



## Article

# Curriculum Guidelines for High School: the prevalence of training to the labor market

Aline Arantes do Nascimento<sup>1</sup>, Sandra Regina de Oliveira Garcia<sup>2</sup>, Eliane Cleide da Silva Czernisz<sup>3</sup>

State University of Londrina (UEL), Londrina-Pr, Brazil

### Abstract

This article discusses the National Curricular Guidelines for Secondary Education (DCNEM) from the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education — LDBEN — n. 9394/96. It aims to analyze the intentions present in DCNEM, updated by Resolution 03/2018, regarding DCNEM, proposed by Resolutions 03/1998 and 02/2012. Questioning: What are the contexts in the period of their formulations? What are the proposals for training present in DCNEM of 1998, 2012 and 2018? What are the similarities and differences between them? How do the current guidelines advance or not as a guide for pedagogical work? This is a reflection based on bibliographic research, analysis of legislation and documents. This study is important for teachers and educators who are concerned with High School education and who seek to understand the evolution of curriculum orientations throughout the history of Brazilian education. As results, the analysis highlights that DCNEM has evolved in accordance with the society and education projects of each period. It concludes that the current DCNEM express the lack of discussion and the revealed interests in the reform promoted by the Law 13415/2017, an aspect that can compromise the improvement of High School and its direct link with what is demanded by the productive sector.

**Keywords:** High schools, Educational objectives, Educational policy.

## 1. Introduction

In this text, we deal with secondary education in the context of curricular changes developed from the 1990s onwards. Since then, public education policies implemented in Brazil have been characterized by a notable concern with educational results, with efficient forms of management and with a student education that meets the needs of the job market.

---

<sup>1</sup> Basic Education Teacher at the São Bernardo do Campo Municipal Network, Master in Education. Member of the research group “State, Public Policies and Education Management”. ORCID id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5834-4143> E-mail: [alinearantesnasc@gmail.com](mailto:alinearantesnasc@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Professor at the Department of Education at the State University of Londrina, PhD in Education. Member of the research group “State, Public Policies and Education Management and of the EMPesquisa group”. ORCID id: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6684-181X> E-mail: [sandragarcia@uel.br](mailto:sandragarcia@uel.br)

<sup>3</sup> Professor at the Department of Education at the State University of Londrina, PhD in Education. Member of the research group “State, Public Policies and Education Management and of the EMPesquisa group”. ORCID id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5834-4143> E-mail: [eczernisz@uel.br](mailto:eczernisz@uel.br)

These characteristics are strongly influenced by a context of neoliberalism and capitalist crisis, and are seen reinvigorated in the current context. They are also shown in the inflation, unemployment, and social inequality indices, in the processes of flexibilization and precariousness of labor relations, in the reduction of funding for public policies, in the pressure that is put on teachers, managers and other education professionals so that they attest to the development of the pedagogical work and achieve school performance.

It is in this chaotic scenario that we also witness the interest of business groups to act on education agendas, explained in the defense of the right to education, in defense of integral education, in the link with the world of work, in the dissemination of entrepreneurship, of financial education in school and the development of a life project for students. It is also noted the significant influence of international organizations with regard to educational policies, with the defense of promoting education for all, the expansion of higher education, the advancement of distance education and the defense of the so-called "new" secondary education, developed from a reform imposed by the Temer government.

It should be noted that, if on the one hand, in the critical analysis of the issue, we see that it is a reform guided by neoliberal intentions, which aims at the appropriation of secondary education as part of a lucrative business and component of a capitalist society project, on the other hand, constant attention is needed to the directions that secondary education has followed. For this, education should be designed based on other assumptions and curriculum composition; an expensive and necessary task for all teachers and educators in the country who really care about the direction of Brazilian public education and the future of youth.

The Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN) — Law n. 9394/96 —, which made secondary education part of basic education, explained both the interests related to education for the job market, and instruction that would make it possible to understand the foundations present in the productive process; duality very well observed by Saviani (1997). The LDBEN is today completely re-characterized by Law 13.415/2017, which was preceded by a Provisional Measure (MP) 746/2016. This period, since the approval of LDBEN 9394/96 until today, when we just received Ordinance n. 521 — of July 13, 2021 — which establishes the National Schedule for the implementation of the so-called New Secondary Education, outlines a process of struggles, both in defense of a secondary education committed to social transformation, and the defense of flexible education and developed under the strong influence of market assumptions. The purpose of this text is precisely to make notes on the education proposals based on the main documents guiding the changes since the LDBEN, with emphasis on the National Curriculum Guidelines for secondary education of 1998, 2012 and 2018.

In the analysis we propose, we noticed that in a period of approximately 30 years, many changes involved high school. An LDBEN and three curricular guidelines were approved, which clearly shows that Secondary Education (ME) is a formative stage of interest and in dispute. As we consider that the intentions for education in EM constitute important data that need to be studied, we ask: what are the proposals for education arising from the contexts and printed in the National Curriculum Guidelines for Secondary Education (DCNEM) of 1998, 2012

and 2018? What are the similarities and differences between them? How do current curricular guidelines advance or not as a guideline for pedagogical work?

In this context, we verified the importance of the curriculum so that we understand it “[...] as being the set of activities [...] that are carried out with a view to a certain purpose” (SAVIANI, 2016, p. 55). We start from the understanding that such guidelines bring with them defenses and perspectives for education that deserve to be studied — the reason for this text. We understand that this is an important reflection for researchers, teachers and high school students because it is an analysis of the intentions observed in the reformulations that occurred over the years. We believe that such an understanding is essential so that the school can think about maturing reflections and building paths with the intention that the educational work can be improved, aiming at the development of an education with more quality; action that does not take place without a historical analysis of the intentions present in the political and pedagogical directions for this educational stage.

