

THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE CHALLENGE OF ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE TEACHING PRACTICE IN BASIC EDUCATION

AS CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS E O DESAFIO DA ANTROPOLOGIA NA PRÁTICA DOCENTE NA EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA

LAS CIENCIAS SOCIALES Y EL DESAFÍO DE LA ANTROPOLOGÍA EN LA PRÁCTICA DOCENTE EN EDUCACIÓN BÁSICA

Eliane Anselmo da SILVA¹
Raoni Borges BARBOSA²
Lidiane Alves da CUNHA³

ABSTRACT: The Social Sciences demarcate their importance in the construction of the plural and democratic identity of modern society, whose civilizing principles have been historically represented in the process of elaborating the sociological, anthropological and political discourse of civilizational progress. In Brazil, in recent years, more in-depth debates about the teaching of Social Sciences in Basic Education began. Since the mandatory teaching of Sociology, understood as a formative space in Social Sciences in High School, Brazilian society began to reflect on the place of Anthropology in school. In this perspective our research originates in the need to understand the teaching/learning process of Anthropology in the scope of Basic Education. Thus, the purpose of this article is to reflect on the contributions of anthropological knowledge and Social Sciences in the school context, thinking about their challenges and contributions in the teaching practice and in the construction of critical reflexivity about society and culture.

KEYWORDS: Anthropology. Social sciences. Basic education. Teaching. Teaching practice.

RESUMO: *As Ciências Sociais demarcam sua importância na construção da identidade plural e democrática da sociedade moderna, cujos princípios civilizadores foram historicamente representados no processo de elaboração do discurso sociológico, antropológico e político do progresso civilizacional. No Brasil, nos últimos anos, começam a se pautar debates mais aprofundados em torno do ensino das Ciências Sociais na Educação Básica. A partir da obrigatoriedade do ensino da Sociologia, compreendida enquanto espaço formativo das Ciências Sociais no Ensino Médio, a sociedade brasileira*

¹ Rio Grande do Norte State University (UERN), Mossoró – RN – Brazil. Adjunct Professor IV linked to the Department of Social and Political Sciences and Vice Coordinator of the Postgraduate Program in Teaching. Doctorate in Anthropology (UFPE). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6624-8493>. E-mail: elianeanselmo@uern.br

² Rio Grande do Norte State University (UERN), Mossoró – RN – Brazil. Visiting Professor linked to the Department of Social and Political Sciences and to the Postgraduate Program in Social and Human Sciences. Doctorate in Anthropology (UFPE). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2437-3149>. E-mail: raoniborgesb@gmail.com

³ Rio Grande do Norte State University (UERN), Mossoró – RN – Brazil. Adjunct Professor IV linked to the Department of Social and Political Sciences and Coordinator of the Social Science Teaching Initiation Program - PIBID. Doctorate in Social Sciences (UFRN). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2161-9446>. E-mail: lidianecunha@uern.br

passou a refletir sobre o lugar da Antropologia na escola. Nessa perspectiva se originam nossas pesquisas, no intuito de compreender o processo de ensino/aprendizagem da Antropologia no âmbito da Educação Básica. A proposta deste artigo é refletir sobre as contribuições do saber antropológico e das Ciências Sociais no contexto escolar, pensando seus desafios e contribuições na prática docente e na construção da reflexividade crítica sobre a sociedade e a cultura.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Antropologia. Ciências sociais. Educação básica. Ensino. Prática docente.*

RESUMEN: *Las Ciencias Sociales demarcan su importancia en la construcción de la identidad plural y democrática de la sociedad moderna, cuyos principios civilizadores han sido históricamente representados en el proceso de elaboración del discurso sociológico, antropológico y politológico del progreso civilizacional. En Brasil, en los últimos años, se comenzaron a orientar debates más profundos sobre la enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales en la Educación Básica. A partir de la obligatoriedad de la enseñanza de la Sociología, entendida como un espacio formativo de las Ciencias Sociales en el Bachillerato, la sociedad brasileña comenzó a reflexionar sobre el lugar de la Antropología en la escuela. Desde esta perspectiva se origina nuestra investigación, con el fin de comprender el proceso de enseñanza / aprendizaje de la Antropología en el ámbito de la Educación Básica. El propósito de este artículo es reflexionar sobre los aportes del conocimiento antropológico y las Ciencias Sociales en el contexto escolar, reflexionando sobre sus retos y aportes en la práctica docente y en la construcción de la reflexividad crítica sobre la sociedad y la cultura.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Antropología. Ciencias sociales. Educación básica. Enseñanza. Práctica docente.*

