# WHO CARES FOR THOSE WHO EDUCATE? TEACHING, DIGNITY, AND ILLNESS IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

## *QUEM CUIDA DE QUEM EDUCA? DOCÊNCIA, DIGNIDADE E ADOECIMENTO NA EDUCAÇÃO INFANTIL*

## *¿QUIÉN CUIDA DE QUIEN EDUCA? DOCENCIA, DIGNIDAD Y ENFERMEDAD EN LA EDUCACIÓN INFANTIL*

Wagner Eduardo Estácio de PAULA[1]
e-mail: wagner.estacio@unifebe.edu.br |

**How to reference this paper**:

PAULA, Wagner Eduardo Estácio de. Who cares for those who educate? Teaching, dignity, and illness in early childhood education. **Rev. Hipótese**, Bauru, v. 12, esp. 1, e026010, 2026. DOI: 10.58980/eiaerh.v12iesp1.454.

| **Submitted**: 30/07/2026
| **Revisions required**: 05/08/2026
| **Approved**: 08/10/2026
| **Published**: 30/10/2026

**Editor**: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

turnitin ARTICLE SUBMITTED TO THE SIMILARITY SYSTEM

[1] University Center of the Brusque Educational Foundation (UNIFEBE), Brusque – Santa Catarina (SC) – Brazil. Ph.D. in Bioethics. Professor in the Physical Education program and research group leader in the Physical Education program.



(cc) BY-NC-SA

**ABSTRACT:** Teaching in Early Childhood Education combines care, pedagogical intentionality, and public responsibility, yet it is often performed under conditions that weaken teachers' recognition and health. This article examines how the production of dignity through work is affected by overload, professional loneliness, and the individualization of suffering. It offers a new interpretive reading of qualitative research conducted with fifteen teachers from a public Early Childhood Education center in a municipality of Santa Catarina, Brazil. Data were produced through semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and a field diary, and examined using thematic content analysis. Findings show that care becomes dehumanizing when it is confused with unlimited availability and sustained by silent sacrifice. Teacher dignity emerges from relationships of recognition, participation, and shared responsibility. Caring for those who educate therefore requires institutional conditions, collective work, and public policies that do not turn illness into an individual problem.

**KEYWORDS:** Teaching. Early Childhood Education. Dignity. Occupational health. Collective work.

***RESUMO:*** *A docência na Educação Infantil reúne cuidado, intencionalidade pedagógica e responsabilidade pública, mas tem sido realizada sob condições que fragilizam o reconhecimento e a saúde dos professores. O artigo analisa como a produção de dignidade pelo trabalho é afetada pela sobrecarga, pela solidão profissional e pela individualização do sofrimento. Trata-se de nova leitura interpretativa de pesquisa qualitativa com quinze professoras de uma unidade pública de Educação Infantil de um município catarinense. O material foi produzido por entrevistas semiestruturadas, grupos focais e diário de campo, submetidos à análise temática de conteúdo. Os resultados mostram que o cuidado se torna desumanizante quando é confundido com disponibilidade ilimitada e sustentado pelo sacrifício silencioso. A dignidade docente emerge de relações de reconhecimento, participação e responsabilidade compartilhada. Conclui-se que cuidar de quem educa requer condições institucionais, trabalho coletivo e políticas que não convertam o adoecimento em problema individual.*

***PALAVRAS-CHAVE:*** *Docência. Educação Infantil. Dignidade. Saúde do trabalhador. Trabalho coletivo.*

***RESUMEN:*** *La docencia en la Educación Infantil reúne cuidado, intencionalidad pedagógica y responsabilidad pública, pero se realiza bajo condiciones que debilitan el reconocimiento y la salud del profesorado. El artículo analiza cómo la dignidad laboral se ve afectada por la sobrecarga, la soledad profesional y la individualización del sufrimiento. Se presenta una nueva lectura de una investigación cualitativa con quince profesoras de una unidad pública de Educación Infantil de un municipio de Santa Catarina, Brasil. El material se produjo mediante entrevistas semiestructuradas, grupos focales y diario de campo, y se sometió a análisis temático de contenido. Los resultados muestran que el cuidado se vuelve deshumanizante cuando se confunde con disponibilidad ilimitada y se sostiene mediante el sacrificio silencioso. La dignidad docente surge de relaciones de reconocimiento, participación y responsabilidad compartida. Cuidar de quien educa exige condiciones institucionales, trabajo colectivo y políticas que no conviertan la enfermedad en un problema individual.*

