


**TEACHER TRAINING: EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION AND LACK OF TEACHER CARE
POLICIES**

**FORMAÇÃO DE PROFESSORES: DESGASTE EMOCIONAL E AUSÊNCIA DE
POLÍTICAS DE CUIDADO COM OS DOCENTES**

**FORMACIÓN DOCENTE: AGOTAMIENTO EMOCIONAL Y FALTA DE POLÍTICAS DE
CUIDADO DOCENTE**

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2025.030-021>

Leila Cardoso Machado¹, Neila Barbosa Osório², Luiz Sinésio Silva Neto³, Djanires Lageano Neto de Jesus⁴, Wesquisley Vidal de Santana⁵, Eduardo Aoki Ribeiro Sera⁶, Claudiany Silva Leite Lima⁷, Leonardo Sampaio Baleeiro Santana⁸, Fabiano Vieira de Alvarenga⁹, Roseany Calazans Lameira da Silva¹⁰, Valter Henrique da Silva Santos¹¹, Valmir Fernandes de Lira¹², Silvinia Pereira de Sousa Pires¹³, Samuel Marques Borges¹⁴, Luciano Paulo de Almeida Souza¹⁵, Karinne Oliveira Meneses¹⁶, Katiuscia da Silva Fernandes¹⁷, Orcimar Sousa Gomes de Amorim¹⁸, Andreia Firmino de Sousa Brito¹⁹, Genivaldo Rodrigues Trindade²⁰, Fabiana Fonseca Moraes Dias dos Santos²¹, Osiana Lustosa dos Santos²², Elba Maria Rabelo Alves²³, Claudia Berixa Moura Karaja²⁴, Matheus Sousa da Silva Marques²⁵

¹ Master in Applied Linguistics. Universidade Estadual de Mato Grosso do Sul.

² Post-Doctorate in Education. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

³ Post-Doctorate in Health Sciences. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

⁴ Post-Doctorate in Education. Universidade Estadual de Mato Grosso do Sul.

⁵ Dr. in Education in the Amazon. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

⁶ Dr. in Education in the Amazon. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

⁷ Doctorate student in Biotechnology. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

⁸ Master of Education. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

⁹ Master of Science in Software Engineering. Centro de Estudos e Sistemas Avançados do Recife (CESAR).

¹⁰ Master of Education. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

¹¹ Master in Forestry and Environmental Sciences. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

¹² Master of Education. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

¹³ Master's student in Governance and Digital Transformation. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

¹⁴ Master degree of Education. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

¹⁵ Master degree of Education. Universidade Estadual de Mato Grosso do Sul.

¹⁶ Master's student in Popular Demands and Regional Dynamics. Universidade Federal do Norte do Tocantins (UFNT).

¹⁷ Specialist in Social Media Communication Management. Universidade Estadual do Tocantins (UNITINS).

¹⁸ Specialist in Mathematics Education. Universidade Estadual do Tocantins (UNITINS).

¹⁹ Specialist in Applied Linguistics. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

²⁰ School Management Specialist. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

²¹ Municipal Management Specialist. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

²² Graduated in Pedagogy. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

²³ Graduated in Law. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

²⁴ Graduated in Psychology. Universidade Federal do Tocantins (UFT).

²⁵ Graduated in Geography. Universidade Estadual do Pará (UEPA).

ABSTRACT

This article critically analyzes the teacher training process in Brazil, emphasizing the conditions of emotional illness and the lack of institutional care policies for pre-service teachers. The research assumes that the psychological distress experienced by pre-service teachers is not an isolated phenomenon, but rather the result of academic structures that silence pain and normalize precariousness. Using a qualitative and bibliographical approach, in accordance with the assumptions of Lakatos and Marconi (2017), the study highlights how universities, by neglecting care as a formative dimension, contribute to processes of symbolic exclusion, affecting retention, well-being, and the formation of professional teacher identity. The text proposes the centrality of care as an ethical-pedagogical principle capable of reconfiguring initial teacher training, recognizing suffering as a legitimate expression of the formative experience and demanding concrete institutional responses. The study also highlights that effective policies of acceptance, listening, and psychosocial support are not mere complements, but structural conditions for guaranteeing the right to comprehensive and humane training for future teachers.

