

An interdisciplinary experience in anthropology and education: memory, academic project and political background

Tania Dauster

Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro

Abstract

This article constructs the trajectory of the introduction of the discipline Anthropology and Education in the Graduate Program in Education (PPGE) at PUC-Rio. The author introduced the course at the end of the 1980s. The text presents several considerations concerning the field of anthropology, defending anthropological studies as an approach to interdisciplinarity between this discipline and numerous others, particularly education. It then emphasizes the political and academic framework in which pedagogy graduate courses were created, such as the Institute of Advanced Studies in Education (IESAE) of the Getúlio Vargas Foundation (FGV), and the PPGE/PUC-Rio. Finally, it reports the experiences lived by the author and her peers that helped construct the memory of the PPGE/PUC-Rio, focusing on both the relationship between anthropology and education and the research and production experiences of the program.

Keywords: Anthropology, Education, Interdisciplinarity, Ethnography

Resumo

O presente artigo relata a trajetória da introdução da disciplina Antropologia e Educação no Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação (PPGE) da PUC-Rio. A disciplina foi introduzida pela autora, em fins dos anos 1980. O texto apresenta diversas considerações a respeito do campo da antropologia, defendendo os estudos antropológicos como porta de acesso à interdisciplinaridade entre essa disciplina e tantas outras, com destaque para a área de educação. Destaca-se, também, o contexto político e acadêmico da criação de cursos de pós-graduação em educação, como o Instituto de Estudos Avançados em Educação (Iesae) na Fundação Getúlio Vargas e o PPGE na PUC-Rio. Por fim, apresenta-se um relato de experiência que constrói a memória do PPGE/PUC-Rio, com ênfase na relação entre antropologia e educação e as experiências de pesquisa e produção desse programa.

Palavras-chave: Antropologia, Educação, Interdisciplinaridade, Etnografia

An interdisciplinary experience in anthropology and education: memory, academic project and political background

Tania Dauster

Au point d'articulation entre le monde du texte et le monde du sujet se place une théorie de la lecture capable de comprendre l'appropriation des stratégies discursives, c'est-à-dire la manière dont elles affectent le lecteur et l'amènent à une nouvelle forme de compréhension du monde, de l'autre et de soi.

Roger Chartier

The day before yesterday prepares the wheels of tomorrow.

Murilo Mendes

Preliminary observations

In social and cultural anthropology, “fieldwork,” “participant observation” and ethnography are much more than methodological or technical research procedures. They are knowledge processes and constitute practices that anthropologists use for acquiring the same. The fusion between field research and office research is an epistemological revolution that took place at the beginning of the twentieth century. Up to this point, there was a separation between ‘in situ’ observations and later interpretations based on data collected by missionaries or administrators or by people other than the researcher. The anthropologist’s craft became a combination of field and office research as the means to construct knowledge, in other words, as a way to develop an epistemology.

The mode of knowing through ethnography crosses disciplinary boundaries and is a legacy that anthropology passes onto the distinct universes of the social sciences (Cardoso de Oliveira 1998:17). The analogous concept of culture in anthropology has similar relevance. Moreover, this has been the challenge I have faced in establishing my academic project of teaching, supervision and research, as well as part of my professional training to follow this path. (Dauster 2014b:25). At this time, speaking of this trajectory involves constructing a personal memory and thus incurring the risks, proclaimed by Pierre Bourdieu (1996:183), of the “biographical illusion,” in other words, the idea of a story that represents itself as logical when, in fact, it can retain large inconsistencies and hidden meanings for the author him/herself.

In the words of Bela Feldman-Bianco (2013), in 2005, the anthropological community produced, but did not formalize, a table in which the anthropology of education is classified as a subarea denominated specialized anthropology.¹

In discussing the field of anthropology, the author indicates the prospect of “unraveling the cultural codes and the social interstices in everyday life” (2013:19), as the production of a type of knowledge that contributes to an understanding of today’s problems in relation to social differences and inequalities, together with an understanding of the traditional landscape of values and practices, dilemmas of social inclusion and development, whether these are social or economic.

