

Práticas da docência universitária no interior do Amazonas: narrativas do cotidiano educativo

University teaching practices in a regional urban center in Amazonas:
narratives of everyday education

Prácticas pedagógicas universitarias en el interior de Amazonas:
narrativas de la educación cotidiana

Tiago Pereira Gomes 
Federal University of Amazonas, Manaus, AM, Brazil.
ti-pg@hotmail.com

Neide Cavalcante Guedes 
Federal University of Piauí, Teresina, PI, Brazil.
neidecguedes@hotmail.com

Received: June 05, 2025

Accepted: June 23, 2025

Published: January 10, 2026

RESUMO

Este estudo objetiva discutir a prática docente de professoras universitárias no interior do Amazonas. É um recorte da tese de doutorado intitulada: Os processos constitutivos da docência: trilhas formativas, saberes e práticas no Ensino Superior no Amazonas (AM), vinculada ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação (UFPI), ao Núcleo de Estudos sobre Formação, Avaliação, Gestão e Currículo (NUFAGEC), e financiada pela Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Amazonas (FAPEAM). É uma pesquisa qualitativa (Triviños, 2008), de abordagem Etnometodológica (Coulon, 2005) como teoria do social sob a égide das bases epistemológicas da fenomenologia de Schutz (2012; 2018), da teoria da ação (Parsons, 1974), dos cinco conceitos-chave de Coulon (2005), entre outros, realizada no Instituto de Ciências Exatas e Tecnologia (ICET), localizado na cidade de Itacoatiara (AM), no período de fevereiro de 2021 a julho de 2024. O dispositivo de produção de dados utilizado para esta discussão foi a observação participante (Angrosino, Flick, 2009). Realizamos análise interpretativa-compreensiva (Gomes, 2024), elaborada no percurso do estudo. Os dados revelam que as professoras desenvolvem sua prática docente com intencionalidade pedagógica e que estas foram construídas e/ou (re)elaboradas nas vivências experienciadas no seu percurso de vida-formação e profissão favorecendo uma ação didática e pedagógica que atende as necessidades formativas dos estudantes.

Palavras-chave: Prática docente; Universidade; Intencionalidade pedagógica; Amazonas.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to discuss the teaching practice of female university professors in a regional urban center in the state of Amazonas. It is an excerpt from the doctoral thesis entitled: The constitutive processes of teaching: formative pathways, knowledge and practices in Higher Education in Amazonas (AM), linked to the Postgraduate Program in Education (*Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação – UFPI*), the Center for Studies on Training, Evaluation, Management and Curriculum (*Núcleo de Estudos sobre Formação, Avaliação, Gestão e Currículo – NUFAGEC*), and funded by the Amazonas State Research Support Foundation (*Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Amazonas – FAPEAM*). It is a qualitative research (Triviños, 2008), with an Ethnomethodological approach (Coulon, 2005), as a theory of the social grounded in the epistemological foundations of Schutz's phenomenology (2012; 2018), the theory of action (Parsons, 1974), the five key concepts of Coulon (2005), among others. The study was conducted at the Institute of Exact Sciences and Technology (*Instituto de Ciências Exatas e Tecnologia – ICET*), located in the city of Itacoatiara, from February 2021 to July 2024. The data collection procedure used for this discussion was participant observation (Angrosino, Flick, 2009). We used interpretive-comprehensive data analysis, prepared by the researchers. The data reveal that the professors develop their teaching practices with pedagogical intentionality and that such practices were constructed and/or (re)elaborated through experiences in their life journey, that is, education and professional practice, thus fostering didactic and pedagogical action that meets students' formative needs.

Keywords: Teaching practice; University; Pedagogical intentionality; Amazonas.

RESUMEN

Este estudio tiene como objetivo discutir la práctica docente de las profesoras universitarias en el interior de Amazonas. Es una sección de la tesis doctoral titulada: Los procesos constitutivos de la enseñanza: trayectorias de formación, saberes y prácticas en la Educación Superior en Amazonas (AM), vinculada al Programa de Postgrado en Educación (UFPI), al Centro de Estudios de Formación, Evaluación, Gestión y Currículo (NUFAGEC), y financiada por la Fundación de Apoyo a la Investigación del Estado de Amazonas (FAPEAM). Se trata de un estudio cualitativo (Triviños, 2008), con enfoque etnometodológico (Coulon, 2005), como teoría de lo social bajo la égida de las bases epistemológicas de la fenomenología de Schutz (2012; 2018), la teoría de la acción (Parsons, 1974), los cinco conceptos clave de Coulon (2005), entre otros, realizado en el Instituto de Ciencias Exactas y Tecnología-ICET, ubicado en la ciudad de Itacoatiara (AM) de febrero de 2021 a julio de 2024. El dispositivo de producción de datos utilizado para esta discusión fue la observación participante (Angrosino, Flick, 2009). Analizamos los datos de forma interpretativa-comprehensiva, elaborada por los investigadores. Los datos revelan que los profesores desarrollan su práctica docente con intencionalidad pedagógica y que éstas han sido construidas y/o (re)elaboradas, es decir, en las experiencias que han tenido en su recorrido por la vida, la formación y la profesión, favoreciendo una acción pedagógica didáctica que responda a las necesidades formativas de sus alumnos.

Palabras clave: Práctica docente; Universidad; Intencionalidad pedagógica; Amazonas.

