

FORMAÇÃO PEDAGÓGICA NO CURSO DE PEDAGOGIA: INDEFINIÇÕES E DESAFIOS

FORMACIÓN PEDAGÓGICA EN EL CURSO DE PEDAGOGÍA: INDEFINICIONES Y DESAFÍOS

PEDAGOGICAL FORMATION IN THE PEDAGOGY COURSE: INDEFINITIONS AND CHALLENGES

Clara Corrêa da COSTA¹
Helenice Maia GONÇALVES²

RESUMO: Embora a literatura aponte a necessidade de repensar a formação do professor da educação básica, a formação desses profissionais vem se constituindo, ao longo de décadas, um campo de disputas de concepções. As ambiguidades, contradições e indefinições presentes na legislação vigente para a formação de professores no curso de Pedagogia refletem uma tentativa de aliar interesses distintos, sobretudo políticos e econômicos, sem que se chegue a um consenso. Assim, prevalece uma ênfase teórica à formação pedagógica, desenvolvida de forma generalista, em detrimento de conhecimentos tanto de cunho específico quanto pedagógico. A articulação desses conhecimentos, que deveria nortear a formação de professores, muitas vezes não acontece. Diante dessas considerações, este trabalho se propõe a apresentar um debate em torno da política educacional brasileira para a formação de professores no curso de Pedagogia, a fim de identificar fatores que vêm dificultando a implementação de mudanças significativas nesse curso.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Formação docente. Formação pedagógica. Pedagogia.

RESUMEN: Aunque el profesorado señala la necesidad de repensar la formación de los docentes de la educación básica, la formación de estos profesionales se ha constituido, a lo largo de décadas, un campo de disputas de concepciones. Las ambigüedades, contradicciones e incertidumbres presentes en la legislación actual para la formación del profesorado en el curso de Pedagogía reflejan un intento de combinar diferentes intereses, especialmente políticos y económicos, sin llegar a un consenso. Así, prevalece un énfasis teórico en la formación pedagógica, desarrollada de manera generalista, en detrimento del conocimiento, tanto de naturaleza específica como pedagógica. La articulación de estos conocimientos, que debería orientar la formación del profesorado, muchas veces no ocurre. Frente a estas consideraciones, este trabajo propone presentar un debate acerca de la política educacional brasileña para la formación del profesorado en el curso de Pedagogía, con el fin de identificar factores que han dificultado la implementación de cambios significativos en este curso.

¹ Pedro II High School (CPII), São Cristóvão, Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil. Teacher of Basic Technical and Technological Education. Department of Early Years of Elementary Education. Doctorate in Education (UNESA). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2717-4126>. E-mail: correa.clara@outlook.com

² Estácio de Sá University (UNESA), Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil. Level VI adjunct professor in the Postgraduate Program in Education. Post-Doctorate in Educational Psychology (PUC/SP). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1169-9051>. E-mail: helemaia@uol.com.br

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Formación docente. Formación pedagógica. Pedagogía.*

ABSTRACT: *Although the literature points to the need to rethink the formation of teachers of basic education, the formation of these professionals has been constituting, for decades, a field of disputes of conceptions. The ambiguities, contradictions and indefinities present in the current legislation for teacher formation in the Pedagogy course reflect an attempt to combine different interests, especially political and economic ones, without reaching consensus. Thus, a theoretical emphasis on pedagogical formation prevails, developed in a generalist way, to the detriment of knowledge of specific and pedagogical nature. The articulation of this knowledge, which should guide the formation of teachers, often does not happen. Given these considerations, this paper proposes to present a debate around the Brazilian educational policy for the formation of teachers in the Pedagogy course, in order to identify factors that have been hindering the implementation of significant changes in this course.*

KEYWORDS: *Teacher formation. Pedagogical formation. Pedagogy.*

Introduction

Despite the advances in discussions about teacher formation in the last three decades, the literature on the subject has still pointed out the precariousness of initial teacher formation, constantly related to the weaknesses of the courses, to their fragmented character, to the distance between theory and practice and between university and school of basic education.

Consequently, pedagogical formation is the subject of intense debates that seek to overcome the dichotomy between theory and practice, promoting greater depth in research that sought to rescue the role of the teacher, thinking the formation in an approach that is not only academic, but also encompasses development personal, professional and organizational teaching profession.

The pedagogical formation comprises disciplines and practices that, articulated, will give the future teacher the necessary basis to deal, with autonomy, with the most diverse situations that may arise during his teaching practice. Although so dear to those who will dedicate themselves to teaching and present in legal documents and in intense debates about the quality of teaching, it still remains in the background, being considered a “minor activity”, strengthening the belief that it is not so necessary.

This reality significantly affects the graduates of the Pedagogy course, which covers formation for teaching at various levels: in early childhood education, in the early years of elementary school, in the pedagogical subjects of the normal course at high school, as well as in professional education, in the area of school services, in addition to other areas in which

pedagogical knowledge is provided, also encompassing preparation for educational management, which must integrate various functions, such as administration, coordination, planning, monitoring and evaluation of projects pedagogical and public and institutional policies in the area of education (BRASIL, 2006).

In view of the wide formative scope of the course and the little knowledge of the practice of the profession with which many graduates of the Pedagogy course begin in the teaching career, we understand that the current formation model is not yet a knowledge base that articulates theory and practice that it will guide the performance of the future teacher of early childhood education and the early years of elementary school, taking into account their specificities.

