



Renovating and technicist pedagogical-educational foundations and technical curriculum theories: historical determinations and Brazilian educational thought implications¹

Fundamentos pedagógico-educacionais renovadores e tecnicistas e teorias técnicas do currículo: determinações históricas e implicações para o pensamento educacional brasileiro

Fundamentos pedagógico-educativos renovadores y tecnicistas y teorías curriculares técnicas: determinaciones históricas e implicaciones del pensamiento educativo brasileño

Júlio César Maia

Universidade Estadual de Goiás (Brasil)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7162-2136>

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/1566093335953705>

jcesarm@outlook.com

Carla Carolina Rodrigues da Silveira

Universidade Federal de Goiás (Brasil)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8846-1519>

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/4217406718513546>

ccarolrss@gmail.com

Michele Silva Sacardo

Universidade Federal de Jataí (Brasil)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4193-3766>

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/3823041497150247>

smichele@ufj.edu.br

Abstract

The article aims to retrieve the rising movement of innovative and technicist pedagogical, educational, and curricular theories. Initially, it is divided into four sections, each respectively focused on presentation: i) from the response found in renovating pedagogical-educational fundamentals to traditionalism; ii) from J. Dewey's progressivism as the first offensive of technical curriculum theories; iii) from F. Bobbitt's technicism as the second offensive; and iv) from R. Tyler's technical-linear synthesis as the third and final offensive of this set of theories. Then, it aims to grasp the arrival of these theories in Brazil. For this purpose, two additional sections are highlighted, oriented respectively towards the presentation: i) the contribution of education pioneers to the critique of traditional pedagogical-educational fundamentals and the dissemination of technical curriculum theories in this country; and ii) the obstacles faced by the renovating progressive emphasis following the establishment of technical-linear curriculum ideas on the Brazilian educational component.

Keywords: History of education. History of curriculum. Educational thought.

¹ English version by Tácio Assis Barros. E-mail: tacio_barros@discente.ufj.edu.br.

Resumo

O artigo objetiva resgatar o movimento de ascensão das teorias pedagógicas, educacionais e curriculares renovadoras e tecnicistas. Fragmenta-se, inicialmente, em quatro seções, respectivamente orientadas à apresentação: i) da resposta encontrada pelos fundamentos pedagógicos-educacionais renovadores ao tradicionalismo; ii) do progressivismo de J. Dewey enquanto primeira ofensiva das teorias técnicas do currículo; iii) do tecnicismo de F. Bobbitt enquanto segunda ofensiva e; iv) da síntese técnico-linear de R. Tyler enquanto terceira e última ofensiva desse conjunto de teorias. Objetiva, em seguida, apreender ainda a chegada dessas teorias ao Brasil. Para tanto, duas outras seções são evidenciadas, orientadas respectivamente à apresentação: i) do contributo dos pioneiros da educação para a crítica dos fundamentos pedagógico-educacionais tradicionais e difusão das teorias técnicas do currículo nesse país e; ii) dos obstáculos assumidos pela ênfase progressivista renovadora a partir da fixação das ideias técnico-lineares do currículo sobre o componente educacional brasileiro.

Palavras-chave: História da educação. História do currículo. Pensamento educacional.

Resumen

El artículo tiene como objetivo rescatar el auge de las teorías pedagógicas, educativas y curriculares que son renovadoras y técnicas. Inicialmente se divide en cuatro temas, orientados respectivamente a la presentación: 1) de la respuesta encontrada por las bases pedagógicas-educativas renovadoras al tradicionalismo; 2) del progresivismo de J. Dewey como la primera ofensiva de las teorías técnicas del currículo; 3) del tecnicismo de F. Bobbitt como segunda ofensiva y; 4) de la síntesis técnico-lineal de R. Tyler como tercera y última ofensiva de este conjunto de teorías. Pretende, posteriormente, comprender la llegada de estas teorías a Brasil. Para ello, se destacan otros dos temas, orientados respectivamente a la presentación: 1) del aporte de los pioneros de la educación a la crítica de los fundamentos pedagógico-educativos tradicionales y difusión de las teorías técnicas del currículo en ese país y; 2) de los obstáculos asumidos por el énfasis renovador progresivo desde la demarcación de las ideas técnico-lineales del currículo sobre el componente educativo brasileño.

Palabras clave: Historia de la educación. Historia del currículo. Pensamiento educativo.

Introduction

The dawn of the 20th century, according to the Gramscian perspective, marked the reaffirmation of consensus by the dominant social groups in favor of their hegemony. Not coincidentally, such reaffirmation took place on American soil after the First World War. The economic rise of that region, coupled with the capitalist discontinuity experienced by Europe, made the United States of America (USA) capable of addressing the contradictions accumulated by the bourgeois state since the Industrial Revolution.

In the meantime, the educational component, which had been transforming since the 16th century, became a valuable tool for the bourgeois state: safeguarded by “democratic” ideals cherished by liberalism, this component (emanating from the school system) was supposed to ensure the formation of the “collective subject” within the parameters of industrial capitalism. From this premise emerged the innovative theories of education and pedagogy, as well as the technical theories of the curriculum.

Saviani (2005a, 2008) illustrates the juxtaposition between traditional and innovative educational and pedagogical theories: the first group emphasizes “theory” over “practice,” while the second prioritizes “practice” over “theory.” The pedagogical-educational foundations attributed to traditional theories, especially those with religious and secular orientations, gave way to the pedagogical-educational foundations of innovative theories, particularly the new school movement perspective.

According to Saviani (2005a, 2008), this transition represented the decentralization of “teaching methods” and the consolidation of “learning methods”: the decentralization of “theory” – shifting from intellectual formation and concentrating on the roles of the teacher and student in the transmission and assimilation of knowledge – and the centralization of “practice” – emphasizing manual training, placing the student at the center of knowledge construction, and defining the teacher’s role as a “supporting actor” to the student’s role.

Regarding the renewal movement of educational, pedagogical, and curricular components at the beginning of the 20th century, Manacorda (1992) highlights: i) the adaptation of the work process to the educational component through technical-professional instruction, meaning the new importance attributed by educational institutions to the development of productive skills and specializations for work; and ii) the discovery and implementation of child psychology and its “active” demands, that is, the promotion of an educational orientation towards “spontaneity,” the individual’s free initiative, and their intellectual and moral development.

In the author’s own words, it is worth considering how “[...] technical-professional instruction [...] and the active education of the new schools, on one hand, turn their backs to each other, but on the other hand, [...] are based on the same formative element [...] and aim at the same formative goal, the person capable of actively producing” (p. 305). There was a retreat from the “teaching methods” associated with traditional theories: methods that denied the possibility for individuals to encounter the development of their own “autonomy,” thus contradicting the democratic ideal cultivated by economic liberalism in the era of industrial capitalism.

Valdamarin (2006) apprehends how issues related to teaching knowledge, emphasized by “teaching methods”, become a focal point of change with the intensification of “learning methods”. Saviani (2005a) explains that “learning methods” have conceived a training model aligned with the disintegration of “teaching knowledge”.

From these introductory elements that depict the dawn of the 20th century as the birthplace of industrial capitalism responsible for the establishment of a new “collective subject” and consequently, the emergence of pedagogical, educational, and curricular theories aligned with this task, the purpose of this investigation becomes evident.

It involves, initially, reclaiming the rise of innovative and technocratic pedagogical, educational, and curricular theories. To achieve this, it is divided into four sections, aimed at

presenting: i) the response provided by the pedagogical-educational foundations of innovators to traditionalism; ii) the progressivism of John Dewey (1859-1952) as the first offensive of technical curriculum theories; iii) the technicism of John Franklin Bobbitt (1876-1956) as the second offensive; and iv) the technical-linear synthesis of Ralph Winfred Tyler (1902-1994) as the third and final offensive of this set of theories.

Following that, the investigation examines the arrival of these theories in Brazil. Two additional sections are highlighted, aimed at presenting: i) the contribution of education pioneers to the critique of traditional pedagogical-educational foundations and the dissemination of technical curriculum theories; and ii) the obstacles faced by the progressive innovative emphasis due to the establishment of technical-linear curriculum ideas within the Brazilian educational component.

1. Renewed Pedagogical-Educational Foundations: The New School Movement and “Active Pedagogy” as a Response to Traditionalism

In the midst of the abandonment of “teaching methods”, emerge the renewed pedagogical-educational foundations and the formulation of technical curriculum theories. Aranha (2006) emphasizes that such foundations find their point of origin in philosophical pragmatism. It is made clear how “learning methods” oppose the philosophical foundations of idealism and insist on the “mistake” of reducing the true to the useful, privileging practice and experience over systematic knowledge².