Introduction

The school constitutes one of the various formative spaces for the social world that Anthropology has achieved in recent years. Debates have intensified in Brazil on its teaching in basic education, based on the discipline of Sociology, understood as the formative locus of social sciences. But sociology itself, which, with the implementation of Law 11,684, in June 2008, after almost 40 years, when it had been banned from the curriculum in 1971 and replaced by Moral and Civic Education, again has its space weakened by the new High School reform (BRASIL, 2008). The Secondary Education Reform Law, n. 13,415/2017, aims to implement formative itineraries in Secondary Education, reducing the knowledge present at this school stage, as it will reduce the access of Public School students to fundamental content for their comprehensive training (BRASIL, 2017a). Sociology is one of these knowledge, and the removal of this subject from the school curriculum will result in the non-development of a critical perception about society, social relations, the symbolic

structures of culture, the daily institutional and political game, the processes of formation of the person in plural urban sociabilities, among others.

Our intention here is not to analyze the impacts generated by the Secondary Education Reform from the analytical approach of the teaching of Sociology, but to point out the importance of this discipline, showing that, since its mandatory in 2008, it has been contributing to the construction of a critical, reflective and more democratic school, focusing on the contents of Anthropology, based on the experience of our research. Our interest is to understand the teaching/learning process of Anthropology, and thus the challenges of Social Sciences from the perspective of the teacher in Basic Education.

The importance of social sciences for a reflective society

The central argument of the importance of Social Sciences points to its role in the construction of the plural and democratic identity of modern society. In the context of academic discussion in Social Sciences, in fact, the moral principles and fundamental civilizing projects of Euro-American epistemology⁴ – such as human emancipation from tradition and individual happiness – have historically experienced considerable theoretical maturity. This development of social criticism can be highlighted in the process of elaborating the sociological, anthropological and political discourse of civilizational progress, social order, economic growth and the accumulation of collective experience of control and instrumental administration of Nature and Culture. This broad project of a long time, which extends through the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and reaches the contemporaneity of our current Reflective Modernity (GIDDENS, 1991; 2002), – expressed by the Society of Risk (BECK, 2002) – involved the collective production of a secular and empirical knowledge about the social real. Knowledge that intends to dissociate itself from myth and speculation in order to constitute a legitimate, specialized, autonomous and bureaucratized scientific knowledge.

The Social Sciences were historically constituted in accordance with this evolutionary process of search for a true representation of the social reality, which resulted in the formulation of a *Positive Knowledge* - which distinguishes between Science and non-Science - and in the demarcation between traditional knowledge, common sense, religious and scientific aspects of human life in its social, cultural and biopsychic aspects; thus distinguishing, this time, between *Methodologically Reliable Knowledge* based on *Objective*

⁴ For a more detailed discussion of the epistemological foundation on teacher-researcher formation, see Soffner and Kirsch (2018).

Data, on the one hand, and Arts, Philosophy, Humanities, Letters, on the other (PIRES, 2010). Therefore, the Social Sciences are established in what is conventionally the second epistemological distinction in the construction of the modern Science project, in a way that has as a mirror of approximation the Natural Sciences and as a mirror of distancing Philosophy and the Arts.

In the meantime, the notion of objective data comes to encompass a broad repertoire of analytical, descriptive and experimental possibilities, such as the laboratory, the archive and field research. While, in parallel, the notion of scientific methodology in Social Sciences is established under the primacy that the search for truth should be based on impersonal, verifiable and falsifiable practices of formatting assertions from axiologically neutral records.

