

## **SINASEFE and the resistance against the neoliberal agenda: building alternatives for vocational education**

Rodrigo da Costa Lima

Instituto Federal de Santa Catarina, Araranguá, Brasil  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9687-9600>  
[rodrigo.lima@ifsc.edu.br](mailto:rodrigo.lima@ifsc.edu.br)

João Henrique Zanelatto

Universidade do Extremo Sul Catarinense, Criciúma, Brasil,  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1754-1001>  
[jhz@unesc.nrt](mailto:jhz@unesc.nrt)

---

### **Abstract**

This paper aims to analyze how the National Union of Federal Employees in Basic and Vocational Education (SINASEFE) resisted and organized the union struggle against the neoliberal educational policies implemented by the governments of Michel Temer and Jair Bolsonaro. And how, through this resistance, it spearheaded the resumption of debates on policies for vocational education, which resulted in the document titled “SINASEFE’s Contributions to the Development of Public Policies for Brazilian Vocational and Technological Education,” drafted and published in 2023, already under the third administration of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva. To this end, a qualitative study was conducted, utilizing documentary research based on campaigns and key documents produced between 2016 and 2022, made available by the union on its official website.

*Keywords:* Resistance. Vocational Education. Neoliberalism.

---

### **Article details | Open peer review**

Edited by:  
Michel Goulart da Silva

Reviewed by:  
Andreza Lorena Santos Cerqueira  
Ricardo Scopel Velho

Citation:  
Lima, R. C., & Zanelatto, J. H. (2026). SINASEFE and resistance against the neoliberal agenda: building alternatives for vocational education. *Scientia International Journal for Human Sciences*, 1(1).  
<https://doi.org/10.56365/mk9zvc84>

### *Article history*

Received: 09/02/2026  
Reviewed: 10/03/2026  
Accepted: 14/03/2026  
Available: 14/03/2026



## 1. Introduction

The vocational education reform that took place in Brazil following the 2016 coup occurred within the context of a new productive restructuring, which combined the process of deindustrialization with the transition to the use of new information and communication technologies in the productive system, particularly in the most dynamic industries. In platform capitalism, labor relations and the worker's profile have changed profoundly, demanding different types of competencies and skills, among which socio-emotional and digital skills have gained prominence.

The combination of these elements, driven by the influence of business sectors on education, has advanced changes to the high school curriculum in response to capital's new demands regarding workforce preparation, within the framework of a society of dependent capitalism. Precarization, platformization, and the demand for even greater flexibility and adaptability were reflected in the authoritarian educational project, which reduced students' access to a range of scientific knowledge in basic general education, leading to increased educational inequalities.

Vocational training was designed for a world of work with fewer labor rights, a situation that affects both students and teachers, who expressed their dissatisfaction and took a stand against the New High School<sup>1</sup>. Even in such an adverse scenario of a neoliberal offensive, forms of resistance emerged that challenged the flexible, content-deprived education model, which was countered by a perspective of integrated education—a proposal rooted in the historical experience of the working class and its formulations regarding the direction of vocational education.

This article aims to analyze the main acts of resistance by SINASEFE against neoliberal reforms in vocational education between 2016 and 2024. The qualitative research employs documentary analysis, drawing on legislation related to the NEM and the BNCC, as well as documents available on the union's official website that were produced during the aforementioned period.

---

<sup>1</sup> The New High School System (NEM) was one of the first reforms implemented during Michel Temer's administration, via Provisional Measure 746 of 2016. This process resulted in an amendment to the Law on Guidelines and Foundations of National Education (LDBEN) with the enactment of Law 13,415 of 2017, which established curricular flexibility organized around the National Common Core Curriculum (BNCC). This process culminated in a curriculum with a minimum annual workload of 3,000 hours, comprising 1,800 hours for BNCC content and 1,200 hours dedicated to educational pathways, distributed across five major areas: a) Natural Sciences and their Technologies; b) Languages and their Technologies; c) Applied Humanities and Social Sciences; d) Mathematics and its Technologies; and e) Technical and Vocational Education. The Law also provided for the creation of Integrated Educational Pathways, which may combine two or more areas of knowledge and/or Technical and Vocational Education. (BRAZIL, 2017). Secondary education underwent a new reform during the second year of the Lula administration. In August 2024, Law 14.945/2024 was enacted, with its most significant changes being the expansion of the general basic education curriculum to 2,400 hours.

