



Article

Educator expectations and announcements: Dis(un)covering education for people in deprivation of liberty

Elenice Maria Cammarosano Onofre¹, André Luiz Pereira Alves dos Santos²,
 André Santiago Baldan³, Edla Cristina Rodrigues Caldas⁴, Marcos Melo de
 Oliveira⁵

Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar), São Carlos-SP, Brazil

Abstract

The paper is linked to the social and philosophical conception that implies the development of research with political, social, and epistemological options, consistent with the demands of the popular classes to whom the research carried out by the public university is most important. It results from the collaborative work of educator-researchers linked to a Research Center and educational practices for people in restriction and deprivation of liberty. The qualitative study uses as a methodological procedure the participation in formative meetings held in 2020 with educators from Brazilian states and has as its guiding question: what expectations/training needs do manifest the educators who develop educational actions in units of deprivation of liberty for young people and adults in the post-pandemic period? Data were collected through participatory observation in virtual meetings, organized by State Secretariats and Research Groups of Brazilian universities. The analysis of the data had as theoretical support the work of Paulo Freire, and three focuses were analyzed: educating for dialogue, educating for love, and educating for hope. The study reveals through the creative and successful pedagogical experiences that have been developed in Brazilian states, announcements of educators, willing to contribute to modify educational actions for the spaces of deprivation of liberty of young people and adults.

Keywords: Education, Deprivation of liberty, Training of educators.

INITIATING...

Education is an intricate, diverse, and unique phenomenon, in intertwining spaces and times. Bringing education to the focus of studies requires considering diversity as a principle, with strategies for respecting the differences and knowledge of collective subjects and their specific processes of producing life in diversity –

¹ ORCID id: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3623-4728> E-mail: linocam@uol.com.br

² ORCID id: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1948-5621> E-mail: andluz1991@gmail.com

³ ORCID id: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6506-5057> E-mail: andre_baldan@hotmail.com

⁴ ORCID id: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2770-9346> E-mail: edlacristina@gmail.com

⁵ ORCID id: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1387-2487> E-mail: marcosmelo.oliveira@bol.com.br

cultural, political, economic, gender, and generational. It is, therefore, a collective construction, considering the specificities of each location. Thus, the school located in units of liberty deprivation plays a strategic role in the training of teachers when it is understood that the people who live there temporarily have education guaranteed by law as a right.

Education is linked to other educational spaces, with other human formation policies that integrate a project of human being, that is, explicit intentionality to the human being that we want to help to form, with values and attitudes towards the world. For this, it is necessary a collective practice of educators who work in different spaces for the construction of this project of a human being.

Taking the perspective of education in schools of deprivation of liberty units, the understanding of this space and the specific processes of educating oneself to live with the peers, in the present moment of social distancing, but also the organization of a life project for living with other people is a challenge present in our agenda of urgent tasks as researchers in this field.

People in deprivation of liberty have, like other specific collectives (countryside people, quilombos' communities, indigenous communities, refugee groups, among others), unique characteristics in attitude, dressing, walking, language, which must be respected and considered in the pedagogical proposals, in the curricula and the training of educators, specifically in continuing training. It is not a matter of artificially fixing these collectives in "worlds apart", but of provoking a careful and critical look, capable of translating the rights of these minorities, socially integrated into the set of Brazilian society and the context of international relations.

Thinking about the training of educators to deal with diversities is not an exclusive task of the school, nor are we stating that only the training of education professionals is the solution to the changes that need to be effected. However, the school is a reserved space as a place of systematization of knowledge and educators play a privileged role in this activity and, in the case of schools in deprivation of liberty units, in the construction of other life projects.

In our opinion, the training of educators is a continuous process of systematic and organized character, it is an encounter between adult people, an interaction between trainer and trainee with the intention of change, of reconstruction to do differently. Today, with the effects of the pandemic, (re)thinking about training is an unimaginable challenge, because the focus of teacher training, under an emergency, is directed to the use of digital technologies, since the school has gone from face-to-face to the remote mode. We went through times when the processes of teaching and learning required changes in the physical context (the teachers' home and that of the students), the format (face-to-face and distance), relationships with families. In times of metamorphosis: what training? For what school? What content to select? What methodologies to use? What to evaluate? For what? To whom?

As we are encouraged to understand contextualized approaches and the search for knowledge, debates, and reflections in the field of school and non-school education in spaces of deprivation of liberty and the training of educators, in this paper we seek possible understandings to the question: what expectations/training needs the educators who work in schools in detention centers in times of pandemic manifest?

The presented reflections result from participatory observations carried out in training processes with educators from different Brazilian states that, despite the regional characteristics, allow us to situate the study in the Latin American context amid the epidemiological crisis, due to the severe acute respiratory syndrome – Sars-Cov-2, declared a pandemic on March 11 by the World Health Organization – WHO.

The paper is organized in three sections: first, we address the oppressive policies of neoliberalism in the Latin American context and spaces of deprivation of liberty; secondly, we present the study methodology, anchored in contributions of qualitative research through participatory observation; finally, we discuss some needs and expectations announced by educators in the formative meetings.

