

ARTICLE

## THE HISTORICAL TRANSFORMATION OF DIDACTICS IN BRAZIL: REFLECTIONS ON ENDIPE (1972–2024) AND ITS RELEVANCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION<sup>12</sup>

CÉLIO MOACIR DOS SANTOS<sup>1</sup>

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4765-1578>  
<moacircelio@gmail.com>

LÍGIA ARANTES SAD<sup>2</sup>

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2758-8380>  
<aransadli@gmail.com>

<sup>1</sup> Secretaria de Estado da Educação do Espírito Santo (SEDU), Vitória (ES), Brazil.

<sup>2</sup> Instituto Federal do Espírito Santo (IFES), Vitória (ES), Brazil.

**ABSTRACT:** This study analyzes the historical transformation of Didactics, highlighting significant events in Brazil, such as the National Meeting on Didactics and Teaching Practices (ENDIPE), and its importance in teacher education, with a focus on teaching and learning processes. Grounded in established studies in the field of Didactics and teacher training, the investigation explores its trajectory from institutionalization to recent reformulations. Thus, the objective is to analyze how the trajectory of the Didactics discipline in Brazil reflects its processes of disciplinarization, institutionalization, and transformation, considering significant moments and means of dissemination in the educational field. Methodologically, it combines historical and conceptual analysis, exploring the relationships between general Didactics, subject-specific Didactics, and the Brazilian educational context. The results point to reformulations that reflect diverse educational models, alternating between conservative, technicist, and critical approaches. In Brazil, debates about identity and educational purposes mark its insertion in teacher training programs, with challenges such as prescriptive perspectives and disconnection from sociocultural realities. Advances include critical approaches, the valorization of diversity, and the inclusion of Basic Education teachers. However, it is still necessary to better integrate general and specific Didactics, overcoming simplifications to strengthen transformative educational practices.

**Keywords:** Didactics, Teacher Education, History of Education.

### A TRANSFORMAÇÃO HISTÓRICA DA DIDÁTICA NO BRASIL: REFLEXÕES SOBRE O ENDIPE (1972 a 2024) E SUA RELEVÂNCIA NA FORMAÇÃO DOCENTE

**RESUMO:** Esta pesquisa analisa a transformação histórica da Didática, destacando eventos relevantes no Brasil, como o Encontro Nacional de Didática e Práticas de Ensino (ENDIPE), e

---

<sup>1</sup> Article published with funding from the *Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico* - CNPq/Brazil for editing, layout and XML conversion services.

<sup>2</sup> The Editor-in-Chief participating in the open peer review process: Suzana dos Santos Gomes.

sua importância na formação docente, com foco nos processos de ensino e aprendizagem. Fundamentada em estudos consolidados na área da Didática e da formação de professores, a investigação aborda sua trajetória desde a institucionalização até suas reformulações recentes. Assim, o objetivo consiste em analisar como a trajetória da disciplina Didática no Brasil reflete seus processos de disciplinarização, institucionalização e transformação, considerando momentos significativos e meios de divulgação no campo educacional. Metodologicamente, combina análise histórica e conceitual, explorando as relações entre Didática geral, específicas e o contexto educacional brasileiro. Os resultados apontam reformulações que refletem modelos educacionais diversos, alternando entre abordagens conservadoras, tecnicistas e críticas. No Brasil, debates sobre identidade e propósitos marcam sua inserção nos cursos de formação, com desafios como visões prescritivas e desconexão com realidades socioculturais. Avanços incluem abordagens críticas, valorização da diversidade e inclusão de professores da Educação Básica. Contudo, ainda é necessário integrar melhor a Didática geral e específicas, superando simplificações para fortalecer práticas educativas transformadoras.

**Palavras-chave:** Didática, Formação de Professores, História da Educação.

## **LA TRANSFORMACIÓN HISTÓRICA DE LA DIDÁCTICA EN BRASIL: REFLEXIONES SOBRE EL ENDIPE (1972-2024) Y SU RELEVANCIA EN LA FORMACIÓN DOCENTE**

**RESUMEN:** Esta investigación analiza la transformación histórica de la Didáctica, destacando eventos relevantes en Brasil, como el Encuentro Nacional de Didáctica y Prácticas de Enseñanza (ENDIPE), y su importancia en la formación docente, con énfasis en los procesos de enseñanza y aprendizaje. Fundamentada en estudios consolidados en el campo de la Didáctica y la formación del profesorado, la investigación aborda su trayectoria desde la institucionalización hasta sus reformulaciones más recientes. El objetivo consiste, por lo tanto, en analizar cómo la trayectoria de la disciplina Didáctica en Brasil refleja sus procesos de disciplinarización, institucionalización y transformación, considerando momentos significativos y los medios de divulgación en el ámbito educativo. Metodológicamente, combina el análisis histórico y conceptual, explorando las relaciones entre la Didáctica general, las didácticas específicas y el contexto educativo brasileño. Los resultados señalan reformulaciones que reflejan distintos modelos educativos, alternando entre enfoques conservadores, tecnicistas y críticos. En Brasil, los debates sobre identidad y propósitos educativos marcan su incorporación en los cursos de formación docente, enfrentando desafíos como visiones prescriptivas y la desconexión con las realidades socioculturales. Entre los avances se encuentran los enfoques críticos, la valorización de la diversidad y la inclusión de docentes de la Educación Básica. No obstante, sigue siendo necesario integrar mejor la Didáctica general con las específicas, superando simplificaciones para fortalecer prácticas educativas transformadoras.

**Palabras clave:** Didáctica, Formación de Profesores, Historia de la Educación.

## **INTRODUCTION**

In the transition from the 1970s to the 1980s, a time when Brazilian society was beginning to demonstrate clearer opposition to the military regime established in 1964, a group of educators initiated a movement in the educational field that reflected the desires for change prevalent during that period.

Law 5,692/71, enacted during the Military Regime, had a considerable impact on the training of educators and education researchers, especially regarding the discipline of Didactics. By establishing a technical and professionalizing model, the legislation provoked critical reactions among academics, who began to mobilize in favor of more reflective and less instrumentalized

teacher training. According to Saviani (2008), the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN-*Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional*) number 5,692/71 reduced the emphasis on the humanities and critical training, favoring teaching for market demands. This change had a direct impact on Didactics, which began to emerge as a field more oriented toward educational techniques than pedagogical reflection.

In this context, educators began to be organized into scientific associations and research groups to oppose the depoliticization of education. Romanelli (2013) indicates that, given the emphasis on standardized teaching methods, Didactics researchers sought to strengthen the relevance of the relationship between theory and practice, advocating for teacher training that went beyond technical training. Oliveira (1993) contributes by stating that, in his research on the history of Didactics in Brazil, he highlights that LDBEN 5.692/71 sparked a movement of resistance among educators. Following this legislation, education professionals began to debate, both in conferences and in publications, the limitations of a Didactics reduced to mere methodological procedures.

Thus, while LDBEN 5.692/71 imposes an educational model aligned with the interests of the military regime, it also catalyzed the organization of educators around the defense of a more critical Didactics committed to social transformation. As Gadotti (2019) states, this period showed a tension between the imposition of a technocratic teaching and the resistance of educators, who sought, through studies and debates, to preserve the political-pedagogical character of Didactics.