***PALABRAS CLAVE:*** *Docencia. Educación Infantil. Dignidad. Salud laboral. Trabajo colectivo.*


(cc) BY-NC-SA

## Introduction

The question that titles this article was not formulated to adorn a known discussion. It was born from a daily contradiction, lived in the space where young children are welcomed, cared for, and educated. The Early Childhood Education teacher is asked to perceive crying before it turns into helplessness, to recognize unvoiced needs, to organize learning experiences, to communicate with families, to protect, record, plan, and evaluate. However, when this same worker expresses fatigue, pain, insecurity, or inability to fulfill everything assigned to her, the institutional response does not always arrive. In many cases, care remains an obligation directed at the child, while the caregiver is gradually removed from the field of vision of management, public policies, and even their own peers.

The historical constitution of Early Childhood Education helps to understand why this naturalization finds fertile ground. Its institutional origin was linked to the transformations in labor, the inclusion of women in the factory setting, and the need for childcare, forming the woman-work-child triad described by Didonet (2001). In Brazil, the first institutions were marked by welfare, philanthropic, and hygienist actions, while the strictly educational dimension gained legal and pedagogical recognition slowly and amidst disputes (Kuhlmann Jr., 1998; Paschoal; Machado, 2009). The incorporation of Early Childhood Education as the first stage of basic education by the Law of Directives and Bases represented a decisive change, but it did not erase the social marks that associate work with young children with a supposedly natural extension of motherhood, domestic care, and female availability (Brazil, 1996).

The problem isn't in the care. Caring is a constitutive dimension of human life and of pedagogical practice with young children. The problem arises when care is disqualified as knowledge, privatized as a personal attribute of the teacher, and converted into unlimited availability. In this passage, what should be part of an intentional pedagogical action becomes a kind of moral debt: the teacher needs to be always ready, always sensitive, always whole, even if the concrete working conditions fragment her. The educational activity, which in Saviani (2008) corresponds to the intentional production of historically constructed humanity in each subject, comes to be exercised under an organization that removes from the worker the conditions to recognize themselves in what they produce.

Dignity offers a key to interpreting this movement. In the Kantian tradition, a person cannot be reduced to a replaceable means, as they possess a value that admits no equivalent (Kant, 2009). This formulation is decisive for thinking about teaching work, but it needs to be placed in relation to the materiality of life and the intersubjective nature of recognition. Dignity


(cc) BY-NC-SA

is not limited to an abstract quality that accompanies each individual independently of the world; it also manifests itself, is protected, or is violated in concrete relationships, in institutions, and in the possibilities of participating in common life. In Brazil, this duty of protection finds constitutional basis in the dignity of the human person (Brazil, 1988). Sarlet (2007) highlights this relational dimension by maintaining that the recognition of dignity requires a community capable of protecting the person against their instrumentalization. In the workplace, therefore, it is not enough to state that the teacher is worthy; it is necessary to ask if the school organization treats her as a subject, if her voice produces consequences, and if her needs are considered in the decision-making process.

The neoliberal logic deepens this distance because it shifts problems produced collectively onto the individual. Financial-rentier capitalism does not operate solely at the level of major economic decisions; its values permeate institutions, reorganize responsibilities, and make efficiency a moral measure of the person (Bresser-Pereira, 2018). In school, this appears when a lack of resources is transformed into a creativity challenge, overcrowding is treated as a classroom management issue, lack of support is converted into a need for resilience, and illness is attributed to an individual's inability to control emotions. The teacher is called upon to adapt to conditions she did not choose and, if she fails to do so, tends to direct the blame against herself.

