

Work and Education: correlations with the Culture Industry in educational policies¹

Trabalho e Educação: correlações com a Indústria Cultural nas políticas educacionais

Trabajo y Educación: correlaciones con la Industria Cultural en las políticas educativas

Marina Silveira Bonacazata Santos²
State University of Maringá

Jani Alves da Silva Moreira³
State University of Maringá

Abstract: This text aims to understand the relationship between work and education, as well as their restructuring processes, in order to demonstrate the mutual relationship between the two and their correlations with the Cultural Industry in educational policies. It corresponds to the results of exploratory, bibliographic research, whose intention is to provide theoretical support for the analysis of educational policies, with regard to the relationship between work and education, from the perspective of the Culture Industry. The results showed that the productive organization discussed in the text, from the 16th to the 21st century, triggered processes in educational structuring. In traditional teaching, knowledge was centered on the teacher, whereas in technical teaching, this centrality is lost due to the implementation of technologies that now manage the teaching process. The Culture Industry is reflected in both work and education, contributing to the formation of consumers rather than critical and reflective citizens.

Keywords: Work-education; Mass culture; Critical theory; Educational Policies.

Resumo: O presente texto tem como objetivo compreender a relação que há entre o trabalho e a educação, bem como seus processos de reestruturação, a fim de demonstrar a relação mútua existente entre ambos e suas correlações com a Indústria Cultural nas políticas educacionais. Corresponde aos resultados de uma pesquisa exploratória, de cunho bibliográfico, cuja intenção foi propiciar subsídios teóricos para a análise das políticas educacionais no que se refere à relação trabalho e educação, na perspectiva da Indústria Cultural. Os resultados evidenciaram que a organização produtiva abordada no texto, do século XVI ao XXI, desencadeou processos na estruturação educacional. No ensino tradicional, o conhecimento era centrado no professor, já no tecnicista, essa centralidade é perdida, devido à implementação de tecnologias que passam a gerenciar o processo de ensino. A Indústria Cultural se reflete tanto no trabalho quanto na educação ao contribuir para formar consumidores em detrimento de cidadãos críticos e reflexivos.

Palavras-chave: Trabalho-educação; Cultura de massa; Teoria crítica; Políticas Educacionais.

¹ Kátia Cristina Daniela da Silva, State University of Paraná, Campo Grande, Brazil, katiangles02@gmail.com

² Master's degree in Science and Mathematics Education from the Graduate Program in Science and Mathematics Education at the State University of Maringá. PhD candidate in Education from the Graduate Program in Education at the State University of Maringá (UEM), Maringá, Paraná (PR), Brazil. Email: marinabonacazata@gmail.com; Lattes: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/1369137675849065>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4570-2164>.

³ PhD in Education from the Graduate Program in Education at the State University of Maringá. Professor in the Department of Theory and Practice of Education (DTP) and the Graduate Program in Education at the State University of Maringá (UEM), Maringá, Paraná (PR), Brazil. Email: jasmoreira@uem.br; Lattes: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/8162047783765424>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3008-0887>.

Resumen: El presente texto pretende comprender la relación que existe entre el trabajo y la educación, así como sus procesos de reestructuración, para demostrar la relación mutua existente entre ambos y sus correlaciones con la Industria Cultural en las políticas educacionales. Corresponde a los resultados de una encuesta exploratoria, de naturaleza bibliográfica, cuya intención es propiciar subsidios teóricos para el análisis de las políticas educativas, en lo que respecta a la relación trabajo-educación, en la perspectiva de la Industria Cultural. Los resultados evidenciaron que la organización productiva abordada en el texto, desde el siglo XVI hasta el XXI, ha motivado procesos en la estructuración educativa. En la enseñanza tradicional, el conocimiento se centraba en el profesor, pero en el modelo tecnicista se pierde esta centralidad, debido a la implementación de tecnologías que comienzan a gestionar el proceso de enseñanza. La Industria Cultural se refleja tanto en el trabajo como en la educación, contribuyendo a la formación de consumidores en detrimento de ciudadanos críticos y reflexivos.

Palabras clave: Trabajo-educación; Cultura de masas; Teoría crítica; Políticas Educativas.

Received on: February 21, 2025

Accepted on: October 16, 2025

Introduction

This text aims to understand the relationship between work and education and their restructuring processes, in order to demonstrate the mutual relationship between the two and their correlations with the Culture Industry in educational policies. The research question is: What are the consequences of the interconnection between work and education in a society structured on the capitalist system and engendered by the influence of the Culture Industry? In this sense, the theoretical and methodological framework used is that of critical and conceptual theory, centered mainly on the understandings of Adorno and Horkheimer (1985). Criticism, as Postone (1993, p. 140) points out, “is based on the contradictory character of capitalist society, which points to the possibility of its historical negation.”

It is worth highlighting the contributions of Working Group 09 on Work and Education of the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Education (ANPED), which, since its creation, has been a forum for discussion that presents research and studies on the various relationships between the world of work and education, addressing this relationship as a focus of analysis, based on a critical and contextual theoretical framework.

From this same perspective, the results of the research presented here provide theoretical and analytical elements for understanding the relationship between work and education, which is essential for academic analysis of educational policies (Stremel, 2016),

since, given the structure of society, there is a direct correlation among these sectors when we consider the changes in productive organization and in the educational process over the centuries, added to the interconnection of both to the capitalist system and to the Culture Industry, whose system “originates in liberal industrial countries, and it is in these countries that all its characteristic media triumph, especially cinema, radio, jazz, and magazines” (Adorno; Horkheimer, 1985, p. 62). This interconnection, meanwhile, leads to an increasingly technical and less reflective society, driven by profit.

