

## UNIVERSITY TEACHING AS A FORMATIVE PRACTICE: RATIONALITIES, TENSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR INITIAL TEACHER TRAINING

### DOCÊNCIA UNIVERSITÁRIA COMO PRÁXIS FORMATIVA: RACIONALIDADES, TENSÕES E IMPLICAÇÕES PARA A FORMAÇÃO INICIAL DE PROFESSORES

### LA DOCENCIA UNIVERSITARIA COMO PRÁCTICA FORMATIVA: RACIONALIDADES, TENSIONES E IMPLICACIONES PARA LA FORMACIÓN INICIAL DOCENTE



<https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2026.008-098>

Ronaldo dos Santos Barbosa<sup>1</sup>, Maria do Rosário Sá Araújo<sup>2</sup>

#### ABSTRACT

This article examines the predominant rationalities in university teaching and their impacts on the initial training of teachers, with emphasis on undergraduate teacher education programs in Brazil. It argues that conceiving teaching as mere content transmission, sustained by a technical-instrumental rationality, weakens the pedagogical and reflective dimension essential to the education of future educators. The study, of a theoretical-reflective nature, is based on a critical narrative review of the literature on higher education teaching, drawing on Habermas's concept of rationality (1982, 1987) and contributions from scholars in university pedagogy. The central aim is to discuss the tension between technical-instrumental and pedagogical rationalities, identifying their manifestations in teaching practices and their implications for teacher education. The analysis indicates that the predominance of the technical-instrumental model perpetuates transmission-centered practices, undermining the development of pedagogical competencies among prospective teachers. It concludes that overcoming this instrumental perspective requires institutional recognition of the pedagogical dimension and investment in the continuing education of university professors. Such measures are crucial to foster more reflective, intersubjective, and socially committed teaching practices, thereby strengthening the quality of basic education.

**Keywords:** University Teaching. Teacher Education. Pedagogical Rationality.

#### RESUMO

Este artigo examina as racionalidades predominantes na docência universitária e seus impactos na formação inicial de professores, com ênfase nos cursos de licenciatura no Brasil. Argumenta-se que a concepção da docência como mera transmissão de conteúdos, sustentada por uma racionalidade técnico-instrumental, fragiliza a dimensão pedagógica e reflexiva indispensável à formação de educadores. O estudo, de caráter teórico-reflexivo, fundamenta-se em uma revisão narrativa crítica da literatura sobre docência no ensino

<sup>1</sup> Dr. in Geography, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco. Universidade Estadual da Região Tocantina do Maranhão. E-mail: ronaldobarbosa@uemasul.edu.br

<sup>2</sup> Dr. in Regional Development . Universidade de Santa Cruz do Sul. Universidade Estadual da Região Tocantina do Maranhão. E-mail: maria.araujo@uemasul.edu.br

superior, mobilizando o conceito de racionalidade em Habermas (1982, 1987) e contribuições de autores da pedagogia universitária. O objetivo central é discutir a tensão entre racionalidade técnico-instrumental e pedagógica, identificando suas manifestações na prática docente e suas implicações para a formação de licenciandos. Os resultados da análise indicam que a predominância do modelo técnico-instrumental perpetua práticas centradas na transmissão, comprometendo o desenvolvimento de competências pedagógicas nos futuros professores. Conclui-se que a superação dessa perspectiva requer a valorização institucional da dimensão pedagógica e o investimento em formação continuada dos docentes universitários, condição essencial para promover práticas mais reflexivas, intersubjetivas e comprometidas com a formação integral de educadores, fortalecendo, assim, a qualidade da educação básica.

