

Sociological Teaching

V.2, N.3 | jul./dec.
2024

Editorial

Editor-in-Chief

Marcelo Pinheiro Cigales - University of Brasília, Brazil.

Editorial Board

Katherine Lyon - University of British Columbia, Canada.

Amurabi Oliveira - Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil.

Annette Tezli - University of Calgary, Canada.

Deepak Kumar Verma, Dr B R Ambedkar University of Social Sciences, India.

Stephanie Medley-Rath, Indiana University Kokomo, USA.

Sharmila Rama, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.

Scientific Council

Carlos Benedito Martins (UnB/Brazil)

Cristiano das Neves Bodart (UFAL/Brazil)

Igor Martinache - University of Paris - Nanterre/France

Raewyn Connell - University of Sydney/Australia

Layout

Fabio Monteiro de Moraes (UFPE/Brazil)

Summary

Editorial	01-02
Presentation Amurabi Oliveira	03-04
[Article] Sometimes, learning requires more attention and less intention: Possibilities and limits of teacher training in Sociology Bernardo Caprara	05-20
[Interview] Enseñar Sociología en Argentina: una entrevista con Isabelino Siede Marcelo Cigales; Maria Eduarda Barboza Silva	21-35
[Review] Teaching and learning Sociology in Brazilian schools Beatriz Amorim de Barros	36-44

Presentation

This issue of *Sociological Teaching* brings together a series of contributions that explore the challenges, practices, and innovations involved in teaching Sociology in both Latin American and global contexts. The articles featured here foreground the role of the school as a contested space for knowledge production, civic formation, and the negotiation of disciplinary boundaries. Through empirical research, reflective essays, and critical dialogues, the authors offer valuable insights into how Sociology is taught, learned, and reimaged in classrooms, teacher education programs, and curriculum design.

We begin with the article “Sometimes, Learning Requires More Attention and Less Intention: Possibilities and Limits of Teacher Training in Sociology” by Bernardo Caprara, professor of Sociology at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul. In this thought-provoking piece, Caprara explores both the epistemological and practical dimensions of preparing educators to teach sociological content in schools. Drawing on formative experiences from pedagogical residency programs in Brazil, he examines how prospective teachers engage with sociological knowledge not only through structured instruction, but also through affective, unexpected, and reflective encounters within the school environment. The article makes a significant contribution to the expanding field of teacher education, arguing that learning to teach Sociology extends beyond content mastery—it also demands openness to uncertainty, meaningful dialogue, and the lived experiences of both students and teachers.

Next, we present a book review by Beatriz Amorim, a Master’s student in Sociology at the University of Brasília, of *Teaching and Learning Sociology in Brazilian Schools*, written by Cristiano Bodart, professor at the Federal University of Alagoas. This volume, published in Portuguese in 2023, gathers a wide range of experiences, research, and reflections on how Sociology is taught in Brazil’s Basic Education system. The review highlights how the book addresses not only pedagogical strategies but also the institutional and political dimensions of the

discipline. Key themes include the effects of curriculum reform, the role of textbooks, teacher training programs, and the challenges posed by educational policies that often marginalize the social sciences. The review underscores the book's contribution to the construction of a collective memory around the teaching of Sociology in Brazil—a project that is at once academic and activist in nature.

Finally, we present an interview with Argentine sociologist and educator Isabelino Siede, titled “Enseñar Sociología en Argentina: una entrevista con Isabelino Siede.” The interview was conducted by Marcelo Cigales, professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Brasília, and later transcribed by Maria Eduarda Barboza, a Social Sciences student at the same institution. In this conversation, Siede reflects on decades of experience teaching and studying school Sociology in Argentina. He discusses the historical development of the discipline in secondary education, the tensions between normative expectations and pedagogical possibilities, and the specific challenges of teaching Sociology in a context marked by educational inequalities and political contestation. The interview serves as both a critical and personal testimony to how teaching Sociology can be a political and epistemic act - deeply rooted in national traditions, yet open to international dialogue.

Together, these three contributions deepen our understanding of how Sociology is taught and learned in Latin American contexts, and how these practices are embedded in broader political, cultural, and institutional dynamics. They also invite comparative dialogue with teaching experiences from other regions, reminding us that pedagogical innovation often emerges from local struggles, creative resistance, and the ongoing effort to make Sociology meaningful to students' lives.

We hope that readers of *Sociological Teaching* will find in this issue not only valuable empirical insights but also inspiration for their own pedagogical practices, research agendas, and collaborative projects. As always, we welcome contributions from scholars, teachers, and students engaged in the collective task of renewing and defending the teaching of Sociology worldwide..

Amurabi Oliveira
Federal University of Santa Catarina

Sometimes, learning requires more attention and less intention: Possibilities and limits of teacher training in Sociology

Abstract

The aim of this article is to discuss the limits and possibilities of teacher training in Sociology. To do so, we analyze two specific events that took place between November 2022 and April 2024, in the Programa de Residência Pedagógica (PRP) in Sociology at the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). The PRP was a public policy initiative for teacher preparation that placed undergraduate teaching students in public schools through the provision of a stipend. The conclusions of the study of these two cases suggest that learning to teach connects personal experience and social context, and is shaped by attention to the practical dilemmas of everyday school life, sometimes as much or more than by pedagogical intent.

Keywords: School Sociology; Teaching Sociology; Teacher Training; Sociological Craftsmanship; Education of Attention.

Bernardo Caprara
Federal University of Rio
Grande do Sul
E-mail:
bernardocaprara@gmail.com

Introduction

The field of “School Sociology” or “Teaching Sociology” encompasses a community of professionals dedicated to fostering, researching, or applying Social Sciences knowledge in basic education (Mocelin, 2020, p. 57). Therefore, teacher training in Sociology integrates university-level education with schools, within the context of your knowledge production and dissemination. Considering that teaching degrees are privileged spaces for teacher training in Brazil, teaching initiation

scholarship projects are often closely aligned with public policies aimed at schooling (Oliveira, 2020, p. 152).

Recent advances in Sociology teaching in Basic Education have occurred alongside the expansion of undergraduate and graduate programs, the inclusion of the subject in the Programa Nacional do Livro Didático (PNLD)¹, and the dissemination of teacher training policies. With the advent of the Novo Ensino Médio² (NEM) and the Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC)³, Sociology lost its status as a mandatory subject, which had been secured since 2008, and its new place within the “Humanities and Applied Social Sciences” area still sparks heated debates. Even so, there has been a consolidation of institutional spaces dedicated to research, such as academic events, scientific journals, and collective organizations, while the process of establishing Sociology in the school curriculum continues to be significant (Oliveira; Cigales, 2019).

Teacher training in Social Sciences has historically encountered a predominantly academic focus in undergraduate courses, with teaching degrees being the main spaces for practical professional learning (Oliveira; Ferreira, 2016). The Programa de Residência Pedagógica (PRP)⁴ was a public policy aimed at teacher training, executed by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES)⁵. The objectives of the PRP included enhancing the initial training of teachers by providing practical experiences in schools for undergraduate students. Furthermore, it sought to promote the integration of teaching theory and practice, contributing to the improvement of basic education quality and stimulating interest in the profession.

The PRP encouraged exchanges between different educational institutions by integrating undergraduate students who had completed 50% of their coursework or were in their fifth semester into the school context. The project’s structure included

¹ National Textbook Program (<https://www.gov.br/fnde/pt-br/aceso-a-informacao/acoes-e-programas/programas/programas-do-livro>). Accessed October 11, 2024.

² New High School (<https://www.gov.br/mec/pt-br/novo-ensino-medio-descontinuado>). Accessed October 11, 2024.

³ Common National Curriculum Base (<http://portal.mec.gov.br/conselho-nacional-de-educacao/base-nacional-comum-curricular-bncc>). Accessed October 11, 2024.

⁴ Pedagogical Residency Program (<https://www.gov.br/capes/pt-br/aceso-a-informacao/acoes-e-programas/educacao-basica/programas-encerrados/programa-residencia-pedagogica>). Accessed October 11, 2024.

⁵ Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (<https://www.gov.br/capes/pt-br>). Accessed October 11, 2024.

various agents, with each subproject involving resident scholarship holders, mentor teachers in schools, and faculty advisors at the university. The presence of resident scholarship holders in schools entailed observing Sociology classes, analyzing Teaching Plans, Lesson Plans, textbooks, and educational materials, as well as producing and leading activities such as workshops and lessons. In the PRP in Sociology at Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS)⁶ we worked with 15 resident scholarship students in three public schools in Porto Alegre (RS), from November 2022 to April 2024.

Based on the analysis of two specific events that occurred during our work, this article aims to discuss the limits and possibilities of academic teacher training and its relationship with institutional teaching initiation scholarship programs. Drawing on Charles Wright Mills' concept of sociological craftsmanship and Tim Ingold's anthropology of education, I argue that learning to teach intertwines personal experience and social context, and is shaped by attention to the practical dilemmas of everyday school life as much as, if not more than, the pedagogical intentions of teacher education programs.

1. Between the university and the school

Teacher training involves a "teacher knowledge" that manifests through continuous interactions between teachers' identities (including their emotions, cognition, expectations, and personal histories) and their pedagogical practices. The being and acting of teachers are interdependent and dynamic aspects within the school process (Tardif, 2014, p. 16). In Brazil, the training of Sociology teachers has seen considerable expansion over the past decade, even though teachers from other disciplines still teach Sociology in schools (Oliveira, 2015, p. 58). The precariousness of the teaching profession and the saturation of the job market are also significant issues affecting Sociology teacher education in the country (Costa, 2015, p. 199).

The initial teacher training in sociology can be seen as a privileged place for the Social Sciences to closely understand the school environment (Oliveira & Cigales, 2020,

⁶ Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (<http://www.ufrgs.br>). Accessed October 11, 2024.

p. 196). When we began the activities of the PRP in Sociology at UFRGS, as the faculty advisor of the project, I presented the resident scholarship holders with a Work Plan for the entire 18-month period, anchored in denaturalization and estrangement of social relations, two fundamental perspectives of sociological teaching (Moraes, 2020, p. 260). Working in three public schools in the city of Porto Alegre (RS), two state-run and one federal, I suggested we operate based on the following pillars: (1) diagnosing the profile of those involved in the school's daily life and the didactic-pedagogical activities conducted in Sociology classes; (2) planning activities to be carried out by the resident scholarship holders; (3) executing the planned activities; (4) evaluating the entire process, from diagnosis, through planning, and culminating in execution. Additionally, I requested observation reports of school events through descriptive and reflective field diaries, submitted monthly and discussed in bi-weekly meetings with the presence of all resident scholarship holders.