Although there is a consensus in the literature about the need to change the structure of the Pedagogy course, in which teaching is effectively the focus of the teachers of this course, this is an issue that has not yet been resolved. As it is a difficulty that is perpetuated until today, in which pedagogical practices are still crystallized, based on a traditional formation model, it is necessary to promote a greater discussion about the factors that are currently hampering the implementation of possible changes.

It is based on these considerations that this paper proposes to present a debate around pedagogical formation in the Pedagogy course, in order to identify possible factors that have been making it difficult to implement significant changes in the formation of teachers in this course.

The creation of the Pedagogy course

To understand the space occupied by pedagogical formation in the current reality of the Pedagogy course in Brazil, whose identity has been shaping throughout history, presenting, even today, a series of undefined and challenges to be overcome, we will rescue, albeit briefly, the story of its creation.

Teacher formation went through a long structuring process before the creation of the Pedagogy course. The first official institution for the formation of teachers in Brazil, *Escola Normal* (Normal School), was created in Niterói, capital of the Province of Rio de Janeiro, by means of a Letter of Law that executed Decree no. 10 of the Provincial Legislative Assembly, of 10 April 1835 (RIO DE JANEIRO, 1835). The curriculum of the course was quite sparse, consisting only of disciplinary content at the primary level and the only reference to the teaching

methodology referred to the Lancasterian method³, whose theoretical and practical principles would be taught by the director of Normal School.

In the same decade, in 1837, in the Province of Mato Grosso, the creation of Normal School was proposed by Law no. 8, of 5 May, which authorized “the local Government to hire a person from another location, duly capacitated”⁴ to teach the Lancasterian method. In case there is no suitable person, “the competent authority could then send a person from the locality to be instructed in the Normal School of the province of Rio de Janeiro”⁵ (XAVIER; SÁ, 2008, p. 125).

Thus, Joaquim Felicíssimo de Almeida Louzada was sent to the Province of Rio de Janeiro to qualify at the Normal School, having assumed the role of teacher between 1841 and 1844. In 1844, the school governed by him, which qualified teachers and also functioned as a school primary school, was closed “due to the lack of qualified teachers to exercise the position, due to the lack of adequate physical space for the school to function and because there are not enough provincial funds for the maintenance of the institution”⁶ (XAVIER; SÁ, 2008, p. 126).

Like the Normal School of Mato Grosso, the Normal School of Niterói was also closed in 1849 by Luís Pedreira do Couto Ferraz, who, among other factors, considered that the formation provided there was reduced in character and the curriculum was limited. After ten years, in 1859, the Normal School de Niterói was reopened, “however, its definitive implementation only took place in 1862, when the regulation of April 30, 1862 started to be executed”. In article 84, the objectives of the Normal School were defined as follows: “the Normal School aims to qualify, in theory and in practice, intellectually and morally, citizens who are destined to the teaching of primary education”⁷ (CASTANHA, 2008, p. 21).

However, it was only after 1870 that the Normal Schools began to show some success, when ideas of democratization and primary education were consolidated in Brazil. Pedagogical formation remained quite rudimentary, composed of one or two subjects (Pedagogy and/or

³ Lancaster's pedagogical method was chosen by Brazilian elites for “the elementary education of the people”, [...] and “it was guided by the maintenance of order, discipline and obedience for the free and poor population” (NEVES, 2009, p. 62-64).

⁴ “o Governo local a contratar uma pessoa de outra localidade, devidamente capacitada”

⁵ “a autoridade competente poderia, então, enviar uma pessoa da própria localidade para se instruir na Escola Normal da província do Rio de Janeiro”

⁶ “por não haver um quadro de professores capacitados para o exercício do cargo, por falta de espaço físico adequado para o funcionamento da escola e por não haver verbas provinciais suficientes para a manutenção da instituição”

⁷ “a Escola Normal tem por fim habilitar na teoria e na prática, intelectual e moralmente, os cidadãos que se destinarem ao magistério da instrução primária”

Methodology), in addition, in certain cases, with legislation and educational administration (TANURI, 2000).

In Rio de Janeiro, in 1879, Reforma Leôncio de Carvalho “tried to establish, in its article 9, a policy for the organization of Normal Schools in Brazil, defining a minimum curriculum”⁸ (CASTANHA, 2008, p. 27), but with his dismissal, Francisco Maria Sodré Pereira regulated that article and created a Normal School of primary education for teachers, in 1880. With a “bloated” curriculum, changes were necessary, and a new regulation established that the purpose of the Normal School was to prepare primary teachers of the 1st and 2nd degrees, comprising two courses: Sciences and Letters, and Arts.

In the period from 1870 to 1880, the organization of the Normal School faced difficulties, either due to the financial situation of the provinces, either due to the lack of candidates or the connection of the Normal School to the preparatory courses for higher education arising from the Leôncio de Carvalho Reform. However, even in this context, at the end of the Empire, practically all provinces had a Normal School.

From the 1920s onwards, the escolanovista movement began to exert a strong influence on the organization of teaching, supporting ideas of flexibility that sought to adapt the programs to the development and individuality of the student, among other “initiatives, almost totally linked to the formation of the student. primary teacher and, therefore, took place within the scope of the Normal School”⁹ (KULESZA, 2002, p. 6). Furthermore, “half of the “pioneers”- in fact those who contributed the most, for their ideas and performance, to erect the Manifesto into a fundamental historical document of schooling and Brazilian education - were viscerally linked to the Normal Schools”¹⁰ (idem, p. 9). As Kulesza (2002, p. 6) continues, “the Normal Schools were, from 1870 until the mid-1930s, the field of experimentation and diffusion par excellence of educational renewal in Brazil”, being the “great architect of this true revolution on Brazilian soil”¹¹.

