

Writings by countryside female educators on the meanings of pedagogical practice in countryside schools

Elisvania Nunes Braz¹, Nilsa Brito Ribeiro²

¹Instituto Federal do Pará- IFPA. Setor Pedagógico/Ensino. Avenida Brasília s/n. Vila Permanente. Tucuruí - PA. Brasil.

²Universidade Federal do Sul e Sudeste do Pará - UNIFESSPA.

Author for correspondence: elisvaniabraz@yahoo.com.br

ABSTRACT: This article aims at understating in Internship Reports written by female students during the Degree in Countryside Education, the different social voices (discourses) that percolate these women's representation of the pedagogical practices in countryside schools. The working hypothesis is that these representations implicate the relation between the course's objectives to other social spheres that potentialize or challenge the theoretical, methodological and political configuration of the degree itself if taken as object of enquiry. Analyses of excerpts from the reports were theoretically grounded on the social historical conception of language by Bakhtin and the Circle as well as on the theoretical knowledge produced in the Countryside Education studies. Analytical Results are identified in the internship reports written by female students as the remarkable presence of discourses turned to i) the pedagogical "how to" of educators in the countryside; ii) the conflicting relation between school-knowledge and the knowledge from experiences lived by the learning subjects. That discursive regularity present in the students' reports from a teaching degree leads us to the provisory conclusion that discourses by undergraduate subjects produced in the alternance of educational times point to both challenges and potentialities of an educational proposition open to multiple voices present in the very conception of the degree.

Keywords: Amazon, Women, Undergraduate Education, Countryside Education.



A escrita de educandas do campo sobre sentidos da prática pedagógica em escolas do campo

RESUMO. Este artigo tem por objetivo apreender, em relatórios de Estágio escritos por mulheres estudantes de um curso de Licenciatura em Educação do Campo, diferentes vozes sociais (discursos) que permeiam as representações dessas mulheres sobre o fazer pedagógico em escolas do campo. A hipótese de trabalho é que estas representações evidenciam a relação da proposta do curso com outras esferas sociais que potencializam ou desafiam a configuração teórica, metodológica e política do próprio curso, se tomadas como objeto de problematizações. Para a análise de excertos extraídos dos relatórios nos fundamentamos teoricamente na perspectiva sócio-histórica de linguagem formulada por Bakhtin e seu Círculo, além de fundamentos teóricos produzidos no domínio dos estudos da Educação do Campo. Como resultados analíticos, identificamos nos relatórios das educandas em situações de Estágio, uma forte presença de discursos que se voltam: i) para o "como fazer" pedagógico dos educadores das escolas do campo; ii) para a relação conflituosa entre os saberes escolarizados e os saberes do vivido no cotidiano dos sujeitos da aprendizagem. Essa regularidade discursiva presente nos relatórios das estudantes da licenciatura nos leva a concluir provisoriamente que os discursos dos sujeitos em formação produzidos na alternância dos tempos formativos indiciam desafios e potencialidades de uma proposta educativa aberta à multiplicidade de vozes presentes na própria proposta do curso.

Palavras-chave: Amazônia, Mulheres, Formação, Educação do Campo.

La escritura de las estudiantes del campo sobre los sentidos de la práctica pedagógica en las escuelas del campo

RESUMEN. El objetivo de este artículo es analizar, en Informes de Prácticas hecho por mujeres estudiantes de un curso en Licenciatura en Educación del Campo, distintas voces en el hacer pedagógico en escuelas campesinas. La hipótesis de trabajo es que las representaciones evidencian la relación de la propuesta del curso con otras esferas sociales que potencializan o desafían la configuración teórica, metodológica y política del propio curso, si se toman como objeto de estudio fragmentos extraídos de los informes de prácticas. Nos basamos teóricamente en la perspectiva sociointeracionista de Bakhtin y su círculo, además de estudios teóricos en la Educación Campesina. Como resultados, identificamos en los informes de prácticas una fuerte presencia de discursos que se vuelven: i) para el “cómo hacer” pedagógico de los educadores de las escuelas campesinas; ii) para la relación de conflicto entre los saberes de la institución escolar y los saberes vividos en el cotidiano de los sujetos del aprendizaje. Esa regularidad discursiva se nos lleva a la conclusión, provisional, de que los discursos de los sujetos en formación construidos en la alternancia de los tiempos formativos indican desafíos y potencialidades de una propuesta educativa abierta a la multiplicidad de voces que están en la base de la propia propuesta del curso.

Palabras-clave: Amazonia, Mujeres, Formación, Educación campesina.

Introduction

Mikhail Bakhtin and the Circle understand language as a symbolic universe in which we are born and move in a way that all spheres of human activity are bound by its use. We share the Bakhtinian assumption that it is in the human interactive processes in the different life spheres of production that we are constituted through the mediation of language. Therefore, the signs internalized in interactional processes are not univocal in meaning but filled with plurivocal meanings from the different spheres in which we interact to one another. In Bakhtin's words¹:

At any given moment, languages of various epochs and periods of socio-ideological life cohabit with one another. Even languages of the day exist: one could say that today's and yesterday's socio-ideological and political "day" do not, in a certain sense share the same language; every day represents another socio-ideological semantic "state of affairs", another vocabulary, another accentual system with its own slogans, its own ways of assigning blame and praise. Poetry depersonalizes "days" in language, while prose, as we shall see, often deliberately intensifies the difference between them, gives them embodied representation and dialogically opposes them to one another in unresolvable dialogues. (Bakhtin/Voloshinovⁱⁱ, 2006, p. 291).

