despite the apparent flexibility, the BNCC establishes a common core that must be followed by all schools, limiting the autonomy of teachers in the choice of content and teaching methodologies. The need to meet national learning standards imposes control over pedagogical practices, reducing the ability of teachers to adapt teaching to local specificities and the sociocultural demands of students (BNCC, 2017, p. 470).

Thus, this research has as its object of study the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC) and the conception of Integral Education in the context of Brazilian educational policies, analyzing how these elements, within the neoliberal logic, impact the training of students and the performance of teachers. The main objective is to understand how the BNCC and Integral Education favor the adaptation of students to the demands of the market to the detriment of a critical and emancipatory education, in addition to identifying the challenges faced by teachers in the construction of a transformative pedagogical practice. Thus, the investigation seeks to answer the following starting question: in what way do the BNCC and Integral Education, within the neoliberal logic, favor the adaptation of students to the demands of the market to the detriment of a critical and emancipatory education, and what are the challenges of teachers to develop a critical and transformative pedagogical practice?

CRITICAL COMPREHENSIVE METHODOLOGY-: QUALITATIVE APPROACH, BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESEARCH AND WEBERIAN ANALYSIS IN THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BNCC AND THE COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION

The research adopted a qualitative approach, according to Minayo's conception, due to its ability to understand complex social phenomena from the analysis of meanings and contexts. According to Minayo (2006, p. 90), "[...] interpretation consists of relating the semantic structures (signifiers) with sociological structures (meanings) of the utterances present in the message". Thus, the investigation sought to interpret the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC) as a normative document that reflects and reinforces the neoliberal logic in education, shaping teaching based on market interests, and not from an emancipatory perspective.

However, if we do not have a hasty look at the two proposals, we will see that the Method of Interpretation of Meanings is an attempt to advance further in interpretation, moving beyond the contents of texts towards their contexts and revealing the logics and the most comprehensive explanations present in a given culture about a given theme. In this method, it is of fundamental importance that we establish confrontations between: subjective dimension and group positions; text and subtext; text and context; broader speeches and actions; cognition and feeling, among other aspects (Minayo, 2006, p. 105).

The qualitative methodology adopted enabled a critical analysis of the BNCC, going beyond the description of the document and examining its social impacts. Minayo (2006, p. 91) points out that "[...] qualitative analysis requires the researcher to go beyond the simple description of the data, articulating them with a theoretical framework that enables the interpretation of social phenomena". In this sense, the research was not limited to identifying the elements of the BNCC, but analyzed its implications for public education, showing how its standardized curricular structure reinforces inequalities and compromises citizenship education.

Added to this, the descriptive and bibliographic research that was based on the guidelines proposed by Gil, being adequate for the study of phenomena already documented and widely debated. Gil (2008, p. 50) explains that "[...] bibliographic research is developed from material already prepared, consisting mainly of books and scientific articles". In this way, the investigation was based on the analysis of official documents, academic articles and works that discuss the relationship between education and neoliberalism, allowing an in-depth examination of the BNCC from a critical perspective.

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. [...] 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 descriptive approach adopted allowed to characterize and systematize the central elements of the BNCC and its relationship with the contemporary educational model. According to Gil (2008, p. 51), "[...] 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". Thus, the study identified the main provisions of the BNCC that show its alliance with neoliberal rationality, such as the prioritization of skills aimed at the labor market to the detriment of the critical training of students.

To deepen the interpretation of the findings, Weber's comprehensive analysis was used, which is based on the apprehension of the meanings attributed by the subjects to their actions. Weber (1969, p. 110) states that "[...] comprehension refers to the meaning subjectively aimed at by actors, in the course of a concrete activity". In this way, the research analyzed the BNCC not only as a normative document, but as an expression of political and economic interests that shape education according to a productivist and market logic.

That said, the Weberian understanding allowed us to capture the contradictions of the official discourse of the BNCC, which claims to promote the integral education of students, but in practice subordinates education to the demands of the market. Weber (1949, p. 90) proposes the construction of "ideal types" as analytical instruments for the interpretation of social phenomena. Thus, the study used theoretical categories to demonstrate how the BNCC operates within the neoliberal logic, restricting teacher autonomy and curricular diversity.

Thus, the combined use of bibliographic research, qualitative approach and comprehensive analysis enabled a critical reading of the BNCC, evidencing its role in the reproduction of educational inequalities. According to Minayo (2006, p. 90), "[...] The interpretation of the data must articulate the inferences made with a solid theoretical foundation, ensuring an in-depth and contextualized analysis". In this sense, the research related the normative elements of the BNCC with the principles of neoliberalism,

demonstrating how curricular standardization contributes to the commodification of education.

With regard to interpretation, we observe that with this procedure we seek to go beyond the material. And, based on the inferences, we discuss the results of the research in a broader perspective, working on the production of knowledge in a disciplinary area or a field of activity. Thus, through this procedure, we seek to attribute a broader degree of meaning to the contents analyzed (Minayo, 2006, p. 90).

The research revealed that the BNCC, by emphasizing the notion of competencies and skills, reduces education to training for the market, neglecting its emancipatory dimension. Gil (2008, p. 50) warns that "[...] Bibliographic research must be conducted carefully, ensuring that the sources consulted allow a broad and grounded view of the problem investigated". Thus, works by classic authors of education were analyzed, whose reflections corroborate the thesis that the BNCC reinforces the logic of adaptation and competitiveness to the detriment of critical training.

Thus, the use of comprehensive analysis allowed the interpretation of this research object, taking into account that the BNCC and other norms are an instrument of social control, which shapes subjectivities and behaviors based on neoliberal rationality. Weber (1969, p. 110) points out that "[...] the meaning of social actions must be understood from the motivations and contexts in which they are inserted". In this way, the research showed how the BNCC guides teaching towards the formation of individuals adaptable to the market, reinforcing the logic of capital and limiting the possibilities of an education aimed at social transformation.