1 Initial Dialogues

The multiple possibilities through which teaching practices are currently discussed reverberate conceptions that place them in evidence in relation to teachers' know-how in their professional development process. The considerations developed in this study permeate the everyday educational context, based on the understanding that practices occur in social spaces and extend into institutional ones, defining them in their particularities within the context in which they take place. We place the centrality of the reflections developed here on teaching practices within the educational field of university professors, based on a broader study conducted in compliance with the requirements of the Research Ethics Committee (*Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa – CEP*) within the scope of the Federal University of Piauí (*Universidade Federal do Piauí – UFPI*), in accordance with opinion no. 5.133.812 – CEP-UFPI.

This is a qualitative study (Triviños, 2008), with an ethnomethodological approach (Coulon, 2005), grounded in social theory and complemented by the epistemological nuances of Schutz's phenomenology (2012, 2018), action theory (Parsons, 1974), the symbolic interactionism of the Chicago School (Coulon, 2005), Ardoino's multireferentiality (1998), Barbier's concept of sensitive listening (1998), Wright Mills's conception of the researcher as an intellectual craftsman (1986), and Coulon's five key concepts (2005).

We used participant observation (Angrosino; Flick, 2009) as the data generation method, supported by daily field records in the context where teaching practices effectively take place. The participants in this study were five female professors working in different fields at a university in a regional urban center in the state of Amazonas, each with at least 10 (ten) years of teaching experience in public education; in this discussion, we present the narratives of two of them. We prioritized the anonymity of the participants and, therefore, collectively chose pseudonyms based on personalities from their respective fields of education and/or with whom they have a subjective connection.

The data analysis is interpretive-comprehensive, developed throughout the research process (Gomes, 2024), and guided by five phases: preliminary analysis (1), data description (2), data systematization and/or organization (3), data interpretation (4), and data comprehension (5). We initially discuss teaching practices based on conceptual reflections anchored in theoretical frameworks, followed by a description of the teaching activities carried out by the participating professors, the analysis of observations, and, finally, the concluding dialogues.

2 Teaching Practices: conceptual reflections

Teaching practices – educational, pedagogical, and teaching – are articulated based on theoretical and epistemological assumptions that consider them in relation to the actions of actors in their social and educational practices. We are part of a society and, as such, we produce practices that originate from everyday interactions among social actors mobilized by culture, identity, regionality, among other elements that characterize the collective. When we refer to educational practice, we can state that it does not occur “in isolation from the social relations that characterize the economic and political structure of a society, being subordinated to the social, economic, political, and ideological interests of social groups and classes” (Libâneo, 1998, p. 26). Social actions woven into processes of personal, formative, and professional development, established within the webs of meaning of the social and educational spheres, delineate the spatiotemporal context in which educational practice effectively takes place.

Educational practices are “practices that occur in order to bring about educational processes” (Franco, 2012, p. 152), carried out both in school and non-school institutions; that is, education as a social practice takes place in different spaces, whether formal or informal. What distinguishes it from others is the way the specificities and pedagogical intentionalities required by these practices are analyzed and interpreted. It is important to emphasize “a unit of analysis appropriate for understanding the scope and interconnection of subjective initiative with social action involving collective beliefs and institutionalized frameworks” (Fernandes; Grillo apud

Morosini, 2006, p. 444), so that we understand that transformations in social reality arise from educational practice, which is interconnected with pedagogical and teaching practices, thus enabling the construction of society's educational ideals and the development of critical consciousness.

The configurations in webs of meaning through which educational practice is established must be understood in terms of the intentionality and totality in which they occur. The constant, critical, and reflective dialogue of the actions of these practices cannot be disregarded but must be considered a relevant aspect for understanding them within the educational context, since “only practices experienced collectively and pedagogically structured can give meaning to teaching-learning processes” (Franco, 2015, p. 613). Thus, we may affirm that for social practice to be educational, it is necessary to establish objectives and purposes that ensure the transformation of social and educational reality, promoting the reduction of social inequalities and guaranteeing equity and equality of rights, if we aim to fulfill its socially interventionist function.

Because it emerges from a political and intentional act aimed at achieving its purposes, educational practice as a social practice has been characterized in its relationship with human nature and with conceptions of human beings and society within interactional processes, involving ways of being and acting and producing meanings that directly influence the development of other practices when considered in the multidimensionality of the educational field; thus, “educational ends must be social ends, because they can only be social ends” (Charlot, 2013, p. 308). Understanding the social and educational model in which individuals live and socialize ensures a broader perspective on life projects, education, and profession, recognizing the nature of human labor.

We draw on Libâneo (2001, p. 3) in clarifying that intentionally educational action across “various spheres of social practice, through informal, non-formal, and formal modes of education, expands the production and dissemination of knowledge and modes of action (knowledge, concepts, skills, habits, procedures, beliefs, attitudes), leading to pedagogical practices”. These practices are inseparable and are socially determined in different contexts – media, religious, scientific, cultural, regional,

among others – as the author notes, not being restricted to the educational field alone, but encompassing the broader boundaries of educational interactions.

Pedagogical practices, as they reveal themselves to be synonymous with educational practices, are constituted as univocal practices (Franco, 2012). It is appropriate to differentiate them in their definitions in order to situate the field that each encompasses. In this sense, we state that “they are social practices carried out with the purpose of concretizing pedagogical processes” (Franco, 2012, p. 152). The intentionality of pedagogical know-how is a distinctive characteristic of this practice, which is represented in collective dialogue within the educational context, mobilized through negotiations and deliberations, based on the everyday reality in which professional development is woven. It is constituted by a “complex and multifactorial set” (Franco, 2012, p. 156), determining the expectations of a social group based on the constructions established in the process of interaction.