**Palavras-chave:** Docência Universitária. Formação de Professores. Racionalidade Pedagógica.

## RESUMEN

Este artículo examina las racionalidades predominantes en la docencia universitaria y sus impactos en la formación inicial docente, con énfasis en los cursos de grado en Brasil. Argumenta que la concepción de la enseñanza como una mera transmisión de contenido, sustentada en una racionalidad técnico-instrumental, debilita la dimensión pedagógica y reflexiva indispensable para la formación de educadores. El estudio, de naturaleza teórico-reflexiva, se basa en una revisión narrativa crítica de la literatura sobre la docencia en la educación superior, movilizándolo el concepto de racionalidad en Habermas (1982, 1987) y contribuciones de autores en pedagogía universitaria. El objetivo central es discutir la tensión entre la racionalidad técnico-instrumental y pedagógica, identificando sus manifestaciones en la práctica docente y sus implicaciones para la formación de estudiantes de grado. Los resultados del análisis indican que el predominio del modelo técnico-instrumental perpetúa prácticas centradas en la transmisión, comprometiendo el desarrollo de competencias pedagógicas en futuros docentes. Se concluye que superar esta perspectiva requiere la valorización institucional de la dimensión pedagógica y la inversión en la formación continua del profesorado universitario, condición esencial para promover prácticas más reflexivas e intersubjetivas comprometidas con la formación integral de los educadores, fortaleciendo así la calidad de la educación básica.

**Palabras clave:** Docencia Universitaria. Formación Docente. Racionalidad Pedagógica.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

University teaching, especially in undergraduate courses, occupies a strategic position in the training of future teachers and, consequently, in the quality of the educational processes that unfold in basic education. However, this essential function occurs in a scenario of deep complexity. According to Barbosa (2020), the contemporary educational reality is immersed in perplexities, crises, uncertainties, and socioeconomic pressures, resulting in a phenomenon that marks the present day: the precariousness of teaching work.

In this context, a critical gap in higher education emerges. It is recurrent the understanding that mastery of specific content would be a sufficient condition for teaching, which tends to reduce teaching to a technical exercise of exposure and control, to the detriment of its pedagogical and social dimension. This perspective favors the naturalization of practices centered on transmission, making the didactic-pedagogical mediations that are fundamental to the teaching work less visible. Such a scenario is directly reflected in the classroom, where the decisions made reveal the type of rationality that guides those responsible for the educational process.

The discussion about rationalities gains prominence as the predominance of a technical-instrumental rationality — as problematized by Therrien (2006) and Slonski, Rocha and Maestrelli (2017) — restricts teaching to measurable procedures and results. In opposition to this model, Barbosa (2020) defends the need for practices guided by a pedagogical rationality capable of thinking and rethinking the classroom context. For the author, learning to be a teacher involves a continuous movement of reflection, requiring educators to review their own way of learning and build their teaching experience.

This need to transition from technical to pedagogical rationality becomes even more urgent in the face of recent normative changes in Brazil. CNE/CP Resolution No. 04, of May 30, 2024, which establishes the new National Curriculum Guidelines for Initial Teacher Training, proposes a profound reformulation of undergraduate courses. The norm seeks to overcome curricular fragmentation by requiring an organic articulation between theoretical training at the university and practice in basic education, aligning with the competencies of the BNCC. However, without a change in the rationality that sustains the action of university professors, such reforms run the risk of becoming only bureaucratic adjustments.

Recent data from the Higher Education Census (INEP, 2022) reveal that approximately 60% of teachers who work in undergraduate courses in Brazil do not have specific pedagogical training for higher education, basing their practice predominantly on experience as students and on the mastery of disciplinary content. This scenario becomes even more worrying when we consider that these teachers are responsible for the initial training of

educators who will work in basic education, evidencing a cycle of reproduction of teaching practices that are not pedagogically grounded. Such a reality not only favors the naturalization of practices centered on transmission, but also contradicts the national curriculum guidelines for teacher training (Resolution CNE/CP No. 2/2015 and No. 2/2019), which emphasize the need for training based on reflection, praxis, and the development of complex pedagogical skills.

In view of this, this article aims to analyze the predominant rationalities in university teaching practice and discuss their impacts on teacher education, emphasizing the tension between technical-instrumental rationality and pedagogical rationality. As a contribution, it seeks to offer a theoretical-critical framework that illuminates university teaching as a social and formative practice, based on Habermas' formulations of rationality and on interlocutions in the field of teaching in higher education (Santos, 2013; Therrien, 2006; Slonski; Rocha; Maestrelli, 2017).

More specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions: How does technical-instrumental rationality manifest itself in university teaching practices in teaching degrees? What are the consequences of this rationality for the pedagogical training of undergraduates? What elements characterize a pedagogical rationality in higher education and how can it be promoted institutionally?

Methodologically, it is a theoretical-reflective study, based on a critical narrative review of the literature, guided by the identification and contrast of rationalities that sustain ways of teaching in higher education. The analysis mobilizes key authors to delimit interpretative categories and sustain reflection on the work of university professors, focusing on teaching degrees and their formative requirements in the face of the new Brazilian legal scenario.

In addition to this introduction, the article is organized into two main sections. In the section "Theoretical deepening", the discussion on rationality and its expressions in university teaching is developed, opposing the technical-instrumental centrality to the pedagogical rationality and its implications for initial training. Then, in "Final considerations", the main analytical findings are resumed and challenges and implications for the institutional qualification of teaching in higher education are pointed out.

## **2 METHODOLOGICAL PATH**

This study is characterized as a theoretical-reflective research, with a qualitative approach, based on a critical narrative review of the literature. The choice for this modality is justified by the conceptual nature of the object — the rationalities that guide university

teaching — and by the need to build a theoretical-critical framework capable of evidencing tensions and possibilities in teacher education.

The bibliographic review was carried out in the SciELO databases, CAPES Journal Portal, Google Scholar and institutional repositories, considering publications between 2000 and 2024, in addition to classic works. Descriptors such as *university teaching*, *pedagogical rationality*, *technical rationality*, *teacher training* and *teaching degrees* were used. Peer-reviewed articles, theses, dissertations, and reference books in the field were included. The manual search complemented the survey, incorporating fundamental authors such as Habermas (1982, 1987), Freire (1996), Tardif (2014), Schön (2000), Cunha (2010, 2016) and Pimenta and Anastasiou (2014), Barbosa (2018, 2020). The final corpus brought together about 25 works.

The analysis followed the principles of thematic content analysis proposed by Bardin (2011), organized around two main categories: technical-instrumental rationality, which conceives teaching as the transmission of content and control practices, and pedagogical/communicative rationality, which values mediation, dialogue, and articulation between theory and practice. The theoretical discussion was built from the confrontation between these categories, evidencing tensions and possibilities of overcoming instrumental rationality in favor of a more reflective and formative pedagogical perspective.

The study is anchored in Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action (1982, 1987), especially in the concepts of instrumental and communicative rationality, articulated with contributions from authors of university pedagogy and teacher training. This foundation allowed us to delimit interpretative categories and sustain reflection on the work of university professors, focusing on teaching degrees and their formative requirements in the face of the new Brazilian legal scenario.

### 3 THEORETICAL DEEPENING

The theoretical deepening of this research seeks to show how different conceptions of rationality, especially from the work of Jürgen Habermas, offer a critical reference to understand university teaching and its implications in teacher education. The analysis articulates conceptual foundations, manifestations of technical-instrumental rationality and the possibilities opened by pedagogical/communicative rationality.

The notion of rationality adopted here refers to the ways in which subjects orient their actions and decisions according to certain ends, and is always mediated by historical, social and cultural contexts. According to Barbosa (2020), rationality is not a static or universal attribute, but resides in the way subjects make use of embodied knowledge in their concrete

actions. In the educational field, this rationality assumes a central role, as it guides the conceptions of teaching, learning and human formation, directly affecting teaching practice and training processes. Thus, the tensions that emerge in the teaching degrees and their effects on practice are highlighted, recognizing the limits and potentialities of the Habermasian framework in articulation with perspectives that understand teaching as a social, political and formative practice.

### 3.1 RATIONALITY IN HABERMAS: CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

Habermas (1987) distinguishes three types of rationality linked to different constitutive interests of knowledge: the technical, aimed at control and predictability; the practical, oriented towards mutual understanding and understanding; and the emancipatory, which seeks autonomy and liberation from oppressive conditions. These interests are not abstract categories, but reflect different ways of relating to the world and to the subjects, profoundly influencing the way in which the educational process is conceived. Each type of rationality corresponds to a specific form of action: instrumental action (means-ends), strategic action (calculation of interests) and communicative action (oriented to mutual understanding).