It is that notion of language always marked by historical processes in which it is produced, that guides the analysis of reports written by female students from two major Countryside Education (henceforth LPEC) [Licenciatura em Educação do Campo] classes at Federal University in the South and Southeast of Pará (Unifesspa) [Universidade Federal do Sul e Sudeste do Pará], to comprehend how these students dialogue in their written reports with other social voices that constitute their subjectivities in the undergraduate context. Therefore, it the article's main objective to learn from the written reports by female students how they produce in their discourse representations of the educational work in countryside schools and which other voices intersect in the dialogical or interdiscursive process.

Reports were produced in the educational praxis on which the undergraduate course is based which implicates two educational contexts: university time-space and local time-space. By binding both these time-spaces to social reality and to the conditions of the material (re)production of subjects in the countryside, LPEC seeks to overcome classroom limitations and to foster a real possibility of understanding the social contradictions that move it. Regarding

countryside educators, it is important to understand how feminine subjectivities experience their undergraduate degree in the relationship between these educational times.

Methodology

The theoretical framework of the dialogic relationship that holds as founding principle the understanding of the *others'* discourse anchored the steps taken from *corpus* selection to their analysis.

1. The first contact with the Dean of the Countryside Education Degree [Faculdade de Educação do Campo] at Unifesspa allowed access to files from LPEC, where reports written by undergraduates throughout the course are organized.
2. Selecting the 2009 and 2011 classes and respective reports to compose the research *corpus*. Reports by the 2009 class were chosen as this was the first class of LPEC/UNIFESSPA, and it was expected that those reports provided us with characteristic features of the educational history for the first undergraduate experience with supervised register of local time-space. Furthermore, since the 2009 class had already finished the program, the set of written reports would contain the register of all steps of local time-space thus providing a wider insight on the process. Choosing the 2011 class is justified by the reasonable chronological distance from the 2009 class which would allow observations of possible variations of research decisions and the subsequent effects on both

production and register of the research work. Another reason for having chosen the latter was the fact that the Pedagogical Project to which it was bound was a modified version of the 2009 pioneer project.

3. By accessing the archives, the reports were gathered using as organization criterion students register, class years, research steps and guiding axes.

The present investigation develops from a socio-historical perspective characterized by the aspects listed by Freitas (2003, p. 27-28):

1. Data source is the text (context) in which the event rises, focusing on the particular as instance of social totality...
2. Research questions are not established by the operationalization of variables rather they are oriented towards understanding phenomena in all their complexity and historical development. This prevents the creation of artificial situation for investigation and meets the situation as it is happening in its development.

In addition, research subjects (LPEC female students) are seen in its singularity “but situated in relation to the historical-social context, therefore, what happens in the research is not the gathering of individual psyches but a relation of texts to context”ⁱⁱⁱ (Freitas, 2003, p. 29).

From this theoretical-methodological perspective, reports written by female students were taken as discourses which

allowed multiple readings since words are symbolic elements and not translucent: “the enunciation does not communicate it all, the researcher must search for the effects of meanings which demands leaving the enunciation and getting to the enunciable through interpretation”^{iv}. (Caregnato & Mutti, 2006, p. 681). Therefore, reports taken as discourse are connected to the historical conditions in which they are produced. An important data that is part of students’ writing constraints is that their reports integrate the knowledge activated during the university time-space as well as the knowledge that is constructed through experiences developed in the local time-space be it schools or another place of human activity in their communities. The focus of our analysis befalls on the meanings that rise from the articulation between these two forms of knowledge: historically produced knowledge systematized in the scientific sphere and knowledge from experience produced in the subjects’ daily lives.

In the present article, nine reports produced in the confluence of times and spaces in the LPEC degree at Unifesspa were analyzed. Several themes emerged from the discursive analysis of these reports, from which two were chosen: *Teaching knowledge centered on the “how to”* and *tensions between school-*

knowledge and lived knowledge. According to Bakhtin/Voloshinov (2006), the theme (something individual and reiterable) is not taken merely as content, subject, topic or main title of a text/discourse. Consequently, it does not become an isolated word exactly because “The theme of an utterance is concrete-as concrete as the historical instant to which the utterance belongs”^v. (Bakhtin/Voloshinov, 1973, p. 100).

Threading considerations on the Degree

Countryside education according to Caldart (2009) is a new concept and can only be understood in its original materiality, strongly bound to the historical movement that first originated it. Understanding countryside education demands locating it in the triad countryside – public policies – education. These dimensions according to Caldart (2009) are indissociable in the comprehension of Countryside Education as a project originated from social and union movements in the fight for agrarian reform and, most importantly, in the defense of life and of survival in the countryside. Caldart (2009, p. 40) argues that

Countryside Education emerged in a given moment and historical context and cannot be understood in itself or merely in the educational world or in

the theoretical parameters of pedagogy. It is a real movement of fight against the *current state of affairs*: a practical movement with practical purposes or objectives and practical tools, that expresses and produces theoretical conceptions, criticism to certain notions of education, of education policies, of projects for both the countryside and the country but that are interpretations of reality constructed to guide concrete actions/fights^{vi}.