For a practice to be pedagogical, it must have intentional purposes, be previously organized based on teaching planning, and be grounded in educational theories that support teaching action in order to ensure the full realization of learning rights. The knowledge mobilized during this process does not occur only within the classroom context, but also in the spaces where social actors interact and relate, producing social and discipline-specific knowledge of education.

Establishing the conceptual and characteristic nexuses of pedagogical practice implies the need to develop reflections on teaching know-how within the university. Thus, even though it is educational, it is also political, given that educational actions are elaborated through constant dialogue and intentionalities that foster teaching and learning, mediated by the worldview in which professors, students, and the university community influence decision-making for the development of practical action, grounded in the epistemological, theoretical, and pedagogical assumptions that guide the work of university professors.

Revisiting the reflections of Franco (2015, p. 605), who invites us to delve into the field of reflections on teaching practices, we affirm that “pedagogical practices must be structured as critical instances of educational practices, with a view to the collective transformation of the meanings and significations of learning” (Franco, 2015, p. 605).

The author warns that critique, as a component of the re-signification of teaching know-how in education and in the profession, must ensure the (re)construction of epistemological assumptions mediated by ongoing reflection and awareness of affirmative actions in everyday university life.

Within the dimension concerning theoretical models that underpin pedagogical practice, Viana (2016) draws attention to the need to view educational action as a political act that is based on theoretical models of “an epistemological nature (premises of knowledge), theoretical models derived from auxiliary sciences – Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology, etc. – and pedagogical models that support pedagogical practice” (Viana, 2016, p. 70). The relevance of these epistemic foundations enables professors to perceive themselves as active agents in the teaching and learning process, increasingly requiring them to keep pace with social and technological changes, thus fostering the (re)construction of knowledge and practices that respond to the singularities of social actors in the university field.

Pedagogical practices are woven in the local space-time in which educational actions take place, shaped by local structures and conjunctures triggered by the objectives previously defined in teaching planning, in accordance with institutional and program policies. They are the result of collective action, mobilized through negotiations among professors, program coordination, and institutional advisory teams. In this sense, “[..] pedagogical practice is a dimension of social practice that presupposes the theory–practice relationship, and it is essentially our duty, as educators, to seek the necessary conditions for its realization” (Veiga, 1992, p. 16). Every practice has its particularity, as it is carried out by the professor with pedagogical objectives and purposes, fostering the construction of knowledge in education, anchored in the pedagogical-political project of the program in which professors work, as well as in other legal documents that demarcate the formative territoriality of the field in which these practices are developed.

It is influenced by contemporary social dynamics, which assign new meanings to the actions developed in the educational process. In this context, the professor, through sensitive and attentive listening in interactions with students and other subjects of the school, contributes to the construction of meanings about everyday reality,

considering both macro- and microsocial dimensions. This practice is permeated by the influence of education systems, educational policies, labor market demands, and other singular factors, which highlight the complexity in which pedagogical practice is embedded. Teaching work, from this perspective, is collective and depends on multiple forms of knowledge for the development of pedagogical practices, as well as on professionals from specific areas and functions, in addition to a structure that ensures the exercise of the profession, since the professor “cannot work without this pedagogical substratum that weaves collective intentions within the school; without an institutional sphere, which we call pedagogical space, that follows the development of the school’s political project and functions as a critical instance [...]” (Franco, 2012, p. 32). The methodological teaching strategies used by professors activate the theory–practice relationship, being enhanced as they recall knowledge acquired throughout their life, educational, and professional trajectories, reconfiguring it for the development of teaching and learning.

Pedagogical practice, as it is also social, is determined “by a play of forces (interests, motivations, intentionalities); by the degree of awareness of its actors; by the worldview that guides them; by the context in which this practice takes place; by the needs and possibilities specific to its actors and to the reality in which they are situated” (Carvalho; Netto, 1994, p. 59). As it is a complex practice, we emphasize the importance of considering the university’s everyday context in which it is carried out in order to situate its characteristics in relation to linguistic, regional, cultural, social, and identity-related aspects, with a view to highlighting the elements that compose it in the Amazonian educational reality.

Therefore, we cannot issue judgments about the values and competencies of professors based solely on the *Currículo Lattes*. On the contrary, it is necessary to enter the field of teaching practices in order to understand that difficulties are part of educational action in the university field and to discuss how these challenges may be addressed. Reflections in this scenario are pertinent at a time when the teaching profession has been widely debated, as described by Zabalza (2004, p. 105), who states that the professional identity of the professor revolves “around scientific production or productive activities that generate academic merit and that result in

economic and professional benefits”. It is within the context of the school/university that pedagogical practices are established, whether in the university cafeteria, a space that brings together professors and students, where they socialize personal and educational knowledge, or in collegiate meetings and other deliberative councils.

Franco (2012, p. 159) states that “the classroom is organized by the web of pedagogical practices that surrounds it and dialogues with it”, that is, it is through this relationship that teaching practice is established, as it has intentionality for action. In other words, teaching practice can be understood as the practical actions specifically woven within the classroom context by the professor. Autonomy in the development of methodological teaching strategies, grounded in systematic planning carried out within pedagogical practice by the collective, fosters directive, precise, and necessary know-how to achieve the objectives, skills, and competencies of education. “It is a practice exercised with purpose, planning, monitoring, critical vigilance, and social responsibility” (Franco, 2012, p. 160).

