

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

QUESTIONS RAISED ABOUT THE IDENTITY OF THE PEDAGOGY COURSE BETWEEN 1939 TO 1990

Jully Caroline Santos Nascimento

Master in Sociology (``Universidade Federal de Sergipe``, 2022) and degree in Pedagogy (UFS, 2018) and Sociology (UNINTER, 2022)

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: The objective of this article is to explain, based on a recap of academic documents, the most important events during the period of regulation of the Pedagogy course in Brazil between the years 1939 and 1990. The present study analyzes the elaboration of the identity of the course in constant inquiry, as well as ideological constructs of the pedagogue's training about the structure and organization of the course. Mainly in the fragmentation, discredit, ambiguity and separation of the theory and practice of this training, as well as educational policies and the purposes of the world of work. Initially, it aimed to train teachers for teaching in Normal Schools or Education technicians, and later pedagogical qualifications specialized in certain demands would also appear. In this context, the promulgation of opinions and discussions about the existence of the course allowed debates and contradictions throughout the process. This concludes, therefore, an incessant search for the identity of the course in all its occupations and curricula in favor of the affirmation of Pedagogy in Brazil.

Keywords: Course; Debates; Identity; Pedagogy.

INTRODUCTION

This work's central objective is to analyze the advances and gaps in the formation of the identity of the pedagogy course between 1939 and 1990 by highlighting the professional in question. The analysis of how sociopolitical transformations influenced the profile and professional role of pedagogues highlights that the initial project in 1939 intended to train graduates to join technical positions in public administration without worrying about defining a professional profile for pedagogues. This context contributed to the instability of training from that moment on. Opposing this conception, he argues that, before the start of the course, there was already a purpose

of preparing professionals for teaching and research in education, which did not remain during the period of the Vargas dictatorship. The emblems of yesteryear arising from the ambiguities in pedagogy training and the challenges posed by the many reformulation processes to which they were subjected. The work methodology

The Pedagogy course began in the Federative Republic in 1939, through Decree-Law no. 1. 190 /1939, under the effects of the emergence of the first universities in the country. Intensified, in fact, by the multiple cultural and socioeconomic events of the period resulting from the coup d'état in which Getúlio Vargas ascended to the presidency and began the new state. Created through the Faculty of Education, Sciences and Letters, by Law no. 452/1937, aimed at the significant training and improvement of teachers, with emphasis on Normal Schools, thus proposing the instrumentalization of this clientele. In favor of improving education as found in the decree below:

The Faculty of Education, Sciences and Letters is responsible for providing higher education in various disciplines with the objectives of expanding culture in the field of pure sciences; promote and facilitate the practice of original investigations; develop and specialize knowledge necessary for teaching; systematize and improve, finally, technical and scientific education for the fruitful performance of the various national activities (DECREE 19,851, art. 196.).

The course aimed to train bachelors and graduates within a scheme called "3+1", with the bachelor's degree and Pedagogy courses being awarded in three years and the graduate would add another year of Didactics. In this context, teacher training courses assume a generalist nature, where the former would be responsible for teaching isolated subjects from each science, while the latter would teach pedagogical subjects from the Normal

Course at secondary level. This division of the professional field has a decisive impact on the identifying image of the course, making it ambiguous, far from the theoretical basis and scientific investigation. This is in favor of the pragmatic immediacy of technique and the primacy of teaching, as well as the incoherent division of content and method. Such conceptions are still perpetuated today in the course's identity in the face of the passage of various educational and theoretical movements over the decades. So much so that Brazilian education itself has been debated and is still under construction, amidst the most emerging sociopolitical interests. fact indicative of regressions and mismatches due to the devaluation of investment in basic education.

In the mid-21st century, Positivism also has a stronger impact on the country's ideals of progress. This was surrounded by a perspective of material and scientific prosperity that spread a type of culture to be incorporated into social sectors, which education was relevant in adapting to the assumptions defined by Positivist thinking. Although in the field of scientific research, degrees had failed. In this line of thought, a new educational prism emerges in Brazil, based on the ideals of the New School Movement that emerged in 1932, established by the Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education. This movement included renowned intellectuals such as Anísio Teixeira (one of those largely responsible for the construction of universities with a pedagogical axis, which encouraged the implementation of Pedagogy courses), Lourenço Filho, Fernando de Azevedo, among others.