Each participant in the PRP Sociology at UFRGS signed a commitment agreement upon joining the program, pledging to adhere to ethical standards of conduct and to produce and make available data derived from their activities. The observation diaries written by the resident scholarship holders included personal reflections and descriptions of school events. Their contents were discussed in collective meetings, analyzed, and connected with other experiences, concepts, and sociological theories. In addition to the diaries, we produced lesson plans, workshops, teaching materials, presentations at academic conferences, articles for books and scientific journals, and university extension activities.

The three public schools where the 15 resident scholarship holders were placed have distinct characteristics. All are located in Porto Alegre (RS), one in the far east of the city, and two in the central region. Two of the educational institutions are maintained by the Secretaria da Educação do Rio Grande do Sul (SEDUC/RS)⁷. One is a technical school offering high school and integrated technical courses, and the other offers only regular high school education. The third school is maintained by the

⁷ Department of Education of Rio Grande do Sul (<https://educacao.rs.gov.br/inicial>). Accessed October 11, 2024.

federal government, providing elementary, secondary, and adult education (EJA). All three mentor teachers who received the resident scholarship holders from the PRP in Sociology at UFRGS held degrees in Social Sciences and taught Sociology in high school, as well as other subjects in the curriculum.

The records required from the resident scholarship holders were conceived from the methodological perspective of participant observation. In line with Ingold's (2016) approach, participant observation emphasizes continuous immersion in the territories being studied, allowing for a deeper understanding of ongoing cultural processes. In this sense, participant observation offers the possibility of more horizontal and collaborative relationships between researchers and those being studied. Knowledge is an emergent process that happens through active participation and ongoing interaction with the environment and people (Ingold, 2016, p. 407). Considering our work in schools, which was not limited to observing everyday events but also involved planning and conducting lessons and other activities, a less detached and more participatory stance in the school context seemed to align well with our goals.

2 Sociological craftsmanship and sociological imagination

Faced with the constant emergence of the subjectivities of basic education students and the resident scholarship holders themselves, making a problematic axis in the routine of school relationships, with personal experiences constantly intertwining with structural issues, the notion of "sociological imagination" proposed by Mills (1982) helped to underpin some of our actions. We seek to develop a qualified view of ourselves and the world, to perceive lucidly and use the information that crosses our path in dialogue with scientific rationality. Our approach was to locate the individual events of students and schools in the broader historical and social context, allowing understanding how people, in the daily turmoil of their lives, often paid little attention to the structural aspects interacting with their existence (Mills, 1982, p. 11).

I selected two specific events to articulate with the theoretical reflexivity we exercise. The two events that I analyze here were the subject of presentations at scientific meetings by some resident scholarship holders in 2023 e 2024. The case of the school that went a month and a half without electricity in the first semester of

2023, due to the theft of the cables supplying its power, serves well as the first illustration of the horizon we adopted. The lack of electricity created an extremely sad and discouraging environment for both the teaching staff and the students. After more than a month without any prospects of resolving the issue, the extreme exhaustion of the teachers was evident, as was the students' fatigue, along with the sadness of seeing a space they attended every day being practically abandoned by the responsible institutions.

This episode deeply affected the school community and the resident scholarship holders working at this institution, as classroom distraction and dropout rates became major issues. It became even more difficult to capture students' attention during lessons, and the lack of attendance among students at the school without electricity increased significantly. Beyond hindering the development of subject content, the absence of electricity also greatly impacted student retention. On the other hand, the mentor teacher's ability to engage with the students who continued attending classes was noticeable. In response to the disinterest, she interacted with the students' concerns, fostering a sense of closeness and improving communication, which often led to discussions related to the topics covered in class.

While it is true that problems existed before the theft of the electrical cables, the rearrangement of school activities – restricted to daylight hours when sunlight illuminated the premises – made it even more difficult to engage students in the didactic practices proposed by the mentor teacher and the resident scholarship students. This severely diminished the enthusiasm of all those involved in the school. It became very challenging to maintain lessons when fewer than five students attended at a time, and even those five students varied from class to class. In a lesson on stratification and social classes, for example, there was noticeable disengagement near the end of the session. Despite the teacher's dedicated efforts and some success in capturing attention, two students were asleep at the back of the room.

Even though the individual experiences of student dispersion and disinterest are not an absolute reflection of structural occurrences, such as the theft of electrical cables from an institution, they demonstrate the dialectic between historical and social phenomena and the limitations of individual agency. For an individual to understand their personal existence, to evaluate their particular destiny, they must

situate themselves in the historical and social period in which they live (Mills, 1982, p. 12). One can only know their possibilities if they become aware of the possibilities of all other individuals who live under the same circumstances as they do. Every person lives within a society; lives their own biography; lives a historical sequence. Therefore, every person contributes, more or less, to conditioning that society, to the development of History. At the same time, every person is conditioned by society and by the historical processes in which they are involved.

For sociological imagination, three interconnected questions are fundamental: (1) What is the overall structure of the society under investigation? (2) What is the position of this society in human history, how does it differ from others, and what are its characteristics? (3) What variety of people is predominant in the society analyzed and in its historical period? I suggested to the resident scholarship holders that they incorporate these questions into their daily reflections, considering topics such as Western modernity, neoliberal rationality, social inequalities, identities, the Novo Ensino Médio⁸, precarious teaching working conditions, etc. In this direction, sociological imagination promotes an important distinction between “personal troubles” and “public issues of social structure” (Mills, 1982, p. 14). Personal troubles relate to the “self” and its immediate relationships with others (its direct awareness). Public issues transcend the intimate life of the individual because they are connected to various small spheres of social life that interpenetrate, forming the social and historical structure.

The sociological imagination advocated by Mills asserts that individual social scientists should consider their scientific work as a craft. To do so, we must not separate our intellectual work from our own lives. Good intellectual work requires learning to continuously use life experiences in our craft. Craftsmanship is at the core of the artisan, is at the core of the work of social scientists. Artisans of ideas are personally involved in every sociological process they engage in. Their past experiences guide their present and define the horizons of their future experiences. Social scientists need to learn to control this quite complex interaction and they need

⁸ New High School: in Brazil, in 2017, there was a high school reform that excluded various subjects and was understood by many authors as a reform that exacerbates the existing inequalities in the country's education system.

to learn to manage it in their reflections. We have sought to exercise this craftsmanship as the substrate of our activities in schools. We understand that the experiences emerging from these territories, through the participatory observation of resident scholarship holders, connect social structure and biography.

Another relevant occurrence that caused discomfort to the resident scholarship holders was related to classes on gender issues, held at another state school where we work. It was a discomfort that relates to individual subjectivity in the face of social structures. In this case, after observing and teaching classes on gender issues to first and second-year high school classes, resident scholarship holders reported being unable to escape a sort of “group therapy”, where personal experiences dominated the debates to such an extent that there was no space for any theorizing. In a lesson on feminist terms and concepts, most students participated when the discussion touched on topics they could relate to their own experiences, but their engagement went no further than that.

The discomfort with the overvaluation of personal experiences was connected with the idea that Sociology in school should promote an appropriation of sociological language, helping to build democratic responses to current social conflicts (Lahire, 2014). As this seemed not to be happening the emergence of student experiences was perceived as scattered and lacking in meaning. As resident scholarship holders sought to carry out an engaged pedagogy (hooks, 2017), whose objectives encompassed transformation and the promotion of social justice, they felt unable to empower students to act as agents of change and challenge oppressive power structures.

In another situation, after an assessment on the concept of intersectionality (Collins, 2022) based on a film viewing, the students' answers confused opinion with the definition that had been discussed in class. This led to tension between the resident scholarship holders and the class, particularly with one student who could not accept that her answer, based solely on her subjective view of the topic, did not earn the highest grade. The student questioned why she had received a partial mark, and the resident scholarship holders explained that her answer, besides failing to explain the concept of intersectionality, was incomplete.

Although the resident scholarship holders were not averse to the experiences narrated by the school's students, they wanted to articulate these experiences with a reading traditionally understood as sociological. They aimed for it to be possible “(...)

to understand history and biography and the relations between them, within society” (Mills, 1982, p. 12). When faced with the constant return to the subjective experiences of the students’ narratives, without any structural or historical trace present in their speeches, they felt discouraged and unable to offer a Sociology that stimulated critical thinking (Ianni, 2011). Our task became to interpret these experiences more carefully, surpassing them without wasting them.

3 Sometimes, learning requires more attention and less intention

In the previous section, I discussed the importance of experience in Mills’ (1982) sociological craftsmanship and our quest to make constant reflexivity an ally of the practical experiences encountered by resident scholarship holders in Sociology within schools. In parallel, I highlighted the relationship between the artisanal sociology we aim to practice and the sociological imagination. This relationship is evident in how the problematic events arising from daily school life are not merely individual manifestations of different autonomous subjects, but operate dialectically in interdependence with social and historical structures.

Underlying these problematic events in schools and the exercise of craftsmanship and imagination, I see another fundamental dimension for the training of teachers in Sociology and its interface with public policies for the beginning of a teaching career. This dimension represents the limits and possibilities of a pedagogical perspective filled with too much intentionality, a perspective that burdens students with scripts or objectives to be fulfilled as if they were the products of established manuals on how to be a teacher. Criticism of this style of pedagogy resonates with John Dewey’s pragmatic philosophy and Tim Ingold’s view of anthropology as educational practice, both emphasizing the importance of experience in education.

Experience can be an indispensable starting point for learning (Dewey, 1979a, p. 7-9). Experience is not limited to isolated events but constitutes a continuous dynamic in which individuals interact with the environment and acquire knowledge through this interaction. Experience is seen as a constant interaction between the individual and their environment, involving observation, action, reflection, and

critical thinking. It becomes crucial to engage students in real-world situations where they can experiment and learn from actions and interactions.

Learning is not a passive process of absorbing information. It is an active process carried out by people who study and participate actively, exploring, experimenting, and reflecting on what they are doing. Meaningful learning happens when students engage in activities that are relevant to their lives. Thus, education needs to be rooted in daily life and students' concerns, preparing them to participate actively in society, developing collaborative skills, critical thinking, and problem-solving abilities. This perspective leads Dewey (1979b) to emphasize that theory and practice cannot be separated in education. Theory emerges from practice, and practice is informed by theory. For Dewey, meaningful learning occurs when students associate theory and practice in specific contexts.