For decades, the academic and social recognition of this *expertise* has led to an interest in anthropology as a foundational knowledge for graduate and undergraduate programs in education. At the intersection with education, a field in which issues of politics and power are crucial, the following paradox is expressed: while the number of education programs that incorporate anthropology continues to increase, with or without teachers trained in the discipline, anthropology programs still view this relationship with reservation. I fear that the very intersection is undervalued. Education, conceived of as schooling or even in a broader sense, is an object that attracts relatively few practitioners of anthropology from the field of the social sciences. The

¹ I would like to thank Yvonne Maggie for her reading and suggestions, which enabled me to return to past research, Barbara Sette for the competent English version of the text, Dayse Ventura Arosa for her competent revision of the Portuguese text, Ana Beatriz Lavagnino, an intern of my current project, for the collection of bibliographic data, and Phil Bain for the revision of the English version.

anthropologists Delma Pessanha Neves, Simoni Lahud Guedes and Yvonne Maggie² are some examples of researchers on the subject in the area mentioned. However, anthropologists who generally do not have taboo objects seem to have created strategies of detachment and avoidance with regard to education.

I perceive differences, no value judgments intended, between the production of master's and doctoral students in education and that of the social sciences. In this last area, the works are generated within the field of social sciences themselves, within the same frame of references. The field of education, besides having other references, uses the social sciences as theoretical sources, with which it constructs the interdisciplinary dialogue that exceeds its boundaries. The two fields mentioned possess distinct curricular dimensions, purposes, worldviews, traditions, values, classical references and "founding heroes" that mark their analyses and interpretations. Moreover, the researchers from these areas develop their work occupying certain social and academic "positions," establishing distinct academic sociability relationships that necessarily illuminate their representations and investigative practices.

Nevertheless, the sociological and anthropological interest in educational issues has a long history (Gusmão 1997) and a noble lineage. It begins with the sociological works of Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), for whom education as a social practice emerges from life in society, thus highlighting the social character of education. "Education is a socialization of the young generation" (Durkheim 1978:10) and "It is through co-operation and through social tradition that man becomes man." Thus, the author states that man becomes a "social being." "Systems of morality, languages, religions, sciences are collective works, social things" (Durkheim 1978:10). His reflection on education as a social phenomenon leads to the conclusion that, to study it, it is necessary to research social life in its interrelations (Durkheim 1978:90). The specificity of the social, which can be explained only in terms of social codes, and not as a function of the individual or the psychological, distinguishes the theory and construction of sociological epistemology that, in turn, has an influence on social anthropology.

2 Delma Pessanha Neves - Professor of the Graduate Program in Anthropology at the Federal Fluminense University (UFF); Simoni Lahud Guedes - Professor of the Graduate Program of the UFF and Yvonne Maggie - Professor of the Department of Cultural Anthropology of the UFRJ.

The work of Marcel Mauss (1872-1950) aligned the field of sociology with the development of French anthropology and leaves a legacy of thinking and research on “education” as a “total social phenomenon” (Rocha 2011:105). The complexity of Gilmar Rocha’s investigation (2011) on the subject leaves little room for syntheses. However, Rocha’s research reveals the meaning of this expression. This anthropologist indicates some of the aspects relevant for understanding education as a total social phenomenon, starting with the fact that the observer and the subject are of the same nature. In consonance with his thoughts, it is evident that education takes place in everyday life, through symbolic actions, body techniques that consciously and/or unconsciously shape the body. He denaturalizes the notion of the body, while demonstrating that it is a product of history and diversity, shaped by cultures and by educational symbolic actions viewed in a broad sense, whether contextualized in the family, the school, in religious rituals or in other institutions, including that which Marcel Mauss called “prestigious imitation.” The notion of body in its phenomenological concreteness is the central focus because it encompasses that which is biological, psychological and socio-historical. The “body techniques” or “effective traditional acts” as “facts of education” are transmitted over time through education and constitute a vast field of study (Rocha 2011:97).