The article is divided into three sections, in addition to this introduction and the concluding remarks. The first section seeks to discuss the categories of hegemony and resistance based on Gramsci's framework. The second section examines how neoliberal reforms were implemented in Brazil in the post-coup scenario of 2016. The third and final section addresses forms of union resistance and SINASEFE's strategies in the face of the neoliberal offensive.

## 2. Hegemony and Resistance

For the theoretical analysis of the research subject, it is important to examine the concept of hegemony as a key category in Gramscian thought, which can assist us in reflecting on current changes in the field of professional education. Gramsci applied the historical-dialectical method to his analysis of Taylorism-Fordism, using the concept of hegemony as a fundamental category for understanding the transformations in the process of accumulation and its relations with the fields of culture and education. By updating the author's contribution, we seek to contribute to a reflection on the relations of reproduction of hegemony in education in the era of Industry 4.0 and changes in the profile of the worker.

In his time, the Sardinian thinker examined the transformation of capitalism and its influences on education in the early 20th century, analyzing the Taylorist-Fordist system within the context of the Second Industrial Revolution. At that stage of global capitalist development, in its monopolistic phase, he identified that the most dynamic and modern axis of industrial production had shifted from European countries to the United States. For him, the hegemony of the United States and Americanism, which asserted itself in the interwar period, revealed a new form of organization of labor, industrial production, and social consent regarding capitalism (Braga, 2008).

The model of accumulation analyzed by Gramsci (2008) expressed a way of life that emerged from a productive sphere influenced by Taylorism—in terms of work management and organization—and by Fordism, as a driver of production and capitalist accumulation. This model encompassed much more than the productive sphere, extending to politics, culture, ideology, and education, creating a mode of social regulation that encompassed the entire dynamics of working-class life, including the organization and provision of vocational education.

The author saw in the Taylorist-Fordist model of production a transition from what he termed “old economic individualism” to a programmatic economy, in which state planning became a guiding principle. Rationalization took center stage based on the American model— —implying the creation of a new type of human being, in accordance with “the new type of work and the productive process” (Gramsci, 2008, p. 41).

The need for the rationalization of production and labor, at that stage of capitalist accumulation, demanded new methods for the imposition of industry. Americanism began to implement a new model of coercion and discipline linked to the ways workers thought, felt, and lived. Forms of rationalization and prohibitionism (linked to moral codes and a puritanical ideology, which strongly mark American society) were combined, causing the model to shape a new working class:

of the American phenomenon, which is also the greatest collective effort undertaken to date to create, with extraordinary speed and a sense of purpose never before seen in history, a new type of worker and of man (Gramsci, 2008, p. 66).

The new dialectic of Taylorism-Fordism produced a contradiction in the formation of the working class, for while tasks were established in a repetitive manner—increasingly rationalized, mechanized, and internalized by workers as automatic gestures—it ultimately liberated workers' thought and reflection on their own daily practices in the factories.

Unlike the trained gorilla envisioned by Taylor, the worker did not lose his humanity, and by repeating gestures, he freed his mind to seek new, nonconformist horizons. This situation was recognized by the industrialists of the period, leading to a series of educational initiatives and projects aimed at disciplining workers and their professional training.

