

THE COMPLEXITY OF CURRENT CURRICULAR POLICY CHALLENGES IN YOUTH AND ADULT EDUCATION

A COMPLEXIDADE DOS DESAFIOS DAS POLÍTICAS CURRICULARES EM EDUCAÇÃO DE JOVENS E ADULTOS NA ATUALIDADE

LA COMPLEJIDAD DE LOS DESAFÍOS DE LAS POLÍTICAS CURRICULARES EN LA EDUCACIÓN DE JÓVENES Y ADULTOS EN LA ACTUALIDAD

Raimundo Nonato Moura OLIVEIRA¹
Georgyanna Andrea Silva MORAIS²

ABSTRACT: The present text develops around the discursive axis called curricular policies in Youth and Adult Education (EJA, Portuguese initials), highlighting the complexity and challenges inherent to these policies, through its purpose of promoting their critical formation as required currently in this 21st century. It adopts historical-dialectical analysis as a research reference. It explains that any proposal for training at EJA, which aims to overcome tensions, contradictions and limits, implies understanding it within its historical, political, epistemological and pedagogical perspective, as well as the multiple practices that condition it and its impacts on the lives of students taking this type of teaching, recognized as active characters in stories of denied rights.

KEYWORDS: Curricular Policy. Youth and adult education. Complexity and challenges.

RESUMO: O texto em tela desenvolve-se em torno do eixo discursivo denominado políticas curriculares em Educação de Jovens e Adultos (EJA), colocando em realce complexidade e desafios inerentes a essas políticas, mediante seu propósito de promoção de sua formação crítica conforme requerida na atualidade deste século XXI. Adota a análise histórico-dialética como referencial de pesquisa. Explica que toda proposta de formação na EJA, que visa superação de tensões, contradições e limites, implica compreendê-la dentro de sua perspectiva histórica, política, epistemológica e pedagógica, assim como das múltiplas práticas que a condicionam e de seus impactos na vida dos educandos que cursam essa modalidade de ensino, reconhecidos como personagens ativos de histórias de direitos negados.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Política curricular. Educação de jovens e adultos. Complexidade e desafios.

¹ Maranhão State University (UEMA), Caxias – MA – Brazil. Adjunct Professor in the Department of Education. Doctorate in Education (PUC/SP). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7038-8686>. E-mail: kairosrn@hotmail.com

² Maranhão State University (UEMA), Caxias – MA – Brazil. Adjunct Professor in the Department of Education. PhD in Education (UFC). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3609-7620> E-mail: georgyan_morais@yahoo.com.br

RESUMEN: *El presente texto se desarrolla en torno al eje discursivo denominado políticas curriculares en Educación de Jóvenes y Adultos (EJA), destacando la complejidad y desafíos inherentes a estas políticas, a través de su propósito de promover su formación crítica como se requiere en la actualidad de este siglo XXI. Adopta el análisis histórico-dialéctico como referencia de investigación. Explica que cualquier propuesta de formación en EJA, que pretenda superar tensiones, contradicciones y límites, implica comprenderla dentro de su perspectiva histórica, política, epistemológica y pedagógica, así como las múltiples prácticas que la condicionan y sus impactos en la vida de los ciudadanos. Alumnos que cursan esta modalidad de enseñanza, reconocidos como personajes activos en relatos de derechos negados.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Política curricular. Educación de jóvenes y adultos. Complejidad y desafíos.*

Introduction

Currently, there is no lack of recommendations on the construction of curricular policies for the Education of Youth and Adults, with a view to guaranteeing these subjects the right to education, which, due to circumstances, successes and historical needs, resulted in the condition of being schooled, requiring for this, among other things, the improvement of teaching, access to knowledge and qualitative formation of teachers.

However, the realization of this reality, if, on the one hand, represents, from the ethical-political point of view, an obligation, considering the historical deficits with this population, on which the school's professional and collective actions depend, on the other, the curriculum policies remain a complex reality as long as it is not understood that this teaching modality has its own specificities, whose meaning of education goes through the construction/deconstruction of the students' historical, social and cultural experiences.

Several researches in Brazil about Youth and Adult Education have discussed the complexity of the challenges that this type of teaching has historically faced to overcome the process of expelling these subjects from school (VÓVIO; MOURA; RIBEIRO, 2001; VÓVIO, 2009; SOARES, 2011; RÍVERO, 2009; DI PIERRO, 2005; DIAS *et al.*, 2011). The historical-critical reading of these challenges makes it possible to point out the need for any formation policy at EJA, which is significant for changes, implies understanding it within a historical, political, epistemological and pedagogical perspective, as well as the multiple practices that condition it and its impacts on the lives of students who live and attend this type of teaching, recognized as active characters in stories of denied rights.

