

## **The didactic planning in the performance of pedagogues from the Service of Coexistence and Strengthening of Bonds in João Pessoa-PB**

**DIAS, Luciana Silva (João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brasil)<sup>1\*</sup>**

**SEVERO, José Leonardo Rolim de Lima (João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brasil)<sup>2\*\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Mestrado em Educação

<sup>2</sup>Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Centro de Educação

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9799-8628>

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5071-128X>

### **Abstract**

This article aims to discuss the meanings attributed by the pedagogues from the Service of Coexistence and Strengthening of Bonds, in the city of João Pessoa, Paraíba, about the didactic planning process that they develop in their socio-educational routine. The article is based on research that had a qualitative approach inspired by the focus on symbolic interactionism. For data collection, structured questionnaires were answered by 15 educators who are part of the service in João Pessoa. To analyze the data, content analysis was used. It was possible to realize that planning is part of the daily life of the professionals surveyed, with an emphasis on the technical-operational framework of the Service of Coexistence and Strengthening of Bonds and on interests highlighted by the students. The political dimension related to the social meaning of the action they plan is not very evident, which can lead to the loss of transformative power of Social Education practices in the Service of Coexistence and Strengthening of Bonds.

### **Keywords**

Didactics. Didactic planning. Social Education.

## **O planejamento didático na atuação de pedagogas do Serviço de Convivência e Fortalecimento de Vínculos em João Pessoa-PB**

### **Resumo**

Este artigo tem o objetivo de discutir os significados atribuídos pelas pedagogas do Serviço de Convivência e Fortalecimento de Vínculos, na cidade de João Pessoa, Paraíba, sobre o processo de planejamento didático que desenvolvem em seu cotidiano socioeducativo. O artigo se baseia em uma pesquisa que possuiu uma abordagem qualitativa de inspiração no enfoque do interacionismo simbólico. Para a coleta dos dados, aplicaram-se questionários estruturados junto a 15 pedagogas que integram o referido serviço em João Pessoa. Para a apreciação dos dados, recorreu-se à análise de conteúdo. Pôde-se perceber que o planejamento faz parte do cotidiano das profissionais pesquisadas, com ênfase no marco técnico-operacional do Serviço de Convivência e Fortalecimento de Vínculos e em interesses destacados pelos(as) educandos(as). A dimensão política relativa ao sentido social da ação que planejam se apresenta de modo pouco evidente, o que pode levar à perda de potência transformadora das práticas de Educação Social no Serviço de Convivência e Fortalecimento de Vínculos.

### **Palavras-chave**

Didática. Planejamento didático. Educação Social.

## **Planificación didáctica en la actuación de pedagogas en el Servicio de Convivencia y Fortalecimiento de Enlaces en João Pessoa-PB**

### **Resumen**

Este artículo tiene como objetivo discutir los significados atribuidos por las pedagogas del Servicio de Convivencia y Fortalecimiento de Enlace en la ciudad de João Pessoa, Paraíba, sobre el proceso de planificación didáctica que desarrollan en su cotidiano socioeducativo. El artículo se basa en una investigación que adoptó un enfoque cualitativo inspirado en el enfoque del interaccionismo simbólico. Para la recolección de datos, se aplicaron cuestionarios estructurados a 15 educadores que forman parte del servicio en João Pessoa. Para analizar los datos, se utilizó el análisis de contenido. Fue posible percibir que la planificación es parte de la vida cotidiana de los profesionales encuestados, con énfasis en el marco técnico-operativo del Servicio de Convivencia y Fortalecimiento de Bonos y en los intereses destacados por los estudiantes. La dimensión política relacionada con el significado social de la acción que planean no es muy evidente, lo que puede conducir a la pérdida del poder transformador de las prácticas de Educación Social en el Servicio de Convivencia y Fortalecimiento de Enlaces.

### **Palabras clave**

Didáctica. Planificación. Educación Social.