Currently, with the transformations brought about by Industry 4.0, a new pattern of capitalist accumulation has emerged, driven by the growth of new information and communication technologies, which have increased productivity while simultaneously intensifying the replacement of living labor with dead labor, establishing a new level of labor exploitation. Under the dominance of finance capital, capitalism has reorganized its hegemony in the 21st century through new forms of organization of material production and social relations, with repercussions on international relations, culture, the organization of labor, and education, in which schools fulfill the role of reproducing bourgeois hegemony.

The implementation of the new vocational training project in Brazil stemmed primarily from the private hegemonic apparatus of the ruling classes (Fontes, 2010), with institutions linked to the industrial bourgeoisie serving as its main promoters, notably the National Confederation of Industry (CNI) and the state-level Industrial Federations ( ), which rely on the S System<sup>2</sup> as the primary disseminator of the project

---

<sup>2</sup> The S System is a group of nine service-providing institutions that are independently administered by business federations and confederations linked to the main sectors of the economy. Its origins date back to the Getúlio Vargas administration, with the creation of Senai in 1942, aimed at training workers for the industrialization project of the Estado Novo. These are private-law entities that perform functions of public interest. The S System comprises: Senai (National Industrial Apprenticeship Service), Sesi (Industry Social Service), Senac (National Commercial Apprenticeship Service), Sesc (Commerce Social Service), Senar (National Rural Apprenticeship Service), Senat (National Transportation Apprenticeship Service), SEST (Social Service for Transportation),

to update vocational training, based on the competencies required by Industry 4.0. They envision a new type of worker for a new work process, one that involves significant changes compared to the Taylorist-Fordist model studied by Gramsci and the Toyotist model that emerged later, beginning in 1970.

As identified in the vocational education projects recently implemented in Brazil, the shaping and disciplining of the working class according to the principles of Industry 4.0 occur from the perspective of entrepreneurship, digital and socio-emotional competencies, and flexibility in the face of changes in the socio-technical division of labor. Although this occurs in a faltering, partial, and contradictory manner within the context of Brazilian dependent capitalism, it is evident that these perspectives permeate courses and curricula, albeit at different paces.

We are facing a form of neo-Americanism, as an update of workers' subordination to new social ways of acting, feeling, and producing, with implications for their social reproduction and adapting them to the current moment of class domination. If in the 1920s and 1930s Michigan was the symbolic center of the hegemonic Taylorist-Fordist model of labor organization, in the 2010s and 2020s this role has shifted to California and the model of platform capitalism emanating from large global technology corporations.

But the education that expresses the reproduction of hegemony also generates the possibility of overcoming it. Gramsci analyzed the organization of culture and the school based on the organic unity between the production of material life and spiritual life. His theory, linked to the revolutionary project, did not lose sight of the perspective of class struggle nor the relations of domination and resistance existing under capitalism.

Therefore, in his analysis of social conflicts, he understood the state not merely as a legal institution, but as the result of the organic relations between political and civil society, since social conflict is also reflected in civil society. He identified that one of the problems of bourgeois education was the separation between intellectual education and manual labor. In the Italian context of the 1920s, this duality in education was deepened by the reforms of the fascist regime, aimed at organizing two educational systems: one for the intellectual elite and another for the working class. Thus, a "disengaged" school was created, serving a small elite with no preparation for vocational training ( , and another "formative" school, aimed at preparing students for specialized work, in which the student's fate was predetermined (Gramsci, 1982).

Inspired by the Soviet educational experience, Gramsci (1982) pointed out, as a counterpoint to the dual model, the need to build a unitary school that would balance the development of manual labor skills with an education that would enhance students' intellectual capacities—a vision linked to the revolutionary

project of the emancipation of labor and a state capable of managing the transition to a society of freely associated workers (Del Roio, 2018). Civil society presents itself as the primary arena of class struggle, of the maintenance of the hegemony of the ruling classes, and of its contestation. For Gramsci (1982), civil society is not something homogeneous, amorphous, and inferior, but rather a space of conflict, of permanent disputes among social classes for control of hegemony in modern capitalist societies.

