

Education territories in Dual Education: school – family – community

 João Batista Begnami¹,  Antônio Cláudio Moreira Costa²,  Erica Fernanda Justino de Freitas³,

¹ Associação Mineira das Escolas Família Agrícola - AMEFA. Rua Maria Olívia de Jesus, n. 1710, Bairro Floramar. Belo Horizonte - MG. Brasil. ² Universidade Federal de Uberlândia - UFU. ³ Secretaria de Educação do Estado de Minas Gerais.

Author for correspondence: jobabe63@gmail.com

ABSTRACT. This article aims to discuss Dual Education and compare it to Non-School Education. It is based on bibliographic and documentary research, particularly considering the literature on Non-School Education and Dual Education (*Formation en Alternance*). It argues that the Popular Education movement points to learning possibilities by expanding the education territories, with school being just one of them. Dual Education as practiced in Agricultural Family Schools is instilled with a notion of school that goes beyond its walls. The Dual Education processes in those establishments break the hegemonic ideologies that confine education territoriality to formal school by allowing the engagement and interaction of different education actors, times, and territories. By proposing new methodologies for developing pedagogical praxis based on school–community interaction, Dual Education recognizes the plurality of training and learning processes developed in different times and spaces. The training and learning processes that involve families and partners, as well as those involving the students themselves, transcend the school territory by expanding school to the community, social movements, unions, social organizations, among others. As a result, the school is forced to re-elaborate its own representations of locus of knowledge production and to embrace other educational loci, i.e., to expand how it sees and conceives of itself.

Keywords: non-school education, education territories, dual education.

Territórios educativos na formação por alternância: escola – família – comunidade

RESUMO. Este artigo tem como objetivo dialogar sobre a Formação por Alternância e seus cotejos com a Educação Não Escolar. A metodologia adotada para este trabalho foi a pesquisa bibliográfica e documental. O artigo aponta que o movimento de educação popular indica possibilidades de formação que ampliam os territórios da educação, sendo a escola apenas um deles. A Pedagogia da Alternância praticada nas Escolas Família Agrícolas também apresenta concepções da escola para além dela. Os processos formativos desenvolvidos na Formação por Alternância nessas escolas rompem com lógicas ideológicas hegemônicas que limitam a territorialidade educativa ao âmbito escolar formal ao colocarem em interação diferentes atores, tempos e territórios educativos. Ao propor novas metodologias para o desenvolvimento da *práxis* pedagógica pela interação escola e comunidade, a Pedagogia da Alternância reconhece a pluralidade dos processos educativos desenvolvidos em diferentes tempos-espacos. Os processos formativos que envolvem as famílias e parceiros, assim como os processos educativos junto aos estudantes alternantes, extrapolam o território escolar e se expandem para outros territórios, a comunidade, os movimentos sociais, sindicais, organizações sociais, dentre outros. Nesse movimento, a escola é tensionada a reelaborar suas representações sobre o seu lugar de produção do conhecimento e assumir os demais lugares com suas dimensões educativas, ampliando a visão e o conceito de escola para além dela mesma.

Palavras-chave: educação não escolar, territórios educativos, pedagogia da alternância.

Territorios educativos en formación en alternancia: escuela - familia - comunidad

RESUMEN. Este artículo tiene como objetivo dialogar sobre la Educación en Alternancia y sus colisiones con la Educación No Escolar. La metodología adoptada para este trabajo fue la investigación bibliográfica y documental, basada en la revisión de la literatura de autores que abordan la teoría de la educación no escolar y la pedagogía de la alternancia. El artículo señala que el movimiento de educación popular indica nuevas posibilidades de formación, ampliando los territorios de la educación, siendo la escuela solo uno de ellos. La Pedagogía de la Alternancia que se practica en las Escuelas Agrícolas Familiares también presenta conceptos de escuela más allá de ella. Los procesos formativos desarrollados en formación por alternancia en estas escuelas rompen con lógicas ideológicas hegemónicas que limitan la territorialidad educativa al ámbito escolar formal al poner en interacción diferentes actores, tiempos y territorios educativos. Al proponer nuevas metodologías para el desarrollo de la praxis pedagógica a través de la interacción entre escuela y comunidad, la Pedagogía de la Alternancia reconoce la pluralidad de procesos educativos desarrollados en diferentes tiempos-espacios. Los procesos de formación que involucran a familias y socios, así como los procesos educativos con los estudiantes alternos, van más allá del territorio escolar, se expanden a otros territorios, la comunidad, movimientos sociales, sindicatos, Organizaciones Sociales, entre otros. En este movimiento, la escuela se tensa para reelaborar sus representaciones sobre su lugar de producción de conocimiento y asumir los otros lugares con sus dimensiones educativas, expandiendo la visión y el concepto de escuela más allá de sí misma.

Palabras clave: educación no escolar, territorios educativos, pedagogía de la alternancia.

Introduction

This article represents the collective effort of three education researchers committed to liberating education as posited by Paulo Freire for peasant communities. Our aim is to contribute to a critical reflection on the possibilities of Non-School Education, i.e., learning and training transcending the classroom.

We understand that the school is an education space/territory, but it is neither the only one nor the most effective one. The Brazilian school has been both explicitly and implicitly engaged in maintaining the social order, i.e., it has been committed to maintaining the elite's status quo instead of promoting social transformation.

Changing this has always been in the debates of progressive educators enlightened by the Marxist theory. New ways of conceiving of training and learning processes for the working class have blossomed from critical reflection and the seeds of inclusive, secular, free, quality education. A case in point is the Popular Education movement inspired by Paulo Freire's ideas in the 1960s, but other movements have, too, incorporated the principles of Popular Education and added further elements, thereby enhancing the transforming power of education.

We present Dual Education (*Formation en Alternance*) as a Non-School Education strategy that dialogues with school education and other training and learning possibilities to expand the education territories. To this end, we carried out documentary and bibliographic research.

