

DOSSIÊ “Formação de professores na contemporaneidade: da universidade à escola e da escola à universidade”

Intergenerational relationships in Brazilian market of teachers’ education: old and new challenges to consider^{1 2 3}

Relações intergeracionais no mercado brasileiro de formação docente: antigos e novos desafios a considerar

Flavia Medeiros Sarti ^①

^① Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho” – Unesp, Rio Claro, SP, Brasil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2926-5873>, flavia.sarti@unesp.br.

Abstract:

This article based on a literature review focuses on the Brazilian case of teacher education, highlighting some limits imposed for the reconnaissance of its initiatory dimension and the formative potential of intergenerational relationships established among teachers. Teacher education is assumed as a competitive space characterized by symbolic struggles that, according to Bourdieusian perspective, allow the transfiguration of certain relations of domination that are present in the educational field. It is considered that the intergenerational relations among teachers have reached low value in such symbolic market, mainly due to the historical process of devaluation of teachers’ practices and the low power place that Brazilian teachers occupy in this competitive space. That symbolic fragilization of teachers has intensified in the last decades with the emergence of a managerial perspective of teacher education, which has been provoking a degeneration of the professionalization processes of teaching. Such context imposes new challenges in the epistemological, political and cultural plans for the production of a professional model of teacher education, in which teachers occupy more active place on education of teachers’ new generations. Facing these challenges demands, among other actions, the rescue of teachers’ professionalization movement, for which the university can play a relevant role.

Keywords: teachers’ education, intergenerational relationships, teachers’ practices, symbolic market, teachers’ professionalization

¹ Responsible editor: Carmen Lúcia Soares. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4347-1924>

² Normalization, preparation, and Portuguese review: Lucas Giron (Tikinet) – revisao@tikinet.com.br

³ English version: Viviane Ramos- vivianeramos@gmail.com

Resumo:

Este artigo, baseado em revisão de literatura, focaliza o caso brasileiro da formação docente, destacando limites que se impõem para o reconhecimento de sua dimensão iniciática e do potencial formativo das relações intergeracionais estabelecidas no magistério. A formação de professores é assumida como um espaço concorrencial marcado por lutas simbólicas que, conforme perspectiva bourdieusiana, permitem a transfiguração de certas relações de dominação presentes no campo educacional. Considera-se que as relações intergeracionais docentes alcançam reduzido valor em tal mercado simbólico, sobretudo em função do processo histórico de desvalorização das práticas docentes e do lugar de pouco poder que os professores brasileiros ocupam nesse espaço concorrencial. Essa fragilização simbólica dos professores se intensificou nas últimas décadas, com a emergência de uma perspectiva gerencialista de formação docente, que tem provocado uma degeneração dos processos de profissionalização do magistério. Tal contexto impõe novos desafios nos planos epistemológico, político e cultural para a produção de um modelo profissional de formação docente no qual os professores da escola ocupem lugar mais ativo na formação das novas gerações docentes. O enfrentamento desses desafios demanda, entre outras ações, o resgate do movimento de profissionalização dos professores, para o qual a universidade pode desempenhar relevante papel.

Palavras-chave: *formação de professores, relações intergeracionais, práticas docentes, mercado simbólico, profissionalização docente*

Professional education can be defined as a process of socialization of new agents in representations, values, knowledge, and activities that integrate a specific culture (Sorel, 2005). Under such perspective, the induction of new agents in a professional culture requires the use of various dispositives, amongst which the relationships established between different professional generations, novices and veterans. The centrality of the initiation processes in professional education highlights its anthropological and socio-historic dimension, suggesting a strong connection with the profession.

Based on this central assumption and grounded on a literature review on the themes connected to teachers' professionalization⁴ (especially regarding the formation models and practice theories), this article intend to discuss the Brazilian case of teacher education – initial and during the career – specifically certain imposed limits to recognize the formative potential of teachers' intragenerational relationships (Sarti, 2009; Sarti & Bueno, 2017). Therefore, teacher education is assumed as a competition space marked by symbolic fights that, according to the

⁴ Conceptual aspects connected to this problem are based on foreign literature (but not exclusively), while the aspects more directly connected to the Brazilian case are discussed based on national authors. The debate on the national context are also supported by Brazilian legislation.

Bourdiesian perspective (Bourdieu, 2003a), allow the transfiguration of certain dominance relations present in the educational field.

Under such perspective, the concept of *field*, as proposed by Bourdieu (2003a), is key to the discussion proposed here. We consider that the disputes established around teacher education – referring to the definition on where, when, and how teachers should be trained – are anchored in the circulation of specific capitals produced, disputed, and historically acquired by the different groups involved in this competition space (teaching itself and the instances that represent it, the universities, the research foundations, specialists, and the government). The most central and most powerful places in this space of symbolic exchanges tend to be occupied by groups that have, in a given time, capitals considered to be more valuable in the game been played. Thus, some spaces and formative practices targeting teachers and future teachers assume different degrees of legitimacy throughout history.

