

Thinking the Whole, Inhabiting Meaning: philosophy of education as a horizon in teacher education

Amarildo Luiz Trevisan¹
Valdo Barcelos¹
Neiva Trevisan¹

¹Universidade Federal de Santa Maria (UFSM), Santa Maria/RS – Brazil

ABSTRACT – Thinking the Whole, Inhabiting Meaning: philosophy of education as a horizon in teacher education. This paper analyzes the marginalization of Philosophy of Education in teacher education curricula, in the face of the growing emphasis on technical and operational competencies. It argues that the ability to grasp the whole has been gradually displaced from individuals in formation to specialized domains, undermining more critical and reflective approaches to teaching. Reinstating Philosophy at the center of this debate is a way to reconnect pedagogical knowledge with lived experience, calling for a sensitive listening to traditions, contexts, and meanings that permeate the educational act in times of fragmentation and performativity. **Keywords: Teacher Education. Philosophy of Education. Hermeneutics. Totality. Neoliberalism.**

RESUMO – Pensar o Todo, Habitar o Sentido: a filosofia da educação como horizonte na formação docente. O texto analisa o esvaziamento da Filosofia da Educação nos currículos de formação docente, diante da valorização crescente de competências técnicas e operacionais. Argumenta-se que a capacidade de compreender a totalidade foi deslocada dos sujeitos em formação para saberes especializados, comprometendo abordagens mais críticas e reflexivas da docência. Recolocar a Filosofia no centro desse debate é reaproximar saberes pedagógicos da experiência vivida, convocando uma escuta sensível às tradições, aos contextos e aos sentidos que permeiam o ato educativo em tempos de fragmentação e performatividade. **Palavras-chave: Formação Docente. Filosofia da Educação. Hermeneutica. Totalidade. Neoliberalismo.**

Introduction

In recent decades, teacher education has increasingly been guided by logics of performativity that replace collaborative construction with individual success narratives. This shift prioritizes operational competencies over critical reflection (Ball, 2002; Fabris, 2010, 2018). As a result, the ability to think in totality – essential for human development – has been gradually stripped from individuals and reserved for specialists. One noticeable effect of this trend is the marginalization of Philosophy of Education in formative curricula, particularly in contexts that prioritize the functionalization of knowledge. What was once a critical core of education has become treated as either ornamental or supplementary content.

What has been lost is not just a discipline, but an attitude: the willingness to understand the meaning of education in its ethical, political, and existential entirety. The concept of totality, which should be a shared ability of the human spirit—the capacity to comprehend the complexity of the world, to connect individual parts to the whole, and to think critically about life and society—has been taken over by specialists. It has been transformed into technical jargon and is often confined to academic discourse, which is inaccessible to most people (Bueno, 2021). Ironically, this has resulted in increased specialization; discussions from this perspective are now the exclusive domain of professional philosophers, when in reality they should be an epistemic right accessible to everyone.

In this context, how can we reintroduce the ability to think comprehensively in teacher education, ensuring that it is seen as a fundamental right for all rather than a privilege for the few? This is especially important in an educational environment characterized by fragmented knowledge and the neoliberal focus on specialization. How can we understand teacher subjectivity beyond models that emphasize exceptionalism, while also valuing the common human condition inherent in teaching? Additionally, how can we avoid romanticizing teaching as a solely individual, heroic endeavor while still recognizing the ethical and collective power of the teaching profession?

In times of uncertainty and competition, teacher education, viewed through the lens of the Philosophy of Education, assumes both existential and political significance. It cannot be reduced merely to the acquisition of operational competencies, as Ball (2002) and Fabris (2018) warn. Instead, it must be seen as a process that forms individuals capable of discernment, acting with ethical responsibility, and constructing common meanings amid plurality, precariousness, and the demands of an era that calls for more listening than for definitive answers.

Inspired by the contributions of Bueno (2021), Cunha (2009), Fischman (2009), Resende and Silva (2017), von Zuben (2003), Hermann (2006), Fabris (2010; 2018), Ball (2002), and especially Gadamer (1999), we propose a new approach to evaluating the presence of Phi-

losophy of Education in teacher education. Our goal is to reclaim a broader perspective on the formative process.

To structure this approach, we propose three fundamental movements: 1) Understanding education as a critical field that explores the meaning of both formation and teaching practices within contexts characterized by instability, technification, and performative demands; 2) Repositioning teacher education through the lens of Gadamer's hermeneutics, recognizing that formation does not strive for a completed totality. Instead, it is an ongoing process that opens up a dynamic horizon, where parts and wholes interconnect and mutually transform; 3) Challenging the tendency toward knowledge fragmentation, which isolates various forms of knowledge and reduces formation to mere instrumental competencies. We advocate for reestablishing connections between theory and practice, the individual and culture, and technique and meaning.

To democratize the experience for the ordinary person means training teachers to be hermeneutic subjects who can recognize, interpret, and reconstruct meanings through dialogue between their practices and the historical contexts that influence them. This involves developing educational practices that promote questioning, active listening, and interpretation, thus preparing teachers to navigate diverse, unstable, and complex contexts. Teachers should not be seen merely as technicians applying methods, but as ethical and critical interpreters of educational realities. This proposal aims to reaffirm the Philosophy of Education as a foundational element of critical teacher education, standing in opposition to the utilitarian trends that currently dominate the educational landscape.

Forming teachers, reconstructing meanings: the urgency of an integrative vision

The text "Teacher Education: From Uncertainty to Understanding," by Newton Aquiles von Zuben (2003), provides valuable insights into Philosophy of Education's contributions to the discussion of teacher education. From the very beginning, the author establishes a clear thesis: teacher education should not be seen solely as the acquisition of techniques or specific competencies. Instead, it should be understood as a process that occurs within a context of uncertainty, openness, and critical interpretation of reality. Von Zuben (2003) argues that Philosophy of Education operates within this complex space, offering conceptual and ethical tools that enable teacher education to evolve into a reflective, historical, and contextually situated practice. This approach emphasizes the integration of theory and practice, grounded in a deep understanding of the human condition.

My thesis is that appropriating, through constant and rigorous exercise, this critical self-reflection and capacity for understanding as the activity of the hermeneutic dimension of the human subject's own self-creation is the primordial goal of the structural and originating formation of the human individual. Upon this

foundation rest other formative projects, such as teacher education (Von Zuben, 2003, p. 52).

This passage emphasizes a fundamental aspect of human formation, which also applies to teacher education, by underscoring the importance of critical self-reflection as the basis for an individual's self-creation. In this context, Philosophy, as a discipline focused on critical thinking and the hermeneutics of meaning, not only supports but also propels the original process of human formation.

Shortly after, von Zuben (2003, p. 52) states: "In reality, I aim to present a philosophical conceptual framework that encourages reflection on the meaning of teacher education, rather than to discuss its dynamics in detail." This raises the question: What is the significance of teacher education from the standpoint of the Philosophy of Education during times of uncertainty?