In this way, the study demonstrated that the choice of qualitative methodology, combined with bibliographic research and comprehensive analysis, was fundamental to deepen the understanding of the BNCC as a social phenomenon that reflects and reinforces the neoliberal logic in education. Minayo (2006, p. 91) points out that "[...] The interpretation of the data must consider both the objective and subjective aspects of the phenomenon investigated, ensuring a critical and contextualized analysis". Thus, the research contributed, as we will see below, to highlight the limits and contradictions of the BNCC, highlighting the need for an educational model that transcends the market logic and promotes citizenship and emancipatory education.

BNCC, INTEGRAL EDUCATION AND THE CHALLENGES FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

The National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC) has been widely debated in the context of the commodification of education, because, instead of ensuring a critical and emancipatory education, it reinforces the adaptation of students to the demands of the labor market. The BNCC seeks to establish a homogeneous set of competencies and skills, promoting a logic of curricular standardization that disregards the regional and social diversity of students. As the official document points out, "[...] the BNCC defines essential learning, to be guaranteed to students for the construction of their life project and the full exercise of citizenship". However, this perspective is in line with the neoliberal model²¹ of education, in which human formation is replaced by the instrumentalization of knowledge, as highlighted by Laval (2019, p. 83).

In the BNCC, competence is defined as the mobilization of knowledge (concepts and procedures), skills (practical, cognitive and socio-emotional), attitudes and values to solve complex demands of daily life, the full exercise of citizenship and the world of work. [...] This conception shows an alignment with the productivist logic of contemporary capitalism, which subordinates education to the needs of the economic sector (BNCC, 2018, p. 6).

According to the fragment above, the conception of competence in the National Common Curricular Base (BNCC) reflects an alignment with the productivist logic of contemporary capitalism, subordinating education to the demands of the economic sector. This model reinforces the instrumentalization of education, converting it into a mechanism for adapting the workforce to market demands. As Frigotto (2010, p. 56) states, "[...] education is raised to the condition of human capital, transforming itself into a specific sphere of development theories". In this way, education ceases to be a universal right aimed at the integral formation of the subject and becomes a device for adapting to the demands of the productive system²², which weakens its emancipatory and democratic

²¹ Education aligned with the neoliberal model is characterized by an emphasis on efficiency, competitiveness and the adaptation of individuals to the demands of the labor market, to the detriment of a critical and emancipatory education. In this context, the school is conceived as a space for the preparation of flexible labor, reducing the role of teaching to the development of competencies and skills demanded by the productive sector. As Dardot and Laval (2016) point out, neoliberalism transforms education into an instrument of economic adjustment, in which students are encouraged to internalize the logic of entrepreneurship and self-responsibility for their own success or failure. This perspective is reflected in the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC), which prioritizes the formation of "employable" individuals rather than critical citizens, reinforcing curriculum standardization and the logic of measurable performance. As a consequence, education loses its transformative potential and starts to reproduce social inequalities, while legitimizing the precariousness of work and the commodification of knowledge. Dardot, P.; Laval, C. *The new reason of the world: an essay on neoliberal society*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.

²² The integral formation of the subject, which should consider cognitive, social, cultural and critical aspects of education, has been progressively replaced by a technicist approach aimed at adapting individuals to the demands of the productive

function. In this sense, Enguita (1989, p. 137) points out that "[...] functionalism is based on the assumption that the components of the social whole have a function of conservation and reproduction of the balance of the system", evidencing how the school reinforces the current social order.

However, this educational model is not free of contradictions. At the same time that the BNCC proposes a broad and comprehensive education, its technical-instrumentalized character. In other words, the school, under the aegis of neoliberalism, ends up consolidating structural inequalities by privileging a teaching model that favors capital to the detriment of the critical formation of individuals.

In this way, education leaves the sphere of social rights and becomes an individual acquisition, a commodity that is obtained in the market according to the interests of each one and the ability of each one to obtain what they want. The market is a master narrative in educational discourse. The economic purposes of teaching overlap with social and cultural purposes. As I said earlier, the deregulation of economic relations has been accompanied by the deregulation of social rights. Education is a good example of this process (La Ciudadanía Negada, 2010, p. 86).

In addition, the productivist perspective of the BNCC dialogues directly with the notion of school as a space for preparing for work, reinforcing the social division of knowledge²³ and the naturalization of inequalities. Enguita (1989, p. 182) points out that "what children and young people learn, in reality, is what the conditions of salaried work are". In this way, education assumes a functionalist role, moving away from a transformative perspective and consolidating itself as a tool for maintaining the logic of capital. At the same time, Frigotto (2010, p. 47) argues that "the school is a social institution that, through its practices in the field of knowledge, values and attitudes,

system. In this model, teaching ceases to be a space for the construction of knowledge and emancipation to become a functional training, based on the development of specific skills and abilities for the labor market. As Frigotto (2010) states, this logic reduces education to an instrument of capital, converting it into a mechanism for qualifying the workforce, instead of a fundamental right for the construction of a more just and egalitarian society. This trend is reinforced by policies such as the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC), which prioritizes competency-based teaching, emptying critical training and the transformative role of education. Thus, instead of preparing autonomous and conscious citizens, the school starts to play an adaptive role, molding individuals to fit the demands of the market, perpetuating inequalities and limiting the possibility of social transformation. See: Frigotto, G. *Education and the crisis of real capitalism*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010

²³ The social division of knowledge in education reinforces inequalities by structuring curricula and methodologies that allocate different forms of learning to different social classes. While students from the elites have access to a broad, critical and interdisciplinary education, the majority of the population receives a technical education, aimed at preparing labor for the market. As Enguita (1989) points out, "[...] what children and young people learn, in reality, is what the conditions of salaried work are", showing that the school plays a functionalist role in maintaining the current social structure. This logic is intensified with the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC), which establishes standardized training focused on employability, leaving the development of critical thinking and intellectual autonomy in the background. In this way, education, instead of reducing inequalities, ends up reproducing them, reinforcing social stratification and limiting the opportunities for ascension for the most vulnerable layers of the population. See: Enguita, M. F. *The function of education in social reproduction*. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1989.

articulates certain interests and disarticulates others", demonstrating the intentionality underlying educational policies.

