

THE POTENCY AND COMPLEXITY OF A DIALOGICITY: CHALLENGES IN THE FORMATION AND PERFORMANCE OF SOCIAL EDUCATORS

A POTÊNCIA E A COMPLEXIDADE DE UM FAZER DIALÓGICO: DESAFIOS DA FORMAÇÃO E DA ATUAÇÃO DE EDUCADORAS(ES) SOCIAIS

LA POTENCIA Y LA COMPLEJIDAD DE UNA ACCIÓN DIALÓGICA: RETOS DE LA FORMACIÓN Y ACTUACIÓN DE LAS EDUCADORAS Y LOS EDUCADORES SOCIALES

Juliana dos Santos ROCHA¹
Marlene ROZEK²

ABSTRACT: This paper has origin from a research, and it is about the subjective constitution of social educators who are dialogically positioned in relation with their students, considering the need for a space that thinks and discusses the teaching and learning processes in Social Education. Based on the interpretive constructions of the research, which has a qualitative nature, the discussion allows us to understand that the participants' dialogical postures are related to subjective configurations and meanings that are expressed through the recognition of the other's humanity. For that, it was necessary that the participants overcome the productions of the dominant social subjectivity in Brazil regarding their students, that often puts them in a place of inability. A construction that directs the reflection to the necessity for formation that must be thought and structured in a more humane and less technical perspective, to promote critical positions, historical and conceptual knowledge articulated with practice.

KEYWORDS: Social education. Social educators. Subjectivity. Learn. Teach.

RESUMO: *Este artigo originou-se de uma pesquisa e trata da constituição subjetiva de educadoras(es) sociais que se posicionam dialogicamente diante de suas(seus) educandas(os), tendo em vista a necessidade de um espaço que pensa e discute os processos de ensino e aprendizagem na Educação Social. A discussão, feita a partir das construções interpretativas da pesquisa, de cunho qualitativo, permite compreender que as posturas dialógicas dos participantes estão relacionadas a configurações e sentidos subjetivos que se expressam pelo reconhecimento da humanidade do outro. Para tanto, foi necessário que os participantes superassem as produções da subjetividade social dominante no Brasil a respeito de suas(seus) educandas(os), que, muitas vezes, as(os) coloca em um lugar de “não saber”, de incapacidade. Uma construção que direciona a reflexão à necessidade de uma formação que precisa ser pensada e estruturada em uma perspectiva mais humana e menos tecnicista, de modo a*

¹ Projeto Pescar Foundation (FPP), Porto Alegre – RS – Brazil. Pedagogue, Qualification and Improvement. Doctorate in Education (PUCRS). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6923-2107>. E-mail: julianarocha@projtopescar.org.br

² Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), Porto Alegre – RS – Brazil. Professor at the School of Humanities. Doctorate in Education (UFRGS). ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8740-6166>. E-mail: marlene.rozek@puers.br

promover posicionamentos mais críticos e conhecimentos históricos e conceituais articulados com a prática.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Educação Social. Educadoras(es) sociais. Subjetividade. Aprender. Ensinar.*

RESUMEN: *El artículo tiene su origen en una investigación y trata de la constitución subjetiva de los educadores sociales que se posicionan dialógicamente ante sus alumnos, ante la necesidad de un espacio que piense y discuta los procesos de enseñanza y aprendizaje en el contexto de la Educación Social. La discusión, a partir de las construcciones interpretativas de la investigación, de carácter cualitativo, permite comprender que las posturas dialógicas de los participantes están relacionadas con configuraciones subjetivas y significados que se expresan a través del reconocimiento de la humanidad del otro; para eso, era necesario que los participantes pudieran superar las producciones de la subjetividad social dominante en Brasil con respecto a sus (sus) estudiantes, quienes, muchas veces, los colocan en un lugar de “no saber”, de incapacidad. Una construcción que dirige la reflexión a la necesidad de una formación que necesita ser pensada y estructurada en una perspectiva más humana y menos técnica, para promover posiciones más críticas y conocimientos históricos y conceptuales articulados con la práctica.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Educación Social. Educadores sociales. Subjetividad. Aprender. Enseñar.*

Introduction: starting the route

This article is the result of a doctoral research in Education, concluded in March 2020. The investigation sought to understand how social educators who position themselves dialogically before their students are subjectively constituted, in view of the need to establish a space that thinks and discusses the teaching and learning processes in Social Education and, consequently, the possibilities and training needs of these professionals. Such investigation originated from the Master's in Education research that was dedicated to understanding the subjective meanings produced about learning by adolescents who participated in the services offered by the Social Assistance Policy in a Civil Society Organization (CSO) in Porto Alegre, capital of the Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil. The research, completed in 2016, aroused the desire to understand how are constituted the social educators(s) that emerged in the speeches of adolescents as those with whom they were able to build a space for dialogue that favored their learning, which allowed them to feel capable to learn and actually learn.