If Philosophy remains committed to critique and self-critique, it is because it recognizes that the subject is not predetermined or complete but is constantly evolving. This evolution requires an understanding of oneself in relation to the world, others, and history. Self-critique is not simply an exercise in negation or correction; rather, it serves as a means to reveal the conditions that enable the subject to develop in terms of freedom, responsibility, and ethical-political commitment.

Philosophy encourages us to consider teacher education in ways that technicist and performative models often overlook. It offers a vision of totality, which means the ability to understand humanity in its complexity, historical context, and the variety of meanings it encompasses. This perspective challenges the fragmented views of teaching that depict teachers solely as individuals who execute goals or transmit content. Instead, it emphasizes the importance of focusing on belonging within a shared world, where knowledge is always contextually situated and co-created.

In this context, as the quotation suggests, teacher education is built upon a deeper foundation of human formation as an existential subject of meaning. Philosophical reflection is particularly relevant here; it encourages questioning, restless thinking, and a comprehensive perspective. This approach helps cultivate teachers who do more than merely reproduce existing systems. Instead, they redefine teacher education as an ethical and hermeneutic experience, in which understanding also leads to personal transformation. This process returns to the core meaning of formation: it is not about producing isolated competencies but about shaping hermeneutic and deliberative subjects committed to the historical context of knowledge, responsible for the common good, and engaged in the reflective exercise of freedom amidst the complexities of the world.

Von Zuben's (2003) text is abundant in demonstrating that Western rationality, given the crisis of reason, also sits in the dock. The accusation arises from reason itself, highlighting a Western capacity that, despite its history of numerous brutalities, has created a

space for "internal contestation." This space allows for questioning its own institutions and ideas. According to von Zuben (2003), philosophy serves as an example, demonstrating this essential demand for critical self-reflection in its practice.

This highlights an important epistemological and ethical choice: rather than focusing solely on the mechanics of formation, it suggests developing a broader understanding that acknowledges the historical, social, and political influences shaping teaching and educational institutions. This means shifting the focus from mere technical proficiency to a deeper understanding of what it means to develop a teacher in their human entirety, especially in times characterized by uncertainty, the fragmentation of educational knowledge into technical competencies, and performativity.

This reflection from Aquiles von Zuben's (2003) text highlights a crucial aspect of the Philosophy of Education: the necessity for internal critique of the very rationality that has shaped the West. This critique is not intended to negate reason but to affirm its capacity for self-examination. Far from undermining rational thought, such a demand seeks to enhance its ethical and historical dimensions. Hermann's (2006) interpretation further clarifies this perspective by emphasizing that "insofar as Philosophy problematizes the origins, justifications, and limits of knowledge, as well as the meaning of human action, it makes those involved in the educational process aware of the rationality that governs their actions" (p. 66). In this context, rationality is not merely defined by measurable results or constrained by goals, indicators, and rewards, which reduce educational complexity to a mere logic of productivity. Instead, it should be viewed as a historical construction that can – and must – be critically examined by both educators and learners.

Modern rationality, characterized by its universalizing, technocratic, and dominating tendencies, has indeed led to forms of oppression, colonialism, and exclusion. However, it is also within this framework that voices arise to challenge it, creating spaces to question its very foundations. This paradoxical movement is a defining feature of philosophy that explores teacher education, particularly as it is shaped to meet rankings and employability criteria, which often fragment pedagogical knowledge into mere technical competencies. Furthermore, it interrogates the demand for teachers to be flexible – adaptable, versatile, and available – which is not an invitation to autonomy, but rather a market-driven requirement imposed on educators individually.

It is precisely at this point that Philosophy demonstrates its strength: not by avoiding criticism but by fostering critical and interpretive thought during a time when the foundations of education are in crisis. This crisis is made worse by the absence of Philosophy of Education as a discipline in teacher education programs. From this perspective, teacher education cannot ignore this philosophical legacy. Besides merely training technicians or implementers of pedagogical methods, teaching is often romanticized as a heroic journey in which

success is defined by an individual's ability to overcome challenges. However, this narrative, though clothed in symbolic admiration, reinforces the principles of meritocracy and obscures the historical, social, and institutional factors that influence teaching work. As a result, the image of the teacher as a hero emerges as an isolated figure whose success seems to disregard the importance of material conditions, institutional acknowledgment, or collaborative dialogue, shifting the focus of critique from systemic issues to the individual's personal responsibility.

Newton Aquiles von Zuben (2003) clearly expresses his reflections through the lens of philosophical hermeneutics. He emphasizes that teacher education can arise from an understanding rooted in experience, where educators are influenced by language, history, and a willingness to engage with others. He argues that actual formation does not stem from overcoming uncertainty with technical certainties, but rather from navigating uncertainty through active listening, interpretation, and the construction of meaning. Consequently, his approach centers on a hermeneutic ontology of formation.

Maria Isabel da Cunha (2009) critiques technicist models and the fragmentation of knowledge while engaging directly with the fields of the sociology of education and the epistemology of practice. Her analysis emphasizes the experiential, historical, and professional dimensions of teaching, aiming to understand teaching as a complex social practice influenced by the knowledge constructed in relation to everyday school life. While her work shows openness to interpretive thought and considers teacher education as a practice oriented towards totality, her perspective is not strictly aligned with the field of philosophical hermeneutics, unlike von Zuben's approach.

Cunha (2009) emphasizes the complex existential and epistemic nature of teaching, highlighting that being a teacher cannot be simplified to technical frameworks or specialized segments.

Being a teacher is not a task for beginners. The wide range of knowledge and understanding involved in their training requires a holistic approach, which contrasts with the specialization typical of many other professions within the Taylorist organization of work. In those fields, individuals often know more and more about less and less. This leads to fragmented relationships among various aspects, causing the subject of study and work to become disjointed. While this model may work for certain professions, it is not suitable for teaching or for educators' work. The complexity of education demands a focus on the entirety of the subject rather than a narrow specialization (Cunha, 2009, p. 83-84).

The Taylorist metaphor refers to the extreme division of tasks and knowledge into separate, well-defined categories. This approach produces a type of rationality that prioritizes efficiency, control, repetition, and measurement. Its logic has permeated various professional fields, including education. This fragmented approach is evident in how teacher education is typically organized, often broken down into modules, isolated disciplines, specific competencies, and bureaucrat-

ic guidelines. Similar to Taylorism, this leads to a situation in which "one knows increasingly more about increasingly less," and the understanding of the human, the world, and education ultimately fragments and loses its density.

Her critique highlights the shortcomings of fragmented approaches to education that stem from the Taylorist organization of work. These approaches often break down knowledge and the teaching role into isolated, mechanical tasks. As Cunha (2009) notes, university teaching has been significantly influenced by the dominant epistemological views in modern science – particularly in the so-called exact and natural sciences. This influence has shaped what is viewed as socially legitimate knowledge. "Under this perspective, specific content has often been valued far more than pedagogical knowledge and the humanities in teacher education" (Cunha, 2009, p. 85). By rejecting this narrow logic, Cunha (2009) emphasizes teaching as a holistic experience that weaves together various forms of knowledge within an ethical, critical, and context-aware educational framework. Her contribution underscores the need for a teacher education approach that re-engages with the deeper meaning of teaching, recognizing its historical, relational, and transformative dimensions.

