

THE PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY OF THE PEDAGOGUE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE MILITARY DICTATORSHIP IN BRAZIL



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev6n4-055>

Submitted on: 11/05/2024

Publication date: 12/05/2024

Ana Vitória Damasceno Amorim¹, Antonia Dalva França-Carvalho², Ágata Laisa Laremborg Alves Cavalcanti³ and Zilda Tizziana Santos Araújo⁴.

ABSTRACT

The period of the military dictatorship in Brazil, from 1964 to 1985, directly impacted the area of education, as the military made this moment an instrument for the transmission of their ideologies. For this reason, higher education was one of the targets of this government, since they would act in schools in the future and should, imposingly, meet the dictatorial and ideological interests of education imposed by the military government. As a result, the following question arose: What was the professional identity of the pedagogue during the period of the military dictatorship in Brazil? It aimed to discuss the professional identity of the pedagogue in the context of the military dictatorship. The methodology used was bibliographic and documentary research (Gil, 2010), with a qualitative approach. The technique used for data analysis was Bardin's (1997) content analysis. This study revealed that the pedagogy course underwent changes in its organization, in order to meet the interests of the capitalist system of production. In view of this, the professional identity of the pedagogue was defined in qualifications, following the business model and the technicist liberal tendency. In opposition to this model of training imposed by the military, social movements of educators and other instances of education emerged, as a means of fighting against the ideologies of the military and the impositions of this type of training on teachers. Therefore, the professional identity of the pedagogue has always been marked by instabilities, and underwent modifications in the period of the military dictatorship, training pedagogues to serve as uncritical labor and propagate the ideals of the technicist tendency in their teaching practice, with the objective of maintaining the current order.

Keywords: Professional identity, Pedagogue, Military Dictatorship, Technicism.

¹ Master's student in Education
Federal University of Piauí-UFPI
E-mail: anavitoriaamorim3@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5277-7549>
Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/7022388339072297>

² Post-Doctorate in Education
University of Coimbra-UC
Email: adalvac@uol.com.br
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9827-061X>
Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2678561806213333>

³ Dr. in Education
Federal University of Piauí-UFPI
E-mail: agatalaysa@ufpi.edu.br
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8864-2857>
Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2226616167031810>

⁴ Doctorate student in Education
Federal University of Piauí-UFPI
E-mail: tizzianaaraujo@prp.uespi.br
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1306-8410>
Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2669992564304872>

INTRODUCTION

The civil-military coup in Brazil took place on March 31, 1964, and from that date on, there were drastic changes in several areas of society, especially in education. For Freire (2010), it is through education that the individual is able to understand the social context in which he lives, thus becoming capable of transforming it. Recognizing that education could harm the interests of this government, the military began to use it as an instrument for the transmission of their ideologies. And one of the consequences of this conjuncture was the formation of uncritical individuals who followed the norms in force, without any questioning of the impositions that were being made in that period (Libâneo, 1985).

For this reason, higher education was not exempt from the military government – because it is a space of direct threat, because the training process is of a scientific, critical and reflective nature – which coercively intervened to achieve its interests. Thus, the training of teachers was one of the targets, since they would work in schools in the future and need to follow the education proposed by the military. In this context, the pedagogy course underwent a change in the curricular structure and professional identity to follow the principles of the technicist liberal tendency. This model of education aims to train labor to meet the interests of the productive system of production.

By causing changes in the format of the pedagogy course, it also alters the professional identity and therefore the following question arose: What was the professional identity of the pedagogue in the period of the military dictatorship in Brazil? Thus, the objective of this work is to discuss the professional identity of the pedagogue in the context of the military dictatorship, as detailed below.

NOTES ON THE PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY OF THE PEDAGOGUE

All higher education courses, in addition to providing theoretical and practical knowledge for professional practice, direct students to assume a certain identity according to the training they have chosen. Thus, professional identity can be defined as being "[...] a collective identity because it is delineated in the web of social relations and incorporates the culture of the social group and the relations of the productive world in which the professional is inserted" (Brzezinski, 2011, p. 122).