In a context of search for the remodeling of teaching, the Ministry of Education and Public Health was created by Getúlio Vargas in 1930 through Decree No. 19,402, of November

⁸ “tentou estabelecer, no seu artigo 9º, uma política para a organização das Escolas Normais no Brasil, definindo um currículo mínimo”

⁹ “iniciativas, quase que totalmente vinculadas à formação do professor primário e, portanto, deram-se no âmbito da Escola Normal”

¹⁰ “metade dos “pioneiros” – na verdade os que mais contribuíram, por suas ideias e atuação, para erigir o Manifesto em documento histórico fundamental do escolanovismo e da educação brasileira – estavam visceralmente ligados às Escolas Normais”

¹¹ “as Escolas Normais foram, desde 1870 até meados da década de 1930, o campo de experimentação e difusão por excelência da renovação educacional no Brasil”, sendo a “grande artífice desta verdadeira revolução cultural em solo brasileiro”.

14, 1930. Its first holder, Francisco Campos, approved the Statute of Brazilian Universities, which remained in force until 1961. According to this set of regulations, universities could be public or private and should include three of the following courses: Law, Medicine, Engineering, Education, Science and Letters (OLIVEN, 2002).

Francisco Campos regulated a series of decrees that became known as Francisco Campos Reform and “provided an organic structure for secondary, commercial and higher education; for the first time in the history of Brazilian education, a reform that applied to various levels of education and aimed to reach the country as a whole”¹² (MORAES, 1992, p. 293). A series of measures was then posted, such as increasing the number of years for the formation of students in secondary school; the serialization of the course curriculum and its division into two cycles; the mandatory attendance of students to classes; and the implementation of a regular and more detailed student evaluation system. Such measures sought to meet the demands of the capitalist society of the time (DALLABRIDA, 2009).

The country started to demand, more and more, qualified labor for the new management functions and specialized services and, to demand from the State educational actions that would guarantee the formation of qualified personnel to occupy such functions. Thus, the expansion of schooling is also of capitalist interest (TANURI, 2000; SILVA, 2004; SCHEIBE; DURLI, 2011) and “educating the population, urban and also rural, seemed to be the first condition for the consolidation of the capitalist industrial economy and the development of the country was guaranteed. Education would be a requirement for every worker, who should acquire a minimum of education”¹³ (SANTOS; PRESTES; VALE, 2006, p. 136). At the same time, the educators’ movement was gaining momentum and, as noted by Andreotti (2008, p. 2), “the 1930s were fertile in relation to the new education, defended by educators who held positions in public administration and who implemented educational guidelines, supported by this vision of education”¹⁴.

In 1937, the National Institute of Pedagogy was created, effectively starting its work in 1938, when it became known as the National Institute for Pedagogical Studies (INEP). The institute offered courses for the various positions of school administration, contemplating the

¹² forneceram uma estrutura orgânica ao ensino secundário, comercial e superior; pela primeira vez na história da educação brasileira, uma reforma que se aplicava a vários níveis de ensino e objetivava alcançar o País como um todo”

¹³ “educar a população, urbana e também rural, pareceu condição primeira para que se consolidasse a economia capitalista industrial e fosse garantido o desenvolvimento do País. O ensino seria exigência a todo trabalhador, que deveria adquirir um mínimo de instrução”

¹⁴ “os anos 1930 foram férteis em relação à nova educação, defendida por educadores que ocuparam cargos na administração pública e que implementaram diretrizes educacionais, respaldados por essa visão de educação”

demands of qualification of personnel (TANURI, 2000). The following year, in 1939, the Pedagogy course was created by Decree-Law no. 1190, created by the Faculty of Philosophy, Sciences and Letters to meet the dictates of a proposal for professional university formation. Its creation was a consequence of the concern with the formation of teachers to work in the normal course (MARTELLI; MANCHOPE, 2004).

The course had two central purposes: to form, through the bachelor's degree, technicians in education, specialized in bureaucratic issues of the education systems, and to form teachers to work in the Normal Schools and in some subjects of the secondary, by means of a degree. The bachelor's degree was achieved after three years of studies of the fundamentals of education and the graduate degree was given in addition, of an optional character, with a duration of one year, including the didactic course (BRASIL, 1939).

This formation model, in which the qualification of the teacher for the exercise of teaching takes place as an addendum to the bachelor's degree course, became known as “3 + 1”, marking the beginning of a long period of dissociation between educational theories and pedagogical practices.

The Pedagogy course, as well as the other degrees, focused, first, on the study of the specific contents related to the bachelor's degree, and then, the study of the pedagogical contents was carried out in the didactic course. Brzezinski (2015) points out, however, that the job market for the bachelor in Pedagogy, who was formed in education, was never precisely defined. Therefore, according to her, the course, in its initial periods, sought a specific non-existent, consisting of generalities about auxiliary sciences of Pedagogy. Thus, the bachelor's degree in Pedagogy followed the opposite path to the other bachelor's degrees.

It is important to note that the degree in Pedagogy, as it was implemented in 1939, aimed to form teachers who would work at Normal School, who would form primary teachers. However, the contents of the primary course were not included in the curriculum of this degree, which, as Brzezinski (2015, p. 46) points out, disseminated the discourse that “who can do more can do less”. The lack of specific content in the Pedagogy course, which did not develop in the initial periods of the course for the aforementioned reason, unlike what happened in the other undergraduate courses, became a hindrance that led to distortions in relation to its function.

