



Experience Report

The observation of the everyday school life in the formative praxis

Elaine Conte¹, Adilson Cristiano Habowsky², Lilian Soares Alves Branco³,
Míriam Benites Rios⁴

Universidade La Salle (UNILASALLE), Canoas-RS, Brazil

Abstract

The work presents some reflections extracted from a hermeneutic and ethnographic experience, whose objective is to understand the daily school based on the observations made by undergraduate students from different undergraduate courses in schools of Canoas/RS, Brazil. This is a collective investigation, developed in the first semester of 2016, in the disciplines of Didactics and Curricula and Programs. From a pre-established script, we verified the Pedagogical Political Project, the methodological approach and the planning adopted by teachers in schools, as well as the educational models and routines identified. The dialectical movement between the school routine and the university education allowed articulating teaching and research, enhancing the reflective exercise of the evaluation of contexts and praxis. Based on the reports presented in class, it was possible to discuss and reevaluate that the changes in education go through social engagement and recognition of pedagogical contexts as a way to approximate the academic formation of the perplexities, tensions and contradictions of Praxis.

Keywords: Observation, School daily life, Pedagogical praxis.

Introduction

The study presents an analytical-theoretical reflection from the experiences of everyday school *observation*⁵ derived from common subjects to undergraduate courses (teacher training and political and social practices) as a place that promotes

¹ Professor of the Graduate Program in Education - PPGED/UNILASALLE/Canoas/RS. Leader of the Center for Studies on Technologies in Education - NETE/CNPq.

ORCID iD: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0204-0757> Email: elaine.conte@unilasalle.edu.br

² Master student in Education at La Salle University - UNILASALLE. CAPES Fellow and member of the NETE/CNPq research group.

ORCID iD: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5378-7981> Email: adilsonhabowski@hotmail.com

³ Master student in Education from La Salle University. Scholarship CAPES/PROSUP and Member of the Center for Studies on Technologies in Education - NETE/CNPq.

ORCID iD: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6629-6006> Email: lilian.sab@gmail.com

⁴ Master's student in Education, La Salle University Graduate Program. Scholarship CAPES/PROSUP and member of the Center for Studies on Technologies in Education - NETE/CNPq.

ORCID iD: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4788-0661> Email: miriambrios@gmail.com

⁵Parra & Hernandez (2019) propose a methodology for classroom observation, to address the epistemological limitations of the main observation models in relation to the professionalization of educators, because working with observation implies not only identifying patterns in classroom events, but opening investigative spaces and collaborative dialogues.

and transforms knowledge and the implications of understanding these contexts. to educational experiences (CERTEAU, 2014; PARRA; HERNANDEZ, 2019). Students in the Didactics and Curriculum and Program subjects were challenged, in the first semester of 2016, to understand the daily life of the classroom with an immersion in praxis, seeking to inquire about the characteristics of schools, as well as to understand and evaluate the field. as part of a social totality, including the possibility of giving visibility to pedagogical praxis, the Pedagogical Political Project (PPP) of schools and the planning of teachers of basic education.

The experiment was initially carried out at a community university, located in Canoas / RS and the field work implemented in free choice municipal, state and private school spaces, weaving relationships with the knowledge and daily life of the school to enhance and dialogue with one's own higher education. After the field research were elaborated reports by the academics and collective debates in their final presentations. The objective was to demonstrate the contribution of fieldwork to review the knowledge of basic school daily life, through the analysis of the perception of university students regarding the subjects of Didactics and Curricula and Programs. The research aimed to understand the potentialities of school daily life to rethink the theories and pedagogical praxis, for the re-elaboration of the tensions present between the theoretical-practical horizons and the political-curricular strategies studied in the subjects.

It is about bringing the theoretical-formative conceptions closer to concrete actions, aiming to reflect on the (re) construction of methodologies and the projection of political-educational strategies that relate to the principles of criticism and continuous self-assessment. These processes are fundamental for undergraduates to recognize the knowledge necessary for educational practices and to give meaning to the theoretical knowledge of the subjects revealed in thinking about the different contexts experienced in schools, the formation of professionals in articulation with the pedagogical coordination. , subsidizing the construction of interactions and formative correlations. Often, the very logic of academic education isolates what needs to be discussed in the disciplines, from the contexts in which they are generated, causing certain paradoxes that hierarchize and enclose the conceptions of practices.

The pedagogical procedures, based on the school network, developed to the point of abandoning as useless or breaking the teaching staff that perfected them for two centuries. [...] In short, everything happens in Education as if the way to implement it technically if it had been carried out excessively, eliminating the content that gave it the possibility of being and, since then, loses its social utility. (CERTEAU, 2014, p. 238, emphasis added)

It is worth remembering in this text that the planning of academic disciplines had two distinct moments. In the first quarter, the current didactic conceptions and curricula and programs were presented and rethought, according to the basic references of the subjects, through dialogued expository classes, group discussions and dialogues with Rubem Alves "The Vulture Curriculum" (ALVES, 2000) and other Stories of Who Loves to Teach. In the second quarter, field observations were made about what was studied and the current perspectives of daily school life, in view of the existing challenges and based on the language and perspective of the undergraduate students involved in praxis visualization. in the relational fields of sociability.