Identity is important because it characterizes and distinguishes the professional from others who exist in society. However, the reality of the pedagogy course in Brazil throughout its history has gone through different conceptions of professional identity, sometimes

becoming confusing and undefined in the legal documents that regulated this training. The justification for this lies in the fact that, even though the science of Pedagogy defines a professional identity for the pedagogue, it is disregarded in the official documents that regulated/regulate this training.

At the beginning of the Pedagogy course in Brazil, in 1934, two identities of the pedagogue coexisted. One referred to the professional identity of the pedagogue as an education technician, who could work in secretariats and in the Ministry of Education, both at the municipal, state and federal levels, as well as in the bureaucratic sectors of schools (Severo; Pimenta, 2023). The other identity assumed in this period was teaching to work in the Normal Schools.

However, in this period, the professional identity of the pedagogue was confusing, as the fields of professional activity were not defined, proof of this was Decree-Law No. 1,190/39, which dealt with the organization of the course, but did not detail fundamental aspects to understand the place and spaces possible for the pedagogue. Therefore, this professional was at the mercy of the demands that arose.

In the civil-military government, the professional identity of the pedagogue was modified through changes in the curriculum and organization of initial training. This reveals that depending on the social, political and economic context, the professional identity of the pedagogue was redefined. As in this period education was based on the technicist conception of teaching, this identity was fragmented into various qualifications such as the business sector, with the objective of meeting the demands of the capitalist system (Cruz, 2011). This disregarded the criticisms that already exist about the professional identity of the pedagogue and its possible reformulations.

Currently, due to the advancement of the concept of education, the professional identity of the pedagogue is formed by teaching and pedagogical work. Teaching work is that carried out in the classroom space, while pedagogical work encompasses other spaces beyond the school, such as: hospitals, companies, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), among others (Libâneo, 2010). What still continued in the identity of the pedagogue from the period of the military dictatorship to the present day was the teaching practice, but today it is directed by other pedagogical trends that seek emancipation and social transformation through education.

METHODOLOGY

To achieve the objective of this investigation, exploratory research was adopted as a paradigm from the perspective of Gil (2010). Thus, exploratory research contemplates themes that are little investigated, requiring more research to explore and deepen the theme. In this case, it is the professional identity of the pedagogue in the context of the military dictatorship.

For this, bibliographic research was used, carried out in books, articles and other materials. The authors who were the basis for this article were Libânio (2010), Cruz (2011), Saviani (2007), among others, as they are references on the subject. In addition to documentary research, as a way to add to the analysis of information. Documentary research is that, as the name implies, done through documents. In view of this, the basic material for this article were the official documents published during the military dictatorship that dictated the identity of the pedagogue and the organization of the pedagogy course.

Regarding the approach, qualitative research was used from the perspective of the researcher Minayo (2002). This research focuses on "the universe of meanings, motives, aspirations, beliefs, values and attitudes, which corresponds to a deeper space of relationships, processes and phenomena that cannot be reduced to the operationalization of variables" (Minayo, 2002, p. 21-22). Through this approach, it was possible to understand the professional identity of the pedagogue in the context of the military dictatorship in Brazil.

As for data analysis, the technique used was Bardin's (1997) content analysis, which means "[...] a set of communication analysis techniques that uses systematic and objective procedures to describe the content of messages". Thus, the materials were selected for analysis, followed by their exploration with a view to creating empirical categories, and, finally, critical and reflective analysis of implicit and explicit information.

EDUCATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE TECHNICIST LIBERAL TENDENCY

Education, throughout the History of Humanity, has had different conceptions depending on the social, political and economic context. For this reason, pedagogical tendencies emerge, which according to Libâneo (1985), are the characteristics of how education is shared in a given historical context and that are present to the present day. Pedagogical trends are divided into two groups, which are: Liberals and Progressives, both approach education from different perspectives.

Thus, the liberal tendency was the one that was present during the period of the military dictatorship in Brazil, for aligning education with the interests of the capitalist system. For this reason

The term liberal does not have the meaning of "advanced", "democratic", "open", as it is usually used. The liberal doctrine appeared as a justification for the capitalist system that, by defending the predominance of freedom and individual interests in society, established a form of social organization based on the private ownership of the means of production, also called class society. Liberal pedagogy, therefore, is a manifestation of this type of society. (Luckesi, 1999, p. 54, emphasis added).