The author further adds that pedagogical practice, as it is included among “social practices that are organized to address certain educational expectations of a social group” (Franco, 2012, p. 161), can be understood from the perspective of totality, whereas teaching practice develops within particularity. It is a dialectical relationship that unfolds within a social, cultural, historical, and ideological conception, producing a social dynamic between the internal and external dimensions of the educational context.

3 Teaching practice and pedagogical intentionality in the university context

The meanings and significations through which teaching practice is woven are implicated in its mediation between society and the classroom, due to its connection with pedagogical practice and educational practice. We refer to an interlocution that registers this dialogue among practices that reverberate the objective reality in which educational processes are concretized. Pedagogical intentionality in teaching know-how is a distinctive aspect of teaching practices, as it guides teaching work with social

responsibility and with the purpose of education and the guarantee of learning rights, especially since “pedagogical practices must reorganize and recreate themselves daily in order to fulfill the initial project, which is transformed as life, everyday experience, and existence permeate it” (Franco, 2012, p. 164).

It is necessary to reflect on the pedagogical conditions in which professors live and interact within their everyday university realities, and these “are shaped by the conditions/contradictions of the subjects’ lives and existence, by the *space-time* contexts in which education takes place, by the dynamics that involve and create the educational collective, by the subjectivities that construct the meaning of teaching/learning in society, among others” (Franco, 2012, p. 218). Recognizing this movement of knowing and doing in the professional development of social actors within their spaces of interaction highlights the totality of pedagogical practice for the exercise of the particularities of teaching practice, in light of directive actions in response to challenges that emerge in the educational field, mobilized through reflection in which decisions and pedagogical interventions are materialized, with a view to meeting the objectives and purposes of teaching proposals.

Teaching practice, in this direction, is grounded in “disciplinary knowledge, knowledge related to content and its social scope, as well as didactic knowledge, related to different forms of content management, learning dynamics, values, and teaching projects” (Franco, 2015, p. 607). It reflects pedagogical practice because intentionality moves from totality to the objective particularity of teaching action within the classroom context. Teaching authorship in the development of teaching strategies, even when guided by management and the education system, is mobilized by professional autonomy established through a singular perspective on everyday educational reality.

The knowledge and practices mobilized in the classroom carry meanings and significations that demarcate the territoriality of practice, placing the plurality of directive actions of the professor with intentionalities that converge toward pedagogical objectives and purposes. It is within this scenario, therefore, that the theoretical and practical singularities of professional knowledge are woven, aiming at the development of skills and competencies inherent to the profession or their re-signification according

to the everyday reality of the educational context. It is from this perspective that the following records weave the teaching practices of two of the professors participating in this study, observed through the researcher's lens. In this case, we chose to present epistemological arguments that can anchor the narratives of Amazonian university professors in order to describe the teaching practices developed in their everyday practice.

2.1 The teaching practice of Prof. Maria Gaetana Agnesi

By following the teaching practice in the course Calculus I, with a workload of 90 hours, in the first semester of the bachelor's degree program in Production Engineering, taught by Professor Maria Gaetana Agnesi, on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., we observed her didactic action in the content of derivatives and differentials, among others described in the course syllabus. We followed her lectures and the explanation of the initial content, beginning with a review of the previous class and continuing with knowledge from Basic Education, enabling students to recall and apply it in the proposed activities, that is, in the list of exercises related to the subject studied.

The initial perceptions observed in the context of practice indicate that the professor carries out her professional activities mediated by planning that guides her educational action. Menegolla and Sant'Anna (1992) explain that it is through the act of planning that the teacher establishes directions, outlines pathways, and indicates goals, purposes, and objectives that underpin teaching and learning. This previously organized structuring becomes the basic instrument of everyday teaching practice and can indicate the paths to be unveiled that ensure learning rights within the university space. These authors add that planning is the instrument that systematizes the teacher's action, contributing to the consolidation of the objectives of the course plan.

It is the anticipation of the knowledge and content to be developed in the classroom, the definition of the most important objectives, as well as the selection of the best teaching procedures and techniques, as well as the human and material resources to be used for better teaching and learning. In addition, the course plan proposes the

determination of the most effective evaluation techniques and instruments to verify the achievement of objectives in relation to learning (Menegolla; Sant'anna, 1992, p. 64).¹

The professor, in this direction, understands the importance of planning as a guiding element of her practice, substantiated in the revisiting of the knowledge of the content taught, adopting a study routine within her pedagogical time, in which she grounds and structures her didactic action in order to conduct it in a clear, objective, and easily understandable manner.

Interaction and attentive observation of students are distinctive characteristics of the professor who, in addition to demonstrating mastery of disciplinary knowledge, establishes a mutual relationship with students, especially regarding doubts that arise during classes, generally encouraging them to go to the board and demonstrate how they solved the problem under discussion.

Bardagi and Hutz (2012) state that professors are perceived by students entering the university as role models and sources of support and guidance. It is as if their formative and professional identity were supported by the practical actions of their professors. It is not only an influence of content and learning, but also of interactions that extend beyond the boundaries of knowledge, into social and educational life.

The way students are treated, welcomed, and encouraged makes the initial university experience highly significant and fundamental for the quality of students' formative trajectories (Soares; Almeida; Diniz; Guisande, 2006), characteristics of Professor Maria Gaetana Agnesi that also extend to the other professors. In the spaces of participant observation, we had the opportunity to engage in dialogue with some students about the university educational context they were experiencing at that moment as first-year students, in order to understand everyday reality.