Valuable in other historic moments, the intragenerational teacher relations have nowadays a reduced value in the symbolic market around which Brazilian teacher education is established. The devaluation is connected to articulated processes, among which we highlight: the depreciation of teachers' practice during the 20th century and the place of little power occupied by Brazilian K-12 teachers in this competitive space, inhabited by different agents with capitals considered to be more legitimate.

Brazilian teachers and their practices in the market of teacher education

Different educational models have had a space in the history of Brazilian teacher education. The oldest one is the French-inspired normal model that reached Brazil in the imperial time, in the 1830s, targeting the education of elementary teachers. After decades of instability – with the creation and extinction of different normal schools in different provinces – the model affirmed itself, reaching its climax under the republic (Tanuri, 2000). Initially starting with a very simple curriculum base, restricted to the contents of primary education and only one pedagogical subject (Pedagogy or Teaching Method), and rudimentary material conditions, Brazilian normal schools affirmed themselves as a space of teacher education. In the end of the 19th century, under the influence of São Paulo experience, they adopted a broader

curriculum marked the emphasis on scientific subjects and encyclopedic culture. The practical dimension of training was key in that scenario, with the creation of model schools, attached to the normal schools, as a space to learn *good pedagogical practices*.

The education offered by normal schools at the time allowed teaching to overcome its vocational tradition, affirming itself as a trade (Tardif, 2013), a regulated activity, that required the learning of rules (of teaching and managing students) demanding, then, a specific preparation. The learning of such teaching rules required professional socialization processes, overcoming the simple mastery of some structures of movements, as teaching was understood as a practical art (Scheffler, 1974) to which there were no exhaustive rules that would be efficient to guarantee success.

Under this perspective, “the method was not dissociable from the practice, the arts of doing” (Carvalho, 2000, p. 113) and the teaching rules were legitimized by use, granting authority to teachers considered to be exemplary, who incorporated the expertise of teaching and actively participated in the education of the new generations of teachers. Their model action could be imitated by aspiring teachers. Teacher learning was then based on the observation of pedagogical work and the establishment of intergenerational relationships, under an artisanal-like formative model (Lang, 1996) and a charismatic model (Bourdoncle, 1990), marked by the interpersonal relationships and the learning of practical and moral aspects connected to teaching.

According to Carvalho (2000), that educational model was structured under the “primacy of visibility”, that supposed an approximation of aspiring teachers to the pedagogical practices, through which they would learn their principles, so as to inventively reproduce them. Teacher education assumed then an “intra-referent” character (Bourdoncle, 2000), happening *in loco* and by the teachers themselves. In that configuration, teachers and their culture occupied its own place in the education of primary teachers. In the perspective proposed by Michel de Certeau (1994), this place is marked by strategy, allowing subjects and groups to manage their relations with the exterior and, through that, capitalize the proceeds, expand their domains, and guarantee its independence faced by the circumstances.

A different scenario is presented to lower and upper secondary teachers, to whom no teacher education was foreseen until 1931, when the Reform Francisco Campos started to require a pedagogical complementation, taught in the education institutions (soon incorporated

by the recently created universities). In the higher education level, the Teaching degree – offered by the Philosophy Schools– granted these teachers a register in the Ministry of Education. For these secondary teachers, the educational model until that time was established by the “cultivated man” (Bourdoncle, 1990), strongly marked by an academic perspective that implied a centrality of cultural-cognitive contents. “The pedagogical-didactic aspects were relegated in this education to an appendix of little importance” (Saviani, 2009, p. 147) as it presumed that these teachers would teach students that would have been properly prepared in primary education on the dispositions to study and the school dynamic. Therefore, pedagogical knowledge would not be of great value.

It was in the space of primary education and normal school that the pedagogical practice affirmed itself at the time of a specific teaching capital, produced by the teacher from his/her socialization in the teaching culture. The understanding of teaching as a *practical art* gave teachers their *own space* in the process of producing the teaching activity, although highlighting their personal dimensions, understood as nuclear elements to solve the difficulties faced during work (Chartier, 1999). The teacher was assumed, under this perspective, as the producer of the pedagogical practice and, therefore, as the main agent to educate new teachers. The intergenerational relations established between experience teachers and pre-service teachers were, under this educational model, a *sine qua non* condition of teachers’ education.