## **1 Introduction**

The Social Assistance Policy in Brazil is responsible for providing social protection and specific services to assist different families in overcoming social vulnerability and preventing risk situations (BRASIL, 1993). Therefore, the Service of Coexistence and Strengthening of Bonds (SCFV, in Portuguese) is a national service of basic social protection complementary to the Global Attention to the Family Program (PAIF, in Portuguese), with a preventive, protective and proactive nature, aiming to prevent and protect the users from risks and violation of rights and to contribute to the strengthening of family and community bonds (BRASIL, 2009b).

SCFV was created to the detriment of a reorganization by the Ministry of Social Development (MDS, in Portuguese) aiming to unify rules involving services such as the Child Labor Eradication Program (PETI, in Portuguese), the National Youth Inclusion Program (ProJovem, in Portuguese), as well as those involving the elderly, so that the funding for those programs could be unified. SCFV aims to integrate individuals in participative structures of society, through socio-educational practices that stimulate

the critical, political and social development of those individuals grouped through life cycles (BRASIL, 2009b).

Usually, the groups that are part of SCFV gather at the Social Assistance Reference Centers (CRAS, in Portuguese) or at other socio-educational institutions referenced by them. In these institutions, the educators plan activities and strategies that enable the creation of situations of dialogue, conflict resolution, social participation, construction of life projects, valorization of differences, knowledge of rights and obligations etc. These are activities that can contribute to the critical education of these users or, in another perspective, can focus only on welfare and reduction of conflict without contributing to social transformation.

In the perspective of critical progressive Social Education (SEVERO, 2017), SCFV can develop very important and complex community work to contribute to the improvement in the quality of life of students, families and communities, cooperating in overcoming their social vulnerabilities. This requires a qualified team to achieve those objectives.

Reflecting about the meaning of planning is an indispensable condition to understand the concepts constituted by educators, which are translated in their way of acting with SCFV collectives and in the knowledge of strategies used in understanding the problem or situation.

We believe that there is no teaching without planning, because that process requires responsibility and intentionality. Although it is naïve to think that planning by itself will guarantee success in teaching, without it, the details and variety of the aspects involved are lost. About that theme, Padilha (2001, p. 30, our translation) states: “[...] the act of planning is always a process of reflection, of making decisions about the action, of predicting needs and rationalizing the use of necessary means to achieve goals”. We can notice that it goes beyond a bureaucratic practice like creating plans or programs and executing them; it is a process of development of the pedagogical praxis itself.

Through a search in the portal of scientific journals of the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (Capes, in Portuguese) and the Brazilian Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (BDTD, in Portuguese), using the descriptors “Education and Service of Coexistence and Strengthening of Bonds”, “Educational

Practices and Service of Coexistence and Strengthening of Bonds”, Dias and Severo (2018) indicate that, among five studies retrieved through those descriptors, none discussed the practice of didactic planning, but they analyzed the impact of artistic practices (theater, dance, capoeira and music) and leisure in the process of integration and strengthening of bonds.

The reflection proposed in this article intends to evidence the importance of academic investment in studies that unveil new forms of didactic planning outside of schools, enabling the construction of a theoretical-methodological landmark that guides social educators’ actions systematically and reflexively. Consequently, we believe that didactics can contribute to improve the processes of teaching and learning developed in Social Education.

## **2 Methodological path**

The research follows a qualitative approach, based on the researchers’ interpretation as a simultaneously systematic and dynamic relationship with the object (SAMPIERI; COLLADO; LUCIO, 2013). The methodological design was corroborated by symbolic interactionism, grounded on Blumer (1980) and Mead (1977), an epistemological perspective that reinforces the scientific importance of meanings attributed by individuals, understanding them not as the result of isolated cognitive activity, but as the result of social and cultural relationships between individuals. Thus, these relationships are constituted in and constitute labor as a process of interaction between people, contexts and institutional cultures. Within the logic of symbolic interactionism, the perspective of the individual is taken as the research’s object of analysis, so that the social subject is seen as a critical agent able to interpret and construct their social world through their interactions with others (BLUMER, 1980).