This study is relevant because it enables the recognition of the different classroom contexts in the observed schools, articulated with the ongoing university education, which integrates teaching, research and extension, fundamental processes for the construction of critical teacher education, as well as the necessary knowledge. to the educational practice, emphasizing that these practices need to occur not only in the moments of the obligatory stages of the undergraduate degrees. Mutual recognition of the necessary revision and updating of pedagogical praxis implies overcoming the Manicheans and the centralization of pedagogical practices, in an attempt to re-elaborate cooperative actions through interdependence, which brings together “theory practice, freedom authority, ignorance of knowledge, respect. to the teacher respecting the students, teaching to learn” (FREIRE, 1996, p. 106-107).

Methodological Paths

Based on the ethnographic perspective of school practice, we come into direct contact with the situation studied and the people selected, through observation that allows the transition between observation and analysis, between theory and empirics, to obtain data (ANDRÉ, 2008). This type of research proposes the description of the school field in a dynamic and unfinished process, conferring authority on the community and those who cooperate and talk with each other, by collecting data on values, habits, beliefs, practices, languages, meanings, relationship theory. and practice and behaviors of the group in question, contributing to the (re) elaboration of meanings to human existence, thinking about the reconfiguration of conceptions through social knowledge.

Baptista and Cunha (2007, p. 173) say that qualitative research “tends to apply a more holistic approach than the quantitative method. In addition, it pays more attention to the subjective aspects of human experience and behavior.” The ethnographic research takes into account the daily school life and implies an exploratory research, whose purpose is to bring the researcher closer to the culture studied. This is how we come into direct contact with different school situations through observation, which allows us to move between observations and analysis, between theory and empiricism, to obtain data that can be resignified in the hermeneutic dimension. This type of research proposes the description of the context in a dynamic and unfinished process, conferring authority on the community and those who cooperate and dialogue intersubjectively, by collecting data on values, habits, beliefs, practices, languages, meanings, relationships and behaviors of the group in question. collaborating for the (re) elaboration of meanings to the collective existence. Baptista and Cunha (2007, p. 173) argue that observation “is a method by which the researcher captures the reality to be analyzed. It can be: spontaneous unstructured; non-systematic participant observation; systematic observation”. Given these characterizations, the study is also free, spontaneous and semi-structured, in view of the passage from the immediate experience of the world to the symbolic.

In addition, we explore a “hermeneutic-reconstructive-critical framework” that takes “the theory-practice relationship as communicative praxis, as a concrete process that is effectively experienced in the daily life of each individual, motivated by natural interests and historical-social needs.” (MÜHL, 2003, p. 267). We aim to promote a fusion of horizons to enter the interpretive universe and seek the meanings of discourses and texts that also escape the law of each text produced by

the thinkers of the social environment. Thus, the "hermeneutic attitude arouses different world views and discourses as inspiring and disturbing questions to continue the educational dialogue with the differences and the plurality of ways of thinking, feeling and acting in the world." (HABOWSKI; CONTE; PUGENS, 2018, p. 183). Hence the hermeneutic dimension comes from openness to everyday language, which gives rise to new meanings for the political dimension of giving voice to others, reevaluating what is good and right in community life and giving rise to new texts, which are products of collective action. in circular processes of culture and in comprehensive interdependence in dialogue.

The work took place in the process and dynamics of institutional relations, whose concern guided the meaning and the sense of sociocultural factors and involved a fieldwork of the actors (undergraduates), the description of the collected data and the formulation of hypotheses, in an open study, flexible and constantly rebuilt, resonating with concerns raised in this essay. Gamboa (2007, p. 100) states that "the objects of research need to be understood, that is, research consists in capturing the meaning of phenomena, knowing or unraveling their meaning or their senses, clarifying that understanding supposes an interpretation, a way to know their meanings".

Observation practice in schools was conducted in May 2016 and considered for analysis, the data collected by 70 undergraduate students in different undergraduate courses (Pedagogy, Physical Education, Biological Sciences, History, Geography), enrolled in the disciplines of "Didactics" (41 academics) and "Curricula and Programs" (29 academics). Therefore, it was the 70 undergraduates who performed the observation and collection of information in the schools. The level of education analyzed was Basic Education (Kindergarten, Elementary and High School), in which the university students were inserted and it was the undergraduates who made the selection of the schools. The selection criteria were based on their proximity to their residence or because they attended these schools, or because they already work in these educational institutions.

To carry out the observation, we developed a common script to be followed by all 70 undergraduates who performed the observation, as follows: 1) Verify the Political-Pedagogical Projects (as they are described; what elements make up; describe the conception of education adopted); 2) Observe the teacher's dynamics, strategies, methodologies and planning evidence. Thus, the undergraduates had to write a report of the activities and then made the oral presentation of the observations to the classmates and it was from there that we performed the analysis and discussed the data. Baptista and Cunha (2007, p. 181) state that content analysis "seeks a situation already defined a priori, uses a text to demonstrate this existence of the theoretical basis of the situation analyzed".