The distinction between these rationalities is fundamental to understand the dynamics that cross higher education. Technical or instrumental rationality seeks to maximize efficiency through the control of variables and the predictability of results. It presupposes a subject who acts on objects, transforming them according to previously established ends. In contrast, practical rationality recognizes that human action is not reduced to means-ends calculations, but involves the interpretation of shared meanings and the negotiation of meanings between subjects. Emancipatory rationality, in turn, goes further, proposing that educational action should be committed to the liberation of conditions that limit the autonomy and critical reflection of the subjects.

In this context, language assumes a differential and constitutive role. As Barbosa (2020) points out, in the Theory of Communicative Action (TAC), language is the possibility of understanding between subjects through communicative contexts, about a given social reality. It is not a merely instrumental language, used to transmit information in a unidirectional way, but a language that is constituted by interaction, dialogue and the search for mutual understanding. This understanding is essential to rethink university teaching, as it calls into question teaching models that reduce pedagogical communication to a process of encoding and decoding messages.

Communicative rationality, therefore, is not just one type of action among others, but represents a qualitative transformation in the way we understand the relationship between

subjects. When teachers and students engage in authentic communicative processes, oriented to mutual understanding, the conditions are created for knowledge to be not only transmitted, but collectively constructed. This implies recognizing that each participant in the pedagogical interaction brings with them a valid perspective, meaningful experiences, and reflective capacities that should be valued. Thus, education ceases to be a process of deposition of content and becomes a space for the production of shared meanings.

### 3.2 TECHNICAL-INSTRUMENTAL RATIONALITY IN UNIVERSITY TEACHING

The predominance of technical-instrumental rationality in higher education has been pointed out as the organizing matrix of contemporary teaching practice. Cunha (2010, 2016) states that the bachelor's tradition and the valorization of research to the detriment of teaching reinforce a teaching culture centered on the transmission of content. This logic reduces teaching to a technical practice, devoid of critical reflection, and perpetuates teaching models that privilege disciplinary specialization to the detriment of pedagogical training. Santos (2013) corroborates this view by showing that many teachers structure their pedagogical action under the belief that the mastery of specific knowledge is sufficient for the exercise of teaching, reducing teaching to a set of operational procedures that disregard the complexity of the educational process.

This logic is often driven by what Habermas defines as the "System"—the sphere governed by instrumental reason, power, and capital—that tends to colonize the "Lifeworld"—the sphere of cultural reproduction, socialization, and mutual understanding. Barbosa (2020) points out that this "colonization" of the World of Life by the System represents a threat to the autonomy and reflexivity of the subjects. In the university context, this dynamic is manifested through pressures for productivity, quantification of results, standardization of practices and reduction of teaching to measurable indicators. Teachers, pressured by systemic demands (publications, performance indexes, external evaluations), tend to reproduce an instrumental logic that leaves no room for critical reflection or genuine dialogue with students.

Slonski, Rocha and Maestrelli (2017) demonstrate that entry into a teaching career in higher education occurs, to a large extent, without specific didactic-pedagogical preparation, which leads teachers to build their practices based on previous experiences as students. Such dynamics contribute to the reproduction of traditional teaching models and to the maintenance of a naturalized technical rationality in the university context. This naturalization is particularly problematic because it masks the political and ideological choices underlying teaching practice, presenting as "natural" or "obvious" a way of teaching that is, in fact, historically constructed and socially situated.

The problem is deepened when we consider that this absence of systematic pedagogical training is not merely an individual gap, but reflects an institutional conception that devalues teaching as a specific field of knowledge. Soares and Cunha (2010) identified that most university professors do not have specific pedagogical training, reproducing practices experienced as students. Veiga (2014) adds that the absence of institutional spaces for pedagogical training contributes to the maintenance of this transmissive culture. Slonski et al. (2017) also problematize the widely held idea that mastery of content guarantees, by itself, the ability to teach. This conception sustains a naturalized view of teaching, in which teaching is understood as an intuitive skill or resulting from disciplinary expertise, disregarding that teaching is a specific field of knowledge that demands continuous professional development.

