


THE TEACHER OF THE CAMPO SCHOOL, THE SUPERVISED CURRICULAR INTERNSHIP AND THE TRAINING OF FUTURE TEACHERS

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev6n2-181>

Submitted on: 09/23/2024

Publication date: 10/23/2024

Andréa Maxilane Schneider Kruger¹, Kalline Pereira Aroeira², Aldieris Braz Amorim Caprini³

ABSTRACT

This article has as its main concern to analyze the role of the teacher of the field school, in the supervised curricular internship, the scenarios and conceptions related to their work with undergraduates. The research systematizes reflections focused on teacher training, focusing on collaborating professionals, who assume, together with internship advisors (professors from higher education institutions), an important demand in the training networks organized between Higher Education Institutions and Basic Education. It is based on a master's research developed in the Professional Master's Graduate Program in Education at the Federal University of Espírito Santo and adopts a qualitative approach, dialoguing with teachers who work or have worked as internship supervisors in a municipality in the south of the state of Espírito Santo. In its theoretical contribution, it mainly uses the contributions of the studies of Pimenta and Lima (2018), Pimenta (2012) and Nóvoa (2012; 2019). The analysis indicates that, in the statements of the participating supervising teachers, a conception of the learning internship by imitation of models and techniques based on the dichotomous understanding in relation to theory and practice still prevails, not being explored, in their contexts of action, the perspectives of internship with research and approximation of the professional reality in which the future teacher will work. The study highlights that the non-recognition of the institutionalized participation of the internship supervising teacher weakens the training in professional knowledge of future teachers, in the context of the supervised curricular internship, and the importance of these professionals going through continuous training processes.

Keywords: Supervised Internship. Teacher Training. Supervising Professor.

¹ Master in Education from UFES
Federal University of Espírito Santo

² Dr in Education from USP
Federal University of Espírito Santo

³ Dr in Education from PUC-SP
Federal Institute of Espírito Santo

INTRODUCTION

The teacher of the supervised curricular internship field school is the professional who shares teaching knowledge and collaborates for the (re)construction of knowledge with the undergraduates, in partnership with the university teacher. Their academic and professional training focuses on working at school as a teacher of Basic Education, however, when they receive and welcome the future teacher, within the scope of the curricular internship, they also start to exercise the function of supervising teacher (BENITES, 2012).

In this perspective, the intern, in the context of the Supervised Curricular Internship, in addition to interacting in training processes with Higher Education teachers, carries out formative exchanges with the teacher of the field school. These teachers provide links between the knowledge of the Higher Education institution and the reality of pedagogical practice, since all these subjects produce knowledge about the teaching activity (DANIEL, 2009).

With this understanding, the pedagogical practices produced in the internship processes need to be the target of reflection not only by a teacher, but also by an articulated action between the trainee student, the teacher of the internship field school and the teacher of the Supervised Curricular Internship discipline, the latter being the articulating representative of the formative environment of Higher Education.

This implies recognizing the undeniable contribution of the teacher of the field school in the production of knowledge of the licentiate and the importance of the participation of the teacher of the field school in the Supervised Curricular Internship. However, many times, Basic Education teachers are "indirectly" in charge of teacher training, with actions restricted to the reception of interns and the filling out of documents (CYRINO, 2012).

It is important to highlight that the internship is a field of professional knowledge, with opportunities to develop teaching activities, and favors observing, problematizing, as well as reflecting on the practices exercised by professionals, which can help the future teacher in the process of professional insertion (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2018). It is not only a matter of dealing with knowledge, but of mobilizing it "[...] in situations of human relations" (NÓVOA, 2019, p. 205).

In this sense, there is no way to ignore the valuable participation of the school teacher in this formative process. It is necessary to highlight the importance of "[...] imbrication between subjects and institutions" (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2006, p. 12). In this

articulation, the particularities of an institution can interfere in the teacher's training, whether initial or continued, and he, in turn, can contribute to or influence the constitution of the institution through participation in pedagogical actions (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2018). There is, therefore, a mutual and reciprocal construction, resulting in dialogical actions for an institutional collective, a field of teaching learning for the future teacher.