The reflections presented come from bibliographical studies, from authors who develop reflections guided by the approach of historical materialism and are high school researchers, who analyze the formative perspective of curricular guidelines in relation to the structuring of work and the neoliberal context, to envision the possibilities of an effectively emancipating education for EM students. For this understanding, it is necessary to analyze the legislation that originates and directs the educational policies implemented in schools, and in this way bring with them the guidelines from the different groups and defenses that were at the base of their formulation, synthesizing the expression of social struggles for the defense of education, aspects that can be verified in the analyzes of Ciavatta and Ramos (2012), and Kuenzer (2005; 2007), Frigotto (2015) and Gonçalves (2017).

We understand that such procedures are components of bibliographical research, which, according to Lima and Mioto (2007), enables the deepening of the analysis based on questioning the subject, in its revision and theoretical re-elaboration. Likewise, we emphasize that the analysis of legislation makes it possible to recover the interests present at the time of approval (explained in its description) and to understand them, as observed by Castanho (2019, p. 07): “the context of production/elaboration of a law , the interests that are involved, the mechanisms for its achievement or execution, are fundamental steps to explain its real dimension, as a historical source, loaded with social memory”.

We observed that the DCNEM are normative documents, which demarcate intentions for school education. They relate to the historical moment, government perspectives and social struggles. Evangelista (2009, p. 3) comments that “[...] a document is history. No investigation is possible that goes beyond the historical projects it expresses”. The author adds that: “[...] Documents offer clues, signs, traces and understanding the historical meanings of the materials found is its task. It will be important to understand its position in relation to its history, the history of its theme and the history of the production of its empirical work” (EVANGELISTA, 2009, p. 06). We understand that the author's arguments contribute to the analysis of resolutions that establish curricular guidelines for secondary education.

The discussion is organized in three moments: we begin by exploring the contextual characteristics and educational proposals for high school based on

LDBEN 9394/96 and the 1998 DCNEM. Next we address the context of discussion, proposal and approval of the 2012 DCNEM with its respective education proposal for high school; and the 2018 DCNEM, considered an update.

## **2. Proposals for education in High School in the context of LDBEN 9394/96 and DCNEM of 1998**

Defenses for education in High School have been influenced by the economic and political changes observed, with greater intensity, since the 1990s, when secondary education visibly begins to follow guidelines aimed at education for the market. It is a period in which there were changes in the production pattern; a moment of restructuring the forms of organization and management of production, motivated by an intense process of crisis and the need for capitalist expansion, which modified the modes of production, the commitments of the State and also the ways of life of the population.

This period became known as a moment of development of flexible accumulation which, according to Harvey (1995, p. 40), “[...] is based on the flexibility of work processes, labor markets, products and consumption patterns”. According to the author, it was a period that affected the development of countries, expanded the service sector and the industrial sector, improved forms of communication and increased pressure on the workforce. Harvey highlights the restructuring that took place in the labor market; aspect that we consider here as a justification for changes that are being processed in current secondary education. The flexibilization affected, as we can see in Harvey's studies, forms of hiring, working hours, labor rights and union organization. When analyzing this period, Harvey (1995, p. 144) points out: “The current tendency of the labor markets is to reduce the number of 'core' workers and increasingly employ a workforce that enters easily and is fired without costs when things get bad”.

It should be noted that, in the 1970s, compulsory professionalization with an emphasis on technical education was developed in Brazil. The objective was to prepare, in public high schools of that period, part of the work force necessary for the country's economic development, driven by the reinforcement of the idea of human capital formation, whose focus was based on the understanding of education with economic return. We understand that the significant emphasis on technical education marks this formative stage that today corresponds to high school, as a moment that aims to educate for work and prepare the professional contingents that the market requires, even if this is not the students' desire.

Aimed at serving the labor market, such education is accentuated in the context of neoliberalism, whose influences can be seen in the government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso, which, guided by the ideology that reinforces individual responsibilities in the face of the competitive economic context, seeks efficiency, effectiveness and emphasizes the guiding competitiveness of the state apparatus. In this context, it is required the education of students focused on the development of skills and competences, aiming to serve the market and the competitive world, with the objective, as observed by Ciavatta and Ramos (2012, p. 17), “[. . .] the formation of flexible personalities to adapt to an unstable and uncertain reality”.

Gentili (2005) highlights this aspect when mentioning employability, as does Kuenzer (2005) when commenting that the new forms of discipline arising

from the productive world affect the development of subjectivities. Kuenzer (2005, p. 82) states:

[...] that the purpose of the pedagogical work, articulated to the capitalist work process, is the discipline for social and productive life, in accordance with the specificities that the production processes, as a result of the development of the productive forces, assume.

According to Kuenzer (2007), prior qualification matters less than adaptability. For her, the discourse on the need to raise levels of knowledge and the ability to work intellectually, based on flexible accumulation, clearly shows that, in fact, what is sought is to have “[...] available for consumption , in production chains, the workforce with unequal and differentiated qualifications that, given the different forms of contracting, subcontracting and other precarious agreements”, ensures productivity and precariousness of work. (KUENZER, 2007, p. 1168)

The proposals adopted by international organizations, such as the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (1995, p. 38) combine with this period. , who defend the necessary productive restructuring with equity, for which the action of a State that can:

[...]support the business base built in previous periods, so that it fully exercises its responsibilities in the productive sphere, and furthermore promotes the generation of international levels of competitiveness, at the same time that it seeks to establish a greater degree of equality between citizens (compensatory function of the state ).