After the consolidation of several academic experiences supported by the National Program of Education in Agrarian Reform [Programa Nacional de Educação na Reforma Agrária] (Pronera) as well as by countryside social and union movements and the yet existent in 2007 association of Federal University of Pará [Universidade Federal do Pará] (UFPA^{vii}) to the Federal Government Sponsoring Program to Plans for Restructuring and Expanding Brazilian Federal Universities [Programa do Governo Federal de Apoio a Planos de Reestruturação e Expansão das Universidades Federais Brasileiras] (REUNI)^{viii}, UFPA/Marabá started offering the first Degree in Countryside Education in the South and Southeast of Pará in 2009. In the initial notes in the book *Counter-hegemonic practices in educational degrees: reflections from the degree in Countryside Education in the South and Southeast of Pará* [Práticas contra-hegemônicas na formação de educadores: reflexões a partir do curso de Licenciatura

em Educação do Campo do Sul e Sudeste do Pará] (2014), the editors allude to the experiences of educating countryside educators and highlight:

The total conquered by this historical construction has enabled the conception of the Teacher Degree in Countryside Education [Licenciatura Plena em Educação o Campo] (LPEC) that since 2009 has offered one class per year. Albeit the institutionalization of degrees for Unifesspa represent the convergence of a national policy for Countryside Education, it answers more concretely to demands by movements in Countryside Education in the region, especially as part of the fight for Agrarian Reform. (Santiago, Souza & Ribeiro, 2014, p. 11)^{ix}.

More than the offer of a new teacher degree, LPEC is a proposal born from/with countryside subjects (Caldart, 2011) similar to other regions in the country. In the South and Southeast regions in Pará, the degree is presented as part of a wider fight in which the counter-hegemonic project of graduating countryside educators is inserted. Underlying the mission of the degree regarding social struggle, its required courses are structured in four knowledge areas “sustaining the exercise and search for interdisciplinarity as a principle for future educators”. (Unifesspa, 2014, p. 15)^x. They are Human and Social Sciences [Ciências Humanas e Sociais] (CHS), Agrarian and Natural Sciences [Ciências Agrárias e da Natureza] (CAN),

Literature and Languages (LL) and Mathematics (MAT).

Choosing areas of knowledge is an important strategy for teaching degrees to expand the offer of final years of primary education and high school in the countryside because in many places schooling is yet limited to the initial years of primary school. It is highlighted in respect to the expansion of access to education that “the main intention is to contribute to the construction of processes capable of triggering changes in the reasoning of use and production of knowledge in the countryside”. (Molina, 2015, p. 153)^{xi}.

This reasoning is related to the “process of destabilization of a given order and the denaturalization of a (disciplinary) curriculum that is historic, but begins to be taken as the only possible in working with knowledge” (Caldart, 2011, p.141)^{xii}. Criticism to this reasoning promotes rethinking of both the education of future educators and their teaching activities in various localities. Molina and Sá (2012, p. 471-472) claim that:

As respects the proposal of educating in areas, disciplines are not the main objective of the pedagogic work with knowledge. This work is directed towards questions of reality as objects of study based on the appropriation of scientific knowledge already stored. Epistemological questions are thus made about the

very conception of knowledge, science and research. It is questioned how the pedagogical work can guarantee the movement between appropriation of knowledge and its production and the articulation of knowledge and educational process as a permanent whole between the knowledge sciences helps producing and current life issues. Phenomena from real life need to be studied in their complexity, such as they exist in reality, by means of an approach that comprehends totalities in their contradictions, their historical movement. (Molina & Sá, 2012, p. 471-472)^{xiii}.

The choice of working with knowledge areas in LPEC is based on the pedagogy of praxis and the appreciation of the subjects’ experiences as concrete forms of producing and generating knowledge to transform reality (Unifesspa, 2014). Due to the understanding of praxis as reflexive action of constructed knowledge and the association of theory-practice in the teaching practice, the degree assumes as ethical and pedagogical principles: contextualized higher education; the reality and experiences of countryside communities as object of study and knowledge source; research as educational principle; the indivisibility of theory-practice; planning and educational act integrated to the knowledge areas; learners as subjects of knowledge and; academic production to transform reality.

It is announced in the curricular guidelines of the Pedagogical Project

designed for the LPEC/Unifesspa the articulation of various knowledge in the context of countryside populations without neglecting the theories and methods from the academic sphere. It is believed that through these guidelines, the degree achieves its mission.

The bond between education to the space of rural life is materialized and organized in LPEC through the alternance of two times in the graduation that complement each other dialectically to promote the pedagogical education of countryside educators. They are: the University Time-Space [Tempo-Espaço Universidade] (TEU) and the Local Time-Space [Tempo-espaço Localidade] (TEL)^{xiv}. These time-spaces are comprehended as “territories of knowledge characterized by disputes, conflicts, power relations inherent to the historical construction of the social being”. (Costa & Monteiro, 2014, p. 117).

The organization of times and spaces in alternance (School Time and Community Time) is based on the principle that school and community are times/spaces to construct and evaluate knowledge and therefore it is necessary to overcome the understanding of school as a place of theory and the community as the place of application/transformation. During the graduation, the student develops a time to study at university and another one at home/work. Hence, there are no distances during the graduation but different

spaces/times to produce and socialize knowledge. (Antunes-Rocha, 2010, p. 02).

University Time-space embraces Seminars of socialization of Local Time-Space and “studies on pedagogical knowledge and countryside education centered on teacher’s education”. (Unifesspa, 2014, p. 29), materialized in studies throughout the Common Core Requirements and Specific Requirements Core.

Local Time-space is the moment in which learners are immersed in their places of origin to practice local research and to learn the social, educational, political and cultural context through investigative practice. Such time-space gathers different activities in its educational itinerary. According to the Pedagogical Project (PP), these activities are divided into: Socio-Educational Research and Teaching Internship. According to the curricular project, Local Times-space is:

The time of practices of social and educational research, configuring a moment of academic investigation on the pedagogical day-today of rural schools and the communities where they are located. It is the moment to collect data and go through socio-educational experiences along with the school and the community to foster reflections on the reality and pedagogical processes that are developed in the countryside. (Unifesspa, 2014, p. 30).