To address this proposal, we will first seek to interrelate Critical Theory, the Culture Industry, and the elements necessary for understanding the link between work and education. Second, we will discuss the mutual relationship established between changes in work and education in Brazil and, finally, we will address the correlation between work, education, and the Culture Industry, as proposed by Adorno and Horkheimer.

This article presents an analysis based on the periodization from the 16th to the 21st century, as we refer to the understanding of pedagogical trends present in this period, which begins with manufacturing and extends to the phase of the National Common Core Curriculum (BNCC). We use exploratory research methodology of a theoretical-bibliographic nature. According to Gil (2017), exploratory research allows familiarity with the problem investigated by making it explicit. The bibliographic character involves existing materials on the topic to be discussed, with an emphasis on books and scientific articles (Gil, 2017).

The results indicate that the relationship between work and education is intrinsically linked to educational policies, which are not yet effective in terms of the Cultural Industry perspective proposed by Adorno and Horkheimer (1985), which should prioritize the training of critical and reflective individuals, since in the current context, to the detriment of critical thinking, the organization of work and liberal teaching pedagogies obey the capitalist order of training for profit, in which technology is increasingly applied in education to expand productive capacity. The BNCC (Brazil, 2018), for example, establishes competencies and skills that are consistent with the training of labor for the market.

Critical Theory and the Culture Industry: analytical elements for understanding the relationship between Work and Education

Critical Theory is intrinsically related to the academic field of educational policy. The concept of policy is complex and can be understood as the process by which the State exercises its power and control in the field of regulation, planning, and legislation, with

or without consent (Moreira, 2015). However, the author mentions that policies should also be understood as a political process that encompasses negotiations and struggles between classes with divergent views, requiring discussions and disputes that lead to conflicts between groups. Therefore, "Politics should be understood as a process rather than a product" (Moreira, 2015, p. 28). Politics applied to the field of education is called educational policy. Regarding education, Adorno emphasizes that it does not have the duty to modify the

People from outside; but it is also not merely a matter of the transmission of knowledge, whose lifeless nature has already been sufficiently emphasized, but rather of the production of genuine consciousness. This would, in fact, be of the utmost political importance; his idea, if I may put it this way, constitutes a political imperative." (Adorno, 1995a, pp. 141–142)

One of the central themes of Critical Theory is the Culture Industry, which has a direct impact on the emancipatory process, since it is related to state capitalism, which, due to the hegemony of instrumental reason, interferes with morality, science, and art in a world run by a monopolistic economy, that is, through the influence of the Culture Industry, which in turn hinders emancipation, or critical thinking. For this reason, without a critical social theory, "any emancipatory orientation runs the risk of getting lost in mere normativism" (Melo, 2011, p. 254). Therefore, according to critical theory, education should "guide individuals to consciously resist the dominant impositions of control in society" (Mendes, 2021, p. 38), that is, it should not only value technique, but also awareness and personal emancipation, hence the relevance of understanding the changes in work and education over time related to the influence of the Culture Industry.

From the 16th to the 18th century, Brazil experienced a strong religious influence on work and education, mainly from the Catholic Church, due to the domination of education by the Jesuits, who arrived in the country through a movement known as the "Crusades" and took over Brazilian education through catechization. However, due to the war that broke out across Europe, which was opposed to the Jesuits, the Society of Jesus was expelled from Brazil and other colonies "in 1559, and its extinction in 1773, which disrupted the school system, largely supported by the Jesuits. Thus, for 200 years, the power of the Church in Brazil was unquestionable" (Casimiro, 2010, p. 84).

From the imperial period, between the 19th and 20th centuries, a profound reconfiguration can be observed: knowledge becomes detached from the religious domain and is guided by the fundamentals of science. In the transition from feudal order to bourgeois society, the clash between faith and scientific rationality intensifies, a conflict

that becomes more acute as the bourgeoisie asserts itself as a social class. This process culminated in the 18th century with the rise of science as the hegemonic reference point for thought, a milestone of the Enlightenment, a rationalist movement led by the European elites (Gay, 1973).

It is well known that work is essential for human beings. Through work, humans transform and interfere with nature in order to survive. According to Marx (1989, p. 202), work can be defined as the “process in which human beings, through their own actions, drive, regulate, and control their material exchange with nature,” which is why it is related to a product to be marketed.

In Brazil, we can highlight different periods in terms of production structuring modes, from manufacturing, in which the production agent is human labor (Marx, 2013), to machinery, with the implementation of machines in industries. Subsequently, Taylorism⁴, which establishes rationalization with strict control and supervision of production time, organization of space, and simultaneity of work (Taylor, 1990), followed by the Fordist⁵ model, with mass production and large inventories (Harvey, 1992), and then Toyotism, with the flexibilization of work.