Cunha (2009) emphasizes, in line with the ideas of Gadamer, Heidegger, and other thinkers in philosophical hermeneutics, that university teaching cannot be viewed simply as a model of technical functionality. Instead, it occurs through engaging with the entirety of human experience, which includes the development of individuals, their life stories, emotions, contradictions, and various horizons of meaning. While it is true, as Cunha (2009, p. 85) states, that "to be a university professor, what is important is mastery of the knowledge of one's specialty and the academic forms of its production," this view captures only one facet of the teaching process. Teaching practice, beyond specialization, requires a broader perspective that integrates epistemological, ethical, existential, political, aesthetic, affective, historical, and social dimensions.

This is, once again, a hermeneutic task. A teacher is not someone who knows everything; instead, they are a person capable of interpreting and creating meaningful connections. They must recognize the uniqueness of each individual within a shared and provisional understanding. Similar to the role of art in Gadamer's (1999) work on the interpretation of tradition, teaching practice can only be fully appreciated when we acknowledge the questions it addresses, the meanings it conveys, and the world that shapes it.

In other words, the complexity of teaching does not allow for an outdated compartmentalization, as schools and universities are not assembly lines, and students are not products to be standardized. Education involves relationships, communication, experiences, conflicts, and care. For this reason, teachers need to adopt a broader perspective rather than simply focusing on the efficiency of isolated components.

To value the dimension of knowledge in teacher education, as suggested by the hermeneutics of von Zuben and Cunha, is to redefine the political, ethical, and existential aspects of teaching. This approach resists the tendency to simplify, measure, and prioritize productivity, instead affirming education as a space for listening, interpretation, and a commitment to life. Ultimately, the goal is to develop teachers who not only understand various forms of knowledge but also know how to live and teach with integrity, recognizing the importance of our shared human condition in teaching practice.

This philosophical-hermeneutic perspective avoids both technical reductionism and the totalizing tendencies of closed systems. It reinstates thought as a dialogical and situated experience. In teacher education, this means shifting the focus from simply applying methods to actively listening to the meanings that arise in educational practice. On this ground, philosophical hermeneutics – especially as articulated by Gadamer (1999) – offers a rich framework for understanding teaching as an interpretive process. In this view, the relationship between part and whole is not a separation but an interwoven dimension of experience.

Hermann (2006, p. 67) argues that "[...] even recognizing that Philosophy of Education is not a mere deduction from philosophical systems, this discipline is an active dialogue with the thinkers who have shaped the educational tradition of the West precisely because they still hold valuable truths that can enlighten us today". It is through this engagement with classical ideas, rather than an uncritical reproduction of them, that education gains its transformative potential. This approach also justifies the importance of listening to influential philosophers like Hans-Georg Gadamer, whose philosophical hermeneutics rejects the rigid separation of part and whole, viewing them instead as in a constant state of tension and circularity.

Teacher education between the part and the whole: hermeneutic horizons of understanding

In incorporating the hermeneutic dimension into teacher education, the goal is not to introduce yet another methodology but to reconnect the educational process with real life. It is important to acknowledge that every act of teaching and learning is also an act of interpretation – of oneself, others, and the world. Because of this, to envision teacher education as a shared journey means recognizing its inherent purpose: to shape individuals who can read the times, listen to unheard voices, understand histories, and responsibly engage in the present.

This is an urgent political and epistemological task: to democratize access to critical interpretations of reality. Teacher education should no longer be merely a training process; it must once again become a space for mediation between the individual and the collective, between lived experiences and theoretical understanding, and be-

tween tradition and transformation. As Gadamer (1999, p. 357-358) proposes:

This distinguishing mark of historical consciousness cannot consist in its really being 'absolute knowledge' in Hegel's sense – i.e., in its uniting the whole history of mind in a present self-consciousness. The claim of philosophical consciousness to contain within itself the whole truth of the history of mind is contested precisely by the historical worldview.

This quotation from Gadamer is particularly significant in the discussion about teacher education, primarily when we aim to uphold the concept of a non-totalizing totality. This refers to an articulating formation that does not equate to an absolute, fixed, or supposedly closed understanding of knowledge. In other words, hermeneutics, by emphasizing the reclaiming of knowledge's wholeness in the formative process, does not advocate for a return to a hegemonic, systemic, or dogmatic approach to education. Instead, it promotes an ethical and interpretive movement that embraces the various meanings of historical experiences.

Gadamer (1999) argues against the idea that spirit, or the subject, can fully capture the complete truth of history. This critique of the Hegelian concept of absolute spirit is a crucial aspect of contemporary hermeneutics. It shifts the understanding of knowledge from an all-encompassing totality to a contextual totality.

This has significant implications for teacher education. If historical consciousness is not totalizing, it means that teachers cannot be trained as if they exist outside of history, acting as neutral agents who transmit complete and finished truths. Instead, teachers are individuals shaped by history, influenced by the contradictions of their time, and affected by the limitations and possibilities of the world in which they live. Therefore, their education must embrace this incompleteness – not as a failure, but as a fundamental condition that enables listening, mediation, and the collaborative construction of meaning.

The quotation also helps clarify a common misunderstanding in the debate: reflecting on a shared perspective in teacher education does not suggest an endpoint in knowledge; instead, it highlights that our understanding always emerges from a specific viewpoint, rooted in a particular time and historical context. Thus, historical consciousness is characterized by a humble approach to interpretation, a willingness to engage in dialogue, and an openness to otherness. It is not about arrogance, claiming to know everything, or attempting to dominate the past or future of education.

Performativity transforms teaching into a product and the teacher into a manager of results (Ball, 2002). In contrast, Gadamer provides a remedy against techniques that claim to be neutral and against ideologies that present themselves as scientific. He urges us to educate teachers who think historically, understanding that all knowledge is context-dependent, that all knowledge requires interpretation, and that all truths emerge through encounters rather than impositions.

Understanding teacher education as an open, situational, and relational process leads us to a deeper notion of interpretive experience. Every act of understanding is grounded in the concrete existence of the individual who interprets. This means that there is no neutral or external comprehension of the world; all interpretation is influenced by the historical, emotional, and anticipatory context of the interpreter. In this context, Gadamer, engaging with Heidegger, emphasizes that understanding is not merely a rational activity, but an existential experience. In this experience, the individual recognizes their connection to a history and a world that both precedes and calls upon them. As he states:

Heidegger correctly argues that what he refers to as ‘thrownness’ (*Geworfenheit*) and the concept of project are inherently related. This means that no understanding or interpretation involves this entire existential structure, even if the individual intends to read ‘what is there’ and to extract the truth from sources about ‘how it really was’ (Gadamer, 1999, p. 396-397).

This quotation from Gadamer, rooted in Heidegger's hermeneutic ontology, further expands the understanding of teacher education as an existential and interpretive practice. Gadamer (1999) revisits a key concept of Heideggerian philosophy – *Geworfenheit*, or *thrownness* – to emphasize that all human understanding is shaped by the individual's historical, cultural, and existential context. Even in the most objective attempts to *describe reality* – such as when a historian aims to portray *how things truly were* – this fundamental condition inherently shapes understanding: we are beings thrown into the world and, at the same time, we project meaning onto it.