Reflecting on the dilemmas brought from the school context and the importance of experience for educational practices and the knowledge construction, my goal became to promote among the resident scholarship holders a less "intentional" and more "attentional" teaching approach (Ingold, 2015, p. 27). While still guiding their planning and encouraging that their practices and observations was always guided by data and theoretical references, I began to accentuate the intrinsic learning from the dilemmas and difficulties faced by the resident group in the schools. Accepting the immanence of the world, its uncertainties and flows, we turned this "attentional" attitude into the raw material for our teaching-learning project (Schweig, 2019, p. 147). I sought to demonstrate how these problematic events and the necessary attention given to them have an educational character in themselves, as it is essential to deal (with care and responsibility) with their consequences, such as the increasing dispersion and disinterest in a school without electricity or the "excessive individualization" of also structural themes.

In the situations we analyzed, occurring in different schools, one of the main learnings was related to paying attention to the movements of teachers and administrative teams. Learning, after all, involves following what others do (Ingold, 2010, p. 21). Beginners feel, watch, and listen to the movements of those whose practices are more skilled, the specialists, and try to replicate these movements themselves. They aim to act like highly skilled practitioners, blending attention,

imitation, and improvisation. In this context, imitation or copying occurs under the guidance of experts, and improvisation emerges as beginners produce knowledge in their own way, discovering for themselves. Imitation/copying and improvisation are part of a situated and attentive involvement, essential for beginners to become skilled practitioners. The learning that occurs through this guided rediscovery is related to the notion of “showing”, making something present to someone, enabling them to grasp what has been shown directly, through their own senses.

Analyzing learning also means analyzing the production of knowledge. In this regard, the images of the maze and the labyrinth can be conceived as two senses of education (Ingold, 2015, p. 27). Traditional education is based on the model of the maze, a linear and hierarchical structure that takes students from point A to point B, following a predetermined path. In this model, knowledge is understood as something that already exists and must be transmitted to students who act passively. On the other hand, the labyrinth model offers a more engaging and immersive alternative for learning about the world. In the labyrinth, there is no predetermined path but rather a series of choices and possibilities. Knowledge is actively constructed by students, who are encouraged to experiment and discover the ways of life autonomously.

The resident scholarship holders had no power to make decisions in the problematic situations we examined, especially in the case of the theft of electrical wires. They also could not find ready-made answers at the university for the dilemmas they faced, as the undergraduate experience differed significantly from the experience of teaching in schools. The learning we valued was related to educating our attention to the actions taken by the school management and teachers, considering what we found valuable or not, and what we would do differently or not. Sociological concepts and theories were constantly supporting our actions, but the way they could come to life in the classroom could only emerge from the classroom itself. About the gender studies, students participated in small group discussions to analyze case studies or real-life scenarios in various social contexts. They were encouraged to apply the sociological theories discussed to critically assess these situations and identify underlying social structures and power dynamics. Their own experiences were used as possibilities for connecting themselves with other known experiences.

In the process of knowledge construction, attention is crucial. According to Ingold (2010), attention is not an isolated mental function but an activity that occurs in situated contexts. It has deep roots in direct interaction with the world around us. Unlike an internal mental process, attention is seen as an active response to the demands of the environment and the tasks we face. For this reason, the body and the senses are pivotal in educating attention. Our senses are the primary means through which we engage with the world, shaping how attention perceives, interprets, and interacts with the environment. As a result, efficient learning requires education of the senses, where we develop our ability to perceive the world with depth and engagement.

This perspective raises critiques of dominant cognitive sciences, which tend to define the mind as isolated entity processing information in an abstract manner. Context and concrete experience would take a back seat in cognition and learning. In contrast to this argument, effective education is not limited to information transmission or cognitive skills training. It should emphasize active engagement of students with the world around them. This entails exploring context, asking questions, experimenting, observing, and meaningfully interacting with the environment in which one lives. Educating attention is not confined to classrooms; it can occur in all aspects of everyday life. Its learning involves practice and action. Rather than passively absorbing information, learners need to actively engage in activities that challenge the use of senses, skills, and knowledge in an integrated manner.

Final Remarks

Teacher training in Sociology and teacher initiation scholarship programs have been emerging as important research topics among the Brazilian academic community in the field of Social Sciences teaching (Brunetta; Bodart; Cigales, 2020, p. 312). In the PRP in Sociology at UFRGS, we have built a connection between the university and basic education schools, aiming to strengthen the professionalization of future teachers, with the weekly presence of 15 undergraduate students in three public schools. By producing data through attentive reflexivity, we faced the challenges of the school by exercising sociological imagination and education of attention. This led us to seek to

understand the possibilities and limits of teaching “with” people and their practices conducted in everyday school life, rather than “about” them.

The two events that occurred in the schools – the theft of electrical cables that left one institution without power for a month and a half and the assessment on the concept of intersectionality – illustrate the challenges and possibilities of teacher training in Sociology. The first event highlights how external factors, such as lack of infrastructure, can disrupt the continuity of pedagogical practices and affect student engagement, demonstrating the limits of academic training in dealing with unpredictable situations in school life. The second event reveals the difficulties of mediating theoretical concepts with students' subjective perceptions, pointing to the need for teaching strategies that foster a deeper understanding of the content. These episodes suggest that Sociology teacher training must go beyond the transmission of theoretical knowledge, integrating practical experience and the ability to handle the dilemmas of the school environment, in order to strengthen both teacher presence and student learning.

Education in Western modernity has been characterized as a process of knowledge accumulation. It has been responsible for transmitting or instilling in learners what has been produced by humanity for centuries, with a focus on classrooms and curricular content. Schools and universities are exemplary institutions of this dominant conception, largely based on monoculturalist explanations of the world (Sodré, 2012, p. 15). Such institutions can also be classified as reproducing social and cultural inequalities, exerting symbolic violence on their audience, and reproducing a dominant cultural arbitrariness (Bourdieu; Passeron, 1992). Contrary to these perspectives, we opted to consistently address sociological content critically, aiming for an engaged approach to teaching Sociology (Machado; Caprara, 2024). This choice included leveraging students' experiences in our educational activities while educating our attention towards school phenomena.

It is evident that pedagogical intentionality is important and that this type of teaching is part of the educational process. Problematizing didactic mediation (Lopes, 1999, p. 201) and providing content for debates and activities were concerns throughout the PRP journey. What I proposed in this paper was not to neglect lesson planning, assessment development, or intervention projects in schools. On the contrary, faced with the central issues that emerged from the schools, we proposed to

immerse our teaching intentions in the learning that the problematic situations themselves insisted on making us consider. In other words, we sought to understand how our biographies and actions are interrelated with the social and historical context in which we live, stimulating that our critical reflexivity is intimately related to a posture of attention and deep interaction with the immanence of the environment in which our experiences occur.

Educating is much more than transmitting representations of the world. It is not limited to bringing information “inwards”. Knowledge pulsates when it leads people “outwards”, to inhabit the world they live in with attention. Knowledge pulsates when it helps to navigate the labyrinths of existence, experiencing paths that are less “intentional” and more “attentional” (Ingold, 2015). Educating does not have to be like filling a bucket; it can be like making a fire. You don’t know how the fire will be, where it will go, or how it will burn. There are always risks. However, educating can be flame and potency. It can be rediscovering life in flux. After all, looking at the world only through accumulated knowledge can make one see only the knowledge itself, and not the world.

In this perspective, learning is associated with educating attention. As Ingold (2020, p. 49) asserts, “(...) if education is about caring for the world in which we live, and its multiple human and non-human inhabitants, then it is not so much about understanding them, but restoring them to presence, in order to then attend to and respond to what they have to say”. Learning to be a sociology teacher, therefore, sometimes may result as much or more from an attentive stance towards practical events that emerge from the school territory, “getting the hang of it”, than from an elaborated intentionality in offices or pedagogical documents.

References

- Bourdieu, Pierre; Passeron, Jean Claude. 1992. *A reprodução*: elementos para uma teoria do sistema de ensino. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves.
- Brunetta, Antonio Alberto; Bodart, Cristiano das Neves; Cigales, Marcelo Pinheiro. 2020. *O ensino de Sociologia e o PIBID*. 309-313. In: Brunetta, Antonio Alberto; Bodart, Cristiano das Neves; Cigales, Marcelo Pinheiro. *Dicionário do Ensino de Sociologia*. Maceió: Editora Café com Sociologia.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2022. *Bem mais que ideias: a interseccionalidade como teoria social crítica*. São Paulo: Boitempo.

Costa, Leomir Souza. *Formação de professores de ciências sociais/sociologia: subsídios para o debate*. Em Tese, n. 2 (v. 12): 187-203.

Dewey, John. 1979a. *Experiência e educação*. São Paulo: Ed. Nacional.

Dewey, John. 1979b. *Democracia e educação: uma introdução à Filosofia da Educação*. São Paulo: Ed. Nacional.

hooks, bell. 2017. *Ensinando a transgredir: a educação como prática da liberdade*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Ianni, Octávio. 2011. *O ensino das Ciências Sociais no 1º e 2º graus*. Caderno Cedes, n. 85 (v. 31): 327-339. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-32622011000300002>

Ingold, Tim. 2020. *Antropologia e/ou educação*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

Ingold, Tim. 2016. *Chega de etnografia! A educação da atenção como propósito da antropologia*. Educação, n. 3 (v. 39): 404-411.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15448/1981-2582.2016.3.21690>

Ingold, Tim. 2015. *O dédalo e o labirinto: caminhar, imaginar e educar a atenção*. Horizontes Antropológicos, Porto Alegre, n. 21 (v. 44): 21-36.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-71832015000200002>

Ingold, Tim. 2010. *Da transmissão de representações à educação da atenção*. Educação, n. 1 (v. 33): 6-25.

Lahire, Bernard. 2014. *Viver e interpretar o mundo social: para que serve o ensino da Sociologia?* Revista de Ciências Sociais, n. 1 (v. 45): 45-61.

Lopes, Alice Ribeiro Casimiro. 1999. *Conhecimento escolar: ciência e cotidiano*. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ.