Thus, this article deals with the subjective constitution of an educator and a social educator, Fiona and Watusi, who participated in conversational dynamics, organized in six meetings with each of them, guided by the following questions: how personal and professional

experiences are configured subjectively in the experience of being a social educator? How do the subjective configurations of social educators are expressed in personal and professional positions vis-à-vis with the students being attended by them? What beliefs about learning do social educators have? How do the educators perceive the learning of the students? From these questions, the objective was to better understand the power and complexity of a dialogical practice and the challenges of the performance and training of these workers.

Thus, this text seeks to articulate knowledge about subjectivity, learning and Social Education, in order to generate intelligibility about the field of Social Education, contributing to the expansion of important reflections at the national level. The proposed outline deals with the power and complexity of an ethical posture that promotes the construction of a dialogical space in Social Education, reflecting on the challenges of formation and the performance of social educators for the constitution of this posture.

To this end, the article is organized as follows: an introduction, which aims to situate the reader on how the proposed reflections arise; a second part, dedicated to explaining the methodological paths of the investigation from which this text emerges; afterwards, the reader will find a synthetic articulation of the theoretical bases of the research, which deal with subjectivity, learning and Social Education, with a position that defends the importance of these concepts for the expansion of scientific knowledge about the research field; and, finally, the reflections that arise from the construction of information are presented, the interpretation of the researchers on the dialogues that were established with the research participants, aiming to reflect on postures and dialogical actions of social educators.

As pointed paths, possibilities of unfolding and provocations, it is considered that a dialogical action within the scope of Social Education, by social educators, consists of postures and practices that promote the effective participation of students, respecting their humanity, their guidelines and knowledge, considering them capable of learning and teaching, a process that proves to be potent for the promotion, defense and guarantee of rights and the emancipation of the public it serves. To this end, the challenge is to provide quality formative processes, more humane and less technical, that promote a series of knowledge articulated with experiences in the field, among which, in an introductory way, the following stand out: knowledge about learning as a human process, historical knowledge about the expressions of the social question and diverse aesthetic knowledge and experiences, which confront the hegemonic social constructions.

Methodological paths: Qualitative Epistemology and Constructive-interpretive Methodology

The investigation from which this reflection arises is a qualitative research, based on the assumptions of Qualitative Epistemology, proposed by the Cuban psychologist Fernando González Rey, whose principles guide studies that propose to study the phenomenon of subjectivity. In this sense, the author points out that science is knowledge and explanation, not a mere description of the empirical, and, when it comes to phenomena such as subjectivity, building scientific knowledge, generating zones of intelligibility, requires apprehending and interpreting a psychological expression that is dynamic, procedural, and dialectic (GONZÁLEZ REY, 2017). It should be noted, then, that Qualitative Epistemology understands that science has a procedural character and is produced from the active interaction of the human being, which carries with it a history, which deals with an equally historical and changeable object, integrated simultaneously in multiple systems in relation to reality.

In this complex system, the individual who participates in an investigation is not passive, nor a mere informant. Nor does the researcher use information to simply signify a reality. The information is being constructed by both in a perspective of dialogicity. Spaces of intelligibility produced from scientific research, but which are never considered as the final truth, are not exhausted in themselves and open space for deepening and for new theoretical constructions.

The Constructive-Interpretative Methodology emphasizes its theoretical nature. In this way, the research is oriented towards the development of comprehensive models about what it proposes to study, since it starts from the principle that knowledge is a construction process, legitimized by the capacity to produce new concepts “in the course of confrontation of the researcher's thinking with the multiplicity of empirical events coexisting in the investigative process” (GONZÁLEZ REY, 2005, p. 7, our translation). Thus, knowledge is not a reality ready to be known and ordered according to universal categories. Furthermore, another important principle of this perspective is to consider the theory as a theoretical model in development, not as a ready and static truth, thus, “the meaning of each empirical record during the development of a theoretical system is, necessarily, an act of theoretical production, because it is inseparable from the theoretical system” (GONZÁLEZ REY, 2005, p. 7, our translation).

In this way, in the course of the research, the researcher constructs information from indicators³ that arise from conversational dynamics, that is, makes an interpretive effort to

³ The indicators represent the researcher's interpretive effort, allowing the fabric of a set of reflections, in an integrated analysis of the research information, and, in the course of the construction of the information, through

generate intelligibility about the configurations and subjective meanings that relate to their research problem - in this case, how are social educators subjectively constituted with dialogical attitudes towards their students? The linking of ideas, of indicators, allows the researcher to construct some hypotheses of interpretation, which can be deepened or refuted in the research process, configuring themselves in the theoretical unfolding according to the studied theme.