On the other hand, the imposition of a mercantile logic on education ignores the subjective and social aspects of learning, reducing the school to a space for the training of efficient workers, but without guaranteeing a full citizenship education, as highlighted by Laval and Dardot (2016, p. 214). This conception not only restricts the role of the school, but also conditions the subjects to a logic of precariousness and individualization of success. In this context, Ball (1994, p. 13) states that "[...] the market offers a powerful response to a whole set of technical, ideological and management problems, but systematically favors some to the detriment of others", reaffirming the excluding role of market logic in education.

In this way, education leaves the sphere of social rights and becomes an individual acquisition, a commodity that is obtained in the market according to the interests of each one and the ability of each one to obtain what they want. The market is a master narrative in educational discourse. The economic purposes of teaching overlap with social and cultural purposes. As I said earlier, the deregulation of economic relations has been accompanied by the deregulation of social rights. Education is a good example of this process (Gentili, 2005, p. 45).

In this way, the BNCC, by emphasizing the notion of competence as a mobilization of knowledge aimed at solving the demands of life and work, reinforces an educational model that subordinates human formation to the interest of the market. For Mészáros (2008, p. 312), "[...] education cannot be at the service of the reproduction of the capital system, but rather of the construction of a society that goes beyond its contradictions". Therefore, it is essential to rethink the current educational model, ensuring that it not only meets economic requirements, but also promotes a critical and emancipatory education for all citizens. After all, according to Apple (1979, p. 36), "[...] the hidden curriculum of schools teaches students 'essential' ideological norms and distinctions, 'demanded' by the labor market", becoming a mechanism of social and economic reproduction.

Consequently, the BNCC operates as an instrument of curricular standardization, removing from schools and teachers the autonomy to adapt the contents to local realities. Although the official discourse suggests curricular flexibility, in practice, the imposition of standardized competencies and skills restricts pedagogical freedom. According to the BNCC: "[...] general competencies organize essential learning, ensuring a common basis and guiding the construction of curricula in the different education systems". However, this

standardization is directly linked to neoliberal rationality, which transforms education into a training mechanism for the market, as Apple (2001, p. 76) warns.

The normative operates as an instrument of curricular standardization, removing from schools and teachers the autonomy to adapt the contents to local realities. Although the official discourse suggests curricular flexibility, in practice, the imposition of standardized competencies and skills restricts pedagogical freedom (BNCC, 2018, p. 15). However, this structure reinforces neoliberal rationality, converting education into a mechanism for adapting to the labor market. In this sense, Frigotto (2010, p. 154) observes that "[...] the new concepts abundantly used by businessmen and their advisors are an imposition of the new forms of capitalist sociability", demonstrating the connection between the market logic and the curricular structure of the BNCC.

In addition, the curricular standardization imposed by the BNCC disregards the social, economic, and cultural diversity of the country, making education a homogeneous experience that is distant from the real needs of students. As Apple (2001, p. 96) points out, "[...] schools serve to maximize the production of technical knowledge", prioritizing skills that meet the demands of the productive sector. This logic is reinforced by Marx and Engels (1983, p. 11), who warn that "[...] the bourgeoisie cannot count only on economic and political powers, but also needs the school apparatus to consolidate its domination." In this way, the BNCC, by instituting a unified curriculum, removes from schools the ability to develop pedagogical proposals that value the local reality and promote a critical and liberating education.

The standardization of school content has been presented as a solution to ensure equity in learning. However, this approach ignores the complexity of educational realities and imposes a rigid structure, in which regional and cultural specificities are subjugated by a single model of teaching. The social and economic diversity of students demands flexible methodologies and adaptable curricula, capable of recognizing local singularities and promoting an education that respects differences (Saviani, 2013, p. 102).

Consequently, the logic of the BNCC follows the model of neoliberal educational reforms, which seek to subordinate education to the demands of the market, weakening the social role of the school. According to Laval and Dardot (2016, p. 214), "[...] neoliberalism imposes a model of education that is not limited to transmitting knowledge, but also produces subjects that are adaptable and flexible to the needs of the market." This perspective dialogues with the analysis of Enguita (1993, p. 74), who argues that "[...] education must be understood within the logic of capital, which needs to train disciplined,

adaptable and productive workers". In this way, the school becomes a space of preparation for insertion in the market, moving away from an emancipatory proposal.

That said, the curricular centralization imposed by the BNCC also reduces teacher autonomy, restricting the freedom of pedagogical planning and the possibility of innovation in teaching. As Marx (1869, p. 35) points out, "[...] education can be state-owned, without being under the control of the government [...]", suggesting that educational regulation should not mean the imposition of rigid guidelines that compromise the autonomy of educators. In this same perspective, Laval (2019, p. 87) highlights that "[...] the school, under the neoliberal logic, is managed like a company, where performance indicators determine its functioning and justify the precariousness of teaching conditions". This demonstrates that curricular standardization, instead of promoting educational equality, ends up reinforcing inequalities, limiting the development of contextualized pedagogical practices.

The professionalization of teaching, which consisted above all in the prescription of methods and the learning of procedures for controlling the 'quality of products', led to a vertical division of labor, according to the Taylorian scheme, which opposed specialists in the science of education, holders of the correct methods of standardization of educational action and its measurement, to the mere executors in charge of applying innovations and carrying out standardized teaching procedures. The standardized metric made available by the administrative councils allowed for stricter control of the teacher. Efforts to reorganize classrooms and courses, rhythms and occupation of schools have multiplied, in order to reduce costs, sometimes with disastrous pedagogical consequences (Laval, 2019, p. 112).