In 1946, there was an attempt to replace the “3 + 1” model, with the course having a mandatory four years. The first three years were composed of fixed and compulsory subjects and, in the fourth, the student could choose to take optional subjects or theoretical and practical didactics (SCHEIBE; DURLI, 2011). However, the model that intended to overcome the traditional “3 + 1” was just a way of reiterating it, since the title remained dissociated.

In the same year, as a result of the pedagogical thoughts of educational movements that aimed at improving education, the Minister of Education and Health at the time, Clemente Mariani, appointed a commission of notable educators with the purpose of presenting a preliminary draft of the general reform of national education (TANURI, 2000; SCHEIBE; DURLI, 2011).

After 13 years of disputes “between confessional and privatist interests in education and the republican view of the democratic, secular and free school” (AZANHA, 1999, p. 167), the project was consolidated, in 1961, in the first Law of Guidelines and Bases of Education, Law no. 4,024 (BRASIL, 1961), with the main banner of democratizing teaching and defending public schools.

Chapter IV of this law deals with the formation of teachers for primary and secondary education, defining that “the formation of teachers, advisors, supervisors and school administrators for primary education and the development of technical knowledge related to childhood education”¹⁵ is a competence of normal education, and will be held for at least four years, “in a normal junior high school”¹⁶ (BRASIL, 1961, Art. 52).

In the mid-1960s, the country experienced a time when the principles of efficiency, productivity and rationality began to reorganize the educational process. Thus, the aim was to make the school more productive, efficient and operational, considering formation for work. A technical view was increasingly emphasized, valuing the division of labor, seeking to meet the peculiarities of the labor market (TANURI, 2000; SCHEIBE; DURLI, 2011; BRZEZINSKI, 2015).

In 1968, the University Reform Law, Law no. 5.540 (BRASIL, 1968), which established the rules for the organization and functioning of higher education. The Pedagogy course stopped being part of the Philosophy Colleges and started to be offered by the Education Colleges. The Law proposed different qualifications for the Pedagogy course, among which students would choose the one they wished to pursue in their career, namely: Teaching in Normal Education, School Administration, Teaching Supervision, School Guidance and School Inspection, also enabling the teaching in the early years of schooling, by studying Methodology and Teaching Practice during the formative course. The minimum curriculum was maintained, with a part common to the course and another part diversified, according to the qualification chosen by the student.

¹⁵ “a formação de professores, orientadores, supervisores e administradores escolares destinados ao ensino primário e o desenvolvimento dos conhecimentos técnicos relativos à educação da infância”

¹⁶ “em escola normal de grau ginásial”

Scheibe and Durli (2011) point out that there was a disagreement in relation to the degree to be given to graduates of the Pedagogy course in their new configuration. According to the authors, the documents' rapporteur, Valnir Chagas, defended only a bachelor's degree. However, considering the graduate a specialist who received formation for teaching, the plenary of the Federal Council of Education (CFE) chose to confer the unique title of graduate.

It should be noted that the common curriculum base of the course included the same subjects as the old bachelor's degree, proposed by the legislation of 1962. Therefore, a fragmented model was maintained, albeit with a new guise. Formation along the lines of the “3 + 1” scheme, previously complemented by pedagogical disciplines, providing the title of graduate, is then complemented by disciplines that aim to enable different specialists in educational matters.

The legislation, which until then had been presented more generally, mentioning the formation of the “education technician”, becomes clearer with regard to the professional to be formed and his field of activity. However, the course loses its teaching identity, making the identity of a specialist increasingly central, based on technicality.

The 1980s to 1990s were marked by mobilizations by educators with the intention of intervening in the policies for the reformulation of teacher formation courses. Numerous criticisms have emerged in relation to the legislation for the Pedagogy course with the proposal of different qualifications, in relation to its theoretical and generalist character, to the fragmentation of formation, to the division of labor in the educational environment and to the rupture between theory and practice. However, the legislation remained in force for three decades, until the approval, in 1996, of the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN).

The 1990s were marked by a neoliberal trend, accentuating a technical rationality of formation, which made the teaching profession in a position of social devaluation, with the quality of teaching having suffered drastic consequences at all levels. In this context, disregarding the entire trajectory of the Pedagogy course in the sense of the advances achieved towards the adoption of the teacher formation model for the initial years of schooling at a higher level, the Law “established the formation of education professionals for administration, planning, inspection, supervision and educational guidance for basic education”¹⁷ (BRASIL, 1996, Art. 64).

¹⁷ a formação de profissionais de educação para administração, planejamento, inspeção, supervisão e orientação educacional para a educação básica”

The technical character of the course was reiterated, as a professional bachelor's degree, establishing the formation of a specialist in administrative management and pedagogical coordination. No mention was made in the document of the Pedagogy course as a place for teacher formation. To this end, LDBEN announced a new institution in the educational scenario, the *Instituto Superior de Educação* (Higher Education Institute), being indicated as the preferred place for the formation of teachers for early childhood education and the early years of elementary school. However, it would be admitted “as a minimum formation for the exercise of teaching in early childhood education and in the first four grades of elementary education the one offered at a secondary level in the normal mode”¹⁸ (BRASIL, 1996, Art. 62).