The research participants were 15 pedagogues who work at SCFV units in João Pessoa, Paraíba (PB). The participants were informed of ethical procedures according to the guidelines in Resolution n. 466/2012, by the National Health Council (CNS, in Portuguese), expressing their free and informed consent. The research was approved by the Committee of Ethics in Research of the Health Sciences Center at the Federal University of Paraíba (UFPB, in Portuguese), with the number 3.191.518. The pedagogues

had their identities protected, including the units where they work, and were named pedagogues 1, 2, 3, and so on, in this study.

Data collection took place through a structured questionnaire with multiple-choice questions. The questionnaires were answered during a continued training workshop on November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2018, offered by the extension project “Social Pedagogy Workshops at SCFV”, developed in the context of the Group of Study and Research in Pedagogy, Educational Work and Society (Gepptes, in Portuguese), at UFPB. This project aimed to cooperate with training actions for social educators and management teams working at the SCFV in the municipality of João Pessoa-PB.

Data analysis was carried out based on content category analysis, through which the researcher works with text units, creating thematic categories that help to explore and better explain the text *corpus*, confronting it with the research objectives and then analyzing it (BARDIN, 2011).

### **3 Theoretical framework**

We believe that reflecting about the didactic dimension of planning is important in the training of educators who work or wish to work outside school spaces, where the SCFV is located. Planning is an exercise of analytic-strategical thought and demands reflection about reality, about practices, because it consists of reflective and early preparation of an action in order to achieve certain objectives. Vasconcellos (1995) explains that the main goal of planning is enabling more significant and transformative work. It is paramount that the educator plans their actions in a conscious, critical and intentional manner, willingly and committed to educational practice.

In Brazil, Social Education emerges through socio-educational actions of initiatives working with poor children and teenagers, in situations of neglect, violence, aiming to overcome those circumstances and guarantee their social rights (MACHADO, 2014), with the objective of “[...] contributing to the individual’s social integration, stimulating critical capabilities, so that they can improve and transform the social environment where they live” (CASTELEIRO, 2008, p. 5, our translation). To that end, it deals with the concept of broad education, considering the process of social interaction

in the individuals' environment; it is created to systematize social education and guarantee the social rights of all citizens.

This education takes place in different educational spaces and is supported by the social assistance policy, that is, in spaces and services structured by that policy, whose main characteristic is reinforcing social protection through specific actions to assist different collectives in situations of social vulnerability and social risk. Educational practices developed in those social assistance spaces can be considered a manifestation of Social Education and need to be investigated and valued, so that its formative character is problematized concerning the possibilities to promote social transformation. We believe that it is necessary to have didactics that guides the pedagogical practice of Social Education toward the promotion of reflection/action that offers effective mediation of the processes of teaching and learning for those involved (SEVERO, 2018).

Didactics is historically linked to school education, but that doesn't mean that school is the only space for education and development of teaching and learning. In this sense, we understand that didactics can encompass the socio-educational processes prescribed by Social Education in order to actually promote critical and emancipatory education.

According to Pimenta (1998), the object of investigation in didactics is teaching, understood as social practice; there is no inconsistency in interpreting that didactics can occupy other spaces, aiming not to reproduce the school formula, but to create possibilities for dialogue to improve socio-educational processes, understanding that these actions aim to develop individuals globally and cause conditions for their participation as actors in their own story, essential aspects of the Social Education practice (SEVERO, 2018).

Therefore, we believe that all education should be social, since it can't be limited to only one period of our lives and isn't over when the person stops going to school. On the contrary, it accompanies us through life. It can be observed that the individual's socialization happens in different spaces, and not only within school. So, it is important to emphasize that there is no single way to understand Social Education. To Casteleiro (2008), current Social Education is the result of social policies and is marked by specific contexts in each country, thus its understanding can also be broad and diverse.

According to Imbernón (2010), initial and continued training of educators is strongly conditioned to the organization of the educational institution and the single prevailing educational thought (same curriculum, identical administration, equal training for all etc.), disregarding other ways to teach, to organize, to appreciate other cultural and social identities. That author directs this criticism more specifically to teacher training. However, this can be problematized and directed in discussions about the training of social educators, because it isn't possible to think about Social Education homogeneously; the contexts and subjects of educational-social practices are complex and plural, demanding broad knowledge and abilities, as well as diverse educator profiles.