Therrien (2006) and Slonski, Rocha and Maestrelli (2017) reinforce that the posture of "content specialists" disregards the specificities of the teaching-learning process, generating negative impacts on the training of future teachers. When university professors do not recognize teaching as a practice that requires specific knowledge — pedagogical, curricular, experiential — they tend to reproduce with their students the same practices they experienced, perpetuating a cycle of uncritical transmission. This is particularly serious in teaching degrees, where future teachers learn, through example, that teaching is synonymous with transmitting content, with no room for reflection, dialogue or the collective construction of knowledge.

### 3.3 PEDAGOGICAL RATIONALITY AND COMMUNICATIVE ACTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

In opposition to the technical model, pedagogical rationality understands teaching as a complex, situated and intentionally formative social practice. Habermas (1987) associates this rationality with practical and emancipatory interest, oriented to dialogue and the autonomy of the subjects. In this sense, university teaching cannot be reduced to mere transmission, but must be understood as critical and reflective mediation, capable of promoting meaningful and emancipatory learning. For Therrien (2006), this rationality is constituted in intersubjectivity, dialogue and communication, with human formation, intellectual autonomy and social emancipation as its horizon.

Barbosa (2020) and Therrien (2006) converge in stating that communicative action can guide the teacher's work towards an emancipatory and reflective practice, the result of which is learning that satisfies both those involved in the pedagogical relationship. Unlike instrumental action, which seeks only to achieve predetermined goals, communicative action

opens space for participants to negotiate meanings, question assumptions and build shared understandings. This means that, in a classroom guided by pedagogical rationality, knowledge is not something that the teacher "owns" and "transmits", but something that emerges from the interaction between teacher, students and content.

Teaching, thus understood, goes beyond the logic of technical application and assumes an ethical and political commitment to the formation of subjects. Pimenta and Anastasiou (2014) argue that teaching requires specific knowledge that goes beyond the disciplinary domain, including pedagogical and experiential knowledge. Tardif (2014) reinforces that teaching knowledge is plural and constructed throughout the professional trajectory, which contradicts the instrumental view that it is enough to master the content to teach. This knowledge is not static or predefined, but is constantly re-signified in practice, through reflection on concrete teaching situations.

Therrien (2006) problematizes the historically constructed dichotomy between theory and practice in teacher education. For the author, pedagogical practice should not be conceived as a mere application of previously elaborated theories, but as a privileged space for the production of knowledge. From this perspective, the teacher interprets, re-signifies and transforms knowledge in the light of concrete teaching situations, which reinforces the centrality of critical reflection on action in the constitution of teaching professionalism. This understanding finds resonance in the contributions of Slonski, Rocha and Maestrelli (2017), who defend teacher training as a space for systematic reflection on practice.

Santos (2013) adds that pedagogical rationality requires problematizing and contextualizing knowledge, favoring the integral formation of students. This implies that the teacher not only transmits information, but that he helps students to understand how this knowledge relates to their lives, to society and to contemporary issues. The contextualization of knowledge is, therefore, a political act, as it reveals the power relations that cross the production and circulation of knowledge. Slonski, Rocha and Maestrelli (2017) emphasize that pedagogical training in higher education should promote reflective processes capable of enabling teachers to understand, analyze and transform their own performance. Such an approach shifts the formation from a prescriptive logic to a formative perspective, in which critical reflection is a central element of teacher professional development.

Another relevant aspect addressed by Therrien (2006) refers to the heterogeneity of teaching knowledge. The author shows that the teacher mobilizes, in his performance, disciplinary, pedagogical, curricular and experiential knowledge, built throughout his personal and professional trajectory. This knowledge does not work in isolation, but in articulation, forming a complex web of knowledge that guides practice. Slonski et al. (2017) reinforce this

understanding by stating that university teaching is a field of multiple knowledge, whose articulation requires formative processes that recognize the complexity of teaching and value the autonomy and pedagogical responsibility of the teacher. Recognizing this multiplicity of knowledge is fundamental to overcome the reductive view that sees the teacher as a mere "content specialist".