ECLAC and UNESCO (1995) recognize that there has been an increase in access to secondary education in Latin American and Caribbean countries, but note that this process has implications for the quality of education and point out the need for:

Alongside the transmission of skills and abilities, in addition to the willingness to take risks and make decisions that facilitate the productive integration of students into today's world, it is necessary to educate them in the social values inherent in modern citizenship, the foundation of the democratic system and development with equity. (ECLAC; UNESCO, 1995, p. 54).

In addition to such an indication for the education, the organizations also observe that there has been a “curriculum obsolescence”; an aspect that, in the view of ECLAC and UNESCO (1995, p. 58), promoted a distancing of the curricular structure of secondary education in relation to the development of the economy and society. They also note that “[...] there is often a lack of correspondence between the studies completed and the actual occupation” (ECLAC, UNESCO, 1995, p. 58-59).

It appears that curricula suffer interference, as observed by Ciavatta and Ramos (2012), who highlight, in an analysis of the “guidelines era”, the global

tendency for the curriculum to be internally regulated by international reforms, suggested by bodies external to the country.

As can be seen, the alterations proposed for EM, in the 1990s, suffered external influences, directed education towards the market, in the midst of oppositions that signaled another direction for education; aspect that we cannot ignore here. On this, Ciavatta and Ramos (2012, p. 16) comment, when referring to the re-democratization process, which brought the “[...] debate on a new type of education that incorporated political dimensions committed to citizenship”. We understand that this desire was explained by an “[...] important social struggle for a unitary, technological and polytechnic education project, aiming at the omnilateral education of workers and having work as an educational principle” (CIAVATTA; RAMOS, 2012, p 18).

The result of such attempts is expressed in the LDBEN, in article 35 of the original text of Law n. 9394/96, approved in 1996, in the wording of items I and IV. Despite this demarcation, we found that the same article maintains, in the wording of one of the items, the appointment of education for adaptation with flexibility to serve the market; aspect that marks the different educational projects that gave rise to LDBEN n. 9394/96. It is about reinforcing the structural duality and, at the same time, expression of “[...] lack of identity [...]” and “[...] point of great tension in the educational debate [...] ”, as commented by Gonçalves (2017).

Frigotto (2015, p. 09) corroborates the reflection on the school as an institution of social maintenance, stating that:

In its genesis, it constitutes the institution that became necessary in terms of socialization and reproduction of knowledge, ideas and values of the bourgeois class, although, as a society of antagonistic classes, the school is also a space of struggle for the working class.

What is observed is a social division of the school similar to the social division of labor in society. The school, due to reproduction, assumes the duality that presents itself as “[...] the classical, formative school, with a broad scientific and cultural base, for the ruling classes, and another pragmatic, instrumental, training restricted professional education and from the perspective of market demands, for workers” (FRIGOTTO, 2015, p. 10). It is with this orientation that curricula under neoliberalism is established, according to Gentili (1997, p. 53); a process that has been developing since the end of the last century, which maintains a similarity between restaurant menus and the “[...] neotechnicist strategies of curriculum reform [...]”.

The analysis raises important elements that confirm the intentions of a minimized education focused on the labor market.

It is important to highlight that the DCNEM resolutions bring the synthesis of the opinion that the commission established by the Basic Education Chamber prepares. It is clear, therefore, that the Ministry of Education (MEC) indicates the concept that will be defined in the Guidelines. In this way, we can verify, in Opinion n. 15/98 — whose rapporteur was Guiomar Namó de Mello — that EM is presented as a demand “[...] to ascend to more advanced levels of the education system [...]” and that the aspiration of young people, in addition to of the process of urbanization and economic growth, it focuses on the growing

appreciation of education “[...] as a strategy for improving life and employability [...]” (BRASIL, 1998, p. 08).

The study of Resolution n. 03/1998 allowed verifying that it is composed of 15 articles presented sequentially. In them, there is an emphasis on the areas of knowledge and what should be taught in each of them for the common national base and for the diversified part of the curriculum. This Resolution is also distinguished by bringing a detail of the aesthetic, political and ethical values present in LDBEN n. 9394/96; these values which, according to the text of article 3, are reinforced:

Art. 3rd For the observance of the values mentioned in the previous article, the administrative and pedagogical practice of the teaching systems and their schools, the forms of coexistence in the school environment, the mechanisms of formulation and implementation of educational policy, the criteria for allocation of resources, the organization of the curriculum and teaching-learning situations and assessment procedures should be consistent with aesthetic, political and ethical principles,[...].

In addition to this particularity, Resolution n. 03/1998 highlights the principles that will structure the EM curricula: “Art. 6th The pedagogical principles of Identity, Diversity and Autonomy, Interdisciplinarity and Contextualization will be adopted as structuring of the secondary education curricula”. It is observed that the approach to the principles and concepts present in this Resolution is visibly broad. Its text develops in such a way as to deepen these foundations, making clear its consonance with LDBEN n. 9394/96. It should be noted that the pedagogical principles are fundamental for the practice that will be developed in the classroom and for the meaning of school education, since it is essential to have the principles as a guideline to develop a work with the different publics that reach the school.

With regard to curriculum organization, the 1998 guidelines indicate that the curriculum will be organized from a common national base, which, according to Resolution n. 03/1998, is supported by three areas, as highlighted in article 10: I- Languages, Codes and their Technologies; II- Natural Sciences, Mathematics and its Technologies; III- Human Sciences and their Technologies.

It is verified in Resolution n. 03/1998 that the modern foreign language is presented as mandatory or optional and makes up the workload of the diversified part of the curriculum. The total workload of secondary education is presented in article 11 of Resolution n. 03/1998 and it is established that: “III - the common national base must comprise, at least, 75% (seventy-five percent) of the minimum time of 2,400 (two thousand and four hundred) hours, established by law as a workload for the high school;”.