Capitalism incorporates abstract labor, which is not focused on production, but rather on social interaction, and is therefore a way of dominating society and interfering in social relations. Intrinsic to its reproductive logic, capitalism thus manifests a form of social pathology (Postone, 1993). For this reason, it is necessary to reflect on the fact that working conditions are intertwined with the educational process. In the 16th and 17th centuries, educational organization began to reflect the growing centrality of commercial activities, as society at that time was restructuring itself on the basis of exchange relations. In this context, teaching began to value the experimental method, whose purpose was not only to guide how knowledge should be produced, but also to affirm the philosophical principles characteristic of this period of social transition (Zilsel, 2018).

In the 19th century, the bourgeoisie came to power and, in this sense, the goal became to consolidate bourgeois democracy (Saviani, 2008) through education, as a way to break with ignorance and marginalization. It is worth discussing here the liberal pedagogies of teaching, which aim to justify the capitalist system, which organizes society into a so-called class society

4 Taylorism, as a model for organizing productive work, was developed by Frederick W. Taylor. It is also called scientific management, whose goal is to increase productivity through the division and specialization of tasks, with strict control of time and standardization of work methods (Taylor, 1990).

5 Fordism is an industrial production model created by Henry Ford in the early 20th century, characterized by mass production using assembly lines, product standardization, and division of labor, in which industrial rationalization is applied on a large scale (Ribeiro, 2015).

based on private ownership of the means of production (Gadotti, 1999). Liberal pedagogies range from Traditional Pedagogy to Technicist Pedagogy; thus, schools based on Traditional Pedagogy "are organized as teacher-centered agencies, which transmit cultural knowledge to students according to a logical progression. It is up to them to assimilate the knowledge that is transmitted to them" (Saviani, 2008, p. 6), therefore the educational policy in force during this period consisted of content that had no relation to the daily lives and social reality of the students (Gadotti, 1999).

At the end of the 19th century, traditional pedagogy began to be criticized and gradually gave way to new pedagogy, in a movement we call "escolanovismo" (new schoolism). The new school maintains the idea of social equalization and correction of marginality present in traditional schools (Saviani, 2008), but the marginalized are no longer the ignorant, but rather the rejected. New pedagogy focuses not on learning, but on learning to learn, and has "experimental inspiration based mainly on contributions from biology and psychology" (Saviani, 2008, p. 8). In this pedagogy, the teacher mediates the student's learning by giving them autonomy and freedom to learn, so the teacher is no longer the center of the learning process (Gadotti, 1999), and educational policy is therefore focused on the students.

At the dawn of the 20th century and in the current phase of the 21st century, technical education has predominated, mainly due to large-scale industrialization and new technologies in the labor market. In this sense, Technical Pedagogy has begun to take hold in schools, focused no longer on learning to learn, but rather on learning to do, that is, "this pedagogy advocates the reorganization of the educational process in order to make it objective and operational" (Saviani, 2008, p. 10), as educational policy focuses on training students as labor for industry (Gadotti, 1999). After the phase of structural crisis of capital, especially after 2008⁶, there was an intensification of technicality with hegemonic pedagogies, called neotechnical and neoconservative, designed for the training of multifunctional, versatile, and adaptable subjects (Antunes, 2017). In this context, the Culture Industry is present in the process of work organization and education in our country, in which education has become devoid of its critical, ethical, and emancipatory content.

⁶ The post-2008 capital crisis represents a new stage in the restructuring of global capitalism, marked by intensified financialization, structural job insecurity, and the consolidation of an accumulation model based on overexploitation and platform-based digital logic. Antunes (2018) points out that capital sought to restore its profit rate through extreme deregulation and flexibilization, while Tonello (2021) argues that this phase deepens the subordination of labor to financial logic, expressed in the advance of informality and Uberization, phenomena that redefine the morphology of the contemporary working class.

In this way, workers perform their duties within industries without having any notion of the final product; however, when finished, this product receives a value to be sold/consumed in society. As Adorno and Horkheimer (1985, p. 60) mention, this “is a model of the gigantic economic machinery that, from the outset, gives no respite to anyone, either at work or at rest, which so closely resembles work.”

For the Culture Industry, it is necessary to create a consumer society, therefore theoretical knowledge and critical thinking, in this context, are disregarded and, according to Adorno (1995a, p. 120), “Education only makes sense as education directed towards critical self-reflection,” which the Culture Industry does not propose. Today's schools, in turn, train people for consumption and contribute to the spread of so-called Mass Culture.

In light of the above, this article aims to outline the changes in the structure of work in line with changes in the educational process in Brazil, in order to demonstrate the mutual relationship between the two and their correlations with the Culture Industry proposed by Adorno and Horkheimer (1985).

Changes in the structure of work and changes in the educational process in Brazil: a mutual relationship

The configuration of work in Brazil has changed over the centuries, and education has followed these changes, as schools have increasingly trained students to enter the labor market. This section seeks to outline the main changes in the country's labor and educational structures from manufacturing to the present day in order to highlight the relationship between these sectors.

According to Marx, all labor results in a product, which, in turn, has a use value and an exchange value. The former is realized in the use or consumption of the product and is responsible for “forming the material content of wealth” (Marx, 2013, p. 97). The latter is a regular social process, in the sense that “on the one hand, the separation between the usefulness of things for immediate need and their usefulness for exchange is confirmed” (Marx, 2013, p. 131).

In addition to their use value and exchange value, products are also influenced by what is known as surplus value or added value, resulting from “the transformation of the value of a commodity that is paid after its use value, under the command of capital, recreates the old exchange value as a substance capable of increasing by itself” (Marx, 2013, p. 62). Surplus value can therefore be understood as unpaid labor.