In view of this, the school aimed to train students to assume social roles, according to the skills they had. With this, they had to learn to follow the norms and values present in class society, without questioning them. As much as this trend spread the idea that everyone had the same opportunities, effort and dedication were enough to achieve the goals, it did not consider the existing social inequalities.

Because the liberal tendency remained for almost five decades in the pedagogical practices of teachers, it assumed different classifications depending on the period of history, namely: traditional, renewed progressivism, renewed non-directive and technicist (Libâneo, 1985). Education during the military dictatorship, in the years 1964 to 1985, was based on the ideals of the technicist pedagogical tendency.

It is notorious that education in the technicist liberal tendency was at the service of the system of production. When training labor, the school was not concerned with the development of students' criticality. This reveals that the military government used education as an instrument of manipulation and alienation of the masses, with the objective of maintaining the current order, in addition to serving the interests of capital. The curricular contents did not provide the necessary knowledge to provoke reflection and understand the social scenario that was being lived in that period.

This context reveals, depending on the way education is being offered, it can liberate or alienate society (Freire, 2010). The military recognized the importance of education to sustain the project underway at that time, and for this reason, disseminating the technicist liberal tendency in schools was one of the strategies of this government to transmit its ideologies, in addition to structuring politics and economics in its own way. Thus, the education offered in educational institutions had to follow this teaching trend, including in higher education, such as the pedagogy course.

The justification for the adoption of the technicist liberal tendency is that educational institutions would be effective in teaching, as they would follow the business model, attending to the capitalist system of production. For this reason, the teaching method used to transmit the knowledge of teachers to students was based on Taylorism, bringing about the "division of tasks among the various teaching technicians who are in charge of the rational planning of educational work" (Aranha, 1996, p.175). It was up to the teacher to bring these ideas into the context of the classroom, being only an executor.

In this tendency, students are considered human resources, who must learn the techniques to be laborers in order to meet the desires of capital (Luckesi, 1999). For this reason, the conceptions of industrial production models, such as Taylorism, were transported to the school organization, with the purpose of standardizing the teaching and learning process and, thus, making students fit for future work in industries. Thus, the false idea of the school that prepares for life was created, without causing strangeness.

THE PEDAGOGY COURSE IN THE MILITARY DICTATORSHIP

To understand the professional identity of the pedagogue that was assumed during the military dictatorship in Brazil, it is necessary to analyze the period before it. This is relevant because it provides information about how the Pedagogy course was organized and what changed with the civil-military government. For this reason, it is worth mentioning that the education of the pedagogue throughout history has suffered political, economic and social influences that contributed to the (in)definition of his professional identity, and, as the interests of the current government were modified.

The Pedagogy course was created in 1939, in the context of the structuring of the so-called National Faculty of Philosophy. Thus, Decree-Law No. 1,190/39 established the guidelines for its installation and also for the organization of the training of pedagogues in Brazil. The courses offered at this institution were established by sections, following this order, according to the document cited above: Philosophy, Sciences, Letters and Pedagogy, and a special section called Didactics. In view of this, the Sciences and Letters section had different courses, while Pedagogy, Philosophy and Didactics had only one training that received the section's own name. In the case of the pedagogy section, the pedagogy course was offered.

During this period, the Pedagogy course trained professionals in two modalities: Licentiate and Bachelor's Degree. This training model was called the 3+1 scheme (three

plus one), as it resulted in the sum of the years of graduation of the bachelor's degree with the licentiate. To be a bachelor's degree, it was necessary to attend a period of three years and, at the end, he was able to take the degree, which lasted one year. The licentiate, in turn, was based on the Didactics section, which provided knowledge related to the exercise of teaching (Saviani, 2007). It is notorious that the bachelor's degree courses had a more extensive training in relation to the licentiate, because the professional identity of the pedagogue was different.