This article starts from a new interpretative reading of the empirical corpus built in a master's research on the perception of early childhood education teachers regarding the production of dignity through work (Paula, 2019). The excerpt does not repeat the analyses previously developed. Its originality lies in bringing together, in the same analytical movement, four dimensions that usually appear separately: care as a pedagogical element, dignity as relational production, illness as an expression of working conditions, and institutional responsibility for those who educate. The problem guiding the discussion can be formulated as follows: how does care, when organized under conditions of overload, consolidation, and individual accountability, interfere with the production of dignity and the health of early childhood education teachers?

The objective is to analyze how the production of dignity through work is affected by processes of professional consolidation, dehumanization, and illness, highlighting the necessary conditions for care to cease depending on individual sacrifice and be sustained by public and collective responsibility. By placing the question "who cares for who educates?" at the center of the text, the aim is not to transfer the care of the child to the teacher, as if there were a


(cc) BY-NC-SA

competition between needs. The opposite is sought to be affirmed: the protection of childhood and the protection of teaching work belong to the same ethical project. Early Childhood Education committed to human formation cannot produce the child's well-being through the silent degradation of those who educate them.

## Methodological path

The study corresponds to a social research with a qualitative approach, descriptive-interpretive character, and dialectical orientation. The qualitative choice stemmed from the nature of the object: the production of dignity through work could not be apprehended solely by external indicators, because it involves meanings, experiences, contradictions, bonds, and ways of recognizing oneself in institutional relationships. From Minayo's perspective (2014), qualitative social research works with interpretations constructed by historical subjects, situated in specific life conditions. The knowledge produced is neither neutral nor external to the field; it is born from the encounter between the participants' voices, the researcher's records, and the theoretical framework that allows for questioning reality without reducing it to a sum of testimonies.

The field was a public Early Childhood Education unit located in a socially vulnerable neighborhood in a Santa Catarina municipality. Fifteen teachers currently working in the investigated unit participated, selected by intentional sampling. The inclusion criteria were to be active in the unit and have at least two years of teaching experience with young children. Professionals in management roles and Physical Education teachers were excluded, a measure adopted to reduce constraints arising from the researcher's professional integration. The exclusively female composition was not previously established; it corresponded to the configuration of the teaching staff and, at the same time, revealed the permanence of the historical feminization of this stage of basic education.

The production of empirical material involved three procedures: field diary, semi-structured interviews, and focus groups. The diary recorded aspects of the routine, shift organization, relationships between professionals, physical conditions, and situations that would hardly be fully recovered from memory through interviews. One-on-one conversations allowed each teacher to address health, work, family, recognition, professional stigmas, and dignity in a more protected space. The focus groups, conducted in two rounds, circulated interpretations within the collective, making visible agreements, tensions, and shifts in position


(cc) BY-NC-SA

produced by contact with the colleagues' speech. The combination was methodologically relevant because the same participant, at times, presented in the group meanings that expanded or contradicted what she had stated individually. This difference was not treated as an inconsistency, but as an expression of the relational and provisional nature of thought.

The interviews and press conferences were recorded, transcribed, and organized through adjusted thematic content analysis. The adjustment consisted of prioritizing the significance of arguments, rather than the numerical frequency of words. After successive readings, units of record were selected, codes were assigned according to a semantic criterion, and elements were grouped by analogy. Next, a cross-sectional exploration of the dataset was carried out, along with an effort of interpretive synthesis, in dialogue with Minayo (2014). The original research produced two broad categories: consolidation at the interface between teaching, neoliberalism, and dignity; and the movement from waiting to collective action. For the present article, the corpus was reread from an exclusive question: what do the speeches reveal about the ethical, institutional, and political conditions of care directed at those who educate?