Keywords: Teacher Training. Psychological Distress. Care Policies. Symbolic Exclusion. Emotional Health.

RESUMO

O presente artigo analisa criticamente o processo de formação docente no Brasil, com ênfase nas condições de adoecimento emocional e na ausência de políticas institucionais de cuidado aos professores em formação. A investigação parte do pressuposto de que o sofrimento psíquico vivenciado pelos licenciandos não é fenômeno isolado, mas resultado de estruturas acadêmicas que silenciam a dor e normalizam a precariedade. A partir de uma abordagem qualitativa e bibliográfica, conforme os pressupostos de Lakatos e Marconi (2017), o estudo evidencia como a universidade, ao negligenciar o cuidado como dimensão formativa, contribui para processos de exclusão simbólica, afetando a permanência, o bem-estar e a constituição da identidade profissional docente. O texto propõe a centralidade do cuidado como princípio ético-pedagógico capaz de reconfigurar a formação inicial, reconhecendo o sofrimento como expressão legítima da experiência formativa e exigindo respostas institucionais concretas. O estudo destaca ainda que políticas efetivas de acolhimento, escuta e suporte psicossocial não são meros complementos, mas condições estruturais para garantir o direito à formação plena e humanizada dos futuros professores.

Palavras-chave: Formação Docente. Sofrimento Psíquico. Políticas de Cuidado. Exclusão Simbólica. Saúde Emocional.

RESUMEN

Este artículo analiza críticamente el proceso de formación docente en Brasil, haciendo hincapié en las condiciones de enfermedad emocional y la falta de políticas institucionales de atención para docentes en formación. La investigación asume que el sufrimiento psicológico que experimentan los docentes en formación no es un fenómeno aislado, sino el resultado de estructuras académicas que silencian el dolor y normalizan la precariedad. Mediante un enfoque cualitativo y bibliográfico, de acuerdo con los supuestos de Lakatos y Marconi (2017), el estudio destaca cómo las universidades, al descuidar el cuidado como dimensión formativa, contribuyen a procesos de exclusión simbólica, afectando la retención, el bienestar y la formación de la identidad profesional docente. El texto propone la centralidad del cuidado como principio ético-pedagógico capaz de reconfigurar la formación inicial

docente, reconociendo el sufrimiento como expresión legítima de la experiencia formativa y exigiendo respuestas institucionales concretas. El estudio también destaca que las políticas efectivas de aceptación, escucha y apoyo psicosocial no son meros complementos, sino condiciones estructurales para garantizar el derecho a una formación integral y humana de los futuros docentes.

Palabras clave: Formación Docente. Sufrimiento Psicológico. Políticas de Atención. Exclusión Simbólica. Salud Emocional.

1 INTRODUCTION

Teacher training in Brazil has been going through a field of tensions that, far from being restricted to curricular content or teaching methodologies, reveal a deeper scenario of illness, emotional exhaustion and invisibility of teacher suffering even during the years of licentiate. In the name of academic excellence, students in teacher training courses are required to have a trajectory marked by overload, precarious conditions and the absence of institutional care networks. This process, although silent, has a direct impact on the constitution of professional identity and compromises the future exercise of teaching. The focus of this study falls, therefore, on the critical analysis of the conditions of teacher training at higher level, taking as the center of problematization the emotional exhaustion and the absence of effective care policies for the undergraduates.

The justification for this investigation finds resonance in the growing dropout rate in teaching degree courses, in the high rates of psychological distress among students of pedagogy and related areas, and in the fragility of institutional responses to the subjective and emotional demands of these subjects. While the national guidelines for teacher training emphasize the development of technical competencies and skills, there is a systematic neglect of the human, affective and relational dimensions that make up the training process. The university, as a space that should articulate knowledge, welcoming, and listening, often assumes an instrumental posture, focused on the fulfillment of workloads and bureaucratic requirements, to the detriment of care as a pedagogical principle.

The central problem that guides this research can be formulated as follows: to what extent does the absence of care policies for teachers in training contribute to the production of a scenario of emotional illness and symbolic exclusion in teaching degree courses? By unfolding this question, it seeks to understand not only the symptoms of teacher suffering during training, but, above all, the institutional and political mechanisms that keep them naturalized. We are interested in investigating how the silence around pain is constructed and sustained within academic structures and what are the implications of this for permanence, mental health and the construction of teacher identity.