In this phase of development of the Social Sciences – which refers to the works of Marx, Durkheim, Tarde, Spencer, Simmel, Weber, Frazer, Morgan and others – the notion of scientific discovery, so dear to the positivist ideal of technical and civilizing progress, starts to crystallize, in the discourse of Social Sciences, as: a) the exercise of revealing taboos, interdicts, social problems made invisible and silenced in the public space and not framed as a political problem; b) the effort to prevent public and political arenas for the production of knowledge about the social reality from being extinguished by religious, economic and political interests; c) the commitment to the emancipatory mission of scientific production in relation to tradition, common sense and magical, mythological and religious knowledge; d) and, finally, the theoretical-methodological framework of everyday life and history as a human laboratory, in which common sense and social movements act in the production of scientific discoveries.

It is worth emphasizing, in the aforementioned process of historical, academic and institutional maturation of Social Sciences, its immense epistemological and theoretical-methodological heritage of Renaissance, Enlightenment discursive practices and revolutionary and modernizing political contexts, such as Political Philosophy, Philosophy of History, Survey and Social Reform, and Biology (BOTTOMORE, 1971). In this tuning fork, the Social Sciences accommodate axiological imperatives of positive and practical control of the Natural and Human Environment, present in technical and conceptual vocabularies of Physics paradigms (Flow, Quantity, Dynamics, Mechanics, Entropy, Equilibrium, Relations of Forces), of Biology (Tissue, Organ, Morphology, Physiology, Function, Pathology, Disease, Evolution), History and Philosophy (Social Progress and Evolution, Event, Time and Space, Humanity, Theology and Teleology, Political Society and Civil Society, State, Dialectics), and Mathematics (Statistics, Geometry, Volume, Area, Saturation, Function).

As scientific knowledge strongly influenced by the bourgeois or modernizing revolutions that found urban-industrial, rational-bureaucratic modernity and the Nation-State - such as the English Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, the Protestant Reformation, the French Revolution, the American Revolution, the Independentist and Republican Movement in America, the Russian Revolution, the Chinese Revolution and other movements that historically marked breaks with traditional ways of life – the Social Sciences gradually develop an analytical look at society and culture, primarily around the Problem or Social Question and, continuously, on other problematic and challenging aspects of the social and cultural reality, synthesized, for example, as the Urban Question, the Political Question or the Ecological Question. In the scientific elaboration of the Social Question that dominated debates in Social Sciences in the 19th century, Marx's theory of historical materialism; Weber's theory of the rationalization of the social; and Durkheim's theory of social solidarity.

At this point, the notion of Social Sciences has been consolidated as an academic and professional practice, whose models of causal explanation and understanding of trends in the Social Structure - the complex network of institutions and groups in systemic social connection - and the Symbolic Structure - complex network of communication, kinship and public rituals do justice to its Greco-Roman hybrid name: the *socius*, of Latin tradition, refers to the relational classification of human life; the *logos*, from the Greek tradition, points to the symbolic classification of social facts. The Social Sciences were consolidated, then, as the general scientific knowledge about society, gradually presenting more precise conceptual methods and schemes, replacing general theories and final and closed explanatory systems of a conservative nature.

Conservatism was, then, the obsessive preoccupation with the loss of tradition, which, visibly, happened as a result of the irreversible processes of modernization. These processes that erected cities, industries, factories, markets, bureaucracies, sciences, and, in short, the pulsating current life in a globalized informational capitalism regime that the Social Sciences currently strive to explain, understand, historicize, describe and interpret, fostered increasingly individualistic moral and emotional postures. This mode of social navigation produced new cultures in accordance with the ephemeral, punctual, rationalized, impersonalized and institutionalized social bonds of the urbanism that was emerging as a way of life.

Social Sciences would be, therefore, linked to the collective construction of a critical mass of consciousness and understanding for human emancipation from the systematic problematization of (objective) experience and (subjective) individual experience beyond

their moral and emotional, cognitive horizons and behavioral, temporally and spatially limited. Bauman (2015), for example, in this tuning fork, concludes that the Social Sciences can be defined as the exercise of theoretical *de-construction* of social reality, in order to position the tense relationship between individual, culture and society on different bases of understanding and explanation. And this is the importance of Social Sciences at School.