Educational times for LPEC – TEU and TEL – are composed of five thematic axes: (*Society, State, Social Movements, and Agrarian Questions; Countryside Education; Knowledge, Culture and Identity; Familiar systems of production; Countryside, territoriality and sustainability*) distributed in eight stages. According to this proposal, the axis model breaks with the disciplinary tradition to articulate different knowledge areas. Three distinct and interrelated cores – core foundation, specific requirement core and free or complementary core – consolidate the educational trajectory in the eight stages of time-spaces oriented by the theme axes.

Internship reports, the corpus of the present paper, are produced in the movement of alternance between both these times (TEU and TEL) and are always guided by the reflections produced in each axis. Therefore, the interpretation of meanings from the students' reports must take into account the context fostered by the reflections in each axis. Next, the analysis of the enunciations extracted from the reports follows a dialogical conception of language as it enables the mobilization of different voices present in a given discourse and the social struggle there produced. Before analysis, nonetheless, brief notes on the Bakhtinian dialogical

theory that supports analysis have to be shared.

In the discourse of women educators, other voices rehearse dialogue

The effective organization and development of analysis involved collecting the enunciations around themes as the *meaning/theme* constitute the unit of a complex whole in the discursive chain circulating in the society. Theme for Bakhtin has no correspondence to the random gathering of subjects to debate as it is traditionally done in writing classes at school. Bakhtin argues that the theme emerges from the subjects' discourses in their relation to history, in a given sphere of human activity, therefore it is not an *a priori* data to discourses because it can only be comprehended in the relationship between the researcher to what is said in a given conjuncture.

In the current investigation, what is written/said in the reports is taken as discourses/enunciations mobilized by representations that undergraduate students produce about the world, about themselves, about the other from the social and ideological place they occupy in the world. Writing by these female students, discursively understood, composes the enunciative chain of the endless production of their knowledge throughout the

graduation, even before they get to the school. Meanings conveyed by the reports are always interpreted in their dialogic relationship because no discourse circulates in the world without carrying the echoes of alterities, no discourse is indifferent to the social voices with which it dialogues in the form of response, adherence, rebuttal, complement, questioning, refusal etc.

Following the method proposed by Bakhtin (1973) for working with language, the first approximation concerns the socio-historical conditions in which the Project of Countryside Education is materialized and the political, educational and cultural context of the subjects involved in the project as previously discussed. The second approximation involves the spheres in which the reports were produced, considering the scientific/university sphere, the research environment in the community as well as the students' work spaces; finally, the materiality of the enunciation is achieved to comprehend the movement of discourses.

A dialogical process with the academic knowledge is realized when the students recollect knowledge from the community, granting it research status and objectifying it in both the learning process and the construction of new knowledge. Consequently, a complex discursive

movement guided by the constitutive dialogic principle of that articulation that transits from systematized knowledge (TEU) and social/local knowledge (TEL). Each one of these time-spaces is constituted by its inherent ideologies that reveal their tensions and conflicts.

In this regard, we share the Bakhtinian notion that words once they are said are inevitably inhabited by other voices in such a way that every discourse in recollecting the *already said* is open to the incorporation of new voices in an interactive process between the discourse that precedes the saying and the discourse to come. Therefore, it is assumed that words enunciated by students in their reports dispute different meanings thus allowing the observation of signs of ideological struggle.

Enunciations under analysis were divided into two themes that appeared more frequently in the students reports, characterizing their relation with the educational practice in the countryside schools. These themes were: teacher knowledge centered on the "how to"; tensions between school knowledge and lived knowledge.

Teacher knowledge centered on the "how to"

Enunciations collected under this theme refer to the close attention paid by students in LPEC to the issue of teaching methods in countryside schools. At times, the attention to that dimension of teaching at times holds a positive nature, at other times, a negative one. Focusing on these discourses helps understanding the conception of education underlying a discourse in which the teaching method, that is, the *how to*, juxtaposes the *what do to do*, *why to do it*, *whom to do it with*. What histories of education are at the basis of such discourses?

E1^{xv}:

Even though content is the teacher's basic instrument, it is interesting to highlight that its socialization occurs under a careful thinking of the subjects' day-to-day so students can reflect critically following the theoretical frame necessary for thinking the reality in which they are involved. In other words, the teacher makes an effort to contextualize content by bringing examples from the media, daily examples from the students' lives especially when it concerns youth, thus dialoguing with their lived experiences and previous knowledge in an interdisciplinary manner using elements of other disciplines to construct the philosophical thinking (I. S. S. S. / VI TEL, 2014^{xvi,xvii}).

E2:

Although the teacher used just the textbook in her classes, in three moments she brought examples from the activities to the students' reality, which caused greater participation by the students in giving examples, also these examples were in the number

of two or three, soon the teacher asked students to answer two questions from the textbook, when she ended the interactive dialogue in the classroom (M. E. C. G./ IV TEL, 2011)^{xviii}.

E3:

Following the content and the lesson plan, the teacher when working with texts starts by orally reading it, introducing reflexive questions, then moving to the interpretation questions in the book, that is when students sit together and copy and answer, mostly it happens like this. Grammar studies follows the almost same method, studying concepts from the content after explanation by examples, doing the exercises, individual activity in class where students copy the questions from the book onto their notebooks and answer them afterwards. There are times when the textbook questions are replaced by questions written by the teacher. While students are silently answering the questions, the teacher prepares something for later and when the time is up, questions are corrected or left for the next class. Generally, this is how classes occur three days a week (A. C. S. D. / IV TEL, 2011)^{xix}.