Another event was the 1st National Meeting of Didactics Teachers, held in 1972 at the University of Brasília (UnB). It is considered a landmark in the history of Brazilian education, especially in the context of the changes by LDBEN 5.692/71. Organized during a period of intense political repression, the event brought together educators seeking to discuss the future of Didactics based on the military regime's increasing instrumentalization of teaching. Oliveira (1991) pointed out that the meeting represented an attempt to resist the discourse of scientific neutrality propagated by the educational legislation of the time, which reduced Didactics to a set of pedagogical techniques detached from critical reflection. Saviani (2008) added that the event was one of the first forums for articulation of teachers who rejected the subordination of education to the economic interests of the military regime.

During this period of resistance, Cunha (1975) also mentions the existence of other groups that were consolidated, such as the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Education (ANPEd-*Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Educação*), created in 1976. The author argues that, although the legislation sought to regulate the educational process, it also indirectly encouraged the formation of research groups that questioned its structure, such as ANPEd. In this context, Oliveira (1993) highlights that Didactics underwent a process of theoretical reworking, incorporating debates about the relationship between education and society, in response to the challenges imposed by authoritarian legislation.

Thus, the resistance movements and discussions promoted at the first academic meetings on Didactics fostered new connections among educators. Beginning with the 1st National Meeting on Teaching Practice, held in 1979, and the 1st Seminar called “The Didactics in Question,” held in 1982, a space for critical reflection on the foundations, concepts, political orientations, and educational practices in Brazilian schools was consolidated. These events not only reinforced the search for a Didactics that articulated theory and practice but also highlighted educators' commitment to critical and contextualized teacher training, strengthening the theoretical reworking movement from the previous period.

The convergence of purposes between the two movements led to their unification in 1987, after three meetings in each area, and culminating with the creation of the IV National Meeting on Didactics and Teaching Practices (IV ENDIPE-*Encontro Nacional de Didática e Práticas de Ensino*). Since then, the National Meeting on Didactics and Teaching Practices (ENDIPE) has been established as a biannual forum for debates among researchers, specialists, educational administrators, teachers, and students from different regions of Brazil and other countries.

Over the decades, ENDIPE has been a diverse and relevant forum for discussing studies, research, and experiences related to educational processes at various levels. Nationally recognized, the event has contributed to advancing knowledge about educational phenomena and developing innovative pedagogical proposals.

Throughout the 24 meetings held to date, it has been possible to monitor educational trends over the past five decades and their impact on schools and teaching practices. These events promote a space for dialogue and exchange, bringing together individuals committed to understanding and transforming educational processes and pedagogical practices, in a constant movement of analysis and action.

Based on these introductory considerations, this article focuses on aspects of the trajectory of the Didactics discipline, highlighting significant moments in the Brazilian context. This text is part of a doctoral research project defended in 2024, with some expansions, developed in the Graduate Program in Science and Mathematics Education at the Federal Institute of Education, Science, and Technology of Espírito Santo. We aim to explore the process of disciplinarization experienced by the Didactics discipline, highlighting moments in its institutionalization, means of dissemination, development processes, and transformations.

We adopt the term disciplinarization, as understood by Hofstetter and Valente (2017), as the historical process of constituting school knowledge into systematized disciplines characterized by their content, methods, and purposes. It is a complex and dynamic movement of selecting, organizing, and legitimizing specific knowledge in school curricula and teacher training. From this perspective, we will analyze how Didactics has been established as a discipline focused on teaching issues, articulating pedagogical knowledge in teaching practice.

Our focus is on the ENDIPE, a privileged space for the production and circulation of didactic knowledge. We are interested in understanding the process of disciplinarization of Didactics in this event, identifying its historical trajectory, the content and methods mobilized, as well as the transformations that occurred over time—in line with the debates of authors such as Chervel (1990), who emphasizes the role of school knowledge in structuring disciplines, and Goodson (1997), who highlights the social and political factors involved in disciplinary consolidation.

The studies of Bourdieu (2003), Hofstetter and Valente (2017) consider four important characteristics of the process of specialization of disciplines, or what could be called the process of disciplinarization. These processes can be expressed through instances that serve as the basis for their constitution. First, it is necessary to consider the issue of institutionalization, that is, legitimizing the discipline. After this step, there is the issue of communication infrastructure, considering which channels will disseminate the knowledge that constitutes the discipline. In the third stage, it is necessary to validate this knowledge. To this end, a theoretical and methodological framework must be systematically developed that can largely meet the discipline's demands. Finally, it is essential to socialize this discipline so that, while it is disseminated, it can also be reflected upon and reconfigured as new questions emerge, in a constant process. Thus, by historically bringing together the meetings that permeated the discussions surrounding the Didactics discipline, we understand that we are contributing to this process of disciplinarization.

Based on the initial presentation of this text, the research question is characterized as follows: How does the trajectory of the Didactics discipline in Brazil reflect its processes of disciplinarization, institutionalization, and transformation, considering significant moments and means of dissemination in the educational field?

This question aligns with the objective stated in the text, which is to analyze the history of the Didactics discipline, highlighting its institutional milestones, dissemination and development processes, and the changes experienced over time.

From this perspective, we will present elements that indicate the insertion of Didactics in the national context, based on a historical analysis of the ENDIPE, as well as the challenges, advances, and difficulties associated with this trajectory. The aim is not to conduct an exhaustive

analysis or examine all the papers presented at these meetings. We intend to reflect on the themes based on the event titles and their thematic axes, seeking to understand the rationale behind their choices, draw possible inferences, and contextualize, even succinctly, each event within its respective historical context.

Thus, given the broad historical scope suggested in the title of this study, it is important to clarify that the analyses presented here are based primarily on sources and productions related to the period between 1972 and the first half of the 2010s. Although the article's title refers to the period from 1972 to 2024, the analytical corpus of the work does not exhaustively cover the most recent debates and productions on Didactics, especially in the 2010s and 2020s. For the more recent period—particularly after 2015—the reflections proposed in this study are based on a reading of the themes and thematic axes of the ENDIPE, seeking, from them, to draw inferences about the directions taken by Didactics in contemporary times. This methodological choice follows the research objectives and the nature of the sources used, which are primarily from the doctoral thesis that gave rise to this article.

## **DIDACTIC AND SPECIFIC DIDACTIC: HISTORICAL FOUNDATIONS, TRAJECTORY, AND PERSPECTIVES**

Didactics emerged in a context of transition between medieval and bourgeois society, a period marked by profound transformations in the educational landscape. Cambi (1999) argues that with the advent of modern society, schools underwent profound changes, aiming to counter the previously predominant religious model. Garcia (2014) notes that although many vestiges of medieval schools persisted, students were divided by age group, curricula were implemented, and discipline became the central element in the educational environment.