This issue has been the subject of concern for almost two decades, in the context of studies of the international scenario, focusing among other issues on preparation, mentoring of collaborating teachers, training of future teachers, and partnerships between training schools (BENITES; SARTI; SOUZA NETO, 2015). In the Brazilian scenario, we identified that changes are pointed out in the initial training projects of future teachers and in the legislation, in order to systematize guidelines for supervision, which collaborate for a professional, reflective and investigative performance of future teachers (CYRINO; BENITES; SOUZA NETO, 2015).

In view of the above, with the expectation of collaborating with the discussion and formulations in this sense, we seek in this article to analyze the role of the teacher of the field school, in the supervised curricular internship, the scenarios and conceptions related to their work with undergraduates. In this way, the research systematizes reflections focused on teacher training, focusing on these collaborating professionals, who assume, together with the internship advisors (professors of higher education institutions), an important demand in the training networks organized between Higher Education and Basic Education Institutions. We start from a master's research developed in the Professional Master's Graduate Program in Education of the Federal University of Espírito Santo, which adopts the qualitative approach and is based on academic production that values the unity between theory and practice and the process of individual and collective reflection of the teacher (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2018; PIMENTA, 2012), which understands the internship as the curricular axis of the formative processes of initial teacher training.

The text is organized into three sections, in addition to the final considerations. In the first and second sections, we present the founding conceptions, in which we invest in relation to the supervised internship, and a discussion about the role of the teacher of the field school in the supervised curricular internship. Next, we present an excerpt of the results from the analysis of data from the field research carried out with supervising teachers, who work or have worked as internship supervisors in a municipality in the south of the state of Espírito Santo, covering the discussions around issues and aspects

experienced by these professionals, in the context of the training of undergraduates, in mandatory curricular internship processes.

THE SUPERVISED CURRICULAR INTERNSHIP AS A FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE AND CENTRAL CURRICULAR AXIS IN TEACHER TRAINING COURSES

Assuming the internship as the curricular axis of the formative processes of initial teacher training means, in our understanding, that this curricular component contributes to the reflection on the teaching praxis of the future teacher and the supervising teacher, strengthening the unity between theory and practice in the teaching degree courses.

The internship in this conception is a formative process, to be carried out in initial teacher training courses, being an indispensable moment for the construction of identity, knowledge and postures necessary for teaching (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2018). In this way, the approximation with the future field of professional activity of the licentiate occurs to understand and problematize the teaching practice, producing knowledge focused on teaching.

The curricular internships of future teachers, when they occur in this perspective, can provide higher education students with the opportunity to critically analyze the complexities of institutional practices, with the foundation of specialized theories, in order to favor practice and theory to permeate the teacher training course from start to finish.

The action of the actors in this process therefore encompasses the formative scenario of school education and higher education, collectively constituted with the participation of the advisor teacher, the future teacher and the supervising teacher. The guiding teacher and the supervising teacher collaborate with the articulation between the higher education instance and the school reality, but the supervising teacher acts directly with the sharing of knowledge arising from their experiences in the school field (DANIEL, 2009). In this configuration of exchanges and sharing, the Supervised Curricular Internship permeates the formative processes of these three actors in the teacher training process and collaborates with these processes.

In addition, it is necessary to emphasize the importance of reflection and problematization of the situations experienced by the licentiate students in the internship processes. We highlight, like Lima and Aroeira (2011, p. 124), the importance of collective reflection, in the context of the Supervised Curricular Internship, as a training strategy that helps in the transposition of problem situations and their dilemmas and that "[...] can

contribute to the search for alternatives among peers, which are assumed according to the resignification of theories related to reflected educational practice [...]. In this way, reflection takes place at the individual and collective levels. However, the collective act is enhanced in the relationship, exchange and sharing with peers, who, based on theories, build higher levels of discussions and teacher learning.

In this sense, the idea of carrying out the internship with research and an investigative teaching performance have raised proposals for "[...] recognition of the teacher as a producer of knowledge and an epistemology of teaching practice, capable of conferring its own status of knowledge to the development of teaching knowledge" (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2018, p. 40). In this scenario, the teacher of the internship field school will be in full and permanent professional development, given the possibility of reflection on their teaching praxis and the opportunity to produce and collaborate for the construction of teaching knowledge of future teachers.