An educator and a social educator participated in the investigation, considered by the adolescents participating in the master's research and by the researcher as those who had dialogical attitudes towards their students, who potentiated the learning and teaching processes in their contexts of work. The research field lasted one and a half year, with an average of six meetings with each participant, in addition to messages with themes considered important to be studied in depth. The meetings took place as conversational dynamics caused by guiding questions about doing and being social educator and, in subsequent meetings, questions emerged from the indicators constructed from the dialogues. The completion of sentences was also used as an inducer of dialogue, an activity in which a series of sentences initiated is presented for the participant to complete them (GONZÁLEZ REY, 2005), and the psychopedagogic projective technique Par Educativo, which consists of ask the participant to draw a scene with two people, one teaching and the other learning (VISCA, 2002). In the last two cases, after the technique, conversational dynamics were followed.

Subjectivity, learning and social education: theories in dialogue

Subjectivity is here understood as a symbolic-emotional phenomenon that develops in culture in a dialectic movement between individual and social, a concept based on the Theory of Subjectivity, proposed by González Rey and collaborators. Such theory (GONZÁLEZ REY; MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, 2017) is based on the assumptions of Vygotsky's Cultural-Historical Psychology (1896-1934) and seeks to pave the way for a new understanding of subjective processes, a more complex view, which thinks about the constitution and the development of the individual in the culture and that tries to overcome dichotomies, such as objective versus subjective, social versus individual, cognitive versus affective.

In this theoretical framework, subjectivity is no longer an intrapsychic phenomenon or a linear and causal internalization of the social, and is now considered an open, recursive and complex system. Open because it is a production that happens throughout life; recursive

the coherence and the link between the indicators, unfold in hypotheses (GONZÁLEZ REY; MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, 2017).

because, when producing subjectivity in the moment lived, the individual reconfigures and produces new subjective meanings in a plot that is composed by the current experience, but that is intertwined with previous experiences and productions (GONZÁLEZ REY; MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, 2017); and, complex, not as something difficult to be understood, but as a quality that is expressed by the “disorderly, contradictory, plural, recursive, singular, indivisible and historical” character (MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, 2005, p. 4, our translation) of human systems.

Subjectivity, according to the theory, is organized into subjective configurations, which are not prior to experience and not even determinants of it, on the contrary, “they are experience itself as lived subjectivity” (GONZÁLEZ REY, 2012a, p. 28, our translation). The individual produces subjectivity by unconsciously organizing these subjective configurations in the course of the current experience, correlating it in a disorderly way with past experiences and with the production of social subjectivity. This production generates emotions, beliefs, representations, among others.

In a dialectical perspective, subjectivity encompasses all human processes, from the macrosocial to the individual; it does not dialogue with universal attributes but comprises a production of subjective meanings that cannot occur separately from the context and the complex forms of social organization. “Subjectivity is of the order of the constituted, but it represents a form of constitution that, in turn, is permanently reconstituted by the actions of the subjects within the different social scenarios in which they act” (GONZÁLEZ REY, 2012b, p. 126, our translation), that is, subjective configurations are open and moving systems.

Thus, it is important to highlight that, in this conception, subjectivity is a phenomenon with two facets: social subjectivity and individual subjectivity. The human being produces subjectivity in a dialectical movement between these two perspectives, he is a producer of social subjectivity and is produced by it. The subjectivity produced by a person is never separated from the social, nor is it a linear appropriation of social subjectivity, there is, in this production, the facet of individual subjectivity (GONZÁLEZ REY; MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, 2017).

However, often the production of individual subjectivity, in the sense of the possibility of creating alternative subjective paths to social subjectivity, is not easy and tends to require intense psychic work by the individual. For González Rey and Mitjás Martínez (2017, p. 54, our translation), “social subjectivity is a constant source of production of subjective meanings in the plots of its multiple characters”, that is, they are beliefs, values, symbolic constructions in general, that participate actively in the production of subjectivity of individuals, who also produce social subjectivity. It should be noted, then, that social subjectivity is expressed in beliefs, myths, social representations, morals, power relations, the ways in which institutions

function, hierarchies, the way knowledge circulates, ideologies, quality of the dialogues that are characterized in the spaces, among others (GONZÁLEZ REY, 2002).

In this context, learning and teaching do not occur outside the production of subjectivity, but are permeated by dichotomous ideas that are part of the representation of the human, and also by beliefs and values that marginalize populations due to the idea that these processes are related only to schooling (ROCHA, 2016). Historically, schooling constitutes for a specific portion of society - the elites (JOHANN, 2008) -, often promoting the precariousness of learning and teaching related to those who do not fit the required standards or who do not meet the standardized requirements most common assessments of this type of education.