OPPRESSIVE POLICIES OF NEOLIBERALISM IN THE LATIN AMERICAN CONTEXT AND SPACES OF DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY

The world is the totality of totalities. It is in it that life is produced and reproduced, where the contact with the other occurs as a community; it is also in it that the struggles and the production of knowledge take place. (ARAÚJO-OLIVEIRA, 2014).

By realizing that the world context directly influences the relationships between individuals and the production of knowledge, it becomes important that we have awareness, from our feet, for the understanding of others.

The Latin American context reveals to us a scenario of struggles. The very expression *Latin America* creates Latinos and non-Latinos. This America with "origins" in the European peoples of Latin roots differs from Anglo-Saxon America with colonial roots, which differs from the America of African origins, which differs from the America of the original people of this land.

The philosophical, scientific, religious, cultural thought of the Latin American scenario is influenced by the oppressive culture that establishes centrality. By creating a parameter of the European-centered subject as if it were the only parameter, we make the different inferior, barbaric, irrational, savage. It is not possible to accept absolute scientific neutrality since scientific neutrality is an ideological position.

An example of ideological hegemony that aims to guide the south is neoliberalism. After the 1970s, mainly among the member countries of the European Organization for Trade and Development (OECD), this economic model is strongly supported, showing signs of success in contributing to deflation, generating increased profits and employment rates; contributing to the resuscitation of world capitalism, which had suffered from crises in the early 1970s. In the 1990s neoliberal ideals gained popular appeal and successfully contributed campaigns in countries such as England, with Major in 1992; Sweden, with the united right-wing front in 1991; and France in 1993. Latin America sees signs of neoliberal policy from the Pinochet government in Chile, passing through Bolivia in the mid-1980s and arriving in Argentina, Venezuela, and Peru in the 1990s (ANDERSON, 1995).

One could add Brazil to these Latin American countries indicated by Anderson (1995, 2017), for the country has, for years, been through a model of economic policy with neoliberal ideals – more openly in the current government (starting in 2018), because the Minister of Economy, Paulo Guedes, declares himself

openly neoliberal and defends cuts in public investments and the privatization of state-owned companies to reduce the influence of the State in the economy.

However, it should be noted that Anderson (1995, 2017), despite pointing out the success of neoliberal policies in some sectors, highlights the failure of the political-economic model concerning economic and social growth. By instigating large financial movements through parasitic investments, such as speculation and currency fluctuation, there is low investment in the production of real goods. The author analyzes the intensification of neoliberal policies manifested through measures of economic austerity, the growth of xenophobia, and the deepening of social inequalities. These demonstrations have joined the elections of far-right governments in several countries and are characteristic of neoliberalism since the 2000s.

To guide an economic policy, disregarding the particularities of each country and/or region, as a magic formula for success, is a clear example of a standard that states: all others are wrong! Here is a sign of a relationship of experienced oppression. In this situation of oppression, oppressors and oppressed are trapped in a dual relationship, and both imprisoned live dehumanizing violence. It would be up to the oppressed when they perceive themselves in this relationship, to seek liberation through a *praxis* based on the "reflection and action of men on the world to transform it" (FREIRE, 2019, p. 52).

The oppressors, believing that everything is reduced to an object, subject to being bought, believe that *to be* "[...] is *to have*, and to have as a class that possesses" (FREIRE, 2019, p. 63), to the point of believing that the right is only one – their own, which inaugurates violence against the other, the oppressed. By experiencing this dual reality, in which "[...] to be is to seem, and to seem is to seem like the oppressor [...]" (FREIRE, 2019, p. 43), the oppressed ones internalize social violence and start to establish that to be a man is to be like the oppressor, thus becoming a *sub-oppressor*, assuming a position of adherence to the oppressor (FREIRE, 2019, p. 43-44).

Just perceiving oneself in this dual relationship does not characterize the liberation from oppression; there must be a constant search to overcome this cycle of socially established violence. Aiming at social liberation, it is necessary to learn to live with the different, to respect the different ways of living, to provide development opportunities, overcoming adversities and relationships of domination (FREIRE, 1992).

In the direction indicated by Freire (1992), it is possible to signal that the pandemic has profoundly changed society, the way of living, working, studying, and sharing spaces. It has allowed (re)thinking about the oppressive policies of neoliberalism, which certainly cannot cope with it. The rules of social coexistence have changed the way people interact. Their social practices have been reframed for a way of life that had been withdrawn from us by neoliberal demands, a way of life before the neoliberal way of life. Many returned to living with their children, to having time to read books, to sitting at the table with their family, and to think about everyday life. But in spaces of deprivation of liberty, social practices have not been reframed, yet greatly reduced.

We understand by social practices all situations that generate interactions between people and the cultural, social, and natural environments in which they are

inserted. Social practices can lead to maintenance, change, or innovations in the ways of seeing and acting by those who participate in them (OLIVEIRA et al., 2014). In times of pandemic, people in liberty deprivation have had limited possibilities for interacting with other people. In addition to freedom, group activities, such as recreational, school, and non-school activities, the provision of religious assistance and visitation is suspended. This means that they had curtailed ways of living that allow them to hope and seek other meanings for life in incarceration. In this scenario, the only possibility for people to be deprived of their freedom to interact is between themselves, in the cell or on the patio, while they are sunbathing, and it does not happen every day. The absence of social practices in these spaces is inhumane and increases the possibility of having a single perspective when they leave: the return to deprivation.