The first period to be considered in terms of productive organization in Brazil is manufacturing. This mode of production lasted in the country from the mid-16th century to the early 18th century. The predominant workforce consisted of children, adolescents, women, and people with disabilities, due to their lower cost and ease of access, especially in the case of children.

There are two modes of manufacturing. In the first, workers in autonomous roles are part of the same workshop and produce a single product. In the second, although still in the same workshop, the final products rely on the union of partial workers in the same time frame, who subsequently take on a specific role (Marx, 2013). These different types of manufacturing lead to changes in work tools, because as the operations of the productive sector become dissociated, each stage is carried out by a partial worker (Marx, 2013).

In this context, homogeneous and organic manufacturing stand out. In homogeneous manufacturing, artisans work individually for their clients, while in organic manufacturing, products go through interconnected stages in their production. In this sense, the division of labor in manufacturing allowed for an increase in production in a shorter time frame (Marx, 2013).

The structuring of work in the manufacturing period is essentially focused on trade. According to Smith (1985), in manufacturing, workers had little time to devote to education, so the main focus was on the moral and intellectual effects of simplified work, therefore teaching should emphasize only what was necessary, such as reading, writing, and arithmetic. In this way, the state would spend little and could provide the population with an education (Smith, 1985).

Later, at the end of the 18th century, with the Industrial Revolution, there was the period of machinery, which focused on using machines to “make goods cheaper and shorten the part of the working day that the worker needs for himself, in order to prolong the other part of his working day, which he gives freely to the capitalist” (Marx, 2013, p. 303).

Machines differ from tools used in manufacturing in the sense that “in tools, man would be the driving force, whereas machines would be driven by a natural force other than human power, such as that derived from animals, water, wind, etc.” (Schulz, 1843, p. 38). Therefore, man's duty becomes knowing how to operate the machines and no longer being directly involved in the execution of the work, since production is mechanized.

In machinery, the work could be carried out through the cooperation of many machines of the same type or through a system of machines. In the first case, the same machine carries out the entire production process, while in the second, there are specific machines for a given stage of product production, thus involving a set of complementary machines (Marx, 2013).

During the age of machinery, production expanded considerably. The quantity to be produced depended on the speed achieved by the machine. A factor that had a major impact on production was the wear and tear on the machinery, and it is worth noting that the machines transferred their own value to the products they produced, since they were considered part of those products, precisely because they were integrated into the production process. Machinery has an assigned value due to its durability, which is superior to that of manufacturing tools (Marx, 2013). It can be said that the profits of the bourgeoisie, who owned the means of production, became even greater, added to the increase in surplus value, due to the excessive exploitation of workers, who worked beyond normal hours without being paid for their labor (Marx, 2013).

Regarding education during the Industrial Revolution and the rise of machinery, Engels (2007) found that, in practice, there was no intellectual, moral, or social education, but rather immorality. The means of instruction offered were insufficient, and most teachers were not adequately qualified. Few schools operated during the week and were attended by few workers.

According to the author, night schools had few students because, as the working day was 12 hours long, many did not attend school and those who did ended up sleeping due to tiredness and exhaustion. As for children, due to working in factories or at home, they also did not attend classes properly, falling victim to illiteracy and ignorance.

After machinery, Taylorism was introduced in Brazil in the early 19th century, as already mentioned, establishing the principles of scientific management in 1911. The main changes in production established by this organizational system are rationalization, with strict control and supervision of production time, organization of space, and simultaneity of work. Workers began to have a specific function in production, thus reducing their autonomy (Taylor, 1990). In Taylorism, time was of great importance, which was directly reflected in increased production.

Each worker was assigned the most suitable task according to their aptitude, and maximum production was demanded of the worker, who received a higher salary the greater their production (Taylor, 1990). Planning in Taylorism was a fundamental step and required a skilled worker to carry it out, as it demanded the understanding and organization of scientific data.

In the 19th century, traditional schooling persisted in the country. Saviani (1989, pp. 57-58) points out that “traditional teaching aimed to transmit knowledge obtained by science, therefore already summarized, systematized, and incorporated into the cultural heritage of

humanity.” During this period, the content to be transmitted by the teacher, a central figure, was more important than practice, and reason prevailed over feelings in science.

According to Saviani (2008), in traditional education, marginalized individuals were those citizens who lacked enlightenment, that is, they were deprived of access to knowledge. The duty of the school was to end ignorance by spreading instruction based on logical knowledge of humanity and, in this way, universalize education to all who did not have access to it. However, this goal was not achieved because “the school in question, in addition to failing to achieve its goal of universalization (not everyone enrolled in it, and even those who did enroll were not always successful)” (Saviani, 2008, p. 6). In the face of the class society that sustained capitalist reality, in traditional education, “Teachers are the agents of communication of knowledge and skills and of the imposition of rules of conduct” (Gadotti, 1999, p. 150).

Thus, the society that sought to consolidate itself was the bourgeoisie, which held power and sought to implement so-called bourgeois democracy through a social contract developed “freely” in society (Saviani, 2008) and, in this sense, freedom would be achieved by overcoming ignorance. The main objective of the school, in this context, was to “transform subjects into citizens” (Saviani, 2008, p. 6). As universal access to school was not achieved, criticism of traditional education began to intensify.