The project was approved by the Research Ethics Committee with Human Beings of the University of Vale do Itajaí, under Opinion No. 2,777,683 and the Certificate of Presentation for Ethical Appreciation (CAAE) No. 92431218.7.0000.0120. All participants received clarification on objectives, procedures, risks, confidentiality, and freedom to withdraw, formalizing their consent. The research complied with Resolution No. 466/2012 of the National Health Council (Brazil, 2012). The full corpus is not publicly available because it contains experiences and contextual elements that, even without names, could facilitate the undue identification of the participants.

## Early Childhood Education, care, and teaching work

The first analytical movement requires removing care from two equally limiting positions. On one hand, it cannot be treated as a minor activity, opposed to educating, as if cleaning, feeding, welcoming, touching, and protecting were actions devoid of knowledge. On the other hand, it cannot be conceived of as a spontaneous inclination of women, dispensing with training, planning, and institutional conditions. In Early Childhood Education, care and education form a practical unit: the child learns in their relationship with their body, with time, with space, with objects, and with others. This unit, however, is only pedagogically realized when there is intentionality, observation, and the possibility of sharing responsibilities. Without


(cc) BY-NC-SA

these conditions, the integration between care and education runs the risk of being mobilized to indefinitely expand the teacher's field of obligations.

The participants clearly perceived that their own dignity was linked to the children's experience. In a discussion about concrete conditions, FP13 stated: "And, consequently, if the child has no dignity, we don't have it either." The sentence does not reduce the teacher to the child nor does it confuse their rights; it reveals that the product of teaching work returns to the one who performs it. When the professional recognizes that the space offered is insufficient, that the number of children prevents adequate attention, or that the materials do not allow for the development of what was planned, they are not just experiencing an operational difficulty. She feels that she is participating in an educational offering below what she considers fair. Suffering, in this case, arises from the distance between the good one wishes to produce and what circumstances allow to be realized.

> To have dignity, I need to have conditions. I am worthy of having food, housing, of working, but what is offered to us to build this dignity? Regarding education, I say: poor children, their dignity is stolen from the moment they have thirty children and one toilet. This is not dignity. And I feel horrible, but I am offering what I can offer (FP16, our translation).

The testimony articulates three interconnected plans. There is the material level, expressed in the inadequacy of the structure; the pedagogical level, because precariousness limits the way of caring for and educating; and the moral level, since the teacher feels involved in what she offers, even though she knows she does not control the conditions. The phrase "I am offering what I can offer" carries a double consciousness. On the one hand, it acknowledges objective limits and protects the female worker from absolute blame. On the other hand, he expresses frustration at not achieving what he considers a worthy action. Precariousness, therefore, does not remain outside the person: it permeates the judgment they make about their own work and alters the relationship with the meaning of being a teacher.

This relationship helps to understand why the quality of Early Childhood Education cannot be discussed without working conditions. The expansion of services constitutes a social achievement, especially for historically excluded children and families, but the increase in spots, when not accompanied by investment, can transfer the daily management of scarcity to within the classrooms. The teacher becomes responsible for making what doesn't fit, fit: bodies, times, needs, expectations, and documents within a limited structure. Your professional knowledge is consumed in resolving emergencies, leaving less room for observation, study,


(cc) BY-NC-SA

creation, and collective reflection. The work continues to happen, but it progressively moves away from the pedagogical image that justified its formation.

When care is naturalized as a feminine attribute, demands tend to be interpreted as an extension of what the teacher "would already know" how to do. This reading empties professionalism and favors the low social visibility of the trade. At the same time, feminization cannot be treated merely as a statistical description; it refers to a social division that historically assigned women the responsibility for sustaining daily life, often without economic or political recognition. In school, this legacy appears when the teacher is expected to resolve family conflicts, absorb suffering, maintain an affectively stable environment, and compensate for deficiencies in other public policies. The more she achieves, the more the institution becomes accustomed to depending on her ability to exceed her formal role.