In the field of teacher education, it is important to recognize that there is no neutrality in interpretation, even when educators think they are simply transmitting information or applying techniques. Teaching, understanding others, and interpreting texts – whether they are historical documents, educational phenomena, or pedagogical practices – are always influenced by the meanings shaped by the individual's existence, including their history, values, language, and finite nature.

Gadamer (1999) challenges the notion that knowledge can exist independently of the individual who possesses it. Understanding is not solely a cognitive process; it is a way of being in the world. This perspective shifts the focus of teacher education from mere knowledge acquisition, driven by competition and accolades, to the cultivation of being. Consequently, teaching is not evaluated based on performative criteria that reduce it to a product and the teacher to a manager of results (Fabris, 2018). Instead, teaching is viewed as a practice deeply rooted in the hermeneutic condition of life, where the educator both interprets and is interpreted, teaches and is transformed, projects and is cast.

This dual process – between *being cast* (into a historical and finite condition) and *project* (having the capacity to create openness and meaning) – is essential to existence and, therefore, to education

itself. A teacher does not begin from scratch, nor are they a neutral observer; they are already involved in the worlds of language, tradition, and values that shape and challenge them. Recognizing this is crucial for deconstructing the technical perspective of education, which attempts to separate the individual from knowledge and overlooks the historical context of educational practices.

This is undoubtedly a profound and essential requirement: to recognize that teaching is a way of engaging with the world, and that understanding is always a situated and finite act, shaped by historical context and openness to others. However, the hermeneutic tradition has not always managed to resist the temptation to transform this openness into an ideal of totalizing knowledge. There exists, in the very history of hermeneutics, an ambiguous movement that acknowledges the limits of human understanding while flirting with the idea of overcoming these limits through a form of reason capable of encompassing all of history and reconciling the present with tradition. It is precisely this tension that Gadamer addresses when revisiting the trajectory from Schleiermacher to Dilthey.

We cannot take this question seriously enough if we think of the historical conception of the world and its development from Schleiermacher to Dilthey. The phenomenon is always the same. The demand of hermeneutics is satisfied only in the infinity of knowledge, of the thinking mediation of the totality of tradition with the present. This presents itself based on the ideal of a total *Aufklärung*, of the definitive rupture of the limits of our historical horizon, of the subsumption of our own finitude into the infinity of knowledge, in a word, in the omnipresence of spirit that knows historically (Gadamer, 1999, p. 506).

This quotation from Gadamer addresses a key aspect of philosophical hermeneutics. It extends the discussion on teacher education as an experience of meaning, rather than merely a submission to totalizing knowledge. He critiques a recurring temptation in modern philosophical-hermeneutic traditions – from Schleiermacher to Dilthey – the illusion that, through historical knowledge and critical reasoning, we can completely overcome the limits of our own perspective, achieving a kind of *omnipresence of spirit that fully understands history*.

Gadamer's critique is highly relevant to current challenges in teacher education. Many teacher education programs still operate under the belief that accumulating more knowledge – whether it be mastery of normative theories or familiarity with various practices (such as methodologies, legislation, tools, and techniques) – will result in a more complete teacher. This perspective implies that, through endless knowledge acquisition, we can overcome our limitations and the historical context of the educator.

Gadamer (1999) reminds us that hermeneutics is not about achieving the totality of knowledge; instead, it involves recognizing our limitations and understanding that we always interpret from a specific, finite, and ongoing perspective. In this context, teacher edu-

cation should not aim for complete pedagogical omniscience but should focus on fostering an interpretive awareness of time and language. This awareness acknowledges its place in a historical process, engaging with tradition without being bound by it, while remaining open to new ideas without falling into relativism.

The *mediation* of which Gadamer speaks does not occur as complete fusion or overcoming of limits, but as a continuous process, marked by listening, alterity, and openness to what is not yet given. Moreover, it is precisely this that can restore to teacher education its ethical and existential density: the awareness that to form is an exercise in inhabiting time, not in mastering it.

In deconstructing the ideal of a total *Aufklärung*, Gadamer (1999) encourages us to reconsider the concept of formation. Rather than viewing it merely as the accumulation of knowledge towards an unattainable completeness, we should see it as a finite, shared hermeneutic process. This approach requires a willingness to listen, an awareness of the importance of timing, and the courage to teach without claiming absolute certainties.

This interpretive approach requires prior and trusting listening, recognizing that all meaning must be pursued even before it is fully understood. It entails acknowledging that there is something within what we encounter – be it a text, a tradition, an experience, or a person – that responds to a question yet to be formulated. This dynamic is central to hermeneutics and is clearly expressed through the analogy of aesthetic experience. Understanding a work of art, for instance, does not mean deciphering it completely, but instead perceiving that it holds within it a potential answer, provided we can identify the underlying question. Within this framework, Gadamer (1999, p. 545) observes:

A work of art can only be understood to the degree that its appropriateness is assumed. To comprehend it as an answer, one must first grasp the question it responds to. This is a fundamental principle of hermeneutics, which we have previously referred to as the ‘anticipation of totality’.

This quotation from Gadamer revisits and deepens a central idea of his philosophical hermeneutics – the anticipation of totality – and applies it to the realm of art. This has significant implications for teacher education and the concept of education as a hermeneutic experience. Gadamer (1999) emphasizes that understanding does not start from scratch, nor is it solely a rational or analytical endeavor. Instead, it emerges from prior presuppositions – an act of trust or openness. We assume that there is something meaningful to understand, that what presents itself holds significance, and may contain answers to questions we have not yet learned to articulate. This principle applies beyond art; it extends to all interpretative processes, including teacher education. Gadamer proposes a radical shift in perspective: we do not commence our inquiries with preformed answers. Instead, we begin by listening to implicit, unanswered questions. Genuine understanding, therefore, requires an attitude of attentive listening and

receptivity to meanings that are not yet fully revealed. This attitude necessitates a situated and holistic comprehension of the world – the belief that a unity of meaning can be attained, even if only temporarily, provisionally, or in a limited sense.

Philosophy of education in teacher education: what remains to be said?

If the purpose of teacher education goes beyond merely preparing individuals for effective practice and instead aims to cultivate a subject who can recognize themselves as a critical interpreter of their time – serving as a guardian of meaning amidst the chaos of the present – then the pivotal question emerges: *what can be said about the role of the Philosophy of Education in this process?* It is within this context that the Philosophy of Education provides its most significant contributions. Rather than offering ready-made answers, it keeps the essential inquiry alive: "What is the purpose of training teachers?". By emphasizing this question, the Philosophy of Education reaffirms its hermeneutic and critical role as a field that challenges and expands the meanings of teacher formation, creating space for doubt, reflection, and change. As Hermann (2006, p. 66) states, the Philosophy of Education:

[...] education is a critical and reflective understanding of its meaning, addressing and questioning the complexities involved in human formation. From this standpoint, it explores how various ontological, epistemological, anthropological, political, ethical, and aesthetic considerations influence educational practices.