The state is taken as an expression of the conflicts and the correlation of forces existing in society, in relation to the interests of social classes and their factions, without separating it or placing it above the country's social, economic, and political life, but as a dialectical relationship between political power—the state *in the strict sense*—and the class relations existing in civil society, in the struggle for hegemony. This leads to the notion of the expanded state, formulated by Antonio Gramsci, as “[...] the entire complex of practical and theoretical activities through which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its rule, but also manages to obtain the active consent of the governed” (Gramsci, 2007, p. 331).

State power operates within what Poulantzas (2000) defined as an institution situated directly within the relations of production and the social division of labor inherent in capitalism, which allows us to situate the state within the broader field of struggles. This element of the author's theory is an important foundation for theoretical reflections on the categories of analysis, since the state, based on a relative separation from the economy, acts in contemporary capitalism as the organizer of education in general and vocational education in particular. The transformations and reforms proposed by the state articulate changes in capitalist relations of production and in the class struggle.

The organization of education in capitalist society also proceeds from the principle of “the legitimization of the practices of the state and its agents as bearers of a particular knowledge, of an intrinsic rationality” (Poulantzas, 2000, p. 55). For the Greek theorist, the character of the capitalist state originates in the autonomy of economic power and political power, between the political struggle and the economic struggle. In this form of state, led by the ruling class, its political interests are represented, but not directly its economic interests. This allows for a certain degree of maneuvering and disputes within its own structures, which guarantees some economic interests of the dominated classes, always within the limits of the system—, without jeopardizing the order—provided they are compatible with the hegemonic domination of the ruling classes.

Therefore, the class struggle in capitalist society results in the possibility that the dominated classes may have some of their interests met, placing certain limits on the ruling class, in which the state is pressured “[...] by the political and economic struggle of the dominated classes; however, this simply means that the

state is not an instrument of classes, but rather the state of a society divided into classes” (Poulantzas, 2019, p. 194).

This theoretical contribution regarding the capitalist state and its potential to respond, under the pressure and struggle of the dominated classes, certain political and economic demands and requirements, allows us to understand how educational policies are organized in the country, particularly in the area of secondary-level technical and vocational education, which, as analyzed since the first chapter, is an expression of the struggles between class interests, which have historically shifted in different historical contexts.

This is the very basis for the analysis of the influences of secondary education reform, of new conceptions of worker training from the perspective of Industry 4.0, and of resistance to such projects, in which Brazilian education has been hegemonically guided by neoliberal policies, against which alternatives proposed by the working class are emerging.

In the Brazilian case, neoliberal educational policies became hegemonic in the 1990s, consolidating through coercive measures by the State, but also through a broad movement of a “complex process of hegemony-building” (Gentili, 1996), which transformed neoliberal ideology into the primary framework for the formulation of educational policies, in direct relation to the productive restructuring, mass unemployment, privatization of public services, reduction of the public budget, and the implementation of educational reforms subordinated to international financial agencies that marked that decade.

The use of neoliberal public policies to reform education may at first seem contradictory, given that the organization of the education sector by the state under neoliberalism aims to reduce government involvement. However, upon systematic analysis, it becomes clear that, in order to carry out its agenda, the state plays a central role in the formulation and implementation of neoliberal educational policies, based on the interests of the ruling class (Leher; Motta, 2012).

The transition to neoliberal hegemony in education after the 1990s was based on at least two structural characteristics that have historically permeated the educational field in the country. According to Saviani (2008), the first concerns the resistance of the political and economic ruling elites to the state’s maintenance of public education, which is reflected in the chronic shortage of resources for the sector, and the second refers to the discontinuity of educational policies, marked by a series of reforms that promise innovative solutions, periodically presenting the educational system with new plans and goals that completely reorient

the system. Added to these two aspects are the social inequalities that have historically manifested in Brazilian education and that hinder the chances of retention and success for students from the working class.<sup>3</sup>

However, as a result of the mobilizations and organization of the working class, educational policies underwent a shift at the beginning of the 21st century. According to Cichaczewski & Castro (2023), during the PT governments, a new orientation for vocational and technological education was implemented, which reflected, albeit partially, demands and formulations that originated in the struggles of the Brazilian working class, which emerged in the context of the struggles for the country's redemocratization beginning in the 1970s, and in the reorganization of the class in the 1980s and 1990s.