Sociology as a space for Social Sciences at school

Sociology comprises the formative space reached by the Social Sciences at school, through its obligation in High School, with the implementation of Law 11,684/08 (BRASIL, 2008). The Basic Education Directive Law highlights the importance of teaching sociology at school, establishing as one of the central purposes of its teaching the construction of the student's citizenship.

Considering that sociological knowledge has as its basic attributions to investigate, identify, describe, classify and interpret/explain all facts related to social life, it therefore allows the student to be instrumentalized in order to decode the complexity of social reality. Thus, whether at school or any other pedagogical institution, such as public education policies and everything that configures a place par excellence for teaching-and-learning, it is necessary to understand that we exist within networks and webs of symbols, of meanings, of social institutions, in obvious or camouflaged forms of power, as Brandão warns us (2007, p. 14). The return of the discipline of Sociology to Basic Education represented a struggle on the part of sociologists throughout Brazil. And even though the name of the discipline is Sociology, it must necessarily be taught by a professional with a teaching background in Social Sciences, as provided for in the National Curriculum Guidelines (NCOs). The obligatory nature of the discipline of Sociology in high school curricula, a space par excellence for the social sciences that must combine knowledge of Sociology, Anthropology and Political Science – impels Anthropology to build a new locus for debate and reflection on issues related to Basic Education. Now, the teaching of contents previously thought only for Higher Education must also be thought of for High School, presenting challenges for teachers with this training, both at the pedagogical and methodological level.⁵

It should be noted that on 16 February 2017, Law 13,415 was sanctioned in the Federal Official Gazette, which amends Laws 9,394 and 11,494:

⁵ The discussion on teacher formation in Brazil, with reference to the new National Curriculum Guidelines for the initial and continued formation of Basic Education teachers, was deepened by Medeiros and Aguiar (2018).

Alters Laws n. 9,394, of 20 December 1996, which establish the guidelines and bases of national education, and 11,494, of 20 June 2007, which regulates the Fund for the Maintenance and Development of Basic Education and the Valorization of Education Professionals, the Consolidation of Labor Laws - CLT, approved by Decree-Law n. 5.452, of 1 May 1943, and Decree-Law n. 236, of 28 February 1967; revokes Law n. 11,161, of 5 August 2005; and institutes the Policy to Promote the Implementation of Full-Time High Schools (BRASIL, 2017a, n/p, our translation).

This legislation reform transfers the obligation to teach Physical Education, Art, Sociology and Philosophy in the High School Curriculum to the National Common Curricular Base:

§ 1o The diversified part of the curricula dealt with in the caput of art. 26, defined in each education system, should be harmonized with the National Common Curricular Base and be articulated from the historical, economic, social, environmental and cultural context.

§ 2o The Common National Curricular Base for secondary education will necessarily include studies and practices in physical education, art, sociology and philosophy (BRASIL, 2017b, n/p, our translation).

The change in legislation annuls the obligation to teach Sociology in High School, suggesting the study of Social Sciences, in their sociological, anthropological and political perspectives, through the National Common Curricular Base. But it is necessary to understand that the establishment and strengthening of Sociology in High School tends to contribute to the expansion of the context of simple professionalization and technical formation, as they can represent an awareness of relevant aspects of the action of subjects and reality in which we are inserted.

We believe that the search for an alternative to traditional teaching should be the keynote in all subjects at school, but especially in Sociology, given its problematizing bias of social reality and its functions of "strangeness" and "denaturalization", as provided for in the Curriculum Guidelines for High School (BRASIL, 2006).

The teaching of Sociology allows Anthropology and Political Science, which, although not mandatory subjects, can be part of formation and are present in the teaching-learning process. In this context, it is important to consider the fact that Anthropology provides theoretical and methodological elements for thinking about current societies. From notions such as cultural experiences, network of relationships, social roles and the process of constitution of social identities, it is possible to understand the social, cultural, political and economic contexts through constant flows, hybridisms, multiculturalism, new identities and

contemporary sociabilities, most often marked by ethnocentric attitudes and differentiations between “us” and “others”.

The role of Sociology, and consequently of Anthropology, at school, is linked to formation for citizenship and living with diversity, contributing to the development of cognitive and cultural skills, considering the prior knowledge of young students⁶. Problems such as the recognition of otherness, and the different forms of exclusion and social inequalities in Brazil and in the world, can be approached from a socio-anthropological perspective.