## When care turns into sacrifice

The word sacrifice appears here not to deny the commitment implied in any educational relationship, but to distinguish commitment from self-denial. Professional commitment involves responsibility, study, presence, and willingness to respond to others. The naturalized sacrifice begins when the continuity of service depends on the teacher ignoring her own body's signals, remaining silent in the face of inadequate conditions, and accepting as a personal failure what stems from the organization of work. The institution starts to function because someone supports it, and the fact that it continues to function is used as evidence that the conditions would be sufficient. A vicious cycle is formed: the greater the teacher's improvisational ability, the less visible the deficiency she is compensating for.

In collective discussions, adaptation appeared a few times as advice learned in daily life. Faced with seemingly unchangeable difficulties, FP11 stated: "There's no point in stressing out because it never changes"; then, FP12 added: "You have to learn to deal with it." The expressions can be understood as psychic protection strategies. Faced with what cannot be immediately changed, reducing expectations can prevent even greater suffering. However, when this defense transforms into a norm, it also removes its historical and political character from reality. What was produced by human decisions comes to be perceived as an inevitable landscape. One learns to cope, but unlearns to ask why it is so and who could be responsible for the change.


(cc) BY-NC-SA

This shift is characteristic of neoliberal individualization. The institutional issue is translated into the vocabulary of personal adaptation. Instead of asking if the commute, class composition, infrastructure, and management relations are adequate, the question is whether the teacher knows how to control stress. Instead of building collective channels for participation, discourses on emotional balance are offered. Instead of acknowledging illness as a possible result of working conditions, it is recommended that each person take better care of themselves. Self-care practices can be valuable, but they become insufficient and even ideological when they take the place of public responsibility. No individual breathing technique changes the number of children in a room; no motivational lecture replaces an absent professional.

Berlinguer (2015), when discussing everyday bioethics, shifts the focus from major biomedical events to the choices and relationships that daily protect or threaten life. This perspective is particularly fruitful for teaching work. The damage doesn't just appear in exceptional events; it accumulates in ignored pain, in the fear of asking for help, in the absence of time to go to the bathroom, in the guilt for being absent, and in the obligation to remain affectively available throughout the entire shift. They are small situations, repeated and normalized, that build a condition of wear and tear. Work ethics cannot solely evaluate the product delivered to society. You need to consider what happens to the worker while this product is being made.

The research identified reports of burnout, emotional distress, medication use, pain, and physical injuries. These elements were not interpreted as a collective diagnosis nor as proof of a simple causality. Health is produced by multiple determinants, and it would be inappropriate to attribute all harm exclusively to work. Nevertheless, the statements showed that the participants recognized links between symptoms, overload, number of children, lack of support, and difficulty in taking time off when sick. The relationship with the children, which produced pleasure and meaning, also contributed to many remaining at work even when they needed care. The phrase "they need me" functioned simultaneously as an expression of bond and as a moral impediment to rest.

The machine metaphor helps to understand dehumanization, as long as it is not taken as a mere literary device. The machine is valued for its function, can be calculated in terms of cost, and is replaced when it stops producing. The person, on the contrary, should not be treated as a functional equivalent. Kant (2009) offers the moral basis for this distinction by stating that humanity must be considered an end in itself. In everyday life, however, the teacher may feel


(cc) BY-NC-SA

that her institutional value diminishes when she needs to take leave, when she doesn't meet goals, or when she asks for help. The recognition received while enduring everything is not full recognition; it is approval conditioned on the ability to continue functioning.

The question "who takes care of who educates?" becomes, here, a question about the distribution of responsibilities. If the answer is "the teacher herself," the care remains privatized. If the answer is merely "management," the broader determinations of educational policy, funding, and municipal organization are disregarded, as Zluhan, Corrêa, Zwierewicz, and Violantt-Holz (2025) also point out. Care must be built on articulated levels: supportive relationships in daily life, democratic management, support teams, worker health policies, material conditions, career, and public authority commitment. None of these levels, in isolation, solves the problem; the absence of one of them increases the burden on the others.