With this perspective, the internship is no longer an "appendix" or a discipline isolated from the others and becomes part of the body of knowledge of initial teacher training, in which it provides students with supervised internships in basic schools with the opportunity to:

[...] to develop activities that enable knowledge, analysis, reflection, of the teaching work, of the teaching actions, in the institutions, in order to understand them in their historicity, identify their results, the impasses that present the difficulties (PIMENTA; LIMA, 2018, p. 46).

In view of this purpose, the internship with research collaborates for the unity of theory and practice, and the school tends to be a space that articulates the dialogue between the school reality and initial training. It is worth noting that this way of understanding the internship is not only defined through an amicable agreement between the professors of the higher education institution and the field school, but also by attributions that must be included in the pedagogical projects of the training institutions. In addition, we consider the need for a regulation that guides, in a systematic way, this institutional integration in the training processes.

Another aspect to which we draw attention is that the Federal Internship Law (BRASIL, 2008) defines the relationships of student internships and uses the denomination "supervisor of the granting party" for that teacher of the basic school, who receives the

trainee student. However, he does not present "concern with the training of this supervisor" (CYRINO; BENITES; SOUZA NETO, 2015, p. 253). As a result, institutions end up without specific support for a better contribution to the development of the supervised curricular internship.

It is important to emphasize the relevance of the formulation of continuous training processes for internship supervising teachers (teacher of the field school) and that one of the greatest challenges for teacher training is for training institutions to remain articulated in favor of the realization of an emancipatory training, in favor of the unity between theory and practice, in order to overcome the difficulties of the school context in a reflective and critical way.

THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL TEACHER IN SUPERVISED CURRICULAR INTERNSHIPS

The teacher of the internship field school acts as the teacher of the internship who accompanies, collaborates and contributes to the training processes of future teachers of basic education. In other words, it is the professional who, in interaction with the intern and in partnership with the University's advisor, shares knowledge, knowledge and produces, in a collaborative way, new possibilities for teaching activity in school education.

For this training activity, "[...] theory and practice are the articulating nucleus of professional training" (PIMENTA 2012, p. 80). In other words, the unity between theory and practice feeds the teaching activity, requiring a process of continuous training that feeds back into the production of teaching knowledge.

In this context of training the future teacher, it is recognized that the role of the supervising teacher, who works in the internship processes in the basic school, is to collaborate in the mediation, monitoring and exchange of knowledge regarding the training processes of undergraduates. In this performance, the supervising teacher strengthens his teaching praxis, contributing to the production of knowledge by future teachers and to the articulation between the school and the university.

We understand that supervisory action should be supported by an interinstitutional project, between school and higher education institution, which implies collaborative teaching work, processes of reflection and constant sharing with the other actors in this process, future teachers and guiding teachers. Therefore, the activity of the school supervisor needs to be supported by the work in partnership between the institutions and the respective actors involved.

As Aroeira (2018a) explains, in these interinstitutional projects, it is necessary to assume as a principle the reflection on teaching and dialogue between peers from the school and the training institution. These instances institutionalize the realization of internship projects in the Pedagogical Political Project (PPP), so that the teacher of the internship field school is not only receiving a "visitor to the school", but that he is working in partnership with the peers of the training institution in the training of the future professional teacher.

The contribution of the teacher from the field school to the initial teacher training is precisely due to the collaboration and partnerships carried out in the form of research and collective investigation, through the significant exchanges, in initial or continuing education. In this sense, the teacher is not only there to contribute to the training of his peers, but also to collaborate with his training in the sharing of knowledge.

In other words, the exchange of experiences lived in the school context, when shared in the collectivity, through critical reflection, expands possibilities of solutions to the problems experienced in school education. In this scenario, the challenge of those who assume the role of supervisor, in the context of the supervised curricular internship, is to be a critical reflective intellectual professional, who acts as a co-trainer of future teachers, collaborating for the construction of teaching knowledge in this formative process. This is because the supervisory action can cover learning that goes beyond the context of the classroom, so that significant and relevant pedagogical practices are developed for teachers and future teachers.