Resolution no. 03/1998 points out that, among the basic skills to be developed by students, continuous learning and the development of autonomy and critical thinking are indicated.

The “understanding of the meaning of the sciences, letters and arts and the process of transformation of society and culture [...]” is also highlighted, in addition to highlighting the understanding of the guiding principles of modern production as a form of insertion in work . The Resolution's indications are directed to the development of learning and skills that enable the exercise of

citizenship. In this sense, there is also the appreciation of the teacher's work, provided for the formulation of the pedagogical proposal in article 7 of Resolution n. 03/1998, when there is a reinforcement of the teaching role. These highlighted aspects give us clues about the indications made for the formation of high school students in the period.

It should be noted that the DCNEM structured concurrently with the National Curriculum Guidelines for Professional and Technological Education – (DCNEPT), opened the space for this stage, mainly in the modality of professional education, to induce the creation of a large technical education market with the expansion of the offer in the private network, an issue debated and criticized by researchers from GT 09 of the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Education (ANPEd). Unfortunately, this privatist view and direction of education was ensured by the advance of the neoliberal policy of a minimal state.

### **3. The 2012 DCNEM and the proposals for education in high school in updating the DCNEM in 2018**

It should be noted that the MEC sent the Council a triggering document that was considered as a base text by the DCNEM rapporteur. This document represented the synthesis of debates held since 2003, when the Ministry of Education began a process of discussions on secondary education; it is enough to remember that the book *Ensino Médio, Ciência, Cultura e Trabalho*, edited by Frigotto and Ciavatta (2004), contains central elements that are also presented as the central axis of the 2012 guidelines.

In contrast, the update of the DCNEM that took place in 2018 meant a resumption of the DCNEM Opinion n. 15/1998 and Resolution n. 03/1998 and an alignment with law n. 13415/17, without any debate and listening process; it was “updated”, being mischaracterized, returning to the principles present in the 1990s and creating false similarities.

Opinion no. 05/2011 was rapporteur by José Fernandes de Lima, who points out that secondary education goes beyond professional education, as it “[...] achieves the construction of citizenship [...]”. For him, young people need the school to “[...] expand their horizons and provide them with intellectual autonomy [...]”, thus guaranteeing the exercise of social rights (BRASIL, 2011, p. 01).

A change can be seen here in the direction of secondary education, which is aimed at strengthening the intelligentsia; path that, to be followed, requires the in-depth study of subjects contemplated in disciplines that constitute the fundamentals of EM, such as: Philosophy, Sociology, History, Geography, Arts and other contents that are addressed as transversal in the curriculum in question.

In Resolution n. 02/2012, 23 articles and a text subdivided into titles and chapters are presented. Title I corresponds to the object of the Resolution and legal and conceptual reference. Title II highlights the curricular organization and forms of offer. Title III details the political-pedagogical project and the teaching systems. In this Resolution, the importance and visibility attributed to the political-pedagogical project of the school units are quite notorious; aspect that can be proven in several articles. For us, this characteristic gives the Resolution the importance and appreciation of the role of school units in the elaboration and



development of the political-pedagogical project. Such valuation imprints the mark of autonomy in the development of the pedagogical work of the school units, as well as guarantees, in the text of the Resolution, the fulfillment of the principle of democratic management.

Resolution no. 03/2018 presents 38 articles and is subdivided into titles I, II, III and IV. Title I corresponds to the object and the reference. Title II highlights the curricular organization and forms of offer. Title III presents the teaching systems and the pedagogical proposal. Title IV contains general and transitional provisions. Opinion no. 03/2018 had Rafael Esmeraldo Lucchesi Ramacciotti as rapporteur.

Sometimes, excerpts from Opinion n. 15 of 1998, which corresponds to Resolution n. 03/1998. This data demonstrates that the advances contained in the regulations — Opinion n. 05/2011 and Resolution n. 02/2012 — were not considered, prevailing, in the current text of the DCNEM, the strengthening of preparation for employability. This characteristic is present in the educational policies that were developed in the context of neoliberalism and it is a characteristic that pleases the interests of the business community, which will be able to participate in the development of secondary education, protected by the regulations.

Differently, regarding the concept of secondary education, the 2012 guidelines establish in art. 3 that “Secondary Education is a social right of each person and a duty of the State in its public and free offer to all”. The 2018 guidelines already indicate the promotion and collaboration of society; an aspect that today becomes very visible with the participation of the business community in high school educational agendas. Let's see what an excerpt from Article 3 says:

Secondary education is everyone's right and the duty of the State and the family and will be promoted and encouraged with the collaboration of society, aiming at the full development of the person, his preparation for the exercise of citizenship and his qualification for work, as provided for in art. . 205 of the Federal Constitution and in art. 2 of Law No. 9.394/1996 (LDB).

While it was verified in the 2012 DCNEM — a reinforcement of the constitutional precept of the right to education, as well as the development of citizenship, also described in the LDBEN when mentioning the EM — in its update in 2018, the public responsibility in its promotion was not more central. This is a fundamental aspect in the analysis of the guidelines, which clearly shows the openness to other participation in the definition of the course of secondary education. We recall, however, that the 2018 DCNEM update changed LDBEN n. 9394/96, a law that was presented with the marks of the hybridity of conceptions that represent the divergences of the defenses of education corresponding to the desires of antagonistic classes, present in the projects that originated them, but that were at least debated with society from their representatives.