## Dignity, recognition, and health in teaching work

The relational dimension of dignity became explicit in a dialogue. FP12 maintained that no one offers dignity, as it would depend on how each person sees themselves. FP16 responded by asking how it would be possible to separate that perception from what is offered: housing, work, education, and conditions for acting with quality. The clash between the speeches is theoretically fruitful. If dignity were only granted externally, the person would depend on the recognition of others to have value. If it were merely an internal feeling, institutions could violate rights and still hold the individual responsible for not perceiving themselves as worthy. The way out is to recognize that dignity is not created by the institution, but its experience and protection depend profoundly on the relationships and conditions in which the person lives.

Recognition, however, is not irrelevant in its affective dimension. A teacher synthesized: "And how valuable a hug and a 'thank you' are, that's worth more than money" (FP10). The phrase should not be used to justify low pay; its meaning lies in the relational value of realizing that the work reached someone. In another account, a participant described the effort of a father who ran out of work to attend his son's presentation and stated she was overcome with pride and gratitude. These events show that the recognition of the child and the family can recompose meanings corroded by routine. The teacher sees that her action was not in vain and that someone else noticed the commitment invested.

Charlot (2000) understands the human being as a subject who is constituted in relation to the world, to themselves, and to others. This perspective allows us to understand why


(cc) BY-NC-SA

teaching work affects identity so intensely. The teacher does not hand over an external object and walk away; she engages in a relationship that transforms her. As you follow the child's development, you also produce a reading of yourself. When one realizes they have taught, welcomed, and expanded possibilities, the work can produce pride and belonging. When prevented from doing what it considers necessary, frustration reaches the professional image itself. Dignity through work is, in this sense, an intersubjective production: it occurs in the encounter between what the person wishes to accomplish, what they are able to do, and how they are recognized.

Faculty health also needs to be considered in this relational field. Alexandrino, Zluhan, and Corrêa (2025) corroborate the notion that health as the mere absence of disease is insufficient to understand female workers who remain active but describe exhaustion, fear, loss of meaning, and persistent pain. Berlinguer (2015) distinguishes between a health focused on productive adaptation and a substantial health, linked to the possibility of feeling well and living with autonomy. A policy that only reduces absences can produce present and deeply ill workers. Taking care of health is not about quickly returning the teacher to their post; it's about questioning the conditions that contributed to suffering and creating possibilities for transformation.

The professional consolidation identified in the research did not correspond to the physical absence of people. The teachers worked surrounded by children, families, and colleagues, but they could feel that their words were not producing any return. Solidification arose when speech echoed without consequence, when asking for help meant exposing oneself to judgment, and when the decision about the work was made far from those who carried it out. This form of consolidation is politically produced: it individualizes common experiences and prevents suffering from becoming a collective agenda. By remaining isolated, each teacher seeks to solve alone what is repeated in many classrooms.

## Who takes care of those who educate? Institutional responsibility and collective movement

Answering the central question requires avoiding two easy solutions. The first is to romanticize teacher resistance, celebrating the ability to continue despite everything. The second is to represent the teacher only as a victim, removing any agency from her. The participants showed weariness, but also produced criticism, solidarity, and projects. In their


(cc) BY-NC-SA

speeches, hope did not appear as a passive expectation that someone, at some point, would solve the problems. She approached the movement that Freire (2014) calls "hoping": recognizing the incompleteness of the present and acting with others to transform it.

The difference between waiting and moving is crucial. When FP09 stated that "we don't see light at the end of the tunnel," they expressed a real experience of exhaustion and the closing of possibilities. It would not be ethical to respond to that statement with mandatory optimism. Critical hope does not deny the darkness; it begins by naming it. Your next move is to ask what can be built collectively, on what scales, and with what alliances. Sometimes, the immediate transformation will be small: reorganizing a planning moment, creating a support protocol, establishing a listening channel, or collectively registering a demand. Small actions do not replace structural changes, but they can prevent impotence from becoming total.

