



Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional
Online Journal of Policy and Educational Management



¹ Professional Master's Program in Education at Adventist University Center of São Paulo (MPE-UNASP), Engenheiro Coelho - (SP) - Brazil. Master in Education from MPE-UNASP (SCHOOL MANAGER IN BASIC EDUCATION).

² Professional Master's Program in Education at Adventist University Center of São Paulo (MPE-UNASP), Engenheiro Coelho - (SP) - Brazil. Doctoral degree in Education from PPGE-UNESP - Marília - SP (PERMANENT TEACHER at MPE-UNASP).

³ Adventist University Center of São Paulo (UNASP), Engenheiro Coelho - (SP) - Brazil. Doctoral degree in Religious Sciences and Master in Communication. (UNASP MEP PERMANENT TEACHER).

⁴ Graduate Program in Education - São Paulo State University (UNESP) - Marília - (SP) - Brazil. Doctoral degree in Education from the PPGE-UNESP - (TEACHER at the DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION - UNESP).



THE TRAJECTORY OF THE SCHOOL MANAGER IN BRAZIL: HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL INFLUENCES AND ADMINISTRATIVE MODELS

A TRAJETÓRIA DO GESTOR ESCOLAR NO BRASIL: INFLUÊNCIAS HISTÓRICO-SOCIAIS E MODELOS ADMINISTRATIVOS

LA TRAYECTORIA DEL GESTOR ESCOLAR EN BRASIL: INFLUENCIAS HISTÓRICAS Y SOCIALES Y MODELOS ADMINISTRATIVOS

Anderson Macário GOMES ¹
anderson.gomes@adventistas.org
Giza Guimarães P. SALES ²
giza.sales@gmail.com
Rodrigo FOLLIS ³
rodrigo.follis@unasp.edu.br
Angélica Pall ORIANI ⁴
angelica.oriani@unesp.br



How to reference this paper:

Gomes, A. M., Sales, G. G. P., Follis, R., & Oriani, A. P. (2025). The trajectory of the school manager in Brazil: Historical and social influences and administrative models. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 29, e025006. 10.22633/rpge.v29i00.19884

Submitted: 20/10/2024

Revisions required: 07/12/2024

Approved: 15/02/2025

Published: 13/03/2025

ABSTRACT: School management in Brazil has undergone a dense and multifaceted trajectory, deeply influenced by political, economic, and cultural dynamics. This study examines the historical development of the role of the principal/school administrator, highlighting the transitions from an autocratic and centralized model to more participatory and democratic approaches. The establishment of graded primary schools and school groups triggered the need for a structured administration, initially inspired by foreign models and characterized by a techno-bureaucratic framework. Over the centuries, the role of the school principal has been shaped by positivist and business influences, often neglecting pedagogical specificities. Based on a bibliographic review, the article discusses the disruptions and continuities in this process, identifying the challenges faced by contemporary school managers and suggesting pathways for a management approach that balances administrative and educational demands.

KEYWORDS: Education. School principal. School administrator. Management models.

RESUMO: A gestão escolar no Brasil percorreu uma trajetória densa e multifacetada, profundamente influenciada por dinâmicas políticas, econômicas e culturais. Este estudo examina o desenvolvimento histórico da função do diretor/gestor escolar, evidenciando as transições de um modelo autocrático e centralizador para abordagens mais participativas e democráticas. A criação da escola primária graduada e dos grupos escolares desencadeou a necessidade de uma administração estruturada, inicialmente inspirada em modelos estrangeiros e marcadamente tecnoburocráticos. Ao longo dos séculos, a função do diretor escolar foi moldada por influências positivistas e empresariais, muitas vezes desconsiderando as especificidades pedagógicas. O artigo, fundamentado em revisão bibliográfica, discute as rupturas e permanências desse percurso, apontando os desafios enfrentados pelo gestor escolar contemporâneo e sugerindo caminhos para uma gestão que equilibre demandas administrativas e educacionais.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Educação. Diretor escolar. Gestor escolar. Modelos de gestão.