The methodological choice that guides this work is based on a qualitative and bibliographic approach, as supported by Lakatos and Marconi (2017), who defend the importance of interpretative and reflective analysis in the treatment of complex social phenomena. The bibliographic investigation allows us to map discourses, contradictions and gaps present in academic production and normative documents on teacher training. This

methodological option also enables the articulation between different analytical categories (such as suffering, symbolic exclusion, care policies and professional identity), building a critical and grounded reading of the object in question.

The general objective of this study is to analyze how the teacher training process, in its current structure, has functioned as a space for the production of emotional suffering, aggravated by the absence of institutional policies of care and support for undergraduates. As specific objectives, it is proposed: (a) to identify the main factors associated with the emotional exhaustion of undergraduate students; (b) to discuss the role of the university in promoting (or omitting) welcoming and listening strategies; (c) to reflect on the symbolic effects of the absence of care in the training path and in the perspectives of permanence in the teaching profession.

The relevance of this work lies not only in the denunciation of the suffering experienced by the undergraduates, but in the urgency of rethinking the place of care as a structuring dimension of teacher training policies. What is at stake is not only the health of those who learn to teach, but the quality of public education that is intended to be offered to society. After all, an education that sickens its subjects compromises, from the beginning, their capacity for social transformation. Recognizing and facing this problem is an urgent task for training institutions, public managers and the entire academic community committed to humanized education.

2 THE CONDITIONS OF TRAINING AS A FIELD OF PRODUCTION OF TEACHER SUFFERING

Teacher training in Brazil, especially with regard to teaching degrees, has been marked by deep contradictions between discourse and practice. Although the importance of preparing critical, reflective teachers committed to social transformation is affirmed, the daily life experienced by these subjects reveals a scenario of precariousness, institutional abandonment and emotional overload that compromises their mental health and their permanence in the profession (Gatti; Barreto, 2009).

The university, as a space for training and construction of professional identity, should be an environment of stimulation, listening and care. However, what is often observed is a structure marked by exclusionary practices, absence of psychological support, and disproportionate academic demands, especially for students from lower classes, who face socioeconomic and institutional barriers to completing their education (Reis et al., 2020).

The absence of public policies aimed at the comprehensive care of future teachers deepens this scenario of vulnerability. Even with Law No. 12,796/2013, which modifies the LDB to include specific guidelines on the training of education professionals, the focus continues to be centered on technical and operational aspects, neglecting the emotional and subjective dimension of the training process (Law No. 12,796, 2013).

It is in this context that what Esteve (1994) called "*teacher malaise*" appears, an expression that, according to the author,

It's intentionally ambiguous... When we use the word malaise we know that something is not right, but we are not able to define what is not going and why... (Esteve, 1994, p.12-13).

This malaise manifests itself insidiously during training, eroding motivation, the sense of belonging and the expectation of professional fulfillment.

The feeling of inadequacy experienced by many undergraduate students is not the result of personal fragility, but of continuous exposure to a system that devalues teaching and imposes structural obstacles to their education. The precariousness of material conditions, the overload of tasks, unpaid internships and academic competition are elements that directly contribute to the psychic illness of these subjects (Gasparini et al., 2005).

In addition to the formal academic load, many students accumulate extensive working hours outside the university, which prevents them from fully experiencing the training process. The routine becomes exhausting, marked by long commutes, inadequate nutrition and sleep deprivation.

As Tavares (2007) shows,

"[...] they are long, with rare rest breaks and/or brief meals and in uncomfortable places. The intense and variable pace, starting very early in the morning, can be extended until the evening due to double or triple working hours. In the hustle and bustle, schedules are disrespected, hours of sleep are lost, people eat poorly, and there is no time for leisure. Levels of attention and concentration are required to perform the tasks. When the work is devoid of meaning, is not recognized or is a source of threats to physical and/or psychic integrity, it ends up causing suffering to the teacher".

The suffering becomes even greater when the student does not find in the formative spaces real opportunities for expression and listening. Education, instead of being a dialogical and humanizing process, starts to function as a system that silences, oppresses

and demands, reproducing the logic of productivity and efficiency to the detriment of care and the collective construction of knowledge (Seligmann-Silva, 2020).