Philosophical pragmatism influenced innovative theories, especially those aligned with the concept of “active education”. The experiences of this specific group are identified as the New School (or school reform) movement. According to Gadotti (2001), this movement is characterized by the mobilization, across different nations (including those sensitive to distinct hegemonic processes³), of a pedagogical action grounded in practical activity (or experience). Gadotti (2001)

² It is worth mentioning the main reference of this philosophical stream, William James, to illustrate how his influences reverberated on educational, pedagogical, and curricular theories. James (2005), in the “second lecture”, “What Pragmatism Means”, compiled in the referenced edition, makes it clear how the etymology of this term refers to the word *práγμα*, which means “action”, “practice”, and “practical.” He further emphasizes that the term in question was first coined by the American philosopher Charles Peirce in 1878: on that occasion, James (2005, p. 44-45) states that C. Peirce, “[...] after pointing out that our beliefs are really rules for action, said that to develop the meaning of a thought, we need only determine what conduct it is fitted to produce: that conduct is for us its sole significance”. Thus, James (2005) makes it clear that the “perfect clarity” of thought about an object or phenomenon comes from the effects applicable to the practical nature of this object or phenomenon. Therefore, only what promotes sensations and, consequently, functional practical reasons is considered true and important. The pragmatic philosophical stream understands the reinvention of reality as natural, meaning that reality is continually constructed, and at each moment of its renewal, it is fixed based on a determined criterion of practical utility. In this logic, any pattern of development that “satisfies material needs” of humans, that is, any human “experience” that presents itself, even minimally, as “useful,” is considered true because it carries functional practical reasons. The notion of experience, therefore, is highlighted by pragmatists. Nevertheless, this concept of “experience” as the guide for human development, as well as adaptation to reality by emphasizing practical utility, becomes evident in the context of the acceptance of innovative theories and the discourse directed to these regarding so-called “learning methods.”

³ The innovative theories associated with the concept of “active education” did not solely serve to permeate a liberal-bourgeois hegemonic platform. Gadotti (2001) makes it clear that it is a mistake to think otherwise; many socialist educators were influenced by this movement. In a study on Russian education during the revolutionary period, Bittar and Ferreira Junior (2015) identify points of connection with the ideas of J. Dewey, a theoretical icon of the New School movement. It is noteworthy to consider the passage, cited by Manacorda (1992, p. 301), in which Lenin, the leader of the Bolsheviks during the revolution, addresses his wife Nadezhda Krupskaya, a pedagogue and head of Soviet extracurricular education at the time, regarding the testimony of a Russian emigrant about the educational model cultivated by Americans: “It is necessary to study meticulously the American experience, it is necessary to adopt everything that has been achieved in capitalist countries, evaluate it based on the criteria of our Marxist position and see what suits us and what does not suit us”.

makes it clear that the references of this movement, beyond the pragmatic philosophical foundation, are also connected to the experiences of Vittorino da Feltre (1378-1446⁴).

The New School movement is demarcated by experiences that shared individual self-formation, practical activity, and experience as principles of organizing pedagogical work. Cambi (1999) defines as a common characteristic of these experiences the dependence of cognitive processes on action. Such experiences presupposed the essentiality of the educational component being subject to external influences and, consequently, not limited to the artificiality of traditional theories.

Not surprisingly, American experiences related to innovative theories gained strong momentum throughout the history of education and pedagogical ideas. This study, taking note of this fact, originates from the American context, specifically allied with the figure of J. Dewey, for the dissemination of New School thinking. It is important, however, to note other influential figures in the spread of this thinking, such as Cecil Reddie (1858-1932), Edmond Demolins (1852-1907), Gustav Wyneken (1875-1964), Georg Michael Kerschensteiner (1854-1961), and Maria Montessori (1870-1952).

It is worthwhile to focus on J. Dewey - considered by Cambi (1999, p. 546) as the “[...] most organic theorist of a new model of pedagogy, [...] the most critical experimenter of new education, [...] the intellectual most sensitive to the political role of pedagogy and education, seen as master keys of a democratic society” - to highlight the pedagogical-educational and curriculum-related foundations of renewal.

2. J. Dewey’s progressivism as the first hallmark of technical curriculum theories

Philosopher, psychologist, and American educator, J. Dewey played a significant role in the dissemination of New School thinking. It is not coincidental that he is regarded as one of the most influential precursors to the study of the curriculum, with his contribution to the renewal movement often placed within the realm of technical curriculum theories. These theories, as stated by Malta (2013), are linked to the exploration of knowledge “suitable” for the school system in response to the reaffirmation of consensus through liberal-democratic means in the early decades of the 20th century.

Pacheco (2009) labels this configuration adopted by the curriculum as the “theory of instruction”: the “collective subject” around the educational component followed the development of capitalist production relations, shaping the curriculum as instruction. Through the formal transmission of “suitable” knowledge, it ensured the hegemonic process of dominant social groups. The “theory of instruction” marks the context in which technical curriculum theories are established: it represents the idealization of an educational component that catered to the industrial impulses of a particular type of capitalism.

Although both share the same end, the two emphases distinguished by Manacorda (1992) that characterize innovative theories (technical-professional and “active education”) reflect the two different curricular conceptions attributed to technical curriculum theories (progressivism and technocracy). These conceptions align with Silva’s (2017) study, which,

⁴ Italian humanist educator of the 14th and 15th centuries, Vittorino da Feltre stands out as a precursor of pedagogical concepts later disseminated. Among these concepts, Rodrigues (2018) highlights the establishment of a free school for the “unfortunate”, the teacher's posture, the notion of independent reasoning, the proposal for gradual teaching, and more. The closest alignment that can be drawn between innovative theories and Vittorino da Feltre is characterized by the exclusive orientation of the educational component based on the interests of the students. Rodrigues (2018, n. p.) expresses his views on Vittorino da Feltre's “Casa Giocosa” as follows: “He furnished his school, established in 1423 in a village near Mantua [...] where paintings and drawings depicted children playing with all kinds of toys. Removed from the bustling and worldly courtly life, he lived there with the [...] students [...], making it considered the first secular boarding school. It can also be seen as a true new school, where a climate of joy and freedom prevailed, and [where they corrected] [...] the common abuses of the time [...]”.

within the framework of technical curriculum theories (referred to by him as “traditional theories”), identifies two distinct renovative perspectives: i) the progressive, which prioritized the democratic-liberal impetus over purely economic interests; and ii) the technocratic, whose formation of the “collective subject” is oriented toward productive and economic demands.

The peculiarity of J. Dewey, as stated by Malta (2013), aligns with the first of these perspectives by rejecting entrepreneurship as an educational principle and advocating for the diffusion of democratic-liberal principles. He “advances” over traditional theories through progressivism, aiming at the generalization of the educational component by emphasizing liberal ideals such as “autonomy”, “freedom”, “responsibility”, etc. Dalbosco (2010) asserts that the ideas of teaching as “transmission” and learning as the “memorization of content”, which are central to traditional theories, hinder the “democratic ideal of education” and the belief that “learning is based on doing” (on “practical activity”).

Facci (2004) asserts that J. Dewey was skeptical of pedagogical practices that advocated obedience and submission: what mattered to him was that the educational component be continuously constructed from the “concrete, active, and productive experience” of each individual. The idea of “experience,” which aligns with philosophical pragmatism, fits into Dewey’s conception of education. Teixeira (1978) attributes the greatest merit of this conception to the integration of “[...] learning obtained through a specific exercise intended for it (school), with the learning directly absorbed in social experiences (life)” (p. 119).

In “Democracy and Education” from 1916, Dewey (1979) justifies the affinity of his ideas with philosophical pragmatism. By criticizing traditional theories and their “scholastic methods” (“teaching methods”), he makes it clear that his position is realistic (not idealistic), pragmatic, and innovative. He advocates the predominance of the body, the external environment, and corporeal-sensory conditions as sources of knowledge appropriation. These elements, according to him, correspond to the “experiences” from which education should affirm itself.

Dewey (1979) found himself, at the beginning of the 20th century, tasked with countering philosophical essentialism and its entire influence on the educational component represented by traditional theories. Refuting the substantiality attributed to the “mind” by this philosophical stream, through the lens of realism and pragmatism, marked his endeavor.