In this new scenario, according to Garcia (2014), as a consequence of the Protestant Reformation, the invention of the printing press, and the economic rise of merchants, the Czech Protestant bishop Johann Amos Comenius (1592-1670) left Western education with a work that would constitute Modern Didactics: the *Didactics Magna*. Organized and published in the 17th century, between 1621 and 1657, this compendium pedagogically systematized what Comenius called the “art of teaching everything to everyone.” This method, proposed by Comenius, was an attempt to synthesize scientific and rational knowledge with the idea of salvation coming from God. This entire process of reformulating pedagogy, encompassing everything from didactic methods to the structuring and functioning of educational institutions, contributed to the formation of the contemporary school model. However, even while devising different levels that respected individual development, there was no variation in the curriculum. Practical teaching, that is, learning by doing, was prioritized, with no room for theoretical discussion. According to Libâneo (2002), Comenius established the centrality of the methodological dimension in the educational field, not through a prescriptive set of techniques, but through a proposal grounded in philosophical foundations, characteristic of the period known as naturalist-essentialist didactics. This conception represents a significant shift in the history of education, proposing a pedagogical theory linked to philosophical principles. Following this historical process, thinkers such as Rousseau (1712–1778), Pestalozzi (1746–1827), and Herbart (1776–1841) contributed to the development of psychologically based didactics, which emphasize the mental processes involved in learning. From the late 19th and early 20th centuries onward, the incorporation of assumptions from experimental psychology began, leading to the emergence of scientific-experimental didactics. According to the same author, these phases and approaches began to coexist historically, maintaining a relationship of dependence on psychological frameworks for a long period. Only with the strengthening of critical currents and social movements did didactics begin to embrace new theoretical contributions from philosophy, sociology, and politics.

The historical development of Didactics, as Chervel (1990) shows, was marked by continuous theoretical and methodological transformations. Only in the early 20th century did the



discipline achieve more systematic studies of its dimension, purpose, and limits, paving the way for the emergence of Specific Didactics. This change reflects the growing complexity of the educational process, which requires more specialized approaches for different areas of knowledge.

In this context, we understand the current importance of Didactics and its specific derivations in teacher training. As Pimenta (2005) argues, General Didactics maintains its fundamental nature by investigating the teaching and learning processes, while Specific Didactics—also called teaching methodologies or practices—deepen this reflection in each area of knowledge. Marcelo (1999) emphasizes that this dual dimension is essential in teacher training courses, as it allows for the articulation of general pedagogical theory with the particularities of each discipline.

Regarding Specific Didactics, some misunderstandings can occur, especially in understanding its true purpose. Franco and Pimenta (2016) state that Specific Didactics is often treated as a means of achieving the didactic transposition of content, which ends up simplifying the broader objective of this discipline and its complex interactions with teaching. For D'Amore (2007), Specific Didactics distinguishes itself both from the scientific field from which it originates and from General Didactics by bringing with it “other parameters, paradigms, and objectives” (p. 25).

From this perspective, Didactics is, initially, a teaching practice focused on a particular school subject or discipline. As Chervel (1990) points out, a school subject consists of a variable set of elements, including presentation methods, exercises, motivational strategies, and an assessment system. The unique combination of these components gives rise to the Specific Didactics of each subject. Didactics is understood in the context of discourses, teaching structures, and assessment methods relevant to the specific knowledge of a school subject. It inseparably encompasses both the organization of knowledge and the particular approaches to teaching it in a given subject.

Beyond these methodological issues, regarding pedagogical issues, Libâneo (2013) expands these discussions by considering two major aspects. The first is the theoretical-scientific training of professionals who will work in education—that is, the specific academic training in their field. The second is technical-practical training, in which teachers acquire didactic knowledge, including knowledge of the disciplines of Didactics, Methodology, Teaching Practices, and others.

Pimenta (2010) understands that, through the efforts of scholars, Didactics seeks to overcome the conservative conceptions established since Comenius's work and his idea of teaching everything to everyone. In the Brazilian context, as a field of Pedagogy, Didactics relates to a set of trends adopted here, emerging from the social and political transformations demand at different times. However, it is always important to remember that, according to Pimenta (2010), Didactics has teaching as its object of investigation and, therefore, is manifested in historically situations. This implies that teaching is present in the most diverse social contexts, regions, areas of activity, schools, educational systems, cultures, and society.

New possibilities for Didactics are emerging to overcome the conservative view that has prevailed for so long. Pimenta (2010) emphasizes that research on teaching has begun to focus on a “living” social practice, in constant movement, where teaching is also “living,” and theory and practice become inseparable at the subjective level. This occurs because there is always a continuous dialogue between the educator's knowledge and their teaching practice.

Working with Didactics is a potential opportunity to contribute to ensuring that teaching, the core of teaching, results in the learning necessary for student development, empowering them for a critical integration into society. In this context, this integration aims to transform the conditions of these students, wherever they are located, organizing collectively in pursuit of their rights as citizens.

This is the current understanding of the role of Didactics, which has teaching as its objective, in the relationship between teacher and student, mobilized by knowledge to be critically processed and situated in the diverse contexts that determine teaching practices.

In this sense, the importance of didactics is reinforced as an integrated field, linking different knowledge and experiences in teacher training, rather than fragmenting them into isolated or dichotomized approaches. By situating Didactics at the interface of theoretical and practical knowledge, the author highlights its role in developing a reflective teacher, aware of their pedagogical choices and the implications of their actions. This professional is seen as someone who masters not only the disciplinary content but also the pedagogical foundations that underpin their practice, allowing them to act autonomously and responsibly in diverse educational contexts. This approach emphasizes Didactics as an essential element for strengthening teachers' critical thinking, promoting training that goes beyond technique and achieves a broad and conscious understanding of educational practice.

Thus, as a domain of knowledge and pedagogical practice, Didactics has a unique epistemological status, distinguishing it as an essential discipline in educator training. According to Libâneo (2013), Didactics is not limited to a set of teaching procedures, but rather constitutes a scientific field that analyzes teaching and learning processes, intentionally articulating the content, methods, conditions, and objectives of the educational act. This understanding reinforces its disciplinary dimension, as it is constituted around specific objects such as teaching, pedagogical mediation, and the relationship between theory and practice. According to the author, Didactics mediates between pedagogical knowledge and specialized knowledge in different areas of knowledge, seeking to understand how this knowledge is transformed into teaching objects. This disciplinary conception is also corroborated by Candau (2009) and Pimenta (2005), who highlight the relevance of Didactics in the construction of critical, contextualized educational practices committed to social transformation. In this aspect, Didactics is not limited to teaching techniques, but mainly encompasses reflection on the purposes, meanings, and formative processes that permeate teaching work.

## **THE PATHS TAKEN BY DIDACTICS IN BRAZIL**

The National Meetings on Didactics and Teaching Practices (ENDIPE) represent significant milestones in the trajectory of Didactics in Brazil, reflecting the challenges and advances of this discipline in the educational context. Since its inception, ENDIPE has been established as a privileged space for discussion, exchange of ideas, and sharing of experience, bringing together educators, researchers, and administrators around themes central to teacher training and pedagogical practices. These events reflect the historical, political, and social transformations that have impacted Brazilian education, contributing to the strengthening of Didactics as a field of knowledge and the search for solutions to the challenges faced in teacher training. By analyzing the paths taken by Didactics through ENDIPE, it is possible to understand how it has been positioned in educational demands of different historical contexts, reaffirming its relevance in promoting critical and contextualized pedagogical practices.