The absence of institutional devices for psychological reception and monitoring in undergraduate courses is a reflection of the utilitarian vision that still predominates in training policies. The priority is in the certification and fulfillment of workloads, not in the integral development of the future teacher, who continues to be seen as a cog in the educational system (Freitas, 2007).

In this sense, precariousness is not limited to the material plane, but also crosses the symbolic. The lack of social recognition of teaching, added to the mismatch between the initial expectations and the reality of training, contributes to early disenchantment. Many enter the course with dreams of transformation, but soon find themselves immersed in daily frustrations, lack of guidance and institutional helplessness (Lemos, 2009).

It is important to highlight that this disenchantment does not occur in isolation, but is the result of a structure that devalues the teaching work since its genesis. The university space, which should offer tools for the construction of a solid professional identity, often reinforces stigmas and distances students from the school, making it difficult for them to enter the educational context (Faria Lima, 2023).

The lack of effective policies for monitoring supervised internships and the disconnection between theory and school practice deepen this abyss. The internship, which could be a moment of strengthening the vocation, becomes, in many cases, an experience of solitary coping with structural problems in the school, without the necessary support to elaborate on the difficulties experienced (Araújo et al., 2019).

Teacher training, as it currently occurs, tends to hold the subject responsible for his or her failure or illness. Instead of recognizing the limitations of the system, a meritocratic logic is imposed on the student, where individual effort is the main measure of success. This perspective disregards the social and institutional inequalities that directly affect the training path (Macaia, 2023).

By disregarding care as an essential dimension of training, teaching degree courses contribute to the naturalization of teacher suffering as an inevitable part of the profession. Thus, malaise is not diagnosed, prevented or treated, but internalized as a trait of professional identity, which compromises emotional health and the future exercise of teaching (Penteado; Souza Neto, 2019).

The absence of structured initiatives that promote mental health, psychosocial support and listening spaces at the university aggravates anxiety, depression and mental exhaustion among undergraduates. Institutional negligence in the face of this phenomenon reveals a policy of education that ignores the human in the name of functionality (Vieira, 2010).

It is necessary to understand that the suffering of the teacher in training is not a collateral problem, but a structural one. It reveals the limits and contradictions of a model of education that disregards affections, bodies and subjectivities. To ignore this reality is to perpetuate a system that gets sick even before entering the teaching profession (Gatti; Barreto, 2009).

The lack of articulation between the different training agents (university professors, internship advisors and school managers) also contributes to the isolation experienced by students. This fragmentation prevents the construction of a support network that strengthens the training process and mitigates suffering (Reis et al., 2020).

The notion that teaching is a mission or a personal sacrifice still permeates many formative discourses, and this contributes to the blaming of the student who suffers. The romanticization of individual resistance erases institutional responsibilities and prevents the construction of policies that ensure dignified conditions for training (Freitas, 2007).

Dropout in undergraduate courses is another indication of the exhaustion experienced by many students. Early departure is not only a statistical problem, but evidence that training fails to welcome, sustain and encourage those who enter the teaching profession with a willingness to make a difference (MEC/INEP, 2011).

The transformation of this reality requires the recognition of teacher suffering as a collective and political issue. It is necessary to break with the individualizing logic that makes the structural factors of illness invisible, proposing concrete actions of psychological support, student permanence policies, and symbolic valorization of teaching (Faria Lima, 2023).

Education needs to be reconfigured as an ethical-political process, which puts life at the center and recognizes care as a pedagogical principle. This implies rethinking curricula, methodologies, and pedagogical relationships, incorporating practices of listening, welcoming, and collective construction of knowledge (Seligmann-Silva, 2020).

The existence of mental health devices in higher education institutions should cease to be the exception and become part of the institutional commitment to teacher training. Investing in care is investing in the quality of public education, as emotionally healthy teachers are fundamental agents for a humanizing school (Araújo et al., 2019).

Therefore, when analyzing the conditions of education as a field of production of teacher suffering, it is essential to recognize that change depends on an institutional repositioning. This involves rethinking everything from the physical structures of universities to the values that guide pedagogical practice, placing the subject at the center of education (Lemos, 2009).