In 1914, with Fordism, whose main change from Taylorism was the establishment of mass production with large inventories, the “eight-hour day and five dollars as compensation for workers on the automatic car assembly line [...]” was established (Harvey, 1992, p. 121). The great innovation of the Fordist production model was the implementation of the conveyor belt, but it was also recognized that:

Mass production meant mass consumption, a new system of reproduction of the workforce, a new policy of control and management of the workforce, a new aesthetic and a new psychology; in short, a new type of democratic society (Harvey, 1992, p. 121).

For Ford (1926), every individual was capable of performing work; all that was needed was to provide them with the opportunity. According to him, if a worker “has a higher education, he usually rises more quickly, but it all depends on starting at the lowest position and proving his ability” (Ford, 1926, p. 128). In this production model, no worker was rejected because of their physical or mental condition.

Therefore, the main difference between Fordism and Taylorism is that “Fordism had a project of hegemony. It did not want to simply dominate the workforce, but rather to win their allegiance” (Ribeiro, 2015, p. 71), considering each and every individual, as they were all

fit for work. New Pedagogy was in force in schools during the Fordism period and during its crisis at the end of the 19th century. This pedagogy focused on the student, and no longer on the teacher, as the main agent for the acquisition of knowledge.

According to the New School, marginalized individuals were those who were rejected. Marginality was not viewed negatively by the New School, as was the case in traditional schools, but rather as a difference. It is important to note that the new school nevertheless maintained the duty to correct marginality for the sake of social equality present in the traditional school. Saviani (2008, p. 7) points out that “Based on the experiences carried out with ‘abnormal’ children, the intention was to generalize pedagogical procedures for the entire school system.”

New Pedagogy mainly changed aspects related to the pedagogical and philosophical structure of teaching and research. Based on this, students begin to apply the methods they learn in practice through experiments, and teachers take on the role of mediators of learning. The logical reasoning of traditional teaching gives way to the expression of emotions and feelings, which is directly reflected in students' creativity and freedom of expression (Saviani, 2008).

It is important to note, however, that the new school “ended up dissolving the difference between research and teaching, without realizing that, in doing so, while teaching was being impoverished, research was also being undermined” (Saviani, 1989, pp. 57-58), since scientific knowledge and research depend directly on the transmission of knowledge, an aspect that New Pedagogy does not take into account. In this context, “the school must adapt to individual needs and the social environment” (Galvão, 2024, p. 96) and, in 1973, the context was one of deep recession, most evident in the oil crisis, which “removed the capitalist world from the suffocating torpor of ‘stagflation’ (stagnation of goods production and high price inflation) and set in motion a series of processes that undermined the Fordist compromise” (Harvey, 1992, p. 140).

Workers' dissatisfaction with the situation culminated in the crisis of Fordism and the implementation of Toyotism, also known as flexible accumulation, in the 20th century. Its main feature is the flexibilization of work, with the implementation of assembly lines, reduced inventories (just in time), and on-demand production through the establishment of productive islands with task integration, which allowed for the separation between planning and execution of work, which is now carried out in groups (Harvey, 1992).

The high growth of the industrial and service sectors in Brazil during the Toyotist period culminated in a process of change in the educational structure. In the 20th century, faced with new technologies in the labor market, education became

technical in the sense that both teachers and students became hostages to the machinery used in education. These machines controlled all the logistics of teaching and learning in schools. In schools guided by technicality, the emphasis was “on improving the existing social order (the capitalist system), articulating directly with the productive system” (Luckesi, 2011, p. 74), so education became a technology for maximizing production rather than for training critical individuals from the perspective of the Culture Industry as proposed by Adorno and Horkheimer (1985).

Given this, in Technical Pedagogy, the mechanized process defines the guidelines for structuring teaching and learning. Teaching machines brought ready-made proposals, so teachers no longer had to worry about planning their lessons, as they arrived in the classroom already prepared. Students become passive in the face of technology, as they simply follow the established content without developing the critical and reflective thinking skills they had when, in New Pedagogy, they were at the center of learning.

Based on the above, it is clear that, over the centuries, work in our country has become mechanized and increasingly complex, from artisans in manufacturing, with a single tool for small-scale production, to Toyotism with the mechanization of production, technological implementation in industries, and large-scale production, albeit on demand, with work carried out in production islands.

There is a link between the changes that have taken place in the organization of work and in Brazilian education, and these sectors, in turn, are directly related to the cultural industry. It can be said that, over the centuries, work has become mechanized and the educational process has followed suit. There has been a clear transition from commerce-driven education in the manufacturing era to mechanized teaching and learning in the technical schools of the 20th century. These schools produce alienated students who lack critical thinking skills, characteristics that are integral to the Culture Industry.

Correlations between work and education: the Culture Industry, proposed by Adorno and Horkheimer

In a globalized world immersed in the capitalist system, the Culture Industry is present in various forms: art, television, music, cinema, and exerts a direct influence on society in general, mainly by stimulating unconscious and excessive consumption, which, in turn, contributes to the maintenance of capitalism. This section seeks to present the correlations between work and education with the Culture Industry, as proposed by Adorno and Horkheimer (1985), with the aim of understanding its influence on educational policies.

The concept of Cultural Industry emerged with the publication of the book written by Adorno and Horkheimer (1985), philosophers linked to the Frankfurt School, entitled *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, which was first published in 1947.

