Received: 11 January 2024 | Accepted: 26 May 2026 | Published: 15 August 2026

ARK: 24285/RCC.v08i16.309

ARTICLE

REVISTA COLETA CIENTÍFICA

Who cares for young children? Families, the State and early childhood education in Brazil's National Care Policy

Quem cuida das crianças pequenas? Famílias, Estado e educação infantil na Política Nacional de Cuidados

Raphael Alves de Oliveira[1]
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6608-3298
https://lattes.cnpq.br/9512157066307239
Universidade de Brasília (UnB), Distrito Federal, Brasil
E-mail: raphalvez@gmail.com

Informações da publicação

ARK: 24285/RCC.v08i16.309

ISSN: 2763-6496

Keywords:
Care policy.
Early childhood education.
Family–school relationship.
Gender.
Human development.

Palavras-chave:
Política de cuidados.
Educação infantil.
Relação família-escola.
Gênero.
Desenvolvimento humano.

Abstract:
This article analyses how Brazil's National Care Policy (Law 15,069/2024) and National Care Plan (Decree 12,562/2025 and Joint Ordinance 35/2025) position families and early childhood education in the social organisation of child care. Drawing on the care diamond framework and on the understanding of family and school as developmental contexts, this qualitative documentary study used two-phase content analysis, complemented by household survey data on crèche coverage. Results show that the framework breaks with familialism by recognising unpaid carers as rights holders and by assigning the State the roles of provider, coordinator and promoter of cultural change, while naming the market and the community as co-responsible without specifying their obligations in detail. Early childhood education occupies a central place, but is framed mainly as a means of reconciling paid work and care, with priority for single-mother households. Redistribution of care within families and partnership between families and educational settings are the least developed dimensions. The study concludes that the expansion of crèches under the care framework should be linked to educational quality standards and to family–setting partnerships, so that services created to relieve families also become developmental contexts for children.

[1] Graduado em Educação Física pela Universidade de Brasília. Graduado em Pedagogia pela Faculdade Aberta do Tocantins. Pós-graduado em Educação Infantil e Alfabetização pela Faculdade Catedral.

© 2026 The authors
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License — CC BY 4.0

Resumo:
Este artigo analisa como a Política Nacional de Cuidados (Lei nº 15.069/2024) e o Plano Nacional de Cuidados (Decreto nº 12.562/2025 e Portaria Conjunta nº 35/2025) posicionam as famílias e a educação infantil na organização social do cuidado das crianças. Com base no diamante do cuidado e na compreensão de família e escola como contextos de desenvolvimento, a pesquisa qualitativa e documental empregou análise de conteúdo em duas fases, complementada por dados sobre o atendimento em creches. Os resultados mostram que o marco rompe com o familismo ao reconhecer as cuidadoras não remuneradas como sujeitas de direitos e ao atribuir ao Estado os papéis de provedor, coordenador e promotor de mudança cultural. A educação infantil ocupa lugar central, mas é concebida principalmente como meio de conciliar trabalho remunerado e cuidado, com prioridade para famílias monoparentais femininas. A redistribuição do cuidado dentro das famílias e a parceria entre famílias e instituições educativas são as dimensões menos desenvolvidas.

1 Introduction

In Brazil, as in most of Latin America, the care of young children has historically been treated as a private matter of families, and within families, of women. Public provision of early childhood education for children under four expanded slowly and unequally: in 2024, only 41.2% of children aged 0 to 3 attended a crèche, well below the 50% target set by the 2014–2024 National Education Plan, and the gap between the richest and the poorest fifths of the population widened from 22 to 29.4 percentage points between 2016 and 2024 (Todos Pela Educação, 2025). In 2025, coverage reached 43.3%, the highest level on record, but still short of the old target (Todos Pela Educação, 2026).

Between 2024 and 2025, the Brazilian State introduced a framework that explicitly challenges the private framing of care. Law 15,069 of 23 December 2024 established the National Care Policy, recognising care as a right that encompasses the right to be cared for, the right to care and the right to self-care, and setting social and gender co-responsibility for care as a guiding principle (Brasil, 2024). Decree 12,562 of 23 July 2025 regulated the National Care Plan, and a joint ordinance issued in December 2025 set out 79 actions organised into five axes for the period 2025–2027, with an estimated investment of about R$ 25 billion (Brasil, 2025a, 2025b). Children and adolescents, with special attention to early childhood, are among the priority groups, alongside unpaid carers.