In these processes of collective training, the supervising teacher can promote a "[...] a particularly rich teaching and learning environment, scientifically and pedagogically developed, critically elaborated and, at the same time, specific and eclectic, but, above all, open, dialogical, flexible and available" (MESQUITA; FORMOSINHO; MACHADO, 2012, p. 72). We also emphasize that the principle of a supervisable action is based on the continuity of education, in a dialectical process, which highlights the complexity of these processes in the face of the "[...] total uncertainty, instability and consequent unpredictability of the future conditions of professional practice [...]" (SÁ- CHAVES, 2011, p. 92), which occur in different times and places in the school daily life. In this context, it is important to "[...] valuing joint actions, collective projects, capable of producing changes in school contexts [...]" (MESQUITA, FORMOSINHO, MACHADO, 2012, p. 72), both in higher institutions and in the field schools of supervised internships. In other words, we highlight

with Nóvoa (2012, p.13): "[...] the need for teachers to have a predominant place in the training of their colleagues, that is, the need for teacher training to be done from within the profession".

With this understanding, the school is assumed as an institution that constantly re-signifies its role, in the face of the demands imposed by society, as a space to work with knowledge, to oppose an individual perspective to a more collective one, to proceed with a reflexive mediation that is an investigative work that requires knowledge (PIMENTA, 2013). In summary, the school is a field of infinite teaching learning possibilities, it is the starting and ending point of the processes of supervised curricular internships, and therefore the professionals who work in it and their contribution to the training of future teachers cannot be disregarded.

SCENARIOS AND CONCEPTIONS PRESENTED BY INTERNSHIP SUPERVISOR TEACHERS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE TRAINING OF UNDERGRADUATES

In this section, we analyze scenarios related to the context of the training of licentiate students and conceptions presented by teachers who work or have worked as supervisors of interns in undergraduate courses in elementary schools. To this end, we conducted qualitative field research, with the application of a questionnaire and an online interview with teachers from the Municipal Education Network of the municipality of São Gabriel da Palha, in the state of Espírito Santo.

With these procedures, we opted for a methodology that could give voice to the participants, considering them "[...] as subjects-object of the research who experience a certain reality that is being focused" (MINAYO, 2001, p. 57). After the approval of the Research Protocol by the Human Research Ethics Committee, we made the questionnaire available online, with closed questions, to 156 teachers of the Municipal Education Network of the Elementary School stage, installed in the urban area of the city, through a Whatsapp application group, managed by the principal of each school, with the objective of identifying the participants and characterizing their profile.

The field study took place during the period of the national and global Covid-19 pandemic, during the year 2020, starting with the application of an online questionnaire, at which time we obtained the return of 44 teachers. These participants previously received

clarifications regarding the research and the Informed Consent Form (ICF). Of the total mentioned, 12 (twelve) teachers expressed their willingness to also participate in the second instrument of the research, which was the individual semi-structured online interview. To ensure that the identity of the teacher participants is preserved, in this article the term Supervisor Participant (SP) is used to mention these teachers. We resorted to the recommendations indicated by Bardin (1977) to carry out the content analysis of the testimonies, thematizing and categorizing the main aspects related to the objectives of this study, based on the theoretical framework assumed in this discussion.

In this sense, when we consider the different conceptions of supervised curricular internship, highlighted by the academic production, we initially seek to characterize the conceptions of the supervising professors regarding the internship and what role they evaluate to play in this context of teacher training. We noticed that, in general, the participants do not explore, in their speeches, the perspectives presented by Pimenta and Lima (2018), who conceive the Supervised Curricular Internship as a field of knowledge and approximation of practice. In addition, they do not address in their testimonies the conception of internship as research, a concept that has been gaining space in teacher training curricula.

In the participants' statements, we found the allusion to the conception of internship as "imitation of models", that is, the practice is focused to be the target of imitation in the teaching activity. In this type of conception, the teacher's role ends up being to mirror practices carried out in the classroom, with the intention of being reproduced by students in their professional activity. The supervising teacher (PS1) indicates an understanding from this perspective:

[...] He will copy a little, not in this copying, but molding himself with my practices. And he's going to follow his area. And, you will always remember: I learned from the teacher so-and-so, in the internship this. So he's going to adapt his practice to mine (PS1).

This report leads us to a type of reception for trainees, which Araújo (2014) called "Model Monitoring", in which the supervising teacher endowed with all the knowledge presents himself as a model to be followed by the trainee, who will only be deducing how it is done and will reproduce it later in his practice.