Pérez-Gómez (2007) explains the importance of considering the process of professional training and development of educators concerning different ways to think the educational practice. Thus, the three current perspectives are mentioned:

I – The traditional perspective, which understands teaching as an artisanal activity and the teacher as an artisan. II – The technical perspective, which understands teaching as an applied science and the teacher as a technician. III – The radical perspective, which understands teaching as a critical activity and the teacher as an autonomous professional who investigates reflecting on their practice. (PÉREZ-GÓMEZ, 2007, p. 353, our translation).

The third perspective highlights reflection in the practice for social reconstruction. Teaching is understood as a critical activity and the educator is seen as a professional who reflects critically on everyday practices to understand the processes of teaching and learning, as well as the social context where education takes place. These characteristics are indispensable to an emancipatory education. Thus, it intends to develop the social conscience of citizens for the construction of a fairer and more equal society, fighting social injustice.

To that end, planning is an indispensable didactic dimension in pedagogical practice, aiming to constitute reasons and modes of action for the organization of teaching and learning processes compatible with this critical-progressive premise of education. Just as planning should be part of the routine of professionals who work with school education, it is relevant for this practice to be thought or resignified for other educational spaces. It doesn't mean reproducing or denying the planning models developed in a school context, but (re)creating planning that enables consistent socio-

pedagogical intervention; planning that is alive and isn't reduced to a plan or a bureaucratic activity.

Padilha (2001, p. 30, our translation) states that “[...] the act of planning is always a process of reflection, of making decisions about the action, of predicting needs and rationalizing the use of necessary means to achieve goals”. Thus, this process goes beyond a bureaucratic practice expressed in the creation of desired plans or programs and their execution, often in a hierarchical logic that separates those who plan and who execute. We understand that planning is a process of developing pedagogical practice itself.

To Pérez Serrano (2004, p. 274, our translation), “[...] planning is designing plans for the execution of a job; making a plan or project for an action, foreseeing the action” in order to give early and systematic answer to socio-educational needs. The success of activities in SCFV corresponds, among other factors, to good planning. However, it is important to emphasize that planning should always be flexible, so it can be modified when circumstances require it. Effectively, having a plan doesn't guarantee a positive result in socio-educational interventions, but previous knowledge and a strategic view of each situation help to face the unexpected and to qualify decision-making.

Gandin (1994) indicates two levels of planning: the first is the operational level (technical dimension), which aims to answer “how” and “with what”, dealing with means, time, resources and techniques separately; in this sense, it seeks efficiency and limits itself to the short term; the second is the political level (political dimension), which seeks to answer “for whom”, “for what”, including “what”, being broader since it deals with ends, meaning and expectation of impact. We can notice that the technical dimension and the political dimension are interdependent and, together, give meaning and vitality to planning. When these dimensions are considered as antagonistic, they usually reveal a relationship of power and disguised intentions, limiting the understanding of reality. Luckesi (1992, p. 32, our translation) “[...] proposes that planning is an act simultaneously political-social, scientific and technical through which ends are projected and means are established to achieve them”.

SCFV professionals work with individuals in situations of social vulnerability and exclusion and face problems of a complex nature that require critical reflection about the



intentionality of the policies that make up their work context, observing that “[...] the planning activity, without observing its ideological meanings, is one way – among many others – to protect the society model assisted by that planning” (LUCKESI, 1992, p. 118, our translation). It is paramount to think about political and social issues involved in the definition and operationalization of social policies, problematizing their objectives and strategies of action, crucial aspects of reflective planning.

#### **4 Results and discussions**

With the premise that symbolic interactionism has, as an empirical starting point, the meanings attributed by individuals in their everyday activities, we seek a dialogue with the data collected through the questionnaires answered by pedagogues who work at the SCFV in the city of João Pessoa-PB. Concerning duration of employment, all professionals have over four years of experience. These pedagogues work with children, teenagers and elderly people assisted by SCFV, performing the function of technicians or social educators.