However, in the passage from the 19th to the 20th century, this educational model, grounded on the concept of teaching as a practical art and the processes of intergenerational socialization was greatly shaken by the emergence of scientific pedagogy. From then on, scientifically authorized knowledge would act as fundamentals for teacher practice, at the same time, that teaching methods would go through autonomization processes (Carvalho, 2000). Learn to teach would no longer correspond to learning teaching models and started to be connected to the learning of knowledge (produced outside teaching) to be applied in a teaching situation. Pedagogy, now understood as an applied science, was no longer a subject of teachers themselves, and the most legitimated knowledge on education was produced by other agents, specialists in the subjects that would then offer the resources to teachers’ practice. The former model schools were transformed into Laboratory schools (*colégios de aplicação*), while teachers experienced the prevalence of the technical dimension of their work, now reduced to the technical dimension of their work, an instrumental level. The teaching methods gained autonomy, getting farther from the practice

in two different, but complementary directions: one of progressive didacticism; and one of supervalorization of the educational “sciences” as fundamentals of teacher practice. In this process, the pedagogical written material becomes didactic in a proliferation of discourses on the methods and the fundamentals of teacher practice. (Carvalho, 2000, p. 114)

Therefore, it is established in Brazilian educational field, the idea that an “efficient education is basically the competent application of a methodological knowledge, epistemologically grounded in other types of knowledge, especially psychological”, that overlapped the centrality given before to the “pedagogical point of view” (Azanha, 2004, p. 370) and the idea of teaching as a “creative activity” (Azanha, 1987, p. 77).

In this scenario, teachers lost their space in the normal model of teacher education, which now assumed new formats. In that new normal school, more in tune with pedagogical modernity (Carvalho, 2000), teacher education was the responsibility of pedagogues (specialists in education) and high school teachers. According to the *Lei Orgânica do Ensino Normal* (Decreto-Lei nº 8.530, 1946), normal school teachers should be educated in the higher education level and the primary teachers did not play a central role in the education of the new generation of teachers. They lost then their *own place* (Certeau, 1994) conquered in this education and started to be passive references for the action of other agents that, at that moment, had the capitals valued in the field, under the aegis of scientific pedagogy. Teachers then found a scenario of symbolic weakening of their knowledge and practices.

In the case of high-school teachers’ education, held in the university, the scientific pedagogy had found a favorable environment in certain aspects. With the establishment of a standard training curriculum – grounded by the one of *Faculdade Nacional de Filosofia*, created in 1939 –, the pedagogical education of these teachers broadened and encompassed General Didactics, Special Didactics, Educational Psychology, School Administration, Biological Fundamentals of Education, and Sociological Fundamentals of Education (Decreto-Lei 1.190, 1939). An academic model of teacher training (Borges, 2008), based on the assumption of applied sciences, affirmed itself in that space marked, from the start, by the concern of educating a “cultivated man” (Bourdoncle, 1990) and the emphasis on cultural-cognitive contents (Saviani, 2009).

The establishment of this application model (Tardif, 2006) in Brazilian teachers’ education, in the Teaching undergraduate degrees and the normal schools, meant its entrance in an epistemological conception close to positivism (Schön, 1983). Under this perspective, the

expectation is that teachers would be trained as technicians-specialists (Pérez Gómez, 1997), able to rigorously apply the theories and the education methods created outside teaching. The teacher practice was then separated from its social and political dimension and reduced to an instrumental level, rooted in the “discursive field of methodological prescriptions deduced from scientific fundamentals” (Carvalho, 2000, p. 114).

The autonomy of teaching methods, which started to be grounded on the education sciences and didactize itself (Carvalho, 2000), implied significant changes in teacher education. Learning to teach would no longer be connected to processes of professional socialization and, in this direction, the intergenerational relationships between teachers and aspiring teachers would not be an axis on teacher training. The contact of pre-service teachers with teaching was reduced to an instrumental level, as an activity connected to the pedagogical subject (Didactics or Teaching Methodology and Practice)⁵. In the Laboratory schools, the contact of future teachers – undergraduate students or normal school students– with teaching would no longer aim the appropriation of exemplary practices but its scientifically grounded scrutiny. It was expected a teacher education of “high technical level, with an experimental character” (Lourenço Filho, 2001, p. 57)

based on the application of positive technical knowledge and on a philosophy – not the philosophy of complicated systems, that are memorized, or abstract principles, that are hardly understandable, but of real factors, of the disposition to understand and plan the delicate work, harmonious, of progressive execution, sometimes almost insensible to its effects, but always active, always inexorable and, what is more scary, irreversible (Lourenço Filho, 2001, p. 56)

Such processes of rationalization certainly aggregate symbolic value to the institutions of teacher education, significantly working for its assertion in the educational field. However, it seems possible to say that, in the wake of what happened with the teaching methods, such education also went through processes of autonomy, getting farther from the pedagogical practices and their agents; getting farther even from teachers, its reference group.

Thus, the advent of a scientific pedagogy has brought new configurations for the game of teacher education. From the *own place* of teaching, education would become *the place of the other*

⁵ In the case of Teaching undergraduate degrees, the *Decreto-Lei* 9.053/1946 determines the creation of a Laboratory school to each Philosophy School in the country, aimed towards the teaching practice of the students enrolled in the Didactics course. For the normal schools, the *Decreto-Lei* 8.530/1946 stipulates that all establishments of the type had to create primary education schools attached to them for “teaching demonstration and practice”.