The suffering of the teacher in training can no longer be treated as a natural or inevitable fact, as it is the symptom of a failed model that needs to be faced with courage, listening and effective public policies. The university has a strategic role in this process and can no longer omit itself in the face of the reality that sickens its future professors (Tavares et al., 2007).

Thus, it is necessary to understand that the conditions of training directly influence the type of professional who will arrive at school. A teacher trained under the weight of silence, loneliness and illness will hardly be able to act as an agent of transformation. Taking care of the teacher in training is, therefore, taking care of the future of Brazilian education (Penteado and Souza Neto, 2019).

2.1 TEACHER TRAINING AS A PLACE OF SILENT ILLNESS

Teacher training, which should be understood as a space for critical, emancipatory and humanizing construction, has operated, on the contrary, as a fertile ground for the silent suffering of thousands of future teachers. This illness does not manifest itself with fuss, but infiltrates the daily lives of the undergraduates through small negligences, institutional silences and naturalized inhuman demands. What should be a place of reception for subjectivity and the dream of social transformation, becomes an oppressive, bureaucratic, and technocratic environment, where the subject is reduced to his productivity, his resilience, and his ability to endure the unbearable (Seligmann-Silva, 2020).

The term "silent illness" here is not a mere rhetorical resource, but a clear denunciation of the institutional invisibility of the suffering of undergraduates. These students, mostly from vulnerable contexts, face multiple working hours, lack of psychological assistance, absence of permanence policies and a curriculum that, despite being progressive in discourse, reproduces exclusionary and authoritarian pedagogical practices. Silence is not the absence of pain, but its normalization as an integral part of the formative trajectory (Gatti; Barreto, 2009).

This illness is often interpreted as individual fragility, lack of vocation or resistance to the demands of the profession, when, in fact, it reveals the exhaustion of a formative model that neglects the real conditions of existence of the subjects. Responsibility is transferred from the system to the individual, reinforcing the blaming of students for not being able to sustain, emotionally and physically, a structure that disregards their humanities (Freitas, 2007).

Success is measured by academic performance in adverse contexts, and dropout, seen as personal failure. Dropout from teacher training courses, therefore, is not the result of giving up on dreams, but of the lack of minimum conditions to sustain them. The student is forced to survive in an environment that does not recognize his struggles, his pains and his limits. The university, which should be a space of liberation, becomes a hostile territory (Lemos, 2009).

The neglect of the mental health of the licentiate students is thus revealed as a symptom of a conception of training that prioritizes results and ignores processes. Care is understood as a private responsibility, when it should be a collective and political commitment of the educational institutions. The absence of permanent devices for listening, welcoming, and psychological guidance is not accidental: it is a choice that reproduces the productivist logic and denies the right to fragility (Vieira, 2010).

Illness is aggravated in the practice of supervised internships, which, in many cases, become experiences of exposure to the structural violence of public schools, without effective mediation. The student is thrown into a battlefield for which he has not been sufficiently prepared, and from which he is not protected. There is a lack of follow-up, a lack of dialogue with the advising professors, a lack of institutional listening. The internship, far from being a place of professional maturation, becomes, for many, the trigger for giving up (Araújo et al., 2019).

As Esteve (1994) points out, the so-called "teacher malaise" is not a sudden event, but a cumulative process that begins in training and continues throughout the career. This pain, which finds no name or place in the institutional structure, is lodged in the subject's guts, undermining his energy, enthusiasm and sense of belonging. When it is not heard, suffering crystallizes as identity: the teacher graduates believing that being sick is part of the job.

In addition, the organization of curricula often disconnects theory and practice, keeping students hostage to an abstract discourse that is alien to the reality of schools. Instead of a critical approach to the school floor, what we see are decontextualized content, repetitive

methodologies and evaluations that reinforce the logic of competitiveness. The future teacher, in view of this, does not find meaning in training and begins to question his professional choice, not because of the absence of vocation, but because of the presence of suffering (Faria Lima, 2023).

The journey of the graduate often begins before sunrise and ends after the last bus of the night. The accumulation of classes, readings, evaluative activities and labor obligations outside the university becomes unsustainable. As Tavares (2007) describes, the routine is strenuous, the time for rest is non-existent, the diet is precarious, and health is left aside in the name of an education that demands a lot and offers little in affective or institutional return.