As we move forward in our reflection we realize that the reading, observation, collective reflection, to read and re-observe, to experience at university and school, the feeling of being a teacher in praxis, effectively benefits the advances of plural knowledge in projects from diverse and potentially creative social worlds. The content of this research initially discusses the issue of pedagogical praxis, based on Vázquez (1997), the Pedagogical Political Project (PPP) as a principle for the democratic management of the school, with Gadotti (2000) and Sacristán (1999; 2001), and the educational act as a possibility to produce singular and historical subjects, in an unfinished projection, with Saviani (2008) and Freire (1980; 1987; 1996; 2006). In conclusion, we resume the study made as a pretext that seeks new meanings to the

pedagogical work and the relevance for undergraduates about observation in the school field.

The pedagogical praxis

Discussing pedagogical praxis is challenging, not only for academics who are in the formative movement, but also for teachers, who need to self-assess their own practice to try to detect problems, find conflicts and reflect on experiences. renewal and pedagogical transformation. In fact, confronting the educational relationship in practice implies rethinking pedagogical praxis, analyzing the political meaning of our actions and attitudes in the face of the other's thinking, considering that we have the power to influence students to intervene in reality. Vázquez (1997, p. 158-159) understands that education enables human beings to “move from the realm of shadow, from superstition, to the realm of reason. To educate is to transform humanity. The task of transforming humanity is left to educators who, in turn, do not transform themselves, and whose mission is to transform others”.

Praxis gives us an interpretation of the world, which implies reconciling the demands of historically constructed pedagogical praxis with the demands of daily professional activity. Praxis occurs in the world of life and has a real and objective meaning in daily life, where people interact through social representations, positions and even (self) alienation throughout the educational process and can recreate meanings from action and Collective reflection.

[...] praxis presents itself to us as a material, transformative and goal-oriented activity. Outside it is the theoretical activity that does not materialize [...] and the purely material activity, that is, without the production of purposes and knowledge that characterizes the theoretical activity. [...] Determining what praxis is requires further delimiting the relationship between theory and practice. (VAZQUEZ, 1997, p. 208).

Beyond this delimitation of praxis as a coordinator of actions between theories and practices constructed among the agents of the social world, praxis can be understood as a “human material activity that transforms the world and man himself. This real, objective activity is at the same time ideal, subjective and conscious.” (VÁZQUEZ, 1997, p. 394). Thus, it is noteworthy that not every activity is a praxis, if it doesn't develop a modification, a strangeness, a perplexity and relational dialogue of contents or realities, it lies in the mere reproducibility. Education goes beyond contemplation and transmission of knowledge, and the complexity of pedagogical action proves to us that we must not fragment what is happening in a real situation or context.

To recognize the existence of scientific, pedagogical, social and human problems the educator who rethinks his own practice launches possibilities and conversations that allow the strangeness of reality. This is a condition of possibility for the renewal of the world, the transformation of oneself and the other, and derives from this responsible, sensitive orientation that is (re) constructed through the mediation of formative processes and interaction with others. Such a perspective “[...] leads us to new perceptions of the world, since it arises as a possibility of (re) learning that articulates rationality and sensibility, in the recreation and renewal of thinking and acting in the world”. (JACOBI; HABOWSKI; CONTE, 2018, p. 11).

Similarly, it is essential to think of pedagogical praxis as a determining factor for the position of academics, as research teachers, in the dialectic of analysis of social relations expressed in school daily life and in the deepening of institutionalization-dominance-resistance relations (proposal as a way of overcoming the pessimistic theories of sociocultural reproduction, hostage to alienated practices). According to Freire (1996), action is only human when, more than a pure doing, it is a doing that also does not dichotomize from reflection, arousing a critical look in the students so that change occurs collaboratively, from the observed praxis. and lived.

Praxis has many meanings and definitions. For Vázquez (1997), praxis was a term used in ancient Greece that refers to action, here taken up as communicative praxis, but was also related by Aristotle to morality, in which every action follows a moral conduct. It is worth remembering that these meanings are interdependent and one does not exclude the other, because the pedagogical praxis is directly linked to the relationship with the other, with nature, with the world and inserted in a context of educational action and reflection. Then, we can relate praxis with political, moral, ethical, aesthetic action, in short, guides the production of reflections on the research process, for the development of the complexity of pedagogical praxis in an emancipating society. Containing a revolutionary force in the ways of acting in the world, praxis is the condition of overcoming alienated labor. Thinking about the education professional we are forming requires an action of cooperative freedom, with a view to the development of a more just and democratic society, for the formation of a critical, reflective and transformative citizen.

Considering the praxis from the pedagogical intentionalities and projective purposes, what is proposed is (re) know, (re) learn and understand the movement of the real, to help transform the existing conditions in the school daily life. From Vázquez's perspective (1997, p. 318), "in order to reach the sphere of intentional praxis, man's conscious activity aspires to the realization, both in the production of the project from which he departs, and in the practical process of its realization, if in the form of the result, insofar as the object is objectified or materialized". Thus, we consider the importance of theory allied to practice for a social transformation and realization of the subject in the world, based on the reflection on his own practice (effort given to the realization of a project). It will be through the reflection that the teacher has of his practice that it will be possible the ability to (re) know the problem (s) he faces in his practice and outline strategies to overcome the mishaps. The teacher needs to keep alive the symbiosis of teaching and learning together with others (collaborative work because they continue to communicate through students) in order to reflect on their own work, from accomplishment, through what they need to review, to always seek improvement. of projective action.