We note that Resolution n. 03/2018 maintains some excerpts from Resolution n. 02/2012 — despite being reframed — in view of all the content presented, which visibly focuses on explaining the specificities of secondary education in accordance with Law n. 13,415/2017. Unlike Resolution n. 02/2012, Resolution no. 03/2018 never mentions the term “pedagogical-political project”

and uses “pedagogical project” as a reference for the development of school activities, which we understand can compromise and reduce the meaning of pedagogical work — an action policy to be defined by the collective of school units within what article 206 of the Federal Constitution (1988) proclaims.

It is important to remember that Law n. 13,415/2017, as already mentioned, originates from MP n. 746/2016 and amends LDBEN n. 9394/96. We also point out that the DCNEM, made official by Resolution n. 03/2018, make up the tripod of the EM reform together with Law n. 13,415/2017 and with the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC); a subject discussed by Silva (2018). In this sense, we understand that the term used in the Resolution as “updating” of the DCNEM cannot be naively understood when it is verified, in the letter of this Resolution, only as changes in the organization, conception and foundation of the EM, but as an alteration of a project of education that corresponds to a conservative and limited model of society. Returning to Evangelista's arguments about which documents carry with them the history of their creation, it is necessary to verify the approval of this resolution, also considering the intricacies that surrounded it and resulted in its proposition.

As for the concept of curriculum, it is not defined in the 1998 Resolution, as it is highlighted in the 2012 and 2018 Resolutions. Article 6 of the 2012 Resolution says:

The curriculum is conceptualized as the proposal for educational action constituted by the selection of knowledge constructed by society, expressed through school practices that unfold around relevant and pertinent knowledge, permeated by social relations, articulating students' experiences and knowledge and contributing to the development of their identities and cognitive and socio-affective conditions<sup>4</sup>.

In the update of the 2018 Resolution, in article 7, the same wording is maintained, changing only the last word, which changes from “socio-affective” to “socio-emotional”. We attribute this fact to the strengthening of skills development; this aspect is also visible in Law n. 13,415/2017; a formative perspective that accompanies the interests for the formation of workers, according to the business sector has been waving.

The direction of secondary education in the 2012 Resolution, article 7, highlights the “common national base and the diversified part” in the constitution of a whole “[...] in order to guarantee both knowledge and common knowledge necessary for all students, as well as education that considers diversity and local characteristics and regional specificities”. It is also noteworthy that the said Resolution, in Article 2, mentions the “principles, fundamentals and procedures” that should “guide educational public policies” contained in the General National Curriculum Guidelines for Basic Education (DCNGEB). In this educational axis for the DCNEM, the reinforcement of human rights can be seen, which is a guiding principle of the guidelines, as well as the themes: diversity, environment,

---

<sup>4</sup> A Palavra como está na citação, escrita com hífen e acento, era utilizada antes do Novo Acordo Ortográfico. Essa palavra, após o novo Acordo Ortográfico é escrita sem hífen e sem acento na primeira vogal “o”: “socioafetivas”.

technology, culture and work. With this direction, the curriculum has four areas of knowledge highlighted in Resolution n. 02/2012: “Languages, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Human Sciences”.

In the guidelines updated by Resolution n. 03/2018, the education itineraries appear as part of the organization of the curriculum. Article 10 recommends: “High school curricula are made up of general basic education and education itinerary, inseparably.” In article 11, basic general education has the reinforcement of added skills and abilities from the BNCC, which was approved in 2017, ratifying the reform process. In this article, the following areas of knowledge are emphasized: I- Languages and their Technologies; II- Mathematics and its Technologies; III- Natural Sciences and their Technologies and; IV- Applied Human and Social Sciences. We understand that such indications show that, in the DCNEM of 2012, there was an intentionality for the unity of education, without valuing the fragmentation between areas; aspect seen in the 2018 DCNEM update which, in addition to not offering the student the possibility of attending all itineraries, limits their education.

As for the modern foreign language, in Resolution n. 02/2012, it also occupies a place in the optional workload, one of which is chosen by the school community and another is offered within the possibilities of the school. This data shows that the school community will be able to express itself, choosing the language of interest; important factor in meeting regional diversity, as well as a way of exercising democratic school management. As for Resolution n. 03/2018, highlights that the modern foreign language will be English and a second one may be optionally offered: Spanish. This leads us to question the place attributed to the school community in this process, since, sometimes, the alterations of the so-called “new high school” were presented to Brazilian society as a way of enabling students to choose their education paths. In addition, it leaves room for questions about the role of the community in the face of the precept of democratic management of public schools.

Regarding the workload, Resolution n. 02/2012, which details it better, generally advocated in article 14, item II that:

II - in regular High School, the minimum duration is 3 (three) years, with a minimum total workload of 2,400 (two thousand and four hundred) hours, having as reference an annual workload of 800 (eight hundred) hours, distributed over at least 200 (two hundred) days of effective school work;

In addition to the general definition, the Resolution also specifically establishes, in item VI of article 14, minimum workloads of:

- a) 3,200 (three thousand and two hundred) hours, in regular high school integrated with high school technical professional education;
- b) 2,400 (two thousand, four hundred) hours, in Youth and Adult Education integrated with Professional Technical Education of Middle Level, respecting the minimum of 1,200 (one thousand, two hundred) hours of general education;
- c) 1,400 (one thousand and four hundred) hours, in Youth and Adult Education integrated with initial and continuing education

or professional qualification, respecting the minimum of 1,200 (one thousand and two hundred) hours of general education;

In Resolution n. 03/2018, article 17, paragraph 2, we found that it is mentioned that:

§ 2nd In daytime high school, the minimum duration is 3 (three) years, with a minimum total workload of 2,400 (two thousand and four hundred) hours, having as reference an annual workload of 800 (eight hundred) hours, distributed over at least at least 200 (two hundred) days of effective school work, considering that:  
I - the total workload must be increased to 3,000 (three thousand) hours by the beginning of the 2022 school year;  
II - the total annual workload must be progressively increased to 1,400 (one thousand four hundred) hours.