Thus, the bachelor's degree course was intended for the professional exercise of education technician, who could assume functions in the municipal, state and federal departments of education, in addition to being able to work in schools performing bureaucratic teaching functions. While the licentiate course directed the training of teachers to work in Normal Education. However, other licentiate courses also operated in the Normal Schools, because the Organic Law of Normal Education allows this (Cruz, 2011), and it is not the exclusive field of pedagogues. In Decree No. 1,190/39 there was no field of action of the pedagogue in this period of implementation.

The 3+1 model (three plus one) was revoked by Decree Law No. 3,454, published on July 24, 1941, so it was no longer acceptable to attend a degree and a bachelor's degree concomitantly. The Pedagogy course underwent changes with the publication of the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN) of December 20, 1961. The justification for the changes happened because the National Council of Education (CNE), published Opinion No. 251, authored by counselor Valnir Chagas. One of the changes made was to grant autonomy to Higher Education for organization, course offerings, among others.

One of the first changes made during the military dictatorship was the so-called University Reform, provided for in Law No. 5. 540 of November 28, 1968. The impact of this reform was on higher education, with the objective of reorganizing it in order to bring to the training of teachers the foundations of the technicist conception and the developmental project of the nation. As a result, the National Faculty of Philosophy extinguished the sections of the courses and these became part of the specific areas.

In view of these changes, the didactics section, which was intended for teacher training, conferring on academics the degree of licentiate, became just a discipline. Thus, this discipline was contemplated in the courses offered by colleges, as well as by departments in the area of education (Cruz, 2011). This directly impacted the extinction of

the bachelor's degree, making the course a degree and, in this way, transformed the professional identity of the pedagogue.

After that, on April 11, 1969, Opinion No. 252 of the Federal Council of Education (CFE) was approved, added to CFE Resolution No. 2/1969, revealing the minimum curriculum for the undergraduate course in pedagogy, organized over a period of four years. Thus, the organization of the course was based on qualifications divided into: school administration, educational guidance, school supervision, school inspection and teaching (Brasil, 1969).

Therefore, the objective of the Pedagogy course during this period was to train both teachers for Normal Education and the specialist in education. To achieve this goal, the official curriculum was organized by a common part and a diversified part. In the common curriculum, knowledge from the disciplines of general sociology and education, educational psychology, philosophy of education, history of education, and didactics were offered.

The diversified curriculum included the disciplines considered specific for each qualification mentioned above. Added to this, there were three common disciplines, which were part of most of the qualifications, so called: structure and functioning of 1st degree education, structure and functioning of 2nd degree education and supervised internship (Brasil, 1969). In addition, the official curriculum of the Pedagogy course in the diversified part was somewhat fragmented, in order to contemplate this professional identity of qualifications.

This professional identity of the pedagogue in the context of the military dictatorship was supported by the technicist liberal tendency, with the aim of training professionals to meet the demands of the capitalist system of production. The consequences of this type of training was that future pedagogues did not develop the necessary knowledge to read and critically analyze the world and human relations.

Education in Higher Education was based on the ideals of technicism, because the military wanted to maintain the current order, and this was one of the spaces considered threatening, given that knowledge is produced and resignified. That is why the training was of uncritical labor, because the pedagogues could not wake up to the reality that Brazil was at that time. And when they worked in schools, they had to follow the ideas of technicism.

Even in the face of this period marked by persecution of those who were contrary to the interests of the military, there were several criticisms of the pedagogue's training being structured in this way. The criticism came from professors in higher education and other

areas of education, as well as from educational associations and movements, as this training led to the precariousness of work (Brzezinski, 1996). This reveals that the individuals directly and indirectly involved with higher education were concerned with the chaotic scenario that the training of pedagogues and teachers was in.

The result of these criticisms led to the emergence of movements of professors and Higher Education Institutions in the period of 1970 and 1980.

[...] the 1st Seminar on Brazilian Education, held in 1978, at UNICAMP, and the 1st Brazilian Conference on Education, held in 1980, at PUC in São Paulo, when the Pro-Participation Committee in the Reformulation of the Pedagogy and Licentiate Courses was created. In 1983, this Committee constituted CONARCEFE-National Commission for the Reformulation of Educator Training Courses, which, in 1990, during its 5th National Meeting, became ANFOPE- National Association for the Training of Education Professionals (Cruz, 2011, p.49)

The objective of these movements was to create forces to resist all forms of impositions by the military, including the fact that the Pedagogy course and other degrees have a technicist character. Therefore, one of the agendas of the movements was that the professional identity of the teaching degree courses should be centered on teaching. This model of qualifications was in force for a period of three decades, being revoked as of the LDB approved by Law No. 9,394, of December 20, 1996.