RESUMEN: La gestión escolar en Brasil ha seguido una trayectoria densa y multifacética, profundamente influenciada por dinámicas políticas, económicas y culturales. Este estudio examina el desarrollo histórico del rol del diretor/gestor escolar, destacando las transiciones de un modelo autocrático y centralizado hacia enfoques más participativos y democráticos. La creación de la escuela primaria graduada y de los grupos escolares generó la necesidad de una administración estructurada, inicialmente inspirada en modelos extranjeros y caracterizada por un marco tecnoburocráticos. A lo largo de los siglos, la función del director escolar ha sido moldeada por influencias positivistas y empresariales, a menudo desconsiderando las especificidades pedagógicas. Basado en una revisión bibliográfica, el artículo analiza las rupturas y continuidades de este proceso, identificando los desafíos que enfrentan los gestores escolares contemporáneos y sugiriendo caminos hacia una gestión que equilibre las demandas administrativas y educativas.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Educación. Director escolar. Gestor escolar. Modelos de gestión.

Article submitted to the similarity system



Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes

Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz



INTRODUCTION

When we look at school management in Brazil, considering its historical and social aspects, it is necessary to analyze the figure of its central agent, the school manager, in order to understand the trajectory of its formation and development. This trajectory takes place in complex contexts, marked by political, economic and cultural influences, both internal and external.

While the school seeks its place of survival in the midst of the changes and influences it is undergoing in the post-world: Industrial, Technological, Digital, and Information Revolutions, some administrative and business models developed in the United States, Europe and Asia are widely adopted in the field of school management. This leads managers to incorporate elements of strategic planning and control, typical of the North American business model, into their practices. Direct influences, such as Taylorism, Fordism, and Toyotism, emphasize efficiency, standardization, bureaucratic organization, and productivity, often reflected in 20th century Brazilian school practices (Linhart, 1983).

As Paro (2004) mentions, in Brazil, there is a predominance of administrative approaches in Brazilian schools, to the detriment of genuinely educational perspectives. The author criticizes the adoption of business principles in school administration, which often neglects the pedagogical aspects that are essential for students' education. Paro argues that this excessive emphasis on bureaucratic administration compromises the quality of teaching and takes the school away from its primary function of promoting learning and the integral development of students. It also advocates school management that prioritizes pedagogical dimensions and is committed to social transformation, overcoming the conservative nature of practices (Paro, 2022). Thus, in seeking to take a closer look at the theoretical, economic, political, and cultural conceptions of the way Brazilian schools are managed, we aim to identify the characteristics and influences surrounding the role of school principal/manager in order to gain a more in-depth understanding of the training of this professional and provide more detailed analysis of the subject.

The aim of this study is to understand the historical changes that have taken place in the role played by the school principal/manager in Brazil, highlighting the factors that have shaped the transition from a centralized and autocratic model to a more participatory and democratic approach. Seeking to offer a panoramic view of the trajectories, continuities, and ruptures involved in the process of developing and consolidating this career, this study also aims to promote a greater understanding of the role of the school manager and contribute to meeting the current challenges facing education.

Finally, understanding that the role of the manager and the school management model have been built in parallel, as a consequence or under the influence of the theoretical, economic, and political conceptions of each phase of our history, it becomes essential to

analyze the behaviors, phenomena, and practices of the cultural, social, political, economic and educational context. This exercise is essential to check whether the school management model that has developed over time needs to be revised, adjusted, or improved. It is from this understanding that the challenges and needs of the school are perceived, and its management models continually demand solid and continuous training, as well as the development of skills and competencies on the part of the school manager, in order to face the challenges that permeate contemporary education.

Understanding the history of school management in Brazil

The history of education provides essential elements for understanding the trajectory of school management in Brazil. In the colonial period, Jesuit schools structured the Brazilian educational system, which was predominant until the middle of the 18th century. With the Pombaline Reform, implemented in 1759 by the Marquis of Pombal, the Portuguese Crown broke with the religious order, expelling the Jesuits and dismantling the only consolidated model until then. From that moment on, responsibility for education passed from the Church to the Portuguese state, marking the transition to a state model, albeit in a slow and disorganized way, due to the absence of a previously established structure.