The study of anthropology is also a form of education insofar as it invites us to see in the other and in their differences, often alternative forms of sociability or conflict resolution between men. Who knows, thus enabling us to be more open (visual, dialogic, intellectual, cognitive and affective) to face the problems of everyday life. In this sense, considering the challenges experienced in education, whether schooled or not (ROCHA; TOSTA, 2009, p. 20, our translation).

In this way, Anthropology can contribute to discussions on these themes, offering references for the formation of a citizen awareness, in accordance with the Curriculum Guidelines for High School - Human Sciences and its Technologies, with regard to the sociocultural context (BRASIL, 2006, p. 34).

Anthropology at school: how and why?

As can be seen, in recent years Anthropology has expanded its presence in the most diverse non-university formations, and the school constitutes one of these formative spaces. In this perspective, a deeper debate has been initiated in Brazil on the teaching of Anthropology in Basic Education, based on its contents in the discipline of Sociology.

Anthropology, in its dialogue with Education, is still considered an underexplored debate, even when the History of Anthropology shows that important anthropologists have become a reference for the study of educational issues (GUSMÃO, 1997). Since the creation of modern Anthropology, there has been and still is a great and persistent distancing from what has to do with the intentional processes and structures of pedagogical socialization of children, adolescents and young people (BRANDÃO, 2007, p. 4).

But of course, as the aforementioned authors remind us, it is true that there were exceptions, even on rare occasions, when they were visible and had some greater impact, as was the case with the *American School of Culture and Personality*. This trend, which had a

⁶ This discussion on Education and Diversity is explored by Campos, Grando and Passos (2015).

short but fruitful life, between the 1940s and 1960s, motivated anthropologists such as Margareth Mead, Ralph Linton and Ruth Benedict, with interests focused on the cultural relations of socialization and its effects on the social formation of a given type of “personality” and “culture” (BRANDÃO, 2007, p. 4).

But it is a fact that few anthropologists are dedicated to the study of the theme of Education. Formal education and the school institution are the target of its interests only accidentally, because almost all ethnographies were carried out with indigenous cultures, almost always alien to the school and the education professional, emphasizes Brandão (2007, p. 5). Education becomes more evident in anthropological studies when it comes to themes related to other interests, such as the indigenous or quilombola issue.

Only a few years ago, as a result of educational policies aimed at these groups, questions about education have become more present, with anthropologists and educators opening up a converging interest around this theme. According to Brandão (2009), for a long time Anthropology ignored native or popular forms of education for children and young people. The education that was directed at them sought to civilize them, turning them into a somewhat hybrid and marginalized figure, “not yet an indian nor even a white person”.

However, it is not surprising that the anthropology that was born from participatory observation research with tribal communities was much more interested in the rites of passage or “graduation”, and in the social destiny of the “graduate”, than in the daily school work of their formation through learning, whether at school or not, as Brandão states (2007, p. 5). "In part, this is due to the fact that a first anthropology - and that of today too, to a large extent - was almost insensitive to the world of children and adolescents, except in moments of study of rites of passage" (BRANDÃO, 2009, p. 13, our translation).

In Brazil, particularly, in the set of factors that hindered the dialogue between Anthropology and Education, there is also the formation of the educator, who went through different central or affluent subjects of Pedagogy, History of Education, along with some sparse Psychologies focused on the question of learning, complemented by a precarious formation in Educational Sociology to complete the picture. And, in this context, we cannot forget that, long before it was discovered by the academy and by the Pedagogy of universities, and even by Anthropology itself, this dialogue was strongly emphasized by the Popular Culture movements of the 1960s, based on the relationship between Culture and Education. Paulo Freire's works represent the locus of this debate and the memory of this trajectory (BRANDÃO, 2009, p. 13-14).

But, before intending to think of Education as an object of study by anthropologists, the reflections that interest us concern the teaching of Anthropology and its methodologies, particularly in basic education. Debates on teaching methodologies and on strategies for bringing anthropological knowledge into the classroom are scarce. Thus, a closer debate between Anthropology and Education, for example, seems increasingly necessary. For that, it is necessary that Anthropology rethinks the ways to operationalize its knowledge, beyond that focused on research itself, but that it expands beyond the walls of the academy.

