

REMOTE TEACHING AND SUPERVISED INTERNSHIP IN RURAL EDUCATION:
DILEMMAS, CHALLENGES AND LEARNINGS

*ENSINO REMOTO E ESTÁGIO SUPERVISIONADO NA EDUCAÇÃO DO CAMPO:
DILEMAS, DESAFIOS E APRENDIZAGENS*

*ENSEÑANZA REMOTA Y PASANTÍA SUPERVISADA EN EDUCACIÓN DE CAMPO:
DILEMAS, DESAFÍOS Y APRENDIZAJE*



Adriana Lima Monteiro CUNHA¹
e-mail: adrianamonteiro10@ufpi.edu.br



Maria do Socorro Pereira da SILVA²
e-mail: socorroprof@ufpi.edu.br



Thaynan Alves dos SANTOS³
e-mail: thaynan12santosalves@hotmail.com

How to reference this article:

CUNHA, A. L. M.; SILVA, M. S. P.; SANTOS, T. A. Remote teaching and supervised internship in rural education: Dilemmas, challenges and learnings. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 18, n. 00, e023058, 2023. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v18i00.18017>



| Submitted: 05/03/2023
| Revisions required: 22/06/2023
| Approved: 11/06/2023
| Published: 31/08/2023

Editor: Prof. Dr. José Luís Bizelli
Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

¹Federal University of Piauí (UFPI), Bom Jesus – PI – Brazil. Professor of the Degree in Rural Education (LEDOC). PhD in Education (UFPI).

²Federal University of Piauí (UFPI), Teresina – PI – Brazil. Professor of the Degree in Pedagogy, Department of Fundamentals of Education (DEFE). PhD in Education (UFPI).

³Federal University of Southern Bahia (UFSB), Teixeira de Freitas – BA – Brazil. Master's student in Science and Sustainability.

ABSTRACT: This study aims to analyze the challenges and learning experienced by trainee students during the supervised internship in the period of remote teaching in the Degree in Rural Education (LEdoC). The methodology used was the qualitative approach, through participant research. To produce the data, we adopted the literature survey, the analysis of the resolutions and application of the questionnaire instrument to the trainee students of the Degree in Rural Education, Campus Professora Cinobelina Elvas in the municipality of Bom Jesus, Piauí. The results pointed to the fragility of remote teaching in rural basic schools due to the impossibility of carrying out an emergency proposal without meeting the minimum conditions of access to technologies and digital platforms. The data also revealed that, even with this conditioning factor of remote teaching on an emergency basis, the supervised internship as a curricular component enabled learning about teaching and pedagogical processes.

KEYWORDS: Remote learning. Supervised internship. Rural education. Learning. Teaching.

RESUMO: Este estudo tem como objetivo analisar os desafios e as aprendizagens vivenciadas pelos estudantes-estagiários durante o estágio supervisionado no período do ensino remoto na Licenciatura em Educação do Campo (LEdoC). A metodologia utilizada foi a abordagem qualitativa, por meio da pesquisa participante. Para produção dos dados, adotamos o levantamento da literatura, a análise das resoluções e aplicação do instrumento questionário aos estudantes-estagiários do curso de Licenciatura em Educação do Campo, Campus Professora Cinobelina Elvas no município de Bom Jesus, Piauí. Os resultados apontaram para a fragilidade do ensino remoto nas escolas básicas do campo pela impossibilidade de realização de uma proposta emergencial sem atender as condições mínimas de acesso às tecnologias e plataformas digitais. Os dados também revelaram que, mesmo com esse condicionante do ensino remoto em caráter emergencial, o estágio supervisionado como componente curricular possibilitou aprendizagens sobre a docência e sobre os processos pedagógicos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Ensino remoto. Estágio supervisionado. Educação do campo. Aprendizagem. Docência.

RESUMEN: *Este estudio tiene como objetivo analizar los desafíos y aprendizajes experimentados por los estudiantes-practicantes durante la pasantía supervisada en el período de enseñanza remota en la Licenciatura en Educación del Campo (LEdoC). La metodología utilizada fue el enfoque cualitativo, a través de la investigación participante. Para la producción de datos, se realizó una revisión bibliográfica, análisis de resoluciones y aplicación de un cuestionario a los estudiantes-practicantes del curso de Licenciatura en Educación del Campo, Campus Professora Cinobelina Elvas en la ciudad de Bom Jesus, Piauí. Los resultados señalaron la fragilidad de la enseñanza remota en las escuelas rurales debido a la imposibilidad de llevar a cabo una propuesta de emergencia sin cumplir con las condiciones mínimas de acceso a tecnologías y plataformas digitales. Los datos también revelaron que, a pesar de esta limitación de la enseñanza remota como medida de emergencia, la pasantía supervisada como componente curricular permitió el aprendizaje sobre la enseñanza y los procesos pedagógicos.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Enseño remoto. Pasantía supervisada. Educación del campo. Aprendizaje. Docencia.*

Introduction

The emergence of the discourse of implementing remote teaching in higher education and basic education in the countryside temporarily creates a narrative of erasing digital exclusion rates in rural areas. The false narrative of technological development at the service of society has always left the rural environment on the sidelines, but not only that, the State has ignored the socioeconomic conditions of peasants and their accelerated process of impoverishment with the advancement of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The encounter between rural education in higher education and basic school, and their accelerated approximation due to the requirement of the Supervised Internship as matrix of practical training and teaching practice showed that the digital divide deepens at a time when students and teachers of rural education are confronted with the lack of access to digital technologies and, not only that, without training and qualification for the full exercise the teaching practice and the teaching and learning process in a virtual environment. This picture reveals that both students, who experience the supervised internship as a moment of practical training, and basic education teachers who update their training within the profession in the daily work of teachers, were forced to accelerate their self-training for the use of technologies of remote teaching, most of the times without pedagogical support and material conditions by the State and the University.