With the arrival of the royal family in Brazil in 1808, and in an attempt to consolidate national education, several educational institutions were created in Rio de Janeiro and other provinces from then on, among them: the Colégio das Fábricas and the Liceus, whose aim was to train artisans, manufacturers, apprentices and workers for the new factories that would be set up in the country (Brazil, 1891). In the imperial period, with the increase in schools, the government created the position of teacher-director, subordinate directly to the emperor, reinforcing state control over education. The principal was appointed by the government to manage teachers, pupils and all the work carried out at the school. Appointments often lacked transparency and impersonality, characteristics that were not yet part of current administrative practices at the time (Seco et al., 2006).

According to Oriani (2015), the role of the school principal, between 1894 and 1904, in the context of independent Brazil and under the 1891 Constitution, became essential to the process of institutionalizing elementary school. The creation of the school groups introduced a new form of education marked by greater systematization of administrative and didactic-pedagogical aspects, as well as fostering debates on educational innovation and democratic management in the country, themes that were still in their infancy at the time. Until then, the schools operated in multi-grade classrooms, without specific degrees. With the creation of school groups, there was also a need for greater supervision and monitoring, giving the principal a predominantly supervisory and controlling role.

In the context of the Brazilian Republic, Decree No. 3,890 was approved in 1901, establishing the National Education Reform for the Official Institutes of Higher and Secondary Education. This reform restructures the position of the school principal. Their duties now include complying with legal and labor aspects, carrying out bureaucratic, administrative and pedagogical tasks, as well as supervising classes and exams. Later, in 1915, Decree No. 11,530 reorganized secondary and higher education, expanding the responsibilities of the principal, who became directly responsible for the financial and disciplinary management of the institutions. In addition, the appointment of principals ceased to be the prerogative of the governors and became the responsibility of the President of the Republic, reinforcing central control over school administration.

School administration/management in Brazil during the republican period was marked by administrative models that reflected each political phase experienced in the country. From the 1920s onwards, education began to be conceived as an engine of progress and an instrument of national reconstruction, differentiating itself from previous periods in which it was not treated as a government priority, or its focus was restricted solely to the issue of literacy. The value of education grew as it was consolidated as an effective means of social promotion and economic advancement, and in this case, it was necessary to know how to manage the school machine. This scenario began to change with the effervescence of a political and intellectual movement that boosted educational thinking, culminating in the spread of the ideals of educational renewal and the publication of the Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education, in 1932, a document that marked a new chapter in Brazilian educational history (Gomes, 2019).

From the first decades of the 20th century, education began to occupy a prominent role on the agenda of various organized sectors of society, resulting in significant structural advances in the 1930s, such as the creation of the Ministry of Education and Public Health, the formulation of a National Education Plan and the inclusion of free and compulsory elementary education in the Federal Constitution of 1934. In addition, numerous educational reforms were implemented, some under the responsibility of the central government and others led by the states (Andreotti et al., 2021, p. 132).

The first theoretical studies on school administration/management, according to Drabach and Mousquer (2009), began to develop in the 1930s, a period of intense social, political, and economic reorganization promoted by Anísio Teixeira and the educational renovators, supporters of pragmatism and rationality. The current context still reflected remnants of the second and third Industrial Revolution, whose transformations in the production model directly influenced the administration of educational institutions, consolidating a more systematic vision and a technicist tendency in education.

Despite the institutional advances, the reforms of this period were marked by a strong techno-bureaucratic bias. Educational administration became guided by the operational effi-

ciency of institutions, while human, pedagogical, cultural and political aspects were relegated to the background. Studies on school administration followed the principles of classical theories, prioritizing the rationalization of work, hierarchy and control as the foundations of school organization.

Under the aegis of this technical rationality, there is a contradiction in the work of the school manager, who must balance the entire framework of legal dictates that value participation and the democratic process in the reality of schools. In this context, we can see a return to an administration with a business bias, which legitimizes the product to the detriment of the human. The manager's work is changing, and the demands are increasing, especially in the administrative dimension (Paschoalino, 2018, p. 4, our translation).

However, despite the progress made, intense ideological clashes emerged between the reform educators and the conservatives, reflecting the polarization of diametrically opposed educational concepts. On the one hand, the reform educators advocated a liberal educational approach, aimed at overcoming traditional pedagogy and reconfiguring the direction of national education. Its proposals include the implementation of a public, secular, free and compulsory school, as well as the formulation of a national education plan based on the universalization of access and the democratization of education.