(Certeau, 1994, p. 46). The other, at that moment, were the specialists linked to the fundamentals of education and the pedagogical subjects. By stopping to be considered a “creative activity” (Azanha, 1987, p. 77) and becoming a mere space to apply knowledge considered *fundamental*, teacher practice suffered a strong devaluation in the educational field, losing value as a specific capital. These ‘exchange variation’ led to significant losses to school teachers, as they were before recognized as teaching experts due to their practical knowledge. After this loss, they could no longer assume the protagonism they formerly had in educating their peers. They lacked symbolic resources.

This process of devaluing the teaching practice of Brazilian teachers intensified due to other changes in the configuration of the educational field. During the process of massification of school access in the country, starting in the 1970s, and the following school failure of a great parcel of the population, new social representations emerged on schoolteachers, marked by what Souza (2001, 2006) called the “argument of incompetence”. According to this argument, “the main cause of the low quality of the educational system is exactly the incompetence of teachers”, what helped build “a homogenous persecution on teachers and the teaching practice, considered technically incompetent and politically uncommitted” (Souza, 2006, p. 484).

Once more, teachers’ practice lost symbolic value in the field. After being reduced to a mere space to apply knowledge externally produced by the education sciences, teachers’ practice started to be treated as a space of technical incompetence, resulting from a presumed faulty application of the theories. The educational problems, which involve several dimensions – political, social, cultural, and economic, among others– were reduced to the technical difficulty of teachers. And the losses initially suffered by teachers faced by the scientific pedagogy and the epistemology of the positivist practice that grounded it, which reduced teachers to technicians-specialists– expropriating from their work the political and social dimensions– had become even more sensitive, with the denouncement of the political disengagement in their work.

Thus, Brazilian teachers reached the end of the 20th century in a situation of symbolic destitution. The practice, their specific capital, had not only lost its value but also caused serious losses in the field.

What is the *place* of Brazilian teachers in teacher education?

The exchange alterations that marked the competition space in education and teacher training/education during the 20th century, bequeathed to K-12 Brazilian teachers an extremely negative balance. The social representations that highlighted their teaching expertise, connected to the artisanal model of teaching and teacher education, were gradually taken down due to the devaluation of their symbolic capitals— knowledge linked to practice— in the scope of disputed established in the educational field, especially regarding the emergence of scientific pedagogy (Carvalho, 2000) and, later on, the affirmation of the argument of teacher incompetence (Souza, 2001).

This state of accentuated symbolic fragilization discarded our teachers from more central places in the educational field and teacher education. An interesting model of analysis proposed by Nóvoa (1999a) allows us to explore issues related to the place occupied by these teachers in the competition space of education. On what he called *triangle of knowledge*⁶, Nóvoa clarifies that the teaching profession has been produced from the inter-relation of three types of knowledge: the experience knowledge (produced by teachers), the pedagogical knowledge (produced by specialists in education sciences), and the subject knowledge (produced by specialists in the different domains of knowledge). According to the proposed model, these three types of knowledge are vertices of a triangle. The processes of rationalization of teaching have favored, since the first decades of the 20th century, privileged connections between the two vertices that represent the scientific knowledge (pedagogy and other subjects) and relegated to the teachers (and their knowledge) the “declaring side” [in Portuguese, the “place of the dead”]⁷ in the game established. In this sense, Nóvoa (1999a) clarifies that teachers have assumed a place of passivity in the process of producing educational discourses at the same that, paradoxically, they serve as a pretext for the intense discursive production done by the other groups involved (Nóvoa, 1999b).

⁶ Inspired by the pedagogical triangle presented by Jean Houssaye (1988) that proposes the consideration of pedagogical models from the interaction of three elements: the subject who teaches, the student, and the teaching content. The same elements occupy the vertices of the didactic triangle proposed by Chevallard (1991).

⁷ As in a game of bridge, the player on the declaring side is the passive reference of the other players: no move can be drawn without paying attention to his/her cards on the table, but he/she cannot have his/her own strategy.

Amidst this scenario, fruitful in discourses on teachers and their practices, the “creation of the professional teacher” (Popkewitz & Nóvoa, 2001) stand out, which aim to revert the alleged technical incompetence of teachers through the “hyper-rationalization of teaching and learning” (Ropé, 1997, p. 81) from the decomposition of tasks, explicitation of previously-established criteria, and the standardization of educational situations. It is a re-affirmation of the application models of teacher education, established for many decades in the field and now strengthened by the current configuration, which submits the traditional academic perspective, marked by the centrality of cultural-cognitive contents in the formation of the cultivate men (Bourdoncle, 1990), and a generalist perspective that wants to produce “a competitive business culture” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 75), alien to the teaching culture in this space⁸. Once more, teaching is considered a space to competently apply a methodological knowledge epistemologically ground in other types of knowledge (Azanha, 1987).