Decree 5.104/2004 and the creation of the Federal Institutes (IFs) were the main expressions of an educational policy that reinforced high school education integrated with vocational education, as a model of professional training that contrasts with the previous logic, challenging the duality of education and an education subsumed to the market. Even within the contradictions of the class-conciliation governments and the popular-democratic project led by the PT, the IFs represented “[...] an educational experiment deeply rooted in the recent tradition of struggles by the Brazilian working class, which would not exist without it” (Cichaczewski & Castro, 2023, p. 465).

With the crisis of Lulism and the advent of the 2016 coup, educational reforms, particularly in secondary education, began to directly serve the interests of the ruling classes, without mediation. The vocational education envisioned by capital was revived as a hegemonic project, centered on the division between intellectual and manual labor, between knowing and doing, grounded in the principles of unilateralism, instrumentalization, alienation, and the reification of the school, which serve the perspectives of a narrow education fully subsumed under the forms of capitalist sociability (Antunes & Pinto, 2017).

A project associated with the school of capital, which Meszáros (2007) understands not only fulfills the purpose of providing the knowledge and labor force necessary for the expansion of the capitalist system, but also serves to produce and transmit a series of values that legitimize dominant class interests, which seek to impose an order that advocates the idea that there are no alternatives, establishing structural domination and hierarchical subordination.

During the second half of the 2010s, secondary education underwent a significant reform process in Brazil. This led to changes that involved amendments to the Law on Guidelines and Bases for National Education (LDBEN) and curricular transformations in the final stage of basic education. In scope, the NEM

---

<sup>3</sup> As an illustration of educational inequalities, we can cite data from the Brazilian Yearbook of Basic Education, published in 2025, which revealed that among high school students, 16.3% of the wealthiest 20% demonstrated adequate learning outcomes, while among the poorest 20%, the figure was only 2.4%. (Basilio, 2025).

and the National Common Core Curriculum (BNCC) also had repercussions on secondary-level vocational and technical education in the country, one of the educational pathways offered to students.

The changes in Brazilian secondary education occurred within the context of a set of neoliberal reforms, which advanced rapidly after the 2016 coup, through the implementation of the agenda proposed in the document “A Bridge to the Future,” drafted by the Ulysses Guimarães Foundation, an institution linked to the Brazilian Democratic Movement (MDB).

The program served the interests of dominant sectors and major business leaders, and served as the basis for the policies of the governments of Michel Temer (2016–2018) and Jair Bolsonaro (2019–2022). The advent of the NEM and the BNCC occurred in tandem with labor reform (Law 13,467/2017), the spending cap (Constitutional Amendment 95/2016), outsourcing for core activities (Law 13,429/2017) and pension reform (Constitutional Amendment 103/2019), which were part of a broad effort by factions of the ruling class to establish new forms of labor regulation through the removal of labor and social rights. During the administration of Jair Bolsonaro, public policies focused on vocational education were implemented, such as the development of the New Pathways Program, the new National Catalog of Technical Courses (CNCT), and the new National Curriculum Guidelines for Vocational and Technological Education (DCNEPT).

This occurred in parallel with the transformations brought about by Industry 4.0, in which a new pattern of capitalist accumulation emerged, driven by the rise of new information and communication technologies. These technologies increased labor productivity while simultaneously intensifying the replacement of living labor with dead labor, establishing a new level of labor exploitation. Under the hegemony of finance capital, capitalism reorganized itself in the 21st century through new forms of material production and social relations, with repercussions on international relations, culture, the organization of labor, and education, in which the school fulfills the role of reproducing bourgeois hegemony.