In this perspective, what matters in this text on the issue of the complexity of the curricular policy challenges in the education of young people and adults is its expansion and

understanding as a form of knowledge to reflect the formation processes and promote changes in the teaching and learning practices of educators and students in an emancipatory sense.

Historical aspects and the complexity of curriculum challenges in EJA

The Education of Youths and Adults (EJA), according to studies (BEISEIGEL 1974; 1997; 2000; 2003; FÁVERO, 2009) that support this literature, appears in the Brazilian context as an educational policy from the 1940s, despite the understanding that the need to offer it has been registered since the imperial period, becoming historicized only at the beginning of the republican period. Prior to this period, Youth and Adult Education was not a recurring concern of governments and appeared in normative texts associated with adult education and as general education, in the sense of rights.

Carlos (2006) states that in the Federal Constitutions (1891, 1934, 1937 and 1946) adult education appeared both as a precondition for the political exercise of voting, through the prohibition of illiterate voting in Brazil, as inserted in the context of primary education, under the responsibility of the states and municipalities for its creation and maintenance, with the Union only having the task of encouraging and promoting it through agreements with the federal units.

Only after 1940, adult education started to gain reference in the history of Brazilian education. It emerges as a construction that arises from the industrialization process, considering social, political, economic, cultural factors, permeated by a critical and modernizing aspect and by a participatory tone. However, its intensification occurred, from the mid-1980s, when problems related to young people began to be studied in Social Sciences, highlighting the youth category. It is, therefore, that the designation of Youth and Adult Education begins to be used in history (FÁVERO, 2009).

Therefore, the phenomenon of adult education, after the 1940s, begins to be perceived as a right and starts to materialize in concrete initiatives, such as the creation of the National Fund for Primary Education in 1942, of the Education Service of Adults and the Adult Education Campaign, both in 1947, the Rural Education Campaign started in 1952 and the National Campaign to Eradicate Illiteracy in 1958, both at the state and local levels (FÁVERO, 2009). All of them aim to provide schooling benefits to broad sections of the population hitherto excluded from school, based on two guiding trends, the industrial modernizer and the critical-emancipatory one.

In the modernizing perspective of industrial capitalism, schooling is used as a mechanism for shaping the working class to the societal paradigm, appropriate to the interests of the modernization process of the nation-state and to the interests of the industrial sector at each moment in the country's socio-political economic and cultural history. Almost all public policies, aimed at this teaching field, functioned as a mechanism for the implementation of an education whose central axis is the insertion of the country in a globalized economy (SHIROMA; MORAES; EVANGELISTA, 2004; FÁVERO, 2009).

With the changes and the transition from industrial capitalism to the globalized market, the schooling process continues to be used as a mechanism for shaping the working class, now, within a corporate paradigm renewed by the neoliberal spirit. In this context, the discourse of implanting a “quality education” prevails as a condition both for the insertion of the country in a globalized economy and for the promotion of economic development with social equity, according to the declaration of the Organization of Ibero-American States for Education, Science and Culture (OEI, 1996).

As can be seen, in the market perspective, the insertion of the country in the context of the productive restructuring of capital depends on a manpower with adequate formation to carry out work that meets the specificities of the moment, therefore, it is necessary to develop versatility and multifunctionality (PAIVA, 2009). Multipurpose, understood as the subject's ability to exercise or perform different tasks, that is, to be versatile, developing their potential to exercise multiple functions, that is, to be multifunctional.

In this sense, today's educational policies focused at the formation of young and adult audiences aim to transform them into “competent” workers. Thus, education, acquiring centrality and associated with a productivist conception, converges to the formation of young and adult workers based on social and cognitive skills that affect them to professional profiles geared towards the new social configuration (VIEIRA, 2000; VÓVIO; MOURA; RIBEIRO, 2001).

In the critical-emancipatory trend, on the contrary, the schooling process is thought of and used as a mechanism for raising awareness and freeing people from their situated and conditioned social conditions. It is schooling based on an educational policy aimed at social transformation, assuming a position contrary to the education processes in the perspective of adapting the population to modernization processes conducted by the dominant political forces (BEISEIGEL, 1974; 2003).

This trend, in contrast to the political and cultural effervescence of the previous trend in its various historical moments, built experiences towards popular groups linked to unions and

other social movements, linked to the gestated pedagogical paradigm, in which a dialogical pedagogy was advocated as a principle educational liberation/emancipation of adult learners and their role as subjects of learning, producers of culture and transformation of the world (DI PIERRO; JOIA; RIBEIRO, 2001).