However, in this moment, the knowledge that could ‘redeem’ teacher education is grounded in a managerial ideal (Ball, 2005) and not only in education sciences. According to Goodson & Hargreaves (2008), the mercantilization of teacher education is substituting the *academic mystification* as a way for professionalization. Thus, the application model of teacher education is today less academic and more business-like, aiming the education of an efficient men, more than a cultivated one.

We presuppose that this new version of an old model guides the negotiations that take place in the highly organized model around teacher education, a market of symbolic goods in which economic acts are transformed into symbolic acts already legitimized by the agents that hold the most valuable capitals in the educational field (Souza & Sarti, 2014). According to the current version of this application model of education, which produces an *illusio* (Bourdieu, 2003a) of the exchanges established in this market, the consumption of discursive products produced by *legitimate* instances would allow teachers to reach the *performativity* (Ball, 2005) – performance and efficiency– which could make render them a symbolic recovery in the field.

However, we have to consider that this educational way has been reverted in processes of “conceptual colonization” (Smyth, 1992) that, contrary to the promised profit and empowerment, tend to enclosure teachers in an ambiguous place, in which they are at the same

⁸ The hyper- rationalization is considered here as an element of the application model that is kept in the current model of teacher education, marked by a managerial perspective.

time *consumers* of educational products and, following the leads offered by Popkewitz and Nóvoa (2001), as one more *product* of this educational market that, thus, feeds back itself (Souza & Sarti, 2014). These two places reserved to teachers— as consumers and as products – situate them into marginal positions in the disputes. They also continue in the *declaring side* in the game established in the specific triangle of teacher education (Sarti, 2012) formed by the teachers, the university and its specialists, and the public power. In this space, Brazilian teachers also assume the place of passive references for the other agents involved in the game, though their existence is what allows all the moves in this game.

The production of a deteriorated movement of teachers’ professionalization

Despite the space of little prestige occupied by Brazilian teachers in the competition spaces they are inserted, the new version of the application model of teacher education, based on a managerial ideology (Ball, 2005), is discursively grounded in the rhetoric around teachers’ empowerment and the investment on teachers’ autonomy, their ability of self-reflection, and their academic and scientific qualifications (Popkewitz & Nóvoa, 2001). The new teacher to be *manufactured* through education has to be competent— autonomous, responsible, cooperative, and reflexive –, besides being an entrepreneur, search for solutions to the problems imposed by their work through innovative ideas and leadership spirit.

In this sense, a managerial conception of teacher professionalism, imported from the economic field⁹, tries to affirm itself in the disputes established in the educational field through diverse strategies, among which the appropriation of discourses on the importance of practical knowledge and the creative possibilities of teachers work, that problematize the positivist epistemology which guides the dominant perspective on teachers’ work and education. According to Goodson & Hargreaves (2008) discourses related to this “practical professionalism” (p. 218) produced by groups established in the field that tried to grant “dignity and status to the knowledge and the practical senses that people make up of their own works”

⁹ Such conception can cause a certain discomfort to certain groups in the educational field, in part due to the *logic of uninterest* that characterizes this space and that, similar to the scientific field described by Bourdieu (2003a), “produces and supposes a specific form of interest” (p. 113) from which educational practices show themselves to be *uninterested* when related to the interests produced in other fields.

(Goodson & Hargreaves, 2008, p. 2014), are “kidnapped” by the public reforming power (and other instances related to it) and are placed “under the service of dubious political projects that restructure education in a nefarious way” (p. 218). This *discursive kidnap* have resulted, according to these authors, in a de-professionalizing practice that redefines teachers’ professionalism.

in terms of competences and patterns of pedagogical practice in the workplace, teachers are morally liable by the ends and curriculum processes that were taken away from them, while financial resources are been removed. (Goodson & Hargreaves, 2008, p. 218)

Such scenario, advert the authors, could lead to a

period of de-professionalization of professionalism in which more strict and technical definitions drained of any critical voice or moral purpose, seriously hinder the long-term aspirations of teachers for a higher status and professional recognition. (Goodson & Hargreaves, 2008, p. 218)

Foreign to more consequent production on the epistemology of teacher practice (Schön, 1997; Tardif, Lessard, & Lahaye, 1991; Zeichner, 1993), such discourses reduce the productive dimension of the practice to a mere search for technical innovations. The teacher, now an *entrepreneur*, should assume a perspective of dissatisfaction and teaching innovation. Among the many news of the so-called *society of knowledge* and the use of technologies of information and communication, the teacher has to find ways to solve the problems imposed by work. However, we should point out that, differently from what is defended in the perspective designated by Goodson & Hargreaves (2008) as “practical professionalism”, teachers’ investigative posture prescribed by teachers’ managerial perspective is not grounded in the assumption of the limits of technical rationality to face the “intermediate areas of practice” (Schön, 1983), that would then be recognized in its complexity. On the contrary, the new imposed model of managerial guidance reaffirms the idea— dear to the positivist epistemology— that the practical action is reduced to the mere space of *application* knowledge produced elsewhere.