Mocelin, Daniel Gustavo. 2020. *O ensino de Sociologia e o seu campo*. 57-62. In: Brunetta, Antonio Alberto; Bodart, Cristiano das Neves; Cigales, Marcelo Pinheiro. Dicionário do Ensino de Sociologia. Maceió: Editora Café com Sociologia.

Moraes, Amaury Cesar. 2020. *O ensino da Sociologia e as Orientações Curriculares para o Ensino Médio (OCEM)*. 259-264. In: Brunetta, Antonio Alberto; Bodart, Cristiano das Neves; Cigales, Marcelo Pinheiro. Dicionário do Ensino de Sociologia. Maceió: Editora Café com Sociologia.

Mills, Charles Wright. 1982. *A imaginação sociológica*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

Oliveira, Amurabi. 2020. *O ensino de Sociologia e a formação inicial de professores*. 149-152. In: Brunetta, Antonio Alberto; Bodart, Cristiano das Neves; Cigales, Marcelo Pinheiro. Dicionário do Ensino de Sociologia. Maceió: Editora Café com Sociologia.

Oliveira, Amurabi. 2015. *Cenários, tendências e desafios na formação de professores de Ciências Sociais no Brasil*. Política e Sociedade, n. 31 (v. 14): 39-62.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/2175-7984.2015v14n31p39>

Oliveira, Amurabi; Cigales, Marcelo Pinheiro. 2019. *O ensino de Sociologia no Brasil: um balanço dos avanços galgados entre 2008 e 2017*. Temas em Educação, n. 2 (v. 28): 42-58.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22478/ufpb.2359-7003.2019v28n2.46060>.

Oliveira, Amurabi; Cigales, Marcelo Pinheiro. 2020. *O lugar da teoria e da prática na formação de professores de sociologia*. O Público e o Privado, n. 35 (v. 18): 181-202.

Oliveira, Rafaela Reis Azevedo de; Ferreira, Luciana Gomes. 2016. *Ensino de Sociologia na Educação Básica: perspectivas docentes sobre desafios contemporâneos*. Teoria e Cultura, v. 11, n. 1 (v. 39): 45-53.

Machado, Lucas Antunes; Caprara, Bernardo Mattes. 2024. *Por um ensino de Sociologia engajado: proposições a partir da pedagogia de bell hooks*. Práxis Educativa, v. 19: 1-18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22420/rde.v18i40.2028>.

Schweig, Grazielle Ramos. 2019. *A etnografia como modo de ensinar e aprender na escola*. Revista FAEEBA – Educação e Contemporaneidade, n. 56 (v. 28): 136-149.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21879/faeeba2358-0194.2019.v28.n56.p136-149>

Sodré, Muniz. 2012. *Reinventando a educação: diversidade, descolonização e redes*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

Tardif, Maurice. 2014. *Saberes docentes e formação profissional*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

Accepted in: august 2024

Enseñar Sociología en Argentina: una entrevista con Isabelino Siede¹

Marcelo Cigales²
Maria Eduarda Barboza Silva³

Introducción

Isabelino Siede es una de las principales referencias sobre la enseñanza de Sociología en la escuela secundaria en Argentina, habiendo organizado el libro *“El oficio de enseñar sociología en la escuela secundaria”* (Homo Sapiens, 2017). Es Doctor en Ciencias de la Educación por la Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA) y profesor e investigador en la Universidad Nacional de La Plata (UNLP), en la Universidad Nacional de Moreno y en la Universidad Nacional de la Patagonia Austral.

Ha publicado los libros *“Entre familias y escuelas: alternativas de una relación compleja”* (Paidós, 2017), *“Peripecias de los derechos humanos en el currículo escolar de Argentina”* (Eudeba, 2016), *“Casa y jardín: complejas relaciones entre el nivel inicial y las familias”* (Homo Sapiens, 2015), *“Ciencias sociales en la escuela: criterios y propuestas de enseñanza”* (compilador, Aique, 2010), *“La educación política: ensayos sobre ética y ciudadanía en las escuelas”* (Paidós, 2007), *“Ciudadanía para armar: aportes para la formación ética y política”* (organizador, en colaboración con Gustavo Schujman, Aique, 2007), *“Formación ética: debate e implementación en la escuela”* (Santillana, 2001), *“Retratos de familia en la escuela: enfoques disciplinares y propuestas de enseñanza”* (organizador, en colaboración con Silvia Calvo y Adriana Serulnicoff, Paidós, 1998).

¹ Esta entrevista forma parte del proyecto de investigación “Historia de la enseñanza de la sociología en América Latina: una perspectiva comparada entre Brasil y Argentina”, financiado por CAPES-Print, con el número: 88887.974646/2024-00.

² Doctor en Sociología Política pela Universidad Federal de Santa Catarina. Profesor de Sociología en la Universidad de Brasília. Coordinador del Laboratorio de Enseñanza de Sociología Lélia Gonzalez.

³ Estudiante de licenciatura en Ciencias Sociales en la Universidad de Brasília. Becario de Iniciación Científica en la Fundación de Investigación del Distrito Federal.

Además, participó en el desarrollo de proyectos curriculares en la Ciudad de Buenos Aires y en las provincias de Buenos Aires, Córdoba y Chubut. También ha publicado numerosos artículos académicos, materiales para el desarrollo curricular y textos de enseñanza para la Educación Primaria y Secundaria.

La entrevista que sigue tuvo lugar el 22 de octubre de 2024, a las 14:00 horas, en la Plaza Presidente Juan Domingo Perón, en la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Argentina. Bajo la sombra de un árbol, Isabelino pudo responder a una serie de preguntas sobre el desarrollo del campo de investigación sobre la enseñanza de la Sociología en la escuela secundaria en Argentina, centrándose también en su propuesta metodológica enfocada en lo que denomina “problematización-conceptualización”, la cual será explicada en detalle en esta entrevista.

Esta entrevista formó parte del período en que estube trabajando como Profesor Visitante Junior en la Universidad de Buenos Aires, y contó con el financiamiento del programa CAPES-Print, al cual quisiera expresar mi sincero agradecimiento. La entrevista fue grabada y, posteriormente, transcrita por la estudiante y becaria del Programa de Iniciación Científica (PIBIC), Maria Eduarda Barboza da Silva, quien ha estado llevando a cabo investigaciones sobre la historia de la enseñanza de la Sociología en Brasil y en Argentina.

Entrevista

¿Podría hablar de sus temas de investigación en el máster y el doctorado y cómo te acercaste del tema de investigación acerca de la enseñanza de la sociología?

Isabelino Siede: Bien, en mi formación de posgrado no trabajé sobre enseñanza de la Sociología, sino sobre la enseñanza de los derechos humanos. Los derechos humanos son una categoría muy relevante para el contexto político de nuestro país porque el pasaje de la última dictadura cívico-militar a la democracia estuvo vinculado a las denuncias de violación de los derechos humanos y en la década del 80 se realizó un gran juicio a las juntas militares y luego una serie de juicios a responsables de la violación de derechos humanos y es un contenido que desde hace tiempo circula en las escuelas pero yo quería indagar cuándo, como y con qué matices

había ingresado en esta categoría de derechos humanos al sistema educativo como contenido de enseñanza. Para eso, trabajé sobre la historia de la relación entre Argentina y los organismos internacionales, Argentina fue uno de los países que estuvo presente cuando se aprobó la declaración universal de derechos humanos y en esa declaración ya había un compromiso de enseñar los derechos humanos, pero tardó bastante tiempo en incorporarlo en el currículum, indagué en los planes de estudio, en los textos escolares de los años 1950, 1960 y 1970, y es lo que yo llamaba el periodo de la inclusión intermitente: Los derechos humanos entraban o salían del currículum.

Fundamentalmente entraban durante los gobiernos dictatoriales, que eran gobiernos generalmente de ideología liberal, liberal en economía, y por eso adherían a la civilización occidental y cristiana, y por eso daban los derechos humanos en el currículum. Mientras que cuando había gobiernos populares vinculados al nacionalismo popular los sacaban porque lo veían excesivamente cosmopolita. Eso hasta el año 1976.

Luego de la dictadura, los derechos humanos aparecen ya de forma definitiva en el currículum, pero muchas veces ligados a las violaciones ocurridas durante la dictadura civico-militar, lo cual es muy relevante, pero al mismo tiempo empobrece un poco la categoría de derechos humanos porque la hace mirar hacia atrás, hacia el pasado, y la circunscribe a los derechos individuales, civiles y políticos. Y entonces había ahí la necesidad de ampliar la categoría de derechos humanos y poder abrirla a las demandas de la sociedad actual.

Bueno, trabajé ahí indagando a los que habían escrito los diseños curriculares, a los autores de los libros de texto, y también entrevistando docentes acerca de qué enseñan cuándo enseñan derechos humanos. Eso fue mi tesis y doctorado, y está publicado en un libro que se llama “Peripecias de los Derechos Humanos en el Currículum Escolar de Argentina” (Siede, 2016).

La investigación de la universidad fue por otro lado. Empezamos hace algunos años, desde la Cátedra de Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales, nosotros trabajamos con estudiantes de Ciencias de Educación y de Sociología. En Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales lo que uno puede ver como producción académica es entre un 70 y 80% de enseñanza de la historia, entre un 20 y 30% de enseñanza de la geografía. Pero es casi inexistente la didáctica de la Sociología, de la Antropología, de la Ciencia Política. Es

decir, la historia y la geografía han ocupado un terreno enorme en la didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales, como lo han ocupado antes en las aulas, las escuelas primarias y secundarias. Como nuestra materia estaba destinada a futuros profesores de Sociología, nosotros trabajábamos con bibliografía de historia, de geografía, y nos decíamos, bueno, esto es algo parecido. Pero no había nada que efectivamente fuera de Sociología, y entonces decidimos, hace algunos años, empezar a indagar en dos líneas de trabajo.

Por un lado, lo que llamamos la línea naturalista, que es empezamos a preguntarnos qué se enseña de Sociología en las escuelas, cómo se enseña, quiénes son las personas que enseñan Sociología y para eso empezamos a hacer entrevistas a docentes que efectivamente enseñan Sociología en escuelas secundarias de toda la provincia de Buenos Aires. La provincia de Buenos Aires es una de las 24 provincias de la Argentina, pero abarca casi la mitad del sistema educativo, que es la más populosa, la más grande territorialmente, pero sobre todo es la que tiene mayor cantidad de población. Tiene un poco más del 40% de toda la población escolar.