We assume that anthropology, within the discipline of Sociology, can help students and teachers of Basic Education to know, relativize and critically think about the diversity and inequality that shape the Brazilian reality, demystifying notions that are already naturalized and/or deemed essential. Anthropology is responsible for investigating the specificity of behavior, organization, values, feelings and beliefs of human societies, in short, their lifestyle and worldview.

Anchored in their own methodology, anthropologists are able to offer interpretations of cultural practices and specific symbolic representations of different social groups, providing a far-reaching look at life in society. For this purpose, the collection of empirical, ethnographic data, through fieldwork, surveys of life histories, testimonies and in-depth interviews, documentary research from primary, secondary and theoretical sources, allows interpretations of realities that can guide anthropologically the possibilities of action of institutions, involving different social, cultural and political groups.

In the current situation, in addition to living in a dense and dramatic way his own apprenticeship experience, the anthropologist is put to the test by his own “objects” of studies. In this sense, both from a theoretical and methodological point of view, the anthropologist sees himself obliged to rethink, reassess, reinterpret his own models, theories and methods, in addition to learning from the difference of the “other” (ROCHA; TOSTA, 2009, p. 18).

Thus, in the same way that the sociology teacher needs to adapt his approach regarding issues related to anthropology, allowing them to be worked on within sociology classes - since it is under the yoke of this discipline that we enter Basic Education – the student needs to have the opportunity to exercise the knowledge acquired in the classroom, so that he can experience this knowledge in practice, discovering by himself the scientific practice.

It is up to Anthropology to also reflect on its relationship with Education, given that its concepts and themes will penetrate Basic Education, gaining a new form of dissemination outside academic walls. This movement brings several challenges, which must be assumed by

anthropologists, both in relation to the formation of graduates in Social Sciences, developing teaching methodologies that consider the didactic transposition of contents to such level of education, as well as making sure that and how these contents are being assimilated by students, also reflecting on ways to contribute to this end.

Anthropology in its relationship with education is intended as an instrument capable of adding to a more humanistic, better and more efficient teaching in the scenario of educational institutions in Brazil, whether public or private, and in all types of education. As shown by Rocha and Tosta (2009, p. 17, our translation):

Anthropology is a form of education, and education is only possible as an anthropological practice. This is the assumption from which we present, to education professionals (teachers of all types of education, especially teacher educators and social agents who work with socio-educational projects) and to undergraduate students and other areas in general, the way we think about anthropology. Anthropology is not only an academic discipline capable of providing an explanation of the representations of otherness and/or the practices of the “other”, but a way of producing a humanistic sense of our experiences in the world of everyday life.

Thus, it is important to think about the operationalization and feasibility of this objective of teaching Anthropology, to produce a humanist sense for the daily experiences of the student. At the level of Basic Education, it also takes the student to exercise the knowledge acquired in their classroom to make them aware of the sociocultural discussions of their time. However, what is observed in the daily life of our schools and at the university are very small efforts regarding the development of strategies for the application of these concepts in the classroom.

Anthropology at school: what teachers think

A survey carried out from the Scientific Initiation Scholarship Program – PIBIC, in 2017, with three sociology teachers from three public schools in Mossoró/RN – State School Professora Maria Stella Pinheiro Costa, State School Moreira Dias and the Integrated Education Center Professor Eliseu Viana, verified some of the main difficulties in transposing the contents not only of Anthropology, but of the three areas of Social Sciences at this level of education. The research was carried out through interviews, in addition to participant observation in sociology classes, especially in those where Anthropology contents were taught.

The three interviewed professors, among whom we have a man and two women, have a degree in Social Sciences from the Rio Grande do Norte State University – UERN. Each teacher and their respective school are linked to the Institutional Scholarship Program for Initiation to Teaching-PIBID, of the Social Sciences course at UERN. The choice of schools linked to PIBID allowed for greater inclusion in the research field and better interaction with teachers and their respective classes.