The novelty of this perspective compared to the more traditional model of application is, at least in the Brazilian case, on the pulverization of the producing instances and the disseminators of the resources to be *applied*, as well as the dilution of the periods of subjects’ education/training. The monopoly reached throughout the 20th century by the educational sciences, produced by academic-scientific instances and diffused among teachers mainly through pre-service education, has been severely shaken faced by the demands around a teacher

education based by results measured especially through external evaluations and targeting learning management.

In this perspective, teacher education— now seen as a long-life education – is a product that circulates in a broad and diversified market established not only by the universities, but also through publishing companies of didactic books, companies of pedagogical consultancy, private and philanthropic foundations, non-governmental organization, and other instances (Souza & Sarti, 2014). It is up to teachers, as before, to engage themselves in this market as consumers, but now assuming an entrepreneur attitude, looking for *more efficient* products that provide *efficient* solutions for their problems. The passive consumption of standard educational products do not give them enough symbolic resources to keep them on the game. New objects linked to technical, emotional, and behavioral competences – technological fluency, management and communication abilities, resilience, among others – have to be obtained by teachers, leading them to diverse training pathways, commonly external to the school and teaching.

Once more in history, Brazilian teachers have to look for educational resources for their teaching practice and not, as other epistemology would suggest, assume the teaching practice as a formative resource. Again, the resources teachers need to continue in the game are external to teaching and, now, they are urged to consume products from a pulverized educational market, which expands itself even beyond the educational field limits. The instances and agents involved in teacher education are diversified (Souza & Sarti, 2014). New formation agents inhabit this market targeting entrepreneur teachers: the pedagogical consultants, the coaches, the tutors and advisors of online education, motivational speakers, among others.

Teachers' intergenerational relations between new challenges and possibilities

The scenario drawn is highly unfavorable to teacher education as a process of socialization in the culture of teaching and the educational possibilities of the intergenerational relations among teachers. It is especially far from a professional model of education (Borges, 2008; Cyrino, 2016) assumed by the movement of teaching professionalization, in which teachers are central due to the value of the epistemological statute of practice, its main capital,

and the establishment of pluri-categorical teams (Tardif, 2006) around teacher education, involved through the recognition of their expertise.

This current unviability of the assertion of a professional model of teacher education in Brazilian educational field, resulting from the symbolic struggles historically established in this space, suggests processes of degeneration in the movement of teaching professionalization. After all, the professionalization of an occupation demands, as a condition, the professionalization of its formative processes, that started to be controlled by the professional group of reference, whose agents are involved in the education of the new generations, through different ways (Bourdoncle, 2000). Therefore, it presupposes diverse partnerships among the involved instances, in the sense of an education held in *alternation* (Borges, 2008; Bourdoncle, 2000), based on the articulation of educational spaces that allow, on one hand the appropriation of professional education knowledge (Tardif, 2006) and, on the other, the immersion on socialization processes in the occupational culture of reference. The implementation of this education in alternation has historically been one of the great challenges to overcome the application model of teacher education.

However, as shown on the previous pages, the obstacles to be faced towards the professionalization of Brazilian teachers have broadened in the last two decades and now surpass the old epistemological conflict between scientific and practical knowledge. Today, the professionalization of these teachers' education does not depend only on overcoming the great distance established between school and university that, traditionally, has marked the academic model of application-guided teacher education (Borges, 2008). There are other challenges to consider.

The managerial perspective that guides the new model accentuates the symbolic fragilization of our teachers, through a double operation. Besides confirming their *declaring side*, of passive consumer of educational products, it now transforms them into a *performative product* to be consumed: the professional teacher, the entrepreneur teacher, the researcher teacher, the reflexive teacher, etc. And, in an unusual movement in the field, there are losses to the university. Under the managerial perspective, teachers are not expected to consume the *fundaments* of the pedagogical practice, as the educational sciences are questioned on their efficiency and obsolesce. It seems that, though not losing its space in the field of teacher education, Brazilian university faces an oscillation of the value of its capitals in this game.

Such oscillations can generate changes in the configurations of the field and bring new conflicts to its agents. The university will have to find ways to allow it to keep its advantages in this space, reevaluating its capitals, and analyzing its chances of profit. The application model of teacher formation grounded in a traditional academic guidance does not guarantee any longer the same profits. But the game is under way, around the same disputes: who is responsible to educate/train the teachers? What education/training should be offered? In what space?

Maybe a possible pathway for the university is to rescue the professional model of education (Borges, 2008; Cyrino, 2016) which, for years, had been *kidnapped* by the reformist discourse (Goodson & Hargreaves, 2008). This is a difficult path as the creation of a high-level professional education of teachers, through the approximation (unprecedented in Brazil) between university and teaching requires, according to Altet (2009), the “synergy between different fields of knowledge” (p. 232) to face the challenges in the epistemological sphere, with the creation of a new curriculum, the mobilization of all educators/trainers in pluri-categorical teams, the modification of practices and educational times (towards the alternation between university and school placements, among others), and collaborative research studies.