This framework matters for the study of human development in family and educational systems. Developmental psychology understands the family and the school, including early childhood settings, as the main contexts in which children develop, and holds that the quality of the relationships between them shapes children's trajectories (Bronfenbrenner, 1996; Dessen & Polonia, 2007). Care policy, in turn, defines how responsibilities for young children are distributed among families, the State, the market and the community, a distribution that the feminist literature has called the social organisation of care (Razavi, 2007). How a national care policy positions families and early childhood education therefore shapes the developmental ecology of young children and the living conditions of those who care for them.

This article continues a series of documentary studies that examine public policies as arrangements that distribute responsibilities among family, school and the State. Its aim is to analyse how Brazil's National Care Policy and Plan position families and early childhood education in the social organisation of child care, drawing on the care diamond framework and on the understanding of family and school as developmental contexts. Two research questions guide the study:

© 2026 The authors
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License — CC BY 4.0

1. What roles do the policy documents assign to families, the State, the market and the community in the care of young children, and what place do they give to early childhood education?
2. To what extent do the documents translate the principle of social and gender co-responsibility into concrete arrangements that change the relationship between families and educational settings?

The article is organised in six further sections: the policy context, the theoretical framework, the method, the results, the discussion and the conclusion.

2 Policy context

The Brazilian Constitution of 1988 established crèches and preschools as a duty of the State and a right of children and their families, and the 1996 Education Law incorporated them into basic education as its first stage. Since 2009, schooling has been compulsory from age four, but attendance at crèche for children under four remains optional for families and a duty of municipalities to offer on demand. The Legal Framework for Early Childhood (Law 13,257/2016) reinforced the priority of the first six years of life and the role of families in early development (Brasil, 2016a).

Despite these advances, access to crèches has remained limited and stratified. According to an analysis of the Continuous National Household Sample Survey, 30.6% of children in the poorest fifth of the population attended crèche in 2024, compared with 60% of those in the richest fifth (Todos Pela Educação, 2025). Among infants aged 0 and 1, attendance was 18.6%, while among children aged 2 and 3 it reached 62.4%. The new National Education Plan, approved in 2026, raised the target for crèche attendance to 60% of children up to three years old (Brasil, 2026).

The National Care Policy emerged in this context from an interministerial working group coordinated by the Ministry of Development and Social Assistance, Family and Fight against Hunger and the Ministry of Women. Law 15,069/2024 defines care as a right, a form of work and a need, and lists as priority groups children and adolescents, with special attention to early childhood; older people and persons with disabilities who need support; paid care workers; and unpaid carers (Brasil, 2024). Among its principles are social and gender co-responsibility, the interdependence between those who care and those who are cared for, equity and non-discrimination.

Decree 12,562/2025 instituted the National Care Plan, defined its governance through a strategic committee and a management committee, and organised its actions into five axes, which include guaranteeing rights for those who need care and for those who provide it without pay; reconciling paid work with care needs and family responsibilities; cultural transformation towards a fairer social organisation of care; and governance and management of the plan (Brasil, 2025a). The action plan, published in December 2025, comprises 79 actions and 17 action strategies involving more than 20 federal bodies (Brasil, 2025b). Among the actions highlighted by the government are the expansion of places in crèches, preschools and full-time schools, giving priority to single-mother households and vulnerable populations, and the creation of cuidotecas, free care spaces for children in universities, federal institutes and municipalities. States and municipalities may join the plan voluntarily and receive technical support to prepare local care plans.

© 2026 The authors
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License — CC BY 4.0

3 Theoretical framework

3.1 The social organisation of care

Feminist scholarship has shown that care, understood as the set of activities that sustain daily life and the reproduction of people, has been historically assigned to women and rendered invisible as work (Tronto, 1993). Esping-Andersen (1999) introduced the concepts of familialism and defamilialisation to describe the extent to which welfare regimes rely on families for care or, conversely, reduce families' care burden through public services and transfers. Latin American welfare regimes have been characterised as strongly familialist, with women absorbing the gaps left by limited public provision.