In this way, the BNCC, by emphasizing a unified curricular model focused on the formation of skills required by the market, restricts the role of education in the construction of critical citizenship. As Frigotto (2001, p. 47) points out, "[...] the school is a social institution that, through its practices in the field of knowledge, values and attitudes, articulates certain interests and disarticulates others". At the same time, Saviani (2013, p. 89) criticizes the reproducivist function of education, stating that "[...] the school, instead of promoting the overcoming of social inequalities, ends up being a space for maintaining the current economic structure". Therefore, it is essential to rethink the current educational model, ensuring that it not only meets economic requirements, but also promotes a critical and emancipatory education for all citizens.

In addition, the emphasis on competency-based training reinforces a technicist and pragmatic logic, privileging instrumental skills to the detriment of humanistic and critical training. The official document establishes that "[...] The mobilization of knowledge, skills,

attitudes and values must occur to solve complex demands of daily life, the full exercise of citizenship and the world of work". This conception shows an alignment with the productivist logic of contemporary capitalism, which subordinates education to the needs of the economic sector, as Mészáros (2008, p. 114) warns.

In this way, the BNCC limits methodological diversity by requiring teachers to follow standardized guidelines, reducing their autonomy and their ability to adapt pedagogical practices to the specificities of students. Although the document mentions that "[...] schools must ensure the personalization of learning and value students' experiences and prior knowledge", the imposition of a single curriculum base prevents a more contextualized and meaningful approach. As Saviani (2013: 112) states:

Curriculum standardization ignores the diversity of educational experiences and contexts, imposing a homogeneous model that disregards the particularities of students and communities. Although the idea of personalization of learning is defended, what happens in practice is a rigid structure that limits the adaptation of content to local realities. Teaching, reduced to a set of predefined competencies and skills, becomes an instrument of control, restricting the ability of teachers to innovate and meet the specific needs of their students.

On the other hand, the BNCC redefines the role of the teacher, reducing him to an executor of predefined guidelines and weakening his ability to intervene in the educational process in a critical way. The document emphasizes that "[...] the continuing education of teachers must be aligned with the guidelines of the BNCC to ensure pedagogical coherence and quality in education". However, this requirement ignores the importance of teacher autonomy in the construction of pedagogical practices that dialogue with the real needs of students. As Castanho & Mancini (2016, p. 102) points out: "[...] The recognition of diversity is fundamental for the school to act as a space for the democratic construction of knowledge".

Thus, the BNCC favors the commodification of education, by replacing the integral education of students with training aimed at employability. The document mentions that "[...] education must prepare students for the challenges of the twenty-first century, promoting skills such as resilience, entrepreneurship and innovation". This orientation, however, reinforces the neoliberal conception that education should form individuals adjusted to the market, rather than critical citizens, as Frigotto (2010, p. 56) warns.

Technical-professional training is an example of a policy that walks step by step with intense and repeated propaganda. It has been consolidating, as part of a profound cultural revolution in the imagination of the working classes and the population in general – unemployed, underemployed, precarious workers, surplus labor – the

idea that, through the different modalities of this type of training, everyone will become employable. It is naïve to believe that it is possible to correct market distortions based on the qualification of workers. It is not the school that defines the position that the man or woman will occupy in production. On the contrary, often the place that the student's family occupies in the production is what ends up taking the student to a certain type of school. Therefore, it is not possible to solve the employment crisis within the school (Gentili, 1998, p. 89).

In this way, the BNCC, by reinforcing a technicist curriculum aligned with the market, contributes to the emptying of the emancipatory role of education. The document mentions that "[...] education must develop skills that allow insertion into the world of work and adaptation to technological changes". However, this logic compromises the integral education of students, as Dardot & Laval (2016, p. 127) emphasizes, "[...] neoliberalism redefines education as an individual investment, in which the student is seen as an entrepreneur of himself, responsible for his own success or failure."

INTEGRAL EDUCATION IN THE NEOLIBERAL CONTEXT: CHALLENGES FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

Integral Education, inserted in the neoliberal context, faces a fundamental contradiction between its discourse and its practice. While the proposal presents itself as a broad training, aimed at the full development of the subjects, in reality, its implementation has been marked by an alignment with the demands of the market. As Gadotti (2019, p. 64) observes: "[...] Integral education cannot be reduced to a simple extension of school time, without critically rethinking pedagogical content and practices". This logic reflects an emptying of the original concept of citizen education, which should prioritize the critical and emancipatory formation of students. In this sense, Enguita (1989, p. 134) warns that "[...] the school becomes a space for adapting to work and not for transforming reality", evidencing how the neoliberal model captures the idea of Integral Education to reinforce its productivist logic.

Recent experiences, based on the citizen's conception of education, represent a viable alternative, denying and overcoming the neoliberal capitalist project of public schools. They proved that public schools can be competent, participatory and democratic. We can change it. To change, it needs to rely on society, through the creation of a public sphere of non-state decision-making. To change, it is not enough that the analysis of the rulers and the solutions pointed out by them are correct. They need to be legitimized by collective discussion, because it is the collective that operates change (Gadotti, 2019, p. 59).

Consequently, the adequacy of Integral Education to the demands of the market limits its capacity to promote a critical and reflective education. The incorporation of skills aimed at entrepreneurship and student resilience reflects the neoliberal perspective that individual success depends exclusively on personal effort. As Gentili (1998, p. 89) points out: "[...] It is naïve to believe that the qualification of workers will solve the distortions of the market, because the capitalist system is based on structural inequality." Thus, integral education is transformed into a device for the adaptation of individuals to the precariousness of work, instead of a strategy to expand social and political awareness. Frigotto (2010, p. 154) reinforces this criticism when he states that "[...] The school has been shaped by business interests, which seek to train flexible workers, capable of meeting the demands of the global economy".

In addition, the expansion of the school workload, one of the pillars of Integral Education, has not been accompanied by a critical deepening of the contents. Often, this extension of the time spent in school is restricted to complementary activities disconnected from the curriculum, with no connection to an emancipatory political-pedagogical project. As Gadotti (2019, p. 99) points out: "[...] Full-time cannot be limited to keeping students in school for longer hours, without ensuring educational quality and theoretical deepening". Along the same lines, Ball (2012, p. 112) argues that "[...] the neoliberal model of education privileges the measurement of efficiency, without considering the full education of students". Thus, the increase in the school day, instead of contributing to integral education, can reinforce a technicianist and decontextualized logic.