This article consists of three sections. In section 1, we argue that there are other education spaces/territories beyond the formal school. We present our notion of education territories and the movements that have urged an understanding of Non-School Education – especially as developed by social movements – as a pedagogical praxis committed to democratizing knowledge. In section 2, we depict Dual Education as an education strategy that conscientiously dialogues with school and non-school spaces and, therefore, contributes to expanding the education territories. As a school of experience, Dual Education seeks to restructure school times and spaces based on the concrete reality of those individuals directly and indirectly involved in the education process. In section 3, we highlight some methodological strategies used in the development of Dual Education experiences to ensure a more humanizing, inclusive training process, one centered on a dialectical dynamic that allows both educators and students to analyze, understand and act upon reality with a view to transforming it.

We expect that this article fosters debates about the importance of valuing experiences that take place outside the classroom.

Education beyond the school

“Education is also responsible for both opening the doors of the mind and heart and unveiling horizons for the shared construction of more humanized societies.”ⁱ (Brandão, 2002)

Envisioning education possibilities that can transcend the school territory is a necessary step towards enforcing Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The school is undoubtedly a privileged place for developing teaching/learning processes, but education cannot be restricted to that. This is consisted with Article 1 of Act No. 9394/1996, which establishes the Brazilian Education Framework and Guidelines: “education encompasses the learning processes developed in the family, through human coexistence, at work, in teaching and research institutions, in social movements, in civil society organizations, and in cultural events”ⁱⁱ (Brasil, 1996).

Following suit, this article points to the possibility of expanding the education territories and current pedagogical practices. We understand education as an immaterial territory based on Fernandes’s (2010) assumption that

the immaterial territory is related to control/mastery over the knowledge construction process and its interpretations. Therefore, it includes theory, concept, method, methodology, ideology, etc. Building knowledge is also a territorial dispute that takes place in the development of paradigms or theoretical frameworks.ⁱⁱⁱ (Fernandes, 2010, p. 15).

Drawing on Fernandes (2010), we infer that the education territory in Brazil is, and always has been, pervaded by ideological and class disputes. The political and social context in the 1960s was conducive to the creation of new education spaces/territories and new education paradigms in Brazil. Driven by the liberation theology and the ideas of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire, the social movements – especially the peasant leagues (*ligas camponesas*) and the Basic Ecclesial Communities (Comunidades Eclesiais de Base) – began to claim a different type of education, one capable of building historical subjects rather than automatons who obey to the social order established by the ruling elites. Popular Education emerges in this context – closely linked to the popular struggles and social movements and established outside the official technocratic contexts, it pushed the Brazilian government to incorporate its principles (Gadotti, 2012).

In that period, the epistemological paradigm of Popular Education was the search for awareness raising. The function of education should be to humanize human beings, and humanization fundamentally involves the dialogical connection between different historical subjects, with a view to revealing their world and exploring their potentials and contradictions. As such, the education territory could not be limited to the school. This perspective is consistent with Pedro and Stecanela, who state:

... as knowledge, including its production and/or apprehension, is an immaterial territory, it is not necessarily linked to a fixed institution, it takes place through teachings in formal and informal spaces, it is based on the living experiences of a people, it is an integral part of its culture.^{iv} (Pedro & Stecanela, 2019, p. 588).

Drawing on Pedro and Stecanela (2019), we assume that Popular Education does not deny the school territory, but it rather proposes to expand it to beyond the classroom, while also transforming the traditional, banking, elitist, excluding school into a space where the communities' knowledge can dialogue with historically established knowledge. For Gadotti, Popular Education is

... a theoretical paradigm which seeks to code and decode whatever generates popular struggles, one which seeks to collaborate with social movements and political parties that are a conduit to these struggles. It seeks to reduce the impact of social crisis on poverty and to give voice to the indignation and moral despair of the poor, the oppressed, the indigenous, the peasant, the woman, the black, the illiterate, and the industrial worker.^v (Gadotti, 2007, p. 24).

Gadotti (2012) clearly emphasizes that

... one of the original principles of Popular Education has been the creation of a new epistemology, one which is based on the deep respect for the commonsense that popular sectors bring into their daily practice, while also challenging this commonsense and trying to unveil theory from popular practice. Such a theory is not yet known by the people, but it, too, needs to be challenged to incorporate a more rigorous, scientific, unitary reasoning.^{vi} (Gadotti, 2012, p. 14).

Educator Moacir Gadotti is precise when it comes to Popular Education. However, the epistemological genesis of Popular Education is found in Paulo Freire. Based on a critical analysis of formal education, Freire (1983), in his classic work, points to ways to build liberating education, one which transcends the school territory.

As pointed out before, this way of educating was first identified as Popular Education, but later scholars have referred to it as a Non-Formal Education process. Coombs (1968) and

the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 1972) were pioneers in the use of the term Non-Formal Education (Cazelli, Costa & Mahomed, 2010, apud Marquês & Freitas 2017) as a way to conceive of education beyond the school.

The Brazilian and the international literatures qualify as formal the education processes developed within the territorial limits of the school. Meanwhile, the Brazilian literature particularly qualifies as non-formal or informal those education processes developed outside the school territory. Gohn (2006) defines those three education processes as follows:

Formal education is the one developed in schools, with previously established syllabuses; informal education is the one whereby individuals learn during their socialization process – in the family, neighborhood, club, friends, etc. – one which is instilled with their own values and cultures, with inherited feelings and senses of belonging; non-formal education is the one whereby an individual learns “in the world of life”, via processes of sharing experiences, especially in everyday collective spaces and actions.^{vii} (Gohn, 2006, p. 28, underline added).