Franz Boas, together with Bronislaw Malinowski, revolutionized the discipline of anthropology in the early twentieth century, when they founded ethnography, based on fieldwork conducted by the researcher himself. Franz Boas (Rocha & Tosta 2009:46) studied the United States school system directly, showing its inconsistency, since while defending the idea of freedom the system is repressive in its practices. The author rejects the concept of race and affirms that of culture, which dilutes explanations of a biological or geographical character to make way for the historical and cultural; he struggles for racial equality and is opposed to evolutionism, while contesting ethnocentric attitudes (Rocha & Tosta 2009:35-36). Following Boas’ lead, “American cultural anthropology” pursues this line of explanation, incorporating political and “applied” aspects on issues of education, nutrition or health. The works of Ruth Margaret Mead (2009:46) are important heirs of this perspective, such that Mead’s work (2009:46) is a significant example of what Boas had in mind, in 1928, concerning the application of anthropological studies as criticism and finding solutions to social issues. According to

Rocha and Tosta (2009:45), this anthropologist is the forerunner of what is meant today by the anthropology of education and/or of the child. At the time, what was perceived as the political action and practical contribution of “applied anthropology” to society was being outlined.

Gilberto Freyre, a former disciple of Franz Boas while attending university in the United States, was influenced by his teacher and marked by cultural anthropology, and is considered to be the interpreter of the formation of the Brazilian patriarchal family. He was an intellectual with international access, though still deeply attached to Brazilian references, particularly the context of the State of Pernambuco, in northeastern Brazil.

In sketching this condensed view of the relationships between anthropology and education, I would like to mention the work of Josildeth Gomes Consorte (1997).³ This anthropologist demonstrates how culturalism infiltrated Brazil in the 1930s, signaling the relationships between the concept of culture and diversity. In the same sense, the attention of politicians and educators was notable, due to the massive influx of Italian, Japanese and German immigrants. Culturalism and education have been linked since the 1930s to respond to the challenges that cultural diversity presented for the educational system (Consorte 1997:26-37). Several substantial works that would contribute to public policies originated from the National Institute of Pedagogical Studies (*Instituto Nacional de Estudos Pedagógicos*, INEP), in the 1930s. The author also cites studies by Arthur Ramos (1999:28-29)⁴ in reference to education and

3 PhD in Social Sciences (area of Anthropology), from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). Professor of the Department of Anthropology at PUC-SP. In the 1950s, she belonged to a group of social scientists that conducted research on education with Anísio Teixeira, at the Brazilian Center for Educational Research. <www.pucsp.br/~csopos/curriculo/josi.html>. Accessed on Sept. 25th, 2014.

4 Psychiatrist, social psychologist, ethnologist, folklorist and Brazilian anthropologist. He was born on July 7th, 1903, in Alagoas, and died at 46, in Paris, France. He was one of the leading intellectuals of his time and eminent in the study of the Negro and Brazilian identity. He was also important in the process of institutionalizing the social sciences in Brazil. In 1926, he defended his doctoral thesis: *Primitive and madness*. In the same year, he received a PhD in Medical Sciences from the Bahia College of Medicine. In the United States, he taught, researched and participated in several symposia at the Universities of Louisiana, California, Harvard and Columbia, alongside important names of the social sciences. In Brazil, he gained recognition and respect from Jorge de Lima, Rachel de Queiroz, Jorge Amado, Gilberto Freyre, Estacio de Lima, Theo Brandão, José Lins do Rego, Aurélio Buarque de Holanda, Graciliano Ramos, Nise da Silveira, Silvio de Macedo, Rita Palmares, Lily Lages and Gilberto de Macedo, among many others, his friends and admirers. He was a humanist, and through his libertarian ideas, fought against imperialism and racial prejudice and was arrested twice by the Department of Political and Social Order (DOPS), during the Vargas dictatorship. In 1949, in the French capital, he was director of the Department of Social Sciences of UNESCO, when he drew up the first UNESCO Project in Brazil in the 1950s. He died helping to construct a peace plan for the world, alongside Bertrand Russell, Jean Piaget, Maria Montessori and Julien Huxley. <http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arthur_Ramos>. Accessed on Sept. 30th, 2014.

health issues. Other names worthy of mention arose from 1950 onward, when UNESCO, interested in race relations in Brazil, involved renowned intellectuals like Thales de Azevedo⁵, Roger Bastide⁶ and Florestan Fernandes⁷ in their research proposal. I would like to add Josildeth Consorte to this list of researchers located at state research and educational institutions. She worked at the