On the other hand, conservatives, backed by significant political influence, defend the preservation of private school interests and an educational perspective aligned with traditional values. Among their agendas, were the maintenance of religious education in schools, the right of parents to home-school their children, gender segregation in schools, and the prioritization of private education as the predominant model.

Despite the opposition between reform educators and conservatives, school administration/management remained strongly influenced by techno-bureaucratic principles, prioritizing efficiency, control, and rationalization. At the same time, Catholic conservatism played a significant role in centralizing decisions, promoting traditional values that reinforced educational practices in line with religious precepts. With political and cultural influence, Catholic groups encouraged religious teaching, gender separation in schools, and the prioritization of private education.

In this scenario, an authoritarian management model prevailed, where the school principal concentrated decisions without any room for the participation of the community or educational agents. The verticalization of decisions and the lack of dialogue consolidated an administration based on paternalism, a culture of power and mutual distrust, alienating educators from decision-making processes. School management thus became hierarchical, individualistic, and arbitrary, reinforcing centralizing administrative methods (Braga, 2009).

Considering the aspects highlighted, Moreira and Quirino (2014) state that school administration/management in this period was strongly centered on the figure of the principal,

who was responsible for complying with the rules for the smooth running of the school. Its functions include controlling, supervising, and conducting administrative and pedagogical actions in accordance with the education system in force.

The periods described mark the evolution of Brazilian education administration over the course of the 20th and early 21st centuries. Present in this historical process of building administration, among others, is a certain overcoming of cultural and human aspects that were previously considered secondary to administration (Gomes, 2019, p. 64, our translation).

When analyzing this moment in school administration/management, Lück (2011) points out that, due to the characteristics of social processes, marked by the diversity, plurality, and dynamism of the aspects involved in education, it is inconceivable that schools should continue to be guided by the paradigm of the General Theory of Administration. This paradigm evaluates both organizations and the people who work in them as parts of a machine, managed in an arbitrary and controlling way to achieve success in their objectives. According to this concept, solutions to school problems ignore the social aspects that are fundamental to promoting education and learning.

In the post-World War II period, discussions and studies on school administration/management began to gain greater prominence. This moment was marked by a reaction against the traditional principles and practices of the classical schools of management. The post-war context seeks to rescue an educational system's human dimension and essential elements. The focus is now on the theory of open and contextual systems. School administration/management began to be conceived as a pedagogical act, rather than a business or commercial practice. Education came to be seen as a professional field of study and intervention, breaking with the merely bureaucratic and utilitarian logic characteristic of some historical moments.

This new stage, fraught with paradigmatic changes, reinforces the importance of studies in the history of education and the history of school management in Brazil, not only to give us an understanding of the past and appreciation of the present, but also to offer conceptual and analytical bases to help formulate new administrative models capable of meeting the challenges of contemporary times.

Some milestones and advances in school administration

Between the 1950s and 1960s, the period was marked by economic recovery and development, moving away from a classic management model and towards a model aimed at meeting the economic and social needs of the time. This new reality has led to a greater need to prepare people to take on leadership roles, especially in the educational context, such as principals, supervisors, coordinators and educational advisors. During this period, among

some changes, such as the enactment of the first National Education Guidelines and Bases Law - LDB 4024/1961 (Brazil, 1961), there was also the drafting of the first National Education Plan in 1962 (Brazil, 1962), which was drawn up in an attempt to consolidate education as a factor in economic development. School planning began to meet the needs of the industrialization process, preparing people for the job market. Some names, such as Anísio Teixeira and Lourenço Filho, were advocates of a more inclusive school model that favored the interests of comprehensive education and training for work.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the General Theory of Organizations underpinned most of the studies on school administration/management, with José Querino Ribeiro, Manoel Bergstrom Lourenço Filho, and Myrtes Alonso standing out. In 1964, during the military dictatorship, schools came under greater state control, with little autonomy for principals and managers. Education was geared towards training workers for the industrial sector, reflecting the technical nature of the period. School administration remained rigid, with little room for pedagogical innovation or community participation. Authors such as Andreotti, Lombardi and Minto (2021) mention that, in consolidating this new model for organizing and guiding school administration/management, the government reinforced the bureaucratic structure and guaranteed more decision-making power to the technicians who ran the Education Departments. In the past, the position of director was filled primarily by political appointment, but since these changes, this position has been filled by a professional based on their technical qualifications.