It is from this theoretical-philosophical position that J. Dewey engages in a reflection on the educational component. Cambi (1999, p. 548), assuming that the central role of this reflection for J. Dewey aligned with liberal-democratic aspirations, asserts: the educational component must commit to shaping “every citizen for and in democracy” based on a renewed conception of education that allows them to grasp the meaning of autonomy, free initiative, and freedom. Thus, as Gesser (2002) adds, J. Dewey was more inclined towards securing democratic ideals, and consequently towards experience and human interest as the presuppositions of the educational component, rather than purely economic and productivity-driven impulses.

In “The School and Society” from 1899, Dewey (2002) clarifies how problematic it would be for the school, following traditional theories, to lag behind the “social transformation” driven by the “progress” of capitalist production relations during the transition between the 19th and 20th centuries. For Dewey (1979), the “progressive” movement outlined by the educational component, willing to see the school as a miniature society, becomes clear: the school system should not only adapt to social changes but also promote the democratic-liberal ideal and consequently overshadow the repressive and authoritarian character fostered by traditional theories.

Dalbosco (2010, p. 57) makes it clear how J. Dewey criticized the “[...] priority of spiritual activity in the name of dispensing with experience and the emphasis on the role of the educator to the detriment of reducing the role of the learner to that of a mere spectator”. Dewey presumed that such prioritization strengthened the duality of body and mind, along with an

authoritarian and vertical educational component, incompatible with the ideal of a democratic and liberal society. For Dewey (1979), breaking free from this duality relies on the concept of the human being as an “agent organism”, capable of intervening in reality based on a network of interactions and relationships derived from accumulated experiences.

The progressive education model, upon which the “theories of instruction” in the curriculum field are based, presupposed the break from discursive transmission (by the teacher) and passive storage (by the student). Such a mechanism, characteristic of traditional theories, rejected the concept of the “agent organism” advocated by J. Dewey.

Moreira (1990) makes it clear that J. Dewey’s belief in progressive education is driven by “social progress,” considering his insight into integrating systematic knowledge with individual experiences. Nevertheless, Manacorda (1992) warns: given the liberal-democratic nature of the progressive tendency, the notion of “social progress” should never be confused with that cultivated by socialist tendencies. In J. Dewey, he continues, there is “[...] the proclaimed purpose of educating the individual to participate in change, conceived as the progressive evolution of a inherently positive state of affairs” (p. 320): this reading renders the renovative tendency an accomplice to the bourgeois project of sociability.

To address the notion of social progress or “socialization” within the Deweyan perspective, Manacorda (1992) starts from the following assumption: “‘Social’ or sociality, obviously, does not mean socialism, since there is a bourgeois society and sociality” (p. 316). He continues: “[...] although Dewey is not insensitive to social problems and socialist instances, however, in his insistence on the social function of the school, we need to highlight above all some traces of what we would call pedagogical illusion...” (p. 316).

It is important to ensure, therefore, that J. Dewey’s progressivism shares the emphasis on the “socialization of education”; however, this perspective captures its mark in the liberal-democratic model, meaning it reconciles educational components with alienated labor, subject to the impulses of industrial capitalism. Therefore, the liberal-democratic ideal conceived by J. Dewey’s educational perspective seeks to shape the formation of the new modern “collective subject”: free, autonomous, responsible, etc., and, nevertheless, an accomplice to a “transformation” social whose real contradictions are not negatively interrogated but seen as an “inherently positive state of affairs.”

Lopes and Macedo (2010), in investigating J. Dewey’s contribution to the curriculum, understand how the notion of experience, guided by the practice of democratic principles, took the form of an educational principle. They clarify that “The central focus of the curriculum for Dewey is on the resolution of social problems” (p. 23), meaning the school’s importance in prompting individuals to solve problems democratically and cooperatively.

3. Progressive Antithesis: F. Bobbitt’s Technicism and its Contributions to Curriculum Technical Theories

Aligned with the set of renovating theories of education and pedagogy is also the technocratic trend of the curriculum, which, even though it does not share the “progressive” aspirations and the idea of “active education,” presumed the strengthening of the bourgeois hegemonic process. While through progressivism and the New Education movement, the bourgeois ideological project was enhanced in an educational component that favored individual “autonomy” and “freedom,” technocracy nourished the same ideological project with an educational component committed to the development of professional “skills” and influenced by the Taylorist principles of scientific management.

Taking the form of a major agenda, planning and control of education are guided by a business mindset: far from a trend that exalts individual autonomy, technocracy adopts, as the axis of pedagogical work, practical activity oriented towards the development of capitalist

production relations. It can be said that knowledge now takes the form of planned experience based on predetermined purposes.

Technocracy can be traced back to the horizon of philosophical positivism, which emerged in the 19th century, from the exaltation of scientific knowledge (attributed to the natural sciences) as a formula for unveiling the laws of the universe. The educational component, as Gadotti (2001) points out, attributed an alternative position to the philosophy of the Frenchman Auguste Comte (1798-1857).

Among the volumes that make up his “Course of Positive Philosophy,” published between 1830 and 1842, Comte (1978) formulates that “revolutionary ideas” (Enlightenment and the French Revolution) failed due to the “absence of scientific concepts.” True science, “positive” science, would consider the phenomena of humanity as facts: it would be neutral, grounded in natural laws, substantiated by the notion of “order and progress,” and beyond any “critical”, “destructive”, “subversive”, “revolutionary” doctrine, and so on. The notion of “order and progress” from positivism influences educational, pedagogical, and curricular theories.

According to Gadotti (2001), however, “Positivism, whose doctrine aimed at replacing the mythical and magical manipulation of reality with a scientific view, ended up establishing a new faith, faith in science, which subordinated scientific imagination to pure empirical observation” (p. 110). The resignation of the “critical doctrine”, combined with the empirical observation of facts and coherence of behavior based on the “principle of the invariability of natural laws”, made this philosophical doctrine intimate to bourgeois hegemony and brought the educational, pedagogical, and curricular fields closer to the concepts of “efficiency”, “order”, “coherence”, “accuracy”, etc.

Thus, the foundation for the new modern “collective subject” accommodates the principles of scientific management: Aranha (2006) observes how technological advancements driven by the 20th century prompted specializations that aligned with the productive aims of mercantile capitalism. The design of techniques for the rationalization of work, anchored in the principles of positive philosophy, became evident.

Although the spotlight was on the progressive theories linked to “active education”, there were theorists sympathetic to technocracy. Among them stands out J. F. Bobbitt, who contributed to refining the educational component in line with scientific management: his influence is perceived in the decades of the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s when the appropriation of liberal-democratic principles for the formation of the “collective subject” was not as urgent as the reestablishment of the economy and the productive drive.

Despite J. F. Bobbitt originally publishing his work, “The Curriculum”, in 1918, it depended solely on the American recovery post the 1929 Crisis to gain recognition. This moment is related to the new concentration of forces arising from mass production processes under state supervision. Gramsci (2020), in “Americanism and Fordism”, had already observed the peculiarities of productive activity in the organization of American life, shedding light on the “era of organizers”, which redirected values cultivated by the U.S. toward a new Fordist turn.

The educational component, particularly disillusioned with the hopes nurtured by the New Education movement (Escolanovismo), relied on the principles of scientific management. J. F. Bobbitt played an influential role in this process. While the New Education movement seemed conducive to asserting bourgeois hegemony, it fostered, during the Fordist era, the importance of competitiveness in directing production processes - a belief tested during the economic breakdown of the U.S. in the 1920s.

The values of the New School needed to be revised based on a new mode of regulation. This necessity gave rise to the technocratic ideas of the American educational component. Moreira and Silva (2005), in describing the influence of these ideas on educational, pedagogical, and curricular theories, highlight a radical transition guided by “A new conception of society,

based on new practices and values derived from the industrial world [...]. Cooperation and specialization, instead of competition, shaped the cores of a new ideology” (p. 10).

The prominence given to the curriculum project designed by J. F. Bobbitt over the renovating theories of education, subsumed into mercantilism and productivity, is notable. For Bobbitt (1918), the curriculum envisions cooperation and industrialization, Taylorist principles, to minimize competitiveness, which had disrupted the U.S. economy in 1920.

Moreira and Silva (2005) note how, in Bobbitt’s technocratic perspective, the curriculum becomes an “instrument” for the implementation of social control and adaptation to economic, social, and cultural novelties shielded by the model of forming the new “collective subject”: the school was tasked with teaching behaviors, habits, and values tied to Taylorist principles of order, rationality, cooperation, efficiency, productivity, etc.