5 Born on August 26th, 1904, in Salvador, and died on August 5th, 1995. He studied at the Jesuit School, Antônio Vieira (1914-1919), and later at the Bahia College of Medicine (1922-1927), receiving honors for his inaugural thesis: *Fibromyomas of the uterus: notes and statistics in Bahia*, approved on December 23rd, 1927. Doctor and teacher, as he used to identify himself, he was also a man of the press. He began his public service career as director of the Secretariat of the Council of Social Assistance for the Department of Education, Health and Public Assistance. Because of his medical training, Thales de Azevedo was in charge of the first chair of anthropology and ethnography in Brazil, at the College of Philosophy, a discipline that was part of the curriculum of geography, history and social sciences. <<http://www.thalesdeazevedo.com.br/biografia.htm>>. Accessed on Sept. 30th, 2014.

6 French sociologist. He was born on April 1st, 1898 and died on April 10th, 1974. He graduated from the Faculty of Arts of Bordeaux and from the Sorbonne. A member of the “French mission,” he was part of the core faculty at the College of Philosophy of São Paulo, teaching for almost twenty years in Brazil (1937-1954). He received the title “*Doctor Honoris Causa*” from the University of São Paulo. He was a member of the Societies of Sociology and Psychology of São Paulo, and the Society of Anthropology in Rio de Janeiro, of the Folklore Society in Rio Grande do Norte, and the Ceará Historical Institute. While in Brazil, he studied the Afro-Brazilian religions for many years, becoming an initiate in Candomblé from Bahia. In 1973, Bastide republished “*Brazil, land of contrasts*.” After retiring, he worked in the Social Psychiatry Center in Paris, which he had founded. His last book, *Sociology of Mental Disorder*, used research results from the center. He was awarded the Order of the Southern Cross, a commendation that the President of Brazil awards to foreign personalities, for services to Brazilian culture and for Brazil-France cultural cooperation. <http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roger_Bastide>. Accessed on Sept. 30th, 2014.

7 Born in São Paulo on July 22nd, 1920, and died on August 10th, 1995. He was a sociologist and politician, elected federal congressional representative for the Workers Party (PT). He studied until the third year of primary school returning only much later to school, enrolling in a mature student course, which enables adults to complete their schooling. In 1941, Florestan entered the College of Philosophy, Arts and the Humanities at the University of São Paulo, graduating in social sciences. He began his teaching career in 1945 as an assistant professor to Fernando de Azevedo, in the chair of Sociology II. He earned a master’s degree at the Free School for Sociology and Politics with the thesis “*The social organization of the Tupinambá*”. In 1951, defended his doctoral thesis “*The social function of war in Tupinambá society*” at the College of Philosophy, Arts and the Humanities at USP, later established as a classic of Brazilian ethnology, exploring the functionalist methodology. The study of the theoretical and methodological perspectives of sociology became one of Florestan’s characteristic lines of work in the 1950s. His most important essays on the foundations of sociology as a science were later collected in the book “*The Empirical Foundations of Sociological Explanation*.” His intellectual commitment to the development of science in Brazil underlies his activism in the Campaign for the Defense of Public Schooling, he campaigned for public, secular and free education as a citizen’s basic right in the modern world. Forced into retirement by the military dictatorship in 1969 he was Visiting Scholar at Columbia University, Full Professor at the University of Toronto and Visiting Professor at Yale University and, as of 1978, a professor at the PUC-São Paulo. In early 1979, he returned to the Faculty of Philosophy, Letters and Human Sciences, now reformed for a summer school on the socialist experiment in Cuba, at the invitation of students of the Academic Centre for Social Sciences. In 1986, he was elected as a congressional representative by the Workers Party, with outstanding performance in discussions during the debate on free public education. In 1990, he was re-elected as a federal congressional representative. He worked for the newspaper *Folha de São Paulo*, from the 1940s, and later, in June 1989, had a weekly column in this newspaper. The name of Florestan Fernandes is necessarily associated with sociological research in Brazil and Latin America. Sociologist and university professor with over fifty works published, he transformed social thinking in the country and established a new style of sociological research, marked by analytic and critical rigor, and a new standard of intellectual activity. <http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Florestan_Fernandes>. Accessed on Sept. 30th, 2014.