According to Vázquez (1997), since ancient Greek society, practical activity is neglected in favor of theoretical activity, which has caused the loss of revolutionary strength and the constitutive tension of this relationship, falling into conformism with ends in themselves. After all, both dimensions require effort, habits, annoyances and suffering. For the author,

Between theory and transformative practical activity there is a work of educating the consciences, organizing the material means and concrete plans of action: all this as an indispensable passage for developing real, effective actions. In this sense, a theory is practical in that it materializes, through a series of mediations, what previously existed only ideally, as knowledge of reality or the ideal anticipation of its transformation. (VAZQUEZ, 1997, p. 207).

Thus, we can realize that the teacher needs to have a theoretical basis to justify and plan the practice, as well as to understand the experiences lived during the teaching practice. Reflexivity implies the ability of the teacher to investigate the practice in order to constantly update his teaching action. But, “do we, teachers, have this knowledge? Or to put it another way, do we have validated theoretical references in practice that can not only describe it, but also explain it, and help us understand the processes that are produced in it? (ZABALA, 1998, p. 14).

In the dispersed and disoriented society in which we live, knowledge is belittled by various education professionals, as being something far from practice or mere coercion, being totally at the mercy of external fads. According to Zabala (1998), theoretical knowledge helps to a deeper understanding of the experiences lived in practice and links the teaching work to the political and sociocultural contexts, in the dialectic between instrumental and communicative action, to build a critical school culture conducive to autonomy. Every action of the teacher begins in the daily thinking of the theoretical reflection on the practice, whose experience, if evaluated correctly, leads to changes in practice.

If we understand that the improvement of any human actions depends on knowing and controlling the variables that intervene in them, the fact that the teaching / learning processes are extremely complex - certainly more complex than those of any other profession - does not prevent, but it makes it more necessary for us teachers to have and use references that help us interpret what happens in class. (ZABALA, 1998, p.15).

Certainly, teachers act on educational, ethical, scientific and political principles when dialectically integrating theory and practice. Then, we observe the importance of theoretical support in understanding the situations experienced in the classroom and in the school environment, since the references justify and validate the teaching practice. Everything is interconnected and social transformation arises from these actions that affect students making them aware of the possibilities of educational research in the world, that is, “[...] these experiences must intervene to be as beneficial as possible for development and the maturing of boys and girls”. (ZABALA, 1998, p. 29). Therefore, it is necessary to overcome the verticality and unidirectionality of the pedagogical actions that limit the application of teaching and learning contents, for a reciprocity of action between different moments, generations, discourses and realities.

It is necessary to recognize the research as a scientific and educational principle in the relation with the formative teaching and student practice, proposing the understanding of the lived knowledge and the social role that we play, in the evolution and transformation of the act of teaching and learning always (PUGENS; CONTE; HABOWSKI, 2018). Thus, we need to promote training activities that include the observation and renewal of the teacher's work since the beginning of the course, so that students are faced with different practices and can reflect on school culture, to project new actions to the specificities of education. The idea is that these practices of observation of the educational context are contemplated in the curriculum of the course, so that students can participate in the dilemmas and contradictions in all knowledge (including technological) to overcome difficulties through actions in the contexts. of research and performance. Indeed, knowledge of professional practice helps to reveal hidden curricula and knowledge of pedagogical

experience into which teaching work is integrated. For Lüdke (2001), research is the scientific educational foundation, since without classroom investigation, the teacher's pedagogical work takes a reproductive and passive perspective of teaching, passing on to students' information he received from other authors.

It is the proper scientific formation of teachers that manifests the pedagogical intentionalities and the links between the scientific and educational principles of the craft. It is a scientific and educational principle in teacher education, thinking of a teacher as a researcher who (re)builds shared knowledge among students, with exchanges of knowledge, cultures and different worldviews that students and teachers bring with itself, which involves a process of intersubjective relations that happens through the creation of spaces and situations that promote challenges and questions. This dimension of the pedagogical work requires a broad and professional training making the teacher also a learner, constantly reflecting on his practice, debating with his fellow teachers and researchers, dialoguing with the school community, seeking knowledge necessary for the work that develops.

Clarifying the PPP controversies

Based on the information presented by the undergraduates about the PPP, we show that there are big differences in the schools of Canoas / RS, so that some schools made PPP available, but many denied unjustified access, others said they would send it, but this never happened. Some academics have reported the PPP as loose, isolated or a poorly accessed or available document, generating particular experiences and the lack of agreements on the feasibility of practices with the common goals of training, as well as the fragmentation and unfeasibility of the debate about the issues present in a hidden curriculum of teacher education. Another important fact is that few schools collectively made the construction of the PPP, so the document is dissociated from the pedagogical practice and often forgotten in drawers of the school offices. Considering the importance of the PPP, it is understandable that it should be the north, the guide of this school community that thinks by contradiction, directly influencing the pedagogical praxis. Therefore, investigating and talking about the PPP during the formative processes is essential.