E4:

Watching the students' classroom routine, I noted that the in one class teacher was using as the main support materials the textbook, the board and chalk. Usually, teachers write the content on the board, explain it, students write it down and answer activities and afterwards return it for the teachers to correct. (M. R. J./III TEL, 2009).

The curricular activity that generated the reports from which enunciations 1 to 4 were extracted is named *Teaching Internship for Systematic Observational*

Research. That activity consists of observing and registering school knowledge and methods developed in countryside schools. In spite of the diversity of aspects to be observed by LPEC students during the observation and registering stage in the internship, the reports show that their emphasis most frequently lies on the teaching method used by the school teacher. The sustained attention to teaching methodology produces the effect of searching for related meanings, in other words, it is necessary to investigate the historical conditions that guide students to choose as center of their observations the methods used by the teacher in the classroom.

Focusing on the materiality of enunciations 1, 2, 3 and 4, it is seen that future teachers watch the teaching practice questioning, confronting and evaluating it according to what they consider to be a transformative and coherent to the specific needs of countryside subjects.

In their representations, the teacher in primary countryside schools is characterized as the one who 1) **is limited to the use of the board, chalk and the textbook as exclusive pedagogical support to teaching** (*I noted that the in one class teacher was using as the main support materials the textbook, the board and chalk.*); 2) **seldom uses examples**

from students' daily lives or resorts to research to produce knowledge (*Although content is the only instrument used by the teacher, who little stimulates investigation or research, at first I do not see the activities involving projects or group actions, I also did not noted the exploration of local knowledge such as oral stories, local knowledge or popular tales*); 3) **follows a linear application of didactic activities** (*Usually, teachers write the content on the board, explain it, students write it down and answer activities and afterwards return it for the teachers to correct*).

These negative representations are found in many writings by LPEC students. At the same time, these evaluations delineate representations by the students concerning the “good educator” in the countryside such as in enunciation 1: “*it is interesting to highlight that its socialization occurs under a careful thinking of the subjects' day-to-day so students can reflect critically following the theoretical frame necessary for thinking the reality in which they are involved*”. The same positive observation is seen in enunciation 2: “*she brought examples from the activities to the students' reality*”.

The excerpts show that the methodological practice is the main aspect observed by students. That relevance is

permeated with meanings that at times attribute the choice of this or that method to the success or failure of the teaching-learning process. By placing in the enunciative scene proposals that aim to improve the educational process they are analyzing, students seem to distance themselves from the negative image of the observed teacher, while they also (re)construct for themselves the image of an educator aware of the life stories of the subjects in the countryside.

Enunciations centered on the discourse of action (the teacher did that or did not do that) rather than on the understanding of why these actions were realized, promotes the debate on the Pedagogy of Competences (Ramos, 2012) as a strong tendency in the field of teacher education and well discussed in the official documents that guide education in Brazil. Revisiting the discourse of the other, that of the competences, is necessary in a degree that aims to overcoming discourses of pedagogic competences, since analyzing discourses means considering the social and historical dimensions of the texts in order to examine the process of discursive constitution as well as emerging representations.

The notion of competence became very popular in the 1990s especially after the educational reforms occurred in Brazil

to attend the demands of the process of productive restructuring of capital. In that pragmatic conception of teaching, emphasis is placed on the valorization of subjectivities and individual differentiation. Thus, the emphasis students' discourse place on the "how to" as the main dimension of teacher's education might implicate the logic of competences, specially if those enunciations are not taken throughout their degree as objects of reflection. Therefore, dialogue between the many voices that sustain the discourse enabled by LPEC students' reflections allow insight into conceptions and pedagogical representations upon which the educational processes started in primary school are based.

Naturally, these students' discourses dialogue with LPEC academic discourse which has been fiercely criticizing conceptions of teaching that take the textbook as the exclusive source of information for the primary school teacher. This dialogical relation enables the observation in the students' discourse of the textbook as a "villain" in the teaching-learning process by either stripping the teacher of their autonomy or preventing a wider approach on the historic, political, and social context, precisely because they

do not embrace the themes of the concrete life of the subjects.

Therefore, LPEC students are anchored on their academic education to elaborate their perceptions of the other and, in that, they show that countryside education has a very long path to trace towards problematizing the construction of new teaching identities in countryside schools. Therefore, discourses converge to another theme which we named *tensions between school knowledge and lived knowledge*, to show in the discourses, the expectations of LPEC students regarding the transformation of the school and educational processes lived and practiced locally.

Tensions between school-knowledge and lived knowledge

The focus of this session is the tension denounced by students in their discourses in respect to the silencing of subjects' knowledge regardless of their school knowledge. Thus, it is seen the presence of interdiscursive relations between LPEC students and the project Countryside Education in the defense of an indissociable link of University-systematized content and the subjects' daily knowledge that are brought into the school system.

Enunciations 5 and 6 although produced by students from different classes belong to the same knowledge axis: *Knowledge, Culture and Identity*. Research from both classes were themes "school knowledge in teaching practice and school curriculum aimed at: observing school knowledge for countryside education, focusing educational relations and curricular content practiced..." (Unifesspa, 2014, p. 42).

E5:

In the pedagogic process of the school I could note the difficulties of the teachers in planning the teaching, they follow textbooks to select and organize knowledge used to educate students without looking at the curricular implications of that attitude, as the didactic material is far from the reality of these students (C. M. da C./ III TEL, 2009).

E6:

The knowledge the school presents to students is exclusively that of the textbooks, there is not a crossing of texts with the students' reality, the valorization of each student's culture and their empiric knowledge is not taken into consideration in the classroom. During classes, the educator used just the textbook and the notebooks to copy and answer activities, the evaluations are of a single type, students answer all questions and get good grades, if they cannot answer the questions according to the educator's corrections, they either did not learn anything or are not capable of moving onto the next year/grade (L. S. S. / IV TEL, 2011).