However, between the 1970s and 1980s, despite all the investment, especially in the predominant technical nature of education at that time, including the 1961 LDB Reform, systematized in Law No. 5692/1971 (Brasil, 1971), this reform did not achieve its objectives, revealing substantial gaps in the general and technical training of students and highlighting the need to re-evaluate its curricular and methodological processes. The various educational movements in the country strove to promote a school administration with democratic contours, seeking to abandon the authoritarian and bureaucratic style, evidently far removed from the dynamics and school life necessary for the development of its community, despite coexistence with the current military government. During this period, school administration/management began to adopt more democratic characteristics, seeking to involve the community in day-to-day decisions, albeit in a timid and insipient way.

In this context, the role of the school principal has changed, requiring a balance between school autonomy and accountability to the government. Rodrigues (2012) points out that the period from 1984 to 1987 marked the transition from scientific administration to a more democratic approach, decentralizing management and broadening the participation of teachers, students, staff, and the community. This model strengthened dialogue, transparency, and the collective construction of decisions, seeking to establish a commitment to the democratization of education and making institutions more collaborative and adaptable to the

demands of contemporary society.

Andreotti et al. (2021) point out that the school principal has several responsibilities, such as reporting to the government, managing the budget, making expenditures and overseeing secretarial and library services. He also supervises teaching programs and acts as rapporteur and supervisor of school regulations, being responsible for implementing the policy guidelines defined by higher levels of educational administration.

This role requires the principal to act as a mediator between the administrative bodies and the school staff, balancing institutional demands and the needs of the community. However, faced with the conflict between loyalty to hierarchical superiors and commitment to the interests of the school, the tendency is often to prioritize the demands of the central administration to the detriment of local demands (Andreotti et al., 2021).

Gaining democratic contours

In the early 1980s, Brazil experienced an essential moment in its history: the process of re-democratization. The military regime came to an end in 1984, and in 1985, a new chapter of a democratic country began. With the promulgation of the 1988 Federal Constitution (Brasil, 1988), the term “democratic management” came into use, bringing the possibility of new perspectives and paths for education. From then on, the term “administration” was gradually replaced by “management,” reflecting a significant conceptual change (Marangoni, 2017).

Long before this change, educators such as José Querino Ribeiro and Anísio Teixeira, as mentioned, had already introduced fundamental reflections on school administration/management in Brazil. Ribeiro argued that administration was a means, not an end in itself. Its approach was based on the rationalization of work, the division of functions and the improvement of management as a way of reducing the risks of labor segmentation. Teixeira, on the other hand, had a different view, arguing that school administration should not follow the lines of business administration, but should take on a mediating character. For him, the role of the school administrator was essentially a service to the educational community, rather than a position of command and control (Teixeira, 1968, p. 14).

To a certain extent, we can see a complex transition, marked by advances and setbacks, not only in the change of terminology from “school principal” to “school manager,” but also in the conception of the position, in its actions and in the relevance of a proactive approach so that what is essential in a school can happen: the teaching and learning process.

In order to overcome paradigms and defend a perspective on school management, Lück (2011) advocates a redefinition of terminology that encompasses this broader concept. The author believes that replacing the term “school administration” with the term “school management” is quite pertinent since the former suggests a primarily commercial and capitalist

administration, which seems to restrict the understanding of the function, which is not in line with reality and the school context. It is important to note that this change does not imply the negation or replacement of the concept of school administration, but rather its transcendence.

Following on from this, the concept of “school management” is proving to be more efficient and more relevant. Both the Federal Constitution (Brazil, 1988) and the National Education Guidelines and Bases Law - LDB 9394/96 (Brasil, 1996) enshrine the term “school management,” a concept that dominates the political, administrative, and pedagogical discourse surrounding the governance of a school unit

Management is an activity that does not have an end in itself but is always oriented towards the pursuit of certain results. In the case of school management, the main objective is to guarantee the learning and development rights of children and young people (Vieira et al., 2020).

Other dimensions coexist and are fundamental to the organization and functioning of the school. However, it is necessary to recognize that the main purpose of educational institutions is to ensure the integral development of children and the learning of students. In order for the teaching-learning process to take place effectively, a number of conditions must be met. In this context, the school manager acts comprehensively throughout the educational environment, directing the human, financial and material resources available to create a space conducive to pedagogical work (Vieira et al., 2020).