The philosophical act of placing oneself in the dock – submitting to critique, including self-critique – paradoxically represents one of the most authentic forms of freedom. By acknowledging its limits, failures, and contradictions, reason does not vanish or become irrelevant; instead, it reinvents itself. It transitions from being a mere tool of universal imposition to a dynamic field of dialogue and openness, constantly evolving. Incorporating this *ethos* into teacher education goes beyond simply training competent teachers; it involves shaping individuals who view knowledge as an ongoing task. These individuals understand teaching as a shared experience of thought and, in doing so, demonstrate the courage to question the world alongside their students.

The Philosophy of Education serves a unique and essential role in our understanding of education. It should not be viewed merely as one specialized area of knowledge among many, nor should it be treated as a supplementary aspect of educational sciences. Its true strength lies in its ability to question the entirety of education, challenging the tendencies to fragment and treat knowledge as a mere tool. It allows human formation to reach its most radical meaning – as an ethical, political, and existential endeavor. It encourages educators to go beyond accepting ready-made answers and to engage deeply

with the questions that underpin a meaningful and transformative educational practice.

Sociology, psychology, and the history of education provide valuable insights into the educational process. They reveal aspects such as the power structures that shape learning, the psychological mechanisms underlying the learning process, and the historical contexts of schooling. However, each of these disciplines tends to focus on specific aspects or boundaries within its study. In contrast, the Philosophy of Education seeks a more comprehensive understanding. It examines the foundational questions about education – its meaning and ultimate purpose. It poses essential questions such as: What kind of human beings are we trying to educate? What goals do we aim to achieve? What kinds of societal projects are we supporting through education?

This critique becomes even more compelling when we consider that many concepts used to *recompose the whole* – such as interdisciplinarity, transdisciplinarity, holistic thinking, complex thinking, and inclusive thinking – despite their merit and intended purpose, are often absorbed by educational structures without scrutinizing the epistemic foundations that underpin fragmentation. In practice, these concepts often turn into rhetorical tools that serve as temporary fixes rather than transformative alternatives. They circulate in public policies and educational discourses with symbolic significance but rarely challenge the dominant logic that separates, hierarchizes, and compartmentalizes knowledge.

At this juncture, Resende and Silva's analysis is particularly relevant and timely. According to the authors, the loss of a sense of totality is not simply a result of technological advancement or the complexities of modern knowledge. Instead, it represents a political act of expropriation – a historic divide imposed on workers that also affects educators. This viewpoint is clearly articulated in the following observation:

Through the division of labor and, consequently, the division of knowledge, workers have been separated from the overall productive process. As a result, they are limited to viewing knowledge as a collective product. Workers retain only small segments of knowledge, while the dominant sector appropriates the entire process, redefining it as a theoretical framework. The only information returned to workers pertains to the specific tasks they will perform within the production process (Resende; Silva, 2017, p. 571).

The quotation from Resende and Silva highlights a historical process of expropriation of totality concerning both labor and knowledge. With the division of labor – characteristic of Taylorist principles and further intensified by neoliberalism – workers have become distanced from a comprehensive understanding of the productive process. They are reduced to mere executors of fragmented and technical tasks. This alienation is not only material but also epistemic: integrated and critical knowledge of the process is monopolized by

the dominant classes, who turn knowledge into a tool for domination. In contrast, workers are confined to the knowledge necessary to complete their specific tasks.

From the perspective of the Philosophy of Education, we can observe a similar phenomenon in the field of education. Teacher education, increasingly focused on operational competencies, tends to fragment knowledge and hinders the development of a comprehensive and critical understanding of education (Ball, 2002; Fabris, 2018). Just as the alienated worker becomes a specialist in isolated tasks, the teacher may become proficient in specific techniques while losing sight of the broader significance of their educational work.

Investigating the ability to think expansively – both in the context of labor and teacher education – represents a significant political and transformative action. It entails empowering individuals with the right to understand, interpret, and engage with the world around them. By advocating for this broader perspective, we challenge the tendencies towards fragmentation and alienation, emphasizing that Education should be a critical, contextual, and relational experience.

The film *Modern Times* (1936) by Charles Chaplin serves as a clear example: the worker, reduced to mechanically repeating a single part of the production process, loses sight of the broader purpose of their work. The technical division of labor – serving capitalist interests – creates efficient workers who are disconnected from the meaning of their tasks. A similar phenomenon occurs in Education: from early schooling to the hyper-specialization seen in post-doctoral studies, this rigid disciplinary separation produces specialists who are knowledgeable about specific fragments, but not necessarily thinkers who can grasp the complexity of the whole.

This logic permeates teacher education. We start by teaching children in a divided, compartmentalized school system, which leads to teachers who replicate this model. The single-teacher approach in early childhood, which maintains a sense of wholeness, gradually gives way to a more specialized disciplinary focus that intensifies over time, making it difficult to see the whole. As a result, teacher preparation loses sight of the concept of totality, diminishing critical thinking skills. Consequently, we end up with teachers who have extensive knowledge about specific subjects but lack an understanding of their broader implications for life, society, and the world.

As an antidote to this process, it is important to examine how the hermeneutic process begins and what effects it has on our understanding, particularly given that we are embedded in a tradition. Gadamer (1999) emphasizes a fundamental principle of hermeneutics: we must interpret the whole by considering its parts, while simultaneously understanding each part in the context of the whole.

This principle stems from ancient rhetoric, and modern hermeneutics has transferred it to the art of understanding. It is a circular relationship in both cases. The anticipation of meaning in which the whole is envisaged becomes actual understanding

when the parts that are determined by the whole themselves also determine this whole (Gadamer, 1999, p. 437).

Gadamer (1999) emphasizes that understanding is not linear or objective; instead, it involves a circular, continuous movement between the whole and its parts, influenced by history and the interpreter's affiliation. In relation to the previous question – *how does the hermeneutic process begin, and what are the implications of belonging to a tradition?* – this quotation illustrates that the hermeneutic effort starts from a historical and cultural context, meaning it is rooted in a tradition that provides pre-existing meanings. Therefore, understanding is a dialogical process with this tradition, where the interpreter adjusts their expectations as new meanings emerge from the parts being interpreted.

Gadamer (1999) emphasizes the circular nature of the hermeneutic process and elaborates on the significance of the so-called *hermeneutic circle*, which is a central concept in his philosophy of understanding. He points out that this principle originates in ancient rhetoric, where understanding discourse involves considering both the whole and the parts in a dynamic, interdependent relationship. According to Gadamer, modern hermeneutics focuses on this principle and shifts its emphasis from *the art of speaking* (rhetoric) to *the art of understanding*.

At the heart of this concept is what he calls *the anticipation of meaning*. When we encounter a text, a speech, or a tradition, we do not begin from scratch. Instead, we already have an expectation or general idea of the whole – what can be called a pre-understanding – that guides our interpretation of the parts. However, as we analyze these parts, they compel us to revise or adjust our understanding of the whole. In this way, the whole informs the parts, and the parts reshape the whole. This creates a circular movement of understanding, characterized by a back-and-forth exchange between the general and the specific, between our initial expectations and the insights revealed through the interpretive experience.