Malta (2013) emphasizes that in J. F. Bobbitt’s view, curriculum studies should encompass three consecutive functions: i) mapping skills consistent with prevailing “political and ideological interests”; ii) designing a curriculum matrix that would address the development of these skills; and iii) materializing, through measurement instruments, the degree of precision of the curriculum in achieving these skills.

In Bobbitt’s (1918) technocratic formulations guided by scientific management, these functions aimed at eliminating waste in the educational component. Teaching, as noted by Saviani (2012), involved prioritizing the “rational organization of means”: the focus previously placed on student initiative shifted to the role of executors who were “[...] supposedly qualified, neutral, objective, impartial specialists” (p. 11). The transition of knowledge, once derived from “daily experiences,” now took on the new condition of “planned experiences” based on “pre-determined purposes” and entrusted to “specialists”.

Silva (2017), discussing J. F. Bobbitt’s approach, clarifies how the curriculum took the form of an “organization question”. For him, “The supposedly scientific activity of the curriculum specialist is nothing more than a bureaucratic activity” (p. 24): it assumed technical standards “[...] as important in education as [...] in a steel manufacturing plant because, [...] ‘education, like the plant [...] is a molding process’” (p. 24).

4. Tylerian synthesis as the final breath of curriculum technical theories: linear-technical contributions

The ideas of J. F. Bobbitt converge, according to Lopes and Macedo (2011), with the technical-linear proposal of the American R.W. Tyler: this parallelism reflects the technocratic aspect of the renovating theories (particularly technical curriculum theories) on educational and pedagogical technicist theories. J. F. Bobbitt’s curriculum proposal continues in the ideas of R.W. Tyler, an influential theorist in curriculum theories during the period between the implementation of the Keynesian model of regulation and the remnants of World War II, which forced the emergence of the financial capitalist phase.

Saviani (2012), marking the technicist theories in the second half of the 20th century, illustrates the exhaustion of the New School movement: for him, “a sense of disillusionment was beginning to spread in educational circles. The new pedagogy, while becoming dominant as a theoretical conception [...], in practice, proved to be ineffective in the face of the issue of marginalization” (p. 9-10). The educational response relied on the notion of instrumental efficiency, scientific neutrality, and other principles (rationality, productivity, etc.), aiming to become more “objective” and “operational”. Similar to J. F. Bobbitt’s intention, R.W. Tyler, when composing “Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction” in 1949, aimed to bring pedagogical work closer to factory work.

Tyler (1983) proposes a symbiosis between technocratic and progressivist approaches to the curriculum - although, for Lopes and Macedo (2011, p. 25), “[...] his appropriation of

progressivism has been characterized as instrumental and [...] his planning is much closer to efficiency". He relied on defining goals and objectives to achieve "instrumental efficiency": his technical-linear perspective aimed at planning and rationally organizing the curriculum to prevent influences that could jeopardize the efficiency sought for the post-war "productive efficacy" of the United States.

To perceive the technical-linear aspect of the curriculum imbued with technocracy, according to Moreira (1990), means to disregard its pronounced affinity with progressive ideals capable of guiding curriculum "planning", "organization", and "evaluation". Ideals that, according to Gesser (2002) and Malanchen (2016), influenced R. W. Tyler's ideas in the development of curricular proposals in various peripheral capitalist experiences during the heyday of technicism.

While progressivism may not predominate over the technical-linear tendency, as pointed out by Lopes and Macedo (2011), it is possible to perceive in R. W. Tyler a transition toward J. F. Bobbitt's technocracy. Tyler (1983) poses questions that indicate this transition: "What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes? How can these educational experiences be effectively organized? How can we be sure that these purposes are being accomplished?" (p. 2). Silva (2017) relates these questions respectively to the role of curriculum, teaching, instruction, and evaluation.

Regarding educational objectives, Tyler (1983) emphasizes the "sources", which represent the exact measure between an appreciation of the "nature" of students and the curriculum designer's evaluation of the "necessary knowledge" for the social insertion of these students into "contemporary life". What is observed, as highlighted by Lopes and Macedo (2011, p. 46), is the integration of "[...] different models of curriculum planning that were [...] sometimes focused on the child [...] sometimes on the socially inserted adult that they would become⁵".

There is no doubt that Tyler (1983) emphasizes the importance of the criteria "nature of the students," "daily life," and "recommendation from curriculum specialists" when addressing the educational objectives to be achieved by the school⁶. However, what is worth noting is the advancement of his speculations on the curriculum compared to the technocracy of J. F. Bobbitt. From the "fundamental educational objectives", Tyler (1983) sees the interests of the students as a source of consideration that allows him to go beyond the technocratic curriculum model and also align his proposal with progressive ideals.

⁵ The "exact measure" between the nature of the student and the consideration of a "curriculum developer" based on "contemporary life" to identify educational objectives to be achieved by the school, and consequently, to seek answers to the first argument raised by R. W. Tyler, can be better understood in the set of criteria pointed out by the author himself for achieving this goal: Silva (2017) maintains that within the first chapter, dedicated to responding to this initial question, R. W. Tyler outlines three criteria considered "fundamental" for identifying educational objectives to be achieved by the school. According to R. W. Tyler, these criteria should be equitably balanced and, nevertheless, are related to the "exact measure" between the nature of the student and the consideration of the so-called "curriculum specialists". They are: i) study of students; ii) instruction about life external to the educational context; and iii) recommendations from different specialties. It is precisely because of the importance given to the first of these criteria, that is, the "nature of the students", that R. W. Tyler can be associated with the progressive spectrum. Through the emphasis on the second and third of these principles, respectively "daily activities" (the objective reality from which the future student is likely to be inserted) and reliance on the opinion of "curriculum developers," he approaches the technocratic tendency.

⁶ Regarding this, it's worth checking the study by Lopes and Macedo (2011), as they point out how R. W. Tyler extends not only to the "determination of criteria" but also provides suggestions for formulating these objectives. In light of this, Lopes and Macedo (2011) ensure that R. W. Tyler took into account both the behavioral approach, that is, a certain expected behavior from the student, and the application of content to be taught, in formulating an objective.

The last three questions stem from the level of importance given to educational objectives. It is noteworthy how the detailed specification of “fundamental educational objectives” influences Tyler’s (1983) notion of “experience”. Lopes and Macedo (2011) understand that the identification of experiences should be linked to the consideration of behavior, as well as starting from a prescribed content during the construction of objectives. The organization of experiences should follow specific principles (continuity, sequence, and integration), and evaluation, in turn, should be guided by the achievement of these objectives.

Not by chance, Moreira (1990) understands that, for R. W. Tyler, the process of assimilating the environment, combined with the effectiveness of intellectual processes, is the key to the breadth of social actions assumed by the educational component. He emphasizes that “For Tyler, the school could act as a regulatory agent, analyzing the existing society, identifying flaws, gaps, and needs, and contributing, through individual actions, to social progress” (p. 62-63). Ribeiro (2017) highlights that R. W. Tyler’s emphasis on the notion of content allowed the curriculum to approach the conception of knowledge: for Saviani (2016), however, such a conception was already common since the early writings on the curriculum⁷.

It becomes important, in light of this, to understand how the field of educational and pedagogical theories influences curriculum theories. It is clear that there is no way to separate the question of knowledge from that related to the curriculum: it is from this assumption that curriculum theories develop, and, nonetheless, find expressiveness in R. W. Tyler.

History elucidates how the technical-linear perspective is “called into question” by the diffusion of critical theories. What matters, for now, is to demarcate its essentiality for the interaction between the question of knowledge and the curriculum: it is from R. W. Tyler, ensures Ribeiro (2017), that the dimension of what should be taught becomes central to curriculum investigations. Criticisms of R. W. Tyler’s speculations arise at the moment when the “resolution of social problems” takes the form of social control.

Moreira (1990) reports that despite R. W. Tyler replacing the “homogenization of human conduct” and “bureaucratic control” by approaching progressive principles, he is accused of complicity in the bourgeois project of sociability. In other words, his notion of “social progress”, as clarified by Santos and Machado (2011), fostered the liberal framework adopted by the capitalist experience prevalent at the time. Schmidt (2003) states that the fundamental characteristic of his proposal is the dominance of the “curriculum specialist” in favor of social control and the maximization of the productive instinct of mercantile capitalism. It is important, therefore, to clarify the appropriation of the Brazilian developmental experience on the renewing educational theories and technical curriculum theories.