Integral education cannot be confused with simply increasing the length of stay in school, as this does not guarantee, by itself, the quality of teaching. The extension of the school day needs to be associated with an effective change in the pedagogical conception, incorporating innovative methodologies and a curriculum that dialogues with the multiple dimensions of human development. Otherwise, there is a risk of transforming integral education into an instrument for controlling students' time, without necessarily contributing to their critical and civic formation (Gadotti, 2019, p. 99).

Furthermore, Integral Education has been promoted as a solution to educational inequality, without, however, questioning its structural causes. The idea that a longer stay in school can, by itself, guarantee better learning ignores the socioeconomic factors that influence school performance. As Saviani (2013, p. 102) points out: "[...] the extension of school time cannot be seen as an end in itself, but as part of a larger project of democratization of education". However, this perspective is rarely considered in neoliberal

educational policies, which prioritize productivity and the adequacy of students to market demands. We once again endorse what Laval and Dardot (2016, p. 214) state, "[...] neoliberalism imposes a model of education that is not limited to transmitting knowledge, but also produces subjects that are adaptable and flexible to the needs of the market."

On the other hand, the emptying of the concept of full and citizen education is a direct consequence of the commodification of education. The emphasis on individualized competencies, such as resilience and innovation, shifts the focus of education from the collective to personal performance, reinforcing inequalities. As Coelho (2009, p. 236) states: "[...] the fragmentation of pedagogical work results in the loss of the school's identity as a space for the collective construction of knowledge". This logic aligns with the neoliberal view that the responsibility for educational success or failure rests exclusively with the individual, and not with social and structural conditions. Enguita (1993, p. 74) complements this analysis by highlighting that "[...] curricular standardization, instead of democratizing teaching, reinforces the social division of knowledge".

The tendency to separate social and ethnic groups in space, in social practices, in habitat, in schooling, is not new, in fact, it is perhaps intrinsic to every class society. After a certain level, however, this tendency becomes the general law of a society on the way to an increasingly accentuated social breakdown [...]. This universe of competition has the objective effect of favoring even more those who already have the best economic, social and cultural conditions, and therefore can choose and be chosen by the most prestigious establishments; therefore, it has the effect of functioning in these times of triumphant individualism and school massification as a system of differentiation and legitimate exclusion, that is, as a particularly fearsome supplementary mechanism of class reproduction (Laval, 2019, p. 52).

In summary, Integral Education, when shaped by neoliberal logic, distances itself from its original purpose of humanistic and emancipatory formation. Instead of offering a critical and contextualized education, it has been instrumentalized as a strategy for adapting to the market, reducing its transformative potential. For Gadotti (2019, p. 60), "[...] the Citizen School²⁴ must constitute a space for social organization, aimed at the defense and achievement of rights". Therefore, it is essential to rescue the original meaning of

²⁴ The Citizen School is an educational proposal that seeks to overcome the traditional view of the school as a mere transmitter of content, promoting teaching that values the active participation of students, critical training and the collective construction of knowledge. This conception of education is based on the principles of democracy, social inclusion and the emancipation of subjects, allowing the school to be a space for transformation and not just for adaptation to the demands of the market. As Gadotti (2009) points out, the Citizen School should be a place where learning is linked to the social reality of students, enabling them to understand and question the structures that shape society. Unlike the technicist and standardized model of the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC), the Citizen School prioritizes active methodologies, the dialogue between different knowledges and the appreciation of critical thinking. In this way, this educational perspective represents an alternative to the neoliberal logic, rescuing the role of the school as a space for democratic construction and struggle for rights. See: Gadotti, M. *Education and power: introduction to the pedagogy of conflict*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2009.

Integral Education, ensuring that its implementation is aligned with a democratic and inclusive educational project, and not with a teaching model aimed at the reproduction of the logic of capital.

Thus, the conception of citizen education defended by Gadotti (2019) represents a counterpoint to the neoliberal policies that dominate public education. The idea that the school can be transformed into a space for collective decision-making reinforces the need for active participation of society in the definition of educational directions. However, this view is confronted with the reality imposed by neoliberalism, which seeks to reduce education to the role of training qualified labor for the market. As Frigotto (2001, p. 165) warns: "[...] the tendency to increase access to school [...] becomes of little relevance when examined in the light of the type of school to which the children of workers have access, its organization, its contents, quantity and quality of the education provided". Thus, even under the discourse of participation and democratization, the school continues to be subject to market interests that limit its social function.

In addition, the notion of citizen education cannot be dissociated from the socio-political context in which it is inserted. The proposal to create a public sphere of non-state decision-making in education implies a significant challenge in the face of neoliberal policies that promote the privatization of education. As Laval (2019, p. 112) points out, "[...] The standardized metric made available by the administrative councils allowed for stricter control of the teacher." This demonstrates that, even when one seeks to democratize education, the control mechanisms imposed by the State and the private sector restrict the autonomy of educators and the effective participation of the school community.

In the educational sphere, this privatization process, according to Gentili, is broader than buying and selling, it is more than delegating public responsibilities to private organizations. In education, buying or selling is not a rule of privatization. The training of teachers, definition of curricula, evaluation, are tasks that have been systematically transferred to the private sector. Privatization means redistributing and rearranging power, which makes 'educational privatization more diffuse and indirect than the privatization of productive institutions' (Gentili, 1998, p. 322).

On the other hand, resistance to neoliberal policies in education has manifested itself through various social movements. These movements, as Leher (2018, p. 154) points out, "[...] seek the construction of an alternative educational project to the market model, based on popular participation and the collective construction of knowledge". However, despite these initiatives, the advance of education privatization policies has hindered the consolidation of a truly emancipatory education. The transformation of education into a

commodity, as Anderson (1997, p. 62) points out, "[...] makes education become a product available on the market, accessible only to those who can afford it".