In the pedagogical scene of Educação do Campo (Rural Education), educational packages for the rural environment began to incorporate the teaching fallacy mediated by the digital packages industry, ignoring the education paradigm of and in the countryside, which has an emancipatory education as its pedagogical matrix. In addition to the countless challenges experienced by peasants in the midst of the pandemic, the need to adapt remote teaching, but specifically to carry out the Supervised Internship, immediately presents tensions and challenges due to issues that predate the COVID-19 pandemic itself, which there is an ethical questioning about the right to education in the countryside: what technologies do LEdoC students rely on to carry out the mandatory internship? In progression, what instruments and communication technologies does the rural basic school have in its pedagogical structure? In the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, what conditions would students, elementary school students and teachers face to develop the supervised internship, in front of a virtual school, still in the implementation phase, and often non-existent in rural areas? Hence the need to situate the political and pedagogical legacy that updates the dialectical movement of Rural Education.

The Degree in Rural Education Course (LEdoC) aim at training male and female educators to work in teaching in the final years of Elementary and Secondary Education by area of knowledge, in the management of rural schools and in the social and community educational processes developed in the rural areas (MOLINA, 2017). In this direction, it is visible that there are several spaces for the field teacher to act, which requires professional qualification for the performance of the profession. So, we corroborate the position of authors such as Nóvoa (1992), Pacheco and Flores (1999), in which they state that nobody is born a teacher, but becomes a teacher during a long educational process.

Faced with this statement, we briefly illustrate the educational stages with a view to systematizing the path of future rural teachers. According to Pacheco and Flores (1999), the first stage is the initial education and corresponds to the period of formal preparation that takes place in a specific institution, in which the future teacher acquires the skills and knowledge essential for the performance of the profession. As for the first years of professional activity, it refers to the second stage of education, which comprises initiation into teaching, in which the beginning teacher acquires and develops knowledge and achieves gradually growing professional autonomy. Finally, continuous education, which includes all actions or development strategies towards the professional growth of teachers (PACHECO; FLORES, 1999).

Thus, the formation of the future rural teacher begins in the school context, when the subject has the experience of being a student, configuring the pre-professional stage. When deciding to teach while still in school, the future teacher has an idea of what the role of the teaching professional would be, that is, they supposedly conceive models of teachers that inspire to choose teaching as a profession.

Upon entering the academy, the rural student begins the period of initial education, which consists of the first stage of the construction process of being a teacher, becoming effective through participation in various academic and complementary activities that Degree in Rural Education offers, and one of these academic and training activities instituted by the course is the Supervised Internship.

In this way, the supervised internship assumes an important role in the formation of the future teacher, since it is on the threshold of this formative action that teaching develops. It is usually during the internship that the future teacher comes into contact with the classroom, with the school teachers and with the management and, possibly, keeps in touch with the parents when invited to participate in a meeting at the school space. It is through the internship that the

future teacher experiences the rite of passage – from student to student-intern –, building the theoretical-practical experience of the profession, that is, it is in this place that the training actions are placed in a condition of analysis, reflection and criticism.

In this direction, Pimenta and Lima (2012, p. 24, our translation) assert that the supervised internship has been viewed “[...] as a field of knowledge and training space whose axis is research”. In this way, by treating the internship as a field of knowledge, on the one hand, the approximation and integration of training instances is assumed, including: training courses, field schools and non-school spaces, each playing a fundamental role for the development of this component, bearing in mind that it is in these formative fields that the educational practice takes place. Therefore, the internship needs to be worked as a research activity.

On the other hand, by highlighting the internship as a research activity, we enter into the concept that this component allows student-interns to “[...] develop a posture and researcher skills based on internship situations, preparing projects that allow them to at the same time understand and problematize the situations they observe” (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2012, p. 46, our translation). Therefore, it is through the internship that the future teacher will be able to apprehend and systematize the research elements essential to understanding the chosen profession and also the school and non-school context in which he will work.

Considering the above, our gaze turns to the field of the supervised internship of the Degree in Rural Education Course in the period of the COVID-19 pandemic, based on experiences lived within the teaching profession. Throughout the remote period, the supervised internship at LEdoC took on a different operating format, predominantly taking place remotely. Considering this context and our implication in the course as educators and researchers, we constructed the main objective of the study, which is to analyze the challenges and learning experiences experienced by student-interns during the supervised internship in the remote teaching period. As an investigation question we have: what challenges and learning were experienced by student-interns in the Supervised Internship of LEdoC- CPCE in remote teaching? The ongoing investigation has a qualitative approach as a theoretical-methodological basis, through participant research. For data production, we adopted a literature survey, analysis of resolutions and application of the questionnaire to student-interns of the Degree in Rural Education course, Campus Professora Cinobelina Elvas, enrolled in the discipline of Supervised Internship during the pandemic period.

The article is organized into three sections, in addition to this introduction – in which we present the study theme – and the conclusion. In the first section, we approach the supervised internship as a curricular component in the remote teaching period. In the second section we present the theoretical-methodological assumptions of the research. In the third section, we highlight the results and discussions of the data, emphasizing the challenges and learning experienced in the supervised internship in remote teaching. In conclusion, we present the impacts of remote teaching in primary schools in the countryside and at the university, showing how a challenging period due to the denial of the right to quality education in the place where one lives reinforced the narrative of erasing digital exclusion rates in rural areas.

The supervised internship in rural teacher education in remote teaching

The Degree in Rural Education (LEdoC) is understood as an educational policy built by the intense claims of rural workers who struggle to guarantee the right to land and education, based on a specific system of educating educators that considers the reality and specificities of the field. With regard to the Degree in Rural Education (LEdoC), offered by the Federal University of Piauí, Campus Professora Cinobelina Elvas (CPCE), located in the municipality of Bom Jesus, in the state of Piauí, this course aims to train multidisciplinary teachers, with an emphasis on the areas of Human and Social Sciences, based on the Pedagogy of Alternation, to act in teaching in the final cycles of Elementary and High School in the rural basic school.