But the education that expresses the reproduction of hegemony also generates the possibility of overcoming it. Gramsci (1982) analyzed the organization of culture and the school based on the organic unity between the production of material life and spiritual life. His theory, linked to the revolutionary project, did not lose sight of the perspective of class struggle and the relations of domination and resistance existing within capitalism. Therefore, in his analysis of social conflicts, he understood the state not merely as a legal institution, but as the result of the organic relations between political and civil society, since social conflict is also reflected in civil society.

### 3. Trade Union Resistance

But even in the face of an overwhelming neoliberal offensive and its effects on vocational education, it is possible to conceive of the implementation of reforms through the lens of resistance—as a counterpoint to the dictates of capital—via the organization and actions of the working class, which has its own visions for alternative forms of education, work organization, and social relations, beyond the realm of capital.

Sociologist James Woodcock (2023), in analyzing the organization and mobilization of the working class in the current context of platform capitalism, conceptualizes resistance comprehensively through the following definition:

Resistance can refer to people who oppose change, the refusal to accept or comply, a revolt against an oppressive force, protection against something, or even relationships between material things involving friction or electric current. These comparisons can help illustrate how resistance at work exists in various forms and intensities. Just as with an electric current, in practice we find that resistance is always present (Woodcock, 2023, p. 427).

Whether in traditional or platform-based work relationships, in industries or schools, in rural or urban settings, the question that must be asked is not whether resistance exists, for it is always present among workers from the moment labor exploitation begins. The question is the intensity and strength they are able to bring to their movements against capital.

In this sense, Hodson's (1995) contribution helps us think about resistance in broader terms, by taking into account individual and collective actions—even by a small group of workers—aimed at advancing their demands before management or at reducing the effects of certain demands placed upon them in the workplace. This is associated with traditional forms of resistance, of which the strike remains the greatest expression of struggle.

In the resistance and organization of federal education workers, the National Union of Federal Basic and Vocational Education Workers (SINASEFE), founded in November 1988, plays a key role as the primary representative body for teachers and technical-administrative staff within the Federal Network of Vocational, Scientific, and Technological Education. In the context analyzed, the union sought to act against the advance of the neoliberal agenda, in addition to building an alternative proposal aligned with the demands of the working class.

The Federal Network currently comprises 656 educational institutions, present in all states and the Federal District. It offers nearly 13,000 vocational courses, with over 1,681,363 students enrolled.<sup>4</sup>, represents a base of education workers comprising a total of 83,494 employees, including 47,990 teachers and approximately 43,266 technical and administrative staff (BRASIL, 2024). SINASEFE has 28,555 members nationwide and 94 local chapters, which serve as the organization's grassroots units; each chapter possesses political, administrative, economic, financial, and property autonomy, as well as its own leadership.

Among the resistance actions carried out by the union following the 2016 coup, the campaign in defense of the federal network, launched on June 8, 2018, stands out. It is based on five major mobilizing pillars: a) against budget cuts and Constitutional Amendment 95/2016; b) combating workplace bullying; c) against the dismantling of public education: down with the "School Without a Party" policy, for the repeal of the High School Reform, and against the proposed National Common Core Curriculum (BNCC); d) for the autonomy of the public school system; and e) against the reorganization.

SINASEFE also organized national strikes in December 2016, a movement driven by student occupations that rose up against the high school reform and the Temer government's spending cap; in 2017, with participation in the general strikes of April 28, June 30, and December 5; between 2020 and 2021, with the holding of healthcare strikes against the resumption of in-person classes amid the Covid-19 pandemic; in 2022, the strike took place between May and July, with the agenda focusing on wage adjustments and opposition to Jair Bolsonaro's neo-fascist policies. The most recent strike organized by SINASEFE took place between April and June 2024, during the Lula administration, with salary increases and career restructuring as its central demands.