The textbook is recognized as a resource that teachers can use in the process of teaching-learning. However, it is known that textbooks production from its origins has been questioned for attending editorial demands that disagree with the various pedagogical orientations concerning educational and cultural diversity.

Silva (2012) discusses the fetishization of the textbook and highlights the overestimation of that didactic resource in the Brazilian school culture. He argues that “the status textbooks achieved in social representations is the result of a complex history, significant economic value and ideological and political implications, especially in the times of the Brazilian Republic”. (Silva, 2012, p. 803).

Using the textbook as a single resource “*without looking at the curricular implications of that attitude*” as registered by the student in Enunciation 5, imposes limitations on the educational process that prevent learning subjects from problematizing their local realities and interfering with them. Limiting the construction of knowledge to a single orientation already present in a textbook, for a homogenized and unified content, becomes an obstacle for the development of educational projects turned to local realities. Taking the textbook as the only

trigger for knowledge is dooming countryside schools to precariousness. Hence, it ought not to be ignored that limitations in the material conditions of countryside schools “point to the contradiction between the discourse of law, juridical framework and specific educational policy”. (Silva, 2009, p. 348).

In addition to featuring the textbook as exclusive trigger for learning, the enunciations also denote the educational conception predominant in the methodological practices observed in the countryside schools researched by the students, in which the teacher is the central figure.

E7:

The educator teaches based exclusively on the textbook, there is no bibliographic research, nor approximation of content to the reality of the subjects, students do not discuss the texts that are read in class, do not speak, they just listen to what the teacher reads or says. Content systematization happens through writing activities and correcting them, students do not speak, do not have active voice in the socializations of the activities particularly because it is harder to understand texts without something concrete.

During the in-class observation for History it was possible to notice the lack of dialogue between educator-learner, the methodology consists of always coming into the classroom, warning learners of the content to be studied, ordering students to open the textbook in the appointed pages and reading individually and lowly to

answer the activity because the educator will correct it next class and “mark” it, not minding whether it is correct or not. (L. S. S./III TEL, 2011).

As observed, Enunciation 7 brings representational marks of a discourse that portrays the permanence of the teacher as the sole holder of knowledge. Teaching by the book is thus characterized as silencer of the school-work relation mediated by research. It prevails in this form of teaching and learning:

a) **The teacher as sole holder of knowledge:** *...students do not discuss the texts that are read in class, do not speak, they just listen to what the teacher reads or says...*

b) **Mechanic and by the book teaching:** *...The educator teaches based exclusively on the textbook...*

c) **Application of learning/evaluation as the purpose of the educational process:** *... the educator will correct it next class and “mark” it, not minding whether it is correct or not...*

Discursive sequences highlighted in Enunciation 7 point to pedagogical practices centered in a conception of teaching that focuses on the teacher as sole holder of knowledge while student, at the other end of the process, are positioned as receivers and reproducers of the knowledge supposedly “deposited” by their teacher. Therefore, “*students do not discuss the texts that are read in class, do not speak, they just listen to what the*

teacher reads or says”. This seems to be the state of affairs Countryside Education wants to overcome in order to develop another educational logic. Contrary to the traditional school, discourses suggest a new educational project in which the method is aligned with a humanizing education and part of a wider political project.

Undergraduate students anchored by their academic readings expand their analytical horizon by resorting to academia discourses to corroborate their reflections in a dialogical reflection between the world of knowledge and the lived world without losing sight of the association of academic knowledge to the students’ social life and to the pedagogical representations that are at the basis of the discursive chain.

There are other marks in that enunciation that denote the inefficiency of the mere transmission of knowledge based on the unilateral and authoritative teaching: “*the methodology consists of always coming into the classroom, warning learners of the content to be studied, ordering students to open the textbook in the appointed pages and reading individually and lowly to answer the activity because the educator will correct it next class and ‘mark’ it*”. It is important to highlight the silencing of alterity: “*students do not speak, do not have active voice in*

the socializations of the activities particularly because it is harder to understand texts without something concrete". In that scenario, both teacher and students miss the opportunity to dialogically share knowledge. That seems to be the issue appointed and discussed by students in their reports. According to Freire, dialoguing is a necessary practice for the teacher mediator, as it articulates the learners' experiences to their world and existence.

Dialogue is thus an existential necessity. And since dialogue is the encounter in which the united reflection and action of the dialoguers are addressed to the world which is to be transformed and humanized, this dialogue cannot be reduced to the act of one persons "depositing" ideas in another, nor can it become a simple exchange of ideas to be "consumed" by the discussants. (Freire, 2005, p. 89)^{xx}.

Due to the complexity of the educational process strongly marked by pedagogical and social variables that involve it, LPEC students understand that it cannot be conducted outside the dialogical interaction of school and life, school and society as demanded by an emancipatory project.

Final Considerations

Based on the Bakhtinian thought specially on discursive dialogism, that is, the correspondence of one discourse to another, reports analyses made possible to learn themes that are translated in voices that participate in the students' educational processes, pointing at the life that comes into university, reclaiming new educational objects as well as academic relations that suggest new barriers to be transgressed.

Assuming the notion of dialogism as structuring part of the process of knowledge construction, it was possible to discern in the students' discourse their relation with the theoretical-methodological bases of their graduation which provide them in the evaluation of the other, with the awareness that countryside schools still hold strong ties to the hegemonic and homogenizing pedagogic tradition. The evaluation present in the LPEC reports suggest that as a domain that requires further investigation and enquiry by an emancipatory educational project.