According to the Political Project of the Course of LEdoC - CPCE (UFPI, 2013), 120 students from the rural area are contemplated annually, to work in the basic schools of the countryside located in diverse sociocultural contexts, in the region of Vale do Gurguéia, southwest region of Piauí. These students are selected through a specific selection process, which guarantees democratic access to the Undergraduate Course at the university.

However, peasants' access to higher education is still a major challenge; this is due to the “[...] long process of educational exclusion of peasants, since the right to education was limited to elementary and basic education, even so in a very precarious way” (BATISTA; SILVA, 2020, p. 629, our translation). That is, the denial of the right to school education in the place where one resides; the minimum operating conditions of rural schools, which include the lack of necessary infrastructure and qualified teachers, are existing problems in rural areas that affect, and even more, harm the school development of peasants.

Contradictorily to this situation, one of the fundamental traits of rural workers' movements and workers is the struggle for public policies that guarantee their right to education, and to an education that is in and from the countryside (CALDART, 2011). In this direction, the referred author asserts that: "No: the rural people have the right to be educated in the place where they live; the people have the right to an education designed from their place and with their participation, linked to their culture and their human and social needs" (CALDART, 2011, p. 149-150, our translation). In other words, education in the countryside aims at the realization of the formation of the subject in the place where he lives and is envisaged to be carried out considering the subject's ways of life, his culture, the organizational processes of the communities, the social, economic and cultural needs. Thus, we agree with the position of Gomes and Santos (2022, p. 1081, our translation) when they state:

[...] LEdoC assumes its counter-hegemonic role in the training of teachers for Rural Education when, in its political pedagogical project, it defends the formative conception of overcoming the logic of capital, based on the exploitation of rural workers, in the production of profit and in the field of agribusiness, to the detriment of family farming and the sustainable development of the Brazilian rural environment.

Therefore, it becomes necessary to seek professional qualification in initial education to broaden this horizon, as well as to strengthen the spaces of action of the educator of/in the field.

The intense debate about quality education and the provision of quality education are crucial issues in the educational context. Thus, with the emergence of a virus (coronavirus), in 2019, this was taken more into account, since it both caused the loss of thousands of lives and stopped educational, economic, cultural, social activities in the world.

The implementation of remote teaching in the LEdoCs, in 2021, for the completion of the 2019.2 calendar, was constituted under the need to keep students in academic activity in order to avoid losing the link with the University, to avoid school dropout and the need for teachers meet the requirements imposed by means of measures by the Government of Jair Bolsonaro, without proper organization regarding the structural conditions of Higher Education Institutions, with an accelerated process of precariousness in the face of budget cuts in university resources.

Remote teaching, despite this situation, was incorporated into the LEdoC, within the scope of the University, without a broad debate with students about their social conditions, without dialogue with the State Forum for Rural Education and without discussion with rural social movements in the Piauí, in terms of the impacts of remote teaching on basic schools in

the countryside, disregarding national statistics that confirm the progress in the process of closing rural schools. This position assigns to the LEdoCs responsibilities and duties that fall to the State, for the promotion of rural education in conditions of equality and equity, as stated in Decree n°. 7.352/ 2010 of the Federal Government:

Art. 1 The rural education policy is aimed at expanding and qualifying the supply of basic and higher education to rural populations, and will be developed by the Union in collaboration with the States, the Federal District and the Municipalities, in accordance with the guidelines and goals established in the National Education Plan and the provisions of this Decree (BRASIL, 2010, p. 81, our translation).

The paradigm of education in/from the countryside has as its central principle that the State assumes the implementation of educational policies and programs that consider the active participation of peasant people in the formulation, with the State responsible for implementing the rural education policy. The consequences of this absence of the State include the political option of joining remote education without dialogue with the higher administration about the social conditions of peasant students in the LedoCs.

The adhesion of the LEdoCs to remote teaching led to the return in 2021 of the discussion on the offer of the curricular component Supervised Internship. This discussion permeated the Higher Administration, contemplating resolutions that specified the development of this component during the remote period: the Collegiate Bodies and the Internship Coordination. With regard to the efforts of the Internship Coordination to think about proposals for the Internship to function during the pandemic period, it took into account both the resolutions that determined the development of the academic activities of the Supervised Internships I, II, III and IV, of the period 2020.1, of the courses of the LEdoCs, in remote training, according to CEPEX Resolution n. 056/2021 (UFPI, 2021), and in line with Informative Note 3, of March 16, 2020 (UFPI, 2020), regarding the discussions and debates within the Degree Courses in Rural Education.

In fact, according to Resolution CEPEX/UFPI n°. 056 OF MAY 14, 2021 (UFPI, 2021), the LEdoCs courses should work in remote format, and regarding practical activities, these would need to formalize their actions through specific work plans. In Art. 6 of Resolution no. 056, of 2021, we evidence such determination:

[...] With regard to curricular components that deal with professional internship practices or practices that require specialized laboratories, the application of the replacement will take place based on specific work plans, according to Appendix A, which must be approved, at the institutional level,

by the LEDOC Course Boards, by the Curriculum Monitoring and Development Coordination and by the Graduation Teaching Chamber (CAMEN), which are later attached to the Pedagogical Project of the Course (PPC) (UFPI, 2021, p.03, our translation).

The internship curricular component as a theoretical-practical activity demanded the proper functioning both to the real situation of the return in the remote format and to its formative character, of promoting the dialogue and the meeting of future teachers with the schools and the subjects of the field, as well as with the teaching profession. However, we emphasize that the Internship disciplines in 2021 were carried out remotely, which caused a distancing with the rural schools, with the organizational processes of the communities and, specifically, with the teaching profession.

In view of this scenario, the internship as a field of knowledge and training axis was developed considering the exceptional nature of the COVID-19 pandemic, which caused the loss of its intentionality in the process of being and becoming a teacher, consequently, and may affect the construction this professional identity. In this direction, attentive to the progress of tensions and criticisms about the development of the internship in remote teaching, we problematize: how did the internship as a theoretical-practical component have a link with rural schools in remote teaching?