According to Pimenta (2010), a new perspective on didactics in Brazil took several centuries, beginning with Comenius's traditional understanding that practice should prevail over theory. There were also periods when the centrality of didactics emphasized memorization and the assimilation of knowledge, marking a long period from 1549 to 1930.

At another time, in an attempt to overcome this blemish, new approaches began to be explored, even if they did not initially focus directly on didactics. Therefore, this is the Pioneers of the New School movement. This movement aimed at the formation of a new individual following democratic ideals, ensuring the integral development of all individuals. In the Brazilian context of the 1930s, discussions about the social role of schools and the expansion of access to education intensified amidst important struggles. However, as Veiga (2004) observed, New School adherents advocated for resolving educational challenges within the school, neglecting the complexities of the Brazilian reality in the political, economic, and social spheres. According to Veiga (2004), concerning Didactics, the influence of the New School gave it a technical and practical character,

with an approach that integrated both aspects. From this perspective, the teaching process acquired an investigative dimension, addressing educational problems and their possible solutions. According to Candau (2000), New School Didactics widely disseminated a variety of pedagogical methods and techniques, standing out interest centers, guided study, teaching units, project methods, the use of teaching cards, and the teaching contract, among others.

In the 1930s, as observed by Ferreira and Santos (2012), a process of historical disciplinarization of areas related to educational sciences began. Regarding Didactics, a disciplinarization movement occurred, resulting in its inclusion in the curricula of teacher training courses in Brazil.

Previously, science was conceived uniformly, with a single perspective prevailing in academia. However, over time, this conception lost ground to a new organization, driven by the growing demand for scientific research in society. This context fostered a movement toward specialization both within academia and among scientists.

According to Hofstetter and Valente (2017), in this context, disciplinary specializations emerge, each with its distinctive characteristics. This also occurs in the field of Didactics, as certain objects of study begin to be defined. These objects, with their characteristics, involve theories, methodologies, and other specific aspects, as in General Didactics and Specific Didactics.

Continuing this historical trajectory, even in the face of significant transformations in Brazilian education, Didactics remained predominantly anchored in a conservative and transmissive approach, maintaining this characteristic until approximately the 1960s. However, when questioning whether there was progress or regression from this point onward, the answer is unfavorable. In the 1960s, education faced considerable challenges. According to Pimenta (2010), Didactics adopted a conservative and technocratic approach, inspired by pragmatic currents, focusing on teaching processes detached from political, social, and economic dimensions. In a political context aligned with the elitist liberal democracy characteristic of the developmentalist populist state, Didactics reflected these tendencies (Pimenta, 2005).

Subsequently, with the establishment of the military dictatorship in 1964, the technocratic nature of Didactics intensified. During this period, Didactics began to be structured in a regulated manner, supported by regulations that emphasized planning and control as guidelines for productivity. Didactics courses, as Veiga (2004) highlights, focus on the rational organization of the teaching process, prioritizing formal didactic planning and the development of instructional materials. The prevailing approach reflected theoretical and methodological assumptions that imbued Didactics with concepts of efficiency, technical rationality, and productivity. This perspective marked the practical training of teachers, centering it on techniques considered applicable to any context, often to the detriment of a consistent theoretical foundation.

Without the intention of conducting an exhaustive analysis of the ENDIPE, the following proposal will discuss the topics addressed by this event, with particular attention to the themes of the meetings. The aim is to reflect on the approaches presented, as well as their implications for the field of Didactics.

## **THE TRANSFORMATIONS OF DIDACTICS TOLD THROUGH ENDIPE**

Destacamos que os ENDIPE têm constituído objeto de pesquisas significativas ao longo das décadas, especialmente, por evidenciar as alterações na Didática, nas práticas pedagógicas e nas políticas educacionais no Brasil. A seguir (Quadro 1), apresentamos uma síntese de alguns desses estudos, assim como suas principais considerações.

The proposal highlights aspects that signal the insertion of Didactics into the national landscape, based on a historical analysis of the ENDIPE, as well as their challenges, advances, and difficulties. The aim is not to conduct an exhaustive examination or to encompass all the papers presented at these meetings. The proposal consists of analyzing the topics addressed based on the event titles and, when possible, examining their thematic axes, aiming to identify the criteria that



informed their selection. Based on this analysis, we seek to draw inferences and contextualize, even if briefly, each event within its respective historical context.

We emphasize that the ENDIPE (National Educational Programs of Education) have been the subject of significant research over the decades, particularly for highlighting changes in Didactics, pedagogical practices, and educational policies in Brazil. Below (Table 1), we present a summary of some of these studies, as well as their main considerations.

**Table 1 - Studies on ENDIPE**

Authors	Main Contributions
Libâneo (2002)	During this period, the ENDIPEs began to reflect a strengthening of Didactics as a disciplinary field, discussing the relationships between theory and practice, teacher training, and the impacts of the decade's educational reforms. Libâneo (2002) already indicated that the ENDIPE debates show a consolidation of Didactics as an epistemological field, with a growing concern for overcoming the dichotomy between theory and practice. Beginning with the VIII ENDIPE, a broadening of themes was observed, including multiculturalism, diversity, and innovative pedagogical practices.
Venturim (2005)	This study investigates the debate on teacher-researcher training at the National Meetings on Didactics and Teaching Practice (ENDIPE) between 1994 and 2000, focusing on the interconnection between research, teacher training, and pedagogical practice. Based on a documentary analysis of 77 papers, it is identified that ENDIPEs contribute to the consolidation of the teacher-researcher's identity, valuing research as a formative, political, and epistemological axis of teaching. The analyzed production highlights the integration between theory and practice, knowledge and subjects, indicating the need for new ways of relating to knowledge, marked by doubt, diversity, and openness to dialogue. The study highlights the importance of rethinking the roles of teacher and researcher, as well as the processes of knowledge production, reinforcing the role of ENDIPEs as spaces for collective and formative construction in education.
Mariano (2006)	This dissertation seeks to investigate the findings of the studies presented at ANPED and ENDIPE regarding the professional learning process of early-career teachers. To this end, a timeframe spanning 1995 to 2004 was used to analyze works that discuss beginning teachers and their development, regardless of their educational level. Among other aspects, the studies emphasize the importance of professional socialization, continuing education, and institutional support for beginning teachers' development. Discussions on diversity, inclusion, culture, and the relationship between theory and practice are also highlighted, reaffirming the relevance of critical training models committed to social transformation.
André (2008)	This paper analyzes trends in didactics research at the beginning of the 21st century, highlighting how ENDIPE has become a privileged forum for discussion of didactic knowledge. The paper examines the epistemological evolution of the field of didactics through the research presented at the meetings.
Lacanallo et al (2009); Lima (2004)	Beginning in the 2000s, more systematic studies emerged on the history of ENDIPE, as well as analyses of their impact on the development of the field of Didactics and teaching practices. ENDIPE began to incorporate discussions on new technologies, inclusion, cultural diversity, and the challenges of teacher training in the face of social and economic changes. The events of this period also discuss the tensions between General and Specific Didactics, in addition to reflecting on the challenges of higher education in teacher training.
Sforni (2015)	Based on an analysis of papers published in the ENDIPE Proceedings of 2006, 2008, and 2010, we sought to understand Brazilian scientific production in Didactics based on Historical-Cultural Theory. This theory, by articulating teaching, learning, and human development, offers important contributions to teaching practice. However, its presence in General Didactics research remains limited. The investigation revealed that, in recent decades, Didactics has moved away from a focus on teaching scientific concepts, influenced by neoliberal educational policies and postmodern trends, which weakens its connection with the theoretical contributions of Historical-Cultural Psychology.