Although students' observations cause important shifts in the image of school teachers to an image aligned with principles of Countryside Education there are contradictions that must be brought up in the educational debate. For instance, the attention students dedicated almost exclusively to the teachers' methodologies

as a fixed point in the educational process needs to be problematized since countryside schools are much more than the school itself, which demands that other dimensions of the process must also occupy the discursive scene to prevent the mere and simple instrumentalization of teachers' actions in countryside schools.

Two complementary paths of investigation are thus opened by the students' reports: the homogenizing school tradition present in countryside schools and the educational history of LPEC students centered on the *how to* of the school. Both point to the necessity of further problematization of the degree.

References

Antunes-Rocha, M. I. (2010). Licenciatura em educação do campo. In Oliveira, D. A., Duarte, A. M. C., & Vieira, L. M. F. (Orgs.) *Dicionário: trabalho, profissão e condição docente*. Belo Horizonte: UFMG/Faculdade de Educação. CDROM.

Arroyo, M. G. (1999). A educação básica e o movimento social do campo. In _____, Fernandes, B. M. (Org.). *A Educação Básica e o Movimento Social do Campo* (pp. 10-38). Brasília, DF: Articulação Nacional Por Uma Educação Básica do Campo.

Bakhtin, M. (V. N. Volochínov). (2006). *Marxismo e Filosofia da Linguagem*. 12. Ed. São Paulo: Hucitec.

Caldart, R. S. (2011). Licenciatura em Educação do Campo e projeto formativo:

qual o lugar da docência por área. In _____ (Org.). *Caminhos para transformação da escola: reflexões desde práticas da Licenciatura em Educação do Campo* (pp. 127-154). São Paulo: Expressão Popular.

_____. (2009). Educação do Campo: notas para uma análise de percurso. *Trabalho, Educação e Saúde*, (7), 35-64.

Caregnato, R. C. A., & Mutti, R. (2006). Pesquisa qualitativa: análise de discurso versus análise de conteúdo. *Texto Contexto Enferm*, 679-684. Recuperado de: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/tce/v15n4/v15n4a17> Acesso em 03 de março de 2017.

Costa, E. M., & Monteiro, A. L. (2012). Procampo: uma política de formação inicial para o docente do campo. In *Anais XVI ENDIPE - Encontro Nacional de Didática e Práticas de Ensino*. UNICAMP - Campinas.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogia do Oprimido*. 17. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

_____. (1981). *Ação Cultural para a liberdade e outros escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freitas, M. T. (2003). A perspectiva sócio-histórica: uma visão humana da construção do conhecimento. In Freitas, M. T., Jobim, S. S., & Kramer, S. (Orgs.) *Ciências humanas e pesquisa: leitura de Mikhail Bakhtin* (pp. 26-38). São Paulo, Cortez.

Molina, M. C., & Sá, L. M. (2010). A Licenciatura em Educação do Campo da Universidade de Brasília: Estratégias Político-Pedagógicas na Formação de Educadores do Campo. In Molina, M. C., & Sá, L. M. S. (Orgs.). *Licenciaturas em Educação do campo: Registros e reflexões a partir das experiências Piloto* (pp. 35-62). Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora.

_____. (2015). A educação do campo e o enfrentamento das tendências das atuais

políticas públicas. *Educação em Perspectiva*, (6) 2, 378-400.

Ramos, M. (2012). Escola Unitária. In Caldart, R. S., et. al. (Orgs.). *Dicionário da Educação do Campo* (pp. 343-349). São Paulo: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio, Expressão Popular.

Silva, I. S., Souza, H., & Ribeiro, N. B. (2014). Apresentação. In _____. (Orgs.). *Práticas contra-hegemônicas na formação de educadores: reflexões a partir do curso de Licenciatura em Educação do Campo do Sul e sudeste do Pará* (pp. 11-19). Brasília: MDA.

Silva, M. A. (2012). A fetichização do livro didático no Brasil. *Educ. Real.*, 37(3), 803-821, Recuperado de: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/edreal/v37n3/06.pdf>. Acesso em: 07 de julho de 2017

Unifesspa. (2014). *Projeto Pedagógico do Curso de Licenciatura em Educação do Campo*, Marabá.

ⁱ Bakhtin, M. (1981) *Discourse in the Novel. The dialogic imagination: four essays*. Ed. Michael Houlquist. p. 291.

ⁱⁱ The first Brazilian edition of Marxism and the Philosophy of Language dates back to 1929. The cited edition is from 2006. Due to the debate on the authorship of this work, the double reference Bakhtin/Voloshinov was chosen.

ⁱⁱⁱ In the original: “mas situado em sua relação com o contexto histórico-social, portanto, na pesquisa, o que acontece não é um encontro de psíqués individuais, mas uma relação de textos com o contexto”.

^{iv} In the original: “o enunciado não diz tudo, devendo o analista buscar os efeitos dos sentidos e, para isso, precisa sair do enunciado e chegar ao enunciável através da interpretação”.

^v Bakhtin, M., & Voloshinov, V. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. NY: Seminars Press.

^{vi} In the original: A Educação do Campo surgiu em um determinado momento e contexto histórico e não pode ser compreendida em si mesma, ou apenas desde o mundo da educação ou desde os parâmetros teóricos da pedagogia. Ela é um movimento real de combate ao atual estado de coisas: movimento prático, de objetivos ou fins práticos, de ferramentas práticas, que expressa e produz concepções teóricas, críticas a determinadas visões de educação, de política de educação, de projetos de campo e de país, mas que são interpretações da realidade construídas em vista de orientar ações/lutas concretas.