Razavi (2007) proposed the care diamond as a tool for analysing how care responsibilities are distributed among four institutional spheres: the family or household, the State, the market and the community, including non-profit organisations. The configuration of the diamond varies across countries and over time and has direct consequences for gender equality and for the quality of care received by children. A policy that declares social co-responsibility for care can be assessed by examining whether, and how, it shifts the weight of the diamond away from families, and within families, away from women.

3.2 Family and early childhood education as developmental contexts

Bronfenbrenner's (1996) ecological model conceives development as the outcome of progressively more complex interactions between the child and the people, objects and symbols in their immediate settings, which are in turn shaped by the relationships among settings and by wider social conditions. For young children, the family and the early childhood setting are the two main microsystems, and the relationship between them, the mesosystem, is crucial: development is favoured when there is two-way communication, mutual trust and shared goals between settings (Dessen & Polonia, 2007).

Care policy acts on the exosystem and macrosystem of the child. Parental working hours, the availability of crèches and the cultural norms about who should care for children shape the time, energy and resources available for proximal processes within the family. Research on early childhood has also shown that high-quality early education yields substantial developmental and social returns, particularly for disadvantaged children (Heckman, 2006). From this perspective, early childhood education is not merely a service that frees parents for paid work, but a developmental context in its own right, whose articulation with the family determines its effects.

3.3 Two meanings of crèche in public policy

Brazilian research on early childhood education has long identified a tension between two meanings of the crèche: as a social assistance service intended to free mothers for work, and as an educational institution and a right of the child (Rosemberg, 2002). This tension is relevant for a care policy, which may frame crèches primarily as a means of reconciling women's paid work and care, or as part of children's right to education and development. The analysis considers which of these meanings predominates in the documents and how it affects the family–school relationship.

4 Method

© 2026 The authors
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License — CC BY 4.0

This is a qualitative documentary study. Documentary research allows the analysis of records produced by the State and the reconstruction of the conceptions that guide public action, without the mediation of interviews (Cellard, 2008). The documents were treated as normative arrangements that prefigure roles and relationships among families, the State, the market, the community and educational settings, rather than as descriptions of what actually happens in households and crèches.

4.1 Corpus

The main corpus comprises the three federal instruments that structure Brazil's care framework, presented in Table 1. The complementary corpus includes official government summaries of the plan's actions and secondary data on early childhood education coverage drawn from the Continuous National Household Sample Survey, as analysed by Todos Pela Educação (2025, 2026).

Table 1

Documents in the main corpus

Document	Date	Content analysed
Law 15,069 (National Care Policy)	23 Dec. 2024	Concept of care, principles, objectives, priority groups, co-responsibility
Decree 12,562 (National Care Plan)	23 Jul. 2025	Objectives, priority groups, axes, governance and federative adhesion
Joint Ordinance MDS/MMulheres/MDHC 35 (Plan actions)	11 Dec. 2025	Actions, deliverables, responsible bodies and deadlines for 2025–2027

Source: Prepared by the author based on Brasil (2024, 2025a, 2025b).

4.2 Analytical procedures

The analysis followed the three stages of content analysis proposed by Bardin (2011): pre-analysis, exploration of the material and treatment of results. Units of analysis were statements that assign duties, rights, services or expectations to an agent, as well as statements that refer to children, families, unpaid carers, crèches, preschools or schools.

Coding was carried out in two phases, as in the documentary studies on which this design builds. In the first phase, statements were classified according to the sphere of the care diamond to which they refer: family, State, market or community (Razavi, 2007). In the second phase, statements concerning young children were interpreted according to two analytical categories: the meaning attributed to early childhood education, distinguishing reconciliation of work and care from the child's right to education and development (Rosemberg, 2002); and the relationship between family and educational setting, distinguishing substitution, in which the setting replaces family care, from partnership, in which both share developmental goals (Dessen & Polonia, 2007).

Because the study used only publicly available documents, it did not require ethics committee review under Brazilian research regulations for the human and social sciences (Brasil, 2016b). Reliability was pursued through triangulation among the three normative instruments and between them and the secondary data.