There was an agreement among teachers that there is no separation of the three areas of knowledge in the classroom, but they admitted that the main focus is on the area of Sociology. The most used textbook is Nelson Tomazi's *Sociology for High School*, followed by the book *Sociology in Movement*, but all said they also used other materials aimed at high school. Teachers also stated that they use diversified methodologies in their classes, such as showing films, documentaries and music, as well as shared reading and the study guide.

Among the most discussed topics in the contents of Anthropology, the concept of culture stands out, and is the most mentioned, deriving from it discussions focused on ethnocentrism and cultural relativism, cultural diversity, identity and difference. "Despite the specificities of each class and the students' affinities with each area, Anthropology and its contents are often more attractive, in the sense of working on issues that touch their lives, especially regarding the issue of gender, sexuality, racism and prejudice" (our translation), said one of the interviewed teachers. And it is in this perspective that participant observation, among the methodologies used as strategies for approaching anthropological knowledge in the classroom, is most prominent, as it enables this approach to the daily lives of students.

The greatest difficulty pointed out by professors in teaching Anthropology within the discipline of Sociology is time, that is, the workload. "One hour of weekly class to pass on the content not of one subject, but of three" (our translation), as another teacher points out. This short time limits not only content discussions, but the very methodologies to be used, such as film screenings, for example.

Despite the difficulties, the contributions of anthropology teaching in basic education are evident, in the sense that it helps students to reflect on their own daily life. It was clear that the teaching of Anthropology, through the discipline of Sociology, can help students and teachers of Basic Education to know, relativize and critically think about the diversity and inequality that shape the Brazilian reality, demystifying notions that have already been naturalized.

After reflecting on the teachers' view, the direction starts to focus on the perspective of the students themselves, with the objective of investigating how the contents of Anthropology are being assimilated by them in Basic Education in public schools in the city of Mossoró/RN.

Final considerations

Anthropology, by reflecting and strengthening its relationship with Education, through Basic Education, gains, in addition to a new form of dissemination outside academic walls, the opportunity to transform the view of the other with this very specific public. Such experience obviously brings several challenges, which must be assumed by anthropologists, who must begin to think and develop methodological practices that allow and facilitate access to their knowledge beyond the walls of academia.

This reflects directly on the formation of graduates in Social Sciences who, responsible for teaching Sociology in Basic Education, should also be concerned with methodologies that consider the didactic transposition of contents to this level of education. More than ever, it is necessary to think about the operationalization and feasibility of knowledge in Social Sciences in Basic Education. Regarding Anthropology, much more than knowledge, by enabling a new way of looking at the other, of exercising empathy, of reflecting values and the discovery of identity, offering a humanistic sense to everyday experiences, its knowledge attests to its importance and relevance at this stage of training.

It is from this perspective that we defend that the sociology teacher needs to invest in addressing the themes of anthropology in the classroom. Since it is in this discipline that social sciences enter Basic Education, Sociology carries the responsibility and challenge of thinking about the operationalization of its knowledge. Teaching strategies need to meet the diverse expectations of students in relation to the teacher and the content of sociology. It is not the case now of forming social scientists in Basic Education, but of complying with the minimum of what the LDB – Law of Guidelines and Bases of Education, Law 9,394 of 1996 – determines (BRASIL, 1996).

Initially, it is about creating opportunities for the establishment of a dialogue between the school contents and the reality in which the students are inserted. It could be that simple. But the numerous problems posed by our education system make the task in itself seems so difficult. And consequently, it is in the formation in Social Sciences itself that everything begins. Another debate about the current context of teaching degrees in the country and the Brazilian political crisis would have to be deepened in order to understand the real problems

of teacher formation in Brazil, considering the legislation relating to this formation, that is, the current LDB - and the questions concerning the characteristics of teacher formation courses, curricula, etc.

For now, we are limited to thinking about Social Sciences as a teaching area that is not yet strong in the tradition of teaching Basic Education. Therefore, the bet will be on its professional, in the sense that he builds paths to open up his formation in Basic Education, expanding the transversality of knowledge in Social Sciences, so essential for education. And that, in this perspective, Anthropology has space to be able to make its contribution. This motivates us to reaffirm the principle according to which Anthropology should be thought of much more than an area of knowledge, but as a form of education, or as one of the ways in which education should be lived, that is, as an anthropological practice, an exchange of knowledge based on the exercise of empathy.