Martin-Franchi and Hobold (2024); Bredow and Zamperetti (2023)	In the most recent ENDIPEs, significant progress has been observed in the internationalization of discussions and the incorporation of emerging themes, such as decoloniality, gender relations, ethnic-racial issues, and pedagogical practices with emancipatory potential. The 15th ENDIPE, held in 2010, already demonstrated concern about the effects of neoliberal policies on education, as well as the need to consolidate teacher training guided by critical and ethical principles. Several studies have begun to examine the strengthening of Didactics as an autonomous scientific field, highlighting its connections with narrative research and teaching knowledge. In more recent publications, these analyses have been updated, considering the contemporary challenges faced by Didactics in the face of curricular reforms and new teaching configurations, such as the adoption of hybrid models.
--	--

Source: Prepared by the authors

The studies presented in this table were synthesized to provide an overview of the research addressing ENDIPE and its contributions to the field of Didactics in Brazil. This survey does not intend to show an exhaustive or detailed analysis of each work, but rather to highlight the main references that contribute to understanding the historical trajectory, advances, and challenges related to this event over time. Therefore, the introductory nature of this section in this article is emphasized, recognizing that other research may specifically explore different approaches, periods, or productions. Also, the studies referenced here do not exhaust the topic, as there are numerous other contributions from authors who investigate ENDIPE from different theoretical and methodological perspectives.

Returning to a historical moment of landmark events in the Brazilian scenario regarding Didactics and its role in teacher training, there is an inaugural moment: the 1st National Meeting of Didactics Teachers, held in 1972 at the University of Brasília. In the words of Oliveira (1993), this event initiated the discussion in the country about the identity of Didactics, already highlighting significant concerns in the field about its true purposes. For Romanowski and Martins (2010), it was a historic moment marked by the effort to rationalize the production process, aiming to resume the country's economic growth and industrial development. It was a time when educational planning became the preferred sector, integrated into the National Development Plan. At this first meeting, there were discussions of the need to train technically competent teachers who, above all, were committed to the country's political and economic program.

The break with the disastrous educational landscape mobilized critical educators in the 1980s. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Brazilian society began to oppose the military regime established in 1964, and in this context, educators organized to discuss and reflect on current teaching practices. In 1979, the 1st National Meeting on Teaching Practice took place, and in 1982, the 1st Seminar "Didactics in Question." These events marked the beginning of a process of study and questioning of the foundations, concepts, political orientations, and educational practices in institutions. The table below presents the main themes discussed throughout the events, highlighting the impact of these approaches on the field of didactics during the period analyzed.

**Table 2** - Discussion meetings on Didactics in Brazil (1972 to 2024)<sup>3</sup>

Year	Theme	Promoting institution
1972	I National Meeting of Didactics Teachers	Universidade de Brasília
1979	National Meeting on Teaching Practice	Universidade Federal de Santa Maria – Rio Grande do Sul/RS
1982	I Seminar Didactics in Question	Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro/RJ
1983	II Seminar Didactics in Question	Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro/RJ
1985	III Seminar Didactics in Question	Universidade de São Paulo – São Paulo / SP

<sup>3</sup> ENDIPE was officially designated by this name in 1987, but, for didactic purposes, the term is used in this text to cover the entire period from 1972 to 2024, considering its consolidation in previous meetings.

1987	IV ENDIPE - Pedagogical practice and transformative education in Brazilian society	Universidade Católica de Pernambuco – Recife / PE
1989	V ENDIPE - Organization of the teaching work process in search of the integration of Didactics and Teaching Practice	Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais – Belo Horizonte / MG
1991	VI ENDIPE - Perspectives on teaching work for 2000: Which Didactics and which Teaching Practice? The theoretical bases of an interdisciplinary teaching practice: necessary explanations	Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul – Porto Alegre / RS
1994	VII ENDIPE - Knowledge production and teaching work	Universidade Federal de Goiás – Goiânia / GO
1996	VIII ENDIPE - Educator training and professionalization	Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina – Florianópolis / SC
1998	IX ENDIPE - Looking at the quality of teaching in the classroom	Universidade de São Paulo – Águas de Lindóia / SP
2000	X ENDIPE - Teaching and learning: subjects, knowledge, spaces, and times	Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro – Rio de Janeiro/RJ
2002	XI ENDIPE - Equality and diversity in education	Universidade Federal de Goiás – Goiânia / GO
2004	XII ENDIPE - Universal knowledge and local knowledge	Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Paraná – Curitiba/PR
2006	XIII ENDIPE - Education, Pedagogical Issues and Training Processes: commitment to social inclusion	Universidade Federal de Pernambuco – Recife / PE
2008	XIV ENDIPE - Teaching and Learning Trajectories and Processes: Places, Memories and Cultures	Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Porto Alegre/RS
2010	XV ENDIPE - Convergences and tensions in the field of teacher training and work: educational policies and practices	Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais – Belo Horizonte / MG
2012	XVI ENDIPE - Didactics and Teaching Practices: commitment to public, secular, free, and quality education	Universidade Estadual de Campinas – Campinas / SP
2014	XVII ENDIPE - Didactics and teaching practices in the relationships between school, teacher training, and society	Universidade do Estado do Ceará – Fortaleza/CE
2016	XVIII ENDIPE - Didactics and Teaching Practice in the Contemporary Political Context: Scenes from Brazilian Education	Universidade Federal do Mato Grosso – Cuiabá/MT
2018	XIX ENDIPE - Where is didactics headed? Confronting current theoretical approaches and political challenges	Universidade Federal da Bahia – Salvador/BA
2020	XX ENDIPE - Pedagogical Knowledge-Doings: Dialogues, Insurgencies and Policies	Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro e Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro – Rio de Janeiro/RJ
2022	XXI ENDIPE - Didactics and teaching practices in the context of neoliberal counter-reforms	Universidade Federal de Uberlândia - Uberlândia/MG
2024	XXII ENDIPE - Didactic Knowledge for the Construction of a Democratic School	Universidade Federal da Paraíba – João Pessoa/PE

Source: <https://cepedgoias.com.br/endipes/>

The first meeting on Teaching Practice took place in 1979, which was later followed by the so-called seminars, held in dialogue with practices, but at separate events. On one side, scholars of Didactics gathered; on the other, researchers of Teaching Practices. According to Pimenta (2012), it is important to understand that the term “Teaching Practice” refers to Specific Didactics.

Variz (2008) mentions that only with the seminar “The Didactics in Question,” held in Rio de Janeiro in 1982, this movement to consider Didactics as a discipline, with an eye on its

field of action, became consolidated. According to this author, discussions began to focus on Didactics and its role in undergraduate programs.

Until 1985, the Didactics and Teaching Practice events were held separately. At these meetings, the main focus was on the rejection of the Didactics approach that merely reproduced content, disconnected from political and social contexts, and the struggle against inequality.