The thematic categories that grounded the creation of the questionnaires were: didactic planning, Social Education and non-school pedagogical practices. These categories helped in the cropping of answers present in the questionnaires. Thus, we analyzed questionnaires qualitatively, which is why the index is indispensable, since the relevance of the interpretation of the theme in the answers is more important than the recurrence or repetition of the theme (BARDIN, 2011). The structured questionnaire was created based on the following items: “What is planning for you?”; “How often do you plan activities?”; “Do you use individual or collective tools?”; “What are the didactic resources used to develop educational actions?”.

Through the data collected through the structured questionnaire, we verified a consensus among the participants about the meaning of planning, indicated as a technical process to predict, anticipate and organize actions, implying that it doesn't require reflection and problematization of the political effects that involve decision-making on planned actions. The technical dimension was explicitly present in the following definitions:

*Planning is anticipating, preparing and creating content and practices to be used in daily activities. (PEDAGOGUE 1, our translation).*

*It's creating the activities previously so that they are well executed. (PEDAGOGUE 3, our translation).*

*It's summing up your entire week or month in a schedule to facilitate your work with the teens. (PEDAGOGUE 11, our translation).*

*Previously organizing goals, evaluating, constructing strategies, considering the whole picture. (PEDAGOGUE 13, our translation).*

*Organizing content and systematizing activities in advance. (PEDAGOGUE 15, our translation).*

Considering these excerpts, we observed that the meaning is expressed in the emphasis given to the technical dimension of planning, in which predicting, anticipating and organizing actions seem to dispense with the construction of objectives based on the problematization of the political effects that involve decision-making on planned actions. The technical dimension is important, but we cannot remove the political and social dimensions.

Therefore, as Lück (2014) mentions, planning is the result of decisions that must be made critically, based on the political commitment, in order to contribute to the transformation of reality. It doesn't mean acting just for the sake of acting, but reflecting about every decision, committing to the political dimension intrinsic to the planning process.

The pedagogues indicated that they base their planning on guiding documents and regulations of SCFV, considering the needs shown by the students, as can be identified in the following reports:

*They're created through observation and knowledge of the realities in which we act, uniting the intentionality of work. (PEDAGOGUE 4, our translation).*

*Based on legal regulations of the job and community demands. (PEDAGOGUE 6, our translation).*

*Based on the subjects that students say they want to explore, I look for activities and see which objectives can be developed. (PEDAGOGUE 11, our translation).*

*They are created based on the needs shown by students, families, community, society and through suggestions of activities brought by them. (PEDAGOGUE 12, our translation).*

Pedagogue 11 emphasized that she creates the objectives of her planning based on the students' needs, while Pedagogue 12 added families, community and society. This stage of predicting needs is considered by Gandin (2001) as diagnosis, the moment when there is an intermediation between the desired ideal and existing needs. The action proposals to overcome those needs require a constant decision process and an action and reflection dynamic that, although not explicit in the concepts of planning presented by the pedagogues, are clearly noticed in the creation of planning objectives.

According to the regulations of the service, the themes that guide the workshops are related to the areas: childhood/adolescence, social assistance and human rights, health, environment, culture, sports, leisure, play, and work (BRASIL, 2009a). These are areas that demand critical reflection for coherent objectives.

*The main objectives are in the creation of workshops, where there are exchanges, debates with the users. So, the objectives of my practice concern reflecting and getting to know. Reflecting about the world, the context where we are, and what else arises; getting to know is having contact with new things, especially new places; increasing repertoire. (PEDAGOGUE 3, our translation).*

This participant emphasized that the objectives concern the workshops executed, organized according to the students' age groups. Regarding the professionals who work in the SCFV, it is important for them to reflect and (re)create objectives, instead of simply reproducing the proposals in the documents. This is possible as far as planning is a space of dialogue with the students, also because this relationship strengthens educational bonds, characterizing a horizontal relation and stimulating the participation of the users in activities in a more productive and pleasant way (DÍAZ; SANTOS, 2014).