According to Barbosa and Abdian (2013), the defense of democratic principles by the school community and the government stems from different interests that can be summarized in two assumptions: a) on the part of the school, the authentic desire to overcome the existing style of school administration, orienting itself towards objectives aimed at social transformation; b) on the part of the state, the passage of its responsibilities to civil society, with discourses aimed at gaining educational quality by involving society in the teaching process, based on neoliberal policies.

In contemporary education, neoliberal proposals seem to define the path of education for the coming decades, since the constant emphasis is on increasing and rationalizing time and pedagogical work in teacher and student productivity, decentralization of processes and high performance. This greatly influences the work of the school manager, as well as all those involved in the pedagogical process. Thus, the beginning of the 21st century is marked by a territory in dispute and competition. According to Libâneo (2015), neoliberalism is an economic model that aims for profitability and performance, thus defining the direction and functioning of society adjusted by the capitalist market.

Faced with this reality, education, seen from the point of view of the practice of school management, ends up submitting to market policies in an attempt to coexist and remain active in such a competitive market. It often oscillates between promoting the all-round develop-

ment of the student and offering knowledge to train skilled labor for the job market. The neoliberal model demands an increasing level of professional qualification and those who don't meet this standard sometimes end up marginalized, becoming surplus in a society that values productivity and specialization. In this way, the lack of adequate educational training and the failure to develop skills and competencies become aggravating factors for social exclusion.

Changes in production, due to advances in science and technology, have created a competitive situation on the world market. The competitiveness installed and demanded by transnational capital increasingly involves the development of knowledge and the training of human resources, giving a central role to education (Libâneo et al., 2012, p. 7, our translation).

Contemporary times are characterized by the advance of the political and economic perspectives of neoliberal thinking, in which the majority of governments, especially in the Western world, adopt a minimum state stance, proving incapable of achieving effective results in the planning and development of public policies that serve the less privileged social classes. On the other hand, business alliances interfere in social and educational guidelines, with a purely market focus and strictly economic interests. In this way, it is becoming increasingly evident that the product is being valued to the detriment of processes and the search for good performance indicators, disregarding the subjectivity of individuals and schools, which jeopardizes the full success of educational activities.

The state's attempt to direct the process of change in education, which began in the 1990s, was based on the discourse of technical and administrative agility. To this end, the reforms implemented in education during this period were gradual, diffuse, and segmented, but with surprising speed and the same orientation. The logic behind the structural reforms that public education will undergo in Brazil in all areas (administrative, financial, pedagogical) and levels (basic and higher education) has the same vector. Concepts of productivity, effectiveness, excellence and efficiency will be imported from administrative theories to pedagogical theories (Oliveira, 2006, p. 33, our translation).

The consolidation of this marketing philosophy gained momentum with the World Conference on Education for All, held in Thailand in 1990, aiming to create education methodologies in emerging countries, adjusted to the movement of a globalized economy. The main objective of this meeting was to find ways to develop new intellectual skills and competencies to adapt people to the productive market, as well as to form more demanding, sophisticated, and competent consumers. In other words, the subject's education should be adjusted to global economic interests, including democratic and emancipatory aspects (Libâneo, 2015).

The capitalist premise focused on results and efficiency, which permeates the birth of democratic management, has strengthened with the modernization of production and consumption processes, driving new configurations in the world of work and requiring the con-

tinuous development of skills in line with the demands of the fourth Industrial Revolution (Daniel, 2013).

In Libâneo's (2015) view, these market-based perspectives do enormous damage to Brazilian education, as they prioritize practical, instrumental, and immediate learning over scientific knowledge and the development of student's cognitive abilities. In this scenario, the school manager faces the challenge of balancing the pressure for results and focusing on the importance of intentional and socially responsible educational work.

This reality imposes on managers the need to consolidate professionalism based on democratic criteria, guaranteeing efficient and effective management that values education as a broad training process and not just a mechanism for adapting to the job market.