LDBEN generated a series of vagueness and ambiguities, which were the target of criticism from educators' movements, which intensified the debates about teacher formation after its implementation.

Despite the intention to raise teacher education to a higher level, LDBEN admitted, as a minimum formation for the exercise of teaching, that carried out at the medium level, in the Normal mode. However, the Decade of Education was instituted, which stipulated a period of 10 years, starting from one year after its publication, so that only “teachers qualified at a higher level or formed by in-service training”¹⁹ (BRAZIL, 1996, Art. 87).

In 2013, through Law no. 12,796 (BRASIL, 2013), Article 87, which previously stipulated the deadline for the extinction of that course, was vetoed, reiterating the high-level formation to work in early childhood education and in the early years of elementary school, even if admitted as a minimum education, which was corroborated by its other update, in 2017, through Law no. 13,415 (BRASIL, 2017), remaining still in force.

The way in which the legislation for the formation of teachers has been constituted shows that the maintenance of formation in the normal course, at the medium level, until today has not been a matter of planning, but because of the negative results obtained from the LDBEN. Since it is not possible to create conditions, within the Brazilian reality, for the formation of teachers to take place exclusively at a higher level within the period determined by said Law, it was decided to legalize the maintenance of this formation at a medium level. Thus, until today, this formation is maintained in several states in Brazil, including the most developed ones, such as Rio de Janeiro.

After an intense period of debates, in which educators advocated a broad teaching

¹⁸ “como formação mínima para o exercício do magistério na educação infantil e nas quatro primeiras séries do ensino fundamental a oferecida em nível médio na modalidade normal”

¹⁹ “professores habilitados em nível superior ou formados por treinamento em serviço”

formation to be carried out in Higher Education, which should take place in the Pedagogy course, in 2006, CNE/CP approved Resolution no. 1 (BRASIL, 2006) with the Curricular Guidelines for the Pedagogy course (DCN). The document proposes, in its Article 2, the graduate²⁰ title for teaching in early childhood education, in the early years of elementary school, in high school courses, in the normal mode, in professional education courses in the area of services and support school, as well as in other areas where pedagogical knowledge is foreseen.

The document recognizes teaching as the center of formation in the Pedagogy course. The old formation of the specialist in education is extinct, and the teacher is considered to be the protagonist of educational processes, including, in his competences, participation in the organization and management of educational systems and institutions. The document therefore proposes an expansion of the concept of teaching.

It should be noted that the concept of management itself appears in the document in a new meaning, encompassing administrative and pedagogical management. In addition, research-related activities are part of the management tasks listed in the document. Research therefore assumes a secondary role, being seen as an addendum to management.

We understand that the overload of formative emphases proposed by the DCN, through the expansion of the concept of teaching, gives the Pedagogy course a fragmented character, reducing itself to the possibilities of theoretical-practical approaches. Although the document removed the different qualifications of the course, offering a unique formation, focusing on teaching, directly or indirectly, the formation for the functions that the different qualifications proposed to form remains. By proposing a broader concept of teaching, the document overloads the initial formation in the course, without the problem of fragmentation having been solved.

Although most studies point to the need to rethink the formation of basic education teachers, it is necessary to emphasize that the formation of these professionals has been constituting, for decades, a field of disputes of conceptions. The ambiguities, contradictions and uncertainties present in the legislation in force for teacher formation in the Pedagogy course reflect an attempt to combine different interests in relation to teacher formation, without reaching a consensus.

The immense complexity that makes up the legislation has generated even more tensions and conflicts between educators, who have taken different positions in relation to the identity of the Pedagogy course, which we will focus on below.

²⁰ There a specific type o graduate degree, called Licenciatura, for the exercise of teaching in Brazil

The identity of the Pedagogy course in question

The identity of the Pedagogy course is an issue that has been strongly discussed since before its creation, in 1939, due to the difficulty in defining the functions of the course and, consequently, the field of professional performance of its graduates. The “3 + 1” model was marked by the lack of definition of the identity of the professional to be formed, both in terms of bachelor's and graduate degrees.

The decades following the creation of the Pedagogy course were marked by long and intense debates on teacher formation, which were accentuated in the 1990s. The publication of LDBEN, in 1996, elevating the required formation, to higher education, of teachers to work in children education and in the first stage of elementary school and, later, the 2006 DCN, which presented an expanded concept of the concept of teaching, intensified the debate about the identity of the pedagogy course.

The discussion focused, essentially, with regard to its purposes: to form teachers, specialists in educational matters or both professionals. In the literature on formation in the Pedagogy course, two distinct positions are evident: one that understands teaching, in its broad concept, as the basis for formation in the Pedagogy course and another that values technical, scientific and theoretical formation, considering teaching as one of the educational functions.

The National Association for the Formation of Education Professionals (ANFOPE), since its creation in 1990, has taken a strong position that teaching should be the essence of the Pedagogy course. It is worth noting, however, that teaching is seen by its associates in its broad sense, comprising not only preparation for the role of the teacher, but also for the functions of the “pedagogue”, which include administrative management, coordination pedagogical and research.

The concept of teaching, as defended by ANFOPE, therefore goes beyond the role of teaching in immediate action related to the classroom, encompassing the roles of teacher, manager and researcher. This premise is defended by researchers such as Helena de Freitas, Iria Brzezinski, Leda Scheibe, Lucilia Lino, Marcia Ângela Aguiar, Vera Lucia Bazzo and Zenilde Durli.