When asked about the frequency with which they plan activities developed in SCFV, ten pedagogues answered weekly, and five, daily. It is essential to reserve time for the planning practice, but planning isn't a moment divided in days, weeks, months or years, it is a process that demands continuous unfolding throughout activities, as a permanent dimension of organization of the pedagogical work with all concerned parties (LÜCK, 2014).

More important than the frequency is the reflection about how the planning process happens, if it is considered a technical or formal activity that functions simply to

legitimize their work with upper management, or if it is actually used in a critical way (DIAS; SEVERO, 2018).

When asked about didactic resources that they generally use, the pedagogues reported: “*Books, magazines, videos, games, documentaries/movies/videos, music, poems and texts, papers, multimedia projectors, pens, pencils, glue, paints, brushes, computers, cell phones, Hula hoops, rope, batons, graphic material and games, among other materials*” (PEDAGOGUES 1, 2, 3, our translation).

We observed the variety of materials as pedagogical resources, but the lack of other elements more related to technology, for example, mentioning, generically and separately, “cell phone” and “computers”. This is explained through the precariousness of funding for SCFV, according to Pedagogue 15, but we can also infer that this limitation can be explained through the difficulty of incorporating into the didactic culture technologies of information and communication, including social networks, a limitation also expressed in schools. However, simple incorporation without pedagogical meaning wouldn’t bring significant impact in planning or in daily practice. Didactic-pedagogical materials, when planned, are tools that help the pedagogical practice of educators. Thus, we understand that didactic resources gain relevance according to their potential to mobilize interest and learning capabilities from educators and students. Using materials without previous reflection and disconnected from the objectives doesn’t guarantee success in learning.

Resources must always be considered critically and multidimensionally, which is the result of a critical didactic organization that contemplates all stages of educational practice rooted in context (objectives, planning, resources, methodology, evaluation). The use of an innovative resource disassociated from pedagogical meaning of active learning in students makes us think that the quality of the resource is in how it’s situated in the didactic organization of the formative process for the construction of knowledge and attitudes relative to the purposes of the work in SCFV.

When asked about the use of individual or collective planning, the pedagogues’ answer was unanimous in informing they use collective planning. The following excerpts exemplify the answers:

*Weekly meetings to discuss, plan and organize.* (PEDAGOGUE 3, our translation).

*Meeting to create the activities of the week. (PEDAGOGUE 9, our translation).*

*Weekly meetings with reference techniques and advisors to create the content that will be presented in class with the SCFV. (PEDAGOGUE 11, our translation).*

*We always use collective planning, using themes suggested by the administration. (PEDAGOGUE 14, our translation).*

Gandin (1994) defends a proposal of participative planning based on collective work, which has its own methodology and strategies, in which members develop group thought. However, that thought is the result of a previous process, in which each person must speak out, exposing their personal position, to later leave the individual sphere and enter the group. This dimension must be stimulated in SCFV, because the complexity of objectives and ways to confront social challenges in the territories where educators work demand collaborative work that is consolidated as a defining trait of the socio-pedagogical action of institutions, through a culture of mutual exchanges and support in planning, development and evaluation of processes.

Another question asked concerned the difficulties faced to execute their planning. The answers focused on two points: lack of material resources and lack of training.

*Our greatest difficulty concerns the amount and quality of material resources; also regarding the lack of internet at the CRAS for research and of resources for movies and videos. (PEDAGOGUE 5, our translation).*

*The lack of available material hinders the execution of everyday actions and restricts our advances. (PEDAGOGUE 7, our translation).*

*There is a lack of training to work in SCFV; at universities we are only taught how to work in classrooms. (PEDAGOGUE 8, our translation).*

In the reports by Pedagogues 5 and 7, we notice the lack of didactic material to execute activities, while Pedagogue 8 indicated a problem concerning training, highlighting that she feels a lack of qualification and emphasizing that the Pedagogy undergraduate course didn't prepare her to work in non-school spaces.