In this scenario, reflection serves as a means of reconnecting: between knowledge and life, between technique and ethics, and between education and existence. Cultivating a systemic understanding is not merely a conceptual privilege but a formative and ethical responsibility. The philosophical critique of fragmentation invites us to emerge from Plato's cave; to reject the shadows cast by a system that presents us with partial images as if they were the entirety of reality, and to move toward the light of wholeness, critique, and freedom.

The proposal aims not only to improve teaching or expand the curriculum, but to fundamentally reconstruct the educational framework itself. This framework values the dignity of thought, the sensitivity of observation, the strength of listening, and the courage to question. To train teachers from this perspective means cultivating individuals who can see the whole while appreciating the individual parts, and who understand each part as a reflection of the whole. By

doing so, we can avoid continuing to develop *incomplete individuals* and instead move toward a truly liberatory education.

Teacher education becomes richer when we examine it through three key concepts from Gadamerian hermeneutics: *Bildung*, authority, and tradition. The term *Bildung*, often translated as "formation," refers to the development of the individual through historical, cultural, and linguistic experiences. It is not just about gaining knowledge; it involves transforming oneself through continuous engagement with the world, in a process of openness and self-formation. In Gadamer's view, authority is distinct from authoritarianism. It refers to the legitimacy conferred by knowledge developed over time and experience. This is evident in the relationships we form with teachers or with classical texts, where genuine engagement requires humility and a readiness for dialogue. Tradition should not be seen as old-fashioned or merely conservative; instead, it shapes us and provides the context from which we understand the world. By incorporating these concepts into teacher education, we emphasize that educating is a contextual process influenced by historical and cultural legacies. These legacies should not simply be dismissed or rejected, but critically examined in dialogue with the present and the future. Ultimately, this approach aims to cultivate individuals who can recognize the significance of tradition without being passively controlled by it. It encourages an interpretive stance that balances listening, judgment, and an ethical commitment to building a shared world with others.

It is in teacher education that this reconstruction can (re)begin. It is urgent that we remodel teacher education programs, not just to convey information, but to foster a philosophical attitude toward the world: the courage to question, to listen, to understand, and to engage oneself. In this framework, the teacher moves beyond being a mere executor of curricula and becomes an interpreter of their time, a mediator of meanings, and a guardian of humanity in progress.

To achieve this goal, Philosophy of Education needs to move from its marginal or decorative role in curricula to become central in formative discussions. It should challenge a model of education focused on objectives, rankings, and high performance (Fabris, 2018). Schools must return to being spaces for critical thinking rather than environments that prioritize speed and flexibility through packaged materials and workbooks. Teachers should not be viewed as solitary heroes who save the day; instead, they should collaborate with students – thinking alongside them, rather than about them or for them – about the fundamental issues of existence, coexistence, justice, freedom, and the pursuit of a good life.

Democratizing a comprehensive and contextual understanding of the world ultimately means repoliticizing knowledge. It involves affirming that critical thinking is not a luxury for a select few but a right for everyone. This can only be achieved if we train teachers who have undergone this enriched experience of knowledge in their own educational journeys. Only those who have experienced thinking as a form of freedom can teach others to think independently. In this process,

theory transforms into a practice of liberation. Thus, it returns to its ancestral mission: not to provide ready-made answers, but to sustain the vital questions that define our humanity.

To develop this perspective in teacher education using the hermeneutic key, a change of mindset is essential. It is vital to move away from the notion that human knowledge is solely defined by the pursuit of individual excellence or by conforming to the standards of large-scale assessments. Totality as presented here is not a rigid or dogmatic framework; instead, it views education as an integrative practice that encompasses diverse knowledge, experiences, timelines, subjects, and meanings.

1. Reconfiguring Disciplinary Fragmentation

The first step is to challenge the idea that knowledge should be divided into separate areas, such as history, mathematics, or geography. Teacher education must prioritize a holistic understanding of reality, viewing knowledge as a network of interconnected meanings. In this context, Philosophy of Education plays a crucial role in encouraging educators to explore the world through questions that transcend disciplinary boundaries: *What is justice? Why educate? For whom, and for what purpose?*

2. Recognizing the Student as an Integral Subject

A comprehensive educational vision requires acknowledging the student in their entirety. Students are not merely receptors of information; they are individuals who feel, dream, suffer, think, and create. To prepare teachers for this sensitive listening, it is essential to understand them as ethical mediators of educational experiences, more attentive to the relational aspects of teaching than to the mere application of methods and techniques.

3. Understanding the Interpretive Nature of Knowledge

All knowledge is interpreted. Drawing on hermeneutics, particularly Gadamer's ideas, the Philosophy of Education teaches us that there is no neutral knowledge; all understanding is situated, historical, and influenced by values. In this context, critical formation should focus on teaching students how to interpret the world, recognize underlying interests in various discourses, and value the voices that have been silenced by dominant traditions.

4. Cultivating the Spirit of Questioning

An education rooted in wholeness emphasizes asking meaningful questions rather than merely finding the correct answers. Educators are encouraged to adopt a philosophical attitude, constantly questioning the significance of their actions, the knowledge they impart, and the world they help shape. In this sense, doubt is not a sign of weakness but rather an active openness to others and to new ideas.

5. Grounding Education in the Historicity of the Present

To understand the sense of totality, one must also consider one's position in time. Teachers are not detached technicians; they are historical subjects who navigate political, economic, cultural, and social contradictions. Their formation must include an awareness that teaching and learning occur within specific temporal and material contexts, and that their practice gains meaning when linked to a commitment to the world they aspire to transform.

6. Viewing Education as a Continuous and Ethical Process

Education, from the perspective of a shared horizon, does not conclude with a diploma, nor does it settle for immediate results. It requires ongoing openness, a willingness for self-critique, active listening to others, and a capacity for personal transformation. Educating within this framework is an ethical, political, and aesthetic act – a practice that shapes sensibilities, judgments, and ways of engaging with the world, distinct from the logic of competition and performativity.

7. Repositioning the Meaning of Life at the Center of Teacher Education

Preparing teachers also means developing individuals who can question the meaning of their own existence. In an era where human experience is often diminished in the name of efficiency, productivity, and performance, it is urgent for teacher education to reclaim the ontological dimension of education: the aspects that touch on the mystery of living, the value of others, and the quest for a meaningful life. The classical Socratic maxim "*know thyself*" should not be interpreted as an invitation to solitary introspection, but rather as a call for reflective openness to the world and an attentive listening to what engages the individual within it. This perspective positions education as a vital space for constructing meaning, where teaching goes beyond mere knowledge transmission. It involves helping each student – and each educator – discover reasons to live, coexist, and pursue transformation. In this context, the Philosophy of Education transcends mere theoretical addition; it becomes the essential foundation of formation. It upholds the profound questions of who we are, what we do, and where we are heading.