From the formative point of view, the internship contributed to the formation of future teachers in the field, because it contemplated the fundamentals that guide the conception of internship in initial formation; addressed the construction of the professional identity of being a rural teacher; emphasized the legal frameworks that regulate teacher training courses in Brazil; highlighted the role of students as interns, of professors who train at the University, of supervisors in schools, of internship coordination, among other aspects.

From the point of view of education, remote teaching accentuated the numerous challenges in teaching, as highlighted by Saviani and Galvão (2021, p. 14, emphasis added, our translation): “in remote “teaching” we have little teaching, little learning, little content, low workload, little dialogue. On the other hand, we have many tasks”. That is, with the adoption of remote teaching, both students had difficulties in following this emergency process, conditioned to remote classes without guidance and courses that prepared them to experience the virtual world; how much it affected education professionals with regard to the use of new technologies, overwork, for predominantly developing the teaching profession at home, the various responsibilities of guidance and teaching activity such as online classes, online courses, online guidance, among others.

In view of the context, the problems and challenges in the functioning of basic schools in the countryside became more evident. On the one hand, the suspension of classes, the absence of internet and infrastructure to start online activities, among others; on the other hand, the challenges were carrying out the internship remotely, maintaining contact with schools, establishing contact with supervisors, observing the ambience of the virtual classroom, strengthening the bonds of future rural teachers. Thus, in the literature, authors such as Pimenta and Lima (2012, p. 29, our translation) warn that:

[...] the internship as a curricular component and a central axis in teacher training courses presents indispensable aspects for the construction of being a professional teacher with regard to the construction of identity, knowledge and the necessary postures.

The formative dimension of this component requires trainee students to approach and establish links with basic schools in the countryside, as well as reflection, analysis and criticism of professional activity. In this direction, we will seek to understand the dynamics of the aforementioned curricular component, its organization and the formative stages in the Degree in Rural Education course, at the Campus Professora Cinobelina Elvas.

The organization of the Curricular Internship discipline in the LEdoC Course, Campus Professora Cinobelina Elvas, covers the following structure: Supervised Curricular Internship I, II, III, IV. The internship disciplines are distributed as follows: the Supervised Curricular Internship I, with a workload of 75 hours, having as a summary the approach to the education process and the trajectory of teacher professionalization and its constitutive instances, in addition to a laboratory and planning workshops, teaching action and evaluation, construction of teaching materials, use of new technologies in education. The main objective of the discipline was to analyze the concepts of supervised internship and its importance in the Degree Course in Rural Education/Human and Social Sciences, aiming at apprehending formative elements about teaching learning, as well as the appropriation of teaching action planning.

Regarding the discipline of Supervised Curricular Internship II, the workload is 90 hours, with the following in mind: Approach to the Internship Project, in addition to carrying out the school observational internship (Elementary and High School). The aim of the course was to analyze the implications of supervised internships in teacher education based on the teacher-student-knowledge relationship and the process of building the internship project, such as carrying out school observation.

With regard to the Supervised Curricular Internship III, this has a workload of 120 hours, with the following content: the approach of the internship program focusing on conducting Elementary School. The main objective of the course was to provide the intern with direct and supervised contact with the basic schools in the countryside, in conducting activities in Elementary School in the final years (area of Social and Human Sciences), aiming at a critical understanding of the school organization in relation to the method of pedagogical work.

While the Supervised Curricular Internship IV has a workload of 120 hours, with the following in mind: the approach of the internship project focusing on conducting for high school. The objective sought to provide the intern with direct and supervised contact with the basic schools in the countryside, in conducting activities in High School (Social and Human Sciences area), aiming at a critical understanding of the school organization in relation to the method of pedagogical work.

Regarding the formative stages of the Internship in the initial formation of rural teachers, these include: reading and analysis of the internship documentation, contact with rural schools, planning and observation of teaching and management practice, conducting and producing the Internship Report. During the internship, the student-intern has the opportunity to learn each training stage, especially “learning the teaching profession during the internship means being attentive to the particularities and interfaces of the school reality in its context in society” (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2012, p. 111, our translation). Thus, when the student assumes responsibility for the initial training for carrying out the internship, he also assumes a new *status*: student-intern. Therefore, one of the requirements for taking this subject is to enroll and sign a term of commitment with the schools. So, both the university and the schools begin to celebrate, through legal documentation, the student's bond with basic education schools.

The second training stage runs through the first, signing the Term of Commitment and Agreements, as well as registering in the system with the University through the Integrated System of Academic Activities Management (SIGAA). All these actions require the contact of student-trainers, training teachers and internship coordination with basic schools, aiming to establish links with training instances.

Regarding the third training stage, which comprises planning and observation, these take place at the University under the guidance of the training professors responsible for the Supervised Internship discipline.

The planning of the teaching practice allows the future rural teacher to mobilize the didactic fundamentals and knowledge of the areas for the development of the teaching practice.

In addition, they have the opportunity to use this knowledge under the guidance of a teacher trainer with a view to analyzing and criticizing reality. While the observation process requires the student-trainee to be sensitive to the situations present in the educational context, as well as availability and interest in activities that take place in schools.

The student, while organizing the planning and observation of the teaching practice, has the chance to visualize the learning of both the teacher trainers within the university and the supervisory teachers in the context of the schools. From this perspective, Pimenta and Lima (2012, p. 119, emphasis added, our translation) point out that there are countless types of learning, such as:

Learning arising from the interactive dynamics of knowledge: the study of the relationships established in the meeting/confrontation of university professors, elementary and middle school teachers, interns, each with their values, worldviews and different experiences.

The meeting of knowledge between the professors who trained the internship provides the future teacher with knowledge apprehension, guidance and pedagogical follow-up, an opportunity for discussion and analysis about the experienced reality, as well as perceiving different positions and significant experiences for the process of becoming a teacher.

As for conducting, the fourth formative stage is the apex of the rite of passage from student to student-intern. It is in conducting that the theory-practice unit takes on greater significance due to the nature of teaching and the process of becoming a teacher. It is during this stage that the teacher trainers advise on the production of the Internship Report.