Activities and initiatives such as the Basic Education Movement (MEB) and the Popular Culture Movement of Recife in 1961 of the Popular Culture Centers of the National Students Union, developed under the emancipatory perspective are varied and, despite the opposition and resistance of the various historically dominant policies, have achieved significant educational experiences organized by different actors and based on the Freirean popular education paradigm.

The coexistence of the two trends, the modernizing / marketing / productivist and the critical-emancipatory, as a guide for Youth and Adult Education, has historically led this field of teaching to be carried out for different purposes, experiencing different theoretical conceptions and practices.

Now, on the one hand, serving capital in the perspective of training qualified labor for the job, according to the expectations of the market at every moment in history. In this sense, public policies, such as MOBREAL in 1970, and legislation seek to meet the political and economic interests of the ruling class. On the other hand, seeking to achieve an education that can meet the aspirations of emancipation for the Brazilian population, considering that different activities such as forums, conferences, seminars and meetings have been carried out in order to build alternative teaching proposals that surpass interests of capital.

The crisis that Youth and Adult Education has historically faced, despite investments received, according to Haddad (2009), Soares (2011), Arroyo (2005), Di Pierro (2005), reveals that the impacts of policies around this teaching field, for political, cultural, economic, social reasons, among others, has failed to carry out its schooling path in a democratic way, serving the population on the path of their rights. It is a teaching modality that, according to Arroyo (2005), presents itself as a field open to all sowing cultivation that is not always well defined, throughout its tense history, therefore, undefined and exposed to temporary interventions. In this sense, it tends to become an unprofessional field due to the role of amateurs, the lack of definition, the voluntarism of emergency campaigns and short-term solutions, aspects that, taken as a whole, characterize negative experiences in its history.

Studies show that the insertion of Brazil in the globalized and neoliberal world has brought significant changes to the schooling process of Youth and Adult Education (ARROYO, 2005; PAIVA, 2006; HADDAD, 2009; HADDAD; DI PIERRO, 2000). On the one hand,

because the market demands that education fulfill its role of training competent workers to operate in this new economic model, characterized by new forms of work organization. On the other hand, because it requires the configuration of a specific field of rights and public responsibility of the State capable of responding to this new moment, as well as guaranteeing the specific rights of times and social paths, in which the limits and possibilities of recognition as subjects of human rights are revealed.

However, even with the discourse of an education for young people and adults aimed at meeting market demands and guaranteeing the realization of social rights to education, knowledge, culture, memory, identity, formation and full development (Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education, No. 9394/96, Art. 1 and 2), there are still many challenges from the point of view of the cultural project of the public school. The formative curriculum for this type of teaching presents several obstacles, either due to the difficulties of opening up to the multiplicity of demands that come from society, or due to the specificities and needs of young people and adults themselves.

What is the complexity of the challenges for youth and adult education? Several studies on Youth and Adult Education (EJA) have revealed relevant aspects that characterize the complexity of EJA, in the perspective of significant formation for these school subjects, especially in the sense of overcoming the process of dropping out/expulsion from school (HADDAD, 1992; 1997; 2009; OLIVEIRA, 1999). The discussion in these studies and research points to explanations with an emphasis on historical, political, epistemological and pedagogical aspects, although these characteristics sometimes interpenetrate.

The historical aspect refers to the idea of knowing historically which traditions exist in the field that can help us to answer the current questions of formation of the public of EJA.

In this regard, Beiseigel (2003) points to popular education as a rich source, among other virtualities, to be examined as an alternative to think about education policies for youth and adults, illiterate or with little education. In his opinion, the formative policies that seem to emerge from popular education projects practiced today, with few exceptions, point to a social life marked by respect for citizenship rights.

Di Pierro, Joia and Ribeiro (2001) emphasize that, due to different impulses, Youth and Adult Education (EJA) is invited to reevaluate their identity and tradition. It is urged to re-elaborate its objectives and contents of political formation for democratic citizenship, to revise its curricula inspired by the popular education paradigm, by recognizing the cultural universe of students, and to question the differential valuation of scientific knowledge in view of the knowledge constructed in practices and coexistence in the popular environment.

These authors defend, in this perspective, the historical importance of incorporating into the curriculum certain ethical, political and practical challenges of contemporary social life, related to the exercise of modern citizenship. They highlight the need to qualify subjects through cultural and political actions aimed at recognizing the value of continuing education and basic education as strategies to promote educational and social equity.

In view of these considerations, it is necessary to evoke the observation of Paiva (2006, p. 13, our translation), when asserting that: “education as a human right, continuously reaffirmed, gains strength in the last decades, more in the sense of statements than as the right protected by public policies, an indisputable principle in EJA”.