It is possible to affirm, therefore, that in addition to the overcrowding of spaces, poor hygiene conditions, the deficit of physical and human structure to guarantee human rights, in the current pandemic scenario, these people live other deprivations, in addition to the right to come and go: studying, leisure, religious assistance and the right to maintain family ties.

Unlike free people, people deprived of liberty may even hope for recreation alternatives, school practices, religious worship, and their family ties, but the spaces in which they live limit their hopes to the field of desire. State inertia, justified by the preservation of these people's health and life, created illegality and inhumanity. It is up to us to ask: How can these people read the world without interacting with other people? What (re)socialization can happen without interaction with peers in diverse social practices and with family members?

Educators in these spaces have been showing concerns with their students and (re)meaning how they can (re)take up activities during/after the pandemic. Notably, to create bonds of complicity, friendship, hope, perseverance, and loveliness, is part of the essence of being an educator. Thus, educators who work in places of deprivation of liberty in several Brazilian states are concerned with their students and with expectations about resuming classes: how will it happen? In this direction, collective thinking is projected for education and ongoing formation.

THROUGH PATHS AND TRAILS

The research presented here is part of the research project Training educators for the spaces of restriction and deprivation of liberty, developed in a Research Center in the field of education for people in deprivation of liberty. This is a qualitative study that was conducted in 2020, with the methodological procedure being participation in training meetings with educators. The paper is linked to the social and philosophical conception that implies the development of research with political, social, and epistemological options, consistent with the demands of the popular classes to whom investigations carried out by the public university are most important.

The study seeks to move away from the passive observer perspective and to dialogue with the realities of the participants, the creation of spaces for articulation of diverse voices that refer us to another challenge, which is to potentiate them so that

they can speak and create other spaces of listening. As Garcia (2003) points out, the social researcher can contribute to this process if he is committed to social change.

With these assumptions, data were collected from the technique of participatory observation in formative meetings with educators-researchers from units of deprivation of liberty. The choice of the participatory observation technique is explained by the need for listening and dialogue with educators, intending to broaden and deepen the knowledge that contributes to their realities (STRECK; ADAMS, 2014).

In participatory observation, the researcher is a participant observer and has direct contact with the group of collaborators. With this participatory role, our observation undertook the records of events, the reconstruction of dialogues, the description of the activities and behaviors of researchers and research collaborators (LÜDKE; ANDRÉ, 2013).

We participated in web conference meetings, in various Brazilian federative units, that were characterized as dialogical activities about the formative needs of educators, given the pandemic situation, due to the infection of a large part of the world population by the Coronavirus. The pandemic required that classes and other social practices in deprivation of liberty units to be suspended, because of the imposition of social distancing, from March 2020.

Despite this, technological tools such as *Google Meet* provided virtual training meetings, in which 565 educators chose to participate, to debate/socialize experiences about education in deprivation of liberty units. The meetings were organized by State Secretariats and research groups of Brazilian universities.

From the elaborated records, we opted for the dialectical proposal for the organization and analysis of the collected data. We are based on Minayo (1994, p. 75), who explains: "in this method, the speech of social actors is situated in their context to be better understood". In this direction, we organize the speeches, the dialogues produced, the comments available on the digital platforms, and all the records derived from the participatory observations. We proceeded to an organization, articulation, and analysis of data seeking the "dynamic" relationship "between the ratio of those who practice it and the experience that arises in concrete reality" (MINAYO, 1994, p. 77).

In the following section, three focuses are presented, as they emerged from the analysis process of the collected material: educating for dialogue, educating for loveliness, and educating for hope. The statements presented in the analyzes had the educators' consent through the Free and Informed Consent Form.

NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS ANNOUNCED BY EDUCATORS AT TRAINING MEETINGS

The data collected in the formative meetings were organized after each meeting, based on study references anchored in the work of Paulo Freire, one of the central authors of the Center for research and educational practices for people in restriction and deprivation of liberty. The material was later analyzed by the center's members, based on the concepts of dialogicity, loveliness, and hope from this author.

Educating yourself for the dialogue

Who are the teachers? We are people, people like everyone else. (Speech of an Educator, July 2020)

The Freirean premise on the act of educating was relevant to the times of Covid-19. Assailed by the aforementioned pandemic, educators from all over the world had to reinvent themselves and dive into their work differently, using technology tools more frequently. In Brazil, it has not been different. Consequently, educators working in detention units face the same challenges, in addition to others. Our meetings with the groups of educator-researchers demonstrated expectations and demands about the current moment and the return to classes in the post-pandemic times.

Faced with the insecurities and expectations generated, educators concentrate their concerns with the pedagogical time, with the (re)signification of school and curriculum. They highlight the need to rethink pedagogical practices based on dialogue since the sanitary and public health crises in our country have aggravated (or exposed) the situation in detention units. Thinking about school education, according to the educators, requires a different focus, beyond transmitting the curricular contents established to promote the necessary reception, in face of the post-pandemic reality, never before experienced by societies of the 21st century.

Some questions permeated the meetings we experienced: how are we preparing for the return to the supposedly normal life, and the work activities? How are people deprived of liberty perceiving the absence of school and non-school activities to which they are entitled?