Regarding planning, undergraduates found that many teachers have as pedagogical strategy the articulation between theory and practice, expanding the challenges that lead to mutual recognition, deepening contradictions and valuing cultural differences. However, a minority of teachers use makeshift teaching plans of conformist action and nurtured with the feeling of (in) formed, which emerges as a form of naturalization of banking education processes. The problem is that when we simply repeat the tradition without questioning the daily life, we also close the communication channels to rethink or re-signify what we have learned. Based on these data, we can articulate that the educational action implies a rooting in everyday cultural knowledge to critically dialogue with the distinctions of the pedagogical work process as a way of relearning to see the daily relationships and motivate thinking and dialogue with the conflicting world in order to humanize it.

Luckesi (1992, p. 121) points out that "planning is a set of actions that are prepared by projecting a certain objective, in other words it is a set of coordinated actions aimed at achieving the expected results more efficiently and economically". Planning is the art of interdependent education, it is the core of reflexive action, but it is only possible through the evaluation of the educational process, which involves examination, self-knowledge and reflection on ideologies, values, contents, interests,

especially in educational field of action with the other. “The basic intent of planning is to allow for a more meaningful and transformative dialogic self-assessment and openness work at school and in the world, because planning is the result of a process of reflection and decision making”. (AZAMBUJA; CONTE; HABOWSKI, 2017, p. 159).

The ambiguity that we point out in this reflection reveals that the democratic management of communication processes is a condition for the school to become a space for knowledge exchange, since the participation, mutual respect and commitment of teachers can enable the critical exercise of authorship, which leads to the apprehension of the world. If education is discredited, teachers unmotivated and students disinterested in school, then we should rethink the very theoretical matrices of educational work. It is noteworthy that motivation can be a determining factor for learning, but we have found in some observations its inexistence, due to the decontextualized and abstracted teaching of reality. The idea of projecting oneself into the learners' worlds, the problematization of the community and the reflection on the technical-scientific interests that drive the vital praxis is not even considered or encouraged.

Every project assumes rupture with the present and promises for the future. Projecting means trying to break a comfortable state to risk, go through a period of instability, and seek stability on the promise that each project contains a better state than the present. An educational project can be taken as a promise against certain disruptions. The promises make visible the possible fields of action, compromising their actors and authors. (GADOTTI, 2000, p. 37).

But, according to academics' perceptions, around PPPs operate only legal formalisms and, therefore, should be revised to meet their own knowledge of the world as unfinished and in constant reconstruction. It seems that PPP is a task and social responsibility of the school as a starting point, not representing a solution, but the possibility of dealing with problems of the formal logic of pedagogical action.

Building it means seeing and assuming education as a process of insertion in the world of life, of forming convictions, affects, motivations, meanings, values and desires, where the teaching-learning processes are conceived as linked processes of acquisition of language skills, cognitive and integrative action. (GADOTTI, 2000, p. 68).

Thus, a PPP is endowed with intentions and actions, and the first of its dimensions comprises the commitment to the formation of a field in interrelations with society. This political dimension also includes the art of governing or acting with others, an attitude that can be observed in practical actions and in the organization of pedagogical work. However, education is a political act, inseparable from social practices and experiences, developed in everyday school relations, whether in lesson plans, methodology or assessments, in short, this political dimension is present in all pedagogical praxis. It is worth remembering that a PPP allows the knowledge of theories, conceptions, ways of reading, interpreting reality and acting in contexts, also encompassing the political and curricular plan of socio-educational configuration in formation, as a condition of overcoming the formal logic in articulation of dialectical learning.

If the concrete reality precedes the process of knowledge and elaboration of the schools' PPP, we know that uniting all this complexity is not an easy task, but it is thinking and building together that we will develop the principle of a democratic and participative management, reducing the forms of centralization of power arising by decree (we cite as an example the recent shock of nine-year education). But the construction of the PPP requires time for the maturation of collective ideas, so that authoritarianism does not stand out from the main issues of a democratic and dialogical pedagogy, arousing the sense of belonging to a community. PPP, as the propellant of a democratic school becomes a strategy of complexity and reorganizing action of a concrete and rethought project, which seeks to face conflicts, exclusions and marginalization, to know how to deal with cultural diversity and respect the singularities of a project based on a pedagogical work.

Education should be concerned with stimulating differentiations that do not imply inequalities among students; It should make the common curriculum and equal school for all compatible with the possibility of acquiring unique identities, which means prioritizing the freedom of subjects to learn. (SACRISTÁN, 2001, p. 77).