In this sense, the proposal of a participatory and democratic public education faces structural obstacles that prevent its full realization. The decentralization of school management, for example, is often used as a justification to reduce public investment in education and transfer responsibilities to the school community without guaranteeing the necessary resources to maintain the quality of education. As Gohn (1999, p. 178) points out, "[...] The decentralization of education has served to create the appearance of democratic participation, but in reality it has been a mechanism for reducing costs and transferring responsibilities to the private sector." In this way, the democratization of public schools becomes an even greater challenge in the face of the neoliberal logic that restricts the action of the State. According to Lava (2019: 212):

School decentralization is part of a broader movement [...] In most cases, decentralisation is much more often conceived as a step towards the creation of an education market than as a step towards greater democracy in schools. In education, the desire for more democracy at the grassroots, the demand for the 'right to initiative' of local actors, manifested itself in an increasingly intense way from the 1960s onwards. However, in the neoliberal context, decentralization – not in itself, but in the way it was applied – accelerated the loss of autonomy of the school institution and led it to abandon the ideal of equality, especially in its territorial dimension.

In addition, the imposition of educational policies based on meritocracy and business efficiency²⁵ compromises the quality of public education. The emphasis on performance evaluation and teacher productivity ignores the complexity of the educational process and disregards the structural inequalities that affect student learning. As Ball (2012, p. 112) argues, "[...] the logic of the market imposes an education model that prioritizes the quantification of results to the detriment of human and social development." This technicist approach distances itself from the ideal of a citizen education, which should

²⁵ Educational policies based on meritocracy and business efficiency reinforce the neoliberal logic by treating education as a service regulated by criteria of productivity and measurable performance. These policies promote competitiveness among schools, teachers, and students, using standardized assessments to classify educational institutions and justify cuts in investments in public education. As Ball (2012) points out, the emphasis on the business management of the school reduces the role of education to training for the labor market, emptying its critical and civic function. In addition, meritocracy ignores the structural inequalities of society, holding individuals responsible for their own educational failure and disregarding socioeconomic factors that influence learning. This logic is reflected in the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC), which prioritizes competencies and skills aimed at employability, leaving the integral training of subjects in the background. Thus, the school, instead of being a space of emancipation, becomes an instrument for the reproduction of inequalities and mercantilist logic. See: Ball, S. J. *Global corporate education: new educational policy and the future of public schools*. São Paulo: Vozes, 2012.

promote the integral formation of individuals and stimulate their active participation in society.

Consequently, resistance to the commodification of education requires the construction of new forms of social organization that strengthen community participation in school management. As Santos (1999, p. 10) points out: "[...] We cannot be satisfied with thinking of alternatives. We need an alternative way of thinking about alternatives." This means that the struggle for a truly democratic education must go beyond the mere contestation of neoliberal policies, proposing alternative models of management and financing of public schools.

Thus, the proposal of a citizen, participatory and democratic public education faces significant challenges in the context of neoliberal policies. Although there are successful experiences of resistance and pedagogical innovation, the influence of the market on education continues to be an obstacle to the construction of a truly emancipatory educational model. As Gadotti (2019, p. 57) points out, "[...] The citizen school must be a space for social organization, aimed at the defense and achievement of rights". In this scenario, the defense of a quality public school, accessible to all and committed to the critical formation of subjects, becomes an essential task to overcome the orders of capital.

The struggle in defense of free, quality and democratic public education must be put in its proper place, that is, as one of the fundamental struggles to stop the hegemony of neoliberal thought. It is necessary to experience egalitarian democracy within social, union, student and popular movements and bring it into the social policies of the State. This task cannot be delegated by social movements. Therefore, this struggle does not have an announced end, it is renewed every day, in every assembly, in every class, in every march, in every movement, in every form of struggle against capitalism and its expressions in globality. The future depends on this struggle (Gentili, 1998, p. 89).

Transformative pedagogical practice faces numerous challenges in the context of neoliberal educational policies, which emphasize adaptation to the market to the detriment of the critical formation of students. The BNCC, by defining competencies and skills aligned with the demands of the world of work, limits teacher autonomy and restricts the possibilities of pedagogical innovation. As Freire (2014, p. 56) points out, "[...] the progressive educational practice in favor of the autonomy of the students' being requires from the teacher a critical and engaged posture, which breaks with the ties imposed by traditional teaching". In this sense, Frigotto (2010, p. 78) warns that "[...] education under the logic of capital is transformed into a strategy for the formation of flexible labor, aimed at

the reproduction of inequalities". Thus, resisting this logic requires a commitment to pedagogical practices that promote reflection and criticality.

In addition, the alternatives to the BNCC's logic of market adaptation include the strengthening of critical pedagogy, which values the autonomy of thought and the active participation of students in the learning process. For Freire (2014, p. 72), "[...] Teaching requires the conviction that change is possible, because education must be understood as a form of intervention in the world". This conception is opposed to curricular standardization and teaching aimed at the formation of technical skills, which disregards the cultural and social diversity of students. As Saviani (2013, p. 98) points out, "[...] Curricular standardization ignores the diversity of experiences and imposes a homogeneous model, decontextualized from the real needs of the population." Thus, it is essential that educators seek strategies to resignify the curriculum, making it an instrument of emancipation and not of reproduction of the mercantile logic.

The curriculum must be linked to the students' reality, ensuring that their cultural and social diversity is contemplated in a critical and contextualized way. Excessive standardization can lead to the devaluation of local experiences and the imposition of a homogeneous model that does not meet the specificities of different social groups. The construction of an emancipatory curriculum requires that it be flexible and open to multiple forms of knowledge, allowing for meaningful learning that is connected with the world (Saviani, 2013, p. 145).

That said, teacher autonomy, essential for a critical pedagogy, has been gradually weakened by educational policies based on meritocracy and management by results. To recover this autonomy, it is necessary to invest in spaces for continuing education that allow teachers to critically reflect on their practice. As Freire (2014, p. 39) states, "[...] teaching requires respect for the autonomy of the student's being and the construction of dialogical relationships that promote knowledge". In the same sense, Apple (2012, p. 112) highlights that "[...] the logic of the market imposes an education model that prioritizes the quantification of results to the detriment of human and social development." Thus, it is essential that teachers appropriate methodologies that rescue the role of education as a tool for social transformation.