The last training stage, the production of the internship report, is developed in *Tempo Universidade* (Time in the University) and *Tempo Comunidade* (Time in the Community). With regard to the production of the report, the teacher trainer must guide the student-trainers on how to make this instrument, as well as monitor the writing and analysis process during the internship. In community time, the student-interns begin to experience the school context, document the internship actions for their return to the University, that is, with the production of the report, they socialize their formative experiences.

Methodology

This investigation opts for a qualitative approach and participant research. For Minayo (2012, p. 21, our translation), the qualitative approach is concerned with a level of reality that cannot be quantified, that is, “[...] it works with the universe of meanings, motives, aspirations, beliefs, values and attitudes”. This approach highlights the specificities of human and social phenomena, since it works with subjects and not about them, considering what subjects think and deliberate within a social group, and how they become aware of the problems they experience, as well as how they have the power to decision to solve them.

The type of participant research elucidates an imaginary that breaks up to a certain point with the traditional ethnographic work initially proposed by anthropology, which, even with the intention of emerging in the world of the other, was released from “the effectively social issues of the conditions of life of others” (BRANDÃO, 1999, p. 12, our translation).

In Rural Education, teacher training and its practices seek to merge the various knowledge produced in school and non-school spaces, with the discussion of theories for the production of new knowledge mediated by the Pedagogy of Alternation and in the perspective of interdisciplinary practices. We start from the understanding that research is, above all, an option to announce the world, pronouncing other possibilities, other subjects, other places, other experiences and other ways of producing knowledge beyond the paradigm of modern science.

Streck (2012, p. 6, emphasis added) analyzes: “The mastery of techniques only makes sense within this attitude that Freire qualifies as 'epistemological curiosity', without which technical competence runs the risk of contributing more to the increase of misfortunes than for the reduction of the sufferings and miseries of mankind.” Therefore, the construction of scientific knowledge requires a systematic investigation in which the researcher makes his choices and his ontological, epistemological, theoretical and methodological approaches to investigate reality, perceiving its contradictions, forces in disputes, changes and transformations.

Thus, the educational and methodological practices are of the order of the encounter that takes place between teachers and students. In this sense, it is necessary to understand what conditions (objective and subjective) need to be produced so that, during the internship at school, teachers and students experience educational encounters as a space of power for both and, consequently, towards an active desire to produce knowledge. Progressively, Gimeno Sacristán and Pérez Gómez (1999) state that educational practice is something more than an

expression of teachers' work; it is something that does not entirely belong to teachers, since there are shared cultural traits that form what can be designated as pedagogical subjectivities.

[...] willing to modify the routines of our pedagogical actions, of our didactic procedures; willing to question our own knowledge; discuss the decontextualization and lightening of teaching knowledge; break with the conservative conception of science and disciplinary fragmentation; question the dissociative scheme of the theory-practice relationship; analyze the results of the evaluation design of a classificatory nature, among other issues (VEIGA, 2008, p. 269, our translation).

In this perspective, the knowledge built in the supervised internship of an interdisciplinary nature is fundamental to ensure the dialogue between school and intern, resources and means of communication, disciplinary knowledge and non-disciplinary knowledge; articulation between school and non-school contexts; between professors and students, marked by encounters and reframing of knowledge that elucidate a world view of equity and emancipation both for the subjects and the schools of/in the countryside.

The formative matrix of the Pedagogy of Alternation has, in this itinerary, an innovative contribution to the methodologies of teaching in the internship, since they are oriented towards the formation of basic education teachers as active subjects of the production of knowledge from the relationship between school and community. The teaching methodology in alternation has re-signified the educational practice of teachers who work in basic schools in the countryside and in the city, qualifying the educational processes through interdisciplinarity, rearticulating the pedagogical dimensions of the school based on the paradigm of emancipatory education.

The problematizing issues involve the need to know the process of political and pedagogical organization of remote teaching, to know the conditions of teachers and student-trainers regarding the access and use of TDIC. We chose the dialectical method as necessary for reading the socio-historical process of the forces in disputes, highlighting the movement and contradictions of the offer of remote education for peasants who live in and from the countryside. The dialectical method allows us to reveal the silencing, the hidden questions and the forgotten experiences of the peasants who historically dared to build a project of education of and in the countryside.

Regarding the production of data, we opted for: survey of the literature and analysis of the resolutions that deal with remote teaching, presented in the previous section and analysis of a questionnaire with the following questions: how did the supervised internship take place in the remote period? what challenges were experienced in the supervised internship during the

university period and during the community period in the remote period? what learning was built in the supervised internship in the remote period with student-interns enrolled in the Degree in Rural Education course and taking the supervised internship disciplines during the pandemic period?

For data analysis, we chose the dialectical method as necessary for reading the socio-historical process of the forces in disputes, evidencing the movement and contradictions of the offer of remote education for the peasants who live in and from the countryside. Dialectical analysis means: “a) Addressing the thing itself; b) Apprehend the set of internal connections of the thing, of its aspects; c) Apprehend the contradictory aspects and moments, the thing as a totality and unity of opposites; [...]” (LEFEBVRE, 1983, p. 241, our translation).

The research had the collaboration of three students who graduated from the Degree in Rural Education who attended the Supervised Internship discipline from 2020 to 2021, a period in which remote teaching took place.

For the development of this study, we recognize our involvement as rural educators immersed in the reality of peasant peoples, as well as in the LEdoC course. This calls into question the place of speech that we assume in this scientific production, as we seek successive approximations of reality in order to make public and intelligible the real conditions of how remote teaching occurred and what are the socio-educational conditions of students. Thus, adherence to remote education had a direct impact on the reality of rural people, as it brought to light the context of digital exclusion, denial of the right to quality education, lack of investment in basic rural schools in terms of to digital means and access to technologies. In addition, it also revealed the lack of preparation of the faculty for the use of technologies, among other issues of pedagogical dynamics in remote teaching.