Coulon (2017) notes that entry into Higher Education is marked by ruptures and the construction of new roles and cultural codes for university students. Thus, students

¹ Original: "É a previsão dos conhecimentos e conteúdos que serão desenvolvidos na sala de aula, a definição dos objetivos mais importantes, assim como a seleção dos melhores procedimentos e técnicas de ensino, como também dos recursos humanos e materiais que serão usados para um melhor ensino e aprendizagem. Além disso, o plano de disciplina propõe a determinação das mais eficazes técnicas e instrumentos de avaliação para verificar o alcance dos objetivos em relação à aprendizagem" (Menegolla; Sant'anna, 1992, p. 64).

pointed out that they are adapting to this new academic scenario, in which they take seven courses with different professors and their didactic specificities, also recognizing gaps from Basic Education related to certain content required in the courses.

Baker and Siryk (1984) contribute to this discussion by stating that the process of academic adaptation is related to students' adjustment and/or organization in their entry into university life. For these authors, the degree of adaptation depends on the collaborative work of the institution, program coordination, professors, and more experienced students in welcoming and building bonds at this complex moment in students' lives, when they assume a new identity: undergraduate students. Another aspect mentioned by them relates to the study routine that students have not yet been able to organize; that is, they are still in the process of adaptation and report that professors have contributed since their initial reception and also in providing guidance on how to study at the university, although they still need to plan themselves.

In this direction, the professor's practice involves group activities for problem-solving, during which she rotates responses on the board, encouraging participation and learning through interaction among students, promoting the socialization of results, in line with Cai and Lester (2012, p. 156), who emphasize that teachers "must develop a problem-solving culture in the classroom to make problem solving a regular and consistent part of their classroom practice". Therefore, the moments observed in the teaching practice of Professor Maria Gaetana Agnesi allow us to affirm that the experiences derived from her lived time as a person, student, and professor, for more than a decade, contribute to making her professional development intentional, reflective, and critical, in order to meet the specificities of students' education, considering the contribution of this knowledge to academic know-how.

2.2 The teaching practice of Prof. Gertrude Belle Elion

Participant observation of Professor Gertrude Belle Elion took place in two courses: Pharmaceutics II (30 hours) and Pharmaceutical Technology (45 hours), taught on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays, from 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., for the 7th and 8th semesters, with both theoretical and practical classes. We followed a lecture

on Solid Dosage Forms: powders, granules, tablets, and capsules; semisolid dosage forms: ointments, creams, gels; as well as liquid dosage forms: solutions and suspensions, modified-release forms, followed by sterile products, stability, and the determination of drug shelf life, in addition to other discussions arising from the courses.

Her teaching practice is woven through a relationship of interaction with students, in which she questions them about the content taught, establishing connections with knowledge from previous courses. Lectures and explanatory classes are illustrated with videos and images so that students can learn the theory and apply it in laboratory practices.

Limberger (2013, p. 969) explains that the educational context of Pharmacy students in Higher Education institutions has undergone transformations aimed at “training professionals suited to the health needs of the Brazilian population and of the Unified Health System, integrating the effective articulation of health policies with education”. This context enables spaces for knowledge construction through the development of autonomy and the insertion of students into practical activities that support the consolidation of theory, breaking with normative paradigms and enabling an interpretive understanding of social reality and its phenomena.

The professor, as a mediator of skills and competencies, is also a facilitator of this process when, in the exercise of her profession, she carries out directive actions that meet the needs of her students, considering the Amazonian reality; that is, the discourse and orientation of her classes must ensure this necessary reflection, an aspect that contributes to the professional development of Professor Gertrude Belle Elion.

While observing a practical laboratory class involving the production of a yellow-colored ointment, we noted that the professor made evident the relationship between theory and practice consolidated in this activity. The professor follows a routine in guiding the procedure, explaining to students the materials used and the method, urging them to pay attention to the measurements and calculations required for the accuracy of the product.

The observed experience aligns with Limberger (2013, p. 971), who emphasizes that in laboratories “the students’ approach, at first, may seem simple, but, in practice, the shift in roles may not be so easily perceived: the professor is no longer the conductor, but a companion in the search for learning”. In this sense, students are divided into groups and carry out procedures according to the professor’s guidance, who monitors the results of this initial phase, asking questions about this process in conjunction with knowledge from previously taken courses. Upon returning to the classroom, she revisits the practical experience, moving from practice to theory in the construction of knowledge.

For this reason, when experiencing “the practice setting [...], students perform tasks according to the level of complexity and autonomy they have reached. This stage of the process is of fundamental importance, as it will serve as the starting point for the realization of the pedagogical process” (Silva; Miguel; Teixeira, 2011, p. 80). The use of illustrative videos in the Pharmaceutical Technology course contributes to the understanding of content, considering the absence of modern equipment at the institution and the difficulty of promoting technical visits to factories and other spaces that meet students’ educational needs, in light of the course objectives.

According to Silva, Miguel, and Teixeira (2011), knowledge is constructed as future pharmacists engage in problematizing practical activities, that is, through active participation that expands their learning, configured in the action/reflection/action relationship, fulfilling the requirements of the program’s pedagogical project and other legal frameworks that guide the professional competence of future pharmacists, mediated through experience, theorization, and practice.