⁷ It's important to clarify that Saviani (2016) does not limit the influence of the question of knowledge on curriculum formulation. He advances, making it clear that “[...] educational objectives determine the selection of knowledge that will compose the organization of curricula” (p. 71). His position stands in relation to defining “objective knowledge”, converted into “school knowledge”, as a primordial element for the curriculum. This means establishing connections between the idea of “educational objectives”, as an important tool for composing curricula, and “school knowledge”, that is, converted objective knowledge. It's worth considering with Ribeiro and Zanardi (2018) how the theme of knowledge, particularly recontextualized knowledge in school (school knowledge), goes hand in hand with curriculum formulation. R. W. Tyler is recognized as a prominent figure in terms of the connection between “educational objectives” and the curriculum. However, one should not lose sight of the fact that the curriculum, regardless of whether it aligns with “objective knowledge” (only linking to the question of knowledge) or concerns itself with the adaptation of this into “school knowledge” (also linking to the issue of “educational objectives”), is not a neutral tool. It carries with it an ideological stance, the defense of a sociability project, and consequently, a hegemonic process.

5. The germ of the Brazilian critique of traditional pedagogical-educational foundations: contributions of education pioneers to technical curriculum theories.

The foundation of the new “collective subject” is strengthened during the developmentalist era in Brazil. During the exhaustion of the First Republic (1889-1930), the outlines of the mercantile face of capitalism can be illustrated: the labor and social relations clearly represented the interests of dominant social groups.

The field of educational, pedagogical, and curricular theories adjusted to the economic, political, and social reconfiguration experienced in the 1930s: the overturning of the Oligarchic Republic (1894-1930); the 1929 Crisis (and the stimulation of the Brazilian internal market); the advent of the Vargas Era (1930-45); the notion of the “Compromise State” in contrast to classical liberalism, etc., exemplify the peculiarity of that decade.

In the midst of the 1930s, the Brazilian educational component detached itself from Jesuit legacies and began to be influenced by a range of renewal theories. Saviani (2006, 2013) makes it clear that in this context, this component, previously contested between renewal and Catholic theories, emerged under the ascendancy of renewal theories influenced by various philosophical foundations over others.

The 1930 Revolution compromised the hegemonic position of rural aristocracy and brought to light the aspirations of different groups attached to various social and economic segments, influenced by distinct ideological projects. From the perspective of the educational component, the advent of the Second Republic (1930-37) carried the momentum, developed since the first Republican Constitution of 1891, for the implementation of a public education system based on the principles of gratuity, mandatory attendance, and unity.

With the creation of the Brazilian Association of Education (ABE) in 1924, as Saviani (2013) reveals, both renovating and Catholic proposals for Brazilian education shared space. The conflict between them emerged in the 1930s with the publication of the “*Manifesto dos Pioneiros da Educação Nova*” (Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education) in 1932, which praised progressive tendencies⁸. According to Bittar (2009), the intensity of these conflicts would resurface with the end of the Vargas Era in the form of a struggle between advocates of public schools and advocates of private schools. It is noted, therefore, that the Catholic trend, despite being “hit” by the articulation of governmental institutions with the 1932 Manifesto, persisted during the predominance of the renovating pedagogical conception, accumulating strength for a new offensive.

Notwithstanding, Saviani (2013) understands that there was a balance between Catholics and educational reformers until 1945. This balance is observed in the relationship cultivated between the government and Catholic groups. The maintenance of religious education, through the Capanema Reform of 1931, illustrates such a relationship, along with the incorporation of religious education via the 1934 Constitution. Saviani (2013) notes that for the “governmental trinity” (referring to Getúlio Vargas and respective ministers), “adhering to the New School does not mean renouncing the ‘recovery of lost values,’ a task that [...] had to be performed by religious education” (p. 271). The prevalence of the principle of reciprocal collaboration, Saviani reports, between the State and the Church allowed Catholic groups to have their intentions supported.

⁸ Despite the Francisco Campos Reform, a set of seven decrees issued in April 1931, making the government's interest in introducing religious education into official schools clear and aligning the Catholic trend in Brazilian education to establish an alliance and occupy a privileged position, the “rupture” began in 1931 during the IV National Education Conference and culminated with the publication of the “Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education” in 1932. From then on, the government, particularly Minister Francisco Campos, tended to exclusively support the renewed trends in Brazilian education.

The Manifesto of 1932, influenced by the pedagogical and educational foundations of the New School movement and progressive curriculum, is attributed to the figures of Fernando de Azevedo (1884-1974), Manuel Bergström Lourenço Filho (1897-1970), and Anísio Teixeira (1900-1971). Saviani (2006, p. 34) explains that this document “[...] expresses the position of a group of educators seeking to establish themselves through internal cohesion and the conquest of educational hegemony in the face of society as a whole”. Beyond the defense of New School principles, the Manifesto of 1932 advocated for a national system of public education.

This Manifesto marked in the 1934 Constitution the exclusive competence of the State in regulating and establishing Guidelines and Bases for Education. The influence of the New School ceased with the advent of the *Estado Novo* (1937-1946), New State era, and only gained new emphasis from the Populist Republic (1946-1964). In the period between the 1930s and 1937, as Aranha (2006) reveals, the reformist movement secured some of its achievements: the Francisco Campos Reform and the constitutional text of 1934 provided for the creation of the “old” National Council of Education - although the elaboration of the National Education Plan was hindered, as recorded by Cury (2015), by the closure of the National Congress in 1937 - and the organization of primary, secondary, and higher education levels in the country.

The ideas projected by the New School movement, although gradually censured by the *Estado Novo*, shed light on studies about the curricular role, which, in effect, as ensured by Moreira (1990) and Nereide Saviani (2005), have their initial milestone in this period. The 1934 Constitution, despite the reforms promoted by ministers and directors of public instruction bodies, marked the development of school education under the control of the State and the Brazilian curricular thought. Moreira (1990) understands that the influence exerted by the renovating theories of education, in the face of the New School movement, manifested itself in these reforms: thus begins the curricular organization of the Brazilian educational component.

However, there is a difference between the contribution of the New School movement to the field of curriculum and what presents itself in reality with the arrival of the *Estado Novo*, the 1937 Constitution, and the creation of INEP (National Institute for Educational Studies and Research Anísio Teixeira) in 1938: if among the pioneers of the New School there was a certain value placed on the generalization of the educational component, in the *Estado Novo*, the emphasis is on the integration of progressive assumptions with technocratic ones.

The originality of the New School judgment can be grasped in the work of A. S. Teixeira published in 1932, titled “Progressive Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education,” and republished in 1968 as “A Brief Introduction to the Philosophy of Education: The Progressive School or the Transformation of the School”: in this work, it is possible to observe the representativeness of the New School thought in the Brazilian context.

Teixeira (1975), over six chapters, aligns his ideas with those of J. Dewey and discusses topics that allow speculation about the curricular question, including: i) the opposition between “reactionary school” and “renewing school”; ii) the concentration of forces in the “progressive transformation of the school”; and iii) the importance of conceiving school guidelines centered on “everyday experiences”. The core of the pedagogical-educational foundations of this work is linked to the same defense of liberal democracy as J. Dewey.

According to Teixeira (1975), the school, taken as a “replica of society,” must strive for the “adjustment of the individual to the environment” and value the “reconstruction of programs” and the “psychological organization” articulated with the “methods of learning” representative of the renewal theories. Such methods, in Teixeira’s (1975) understanding, should stem from

“pleasure” and “would” linked to “everyday experience”: the axis of pedagogical work was connected to practical activity, the student, and methods and processes of learning.

From the concern to “reconstruct” educational programs arose the apprehension about the curriculum: the progressive ideas of the New School confronted the rise of the technocratic curriculum ideology expensive to the *Estado Novo* reforms. According to Saviani (2006, p. 38), although “[...] the framework of education was affected, the mechanism of resorting to partial reforms prevailed, lacking an overall plan that would allow a unified organization of national education as a whole, as advocated by the Manifesto [...]”.

The curricular field was built as the New School advocates took on bureaucratic administrative positions: unable to make their advocated education project a reality, the curriculum was influenced by other trends. Thus, starting from the 1937 Constitution and other documents - such as Decree-Law No. 1,190/39, which deals with “fundamental sections” (philosophy, sciences, letters, and pedagogy), and the *Capanema* Reform of 1942 - technocratic traits affected the regulation of Brazilian education.