Faced with this reality, we seek, during the course of the internship disciplines, to encourage students to problematize reality from the offer of remote teaching in basic schools in the countryside. For systematization purposes, we present a summary of how the internship discipline in remote teaching took place, which led us, researchers and teachers in the field, to take this place as a scientific study.

The supervised internship disciplines within the scope of the University took place in mid-2020 and in the year 2021 remotely. The remote format required teachers to go beyond the stipulated time, with the use of digital screens such as computers and cell phones, extra effort to reconcile work activities with activities at home, that is, all teaching activities took place at

the family base, significantly affecting the personal and professional lives of many education professionals.

Regarding the realization of the internship subjects in the remote period within the scope of the University, it happened through digital platforms, such as *Google Meet*. The access conditions of LEdoC students to this digital platform resulted in more *offline classes* than *online classes*, because most students live in the countryside and internet access is precarious in that region.

Dilemmas and challenges of supervised internship in remote teaching in rural education: what lessons can we learn?

The supervised internship in initial teacher training assumes great importance due to its intention, which consists of providing opportunities for the link between university and schools, the apprehension of the theory-practice unit; the students' contact with teacher trainers and supervisors in order to contribute to the development of the teaching profession. In this direction, Kulcsar (2012, p. 58, our translation) emphasizes that:

[...] the supervised internship should be considered a fundamental tool in the teacher training process. It will be able to help the student to understand and face the world of work and contribute to the formation of their political and social conscience, joining theory to practice.

Carrying out the supervised internship in remote teaching at LEdoC, on the Campus Professora Cinobelina Elvas, intensified this focus of being considered a formative axis of teaching learning and understanding of the organizational processes of communities.

However, remote teaching, with its limitations, circumvented the nature of internship development in the initial training of rural teachers. On the one hand, it highlighted social and educational inequalities with the denial of the right to quality education and teaching within the emergency format of remote teaching. With remote teaching, students were limited to the educational process, that is, to follow remote classes, the minimum conditions had to be met, such as: access to internet networks, use of new technologies, courses for teachers with regard to pedagogical use and virtual tools. In this sense, Saviani and Galvão (2021, p. 38, our translation) warn of the fact:

Even to function as a substitute, exceptional, transitory, emergency, temporary, etc., despite the disagreements we have with remote teaching [...] certain primary conditions would need to be met to put remote “teaching” into practice, such as such as access to the virtual environment provided for

appropriate equipment (and not just cell phones); quality internet access; that everyone is properly familiarized with the technologies and, in the case of teachers, also prepared for the pedagogical use of virtual tools.

On the other hand, considering all these limitations, the students together with the teacher trainers and supervisors saw this period as transitory and decisive for the teaching career. Considering this transience of remote teaching, in 2021, the debate within the LEdoCs about offering the internship component became recurrent due to the adherence to the format that would be offered remotely and the minimum conditions for this offer.

The Internship Coordination of the LEdoCs (Bom Jesus, Floriano, Picos and Teresina) in a joint effort sought to think of a proposal that considered the formative viability of carrying out this component in remote teaching, taking as a determinant both the guidelines set out in Resolution n°. 056/2021 regarding the training dynamics of the LEdoCs, with regard to training spaces and times, that is, University Time and Community Time. Under the terms of the proposal built by the internship coordinators and together with the collegiate bodies of the LEdoCs courses, it took into account the COVID-19 pandemic scenario and the legal documentation.

Discussions about the offer of the Internship component revealed the level of educational inequality and digital exclusion of rural schools, students and rural areas in Brazil. At the same time, in the urban environment, institutions were not “prepared” to experience a health crisis, nor did they have the structural and pedagogical conditions to function in a remote format. In addition, it raised again the discussion about the permanence, even remote, of rural students in the Degree, since the resources of the National Policy for the Training of Basic Education Teachers (PROCAMPO), which enabled the implementation and structuring of the LEdoCs at the University, were coming to an end.

Remote teaching required both teachers and rural students to adapt to reality, thus emerging teaching based on *online activities* via *WhatsApp*, through digital platforms such as *Google Meet*, among others. This offer enters into the contradictions of the educational system regarding education in and in the field, since it presents the requirements of offering remote education, but does not have the minimum conditions for the development of remote education. This scenario encompasses the educational context in an overwhelming way, because as stated by Silva (2022, p. 783, our translation):

[...] we are experiencing, due to the pandemic crisis (Covid-19) installed in the country, the pedagogical work via digital platforms, among other technological devices, which provoke, intensively and extensively, the

teaching dynamics, consubstantiating, by the inherent limits the means used (tablet, cell phone, TVs, flash drives, notebook, among others) and the material condition of existence of education workers, mainly teachers and students.

With the pandemic period, remote teaching emerged on an emergency basis and with it we had to learn to use means to develop the teaching and learning process. In this direction, the present study presents as a central question: what challenges and learning were experienced by student-interns in the Supervised Internship of LEDOC-CPCE in remote teaching? This question guided our research with student-interns linked to the LEdoC in Bom Jesus, when we asked student-interns about: How did the supervised internship take place in the remote period? What challenges were experienced in the supervised internship during the university period and during the community period in the remote period? What learning was built in the supervised internship in the remote period? The student-interns, identified here as Student A, Student B and Student C, reported how the internship worked during remote teaching:

The remote internship was challenging, considering that it was a school that served rural students, and access to the Internet and technological devices are often scarce[...]. However, the most accessible way for all students were the printed activities that families sought at school, and the other alternative was to teach classes through the WhatsApp platform, teachers sent short videos, audios and texts with the aim of explain the matter. It was difficult to find ways for interns to participate, as teachers were having difficulty handling technological tools, and with limited time, working twice as hard to serve all students. But our participation took place in order to guide the students through these media to carry out the activities and clear up doubts about the material that the teacher had made available (Student A)

The supervised internship is already a big challenge and in times of a pandemic we had to join the internship completely remotely. What was a challenge, because the schools were already returning to their normal activities, and the academy required us as students to have an internship and the main thing that it was completely remote. This made the internship quite complex, as the schools in the countryside did not want to accept interns who did not go to the school, since the school's activities would return normally, so the main challenge was to find a school that would accept the requirements that the Federal University of Piauí was imposing on us (Student B).