3 Interpreting to understand teaching practice from the perspective of ethnomethodology as a theory of the social

We understand the everyday practices of teaching among the study participants based on the nuances of qualitative research, the theoretical-epistemological foundations of ethnomethodology as a theory of the social, and through the lens of participant observation, highlighting that the professors establish a harmonious

relationship with students in the classroom, fostering participation and interaction in both practical and theoretical disciplinary content. We add that all these positive moments and activities did not diminish the professors' demands regarding punctuality, completion of activities, and, additionally, the requirement for appropriate laboratory attire, as well as in the theoretical assessments conducted by the professors after the completion of all teaching activities.

Regarding differences in students' learning pace, the professors sought to reduce these difficulties by revisiting prior content necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the knowledge taught. All of them used the Google Classroom platform and posted video lectures related to the studied content, which were worked on interactively by professors and students. As an example, we highlight activities from the Calculus I course, which contributed to and encouraged students to study both individually and collectively, in order to enhance the knowledge produced, acquired, and shared as strategies to minimize negative impacts that may have arisen in the process of teaching and learning within the university context.

In dialogue with students during the observations, they unanimously reported that the professors demonstrate mastery of the content and assist them in their learning processes, consistently revisiting explanations when clear understanding had not been achieved, encouraging their academic growth, particularly regarding participation in scientific events and engagement in research and extension activities.

The writings of Quadros and Mortimer (2014, p. 262) contribute in this regard by stating that "the class is a human activity carried out through a set of mediated actions. As an activity, it implies the presence of the subjects, professor and students, each with their own objectives and differentiated roles". It is noteworthy that hypotheses and misunderstandings arising during classes were repeatedly transformed into spaces for reflection, fostering the construction of knowledge, in which professors responded with further questions, promoting debate among students, resolving individual doubts that became socialized and used as learning opportunities for the entire class.

Regarding the methodological procedures used by the professors, we can affirm that they employ didactic-pedagogical actions that meet current pedagogical demands.

We did not observe interdisciplinary activities during the observation period; however, the mediation carried out by the professors leads to meaningful learning insofar as they conduct laboratory practices using local resources and the production of materials that serve as a basis for the consolidation of knowledge in relation to students' everyday lives, in social, cultural, and educational dimensions.

With regard to student–student relationships, it was possible to observe a climate of cooperation among them. When carrying out group work, especially in laboratory practices, they assist one another, sharing experiences related to the procedures guided by the professors. In assessment practices, the professors administer written exams, practical tests, classroom exercises, report writing, and seminars in order to monitor students' progress and, consequently, their own teaching practice.

We observed practice mobilized by sensitive listening to life, educational, and professional trajectories, substantiated in the sharing of knowledge in discussion circles and other spaces of interaction in everyday university life, grounded in narratives recorded in formative and teaching practice memorials. This led us to perceive that the singularity of each professor was expressed in her didactic action in lectures and laboratory classes, articulated with the experiences of her formative and professional trajectories, allowing a perspective on educational reality throughout the development of teaching practices, as they effectively occur within the university, through the microsociological lens of social actors, in the inseparable relationship between the personal, formative, and professional self.

This recognition of the constitution of teaching in Higher Education, grounded in lived experiences in education and socializing interactions in practice, allows us to state that becoming a professor involves going beyond theoretical-practical mastery to include other dimensions that are part of this constitution: technical skill and competence, interaction with students and colleagues, sensitivity and empathy toward oneself and others, within a harmonious, ethical coexistence grounded in social responsibility in the educational field.

The perceptive lenses of teaching practice are the lenses of professional doing, of a craft that is multiple and, at the same time, complex. Teaching techniques and/or methodological strategies are carried out based on the educational epistemologies of

training, constructed and (re)constructed through experiences in/of practice, mobilized by autonomy, reflection, and specific to the university field. In this process of mediating teaching practice, nuances of educational action are revealed, underlying the reservoir of knowledge, producing meaning for professional practice and breaking with traditional paradigms.

In this sense, the professor, as a transformative intellectual, according to Giroux (1997), exercises their function not only in the pedagogical field but also in the political field, in a complementary manner, fostering critical reflections on social and educational reality and thus promoting citizenship-oriented and emancipatory education. In this context, teaching practice must ensure ongoing dialogue on relevant themes that are part of students' sociocultural context, promoting critical thinking articulated with content knowledge itself.

4 Final dialogues

By presenting concepts of teaching practices, we intended to characterize their similarities and particularities as determined within educational reality, whether in the context of Basic Education or Higher Education, the research field/setting. Social theory from the ethnomethodological, phenomenological perspective of action theory and symbolic interactionism engages with these discussions insofar as the practices woven by social actors in their processes of linguistic and symbolic interaction become the focus of investigation and interpretation for understanding teaching practices.

The everyday educational life of university professors is a dynamic field that moves dialectically in the relationship between theory and practice, mobilized by interactions among social actors in their communicative acts underlying personal and professional education. Immersing oneself in this field, in which teaching practices are woven, developed, and laden with meanings and significations, reveals how knowledge is constructed in the context of action within the university, considering the sociocultural reality and benefiting students, professors, and others who are part of this educational collective. The records of everyday life, in this study, are configured in the

apprehension of social facts that can be seen and/or observed microsociologically through students' daily activities and practical actions.

The assumptions of Schutz's phenomenology (2012; 2018), Goffman (2002), Garfinkel (1967), Simmel (1983), and other authors who at various moments converge with the dialogues proposed here, anchor these reflections. Symbolic constructions and intersubjective relations, in this sense, are characteristic elements of phenomenology and assist us in these arguments because they "start from the conception that society is constructed in concentric circles from simple interactions and consider everyday life as the domain in which the meaning of the social is created and understood" (Teixeira, 1991, p. 11).