The Decree-Law No. 1,190/39, according to Saviani (2005b), even though grounded in the New School pioneers with a conception of teacher training distinct from the assumed flaws of the Normal School, bore a technocratic character, notes Cunha (2007a), as authoritarian demands persisted behind the authoritative appearance.

This Decree-Law guided higher education courses referred to as “fundamental sections”: it condensed them into the “3+1 scheme” (generalizing the training of the graduate from a grammar section added to the knowledge of the bachelor). Meeting productive demands, particularly attributed to Higher Education, is evident in streamlining the training of the graduate, whose function, as emphasized by Cury (2003), took on a residual form, as well as in the promotion of the training of the bachelor for technical positions.

The *Capanema* Reform highlights how this utilitarianism extended to other levels of education: its “organic laws”, covering industrial and secondary education in 1942, commercial education in 1943, and normal, primary, and agricultural education in 1946, as well as consolidating the National Service for Industrial Learning and Commercial Learning, aimed at streamlining and reusing training.

The INEP, created in 1938, corresponded to the principles of the New School. Initially directed by M. B. Lourenço Filho, as stated by Bittar (2009), it was committed to supporting the ideas spread by the New School, which was consolidated with the democratic reorientation in 1946, with the new constitutional promulgation and its implications for the consolidation of the National Education Law of Guidelines and Bases (LDB).

Saviani (2006) makes known enlightening facts about this “new renovating turn” in the face of the Brazilian “redemocratization” of the 1940s: noteworthy are A. S. Teixeira’s management in Public Instruction of the Federal District in 1931, the creation of the Teacher’s School in 1932, the founding of UDF (University Center of the Federal District) in 1935, INEP in 1938, CAPES (Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel) in 1951, and CBPE (Brazilian Center for Educational Research) in 1955. From these milestones, Saviani (2006, p. 40) identifies a “[...] growing penetration of the renewing ideology in Brazilian education that became hegemonic [...] until 1961”.

Even in the face of a hegemonic project alluding to the New School pedagogical ideology, the curricular theories of this period, as clarified by Moreira (1990), appeared inconsistent: technocratic and progressivist ideas combined with elements of Catholic tradition forming a “strange mosaic of principles and techniques”. This fact is related to the consolidation

context of the 1961 LDB, taken by Saviani (2013) in two moments: i) accusation of the composition project of the commission for the elaboration of the LDB to the condition of political partisanship - extended to the conflict of centralization of the educational system⁹; and ii) amplification of this conflict from the dichotomy between public and private schools.

The curriculum aligned more with technocratic assumptions than with progressive ideas during this time, a fact that culminated in the rise of educational and pedagogical technistic theories in Brazil. The education conception advocated by the “reformers”, Saviani (2013) points out, tended towards a technical-scientific character, adaptability, and productive and developmental demands in response to industrialism: this is evident as a significant portion of proponents of this trend endorsed the decentralization of the educational system and, consequently, as noted by Hidalgo (1999), the internationalization of productive relations.

The framework of educational regulations during the Brazilian developmental-national period was tied to the “monopolistic” nature of international capitalism: progressivism advocated for the socialization of education and, in contrast, the decentralization of teaching as a critique of authoritarian regimes where the State was “committed.” Therefore, this group supported the internationalization of the economy.

It was met with resistance from Catholic groups, the majority of whom favored private initiatives: as the debate shifted from the centralization of education to the topic of “freedom of education”, reconciling both parties (progressives and Catholics) became the safest path to the 1961 LDB, causing the curriculum in the 1960s to align more with the technical-linear proposal than with progressive ideas.

The conciliation framework established by the 1961 LDB raises reflections on how progressive and technocratic curriculum theories, in the context of the Brazilian experience, mirror the trajectory outlined by the curriculum in the North American context: it is observed, in fact, how the education project designed by the “reformers” proved to be unsuccessful.

6. The Missteps of the Progressive Reformist Emphasis and the Establishment of Technical-Linear Ideas in the Brazilian Educational Component

Cunha (2007b), in investigating Brazilian Higher Education between the enactment of the 1946 Resolution and the 1961 LDB, identifies a trend between the growth in numbers and the frustration in the projects of admission to Brazilian universities in favor of the generalization of this level of education. It also illustrates the modernization process driven by the arrival of the Military Regime, the 1967 Constituent Assembly, the

⁹ Romanelli (2013) marks this first period, in which the debate about the centralization or decentralization of Brazilian education is highlighted, between the years 1948 when the primitive project for the elaboration of the LDB is effectively presented and the commission responsible for it is formed, and 1958, the year in which the theme “exhausts” due to a new substitute amendment proposed by Deputy Carlos Lacerda, which shifts the debate to other directions: now, the theme of “freedom of teaching” becomes the center of attention. Saviani (2013) argues, about the initial debate, that this primitive project, elaborated by a commission in which the escolanovistas were in the majority, had a purely decentralizing bias. When it passed through the National Congress and was sent to the Constitution and Justice Commission, it reached the hands of the former minister, favorable to the centralization of education (a position that favored the Union taking responsibility for education in its entirety). The debate between centralizers and decentralizers, from there on, revolves around interpretations of the then-current Constitution of 1946: some believed that it endorsed the decentralizing position, going against the primitive LDB project, and others took the opposite stance. Although the debate apparently ran its course, Hidalgo (1999) draws attention to the relationship between the centralizing and decentralizing positions and those related to nationalism and internationalism: this author, analyzing the main post-1945 governments, understands that the prerogative of decentralizers often allied itself with internationalism in opposition to the policy woven by the Estado Novo, and in contrast, centralizers positioned themselves in favor of nationalization.

University Reform (Law No. 5,540/68), and the reform of primary and secondary education levels (LDB of 1971).

This process of modernization, according to Cunha (2007b, p. 210), was fueled by the “[...] combination of technical archaism and political conformity” present in the university and school curricula of that period. It was supported by the consolidation of formations and the encouragement of occupying “productive” and “advantageous” technical positions. This tone distorted alongside the contradictions of a higher education model marked by the interplay between a growth pattern and the frustration of admission projects.

The curriculum finds in the conciliatory pattern of the 1961 LDB an open field to align with the technical-linear trend. However, the contradictions exposed by higher education emphasized a critical character among teachers and academics: according to Cunha (2007b, p. 210), “The more the university plunged into a crisis, the greater the objective conditions for an increase in the contingent of those who advocated taking a critical position.” The technical-linear nature of the curriculum would resurface with the 1964 coup, restraining the critical orientation of universities due to the aforementioned contradictions.

The conciliatory stance taken by the 1961 LDB between progressives and Catholics suggested the combination of progressive and technocratic elements in the curriculum. On the other hand, the refutation of the tone presented by Cunha (2007b) revealed both the rise of a critical trend and the exhaustion of technocratic and curricular progressivism. The response found by the Military Regime to halt the critical trend and reaffirm the technical-linear nature of the curriculum would manifest itself in the University Reform of 1968 and the 1971 LDB.

In Brazil, during the 1960s, the field of curriculum witnessed an intensification of research, studies, and investigations. Articles 7, 8, and 9 of the 1961 LDB clarified the attributions of the Federal Council of Education (CFE): established as an entity linked to the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) responsible for deliberating on the Brazilian educational component at its different levels. Article 70 outlines one of its attributions: to define “[...] the minimum curriculum and the duration of courses that qualify for obtaining a diploma capable of ensuring privileges for the exercise of a liberal profession [...]” (Brazil, 1961, n.p.). This attribution gave greater impetus to Brazilian studies on the curriculum’s role.

In compliance with the article 70, the CFE (Federal Council of Education) enacted Opinion No. 251/62¹⁰, which maintained the ‘3+1 scheme’ and established the minimum curriculum for Pedagogy courses in the bachelor’s degree format. This opinion, according to Moreira (1990), influenced Brazilian curriculum studies in 1960 and defined the minimum content for Pedagogy courses based on mandatory and optional subjects. Among the latter, the author highlights ‘Curricula and Programs’, a specialized discipline that should favor a deeper and theoretically grounded approach to curriculum issues” (p. 125).