The author particularly states that

Non-Formal Education designates a process with several dimensions, such as political learning of the rights of individuals as citizens, qualification of individuals for work through the learning of skills and/or development of potentials, learning and practices that enable individuals to form organized groups to solve daily collective problems and pursue community objectives, learning of content that allows individuals to read the world and understand what is happening around them, education developed in the media and by the media (especially the electronic media).^{viii} (Gohn, 2006, p. 28).

Gohn’s propositions suggest that the operationalization *locus* of these education processes is well demarcated, with each of them being completely unrelated to the other. However, we believe that they have at least one point in common, one which is related to intentionality. In fact, we believe that the act of educating is not neutral – whoever educates has an objective, an intention.

A new pedagogical perspective emerged in the mid-1980s, and especially in this first quarter of the 21st century: Non-School Education (NSE). This perspective embraces the continuous creation and recreation of different teaching and learning possibilities beyond the school. According to Severo (2015),

[t]he emergence of NSE as a perspective for developing training and learning practices that meet demands beyond the school is part of a context crossed by social, political, and economic factors related to the globalization process and by cultural factors generated by the momentum of contemporary technology-based communication and experience exchange. From a theoretical point of view, NSE is related to current notions within pedagogy that

expand the meaning of human education based on diversified, complex, dynamic, and interconnected teaching and learning processes that take place in spaces and times beyond the school institution. Such notions include permanent education, lifelong education, integral education, social education, to name but a few.^{ix} (Severo, 2015, p. 562-563).

Severo (2015) seems to suggest that NSE does not ignore the potentials and specificities of the school. It rather seeks to build pedagogical practices that dynamize knowledge production/reproduction and learning processes while also making them socially useful beyond the limits of the school in contemporary times. NSE “not only brings forward new educational practices, but also challenges, directly or indirectly, the function of both the school and what is expected to be learned within this institution”^x (Severo, 2015, p. 565).

Importantly, NSE cannot be categorized as a type of education, whether formal, informal or non-formal. It permeates all these types of education processes by exploring their convergent aspects. Severo (2015) also states that

NSE can be conceptualized as a thematic category that encompasses training and learning practices carried out outside the school. It is, therefore, more appropriate to refer to education spaces where non-formal and informal processes take place, although in some cases it is possible to recognize formal activities that occur outside the school, in unconventional contexts. Similarly, the school can be the context of Non-Formal Education activities, as in the case of social education practices in school institutions. These are an ongoing effort to introduce complementary and integrative activities into the school syllabus and curriculum, such as music, artist and sport workshops, and community outreach programs.^{xi} (Severo, 2015, p. 565).

Based on these assumptions, we argue that Dual Education is fundamentally a Non-School Education process, insofar as it is part of the lifelong learning paradigm. This paradigm allows for “actions that extend the training and self-training times and spaces, based on the contextual needs of both subjects and communities as they emerge in the human sociability and work dimensions”^{xii} (Severo, 2015, p. 566).

More than a Non-School Education praxis, Dual Education is a school of experience based on open, plural, contextualized educational practices, one whereby the individuals’ culture and the experience is the cornerstone for critical, creative knowledge and attitudes. In our view, Dual Education is part of the field of Pedagogies of Praxis and takes inspiration from Marxist scholars such as Pistrak (1981) and Gramsci (2001).

Pedagogy of Praxis is the theory of a pedagogical practice that seeks not to hide conflict, contradiction; on the contrary, it seeks to understand them as inherent to human existence, to make them explicit, to coexist with them. It is sparked off by dialectics. For Pedagogy of Praxis, the school should pursue social goals, rather than only pedagogical goals^{xiii} (Gadotti, 2012, p. 17).

Therefore, it is the product of a dialectic with several dimensions: “as the unique experience of each person, it is also the most complex of social relations, since it is inscribed, at the same time, in the cultural, labor and citizenship dimensions”^{xiv} (Delors, 1999, p. 107).

Dual Education: the school of experience

Dual Education involves education processes in school and non-school times and spaces. In other words, it seeks the training and learning unity of the school territory articulated with the territories of the family, the community, the work etc. – in sum, articulated with the social practices. Pineau (1999) defines Dual Education as a school of experience. “The school of experience is in itself a school of action. Its logic is less of discourse than of action”^{xv} (Pineau, 1999, p. 56). Dual Education is at the intersection of school education and Non-School Education.

Gimonet (2007, p. 67) presents Dual Education as a “pedagogy of the borders” (in Portuguese, “*pedagogia das orlas*”). The border as an edge, a frontier, a place of passage between two paradoxical realities, a place of ruptures and relationships. Spontaneous, informal, random training and learning processes occur in the relationship with the environment in everyday life.

For Gimonet (2007, p. 141-142), all experiential training and learning can be “educational, insofar as the dual learner is engaged in real situations and in all their dimensions: cognitive, affective, social”^{xvi}, with the person embraced in their entirety and no confinement to practical knowledge. If not all knowledge is learned in the school space, then how can we learn what we know beyond the school’s territorial borders?

In fact, knowledge acquisitions through experiences are so vast and varied that school systems ignore them most of the time. The challenge is to recognize and validate them institutionally through the school system and the university. We are facing the debate between commonsense and science, which challenges old impasses about the place of science in human education and the place of commonsense in science production.

Pineau’s approach to the knowledge from experience is similar to Paulo Freire’s “knowledge made of experience” (in Portuguese, “*saber de experiência feito*”). In his posthumous work, Freire (2001) argues:

one thing remains in me, as a person and as an educator, whether thinking about educational practice or doing educational practice; it is a deep respect for the figure of the learner, the learner's taste and the learner's training and learning ... And a great respect, too, for the knowledge “made of experiences only” (in Portuguese, “*só de experiências feito*”), as Camões says, which is exactly the commonsense knowledge. I disagree with scholars who despise commonsense, as if the world had started from the rigor of scientific knowledge. No way! Rigor came later.^{xvii} (Freire, 2001, p. 232).