CONCLUSION

The professional identity of the pedagogue has never been unstable, undergoing modifications over time and this was no different in the context of the military dictatorship in Brazil. The pedagogy course began to be marked by the technicist liberal tendency, in which the pedagogue's identity was fragmented into several qualifications, thus making the pedagogue's work more precarious. With this, the military brought to the initial training, the aspects of the business model, which was on the rise, such as Taylorism, training labor for the capitalist system of production.

Even in the face of interest in trying to stop the scientific advancement of education, and consequently, of the science of pedagogy, important social movements have emerged to try to change this reality. These movements of university professors and other instances of education were important to affirm the commitment to education that liberates and transforms individuals, positioning themselves against what was being dictated by the military. In addition to fighting against the other ideologies propagated by this government.

Therefore, the political context of the time directly influenced the professional identity of the pedagogue, in which it was reconfigured because of the market advantages. Despite being marked by violence, persecutions, deaths, social movements in defense of education arise to try to reverse the setback in teacher training and teaching in the country.

REFERENCES

1. Aranha, M. L. A. (1996). *Filosofia da educação* (2nd ed., revised and expanded). São Paulo: Moderna.
2. Bardin, L. (1997). *Análise de conteúdo* (L. A. Reto & A. Pinheiro, Trans.). Lisboa: Edições 70.
3. Brasil. (1939). Decreto-Lei nº 1.190, de 4 de abril de 1939. Available at: <https://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1930-1939/decreto-lei-1190-4-abril-1939-349241-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html> Retrieved on June 23, 2024.
4. Brasil. (1941). Decreto-Lei nº 3.454, de 24 de julho de 1941. Available at: <https://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1940-1949/decreto-lei-3454-24-julho-1941-413403-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html> Retrieved on July 14, 2024.
5. Brasil. (1962). Parecer nº 251, de 14 de novembro de 1962. Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/ldb_Art64.pdf Retrieved on July 21, 2024.
6. Brasil. (1969). Parecer CFE nº 252, de 11 de abril de 1969. Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/ldb_Art64.pdf Retrieved on July 18, 2024.
7. Brasil. (1996). Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. Available at: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l9394.htm Retrieved on June 20, 2024.
8. Brzezinski, I. (1996). *Pedagogia, pedagogos e formação de professores: Busca e movimento*. Campinas: Papirus.
9. Brzezinski, I. (2011). Pedagogo: Delineando identidade(s). *Revista UFG*, (10). Available at: https://files.cercomp.ufg.br/webby/up/694/o/10_iria_brzezinski.pdf Retrieved on June 19, 2024.
10. Cruz, G. B. C. (2011). *Curso de pedagogia no Brasil: História e formação com pedagogos primordiais*. Rio de Janeiro: WAK Editora.
11. Freire, P. (2010). *Pedagogia do oprimido* (Revised and updated ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
12. Gil, A. C. (2010). *Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa* (4th ed.). São Paulo: Atlas.
13. Libâneo, J. C. (1985). *Democratização da escola pública: Pedagogia crítico-social dos conteúdos*. São Paulo: Ed. Loyola.
14. Libâneo, J. C. (2010). *Pedagogia e pedagogos, para quê?* (12th ed.). São Paulo: Cortez.
15. Luckesi, C. C. (1999). *Filosofia da educação*. São Paulo: Cortez.

16. Minayo, M. C. S. (Org.). (2001). Pesquisa social: Teoria, método e criatividade. Petrópolis: Vozes.
17. Saviani, D. (2007). A pedagogia no Brasil: História e teoria. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados.
18. Severo, J. L. R. L., & Pimenta, S. G. (2023). Formação em pedagogia na América Latina. Revista Internacional de Educação Superior, 9, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.20396/riesup.v9i00.8670012> Retrieved on June 19, 2024.