On the other hand, within schools, there are concrete possibilities of resistance to the logic of the BNCC through the implementation of a counter-hegemonic curriculum, which values popular knowledge and pedagogical practices focused on the reality of students. As Saviani (2013, p. 102) points out, "[...] critical education cannot be reduced to a set of techniques and methods; it must be a dialectical process that relates theory and

practice." In this context, Enguita (1989, p. 134) argues that "[...] the school becomes a space for adapting to work and not for transforming reality". In this way, educators need to find ways to reframe teaching, incorporating perspectives that stimulate critical reflection and student protagonism.

Counter-hegemonic pedagogy emerges from the need to create alternatives to traditional forms of teaching, which often reinforce the dominant ideology rather than question it. The development of pedagogical practices that challenge the status quo is essential to ensure that teaching is at the service of social transformation. This means that the school must go beyond the simple transmission of content, promoting teaching that relates theory and practice in a critical and reflective way (Saviani, 2013, p. 198).

In addition, teacher resistance can manifest itself in the adoption of liberating methodologies, which break with the traditional logic of teaching based on the transmission of knowledge. For Freire (2014, p. 82), "[...] teaching is not transferring knowledge, but creating the possibilities for its production or construction". This perspective requires a change in the relationship between teacher and student, making the student an active subject in the construction of knowledge. As Frigotto (2010, p. 115) emphasizes, "[...] The challenge of education is to form individuals capable of critically understanding the world and acting on it, and not just adapting them to the demands of the market". Therefore, it is essential that educators adopt practices that encourage the active participation of students and the problematization of social reality.

Thus, the struggle for a truly transformative education requires strategies that strengthen the collectivity and organization of teachers. The creation of spaces for debate and exchange of experiences can be a way to resist curricular impositions and build more democratic teaching alternatives. As Gentili (1998, p. 322) suggests: "[...] Privatization means redistributing and rearranging power, which makes educational privatization more diffuse and indirect than the privatization of productive institutions." This vision reinforces the need to collectively build alternatives that break with the logic of education as a commodity.

The new social movements, parties and trade unionism of a new type and the educational policies that are being developed in several capitals and numerous municipalities by these political forces, even with immense limitations and problems, signal that the alternative is underway on the political-ideological, ethical and theoretical-practical levels. [...] The crucial point to produce the alternative to neoliberalism in the outcome of the crisis in all spheres lies, as we have seen, in the capacity to manage and control public funds and in the expansion of the public sphere (Frigotto, 2010, p. 216).

In summary, transformative pedagogical practice faces significant challenges in the context of the BNCC and neoliberal policies, but it also opens up possibilities for resistance within schools. The adoption of counter-hegemonic curricula, the strengthening of teacher autonomy and the implementation of liberating methodologies are possible ways to rescue the emancipatory role of education. As Freire (2014, p. 101) states, "[...] Teaching requires the awareness that change is possible and that education can be an instrument for transforming society". In this scenario, it is essential that educators engage in the struggle for a democratic, critical school committed to the emancipation of the subjects.

CONCLUSION

The National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC) and the conception of Integral Education, when analyzed from the perspective of neoliberalism, show a fundamental contradiction between the official discourse and its practical application. Although they are presented as instruments of democratization and expansion of access to quality education, their structure and guidelines reflect a mercantile logic that reduces school education to a process of qualification for the labor market. This perspective fragments the construction of knowledge and empties the critical and emancipatory dimension of education, consolidating a pedagogical model instrumentalized by the demands of the productive system.

By emphasizing training by competencies and skills, the BNCC imposes a curricular standardization that restricts the pedagogical autonomy of teachers and school institutions. This educational model, based on efficiency and productivity, disregards regional and cultural specificities, ignoring the diversity of realities present in the Brazilian educational context. Curricular centralization not only limits creativity and innovation in teaching, but also reinforces a learning format that prioritizes the adaptation of students to market demands, to the detriment of critical training capable of fostering social transformation.

The conception of Integral Education, in turn, when incorporated into this neoliberal logic, loses its formative essence and becomes a mechanism for conforming to economic demands. Instead of promoting teaching aimed at full human development, Integral Education now favors the acquisition of instrumental skills, aligned with the ideals of entrepreneurship and flexibility in the world of work. Such a process intensifies the precariousness of education, removing from it its potential for resistance and change and transforming it into a space for training business logic.

In addition, the BNCC redefines the role of the teacher, limiting his function to the execution of pre-established guidelines and reducing his capacity for pedagogical intervention. The standardization imposed by the document restricts the possibilities of adapting the curriculum to the real needs of students, making it impossible to have a contextualized and meaningful pedagogical approach. This scenario generates a school environment focused on measurable performance, where knowledge is treated as a commodity and the teaching-learning processes are subordinated to efficiency and productivity indicators.

In this context, the school ceases to be a space for reflection and emancipation to become a place of adaptation and conformity, reproducing the structural inequalities of society. The imposition of a single curriculum and the emphasis on market-oriented skills contribute to the perpetuation of the social division of knowledge, offering different educational perspectives to different social classes. That said, while students from privileged classes have access to a broad and critical education, the majority of the population receives a technicist education, focused on work and the maintenance of the current socioeconomic order.

Given this panorama, it is essential to rethink the educational model imposed by the BNCC and by the neoliberal conception of Integral Education. The strengthening of a critical pedagogy, committed to teacher autonomy and the valorization of local knowledge, can represent a way to break with the logic of commodification of education. In addition, resistance to this model must include the defense of educational policies that promote citizenship education, based on reflection and the transformation of social reality.