The university, as a space/place for the production of knowledge and dissemination of scientific knowledge, contains in its daily activities multiple teaching practices, as well as different social, cultural, ethnic, and other manifestations that reveal much about who the "selves" and the "we" are that are constituted, educated, and teach within it. When we look at this plurality with the aim of interpreting its singularities as practiced by university professors in their processes of social and linguistic interaction within their teaching work, we seek, in fact, to apprehend what is said and unsaid, with a view to understanding the daily routine in Higher Education mediated by teaching know-how.

These actors, in their processes of interaction and socialization, in different spaces and places, make use of "[...] all their senses, all their intellectual capacities, their manipulative skills, their feelings, passions, ideas, and ideologies" (Heller, 1992, p. 17). Thus, attention to the everyday life of teaching is justified because it is a field for identifying the subjectivities expressed by professors, that is, the details, "[...] the minute and obscure aspects of daily life, or aspects considered superficial of existence" (Sodré, 1998, p. 7). For these attitudes to be perceived, it is necessary that the researcher, in addition to being a member, makes use of sensitive listening, attentive to the indexical expressions articulated in interactional discourse across the multiple spaces in which professors move, teach, and interact.

The studies of Agnes Heller on everyday life have stood out in seeking to understand social life, "[...], especially with regard to the study of everyday life as a

privileged locus for apprehending the historical process” (Patto, 1993, p. 121). Entering the universe of university teaching is to traverse paths that reveal knowledge arising from educational practices that drive processes of education and professional development.

Everyday life, “a word that comes from the Latin *cotidie* or *cotidianus*, means every day, the daily, the day-to-day, the common, the habitual” (Guimarães, 2002, p. 11). It is the common daily activities of university professors that produce their different ways of being and doing in professional practice, enabling new knowledge about their educational reality. For the author, “everyday life is the constitution of the reproduction of the individual itself and, consequently, of society itself, through objectifications” (Guimarães, 2002, p. 12). Human action upon the object, as a foundational aspect of objectification, produces meanings and significations about the intentionality toward which this action is directed.

Language, customs, and other aspects that demarcate the territoriality of objectification highlight its importance for social coexistence. Perceiving these nuances within the university becomes relevant because everyday life has its particularities, and the social actions and facts that arise from it, from a subjective perspective, take these studies into account.

The educational practices established in the development of the teaching profession are multiple; therefore, there is a need to select which of these are most appropriate for this study. Thus, we chose not to limit the analyses of the everyday life of Higher Education professors, but rather to identify the teaching practices woven in their daily know-how. Recognizing the trivialities (Certeau, 1998) expressed in moments of interaction, whether in the classroom context or in other environments, makes everyday life an indispensable element for qualitative research, because the classroom in which teaching practice is carried out is not limited to that structure culturally categorized by society, but expands beyond the four walls into different spaces/places in which teaching and learning can, in fact, be realized, re-signifying the traditionally established concept of the place where knowledge is taught.

Everyday life, from this perspective, can be conceived as the period in which social actors “within a time and space, carry out their lives and assign new meanings

to individual desires, allowing the researcher to distinguish the challenges posed through the narratives of their lives, where these individuals are inserted and act in the world and in the group to which they belong” (Spindola; Santos, 2003, p. 121). To understand the everyday life of university professors, it is important to consider their personal, educational, and professional life histories, mobilized by their cultural roots, so that we may understand the various ways of acting, expressing thought, memories, and experiences arising from these trajectories.

Therefore, teaching practices, in their theoretical conceptions, have a multireferential articulation (Ardoino, 1980) because they are linked to different approaches, allowing the researcher, depending on their intentionality and/or interest, to discuss their purpose and objectivity with the aim of providing multiple reflections and the (re)construction of new concepts.

References

ANGROSINO, Michael.; FLICK, Uwe. (Coord.). **Etnografia e observação participante**. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2009.

ARDOINO, Jacques. Abordagem multirreferencial (plural) das situações educativas e formativas. *In*: BARBOSA, J. G. (Coord.). **Multirreferencialidade nas ciências e na educação**. São Carlos: Editora da UFSCar, 1998. pp. 24-41.

ARDOINO, Jacques. **Education et relations**: introduction à une analyse plurielle des situations éducatives. Paris: Gauthier-Villars: UNESCO, 1980.

BAKER, Robert. Will.; SIRYK, Bohdan. Measuring adjustment to college. **Journal of Counseling Psychology**, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 179-89, 1984.

BARBIER, René. A escuta sensível na abordagem transversal. *In*: BARBOSA, J. G. (Coord.). **Multirreferencialidade nas ciências e na educação**. São Carlos: EduUFCar, 1998. pp. 168-199.

BARDAGI, Marucia. Patta.; HUTZ, Claudio. Simon. Mercado de trabalho, desempenho acadêmico e o impacto sobre a satisfação universitária. **Revista de Ciências Humanas**, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 183-198, 2012.

CAI, Jinfa *et al.* Por que o ensino com resolução de problemas é importante para a aprendizagem do aluno? Traduzido por Bastos, A. S. A. M.; Allevalo, N. S. G. **Boletim GEPEN**, Rio de Janeiro, no. 60, pp. 241-254, 2012.