Dialogic education is established as a necessity for returning to activities in the environment in which they are, often a source of hope and an opportunity for a humanizing experience for those who are away from social life. So an educator signaled:

[...] how to build a practice that is a liberation practice? It is not about freedom, it is a practice of liberation. The teacher has to wear a special outfit, different from the one inside. We have the reliability of these subjects who are in these spaces.

[...] we have to think about what educational designs we can build, especially for the resumption of classes. [...] We had contact with our students in March, and suddenly the pandemic arrived, and until this moment, we've lost all ties.

[...] the school is a space inserted in the prison and needs to promote dialogue.

This educator's perspective meets the ideas of Freire (2015). For this author, the purpose of an educational process, permeated by dialogicity, contributes to humanization and liberation. "Dialogicity is a requirement of human nature, on the one hand; on the other, a complaint about the democratic option of the educator" (FREIRE, 2015, p. 1555). It is the dialogicity that allows the student and the educator's satisfaction with the epistemological curiosity. Both are subjects of knowledge and live in a constant gnosiological search.

The dialogical relationship seems to us to be one of the possible answers for the resumption of activities in detention units. It may be the “outfit” that the educator can wear in front of students so that they feel part of the educational practice.

How to cultivate dialogicity in times of social isolation? As we indicated in this study, deprivation of liberty intensified isolation in the period of the pandemic situation. If they were already living in isolation, the students felt more strongly, with the restrictions of visits, the suspension of classroom activities, and the removal of educators from the units. In this direction, the educators affirm:

[...] because in the pandemic they already live in social isolation, and this pandemic made the relationship between them even more difficult because they already live in isolation and are now more isolated.

I worry about those who go to the semi-open condition, who are in the process of returning to society but are completely disconnected from school and work, due to this long period of absence with the covid-19.

[...] My God, what do I do first? Do I take the contents that will be demanded, or do I listen to the students first?

Even with the interruptions this or the other way of dialoguing, educators committed to the liberating educational practice leveraged other social practices that promoted different forms of dialogues, such as reading circles:

[...] At school, we are managing to do a remote activity in the reading club, but we are mapping this now, by collecting the book, we are going to make a kind of rotation, the book will circulate and be exchanged. (Speech of an Educator)

Therefore, the dialogue is configured as the motivation to learn and to teach, and rigor is its main ally in the process of teaching and the development of this process. The dichotomized curriculum and the culture of silence are deconstructed in the dialogue. It also challenges the social relations established in banking education. It is worth noting that banking education is a project of the oppressive classes that deepens and expands in situations of economic and social crises such as the one we are currently experiencing. Therefore, the effort to maintain dialogue is to favor problematization and criticism of historical inequalities, which are even more present in education in deprivation of liberty units.

Dialogicity requires “knowing how to listen” (FREIRE, 2020) and persistence in the pedagogical act. The meetings demonstrated the persistence among educators from deprivation of liberty units, despite the difficulties and challenges imposed by circumstances. The statements of educators indicate these difficulties and the possibilities facing them:

[...] we were not prepared to deal with the extreme changes of the pandemic, neither as a state nor as teachers, educators in prison education, education researchers in spaces of restriction and deprivation of liberty.

We want to legitimize our role there, learning in teaching the subject, but we also have to contribute to emotional and psychological health,

and so that they have more capacity to interact in some situations, through dialogue.

[...] we are in dialogue with the group of teachers, regardless of the area they work in, and thinking: what can we do to rescue reading when resuming classes, regardless of being math, physics, or Portuguese teacher. All teachers are thinking about how these works can support their class, when I return with these students, how can they not let this reading get lost.

We can notice the concern of educators with the effects of the pandemic moment and social distancing. They look for ways out and focus their perspectives in the dialogue, albeit remote, with students who are deprived of liberty, enhancing the awareness and humanization process.

As Onofre states, the role of education in deprivation institutions is relevant, since it is responsible for the

[...] formation of a population that lives on the margins because it grew on the margins of a society that excludes poor, black, illiterate people. They are invisible people until they commit a crime, as defined by social groups to which they never belonged. (ONOFRE, 2019, p. 100)

In this sense, one can dialogue with Rangel (2013), when he perseveres in the question: What is a prison for? Is it only the place of punishment? The author emphasizes the importance of educational actions within the deprivation of liberty units. These actions have not been evoked as a strategy, as they are seen as a privilege, and not as a right. In this sense, although education cannot solve problems in prisons, it is fundamental.

Thus, in addition to the technological tools necessary for educational activities in detention units, in times of pandemic, educators have other concerns and needs for action in this hybrid and complex space. It is necessary to transpose the technical and curricular demands in search of education for a loving dialogue.