Freire does not idealize, but rather seeks in his work to value and legitimize the knowledge from experience. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, he criticizes the oppressive ideology that underrates the individual, considered incapable, to spread the absolutization of ignorance and strengthen the dichotomous view between “those who know” and “those who do not”. Hence, he states that “there is neither absolute knowledge nor absolute ignorance; there is only relativization of knowledge or ignorance”^{xviii} (Freire, 1993a, p. 29). Freire reiterates his disagreement with the scientific view that overvalues science and downplays commonsense; he urges for “demystifying science, that is, putting it in its proper place”^{xix} (Freire, 1993a, p. 12).

Freire's knowledge made of experience represents an important contribution to appreciating commonsense as a way to explore what it has of sound sense in a critical perception of the term (Freire, 1992, p. 26). He criticizes those who go to popular communities with their pre-established theoretical frameworks without taking into account what they already know and how they know it (Freire, 1993a, p. 58). Freire (1993b) refers to the expression “knowledge made of experience” in Kosik (1976) as the basis for understanding the immediate knowledge that characterizes everyday life. Freire (1993b) states that there are two ways of moving in the world, the spontaneous and the systematic, both of which resonates in a debate on the theory–practice relationship, and that those two movements are only perceived and understood in their contradictions to one another.

Speaking of the world's epistemological diversity, Santos (2005, p. 97) shares similarities with Freire when he says that “all knowledge is partial, and social practices are rarely based on a form of knowledge”^{xx}. Both value commonsense as one of the ways to de-dogmatize science. In several other passages in other works, Freire uses the expression “knowledge made of experience”, always seeking to reinforce knowledge from experience as a starting point to build systematic knowledge, with both containing ignorance and wisdom. Both Freire's and Santos's perspectives are consistent with our reflection on the possibility of having other training and learning spaces that reverberate in the education processes beyond

the school. As the school is not the only place of training and learning, Dual Education seeks to associate and integrate other areas of knowledge and integrate action and reflection.

Some factors condition the experience in the formative process. Factor 1 is time. “The formative contribution of experience is linked to time, including when it comes to personal development. ‘Another time, another custom,’ a proverb says”^{xxi} (Pineau, 1999, p. 59). Factor 2 is that formative training and learning are linked to the nature of the experience. It can also be deforming, because “there are bad experiences, which hurt to death, traumatize, and paralyze for life”^{xxii} (1999, p. 59). Factor 3 has to do with the personal dimension. Some people manage to turn everything into opportunities for development, but some are unable to do much due to the most diverse obstacles and resistances.

Just like Freire does not idealize, but rather seeks to appreciate and legitimize knowledge from experience, Pineau (1999) also takes experience as a starting point in a formative process. However, according to Pineau (1999, p. 59), “experience does not automatically contribute to people’s development”^{xxiii}. When he introduces Dual Education as one of the possibilities to account for experience in the curriculum, Pineau (1999) mentions three conditions for experience to become a training factor.

Condition 1 is having direct experience in the reality, i.e., experience imbued with concrete action and interaction. This condition is insufficient, but it represents the starting point. Everyone is ignorant at some level, as Freire says, but everyone also has knowledge made of experience. Ana Lúcia Souza de Freitas (2010), in the entry “knowledge made of experience”, refers to “learning from listening” in Paulo Freire’s work. She comments the following:

The author refers to learning from listening as a way to transform the authoritarian discourse of those who speak *to* the students into a horizontal act of speaking *with* the students. Knowing how to listen is an attitude of respect for the students’ knowledge made of experience.^{xxiv} (Freitas, 2010, p. 366).

The process of writing this article was an opportunity to meet one of our fellow co-authors. Were it not for this writing opportunity, we might not have met. In this co-authorship opportunity, we are doing a little experiment. Will it be formative? Yes, like the second condition that we will deal with next, namely reflection.

Condition 2 for an experience to be formative is reflection. We need to turn to experience, surround it with observation, oral and written communication, confrontation, questioning, analysis, transformation, if we are to move from concrete, particular experience

to a well-thought, reflected experience, and then to general knowledge. This movement can be understood as awareness-raising. The school of experience combines the time for interaction, for the experience itself, with the time for reflection. If the time for interaction is strong, the time for reflection becomes longer and deeper for the actual understanding of what has been experienced (Pineau, 1999).

Condition 3 could include Dual Education in

moving from interaction to reflection, back and forth. No love without reciprocity ... Interaction must be associated with reflection. And reflection is associated with action. This leads to an intelligent action that the Greeks called praxis.^{xxv} (Pineau, 1999, p. 60).

In his interpretation, Paolo Nosella (2007) goes in this direction when he conceptualizes Dual Education in the first work on the topic in Brazil, published in 1977.

The basic formula of Dual Education, as it is easy to see, expresses a very precise political commitment: it rejects discrimination against rural men and rural cultures, it founds the education process upon the fundamental, inalienable responsibility of the family and the community, as well as on the dialectic between practice and theory.^{xxvi} (Nosella, 2007, p. 8).

Thus, the gentle clash between action and reflection, in the words of Pineau (1999, p. 61), leads to an understanding of education beyond the school in the Dual Education processes. From this perspective, he refers to Dual Education as a “crossing-school of experience” (“trans-escola da experiência”), i.e., an interacting school based on integrative exchange between experience and science, with reflection integrating with action and action becoming an intelligent action in a perspective of praxis.

Education territorialities in Agricultural Family Schools

When referring to the territorialities of Dual Education, we point out its ability to occupy different spaces and adapt to the needs of the immediate context. A possible example of Non-School Education is materialized, in our view, in the practices of the Family Centers for Dual Education (in Portuguese, CEFFAs – Centros Educativos Familiares de Formação por Alternância), which are linked to the Agricultural Family Schools (in Portuguese, EFAs – Escolas Famílias Agrícolas).