For the night period as well as for Youth and Adult Education (EJA), the Resolution in question suggests a differentiated methodological organization, in order to comply with the guidelines. In the case of the latter, in addition, 80% of its program can be carried out at a distance; aspect that, in this resolution, we understand to characterize a flexibilization of the offer.

It is important to highlight that working students are the ones who most need to study at night or in Youth and Adult Education. In both cases, the impact of secondary education reform will be immense; first, because there has been a movement since the Bill (PL) n. 6840/13 prohibiting night schooling for children under 18, making their migration to EJA compulsory and taking away the student's right to continue in what is called "regular education". The second aggravating factor is the possibility of offering 80% of distance learning through EJA. Most of the time, working students come from interrupted schooling trajectories, mainly due to the need to enter the labor market. The "new secondary education" removes from these students the possibility of integral human formation and what remains is an education at the service of the productive sector; in this sense, the concept of lifelong education is strengthened to the detriment of permanent education.

With regard to teaching at EM, in the transitional provisions of Resolution n. 03/2018, the teaching practice by people of notorious knowledge stands out in the itinerary of professional education. This indication proves the approximation of secondary education to the market, at the same time that it fails to value the need for academic education, including teaching in the aforementioned education itinerary. It should be noted that being a teacher requires having specific knowledge and relating it to the totality of a pedagogical proposal, it requires understanding the student as a person who learns and develops from year to year. In addition, it presupposes understanding that learning is related to psychological, philosophical, cultural, historical and pedagogical issues. A professional without teaching education does not have such capacity.

Teaching is mentioned in Resolution n. 02/2012, in article 18, described as a requirement for the development of the DCNEM: "III - teachers with working hours and education, including continuing education, suitable for the development of the curriculum, as well as managers and other professionals of the school units". This item shows the appreciation of initial and continuing

education for teaching in EM. In view of the data verified in Resolutions n. 03/1998 and no. 02/2012, we can conclude that Resolution n. 03/2018 recedes in relation to the appreciation of teaching and teaching performance in EM.

With regard to comprehensive education, we found that, in Resolution n. 03/1998, there is no reference to the concept. Resolution no. 02/2012 describes comprehensive education as a basis for the development of ME, which should be provided for in the political-pedagogical project. Differently, in Resolution n. 03/2018, article 6, item I, it is conceptualized that: “integral education: is the intentional development of the physical, cognitive and socio-emotional aspects of the student through significant educational processes that promote autonomy, citizen behavior and protagonism in the construction of your life project;”.

Some issues of this normative narrative need to be problematized. One of them is integral education, aiming to develop the physical, cognitive and socio-emotional aspects, in a context of reducing the approach of fundamental knowledge by suppressing disciplines that now only present themselves as contents — as is the case of Arts, Philosophy, Sociology, just to exemplify. It is even more complicated to think that such approaches will enable the development of protagonism and the construction of a life project; actions that require not only robust education, but also psychological, cognitive, cultural and social maturity. The perspective of integral education, in our opinion, cannot be considered only by the description in the regulations; needs to be discussed in a reasoned way in pedagogical projects.

The data collected in the analyzed Resolutions show that the updating of the ongoing DCNEM is characterized by curricular flexibility, by the flexibility of education and teaching practice when it comes to education itineraries. It is also characterized by reinforcement with regard to the development of skills and education, which has the capitalist market as a reference, as a result of the approval of Law n. 13415/2017.

#### **4. Final considerations**

At the end of this article — which aimed to analyze the intentions present in the DCNEM updated by Resolution n. 03/2018 in relation to the guidelines proposed by Resolutions n. 03/1998 and no. 02/2012 — we verified that, after more than twenty years of curricular alterations, the Brazilian ME maintains, in the DCNEM that support it, the direction for the formation that aims to contemplate the attendance of the interests of the capitalist market, to educate labor force that is either for hiring or as a reserve to regulate wages and hiring. From these reasons derive the emphasis on socio-emotional skills and on building a project for the future aligned with the professional perspective. This guideline, verified in the developed analysis, shows that ME still requires attention because it is an essential educational step for the schooling and development of citizenship of young Brazilians.

It is possible to verify in the analysis of Resolutions n. 03/1998, 02/2012 and 03/2018 totally different educational proposals with regard to the educational perspectives that each one prescribes. We understand that, among them, Resolution n. 02/2012 was the one that brought the greatest progress by contemplating the centrality of the political-pedagogical project, the protagonism of teachers, students, the school community, as well as the defense of the

foundation that the ME must have, without regressing in the aspects commented in what refers to constitutional rights.

It should also be noted that, by the legislation in force for the EM, it is evident the absence of debates that permeated its reform, with the approval of the MP and with the publication of new guidelines that altered the education law and that were also presented without opportunity for dialogues that privileged social actors, historically committed to education. This highlights, once again, the authoritarian characteristic assumed by the reform from the beginning.

We understand that the ME currently needed is not what has a proposal that aims to format the school to meet the interests of the market, developing skills that it needs; but yes, what seems more appropriate to us is a proposal fundamentally aimed at promoting an education that provides young people with the real development of citizenship, that provides opportunities for the continuity of studies and that also aims, with this, to strengthen the scientific and technological development of the country. It is justified, as the adaptation of EM to immediate interests has promoted the contempt of important disciplines such as Philosophy and Sociology and valued itineraries that fragment the knowledge of essential contents for students.