Educating for loveliness

I got emotional ... they [were] saying they missed the classes and teachers. (Speech of an Educator, July 2020)

We understand that knowledge is history, and therefore the subject is historical and social (FREIRE, 2020). It is in this perspective that humanity has been going through significant changes in this pandemic moment, in which social contact started to be demarcated and (re)signified, serious and ethical knowledge has been distorted and diminished, making it necessary “an education from the roots, from the most profound and decisive demands” (ANDREOLI, 1997, p. 48). It is necessary to assume political and epistemological attitudes when educating through the speech, through reflection, discussion, and questioning. This scenario, which has been presented worldwide with the health crisis, permeates the different spheres of society; educational institutions have undergone hard changes, had to adapt and

reorganize quickly – the ways of teaching and educating have been rethought. In this direction, educators had to adapt to this new context and the new ways of teaching and educating themselves. This was a joint process, and both had to (re)learn other ways of seeing and thinking about education. Capacitation and training were necessary so that educators could keep up with the speed of changes.

In the various educational spaces, be it school or non-school, the verbs and actions to teach and educate are acts of loving and demand respect, ethics, decency, seriousness, curiosity, and dialogue. Freire points out that educators, as unfinished beings and aware of this action, seek carefully and curiously the freedom and autonomy for critical knowledge, in which "I experience myself as a cultural, historical, unfinished and conscious of the unfinished" (2020, p. 50). It is in this moment of change and awareness of our unfinished work that, based on Freire's conceptions, we affirm that the loving educator takes an ethical stance and concerning the events and changes that are taking place.

In this pandemic moment, it was evident, therefore, that the act of teaching must follow paths beyond the content itself. Dialogue and, above all, attentive listening are necessary; "it is the respect never denied to the student, to his/her knowledge of the experience made" (FREIRE, 2020, p. 101), because in common-union we seek the overcoming challenges.

One educator highlights the relationship of bonds with the students, "[...] we have bonds with them and they have them with us". Thus she reports attentive listening and social relations with women in deprivation of liberty:

[...] I receive them at the door, not only me, but the teachers, and they kiss and hug, this happens a lot there, this thing of them coming to us and talking, and we listen and there is a bond.

From this relationship established by dialogue and attentive listening, it is necessary to go beyond the content. This is how educators manifest:

*[...] Then I was asking: how are they doing? How are their heads now, and how will they be when we resume classes?
 I am there as an educator who has an important role, when I think about socio-education I have to take dialogue activities to the classroom. Now with the pandemic, I am anxious and asking that I need to prepare for my return. How are they doing?
 Then, my concern is also with the students' minds, we know that many students go through a series of problems, how are they going without the physical presence of the teacher, without that routine, for us to arrive there and call the students, take the students to the classroom, which was the moment they relaxed.*

In the perspective presented, it is possible to highlight that the training of educators goes beyond the content to be taught. As Freire (2020) indicates, training must be constant, and at all times guided by reflection, by thinking, by dialoguing about their postures, their actions, and their educational practice, which moves towards criticism, because the critical reflection is essential for the work and development of the reflective practice of their action. The training of educators must provide these

moments of reflection and dialogue with the theory, because with this commitment to praxis, the educator shares and exposes his act of loving, with everyone involved in the teaching process. "It is by thinking critically about the practice of today or yesterday that the next practice can be improved" (FREIRE, 2020, p. 40). This loving path is signaled by an educator:

[...] it is a challenge to think about pedagogical practice ... it is a special moment ... complex ... our point of arrival needs to be loving [...]

Here we have a positive experience with the direction of the prison; they collaborate too much, they are partners of us, the school, the teachers, the school team. This is very good because the teacher wants to free them, he/she doesn't look at the student's defects, what they did or did not do outside. We treat them with respect and love.

When they perceive themselves in and with the world, that the educator's pedagogical actions assume a critical posture of breaking paradigms and the emergence of naive curiosity, "as an effort of critical knowledge of obstacles, that is to say, of their reasons for being [...] awareness is a human requirement" (FREIRE, 2020, p. 54). It is through this awareness that the training of educators has been one of the spaces for pedagogical actions focused on criticality and reflection, as a moment of "true dialogicity, in which dialogic subjects learn and grow in their differences, especially in respect for it." (FREIRE, 2020, p. 59).

In this exercise, the educator assumes his/her role as a researcher. Freire (2020) highlights that teaching practice is the action itself of teaching and researching, of assuming doubts, reflections, searches, that is, assuming oneself as a researcher and that one perceives him/herself in this movement as an educator-researcher. In times of pandemic, in which educators and students are socially distant, the restlessness in their bodies, minds, and thoughts is evident, but always guided by love, dialogue, and hope, as indicated by their statements:

[...] this loveliness makes us have great experiences at school, and that makes me extremely happy. So, I'm anxious, precisely because of this: what are we going to do when we get back?

[...] about loveliness and school, I have been very worried: there is great synesthesia between us, me, the teachers and the girls at school, we managed to establish some ties ... and my concern is ... whether we will maintain this same kindness, this same affection.

And this way we get there, still being careful when it comes to them, not in a fearful way, but very much on the loving side. We are very anxious, even in this sense, about the moment we arrive, how will we find it? If the same boys ... teenagers, in the socio-educational case, will they be the same? How are they going to be?

It is important to highlight in the educators' speeches the positive emotions that keep a close relationship with their goals or with personal projects. The pride and satisfaction that they show in the teaching/educating process go beyond reaching the goals established for educational activities, but above all because it gives students a drive for learning. In the words of Marchesi (2008, p. 105), emotion is not just a

certain subjective experience of affection or irritation, experienced by the teacher. Emotion includes the perception of a situation based on personal goals and a willingness to take specific actions.