Despite the initial years of the 1960s representing an effort to coexist with different educational, pedagogical, and curricular theories, the advance of liberal-oriented theories is undeniable. Regarding this, Saviani (2013) justifies that the impetus for economic internationalization prevailed over the cult of nationalist political ideology: the progressive

¹⁰ The Opinion CFE No. 251/62, not found in virtual databases, holds great importance for the rise of curriculum studies, as it highlights the “Curriculum and Programs” discipline as optional for bachelor's degree programs in Education. Carmen Silva (2006, p. 37) makes it clear the composition of minimum contents for the bachelor's degree program in Education based on the document in question. Moreira (1990) emphasizes the importance of this discipline for curriculum studies but warns that only in 1968, influenced by the University Reform, it becomes a mandatory discipline in the training of supervisors, as seen in Opinion CFE No. 252/69 and Resolution CFE No. 2/69, also not found in virtual databases, which establish a new configuration for the Education program, breaking the dichotomy between bachelor's and teaching degrees and adopting a minimum curriculum (called the common part) and a diversified one (consisting of specific qualifications, such as administration, supervision, and school inspection).

agenda, focusing on internationalization, decentralization of public schools, and opening the educational component to foreign influences, gained prominence. From this context, the productivity-oriented conception of education accommodated by the Military Regime, even though not aligning with the school reformist goals, absorbed its ideological foundation: ‘social homogeneity.’ Saviani (2012) points out that contrary to the critical movement of the early 1960s, the school reformist tendency radicalized by aligning with the notion of instrumental efficiency.

Here is the field of the rise of the technical-linear perspective of the curriculum, where operability, objectivity, and productivity take the form of a prescription for the Brazilian educational component, gaining prominence in the 1964 coup and driving the educational reforms of the 1960s and 1970s. Aranha (2006), presenting the technicist theory of Brazilian education based on the symbiosis established between positivist philosophy and economism, clarifies its affinity with the technical-linear ideas of the curriculum.”

Technicism, as observed by Saviani (2012, 2013), sought to remove the educational component from all subjectivist interference of the New School: what mattered was the operationalization of objectives and the mechanization of the process. The accuracy of the product resulted from the organization of the means: the decisive element of the educational process did not fall to the teacher or the student but to the planning, coordination, and control of the process in terms of ‘efficiency.’

For the renovating tendency, the ideological basis of ‘social homogeneity’ is achieved when the agents of the pedagogical process adhere to the means to achieve an end. For the technicist tendency, this ideological basis becomes viable when the means define the action of these agents. The educational component conforms to the impulses of the means, albeit subsidized by the demands of the monopolistic face of capitalism: according to Saviani (2012, p. 14), ‘Education [...] [is conceived] as a subsystem, whose effective functioning is essential to the balance of the social system of which it is a part’.

The technicist-linear tendency is imported to Brazil through agreements between the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) and the Agency for International Development, known as MEC-USAID, agreements. Moreira (1990) notes, during the Military Regime, the presence of North American technicians in Brazilian public administration positions. He also highlights agreements between Brazilian and North American universities through exchange programs: these agreements influenced the education of teachers who later held positions in the “Curricula and Programs” disciplines after it became mandatory for the training of school supervisors (an integral part of the “diversified” curriculum of the Pedagogy course from 1969).

Cunha (2007c) explains how the University Reform of 1968 was placed ‘[...] in the service of the prioritized production of a new workforce required by monopolistic capital organized in state and private ‘multinational’ forms’ (p. 287). This reform impacted the curriculum of higher education courses in Brazilian universities.

The University Reform carries the stigma of the first adjustment of the Brazilian educational component from a ‘modern’ perspective, anchored in idealistic impetus and positivist organizational model. Orso (2007) sees in this milestone an alternative lifted by the government for the adjustment and elevation of the educational component to ‘technocratic-business rationality’: however, this desire had the purpose of ‘[...] containing the student movements that had become the government’s ‘number one problem’ (p. 77) since the emergence of the critical movement in the 1960s.

The technocratic trend served to depoliticize university movements and adapt the educational component to the direction of capitalist production relations. The prerogative of the

University Reform is reprinted in the 1971 LDB¹¹: Saviani (2005, p. 10-11) observes in the 1970s the proliferation of “[...] measures related to the development of curricula by specialists and the introduction of education technicians in educational units to guide and supervise the implementation of curriculum guides’: with the reformulation of Pedagogy courses, the ‘Curricula and Programs’ discipline becomes mandatory in postgraduate programs in Supervision and Curriculum at the country’s main universities”.

Moreira (1990) recognizes, in these courses, an emphasis on technical aspects of the curriculum: the discipline “Curriculum and Programs” took on a “practical” character, articulated with the prerogative of “how to do” and avoided any provocation about the theory-practice relationship. According to Moreira (1990), the cultivated interests focused on: i) the appropriation of Brazilian educational legislation, a fact that ensured Supervisors and/or Curriculum Specialists mastery of the “ways to follow” (or “evade”) the legislation; ii) the debate on the professionalization of teaching and the “importance” of technical positions in response to industrial development; iii) neglect of the knowledge issue, as the emphasis was on “logical selection and organization” and “structuring of disciplines”.

In spite of all these interests, the curriculum lacked, as Moreira (1990, p. 140) points out, relations with “[...] political and ideological aspects underlying the process of planning, implementing, and controlling [...]”, aligning itself with organizational models interested in adapting society to the “modern” productivity prerogative, that is, reaffirming the consensual acceptance of the bourgeois hegemonic process over the modern “collective subject”.

Considerations

The comprehensive investigation, which traces the rise of innovative theories of education and pedagogy and, nonetheless, technical curriculum theories, allows us to advance our understanding of the 1970s based on the following two assumptions: i) technical theories, exalted in the USA throughout the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s, finally conformed to the Brazilian educational component, and; ii) the first concerns emerged regarding the training of professionals qualified for supervision, emphasizing the concept of technical-linear theory.

The reconfiguration of this intricate scenario gained prominence at the end of the decade in question: the reconciliation of progressive and technocratic ideals in curriculum studies was put to the test in the “decompression policy” adopted by the last military governments. Moreira (1990a, p. 151) asserts that “[...] in 1974, critical analyses of curriculum and pedagogical issues began to reappear”. The study of the influence of these critical analyses on the educational component of central and “peripheral” capitalist nations (specifically Brazil), in turn, constitutes the subject of future investigation.

¹¹ It is important to understand that during the period between the University Reform and the promulgation of the 1971 LDB, the dictatorial character of the Military Regime became more acute. With the dissolution of the statement to please ‘both sides’, initially put forth in the University Reform, the promotion of this dictatorial character took advantage of a gap: Saviani (2013) reveals how the text presented by the working group responsible for this reform had some of its objectives vetoed by Decree-Law No. 464/69 (Brazil, 1969), determined to align it with the ‘designs of the regime’. The imposition of this Decree must be traced back to the freedom granted to the dictatorial character from Institutional Act No. 5, instituted between the approval of Law No. 5.540/68, the final text of the University Reform, and the Decree in question. Nevertheless, the economy, due to the surge in productive restructuring prompted by the ‘Brazilian economic miracle,’ was doing well, and the so-called ‘triumphant authoritarianism’ was at its peak. It is in this context that the elaboration and approval of the 1971 LDB take place, giving new characteristics to the old levels of primary and secondary education and completing the cycle of educational reforms driven by the peak of technocratic educational and pedagogical theories.

At the end of the 1970s, it is worth noting in advance that a critical trend re-emerges in the Brazilian educational, pedagogical, and curricular fields, expanding and taking center stage in the discussions and academic seminars. This movement was accompanied by a new cycle of accumulation and regulation assumed by capitalism.

Referências

ARANHA, Maria Lúcia de Arruda. *História da educação e da pedagogia: geral e Brasil*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Moderna, 2006. 384 p.

BITTAR, Marisa. A pesquisa em educação no Brasil e a constituição do campo científico. *Revista HISTEDBR*, Campinas, n. 33, p. 3-22, mar. 2009.

BITTAR, Marisa. FERREIRA JUNIOR, Amarílio. Ativismo pedagógico e princípios da escola do trabalho nos primeiros tempos da educação soviética. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 20, n. 61, abr./jun. 2015. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782015206108>.

BOBBITT, John Franklin. *The curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1918. 295p.

BRASIL. *Lei 4.024, de 20 de dezembro de 1961*. Fixa as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. Brasília, 1961. Disponível em: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L4024.htm. Acesso em: 12 jan. 2020.

BRASIL. *Decreto-Lei nº 464, de 11 de fevereiro de 1969*. Estabelece normas complementares à Lei nº 5.540, de 28 de novembro de 1968, e dá outras providências. Brasília, n.p., 1969. Disponível em: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/Decreto-Lei/1965-1988/De10464.htm. Acesso em 12 abr. 2020.