For the Culture Industry, consumption is the main objective, since the cultural goods produced under its aegis promote the development of damaged consciousnesses, concerned with the values of immediate consumption (Pucci, 1998), a factor responsible for driving the capitalist system.

According to Adorno, there is a relationship between the so-called theory of semi-culture—which proposes that culture has a dual character: one that refers to society and one that mediates between society and semi-formation - (Adorno, 2005), and is also related to the Culture Industry, whereas this theory “vouches for the provincial charlatans of politics and, with them, as a last resort, imposes it on the majority of the governed, tamed by big industry and the Culture Industry” (Adorno; Horkheimer, 1985, p. 223). For the authors, the critic of culture feeds on the mythical stubbornness that it provides.

It can be said that cultural critics, based on their criticism of the consumption of material goods, claim that the desire for consumption by humans is a sin, since, according to Adorno, “for cultural critics, sin is satiety, not hunger” (Adorno, 2002, p. 51). In this sense, Adorno and Horkheimer (1985) argue that social progress is directly related to the naturalization of man.

Consumption, in turn, is directly related to society's purchasing power. Social progress results in an increase in resources derived from nature, but these resources are accessible only to a portion of the population, those with better economic conditions, which ultimately widens social inequality. The production and consumption of goods are directly related to alienation, as the workers involved in the production process of these goods are immersed in a technological context that does not allow them to have a notion of the final product, a fundamental condition for the functioning of capitalist dynamics, as stated by the philosopher Maar (2008, p. 9):

The cultural industry, distinct from manufacturing or craftsmanship, imposes its schematism on producers, manipulating men as reified cogs in the continuous expansion of capital. The alienated labor imposed by capitalist domination “shapes,” but in the sense of deformation.

Products within the context of the Culture Industry are manufactured with the specific intention of attracting consumers and are quickly introduced to the market. They rely on advertising strategies that grab consumers' attention while blocking rational

thinking, a deliberate strategy to get buyers to consume a certain product, even if they don't really need it.

For Adorno and Horkheimer (1985), increasingly mechanized work leads workers to escape reality through entertainment, justified mainly by the need for workers to get away from the exhausting routine of work, which requires concentration and reasoning in the face of the technological complexity present in factories, added to the incapacity and impotence generated during the production process. There is an established relationship between work, entertainment, and free time. Although, according to morality, free time is related to the restoration of the workforce, it is possible to highlight the presence of bourgeois behavior in this relationship, since, when workers are enjoying their moments of “entertainment” outside the factory, they unconsciously also consume something that was necessarily produced by someone else. Adorno refers to free time as a way of escaping the production process.

It is important to emphasize that free time, however, does not only impact work, as it is also reflected in education. Schools established grades for students' attention and behavior in the classroom, and in this sense, children used their free time for fun and escape from the rigidity of school, but parents exercised some control over their children's leisure time. In the words of Adorno and Horkheimer (1985, p. 70):

School reports used to include notes for parents. These reflected the perhaps subjectively well-intentioned concern of parents that their children should not overexert themselves in their free time: not reading too much, not leaving the light on too long at night.

Besides the influence of free time on education, it is necessary to highlight another factor that, according to Adorno, also has a direct impact on the educational process, mentioned by the author in his text “Education after Auschwitz,” which is precisely the need for Auschwitz not to be repeated, because, according to the author, “It was the barbarism against which all education is directed.” (Adorno, 1995b, p. 117). It can be said that this terrible episode occurred due to numerous factors, including technological advances combined with a false collective identification and the training of those who manipulate people without question, precisely because of this identification.

Based on the importance of preserving human history, it can be said that Adorno, when speaking of education after Auschwitz, refers to “childhood education, especially in early childhood; and beyond that, to general enlightenment, which produces an intellectual, cultural, and social climate that does not allow such repetition” (Adorno, 1995b, p. 123). People

accepted Auschwitz because of their indifference and coldness towards others, which is why false collective identity is cited as one of the reasons for its occurrence.

According to the author, in order to prevent the Auschwitz massacre from happening again, it is necessary to “seek the roots in the persecutors and not in the victims murdered under the most petty pretexts” (Adorno, 1995b, p. 121), in addition to emphasizing that the only power against such a massacre, based on Kant (2007), would be autonomy for reflection, self-determination, and non-participation. In other words, students need to develop critical thinking in this sense, critical thinking, because “It is only through their knowledge (Cultural Industry) that a new educational, cultural, and communication policy can be proposed that is capable of providing subsidies for the alteration of the Cultural Industry itself” (Fadul, 1994, p. 54).

It is the role of schools to educate citizens who are critical and not alienated from the global and social context in which they live. However, this is a difficult task if we take into account the context of technical pedagogy, which is increasingly present in education, the advance of globalization, the presence of various technologies, and the reconfiguration of capitalism, which increasingly culminate in the formation of individuals for excessive consumption, contributing to the generation of capital.

Technical skills bring with them a new educational pillar that adds to the four existing pillars: learning to learn, learning to be, learning to do, and learning to live together, and, in today's reality, “learning to be an entrepreneur.” The idea of entrepreneurship is present in international documents such as the Delors Report (Delors, 1998) and the Faure Report (Faure et al., 1972), entitled “Learning to Be,” resulting from the International Commission on the Development of Education, chaired by Edgar Faure and established by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

What we currently see in Brazil is a reflection of the entrepreneurial idea that has come from international documents, such as those already mentioned, in Brazilian documents. This is the case of the National Common Core Curriculum (BNCC) (Brazil, 2018), responsible for governing curricula in the country and implementing subjects such as entrepreneurship, life planning, and financial education, among others, which are now present at all stages of education.