The fact is that even research, containing revelations about the advances in relation to Youth and Adult Education (EJA), much remains to be built in order for EJA to become, concretely, a basic right for men and women, youth and adults, workers or not. Therefore, it is imperative, in view of these considerations, to infer that the situation of this teaching modality, in the last decades, presents itself as an issue of law not yet resolved, despite the advances obtained.

From a political point of view, the ways of thinking and acting, that is, the options that the institutions have made regarding the control, selection and distribution of knowledge, reveal themselves to be complex situations and of great difficulties, given the multiple and real needs of the EJA public. Among the political options that are revealed in this field of education, in the last few decades, some reflect the challenge of reversing the enormous social debt generated by a development model that does not promote social justice.

In this sense, Di Pierro, Joia and Ribeiro (2001) emphasize that the development of formative policies for young people and adults, in line with the continuing education paradigm of formation agencies, above all, the school, needs, first, to recognize the right of individuals to autonomously trace their own formative biographies. Second, to modify the planning style, conceiving it as an educational offer, given the diversity of concrete demands from different social segments. Third, recognize that not only the school, but other institutions and social spaces have formative potential. For this reason, they defend the minimum education level of responsibility of the public power, counting on the collaboration of organized civil society.

In addition to these demands, these authors refer to the establishment of more flexible curricula, capable of integrating the dimensions of general and professional education, of recognizing informal and formal learning processes and of combining face-to-face and distance learning so that the subjects acquire new learning, as well as certification, as their formative trajectories have been processed.

Ribeiro (1998) states that the demand for Youth and Adult Education (EJA) at the elementary school level is too broad and complex, an aspect that holds a diverse range of formative needs within itself. In situations of this nature, generally, the option is for reduced formation policies. In this sense, he argues that, when thinking, for example, of consolidating functional literacy, a longer education is necessary to grant to its users a formation in written language, capable of making multiple uses of it, to express their own subjectivity, seek information, plan and control processes and learn new knowledge.

Several studies, using research material on EJA as material for analysis, emphasize that there is a consensus among scholars about the need to refine the view on issues specific to the subjects' life stages, their relations with schooling processes, their exclusion marks and to expand their specificities beyond articulation with the work category (DIAS *et al.*, 2011).

Strictly speaking, what can be seen from this discussion is that the new milestones of this educational modality, which comes under various denominations - “alternative education”, “non-formal education”, “education for life and work”, “continuing education”-, reveal the ambiguity and the unconsciousness of the educational field, as well as the imprecision of approaches that specifically respond to the majority of the youth population in this teaching, in their formation project (RIVERO, 2009). In fact, the understanding is that the compensatory view still prevails, in which the formation is developed in the improvisation of spaces and with educators, whose vision of teaching and learning is guided by a school model that is not very flexible and relevant. It emphasizes, by the way, that the articulation of basic adult education with the policies of minimum income, social assistance, youth, agrarian reform, environment, health, work is precarious and the ethnic and gender diversity of students is not taken into account.

In this scenario there is a preponderance of formation policies based on programs and campaigns that, like the Federal Program “*Brasil Alfabetizado*” (Literate Brazil) in 2014, worked on traditional bases: organization around a short-term teaching-learning module, strictly oriented to literacy; absence of instruments for monitoring and evaluating results; call for volunteers (without any requirement for teacher formation); no prediction of mechanisms that allow the continuity of results in basic education cycles, adding to these factors little flexibility in the organization of times and spaces, such as the adaptation of the modules to the local reality (VÓVIO, 2006).

Considering this reality, the understanding is that, nowadays, from the point of view of the curricular formation policy for Youth and Adult Education, the great challenge converges to the thought that it is necessary to

[...] decentralize the education system and grant autonomy to educational centers to formulate pedagogical projects relevant to the educational needs of the communities in which they are inserted, becoming these the privileged locus of curriculum development (DI PERRO; JOIA; RIBEIRO, 2001, p. 71, our translation).

In fact, it is important to highlight that the formation policies decided in institutional spheres external to the school or initiatives of the school itself, that is, of the educators and students, must generate a formation that starts from the needs of the subjects, being organized and decided in the sense qualification of its performance in social practices.

Therefore, it is important to ratify the international recommendation that emphasizes the process of discussing the quality of education based on the recognition that Youth and Adult Education (EJA) needs to have a clear definition of its political-didactic-pedagogical objectives and strategies engendered in the recognition of the dynamics of life and the school trajectory of the students involved (VI CONFINTEA, 2009).