5 Results

© 2026 The authors
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License — CC BY 4.0

The results are organised according to the spheres of the care diamond and followed by an analysis of the place of early childhood education in the framework.

5.1 The family: from default provider to holder of rights

The most significant shift in the documents concerns the status of the family. Law 15,069/2024 does not treat the family as the natural provider of care, but recognises unpaid carers as a priority group and holders of rights (Brasil, 2024). The triple definition of the right to care, which includes the right to care and the right to self-care alongside the right to be cared for, implies that the people who care for children within families are themselves subjects of protection. This represents a break with the familialist tradition described by Esping-Andersen (1999), in which family care is assumed rather than supported.

The principle of gender co-responsibility goes further, recognising that the family is not a homogeneous unit and that care within it falls disproportionately on women. The plan's axis on cultural transformation and the government's campaign on social and gender co-responsibility for care work address this internal inequality (Brasil, 2025a). Changes to labour and social security rules that would redistribute care within families, however, appear in the plan mainly as objects of mapping and study within the strategy for revising the regulatory framework, rather than as immediate measures (Brasil, 2025b).

5.2 The State: provider, coordinator and promoter of change

The State is assigned three roles. First, it is a provider of services, through the expansion of crèches, preschools and full-time schools, the strengthening of health and social assistance services and the creation of cuidotecas. Second, it is a coordinator, through interministerial governance and voluntary adhesion by states and municipalities, which may prepare local care plans with federal technical support (Brasil, 2025a). Third, it is a promoter of cultural change, through campaigns and training. The scale of the commitment, about R$ 25 billion until 2027, is significant, although the documents analysed do not break down how much of this amount is allocated specifically to early childhood education.

5.3 The market and the community: named but secondary

The private sector and civil society are named as co-responsible for care in the policy's framing, which describes the right to care as being implemented in partnership with families, the private sector and civil society. In the documents analysed, however, the obligations of employers and of community organisations are less specified than those of the State. The market appears mainly as an employer of paid care workers, whose working conditions the policy seeks to improve, and as a potential partner in reconciling paid work and family responsibilities. The community appears through participation in policy formulation and through partnerships with civil society organisations.

5.4 Early childhood education in the care framework

Early childhood education occupies a central place in the plan's actions, but its meaning is predominantly that of reconciliation between paid work and care. The expansion of crèche places is presented with priority for single-mother households and

© 2026 The authors
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License — CC BY 4.0

vulnerable populations, which links access to the care needs of adults, particularly mothers, rather than exclusively to the developmental needs of children (Brasil, 2025b). The cuidotecas follow the same logic: they are free spaces to receive children while their parents or carers study or work in universities, federal institutes and municipalities.

This framing has clear redistributive merit, since it targets the households in which the lack of crèche places most constrains women's participation in paid work and in education. It also responds to the stark inequality in access, with 30.6% coverage among the poorest children compared with 60% among the richest (Todos Pela Educação, 2025). The documents, however, say little about the educational quality of these settings or about their relationship with families. Neither the law nor the decree establishes guidelines for communication between crèches and families, for joint developmental goals or for the integration between cuidotecas and the early childhood education system. The relationship prefigured between family and educational setting is predominantly one of substitution, in which the setting takes charge of the child while the adult is absent, rather than one of partnership. Table 2 summarises the findings.

Table 2
Distribution of care responsibilities for young children in Brazil's care framework

Sphere	Role assigned	Main instruments	Gaps identified
Family	Unpaid carers recognised as rights holders; target of co-responsibility campaigns	Law 15,069/2024; Decree 12,562/2025	Redistribution within families (e.g. leave arrangements) referred to future regulatory review
State	Provider of crèches, schools and cuidotecas; coordinator of federative adhesion; promoter of cultural change	Decree 12,562/2025; Joint Ordinance 35/2025	Budget for early childhood education not specified; adhesion is voluntary
Market	Employer of paid carers; partner in reconciling work and care	Law 15,069/2024	Employer obligations weakly specified
Community	Participant in formulation; partner in implementation	Law 15,069/2024	Roles not specified in concrete actions
Early childhood education	Means of reconciling work and care, prioritising single mothers	Joint Ordinance 35/2025	Little attention to educational quality and to family–setting partnership

Source: Prepared by the author based on Brasil (2024, 2025a, 2025b).