By understanding that social educational practices are actions with pedagogical intent - thought and planned based on objectives - it is understood that learning and teaching are constituents of these practices. Thus, it is emphasized that the concept of learning, which is also the basis for the reflections proposed here, is related to a perspective that has sought to understand learning as a human process, which occurs since birth and throughout human life; a characteristic process of humanization, which allows the appropriation of ways of life, from the reproduction and production of humanity (ROCHA; DI FRANCO, 2017), bearing in mind that “the human condition comprises more than the conditions under which life was given to man” (ARENDRT, 2014, p. 10, our translation). Learning also becomes a human condition.

In this sense, the potential of any human being to learn stands out, considering that, to live in the world, this is necessary. Thus, it is argued, beforehand, that everyone learns, even if there are some differences, hardships or difficulties along the way, given the heterogeneity of the process itself and of the human. It is important to highlight that it is also understood that learning and teaching are two distinct processes, which dialogue with each other, because learning requires being able to teach and teaching requires being able to learn. When individuals can move around in these roles, the tendency is for there to be more fluid processes, with people who feel more capable (ROCHA, 2016; ROCHA; LEMOS; ALVES, 2019).

Learning and teaching are relational processes, as they occur from the human relationship, from historically constructed and culturally located relationships, in an essentially subjective process, when it is considered that subjectivity is constituted in a dialectic movement between social and individual, configuring itself in the lived experience. That is, it means that all knowledge is produced, perpetuated or transformed, within a history and a culture. In this sense, González Rey (2020) points out that intellectual movements, the production of science and knowledge, are always historical and, therefore, human, not occurring independently of

beliefs, humanly produced realities, and social subjectivity. What you choose to teach, or when you choose who to teach, is the result of a historical-cultural construction.

Therefore, it is understood that learning and teaching are not merely cognitive and individual processes, but occur in the human relationship and, therefore, a multiplicity of aspects that constitute the human are part of them. Learning and teaching are, in turn, constituted by affections, emotions, subjectivities, contexts, bodies, cognitive structures, among other possible issues.

Expanded the perspective of learning and teaching beyond the walls of the school and the pre-established and hierarchical contents of the curricular grids of Basic Education, it becomes even more evident the concretization of the verbs "to learn" and "to teach" in the spaces of Social Education. As already explained in the introduction, Social Education has been understood as a space for educational practices with pedagogical intent, which varies according to the specific proposal that materializes, but which, in general, is central to the processes of teaching and learning, that is developed with populations on the verge or in situations of violation of rights, with the purpose of promoting the integral development of the people they serve, as well as the promotion, defense and guarantee of rights and access to opportunities for these individuals, respecting their ability to decide about themselves and to think about their action in the world (ROCHA, 2020).

It is an understanding of Social Education possible now, without the intention of creating a definitive concept with a weight of static truth. In this sense, according to Úcar (2016, p. 31), "the attribute of being under construction is more essential than conjunctural. If the social is mobile, dynamic and in continuous change, the social pedagogy and education that deal with it can only be mobile, dynamic and subject to continuous processes of change". Furthermore, in a more current publication (ÚCAR, 2018) the author stresses that, in a special way, in the last decade, due to the vulnerabilities and vital needs, derived from the situations of war and poverty to which people are subjected, new spaces and scopes of needs and actions are designed that require reflections and (re)planning of actions in the social field, which, once again, refers to this status of permanent construction.

However, it is understood that the target audience of Social Education is not only populations in situations of poverty, as Social Education is committed to act to reduce the drastic effects of social inequalities and injustices imposed by the social organization, in order to develop , together with people, alternatives to improve the lives of individuals, families, communities or groups (DEL POZO SERRANO, 2017). Thus, it can refer, for example, to peace making with different audiences, to dealing with situations of violence in its different

expressions and with different individuals and to initiatives that are dedicated to promoting and defending human rights with all audiences.

Currently, such practices have been developed in Brazil based on public policies, mostly in the area of Social Assistance, such as, for example, the Service of Coexistence and Strengthening of Bonds (SCFV), Institutional Reception, Social Approach, among others, but also in the area of Education, as is the case of the *Mais Educação* Program - as a way of promoting Integral Education (ZUCCHETTI; SEVERO, 2020) - and of the *Mais Cultura* in Schools Program (SOWA; ROSA, 2014), an interministerial proposal by Culture and Education portfolios. Other sectors, such as Public Security Policy, also institute public policies that are consolidated with Social Education, such as the Opportunity and Rights Program (POD), co-financed by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), established in the State of Rio Grande do Sul (SANTOS; PAZINATO; NASCIMENTO; DONATO; ENGELMAN, 2019), and by the former Ministry of Labor, now the Secretariat of Labor, which inter-sectorally with Social Assistance, institutes and organizes Socioprofessional Learning.