The absence of safe spaces for listening and dialogue in universities accentuates the feeling of loneliness and isolation of students. The academic environment often inhibits the sharing of anguish, either due to fear of judgment, or due to the absence of trust in welcoming policies. This lack of effective channels of subjective expression prevents the collective elaboration of pain and reinforces the idea that suffering is individual, personal, and not socially produced (Seligmann-Silva, 2020).

The romanticization of suffering is also an aspect that needs to be fought vehemently. It is still common the idea that teacher training should be arduous, sacrificing and full of trials, as if only the strong deserved to reach the end. Such a view, in addition to being cruel, is counterproductive, as it transforms the training space into a field of tests and exclusions, erasing the need for care as an ethical and political component of training (Penteado; Souza Neto, 2019).

The emotional fragility that sets in throughout the training, therefore, is not accidental. It is the result of a formative project that does not recognize subjectivity as part of the process of learning to teach. The current model is incompatible with the notion of education as an act of hope and transformation. Instead of encouraging dreams, the current education often destroys them, without recognizing the collective responsibility for this process (Gatti; Barreto, 2009).

In this scenario, undergraduate students become the main thermometers of a system that fails to humanize its own processes. They get sick not because they are weak, but because they are continually exposed to situations of helplessness, devaluation, and demands that are incongruent with their realities. Suffering is no longer the exception and becomes the rule, which requires urgent, planned, and sustainable institutional responses (Macaia, 2023).

The discourse of resilience, often mobilized as a response to illness, needs to be critically reviewed. It is not about training students to endure more, but about building structures that make them not have to endure so much. The logic of individual overcoming does not replace policies of permanence, nor does it make up for the absence of support networks and symbolic valorization. Mental health can no longer be neglected or romanticized (Araújo et al., 2019).

Thus, to recognize teacher training as a place of silent illness is to assume the need to break with a tradition that insists on training teachers at the expense of their own humanity. This does not imply weakening formation, but strengthening it based on listening, welcoming, plurality and social justice. The university that trains teachers needs, first of all, to learn how to care. Otherwise, he will continue to be an accomplice of the silence that makes him sick (Faria Lima, 2023).

2.2 THE ABSENCE OF CARE POLICIES AS A FACTOR OF SYMBOLIC EXCLUSION

The absence of institutional policies aimed at the care of teachers in training goes beyond the limits of individual suffering and is inscribed as a subtle but perverse mechanism of symbolic exclusion. It is a process that denies, even if undeclared, the legitimacy of pain, vulnerability and subjectivity in the formative space. By not recognizing psychic suffering as an institutional and collective issue, universities operate a type of exclusion that silences, marginalizes, and dehumanizes future teachers, converting the space of training into a territory of solitary resistance (Seligmann-Silva, 2020).

This exclusion is not material, but symbolic, as it is not only manifested in the lack of scholarships, infrastructure or student assistance (although all this also weighs), but in the absence of policies that recognize undergraduate students as full subjects, with body, mind, affections and limits. What is at stake is the failure to recognize that suffering is part of the formative trajectory and, therefore, requires structured, ethical and political responses. When pain is ignored, it does not disappear, it intensifies and becomes invisibility (Penteado; Souza Neto, 2019).

This invisibility is a form of exclusion that acts on the symbolic plane of the educational experience. Students in suffering, without legitimate spaces to express themselves, become undesirable to the institutional gaze, as if they were obstacles to academic efficiency. The logic of performance and productivity marginalizes them, requiring them to "*move on*," even

when emotionally devastated. Thus, the university trains teachers in the image of a system that normalizes suffering and considers care a luxury, and not a necessity (Freitas, 2007).

The impact of this symbolic exclusion directly affects the constitution of the teacher's identity. Future teachers learn, from the outset, that expressing pain is weakness, that asking for help is a deviation, that slowing down is failure. This implicit pedagogy (cruel and silent) shapes professionals who, when they arrive at school, will repeat the logic of silencing, reproducing, now as agents of education, the absences they experienced as students (Esteve, 1994).