REFERENCES

- BAUMAN, Z. **Para que serve a Sociologia?** Diálogos com Michael Hviid Jacobsen e Keith Tester. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Zahar, 2015.
- BECK, U. **La sociedad del riesgo.** Hacia una nueva modernidade. Barcelona, Buenos Aires: Paidós, 2002.
- BOTTOMORE, T. B. **Introdução à sociologia.** Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Zahar Editores, 1971.
- BRANDÃO, C. R. Algumas palavras sobre a cultura e a educação *In*: ROCHA, G.; TOSTA, S. P. **Antropologia & educação.** Belo Horizonte, MG: Autêntica Editora, 2009. (Coleção Temas & Educação; 10)
- BRANDÃO, C. R. Sobre teias e tramas de aprender e ensinar: anotações a respeito de uma antropologia da educação. **Revista Inter Ação**, Goiânia (GO), v. 26, n. 1, p. 9-30, 2007. DOI: doi.org/10.5216/ia.v26i1.1552
- BRASIL. **Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996.** Estabelece as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. Brasília, DF, 23 dez. 1996. Available: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/19394.htm. Access: 10 Sep. 2020.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria da Educação Básica. **Orientações Curriculares para o Ensino Médio.** Brasília, DF: MEC, SEF, 2006. v. 3.
- BRASIL. **Lei n. 11.684, de 2 de junho de 2008.** Altera o art. 36 da Lei no 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, para incluir a Filosofia e a Sociologia como disciplinas obrigatórias nos currículos do ensino médio. Brasília, DF, 03 jun. 2008. Available: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2007-2010/2008/Lei/L11684.htm. Access: 10 Sep. 2020.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 13.415, de 16 de fevereiro de 2017**. Altera as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. Brasília, DF, 17 fev. 2017a. Available: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2017/lei/113415.htm. Access: 10 Sep. 2020.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Base Nacional Curricular Comum**. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2017b.

CAMPOS, N. S.; GRANDO, B. S.; PASSOS, L. A. Educação e diversidade: as experiências exitosas que reconhecem os saberes e fazeres da cultura na escola. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 10, n. 4, p. 1261-1277, out./dez. 2015. DOI: doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v10i4.6332

GIDDENS, A. **As consequências da modernidade**. São Paulo, SP: Editora Unesp, 1991.

GIDDENS, A. **Modernidade e identidade**. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Zahar, 2002.

GUSMÃO, N. M. M. Antropologia e educação: origens de um diálogo. **Cadernos CEDES**, Campinas (SP), v. 18, n. 43, dez. 1997.

KIRSCH, D. B.; SOFFNER, R. K. Formação do professor-pesquisador: a importância da fundamentação epistemológica. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 13, n. esp. 3, p. p. 2087-2099, dez. 2018. DOI: doi.org/10.21723/riaee.unesp.v13.iesp3.dez.2018.10892

MEDEIROS, E. A.; AGUIAR, A. L. O. Formação inicial de professores da educação básica em licenciaturas de universidades públicas do Rio Grande do Norte: estudo de currículos e suas matrizes curriculares. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v.13, n. 3, p. 1028-1049, jul./set. 2018. DOI: doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v13.n3.2018.10975

PIRES, Á. P. Sobre algumas questões epistemológicas de uma metodologia geral para as ciências sociais. *In*: POUPART, J. *et al.* **A Pesquisa qualitativa**. Enfoques epistemológicos e metodológicos. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Editora Vozes, 2010.

ROCHA, G.; TOSTA, S. P. Introdução. *In*: ROCHA, G.; TOSTA, S. P. **Antropologia & educação**. Belo Horizonte, MG: Autêntica Editora, 2009. (Coleção Temas & Educação; 10)

How to reference this article

SILVA, E. A.; BARBOSA, R. B.; CUNHA, L. A. The social sciences and the challenge of anthropology in the teaching practice in basic education. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 16, n. esp. 3, p. 1490-1505, jun. 2021. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v16iesp.3.15294>

Submitted: 05/02/2021

Required revisions: 30/03/2021

Approved: 12/05/2021

Published: 01/06/2021