Starting from another understanding in relation to the role of teaching, other researchers take a different position from that defended by ANFOPE and its associates. Among them, there are José Carlos Libâneo, Selma Garrido Pimenta and Maria Amélia Franco, who show their concern with the provision of technical, scientific and theoretical formation capable of handling

the formation of teachers, managers and researchers, without their formation been limited to teaching skills.

According to the guidelines of the DCN (BRAZIL, 2006), teaching forms the basis of formation in the Pedagogy course, which is called a degree, and the articulation between teaching, management and knowledge production must be ensured. It is possible to affirm that the document fundamentally incorporated the concept of identity of the Pedagogy course coined by ANFOPE, being the target of criticism from researchers who maintained a divergent position.

Taking into account the - still current - demand for greater articulation between the theories and practices developed in the Pedagogy course, we understand that it is possible that ANFOPE's proposal is closer to meeting, even if not entirely, the needs of teacher formation, for seeking to form protagonists of the teaching and learning process (the teacher) through a common basis, which will also enable them to develop, in an articulated way, throughout the course, skills to exercise management and production functions knowledge through research.

The history of the Pedagogy course was marked by a series of questions, conflicts and impasses regarding its identity, in an attempt to reorganize the course so that it would provide formation based on the demands of society. The impasses still identified today are evidence that there is still a lot to do.

Considering the complexity with regard to the identity of the professional formed in Pedagogy courses, caused by the vagueness in relation to the field of performance of this professional and the priorities established by the universities, we understand that the pedagogical formation ended up not receiving due attention.

Pedagogical formation in the Pedagogy course: what the current scenario reveals

The current scenario of Brazilian education leads us to conclude that the elevation of teacher education at a higher level did not guarantee its quality. In this sense, Santos (2013, p. 71) points out the need to think of a formation model that “responds, in fact, to the demands of the teacher's professional performance, embodied in the challenges of Brazilian education today”²¹.

The LDBEN, published in 1996, considered a central reference for Brazilian education, is still ongoing, although it has undergone significant changes over more than two decades of

²¹ “responda, de fato, às demandas da atuação profissional do professor, corporificadas nos desafios da educação brasileira hoje”

its implementation. Institutions have been slowly adapting to it, and there is still some resistance, especially on the part of public universities, in which the attachment to historical tradition presents itself as a very marked characteristic (CRUZ, 2008; CORRÊA, 2015).

According to Brzezinski (2014), when analyzing the history of the changes made in LDBEN, the expressive amount of interventions in its base text shows, on the one hand, the continuity of the debate around the Brazilian educational problem without, however, failing to reveal contradictions and clashes that involve educators who seek to improve the quality of education. On the other hand, it confirms the tendency of the educational system to act in a fragmented way, in which decisions are taken hastily, “linked to the case-by-case determinations of management governance programs and the implementation of public policies aimed at immediate interests and objectives, which seeks to legitimize inclusion in the legal text”²² (BRZEZINSKI, 2014, p. 30).

Alves-Mazzotti (2011, p. 292) briefly defines the norms regarding teacher formation as “a tangle of guidelines, resolutions, ordinances, opinions that more confuse than clarify managers and teachers responsible for their implementation regarding what and how to do it”²³. In other words, it is evident that the legislation on teacher formation, carried out in a segmented manner, as a result of negotiations of interests, above all, political and economic, constitutes a hindering element in effecting changes in the curricula of Pedagogy courses.

The inaccuracies of the legislation justify, in part, the disordered way with which the formation has been carried out in practice in the educational institutions of the different instances. Although we know that legislation alone does not guarantee its implementation and the quality of teacher formation, it is nevertheless the basis for proposals to emerge to promote changes. The lack of continuity with which Brazilian legislation for teacher formation was being implemented, its contradictions and ambiguities have made it even more difficult to implement actions towards the evolution of teacher formation processes.

The wide curriculum complexity required for the Pedagogy course is also a major challenge to be faced by educational institutions. Authors such as Gatti *et al.* (2019), question the feasibility of time to establish a formation that takes into account all the specificities proposed by LDBEN considering the peculiarities of teaching in early childhood education, in the early years of elementary school, the manager and the researcher. In addition, they point out

²² “atreladas às determinações casuísticas de programas gestores de governança e de implementação de políticas públicas voltadas para interesses e objetivos imediatistas, que se busca legitimar pela inclusão no texto legal”

²³ “um emaranhado de diretrizes, resoluções, portarias, pareceres que mais confundem do que esclarecem gestores e professores responsáveis por sua implementação a respeito do que e como fazer”

the characteristics of the curricula of the courses, which currently maintain a proposal for panoramic and fragmented formation, another element that makes it difficult to carry out a solid formation.

In addition to the characteristics of the legislation, another element interferes significantly in effecting changes in the social reality in which teacher education is developed: the tradition of the old bachelor's, which is still very present in the practice of teacher educators in undergraduate courses.

In relation to this issue, Gatti (2014, p. 36) signals the need to “overcome ingrained concepts and habits perpetuated for centuries and be able to innovate”²⁴. However, he signals that this is a very challenging task when you have “an accommodated academic culture”, combined with the diversified interests of great instances.

In relation to the current formation model of undergraduate courses, Scheibe and Bazzo (2016) believe that there is a certain “shading”, in practice, the graduate degree remains as an appendix to the bachelor's degree, along the lines of the old “3 + 1 model”. Although questioned and mitigated by the legislation, the authors point out that this model is present in the pedagogical culture of teacher education, still based on the separation between theory and practice.