CAMBI, Franco. *História da pedagogia*. São Paulo: Fundação Editora da UNESP, 1999. 701p.

COMTE, Auguste. *Curso de filosofia positiva; Discurso sobre o espírito positivo; Discurso preliminar sobre o conjunto do positivismo; Catecismo positivista*. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1978. 318 p.

CUNHA, Luiz Antônio. *A universidade temporã: o ensino superior, da Colônia à Era Vargas*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2007a. 305 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7476/9788539304578>.

CUNHA, Luiz Antônio. *A universidade crítica: o ensino superior na república populista*. 3.ed. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2007b. 216 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7476/9788539304554>.

CUNHA, Luiz Antônio. *A universidade reformanda: o golpe de 1964 e a modernização do ensino superior*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2007c. 300 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7476/9788539304561>.

CURY, Carlos Roberto Jamil. *A formação docente e a educação nacional*. p. 1-24, 2003. Disponível em: http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/ldb_Art64.pdf. Acesso em 13 jan. 2020.

CURY, Carlos Roberto Jamil. O Plano Nacional de Educação de 1936/1937. *Educativa*, Goiânia, v. 17, n. 2, p. 396-424, jul./dez. 2015.

DALBOSCO, Cláudio Almir. *Pragmatismo, teoria crítica e educação: ação pedagógica como mediação de significados*. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2010. 260 p.

DEWEY, John. *Democracia e educação: introdução à filosofia da educação*. 4. ed. São Paulo: Editora Nacional, 1979. 416 p.

DEWEY, John. *A escola e a sociedade e a criança e o currículo*. Lisboa: Relógio D' Água Editores, 2002. 178 p.

FACCI, Marilda Gonçalves Dias. *Valorização ou esvaziamento do trabalho do professor? Um estudo crítico-comparativo da teoria do professor reflexivo, do construtivismo e da psicologia vigotskiana*. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2004. 292 p.

GADOTTI, Moacir. *História das idéias pedagógicas*. 8ª. ed. São Paulo: Ática, 2001. 319p.

GESSER, Verônica. A evolução histórica do currículo: dos primórdios à atualidade. *Contrapontos*, Itajaí, v. 2, n. 4, p. 69-81, jan./abr. 2002.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. *Cadernos do cárcere*. Temas de cultura; Ação Católica; Americanismo e fordismo. v. 4. 6. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2020. 394 p.

HIDALGO, Angela Maria. Centralização e descentralização nas políticas educacionais do Brasil no pós-30. *Revista Mediações*, Londrina, v.4, n.1, p.53-59, jan./jun. 1999. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5433/2176-6665.1999v4n1p53>.

JAMES, William. *Pragmatismo*. São Paulo: Martin Claret, 2005. 184 p.

LOPES, Alice Casimiro; MACEDO, Elizabeth. O pensamento curricular no Brasil. In: LOPES, Alice Casimiro; MACEDO, Elizabeth. (Orgs). *Currículo: debates contemporâneos*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010. p. 13-54.

LOPES, Alice Casimiro; MACEDO, Elizabeth. *Teorias de currículo*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011. 279p.

MALANCHEN, Julia. *Cultura, conhecimento e currículo: contribuições da pedagogia histórico-crítica*. Campinas, Autores Associados, 2016. 234 p.

MALTA, Shirley Cristina Lacerda. Uma abordagem sobre currículo e teorias afins visando à compreensão e mudança. *Espaço do Currículo*, João Pessoa, v.6, n.2, p.340-354, mai./ago. 2013.

MANACORDA, Mario Alighiero. *História da educação: da antiguidade aos nossos dias*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Cortez; Autores Associados, 1992. 382p.

MOREIRA, Antonio Flavio Barbosa. *Currículos e programas no Brasil*. Campinas: Papyrus, 1990. 192p.

MOREIRA, Antonio Flavio Barbosa. SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da. Sociologia e Teoria Crítica do Currículo: uma introdução. In: MOREIRA, Antonio Flavio Barbosa. SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da. (Orgs.). *Currículo, cultura e sociedade*. 8. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2005. p. 7-38.

ORSO, Paulino José. A Reforma Universitária dos anos de 1960. In: ORSO, Paulino José (Org.). *Educação, sociedade de classes e reformas universitárias*. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2007. p. 63-85.

PACHECO, José Augusto. Currículo: entre teorias e métodos. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v.39, n.137, p.383-400, mai./ago. 2009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-15742009000200004>.

RIBEIRO, Márden de Pádua. Currículo e conhecimento sob diferentes perspectivas teóricas. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, v.17, n.3, p. 574-599, set./dez. 2017.

RIBEIRO, Márden de Pádua; ZANARDI, Teodoro Adriano Costa. As concepções marxistas da Pedagogia Histórico-crítica de Dermeval Saviani em relação à temática do conhecimento: contribuições ao currículo. *Educação em Revista*, Belo Horizonte, v. 34, p. 1-20, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698186783>.

RODRIGUES, José Paz. Vittorino da Feltre, criador da ‘Escola da Alegria’. *Portal Galego da Língua*. n.p., 2018. Disponível em: <https://pgl.gal/vittorino-da-feltre-criador-da-escola-da-alegria/>. Acesso em 18 mar. 2020.

SANTOS, Luan Bergston; MACHADO, Liliane Campos. O currículo: teoria, história e prática docente. In: *CONGRESSO NORTE-MINEIRO DE PESQUISA EM EDUCAÇÃO*, 3., 2011, Montes Claros. Anais... Montes Claros, UNIMONTES, n.p., 2011.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. *As concepções pedagógicas na história da educação brasileira*. p.1-38, 2005a. Disponível em: <https://11nq.com/9VDFC>. Acesso em 16 mar. 2020.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. História da formação docente no Brasil: três momentos decisivos. *Educação*, Santa Maria, v.30, n.2, p.11-26, jul./dez. 2005b.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. O legado educacional do “longo século XX” brasileiro. In: SAVIANI, Dermeval; ALMEIDA, Jane Soares de; SOUZA, Rosa Fátima de; VALDEMARIN, Vera Teresa. *O legado educacional do século XX no Brasil*. 2. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2006. p.9-57.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. Educação socialista, Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica e os desafios da sociedade de classes. In: LOMBARDI, José Claudinei; SAVIANI, Dermeval. (Orgs.) *Marxismo e educação: debates contemporâneos*. 2. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2008. p. 223-274.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. *Escola e democracia*. 42 ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2012. 128p.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. *História das ideias pedagógicas no Brasil*. 4. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2013. 472 p.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. Educação escolar, currículo e sociedade: o problema da Base Nacional Comum Curricular. *Movimento Revista de Educação*, Rio de Janeiro, v.3, n.4, p. 54-84, 2016.

SAVIANI, Nereide. *História do currículo e tradição escolar*. p. 10-19, 2005. Disponível em: <https://cdnbi.tvescola.org.br/contents/document/publicationsSeries/151117CurrículoEM.pdf#page=10>. Acesso em 2 abr. 2020.

SCHMIDT, Elizabeth Silveira. Currículo: uma abordagem conceitual e histórica. *Publicatio UEPG: Ciências Humanas, Linguística, Letras e Artes*, Ponta Grossa, v. 11, n. 1, p. 59-69, jun. 2003.

SILVA, Carmem Silvia Bissolli da. *Curso de Pedagogia no Brasil: história e identidade*, 3. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2006. 160 p.

SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da. *Documentos de identidade: uma introdução às teorias do currículo*. 3. ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2017. 156 p.

TEIXEIRA, Anísio Spínola. *Pequena introdução à filosofia da educação: a escola progressiva ou a transformação da escola*. 7. ed. São Paulo: Editora Nacional, 1975. 150 p.

TEIXEIRA, Anísio Spínola. A pedagogia de Dewey: esboço da teoria de educação de John Dewey. In: DEWEY, John. *Vida e educação*. 10. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Melhoramentos; FENAME, 1978. p. 13-41.

TYLER, Ralph Winfred. *Princípios básicos de currículo e ensino*. 8. ed. Porto Alegre: Globo, 1983. 128 p.

VALDEMARIN, Vera Teresa. Os sentidos e a experiência: professores, alunos e métodos de ensino. In: SAVIANI, Dermeval; ALMEIDA, Jane Soares de; SOUZA, Rosa Fátima de; VALDEMARIN, Vera Teresa. *O legado educacional do século XX no Brasil*. 2. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2006. p. 163-203.