In view of the discussion established, the influence of the Cultural Industry is notable, both in the organization of work and in educational policies, since both sectors are directly influenced by the capitalist system, which, through the alienation resulting from free time and entertainment, as well as from the productive and educational process itself, controls society by directing it towards consumption and profit generation, as it establishes a complex and fast-paced production system in the labor market and a capital-oriented education system.

Conclusions

The present article highlighted the study of educational policies as a specific academic field, given that such policies are interrelated with neighboring fields—such as political science and economics—and are therefore not the result of an isolated process. In this context, education and work are directly connected to the capitalist mode of production, which, over time and through the Culture Industry, has directly affected individuals' critical and emancipatory capacities, exerting a direct influence on social relations through abstract labor.

The changes in the organization of labor—from manufacture, characterized by the predominance of artisanal work carried out with the use of a single tool, in which the final product necessarily passed through all the workers in the workshop, to Toyotism, based on labor flexibility, organized into productive cells with groups of workers and large-scale production, yet with products manufactured according to demand and without maintaining large inventories—make it necessary to understand this historical trajectory. Given the transformations in the relationship between labor and education, we observe the conflicts and struggles inherent to the capitalist system as well as to politics itself.

The productive organization became more technical, especially after the Second World War, a period marked by major technological advances that were also reflected in schools. In traditional education, the teacher was viewed as a key figure responsible for transmitting knowledge to students, who were passive recipients of ready-made content. In technical education, however, the teacher ceased to be the central agent and gave way to mechanized knowledge.

The mechanization of teaching in technical schools occurred primarily due to the use of technologies and pedagogical proposals based on so-called teaching machines, which served as a means of supporting capitalism and maximizing productivity. As a result, teachers no longer needed to devote themselves to preparing lessons, since the system itself became responsible for performing this function. Technical schools train their students for the labor market rather than for the development of critical thinking and reflective capacities. In this context, a new pillar of education begins to gain importance: the notion of “learning to undertake” (learning to be entrepreneurial).

The idea of entrepreneurship is not new and stems primarily from international documents such as *Education: A Treasure Within*, known as the Delors Report (1998), and the Faure Report (1972), titled *Learning to Be*. These documents, in turn, directly influence Brazilian policies, as in the case of the BNCC, which introduced into school

institutions subjects such as life planning, entrepreneurship, financial education, technological education, and others aimed at directing students toward the labor market.

A strong influence of the Culture Industry, as proposed by Adorno and Horkheimer (1985), was noted in the relationship between labor and education, whose central premise is that society is guided by the capitalist system, in which the sole objective is the generation of profit for the so-called bourgeois class. Capitalism is directly influenced by the Culture Industry insofar as its products generate alienation among the population, which is induced to consume without reflection and often without actual need, given that individuals' rational capacity is inhibited.

It was concluded that Adorno and Horkheimer (1985) advocate an education that only acquires meaning through critical reflection. According to the authors, something essential for this to be achieved is ensuring that the episode of the Holocaust that took place in Auschwitz—resulting in tens of thousands of deaths—never happens again. For them, people have forgotten the past and have become increasingly individualistic; therefore, they argue that intellectual, cultural, and social enlightenment is necessary.

Finally, the implementation of public policies capable of positively influencing and improving the Culture Industry is more than urgent—something that may be achieved through the formation of citizens with critical thinking skills, a role assigned to the school. However, given the technological advances, the capitalist system, and the globalization process in which we are immersed, schools end up contributing far more to the expansion of an alienating Culture Industry than to its restructuring and alignment with a critical and reflective education, as advocated by Adorno and Horkheimer (1985).

References

ADORNO, T. W. *Educação e emancipação*. Tradução: Wolfgang Leo Maar. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1995a.

ADORNO, T. W. Educação após Auschwitz. In: ADORNO, T. W. *Palavras e sinais: modelos críticos 2*. Tradução: Maria Helena Ruschel. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1995b.

ADORNO, T. W. *Indústria cultural e sociedade*. Tradução: Julia Elisabeth Levy. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2002.

ADORNO, T. W. Teoria da semicultura. *Primeira Versão*, v. 13, n. 191, maio/agosto, Porto Velho, p. 1-20, 2005. Disponível em: https://primeiraversao.unir.br/atigos_pdf/191_.pdf Acesso em: 19 ago. 2023.

ADORNO, T. W.; HORKHEIMER, M. *Dialética do esclarecimento: fragmentos filosóficos*. Tradução: Guido Antonio de Almeida. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1985.

ANTUNES, R. Da educação utilitária fordista à da multifuncionalidade liofilizada. Trabalho encomendado ao GT 11 – Política da Educação Superior. In: 38ª Reunião Nacional da ANPED, 01 a 05 out. 2017, São Luís (MA). *Anais [...]*. São Luís: UFMA, 2017. Disponível em: http://anais.anped.org.br/sites/default/files/arquivos/trabalhoencom_38anped_2017_gt11_textoricardoantunes.pdf. Acesso em 20 out. 2025.

ANTUNES, R. *O privilégio da servidão: o novo proletariado de serviços na era digital*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2018.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular*. Brasília, 2018.