6 Discussion

Brazil's care framework represents a significant conceptual shift. By defining care as a right with three dimensions and by recognising unpaid carers as rights holders, the law moves away from the familialist assumption that families, and women within them, will absorb the care needs left unmet by public provision (Esping-Andersen, 1999). In terms of the care diamond, the framework seeks to shift weight from the family towards the State and, to a lesser extent, towards the market and the community (Razavi, 2007). The expansion of crèche places targeted at single-mother households is the clearest expression of this shift, as it directly relieves the women who bear the heaviest care burden.

© 2026 The authors
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License — CC BY 4.0

The analysis also reveals limits. The first concerns the pace and instruments of redistribution within families. Gender co-responsibility is affirmed as a principle and pursued through cultural campaigns, but measures that would change the incentives for men to share care, such as reforms in leave arrangements, are referred to future regulatory review. Tronto (1993) argued that care becomes a matter of justice only when its distribution is treated as a political question; the Brazilian framework takes this step at the level of principles, but the instruments that would redistribute care inside households remain the least developed.

The second limit, and the most relevant for the study of human development, concerns the meaning attributed to early childhood education. The framework predominantly treats crèches and cuidotecas as means of reconciling adults' paid work and care. This is a legitimate and necessary goal, but it reproduces the tension identified by Rosemberg (2002) between the crèche as a service for working mothers and the crèche as a right of the child. From the perspective of the ecological model, the crèche is not simply a place where the child stays while the adult is away; it is a microsystem in which proximal processes occur, and whose developmental effects depend on its quality and on its relationship with the family (Bronfenbrenner, 1996). Evidence on early childhood interventions suggests that their returns depend heavily on quality (Heckman, 2006). A care policy that expands places without attention to educational quality and to the family–setting relationship risks expanding custodial care rather than developmental opportunities.

The third limit concerns the mesosystem. When the documents frame the crèche as a substitute for family care during working hours, the relationship between family and educational setting is implicitly defined as sequential rather than collaborative: the family hands over the child, the setting returns the child. Dessen and Polonia (2007) emphasise that family and school share educational functions and that development is favoured by two-way communication and shared goals. For families in the priority groups, often single mothers with long working hours, the conditions for this kind of partnership are particularly fragile. Care policy could contribute to building them, for instance by supporting flexible times for family participation in crèches or by integrating cuidotecas into the pedagogical frameworks of early childhood education, but these possibilities are not explored in the documents analysed.

Finally, the voluntary nature of state and municipal adhesion raises concerns about equity. Crèche provision is a municipal responsibility, and the municipalities with the lowest coverage are often those with the weakest fiscal and administrative capacity. Without binding commitments or targeted funding, the national care framework may reproduce the territorial inequalities it seeks to reduce. The new National Education Plan's target of 60% crèche coverage offers an opportunity for articulation between care and education policies, but the documents analysed do not establish explicit links between the two plans.

7 Conclusion

This article analysed how Brazil's National Care Policy and Plan position families and early childhood education in the social organisation of child care. In response to the first research question, the documents recognise unpaid carers as rights holders, assign the State the roles of provider, coordinator and promoter of cultural change, name the

© 2026 The authors
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License — CC BY 4.0

market and the community as co-responsible without specifying their obligations in detail, and give early childhood education a central place, framed mainly as a means of reconciling paid work and care. In response to the second question, the principle of social and gender co-responsibility is translated into concrete arrangements mainly through the expansion of public services targeted at the most burdened households; redistribution within families and the construction of partnerships between families and educational settings remain the least developed dimensions.

Several implications follow. First, the expansion of crèches under the care framework should be explicitly linked to the quality standards and pedagogical frameworks of early childhood education, so that new places become developmental opportunities and not only custodial solutions. Second, care policy could support the family–setting relationship, for example by promoting flexible arrangements that allow working parents, especially single mothers, to participate in the life of crèches. Third, the regulatory review foreseen in the plan should prioritise measures that redistribute care within families, such as leave arrangements that encourage men's involvement. Fourth, the articulation between the National Care Plan and the new National Education Plan should be made explicit, with shared targets and funding for crèche expansion in municipalities with the lowest coverage.