In this direction, we highlight the lines of educating art in their work with young people in deprivation of freedom:

We resumed classes at the end of June and the teenagers are very happy, those we have contact with, mainly online, they give feedback, they write about how good it is to see these educators again, they ask about us, our families, how we are doing.

We are realizing that this is being good, it is also being good for the staff, the teams working in the Center, they are very overloaded.

I see that those who did not care about the workshops, there is a new importance today, as they add in education.

We are learning, nobody had any experience with video lessons either, we are working a lot, but it is paying off when we get the feedback from the boys.

Freire (2020) highlights that the concern is related to the questions and that, therefore, "the search for clarification, as a sign of attention that suggests alertness, is an integral part of the vital phenomenon" (p. 33). The pandemic phenomenon comes in this sense, to the field of education and teaching "curiosity as a questioning concern, as an inclination to unveil something, as a verbalized question or not" (FREIRE, 2020, p. 33).

Educating for hope

For me to hope, I need to encourage myself, to feed myself in the practice that each partner is doing throughout Brazil. (Speech of an Educator, July 2020)

In the formative meetings with the educators, the need for educational practices to be permeated by hope became evident. In its archaic etymology, the word "hope" used to mean "to have confidence", and "to trust". The confidence of educators in something positive is precisely the hope to continue to develop their work with the students. This is evidenced in the speech of an educator:

[...] In one of these meetings we had with the socio-educational system, including with the Education Management, I even asked: What about the boys? How are they? Have they asked about us? I look forward to knowing how they are doing ... When we get back, will they be there?

[...] it is a challenge to think about pedagogical practice ... it's a special moment ... complex ... our point of arrival needs to be of love, we have ties with them and they have them with us too.

Educational processes in spaces of deprivation of liberty with educators have a human meaning; from the contact with the other, from trust in a better future, it becomes increasingly possible and leads to concrete attitudes of a transformation of reality.

As we announced earlier, based on Freire (2019), we are not finished beings, done, but under construction. We are cultural, social, political individuals. This conception encompasses the possibility of *hope* because it is only possible when we realize that, for being under construction, we can become subjects in the construction of history. This concern with educational processes contributes to the hope of a better future. Thus manifests an educator-researcher:

[...] When we take something ready, whether or not it is something imposing, but we also have to think about what these students want. How do they understand the school? How can the school help resignify them as a subject? As a subject belonging to the society. Now they are deprived, between walls, but they belong to the society, they impact socially, economically, politically. So we can't think of them outside society, they're within society, otherwise, and I keep questioning myself just that: what do these people deprived of liberty intend as students in school? What do they want from the school?

This educator's speech meets the conception that education, although it does not transform the world alone, contributes as a practice of freedom to the development and maintenance of hope, enabling a future, change, and even emancipation, "a world in which women and men are in the process of permanent liberation." (FREIRE, 1992, p.44).

The pedagogy of hope considers that everyone can "say their words", without authoritarianism or sectarianism of educators, taking democratic and popular education and creating an awareness of a social, historical, political subject capable of using their words as an expression of strength. This awareness, although not a revolution in itself, gives the subject hope to rethink his/her actions and reality, and seek transformations.

Concerning democracy, educators must respect the students in their pedagogical practices. There should not be manipulation or imposition of stances. However, this does not indicate that pedagogical practice is exempt and neutral, or even excludes the possibility of debates on divergent topics; demand only, attention to respect for differences.

When each subject manages to change their reality, he/she transforms society and gives meaning to educational processes, whether those that were built in the school environment or outside it. Hope is a mental attitude before practice, which for some can be a dream or a utopia for others.

I am not hopeful for plain stubbornness, but because of existential and historical imperative. I do not mean, however, that, because I'm hopeful, I attribute to my hope the power to transform reality and, thus convinced, I go for the clash without taking into account the concrete, material data, stating that my hope is enough. My hope is necessary, but not enough. It just doesn't win the fight, but without it, the fight falters and stuns. We need critical inheritance, as the fish needs unpolluted water. (FREIRE, 1992, p. 6).

Hope is therefore an attitude that, in to become concrete, needs to join the hope of other people. From the hope together it is possible to make possible dreams because without hope it is impossible to materialize a world less unjust, excluding and evil.

In the meetings with educators who work in deprivation of liberty units, this hope is strongly perceived. Freire (1992) points out that many encourage hopelessness, the belief that there is no point in dreaming and believing that the world can be better. This belief makes any hope of recreating the world to collapse. Hope is a feeling, a thought, a belief that it is possible to make the world different. From this perspective, an educator signals:

[...] now for us to return to schools, to the systems, it is much more difficult to think about the system of resumption, than when we start the school year because now we will arrive at a time when everyone is sensitive, everyone is in another mood, due to this situation that we are all going through.

[...] when we think about planning for the return, then really, we have to leave aside the content itself, [to focus on] what has happened to them in that time.

[...] And this way we get there, still being careful when it comes to them, not in a fearful way, but very much on the loving side. We are very anxious, even in this sense, about the moment we arrive, how will we find it? If the same boys ... teenagers, in the socio-educational case, will they be the same? How are they going to be?