^{vii} Until June 2013, the Marabá University Campus [Campus Universitário de Marabá] presently Unifesspa, was part of UFPA.

^{viii} REUNI was instituted by the Presidential Decree 6,096, 24 April 2007 and integrates the group of actions by the Federal Government for the Plan for Educational Development, through the Ministry of Education and Culture.

^{ix} In the original: “O acúmulo conquistado por essa construção histórica possibilitou a concepção do curso de Licenciatura Plena em Educação do Campo (LPEC), que, desde 2009, tem ofertado uma turma-ano. Ainda que a institucionalização do curso no interior da Unifesspa represente a convergência a uma política nacional de Educação do Campo, ela responde, mais concretamente, às demandas do movimento de Educação do Campo na região, especialmente como parte da luta pela Reforma Agrária”.

^x In the original: “tendo o exercício e a busca da interdisciplinaridade como princípio pautado para a formação dos educandos”.

^{xi} In the original: “... a intencionalidade maior é a de contribuir com a construção de processos capazes de desencadear mudanças na lógica de utilização e de produção de conhecimento no campo”.

^{xii} In the original: “processo de desestabilização de uma ordem dada e de desnaturalização de uma forma curricular (a disciplinar) que é histórica, mas passa a ser assumida como a única possível no trabalho com o conhecimento”.

^{xiii} In the original: “no caso da proposta de formação por áreas, não são as disciplinas o objetivo central do trabalho pedagógico com o conhecimento. Este trabalho se dirige a questões da realidade como objeto de estudo, tendo como base a apropriação do conhecimento científico já acumulado. Colocam-se, então, indagações epistemológicas sobre a própria concepção de conhecimento, de ciência e de

pesquisa. Indaga-se de que forma o trabalho pedagógico pode garantir o movimento entre apropriação e produção do conhecimento e a articulação entre conhecimento e processo formativo como um todo permanente entre o conhecimento que a ciência ajuda a produzir e as questões atuais da vida. Os fenômenos da realidade atual precisam ser estudados em toda a sua complexidade, tal como existem na realidade, por meio de uma abordagem que dê conta de compreender totalidades nas suas contradições, no seu movimento histórico”.

^{xiv} Some institutions adopt Time-school and time-community. In spite of the appearance of such terms in some excerpts in the Pedagogical Project for LPEC/Unifesspa, university time-space and local time-space were presently chosen as they are more recurrent in the document.

^{xv} The identification of the excerpts extracted from the Reports was conventionalized by naming them Enunciation “E” numbered according to the order of presentation (E1, E2, E3 successively).

^{xvi} Each student was identified by the initial of their name followed by the local time-space (TEL) and the class year.

^{xvii} In the original: “Apesar do conteúdo ser o único instrumento de base do professor é interessante destacar que o trabalho de socialização do mesmo dar-se sob um cuidado de pensar o cotidiano dos sujeitos de forma que os alunos possam refletir de maneira crítica com essa fundamentação teórica que se faz necessária para pensar a realidade a qual estão envolvidos. Ou seja, há um esforço do professor de contextualizar o conteúdo trazendo exemplos da mídia, exemplos cotidianos que perpassa pela vida dos alunos, principalmente, quando se trata da juventude, dialogando com suas experiências de vida e com os conhecimentos prévios dos alunos de forma interdisciplinar usando elementos de outras disciplinas na construção do pensamento filosófico”.

^{xviii} In the original: “Embora a professora usasse somente o livro didático nas aulas, em três momentos ela trouxe exemplos da atividade para a realidade dos alunos, nestes momentos houve uma participação maior dos alunos, dando exemplo, também esses exemplos foram dois ou três, logo a professora pediu para os alunos responderem as duas questões do livro, neste momento finalizou o diálogo interativo na sala”.

^{xix} In the original: “Seguindo o conteúdo e o plano de aula, o professor quando vai trabalhar texto começa com a leitura oral do mesmo, introduz

perguntas reflexivas, depois passa para as questões envolvendo interpretação propostas no livro, onde os alunos se sentam juntos e vão copiar e responder, na maioria das vezes é assim que acontece. Com o estudo da gramática, a metodologia é quase a mesma, estudo dos conceitos do conteúdo após a explicação por meio de exemplos, realizar o exercício, vem a atividade individual, realizada na sala, onde os alunos passam as perguntas do livro para o caderno e em seguida respondem as mesmas. Há algumas vezes que as questões do livro são substituídas por questões da autoria do professor. Enquanto os alunos respondem silenciosamente as questões, o professor sempre prepara algo para depois, e acabado o tempo as questões são corrigidas ou deixadas para a aula seguinte. Em linhas gerais esse é o modo como as aulas seguem os três dias da semana”.

^{xx} Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. 30th anniversary. Ed. NY: The Continuum International Publishing Group.


Article Information


Received on April 30th, 2018
Accepted on May 25th, 2018
Published on December 23th, 2018

Author Contributions: The authors 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.

Orcid

Elisvania Nunes Braz
 <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9440-4361>

Nilsa Brito Ribeiro
 <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9213-1726>

How to cite this article

APA

Braz, E. N., & Ribeiro, N. B. (2018). Writings by countryside female educators on the meanings of pedagogical practice in countryside schools. *Rev. Bras. Educ. Camp.*, 3(4), 1294-1315. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20873/uft.2525-4863.2018v3n4p1294>

ABNT

BRAZ, E. N.; RIBEIRO, N. B. Writings by countryside female educators on the meanings of pedagogical practice in countryside schools. **Rev. Bras. Educ. Camp.**, Tocantinópolis, v. 3, n. 4, sep./dec., p. 1294-1315, 2018. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20873/uft.2525-4863.2018v3n4p1294>