Factors such as strong leadership, high expectations of student performance, a climate conducive to learning, prioritizing the teaching of fundamental knowledge and assessing and monitoring student performance are essential. It is important that, based on accumulated experience and the evaluation of implemented policies, new references are established and legitimized with regard to the organization of school hours, both for students and teachers, in order to adapt the work to be carried out by each school (Salgado, 2019, p. 27, our translation).

Democratic management, therefore, aims to overcome centralizing and disciplinary practices, and seeks to promote the participation and pedagogical involvement of the subjects involved. The school must offer a systematized education, giving students the opportunity to develop a critical conscience. Unlike bureaucratic administration, democratic management presents a model of organization guided by collective participation and autonomy, considering the needs and interests of the community and prioritizing the educational process as a central element. Thus, in democratic management, school practices must focus primarily on educational aspects, which represent the real reason for the school's existence. In order for these objectives to be achieved, the community must participate effectively in the school's decision-making processes (Barbosa & Abdian, 2013).

The pedagogical dimension maintains an essential and highly relevant relationship with all the other dimensions in the organization and functioning of school management. Within the school, the main objective is to achieve an adequate teaching and learning process. Participation and autonomy make up the very essence of the pedagogical process, as these characteristics positively influence development and learning.

Participation-oriented education needs to develop people's citizenship and responsibility for the country's destiny. In this sense, educational quality is closely related to democratic management, and there can be no educational success without community participation in the school. By involving everyone in the educational process, the well-established basis of democratic management is built, with decentralization and the principles of autonomy. This is one of the great challenges facing school managers.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This study sought to understand how the role of the school manager in Brazil reflects a historical trajectory marked by profound transformations shaped by political, economic, and cultural contexts. Understanding the past is essential for guiding the paths that school managers must follow in the present and the future. It was observed that, over time, school management has moved away from a primarily centralized and autocratic model, strongly influenced by business and positivist practices, towards a more democratic and participatory approach, although permeated by challenges related to tradition and the new impositions of neoliberal logics.

Among the conclusions reached is the need for the school manager to articulate pedagogical and administrative actions in an integrated manner, prioritizing educational development and the participation of the school community. It is clear that the balance between these dimensions is essential for educational success, especially in a contemporary scenario that demands innovation, flexibility, and inclusion. The research also shows that the role of the school manager goes beyond a technical and bureaucratic function, requiring strategic and reflective action based on pedagogical and administrative knowledge and socio-emotional skills. In order to overcome the remnants of centralization and control still present in management practice, it is essential that the manager understands not only the teaching and learning processes but also the organizational dynamics, educational policies, and interpersonal relationships that influence the school environment.

Finally, the study reinforces the importance of continuing to investigate management models and ways of working for school managers that meet real training needs, promoting practices that ensure both the learning and full development of students and a quality and equitable education for all.

REFERENCES

- Andreotti, A. L., Lombardi, J. C., & Minto, L. W. (2021). *História da administração escolar no Brasil: Do diretor ao gestor*. Editora Alínea.
- Barbosa, A. H., & Abdian, G. Z. (2013). Gestão escolar e formação do pedagogo: Relações e implicações a partir da análise de projetos político-pedagógicos de universidades públicas. *Educação em Revista*, 245-276.
- Braga, E. P. (2009). *A democracia na gestão da escola pública: Um estudo do caso da Escola Estadual "Odilon Behrens"*. São Leopoldo. Disponível em: https://fpl.edu.br/2018/media/pdfs/mestrado/dissertacoes_2009/dissertacao_edgardo_pires_braga_2009.pdf
- Brasil. (1808). *Alvará de 1º de abril de 1808: Permite o livre estabelecimento de fábricas e manufaturas no Estado do Brasil*. Coleção das leis do Brasil, Rio de Janeiro, p. 10.
- Brasil. Presidência da República. (1906). *Lei N. 1.606, de 29 de dezembro de 1906: Cria nas capitais dos Estados da República Escolas de Aprendizes Artífices, para o ensino profissional primário e gratuito*. Decreto N. 7.566, de 23 de setembro de 1909. http://portal.mec.gov.br/setec/arquivos/pdf3/decreto_7566_1909.pdf
- Brasil. Presidência da República. (1961). *Lei N. 4.024, de 20 de dezembro de 1961: Fixa as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional*. http://www.planalto.gov.br/CCIVIL_03/leis/L4024.htm
- Brasil. Ministério da Educação (MEC). (1962). *Plano Nacional de Educação*. MEC. <https://portal.mec.gov.br/arquivos/pdf/pne.pdf>
- Brasil. Presidência da República. (1971). *Lei N. 5.692, de 11 de agosto de 1971: Fixa diretrizes e bases para o ensino de 1º e 2º graus e dá outras providências*. http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L5692.htm
- Brasil. Presidência da República. (1996). *Lei N. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996: Lei de diretrizes e bases da educação nacional*. <http://portal.mec.gov.br/arquivos/pdf/ldb.pdf>
- Drabach, N. P., & Mousquer, M. E. L. (2009). Dos primeiros escritos sobre administração escolar no Brasil aos escritos sobre gestão escolar: Mudanças e continuidades. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 9(2), 258-285.
- Gomes, A. (2019). *As dimensões da gestão no processo de organização escolar: Significados para a equipe gestora*. CRV.
- Libâneo, J. C., Oliveira, J. F. de, & Toschi, M. S. (2012). *Educação escolar: Políticas, estrutura e organização* (10ª ed.). Cortez.
- Libâneo, J. C. (2015). *Organização e gestão da escola: Teoria e prática* (6ª ed.). Heccus Editora.