Despite the educator's fear, because the resumption will occur in an unusual process, it is possible to perceive their anxiety when meeting the students, respectfully, to gain trust, without the banking imposition of education and with the concern of the fulfillment of an established curriculum.

Trust is believing, having faith in others, hoping that together they can transform reality. It is the preparation for what Freire calls *praxis*, "[reflection and action of men on the world to transform it" (FREIRE, 2019, p. 52). If there is no hope that reality can be transformed, there would be no sense in restricting or depriving the freedom of an individual, there would be no point in believing that education contributes to a better future.

NON-FINAL NOTES

The purpose of this paper was to weave, based on the listening of actors and actresses who work in school and non-school activities, in units of deprivation of young people and adults, reflections in search of proposals for the field of education. The formative meetings, organized by secretariats of state and research groups from different Brazilian regions, collaboratively sought to discuss some issues that move us at this moment, around the formative expectations/needs manifested by educators who work in spaces of deprivation of liberty in times of pandemic.

It was possible to notice that the exchange of experiences was favorable to the collaborative work of educators, as it promoted and disseminated activities and knowledge that have been successfully built in recent years. Presenting creative and

successful pedagogical experiences, carried out by educators in Brazilian states, is still overlaid by shyness. The communication and technology devices imposed by the situation of social withdrawal seem to have aroused the need for the use of other forms of communication that have favored the dissemination of knowledge in the field of (school and non-school) education for young people and adults in deprivation of liberty.

The experiences presented by the educators and the participations, via *chat*, with the whole community involved in the meetings evidenced an educational reality often hidden behind the high walls of the units of deprivation of liberty, both for adults and for young people. Certainly, behind these walls, there is a specific world, with its particularities and challenges for the work of educators, since they assume responsibilities as agents of humanization, at the moment of deprivation and for the return to the world of free men. The actors and actresses who un/discover the potential of people who have always exponentially been on the margins of their rights. The sensitivity of educators produces, in a transversal way, the perception that these are people who have had, in most cases, difficult childhoods, generational reproduction of the so-called world of crime, manipulated and invalidated children and young people, accustomed to suffering the desires of retaliation that correspond to feelings of insecurity proper to the societies in which we live.

The reflections presented in section 3 of this paper, based on Freirean premises, allow us to highlight some indications of the problems indicated about the needs/expectations of educators, unveiled in the formative meetings:

- The policies for the training of educators working in spaces of deprivation of liberty are not crystal clear in national plans or social and educational development programs: the practical and social purposes do not correspond to the legally prescribed purposes.
- The initial and continued training of educators in the field of education for young people and adults has been neglected in educational policies, as well as their institutional development by universities.
- The shared work of professionals in spaces of deprivation of liberty, teachers, art educators, psychologists, social workers, security agents, physical educators, religious leaders, among others, is necessary, considering the scenario of deprivation, complex for the educational activity.
- Compulsory social distancing produces behaviors of failure, low esteem, future (im)possibilities in life, and require transversal actions and significant learning.
- Situations of difficulty of attention, low tolerance to failure, and tense personal relationships are recurrent in school activities and non-school activities; they are circumvented by educators, but they are demands that need to be met by cooperative ties of broader educational action.
- Investigations and systematization of pedagogical experiences, in specific themes of the area, need to be stimulated for educators who experience the daily life of deprivation units.
- Curriculum arrangements are inefficient for educational contexts and are not designed for schools for young people and adults in deprivation of liberty. Education for life goes beyond the school education offered behind bars.

Pandemic times cannot be ignored, they are not being a parenthesis, a suspended time in the lives of these people. It is not, therefore, a question of thinking about a different curriculum or a specific didactics. This is another pedagogical time since time in prison has a specific meaning. (CUNHA, 2007).

- The pedagogical experiences presented in the formative meetings that we have experienced indicate that, in times of pandemic, educators, secretariats, and universities have assumed, despite political dismay, a critical and curious attitude in the face of the challenges now in effervescence, with a view to the (re)encounter. Possibilities of approximation have been forged with another look at work, with attentive listening and a more pedagogical life (FREIRE, 2019) together with others and not of others.
- Educators move between prison and the right to education with a specific and concrete work that promotes significant learning situations that indicate the purposes of education in institutions of deprivation of liberty. It is a lifelong socialization process and not *therapeutic resocialization*. Some people have the right to education, guaranteed for all, not young people and adults with special educational needs and who need a therapeutic process.
- The reports of pedagogical experiences indicated that innovative actions, such as the mobile library, artistic and bodily activities, writing letters between educators and students, the use of radio, music, meditation, religious projects, theater, among other pedagogical tools, also used in Latin American countries, enhance forms of education in these spaces and can be used outside the walls, especially in Youth and Adult Education.

The observations, records, reflections, synthesis, and analyses, anchored in Freirean premises, announce that it is possible to (re)view ways for the education of people excluded by the neglect of cruel capitalism. It was evidenced, in the presented study, that problematizing is more important and essential than indicating solutions, because when we problematize situations, we wander around the world, and when we are full of solutions and certainties we roam around the world, as Kohan (2019) points out.