To create this comprehensive vision, we must prioritize education as a meaningful and transformative experience rather than focusing solely on performativity as a measure of value or viewing heroism as the standard model. Our goal is to cultivate teachers who are themselves engaged in ongoing personal development – individuals who can think, feel, listen, interpret, and act holistically in a rapidly changing world.

Conclusion

Throughout this text, we have explored how teacher education, historically driven by technical and instrumental approaches focused on competencies, skills, and standardized responses, has ultimately overshadowed the interpretive aspect of educational practice. This approach leads to initial and ongoing education programs characterized by standardization and acceleration. Ready-made solutions are offered, often packaged in didactic formats that overlook specific contexts, histories, and individual needs. As a result, the valuable formative work that takes place daily, often unnoticed, in schools and universities is diminished.

We began by noting that teacher education has distanced itself from a holistic understanding of experience. It has reduced educators to mere executors of competencies and techniques that lack meaningful connections. Curricula are now regulated by rankings and efficiency, transforming education into a fast and marketable product (Fabris, 2010; 2018; Ball, 2002). This trend is one of the harmful effects of neoliberalism on education and culture: what should be a collective strength is instead turned into symbolic capital for a privileged few. Education focused on multidimensionality – the core of any robust educational project – has been replaced by an emphasis on functionality. The outcome is an education centered on performance, competencies, and measurement – an approach that does not emancipate individuals but instead adapts them to fit predefined professional profiles aligned with high-performance standards of what is often referred to as the "pedagogy of the hero" (Fischman, 2009; Fabris, 2010). This selective and exclusionary logic is not a natural phenomenon; it is a product of historical and ideological forces. Therefore, it can – and must – be challenged. This challenge begins by democratizing access to a comprehensive vision of education, returning it to its roots: common experiences, everyday life, dialogue, and shared living in schools and universities.

This work criticizes the gradual abandonment of Philosophy of Education in teacher training processes, which prioritizes excessive focus on technical and operational competencies. This shift tends to simplify teaching to a series of procedures that lack critical reflection. In contrast, hermeneutic reflection, particularly influenced by Gadamer, offers a critical alternative to this fragmented approach. Hermeneutics encourages active listening, questioning, and interpretation. It fosters the ability to understand the meanings that emerge across contexts, even amid the pressures of neoliberal rationality.

Developing an expanded critical vision in teacher education involves creating a space for future teachers to reflect on their role in the world critically. This includes recognizing the connections between theory and practice, subject matter and culture, and knowledge and power relations. From this viewpoint, the Philosophy of Education extends beyond a mere curricular component; it serves as a foundational element that promotes listening, questioning, and un-

derstanding. Rather than simply providing answers or models of excellence, it fosters the development of shared meanings. This approach emphasizes a commitment to ethical values, not exceptionalism, and highlights the importance of our ethical commitment to others and to the community as a whole.

This call to totality urges us to overcome the logic of fragmentation – not by rejecting specialized knowledge, but by reintegrating it into a broader context of meaning. Teachers should engage with various fields of knowledge, including psychology, philosophy, sociology, didactics, and educational policy. However, this engagement should not merely be a collection of different parts; instead, it should be a formative experience that weaves these areas of knowledge into a situated, committed, critical, and transformative educational project.

In this context, where there is a focus on measurable performance and a demand for exceptional individuality, the Philosophy of Education serves as a reflective field that does not provide ready-made models or normative answers; instead, it questions the meaning of education. It explores the significance of teacher formation in a world characterized by fragmentation, the increasing technicalization of knowledge, and the instability of scientific, rational, and institutional certainties. In this environment, the philosophical approach itself becomes a formative act. It encourages questioning, doubting, thinking, listening, and resisting the tendency toward simplification and efficiency.

In this context, hermeneutics offers a new perspective: forming teachers means cultivating individuals who can listen to the underlying questions in educational practices, students' experiences, and the contradictions in the school environment. It emphasizes that teaching is not merely about meeting demands or striving for recognition and media attention, but is instead an interpretive and ethical endeavor.

Gadamer's hermeneutics emphasizes that educating teachers primarily involves helping them attune to the questions their practice seeks to address, even if those questions have not yet been clearly expressed. This approach prepares teachers to view teaching as an interpretive act, in which each piece of content, each student, and each context becomes a subject to be understood through the questions that emerge within it.

The *anticipation of totality*, in this context, is not simply an illusion of knowing everything. Instead, it represents a willingness to seek meaning; it assumes a connection between the parts and the whole. It suggests that educational practice possesses an internal logic, a symbolic world, and a direction that must be acknowledged. This approach is not about enforcing a universal understanding from a position of authority; rather, it is about facilitating the emergence of meaning in the very act of comprehension – between the teacher, the learner, and the world that engages them.

Gadamer emphasizes that teacher education should not conform to the glamorization of the teaching profession or the emphasis

on performativity that shifts the focus from social and political engagement to mere technical and managerial efficiency. This shift ultimately diminishes the critical and comprehensive role of teacher education. Instead, teacher education must serve as a space for interpreting experiences, listening to the world, and being open to the fundamental questions that shape teaching and learning. This is achievable only when teachers are developed as hermeneutic subjects, capable of recognizing that educational practice is an evolving process of meaning-making. This process addresses profound questions related to humanity, society, justice, and the essence of living.

To educate teachers effectively, we should prioritize teaching them how to ask questions before teaching them how to provide answers. It involves cultivating the poetic, interpretive, and ethical aspects of teaching, and, in the broader context of teacher development, entails the more significant goal of constructing meanings that connect individual parts to the whole and vice versa. Rebuilding an integrative rationality is not merely a theoretical exercise; it is a political, ethical, and civic obligation.

Gadamer shifts the focus of interpretation from formal logic to a historical and experiential logic. He encourages us to recognize that there is no neutral or timeless understanding; understanding always involves updating meanings through a dialogue between the interpreter's horizon and the horizon of the tradition to which the text or phenomenon being interpreted belongs.

This principle, which is classical in hermeneutics – that one understands a part only through the whole and the whole only through its parts – becomes particularly relevant when discussing teacher education. Over time, the formative process has become fragmented into separate disciplines, decontextualized techniques, and practices that lack meaningful connections. As a result, what remains is often fragmented knowledge, disconnected from the historical context of the educator's life and the specific conditions they face.

Bringing Gadamer into this discussion emphasizes the urgent need to (re)signify teacher education as a hermeneutic process. This approach requires us to consider the context of life, historical meanings, individuals' lived experiences, and the cultural and political perspectives that shape the educational act.

Gadamer (1999, p. 278) provides an important principle: teacher education should not be confined to the *dogmatic unanimity of the canon* or to a rigid, uniform structure of a traditional curriculum. Instead, it needs to open to *embrace the diverse realities of historical context*, which includes a range of experiences, narratives, and meanings that shape our current world. This perspective makes teaching a contextual, interpretative, and ultimately ethical practice.