### 3.4 TENSIONS BETWEEN RATIONALITIES IN TEACHING DEGREES: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER TRAINING

In undergraduate courses, the tension between technical-instrumental and pedagogical rationality is even more accentuated and problematic. Gatti (2014) shows that many courses reproduce the logic of bachelor's degrees, prioritizing disciplinary training to the detriment of pedagogical. Libâneo (2015) points out that fragmented curricula reinforce the dichotomy between "knowing the content" and "knowing how to teach", making it difficult to articulate theory and practice. This scenario creates a vicious circle: university professors who do not experience a pedagogical rationality tend to train undergraduates who also do not apply it in their future professional performance.

Santos (2013) argues that this prioritization of disciplinary training contributes to the constitution of professionals who are poorly prepared to deal with the uncertainties, challenges and contradictions of daily school life. The absence of consistent pedagogical training limits the ability of university professors to interpret complex educational situations, critically reflect on their practice and produce knowledge based on experience. When future teachers do not experience, during their initial training, teaching processes guided by pedagogical rationality, they lack practical references to implement this approach in their own classrooms.

Barbosa (2020) points out that recent curricular reformulations — such as CNE Resolutions 02/2015 and 02/2019 — try to strengthen the links between training institutions and schools, recognizing the need for a more integrated and reflective education. However, the challenge remains in the materialization of these changes in the concrete practices of universities. Many institutions still maintain curricular structures that separate content disciplines from pedagogical disciplines, reinforcing the dichotomy that is sought to be overcome. This curricular fragmentation not only harms the training of undergraduates, but also reflects and reinforces the institutional devaluation of teaching as a field of knowledge.

Overcoming this logic requires a deep institutional commitment to the continuing education of university professors, valuing research in teaching and creating systematic spaces for pedagogical reflection. It is essential that universities recognize teaching as a

specific field of knowledge, which demands continuous professional development and institutional investment. Without this change, there is a risk of perpetuating transmissive practices that weaken teacher training and, consequently, the quality of basic education. Teacher training is not a merely technical problem, to be solved through specific curricular adjustments, but a political issue that involves decisions about what kind of professional we want to train and what kind of society we want to build.

Therrien (2006) emphasizes that pedagogical practice should not be conceived as a mere application of theories, but as a space for the production of knowledge. This means that university professors need to be recognized as producers of knowledge about teaching, not just as transmitters of disciplinary knowledge. When the university values only disciplinary research and devalues research on teaching, it reinforces the instrumental logic it seeks to overcome. Therefore, the change in teaching degrees necessarily involves a reevaluation of teaching and research in education in the university context.

### 3.5 LIMITS AND POTENTIALITIES OF THE HABERMASIAN FRAMEWORK FOR THINKING ABOUT TEACHING

The concept of communicative rationality offers a robust framework for thinking about university teaching, but it is not exempt from important limits and criticisms. Young (1996) observes that the theory presupposes ideal conditions for dialogue that rarely materialize in institutions marked by hierarchies and power relations. This criticism shows that, although powerful, the Habermasian framework needs to be adapted to the real conditions of educational practices, where it is not always possible to achieve the "rational consensus" that Habermas proposes as a regulative ideal.

Barbosa (2020) deepens this criticism by highlighting that the colonization of the Lifeworld by the System is not a process that occurs only externally, but that penetrates the institutional structures and subjectivities of the subjects. This means that even when teachers and students want to engage in authentic communicative processes, they face structural obstacles—pressures for productivity, standardized assessments, prescriptive curricula—that make it difficult to fully realize communicative action. Habermas' theory, therefore, does not offer ready-made solutions, but a normative horizon that can guide the criticism and transformation of educational practices.

Freire (1996) complements this perspective by highlighting that it is necessary to go beyond communicative rationality, articulating awareness and politicization in a transformative praxis. For Freire, it is not enough for the subjects to understand each other; This understanding must be oriented towards the transformation of the oppressive conditions that limit humanization. This Freirean perspective enriches the Habermasian framework by

emphasizing that education is always a political act, which cannot be neutral or detached from the struggles for social justice.