Such curricular aspects only legitimize a education that, more and more, is developed to meet the immediate needs of the market, enshrining a project of society in which few possibilities are offered for the development of effective citizenship. There are few chances of a schooling that allows students to trace educational trajectories that favor them to deepen their studies that allow them to think, understand, question and project the world beyond the itineraries that limit the broad human formation.

If we analyze what is currently happening, we will see that the connection with the productive world is a subject present in the evaluation and justification for the alteration of secondary education by Law n. 13,415/2017. Among the arguments for the reform, the criticism that high school was content-oriented stands out, which made education related to the job market impossible. This justification caused some disciplines to be minimized, transformed into subjects to be contemplated, reducing the possibilities of reflection on important contents of disciplines considered the basis for human formation; a path that becomes clearer with the DCNEM.

One can see, in the development of educational policy, the strong intention to make education an instrument of subservience to the capitalist market — a simple element of regulation of sociability. In this sense, we understand that there is a clear dispute between hegemonic forces for education, which “learned” to place the school in this limbo. This aspect also promotes a re-signification of the school as a field of dispute and as a promoter of its redemption to capital in the production of individuals who enter it with the most diverse perspectives for life and leave it, sometimes only prepared to occupy jobs that maintain and/or reproduce the fulfillment of regional market demands, especially when we think of secondary education integrated with technical education.

## References

ANPED.GT 09- Nota de repúdio às Novas Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Educação Profissional e Tecnológica (DCNEPT0Resolução CNE/CP nº01/2021).

Disponível em: [www.anped.org.br/news/nota-de-repudio-novas-diretrizes-curriculares-nacionais-para-educacao-profissional-e](http://www.anped.org.br/news/nota-de-repudio-novas-diretrizes-curriculares-nacionais-para-educacao-profissional-e). Acesso em 12 de julho de 2021.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular**. Educação é a Base. Disponível em: [http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/images/BNCC\\_EI\\_EF\\_110518\\_versaofinal\\_site.pdf](http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/images/BNCC_EI_EF_110518_versaofinal_site.pdf). Acesso em: 20 jun. 2019.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Câmara de Educação Básica, **Parecer N. 03/2018**. Atualização das Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para o Ensino Médio, observadas as alterações introduzidas na LDB pela Lei n. 13.415/2017. Disponível em: <http://www.abmes.org.br/arquivos/legislacoes/Parecer-cne-ceb-003-2018-11-08.pdf>. Acesso em: 01 ago. 2019.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Câmara de Educação Básica. Parecer N. 05/2011. **Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para o Ensino Médio**. Disponível em: [http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&alias=9915-pceb005-11-1-1&Itemid=30192](http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=9915-pceb005-11-1-1&Itemid=30192). Acesso em: 01 ago. 2019.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Câmara de Educação Básica. Parecer N. 15/98. **Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para o Ensino Médio**. Disponível em: [http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&alias=853-parecer-ceb-15-98-pdf&category\\_slug=documentos-pdf&Itemid=30192](http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=853-parecer-ceb-15-98-pdf&category_slug=documentos-pdf&Itemid=30192). Acesso em: 01 ago. 2019.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Câmara de Educação Básica. **Resolução Nº 2, de 30 de janeiro de 2012**. Define Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para o Ensino Médio. Brasília, DF, 2012. Disponível em: [http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&alias=9864-rceb002-12&Itemid=30192](http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=9864-rceb002-12&Itemid=30192). Acesso em: 02 jul. 2019.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional da Educação. **Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais Gerais da Educação Básica**. Brasília, DF, 2013. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/docman/julho-2013-pdf/13677-diretrizes-educacao-basica-2013-pdf/file>. Acesso em: 30 ago. 2019.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996**. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Disponível em: [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/LEIS/L9394.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/LEIS/L9394.htm). Acesso em: 30 ago. 2019.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Resolução CEB N. 03**, de 26 de junho de 1998. Institui Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para o Ensino Médio. Brasília, DF, 1998. Disponível em: [http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/rceb03\\_98.pdf](http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/rceb03_98.pdf). Acesso em: 02 jul. 2019.

BRASIL. Presidência da República. **Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988**. Disponível em: [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/constituicao/constituicao.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicao.htm). Acesso em: 30 ago. 2019.

BRASIL. Presidência da República. **Lei n. 9131, de 24 de novembro de 1995.** Altera dispositivos da Lei n. 4024 de 20 de dezembro de 1961 e dá outras providências. Brasília, 1995. Disponível em: [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/Leis/L9131.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/Leis/L9131.htm). Acesso em: 25 jul. 2019.

BRASIL. Presidência da República. **Lei N. 13.415, de 16 de fevereiro de 2017.** Disponível em: [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/\\_ato2015-2018/2017/lei/l13415.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2017/lei/l13415.htm). Acesso em: 21 abr. 2018.

BRASIL. Presidência da República. **Medida Provisória Nº 746, de 22 de dezembro de 2016.** Institui a Política de Fomento à Implementação de Escolas de Ensino Médio em Tempo Integral, altera a Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Portal da Presidência da República. Brasília, D.F., 23 set. 2016. Disponível em: [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/\\_Ato2015-2018/2016/Mpv/mpv746.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2015-2018/2016/Mpv/mpv746.htm). Acesso em: 25 maio 2018.

CASTANHA, A. P. A legislação como memória educacional, p. 1-18, 2019. Disponível em: **Anais do IX Seminário Nacional do Centro de Memória UNICAMP.** [https://www.ixseminarionacionalcmu.com.br/resources/anais/8/1563560944\\_ARQUIVO\\_ALEGISLACAOCOMOMEMORIAEDUCACIONAL2.pdf](https://www.ixseminarionacionalcmu.com.br/resources/anais/8/1563560944_ARQUIVO_ALEGISLACAOCOMOMEMORIAEDUCACIONAL2.pdf). Acesso em: 15 de junho de 2021.