To educate teachers means creating spaces for meaningful interpretation in which the concrete experiences of both school and university are connected to broader historical, cultural, and political contexts. This process requires letting go of the belief in absolute

knowledge, characteristic of closed, dogmatic viewpoints, and instead embracing the inherent openness of historical awareness. It involves both personal and collective development within the ongoing tension between tradition and innovation, considering what has already been established alongside what can still be created. From this perspective, democratizing education means recognizing integrality as a practice available to all individuals, not just a privilege for specialists. It is a fundamental right for every educator on their journey toward understanding and taking action in the world.

To reclaim hermeneutics' role in teacher education is to emphasize that, to educate, is first and foremost to inhabit questions, foster dialogue, and reconstruct meanings within a shared horizon. Formation shifts from being merely technical training to becoming an experience characterized by listening, mediation, and a critical openness to the diverse historical contexts that shape our lives. Educating future teachers means developing individuals who can interpret their time in a situated and responsible way. These individuals will be equipped to resist the fragmentation often associated with neoliberalism and to transform their educational practices into ethical actions that foster common understandings. Therefore, democratizing the idea of totality is essential for teacher education to reimagine its comprehensive, historical, and collective role, which is rooted in the dialogue between tradition and experience.

Received on May 2, 2025

Approved on August 25, 2025

References

- BALL, Stephen. J. Reformar escolas/reformar professores e os terrores da performatividade. **Revista Portuguesa de Educação**, v. 15, n. 2, p. 03-23, 2002. Disponível em: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Kex9FSGKufZ-XDJyy_cVfJzcOrMk1VXQ/view?usp=sharing. Acesso em: 30 abr. 2025.
- BUENO, Enrico. Descolonizar a teoria crítica: a questão da totalidade. **Contemporânea**, v. 11, n. 3, p. 1057-1085, set./dez. 2021. Disponível em: <https://www.contemporanea.ufscar.br/index.php/contemporanea/article/view/850/488>. Acesso em: 30 abr. 2025.
- CUNHA, Maria Isabel da. O lugar da formação do professor universitário: o espaço da pós-graduação em educação em questão. **Rev. Diálogo Educ.**, Curitiba, v. 9, n. 26, p. 81-90, jan./abr. 2009, p. 81-90. Disponível em: <http://educa.fcc.org.br/pdf/de/v09n26/v09n26a06.pdf>. Acesso em: 30 abr. 2025.
- FABRIS, Eli Terezinha Henn. A pedagogia do herói nos filmes hollywoodianos. **Currículo sem Fronteiras**, v. 10, n. 1, p. 232-245, jan./jun. 2010. Disponível em: <https://biblat.unam.mx/hevila/CurriculosemFronteiras/2010/vol10/no1/15.pdf>. Acesso em: 30 abr. 2025.
- FABRIS, Eli Terezinha Henn. A pedagogia do herói sob as performances das políticas públicas contemporâneas. **Roteiro**, Joaçaba: UNOESC, v. 43, n. 1, p. 205-223, abr. 2018. Disponível em: http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2177-60592018000100011&lng=pt&nrm=iso. Acesso em: 30 abr. 2025.

FISCHMAN, Gustavo. Dos professores super-heróis aos intelectuais comprometidos: limitações e possibilidades das narrativas redentoras em educação. Cultura e docência: novos olhares para a realidade educacional. In: REUNIÃO ANUAL DA ANPED, 32., 2009, Caxambu. **Anais [...]**. Caxambu, MG: 2009. Disponível em: <https://www.maxwell.vrac.puc-rio.br/14479/14479.PDF>. Acesso em: 30 abr. 2025.

GADAMER, Hans-Georg. **Verdade e método**: traços fundamentais de uma hermenêutica filosófica. Tradução de Flávio Paulo Meurer; revisão da tradução de Ênio Paulo Giachini. 3. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1999.

HERMANN, Nadja. Filosofia da Educação. In: MOROSINI, Marília Costa (Org.). **Enciclopédia de Pedagogia Universitária**: glossário. Vol. 2. Brasília: INEP; RIES, 2006. P. 66-67. Disponível em: https://download.inep.gov.br/publicacoes/diversas/temas_da_educacao_superior/enciclopedia_de_pedagogia_universitaria_glossario_vol_2.pdf. Acesso em: 30 abr. 2025.

RESENDE, Stela Galbardi de; SILVA, Roseli Gall do Amaral da. O neoliberalismo: desigualdades educacionais e a alienação. **Colloquium Humanarum**, v. 14, n. especial, p. 565-573, jul./dez. 2017. ISSN 1809-8207. DOI: 10.5747/ch.2017.v14.nesp.000994. Disponível em: https://web.archive.org/web/20201213234452id_/http://www.unoeste.br/site/enepe/2017/suplementos/area/Humanarum/4%20-%20Educa%C3%A7%C3%A3o/O%20NEOLIBERALISMO%20DESIGUALDADES%20EDUCACIONAIS%20E%20A%20ALIENA%C3%87%C3%83O.pdf. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2025.

TEMPOS modernos. Direção: Charles Chaplin. Produção: Charles Chaplin. Intérpretes: Charles Chaplin; Paulette Goddard; Henry Bergman. Roteiro: Charles Chaplin. Estados Unidos, 1936. 1 DVD (87 min.).

VON ZUBEN, Newton Aquiles. Formação de professores: da incerteza à compreensão. In: BICUDO, Aparecida Viggiani (Org.). **Formação de professores? Da incerteza à compreensão**. Bauru, SP: EDUSC, 2003. (Coleção Educar). P. 47-84. Disponível em: <http://www.mariabicudo.com.br/resource/s/LIVROS/Forma%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20de%20professores.%20Da%20incertez a%20a%20compreensoes..pdf>. Acesso em: 30 abr. 2025.

Amarildo Luiz Trevisan holds a PhD in Education: Philosophy of Education from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul. He is a Post-Doctorate in Humanities from Carlos III University, Madrid, Spain. He is a Full Professor of Philosophy of Education in the Graduate Program in Education at the Federal University of Santa Maria (PPGE-UFSM), RS, Brazil; and a PQ-1C researcher at the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3575-4369>

Email: amarildo1.trevisan@gmail.com

Valdo Barcelos holds a PhD in Education from the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC, 2001). He is a Productivity-1 researcher at CNPq and a supervisor for Master's and Doctorate students in the Graduate Program in Education at the Federal University of Santa Maria (PPGE-UFSM), Santa Maria, RS, Brazil. He is an Active Member of the International Academy of Arts, Letters, and Sciences holding Chair 102 - Patron Paulo Freire - and a Mem-

ber of the Santamariense Academy of Letters (ASL).

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7768-1543>

Email: valdohbarcelos@gmail.com

Neiva Trevisan holds a Bachelor's degree in Pedagogy from the Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM, 2000), is a Specialist in Educational Management from UFSM, a Master's in Education from the Graduate Program in Education at UFSM, and a PhD in Education from the Autonomous University of Madrid (UAM/Spain), with a title recognized in Brazil by the Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM). She is currently a Post-Doctorate student in Education at the Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM).

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1857-5545>

Email: neivavtrevisan@gmail.com

Availability of research data: the dataset supporting the results of this study is published in this article.

Editor in charge: Paula Corrêa Henning