In this scope, it is considered that the workers in Social Education are social educators (PEREIRA, 2016). They have, as part of their doing, the responsibility to think and plan actions, with pedagogical intent, which vary according to the service they perform, but which, in general, aim at reducing the impacts of social injustices, the promotion, defense and guarantee of human rights and the emancipation of the public who access Social Education. In general, such work occurs in partnership with other professionals who, in different roles, also develop their practice in favor of social justice.

When understanding the pedagogical dimension of the act of social educators, when thinking about learning and teaching more broadly and, therefore, part of social educational practices, as well as a complex and relational process, the importance of the work of social educators in the current context, especially when considering the strong retraction of public policies aimed at tackling social inequalities in a national context. In this sense, the production of knowledge that can contribute to the development of the field of Social Education is emerging.

The power and complexity of a dialogical action: challenges for the formation and performance of social educators

The dialogues with Fiona and Watusi, subsidy for the construction of information in conjunction with the basic theoretical constructs of the research, allowed to develop some

reflections that were initially made in the master's research with the educated adolescents of Fiona and Watusi. One of the questions that the analysis of the material pointed out is that the research teenagers, residents of the periphery of a capital of the country, public of public policies of Social Assistance, had greater potential to learn when this process was proposed by social educators who positioned themselves dialogically before them, that is, their pedagogical work was organized based on dialogue, listening, collective construction, valuing their knowledge, among other issues. It was intended, then, to generate intelligibility about how these educators were subjectively constituted.

A question that can be thought from the dialogues generated with Fiona and Watusi is that there is an ethical stance that conforms to this doing that was conventionally called dialogic: Fiona and Watusi have a deep respect for their students, for their humanity.

Watusi, a black man, capoeira educator, student of Pedagogy, grew up in a family that cultivates African culture, studies about the theme. His conception of the world and people is closely linked to the production of social subjectivity produced by Afro-Brazilian culture. In this sense, he points out:

The important thing is not to have, it is to be. In the African religion it is to be one more, to share with the other who also is. Bringing that being to education is that too, so while I am passing on my knowledge that I have, that does not make me better or worse, but one who has a different knowledge and is to share my knowledge, so I am being with you (our translation).

From this and other passages, it is possible to infer that Watusi conceives the human being in a very detached way from the social subjectivity produced in a capitalist system in which consumption, competition and merit are central. He goes, in his life process, with his contradictions, subjectifying the human, his students, in a way far removed from the social subjectivity that makes the poorest and mostly black populations invisible. He recognizes them in their humanity, which allows the creation of a link between teacher and learner, essential for the learning processes (ROCHA; LEMOS; ALVES, 2019).

In a different but approaching life process, Fiona also makes subjective movements that distance herself from hegemonic subjectivity. In her case, this process begins with her experience with theater, as a child. From the sensitive relationship with art and with the other, considering that art becomes a centrality in Fiona's life, she develops an attentive look at her student, a look that seeks always see the context, a situated, critical and sensitive look. Fiona says in one of the meetings:

[...] Monalisa, okay? The youth is Monalisa and the family, the school and the community are all that background that they are still discovering today. So, every day I look at these walking comics and think: "What is there that I haven't seen yet?". Because art has this, it makes you look beyond the initial figure, you have to look at the whole: the colors, the shapes, the movement, the ensemble, the harmony, the balance, the rhythm. And in the end, every picture is a picture. One different from the other, but a picture full of history (our translation).

These ways of conceiving their students, which were constituted in the experiences of Fiona and Watusi - through art and diverse culture, through the tensioning of their formations, their studies, which promoted important subjective reflections and productions in the experience of being a social educator, promoting the production of subjective paths alternative to hegemonic social subjectivity -, were significant for the promotion of social educational spaces that enabled processes of teaching and learning based on the active role of everyone in the construction of knowledge.

Thus, the importance of doing something that presupposes participation and the importance of everyone's participation in the educational process is emphasized. In the meantime, it is noteworthy that Fiona and Watusi subjectify learning and knowledge in a way that is very close to the theoretical construction of research, which understands learning as a human process.