In Brazil, the dramatic symbolic fragility of schoolteachers and the distance they traditionally maintain from the academic practices accentuate the difficulties to be faced towards creating a teacher education in this model. To legitimize the field, the professional model of teacher education should be able to guarantee the presence of teachers’ profession in the educational teaching processes, highlighting its socializing dimension (through intergenerational relationships, for example), and reversing the processes of autonomization that has reached it since the emergence of the scientific pedagogy. Teachers have to leave the *declaring side* in this game (Sarti, 2012).

However, such movements do not mean a revitalization of the old and undervalued normal model— artisanal and charismatic – of teacher education. The production of a new model will demand high-level knowledge produced by social and human sciences that allow teachers to overcome intuitive and instrumental knowledge on teaching, towards the complexity and singularity that characterizes their work (Altet, 2009). It is a relationship with the academic-educational types of knowledge in many ways different from the one that has been commonly experienced by the teachers, marked by processes of “conceptual colonization” (Smyth, 1992)

and a supposed passivity of consumption¹⁰ of educational products (Souza & Sarti, 2014). In this direction, the intended education/training should distance itself from the precepts of technical rationality, aiming as a reference a *theory of the practice* that offers more integrative ways to conceive the relations between the structural level and the actions of the subjects (Bourdieu, 2003b).

Therefore, the creation of a professional model of teacher education— with a *place* for teachers and academics, for school and university, for theories of practice and for theoretical practices— will impose to the instances involved old and new challenges in the epistemological, political, and cultural levels, significantly altering the configurations of the Brazilian field of teacher education.

References

- Altet, M. (2009). Conclusion: des tensions entre professionnalisation et universitarisation en formation d'enseignants à leur articulation: curriculum et transactions nécessaires. In R. Etienne, M. Altet, C. Lessard, L. Pasquay, P. Perrenoud (Orgs.). *L'université peut-elle vraiment former les enseignants?: Quelles tensions ? Quelles modalités ? Quelles conditions ?* (pp. 215-232). Louvain-la-Neuve: De Boeck.
- Azanha, J. M. P. (1987). *Educação: alguns escritos*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional.
- Azanha, J. M. P. (2004). Uma reflexão sobre a formação do professor da escola básica. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 30(2), 369-378.
- Ball, S. J. (2005). Profissionalismo, gerencialismo e performatividade. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 35(126), 539-564.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). Official knowledge and pedagogic identities: the politics of recontextualising. In S. J. Ball (Ed.), *The sociology of education: major themes*. London: Routledge Falmer.

¹⁰ This passivity has to be questioned, considering the productive character of ordinary practices (Certeau, 1994).

- Borges, C. (2008). A formação docente em Educação Física em Quebec: Saberes, espaços, culturas e agentes. In C. Traversini (Org.), *Trajetórias e processos de ensinar e aprender: práticas e didáticas* (pp. 147-174). Porto Alegre: EdIPUCRS.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003a). O campo científico. In R. Ortiz (Org.), *A sociologia de Pierre Bourdieu* (pp. 112-143). São Paulo: Olho d'Água.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003b). Esboço de uma teoria da Prática. In R. Ortiz (Org.), *A sociologia de Pierre Bourdieu* (pp. 39-72). São Paulo: Olho d'Água.
- Bourdoncle, R. (1990). De l'instituteur à l'expert: les IUFM et l'évolution des institutions de formation. *Recherche et Formation*, 8(1), 57-72.
- Bourdoncle, R. (2000). Professionnalisation, formes et dispositifs. *Recherche et Formation*, 35(1), 117-132.
- Carvalho, M. M. C. de. (2000). Modernidade pedagógica e modelos de formação docente. *São Paulo em Perspectiva*, 14(1), 111-120.
- Certeau, M. de. (1994). *A invenção do cotidiano: artes do fazer* (6a ed.). Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Chartier, A.-M. (1999). Os futuros professores e a leitura. In A. A. G. Batista, A. M. de O. GALVÃO (Orgs.), *Leitura: práticas, impressos, letramentos* (pp. 89-97) Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
- Chevallard, Y. (1991). *La transposition didactique: du savoir savant au savoir enseigné* (2a ed.). Grenoble: La Pensée Sauvage.
- Cyrino, M. (2016). *Do acolhimento ao acompanhamento compartilhado: a construção colaborativa de uma proposta para o estágio curricular no curso de pedagogia*. Tese de doutorado, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Rio Claro.
- Decreto-Lei nº 8.530, de 2 de janeiro de 1946. (1946, 4 de janeiro). Lei Orgânica do Ensino Normal. *Diário Oficial da União*. Recuperado de <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/decllei/1940-1949/decreto-lei-8530-2-janeiro-1946-458443-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>