Pimenta (2012) clarifies that, starting in 1987, the understanding was that the Didactics and Teaching Practice meetings, which were previously held separately, should be combined since their focus was on discussion and reflection on issues related to teaching processes. Thus, the National Meeting on Didactics and Teaching Practices (ENDIPE) emerged.

In 1991, the general title of the event revealed a concern for teaching, considering the approaching future and the path that needed to be taken to overcome difficulties. In 1998, the event's theme turned to classrooms, recognizing this space as a privileged place in the teaching process and therefore a topic of discussion.

The 15th ENDIPE, held in 2010 at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), marked a significant moment in the history of these meetings, particularly due to the broad participation of researchers and professors dedicated to Specific Teaching Practices. With the theme “Convergences and Tensions in the Scope of Teacher Training and Work: Educational Policies and Practices,” the event brought together a significant number of academic papers, including contributions from master's, doctoral, and elementary school teachers, consolidating its position as one of the most representative in the history of ENDIPE.

However, in subsequent ENDIPEs, a change in the event's profile was observed, with a reduction in the number of symposia and less emphasis on discussions of Specific Teaching Practices. This transformation appears to reflect organizational choices made by the coordinators who took over the event after 2010, which, in some ways, departed from the previously established model. As a consequence, there was a decline in the active participation of professionals dedicated to these areas, making it difficult to continue the academic dialogue and joint production that had been strengthened at the XV ENDIPE.

An analysis of the themes of the post-2015 ENDIPE, such as “Didactics and Teaching Practices in Times of Democratic Crisis” (2016) and “Teacher Training and Resistance in Education” (2018), reveals a shift in focus: from a discussion of teaching methods to a critique of neoliberal educational policies, the precariousness of teacher training, and the defense of socially engaged Didactics. These events highlight how Didactics has recently been mobilized as a tool of political resistance and advocacy for inclusive pedagogical practices, reflecting concerns already present in the debates of the first half of the 2010s, but with renewed intensity.

ENDIPE has continued since its inception and is currently in its twenty-second edition, consolidating a 42-year movement of research and reflection on Didactics and Teaching Practice.

By analyzing, albeit not exhaustively, the general themes addressed at the events, we observe the recurrence of issues such as teacher training, teaching practice, and professionalization in the discussions held throughout the meetings. It should be noted that this observation is limited to the event titles and their thematic axes, not encompassing all the lectures and presentations, which allows for the inclusion of other relevant topics in the discussions held in these spaces.

According to Mariano (2006), progress can be identified since the 1980s, evidenced in the ENDIPE themes, which began to address issues related to the political, economic, and social context and the reality of Brazilian school education. The reflections on teacher training beyond the Comenian perspective of mere transmission and assimilation of knowledge are highlighted. Thus, the concepts present in traditional Didactics, and later in technicist-oriented Didactics—both responsible for reducing teaching to praxis—gradually lost strength. As research in the area of Didactics developed, advances undoubtedly began to be noted (Table 3).

**Table 3** - The main transformations in research regarding Didactics

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Connections between academia and Basic Education;</li><li>- Internships as a field of research for teaching;</li><li>- Quality of public education;</li><li>- Critical, theoretically grounded teaching methods;</li><li>- Cultural diversity;</li><li>- Memory and culture</li><li>- Strengthening inclusive educational practices.</li></ul> |
|---|

Source: Created by the authors.

In the first ENDIPEs, issues related to critical and emancipatory Didactics began to be heavily discussed. As a result, works by Pimenta (2002), Candau (2012), and Libâneo (2012), among others, began to consider Didactics serving a Pedagogy focused on the development of thinking and critical individuals. Another significant advance is the rapprochement between academia and public schools, evident when ENDIPEs began to include participants from Basic Education. According to Lüdke, Cruz, and Boing (2009), this space enriched debates, boosting research on Didactics and its relationship to Basic Education. Furthermore, an emerging theme at the end of the 20th century was the approach to issues related to cultural, gender, and ethnic diversity. Candau (2011) highlights the urgency of incorporating new categories and social practices to address these issues, redefining educational work and, consequently, the discipline of Didactics. The author argues that these themes of multiculturalism, gender and race issues, and other cultural manifestations should be part of the discussions that permeate the discipline today. Another advance was the inclusion of internships, considered courses, in the curriculum as articulators of teaching, connecting theory and practice. França (2013) emphasizes that, with the debate on internships, it is possible to highlight the importance of the process of establishing the teaching profession for teachers and future teachers.

Beginning in the 2000s, the ENDIPE revealed new advances in the field of didactics, highlighting a greater complexity in the topics addressed. Discussions on diversity and inclusion expanded, with a focus on valuing different cultural and social contexts. Didactics began to be analyzed not only as a technical instrument, but as a reflective and critical practice, aimed at building a democratic and transformative education.

The debates also highlighted the role of didactics in articulating theoretical and practical knowledge, with an emphasis on teacher training that prioritizes the integration of scientific knowledge, pedagogical experiences, and the specificities of educational realities. Issues related to equality, memories, and local cultures began to occupy a central place, reinforcing the need for pedagogical practices that engage with contemporary challenges, including ensuring a quality public school.

Also, these advances show a growing appreciation for emancipatory practices, which seek to overcome prescriptive and technocratic models, promoting reflections that consider the political and social context. Didactics has also come to be seen as a field capable of proposing innovative paths in the face of neoliberal counter-reforms, reaffirming its commitment to critical education and social justice. These advances reflect a collective effort to strengthen Didactics as a central area for building educational practices committed to democratic and inclusive values.

After highlighting these advances, it is important to mention some challenges regarding Didactics. The first challenge, according to Martins (1998), would be to overcome the view of the discipline as merely prescriptive. From this perspective, the historical context of its development is ignored, conceiving it as neutral and universal, disregarding its condition of being surrounded by social, political, and economic relations. Linked to this problem, according to Oliveira (1993), there is another challenge to establish what the real contents should be to be worked on in this discipline, which usually disregards the sociocultural reality of students.

The integration of Didactics and Teaching Practices, especially at the beginning of the ENDIPE in the 1980s, represented a significant attempt to unite General Didactics with Specific



Didactics. However, this integration lost momentum over time, resulting in a near-absence of Specific Didactics in the ENDIPE. One possible cause of this phenomenon may be related to the fragmented university model established in Brazil, which compartmentalizes knowledge into specific areas, hindering dialogue between pedagogical and specific disciplines, especially in undergraduate programs and Pedagogy.

It is possible to hypothesize that this absence of Specific Didactics in the ENDIPE is associated with the creation of dedicated spaces for discussion within the knowledge areas, which, paradoxically, reflects a certain undervaluing of Didactics as a fundamental knowledge in teacher training, regardless of the field. In this context, it is essential to reaffirm the role of Didactics in undergraduate courses, as highlighted by Martins (1998), when positioning it as an essential instrument for converting teaching into critical and transformative learning, contextualized with the student's reality.