It is worth noting that when we currently associate the “3 + 1” model to undergraduate courses in specific areas of knowledge, we refer to a formation that prioritizes the area of teaching activity (such as Mathematics, Portuguese Language, Biology, History, Geography), adding pedagogical formation to it, which reinforces the dichotomy between disciplinary contents and pedagogical formation.

When we refer to the Pedagogy course, we see another scenario, even more worrying. There is an overvaluation of pedagogical theories, developed in a generalist manner, to the detriment of the specific knowledge that teachers will be able to teach and the pedagogical knowledge applied to them. Theoretical emphasis is placed on pedagogical formation. Regarding this weakness of the Pedagogy course for the effective exercise of teaching, Gatti (2014) points out that there is a formative deficiency in relation to the specific contents of the different areas to be taught, in addition to a very small space for the development of specific pedagogical skills for the performance of the future teacher. According to the author, there is greater concern with the offer of theories as a way to contextualize the work challenges, which she considers abstract.

²⁴ “superar conceitos arraigados e hábitos perpetuados secularmente e ter condições de inovar”

In an investigation on the exercise of teaching, Maia (2019) highlights the unpreparedness of the teachers formed by the Pedagogy course to deal with the school routine and the lack of familiarity with the contents to be taught. Studies point out that these difficulties result from deficient pedagogical formation, distanced from the reality of the classroom, with little activity aimed at exercising pedagogical practice.

Considering the overvaluation of pedagogical theories, developed in a generalist way in the Pedagogy course, to the detriment of specific knowledge and, also, of pedagogical knowledge, the theoretical emphasis on pedagogical formation prevailing, the dichotomy between theory and practice remains, which it worsens even more in the case of this course, considering that teaching must cover the administrative and pedagogical management of the school space.

Final considerations

Based on the history of the Pedagogy course and considering its current panorama, as presented in this work, it can be said that there are several elements that hinder the development of pedagogical formation in the Pedagogy course that gives the future teacher the necessary basis to deal with autonomy, with the challenges that may arise during their teaching practice.

Among them, we highlight the segmented way in which the legislation for teacher formation was being implemented; the characteristics of the curricula of the courses, which maintain a panoramic formation, in function of the wide curricular complexity required for the course and the feasibility of time necessary for its development; and the attachment to the tradition of the old baccalaureate, present in the practice of teachers of Pedagogy course.

Thus, a theoretical emphasis on pedagogical formation prevails, developed in a generalist manner, to the detriment of knowledge of both a specific and pedagogical nature. The articulation of this knowledge, which should guide the formation of teachers, often does not happen.

Although we are still facing a little optimistic scenario, it is necessary to continue in the quest for improving formation in the Pedagogy course, especially with regard to the pedagogical formation of future teachers. Associations such as ANFOPE, which throughout the history of its creation, fight for this ideal, make us believe that change is possible if we do not let ourselves be carried away by the discourse of difficulty, which has been reinforcing immobility for so long, fruit of the attachment to tradition.

REFERENCES

- ALVES-MAZZOTTI, A. J. Formação para o magistério: o discurso dos formadores. **Revista Diálogo Educacional**, Curitiba, v. 11, n.33, p. 287-307, maio/ago. 2011. Available at: <http://www2.pucpr.br/reol/pb/index.php/dialogo>. Access: 06 Mar. 2020.
- ANDREOTTI, A. L. **O governo Vargas e o equilíbrio entre a pedagogia tradicional e a pedagogia nova**. Available at: http://www.histedbr.fe.unicamp.br/navegando/periodo_era_vargas_intro.html. Access: 17 Mar. 2020.
- AZANHA, J. M. P. Roque Spencer Maciel de Barros: defensor da escola pública. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 25, n. 1, p. 167-169, jan./jun. 1999. Available at: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ep/v25n1/v25n1a13.pdf>. Access: 11 May 2020.
- BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Resolução CNE/CP n. 1/2006, de 15 de maio de 2006. Institui Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para o Curso de Graduação em Pedagogia, licenciatura. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 16 maio 2006. Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/rcp01_06.pdf. Access: 22 Apr. 2020.
- BRASIL. Decreto-Lei n. 1.190, de 4 de abril de 1939. Organização da Faculdade Nacional de Filosofia. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 6 abr. 1939. Seção 1, p. 7.929. Available at: <https://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1930-1939>. Access: 12 Apr. 2020.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Lei n. 4.024, de 20 de dezembro de 1961. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 27 dez. 1961. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L4024.htm. Access: 12 May 2020.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Lei n. 5.540, de 28 de novembro de 1968. Fixa normas de organização e funcionamento do Ensino Superior e sua articulação com a escola média e dá outras providências. Ministério da Educação. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 23 nov. 1968. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L5540.htm. Access: 12 Apr. 2020.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 23 dez. 1996. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/19394.htm. Access: 13 May 2020.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Lei n. 12.796, de 04 abril de 2013. Altera a Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, para dispor sobre a formação dos profissionais da educação e dar outras providências. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 5 abr. 2013. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2011-2014/2013/Lei/L12796.htm#:~:text=LEI%20N%C2%BA%2012.796%2C%20DE%204%20DE%20ABRIL%20DE%202013.&text=Alterar%20a%20Lei%20n%C2%BA%209.394,educa%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20e%20dar%20outras%20provid%C3%Aancias. Access: 13 May 2020.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Lei n. 13.415 de 16 de fevereiro de 2017. Altera a Lei nº 9394 de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, para dispor sobre a formação dos profissionais da educação e dar outras providências. **Diário**

Oficial da União, Brasília, DF, 17 fev. 2017. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2017/lei/L13415.htm. Access: 10 May 2020.