Y ahí hicimos entrevistas a docentes de todas las regiones de la provincia de Buenos Aires y duplicamos en aquellas regiones donde hay más cantidad de habitantes, en Bahía Blanca, en La Plata, en La Matanza, etc. En esa línea naturalista lo que vemos es que hay una gran cantidad de docentes que enseñan Sociología y no son sociólogos. En muchos casos son profesores de Historia, de Geografía, pero también profesores de Literatura, Abogados, Maestros, hay una variedad enorme de gente.

Curiosamente, incluso en escuelas donde también hay sociólogos dando clases, pero cuando ellos llegaron a la escuela ya había otro que daba Sociología, entonces ellos se insertaron en otro espacio curricular. Protección de Ciudadanía, Historia, pero el que da Sociología no necesariamente es sociólogo. Más de la mitad no eran sociólogos. Y ahí lo que vimos también es que hay una enorme dispersión en el Curriculum real. Una cosa es lo que dice el programa curricular y otra cosa es lo que ocurre en la realidad de las aulas. Cada uno enseña literalmente lo que sabe, lo que puede, lo que le interesa, y en muchos casos respetan algo de la lógica del programa que es que hay una primera parte más centrada en los enfoques clásicos, en Marx, en Durkheim, en los grandes conceptos estructurales, y luego hay una segunda parte un poco más dispersa con temas emergentes de la Sociología, con temas de investigación y con digamos suele ocurrir que muchos docentes dicen que en la primera mitad del

año les doy Sociología dura y en la segunda mitad trabajamos temas que les interesan un poco más y vemos cómo abordarlos en la Sociología. Esa es una línea.

La otra línea de investigación es la que llamamos línea propositiva, tratamos de elaborar propuestas de enseñanza para luego llevar a las escuelas. Ahí teníamos que pensar cómo tomar decisiones acerca de estas propuestas de enseñanza. Hay algunas líneas didácticas que trabajan en la línea de ingeniería didáctica, que hay un especialista que diseña una propuesta y luego hay un docente que la lleva a cabo tal como está diseñado de antemano. Hay otras líneas que plantean que todo lo tiene que hacer el docente y que el investigador solo acompaña. Nosotros nos ubicamos en el medio. Lo que hicimos fue armar una propuesta general, seleccionamos materiales, pero terminamos de definir la secuenciación y las consignas junto con los docentes que iban a llevar este trabajo a las aulas. Eso fue un rasgo.

Otro rasgo es que buscamos docentes que hubieran egresado de nuestras clases de la Universidad de La Plata, es decir, docentes con los que ya habíamos trabajado. Y en tercer lugar, eran docentes reales con su grupo de alumnos reales. O sea, no era una situación artificial, los docentes eran docentes que daban clases en escuelas, algunas públicas y otras privadas, todas de la Ciudad de La Plata. Y para eso seleccionamos dos temas. Un tema muy frecuente en la enseñanza de la sociología, es la pobreza. Aquí en Argentina es un contenido de enseñanza, la desigualdad, y entonces se trabaja la pobreza como contenido, y empezamos a trabajar en torno a la pregunta de ¿qué significa ser pobre? y ¿qué es la pobreza? Y con eso armamos una propuesta de enseñanza. Y buscamos otro tema que no es común, pero que nos parecía que podía ser potente, que es ¿por qué nos vestimos como nos vestimos? Sobre la moda, y pensando en cómo abordar temáticas vinculadas con la identidad, con la integración de grupos sociales, con hábitos y actitudes cotidianas de los sujetos.

Entonces, con esas dos propuestas, trabajamos en diferentes escuelas. Lo que logramos en la primera investigación es que los mismos docentes trabajaran el mismo tema con dos grupos distintos. Entonces, un docente trabajó pobreza con dos grupos, y otro docente trabajó moda con dos grupos. Digo que fue valioso porque la primera experiencia de aula siempre sale, digo yo, como el primer panqueque, el primer crepe, sabroso, pero no vistoso. Siempre sale con muchas fallas. Y entonces hay un aprendizaje de los mismos docentes que estaban llevando adelante la propuesta, y dijeron, quiero

hacerla de vuelta. Entonces, al hacerla de vuelta, se apropiaron mucho más de los recursos, de las consignas, pudieron hacer intervenciones más ricas, más potentes.

Nuestro trabajo fue ir analizando clase a clase lo que pasaba y cómo íbamos reformulando las propuestas. Como dices, ese es el trabajo. Ahora lo que estamos haciendo es profundizar la misma línea con nuevos temas, y tratando de ver qué ocurre en las aulas cuando llevamos adelante una propuesta con lo que llamamos un enfoque problematizador. Es decir, centrado en una pregunta que genere un problema de conocimiento.

Perfecto. Me gustaría que pudieras hablar un poco más acerca de la Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales ¿Cómo o cuáles son las contribuciones de la Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales para la enseñanza de la Sociología?

Isabelino Siede: Bien, a ver. Me parece que la primera pregunta que uno se tiene que hacer cuando hablamos de enseñar ciencias sociales es ¿Qué ciencias sociales queremos enseñar? No me refiero a qué disciplinas, sino ¿Lo que nos interesa es enseñar lo que los científicos sociales han producido como conocimiento o lo que nos interesa es enseñar los mecanismos por los cuales han producido ese conocimiento? Es decir: ¿Queremos enseñar lo que los historiadores dicen sobre el pasado o la manera en que los historiadores encaran sus indagaciones sobre el pasado? ¿Queremos enseñar lo que los geógrafos dicen sobre los territorios, sobre los espacios geográficos, o el modo de hacer de la geografía? Y en el caso de la sociología, ¿Queremos enseñar lo que han dicho los pensadores clásicos de la sociología o queremos reconstruir las preguntas que se hicieron y recrear el modo de trabajo que hacen los científicos sociales?

Yo creo que la respuesta a esta pregunta es que nos interesan ambas cosas, no es una u otra. Pero eso nos permite entender que históricamente ha tenido mucho más peso el primer aspecto. Es decir, se ha enseñado mucho más lo que dicen los historiadores de la historia, lo que dicen los sociólogos de la sociedad, lo que dicen los geógrafos en el espacio geográfico y mucho menos cómo es que sustentan eso que dicen, cómo es que han construido ese conocimiento.

Por eso digo que a veces la enseñanza ofrece respuestas a preguntas que nadie se ha formulado. Es decir, si yo llego al aula y les digo: “Dice Weber tal cosa..., dice

Marx tal cosa...” Sí, dicen. Pero ¿En respuesta a qué lo dicen? ¿Qué les preocupaba? ¿Cuál era el problema que querían resolver? Entonces entendemos que necesitamos incluir esos saberes de la sociología, pero desde la reconstrucción de las preguntas, los problemas que intentan resolverse con esos saberes. Y eso implica hacer un giro, un cambio en el modo de enseñar. Cuando uno piensa en el aula, yo creo que uno puede confrontar al menos dos grandes estructuras didácticas que pueden tener muchas variaciones, pero no hay una estructura didáctica tradicional, sin que tradicional sea defectiva, pero sí enraizada en los sistemas educativos e incorporada en nuestra propia historia como estudiante, que un docente primero explica y después ofrece ejemplos para aplicar eso que ha explicado. Es lo que llamamos la estructura *explicación-aplicación*. Primero explico lo que dice tal autor, por ejemplo.

¿Qué ventaja y desventaja tiene ese enfoque? La principal ventaja es el orden. Una clase basada en esa estructura de *explicación-aplicación* es una clase ordenada y es una clase que permite que el profesor tenga control de lo que se habla, o que se habla de aquello que él explicó al inicio. Entonces, ahí hay una virtud y eso hace también que la elijamos como forma habitual de enseñanza. Bueno, esto me permite mantener el orden de la clase.

¿Cuál es la desventaja? La misma. A mayor control del docente, a mayor orden de la clase, menor autonomía del estudiante. Es decir, es una estructura que no promueve, y en algunos casos no permite, la autonomía intelectual de cada estudiante. Porque precisamente de lo que se trata es de hacer lo que el docente me dice que tengo que hacer. Eso se puede lograr de manera exitosa, pero no genera autonomía intelectual, no genera autonomía del estudiante para pensar sociológicamente.

Entonces nosotros planteamos un enfoque alternativo, que llamamos de *problematización-conceptualización*. ¿Y qué significa? Que primero el docente lleve al aula un problema y un problema en ciencias sociales suele no ser mucho más que una buena pregunta. Una pregunta. ¿Qué es el poder? ¿Qué hace que una persona obedezca a otra por algún motivo? ¿Qué es el pobre? ¿Por qué hablamos de pobreza en la sociedad? ¿Por qué nos vestimos como nos vestimos? ¿Qué hace que yo me identifique con algunas cuestiones culturales y no me identifique con otras? ¿Porque la gente cuando me ve puede decir de mí varias cosas solo con verme? Con verme a hablar, con verme moverme. Fuimos pensando muchos ejemplos de propuestas que

podríamos llevar al aula, algunas todavía no las hemos llevado, pero pensaba trabajar sobre temas de jerarquía y de estratificación social. ¿Por qué reaccionamos diferente si entra al aula Lionel Messi y si entra al aula la señora que limpia la escuela? ¿Qué tiene de diferente? ¿Por qué les atribuimos cosas distintas?

Entonces, quizás hacernos preguntas implica empezar a pensar como piensa un sociólogo, como piensa alguien que se hace una indagación sobre algún aspecto de la realidad social y eso nos lleve a recrear alguna de las categorías básicas de la Sociología. Es un camino más arduo, inductivo, pero tiene la principal ventaja que es que promueve la autonomía intelectual. O sea, invita a pensar desde el primer momento.

¿Cuál es la desventaja? Que puede ser bastante más desordenado, que puede ser que las respuestas que yo escuche no sean las que me gustaría escuchar. Pueden ser respuestas discriminatorias, exclusoras, pueden ser muy anodinas, muy ingenuas, pueden estar muy lejos de lo que me interesa escuchar y yo tengo que dar una batalla con esas respuestas que tengo, porque es la materia prima para desde ahí construir algo. E incluso puede pasar, cuando vayamos avanzando en ese problema y yo ofrezca las conceptualizaciones que las teorías clásicas, los autores contemporáneos han hecho sobre ese problema, que los estudiantes digan: “Sí, sí, muy lindo, pero yo no creo nada de eso, yo sigo pensando lo mismo que antes.”