This conception of internship and professional training can lead future teachers not to value their intellectual training, tending to be based only on the performance of the model activity, which was observed in the internship, without resorting to theories to problematize, analyze and build new possibilities related to the situations experienced in their school context.

We also identified a group of contexts and challenges experienced by these professionals, which we categorized with the following themes: school indiscipline, the diversity of daily situations, insufficient time to supervise, the absence of training to perform the function of supervisor and, finally, the inconsistent articulation between the training institutions (the basic school and the higher education institution).

Indiscipline was a theme emphasized, recurrently, by the participating professors, being presented as a challenge for the intern, as it causes insecurity in the process of teaching. According to Júlio Groppa Aquino (1998), a researcher who has collaborated in the discussion on this theme in the educational field, school indiscipline refers to psychopedagogical disorders, which can be of a cognitive nature, interfering with learning, or even of a behavioral nature, which fits into a set of undisciplined actions, which occur in the classrooms, revealing the "[...] legitimate need for transformations within school relations and, in particular, in the teacher-student relationship" (AQUINO, 1998, p. 189).

It should be noted that indiscipline is a subject that directly involves the teacher-student relationship and interferes in the learning circumstances of both basic education students and trainees. Therefore, it should be permanently on the agendas of the collective discussions of the internships, considering that the attitudes of these students, interns and internship supervisors are transformed according to their sociocultural experiences. About this, the participant (PS3) pointed out that:

[...] if I received an intern now. I think [indiscipline] would be one of the issues I would address with him, [...] [because] when I started working as a teacher I thought I would have to be very strict, keep firm control of the class and for that, sometimes, I was even, like, acted very harshly, spoke loudly about imposition and over time we see that it is not much use for you to want to be this authoritarian, and keep track at all times [...] (PS3).

It is worth noting that, on indiscipline, generally, during initial training, the future teacher has access to reflections on this theme, in the pedagogical disciplines of the

course, especially in the context of discussions of the Didactics discipline. This area of knowledge of Pedagogy has as its object the teaching-learning process and bases the teaching activity by subsidizing it with didactic knowledge, which collaborates to think about its teaching praxis without surrendering to the dilemmas of the school reality. The internship processes make a constant dialogue with these issues, supported by the contributions of Didactics. Therefore, based on Aroeira (2018b), we understand the importance of the supervising teacher having a solid background in the pedagogical and didactic areas, so that their supervision processes are anchored by continuous teacher training actions.

As the participant reports: "[...] due to the students' indiscipline, I noticed that the trainees were insecure, discouraged, [...] afraid to pursue a career [teaching] due to everything they witnessed in the classroom" (PS1). Thus, the discomfort generated by the students' indiscipline also affects the supervising teachers, especially those who are at the beginning of their careers, as reported by the teacher (PS3): "in the experiences lived in the past, the students' indiscipline was more pronounced, because I had not yet [...] security at the beginning of the career".

We note that the inconsistent formation of knowledge to deal with indiscipline, as indicated by the research participants, implies an unfavorable scenario for both the student interns and the professors supervising internships. In this sense, we ask: how has the didactic-pedagogical training of our internship supervisors been constituted? This is an issue that cannot be ignored in the training processes produced by Higher Education institutions, which work with internships in undergraduate courses.

Another thematic unit indicated in the dialogue with the participants was that of insufficient time in the context of the internship, which, in relation to the difficulties, was presented in two ways: one referring to the workload of the internship, that is, to the intern's short stay in the classroom, and the other about the teacher's availability of time to accompany this intern.

[...] I think this time is too short for the intern (PS4).

The lack of time to provide interns with more hands-on moments (PS7).

Unfortunately, when there is the opportunity to follow the supervised internship, the student's time in the classroom is quite limited for effective monitoring and guidance (PS9).

[...] the lack of time, also, of how to plan this class so that this student/intern can understand why and how the planning is done (PS2).

[...] have time available to follow the planning [...] of the entire process (PS9).

We noticed in these reports that there are concerns on the part of the supervising teachers regarding the insufficiency of hours dedicated to the immersion of the student interns in the reality of the school and in the process of planning the activities, in relation to the supervised curricular internship. Dedicating time to these actions in internships is a necessary formative demand, because in these contexts future teachers will be able to problematize, analyze and build solutions in relation to the challenges of teaching, creating possibilities for their future professional activity.