Fiona, when talking about her learning experiences as a learner⁴, highlights a learning of youth, when she had difficulties at school due to the teacher's rigid methodology:

[...] there is an unfortunate formula that I can never make work and I score zero in a test. [...] Then I came home desperate and said: "Mom, look, I scored zero in chemistry test, I didn't understand, I can't understand this, here, at all". Then my mother went to look at the test and said: "Well, Even I don't understand it the way it is written here [...]". And she taught me to do everything with a rule of three, without using the formula. Óooooo [musically], very easy, I couldn't believe it. Then in the next test I managed to solve all the calculations and guess what: zero in the test again. The teacher did not accept the way I did it, she wanted to apply the formula. Then my mother was called to the school [...]. We got home and she said: "Decorate this shit formula, develop these questions with the formula and on the side you do it with the rule of three to put the result, because that woman insists that you have to use this formula even though I say that you will never use this formula in life, or in the college entrance exam". Then I took the other test [...], it took me two more hours in the test, but I did it. And I score 10. Then, when I got the result at home, the mother said: "My daughter, understand something, sometimes you have to go around the world, there is no point in hitting it head on". That was my great learning for life [...] (our translation).

⁴ The term *learner* has the value of concept for Psychopedagogy, according to Fernández (2001). It is not the same as using the terms *student* and *teacher*, which refer to objective places in a pedagogical relationship, but it concerns a subject who learns, human learning.

In the dialogue that followed this report and in others, in which Fiona talks about her learning experiences, she often reports as meaningful learning those that are not related to school, which take place in more flexible spaces and in which she has more freedom to express herself, as in the case of the theater, for example. In this way, it is understood that she was subjectively configuring learning as a broad process, of which she was an agent and in which she occupied a symbolic space of those who could learn. Fiona feels the need to learn, she is curious and is constantly studying and learning new things.

Watusi was subjectifying learning a lot due to his relationship with his mother, who taught him about African culture and how to do housework based on orality and example, according to him. Telling about his learnings, he points out: “*Little Mouse [his first capoeira master] taught us about life, about participatory budgeting, about community organization. He sat with us and told us about history [...]*” (our translation), he remembers with affection and expresses subjective meanings produced through the emotion of reliving the moment in memory.

Watusi's schooling experience was difficult, he had difficulties adapting to the rigid model, he had no materials and he does not remember that time with a positive affectivity. However, the learning of capoeira, in the social project he participated in, and the learning with his mother, allowed Watusi to configure learning as a life process. In completing sentences he says: “*Learning is: reflecting, questioning and putting into practice in a constructive way what you have learned regardless of the context*” (our translation). Watusi is a curious, talkative, sensitive and humble adult. He always highlights listening as something essential for an educator, and his practices, according to the report of his students, corroborate this posture.

The subjective configurations of Fiona and Watusi related to learning allow us to think that they understand the complexity of learning, subject it as a life process, as a possibility and, therefore, perceive the potential that their students have to learn. This, in some way, promotes a teaching posture that allows the group to circulate between the roles of preceptor and learner, which creates a powerful dialogue space for everyone, in different ways, to learn and teach (FERNÁNDEZ, 2001).

The practices that reflect this dialogical positioning by Fiona and Watusi tend to be more articulated with the reality of the students, as they are not closed proposals that take into account only what the educator thinks. In addition to the possibility of dialogue within the Social Education spaces, at different times Fiona and Watusi talk about the importance of getting to know their students and the context. Watusi says:

That's why I liked to stay in front of the institution [...] I liked to stay there in the front, eating popsicle sticks, watching the children's movement, eating candy with them. There I knew the real someone [...], I knew the families [...] (our translation).

Watusi knew the community, liked to accompany the children to their home when necessary. Fiona, in turn, talks about the importance of home visits, talking to families and having an open and permeated relationship with the young people with whom she works. In that sense, she says:

One of these days I received a [young woman] here in the room, we spent a long time talking about the end of her relationship. We end up playing this role of advisor sometimes, with ears. [...] This ends up being a safe space to expose themselves (our translation).

From this excerpt, one can reflect on how dialogue promotes bonding and bonding promotes dialogue, constituting itself in a complex way in the relational space in which the educational processes take place in Fiona's work environment. Being open to getting to know her student, subjectively engaged in the educational process with the public she serves, seems to be central, both in the case of Fiona and in Watusi, for the constitution of a dialogical action.

Thus, the respect that Fiona and Watusi have for their students, the recognition of their humanity, as well as the fact that they subjectively configure learning as a life process, which is not an imposition of knowledge, but a construction process that involves the person as a whole, in a complex way, are factors that promote a dialogical action (ROCHA, 2020). This dialogicity, in turn, has the potential to engage students in the social educational process, bearing in mind that: they know the student, respect differences, recognize knowledge and, through dialogue, proposes more flexible teaching and learning processes, in which all participants are active.

The research carried out pointed out some possible ways to think about the formation of social educators with actions that promote significant learning for the public they serve. With regard to making dialogical and the cut made here, some of these paths stand out as possibilities and others are pointed out for new research.