Es decir, tenemos mucho riesgo de fracaso. Pero creo que es el riesgo que hay que correr, porque eso es invitar a pensar en el aula.

Cualquier docente al cual le preguntamos: ¿Para qué enseñar ciencias sociales en la escuela? Yo creo que es casi unánime, todos dicen: “Para promover el pensamiento crítico.” Lo que nos preguntamos es: ¿Y qué significa promover el pensamiento crítico? En algunos casos hay colegas que dicen: “Bueno, yo soy muy crítico, entonces quiero que todos piensen como yo.” Nosotros entendemos que para promover el pensamiento crítico lo que hay que hacer es promover el pensar, que una vez que invitamos a pensar, podemos preocuparnos después para ver cómo lo hacemos crítico. Es decir, si estamos de verdad pensando, podemos ir buscando, bueno, ¿Cuáles son las herramientas que nos garantizan criticidad en el modo de pensar? Por eso es que vamos por ese enfoque que llamamos problematizador. Que es partir de una pregunta y que todas las actividades que vamos desarrollando van desplegando aspectos de esa pregunta.

Y que además esa pregunta que inicia el proceso de enseñanza, que orienta todo el recorrido, toda la trayectoria del trabajo y que además anticipa lo que vamos a evaluar. O sea, le preguntamos el primer día: “¿Qué significa ser pobre?” Trabajamos durante varias semanas con un montón de herramientas para analizar eso. Y el último día les vamos a preguntar: “¿Y ahora qué significa ser pobre? Incluyan en su respuesta lo que vimos de tal autor, lo que vimos de los datos oficiales.” Pero vuelvan sobre la misma pregunta, lo que queremos saber si han podido este enriquecer su respuesta. Por eso en los artículos ponemos la respuesta inicial y la respuesta final. La respuesta final nunca es igual que Weber, Durkheim o Marx. O sea, no es que la gente avance a pasos agigantados, a veces es un poco mejor, un poco mejor. Pero eso es muchísimo. Aprender ciencias sociales es ir avanzando un poco más y poder ir pensando cada vez un poquito más críticamente. Esa es la idea.

***¿Podría hablar un poco de la historia de la enseñanza en Argentina?
¿Cuándo empiezan las primeras experiencias y cuál es tu visión acerca del
desarrollo de la enseñanza en este momento?***

Isabelino Siede: Bueno, la Argentina tiene una larga historia de enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales, pero una muy corta historia de enseñanza de Sociología. El sistema educativo argentino se organiza en la segunda mitad del siglo XIX en paralelo a la organización del Estado argentino. Hacia la década de 1860 empiezan a terminar Las Guerras Civiles en el país, se organiza el Estado Nacional, se organiza un sistema educativo y hay una primera ley de educación común en 1884, pero ya se va expandiendo un sistema que tiene escuela primaria y secundaria, un poquito después también escuela inicial y universidad. Desde esos primeros momentos hay en las escuelas enseñanza de la historia y la geografía de la Argentina. Y al mismo tiempo que se está organizando el Estado, y buena parte de los mismos dirigentes políticos escriben la historia del país desde el punto de vista de quienes triunfaron Las Guerras Civiles, pero también, mientras eso escriben la historia, hay otros pedagogos que están escribiendo cómo enseñar a las escuelas.

O sea, muy rápidamente ingresa a la escuela las ciencias sociales. Pero historia y geografía son las disciplinas que ingresan al siglo XIX y que ocupan buena parte del espacio a lo largo de todo el siglo XX. Recién en la última década del siglo XX se

hace una reforma educativa importante, ambiciosa, con mucha revisión de toda la organización del sistema educativo que poco tiempo después fracasa, porque además se hace en el mismo contexto de un ajuste económico brutal y sin el consenso necesario, con lo cual es una reforma fallida.

Pero en esa reforma fallida se establecen contenidos básicos comunes para el trabajo de las escuelas, y allí desde el Ministerio de Educación de la Nación se consulta especialistas de distintos campos de conocimiento, se consulta sociólogos, antropólogos, acerca de qué debería enseñarse a las escuelas. Y entonces ahí se incluye como una materia, dentro de algunas orientaciones del tramo superior de la escuela secundaria, la sociología, por primera vez. Eso se empieza a implementar en algunas provincias, y en algunas se instala con fuerza como en la provincia de Buenos Aires.

En otras nunca se implementó o se implementó un tiempo y luego se volvió para atrás. Por eso es que ahí ingresa la sociología, y esto ocurrió hace 30 años. Entonces, en ese tiempo en la provincia de Buenos Aires se fue desarrollando una experiencia institucional, pero todavía no ha habido una construcción de un campo de colegas que discuten, que deliberan, por ejemplo, en congresos de profesores de sociología, asociaciones de profesores de sociología. Eso no existe en Argentina.

Lo que está habiendo en los últimos poco más de 10 años es algunos colegas en la Universidad de Buenos Aires indagan la enseñanza de la sociología en un ámbito universitario, y otros en la Universidad de La Plata que indagamos la enseñanza de la sociología en la escuela secundaria, desde estas dos líneas, naturalista y propositiva, pero todavía no hay un despliegue de saberes complejos, extensos, difundidos. Recién estamos tratando de que se pueda instalar esta idea de una didáctica de la sociología y tratando de llegar a una buena cantidad de profesores.

Pero no tenemos ninguna garantía de que sean sociólogos que den la materia, ni tampoco de que la materia se instale en una gran cantidad de escuelas. De las orientaciones que hay en las escuelas secundarias, que son 5 o 6, solo en 2 hay sociología. Quiere decir que son muy pocas en conjunto las escuelas que dictan la materia. Ese es un poco la perspectiva.

¿Podrías hablar acerca de los documentos que nortean el Plan de Estudios de Sociología en Secundaria?

Isabelino Siede: Bien, eso viene trabajando, sobre todo, Victoria Molinari (Deladino e Molinari, 2022). A ver, ha habido hasta ahora 3 programas, en estos 30 años, en la Provincia de Buenos Aires. El más interesante, el más matizado, es el último. Pero en todos los casos, por lo menos desde mi punto de vista, tienen un defecto que es propio de la disciplina joven en el currículo escolar. Cuando a alguien le dicen que tu disciplina puede ingresar al currículum escolar y tenés un año para desarrollarla, lo que hace es como una mirada compacta de toda la carrera de sociología en un año, apretada como para que entre ahí. Y yo creo que eso es un obstáculo en la hora de la enseñanza. Porque está pensado para que un estudiante aprenda muy rápidamente lo que un estudiante de la universidad aprende a lo largo de muchos años, y tratando de que pueda identificar los grandes nombres de la sociología, las grandes teorías sociológicas, categorías básicas de la sociología, pero no invita a pensar sociológicamente.

Este trabajo de problematización y de indagación requiere más tiempo y requiere también que haya más optatividad a los contenidos y mayor margen de decisión de los docentes. Y eso no está previsto en los programas, más bien los programas son compactos. Y entonces plantean en el primer tramo las teorías clásicas, y si tienen tiempo después trabajan en algún tema que les interese. Pero vienen como muchos desarrollos en esa teoría clásica. Siempre que alguien escribe un programa curricular, yo digo que tiene el aliento en la nuca de sus colegas. No vas a ser que te olvides de poner y no te vas a quedar afuera. Y entonces son, creo que, colegas que han tratado de no olvidarse de nada. Y crean unos programas extensísimos, imposibles de abarcar, pero uno se queda tranquilo que está todo puesto ahí. Ahora, no es una herramienta de verdad para el aula. Porque un docente que está en el aula dice, “todo eso no se puede enseñar”. O por lo menos no se puede enseñar de manera constructiva. Se puede enseñar si un docente se pare y dicta y va hablando.

¿Y cuáles son las temáticas más presentes en el currículum?

Isabelino Siede: Básicamente esto que te decía, Marx, Weber, Durkheim, se trabaja bastante. Hay una categoría como generalización social, poder, hay algunas categorías así desde la Sociología del siglo XX. Y luego hay algunos temas que se pueden trabajar y analizar, pero que son un poco más vagos y permiten cierta autonomía del

profesor. La que he entregado más sobre esto es Victoria Molinari (Deladino e Molinari, 2022), que fue haciendo todo un trabajo de compilación y análisis de ese programa.

Y la formación del profesorado, ¿Cómo ocurre la formación del profesorado de sociología hoy en la universidad?

Isabelino Siede: A ver, creo que también en la universidad lo que nos ocurre es que tenemos que hacernos la misma pregunta que nos hacemos con respecto a la enseñanza, ¿Cómo se forma un sociólogo? Apropriándose de todo lo que los sociólogos anteriores han dicho o apropiándose de los modos de hacer de la Sociología. Y en general tenemos todavía una formación universitaria muy centrada en apropiarse de lo producido y más que de los modos de hacer.

Y eso se aprecia mucho en los posgrados, donde por primera vez alguien tiene que escribir una tesis, tiene que llevar adelante un proceso de investigación, entonces le dice “yo no hice esto, yo hasta acá estudiaba, estudiaba, estudiaba y después llegaba y repetía lo que me habían dicho”. En cambio cuando tengo que investigar por mí mismo, me doy cuenta de que eso es algo de lo que se trata. O quienes se meten en la investigación y empiezan a entender qué hace un investigador cuando no había sido eso lo central en su carrera.

Creo que eso es también algo que liga, como problema, a dos formas de ejercicio profesional. Quien se dedica a la investigación está poco preparado para investigar, quien se dedica a enseñar está más acostumbrado a enseñar respuestas cerradas que a llevar una pregunta de investigación al aula. Entonces necesitamos revisar eso, la formación de grados, para que desde el inicio haya preguntas.

Yo me encuentro con colegas que en los primeros años se enojan mucho cuando un estudiante piensa por sí mismo. ¡Y lo descalificas! “No, no, pero está respondiendo eso desde el sentido común. estás dando tu opinión.” Bueno, pero no está mal que uno empiece dando su opinión. En todo caso es tarea del docente someter a crítica a su opinión, pedir justificación, tratar de mostrar la falta de fundamento de su opinión, pero no es callarla, no es silenciarla de manera autoritaria, porque en realidad también el desarrollo profesional de un cientista social requiere que uno llegue a tener una opinión fundada.