Despite these criticisms and limitations, the Habermasian framework remains relevant and potent to illuminate the tensions between rationalities in university teaching and to point out paths for more reflective, intersubjective and emancipatory pedagogical practices. Its articulation with critical perspectives, such as Freire's pedagogy and Barbosa's (2020) contributions on the colonization of the World of Life, broadens its reach and strengthens the understanding of teaching as a social, political, and formative practice. This articulation allows not only to diagnose the problems, but also to glimpse possibilities for transformation.

The articulation between the perspectives of Santos (2013), Therrien (2006), Barbosa (2020) and Slonski, Rocha and Maestrelli (2017) allows us to conclude that teacher training in higher education should be guided by a critical, reflective and communicative pedagogical rationality. Such rationality conceives the teacher as an epistemological subject, producer of knowledge and agent of social transformation. This conception reinforces the need for intentional, continuous and institutionally recognized pedagogical training in the context of university teaching. It is not only a matter of improving teaching techniques, but of transforming the institutional structures and cultures that sustain the devaluation of teaching.

#### **4 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The analysis developed in this article reinforces the central thesis that the rationalities that permeate university teaching are neither neutral nor natural, but historically and socially constructed, producing concrete effects on teacher training and, consequently, on the quality of basic education. It was evidenced that the predominance of a technical-instrumental rationality, centered on the transmission of contents, efficiency and measurable results, weakens the pedagogical dimension essential to teacher training. This scenario reduces teaching to a technical exercise, emptying its formative, critical and emancipatory potential, and perpetuates a logic that compromises the integral education of undergraduates.

On the other hand, pedagogical rationality, based on the assumptions of Habermas' communicative rationality and enriched by the contributions of university pedagogy, points to the need for a profound transformation in teaching conceptions and practices in higher education. This change cannot be understood only as an individual or voluntarist initiative, but requires robust institutional, political and cultural transformations. It is imperative that universities invest in continuing pedagogical training programs, conceived as permanent spaces for reflection, research and professional development, capable of overcoming the

logic of punctual courses and promoting more reflective and intersubjective teaching practices.

In addition, it is essential to value the pedagogical dimension in the criteria for progression in the teaching career, so that the quality of teaching is considered as relevant as scientific production. This restructuring should reach the curriculum of the teaching degrees, overcoming the fragmentation between disciplinary and pedagogical training and promoting an effective integration between theory and practice. To sustain this movement, higher education institutions need to create university pedagogy centers dedicated to teaching advice and foster research on teaching and learning as a legitimate field of knowledge production.

The training of teachers in teaching degrees cannot be restricted to the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge. It should be conceived as a process that enables future educators to act in a critical, reflective, ethical, and politically engaged way, understanding teaching as a transformative praxis. The adoption of a pedagogical rationality in university teaching, replacing the hegemonic technical-instrumental model, is a fundamental and urgent step towards the construction of a higher education committed to the integral formation of subjects, to the democratization of knowledge and to social transformation.

Finally, it is recognized that this theoretical-reflective study has limitations due to the absence of primary empirical data, which restricts the analysis to the conceptual level. This limitation, however, opens space for future qualitative and quantitative research, capable of mapping the predominant conceptions of teaching, identifying innovative practices and investigating how the licentiate students perceive and are affected by the rationalities of their educators. In addition, it would be relevant to broaden the dialogue with critical perspectives such as decolonial pedagogy and the epistemologies of the South, which incorporate dimensions of power and cultural difference often made invisible in Eurocentric approaches.

## REFERENCES

- Anastasiou, L. G. C., & Alves, L. P. (Eds.). (2015). *Processos de ensinagem na universidade: Pressupostos para as estratégias de trabalho em aula*. UNIVILLE.
- Barbosa, R. S. (2018). *Linguagem cartográfica e ação comunicativa: A racionalidade nas práticas docentes dos professores de Geografia do ensino fundamental* [Tese de doutorado, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco]. Repositório Institucional da UFPE. <https://repositorio.ufpe.br/handle/123456789/31061>
- Barbosa, R. S. (2020). A linguagem cartográfica na formação e na prática do professor de Geografia à luz da teoria da ação comunicativa. *Revista FSA*, 17(10), 310–325. Artigo 16.
- Bardin, L. (2011). *Análise de conteúdo*. Edições 70.