Institutional care begins with listening, but does not end there. Listening without responding can increase the feeling of abandonment. The teacher needs to realize that her word follows a path: it is registered, analyzed, returned, and when it cannot be met, it receives public justification. Care management requires procedures, not just goodwill. Meetings with protected time, transparent criteria for class composition, substitution workflows, support for illness situations, and coordination with health services are examples of mechanisms that transform care into organizational responsibility.

Another path is to recognize collective time as part of work and not as an interruption of productivity. Planning together, studying cases, talking about children, and analyzing working conditions are pedagogical activities. When all time is consumed by direct classroom presence and bureaucratic records, cooperation depends on impromptu hallway encounters. The institution benefits from collective knowledge but does not offer time to produce it. This contradiction needs to be addressed because the absence of common spaces reinforces fragmented practices and makes each teacher responsible for inventing isolated answers.

Teacher training also needs to include discussion about work, health, and dignity. Learning methodologies and understanding child development is essential, but not sufficient. The future teacher must recognize that her practice will be crossed by policies, power relations, budget, management, and social inequalities. You must be able to identify when a demand exceeds your individual responsibility and requires institutional coordination. This training does not diminish the commitment to the child; it prevents the commitment from being used against the worker herself. To form for the collective means to teach how to ask for support, build arguments, participate in decisions, and understand health as a political issue.


(cc) BY-NC-SA

Collective work constitutes a pillar of transformation. The collective does not eliminate individual responsibility, but rather inserts it into a network. Each teacher remains responsible for their practice, but they are not abandoned when facing institutional problems. Management makes decisions and is accountable; public authorities guarantee resources; families participate in education; intersectoral services respond to the demands within their purview. The child ceases to depend on the heroism of one person and becomes protected by a community of responsibilities.

## Final considerations

The article analyzed how the production of dignity through work is affected when care, a constitutive element of Early Childhood Education, becomes dependent on overload, professional isolation, and unlimited availability. The statements showed that the teacher does not easily separate her dignity from what she can offer the children. When conditions prevent an action that she recognizes as just and pedagogically qualified, precariousness permeates her relationship with her own craft. Suffering is not born solely from an excess of tasks; it is also born from the impossibility of performing the good that gives meaning to work.

The analysis allowed us to distinguish commitment from sacrifice. Committing to the child does not require denying the teacher's body, silencing pain, or accepting lack of support as destiny. When the institution depends on this denial to function, care becomes a dehumanization mechanism. Neoliberal individualism reinforces the process by transforming structural issues into problems of emotional adaptation. The result is a worker called to take care of herself without being given the conditions to do so, blamed when she gets sick, and valued mainly as long as she can continue.

The question "who takes care of who educates?" does not admit an individual answer. The teacher participates in self-care, but cannot be held responsible for single-handedly neutralizing the effects of a draining organization. They care for those who educate colleagues who break isolation, management that listens and responds, families that build partnerships, public services that assume their responsibilities, and the State that guarantees conditions. Caring is distributing responsibilities without dissolving them.

It is concluded that the quality of Early Childhood Education and teacher dignity belong to the same project. There is no integral protection of the child when the institution is sustained by the silent illness of its teachers. Transforming this reality requires moving beyond waiting,


(cc) BY-NC-SA

without replacing politics with optimism. It requires building collective spaces, making working conditions visible, and recognizing that the person who educates is not an instrument of education, but a subject of rights and a participant in the human formation they help to produce.


(cc) BY-NC-SA

## REFERENCES

ALEXANDRINO, Tarsilla Noemi Bertoli; ZLUHAN, Mara Regina; CORRÊA, Shirlei de Souza. Sentidos ambivalentes atribuídos pelos professores ao trabalho docente. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 29, n. 00, e025012, 2025. DOI: 10.22633/rpge.v29i00.20286. Available at: https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/rpge/article/view/20286 . Accessed in: 28 Jul. 2026.

BERLINGUER, Giovanni. **Bioética cotidiana**. Brasília: Universidade de Brasília, 2015.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. **Resolução nº 466, de 12 de dezembro de 2012**. Aprova diretrizes e normas regulamentadoras de pesquisas envolvendo seres humanos. Brasília, DF: Conselho Nacional de Saúde, 2012.