In this regard, international consensus believes that the task of mobilizing young people and adults to return to school and the challenge of making them remain in the school system is difficult. And there is also a fundamental element that Youth and Adult Education needs to consider: making the knowledge produced and disseminated in this teaching be significant, have quality and allow students greater autonomy to become subjects of their own history (VI CONFINTEA, 2009).

When analyzing, however, several aspects inherent to this field, it is pointed out that making the articulation of personal and biographical ideas with the broader knowledge becomes, nowadays, a challenging act from the pedagogical point of view. This challenge is due to the fact that formation has been configured as a value in itself, which is why the formative processes have multiple dimensions and intentionalities, standing out, however, the instrumental dimension for the job market and emerging as a prerogative the incorporation of youth and adult education into the curriculum of political education for modern citizenship.

As for the epistemological dimension, defining the knowledge that matters to teach and learn in this teaching modality is an issue that has revealed historical difficulties, when analyzed from the point of view of existing paradigms. The complexity of paradigm orientations that involve this teaching field makes it a territory of practices and reflections that transcend the limits of schooling in a strict sense. This engenders diverse formative processes, which fluctuate, sometimes for community development initiatives, sometimes for professional qualification, or even for political formation and other cultural issues, which in many cases allow it to be seen as an indefinite field. In addition, it contributes to the fact that the subjects

of educational action are not always attended to in their basic formative learning needs amid their contexts.

The literature on this teaching scope points to the coexistence of some deliberative paradigms of curricular action in EJA. Most evident, the traditional paradigm, canon of the regular school, with its times and spaces, methods, contents and strictly limited rites, expresses a continuous ignorance of the students as subjects who engage as collective social actors, identities, personal projects, for this reason, subjects of changes that also change contexts (DIAS *et al.*, 2011).

This paradigm with homogenizing postures reduces the student to the condition of student, seen from the perspective of cognition (good, hardworking, lazy), or in the behavioral view (disciplined, rebellious), aspects that prevent the knowledge of these subjects as learners in their concreteness, forged in peculiar social, economic and cultural contexts (DAYRELL, 1998), continually reducing them to the condition of children (OLIVEIRA, 1999).

In addition, the different trajectories of these subjects are not considered: those in the condition of young or working adults, adolescents and young people excluded/expelled from the regular system or who abandoned it some time ago; those who seek school, motivated by entering work or having recently attended regular education and accumulated gaps between age and the grade they attended (DI PIERRO; JOIA; RIBEIRO, 2001; OLIVEIRA, 1999).

Another paradigm present in the curricular discourse of youth and adult education is the modernizing one, with the discourse of modernization of Brazilian society through the industrialization process, from a productivist perspective and from a liberal matrix, whose conception of education, above all, the school, consists of the preparation of individuals to join, in the best possible way, in the social division of labor, promoting increased productivity, the most important factor in raising the social product and thus eliminating poverty in society, and, consequently, the modernization of society (SINGER, 1996; SHIROMA; MORAES; EVANGELISTA, 2004).

Under the guidance of this paradigm, the understanding is that EJA, from the curricular point of view, is considered as a field of second opportunity for subjects to redeem themselves and adjust to modern standards of society's development. In this regard, looking at the subjects and their formation oriented towards entering the job market, increasing the demands for instruction and mastery of skills and competences. In addition, it aims to meet the expectations that adults and older people have to extend their schooling until high school to enter or gain mobility in the labor market and social practices, excluding other important learning (VÓVIO; MOURA; RIBEIRO, 2001).

In the critical-emancipatory paradigm, the approach to the educational phenomenon is broad and systemic. In this sense, Youth and Adult Education is considered as a process of strengthening society, citizenship and a teaching field among most “[...] important where efforts are being made to democratize access to knowledge” (DI PIERRO; JOIA; RIBEIRO, 2001).

What emerges from this set of guidelines, which are used as deliberative guides for curricular action about knowledge in EJA, is that they put it under different perspectives, sometimes being inspired by popular education (BEISEGEEL, 1974; 2000), sometimes as second compensatory opportunity (DI PIERRO, 2005), and currently thought of as a lifelong education (VI CONFITEA, 2009).

Constituted in this way, EJA, as shown by the studies, presents itself as a border field (DI PIERRO; JOIA; RIBEIRO, 2001), undefined, multifaceted, uncertain, not consolidated in the areas of research, public policies and pedagogical interventions and open to all possibilities (ARROYO, 2005). These aspects have made it difficult for school agents to decide, from an epistemological point of view, what to consider as significant knowledge to be built and how to work it in the school formation process.

In fact, each paradigm has its own tradition in the history of Youth and Adult Education and reflects a theoretical and practical point of view in school organization and pedagogical work.