Pero si yo inhibo mi opinión de entrada, entonces ya no voy a tener nunca una opinión fundada, voy a dejar de tener opinión. Y hay gente que termina citando todo el tiempo y hablando de lo que dicen otros, pero no pensando por sí mismo o teniendo criterios de interpretación de la realidad social. Esos son algunos de los problemas que creo que es más largo.

También hay una pregunta aquí muy recurrente en mis entrevistas que hago para los profesores de sociología en Brasil también, que es ¿para qué enseñar y aprender sociología en la escuela?

Isabelino Siede: Bueno, para promover el pensamiento crítico. Creo que para eso tenemos que aprender a pensar. Y pensar no es algo que suceda de modo espontáneo. No es cierto que pensamos de modo espontáneo. Pensar es un ejercicio deliberado y una puesta en juego de destrezas, actitudes y habilidades que uno va conquistando o no. Yo creo que es importante que en el aula cada estudiante entienda que tiene derecho a opinar.

Pero también tiene la responsabilidad por las opiniones que emite y que entonces tiene que poder justificar por qué dice lo que dice. Y tiene también la responsabilidad de escuchar opiniones ajenas para poder ver en qué medida el contraste de opiniones nos permitirá construir algunos acuerdos, reconocer diferencias, plantear los modos de indagar y de poder validar o no algunas de las cosas que decimos o hablamos. Entonces, de lo que se trata de poder pensar el aula de ciencias sociales es como un espacio de construcción dialógica de una mirada sobre la realidad social.

Y por eso creo que se trata de aprender a pensar sociológicamente, pensar históricamente, pensar ideológicamente. Y por eso creo que enseñar ciencias sociales de ese modo contribuye también al ejercicio de una práctica política. Es una pregunta acerca del mundo que vivimos y el mundo al que nos interesa vivir.

¿Podría nombrar tres libros que le parezcan más relevantes para comprender la enseñanza de la sociología en la Argentina?

Isabelino Siede: No hay mucho sobre enseñanza de la sociología en Argentina. Diría que el libro básico es “El oficio de enseñar sociología en la escuela secundaria” (Siede, 2022) que produjimos con mi equipo de investigación de La Plata.

Y hay otro libro que se llama, creo que se llama, “Pensar lo social” de Diana Pipkin (2009) que también es un ejercicio de cómo revisar la enseñanza de la sociología en la universidad, fundamentalmente. No sé si hay mucho más que esto. Hay muy poquito. Pero creo que lo poquito que hay es fecundo, que estamos empezando a darle alguna forma. Y después hay artículos académicos.

Y este libro “El oficio de enseñar sociología en la escuela” ¿Cómo surgió la idea de escribir este libro?

Isabelino Siede: En esa investigación con las dos líneas, naturalista y propositiva, luego nos distribuimos la escritura. Yo hice una introducción al libro, luego hay, de la línea naturalista, hay un recorrido por los programas de sociología de la provincia de Buenos Aires. Tratamos de recrear cuáles son los recursos que utilizan actualmente los docentes, cuáles son los propósitos que tienen los docentes, cuál es el tipo de consignas que utilizan. Fuera del libro, también una colega, Lucía Condenanza, ha escrito cómo evalúan los docentes, cómo dicen ellos que evalúan, siempre basados en entrevistas de los docentes.

O sea, siempre lo que ellos nos dicen, qué hacen. Puede haber una distancia, pero ya eso nos da muchos elementos para trabajar. No hemos hecho observaciones naturalistas. Es decir, no hemos ido a observar a un docente en una clase ordinaria. Sí hemos hecho observaciones de las propuestas de enseñanza que nosotros trabajamos, que produjimos juntos con estos docentes. Y entonces de ahí surgieron estos artículos sobre la enseñanza de pobreza, la enseñanza de moda, y un artículo que escribimos con Belén Cafiero de un enfoque general de una enseñanza problematizadora de la sociología.

No sé si hay otros artículos más. Son artículos hechos al calor de una investigación, donde fuimos produciendo una serie de datos y luego nos organizamos al equipo para distribuirnos el análisis. Pero creo que también es que es un material que sigue en proceso de seguir profundizando. Y, por ejemplo, sería muy útil si propuestas semejantes sobre los mismos temas se llevaran a cabo en otros lugares. Porque eso nos permitiría ver también cambios con respecto a contextos sociales y culturales frente a las mismas preguntas. Sería bueno también poder cotejar las transformaciones

curriculares de sociología de la provincia de Buenos Aires con otras provincias y con otros países. Pero bueno, eso es un trabajo que todavía tenemos por adelante.

¡Muchas gracias!

Referencias

Calvo, S. L., Serulnicoff, A. E., & Siede, I. A. (Comps.). (1998). *Retratos de familia en la escuela: Enfoques disciplinares y propuestas de enseñanza*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Deladino, M. B., & Molinari, V. (2022). La Sociología en la escuela, una mirada curricular. En I. A. Siede (Coord.), *El oficio de enseñar Sociología en la escuela secundaria* (pp. 19–36). Rosario: Homo Sapiens.

Pipkin, D. (2009). *Pensar lo social*. Buenos Aires: La Crujía Ediciones.

Schujman, G., & Siede, I. A. (Comps.). (2007). *Ciudadanía para armar: Aportes para la formación ética y política*. Buenos Aires: Aique Educación. (Colección: Política y Educación).

Siede, I. (2001). *Formación ética: Debate e implementación en la escuela*. Buenos Aires: Santillana Docentes.

Siede, I. A. (2007). *La educación política: Ensayos sobre ética y ciudadanía en la escuela*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Siede, I. (2010). *Ciencias sociales en la escuela: Criterios y propuestas para la enseñanza*. Buenos Aires: Aique. Recuperado de <https://aprender.entrerios.edu.ar/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Siede-I.-Libro-Completo.pdf>.

Siede, I. A. (2015). *Casa y jardín: Complejas relaciones entre el nivel inicial y las familias*. Rosario: Homo Sapiens.

Siede, I. A. (2016). *Peripecias de los derechos humanos en el currículo escolar de Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.

Siede, I. A. (2017). *Entre familias y escuelas: Alternativas de una relación compleja*. Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Siede, I. A. (Coord.). (2022). *El oficio de enseñar Sociología en la escuela secundaria*. Rosario: Homo Sapiens.

Accepted in: august 2024

Teaching and learning Sociology in Brazilian schools

Beatriz Amorim de Barros
University of Brasilia

Bodart, C. (2024). *O que aprender para ensinar Sociologia*. Maceió: Café com Sociologia. 250p.

The book “*O que aprender para ensinar Sociologia*”, authored by Cristiano Bodart, was published in the latter half of 2024 by *Editora Café com Sociologia*. The objective of the publication is to encourage readers to expand their teaching knowledge. The book is set in the Brazilian educational context, in which the teaching of sociology in basic education is restricted to the three years of secondary school and has been marked by curricular intermittencies. Currently, the subject is taught in the Human Sciences module, together with the subjects of History, Geography, and Philosophy, as a result of the New Secondary Education (Law No. 13,415/2017). The author refers to this scenario throughout the book, highlighting the importance of explaining some issues, whether obvious or not, for teacher training in this area. The book is comprised of 250 pages and is structured into four units, presenting reflections, key concepts in short entries, and suggestions for further reading.

The author, Cristiano Bodart, is a professor at the Centre for Education (Cedu) and the Graduate Programme in Sociology (PPGS-ICS), both at the Federal University of Alagoas (Ufal). In addition to his academic role, he is also the vice-president of the Brazilian Association for the Teaching of Social Sciences (Abecs). His academic career spans both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, with involvement in teaching sociology in basic education and scientific production. The present volume represents a synthesis of Bodart's endeavors across these diverse domains, with a unifying objective of interconnecting sociological theory with practical pedagogical applications.

The aim of this book is to encourage the reader in their search for teaching knowledge, in order to contribute to their didactic-pedagogical repertoire. It is not a textbook that explains the "right way" to teach Sociology in high school. On the contrary, the author refutes this idea, pointing out that there is no single way of teaching. His aim is not to teach how to be a sociology teacher, but to propose reflections that will help the reader, whatever their level of training, whether they are a student or a high school teacher, for example, to rethink their practice. This perspective also reinforces the pluralist conception of school sociology, as it puts the possibility of diverse pedagogical practices in dialogue with the theoretical and methodological diversity of the discipline.

The subject is part of the research agenda of the author, who teaches at the Centre for Education (Cedu) and the Postgraduate Programme in Sociology (PPGS-ICS) of the Federal University of Alagoas (Ufal). The author is also vice-president of Abecs and editor-in-chief of the *Cadernos da Associação Brasileira de Ensino de Ciências Sociais* (Journal of the Brazilian Association for the Teaching of Social Sciences), Latitude Journal and Café com Sociologia Journal, as well as founder of the *Café com Sociologia* blog and publishing house. Looking at his career, it is noticeable that there is a transition between undergraduate and postgraduate studies, dialogue with sociology in high school and scientific production, and this circulation is evident in his new book.

The writing is marked by the author's didactic concern for the teaching public, which reflects an attempt at dialogue with those at the beginning of their professional careers. The chapters are the result of the systematisation of the author's experiences in basic education and, later, in higher education, as well as his notes and experiences as head of the supervised internship course in the Bachelor of Social Sciences at Ufal. The content is therefore very close to the reality of everyday school life.

The book illuminates questions that were part of the author's training and dialogues with the difficulties and challenges identified by students in internship classes. It thus becomes evident that despite the solitary nature of teaching sociology, given that the majority of schools employ only one sociology teacher, and in light of the prevalence of insecurities such as the concern "Have I acquired sufficient

knowledge to teach?" – these experiences are not isolated occurrences, but rather are common to the formation of a teaching identity.

In the initial unit, entitled "Being a Sociology Teacher," the author contextualizes the qualifications for teaching sociology at the basic education level, providing justifications based on jurisdiction and the historical context of the subject in the school curriculum. To this end, he employs Ministry of Education (MEC) regulations and Curricular Guidelines, as well as an analysis of historical educational reforms and an examination of training programs, including the pedagogical complementation of the second degree.

The unit also presents a thought-provoking reflection on the nature of teaching knowledge, demystifying the idea that teaching is a gift and emphasizing the view that teaching is a professional practice that is continually built and improved. The author underscores the significance of pedagogical, disciplinary, curricular, critical-contextual, and experiential knowledge, delineating them according to the social sciences. This analysis demonstrates the indispensable role of each in an educational practice that transcends the mere transmission of content, emphasizing their integration. Another pertinent topic is that of the supervised internship, which is acknowledged as a crucial arena for practical and reflective learning, a foundational element in the initial development of teachers. However, the pivotal point of this section, in my view, is the delineation of teaching practice as a procedural undertaking comprising teaching knowledge that is not attained in a single instance, but rather in an integrated manner.