In this regard, we recall what Nóvoa (2019) states, when he highlights the need for "a third place" within teacher training that allows the licentiate, or the newly graduated teacher and the teacher of Basic Education and Higher Education, together to experience, "building training processes directly articulated with pedagogy, reflection, research, writing and public action" (NÓVOA, 2019, p. 2003). The author refers to the third place as an institutionalized place, which connects the university and the education network, so that both institutions assume the training of teachers. In this space, teaching experiences will be promoted, reflected in the community through research on and in the school reality, linked to theory, understanding the "[...] research as a formative principle of teaching" (PIMENTA, 1999, p. 28).

When considering this perspective, it is important to highlight the observation of the research participants about the absence of formative processes formulated by Higher Education institutions, aimed at supervising professors. When we asked what guidance/training the supervising teachers have received, in the context of the Supervised Curricular Internship, the participating teachers indicated:

[...] I didn't receive anything. I only received a communication from the coordinator, pedagogue [...] (PS4).

Oh! Unfortunately, no type of training is offered to the teacher for the monitoring of the supervised internship and this monitoring ends up happening based only on daily educational practice, without us being able to have an instrument to record and monitor this internship (PS9).

[...] I am only informed by the director or pedagogue and that I will receive an intern [...] (PS10).

In this sense, we agree with Cyrino, Benites, Souza Neto (2015), when they indicate that the lack of concern with the training of the supervising teacher minimizes the participation of basic schools in the initial training process, as the improvement of this relationship can happen with a good articulation between the training institutions, being essential for teacher training.

This articulation can certainly collaborate for the production of knowledge by all those involved in the training processes, contributing directly to the strengthening of the theory and practice unity in the teaching degree courses.

However, it is worth noting that, when we asked the participants about the articulation between school and higher education institution in the supervised internship processes in which the supervising professor has participated, we identified that, in many cases, the intern himself does all the articulation and communication between the training institutions. Thus, there is no prior dialogue and the approximation is restricted to the execution of bureaucratic and administrative procedures:

[...] He doesn't have much contact with colleges. Except for a few sheets that we teachers will evaluate the interns, who have passed through us. So it's a fill of sheets that would be that. It's about some things related to the internship, the participation, the engagement of the intern, in short, these things (PS4).

[...] They [the interns] take all the documentation to the school [...] to receive these students [...] with three copies: one for the institution, one for him and one for the school. Because he has to file a copy of the Term of Acceptance at the school to participate. The internship sheets to sign. They take a whole process [...] (PS5).

I don't notice this articulation, the school is only communicated in advance of the interns' arrival, but I don't notice any exchange of communication or planning (PS7).

Other participating professors declared that there is articulation. However, it is limited to the school's management team. As an example, we quote the words of the PS3 participant: "[...] As a teacher, I don't follow this articulation [...] It is very restricted there to the field of direction, of the pedagogue, [...] I can't understand it [...]". This report draws our attention to the lack of communication between peers from the basic school (supervising teachers) and those from the higher education institution (guiding teachers).

We also found, according to the participant's testimonies (PS6), that there are limitations in the articulation between the training institutions and this lack of articulation occurs with both parties:

On both sides I see flaws. [...] Education in general has a great rupture there that needs to be [...] reviewed, [...] I believe that education needs to immediately review this situation [...] It needs a strong link between the institution and schools because I believe in all universities, colleges, but I believe that the undergraduate student needs to go to the field, he needs to go there to set foot in the school to know what a classroom is, what a student is day by day. Because otherwise unfortunately education will continue in this outdated situation that we are in [...] (PS6).

Regarding this occurrence, we understand with Arruda (2014) that the fragility of the articulation between the training institutions is materialized in the absence of the teacher from the field school in the decisions before or after the supervised curricular internship, making the teacher feel outside the context of training. Therefore, like Milanesi (2012) and Arruda (2014), we reaffirm the importance of seeking in the articulation between school and higher education institution the possibilities of effective interaction between advisors, supervisors and interns.

We know that this institutional articulation expands the learning necessary for the preparation of the professional and that the school and the university, when they establish a partnership, in these training processes, directly help to strengthen the theory and practice unity in teacher training courses.