It is essential to understand that the absence of care policies is not neutral. It communicates, even if without words, that certain pains do not deserve to be heard, that certain difficulties must be faced without support, that certain vulnerabilities have no legitimate place in the university. The result is the production of exiled subjects within the institution itself, whose permanence is experienced as a test of resistance, not as an assured right (Gatti; Barreto, 2009).

This symbolic exclusion also operates through curricular gaps. In rare moments, teaching degree courses open space to reflect on teacher suffering, mental health, the emotional impact of pedagogical work or the place of care in training. The affective dimensions of teaching are often ignored, which contributes to the construction of a mutilated professionalism, disconnected from the real human demands of teaching (Araújo et al., 2019).

The supervised internship, for example, evidences this symbolic exclusion. Many students enter school without any effective institutional support, experiencing situations of violence, neglect, lack of structure and pedagogical unpreparedness alone. The university, by not closely monitoring these experiences, reinforces the idea that suffering is a non-negotiable part of the profession and that it will be up to the future teacher to take care of everything, even if he or she has to give up himself or herself (Macaia, 2023).

The absence of spaces for qualified listening and psychological support exposes the mismatch between what is proposed and what is practiced in training courses. It is not enough to include disciplines of ethics, citizenship or social inclusion if the institution itself is not willing to practice care as an ethical-pedagogical principle. What is required, therefore, is not inclusive rhetoric, but a real commitment to policies that guarantee the future teacher a dignified, healthy, and humanized training process (Faria Lima, 2023).

This negligence is also revealed in the way sick leaves, course locks and requests for leave for emotional reasons are handled. Most of the time, students are treated with

indifference or even suspicion, as if they were trying to "take advantage" of the system. This institutional distrust reinforces symbolic exclusion and pushes subjects even further to the margins, making it difficult for them to remain and compromising their education (Vieira, 2010).

From the political point of view, the lack of care policies for the teacher in training configures a serious omission of the State and the training institutions. Law No. 12,796/2013, despite having updated the LDB to include guidelines on teacher training, remains anchored in a technicist perspective, centered on competencies and skills, without any mention of the emotional dimension of the training process. This reveals how much care is still seen as a secondary or peripheral theme in public education policies (Law n. 12.796, 2013).

Symbolic exclusion, therefore, materializes in the absence of policies, but also in the presence of institutionalized practices that silence, neglect or minimize teacher suffering. The student who does not adapt to the pace of the university, who gets sick, who needs to stop, who asks for help, is often excluded from the ideal of the "*good teacher*", of the "*committed professional future*", *being seen as fragile or inadequate. This culture of silencing produces deep marks that will accompany these subjects throughout their careers* (Lemos, 2009).

It is urgent that the university recognizes itself as co-responsible for the emotional health of the professionals it trains. This does not mean transforming the formative space into an environment of assistance or fragility, but assuming that no one becomes a full educator without going through the care of a formative community. Care is not the opposite of excellence, but its condition of possibility. A formation without care is, in essence, an education without a future (Penteado; Souza Neto, 2019).

The creation of institutional care policies involves concrete actions: mental health programs, accessible psychological services, spaces for listening and dialogue, curricular flexibility in cases of illness, permanence scholarships, continuing education for university professors on the health and suffering of undergraduates, and encouragement to create support communities among the students themselves. These measures are not favors, but devices of equity and justice (Araújo et al., 2019).

What is required is an epistemological and ethical turn: the inclusion of care as a structuring value of teacher education. It is not another content to be added to the curricula, but a transversal commitment that permeates all aspects of the formative process from institutional management to pedagogical practices. Care, in this sense, is not something that is offered "*when possible*", but what defines what is possible (Seligmann-Silva, 2020).

The absence of institutionalized care policies makes the university a territory of survival. Students who resist do not do so because the training is good, but in spite of it. This resistance, although dignified, cannot be romanticized. It is necessary to create the conditions for students not only to resist, but to live, learn, teach and dream. And this is only feasible where there is care, care as a policy, as ethics and as a daily practice (Faria Lima, 2023).

If the State and the universities are silent in the face of this agenda, they continue to actively contribute to the reproduction of a sick, frustrated and increasingly precarious teaching profession. The price of this omission is high, as it directly impacts the quality of basic education, the permanence of teachers in the classroom and, above all, the ability of the school to fulfill its social and emancipatory role. Taking care of teachers in training is taking care of democracy itself (Gatti; Barreto, 2009).