My supervised internship was not completely remote, my internship period took place in a hybrid format, initially I made visits to the school, to get to know the physical space, the structure, the school's pedagogical project plan, as we are in the midst of the covid pandemic -19, the school was not open for students. On the other hand, I followed up on digital platforms, such as Google Meet, WhatsApp groups, in which, together with the teachers, classes were given at Meet, we tried to work on the contents through texts, photographs, audios and videos shared in the group, explaining the content on WhatsApp (Student C).

Based on the information provided by the student-interns, it is highlighted that the supervised internship covered both the period considered remote, which covers mid-2021, and the hybrid period that included the end of 2021. Regarding the challenges experienced during the periods mentioned, the student-interns highlighted the following: Student A revealed the absence of remote teaching in basic schools in the countryside, since the minimum conditions such as access to the internet and technological devices do not reach the reality of schools in the countryside, as well as active participation together the digital platforms. Student B emphasized that students linked to the university experienced remote teaching, while basic schools in the countryside adhered to the hybrid period: this provoked resistance from schools in accepting the internship. On the other hand, Student C, during the period of the supervised internship, carried it out in a hybrid format, highlighting the participation in the formative processes both within the scope of the University and within the school space.

With remote teaching, both basic schools in the countryside and the University joined alternatives for teaching using digital technologies. Adherence to remote teaching, even though it was an emergency proposal, significantly affected the school life of rural subjects, because it impacted on the process of educational exclusion of rural people and increased the emptying of rural areas, since most of peasants needed to move to the big cities, which offer internet networks or have public spaces with an open internet signal, throwing peasants to the contamination factors of COVID-19 and expelling families from the countryside. In this sense, Saviani and Galvão (2021, p. 39, emphasis added, our translation) warn of the fact that:

[...] remote “teaching” expanded and also reached public education in a very broad way, making use of identical “variations on the same theme”. Even to function as a substitute, exceptional, transitory, emergency, temporary, etc., in spite of the disagreements we have with remote teaching and which we will address, certain primary conditions would need to be met to put remote “teaching” into practice, such as such as access to the virtual environment provided by suitable equipment (and not just cell phones); quality internet access; that everyone is properly familiarized with the technologies and, in the case of teachers, also prepared for the pedagogical use of virtual tools.

In this sense, remote teaching showed cracks in the way it was used in basic schools in the countryside and universities, since it did not meet the primary conditions such as access to the virtual environment, quality internet access and that teachers were prepared for use of digital technologies.

Thus, remote teaching in primary schools in the countryside is a “great fallacy” coated with digital inclusion narratives without offering a public policy by public managers; An

example of this is the Bolsonaro Government's veto of PL 3477/2020, which regulates financial aid for internet access by students and teachers for remote teaching in basic education (BRASIL, 2020). With this veto, the right to education is violated, increasing the rates of educational exclusion, with serious restrictions on access to school and to technological and communication knowledge by peasants, increasing illiteracy rates in the country.

Based on this reality, we sought in this study to investigate whether teaching was learned through the discipline of Supervised Curricular Internship during the remote teaching period. The trainee students (Student A, Student B, Student C) reported that:

As challenging as it was, we were able to learn about that moment from the teachers' reports, about the difficulties, strategies, even the problems that teachers developed with remote teaching, where, most of them felt incapable, they also developed the stress, anxiety, and we can experience all these problems with teachers up close. With regard to the students, we were not able to have as much contact, but we managed to understand how painful this moment was for them [...]. As we can also see up close the abandonment of rural communities, by the State leaders, the problems of access to the Internet and technology tools that would be essential in those moments (Student A).

During this period of remote internship, we learned to develop methodologies and strategies with the use of technological resources, so it was a significant learning resource for them to be able to develop the mandatory curriculum internship (Student B).

The greatest learning for me was the collective work, which despite the challenges/dropouts/ and difficulties, I see as resistance and the main point for us to be able to continue during this remote teaching. Getting to know the reality of the school's physical structure, partnership of teachers, general servants and students was also a learning experience, since it is the space where we exchange knowledge, share experiences and welcome. I observe that these learnings were possible within a moment that says a lot about resistance, when I refer to this moment of remote teaching, because unfortunately this remote practice is very limited and exclusive, despite the innovations of school managers (Student C).

The reports deal with the challenges of taking a theoretical-practical discipline such as the Supervised Internship in a remote format, due to the possibility that it would be both to establish contact with basic schools in the field and to maintain a bond and learn in the professional context. But also, the reports present learning about teaching how to dialogue, through digital platforms, with teachers about the challenges, difficulties, strategies, that teachers faced in the remote period, as well as understanding the dynamics of collective work.

The supervised internship is a curricular component that promotes dialogue between training bodies, more than that, it is the space of excellence that involves students in the realities

of schools, allowing reflection and critical analysis of reality. In this direction, Pimenta and Lima (2012, p. 111, our translation) state that:

When moving from the university to the school and from there to the university, interns can weave a network of relationships, knowledge and learning, not with the aim of copying, of criticizing only the models, but in the sense of understanding reality in order to overcome it.

Learning about teaching and pedagogical processes is provided within training spaces, such as universities and schools, however, with remote teaching, contact with students, dialogue and ties with schools, the possibility of get to know the school reality closely and intervene critically in it.

So, this teaching has several pedagogical implications in the context of rural basic schools. The first is the relationship between the teaching and learning process within a dynamic of *online teachers* and *offline students*. Remote teaching makes the social dimension of the rural basic school impossible in the human formation of peasants, because it denies egalitarian education and makes the pedagogical work of the act of educating unfeasible.

Conclusion

With the accession of remote teaching, the rural basic schools and the university experienced a tense period due to the denial of the right to quality education in the place where one lives; this reinforced the narrative of erasing digital exclusion rates in rural areas. When we take a look to the context of the University, in the offer of the internship curricular component, we realize how much this education space has been compromised in its completeness, because the formative stages such as the contact and bond with the schools, the diagnosis of the reality, the observations of the teaching practice and management processes, the conduction, the production of reports and their socialization, were developed in a format that does not portray the real conditions of basic schools in the countryside.