The traditional paradigm thinks about school education based on the classic tradition that culture “contains” certain useful knowledge and skills that schools must transmit in order to develop students to participate in the society that awaits them.

The modernist/productivist paradigm of market tendency sees schooling as preparation for life and work, from a conception of the student as an evolving person. It also sees society open to reconstruction through citizens who are morally formed and qualified for work, according to its principles.

The critical-emancipatory paradigm proposes that Youth and Adult Education be assumed as a practice of freedom and offer students forms of action, social reflection and policies that present ways of understanding and fighting to overcome the social structure of injustices, irrationality and deprivation of social, political, economic rights.

As can be seen, the mixture of philosophical traditions in education, by intertwining the theoretical and practical way of thinking in this field of education, makes the process of curricular deliberation problematic in terms of taking a position on the knowledge to be considered and worked on in the formation process.

Di Pierro, Joia and Ribeiro (2001) state that the formation requirements are increasingly complex for the exercise of full citizenship, for the growing demands for qualifications in the exclusive and selective labor market and for cultural demands. They also assert that to equitably contemplate a basic citizenship right under a common quality parameter of diverse formative needs is an impasse and point out as one of the ways out, based on national and international literature, to overcome the conception that the priority function or EJA exclusive is the replacement of lost schooling at the appropriate age.

In this sense, these authors argue that young people and adults are recognized as subjects cognitively capable of learning throughout their lives in the context of ongoing economic, technological and sociocultural changes, requiring the constant acquisition and updating of knowledge at all ages. Formation must be characterized as a process that needs to be comprehensive, diversified and flexible in the face of multiple, diverse and changing needs.

The pedagogical capacity to make curricular knowledge available to students still remains an unresolved issue. The researches, when dealing with school formation, reveal Youth and Adult Education as a field of complex challenges.

Among the various issues arising from the aspect of pedagogical capacity, the importance of curricular flexibility stands out, which, according to Di Pierro, Joia and Ribeiro (2001), needs to be equivalent to the different formative paths and capable of providing students with self-determination of their educational biographies, even choosing the path that best suits their needs and characteristics.

In this perspective, the international experience also points to the flexibility of the curricula and the means and forms of assistance for these students, the recognition of formal and informal learning processes, the combination of on-site teaching methods and distance for individuals to obtain new learning in their different formative trajectories (VI CONFINTEA, 2009).

According to Sérgio (2008), the dimensions of time and space, as elements of the organization of the training curriculum in Youth and Adult Education (EJA), are substantially reduced. These facts make it difficult for the school to develop a pedagogical practice in which the students can deposit their expectations of learning, social ascension, citizenship, self-esteem, professionalization and overcoming the stigma of illiterates. This results that time, as one of the most important variables in the pedagogical practice that provides the organization and materialization of a curriculum, has not contributed to the intellectual and social empowerment of EJA students. And, consequently, it makes it impossible to appropriate

knowledge that makes them face and overcome the challenges of society and the context in which they are inserted.

Di Pierro, Joia and Ribeiro (2001) believe that one of the fundamental elements for this process of making knowledge available to students is to improve the evaluation mechanisms, providing the knowledge acquired through personal and/or professional experience or through non-formal education, diversifying and making the means of access to higher levels of education more flexible.

Thus, the articulation between general and professional training has also revealed itself as another consensual aspect between national and international research and experiences. It is known that among the multiple motivations that young people and adults declare when participating in formative programs, professional and occupational improvement stands out. And when this audience is made up of subjects who already work in the labor market, this articulation becomes more difficult to be sustained (VI CONFINTEA, 2009).

In this sense, even though the work lost the centrality that it had in the recent past in the construction of the identities of subjects and social groups, it remains an important factor in this construction, in view of presenting itself as an exclusive source of providing for subsistence in the impoverished popular strata.

Final considerations

After this reflection on the complexity of the curriculum policy challenges for EJA that result from the historical, political, epistemological, pedagogical aspects and the multiple practices that condition it and its impacts on the lives of students, it is important, in a brief swing, to highlight some considerations that derive from this analysis and that it is an indispensable knowledge to expand and understand the formative processes as starting points for other reflections that may be made on the practices of teaching and learning of educators and students, in the present of this 21st century.

Even in the case of a production based on theoretical foundations and historical analysis, knowledge about the meaning of curricular policies, in the face of constant social, economic, technological, political and cultural changes, becomes important as a guide to think about the necessary school formation to the times, spaces, relationships and experiences that we are experiencing in contemporary society.