In order to strengthen the debate and advocacy for integrated secondary education, in November 2023, the national SINASEFE approved the document titled "SINASEFE's Contributions to the Development of Public Policies for Brazilian Vocational and Technological Education" (SINASEFE, 2024), which was published in 2024.

The result of a debate with the rank-and-file education workers in the network, it was approved at the 35th National Congress of SINASEFE (CONSINASEFE) as an expression of collective reflection on the 15 years of the Federal Network for Professional, Scientific, and Technological Education (RFEPCT), publicizing the union's educational project. This demonstrates the union movement's capacity to develop pedagogical and political alternatives for the working class's vocational education in times of neoliberal offensive.

---

<sup>4</sup> The organization is affiliated with the Confederation of American Educators (CEA) and is not linked to any labor union federation, having disaffiliated from the Central Sindical e Popular Conlutas in 2019.

The document outlines proposals across 12 key areas that guide debates on educational policies, namely: a) Integrated Secondary Education; b) Initial and continuing training for teachers in Professional and Technological Education; c) Youth and Adult Education; d) Democratic management; e) The role of extension programs in consolidating the identity of the Federal Network for Professional, Scientific, and Technological Education; f) Funding; g) Student Assistance Policy; h) Inclusive education and diversity; i) Expansion of the RFEPCT; j) Education in institutions of the Ministry of Defense; k) Access, retention, and success.

Among the proposals, the integrated education project stands out; it is defined as a curricular organization that takes into account the dimensions of work, science, and culture, taking work as an educational principle. Advocating for the proposal of a unified elementary school and the transition to a polytechnic school, in opposition to the hegemonic technicality and pragmatism in the NEM project, SINASEFE points toward a project that broadens access to scientific knowledge, in addition to proposing a critical analysis of society, signaling a project of emancipatory education for Brazil's working-class youth.

#### **4. Final Considerations**

We have identified that the new high school project was imposed in an authoritarian manner, and in full alignment with the neoliberal policies implemented in Brazil after 2016. It reflected in education the precariousness of labor and the reduction of labor and social rights, which are intertwined in Brazilian dependent capitalism with the modernization of some of the economy's more dynamic sectors, in relation to the intensification of productivity through technological advancement.

The reform was linked to issues such as the overexploitation of labor (which manifests itself in the impoverishment of the curriculum for working-class children), social inequalities, and the reframing of structural duality (by restricting access to important scientific knowledge in high school, as reflected in the BNCC and educational pathways), as well as a slow and faltering adaptation to Industry 4.0 technologies, characteristic of a dependent economy.

The set of transformations in educational policies in the area of vocational education implemented after 2016 culminated in a technical and vocational training pathway for the NEM, marked by business- y influence, which was expressed in the BNCC, the new DCNEPT, and the reformulation of the CNCT, combined with the New Pathways Program created by the MEC during the Bolsonaro administration. This signaled a shift away from the principles of vocational training, combining curricular flexibility with the

stripping of scientific content from the high school curriculum, thereby reinforcing neoliberal policies in public education.

Even in an extremely adverse context, SINASEFE organized various defensive actions, including diverse mobilizations, centered on defending the federal school system and the rights of education workers. It was observed that SINASEFE played a central role in defending public education and the careers of teachers and educational administrative staff, in addition to formulating an educational project committed to the interests of the working class.

The successive strikes and mobilizations organized by the union between 2016 and 2024 express not only the struggle for labor rights, such as wage adjustments and career restructuring, but also a broader political resistance against the regressive educational reforms, austerity policies, and the neoliberal agenda that marked the period. In this sense, SINASEFE's actions linked the demands of education workers to a structural agenda for the defense of public and democratic education, from the perspective of the polytechnic school.