In this context, we analyze how Dual Education promotes interaction across education territories “school-family-community”, i.e., Dual Education as a pedagogy of borders, one to

travel across and integrate, avoiding ruptures, dissociations, and juxtapositions of experience and science. This requires the planning and organization of a pedagogical device aimed at allowing training times and spaces to interact, relating the different curriculum components, preventing knowledge fragmentation and the humanist vs. technical training dichotomy, associating families and communities to the training process, and mediating the follow-up of students in their families and communities (Gimonet, 2007; Begnami, 2019). This section analyzes Non-School Education processes by building on the Study Plan, the Family Training Plan, and Visits to Families and Communities (in Portuguese, Plano de Estudo, Plano de Formação das Famílias, and Visitas às Famílias Comunidades, respectively).

The Study Plan is one of the main Pedagogical Mediations of the Dual Education practiced at the CEFFAs. It comprises a set of topics decoded from participatory research with communities in the territory covered by the education center. It is a generative theme, or articulator of block-release sequences. Its purpose is to facilitate the research of reality with a view to understanding and transforming it. Such research, carried out in the school time, is further pursued by the students in their time with their families and communities. It allows students to immerse themselves in the daily lives of their families and communities, as well as to collect data and record them through listening, observation, experiences, interviews, questionnaires, etc. Back at school, the students share their data in a conversation circle called “Placing in Common” (in Portuguese, “Colocação em Comum”). The collective synthesis produced in this activity serves as a basis for dialoging, in a horizontal perspective, knowledge from experience with academic knowledge of both general training and professional training. This process culminates with the students returning to their families/communities to carry out the Return Activities (in Portuguese, “Atividades de Retorno”), i.e., activities designed to act upon reality in the light of more in-depth theoretical reflections made in the school time-space.

The Study Plan provides the training unit in three stages – family/community-school-family/community – by articulating knowledge construction based on the dialog of different types of knowledge in an action-reflection-action cycle. Based on the Non-School Education theory, we observe that the Study Plan promotes the students’ school and Non-School Education processes, while also involving their families’ and communities’ Non-School Education as students manage to develop participatory research and provide feedback through interventions or experiments guided by the Return Activities. The students seek to contribute with solutions to problems identified in the scope of social and family production and

organization, to pass on information of interest to the community, and to carry out training activities, among others resulting from the current topic. To that end, families and communities need to be informed and trained to get involved in the co-forming process of Dual Education.

The Visit to the Family and Community is one of the mediations of the relationship between the school-family-community spaces-times, “it aims to bring educators closer to families and to the students’ life and work”^{xxvii} (Telau, 2015, p. 35). It enhances the pedagogical bond between school and family and allows the school to bring the school closer to the students’ and their communities’ social, economic, political, and cultural life. It becomes one of the primary sources for educators to learn popular knowledge. They learn from the knowledge gathered by the students’ research, but they can reinforce and expand their views on the families’ and communities’ daily lives through their visits. This reinforces the counter-hegemonic logic that communities and their experiences do teach, too.

During the visits, the educators follow the students in their social and educational activities planned for the family/community time-space, the Study Plan research, the Return Activities, and the elaboration and implementation of the Professional Youth Project (in Portuguese, Projeto Pessoal do Jovem – PPJ, as explained below), among others. It represents an opportunity to: observe and understand the students’ and their families’ specificities, their problems, potentials, and perspectives; assess development against the educational, social, economic process; reinforce the families’ roles and responsibilities in the Dual Education process; and raise awareness about the importance of their role in the school’s self-management. The narratives about the activity results point to its importance to creating an environment of mutual trust.

The PPJ begins with a discussion about the students’ Life Project (Projeto de Vida). As the apex of the educational path, it is based on the Pedagogical Mediations of Dual Education. Its preparation is guided by a diagnosis of social, economic, and environmental feasibility. The Study Plans enhance its preparation. The Visits to Families and Communities reinforce its definition and implementation. Its purpose is to encourage learning about the design of projects that enhance opportunities for generating work and income from the perspective of solidarity economy and sustainable life production and reproduction.

In addition, the Visit to the Family and Community provides an opportunity to exchange popular knowledge, experience, and scientific knowledge. First, the educators prepare to the Visits. They plan the objectives, the schedule, and their distribution in the

territory. During the visits, they apprehend the territorial reality, both material and immaterial, of the students, their families, and their communities by engaging in their homes and properties. Upon returning to school, they challenge themselves to systematize the information and to pass them on to the group of educators. This moment allows the school to get to know the reality of both its students and its territory and to organize itself to meet their needs.

The Visit to the Family and Community constitutes an opportunity to apprehend the explicit and implicit demands of the families' and the communities' daily lives, which transcends pedagogical organization and educational performance. It works as a means of permanent diagnosis that updates the topics in the students' Study Plan and provides elements for further topics aimed at family education, thereby giving cohesion to the processes. The topics go beyond the school dimension to cover the community in its entirety and deal with agricultural issues, psychosocial issues, or any other emergent issues.

In doing so, both school and community promote the collaboration and complementarity between academic knowledge and popular knowledge. Despite the challenges of social and militant participation, the EFA has their Association self-managed by the own peasant families and their social partnerships as one of its fundamental pillars. This Association is evidence that this school emerges from a movement of struggle, emphasizing the basic principle of community participation in the defense of rights to quality education for the peasants. As such, its managerial board is basically occupied by parents, caregivers, and partners.

The organization of a school institution with an educational project articulated to the political, economic and cultural conceptions of the countryside requires this group to follow an institutional sustainability project and be aligned to the struggle to maintain the collective project. In this participatory movement, families learn to relate more closely to each other, to claim rights from the government, to establish networks with other social movements and unions, to strengthen the Association and the partner network, and to be familiar with the current educational legislation (Cavalcante, 2010).

