Groups of interlocution as a technique of productionand sistematization on Education research

Grupos de interlocução como técnica de produção e sistematização na pesquisa em educação

Liliana Soares Ferreira[a], Bruna Pereira Alves Fiorin[b], Cláudia Letícia de Castro do Amaral[c], Mariglei Severo Maraschin[d], Liliana Soares Ferreira[e]

[a] PhD, professor, Santa Maria (UFSM), Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Santa Maria, RS - Brazil, e-mail: anaililferreira@yahoo.com.br

[b] MSc, Universidade Federal de Santa Maria (UFSM), Santa Maria, RS - Brazil, e-mail: brualves_22@yahoo.com.br

[c] PhD candidate, Universidade Federal de Santa Maria (UFSM), Santa Maria, RS - Brasil, e-mail: doamaral.claudia@hotmail.com

[d] PhD candidate, Universidade Federal de Santa Maria (UFSM), Santa Maria, RS - Brasil, e-mail: marigleism@hotmail.com

Abstract

This article discusses research on education nowadays, based on a critical perspective of reality, considering the use of interlocution groups as a suitable technique to that. In educational field, researches becomes formal, a pedagogical action; whose aims reveal the institution and researcher's intention. The interlocution group is presented as an interaction moment between the researcher and the researched individuals in order

to socialize the results of the study and to discuss about those data and about issues that need clarification. Through language, each research individual presents his/her conceptions, influenced by his/her experiences, but since this moment of dialogue and interaction, they will be able to socialize and discuss the theme with individuals which possibly have something in common with the rest of the group due to their proximity with the developing research. It considers that groups of interlocution are more than data collection, presentation or quantification; it is a moment of problematization about the research.

Keywords*: Groups of interlocution. Research. Education. Language.

Resumo

Este artigo discute a pesquisa em educação na atualidade, considerando o viés da perspectiva crítica de apreensão do real, e a utilização de grupos de interlocução como técnica apropriada a ela. Inclusa no campo educacional, a pesquisa formaliza-se, passa a ser uma ação pedagógica cujos objetivos revelam a intencionalidade da instituição e do pesquisador. O grupo de interlocução é apresentado como um momento de interação entre pesquisador e sujeitos da pesquisa a fim de socializar os resultados do estudo e discutir sobre estes dados e sobre questões que ainda necessitam ser ampliadas. Através da linguagem, cada um dos sujeitos da pesquisa apresenta suas concepções, influenciados por suas experiências, mas, a partir deste momento de diálogo e interação, terão a possibilidade de socializar e problematizar o tema pesquisado com sujeitos que, possivelmente, tem algo comum entre si devido a sua proximidade com a pesquisa desenvolvida. Considera-se que o grupo de interlocução é mais do que uma coleta, apresentação ou quantificação de dados, é um momento de problematização conjunta acerca da pesquisa.

Palavras-chave*: Grupo de interlocução. Pesquisa. Educação. Linguagem.*

Introduction

Research on education has been understood as important not only in the sense of elaborating understandings about Education, but as an effective production of a work that can constitute necessary changes in schools and in their pedagogical projects. In order to do this, alternatives have been searched for turning the educational research more effective. Thus, this article, based on a dialectical approach of real comprehension, and from a bibliographical research, interlocution groups are presented as a technique of production and systematization for educational research.

Thus, the study comes from the presupposition that searching is a way of producing knowledge and can constitute on basis for planning and carrying out pedagogical work, the class, and consequently, producing school and education. In this process, the interlocution groups are time and space for knowledge production in groups, still during the research process.

It is also understood that is necessary to think how data have been produced by researchers. In recent article, Brazilian professor, Flávia Werle, makes a study analyzing the possibilities of processing an interlocution, in Education field, with the sense of dialogue, share and reciprocity between the post-graduation and the fundamental school:

> […] interlocution is necessary to give support to research and teaching, for a reflexive project of development and of professional identity, for the development of the national system of education for qualification from fundamental school to graduation. My point is that *interlocution* is a key element in the Brazilian education that is not restricted to graduation on education. University, in all its areas, is in position of interlocution with fundamental education and with society. An interlocution that needs to be varied, strong, because it is the whole of the university that education is made, and it is in this multiple dimension that interlocution with fundamental education is to be built (WERLE, 2012, p. 433)

The experience as teachers and advisors of researches revealed as easily the procedures of data production are organized and as hardly

those data are analyzed, mainly if the analyses happens based on a methodological and theoretical proposal coherent and deeply described by the researchers. We start from the understanding that scientific work as a simultaneous possibility for humanization of nature and of human beings and that the transformation on them are result from work (VIEIRA PINTO, 1979).

It is in this context that groups of interlocution are defended as a way, at the same time, producing and analyzing data produced in the research, thus, as a suitable technique for dialectical apprehension of reality. For elaborating this text, points based on the research experience and on books about the theme were systematized. The writing is presented in three argumentative sequences: understandings about research on education, comprehension of groups of interlocution with their interface with dialectical research, followed by a description of groups of interlocution and of a technical analysis of this technique as a possibility of deepening the process of analysis and systematization on education research.

Understandings about research on education

Research is understood as: a) more than only application of a methodology for finding answers for a problematization and is more than a school practice; b) a production work and data analysis based on a problematization made by the researcher. Related to the first possibility, it is a social contribution, being necessary to understand it for producing what has been understood as pedagogical management (FERREIRA, 2008, 2010), the effective teachers' work that is the class production and, in this one, the knowledge production on political contexts that influence and are influenced by this work. Considered dialectically, it not only constitutes the teachers' work, but also research is an attitude inherent to human beings. It is possible to state that, from their elementary actions, human beings dedicate themselves to

investigate, to understand how the social relations are organized and the world itself. Thus, searching is a way of human beings to get into the real, understanding it, interfering and connecting themselves to it and, particularly, it is a way of teachers make their pedagogical work.

Included into educational field, the research becomes formal, it starts to be a pedagogical action whose aims reveal the institution and researcher intentionality. It creates the researcher status for the people involved in the knowledge production in the way that they act from a planning and achieve the results that they expect. In this process of methodical search for results, relations that demand analysis, interpretation, systematization, demand constant research.

The great problem on thinking the research on Education, mainly to the undergraduation level, is the fact that it is a different procedure from the classical process of teaching and learning. Historically, education is characterized for being traditional: a teacher teaches, a student learns. This characterization is so rooted in the pedagogical procedures that are not questioned, since the teaching really works, since the values and culture were transmitted to the learner. However, researches and studies on the pedagogical have shown that teaching and learning are not antagonistic processes. The opposite, it is a social relation dialectically organized. This perspective change demands pedagogical changes. The teacher's teaching and the students 'learning are not enough in a world whose major facility is accessing information and the major difficulty is establishing relations, producing knowledge. Obviously, we are not stating that the educational practices should be reduced to proposals as "learn how to learn". This kind of proposal seems to ignore the necessary reflection and the transforming intervention of the social, the main objective of any pedagogical work. It is important to say that there is not how to think education disconnected to reality, as a way of action, as a necessary social change. Apparently, "learn how to learn" would be a proposition whose major objective is transforming the student into a researcher beyond the school time, necessarily without constituting himself/herself as a citizen ready to act and reflect from his/her environment and with his/her pairs.

Related to the second research understanding, which research is a knowledge production form a problematization, it results two other understandings: a) this kind of research seems to be only action whom is making academic studies and, thus, it seems only to happen in the universities in general; b) such research, on the opposite, is a way of the people keep themselves as permanent inquirers from their realities, contributing to their rewriting, from their findings.

About item a, it was observed a constant association between making research and being on a graduation or on an undergraduation course, in a way that research is seen, not rarely, as a boring academic task. From this comprehension, it seems to damage the creative aspect of research: being a human activity that humanize, an effective work of human beings that is always eager of knowing the world around themselves. About item b, it is intended an understanding of research as a daily activity, from the permanent asking about the pedagogical events in the school to the directions given to the interests of studies about themes that acclaim people to think about their reality. The understanding a does not invalidate the understanding b. Nevertheless, it seems that the first one blocks the possibility of more influent educational research initiatives in the school routines.

Thinking about research on education, it is important to emphasize that language is doubled relevant: in the knowledge intermediation and in the direct relation with the psychological development of human beings. A language thought in its interactive features, from which people can observe the reality, reflect and render it problematic, organizing the way that they will search answers for their problematizations and, mainly, analyzing and systematizing the found answers. In this sense, school should be considered a linguistic environment in which people produce knowledge with their culture, their history, their learning. In order to produce knowledge, it is important the pedagogical work of teachers, aiming at the people valorization, considering that they are structured from their desires and emotions.

It is on this perspective that research has been thought, as elaboration, not only of interactive spaces for knowledge production, but possibility of generating in people, and among them, in the teachers, the concern on producing knowledge, in a way that they dedicate themselves to the pedagogical work. An work like this implies a contemporary conception of science. In this conception, there is a denial of a cartesian method, avoiding the break between the subject and object, nature and human being, and real world is incorporated to the scientific world, in a way that the common sense is also considered a knowledge level, once that reflection exists. Knowledge starts to be organized collectively, way in which a school that aims people emancipation should be organized.

When they see themselves as researchers, people orient their own process of knowledge production. Of course, it is not a simple effort. On the opposite, it implies the reelaboration of presuppositions that have oriented the research. Another way is thinking the research as investigation. Gamboa (2007, p. 25) states that "Investigation comes from the latin verb *vestígio*, that means "to follow clues". Investigation implies a search of something from traces". The author points out that the investigation constitutes a methodical process in which the way to achieve the object, the kind of process to arrive on it, the method or the way is given by the kind of object.

> Every investigation supposes a theoretical body and this one must have a method that were suitable for itself; but, the important relation in the process of elaborating knowledge is changed by the mystification of methods that are not linked to the theoretical context; mainly, when these ones are indistinctly used, only to follow a trend, and the theory is reduced to a definitions body, to a simple reference or to a superficial bibliographical review (GAMBOA, 2007, p. 39).

We do not understand "investigation" as a synonym for "research", attributing to this word a major scope of sense than that one. In the same manner, it renders problematic the restriction of methods

and their detachment to theoretical contexts, mainly when it is restricted to researches of bibliographical review with little depth.

> The investigation practice has the features of the human work, but in the conditions of only achieving a mere academic requirement for the acquisition of a title or achieving a university degree, this dimension is lost and is reduced to a "protocol" that tends to be repeated in other researches of academic glance [...] (GAMBOA, 2007, p. 42).

In this context, research "losses the capacity as a tool of knowing the problematic reality in its transforming dimension, as every creative work should be" (GAMBOA, 2007, p. 42). It is what is aimed in this article, the relevance of research on education not only as a mere requirement for obtaining a title or a simple practice of non-critical review, but as an activity that aims at knowing the educational field and, in the specific case of teachers, it is a method of making their work.

The critical methodology on education research

When we search, it is important to be sure about the theoretical and methodological procedures that orient the process. The methodology presents a perspective (dialectical, hermeneutics, etc), an approach (qualitative, quantitative), a procedure and techniques of collecting and analyzing data; dimensions that must be perfect and coherently articulated to the research.

In any sense, the method must never be understood as a formatting of research and of the researcher's action, but as an previous orientation, attentive to the aspects that characterize the choices made when the research is conceived. Particularly on education, some aspects are especially propitious. As example, the privilege of qualitative research, what does not implies exclusion or demonization (as some want) of quantitative research.

Concerned on protecting the materialist sense of the Marx dialectics, Friederich Engels (2000) analyzed the principles of what he denominated the "dialectics of nature", in a book of same name, and systematized the method of his partner Marx, setting three general rules of dialectics. Such laws, in fact, were already in the book *Science of Logic*, by the idealist Hegel. These are the rules: 1) transformation of quantity into quality and vice-versa; 2) interpenetration of opposites and 3) negation of negation.

Discussing these laws, Brazilian professor José Lourenço Cidra (1998) explains that the first one expresses the fact that the sequential quantitative variations got a point of breaking the process, in which new stages appear or qualities. In the knowledge theory, the law of transformation of quantity into quality excludes, by principle, any positivist hypothesis.

So, considering the historical materialism, it is not considered the quantitative-qualitative aspect as a dichotomy. Triviños (2008) explains that, for the marxists, there is a indispensable relation between the quantitative and qualitative transformation, understanding, thus, that every research can be quantitative and qualitative at the same time. The understanding of "qualitative", therefore, is based on Minayo for whom "the object of Social Science is essentially qualitative" (1994, p.15), because it is related to human elaborations and interactions, historically produced.

There is no doubt that the theoretical-methodological horizons chosen for understanding specific phenomena must be suitable with their complexity, making possible to see what it does not reveals under certain "lens". Frigotto (1998, p. 26) emphasizes that "a fundamental conjecture when a theoretical debate is proposed must be that the theoretical choices are not justify by themselves". In fact, they are varied choices being composed and, thus, constituting the methodology.

Method, by the way, methods are the selected aspects by the researcher in relation to his/her conception of science, themes and, mainly, to the phenomenon problematization. There are not the best or the worst, there are suitable and those that are not. The researchers

need to know to understand which are suitable to their intentions or theoretical support. Because of this,

> Each method is a language and the reality answers in the language in which it is questioned. Only one verification of method can capture the silence that persists on each language which asks. In a phase of scientific revolution, as we live in, this plurality of methods is only possible above methodological transgression. Being right that each method only clarifies what is convenient and when clarifies make it without surprises, the scientific innovation consists on inventing persuasive contexts that conduct to the use of methods out of their natural habitat. (SANTOS, 2006, p. 48)

Based on that, it was chosen the scientific perspective of the historic materialism because of its relation with the history flow. The dialectics is the philosophical basis of marxism, which is not restricted to a specific field of knowledge. Its central feature is to apprehend reality in a comprehensive way, under the totality glance. Kuenzer (1998) explains that the totality category

> implies the conception of reality as a whole in dynamic process of structuring and auto-creating, in which the facts can be rationally comprehended from the place they occupy in the totality of the real itself and of the relations that set with other facts in the whole (p. 64).

According to this perspective, the study objects are necessarily considered on development, mutation, being related to other phenomena, being understood as "synthesis of multiple determinations" (MARX, 1983). Based on historical materialism, no phenomenon is isolated, on opposite, it is inserted in a net of contexts progressively more comprehensive and complex.

The dialectics emphasizes the categories of temporality (time) and historicity (origin, evolution, transformation) to understand phenomena. In this sense, it is necessary that the different stages of

evolution were articulated, in a way that the most developed were the explanation for the least developed and vice-versa (TRIVIÑOS, 2008).

Kuenzer (2012) points out that besides contradiction and totality, praxis and mediation are fundamental methodological categories for researches bases on historical materialism. To the author (2012), they must give support to the research showing that the new knowledge will be produced through permanent and always increasing movement of thinking that goes from the abstract to the concrete by the mediation of the empiric, in other words, through the effective movement of theory to practice and from this to theory, in the search of overcoming the phenomenal and apparent dimension, searching it in its concrete.

Many are the possible techniques for data attainment on the qualitative research: questionnaires, interviews, documental research, observation, and others. However, in the given context, it was perceived the necessity a technique inherently dialectical that implies interaction, dialogue between theory and practice. Based on this, this article proposes interlocution groups as a research technique, understanding that they would be suitable to research on education nowadays, mainly such one that considers historical materialism as a theoretical and methodological horizon. It is because, according to Werle (2012), interlocution is always historically situated.

Interlocution groups and the research on education

The Kairos Group, in the Federal University of Santa Maria context, researches about the Work, Education and Public Policies, on a marxist perspective of reality apprehension. The Group was created in 2008 and, since this year, its integrants are doing studies on a critical perspective that resulted on an important number of articles, monographies and dissertations. The experience with these scientific production and their interlocution with advisors revealed to their authors the necessity of a serious study of the collected data by interviews (technique prioritize by the Group until now), in order to really constitute

them dialectically. It is in this context that we are discussing the technique of group of interlocution as a viable and coherent possibility for the dialectical research on education.

The technique was already used by some integrants from the Group on their researches as on the master thesis by Fiorin (2012), presented here. We believe that this tool is a pedagogical moment that makes possible dialogue and sharing (WERLE, 2012). Depending on the position, pressures, time and objectives, the demands of interlocution are different. Considering specifically the meaning of interlocution word, it was based on Werle to consider that

> Interlocution implies conversation between two or more people, two or more institutions, two or more groups. This "two or more" contains the diverse and the multiple. This "two or more" can become much more, with which a variety of interests, intensities and directions of interlocution are crossed, with this the condition of listening and dialoguing with the interlocutors are altered (2012, p. 424).

This group is understood as "an interaction moment between researcher and the research subjects in order to socialize the study results and to discuss about these data and about questions that still needs to be extended" (FIORIN, 2012, p. 10). Ferreira (2006) presents the interlocution group as

> [...] a way of re-dimensioning differently the research, extracting from it the appearance of being a mere way of making use of the interlocutor discourse and with the research to take benefit, without contributing and without socializing the results. Besides this, it is a way of the research able to make it an activity that unify the involved subjects, having language as an environment of collective production of senses and of the continuous redimensioning of action, aiming at finding the answers for the problem (FERREIRA, 2006, p. 38).

The interlocution group is a complement for the research, not being the only technique for data collection. Before the group, it can be

done: interviews, questionnaires, observations, or other kind of data collection involving the research subjects.

Respected the peculiarities of each research, the interlocution group must be organized taking into account some basic steps, such as:

1) exposition of the group of interlocution groups to the research subjects;
2) presentation of slides with the research results and with the initial data collection;
3) discussion about the research results;
4) presentation of questions that appear after analyzing data by the researcher;
5) discussion about new questions presented looking for amplifying the research and supplying some lacks that could be in relation to the initial data collection;
6) giving opportunity to a space in which the subjects exposes their doubts about the theme or about the research;
7) Clarifying and systematization (FIORIN, 2012).

We believe that from this organization the group of interlocution can collaborate to the research that is been made, being a moment of presentation, discussion, problematization and systematization.

From this technique, it is possible, for example, "[...] to soften one of the critics generally made to the research that involve people: lack of answers or return in relation to research participation" (FIORIN, 2012, p. 10).

> The resistance for participating of researches by teachers, pedagogues or other researchers is more and more evident. Besides the little available time, the subjects point out that they do not have return about their participation in the researches. What has happened with the information given by them? How were data analyzed? How have thought the others that got also engaged to the research? Those ones are only some questions made problematic by people who were available to participate to a research (FIORIN, 2012, p. 10).

Based on this context, it is possible to see that "the group of interlocution becomes a tool of collection and discussion of data, giving opportunity to the participants of the study to interact with the results and to render problematic questions presented by the researcher and by themselves about the research theme" (FIORIN, 2012, p. 10).

It is referred to interlocution, based on the sense that Marques (1995, 1996) has attributed to: the language practice is always interaction, it presupposes that the subjects were involved in a dialogical situation, in a relation you-me: "Interlocution is not a simple amalgam of previous knowledge, a passage from one to the others; but it is learning against the previous learned, negation of what has already been known in the constitution of the new knowledge, of other knowledge" (MARQUES, 1996, p. 14). This comprehension makes to return to a discussion about language presented by Gramsci (1995).

> If it is true that every language contains the elements of a conception of world and culture, it will be similarly true that, from language of each one, it is possible to judge the major or the least complexity of the conception of world. By conception of world itself, we always belong to a specific group, precisely to that one with all social elements that share the same way of thinking and acting. We are conformist from such conformism; we are always men-mass or collective men. [...] Criticizing the conception of world itself, thus, means turn it unique and coherent and to take it to point achieved by the world thought most developed (GRAMSCI, 1995, p. 13).

In this way, it is possible to affirm that, through language, each research subject will present their conceptions, influenced by their experiences, but, from this moment of dialogue and interaction, they will have the possibility to socialize and to render problematic the theme searched with subjects that, possibly, have something in common among them due to their proximity with the develop research.

Complementing the discussion presented by Gramsci (1995), Gadamer (2004), rendering problematic language and world, affirms that

> Language is not only one among many endowments attributed to human beings that are in the world, but it is useful as an absolute basis for men to have world, in which world is represented. For human beings, the world is as world in as way that is not for any other living being that is in the world. But this being-there of the world is constituted by language. [...] Not only the world is world when it comes to language, as the language itself only has its true existence in the fact that in it world is represented. The primitive humanity means, thus, at the same time, the primitive aspect of language of being-in-the-world of human being. We need to follow this relation between language and world, for achieving a suitable horizon for the aspect of language in the hermeneutical experience (GADAMER, 2004, p. 571-572).

Here world cannot be understood as environment, because, in the hermeneutics, only human beings have the world, because only human beings have language. "[...] The world is a common base that everybody recognizes, that unify everybody who communicates in the world" (PALMER, 1999, p. 208). For the author, this world is among people and turns the comprehension that people share, is the place where this comprehension happens and all of this is made possible through language, not understood as tool, but as interaction field (PALMER, 1999).

Recovering the explanation about the choice of the expression "group of interlocution", being already understood its relation with language, it can point out that there is other tool used in the qualitative research, the group of discussion. However, beyond being group of discussion, it is thought that groups of interlocution are constituted by people that influence each other, socializing their experiences from language. This is the reason through which it was chosen the expression "group of interlocution" to denominate the group of people involved in the research.

Based on the presented context, it is considered that group of interlocution is more than data collection, presentation or data quantification; it is a moment of problematization and socialization about the research.

Still with the argument to legitimize the technique, it is important to remember Gatti (2005) for whom the act of searching is turned impossible as a lonely act, not only for beginners as for experts.

> The researcher does not work by himself/herself, nor produces by himself/herself. The intercommunication with pairs, the team play, the nets of changes of ideas and dissemination of proposals and findings of investigation, the groups of thematic reference; constitute an essential condition to the accomplishment of scientific investigations and to the knowledge advance. For the expert researchers, this permanent dialogue with groups of thematic reference becomes fundamental to the critical advance and judicious in theorizations, methodologies and inferences. For the beginner researchers, it is fundamental for their formation, because it is not possible to learn how to search, to develop investigator abilities only reading manuals. This learning is processed by interlocutions, interfaces, important participation in groups of research, in nets that are created in living and companionship (GATTI, 2005, p. 124)

In this article, Groups of Interlocution have been presented as a technique of qualitative research, coherent with the historical materialism, which makes possible to deepen the processes of obtainment, analysis, and systematization of data in the research on Education and also to accentuate the social aspect of the research.

Final considerations

In this work, it was discussed the research on Education as a way of elaborating not only interactive spaces for knowledge production, but of a way of creating in the teachers the concern about building their own knowledge, in a way in which they dedicate themselves to teaching.

Besides this, it was introduced the group of interlocution making explicit the reasons for its use as well as for its denomination:

more than a group of discussion, they are constituted as group of interlocution in which participants influence each other, socializing their experiences from language.

Based on a dialectical view of reality, it was presented what group of interlocution is how to make it and what is its relevance, making evident that this group is understood as a moment of interaction between the researcher and the research subjects in order to socialize the study results and to discuss about these data and about questions that need to be widen (FIORIN, 2012). It is more than collection, presentation or quantification of data; it is a moment of cooperative problematization about the research.

In this way, we believe that from scientific works based on the historical materialism, the use of groups of interlocution is an important moment to give meaning to research on Education collaborating for a dialogical and sharing space as well as for the transformation and humanization of the participants. Moreover, it is important for the reflexive awareness,

> Through work human beings transform the objects that are not operated by hand and turn them into resources for action on nature. Thus, it is not the only presence and apprehension of things that turn them the start point of an aware representation, but the manipulation and fabrication of things to use as a way of action relatively to the others. Only after this it starts the process of nature transformation by human beings, that which is the work properly. But at the same time, it starts the humanization, through the formation of reflexive awareness, able to apprehend the reality of the world as abstract ideas (VIEIRA PINTO, 1979, p. 341).

It is in this context that group of interlocution must be defended as a research technique, looking for an interlocution not only among the research subjects or between those ones and the researcher, but mainly, between the research results and Education, and between this and the society in general.

References

CINDRA, J. L. A Física e as Leis da Dialética. *Revista Brasileira de Ensino de Física*, v. 20, n. 2, jun. 1998.

ENGELS, F. *A dialética da Natureza*. 6. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2000.

ENGELS, F. *Ciência da Lógica*: excertos. Trad. Marco Aurélio Werle. São Paulo: Editora Barcarolla, 2011.

FERREIRA, L. S. *Trabalho, profissionalidade e escola no discurso das professoras dos anos iniciais do ensino fundamental*. 2006. 293 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) –– Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2006.

FERREIRA, L. S. Gestão do Pedagógico: de qual pedagógico se fala? *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, v. 8, n. 2, p. 176-189, jul./dez. 2008.

FERREIRA, L. S. Pedagogia como ciência da educação: retomando uma discussão necessária. *Revista Brasileira Estudos Pedagógicos*, v. 91, n. 227, p. 233-251, jan./abr. 2010.

FIORIN, B. P. A. *Trabalho e pedagogia: considerações a partir dos discursos de pedagogas na escola*. 2012. 100 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) –– Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Santa Maria, 2012.

FRIGOTTO, G. Educação, crise do trabalho assalariado e do desenvolvimento: teorias em conflito. In: FRIGOTTO, G. *Educação e crise do trabalho*: perspectivas do final do século. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998.

GADAMER, H-G. *Verdade e Método II*. Complementos e índice. 2. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2004.

GAMBOA, S. S. *Pesquisa em educação*: métodos e epistemologias. Chapecó: Argos, 2007.

GATTI, B. A. Formação de grupos e redes de intercâmbio em pesquisa educacional: dialogia e qualidade. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, n. 30, p. 124-181, set./dez. 2005.

GRAMSCI, A. *Concepção dialética da história***.** Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1995.

KUENZER, A. Desafios teórico metodológicos da relação trabalho-educação e o papel social da escola. In: Frigotto, G. (Org.). *Educação e crise do trabalho*: perspectivas de final de século. 11. ed. Petropolis: Vozes, 2012. p. 55-75.

MARQUES, M. O**.** *Educação/interlocução, aprendizagem/reconstrução de saberes***.** Ijuí: Editora Unijuí, 1996.

MARX, Karl. *Teorias da mais-valia*. São Paulo: DIFEL, 1983.

MINAYO, M. C. (Org**.).** *Pesquisa social*: teoria, método e criatividade. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1994.

PALMER, R. E. *Hermenêutica*. Trad. Maria L. R. Ferreira. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1999.

SANTOS, B. S. *Um discurso sobre as ciências*. 4. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2006.

TRIVIÑOS, A. *Introdução à pesquisa em ciências sociais*: a pesquisa qualitativa em educação. São Paulo: Atlas, 2008.

VIEIRA PINTO, A. *Ciência e existência*: problemas filosóficos da pesquisa científica. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1979.

WERLE, F. Pós-Graduação e suas interlocuções com a Educação Básica. *Educação*, v. 35, n. 3. p. 424-433, set./dez. 2012.