The relationship between the curriculum and the students' social practice leads us to the feeling of curriculum construction aimed at (re)locating social life within a territorial reality of

a community matrix, contrary to the movement promoted by industrial capitalism, that constantly seeks, in a space of global connections of homogenization and fragmentation, providing a process of “disengaging” from social relations in local contexts of interaction, generating an increasing “deterritorialization” of our lives (GIDDENS, 2011).

In this case, it is also a question of investing in curricular policies that revalue the “local” as an economic, social and political theme, in a context dominated by superficial connections, by short-term horizons in a commercial rationality. It is to recreate reserves of trust and social capital, based on the conviction that culture in a critical perspective counts as a reference to a necessary recontextualization of school formation actions, marking the importance of the relationship between school and the place (CANÁRIO, 2005).

The complex curricular challenges discussed in this text reveal the importance of critical analysis that the historical and contemporary context have in the processes of teaching and learning at school for those who participate in it, from the local social context in dialogue with the global. It is important, therefore, to say that the school needs to promote a profound debate on the issue of social structure and its consequences for people's lives as a starting point for its curricular policy.

Considering the intensity of the socioeconomic demands and needs that complain about curricular policies, it is necessary to look at themes that meet the current reality and evaluate the extent to which these can be developed under critical processes and contribute to the construction of curricular studies in this modality of teaching, in view of the development of students, from a new relationship with society.

In fact, it is a matter of seeking, within the school education of young and adult people, the creation of a new curricular culture, in which educators and students also assume the role of active protagonists in the different phases that make up the formative process: design, organization, monitoring and evaluation. It is in this participatory and constant process that, however complex and difficult the reality may be, the possibilities for transforming curricular practices are generated.

Thus, in this discursive closure, we say that it means investing in the development of a curriculum policy capable of promoting the formation of subjects with qualities of critical understanding about society, of ethical-political commitment with a proposition about alternatives to improve and change what does not benefit individual and collective life. In addition, to act consciously and collectively, assuming a place in history with a predisposition to build and renew culture and knowledge different from the elitist and excluding cultural hegemony, above all, with self-reflection about oneself in relation to others, achieving

consistency and coherence between what is said and done in the school space and in the society in which we live as people, professionals and citizens.

REFERENCES

ARROYO, M. G. Educação de Jovens e Adultos: um campo de direitos e de responsabilidade pública. In: SOARES, L. *et al.* (Org.). **Diálogos na educação de jovens e adultos**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2005. p. 19-50.

BEISEIGEL, C. R. **Estado e educação popular**: um estudo sobre a educação de adultos. São Paulo: Pioneira, 1974.

BEISEIGEL, C. R. Considerações sobre a política da união para a educação de jovens e adultos analfabetos. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, São Paulo, n. 4, p. 26-34, jan./fev./mar./abr. 1997.

BEISEIGEL, C. R. Questões de atualidade na educação popular: ensino fundamental de jovens e adultos analfabetos ou pouco escolarizados. **Educação em Revista**, Belo Horizonte, n. 31, p. 7-19, jun. 2000. Available: <http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo>. Access: 3 Dec. 2012.

BEISEIGEL, C. R. Alfabetização de jovens e adultos: desafios do século 21. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos**, Brasília, v. 84, n. 206/207/208, p. 34-43, jan./dez. 2003. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24109/2176-6681.rbep.84i206-07-08.887>

BRASIL. Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. **Diário Oficial da união**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 27833, 23 dez. 1996. PL 1258/1988

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Continuada. Alfabetização e Diversidade. **Documento Nacional Preparatório à VI Conferência Internacional de Educação de Adultos (VI CONFINTEA)**. Brasília: MEC; Goiânia: FUNAPE/UFMG, 2009.

CANÁRIO, R. **O que é a Escola?** Um “olhar” sociológico. Portugal: Porto Editora, 2005.

CARLOS, E. J. O enunciado da educação de adultos no Brasil: da programação da República à década de 1940. In: REUNIÃO ANUAL DA ANPED, n. 29, 2006, Caxambu. **Anais [...]**. Caxambu, MG, 2006. 17 p. Available: <http://www.anped.org.br/reunioes/29ra/trabalhos/trabalho/GT18-2344--Int.pdf>. Access: 12 Sep. 2012.

DAYREALL, J. T. **Múltiplos olhares sobre a educação e cultura**. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 1998.

DI PIERRO, M. C. Notas sobre a redefinição da identidade e das políticas públicas de educação de jovens e adultos no Brasil. **Educação e Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 6, n. esp. 92, p. 1115-1139, out. 2005. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302005000300018>

DI PIERRO, M. C.; JOIA, O.; RIBEIRO, V. M. Visões da educação de jovens e adultos no Brasil. **Cadernos Cedes**, Campinas, ano XXI, n. 55, p. 58-77, nov. 2001. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-32622001000300005>

DIAS, F. *et al.* (Org.). **Educação de jovens e adultos: o que revelam as pesquisas**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2011.