The focus of this educational movement emerged as a result of the democratization and universalization of education at the beginning of the 20th century, based on preparing men to question and solve their problems, which they learn through experience and

experience. Consequently, specialized labor for the technical manufacturing job market prevailed in recurring prominence for a society that aimed for financial progress, due to the mass influence of John Dewey's theory in Brazil. Emphasizing training for teaching in primary education and normal schools, which consequently interfered with the major objectives of the course.

And yet, in this tangle of probable changes for education, the Pedagogy course demonstrated from an early age an inconvenience for higher education: the inaccuracy of the identity, function and destiny of its graduates. What is the founding bias for the course's curricular structure? What direction must you take after the diploma in hand? And the intention of training pedagogues? Or would it just be a way to fill teaching vacancies with a full and content-rich curriculum? All these questions for a long time received superficial responses. As Brzezinski (1996), p.42 concludes:

Functional pragmatism is the very denial of verticality and in-depth research, as there is no elaboration of theory. This pragmatism was one of those responsible for the "deviation" of the pedagogy course, because it focuses more on the professional aspect. This generated a peculiar and quite contradictory situation: pedagogy was transformed into a practical field. The Professor thus trained began to master methods and techniques(...) he did not seek theory elaborated through research, as if it were possible to separate the inseparable: theory and practice.

With this, the theorization of pedagogue training gains emphasis on the instrumentalization of teacher training. Once again due to the interference of Deweyian thought, which understands that the problems and changes of the emerging time need solutions coming from scientific or experimental intellectuality. While classical philosophical principles would be limited to

a more abstract worldview. Knowledge, in the case of the pedagogy professional, would come in proportion to the constant frequency of experimentation.

METHODOLOGY

Considering the objectives of identifying the dilemmas, debates and paths promoted during the trajectory of the pedagogy course in Brazil, the research was developed using a qualitative approach whose results proved to be the most appropriate. This is because it is a knowledge production resource that does not tend to measure and measure, but understands and seeks explanations for the values and meanings of a social environment.

Online questionnaire, observation, interview and document analysis were the methodological tools used.

Data for the development of the research were obtained through a literature review. The research aimed to report the process of struggles and clashes to significantly develop the training of pedagogy professionals.

COURSE CHARACTERIZATIONS AND REGULATIONS

In this process, given the lack of characterization of this higher school, the problem of the professionalization of the pedagogue, separate from the bachelor's degree and licentiate degree, is even more pressing. Because following federal education standards, it is essential to study three years of specific content studies, such as Chemistry, History, Geography, etc. would take the individual to the level of bachelor's degree. An additional year of Didactics for graduates. As a result, the curricular structure then called "3+1 scheme" established its mark for decades in the university system by separating the method from the content, which in Pedagogy delimited its evolution (Brezinski, 1996). However, although two

career paths were "available" to students, the scenario in the professional market gave significant room for criticism, since insertion into the world of work did not promote many opportunities. As the "education technician" found an insufficient area in the Ministry of Education, in the State departments and municipalities. Sometimes via approval in a public competition, sometimes via political placement carrying out imprecise tasks and adapting to current needs, with a minimum number of vacancies for the role. However, the prestige of the position for those elected surpassed that of the professor on the scale of collegiate authority. On the other hand, the graduate was heading towards normal school or higher education institutions, whose responsibility to guide and provide conceptual support to future primary teachers required substantial learning security from them. Even during graduation, there was no non-existent technical-scientific training, supported by a curriculum saturated with fundamentals. However, starving of what must be its main objective: education.

To this end, in 1962 the effervescence in the debates about the precariousness of the pedagogy course and its identity managed to have a voice to express dissatisfaction with the curriculum, through the insistent inquiry of the professional who was graduating. This depended almost entirely on auxiliary sciences not originating from Education. According to Brzezinski (1996), as a result of this, in opinion CFE 251/62 of the Federal Education Council, by Valmir Chagas, the Pedagogy course was attributed to the training of the education technician and the teacher of subjects in the Normal Course. This maintained the affirmative and at the same time the duality of the course, with a minimum duration of 4 years, thus establishing a minimum curriculum composed of 7 subjects and another 2 chosen by the institution.

These being: Educational Psychology, Sociology (General, Educational), History of Education, Philosophy of Education and School Administration and the two optional options: History of Philosophy, Biology, Statistics, Pedagogical Research Methods and Techniques, Brazilian Culture, Education Comparative, School Hygiene, Curricula and Programs, Audiovisual Education Techniques, Middle School Theory and Practice and Introduction to Educational Guidance. For the graduate, it would be enough to take two more subjects of Didactics and Teaching Practice. Furthermore, it would be necessary to establish minimum content and duration in the course structure.

In this context, Brazil went through winding paths to the incidence of the Military Coup in 1964, which resulted in a major repression of demonstrations opposing the military government and social movements. Among these, some focused on the New School perspective, with the aim of promoting the democratization of Brazilian basic education. Many of the educators began to be persecuted due to their ideological views, many of whom were also exiled or murdered, preferring someone else to change their profession. The same happened with the students.

Another indication of crisis was the creation of decree-law 477, which prohibited students and employees from any acts other than studying and working; basically, without any right to speak out or commit even minor offenses. Furthermore, the pedagogy course and other degrees had to follow the educational model imposed by the agreements between the Ministry of Education-MEC and USAID (United States Agency for International Development), which in fact intended Brazil to engage in capitalist proposals international. Also introducing technical standards in universities, a fact that is much more unfeasible in higher education where

the course suffered significant impacts on its organization. Therefore, the technical process of the professional to be trained received American influences in the educational and capitalist financial sphere, exempting the union of the theoretical foundations of the exercise, imposing curricular fragmentation and critical intellectual impoverishment in teaching practices.

In 1969, some time after the approval of that opinion of 62, the new Valnir Opinion, n° 252/69, was promulgated, responsible for removing the distinction between bachelor's degree and degree. Due to this fact, only teaching prevails as the establishment of a minimum duration and content. The duration would initially be 2,200 hours divided into a minimum of three years and a maximum of seven years. Therefore, in order to obtain specific qualifications, additional studies were instituted by: Teaching of normal courses and administration, guidance, inspection and supervision actions. SILVA (1999)

In view of the shortages in the labor market, in 1969 the CFE opinion n. 252 by Councilor Valnir Chagas met the expectations of the period. Given that he demonstrated that he had the resolution to the objections and deprivations of the course. With this, the opinion intended the training of teachers for normal teaching by degree and specialists for the duties of guidance, administration, supervision and inspection within the school system. Important aspects were also changed in the curriculum at the time, where it was structured for a common learning base, and the specialist was offered specific qualifications for sets of activities.

Another repercussion that the opinion had was the demand for the course due to the multiplicity of specialties offered. According to Silva (1999), the opinion of n. 252/69, contributed to the decline of the course, a result that was paid for by a definition in the

pedagogue's field of work. Unfortunately, pedagogy professionals continued to face difficulties in obtaining employment in schools, as these establishments were now unable to integrate a large demand for specialist professionals trained in the Pedagogy course.

However, the inclusion of studies in higher education only became more defined with the university reform in 1968. Where guidelines and systematization principles were determined for all federal universities, transitions to the Faculties of Philosophy, Sciences and Letters provided for in the Law n. 5,540. This code, according to article 30, also promulgated that specialists active in the functions of administration, planning, inspection, guidance and supervision were granted such functions and disassociated by the option of master's training for normal education.

In 1972, through the intervention of Opinion 867/72, the pedagogy course incorporated into its identity the premise of experience in teaching or teaching in the teaching practice discipline for pedagogy qualifications, which advocated the imperative of supervised internship, performed by the course student with the aim of affirming, at least in teaching qualifications, the pedagogical character affirmed in the sagacity of the exercise of teaching the relevance of the practice in exercise.

Furthermore, the 1980s, often considered the last decade, were certainly not lost for education if we take into consideration, the emergence of educator movements that have since restructured themselves in the country and, in particular, the attention to this relevant issue., which is the training of education professionals. At that time, several institutions were created with the aim of establishing the epistemological status of the pedagogy course, especially CONARCFE (National Commission for the Reformulation

of Educator Training Courses – 1983) which gave rise to ANFOPE (National Association for the Training of Education Professionals). Education) in 1994. Through this panorama:

This movement maintained, in the documents it produced, the spirit of Opinion CFE 252/69 of not differentiating the training of the teacher and the specialist, tending to empty the prescription in this regard regarding the course qualifications. It also reaffirmed the idea that the Pedagogy course is a degree, contributing to mischaracterizing the training of the *stricto sensu* pedagogue. In the mid-1980s, some education faculties, influenced by research, debates at meetings and recommendations from the national movement for teacher training, suspended or suppressed conventional qualifications (school administration, educational guidance, etc.), to invest in a curriculum focused on teacher training for the initial years of primary education and teaching courses. (...) The idea was to train a new teacher, qualified to carry out management, supervision, etc. functions. (...). It can be deduced, however, based on a few studies on innovations in pedagogy institutions and courses, that the balance of these initiatives is modest, while chronic problems persist, such as the endless questioning of the identity of pedagogy and ambiguities regarding the nature of the course, always reflected in the legal documents. There are, in fact, more than 50 years of controversies surrounding the maintenance or extinction of the course, the relevance or not of a field of study specific to pedagogy, the training of primary teachers at a higher level, the training of specialists or technicians in education etc. (LIBÂNIO, P.38-39, 1996).

These disputed debates progressed until the 1990s. Even so, the 1990s brought new perspectives that viscerally influenced the paths of education in Brazil, with lasting results for the pedagogy course. It was from this context that the country developed repairs to its educational systems with the intention of adapting them to the new international

economic position. Such improvements, both organizationally and pedagogically, had the support of foreign entities that developed international events, document efficiency and collaboration.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In carrying out this investigative study, the information presented here had the purpose of truly seeking to understand and deepen the origins, socio-political and economic intentions, struggles, achievements, expectations and questions of the historical path of the Pedagogy course. All this in search, in its various instances, for an authentic identity recognized by academic society, although still quite questioned regarding the professional path to be followed and the curricular plan provided with foundations from sciences other than education. Technicalism and theoretical and practical disaggregation also left their marks on the

course proposal, whose valorization as a degree had already been underprivileged. In the field of research there is a setback compared to others. This has currently improved a lot, but remains outside of many other areas that are dedicated to improving the qualified exercise as well as that of judicious theses. Pedagogical qualifications, for example, subdivided what had been separated from the degree and technical education, a fact that in a certain way contributed to internal power struggles within the school environment and outside it, ambiguity of tasks and occupations, opinions also served more than decrees and regulations. Therefore, the pedagogy course requires a guiding axis so that its identity is imprinted with due recognition as an a priori training course for teacher training which, however, over the years has also offered its activities to several other non-school fields where focus is the same at school: the integral development of learning.

REFERENCES

BRITO, R. M. DE. Breve Histórico do Curso de Pedagogia no Brasil. *Revista Dialógica*, Amazonas, v. 1, n. 1, p. 1-10, 2006. Disponível em: http://dialogica.ufam.edu.br/PDF/no1/1breve_historico_curso_pedagogia.pdf. Acesso em: 22 ago. 2021.

BRZEZINSKI, Iria. *Pedagogia, Pedagogos e Formação de Pedagogos*. Campinas: Papirus, 1996.

BRASIL. **Decreto n. 19.850 de 11 de abril de 1931.**

LIBÂNEO, Carlos José. *Pedagogia, Ciência da educação?* Selma G. Pimenta (Org.). São Paulo; Cortez, 1996.

LIBÂNEO, Carlos José. *Pedagogia e pedagogos para quê?*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010.

_____. Parecer n. 251/62. Currículo mínimo e duração do curso de pedagogia. Relator: Valnir Chagas. Documento, n. 11, pp. 59-65, 1963.

RIBEIRO, Mônica Luiz de Lima; MIRANDA, Maria Irene. Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais Para o Curso de Pedagogia: análise histórica e política. In: **Simpósio Internacional O Estado e as Políticas Educacionais no tempo presente**, 2008, Uberlândia, MG. IV Simpósio Internacional - o estado e as políticas educacionais no tempo presente. Uberlândia, 2008. v. 1. Disponível em: <www.simpósioestadopolíticas.ufu.br/imagens/anais/pdf/EC13.pdf>. Acesso em: 04 ago. 2021.

SILVA, C. S. B. da. **Curso de pedagogia no Brasil: história e identidade**. Campinas: Autores associados, 1999.

TANURI, Leonor Maria. Revista Brasileira de Educação: **História da formação de professores**. Mai/Jun/Jul/Ago 2000 n° 14. São Paulo: Universidade Estadual de São Paulo. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbedu/n14/n14a05.pdf>. Acesso em: 02 ago. 2021.