BRASIL. **Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988**. Brasília, DF: Senado Federal, 1988.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996**. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 1996.

BRESSER-PEREIRA, Luiz Carlos. Capitalismo financeiro-rentista. **Estudos Avançados**, São Paulo, v. 32, n. 92, p. 17-29, 2018. Available at: https://revistas.usp.br/eav/pt_BR/article/view/146435. Accessed in: 28 Jul. 2026.

CHARLOT, Bernard. **Da relação com o saber**: elementos para uma teoria. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2000.

DIDONET, Vital. Creche: a que veio, para onde vai. *In*: BANDIOLI, Anna; MANTOVANI, Susanna. **Educação infantil:** a creche, um bom começo: manual de educação infantil de 0 a 3 anos: uma abordagem reflexiva. 9. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2001. p. 151-155.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da esperança**: um reencontro com a pedagogia do oprimido. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2014.

KANT, Immanuel. **Fundamentação da metafísica dos costumes**. São Paulo: Discurso Editorial; Barcarolla, 2009.

KUHLMANN JR., Moysés. **Infância e educação infantil:** uma abordagem histórica. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 1998.

MINAYO, Maria Cecília de Souza. **O desafio do conhecimento:** pesquisa qualitativa em saúde. 14. ed. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2014.

PASCHOAL, Jaqueline Delgado; MACHADO, Maria Cristina Gomes. A história da educação infantil no Brasil: avanços, retrocessos e desafios dessa modalidade educacional. **Revista HISTEDBR On-line**, Campinas, v. 9, n. 33, p. 78-95, 2009. Available at: https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/histedbr/article/view/8639555/7124. Accessed in: 28 Jul. 2026.

PAULA, Wagner Eduardo Estácio de. **Percepção de professores de educação infantil sobre a produção de dignidade pelo trabalho**: realidades e perspectivas. 2019. 153 f. Dissertação


(cc) BY-NC-SA

(Mestrado Profissional em Saúde e Gestão do Trabalho) – Universidade do Vale do Itajaí, Itajaí, 2019.

SARLET, Ingo Wolfgang. As dimensões da dignidade da pessoa humana: construindo uma compreensão jurídico-constitucional necessária e possível. **Revista Brasileira de Direito Constitucional**, São Paulo, v. 9, p. 361-388, 2007. DOI: 10.62530/2007v09p361.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. **Pedagogia histórico-crítica:** primeiras aproximações. 10. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2008.

ZLUHAN, Mara Regina; CORRÊA, Shirlei de Souza; ZWIEREWICZ, Marlene; VIOLANT-HOLZ, Verónica. The interface between inclusion and creativity: a qualitative scoping systematic review of practices developed in high school. **Education Sciences**, Basel, v. 15, n. 10, art. 1281, 2025. DOI: 10.3390/educsci15101281 . Available at: https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/10/1281 . Accessed in: 1 Jul. 2026.


(cc) BY-NC-SA

## *CRediT Author Statement*

- **Acknowledgments:** To the participating teachers, for their trust and for sharing their professional experiences; to UNIFEBE, for encouraging this research; and to Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação, for the partnership.
- **Funding:** Research conducted using the author's own resources.
- **Conflicts of interest:** The author declares no conflicts of interest.
- **Ethical approval:** Research Ethics Committee involving Human Beings at the University of the Itajaí Valley (Universidade do Vale do Itajaí), Opinion No. 2,777,683 and CAAE No. 92431218.7.0000.0120.
- **Data and material availability:** The full corpus is not publicly available to preserve the confidentiality of the participants; aggregated data may be provided upon a justified request and in compliance with ethical standards.
- **Author contributions:** Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, analysis, drafting of the original version, revision, and final approval: Wagner Eduardo Estácio de Paula.

**Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação**
Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation


(cc) BY-NC-SA