Such an epistemology should be concerned with the context of justification, since the educator's role is to enhance the learning of each student (of the human condition), articulating with social conversations, since “through the actions that perform the education, the teachers manifest themselves and transform what happens in the world”. (SACRISTÁN, 1999, p. 31). It is this (self) critical approach to the challenges of education that we want to arouse in undergraduates, which, like PPP, must align with the school reality. These recontextualizations are essential to better understand the theory-practice relationship in teacher education in academic spaces and to promote a dialectical articulation of these instances in social recognition, without abandoning the concern with the contents. It is also up to education to incorporate the transformative trends to create conditions for all students to have a critical, communicative, reflective and engaged formation with the school reality, developing citizens who propose an educational transformation of society, with respect to cultural differences, thus learning the to (re) build on this social complexity as a starting point.

Subject, education and school conceptions

From an analysis of the construction of the PPP, the pedagogical praxis, the lesson plans, the planning and the methodologies, we think about the process of human and educational formation linking the academics we are constituting and projecting to the world.

The search for effective approximation between social theories and practices must be present during the realization of what is educational and be based on the finding that in today's society there is a very large gap between the contents of the promises of equality and their respective achievements. There is no way to be quiet before the dissimulation of the current formative process that, from the beginning, pleases the semi formation (damaged culture) as justification for the perpetuation of the process of industrialization of

culture, the submission of theory in relation to practice. (CONTE, 2016, p. 894).

Continuing the analysis, we launched the following question: How to reaffirm an open and critical-reflexive look at the educational context and social transformations to contribute to the process of pedagogical formation? We need to awaken the potential of these professionals for the complexity, incompleteness and multiple articulations of educational praxis. Thus, the formative and social processes only make sense through a problematizing and critical social education of contents, directed to the challenge of pedagogical paradigms, which tend to instrumentalize communication and social praxis through activism of the (re) know itself. Therefore, being a teacher is a process that implies constructions of meaning in the social world and learning from constant revision and reformulation of discourses, prejudices, texts, technologies and multiple sources as a way to validate the process of teaching and learning, in a field of tensions and formative interdependence. Freire (1996, p. 13) states that,

Among us men and women, the inconclusion that recognizes itself necessarily implies the insertion of the unfinished subject in a permanent social search process. Historical-socio-cultural, women and men, we become beings in which curiosity, surpassing the limits that are peculiar to it in the vital domain, becomes the founder of the production of knowledge.

A participative subject, author and creator of his own history, curious, who (re) builds together with the other new knowledge, through dialogical and social recognition, cannot live conditioned by the implementation of decontextualized policies by school referents. In this sense, the ability to dialogue transcends naive conceptions of merely showing what and how something is happening, posing other questions that involve the knowledge-power relationship, with its paradoxes and contradictions, as a way of life and language. Thus, saying and pronouncing the world implies constant (re) creation of oneself in relation to otherness, which is not possible with absolutization of answers or without a suggestive openness to change and improve the current situation.

[...] It is the meeting between men, mediated by the world, to designate it. If, in saying his words, in calling to the world, men transform him, dialogue imposes itself as the way in which men find their meaning as men; dialogue is therefore an existential necessity. (FREIRE, 1980, p. 82-83).

Freire (1987) understands that dialogue is necessary to discourage and (re) invent the world, as an element of pedagogical power that, when transforming the world, transforms each other. It is dialogue as the guiding principle that offers us the possibility for hopeful utopia, for there is no dialogue without the hope of change for the advancement and improvement of human lives. For Freire, dialogue becomes openness to the other's gaze, restlessness and curiosity to learn from the other, going beyond the standardization or homogenization of consciousness, "because dialogical subjects not only retain their identity, but defend it and so on grow with

each other. Dialogue, therefore, does not level, does not reduce each other. Neither is it a favor one does to another.” (FREIRE, 2006, p. 118). From this perspective, it is through the relationship of dialogue that begins the act of teaching through participatory research actions and own and collective (re) elaboration, in which we are active, autonomous and motivated to (know) actions, interpretations, as authors of knowledge. This pedagogical dialogue cannot be reduced to a posture of imposing concepts or simply exchanging them, or even, “dialogue cannot become a relaxed chat that marches at random between teacher or student and learner. Pedagogical dialogue implies either the knowable content or object”. (FREIRE, 2006, p. 118).

Dialogue has something liberating and contributes to collective emancipation. Problematizing education contributes to the formation of critical, thinking subjects, as it encourages participants to question the world, to perceive the unfinished human condition and to seek new knowledge. Thus, training critical teachers with the ability to dialogue and make relationships is what will cause changes in education and society, because in developing criticism is no longer an alienated individual and becomes a questioning subject of inequalities and injustices, as it realizes social exclusion and oppression. To paraphrase Charlot (2019, p. 178), we could say that it is “a new anthropological project [of counter-hegemonic practice], in which education articulates the three processes of humanization, socialization and singularity in a logic of solidarity and respect to the dignity of all, [which enables] human adventure in its universal, cultural and unique forms.”