However, as D'Amore (2007) argues, it is inappropriate to analyze General Didactics in isolation from Specific Didactics. Although both have their assertions supported by specific research and reflection, the challenge is to build a bridge between them, recognizing the importance of each and ensuring space in undergraduate programs for the development of both General Didactics and Specific Didactics. General Didactics must be seen as a legitimate and coherent field, which cannot be subsumed by the specificities of Disciplinary Didactics, but must also engage with them to enrich teacher training.

According to Oliveira (1993), in an attempt to reconstruct the discipline of Didactics, it is essential to clearly understand the role of General Didactics and its relationship with Specific Didactics. It is necessary to understand the meaning and interaction between these two categories in the context of teaching and learning, encompassing both the general and the specific. As in D'Amore (2007), Oliveira (1993) recognizes that the existence of the specific should not negate the existence of the general. Research in the Didactics discipline “should develop to capture the contents of these categories, in the case of the phenomenon of teaching in concrete and particular conditions” (Oliveira, 1993, p. 137).

Thus, the reflection points to the need for an integrated understanding of the general and the specific, emphasizing that both are fundamental to the development of a Didactics capable of engaging with the complexity of teaching. In this sense, the reconstruction of the discipline requires a close look at the relationships between broad dimensions and contextual particularities, promoting an approach that values both theoretical foundations and specific pedagogical practices. This articulation is essential to respond to contemporary educational challenges, ensuring that Didactics remains a relevant and transformative field in teacher training and in improving teaching quality.

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This paper sought to examine the historical transformations of the discipline of Didactics, with an emphasis on notable events in the Brazilian context and their relevance to teacher education, particularly in the teaching and learning processes. Thus, the research question sought to analyze how the trajectory of the discipline of Didactics in Brazil reflects its processes of disciplinarization, institutionalization, and transformation, considering significant moments and the means of dissemination in the educational field.

The analysis of the topics addressed by ENDIPE, from 1972 to 2024, highlights profound transformations in Didactics, reflecting historical, social, political, and cultural shifts in the Brazilian educational context. Didactics was predominantly technical and normative, focused on the organization of teaching and teaching practice in more prescriptive forms. However, over the years, it has broadened its approach, incorporating more complex and critical discussions, aligned with the demands of a constantly changing society.

In its early decades, Didactics focused on integrating into teaching practices, seeking to legitimize itself as an indispensable field in teacher training. However, beginning in the 1980s and 1990s, reflections on integration with pedagogical sciences and the demands of teaching emerged, highlighting the need to rethink teacher training and pedagogical practices from an interdisciplinary perspective.

Starting in the 2000s, a significant thematic expansion was observed in the ENDIPE, incorporating debates on diversity, inclusion, and equality, as well as broader cultural and social issues, such as the appreciation of local knowledge and the fight for quality, free public education. This phase also marked a critical response to neoliberal pressures and educational counter-reforms, which directly impacted teaching and teaching conditions.

Recent decades have revealed Didactics as a field of resistance and social transformation, with discussions focused on addressing political challenges, training critical teachers, and building a democratic school. The field reaffirms its relevance by proposing interdisciplinary dialogues and challenges to traditional approaches, consolidating as a space for reflection and action focused on emancipation and social justice.

ENDIPE has been a key space for resistance, reflection, and progress in Didactics in Brazil, both in its disciplinary and scientific fields. Throughout its history, it has become an essential forum for debate on teacher training, pedagogical practices, and public education policies, contributing to the construction of a more critical and transformative education.

In the face of contemporary challenges, there is a growing need to strengthen the connection between General Didactics and Specific Didactics, in addition to integrating urgent issues related to diversity, inclusion, educational technologies, and innovative methodologies. Thus, ENDIPE continues to be a vital space for rethinking education in a context of constant change and social demands.

ENDIPE's trajectory reflects the transformation of Didactics from a predominantly technical and normative field to a critical, multidimensional space in constant dialogue with the demands of society and the contemporary challenges of education. The event reaffirms its commitment to valuing research, critical teacher training, and the defense of a high-quality, democratic, and socially informed public school.

## REFERENCES

- ANDRÉ, Marli. Tendências da pesquisa e do conhecimento didático no início dos anos 2000. *Anais...* Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 2008. Disponível em: [https://repositorio.usp.br/directbitstream/34095c4e-055a-4057-927d-60f6afe28bca/Tend%C3%A2ncias\\_da\\_pesquisa\\_e\\_do\\_conhecimento\\_did%C3%A1tico\\_no\\_in%C3%ADcio\\_dos\\_anos\\_2000\\_%282008%29\\_Sysno\\_671203\\_ReP.pdf](https://repositorio.usp.br/directbitstream/34095c4e-055a-4057-927d-60f6afe28bca/Tend%C3%A2ncias_da_pesquisa_e_do_conhecimento_did%C3%A1tico_no_in%C3%ADcio_dos_anos_2000_%282008%29_Sysno_671203_ReP.pdf). Acesso em: 02 jun. 2025.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *Os usos da Ciência: por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico*. São Paulo: UNESP, 2003.
- BREDOW, Valdirene Hessler; ZAMPERETTI, Maristani Polidori. As políticas educacionais na docência: uma revisão das publicações do Endipe entre 2010-2020. *Revista de Ciências Sociais Política e Trabalho*, n. 57, p. 205-222, 2023. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufpb.br/index.php/politicaetrabalho/article/download/60943/36829/191827>. Acesso em: 10 maio 2025.
- CAMBI, Franco. *História da Pedagogia*. São Paulo: Unesp, 1999.
- CANDAU, Vera Maria (Org.). *Reinventar a escola*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2000.

CANDAU, Vera Maria (Org.). *Didática: questões contemporâneas*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2009.

CANDAU, Vera Maria (Org.). *A didática em questão*. 36. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011.

CANDAU, Vera Maria (Org.). *Didática crítica intercultural: aproximações*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012.

CEPED - Centro de Estudos e Pesquisas em Didática. ENDIPE's. Disponível em: <https://cepedgoias.com.br/endipes/>. Acesso em: 12 mai. 2025.

CHERVEL, André. A história das disciplinas escolares: reflexões sobre um campo de pesquisa. *Teoria e Educação*, Porto Alegre, n. 2, p. 177-229, 1990. Disponível em: <https://ppec.ufms.br/files/2020/09/A-hist%C3%B3ria-das-disciplinas-escolares-2020-09-21.pdf>. Acesso em: 19 maio 2025.

CUNHA, Luiz Antônio. *Educação e desenvolvimento social no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1975.

D'AMORE, Bruno. Epistemologia, didática da matemática e práticas de ensino. *Boletim de Educação Matemática*, v. 20, n. 28, p. 179-205, 2007. Disponível em: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/2912/291221871010.pdf>. Acesso em: 1 dez. 2024.

FERREIRA, Viviane Lovatti; SANTOS, Vinício de Macedo. O processo histórico de disciplinarização da Metodologia do Ensino de Matemática. *Bolema: Boletim de Educação Matemática*, v. 26, p. 163-192, 2012. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/bolema/a/YWWXG6HXfjPPWHG7Tz6Rt5k/abstract/?lang=pt>. Acesso em 1 dez. 2024.

FRANÇA, Dimair Souza. A Supervisão dos Estágios de Ensino pelos Professores da Educação Básica: desafios e limitações. *Olhares: Revista do Departamento de Educação da Unifesp*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 64-89, 2013. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.unifesp.br/index.php/olhares/article/view/47>. Acesso em: 20 dez. 2024.