Center for Educational Research (*Centro de Pesquisas Educacionais, CBPE*), an agency of the INEP, with its founder Anísio Teixeira,⁸ who along with Fernando de Azevedo⁹ were at the head of the Escola Nova [New School] project.

8 Born on July 12th, 1900, in Rio de Janeiro, and died on March 11th, 1971. Anísio Teixeira was a lawyer, intellectual, educator and writer. He played a central role disseminating the premises of the New School movement, which in principle emphasized the development of the intellect and the capacity for judgment, rather than memorization. He reformed the education system in Bahia and Rio de Janeiro, holding various executive positions. Teixeira graduated in 1922 from the College of Law at the UFRJ, currently the Law School at UFRJ. On returning to Bahia in 1924, at the invitation of Governor Goes Calmon, he was nominated the Inspector General of Education – a position equivalent to the current Secretary of Education – beginning his career as an educator and public administrator. While visiting the United States in 1927, he was exposed to the ideas of the philosopher and educator John Dewey, who would strongly influence his thinking. Returning to the United States (1928), he took a graduate course at Columbia. Back in Brazil, he translated two of Dewey's works into Portuguese for the first time. In 1928, he entered Columbia University in New York, where he obtained his master's degree and met John Dewey. In 1931, he moved to Rio de Janeiro, becoming part of the Board of Directors for Public Education in the Federal District. During this mandate, he established the integration of Municipal Education, from elementary school to university. He became Secretary of Education for the State of Rio de Janeiro in 1931 and conducted extensive reformation in the school system, again integrating teaching from elementary school to university at the state level. In 1932, he became one of the most prominent signatories of the *Manifesto dos Pioneiros da Educação Nova* [Manifesto of the Pioneers of the New Education] in defense of free, public, secular, compulsory education. He published two works on education, which along with his other accomplishments, gave him national prominence. Teixeira founded the University of the Federal District in 1935, in Rio de Janeiro, which later became the National College of Philosophy of the University of Brazil. That same year, pursued by the government of Getúlio Vargas, he moved to his hometown in Bahia, living there until 1945. Teixeira became general counselor for UNESCO in 1946. In 1951, he took the post of secretary general at Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), and the following year he became director of the National Institute of Pedagogical Studies (INEP). <http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/An%C3%ADsio_Teixeira>. Accessed on Sept. 30th, 2014.

9 Born on April 2nd, 1894 and died on September 18th, 1974. He was a teacher, educator, critic, essayist and sociologist. At the age of 22, he was made substitute professor of Latin and psychology at the Ginásio do Estado (state high school) in Belo Horizonte, of Latin and literature at the Escola Normal de São Paulo [The Teacher's College of São Paulo], of educational sociology at the Institute of Education of the University of São Paulo (USP), Chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of the college of Philosophy, Sciences and Letters of USP, and Emeritus Professor of the same college. He was General Director for Education for the Federal District (1926-30), General Director of Public Instruction for the State of São Paulo (1933), The Principal of Philosophy, Sciences and Letters of São Paulo (1941-42), a member of the University Council for more than 12 years following the foundation of USP, Secretary of Education and Health of the State of São Paulo (1947), Director of the Regional Center for Educational Research, which he founded and organized (1956-61), Secretary of Education and Culture for the government of Mayor Prestes Maia (1961), and for years he was a writer and literary critic of the newspaper *O Estado de São Paulo* (1923-26). In the Federal District (1926-30) he designed, defended and conducted one of the most radical teaching reforms that has been undertaken in the country. He drew up and executed a broad plan for the school buildings, including the buildings on Mariz e Barros street, for the old Escola Normal [Teacher's College], now the Institute of Education. In 1933, as General Director of Public Instruction for the State of São Paulo, he undertook reforms based on the Education Code. In 1931, he founded and directed, for more than 15 years, the Brazilian Pedagogic Library (BPB) within the Companhia Editora Nacional [National Publishing Co.], which formed part of the Undergraduate Research [Iniciação Científica] series and the Brasileira collection. He was the writer and first signatory of the Manifesto of the Pioneers of the New Education. He was president of the Association of Education in 1938 and was elected President of the Eighth World Conference on Education, which was held in Rio de Janeiro. In 1950, he was elected Vice President of the International Sociological Association (1950-53) at the World Congress of Zurich, was a corresponding member of the International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind (published by UNESCO), was one of the founders of the Brazilian Society of Sociology, of which he was president from its foundation in 1935 until 1960, and was president of the Brazilian Association of Writers (São Paulo section). On August 10th, 1967, he was elected to chair 14 of the Brazilian Academy of Letters, succeeding Antonio Carneiro Leão. <http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fernando_de_Azevedo>. Accessed on Sept. 30th, 2014.