This transformation of the world is only possible through education, because it has the power to change social practices, through a communicative and problematizing process, unveiling the hidden mechanisms of reality. For Saviani (2008), education is a work process, in which the human being needs the production of knowledge for later (consumable) reproduction, and for the new generations to take this knowledge of humanity. The human being is a producer of his existence and this is through work, also through his praxis and culture. In this conception, education has the purpose of (re) production of knowledge, and in this case, teachers become producers of their own knowledge, based on conceptual schemes open to communicative interaction, on which teaching activities depend. Freire (1992) argues that education must be an act of revolutionary freedom at its core, because education is radicalizing through the word that comes from the other the passive, negligent and conformist tendencies of the subject. Therefore, through education we can make and tell other stories, playing our role of inhabiting the world and contributing to social changes and transformations, from the responsibility and understanding of reality and its process of humanization.

It is up to the university to resize the ways of thinking, being a space for debate and discussion, so that the subject is able to educate and transform themselves, organizing a cooperative planning work as a way to develop learning, creating formative possibilities, emphasizing the reality of the students and not subjugating the knowledge built, but seeking the manifestation of thought as something revolutionary in school projects, in order to stimulate research and curiosity. “The school exists, therefore, to provide the acquisition of the instruments that allow the access to the elaborated knowledge (science), as well as the own access to the rudiments of this knowledge. The activities of the elementary school should be organized based on this issue.” (SAVIANI, 2008, p. 15). The school routine is also a place of formation and sociocultural dialogue, related to the problem of science, the socialization of knowledge, so we bet as formative outputs the need to

resume the valorization of social practice, because we need to (re) learn to think, to feel, to know, to research and that matters to education.

These observation and investigation practices should be present throughout the course, in all course disciplines, assisting academics in the analysis of reality, since the task of educating and being a teacher in a context of crisis of pedagogical authority and discredit Regarding their social role and the socio-economic dilemmas they face is no easy task. In fact, the teaching profession is challenging and complex in the face of changes in knowledge, technologies, methodologies and false ideologies of power, which over time constitute the relationship of interdependence between different political and educational areas. The interests of the capitalist system have caused great difficulties for teachers, who need to handle the programmed contents in order to prepare students for the competitive job market to sustain this current competitive system. And the teacher even involuntarily enters this vicious circle of standardization, contributing through his profession, in the propagation of a business school, a pedagogy of results (SAVIANI, 2008). In fact, the demands for effectiveness and production that are made to teachers by various social and educational levels end up reducing the moments of dialogue and experience with otherness, as these are the result of a system of skills and training for the use of materials. ready, enabling teachers to master and operate technologies (for unified evaluations) in the contradictory movement of expansion and cost reduction, forgetting the complexity of what is woven and thought together. The problem is that "in the drive to promote more effective teaching practices in schools, policy makers and practitioners end up sponsoring standardized tools that contribute to a decline in teacher creativity and innovation in the classroom." (PARRA; HERNANDEZ, 2019, p. 21).

Hence the importance of a critical reflection on the meaning of educational action in daily school life to favor the transit between theory and practice in academic education, thus helping to materialize the meaning of educational work in praxis. It is a fact that in teaching practice we observe that many students develop the obsession for the best grade in their education, often emptying the reflection on the meaning of their work and this comes from repercussions on life in society. After all, "all human activities are conditioned by the fact that men live together." (ARENDRT, 2007, p. 31).

Final Provocations

Recognizing the importance of observing the school routine and the difficulties faced in the practice of the profession with the heterogeneity and diversity in the classroom, the work revealed the need for a university education that provides academics with the understanding that it is necessary to confront uprooted practices with the conceptions studied, to create alternatives to the failure of our educational system linking the university to the school (PARRA; HERNANDEZ, 2019). School daily life seems to be more challenging, formative and complex than theories indicate, because it opens up the possibility of knowing how to think and act in the face of diversity, since students' previous knowledge of daily practices in schools was unreflected, taken in a passive and with the inertia of activism devoid of philosophical-pedagogical justification.

From the fieldwork developed, we noticed a change in the students' perception, which began to comprehend, more comprehensively, the characteristics of the PPP in a way articulated with the contexts and to recognize the importance of daily school life, for the construction of class projections in an awareness in tune with

sociocultural practices. It is necessary to reconstruct formative practices that break the artificialized distances between theories (including the PPP as an isolated, ready and formal document of the schools) and practices in the educational context, articulating with the fieldwork, which enables interaction and contact between subjects and the social world for the construction of (re) knowledge. Regarding the planning, the undergraduates found that many teachers have constructivist dimensions and conceptions, respecting the students' knowledge, in an effort of articulation between theory and practice, but they also see in these practices an improvised planning devoid of a scientific Pedagogy.

These facts allowed to stimulate the recognition of the pedagogical contexts and bring the undergraduates closer to the perplexities of daily school life, proving to be an enriching experience for all to reflect on legal discourses and concrete actions. The mobilization and renewal of pedagogical practices requires that after school research we can problematize the results obtained and the frontiers of knowledge as was the case of this (re) construction in the university space. In light of the foregoing, we realize that the call for immediate application of theories stifles the critical potential of thinking about school reality and ends up subjecting theories to improvisation of practices, which often affects teacher education, the hostages of abstract daily theories and alienated practices.