Thus, education should be understood as a fundamental right and not as a service linked to market demands. In order for the BNCC and Integral Education to truly fulfill their role of democratizing education, it is necessary to resignify them from an emancipatory pedagogical project, which values diversity, the active participation of subjects in the learning process and the construction of knowledge that goes beyond the productivist logic. Only in this way will it be possible to guarantee an education that forms critical citizens, capable of questioning and transforming the structures of domination and exclusion that mark contemporary society.

REFERENCES

1. Antunes, R. (2018). O privilégio da servidão: O novo proletariado de serviços na era digital. São Paulo: Boitempo.
2. Apple, M. W. (2001). Educação e poder. Porto Alegre: Artmed.
3. Blasis, J. (2006). Currículo e identidade: Desafios e perspectivas. São Paulo: Cortez.
4. Castanho, S., & Mancini, A. (2016). Educação, diversidade e inclusão: Perspectivas e desafios. São Paulo: Cortez.
5. Dardot, P., & Laval, C. (2016). A nova razão do mundo: Ensaio sobre a sociedade neoliberal. São Paulo: Boitempo.
6. Freire, P. (2014). Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários à prática educativa (52nd ed.). São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
7. Frigotto, G. (2010). Educação e a crise do capitalismo real. São Paulo: Cortez.
8. Gadotti, M. (2009). Educação integral no Brasil: Inovações em processo. São Paulo: Cortez.
9. Gentili, P. (1998). Adeus à escola pública: A desordem neoliberal, a violência do mercado e o destino da educação das majorias. Petrópolis: Vozes.
10. Gil, A. C. (2008). Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa social (6th ed.). São Paulo: Atlas.
11. Laval, C. (2019). A escola não é uma empresa: O neoliberalismo em ataque ao ensino público. São Paulo: Boitempo.
12. Lombardi, J. C. (2010). Políticas educacionais e a crise do capital. Campinas: Autores Associados.
13. Manacorda, M. A. (2007). Marx e a pedagogia moderna. São Paulo: Cortez.
14. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2011). A ideologia alemã. São Paulo: Boitempo.
15. Mészáros, I. (2008). Educação para além do capital. São Paulo: Boitempo.
16. Saviani, D. (2013). História das ideias pedagógicas no Brasil. Campinas: Autores Associados.
17. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). "Educação comprometida": A práxis pedagógica crítica, libertária e engajada sob a lente de Bell Hooks. Caderno Pedagógico, 21(10), e8633. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n10-043>. Retrieved on January 10, 2025.

18. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). “Laços educacionais”: A família como construtora de laços para um ensino “sem preço” e uma educação transformadora. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(9), e7411. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n9-019>. Retrieved on January 10, 2025.
19. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Educação decolonial: Desafios epistêmicos e a luta contra o eurocentrismo, patriarcado e capitalismo na contemporaneidade. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(10), e9101. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n10-142>. Retrieved on January 10, 2025.
20. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). “Necropolítica negra”: O pacto da branquitude e a invisibilidade da morte de mulheres negras no Brasil a partir de uma análise crítica de Cida Bento e Achille Mbembe. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(9), e6560. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n9-036>. Retrieved on January 10, 2025.
21. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). “O espectro da cor”: Desvelando o racismo nacional na polifonia dos quilombos e das leis. *Cuadernos de Educación y Desarrollo*, 16(7), e4984. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.55905/cuadv16n7-151>. Retrieved on January 10, 2025.
22. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Educação afrodiaspórica – O encontro de saberes a partir do pensamento decolonial e da luta antirracista na perspectiva de intelectuais afrodiaspóricos. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(10), e9681. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n10-310>. Retrieved on January 10, 2025.
23. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Descolonizando os currículos – O protagonismo negro na transformação do conhecimento e dos currículos no processo de descolonização educacional brasileira. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(11), e7980. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n11-237>. Retrieved on January 11, 2025.
24. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Tecer saberes, erguer liberdades: A educação como ferramenta de emancipação na luta de mulheres negras pela visão de Ângela Davis. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(13), e11468. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n13-047>. Retrieved on January 10, 2024.
25. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Pretuguês e mefricanidade: A construção do corpo-território e da língua nas manifestações culturais afro-latino-americanas segundo Lélia Gonzalez. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(12), e10807. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n12-168>. Retrieved on January 12, 2025.
26. Dos Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2025). Condenadas pela cor – A disparidade racial na violência de gênero contra mulheres negras e a omissão das políticas públicas a partir do “fascismo da cor” no Brasil. *Aracê*, 7(1), 4407–4436. Available at: <https://periodicos.newsciencepubl.com/arace/article/view/3084>. Retrieved on February 10, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n1-260>

27. Dos Santos, A. N. S., et al. (2025). Letramento racial e educação: Formação de educadores para práticas pedagógicas antirracistas com enfoque na produção intelectual de autores “ladino-amefricanos”. *Aracê*, 7(1), 3897–3916. Available at: <https://periodicos.newsciencepubl.com/arace/article/view/3040>. Retrieved on February 10, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n1-231>
28. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Epistemologia do Sul, pós-colonialismo e descolonialidade: Explorando afinidades e divergências sob o olhar de Boaventura de Sousa Santos. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(10), e9586. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n10-277>. Retrieved on February 11, 2025.
29. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). “Consciência, autonomia e transformação”: A educação como catalisador da transformação social e da consciência crítica na perspectiva de Paulo Freire. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(9), e6729. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n9-110>. Retrieved on February 11, 2025.
30. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). “O avesso da educação”: A incorrigível lógica do neoliberalismo em ataque ao ensino público e seu impacto na educação. *Observatório de la Economía Latinoamericana*, 22(9), e6860. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.55905/oelv22n9-172>. Retrieved on February 12, 2025.
31. Santos, A. N. S. dos, et al. (2024). Entre a libertação e o engajamento – A influência de Paulo Freire na pedagogia transformadora de Bell Hooks. *Caderno Pedagógico*, 21(12), e10414. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n12-075>. Retrieved on February 12, 2025.
32. Tonet, I. (2016). *Educação contra o capital*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular.
33. Weber, M. (1969). *Economia e sociedade: Fundamentos da sociologia compreensiva*. Brasília: UnB.