BRZEZINSKI, I. **LDB/1996 Contemporânea: contradições, tensões, compromissos**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2014.

BRZEZINSKI, I. **Pedagogia, pedagogos e formação de professores: busca e movimentos**. São Paulo: Papyrus, 2015.

CASTANHA, A. P. Escolas Normais no século XIX: um estudo comparativo. **Revista HISTEDBR On-line**, Campinas, n. 32, p.17-36, dez. 2008. Available at: https://www.fe.unicamp.br/pf-fe/publicacao/5395/art02_32.pdf. Access: 06 May 2020.

CRUZ, G. B. **O Curso de Pedagogia no Brasil na visão de pedagogos primordiais**. 2008. 305 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação). Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro. 2008.

DALLABRIDA, N. A Reforma Francisco Campos e a modernização nacionalizada do ensino secundário. **Educação**, Porto Alegre, v. 32, n. 2, p. 185-191, maio/ago. 2009. Available at: <http://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br>. Access: 20 Apr. 2020.

GATTI, B. A. A formação inicial de professores para a educação básica: as licenciaturas. **Revista USP**, São Paulo, n. 100, p. 33-46, dez./jan./fev. 2014. Available at: <http://www.revistas.usp.br/revusp/article/view/76164>. Access: 28 Apr. 2020.

GATTI, B. A *et al.* **A. Professores do Brasil: novos cenários de formação**. Brasília: UNESCO, 2019.

KULESZA, W. A. Genealogia da Escola Nova no Brasil. **Revista Educação em Foco**, Juiz de Fora, v. 7, n. 2, p. 83-92, set./fev. 2002. Available at: <http://www.ufjf.br/revistaedufoco/files/2010/02/061.pdf>. Access: 15 May 2020.

MAIA, H. Formação docente em nível médio e superior: perspectivas de professores sobre o exercício da docência em seu trabalho. **Revista Internacional de Formação de Professores (RIFP)**, Itapetininga, v. 4, n. 2, p. 149-168, abr./jun. 2019. Available at: <https://periodicos.itp.ifsp.edu.br/index.php/RIFP/article/view/1417/1038>. Access: 15 May 2020.

MARTELLI, A. C.; MANCHOPE, E. C. P. A história do curso de Pedagogia no Brasil: da sua criação ao contexto após LDB 9394/96. **Revista Eletrônica de Ciências da Educação**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 1-21, 2004. Available at: <http://www.periodicosibepes.org.br/index.php>. Access: 15 May 2020.

MORAES, M. C. M. Educação e Política nos Anos 30: a Presença de Francisco Campos. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos**, Brasília, v. 73, n. 17-4, p. 291-321, maio/ago. 1992. Available at: <http://emaberto.inep.gov.br/index.php/rbep/article/view/1257>. Access: 15 May 2020.

NEVES, F. M. O método pedagógico de Lancaster e a instituição do estado nacional brasileiro. *In*: ROSSI, E. R.; RODRIGUES, E.; NEVES, F. M. (Org.). **Fundamentos históricos da educação no Brasil**. Maringá: UEM, 2009, p.57-66.

OLIVEN, A. C. Histórico da Educação Superior no Brasil. *In*: SOARES, M. S. A. (Org.). **A Educação Superior no Brasil**. Brasília: Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES), 2002.

RIO DE JANEIRO. **Decreto Nº 1.331-A, de 17 de fevereiro de 1854**. Aprova o regulamento para a reforma do ensino primário e secundário do Município da Côrte. Available at: <https://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/decret/1824-1899/decreto-1331-a-17-fevereiro-1854-590146-publicacaooriginal-115292-pe.html>. Access: 09 May 2020.

SANTOS, I. M. A formação de professores e o curso de Pedagogia, **Debates em Educação**, Maceió, v. 5, n. 9, p. 67-78, jan./jun. 2013. Available at: www.seer.ufal.br/index.php/debateseducacao. Access: 16 May 2020.

SCHEIBE, L; DURLI, L. Curso de Pedagogia no Brasil: olhando o passado, compreendendo o presente. **Revista Educação em Foco**, ano 14, n. 17, p. 79-109, jul. 2011. Available at: revista.uemg.br/index.php/educacaoemfoco/article/view/104. Access: 13 Mar. 2020.

TANURI, L. M. História da formação de professores. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, n. 14, p. 61-88, maio/ago. 2000. Available at: www.scielo.br/pdf/rbedu/n14/n14a. Access: 12 Mar. 2020.

XAVIER, A. P. S.; SÁ, N. P. A escola normal de Mato Grosso no século XIX. **Série-Estudos - Periódico do Mestrado em Educação da UCDB**, Campo Grande-MS, n. 25, p. 123-132, jan./jun. 2008. Available at: <http://www.serie-estudos.ucdb.br/index.php/serie>. Access: 16 May 2020.

How to quote this article

COSTA, Clara Corrêa da; GONÇALVES, Helenice Maia. Formação pedagógica no curso de pedagogia: indefinições e desafios. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 24, n. 2, p. 631-649, maio/ago., 2020. e-ISSN: 1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v24i2.13772>

Submitted: 10/01/2020

Required revisions: 20/02/2020

Approved: 25/03/20

Published: 09/04/2020