## References

- Antunes, R., & Pinto, G. A. (2017). *A fábrica da educação: da especialização taylorista à flexibilização toyotista*. Cortez.
- Basilio, A. L. (2026). Em dez anos, aprendizagem no Ensino Médio encolhe e desigualdade cresce. *Carta Capital*. Recuperado em 13 de março de 2026, de <https://www.cartacapital.com.br/educacao/em-dez-anos-aprendizagem-no-ensino-medio-encolhe-e-desigualdade-cresce/>
- Braga, R. (2008). Introdução. In: Gramsci, A. *Americanismo e fordismo*. Hedra.
- Brasil. *Lei nº 13.415, de 16 de fevereiro de 2017*. Presidência da República. Recuperado em 13 de março de 2026, de [https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/\\_Ato2015-2018/2017/Lei/L13415.htm](https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2015-2018/2017/Lei/L13415.htm)
- Brasil. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Profissional e Tecnológica. (2024). *Plataforma Nilo Peçanha*. Recuperado em 30 de novembro de 2024, de <https://www.gov.br/mec/pt-br/ptnp>
- Cichaczewski, J. C., & Castro, C. A. de. (2023). IF's: uma expressão particular das experiências políticas da classe trabalhadora brasileira no século XX. *Germinal: Marxismo e Educação em Debate*, 15(3), 448–467. Recuperado em 20 de outubro de 2024, de <https://periodicos.ufba.br/index.php/revistagerminal/article/view/54513>
- Del Roio, M. (2018). *Gramsci e a emancipação do subalterno*. Unesp.

- Fontes, V. (2010). *O Brasil e o capital imperialismo: Teoria e história*. EPSJV/Editora UFRJ.
- Gentili, P. (1996). Neoliberalismo e educação: manual do usuário. In T. T. Silva & P. Gentili (Orgs.). *Escola S.A.: Quem ganha e quem perde no mercado educacional do neoliberalismo* (pp. 9–49). CNTE.
- Gramsci, A. (1982). *Os intelectuais e a organização da cultura*. 4ª ed. Civilização Brasileira.
- Gramsci, A. (2007). *Cadernos do cárcere*. 3ª ed. Civilização Brasileira, vol. 3.
- Gramsci, A. (2008). *Americanismo e fordismo*. Hedra.
- Hodson, R. (1995). Work resistance: An underdeveloped concept in the sociology of work. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 16, 79–110. Recuperado em 20 de outubro de 2024, de <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0143831x9501600104>
- Leher, R., & Motta, V. C. da. (2012). Políticas educacionais neoliberais e educação do campo. In R. S. Caldart et al. (Orgs.). *Dicionário da Educação do Campo*. Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio/Expressão Popular.
- Lisboa, V. (2020). Agência Brasil explica: o que é o Sistema S. *Agência Brasil*. Recuperado em 13 de março de 2026, de <https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/economia/noticia/2020-09/agencia-brasil-explica-o-que-e-o-sistema-s>
- Mészáros, I. (2007). *O desafio e o fardo do tempo histórico: o socialismo no século XXI*. Boitempo.
- Poulantzas, N. (2000). *O estado, o poder, o socialismo*. 4ª ed. Graal.
- Poulantzas, N. (2019). *Poder político e classes sociais*. Editora da Unicamp.
- Saviani, D. (2008). Política educacional brasileira: limites e perspectivas. *Revista de Educação PUC-Campinas*, (24). Recuperado em 3 de agosto de 2024, de <https://periodicos.puc-campinas.edu.br/reeducacao/article/view/108>
- SINASEFE. (2024). *Contribuições do SINASEFE na construção de Políticas Públicas para a Educação Profissional e Tecnológica Brasileira: 15 anos da Rede Federal de Educação Profissional, Científica e Tecnológica*. SINASEFE.
- Woodcock, J. (2023). Compreendendo a resistência às plataformas. In: Antunes, R. (Org.). *Icebergs à deriva: O trabalho nas plataformas digitais*. Boitempo.