The EFA Association's management staff is one of the strategies adopted to mobilize the participation and leading role of all individuals, especially women and young people, who generally occupy fewer decision-making spaces. In addition to learning practice in the Association's daily life, the management staff are trained in associativism and cooperativism

as a means of promoting the members' qualification and strengthening their associative and cooperative life.

The Family Training Plan is another Non-School Education strategy in the EFAs. It is guided by the EFA political movement at the national and state levels and seeks both to strengthen the families' and communities' roles in its organizational base, and to provide opportunities for qualifications in several areas.

The Plan consists of four structuring formative dimensions: Association, Dual Education, Human Education, and Sustainable Development. The Association dimension addresses topics related to associativism and cooperativism in general, mainly the specific aspects of the EFA Association, its purposes, and its commitment demands from families. The Dual Education dimension addresses Pedagogical Mediations, which demand a more effective participation of the families in the study process, especially in the activities planned for community time – what is expected of the families at this time together with the students is understanding, support, motivation, and accompaniment. The Human Education dimension involves reflections on generational relationships, life projects, political engagement, etc. The Sustainable Development dimension addresses topics related to agricultural practices, adding value, marketing, etc.

When considering the family–school link in the construction of different types of learning, an intense movement of knowledge exchange stands out, one whereby they reciprocally (re)cognize and strengthen each other. The topics chosen for further study concern the needs expressed by families and/or issues perceived by the school as potentially relevant. Reality provides the elements that will be decoded into training contents in a dialectical relationship, thus fulfilling the social function of education, which is to interpret and act on reality to transform it. Freire (2004) says that education is a process whereby human beings can transform themselves and their social context.

In our analysis of EFA, some of the educational practices, despite their links with formal school, also present Non-School Education dimensions, both in the regular education processes that have students alternate spaces-times in the school and family-community and in the education processes that link families, community leaders and professionals, and their social partners. This demonstrates that the educational practices in the EFAs manifest the conception of school beyond itself, as promoted by Dual Education. This finding points to the need for further studies.

Final remarks

Surpassing the hegemonic ideological logics that confine education territoriality to the formal school environment is a complex task, because the school has been historically conceived of as the only space capable of developing valid/socially accepted training processes. However, counter-hegemonic educational movements emerged to challenge the centrality of the formal school in the last quarter of the 20th century. The Popular Education movement represented by Brazilian educator Paulo Freire has pointed to new training and learning possibilities, with the school being just one of them.

The education territories are not limited to an epistemological dispute, as we should be committed to guaranteeing the right to education for all, a subjective right of all citizens. Our reflection in this article evinces that the formative processes in Dual Education intermediate school education and Non-School Education, thereby significantly expanding the education territory.

The territories in Dual Education propose new methodologies for pedagogical praxis. Restructuring the curriculum by having the students' and the communities' knowledge as its cornerstone re-signifies knowledge. The different experiences identified in the pedagogical journey provide the guidelines to be observed in the training of the intra-school and extra-school community. In this challenging context, both school and community integrate a whole and seek to encompass the plurality of learning built in different experiences.

The training and learning processes that involve families and partners, as well as those involving the students themselves, transcend the school territory by expanding school to the community, social movements, unions, non-governmental organizations, etc. As a result, the school is forced to re-elaborate its own representations of locus of knowledge production and to embrace other educational loci, i.e., to expand how it sees and conceives of itself, thereby reinforcing Dual Education as a pedagogy of the borders. This practice helps the EFA project to strengthen and guide the communities' project building on sustainable life production and reproduction.

This article points to the relevance of reflecting on and further studying Non-School Education in the context of training experiences in Dual Education.

References

- Begnami, J. B. (2019). *Formação por Alternância na Licenciatura em Educação do Campo: possibilidades e limites do diálogo com a Pedagogia da Alternância* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte.
- Brandão, C. R. (2002). *A educação popular na escola cidadã*. Petrópolis-RJ: Editora Vozes.
- Brasil, (1996). *Lei de diretrizes e bases da educação nacional – nº 9394/96*. Recuperado de: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/19394.htm
- Cavalcante, L. O. H. (2010). Das políticas ao cotidiano: entraves e possibilidades para a educação do campo alcançar as escolas no rural. *Ensaio: aval. pol. públ. educ.*, 18(68), 549-564. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40362010000300008>
- Coombs, P. H. (1968). *La crise mondiale de l'éducation. Une analyse de systèmes*. Paris: PUF.
- Delors, J. (1999). *Educação: um tesouro a descobrir*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Fernandes, B. M. (2010). *Sobre a Tipologia de Territórios*. Recuperado de: http://www.gepec.ufscar.br/publicacoes/ruralidade/sobre-a-tipologia-de-territorios.pdf/at_download/file.
- Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogia da tolerância*. São Paulo: Unesp
- Freire, P. (2001). *Pedagogia dos sonhos possíveis*. São Paulo: Unesp.
- Freire, P. (1993a). *Política e educação: ensaios*. São Paulo: Cortez, 1993a. (Coleção questões da nossa época), v.23.
- Freire, P. (1993b). *Professora sim, tia não: cartas a quem ousa ensinar*. São Paulo: Olho D'Água.
- Freire, P. (1992). *Pedagogia da Esperança: um reencontro com a Pedagogia do oprimido*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Freire, P. (1983). *Pedagogia do Oprimido*. 17.ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Freitas, M. L. (2010). Saber de experiência feito. In Streck, D. R., Redin, E., & Zitzkoski, J. J. (Orgs.). (2010). *Dicionário Paulo Freire* (pp. 365-367). 2ª ed. revisada e ampliada. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora.
- Gadotti, M. (2012). Educação popular, educação social, educação comunitária: Conceitos e práticas diversas, cimentadas por uma causa comum. In *Revista Dialogos: Pesquisa em Extensão Universitária*, 18(1), 10-32.
- Gadotti, M. (2007). Paulo Freire e a Educação Popular. *Revista Trimestral de Debate da FASE*, (113), 21-27.