In this way, it is visible, in the educational context, specifically in the context of basic schools in the countryside, the lack of investment and of an educational policy that meets the reality of peasant education. In this sense, what we have is the absence of government policies and actions aimed at people in rural areas, weakening the sense that education is everyone's right, since not everyone can enjoy an acquired right. Faced with this reality, the narrative is still propagated that the countryside is a place of backwardness and that the country's economic and educational development is based on Eurocentric scientific production, disregarding the

popular knowledge of people who live in the countryside and diminishing their role as transforming agents of their reality and economic and social transformation.

Thus, the data indicated that the supervised internship during remote teaching both enabled learning about being and becoming a teacher, about didactic procedures, and pointed out challenges during this formative stage as the dynamics of remote teaching. In addition, it highlighted the social and structural issues of education in the countryside with regard to the closure of basic schools, the lack of internet, as well as the difficulties and tensions in the development of activities in this curricular component. Even in the face of this scenario, we understand the internship as a space for education and teaching education that permeates teacher training, therefore, it constitutes one of the first opportunities for the insertion of future teachers in the profession.

REFERENCES

- BATISTA; O. A.; SILVA; M. S. P. Educação do Campo na Universidade: realidades e desafios socioeducacionais dos camponeses. **Interfaces da educação**, v. 11, n. 33, p. 617-637, 2020. Available at: <https://periodicosonline.uems.br/index.php/interfaces/article/view/4522/3948>. Access: 10 Apr. 2022.
- BRANDÃO, C. R. (org.). **Repensando a pesquisa participante**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1999.
- BRASIL. **Projeto de lei n. 3477, de 2020**. Brasília, DF: Senado Federal do Brasil, 2020. Available at: <https://legis.senado.leg.br/sdlegetter/documento?dm=8916306&ts=1616156368586&dispositivo=inline>. Access: 12 May 2021.
- BRASIL. **Decreto n. 7.352, de 4 de novembro de 2010**. Dispõe sobre a política de educação do campo e o Programa Nacional de Educação na Reforma Agrária –PRONERA. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2010. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2010/decreto/d7352.htm. Access: 12 Mar. 2021.
- CALDART, R. S. Por uma educação do campo: traços de uma identidade em construção. *In*: ARROYO, M. G.; CALDART, R. S.; CASTAGNA, M. **Por uma educação do campo**. 5. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2011.
- GIMENO SACRISTÁN, J.; PÉREZ GÓMEZ, A. **Compreender e transformar o ensino**. 4. ed. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1999.
- GOMES, D. A.; SANTOS, J. S. A implementação e a consolidação dos cursos de formação de professores para a educação do campo: uma revisão sistemática. **RIAAE – Revista Ibero-**

Americana de Estudos em Educação, Araraquara, v. 17, n. 2, p. 1079-1097, abr./jun. 2022. Available at: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/iberoamericana/article/view/14369/13315>. Access: 10 Apr. 2022.

KULCSAR, R. O estágio supervisionado como atividade integradora. In: PICONEZ, S. C. B. (coord.). **A prática de ensino e o estágio supervisionado**. 23. ed. Campinas, SP: Papirus, 2012.

LEFEBVRE, H. **Lógica Formal/Lógica Dialética**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Civilização Brasileira, 1983.

MINAYO, M. C. S.; DESLANDES, S. F.; GOMES, R. **Pesquisa social: teoria, método e criatividade**. 32. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2012.

MOLINA, M. C. Contribuições das Licenciaturas em Educação do Campo para as políticas de formação de educadores. **Educ. Soc.**, Campinas, v. 38, n. 140, p. 587-609, jul./set. 2017. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/57t84SXdXkYfrCqhP6ZPNfh/abstract/?lang=pt>. Access: 10 Apr. 2022.

NÓVOA, A. **Os professores e a sua formação**. Lisboa: Dom Quixote, 1992.

PACHECO, J. A.; FLORES, M. A. **Formação e avaliação de professores**. Porto: Porto Editora, 1999.

PIMENTA, S. G.; LIMA, M. S. L. **Estágio e docência**. 7. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

SAVIANI, D.; GALVÃO, A. C. Educação na Pandemia: a falácia do “ensino” remoto. **Caderno Universidade & Sociedade**, Rio de Janeiro, Ano XXXI, n. 67, 2021.

SILVA, W. A. Trabalho educativo, tecnologias educacionais e formação humana. **RIAEE – Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 17, n. esp. 1, p. 0781-0794, mar. 2022. Available at: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/iberoamericana/article/view/15880>. Access: 10 Apr. 2022.

STRECK, D. R. **Fontes da pedagogia latino-americana: uma antologia**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2012.

UFPI. **Projeto Político do Curso**. Campus Professora Cinobelina Elvas. Bom Jesus, 2013.

UFPI. **Resolução CEPEX/UFPI n. 56 de 14 de maio de 2021**. Dispõe sobre a regulamentação, em caráter excepcional, da oferta de Componente Curricular para o Período Letivo 2020.1 para estudantes dos cursos de Licenciatura em Educação do Campo (LEDOC), no formato remoto, em decorrência da pandemia do novo coronavírus – COVID-19, e dá outras providências. Teresina, PI: UFPI, 2021.

VEIGA, I. P. A. (org.). **Aula: gênese, dimensões, princípios e práticas**. Campinas, SP: Papirus, 2008.

CRediT Author Statement

Acknowledgments: Not applicable.

Financing: There was no financing

Conflicts of interest: Not applicable.

Ethical approval: The work respected research ethics.

Availability of data and material: Not applicable.

Author contributions: The authors Adriana Lima Monteiro Cunha and Maria do Socorro Pereira da Silva, as well as the author Thaynan Alves dos Santos jointly produced the writing of this article.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.
Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation.