FRANCO, Maria Amélia Santoro; PIMENTA, Selma Garrido. Didática multidimensional: por uma sistematização conceitual. *Educação & Sociedade*, v. 37, p. 539-553, 2016. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/9KvRMpt5MSQJpB5pqYKfnyp/?lang=pt>. Acesso em: 5 dez. 2024.

GADOTTI, Moacir. *História das ideias pedagógicas*. 7. ed. São Paulo: Ática, 2019.

GARCIA, Ronaldo Aurélio Gimenes. A didática magna: uma obra precursora da pedagogia moderna? *Revista HISTEDBR On-line*, v. 14, n. 60, p. 313-323, 2014. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/histedbr/article/view/8640563>. Acesso em: 12 dez. 2024.

GOODSON, Ivor Frederick. *A construção social do currículo*. Lisboa: Educa, 1997.

HOFSTETTER, Rita; VALENTE, Wagner Rodrigues (Org.). *Saberes em (trans)formação: tema central da formação de professores*. São Paulo: Livraria da Física, 2017.

LACANALLO, Luciana Figueiredo et al. A didática na perspectiva histórico-cultural: uma análise dos ENDIPES 2004 e 2006. *Publicatio UEPG: Ciências Humanas, Linguística, Letras e Artes-ATIVIDADES ENCERRADAS*, v. 17, n. 1, 2009.

LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. *Didática: velhos e novos temas*. Goiânia. Edição do Autor. 2002.

LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. O Dualismo Perverso da Escola Pública Brasileira: escola do conhecimento para os ricos, escola do acolhimento social para os pobres. *Educação e Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v. 38, n. 1, p. 13-28, mar. 2012. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/ep/a/YkhJTPw545x8jwpGFsXT3Ct?lightbox=0>. Acesso em: 10 fev. 2023.

LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. *Didática*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2013.

LIMA, Maria Socorro Lucena. *A hora da prática: Reflexões sobre pratica de ensino e ação docente*. 3. ed. Fortaleza: Ed. Demócrito Rocha, 2004.

LÜDKE, Menga; CRUZ, Giseli Barreto da; BOING, Luiz Alberto. A pesquisa do professor da educação básica em questão. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, v. 14, p. 456-468, 2009. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbedu/a/L3jcpjz7VFSZjXZTbWhshrv/?lang=pt>. Acesso em: 20 dez. 2024.

MARCELO, Carlos Garcia. *Formação de professores: para uma mudança educativa*. Porto: Porto Editora, 1999.

MARIANO, André Luiz Sena. *A construção do início da docência: um olhar a partir das produções da ANPEd e do ENDIPE*. 2006. 156 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos, 2006.

MARTIN-FRANCHI, Giovanna; HOBOLD, Márcia de Souza. O estado da arte do campo da didática no Brasil: As produções científicas no período de 2008 a 2018. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, v. 54, p. e11342, 2024. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/cp/a/6LKrfsk3TfGx8gHpm4mjnPps/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Acesso em: 10 maio 2025.

MARTINS, Pura Lúcia Oliver. *A Didática e as contradições da prática*. Campinas: Papirus, 1998.

OLIVEIRA, Maria Rita Neto Sales. Elementos teórico-metodológicos na construção e na reconstrução da didática. *Educ. Rev. [online]*. 1991, n.14, pp.40-47. Disponível em : [http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?pid=S0102-46981991000200005&script=sci\\_abstract&tlng=pt](http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?pid=S0102-46981991000200005&script=sci_abstract&tlng=pt). Acesso em: 01jun. 2025.

OLIVEIRA, Maria Rita Neto Sales. *A Reconstrução da Didática: elementos teórico-metodológicos*. 2. ed. Campinas: Papirus, 1993.

PIMENTA, Selma Garrido. Professor Reflexivo: construindo uma crítica. In: PIMENTA, Selma Garrido; GHEDIN, Evandro (Org.). *Professor Reflexivo no Brasil: gênese e crítica de um conceito*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002. p. 17-52.

PIMENTA, Selma Garrido (Org.). *Didática e formação de professores: percursos e perspectivas no Brasil e em Portugal*. 2.ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2005.

PIMENTA, Selma Garrido. Epistemologia da prática: ressignificando a didática. In: FRANCO, Maria Amélia Santoro; PIMENTA, Selma Garrido (Org.). *Didática: embates contemporâneos*. São Paulo: Loyola, 2010. p. 15-41.

PIMENTA, Selma Garrido. O protagonismo da didática nos cursos de licenciatura: a didática como campo disciplinar. *Didática: teoria e pesquisa*, v. 1, p. 81-97, 2012. Disponível em: [https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/4892093/mod\\_resource/content/1/PIMENTA-O%20protagonismo%20da%20Did%C3%A1tica.pdf](https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/4892093/mod_resource/content/1/PIMENTA-O%20protagonismo%20da%20Did%C3%A1tica.pdf). Acesso em: 1 fev. 2023.

ROMANELLI, Otaíza de Oliveira. *História da Educação no Brasil*. 38. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013.

ROMANOWSKI, Joana Paulin; MARTINS, Pura Lúcia Oliver. Formação continuada: contribuições para o desenvolvimento profissional dos professores. *Revista Diálogo Educacional*, v. 10, n. 30, p. 285-300, 2010. Disponível em: <http://educa.fcc.org.br/pdf/de/v10n30/v10n30a04.pdf>. Acesso em: 10 out. 2024.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. *Educação brasileira: estrutura e sistema*. 10. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2008.

SFORNI, Marta Sueli de Faria. O trajetória da didática no Brasil e sua (des)articulação com a teoria histórico-cultural. *Revista HISTEDBR On-line*, Campinas, v. 17, n. 4, p. 1001-1020, out./dez. 2015. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/histedbr/article/view/8640516>. Acesso em: 01 jun. 2025.

VARIZO, Zaíra da Cunha Melo. Os caminhos da Didática e sua relação com a formação de professores de Matemática. In: NACARATO, Adair Mendes; PAIVA, Maria Auxiliadora Vilela (Org.). *A formação do professor que ensina Matemática: perspectivas e pesquisas*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2008. p. 43-59.

VEIGA, Ilma Passos de Alencastro. Didática: uma retrospectiva histórica. In: VEIGA, Ilma Passos de Alencastro (Coord.). *Repensando a Didática*. 21. ed. Campinas: Papirus, 2004. p. 25-40.

VENTORIM, Silvana. *A formação do professor pesquisador na produção científica dos Encontros Nacionais de Didática e Prática de Ensino: 1994-2000*. 2005. 346 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Faculdade de Educação, Belo Horizonte, 2005.

**Submitted:** 01/31/2025

**Preprint:** 01/28/2025

**Approved:** 06/15/2025

**Editor(a) de seção:** Suzana dos Santos Gomes

## DATA AVAILABILITY DECLARATION

The content underlying the research text is contained in the manuscript



## **CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE AUTHORS**

Author 1 - Project coordinator, actively participated in data analysis and review of the final manuscript.

Author 2 - Data collection, data analysis, and manuscript writing.

## **DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in this article.