Gohn, M. M. G. (2006). Educação Não Formal participação da sociedade civil e estruturas colegiadas nas escolas. *Ensaio: Avaliação, Política Pública e Educação*, 14(50), 27-38. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40362006000100003>

Gramsci, A. (2001). *Cadernos do Cárcere*. Trad. Carlos Nelson Coutinho. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

Kosik, K. (1976). *Dialética do Concreto*. 2 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Marques, J. B. V., & Freitas, D. (2017). Fatores de caracterização da Educação Não Formal: uma revisão da literatura. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 43(4), 1087-1110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1517-9702201701151678>

Nosella, P. (2007). Militância e profissionalismo na educação do homem do campo. *Revista da Formação por Alternância*, 1(4), 5-18.

Pedro, J. C., & Stecanela, N. (2019). O Território Educativo na política educacional brasileira: silêncios, ruídos e reverberações. *Práxis Educativa*, 14(2), 583-600. <https://doi.org/10.5212/PraxEduc.v.14n2.010>

Pineau, G. (1999). Alternância e desenvolvimento pessoal: a escola da experiência. In *Anais do 1º Seminário Internacional, Alternância e Desenvolvimento em Salvador* (pp. 56-63). Brasília: DF.

Pistrak, E. (1981). *Fundamentos da Escola do Trabalho*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

Santos, B. S. (Org.). (2005). *Semear outras soluções: os caminhos da biodiversidade e dos conhecimentos rivais*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira. (Reinventar a emancipação social para novos manifestos, v.4).

Severo, J. L. R. L. (2015). Educação não escolar como campo de práticas pedagógicas. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*, 96(244), 561-576. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S2176-6681/345513545>

Telau, R. (2015). *Ensinar - incentivar - mediar: dilemas nas formas de sentir, pensar e agir dos educadores dos CEFFAs sobre os processos de ensino/aprendizagem* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte.

UNESCO, (1972). *Apprendre à être*. Relatório da Comissão Internacional sobre o Desenvolvimento da Educação UNESCO. Paris, Fayard.

ⁱ Original in Portuguese: “Cabe, também, à educação a responsabilidade de abrir as portas da mente e do coração e de apontar horizontes de construção partilhada de sociedades humanas mais humanizadas.”

ⁱⁱ Original in Portuguese: “... a educação abrange os processos formativos que se desenvolvem na vida familiar, na convivência humana, no trabalho, nas instituições de ensino e pesquisa, nos movimentos sociais e organizações da sociedade civil e nas manifestações culturais.”

ⁱⁱⁱ Original in Portuguese: “O território imaterial está relacionado com o controle, o domínio sobre o processo de construção do conhecimento e suas interpretações. Portanto, inclui teoria, conceito, método, metodologia, ideologia etc. O processo de construção do conhecimento é, também, uma disputa territorial que acontece no desenvolvimento dos paradigmas ou correntes teóricas.”

^{iv} Original in Portuguese: “... sendo o conhecimento, sua produção e/ou apreensão, um território imaterial, ele não está necessariamente vinculado a uma instituição fixa, se dá através dos ensinamentos em espaços formais e informais, e os saberes são construídos nas experiências vivenciais de um povo, são elementos da sua cultura.”

^v Original in Portuguese: “... um paradigma teórico que trata de codificar e decodificar os temas geradores das lutas populares, busca colaborar com os movimentos sociais e os partidos políticos que expressam essas lutas. Trata de diminuir o impacto da crise social na pobreza, e dar voz a indignação e ao desespero moral do pobre, do oprimido, do indígena, do camponês, da mulher, do negro, do analfabeto e do trabalhador industrial.”

^{vi} Original in Portuguese: “... um dos princípios originários da educação popular tem sido a criação de uma nova epistemologia, baseada no profundo respeito pelo senso comum que trazem os setores populares em sua prática cotidiana, problematizando-o, tratando de descobrir a teoria presente na prática popular, teoria ainda não conhecida pelo povo, problematizando-a também, incorporando-lhe um raciocínio mais rigoroso, científico e unitário.”

^{vii} Original in Portuguese: “A educação formal é aquela desenvolvida nas escolas, com conteúdos previamente demarcados; a informal como aquela que os indivíduos aprendem durante seu processo de socialização – na família, bairro, clube, amigos etc., carregada de valores e culturas próprias, de pertencimento e sentimentos herdados; e a educação não-formal é aquela que se aprende “no mundo da vida”, via os processos de compartilhamento de experiências, principalmente em espaços e ações coletivos cotidianos.”

^{viii} Original in Portuguese: “A educação não-formal designa um processo com várias dimensões tais como: a aprendizagem política dos direitos dos indivíduos enquanto cidadãos; a capacitação dos indivíduos para o trabalho, por meio da aprendizagem de habilidades e/ou desenvolvimento de potencialidades; a aprendizagem e exercício de práticas que capacitam os indivíduos a se organizarem com objetivos comunitários, voltadas para a solução de problemas coletivos cotidianos; a aprendizagem de conteúdos que possibilitem aos indivíduos fazerem uma leitura do mundo do ponto de vista de compreensão do que se passa ao seu redor; a educação desenvolvida na mídia e pela mídia, em especial a eletrônica etc..”

^{ix} Original in Portuguese: “A emergência da ENE como perspectiva de desenvolvimento de práticas formativas que atendem a demandas além-escola se insere em um contexto atravessado por fatores sociais, políticos e econômicos relativos ao processo de globalização, bem como por fatores culturais gerados pela impulsão da comunicação e pela troca de experiências apoiadas em tecnologias contemporâneas. Do ponto de vista teórico, a ENE se relaciona com conceitos correntes no campo da pedagogia que expressam um significado ampliado para a formação humana com base em processos de ensino e aprendizagem diversificados, complexos, dinâmicos e interconectados em espaços e tempos distintos da instituição escolar, a exemplo do conceito de educação permanente, educação ao longo da vida, educação integral, educação social etc..”