- Brasil. Conselho Nacional de Educação. (2015). Resolução CNE/CP nº 2, de 1º de julho de 2015. Define as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a formação inicial em nível superior. CNE.
- Brasil. Conselho Nacional de Educação. (2019). Resolução CNE/CP nº 2, de 20 de dezembro de 2019. Define as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial de Professores para a Educação Básica. CNE.
- Brasil. Conselho Nacional de Educação. (2024). Resolução CNE/CP nº 4, de 29 de maio de 2024. Dispõe sobre as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial em Nível Superior de Profissionais do Magistério da Educação Escolar Básica (cursos de licenciatura, cursos de formação pedagógica para graduados não licenciados e cursos de segunda licenciatura). Ministério da Educação. [http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&alias=79631-rcp002-17-pdf&category\\_slug=dezembro-2017-pdf&Itemid=30192](http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=79631-rcp002-17-pdf&category_slug=dezembro-2017-pdf&Itemid=30192)
- Cunha, M. I. da. (2006). Docência na universidade, cultura e avaliação institucional: Saberes silenciados em questão. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 11(32), 258–271.
- Cunha, M. I. da. (2010). *O bom professor e sua prática* (24th ed.). Papyrus.
- Cunha, M. I. da. (2016). Prática pedagógica de professores universitários: Problemas, perspectivas e caminhos. *Revista Práxis Educacional*, 12(23), 207–226.
- Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários à prática educativa*. Paz e Terra.
- Gatti, B. A. (2014). A formação inicial de professores para a educação básica: As licenciaturas. *Revista USP*, 100, 33–46.
- Gatti, B. A., et al. (2019). *Professores do Brasil: Novos cenários de formação*. UNESCO.
- Habermas, J. (1982). *Conhecimento e interesse*. Zahar.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *Teoría de la acción comunicativa: Complementos y estudios previos*. Cátedra.
- Habermas, J. (2012). *Teoría do agir comunicativo* (2 vols.). WMF Martins Fontes.
- Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. (2023). *Censo da Educação Superior 2022: Principais resultados*. INEP.
- Libâneo, J. C. (2015). Formação de professores e didática para desenvolvimento humano. *Educação & Realidade*, 40(2), 629–650.
- Nóvoa, A. (2009). *Professores: Imagens do futuro presente*. Educa.
- Nóvoa, A. (2017). Firmar a posição como professor, afirmar a profissão docente. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 47(166), 1106–1133.
- Pimenta, S. G., & Anastasiou, L. G. C. (2014). *Docência no ensino superior* (5th ed.). Cortez.
- Pimenta, S. G., & Lima, M. S. L. (2017). *Estágio e docência* (8th ed.). Cortez.
- Rother, E. T. (2007). Revisão sistemática X revisão narrativa. *Acta Paulista de Enfermagem*, 20(2), v–vi.
- Santos, F. K. S. dos. (2013). Limites e possibilidades da racionalidade pedagógica no ensino superior. *Educação & Realidade*, 38(3), 915–929.

- Schön, D. A. (2000). Educando o profissional reflexivo: Um novo design para o ensino e a aprendizagem. Artmed.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.
- Slonski, T. B., Rocha, S. L., & Maestrelli, S. R. P. (2017). A formação pedagógica do professor universitário: Um desafio para a qualidade do ensino superior. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação*, 12(3), 1650–1664.
- Soares, S. R., & Cunha, M. I. (2010). Formação do professor: A docência universitária em busca de legitimidade. EDUFBA.
- Tardif, M. (2014). *Saberes docentes e formação profissional* (17th ed.). Vozes.
- Therrien, J. (2006). A formação pedagógica do professor universitário: Um desafio para a qualidade do ensino superior. *Educação & Sociedade*, 27(96), 897–911.
- Veiga, I. P. A. (Ed.). (2014). *Docência universitária na educação superior*. INEP.
- Young, I. M. (1996). Communication and the other: Beyond deliberative democracy. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political* (pp. 120–135). Princeton University Press.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1993). *A formação reflexiva de professores: Ideias e práticas*. Educa.