It should be noted, as conclusions, that formation for social educators, at any level, needs to:

a) promote knowledge about learning from a human production perspective, dissociating learning and teaching from the schooling process (ROCHA, 2016);

b) promote historical knowledge so that social educators can more deeply understand the expressions of the Social Question, subjectively configuring their students in a way that is detached from the social subjectivity produced hegemonically about them;

c) promote knowledge, debate and reflection on the importance of relationships, dialogue and circulation between the roles of teaching and learning in educational processes, critically confronting such knowledge with reality;

d) promote experiences that contemplate cultural diversity and aesthetic experiences, since art as an expression of culture itself (VYGOTSKY, 1999), in the course of the aesthetic experience it provides, has the potential to cause important tension between different subjective configurations and, therefore, can contribute significantly for the subjective constitution of social educators in a perspective of criticality and sensitivity;

e) to value different cultures and knowledge, considering that the formation of social educators needs to consider and, in some way, show different cultures, because the public served is diverse and tends to distance itself from the reality experienced by the authors mostly used in the gym;

f) consider the subjective development of social educators, so that they can emerge as agents and subjects, a capacity that seems to be fundamental for them to transcend ready-made information and generate their own ideas in the course of learning and teaching (ALMEIDA; MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, 2019).

Final considerations

By weaving the possible reflections in these few pages on the power and complexity of a dialogical activity and, therefore, on the challenges that arise from such reflections, innumerable new provocations are introduced regarding the field of Social Education, formation and the practices of social educators. What has been built so far, as already pointed out, these are understandings that are not intended to be static concepts. The production of science is understood as partial and moving construction, which constantly provokes new intelligibilities about human experience in different fields.

From the articulation of the researches on which this article is based, it is understood that a dialogical action on the part of social educators has great potential to promote more flexible educational processes, to teach and learn, and that embrace differences, the needs, interests, knowledge and contexts of students. However, the formation processes of these workers need to be committed to a more humane and less technical formation, which promotes

a series of knowledge articulated with experiences in the field, since it is in the lived experience that individuals are impacted, understanding the theory in more depth and producing subjectivity, with the possibility of generating alternative routes to the dominant social subjectivity (GONZÁLEZ REY; MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, 2017).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: To the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) for funding the research from the CAPES/PROEX doctoral scholarship.

REFERENCES

ADORNO, T. W. **Educação e emancipação**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1995.

ALMEIDA, P.; MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, A. A configuração subjetiva da ação do aprender: um estudo de caso sobre o aluno em seu momento de ingresso no ensino superior. **Revista Obutchénie**, Brasília, v. 3, n. 1, p. 88-113, set. 2019. Available: <http://www.seer.ufu.br/index.php/Obutchenie/article/view/50592>. Access: 10 Sep. 2020.

ARENDT, H. **A condição humana**. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2014.

DEL POZO SERRANO, F. J. Pedagogía social en Colombia: entre la experiencia de la educación popular y el reto de la investigación-acción en la profesionalización socioeducativa de un país en posconflicto. **Ensino & Pesquisa**, União da Vitória, v. 15, n. 2, p. 97-116, jul. 2017.

FERNÁNDEZ, A. **Os idiomas do aprendente**: análise de modalidades ensinantes em famílias, escolas e meios de comunicação. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2001.

GONZÁLEZ REY, F. **Sujeto y subjetividad**: una aproximación histórico cultural. México: Thomson Eds., 2002.

GONZÁLEZ REY, F. **Subjetividade, complexidade e pesquisa em psicologia**. São Paulo: Thompson Learning, 2005.

GONZÁLEZ REY, F. A configuração subjetiva dos processos psíquicos: avançando na compreensão da aprendizagem como produção subjetiva. *In*: MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, A.; SCOZ, B. J. L.; CASTANHO, M. I. S. (Org.). **Ensino e aprendizagem**: a subjetividade em foco. Brasília: Liber Livro, p. 21-42, 2012a.

GONZÁLEZ REY, F. **O social na psicologia e a psicologia no social**: a emergência do sujeito. 3. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012b.

GONZÁLEZ REY, F. Relación entre lo teórico y lo empírico. *In*: GONZÁLEZ REY, F.; QUEVEDO, J. E. M. **Subjetividad, cultura e investigación cualitativa**: los antecedentes desde la personalidad y el método clínico. Bogotá: Editorial Aula de Humanidades, 2017. p. 251-266.

GONZÁLEZ REY, F. The Rescue of Subjectivity from a Cultural Historical Standpoint. *In*: BESHARA, R. K. (Ed.). **A critical introduction to psychology**. Hauppauge: Nova Science Publishers, 2020. p. 8-26.