^x Original in Portuguese: “... não só são processadas novas práticas educativas, como também essas práticas põem em avaliação, direta ou indireta, a função da escola e das aprendizagens que se espera que sejam promovidas em seu âmbito.”

^{xi} Original in Portuguese: “Compreende-se que a ENE pode ser conceituada como uma categoria temática que engloba práticas consideradas formativas situadas fora da escola. É, portanto, mais adequada para se referir aos espaços educativos em que ocorrem processos não-formais e informais, embora em alguns casos seja possível reconhecer atividades formais que se desenvolvem fora da escola, em contextos não convencionais. Do mesmo modo, a escola pode ser cenário de atividades educativas não-formais, como ocorre no caso das práticas de educação social em instituições escolares, as quais configuram um campo em construção pelo esforço de inserir no contexto da escola, especialmente sob a perspectiva da educação integral, atividades de caráter educativo complementar e integrativo ao desenvolvimento do projeto político-pedagógico e do currículo, a exemplo de oficinas musicais, artísticas, esportivas e extensão comunitária.”

^{xii} Original in Portuguese: “... ações que prolongam os tempos e os espaços de formação e autoformação, com base em necessidades contextuais dos sujeitos e das comunidades, emergentes nas esferas das sociabilidades humanas e do trabalho.”

^{xiii} Original in Portuguese: “A pedagogia da *práxis* é a teoria de uma prática pedagógica que procura não esconder o conflito, a contradição, mas, ao contrário, entende-os como inerentes à existência humana, explicita-os, convive com a contradição e o conflito. Ela se inspira na dialética. Para a pedagogia da *práxis* a escola deve perseguir objetivos sociais e não meramente pedagógicos.”

^{xiv} Original in Portuguese: “Experiência singular de cada pessoa, ela é, também, a mais complexa das relações sociais, dado que se inscreve, ao mesmo tempo, no campo cultural, no laboral e no da cidadania.”

^{xv} Original in Portuguese: “A escola da experiência é em si mesma uma escola da ação. Sua lógica é mais da ação do que a do discurso.”

^{xvi} Original in Portuguese: “... toda formação experiencial pode ser formadora, na medida em que o alternante está engajado em situações reais e em todas as suas dimensões: cognitivas, afetivas, sociais.”

^{xvii} Original in Portuguese: “... uma coisa continua em mim, como pessoa e como educador, quer pensando a prática educativa quer fazendo a prática educativa, é um profundo respeito à figura do educando, ao gosto do educando e à formação do educando. [...] E um grande respeito, também, pelo saber “só de experiências feito”, como diz Camões, que é exatamente o saber do senso comum. Discordo dos pensadores que menosprezam o senso comum, como se o mundo tivesse partido da rigorosidade do conhecimento científico. De jeito nenhum! A rigorosidade chegou depois.”

^{xviii} Original in Portuguese: “não há saber nem ignorância absoluta; há somente uma relativização do saber ou da ignorância.”

^{xix} Original in Portuguese: “... desmitificar e desmistificar a ciência, quer dizer, pô-la no seu lugar devido.”

^{xx} Original in Portuguese: “... todo conhecimento é parcelar e as práticas sociais só raramente assentam numa forma de conhecimento.”

^{xxi} Original in Portuguese: “A contribuição formadora a experiência, também no desenvolvimento pessoal, é ligada ao tempo. ‘Outro tempo, outro costume’, diz um provérbio que pretende consignar esta experiência do tempo.”

^{xxii} Original in Portuguese: “... existem as más experiências, que ferem de morte, traumatizam e paralisam para toda a vida.”

^{xxiii} Original in Portuguese: “... a experiência não contribui automaticamente para o desenvolvimento das pessoas.”

^{xxiv} Original in Portuguese: “A aprendizagem da escuta é referida pelo autor como um caminho para transformar o autoritarismo do discurso de quem fala *para* os educandos na horizontalidade de quem fala *com* os educandos. Saber escutar é uma atitude de respeito aos saberes de experiência feito dos educandos.”

^{xxv} Original in Portuguese: “Alternância entre a interação e a reflexão, nos dois sentidos. Nada de amor sem reciprocidades. [...] A interação deve se associar com a reflexão. E a reflexão se associa com a ação. Então, neste caso, atinge-se uma ação inteligente que os gregos chamaram de *práxis*.”

^{xxvi} Original in Portuguese: “A fórmula básica da Pedagogia da Alternância, como é fácil perceber, expressa um compromisso político bem preciso: rejeita a discriminação do homem e da cultura do campo, embasa o processo educativo na reponsabilidade fundamental e inalienável da família e da comunidade, bem como na dialética entre teoria prática.”

^{xxvii} Original in Portuguese: “... tem a finalidade de aproximação dos educadores das famílias e do contexto de vida e trabalho dos estudantes.”

Article Information

Received on May 15th, 2021
Accepted on April 13th, 2022
Published on June, 06th, 2022

Author Contributions: The author were responsible for the designing, delineating, analyzing and interpreting the data, production of the manuscript, critical revision of the content and approval of the final version published.

Conflict of Interest: None reported.

Article Peer Review

Double review.

Funding

No funding.

How to cite this article

APA

Begnami, J. B., Costa, A. C. M., & Freitas, E. F. J. (2022). Education territories in Dual Education: school – family – community. *Rev. Bras. Educ. Camp.*, 7, e12193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20873/uft.rbec.e12193>

ABNT

BEGNAMI, J. B., COSTA, A. C. M., & FREITAS, E. F. J. Education territories in Dual Education: school – family – community. *Rev. Bras. Educ. Camp.*, Tocantinópolis, v. 7, e12193, 2022. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20873/uft.rbec.e12193>