Concerning training, the National Curricular Guidelines for the Pedagogy course (BRASIL, 2006) anticipates the inclusion of non-school spaces in the pedagogue's practice, but it isn't clear how this professional will be educated and what are the acting principles in these different spaces. Even so, we consider that the curriculum for the

Pedagogy course should incorporate knowledge and experiences for the pedagogue's training, so that they are apt to work in non-school educational spaces.

Pedagogy courses must analyze and reflect on educational practices developed in their multiple spaces and times, considering social demands for human qualification in a society of contradictions, but also of pedagogical opportunities. As stated by Saviani (2007, p. 152, our translation), "[...] pedagogy is capable of articulating into a coherent group the different approaches on education, having as starting point and as destination point the educational practice itself".

That said, we verify that the pedagogues are aware of the operational landmark, the importance of predicting needs and the difficulties that surround the planning process. Therefore, it is important for the pedagogues to understand that planning isn't simply organizing the existing reality, that is, simply an operationalized stage. Concerning the concepts presented by the pedagogues about planning, although they don't problematize the political landmark, it is evident that they take it into consideration in the process of creating objectives, as well as the importance of diagnosing reality and the needs presented by students.

## 5 Final considerations

We understand that planning is the process through which educational practice is conceived within intentionality, projected in order to contribute to the achievement of goals. This projection begins mainly in the real learning needs, which guide the moment of planning. It becomes paramount to determine the educational purposes as an operation that enables transforming the objectives into strategies involving content and the most adequate methodology. Thus, creating objectives helps in creating an action strategy.

This article discussed the reflection about didactic planning in the practice of pedagogues who work at the Service of Coexistence and Strengthening of Bonds (SCFV, in Portuguese). Based on the data collected, we notice that the planning action is present in the routine of the participants. However, we observe a dichotomy concerning the understanding of the political and operational dimensions of planning. The political landmark is misplaced in the context of planning, which centers operational aspects or

the diagnosis of students' interests concerning tastes or inclinations. We conclude that there is a need for resignification regarding that understanding, considering that fragmenting those dimensions may reflect on the execution of planning.

## 6 References

BARDIN, L. *Análise de conteúdo*. 70. ed. Lisboa: LDA, 2011.

BRASIL. Lei nº 8.742, de 7 de dezembro de 1993. Dispõe sobre a organização da Assistência Social e dá outras providências. *Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 8 dez. 1993.

BRASIL. *Norma Operacional Básica – NOB RH*. Brasília, DF: Ministério do Desenvolvimento Social e Combate à Fome, 2009a.

BRASIL. Resolução CNE/CP nº 1, de 15 de maio de 2006. Institui Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para o Curso de Graduação em Pedagogia, licenciatura. *Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 16 maio 2006.

BRASIL. Resolução nº 109, de 11 de novembro de 2009. Aprova a Tipificação Nacional de Serviços Socioassistenciais. *Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 25 nov. 2009b.

BRASIL. Resolução nº 466, de 12 de dezembro de 2012. Diretrizes e normas regulamentadoras de pesquisas em seres humanos. *Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 13 dez. 2012.

BLUMER, H. A natureza do interacionismo simbólico. In: MORTENSEN, C. (Org.). *Teoria da comunicação: textos básicos*. São Paulo: Mosaico, 1980. p. 119-138.

CASTELEIRO, S. *Pedagogia social: aspectos essenciais e definitórios*. 2008. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação Social e Comunitária) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação Social e Comunitária, Universidade da Beira Interior, Covilhã, 2008.

DIAS, L. S.; SEVERO, J. L. R. L. Mapeamento de teses e dissertações sobre Pedagogia Social e Educação Social no contexto brasileiro. In: EPEN, 24., 2018, João Pessoa. *Anais...* João Pessoa: Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 2018.

DÍAZ, C. G.; SANTOS, L. S. La formulación de los objetivos instructivos en el contexto del currículo docente. *Educación Médica Superior*, La Habana, v. 28, n. 3, p. 467-481, 2014. Available at: <http://www.ems.sld.cu/index.php/ems/article/view/279>. Access on: Mar. 20, 2020.