As educators-researchers, it is up to us to seek understandings about the dynamics of deprivation units and the resistances that exist for their unveiling. How to tear down the walls and the symbolism of prison? How to search for groups with security teams? It is up to us to take the first step and propose institutional agreements to ensure educational work.

For their part, pandemic times have led us to look inside ourselves more carefully. It was possible to realize that self-care is a process that educates us. It is education with ourselves and with others. As Santos (2020) points out, the pandemic is a cruel pedagogy, but it is pedagogy! It is necessary to take care of the other, especially those who have not respected their basic rights of survival and dignified life.

Without the intention of exhausting the subject, but contributing to the discussions, we have for now finished our reflections. It is a battle that must instigate us to seek new forms and experiences of educational work in the field of education in spaces of deprivation of liberty. Our pedagogical force is solidified in the education

that transforms, reconstructs, revitalizes, and, therefore, proposes to break the protocols of compulsory removal that prohibits and punishes.

You must fight, fight, fight, and not lose the strength and vitality!

References

ANDREOLI, Balduino. Contribuição de Ernani Maria Fiori para uma pedagogia política de libertação. **Cadernos de Educação**. Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Federal de Pelotas, v. 6, 1997, p. 41-72.

ANDERSON, Perry. Balanço do Neoliberalismo. In: SADER, Emir; GENTILI, Pablo (Orgs.). **Pós-neoliberalismo: as políticas sociais e o Estado democrático**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1995, p. 9-23.

ANDERSON, Perry. Neoliberalismo, ordem contestada. **Outras Palavras**. São Paulo. 25 de março de 2017. Disponível em: <https://outraspalavras.net/sem-categoria/neoliberalismo-ordem-contestada/#> Acesso em: 3 ago. 2020.

ARAÚJO-OLIVEIRA, Sônia Stella. Exterioridade: o outro como critério. In: OLIVEIRA, Maria Waldenez; SOUSA, Fabiana Rodrigues. (Orgs.). **Processos educativos em práticas sociais: pesquisas em educação**. São Carlos: EdUFSCar, 2014. p. 47-112.

CUNHA, Manuela Ivone. O tempo insuspenso. Uma aproximação a duas percepções carcerais da temporalidade. In: ARAÚJO; Emilia, DUARTE, Ana Maria; RIBEIRO, Rita. (Orgs.). **O tempo, as culturas e as instituições**. Para uma abordagem sociológica do tempo, Lisboa: Edições Colibri, 2007, p. 91-104.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da Esperança: um reencontro com a Pedagogia do Oprimido**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1992.

FREIRE, Paulo. **À sombra desta mangueira**. 11. ed. – Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2015. Recurso digital. Formato: Epub.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia do Oprimido**. 71. ed. Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2019.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à uma prática educativa**. 63. ed. Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2020.

GARCIA, Regina L. Para quem investigamos – Para quem escrevemos: Reflexões sobre a responsabilidade social do pesquisador. In: MOREIRA, Antônio Flávio; SOARES, Magda; FOLLARI, Roberto A., GARCIA, Regina Leite (Orgs.). **Para quem investigamos – Para quem escrevemos: o impasse dos intelectuais**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2003. p. 11-35.

KOHAN, Walter. **Paulo Freire mais do que nunca: uma biografia filosófica**. Belo Horizonte: Vestígio, 2019.

ONOFRE, E. M. C.; SANTOS, A. L. P. A.; BALDAN, A. S.; CALDAS, E. C. R.; OLIVEIRA, M. M. *Educator expectations and announcements: Dis(un)covering education for people in deprivation of liberty*. Dossier Education in prisons: educational experiences, training of teachers and social-educational agents.

LÜDKE, Menga; ANDRÉ, Marli E. D. A. **Pesquisa em Educação: abordagens qualitativas**. 2. ed. São Paulo: EPU, 2013.

MARCHESI, Álvaro. **O bem-estar dos professores**. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2008.

MINAYO, Maria Cecília de S. **Pesquisa social: teoria, método e criatividade**. 23ª Ed. Petrópolis/RJ, 1994.

OLIVEIRA, Maria W.; SILVA, Petronilha B. G.; GONÇALVES JUNIOR, Luiz; MONTRONE, Aida V. G.; JOLY, Ilza Z. L. Processos educativos em práticas sociais: reflexões teóricas e metodológicas sobre pesquisa educacional em espaços sociais. In: OLIVEIRA, Maria W.; SOUSA, Fabiana R. (Org.). **Processos educativos em práticas sociais: pesquisas em educação**. São Carlos: EdUFSCar, 2014, p. 29-46.

ONOFRE, Elenice. M. C. Educação Escolar em prisões: brechas, apostas e possibilidades. **Revista NUPEM**, v. 11, n. 23, p. 99-129, 2019.

RANGEL, Hugo. Educación contra corriente en las Cárceles latinoamericanas: la enseñanza vc el castigo. **Revista Educação & Realidade**, v. 38.1, p. 33-69, 2013.

SANTOS, Boaventura Sousa. **A cruel pedagogia do vírus**. Coimbra: Almedina, 2020.

STRECK, Danilo R., ADAMS, Telmo. **Pesquisa participava, emancipação e (des)colonialidade**. Curitiba: CRV, 2014.

Sent on 2020/August/21 | Approved on 2020/September/20