The second unit, entitled "What is the point of teaching sociology?," provides a more detailed examination of the subject matter in the context of school-based sociology. It draws a distinction between this approach and that taken in higher education, emphasizing the comprehensive nature of sociology as a discipline that incorporates themes from the social sciences as a whole, including anthropology and political science. This approach serves to reinforce the specific nature of sociology teaching in basic education. It is guided not only by theoretical mastery, but also by articulation with the objectives defined by the 1996 Brazilian Education Guidelines and Bases Law (LDB), such as preparation for the exercise of citizenship and for the world of work. In this sense, the book is fulfilling its objective of linking pedagogical

knowledge to sociological reflection. Furthermore, it is delineating the social function of sociology in accordance with the LDB.

Similarly, the author takes care to define the concepts of "sociological alphabetization" and "sociological literacy." Sociological alphabetization is defined as the "acquisition of the theoretical and social apparatus of the social sciences" (Bodart, 2024, p. 68). It is developed gradually through the denaturalization of the social world and the introduction of epistemic knowledge. In turn, sociological literacy refers to the capacity to comprehend social structures in greater depth, situating them within the context of the students' own experiences, and empowering them to engage in critical analysis and transformative action. These concepts, which have been relatively unexplored and underutilized in the social sciences, are presented in a discursive and accessible manner, thereby enriching the reader's theoretical and practical repertoire.

Another significant aspect is the historical contextualization of sociology teaching, which can be traced back to the nineteenth century. This enables an understanding of the current challenges from a historical perspective. Still in the second unit, the author examines the ways in which the projects for society and the functions assigned to the school have shaped the presence of sociology in the curriculum over time. From its formal inclusion in 1930 to its reinstatement in 2008 by Law N. 11,684 (Brazil, 2008), the subject has been at the center of ideological disputes, as evidenced by the opposition between Catholic sociology and the critical strand, the latter of which has been predominant in contemporary times.

The author summarizes this trajectory in tabular form, enumerating the principal milestones in the history of sociology teaching in Brazil. This didactic resource, in addition to being of great pedagogical value, contributes to an understanding of the ongoing process of autonomization of school sociology (Oliveira, 2023). It is evident that the creation of organizations such as Abecs, the National Meeting of Sociology Teaching in Basic Education (Eneseb), and the inclusion of Sociology in public educational policies, such as the Institutional Program for Initiation into Teaching (Pibid) and the National Textbook Plan (PNLD), have played a pivotal role in the autonomization of the field of Sociology teaching research, which includes School Sociology.

Conversely, the analysis does not fail to highlight contemporary challenges, particularly in the context of the high school reform. The replacement of Sociology by "studies and practices of Sociology" and the reduction in its workload represent significant setbacks that jeopardize the consolidation of the subject as a critical and formative tool. The unit therefore offers a comprehensive and critical view of school sociology, articulating its historical relevance, its current challenges, and its importance for the formation of aware and engaged citizens.

Sociology's historical lack of stability in the curriculum is often cited as one of the main causes of various shortcomings in the teaching of the subject. Among these deficiencies are the lack of teaching resources, the absence of a well-structured curriculum, obstacles in teacher training and the low demand for degree courses in Social Sciences. Understanding this historical context helps us to better understand the current situation of school sociology and the challenges to be faced (Bodart, 2024, p. 87).

An understanding of history is crucial for grasping the social, cultural, and political transformations that have shaped the present, thereby enabling the construction of a more conscious and responsible future. In particular, an examination of the history of sociology in Brazilian education is important for understanding the temporality of its presence and absence. This analysis can inform the development of strategies to address current weaknesses and challenges in the field of citizen and critical education.

The third unit, entitled "How to Teach Sociology?," considers the essential elements of planning and implementing the teaching of this subject, with a particular emphasis on the role of the teacher as a facilitator and mediator of knowledge. The author examines the utility of various tools, including subject plans, lesson plans, and didactic sequences, and posits that they are indispensable for the effective organization of teaching. Furthermore, he discusses the significance of planning as a framework for knowledge construction and assessment as a tool for monitoring and adjusting this process. He argues for a gradual approach that begins with the students' existing knowledge and gradually progresses to more complex content. This discussion is illustrated with tables that suggest verbs for use in subject plans and lesson plans. These resources are dynamic in that they translate the discussion into concrete examples that can be adopted.

The unit draws on pedagogical and sociological knowledge to define key concepts such as cultural artefacts, resources and teaching strategies. It considers their applicability in the classroom and suggests materials and themes. In addition, it considers the concept, theory, theme, and research as pedagogical presuppositions, weighing the advantages and disadvantages of each of these principles. It then proceeds to an analysis of the various types of lessons, including thematic, baccalaureate, contextualizing, and instrumentalizing, in a balanced manner, also elucidating the positive and negative aspects of each lesson model. The author notes that as pedagogical knowledge is developed, practice and methodological diversification also improve.

Another important point is to reflect on the approach to sensitive themes such as social inequality, racism, gender and violence, which are inevitable issues in sociology teaching. These controversies are intrinsic to the discipline and, if managed effectively, can facilitate informed and critical discourse. Strategies are proposed for addressing manifestations of intolerance and generalizations, employing what he terms the "decomposition and recomposition" of knowledge.

Teaching sociology necessarily involves clashes with untruths, as happens in all school subjects. However, in the case of Sociology, these clashes often involve beliefs, values and understandings about interpersonal relationships, which requires care and sensitivity to avoid embarrassing or even violent situations (Bodart, 2024, p. 174).

Lastly, the unit considers various pedagogical approaches, including traditional models such as the lecture, which can be enhanced with greater student engagement, and innovative practices such as debates, seminars, out-of-class activities, and the socio biographical notebook, a distinctive resource with potential for reflection. In this way, the unit offers a comprehensive and practical vision, integrating diverse methodologies and a critical reflection on the role of the teacher in teaching sociology.

The fourth unit, entitled "How to Assess in Sociology Teaching?," addresses the assessment process. The section presents proposals for assessing sociological alphabetization and sociological literacy and deconstructs the notion of assessment as a result, arguing that it is a process. In this way, the author proposes the diversification of assessment strategies throughout the academic year, the utilisation of resources with which students are already familiar, and the conceptualisation of

the various types of diagnostic, formative and summative assessment. This approach once again emphasises the interdisciplinary nature of Pedagogy and Sociology. Moreover, it is stated that an assessment should "encourage students to reflect critically on their own position in society and to understand the connections between biography and history" (Bodart, 2024, p. 220).

In conclusion, the final considerations revisit the discussions presented throughout the book, underscoring that the objective is not to impart a set of techniques that will render the reader a superior teacher upon completion of the book, but rather to facilitate a process of shared reflection that will enhance their pedagogical practice. The text emphasizes that teaching practice is a challenging process, yet it is also a continuous discovery, offering the potential for innovation and the construction of knowledge collectively with students. In regard to the role of the sociology teacher, it can be summarized as that of a mediator of knowledge, one who stimulates critical thinking and sociological literacy. Also essential is the ability to work with pluralistic approaches and to recognize the various theories that comprise the social sciences. Additionally, it is of the utmost importance to integrate teaching practice with discussions on teaching sociology, as this facilitates the continuous education of teachers.

As the author notes, "teacher training, particularly for a foundational subject like sociology, necessitates a discerning approach to the nuances of the school environment, the realities of the students, and the intricate social phenomena addressed in the classroom" (Bodart, 2024, p. 245). In this context, the book meets its intended objectives, offering an authentic and accessible reflection on the role of sociology and its context in the school curriculum, as well as its pedagogical objective. To this end, the integration of sociological and pedagogical knowledge throughout the book serves to underscore the necessity for a closer alignment between these two domains, with a view to enhancing the quality of sociology teaching. Nevertheless, the text allowed for the introduction of specific sociological inquiries, such as the proposal to mobilize theories from seminal figures in the field, including Karl Marx and Max Weber, as well as contemporary scholars like Anthony Giddens, Pierre Bourdieu, Bernard Lahire, and Pierre Bourdieu who have been referenced as theoretical references on occasion.

I posit that this book is essential reading for educators at the post-secondary level who teach subjects related to a degree in Social Sciences. I also recommend it for researchers in the field of Sociology teaching, as well as undergraduate and postgraduate students. The book offers insights that can inform more nuanced analyses of the relationship between Sociology and Pedagogy. It is evident from the author's personal reflections and expressed insecurities that there are several fundamental yet often overlooked aspects of the field of sociology teaching, particularly in the context of school sociology studies, that warrant further investigation and discussion.

In light of the aforementioned, the book constitutes an invaluable contribution to the teaching of sociology in basic education, offering theoretical reflections and practical tools to assist teachers in navigating the daily challenges of teaching. The author employs a clear and didactic approach to underscore the significance of the subject in fostering critical and citizens' education among students, while also furnishing concrete pedagogical strategies that can be effectively implemented in the classroom. By establishing a connection between sociology and pedagogy, the book expands our comprehension of the function of school sociology and presents strategies for enhancing its presence in the curriculum.

In addition, as well as offering support for teaching practice, the book contributes to consolidating the teaching of Sociology as an expanding field of research, fundamental to understanding the challenges and possibilities of this discipline in the Brazilian educational context. It is possible to observe, from reflections and insecurities that the author believed to be individual, that there are several 'unspoken obviousnesses' that can make up the research agenda of the field of Sociology teaching, especially focused on School Sociology studies.

For these reasons, it is strongly recommended reading for teachers currently engaged in this field, as well as for those preparing to enter it, as it provides a robust and reflective foundation for professional practice, while contributing to the advancement and consolidation of sociology in basic education.

References

Brazil. (2008). Lei 11.684, de 02 de junho de 2008. Altera o art. 36 da Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, para incluir a Filosofia e a Sociologia como disciplinas obrigatórias nos currículos do ensino médio. Presidência da República. Casa Civil. Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. Distrito Federal.

Oliveira, A. (2023). *O campo do ensino de Sociologia no Brasil: gênese, agentes e disputas*. Maceió: Café com Sociologia.

Accepted in: august 2024