FÁVERO, O. Educação de jovens e adultos: passado de histórias; presente de promessas. *In*: RÍVERO, J.; FÁVERO, O. **Educação de jovens e adultos na América Latina: direito e desafio de todos**. São Paulo: UNESCO: Moderna, 2009.

GIDDENS, A. **Mundo em descontrole: o que a globalização está fazendo de nós**. Rio de Janeiro. Record, 2011.

HADDAD, S. Tendências atuais na educação de jovens e adultos. **Em Aberto**, Brasília, vol. 11, n. 4, p. 3-12, out./dez. 1992.

HADDAD, S. A educação de pessoas jovens e adultas e a nova LDB. *In*: BRZEZINSKI, I. (Org.). **LDB interpretada: distintos olhares se entrecruzam**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1997.

HADDAD, S. A participação da sociedade civil brasileira na educação de jovens e adultos e na CONFINTEA VI. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 14, n. 41, p. 355-369, maio/ago. 2009. Available: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbedu/n14/n14a07.pdf>. Access: 2 June 2010.

HADDAD, S.; DI PIERRO, M. C. Escolarização de jovens e adultos. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, n. 14, p. 108-130, maio/ago. 2000. Available: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbedu/n14/n14a07.pdf>. Access: 2 June 2011.

OEI. Organização dos Estados Iberoamericanos para a Educação, a Ciência e a Cultura. 1996. Available: <http://www.oei.es/educacion.php>. Access: 23 Oct. 2012.

OLIVEIRA, K. M. Jovens e adultos como sujeitos de conhecimento e aprendizagem. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, São Paulo, v. 12, p. 59-73, 1999.

PAIVA, J. Direito à educação de jovens e adultos: concepções e sentidos. *In*: REUNIÃO ANUAL DA ANPED, n. 29, 2006, Caxambu. **Anais [...]**. Caxambu, MG, 2006. 17 p.

PAIVA, J. **Os sentidos do direito à educação de jovens e adultos**. Petrópolis, RJ: DP ET Alii/FAPERJ, 2009.

RIBEIRO, V. M. M. **Alfabetismo e atitudes: pesquisa junto a jovens e adultos**. Campinas, SP: Ação Educativa/Papirus, 1998.

RÍVERO, J. Alfabetização e Educação de Jovens e Adultos na América Latina, direito humano fundamental e fator social de equidade social. *In*: RÍVERO, J.; FÁVERO, O. **Educação de jovens e adultos na América Latina: direito e desafio de todos**. São Paulo: UNESCO: Moderna, 2009.

SÉRGIO, M. C. A organização do tempo curricular na prática pedagógica da educação de jovens e adultos (EJA). **Revista E-Curriculum**, São Paulo, v. 3, n. 2, jun. 2008. Available: <http://www.pucsp.br/ecurriculum>. Access: 1 nov. 2012.

SHIROMA, E. O.; MORAES, M. C. M.; EVANGELISTA, O. **Política educacional**. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2004.

SINGER, P. Poder, política e educação. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**. Conferência de abertura da XVIII Reunião Anual da ANPEd, Caxambu, outubro de 1995, n. 1, p. 5-15, 1996.

SOARES, L. *et al.* (Org.). **Diálogos na educação de jovens e adultos**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2011. p. 7-17.

VIEIRA, M. C. Políticas de Educação de Jovens e Adultos no Brasil. Experiências e desafios no município de Uberlândia (anos 80 e 90). *In*: REUNIÃO ANUAL DA ANPED, n. 23, 2000, Caxambu. **Anais [...]**. Caxambu, MG, 2000. 24 p.

VÓVIO, C. L. Alfabetização de pessoas jovens e adultas: outras miradas, novos focos de atenção. *In*: SAMPAIO, M. N.; ALMEIDA, R. S. (Org.). **Práticas de educação de jovens e adultos: complexidade, desafios e propostas**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2009. p. 296-324.

VÓVIO, C. L.; MOURA, M. P; RIBEIRO, V. M. **Fundamentos da educação de jovens e adultos**. Brasília: SESI, 2001.

How to reference this article

OLIVEIRA, R. N. M.; MARIAIS, G. A. S. The complexity of current curricular policy challenges in youth and adult education. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 24, n. 3, p. 1350-1367, Sep./Dec. 2020. e-ISSN:1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v24i3.14167>

Submitted: 20/06/2020

Required revisions: 28/07/2020

Approved: 20/08/2020

Published: 01/09/2020