GONZÁLEZ REY, F.; MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, A. **Subjetividade**: teoria, epistemologia e método. Campinas: Alínea, 2017.

JOHANN, J. R. **Educação e a utopia da esperança**. Canoas: Ed. ULBRA, 2008.

MITJÁNS MARTÍNEZ, A. A teoria da subjetividade de González Rey: uma expressão do paradigma da Complexidade na Psicologia. *In*: GONZÁLEZ REY, F. (Org). **Subjetividade, complexidade e pesquisa em psicologia**. São Paulo: Thompson Learning, 2005. p. 1-25.

PEREIRA, A. A profissionalidade do educador social frente a regulamentação profissional da educação social: as disputas em torno do projeto de lei 5346/2009. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 11, n. 3, p. 1294-1317, 2016. Available: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/iberoamericana/article/view/6041/5910>. Access: 8 Sep. 2020.

ROCHA, J. S. **O aprender como produção humana**: os sentidos subjetivos produzidos acerca da aprendizagem por adolescentes em situação de vulnerabilidade social. Orientadora: Marlene Rozek. 2016. 217 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2016.

ROCHA, J. S. **A constituição subjetiva de educadoras(es) sociais**: tornar-se educador(a) no processo de vida. 2020. 228 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2020.

ROCHA, J. S.; DI FRANCO, A. A aprendizagem em contexto de vulnerabilidade social. *In*: ROZEK, M.; DOMINGUES, C. L. K. (Org.). **As dificuldades de aprendizagem e o processo de escolarização**. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 2017. p. 165-194.

ROCHA, J. S.; LEMOS, M. S.; ALVES, T. P. Aprendizagem: como educadora e educador social, o que é fundamental saber sobre o tema? *In*: MONTEIRO, S. A. S. (Org.). **Filosofia, política, educação, direito e sociedade**. Ponta Grossa: Editora Atena, 2019. v. 6. p. 295-306.

SANTOS, C.; PAZINATO, E.; NASCIMENTO, N.; DONATO, R. S.; ENGELMAN, T. Índice de compliance de atividade policial (ICAP) no contexto do monitoramento do uso da força nos territórios do Programa de Oportunidade e Direitos no Estado do Rio Grande do Sul. *In*: ENCONTRO NACIONAL DE ENSINO E PESQUISA NO CAMPO DE PÚBLICAS, 3., 2019, Natal. **Anais [...]** Natal: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, 2019. p. 2011-2026.

Available:

[https://zone.inatto.com/acp.root/acp_data/anais2020/trabalhos/st13/09_indice_de_compliance_da_atividade_policial_\(i.pdf](https://zone.inatto.com/acp.root/acp_data/anais2020/trabalhos/st13/09_indice_de_compliance_da_atividade_policial_(i.pdf). Access: 8 Sep. 2020.

SOWA, A.; ROSA, R. Programa Mais Cultura nas Escolas: desafios e possibilidades para a construção de sujeitos inter/transculturais. *In*: CONGRESSO DE CIÊNCIAS DA COMUNICAÇÃO NA REGIÃO SUL, 15., 2014, Palhoça. **Anais [...]**. São Paulo: Intercom, 2014. p. 1-12.

Available: <https://portalintercom.org.br/anais/sul2014/resumos/R40-1103-1.pdf>. Access: 8 Sep. 2020.

ÚCAR, X. **Pedagogías de lo social**. Barcelona: Editorial UOC, 2016.

ÚCAR, X. Pedagogía social en Europa y América Latina: diálogos e interacciones en el marco de lo común. In: DEL POZO SERRANO, F. J. **Pedagogía social en Iberoamérica: fundamentos, ámbitos y retos para la acción socioeducativa**. Barranquilla: Editorial Universidad del Norte, 2018. p. 3-33.

VISCA, J. **Técnicas proyectivas psicopedagógicas**. 4. ed. Buenos Aires: Visca & Visca, 2002.

VYGOTSKY, L. **Psicologia da arte**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1999.

ZUCCHETTI, D. T.; SEVERO, J. L. R. L. As dimensões tempo e espaço em práticas de educação integral: implicações curriculares a partir do diálogo entre Paulo Freire e Darcy Ribeiro. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 15, n. 2, p. 560-577, abr./jun. 2020. Available: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/iberoamericana/article/view/12467>. Access: 8 Sep. 2020.

How to reference this article

ROCHA, J. S.; ROZEK, M. The potency and complexity of a dialogicity: challenges in the formation and performance of social educators. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 15, n. esp. 3, p. 2411-2428, Nov., 2020. E-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v15iesp3.14449>

Submitted: 20/07/2020

Required revisions: 30/08/2020

Approved: 29/09/2020

Published: 30/10/2020