The study has limitations. Documentary analysis reveals what policies prefigure but not how families, educators and municipalities experience them, and the plan's implementation had just begun at the time of writing. The analysis relied on the official summaries of the plan's actions and did not examine local care plans or municipal regulations. Future research could investigate how municipalities that join the plan articulate care and early childhood education, how cuidotecas operate in practice and how they relate to families, and how single mothers in priority groups experience the new services.

Brazil has taken an important step by recognising care as a right and a collective responsibility. For young children, the next step is to ensure that care policy and education policy converge, so that the settings created to relieve families also become contexts in which children develop in partnership with those families.

References

Bardin, L. (2011). *Análise de conteúdo* [Content analysis]. Edições 70.

Brasil. (2016a). *Lei nº 13.257, de 8 de março de 2016* [Legal Framework for Early Childhood]. Presidência da República.

Brasil. (2016b). *Resolução nº 510, de 7 de abril de 2016* [Resolution on ethical standards for research in the human and social sciences]. Conselho Nacional de Saúde.

Brasil. (2024). *Lei nº 15.069, de 23 de dezembro de 2024: Institui a Política Nacional de Cuidados* [Establishes the National Care Policy]. Presidência da República. https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2023-2026/2024/Lei/L15069.htm

Brasil. (2025a). *Decreto nº 12.562, de 23 de julho de 2025: Regulamenta o art. 9º e o art. 11 da Lei nº 15.069, de 23 de dezembro de 2024, que institui o Plano Nacional de Cuidados* [Regulates the National Care Plan]. Presidência da República. https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2023-2026/2025/decreto/d12562.htm

Brasil. (2025b). *Portaria Conjunta MDS/MMulheres/MDHC nº 35, de 11 de dezembro de 2025: Estabelece as ações do Plano Nacional de Cuidados* [Sets out the actions of the National

© 2026 The authors
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License — CC BY 4.0

Care Plan]. Ministério do Desenvolvimento e Assistência Social, Família e Combate à Fome; Ministério das Mulheres; Ministério dos Direitos Humanos e da Cidadania.

Brasil. (2026). *Lei nº 15.388, de 14 de abril de 2026: Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação* [Approves the National Education Plan]. Presidência da República.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1996). *A ecologia do desenvolvimento humano: Experimentos naturais e planejados* [The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design]. Artes Médicas.

Cellard, A. (2008). A análise documental [Documentary analysis]. In J. Poupart et al., *A pesquisa qualitativa: Enfoques epistemológicos e metodológicos* (pp. 295–316). Vozes.

Dessen, M. A., & Polonia, A. C. (2007). A família e a escola como contextos de desenvolvimento humano [Family and school as contexts of human development]. *Paidéia*, *17*(36), 21–32.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). *Social foundations of postindustrial economies*. Oxford University Press.

Heckman, J. J. (2006). Skill formation and the economics of investing in disadvantaged children. *Science*, *312*(5782), 1900–1902.

Razavi, S. (2007). *The political and social economy of care in a development context: Conceptual issues, research questions and policy options* (Gender and Development Programme Paper No. 3). United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Rosemberg, F. (2002). Organizações multilaterais, Estado e políticas de educação infantil [Multilateral organisations, the State and early childhood education policies]. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, (115), 25–63.

Todos Pela Educação. (2025). *Panorama do acesso à educação infantil no Brasil* [Overview of access to early childhood education in Brazil]. https://todospelaeducacao.org.br/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/estudo-panorama-do-acesso-a-educacao-infantil-no-brasil-todos-pela-educacao.pdf

Todos Pela Educação. (2026). *PNAD 2025: Acesso à educação infantil no Brasil* [PNAD 2025: Access to early childhood education in Brazil]. https://todospelaeducacao.org.br/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2026/07/pnad-2025-acesso-a-educacao-infantil-no-brasil-todos-pela-educacao.pdf

Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. Routledge.