In this context, we corroborate Cyrino (2012), when he criticizes that the basic school is indirectly responsible for the training of future teachers, restricting this action to the reception of interns, thus weakening the action of the supervising teacher. It is necessary that teachers are recognized as an integral part of the training process, with responsibilities assumed with teacher co-training (ARRUDA, 2014) and that this work becomes visible (FERREIRA, 2015) before the academy. In this way, these professors will fulfill their role in the process of initial teacher training, working collaboratively with peers at the Higher Education institution.

The reports of the participating teachers indicate that the articulation between the training institutions is still non-existent in the education network in which they work. This fragility causes the absence of collective discussion/reflections on factors that interfere in

the school day-to-day, such as, for example, indiscipline and lack of time to problematize everyday issues, in addition to the greater contribution to the co-training of future teachers, these last two limitations being the ones that directly interfere in the scenario of the internship supervising teacher.

Although indiscipline has been pointed out by the interviewees as a limitation that disfavors the context of the supervised curricular internship, we know that learning to deal with it is a teaching action that is part of the repertoire of teacher learning and that permanently challenges the initial or continuing training of teachers. From this perspective, we reiterate the importance of organizing training processes for teachers, who assume the role of co-trainers of future teachers, discussing the challenges of teaching in school education, as well as the alternatives for facing the dilemmas of the classroom.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

When we analyze the role and contribution of the teacher of the field school in the formative processes of students of undergraduate courses, we support the idea that the teacher of the field school is the one who accompanies, who collaborates for the formative processes of future teachers of Basic Education, who is in interaction with the intern and in partnership with the advisor teacher of the institution of Higher Education, sharing knowledge, knowledge and producing, in a collaborative way, new possibilities for teaching activity in school education.

In this discussion, we also assume the internship as the curricular axis of the formative processes of initial teacher training, which in our understanding contributes to the reflection on the teaching praxis of the future teacher and the supervising teacher, strengthening the unity between theory and practice in the teaching degree courses.

We consider that the role of the internship supervising teacher is to mediate the dialogue between the school reality and the initial teacher training and that it is still necessary to better identify the professionals involved in the act of carrying out the internships and to advance in the systematization of norms and forms of organization of the activity of this professional in school institutions.

In the course of the discussions assumed in this article, we found that not institutionally recognizing these teachers in the internship processes weakens the formative processes of the supervised curricular internship and the articulation between the school and the training institution. From this perspective, we consider that processes of continuous

training of these teachers expand the possibilities of professionalization of supervising teachers in favor of collective work.

We identified that the prevailing understanding of the internship as a moment of learning by imitation of models and the dichotomous understanding in relation to theory and practice prevails in the testimonies of the participating supervising professors, and the perspectives of internship with research and approximation with the professional reality in which the future professor will work are not explored by the participants.

In addition, we found that the contexts presented by the participants such as school indiscipline, the diversity of daily situations, insufficient time to supervise, the absence of training to perform the function of supervisor and the inconsistent articulation between the training institutions are scenarios in the supervision of internships that do not differ from one degree to another. That is, regardless of the degree you are studying, the challenges in the internship contexts are similar. Therefore, these are themes to be discussed in the training processes of future teachers, in the teaching courses and in the continuous training of teachers involved with the internships.

We understand that supervisory action requires theoretical-practical training and should be supported by an interinstitutional project, between school and higher education institution, which implies collaborative teaching work, processes of reflection and constant sharing with the other actors in this process, future teachers and advisors, as well as being anchored by the work in partnership between the institutions involved.

That said, we corroborate the importance of undertaking policies and initiatives that invest in actions and processes that involve teaching, research and extension aimed at the professional development of these professors in university and interinstitutional training actions.

REFERENCES

1. Aquino, J. G. (1998). Indisciplina e a escola atual. *Revista da Faculdade de Educação*, 24(2), 191–204.
2. Araújo, S. R. P. M. de. (2014). *Acolhimento no estágio: Entre modelos e possibilidades de formação docente* [Dissertação de mestrado, Universidade Estadual Paulista].
3. Aroeira, K. P. (2018a). Possibilidades na formação de futuros professores e a organização dos estágios em cursos de licenciatura. In *Anais do XIX ENDIPE*. Universidade Federal da Bahia.
4. Aroeira, K. P. (2018b). Didática e estágios nas licenciaturas: Uma articulação necessária na produção das práticas pedagógicas. In K. P. Aroeira & S. G. Pimenta (Eds.), *Didática e estágio* (pp. 17–36). Appris.
5. Arruda, T. O. de. (2014). *Estágio curricular supervisionado: O papel do professor responsável pela Educação Básica na formação inicial em Educação Física* [Dissertação de mestrado, Universidade Federal de Pelotas].
6. Bardin, L. (1977). *Análise de conteúdo*. Edições 70.
7. Benites, L. C. (2012). *O professor-colaborador no Estágio Curricular Supervisionado em educação física: Perfil, papel e potencialidades* [Tese de doutorado, Universidade Estadual Paulista].
8. Benites, L. C., Sarti, F. M., & Souza Neto, S. de. (2015). Dos mestres de ensino aos formadores de campo no estágio supervisionado. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 45(155), 162–181.
9. Brasil. (2008). *Lei nº 11.788, de 25 de setembro de 2008*. http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2008/lei/l11788.htm
10. Cyrino, M. (2012). *Formação inicial de professores: O compromisso do professor-colaborador e da instituição escolar no processo de estágio supervisionado* [Dissertação de mestrado, Universidade Estadual Paulista].
11. Cyrino, M., Benites, L. C., & Souza Neto, S. de. (2015). Formação inicial em pedagogia: Professores colaboradores no estágio supervisionado. *Educação Unisinos*, 19(2), 159–167.
12. Daniel, L. A. (2009). *O professor regente, o professor orientador e os estágios supervisionados na formação inicial de futuros professores de Letras* [Dissertação de mestrado, Universidade Metodista de Piracicaba].
13. Ferreira, C. C. (2015). *O trabalho (in)visível do professor de ensino fundamental no estágio supervisionado de espanhol: Interfaces entre estudos discursivos e do trabalho* [Tese de doutorado, Universidade Federal Fluminense].

14. Lima, M. S. L., & Aroeira, K. P. (2011). O estágio curricular em colaboração, a reflexão e o registro reflexivo dos estagiários: Um diálogo entre a universidade e a escola. In M. de O. Gomes (Ed.), **Estágios na formação docente: Possibilidades formativas entre ensino, pesquisa e extensão** (pp. 87–108). Edições Loyola.
15. Mesquita, E., Formosinho, J., & Machado, J. (2012). Supervisão da prática pedagógica e colegialidade docente: A perspectiva dos candidatos a professores. **Revista Portuguesa de Investigação Educacional**, 12, 67–84.
16. Milanesi, I. (2012). Estágio supervisionado: Concepções e práticas em ambientes escolares. **Educar em Revista**, (46), 189–204.
17. Minayo, M. C. de S. (Ed.). (2001). **Pesquisa social: Teoria, método e criatividade**. Vozes.
18. Nóvoa, A. (2012). Devolver a formação de professores aos professores. **Cadernos de Pesquisa em Educação – PPGE/UFES**, 18(35), 11–22.
19. Nóvoa, A. (2019). Entre a formação e a profissão: Ensaio sobre o modo como nos tornamos professores. **Currículo sem Fronteiras**, 19(1), 1–15.
20. Pimenta, S. G. (1999). Formação de professores: Identidade e saberes da docência. In S. G. Pimenta (Ed.), **Saberes pedagógicos e atividade docente** (pp. 15–34). Cortez.
21. Pimenta, S. G. (2012). **O estágio na formação de professores: Unidade teoria e prática?**. Cortez.
22. Pimenta, S. G. (2013). Políticas públicas, diretrizes e necessidades da educação básica e formação docente. In J. C. Libâneo, M. V. R. Suanno, & S. V. Limonta (Eds.), **Qualidade das escolas públicas: Políticas, didática e formação de professores** (pp. 45–68). CEPED Publicações.
23. Pimenta, S. G., & Lima, M. S. L. (2006). Estágio e docência: Diferentes concepções. **Revista Poiésis**, 3(4), 5–24.
24. Pimenta, S. G., & Lima, M. S. L. (2018). **Estágio e docência**. Cortez.
25. Sá-Chaves, I. da S. C. (2011). **Formação, saberes e supervisão: Contribuições nas áreas de formação de professores e outros profissionais**. UA Editorial..