CARVALHO, Maria do Carmo Brant de.; NETTO, José Paulo. **Cotidiano: conhecimento e crítica**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1994.

CERTEAU, Michel. de. **A invenção do cotidiano: artes do fazer**. Translation by Ephraim Ferreira Alves. 3rd ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998.

CHARLOT, Bernard. **A mistificação pedagógica: realidades sociais e processos ideológicos na teoria da educação**. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 2013.

COULON, Alan. **Etnometodologia**. Translation by Ephraim Ferreira Alves. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2005.

COULON, Alan. O ofício de estudante: a entrada na vida universitária. **Educação e Pesquisa**, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 1239-1250, 2017.

FERNANDES, C. M. B.; GRILLO, M. C. Currículo e prática pedagógica da educação superior. *In*: MOROSINI, M. *et al.* **Enciclopédia Pedagogia Universitária**. Glossário, vol. 2. Brasília: Inep/Ries, 2006, pp. 441-457. Available at: http://www.furb.br/proen/new/docs/Enciclopedia_Pedagogia.PDF. Accessed on: Sep. 24, 2023.

FRANCO, Maria. Amélia Santoro. **Pedagogia e prática docente**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

FRANCO, Maria. Amélia Santoro. Práticas pedagógicas de ensinar-aprender: por entre resistências e resignações. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 601-614, Jul./Sep. 2015.

GARFINKEL, Harold. **Studies in ethnomethodology**. Cambridge: Press, 1967.

GIROUX, Henri. Professores como intelectuais transformadores. *In*: GIROUX, Henri. **Os professores como intelectuais: rumo a uma pedagogia crítica da aprendizagem**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1997. pp. 157-164.

GOFFMAN, Erving. **A representação do eu na vida cotidiana**. Translation by Maria Célia Santos Raposo. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2002.

GOMES, Tiago Pereira. **Processos Constitutivos da Docência: trilhas formativas, saberes e práticas no Ensino Superior no Amazonas**. Advisor: Neide Cavalcante Guedes. 2024. 375 f. Thesis (Doctorate in Education). Graduate Program in Education. Center for Education Sciences. Universidade Federal do Piauí, Teresina, 2024. Available at: https://ufpi.br/images/arquivos_download/PPGED/PUBLICAES/Teses%20publicadas/Tiago%20Pereira%20Tese%20completa.pdf. Accessed on: May 26, 2025.

HELLER, Agnes. **O cotidiano e a história**. 4th ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1992. 120 p.

LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. Pedagogia e pedagogos: inquietações e buscas. **Educar**, Curitiba: Editora da UFPR, no. 17, pp. 153-176. 2001.

LIMBERGER, Jane Beatriz. Metodologias ativas de ensino-aprendizagem para educação farmacêutica: um relato de experiência. **Interface-Comunicação, Saúde, Educação**, vol. 17, pp. 969-975, 2013.

MENEGOLLA, Maximiliano et al. **Por que planejar? Como planejar?: currículo, área, aula**. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1992. (Collection: Escola em Debate/2).

MILLS, Charles Wright. **A imaginação sociológica**. 6th ed. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1986.

PARSONS, Talcott. **O sistema das sociedades modernas**. São Paulo: Pioneira, 1974.

PATTO, Maria Helena Souza. O conceito de cotidianidade em Agnes Heller e a pesquisa em educação. **Perspectivas: Revista de Ciências Sociais**, vol. 16, 1993.

QUADROS, Ana Luiza de; MORTIMER, Eduardo Fleury. Fatores que tornam o professor de Ensino Superior bem-sucedido: analisando um caso. **Ciência & Educação**, vol. 20, no. 01, pp. 259-278, 2014.

SCHUTZ, Alfred. **A construção significativa do mundo social: uma introdução a sociologia compreensiva**. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2018.

SCHUTZ, Alfred. **Sobre fenomenologia e relações sociais**. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2012.

SILVA, Rinaldo Henrique Aguiar da et al. Problematização como método ativo de ensino-aprendizagem: estudantes de farmácia em cenários de prática. **Trabalho, Educação e Saúde**, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 77-93, Mar. 2011.

SIMMEL, Georg. **Sociologia**. São Paulo: Ática, 1983

SOARES, Ana. Paula *et al.* Modelo multidimensional de ajustamento de jovens ao contexto universitário (MMAU): estudo com estudantes de ciências e tecnologias versus ciências sociais e humanas. **Análise Psicológica**, vol. 1, no. 24, pp. 15-27, 2006.

SODRÉ, Muniz. Apresentação. *In*: MAFFESOLI, M. **Dinâmica da violência**. São Paulo: Vértice, 1998. p. 172.

ISSN: 1984-6444 | <http://dx.doi.org/10.5902/1984644492317>

SPINDOLA, Telma.; SANTOS, Rosângela da Silva. Trabalhando com a história de vida: percalços de uma pesquisa(dora?). **Revista da Escola de Enfermagem da USP**, São Paulo, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 119-126, 2003.

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

VEIGA, Ilma Passos Alencastro. **A prática pedagógica do professor de didática**. Campinas: Papirus, 1992.

VIANA, Iêda. Prática pedagógica: matrizes teóricas e interfaces conceituais. *In*: SILVA, Maria Cristina Borges da (ed.) **Práticas pedagógicas e elementos articuladores**. Curitiba: UTP, 2016. p. 172-1998.

ZABALZA, Miguel Angel. **O ensino universitário: seus cenários e seus protagonistas**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 2004.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)