3 CONCLUSION

The reality faced by future teachers highlights the urgent need to re-signify the training processes from a perspective that values not only the technical domain, but also the human and subjective dimension of teaching. Ignoring the signs of wear, silencing the anguish and treating suffering as an individual weakness contributes to the perpetuation of an exclusionary model, which distances the subjects instead of strengthening them. It is necessary to recognize that one does not learn to teach only with theories and internships, but also with care, acceptance and real conditions of dignified permanence in the formative spaces.

Transforming this scenario requires institutional courage to break with obsolete logics and incorporate practices that put life at the center of pedagogical decisions. When you invest in the emotional well-being of those who prepare to teach, you also invest in the power to transform education as a whole. There is no quality education without whole subjects, and there is no possible future for teaching without listening, valuing and protecting those who are trained for this profession.

REFERENCES

- Araújo, T. M., Pinho, P., & Masson, M. L. V. (2019). Trabalho e saúde de professoras e professores no Brasil: Reflexões sobre trajetórias das investigações, avanços e desafios. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública*, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311X00087318>
- Brasil. Ministério da Educação. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. (2011). Sinopse estatística da educação superior, 2011. MEC/INEP/DEED.

- Brasil. (2013). Lei n. 12.796, de 4 de abril de 2013. Altera a lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, para dispor sobre a formação dos profissionais da educação e dar outras providências. Diário Oficial da União. Presidência da República.
- Esteve, J. M. (1994). O mal-estar docente. Paidós.
- Faria Lima, C. (2023). Precarização, adoecimento & caminhos para a mudança: Trabalho e saúde dos professores. Fundacentro.
- Freitas, H. C. L. (2007). A (nova) política de formação de professores: A prioridade postergada. *Educação & Sociedade*, 28(100), 1203–1230.
- Gatti, B., & Barretto, E. S. S. (2009). Professores do Brasil: Impasses e desafios. UNESCO.
- Gasparini, S. M., Barreto, S. M., & Assunção, A. Á. (2005). O professor, as condições de trabalho e os efeitos sobre sua saúde. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 31(2), 189–199.
- Lakatos, E. M., & Marconi, M. de A. (2017). Fundamentos de metodologia científica (8th ed.). Atlas.
- Lemos, J. C. G. (2009). Do encanto ao desencanto, da permanência ao abandono: O trabalho docente e a construção da identidade profissional [Doctoral dissertation, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo].
- Macaia, A. A. S. (2023). Excluídos no trabalho? Análise sobre o processo de afastamento por transtornos mentais e comportamentais e retorno ao trabalho de professores da rede pública municipal de São Paulo. In C. Faria Lima (Ed.), *Precarização, adoecimento & caminhos para a mudança: Trabalho e saúde dos professores*. Fundacentro.
- Penteado, R. Z., & Souza Neto, S. (2019). Mal-estar, sofrimento e adoecimento do professor: De narrativas do trabalho e da cultura docente à docência como profissão. *Saúde e Sociedade*, 28(1).
- Reis, A., & André, M. E. A. D. (2020). Políticas de formação de professores no Brasil, pós LDB 9.394/96. *Formação Docente – Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa sobre Formação de Professores*, 12(23), 33–52. <https://doi.org/10.31639/rbpf.v12i23.289>
- Seligmann-Silva, E. (2020). Saúde mental e trabalho: O caso dos profissionais do ensino. In C. Faria Lima (Ed.), *Precarização, adoecimento & caminhos para a mudança: Trabalho e saúde dos professores*. Fundacentro.
- Tavares, E. D., Alves, F. A., Garbin, L. de S., Silvestre, M. L. C., & Pacheco, R. D. (2007). Projeto de qualidade de vida: Combate ao estresse do professor [Conclusão do curso de Gestão da Qualidade de vida na empresa]. Universidade Estadual de Campinas.

Vieira, I. (2010). Conceito(s) de burnout: Questões atuais da pesquisa e a contribuição da clínica. *Revista Brasileira de Saúde Ocupacional*, 35(122), 140–148.
<https://www.scielo.br/j/rbso/a/KTtx79ktPdtVSxwrVrkkNyD/>