CEPAL/UNESCO. **Educação e Conhecimento:** eixo da transformação produtiva com equidade. Brasília: IPEA/CEPAL/INEP, 1995.

CIAVATTA, M.; RAMOS, M. A “era das diretrizes”: a disputa pelo projeto de educação dos mais pobres. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 17, n. 49, p. 11-37, jan-abr., 2012. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbedu/v17n49/a01v17n49.pdf>. Acesso em: 28 jul. 2019.

DELORS, J. **Educação: Um Tesouro a descobrir.** Relatório para a UNESCO da Comissão Internacional sobre Educação para o século XXI. Disponível em: [http://dhnet.org.br/dados/relatorios/a\\_pdf/r\\_unesco\\_educ\\_tesouro\\_descobrir.pdf](http://dhnet.org.br/dados/relatorios/a_pdf/r_unesco_educ_tesouro_descobrir.pdf). Acesso em: 28 ago. 2019.

EVANGELISTA, O. Apontamentos para o trabalho com documentos de política educacional. **I Colóquio A Pesquisa em Trabalho, Educação e Políticas Educacionais.** Belém: UFPA, 2009.

FRIGOTTO, G.; CIAVATTA, M. (Orgs). **Ensino Médio, Cultura e Trabalho.** Brasília, MEC, SEMPEC, 2004.

FRIGOTTO, G. Contexto e sentido ontológico, epistemológico e político da inversão da relação educação e trabalho para trabalho e educação. **Revista Contemporânea de Educação.** v. 10, nº 20, jul./dez., 2015. Disponível em: <file:///C:/Users/aline/Downloads/Frigotto%20%20e%20a%20Teoria%20do%20Capital%20Humano.pdf>. Acesso em: 28 dez. 2017.

GENTILI, P. La McDonaldización de la escuela: a propósito de “Educación, identidad y papas fritas baratas”. APPLE, Michael W.; SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu; GENTILI, Pablo. **Cultura, política y currículo: Ensayos sobre la crisis de la escuela pública.** Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada S.A., 1997. p. 41-61.



GENTILI, P. Três teses sobre a relação trabalho e educação em tempos neoliberais. In: LOMBARDI, J. C. SAVIANI, D. SANFELICI, J. L. (Orgs). **Capitalismo, Trabalho e Educação**. Campinas, SP: Autores associados, HistedBr, 2005. p. 45-59.

GONÇALVES, S. da R. V. Interesses Mercadológicos e o “novo” ensino médio. **Revista Retratos da Escola**. Brasília, v. 11, n. 20, p. 131-145, jan-jun, 2017. Disponível em: <http://www.esforce.org.br>. Acesso em: 30 ago. 2019.

HARVEY, D. A transformação político-econômica do capitalismo do final do século XX. **Condição pós-moderna: uma pesquisa sobre as origens da mudança cultural**. 4 ed. [S.l.]: Edições Loyola, 1994.

KUENZER, A. Z. Exclusão Includente e Inclusão Excludente: a Nova forma de dualidade estrutural que objetiva as novas relações entre educação e trabalho. LOMBARDI, J. C. SAVIANI, D. SANFELICI, J. L. (Orgs). **Capitalismo, Trabalho e Educação**. Campinas, SP: Autores associados, HistedBr, p. 77-95, 2005.

KUENZER, A. Z. Da dualidade assumida a dualidade negada: o discurso da flexibilização justifica a inclusão excludente. **Educação e Sociedade**. Campinas, v. 28, n.100 - Especial, p.1153-1178, 2007.

LIMA, T. C. S.; MIOTO, R. C. T. Procedimentos metodológicos na construção do conhecimento científico: a pesquisa bibliográfica. **Revista Katálisis**, Florianópolis, v. 10, n. esp., p. 37-45, 2007.

MELLO, G. N. **As novas diretrizes para o ensino médio**. Guia Interativo de Informação Profissional e Educacional- São Paulo. Editora CIEE, vol 17. 1998.

SAVIANI, D. Educação Escolar, currículo e sociedade. O problema da Base Nacional Comum Curricular. **Movimento Revista de Educação**. Rio de Janeiro, ano 3, n. 4, 2016. Disponível em: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329113714\\_EDUCACAO\\_ESCOLAR\\_CURRICULO\\_E\\_SOCIEDADE\\_o\\_problema\\_da\\_Base\\_Nacional\\_Comum\\_Curricular](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329113714_EDUCACAO_ESCOLAR_CURRICULO_E_SOCIEDADE_o_problema_da_Base_Nacional_Comum_Curricular). Acesso em: 30 ago. 2019.

SILVA, M. R. O golpe no ensino médio em três atos que se completam. In: AZEVEDO, J. C.; REIS, J. T. (Orgs.) **Políticas Educacionais Pós-Golpe**. Porto Alegre, Editora Universitária Metodista IPA, 2018, p. 41-54.

English translation of the original in Portuguese. NASCIMENTO, A. A. do; GARCIA, S. R. de O.; CZERNISZ, C. da S. Diretrizes Curriculares para o Ensino Médio: a prevalência da formação para o mercado de trabalho by Rubem de Oliveira Cauduro e-mail: [caudurorf@hotmail.com](mailto:caudurorf@hotmail.com).

#### Authors' contributions

Author 1: Data collection, analysis and elaboration of the text.

Author 2: Data collection, analysis and elaboration of the text.

Author 3: Data collection, analysis and elaboration of the text.

Submitted on: September 13th, 2021 | Approved on: September 12th, 2022