- Linhart, R. (1983). *Lenin, os camponeses*, Taylor (D. A. Reis & L. A. Reis, Trans.). Marco Zero.
- Lück, H. (2011). *Gestão educacional: Uma questão paradigmática* (8ª ed.). Vozes.
- Marangoni, R. A. (2017). *Gestores escolares: Representações e práticas*. Appris.
- Moreira, P., & Quirino, R. (2014). A formação de gestores escolares em uma perspectiva de gestão democrática: A experiência do programa nacional escola de gestores da educação básica na Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. *XI Congresso Brasileiro de Ensino Superior à Distância – ESUD 2014*, Florianópolis-SC, UNIREDE. <https://esud2014.nute.ufsc.br/anais-esud2014/files/pdf/128058.pdf>
- Oliveira, D. A. (2006). Gestão democrática da educação no contexto de reforma do Estado. In N. S. C. Ferreira & M. Â. Aguiar (Orgs.), *Gestão da educação: Impasses, perspectivas e compromissos* (4ª ed., Vol. 1, pp. 91-112). Cortez.
- Oriani, A. P. (2015). *A célula viva do bom aparelho escolar: Expansão das escolas isoladas pelo estado de São Paulo (1917-1945)* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho, Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências, Marília, SP.
- Paro, V. H. (2004). *Gestão democrática da escola pública* (3ª ed.). Ática.
- Paro, V. H. (2022). *Administração escolar: Introdução crítica*. Cortez.
- Paschoalino, J. B. de Q. (2018). *Gestão escolar na educação básica: Construções e estratégias frente aos desafios profissionais*. Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ).
- Rodrigues, V. M. de O. F. M. (2012). *A gestão escolar nos cursos de Pedagogia da cidade de São Paulo: Um estudo em três instituições privadas* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC-SP).
- Salgado, A. P. M. (2019). *As funções do diretor pedagógico: Uma visão das funções do diretor pedagógico de uma creche da Ilha da Madeira*.
- Seco, A. P., Ananias, M., & Fonseca, S. M. (2006). Antecedentes da administração escolar até a República (1930). *Revista HISTEDBR On-line*, Campinas, n. especial, 54-101.
- Teixeira, A. (1968). Natureza e função da administração escolar. In *Anais do I Simpósio Interamericano de Administração Escolar* (pp. 1-47). ANPAE.
- Vieira, S. L., Vidal, E. M., & Nogueira, J. F. F. (2020). *Gestão escolar no Brasil*. FGV Editora.

CRediT Author Statement

Acknowledgements: Thanks to the UNASP Professional Master's Program.

Funding: There is no promotion.

Conflicts of interest: There are no conflicts of interest.

Ethical approval: Yes. Opinion no: 6.137.166.

Data and material availability: Yes. The dissertation that led to this article is available on the Institution's Library website.

Authors' contributions: Author 1: The contribution consisted of exploratory, bibliographical, and field research; data collection; data analysis and interpretation; and writing the text. Author 2, 3 and 4: Guidance, proofreading, contribution to writing.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação

Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation

