

Dossier: TEACHER EDUCATION AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE - TIMES, TENSIONS AND INVENTIONS

TEACHING PRACTICE IN HISTORY IN TIMES OF PANDEMIC: PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS

NADIA GAIOFATTO GONÇALVES¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9375-8659>

ANA CLÁUDIA URBAN²

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9957-8838>

ABSTRACT: The objective of this article is to reflect on the teaching of history based on the experience with students of the Undergraduate course in History/UFPR during the development of the subject Teaching Practice in the academic year of 2020. As part of the activities of that subject was the monitoring of remote classes offered by the State Secretary of Education of Paraná (SEED-PR) and the systematization of records through a field diary. For the reflections of this article, we will address the observations made by the undergraduate students themselves about remote classes focused on the Final Years of Elementary and Secondary Education. Based on this material, here taken as a source, we intend to discuss the undergraduates' perceptions about the teaching-learning relationship, considering the methodological debate present in the monitored classes. As a result, we point out the presence of the dilemma quantity x quality (deepening, problematization) of content; the way of mediating academic knowledge and school historical knowledge and the mnemonic characteristic of the activities proposed in the remote classes, in detriment of problematizations that consider the students' argumentation when relating to historical knowledge. For the analysis of these questions, we use as reference the contributions of Pierre Bourdieu, especially the concepts of *habitus* and field, those of the field of History Education with Jörn Rüsen, to reflect about the formation of historical consciousness and those of Ana Zavala, to think about the teaching practice and the meaning of these observations in the initial formation of History teachers.

Keywords: teacher training, history teaching, teaching practice.

PRÁTICA DE DOCÊNCIA EM HISTÓRIA EM TEMPOS DE PANDEMIA: PERCEPÇÕES DE LICENCIANDOS/AS

RESUMO: O objetivo deste artigo é refletirmos sobre o ensino de História a partir da experiência realizada junto a estudantes do curso de Graduação em História/UFPR durante o desenvolvimento da disciplina Prática de Docência no ano letivo de 2020. Como parte das atividades da referida disciplina estava o acompanhamento de aulas remotas ofertadas pela Secretaria de Estado da Educação do Paraná (SEED-PR) e a sistematização de registros por meio do diário de campo. Para as reflexões deste artigo abordaremos as observações feitas pelos/as próprios/as licenciandos/as acerca de aulas remotas voltadas para os Anos Finais do Ensino Fundamental e para o Ensino Médio. A partir desse material, aqui

¹ Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice of Teaching - Education Sector – UFPR. Curitiba, PR, Brasil. nadiagg@ufpr.br

² Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice of Teaching - Education Sector – UFPR. Curitiba, PR, Brasil. claudiaurban@uol.com.br

assumido como fonte, pretendemos discutir as percepções dos/as licenciados/as sobre a relação ensino aprendizagem, considerando o debate metodológico presente nas aulas acompanhadas. Como resultado apontamos a presença do dilema quantidade x qualidade (aprofundamento, problematização) de conteúdo; a forma de mediar o conhecimento acadêmico e o conhecimento histórico escolar e a característica mnemônica das atividades propostas nas aulas remotas, em detrimento de problematizações que consideram a argumentação dos alunos ao se relacionarem com o conhecimento histórico. Para a análise destas questões utilizamos como referência as contribuições de Pierre Bourdieu, em especial os conceitos de *habitus* e de campo, as do campo da Educação Histórica com Jörn Rüsen, para refletir sobre a formação da consciência histórica e as de Ana Zavala, para pensar a prática docente e o sentido destas observações na formação inicial de professores de História.

Palavras-chave: formação de professores, ensino de História, prática de docência.

LA PRÁCTICA DOCENTE EN EL AREA DE HISTORIA EN TIEMPOS DE PANDEMIA: PERCEPCIONES DE LOS LICENCIANDOS

RESÚMEN: El objetivo de este artículo es reflexionar sobre la docencia de la Historia a partir de la experiencia realizada con académicos de la Licenciatura en Historia/UFPR durante el desarrollo de la disciplina Práctica Docente en el año académico 2020. Formaba parte de las actividades de esa disciplina la asistencia a las clases remotas que ofrece la Secretaría de Educación del Estado de Paraná y la sistematización de registros a través del diario de campo. Para las reflexiones de este artículo, nos acercaremos a las observaciones realizadas por los propios licenciandos sobre las clases remotas enfocadas a los últimos años de la educación secundaria y Bachillerato. A partir de este material, asumido aquí como fuente, pretendemos discutir las percepciones de los licenciados sobre la relación enseñanza-aprendizaje, considerando el debate metodológico presente en las clases asistidas. Como resultado, señalamos la presencia del dilema cantidad x calidad (profundización, problematización) de los contenidos; la forma de mediar el conocimiento académico y el conocimiento histórico escolar y la característica mnemotécnica de las actividades propuestas en las clases remotas, en detrimento de las problematizaciones que consideran los argumentos de los licenciandos al relacionarse con el conocimiento histórico. Para el análisis de estas cuestiones utilizamos como referencia los aportes de Bourdieu, especialmente los conceptos de *habitus* y campo, los del campo de la Educación Histórica con Rüsen, para reflexionar sobre la formación de la conciencia histórica y los de Zavala, pensar la práctica docente y el significado de estas observaciones en la formación inicial de los profesores.

Palabras clave: formación del profesorado, enseñanza de la historia, práctica docente.

INTRODUCTION

Historically, teacher education has faced recurring challenges that are sometimes reconfigured to meet specific demands. The Covid-19 pandemic has brought new elements to this discussion, in addition to others that have been aggravated. As addressed by Macedo (2021), for the educational field, the inequality that marks public schools and the profile of their teachers and students was enhanced by the pandemic, in its unfolding social, educational, and also digital inequalities, being necessary to resume, as proposed by the author, the discussion about whether education in this context, continues to be a right, or can be considered a privilege.

In our institution, we can identify that there have also been impacts. In a survey conducted by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies³ about the Emergency Remote Learning (ERE) in which about 20% of the undergraduate students answered (the answer was voluntary), these indicated "89.6% (x students) reported having enrolled and attended at least one subject in the ERE modality, while 10.5% did not attend because they did not enroll (7.9%) or because they canceled the enrollment even before attending (2.6%)" (p.40). Still, the reasons for those who did not take courses in this modality range from the lack of offer of the subject (optional for teachers in the first moment) (27.5%), not being able to get a vacancy (19.5%), to personal or environmental difficulties (about 30%), and only 2.1% indicated they had no equipment (p.41).

About this data, we can ponder both the low percentage of respondents and the fact that the survey was published and answered online, as well as the fact that the results are aggregated without identifying the answers per course. In addition, a significant, but ignored, number of students without equipment or access to the internet did not answer because they were not informed of the survey's existence, or even because they had no way to answer it. However, it should be pointed out that there was more than one institutional edict for the loan of equipment to students who needed it. For now, there is not enough data to say how they were impacted, but it is plausible the hypothesis that also in higher education, social, educational, and digital inequalities affected the studies of these undergraduate students.

In this context of pandemic and remote teaching, with public schools closed in person, the issue of teaching practice - here assumed as a synonym for internship - has emerged as a challenge for undergraduate courses, with the most diverse responses, from the suspension of the subject and its related activities, to the search for alternatives that would allow its continuity, within the possibilities of not being present.

In this article, we will approach the training of history undergraduate students at the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR) regarding one of the activities that were developed remotely in the course of Teaching Practice in History, in 2020. In the face-to-face version, the menu of the subject is made up of three main axes: observation, planning and supervision. These aspects mark the dynamics of the actions involving the relationship between the student in training phase and the Basic Education schools. Here we will deal only with the first stage of the discipline's activities, which is observation, although the undergraduate students have subsequently developed the other stages.

At the beginning of the pandemic period, the UFPR school calendar was suspended on March 17th. Then, Resolution 42/2020-CEPE⁴ was edited, which provided the possibility of performing the internship activities and the teaching practice remotely. Thus, it was established the option for teachers to offer these disciplines and, also, the option for students to adhere or not, since the calendar was suspended.

As the Paraná State Department of Education (SEED) started to make classes available through the YouTube channel⁵, we proposed a first stage of remote activities. With the limit of not having the interaction of the teacher, in SEED's classes, with basic education students (Fundamental II and High

³ Available at http://www.prograd.ufpr.br/portal/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Periodo-Especial-Junho-Outubro-2020_ERE1_Pesquisa_Relatorio-Final1.pdf?fbclid=IwAR2kcHfjuNmpdRTyc3B_qgGTsCgyWIFUTnkikGG6mI0gTAPsALA-fBtedGA

⁴ Available at <http://www.soc.ufpr.br/portal/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/RESOLU%C3%87%C3%83O-N%C2%BA-42-2020-CEPE.pdf>

⁵ Paraná Lecture Channel - https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCfbFento2_mCEyUgeiwImiQ

School), it would be possible for the undergraduate students to observe elements such as didactic choices, problematization of the theme, dialogue with historiography, vocabulary used, proposed activities, among others.

We formalized the proposal with the Department and the Course Collegiate, and once it was approved, we consulted the students enrolled in the course. The adherence to the proposal, which was, in fact, an option, was discussed in due course. Thus, those who chose not to do the activity would have the right to develop the activities related to the discipline when the school calendar returns. There was a considerable acceptance from the students, with 32 participants out of 39 enrolled.

This stage took place from May 19 to July 21, with a pre-established schedule for monitoring the activities, including general meetings with the three classes, as well as individualized assistance. The field diary (OLIVEIRA, 2009) was used to record the observations, just as we would do in the face-to-face teaching practice. With this methodological choice, the students should record their observations in relation to the classes and, at the end of a block of observed expositions, systematize a reflection, always considering that the nature of the classes did not allow interaction, so the intention was to analyze the contents, class structure, proposed activities, among other aspects. The meetings between academics and teachers of the Teaching Practice course took place regularly and were permeated by reflections recorded in the diary. The notes from these field diaries are our main source, which will be discussed in the sequence of this article.

The criterion for the choice of which diaries would be included here was to bring excerpts that, in some way, were representative of recurring issues in the observations recorded by the students, with a good quality of synthesis and criticism, in order to optimize the reflections on the issues mentioned by them. Thus, we avoided quoting the journals of other students who, although they have dealt with the same elements, sometimes did not do it in a systematized way, or did it only by means of description.

Also, we have chosen to bring the link to the classes that are mentioned in the quotations for two reasons: to allow the readers of the article to access them and evaluate or understand the observations registered, and because they are public and accessible, with no need of authorization for this mention. We do not intend here to make any judgment about the teachers, assuming that the classes attended, and now available to the public, are sources for debate and reflections about history teaching, and for this reason we also sought to allow readers to view the observed classes.

As important references for us to think about this training, and particularly this experience - which was also for us, as teachers, of much learning - we highlight the concepts of *habitus* and *field*, by Pierre Bourdieu. For the author, *habitus* can be understood as the set

[...] of dispositions acquired through experience, therefore, variable according to place and time. [...] Being the product of the incorporation of objective necessity, the *habitus*, necessity turned into virtue, produces strategies that, although they are not the product of a conscious aspiration of ends explicitly set from an adequate knowledge of the objective conditions, nor of a mechanical determination of causes, they show themselves to be objectively adjusted to the situation. [...] [Agents] do, much more often than if they acted by chance, "the only thing to do". This is because, abandoning themselves to the intuitions of a "practical sense" that is the product of continued exposure to conditions similar to those in which they are placed, they anticipate the necessity immanent to the flow of the world (BOURDIEU, 2004, p. 21-23).

Thus, this discussion helps us to think about how personal trajectories - and beliefs, values, representations, in this case, history teaching, about being a teacher, among others - shape choices in practice, including professional ones, as part of the *habitus* (GONÇALVES, 2012). Both on the part of our undergraduates, teachers in training, and of the teachers whose classes we attended.

Very closely linked to *habitus*, the concept of field, as a social space in which agents interact - and establish themselves and dispute for norms and various capitals - reminds us of the configurations that are socially and historically constructed, with which agents, with their specific *habitus*, interact (BOURDIEU, 1996). The school, the school culture, the curriculum, the textbook, the classroom, even the teaching of history, are thus permeated by elements that are beyond what each agent particularly can think of, and he/she will have to deal with these demands, with these traditions or conventions, in a continuous process of disputes, confrontations and accommodations.

Although we are aware of the existence of the *habitus* of the undergraduates and of the teachers of the Paraná classes, it is not our intention to approach it in the sense of their particularities, but to identify expressions of this *habitus* in relation to the way the history classes are organized and taught (choices, didactic strategies, referential, approach to the themes, among others), and in how they are perceived, in their positives and limitations, by the students who were observing and analyzing them. That is, in what way it manifests itself in the teachers' practices (as the practical sense mentioned by Bourdieu), as well as in the students' representations and expectations, based on the theoretical and methodological discussions approached in the pedagogical subjects of the course.

Dealing specifically with the formation of history teachers, we can understand *historical consciousness* and its formation as an inherent part of the *habitus*, and profoundly necessary for this teacher, also because his/her classes - and all the choices they involve - will be permeated by this consciousness, and in an ideal situation, with the purpose of developing a reasoned, reflexive and critical historical learning.

Rüsen (2010) understands *historical consciousness* as "a general category that not only relates to the learning and teaching of history, but covers all forms of historical thinking; through it one experiences the past and interprets it as history" (RÜSEN, 2010, p. 36). The author highlights three main points about it:

First, historical consciousness cannot be merely equated as knowledge of the past. Historical consciousness gives structure to historical knowledge as a means of understanding the present time and anticipating the future. (...)

Second, historical consciousness can be analyzed as a coherent set of mental operations that define the peculiarity of historical thought and the function it performs in human culture. (...)

Third, by analyzing the operations of historical consciousness and the functions it fulfills, that is, by guiding life through the structure of time, the *didactics of history* can bring new insights into the role of historical knowledge and its growth in practical life (RÜSEN, 2010, p. 36-38, emphasis added).

From the understanding of this concept, and the way it permeates and guides the purpose of teaching history, we understand that by observing the practices of other teachers, undergraduates can better understand some didactic choices made, as well as their limits and potential for the development of this *historical consciousness*, while perceiving elements of the *habitus* and the strength of conventions of the field on this teaching action.

Finally, Zavala's (2017) reflection helps us in relation to the representation of what a good teacher is, how it is constructed - in the *habitus*, in the fields, as the academy - and in what we understand as a good history teacher, with the epistemological specificities of history. Necessarily, this representation, which each student has, appears in the expectation of attending the SEED classrooms and in the analysis of the observed practices. It can also have an impact on the way they see themselves or expect to be "trained" in order to be able to put this ideal of teaching into practice. To the author,

It is clear that when one enrolls in a professional training institution (whether it is a teachers' college or a medical school), one already has some idea of what one will do when practicing the profession. However, when it comes to professional teacher training, there are some considerations that could be relevant. In fact, unlike in the case of other professions, everyone has been in front of an enormous diversity of teaching professionals practically all their lives, or at least in the last 15 years before enrolling in the career (and sometimes more, because not everyone does so when they graduate from high school), living passively with the practice of the profession they have chosen. It is also clear that when someone enrolls in a teacher training institution -as in any course or career- he/she does not expect to leave the same as when he/she entered. What is not so clear is that -once in the profession- everyone feels called to change what they do, provided they find reasons to do so. Nor is it clear that, from a world outside the practices, one can appreciate the multiple and diverse processes of change that occur in the riverbed. (ZAVALA, 2017, p.728)

In this sense, we can understand the importance of this formation as a whole, with the purpose of subsidizing, in a grounded manner, reflections that may clarify, guide and help these students to think about what it is to be a teacher, without illusions about an absolute autonomy and independence

in the classroom and school - since there are external configurations, but also that allows them to perceive the possibilities, the meaning and the relevance of a practice that effectively contributes, in the case of our discipline, to the formation of a more elaborate, grounded and critical historical consciousness, so necessary for the exercise of a citizenship with a humanist bias.

THEMES OF THE CLASSES AND APPROACHES OF THE CONTENTS IN THE PARANÁ CLASSES

Considering that the classes made available by SEED covered from the 6th year of Elementary School to the 3rd year of High School, we evaluated, together with the students, the possibility of following several classes and choose the year of schooling that interested them the most, the content approached in a certain year, a sequence of classes or even the year corresponding to the beginning of the observations, considering that some students had already started their activities in the school space.

The first element that we highlight, present in the field diaries, was the perception of the undergraduate students regarding the permanence of a chronological and linear organization of the contents and, more than that, of an approach that is generally traditional, informative and little problematic. The example below, related to a 9th grade class, with the theme First Republic⁶, is quite representative and brings up issues that were recurrent in other academics' speeches. We have kept the quotation in its entirety, both to give an idea about the form of the diaries, and to allow us to visualize the set of observations regarding this class.

The teacher begins the class by briefly introducing the content, explaining the multiple names given to the First Republic and heavily emphasizing its periodizations (Sword Republic 1889-1894 and Oligarchic Republic 1894-1930). Right at the beginning she mentions the Vargas government and the creation of the name Old Republic, but does not go into depth on the subject.

The lesson deepens with the projection of the textbook, with the first page of the corresponding chapter and an image about political candidates. The teacher tries to establish a parallel with the present, asking the students if they can identify similarities between the ways of getting voters in the two periods of time. She then asks the students to answer the questions in the book for the teacher to correct them when they return to class. This approach, then, is left up to the students as the teacher does not problematize the issue and moves on with the lesson.

The class is focused on the second period presented by the teacher, the Oligarchic Republic. Therefore, she spends a significant amount of time explaining denominations and concepts connected to politics, oligarchy, coronelism, the electoral system, and its various characters and situations. Although the language is more scientific in much of the class, the teacher brings her former students and those who are watching the class closer through frequent questions ("Hence, many of my students ask and I guarantee you must be having the same doubt[...]"), making the class seem like a conversation at certain points.

When presenting the *café com leite* (coffee and milk) policy, the teacher tries to problematize the name and the concept, but this is done in a quick way, without showing which historians defend and differ about the name, and does not seem to have any importance in the final content. The explanation of what the policy was takes up most of the time. For some reason, this is the only point that she resumes what she had talked about, summarizing and stressing why the *café au lait*.

Quickly, from a table, the teacher tries to relate the First Republic to the industrialization and modernization of Brazil. She projects two questions that she answers soon after, without stimulating a reflection on. The urbanization process is more explained than the other two, and the picture chosen for this is better used than the previous table. With urbanization, the teacher was able to better establish a construction of knowledge, chaining the events together, instead of simply dictating the content as she did in much of the lesson. On this topic, she tries to bring the content closer to the student by asking for research on the processes of modernization and urbanization in the place where the student lives.

⁶ This class is available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3wVYeV7b4oM&list=PLnGI1S4-A8rusWZo8V_ZgwF7eE0-03PIT&index=2&t=0s

Immigration is addressed even more quickly, with a focus on the motivations for it and with cursory mention of its consequences. She presents and explains a chart about the quest for whitening in Brazil and a graph about the increase in immigration.

It is a largely expository lesson, without much reflection or encouragement to the students, and clearly organized into topics (Political, economic and social dimensions, with few relationships between them).

Charges, graphics and explanatory slides are the main support for the teacher's explanation, but they are not treated as historical sources or even placed in the foreground of the explanation. They are just visual resources for the students, sometimes quickly explained. She devotes several minutes to quizzes of objective questions and then more subjective questions. [Some questions the correction is again left to the face-to-face classes, and some (few) she gives the answer. The questions are just projected, without explanations or problematizations about them. One of the questions is about the 1891 Constitution, which was not addressed at any point in the class.

In general, the class was executed very quickly and superficially in relation to the content. I don't know if this occurred because it was an elementary school class or because it could only deal with the content in one class, but it was not a sufficient or thought-provoking explanation considering the subject matter. There was no problematization or incentive for the students to think about what was being presented, the supports were used as simple illustrations and the approximations with the student's reality were entirely up to them. (Student 1).

Here we highlight issues about the undergraduate student's perception of the class attended:

- The linear and chronological dimension, little or superficially explained in relation to the interrelations between the political, economic and social dimensions;
- The absence of the simultaneity dimension (either in what was happening outside Brazil, or with a more regional context, in Paraná, since these classes, unlike the face-to-face classroom, have students from all over the state as audience);
- A certain superficiality in the approach to concepts;
- Little or no explicit dialogue with historiography;
- Only illustrative use of historical sources;
- A hurried approach to content (lots of concentrated content), with little room for deeper problematization, including the relationship with the present;
- Activities proposed, but not explained or addressed. About the exercises, we will address them in the next topic of the article.

First of all, it is important to think about the representation of a good history class and a good history teacher, which eventually emerges from these observations. Like most of the class, this student did not do any face-to-face teaching practice, because the pandemic situation prevented her from being in the school space. Having not carried out teaching practice up to this point, the idea of a history class in basic education seems to be quite idealized, since the references the student has, besides those of her own trajectory as a student in basic education, which are more distant, are the classes at the University. In other words, classes in which the conceptual dimension, the interrelations of different fields, the references and the sources, should be approached in the most grounded and problematized way possible. The curriculum itself allows for this, as each subject that deals with historical contexts or themes is focused on a specific theme or cutout, which the teacher, in general, researches and is a specialist in. In this way, the depth of approach, the vocabulary, and others, is more in-depth and precise.

Here we recall a recurring issue in discussions about teacher education, namely, how the undergraduate curriculum still has remnants of the 3 + 1 model, in a separation - or at least disputes - between content and historiographical research (what) and the pedagogical dimension and the research related to it (why, for what, for whom, how to teach) (GONÇALVES and MONTEIRO, 2017).

In higher education graduation, it is common for the subject to be taught from a historiographical perspective, but without any reflection on its presence in the Basic Education curriculum, in textbooks, or even on the possibilities of approaching the subject in Primary and Secondary Education. This issue involves disputes of fields, already treated by authors such as Martins (2002), Mesquita (2008) and Cerri (2018), in this frontier place that is the teaching of History (MONTEIRO and PENNA, 2011) and that is coming back to the fore with force, through the approval of the Common National Base for Teacher Training (BNCFP) (BRASIL, 2019).

In the case of the more linear and traditional approach, we can think of how it is also linked to disputes over the curriculum, which is still quadripartite and Eurocentric (although the subject of the

class under discussion is Brazil), issues that were also recently problematized in the discussion of the Common National Curriculum Base (BNCC) for History (MORENO, 2016), whose first version sought to break with this model and was strongly opposed and questioned. In the end, the approved BNCC (BRASIL, 2017) can be understood as conservative in relation to the contents and their organization, in a movement of a certain accommodation as to what historically was already consolidated in undergraduate curricula, in basic education, in common sense, in textbooks, in school culture and in the *habitus* of many of the agents involved in this discussion, although with issues that have been quite problematized in the academic field.

In the observation of the classes, this issue of the curriculum was recurrent, associated with a dilemma that is not only of history teaching: the quantity x quality of the contents to be taught, which is reflected in the level of depth, time and problematization of the historical themes and contexts. The content of basic education for History goes from the acephic people, to the election of the current president, which is always being extended, associated with new themes that are being inserted in the time period already consolidated. This is one of the several dilemmas of the teaching practice discussed by Lourencetti and Mizukami (2002), which, in a certain way, is associated to other problems identified by the undergraduate student, such as the lack of deepening on the context (more informative approach), on the inter-relations between different fields, on the related concepts, and even on the sources used, since they end up being more illustrations than, in fact, problematized as sources. As we mentioned, these characteristics were recurrently present in the field diary annotations.

About a 9th grade class, a continuation of this first one, but with a focus on the Revolts of the period⁷, another student comments:

The teacher does not connect the issues with the periodization and the concepts presented in the previous lesson. Why study the uprisings? How do they fit into the Brazilian context, what connects them? There is no conceptual discussion about revolt, and the teacher even uses the concept of revolution to talk about Canudos.

Although she uses sources (still predominantly illustrative), she could have explored literary sources. She could have started the theme of the Canudos revolt with an excerpt from the classic work "*Os Sertões*" (Rebellion in the Backlands) by Euclides da Cunha. This would be a way to connect the work, the author, and the story of Canudos with the broader Brazilian political context.

An example of the difficulty in attributing meaning to the study of themes is the *Revolta da Chibata* (the Revolt of the Lash), which the teacher says "is relevant to conclude this 'phase of the revolts'". Not even the teacher establishes a clue of the historical meaning that can be attributed to this revolt, it could be solved by a conceptual discussion about what is revolt in the context studied. The lesson is, on the whole, a compilation of disconnected facts and not problematized even superficially. (Student 2)

In this case, it is possible to observe a certain choice, or difficulty, in the contextual and conceptual dimension, besides the factual approach of content, without seeking an explanatory sense, often giving the impression of content for content's sake, that is, that it is addressed because it is in the curriculum guideline or in the textbook, but without a more elaborate sense. This type of situation is also identified in other teachers' presentations.

About a class with the theme Industrial Revolution, for the 8th grade⁸, the undergraduate student comments:

Whenever the teacher says "Industrial Revolution" she says it's the first one, but she doesn't even comment that other revolutions of this type will happen, which I believe may confuse some students. New concepts are explained, but never problematized. [...]

I am starting to think that my comments are always the same. But this is happening because all the classes for now follow the same line: simplistic and brief explanations, no problematization, easy activities that do not generate reflection, a language appropriate to the age of the students by the teachers, they only use the slides, rarely the textbook, and there is very little use of sources;

⁷ Class available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZU0L0yF80cA&list=PLnGI1S4-A8rusWZo8V_ZgwF7eE0-03PIT&index=2

⁸ Class available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mWOaCWgPQqc&list=PLnGI1S4-A8ruiqiAoN66GfhDhpTuofEH2&index=5>

only images are shown, which are not used to build knowledge with the student, they are just presented. (Student 3)

This was the fifth class attended by the undergraduate, involving two different teachers. However, the other teacher's classes were considered better in some aspects, as in the case of this one, whose theme was Revolutions in England - 16th and 17th centuries⁹:

Before starting the subject, itself, the teacher makes a differentiation between England, Great Britain and United Kingdom, thus making it easier for the student to locate himself geographically and making it clear that the lesson would be specifically about England, showing the map of the country and where it is located in the world. [...]

Anyway, the teacher starts talking about the 16th century and shows a picture of the monarch of the time, Elizabeth I, and mentions that her clothes were a way of demonstrating power. Again, he talks about aspects of the present, remembering that currently the Queen of England is Elizabeth II. Again, the teacher reminds the students about a content from the previous year - Henry VIII, father of Elizabeth I, and the religious reforms.

The teacher mentions the mercantilist policies of the time and makes an analogy with Brazil and Portugal regarding the Colonial Pact, reminding the students of what they learned in 7th grade. More concepts are presented, such as bourgeoisie, *gentry* and *yeomen*, pirates and privateers (once again, the teacher presents examples from the students' everyday life to explain and differentiate these terms). The next topic covered is enclosure and the social changes this brought. [...]

The teacher's language is quite colloquial, being easy for the students to understand. To help in his explanations, he uses slides, which contain images related to the content. I thought everything was well explained, although the teacher did not do any kind of problematization about what he was teaching. No type of source is used in the explanation and there is no interdisciplinarity either. (Student 3)

Thus, we observe that, in the perception of the student, this teacher demonstrates greater knowledge on the subject, making interrelations with the present and with content from previous years, explaining concepts and trying to illustrate them with situations more familiar to students, in an accessible language. However, the issue of little problematization and the use of sources as illustrations still remains.

In other notes, several positive characteristics are highlighted, but always pondered, in the eyes of the students, on what could have been better. In the case of this class for the 3rd year of High School, with the theme Urbanization and Industrialization in the 1st Republic¹⁰, the student highlights:

As for the content, although a little shallow, the teacher articulates well the Brazilian context with the global context (2nd Industrial Revolution). She makes good use of the concepts, explaining them, and points out a procedural analysis (she uses the concept of long duration). An example is the approach to slavery, which although abolished in 1888, had consequences that did not end with it; the teacher points very well to the relationship of abolition with urbanization and the place of black people in these urban societies. She does not elaborate on the issues of immigration with industrialization and the labor movement.

When the teacher questions the reason for studying historical processes (search for historical meaning to the content), she appeals to the notion of history as "master of life" - history would provide examples and "mistakes" that can be avoided in the present. While the "exemplary" nature of history is not completely erroneous, it is insufficient and does not escape the commonplace, which seems insufficient for the attribution of meaning (issues raised in the last comment). (Graduate 2)

In this case, the meaning for learning history appears in an explicit way, in an explanation that today is understood to be outdated, since, according to the way it is presented, it may reinforce the idea of cyclical history. However, we must consider that, from the perspective of *historical consciousness* and the relationship between past, present, and future that it presupposes, an approach that presents these relationships could have been made. Considering, therefore, that by knowing about the past, it is possible to better understand the present, even to make choices different from the previous ones - in the perspective that there may be similarities between situations and choices, but not repetition of the same

⁹ Class available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=42YcDAQ9Ufk&list=PLnGI1S4-A8ruiqiAoN66GfhDhpTuofEH2>

¹⁰ Class available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vooqFMi207E&list=PLnGI1S4-A8rubSjkXdtgF9U7sOIjr2T0A&index=4>

context - according to the expectation of the future that one has. The discussion becomes even more pertinent when we remember that this statement was made for the 3rd year of high school, when the teacher - even without knowing the students who would be watching her class through YouTube - could at least assume that they had conditions for a more elaborate reflection on this sense.

The set of choices that each teacher makes stems from several elements, from his/her *habitus*, with all the values, beliefs, experiences and lived results that are aggregated there; from his/her knowledge and interest in some subjects, more than in others - either because of readings he/she has done, or because of a particular interest, or because he/she perceives greater meaning and significance, among others; their working conditions, such as the number of classes, of which years (which implies different contents), workload, salary; the purpose they have or conceive of regarding this teaching, in the case of History, which is related to their *historical consciousness* and professional ethics. We could list several other variables that can have an impact on these choices, whose set, not always totally conscious and intentional, results in a given practice. On the other hand, the *reasons* for these choices still constitute a theme that needs further investigation and deepening, as indicated by Gonçalves and Monteiro (2017), since research on the teaching knowledge of history teachers ends up focusing on *what* and *how* they do, and not on these other questions.

The questions raised as problems are also linked to the proposed activities or exercises, as we will see in the next topic.

ACTIVITIES PROPOSED IN PARANÁ'S CLASSES

Another aspect highlighted in the analyses made by the undergraduate students refers to the activities. It is worth mentioning that we recognize that, given the absence of interaction between students and teachers in the Paraná Classes, the dynamics involving the performance of the activities was compromised. However, the emphasis given in the field diaries was based on the format and their purposes and on how they were articulated or not with the class course.

About the activity related to the content of the Revolts in the First Republic¹¹, the scholar observed:

[...] the activity that follows is quite simplistic, it asks for the name of the leader in a multiple-choice question, while there were so many themes, charges, and diverse possibilities to generate debates and reflections. The other was already interesting, as it asked the students to research messianism, working on writing and argumentation skills. (Student 4)

We can see that the student is correct in his assessment, as shown below:

Paraná Class - 9th grade - History - Lesson 02 - Revolts in the First Republic

Activities:

1 - What is the name of the religious leader of the Contestado region?

- A) João Maria
- B) José Maria
- C) João Raimundo
- D) Antônio Conselheiro

2 - Research the meaning of the term **messianism** and explain why the Canudos revolt can be considered a messianic movement.

Source: Aula Paraná - Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZU0L0yF80cA>

It is prudent to register that the place of the activity in a class must connect precisely with the didactic intention, that is, it is not performed with an end in itself, and it is necessary to consider that this path articulates several aspects, such as: the relation of the subject with the content, the selection of sources made by the teacher, the pedagogical development of the class and, also, the activity. Thus, building the path of a class (content) denotes a movement that does not happen in a fragmented way, or

¹¹ This class is available at <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZU0L0yF80cA>>

at least it should not. This is why some academics noticed in their evaluations that the class was conducted in a positive way, with the use of sources and the citation of historiographic texts. However, when the student, who would be following the class, was asked to register his arguments about the content, the professor's orientation was essentially based on questions of registration of names, dates, or a mere description, as is evident in the observations reported below about the content *Tenentismo* (from Portuguese *tenente*, "lieutenant"), a movement among idealistic young Brazilian army officers, mostly from the lower middle class, who pushed for social justice and national reforms in Brazil in the 1920s) and Prestes Column (rebel social movement between 1925 and 1927 in Brazil, with links to the revolts of Tenente)¹²:

To fix the themes presented, he [the teacher] makes some very simple quizzes, which don't make the students think and build knowledge, only record dates, names and events. Next, the same type of knowledge construction happens with the exposition of the theme of the Revolt of the 18 from the Copacabana Fort, without sources and followed by a very simple quiz as well. With the Prestes Column, the teacher brings images and maps, but could have brought some sources, since the subject is very rich, and the questions that follow also do not provide a space for reflection, since they are very simple questions. (Student 4)

These are some examples of the activities¹³ to which the graduate refers:

- 1) *Tenentismo* was a movement formed mainly by:
 - a) Army officers.
 - b) School officers.
 - c) Navy officers.
 - d) Fans of the army.

- 2) It was not a demand of the *Tenentismo* movement:
 - a) Secret ballot.
 - b) End of corruption.
 - c) Halter vote.
 - d) Compulsory education.

- 3) About the revolt of the 18 of the Fort and the revolt of July 1924:
 - a) They defeated [sic] the government.
 - b) They were defeated by the government.
 - c) They managed to remove the president.
 - d) There were no deaths and they achieved their goals.

Source: Aula Paraná - [Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l4lNDF12PHg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l4lNDF12PHg)

Still about the activities, other academics registered the following:

'Finally, perhaps the most negative aspect of the class was the questions, as they were rigidly factualist, with only one of them being dissertative. (Student 5)

After 22 minutes of class, the teacher brings a quiz, giving students three minutes to answer each question in their notebook, followed by an explanation of the quiz answers. This quiz consists of multiple choice and objective questions about subjects covered in the class. It is from this lesson onwards that the teacher starts to leave a countdown on the screen showing the students how long they would have to answer these questions. (Student 6)

The teacher also leaves multiple choice questions giving a time for students to answer. Despite this, the time to solve questions is very short. Right after that, the teacher cites essay questions (some from the textbook), quoting the page, but without giving time for students to answer, only asking students to write them down to do later. (Student 6)

¹² Lesson available at <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l4lNDF12PHg>>.

¹³ Lesson available at <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l4lNDF12PHg>>.

The procedures related to the activities demanded significant debates in the virtual meetings between the students and us, the teachers of the subject, precisely because they triggered doubts and reflections about the meaning of the so-called activities, or about how to conduct this process. As we have already said, the fact that the Paraná Classes are held without interaction between the subjects - teacher and student - the dynamics of the activities, as well as of every class, took on different contours and, in the case of the debate with the students, the reflection was about other possibilities besides those they found in the online classes.

When we think about the activities to be carried out in class, it is necessary to recognize the whole that involves it: the way the teacher organized his/her class, his/her conception of History, of teaching, of learning, that is, what sustains each teacher's own practice.

As we have already mentioned in this article, we need to consider in this process the teachers' formation, and more than that, their *habitus*, which involves their *historical consciousness*, both dynamic and constituted throughout their lives and trajectories, and which also contemplate an idea of *being a teacher* that is mediated in practice between an ideal and the objective conditions of development of their professional activity. The way in which the conception of teaching and learning was built undoubtedly goes through training, however, we know that it is also possible to find different paths throughout professional life.

Pagès Blanch (2004), in his article *Enseñar a enseñar Historia: la formación didáctica de los futuros profesores de Historia* (Teaching to teach history: the didactic training of future history teachers), states that the Didactics of History aims to be a point of reference in which teachers can anchor their reflections on a practice concerned with the teaching and learning of history and, in this way, add arguments or ways of thinking about teaching and learning, going beyond the mark of content-based teaching, often tinged with an exclusively linear rationality.

The Didactics of Social Sciences and History is concerned with studying the relationships between teacher, student, and school knowledge in the context of a class and a center and at a particular historical moment, and investigates its origins and traditions. It intends to elaborate theoretical and practical knowledge that allow us to analyze and understand what happens when we teach and learn History and Social Sciences in concrete contexts and to think about alternatives for its teaching. (PAGÈS BLANCH, 2004, p.157)

The author also states that the Didactics of History should also be concerned with the professional who will work with young people and children, who, through their practice, may reveal their conception and way of understanding History, as well as their way of relating to historical knowledge itself.

In this sense, we understand that when teaching History there is a way to do it, and that this way, undoubtedly, involves the trajectory through which the teacher himself built his beliefs and convictions about what it is to teach History.

The debate arising from didactic transposition¹⁴ elucidates aspects present in the way the practices of the classes commented by the students are organized. There is, in this perspective, a movement that takes the content "wise knowledge" or "school knowledge" as a solved fact. The student is the "beneficiary" of the modification occurred with the knowledge. Let us explain: the perspective of didactic transposition undertakes a way of thinking that takes teaching as a priority - that is, the content, the form in which it should be worked out. The teacher is the one who makes these choices, that is, selects, organizes, uses sources, and systematizes the "transposition". The student, subject of this process, receives this modification undertaken in relation to knowledge and through the teacher's action. Chevallard (2005) proposes a didactic treatment of the content to be taught. This "didactic process" is what characterizes transposition, that is, the content is taken as a reference point for the didactic treatment, with a view to teaching.

With Chevallard's contributions it is understood that there was an exercise to understand the teaching of history in the direction of a specific didactics, in which, taking a given content as a reference,

¹⁴ For more information, see CHEVALLARD, Yves. *La transposición didáctica: del saber sabio al saber enseñado* (The didactic transposition: from knowledge to taught knowledge). 3 ed. Buenos Aires: Aique, 2005.

it would undergo a "recreation, modification, or adaptation", being "transformed" into a teaching content, hence the expression didactic transposition.

We can consider the existence of a didactic transposition, as a whole process, as situations of *didactic creations of objects* (of knowledge and teaching at the same time) that become "necessary" by the demands of the didactic function. (CHEVALLARD, 2005, p. 47)

Similarly, Monteiro (2002), in his reflections shows some points in relation to didactic transposition, stating that this approach has received criticism regarding an absence of explanation between the knowledges. He also points out:

Another restriction refers to the fact that the author, perhaps because he operates in the field of mathematics which is a body of knowledge that is very well delimited and systematized, refers exclusively to academic knowledge as the only reference for the elaboration of the knowledge taught. (MONTEIRO, 2002, p.83)

Still according to Monteiro, Chevallard does not take into account the "educational dimension" that, for this researcher, is a fundamental aspect to understand the process of a didactic transposition in relation to school knowledge. Discussions about this relationship between learned knowledge and taught knowledge:

[...] can provide an instrumental for the better understanding of the teaching processes, considering the specificities of the different disciplines. The main one is the identification of the conceptual changes made during the process of didactic transposition from the needs of the "didactic reason", i.e., the logic that demands that the taught knowledge, besides the fact of meeting a sociological reason (political and cultural demands), needs to be possible to be taught. (MONTEIRO, 2002, p. 85)

The importance of the debates on didactic transposition lies in the fact that this concept broadens the discussions around the relationship between the knowledge to be taught and the knowledge taught, that is, the distance that exists between a so-called wise knowledge, or academic knowledge and the knowledge necessary or appropriate for teaching.

In this sense, the academics' look when analyzing the activities reveals the presence of this way of thinking about learning, that is, the didactic treatment of the content, through the proposed activities, assumes the outlines of the transposition. We reaffirm that the online format is limiting when it comes to interaction, however, the construction of the activities presented is close to the idea of transposing content. The following observation demonstrates precisely the concern with the content: "After all, if the presentation of the class was not very instigating and did not approach the context of the students and their historical consciousness, it is important to emphasize that the teacher had mastery of the content and knew how to explain well what was proposed. (Graduate 5)

The exercise of observation, recording, and analysis of the classes and activities generated reflections, concerns on the part of the students who, even in an unpromising scenario, glimpsed the possibility of entering the school's physical space.

In view of the horizon of possibilities, sometimes aspects were highlighted that had already been discussed in the course that preceded the Teaching Practice, entitled Methodology of History Teaching, which was based on the construction of history classes anchored in the science of History, that is, in the assumption that the architecture of a history class needs to go beyond the idea of transposing or mediating content, and contemplate a fundamental methodological principle which is historical learning, as elucidated by Schmidt:

[...] learning must be based on historical thought forms elaborated by the learning subject, and it is to these thought forms, organically linked to the act of narration, that the teaching of history needs to relate. According to these assumptions, historical learning would occur when the subject develops, through historical narrative, a meaning for historical experience, in such a way that he can orient his existence in relation to himself and others in the flow of time. In this sense, the

perspective of learning can only be oriented in the direction that the subject is a constructor of his knowledge. (SCHMIDT, 2017, p.67)

Thus, we argue that it is a *sine qua non* condition to think about history teaching that recognizes students and teachers as subjects in the process and thus contributes to the challenge of teaching to think historically.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Considering that the observations discussed here come from undergraduate students of History in a discipline of Teaching Practice, we can think about what they have learned and what they have apprehended from them. In the discussions with these students about the field diaries and the classes attended, there was the perception that, because they were classes made available on a YouTube channel by SEED, there was the expectation of greater care in the planning, in the historiographic and problematizing treatment of the contents by the teachers, or that there would be a team watching the classes, making adjustments or edits, before their publication. After all, it was and is the teachers and SEED itself that, in a certain way, were exposing themselves through this material. However, this treatment of the lessons did not occur.

Although these classes were available online, several issues identified in the field journals are also common when the Teaching Practice is face-to-face - with more or less variation, of course, depending on the teacher being observed in the school -, showing that despite the change in the support, in the technological dimension, the basis of each teacher's practices is similar to that of the face-to-face classroom.

Other elements identified were some predominant tendencies in the classes attended by the undergraduates, even when they were High School classes: the approach to History in a chronological way, with few problematizations; the dilemma quantity of content x quality in the deepening and problematization of the themes; few moments in which the documents brought were questioned and treated as sources; besides the activities, generally very simple, objective, with questions aimed at fixing dates, names or information mentioned in the teacher's previous explanation.

On one hand, we can remember that all of us were taken by surprise with the need to learn to deal with technology and remote classes, and in the case of these teachers it was no different, which may help us understand why the structure, the themes and the approach of the classes made available continued similar to what was already done in the classroom, even though there was more preparation of the projected slides (a resource rarely available to public network teachers in the classroom). Once again, we can remember that the weight of *habitus* is very heavy on practice, and this does not change radically because the support changes, or because the teacher is being filmed. As Zavala (2017) states, we are all good, bad, and average teachers, at different moments in our career, and in our professional performance. Elements under our control, such as the awareness of our *historical consciousness*; the level of knowledge and interest in certain themes and contents, which impacts the meaning we attribute to them, and consequently, the attention we give to them; the planning we do of the classes; and elements out of our control, such as the dilemma quantity x quality of contents, as already mentioned, or the length of classes and the resources available, for example, impact directly on the possibilities and quality of a class. Moreover, what we do not address here, but which in a face-to-face class is also important to highlight, are the interests and meanings attributed by the students in relation to the school, the subject, and that particular content, and which are also not under our control, although we should consider them in our planning.

We emphasize the need to reflect on aspects which enable both the future teacher and the teacher who is directly involved in the classroom to glimpse a practice centered on the processes of production of historical knowledge, permeated by the problematization of teaching. We propose, then, that this practice should have as a reference the reflection about the path of production of historical knowledge, with a view to the formation of *historical consciousness*.

The investigations that take the practice of the teacher as an object of study have a close relationship with the process of initial formation; however, this formation should not be dissociated from

the dynamics that characterize the school, the classroom. Thus, the school is the *locus* where these analyses can certainly find space and reach significant dimensions, specifically as to the history teacher, who

[...] is responsible for teaching the student to capture and value the diversity of points of view. The teacher is responsible for teaching the student to raise problems and to reintegrate them into a wider set of other problems, seeking to transform, in each history lesson, themes into problematics (SCHMIDT, 1997, p. 57).

For the debate we present here, the *locus* were the possibilities revealed by online classes, with their peculiar characteristics, both for those who organized them and for those who followed them. However, even if emptied of the relationship that only happens inside the school, these classes contributed to the fundamental debate that is to think about the teaching-learning relationship, so proper to those who assume that:

Historical literacy is about learning for the formation of more complex historical consciousness. This means that the teaching of history should aim at the formation of a historical consciousness that overcomes traditional and exemplary forms of historical consciousness, which are responsible for the consolidation of narratives based on linear organizations of time, as well as the views that history is the master of life. At the same time, it also seeks to avoid the formation of critical consciousnesses based on narratives that break with any possibility of revisiting the past. (SCHMIDT, 2017, p. 74)

The problematizations that the concepts of *habitus*, *field*, *historical consciousness*, and *initial formation*, addressed in this article, allow us to make, were mobilized for the construction of a more grounded reflection of these undergraduate students in relation to the role of the teacher, the function of history teaching in Basic Education, as well as their own practice, afterwards.

We consider, then, that despite the moment, the atypical experience, and the limitations involved for the Teaching Practice, the results were quite satisfactory, and the initial stage treated here, of observation of the Paraná Classes, was fundamental, as it brought elements and an important basis for the activities that followed in the discipline, providing the students who developed them with subsidies, foundations and relevant reflections that contemplate the purpose of the discipline, about teaching and teaching History.

* The translation of this article into English was funded by the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais – FAPEMIG – through the program of supporting the publication of institutional scientific journals.

REFERENCES

BOURDIEU, Pierre. *A economia das trocas lingüísticas: o que falar quer dizer*. Prefácio Sergio Miceli. Tradução Sergio Miceli et al. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1996. (Clássicos 4)

_____. *Coisas ditas*. Tradução Cássia R. da Silveira; Denise M. Pegorim. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2004.

BRASIL. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular*. Brasília: MEC, 2017. Disponível em http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/images/BNCC_EI_EF_110518_-versaofinal_site.pdf Acesso em 20 de março de 2021.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Resolução CNE/CP n. 2, de 20 de dezembro. *Define as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial de Professores para a Educação Básica e institui a Base Nacional Comum para a Formação Inicial de Professores da Educação Básica (BNC-Formação)*. Brasília, 2019. Disponível em: http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=133091-pcp022-19-3&category_slug=dezembro-2019-pdf&Itemid=30192 Acesso em 20 de março de 2021.

CERRI, Luis F. O ensino de História como objeto de pesquisa e de ação educativa: a atualidade de uma Associação Brasileira de Ensino de História. *HHMagazine – Humanidades em Rede*, 21/12/2018. Disponível

em <https://hmagazine.com.br/o-ensino-de-historia-como-objeto-de-pesquisa-e-de-acao-educativa-a-atualidade-de-uma-associacao-brasileira-de-ensino-de-historia/>. Acesso em 20 de março de 2021.

CHEVALLARD, Yves. *La transposición didáctica: del saber sabio al saber enseñado*. 3 ed. Buenos Aires: Aique, 2005.

GONÇALVES, Nadia G.. Para além da reprodução: contribuições de Pierre Bourdieu para uma reflexão sobre formação de professores para o ensino de História. *EntreVer - Revista das Licenciaturas*, v. 2, p. 153-171, 2012.

GONÇALVES, Nadia G. e MONTEIRO, Ana M. F. C. Saberes e práticas docentes e ensino de História: temas, conceitos e referenciais (1970-2014). *Educação em Revista* (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, v. 33, e156257, 2017. Disponível em <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0102-46982017000100112&lng=en&nrm=iso>. Acesso em 20 de março de 2021.

LOURENCETTI, Gisela C. e MIZUKAMI, Maria G. N. Dilemas de professoras em práticas cotidianas. In: MIZUKAMI, Maria G.N. e REALI, Aline M.M.R. (orgs.) *Aprendizagem profissional da docência: saberes, contextos e práticas*. São Carlos: Ed. UFSCar, 2002, p.49-69.

MACEDO, Renata M. Direito ou privilégio? Desigualdades digitais, pandemia e os desafios de uma escola pública. *Estudos Históricos* (Rio de Janeiro) [online]. 2021, v. 34, n. 73 [Acessado 13 Julho 2021] , pp. 262-280. Disponível em: <<https://doi.org/10.1590/S2178-149420210203>>.

MARTINS, Maria C. *A história prescrita e disciplinada nos currículos escolares: quem legitima esses saberes?* Bragança Paulista: EDUSF, 2002.

MESQUITA, Ilka M. D. *Memórias/identidades em relação ao ensino e formação de professores de história: diálogos com fóruns acadêmicos nacionais*. 2008. 269 f. (Doutorado em Educação) - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, SP. Disponível em: http://repositorio.unicamp.br/bitstream/REPOSIP/252062/1/Mesquita_IlkaMigliode_D.pdf. Acesso em 20 de março de 2021.

MONTEIRO, Ana Maria F. da C. e PENNA, Fernando de A. Ensino de História: saberes em lugar de fronteira. *Educação & Realidade*, v.36, n.1, p. 191-211, jan-abr. 2011. Disponível em <https://seer.ufrgs.br/educacaoerealidade/article/view/15080/11518> Acesso em 20 de março de 2021.

MONTEIRO, Ana Maria F. da C. *Ensino de História: entre saberes e práticas*. Rio de Janeiro, 2002. 256 f. (Tese de Doutorado) Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro. PUC/Rio.

MORENO, Jean Carlos. A história na Base Nacional Comum Curricular. Déjà vu e novos dilemas no século XXI. *História & Ensino*. Londrina, v. 22, n. 1, p. 07 - 27, jan./ jun. 2016. Disponível em <http://www.uel.br/revistas/uel/index.php/histensino/article/view/26158/19188> Acesso em 20 de março de 2021.

OLIVEIRA, Odisséa B. O diário na prática de ensino. *Seminário do 12 COLE*, 2009. Disponível em http://alb.com.br/arquivo-morto/edicoes_anteriores/anais16/sem12pdf/sm12ss09_06.pdf Acesso em 20 de março de 2021.

PAGÈS BLANCH, Joan. Enseñar a enseñar Historia: la formación didáctica de los futuros profesores de historia. In: HERNÁNDEZ, José Antonio Gómez e MARIN, M. Encarnación Nicolás. *Miradas a la historia reflexiones historiográficas en recuerdo de Miguel Rodríguez*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, Vicerrectorado de Extensión Cultural y Proyección Universitaria 2004, p. 155-178.

RÜSEN, Jörn. Didática da História: passado, presente e perspectivas a partir do caso alemão. In: SCHMIDT, M. A.; BARCA, I.; MARTINS, E. R. (Orgs.). *Jörn Rüsen e o ensino de história*. Curitiba: EdUFPR, 2010, p. 23-40.

SCHMIDT, Maria A. Jörn Rüsen e sua contribuição para a didática da História. In: Dossiê: sentido e relevância da História no mundo contemporâneo. *Intelligere, Revista de História Intelectual*. vol. 3, no 2, out. 2017. Disponível em: <http://www.revistas.usp.br/revistaintelligere/article/view/127291/136217> Acesso em 20 de março de 2021.

SCHMIDT, Maria A. A formação do professor de História e o cotidiano da sala de aula. In: BITTENCOURT, Circe (org.) *O saber histórico na sala de aula*. São Paulo: Contexto, 1997. p.54-66.

UFPR. PROGRAD. *Relatório Geral – Ensino Remoto Emergencial*. Curitiba: PROGRAD-UFPR, 2020. Disponível em http://www.prograd.ufpr.br/portal/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Periodo-Especial-Junho-Outubro-2020_ERE1_Pesquisa_Relatorio-Final-1.pdf?fbclid=IwAR2kcHfJuNmpdRTyc3B_qgGTsCgyWIFUTnkikGG6mI0gTAPsALA-fBtedGA

URBAN, Ana Claudia. *Didática da História: contribuições para a formação de professores*. Curitiba: Juruá, 2011.

ZAVALA, Ana. En torno a los discursos acerca de la formación profesional docente. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v. 47, n. 164, pág. 716-739, junho de 2017. Disponível em <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0100-15742017000200015&lng=en&nrm=iso>. Acesso em 20 de março de 2021.

Submitted: 22/03/2021

Approved: 11/09/2021