CASIMIRO, A. P. B. S. Estado, igreja e educação no Brasil nas primeiras décadas da república: intelectuais, religiosos e missionários na reconquista da fé católica. *Acta Scientiarum. Education*, v. 32, n. 1, p. 83-92, 2010. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.uem.br/ojs/index.php/ActaSciEduc/article/view/9483/9483>. Acesso em: 19 out. 2025. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4025/actascieduc.v32i1.9483>.

DELORS, J. *Educação: um tesouro a descobrir*. Relatório para a UNESCO da Comissão Internacional sobre Educação para o século XXI. São Paulo: Cortez, 1998.

ENGELS, F. *A situação da classe trabalhadora na Inglaterra*. Tradução: B. A. Schumann. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2007.

FADUL, A. *Indústria cultural e comunicação de massa*. 1994. Disponível em: http://www.crmariocovas.sp.gov.br/com_a.php?t=002. Acesso em: 19 ago. 2023.

FAURE, E.; HERRERA F.; KADDOURA, A-R.; LOPES, H.; PETROVSKI, A. V.; RAHNEMA, M.; WARD, F. C. *Aprender a ser*. Lisboa: Portugal, 1972.

FORD, H. *Minha vida e minha obra*. Tradução: Monteiro Lobato. Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1926.

GADOTTI, M. *História das ideias pedagógicas*. 8 ed. São Paulo: Ática, 1999.

GALVÃO, A. O. *Tendências pedagógicas da Educação: uma breve explanação*. São Paulo: Dialética, 2024.

GAY, P. *O Século das Luzes: os filósofos e a sociedade*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1973.

GIL, A. C. *Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa*. São Paulo: Atlas, 6 ed. 2017.

HARVEY, D. *Condição pós-moderna: uma pesquisa sobre as origens da mudança cultural*. Tradução: Adail Ubirajara Sobral e Maria Stela Gonçalves. São Paulo: Edições Loyola. 1992.

KANT, I. *Fundamentação da Metafísica dos Costumes*. Tradução: Paulo Quintela. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2007.

LUCKESI, C. C. *Filosofia da Educação*. 3 ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

MAAR, W. L. Prefácio. In: DURÃO, F.; ZUIN, A.; VAZ, A. F. (org.). *A indústria cultural hoje*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2008.

MARX, K. *O Capital*. Tradução: Rubens Enderle. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 1989.

MARX, K. *O capital: crítica da economia política*. Tradução: Círculo do Livro Ltda. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.

MELO, R. Teoria crítica e os sentidos da emancipação. *Caderno CRH*, v. 24, n. 62, p. 249-262. 2011. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/ccrh/a/Ph8SPw5NqDZ7MmdVyJnsdpd/?lang=pt> Acesso em: 20 set. 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-49792011000200002>.

MENDES, N. R. G. *Precarização das condições de trabalho docente na educação pública: análise à luz da teoria crítica frankfurtiana - barbarização e resistência*. 2021. 109f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Programa de Pós-Graduação Stricto Sensu em Educação, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Goiás, Goiás, 2021.

MOREIRA, J. A. da S. *Políticas de financiamento e gestão da educação básica (1990-2010): os casos Brasil e Portugal*. Maringá: Eduem, 2015.

POSTONE, M. *Time, labor and social domination: a reinterpretation of Marx's critical theory*. Cambridge, 1993.

PUCCI, B. A Teoria da Semicultura e suas contribuições para a Teoria Crítica da Educação. In: ZUIN, A. Á. S.; PUCCI, B.; RAMOS-DE-OLIVEIRA, N. (org.). *A educação danificada: contribuições à teoria crítica da educação*. Petrópolis/São Carlos: Vozes, 1998.

RIBEIRO, A. de F. Taylorismo, fordismo e toyotismo. *Lutas Sociais*, v. 19, n. 35, São Paulo, p. 65-79. 2015. Disponível em: <https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/l/article/view/26678>. Acesso em: 15 ago. 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23925/l.v19i35.26678>.

SAVIANI, D. *Escola e democracia*. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 2008.

SAVIANI, D. *Sobre a concepção de politecnia*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, 1989.

SCHULZ, W. *Die bewegung der production: eine geschichtlich-statistische Abhandlung zur Grundlegung einer neuen Wissenschaft des Staats und der Gesellschaft*. Zürich [u.a.]: Dr. und Verl. des Literar. Comptoirs, 1843.

SMITH, A. *A riqueza das nações: investigação sobre sua natureza e suas causas*. Tradução: Luiz João Baraúna. 2 ed. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1985.

STREMEL, S. *A constituição do campo acadêmico da política educacional no Brasil*. 2016. 315 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Universidade Estadual de Ponta Grossa, Ponta Grossa, 2016.

TAYLOR, F. W. *Princípios da administração científica*. Tradução: Arlindo Vieira Ramos. 8. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 1990.

TONELO, I. *No entanto ela se move: a crise de 2008 e a nova dinâmica do capitalismo*. 1 ed. São Paulo: Boitempo/Iskra, 2021.

ZILSEL, E. As raízes sociais da ciência. Tradução: Flávio Magalhães Piotto Santos. *Khronos: Revista de História da Ciência*, São Paulo, [s.l.], n. 6, p. 113-116, dez. 2018. Disponível em: <https://revistas.usp.br/khronos/article/view/148637/149958>. Acesso em: 25 out. 2025.