GANDIN, D. A posição do planejamento participativo entre as ferramentas de intervenção na realidade. *Instituto Latino-Americano de Planejamento Participativo*, Porto Alegre, v. 1, n. 1, p. 81-95, 2001. Available at: <https://biblat.unam.mx/hevila/curriculosemfronteiras/2001/vol1/no1/4.pdf>. Access on: Mar. 20, 2020.

GANDIN, D. *A prática do planejamento participativo*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1994.

IMBERNÓN, F. *Formação continuada de professores*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2010.

LÜCK, H. *Planejamento em orientação educacional*. 23. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2014.

LUCKESI, C. C. Planejamento e avaliação na escola: articulação e necessária determinação ideológica. *Ideias*, São Paulo, n. 15, p. 115-125, 1992. Available at: <http://professor.ufop.br/reginaaraujo/classes/edu-517-gest%C3%A3o-e-planejamento-escolar/materials/texto-06-planejamento-e>. Access on: Mar. 20, 2020.

MACHADO, É. R. *O desenvolvimento da Pedagogia Social sob a perspectiva comparada: o estágio atual no Brasil e Espanha*. 2014. 304 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2014.

MEAD, G. H. O jogo livre (folgado), o jogo regulamentado e o “outro-generalizado”. *In: BIRNBAUM, P.; CHAZEM, F. (Org.). Teoria sociológica*. São Paulo: Hucitec: USP, 1977. p. 36-40.

PADILHA, R. P. *Planejamento dialógico: como construir o projeto político-pedagógico da escola*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2001.

PÉREZ-GÓMEZ, A. I. A função e formação do professor/a no ensino para a compreensão: diferentes perspectivas. *In: SACRISTÁN, J. G.; PÉREZ-GÓMEZ, A. I. (Org.). Compreender e transformar o ensino*. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2007. p. 353-379.

PÉREZ SERRANO, G. *Elaboração de projectos sociais: casos práticos*. 12. ed. Porto: Porto, 2014.

PIMENTA, S. G. Panorama atual da didática no quadro das ciências da educação: educação, pedagogia e didática. *In: PIMENTA, S. G. (Coord.). Pedagogia, ciência da educação?*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 1998. p. 39-70.

SAMPIERI, R. H.; COLLADO, C. F.; LUCIO, P. B. *Metodología de la investigación*. 3. ed. México: McGraw Hill, 2010.

SAVIANI, D. *História das ideias pedagógicas no Brasil*. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2007.



SEVERO, J. L. R. L. O horizonte da pedagogia social: uma perspectiva de aproximação conceitual. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação*, Araraquara, v. 12, n. 4, p. 2122-2137, 2017.

SEVERO, J. L. R. L. Quando a didática frequenta outros espaços: indícios conceituais para abordagem de processos educativos não escolares. João Pessoa: Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 2018. p. 249-271.

VASCONCELLOS, C. S. *Planejamento: plano de ensino-aprendizagem e projeto educativo*. São Paulo: Libertad, 1995.

**Luciana Silva Dias (João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brasil)**

**Universidade Federal da Paraíba (UFPB), Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação,  
Mestrado em Educação**

Master's student in Education at UFPB. Student of the Study and Research Group in Pedagogy, Educational Work and Society.

Authorship contribution: Data collection and analysis and preparation of the initial text version.

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/895916677314290>.

E-mail: [lucianadiasibn@gmail.com](mailto:lucianadiasibn@gmail.com).

**José Leonardo Rolim de Lima Severo (João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brasil)**

**Universidade Federal da Paraíba (UFPB), Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação,  
Centro de Educação**

PhD in Education from UFPB. Leader of the Group of Studies and Research in Pedagogy, Educational Work and Society. Adjunct professor at UFPB, wave works in the Graduate Program in Education.

Authorship contribution: Structuring, reviewing and expanding the text and guidance on data analysis.

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1461468952362951>.

E-mail: [leonardorolimsevero@gmail.com](mailto:leonardorolimsevero@gmail.com).

**Responsible publisher:** Lia Machado Fiuza Fialho

**Ad hoc experts:** Ana Paula Silva e Karina Dias



Received on August 21, 2019.

Accepted on January 23, 2020.