It is important to mention in these final considerations, the implications of the findings with a view to re-elaborating the tensions present between the curricular theories studied and school daily life, to insist on the formative relevance of an awareness for the examination of school daily life. Finally, we seek with this initiative to give visibility to interactions and dialogues with the pedagogical universe as praxis overcoming academic distances with schools, to train teachers in educational contexts, creating moments of reflection on dilemmas and formative contingencies, which only make sense in everyday praxis. However, enabling these moments of observation and research in school practice of new sources of theoretical and practical reflection for academics can change the ways of recognizing contexts, to better understand the reality and address the problems of education, without omissions, abstractions or generalizations to existing differences.

References

ALVES, R. O currículo dos urubus. In: ALVES, R. **Estórias de quem gosta de ensinar**. 10. ed. Campinas: Papyrus, 2000. p. 69-74.

ANDRÉ, M. E. D. A. **Etnografia da prática escolar**. Campinas: Papyrus, 2008.

ARENDT, H. **A condição humana**. 10. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2007.

AZAMBUJA, P. L.; CONTE, E.; HABOWSKI, A. C. O Planejamento Docente na Educação Infantil: metamorfoses e sentidos ao aprender. **Pesquisa em Foco**, São Luís, v. 22, n. 2, jul./dez. 2017. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.18817/pef.v22i2.1503>

BAPTISTA, S. G.; CUNHA, M. B. Estudo de usuários: visão global dos métodos de coleta de dados. **Perspect. ciênc. inf.**, Belo Horizonte, v. 12, n. 2, p. 168-184, maio/ago. 2007.

CERTEAU, M. **A invenção do cotidiano: as artes de fazer**. 22. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2014.

- CHARLOT, B. A questão antropológica na Educação quando o tempo da barbárie está de volta. **Educar em Revista**, Curitiba, v. 35, n. 73, p. 161-180, jan./fev. 2019. DOI: 10.1590/0104-4060.62350
- CONTE, E. Notas sobre Teoria e Práxis. **Educação e Filosofia**, Uberlândia, v. 30, n. 60, p. 883-903, jul./dez. 2016. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14393/REVEDFIL.issn.0102-6801.v30n60a2016-p883a903>
- FREIRE, P. **Educação como prática da liberdade**. 10 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1980.
- FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do Oprimido**. 17. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.
- FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.
- FREIRE, P. **Extensão ou Comunicação?** 11. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2006.
- FREIRE, M. O sentido dramático da aprendizagem. In: GROSSI, E. P.; BORDIN, J. (Org.). **Paixão de aprender**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1992. p. 11-14.
- GADOTTI, M. **Perspectivas atuais da Educação**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas Sul, 2000.
- GAMBOA, S. A. S. A dialética na pesquisa em educação: elementos de contexto. In: FAZENDA, I. (Org.). **Metodologia da pesquisa educacional**. 4. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2007. p. 91-115.
- HABOWSKI, A. C.; CONTE, E.; PUGENS, N. B. A perspectiva da alteridade na educação. **Conjectura: Filos. Educ.**, Caxias do Sul, v. 23, n. 1, p. 179-197, jan./abr. 2018. DOI: 10.18226/21784612.v23.n1.10
- JACOBI, D. F.; HABOWSKI, A. C.; CONTE, E. Do caos ao cosmos: A metamorfose do aprender. **Revista Diálogos (RevDia)**, Mato Grosso, v. 6, n. 1, p. 7-23, jan./abr. 2018.
- LÜDKE, M. **O professor e a pesquisa**. 5. ed. Campinas: Papirus, 2001.
- LUCKESI, C. C. Planejamento e Avaliação escolar: articulação e necessária determinação ideológica. In: BORGES, Silva Abel. **O diretor articulador do projeto da escola**. São Paulo: FDE, 1992. p.115-125.
- MÜHL, E. H. Habermas e a educação: racionalidade comunicativa, diagnóstico crítico e emancipação. **Educ. Soc.**, Campinas, v. 32, n.117, p. 1035-1050, out./dez. 2011. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302011000400008>
- PARRA, J. D.; HERNANDEZ, C. Classroom observation in context: an exploratory study in secondary schools from Northern Colombia. **Rev. Bras. Educ.**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 24, p. 1-25, mar. 2019. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s1413-24782019240005>
- PUGENS, N. B.; CONTE, E.; HABOWSKI, A. C. Pedagogia Científica na Educação Infantil: pressupostos montessorianos. **Revista Intersaberes**, Canoas, v. 13, n. 29, 354-368, 2018. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22169/revint.v13i29.1379>
- SACRISTÁN, J. G. **Poderes instáveis em educação**. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 1999.

SACRISTÁN, J. G. **A educação obrigatória**: seu sentido educativo e social. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2001.

SAVIANI, D. **Pedagogia histórico-crítica**: primeiras aproximações. 10. ed. São Paulo: Autores Associados, 2008.

VÁZQUEZ, A. S. **Filosofia da Práxis**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1997.

ZABALA, A. **A prática Educativa**: Como ensinar. Porto Alegre: ArtMed, 1998.

Sent on: 19/May/2018

Approved on: 11/April/2019

Ahead of print on: 15/September/2019