- Decreto-Lei nº 1.190, de 4 de abril de 1939. (1939, 6 de abril). Dá organização à Faculdade Nacional de Filosofia. *Diário Oficial da União*. Recuperado de <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/decllei/1930-1939/decreto-lei-1190-4-abril-1939-349241-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>
- Goodson, I., & Hargreaves, A. (2008) Mudança educativa e crise do profissionalismo. In I. Goodson, *Conhecimento e vida profissional* (pp. 209-21). Porto: Porto Editora.
- Houssaye, J. (1988). *Triangle pédagogique: théorie et pratiques de l'éducation scolaire*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Lang, V. (1996). Professionnalisation des enseignants, conceptions du métier, modèles de formation. *Recherche et Formation*, 23(1), 9-27.
- Lourenço Filho, M. B. (2001). *A formação de professores: da Escola Normal à Escola de Educação*. Brasília: Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais.
- Nóvoa, A. (1999a). Prefácio à segunda edição. In A. Nóvoa (Org.), *Profissão professor* (pp. 7-10). Porto: Porto Editora.
- Nóvoa, A. (1999b). Os professores na virada do milênio: do excesso dos discursos à pobreza das práticas. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 25(1), 11-20.
- Pérez Gómez, A. (1997). O pensamento prático do professor: a formação do professor como prático reflexivo. In: A. Nóvoa (Org), *Os professores e a sua formação* (pp. 93-114). Lisboa: Dom Quixote.
- Popkewitz, T., & Nóvoa, A. (2001). La fabrication de l'enseignant professionnel: la raison du savoir. *Recherche et Formation*, 38(1), 5-13.
- Ropé, F.(1997). Dos saberes às competências? O caso do francês. In F. Ropé, & L Tanguy (Orgs.), *Saberes e competências: o uso de tais noções na escola e na empresa* (pp. 21-30). Campinas: Papirus.
- Sarti, F. M. (2009). Parceria intergeracional e formação docente. *Educação em Revista*, 25, 2, 133-152.
- Sarti, F. M. (2012). O triângulo da formação docente: seus jogadores e configurações. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 38(2), 323-338.
- Sarti, F. M.; Bueno, M.C. (2017) Relação intergeracional e aprendizagem docente: elementos para rediscutir a formação de professores. *Educação em Questão*, 55, 45, 227-253.

- Saviani, D. (2009). Formação de professores: aspectos teóricos e históricos do problema no contexto brasileiro. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 14(40), 143-155.
- Scheffler, I. (1974). *A linguagem da educação* (B. Barbosa Filho, trad.). São Paulo: Edusp.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. (1997). Formar professores como profissionais reflexivos. In A. Nóvoa (Org.), *Os professores e a sua formação* (3a ed., pp. 79-91). Lisboa: Dom Quixote.
- Smyth, J. (1992). Teachers' work and the politics of reflection. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(2), 267-300.
- Souza, D. T. R. de. (2001). *Teacher professional development and the argument of incompetence: the case of in-service elementary teacher education*. Tese de doutorado, Universidade de Londres, Londres.
- Souza, D. T. R. de. (2006). Formação continuada de professores e fracasso escolar: problematizando o argumento da incompetência. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 32(3), 477-492.
- Souza, D. T. R. de, & Sarti, F. M. (2014). Mercado simbólico de formação docente. In D. T. R. de Souza, & F. M. Sarti (Orgs.), *Mercado de formação docente: constituição, funcionamento e dispositivos* (pp. 3-19). Belo Horizonte: Fino Traço.
- Sorel, M. (2005). Préambule. In M. Sorel, & R. Wittorski (Orgs.), *La professionnalisation en actes et en questions* (pp. 7-10). Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Tanuri, L. M. (2000). História da formação de professores. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, (14), 61-88.
- Tardif, M. (2006). *Saberes docentes e formação profissional* (6a ed.). Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Tardif, M. (2013). A profissionalização do ensino passados trinta anos: dois passos para a frente, três para trás. *Educação e Sociedade*, 34(123) 551-571.
- Tardif, M., Lessard, C., Lahaye, L. (1991). Os professores face ao saber: esboço de uma problemática do saber docente. *Teoria e Educação*, 4, 215-33.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1993). *A formação reflexiva dos professores: ideias e práticas*. Lisboa: Educa.

References consulted

Decreto nº 19.890, de 18 de abril de 1931 (1931, 1 de maio). Dispõe sobre a organização do ensino secundário. *Diário Oficial da União*. Recuperado de <http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/decret/1930-1939/decreto-19890-18-abril-1931-504631-publicacaooriginal-141245-pe.html>

Submission data:

Submitted for evaluation in August 2, 2018; revised in June 27, 2019; accepted for publication in September 4, 2019.

Corresponding author:

Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho” - Campus de Rio Claro – Educação. Av. 24^a, n. 1515, Rio Claro, SP, 13506-900, Brasil.