Ana Waleska Mendonça¹⁰ (2008:43), in her research on the contribution of the CBPE, an institutional project marked by Teixeira's personality and interests, reflects on the dialogue initiated therein, between what she denominated the political encounter of two intellectual traditions which, in her words, arose both from the field of social sciences and from that of education. This interdisciplinary perspective constituted a feature of CBPE's research tradition, later lost following the discontinuity of the Center's activities, which was not strengthened by the implementation of graduate courses in Brazil from 1970 onward. The later inclusion, resumed the link between the social sciences and education through the sociology of education. Later, in 1987, I established the area of anthropology and education in the Graduate Program in Education (PPGE) of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio) as a core discipline, without the political tone and goals of the CBPE. In a different manner and with other objectives, the PPGE seeks to articulate the traditions of these disciplines. It has been a long while, however, since the interdisciplinary relationships structure the program and the research that provides the academic tone of the PPGE/PUC-Rio. Nowadays, the PPGE/PUC-Rio distinguishes itself through its multidisciplinary approach to understanding educational phenomena and the interdisciplinarity between the human and social sciences.

Returning to the CBPE, as Ana Waleska Mendonça (2008) highlights, founded on Corrêa (1987), the idea of project present in the participating intellectual discourses has meant the convergence of a reference group around common issues and a sense of political action lent to knowledge production activities, something that the researcher claims is a characteristic of the multidisciplinary work of the CBPE (2008:44). Ultimately, the objectives of the CBPE were intervention in education and in teacher training, based on knowledge accumulated through research. Its interest in the reorganization of society through transformation in schools dates back to 1930 (Mendonça 2008:45).

¹⁰ PhD in Education from PUC-Rio, with post-doctoral fellowship at the University of Lisbon, she is a Professor of History of Education in the Department of Education at PUC-Rio and a CNPq researcher.

Zaia Brandão¹¹ and Libânia Xavier¹² (2008:68) state that, for a decade, the articulation between the social sciences and education was of great relevance to the field of education. The researchers (2008:72) remark that the articles published by the CBPE during the 1950s indicate two lines of production emerging therefrom: one anthropological in character, through studies involving the community, and the other sociological, marked by the theme of stratified organized changes in Brazilian society.

The research conducted by Xavier and Brandão (2008) reveals the influence of the Chicago School, referencing empirical studies on educational issues, Teixeira's relationships with sociologists like Donald Pierson, and the expansion of theoretical references in the interpretation of educational phenomena.

Continuing these preliminary notes, I would like to mention the important set of works realized by the anthropologist and poet Carlos Brandão¹³, from the 1990s. His works on anthropology and education are of a seminal character and this articulation was always present in his academic research and themes of interest.

In closing this introduction concerning the encounter between anthropology and education, it is worth noting the role of Roberto DaMatta¹⁴ at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Education (*Instituto de Estudos Avançados em Educação*, IESAE) of the Getúlio Vargas Foundation (FGV)¹⁵ in Rio de Janeiro, which was created in 1971 and closed in 1990.

11 Professor at PUC-Rio, a CNPq 1A researcher and Scientist of Our State (FAPERJ), coordinator of Soced-Research Group in the Sociology of Education and editor of the SOCED Bulletin online.

12 PhD in Education from PUC-Rio and Professor of the Graduate Program in Education of UFRJ.

13 Graduated in psychology from PUC-Rio in 1965, a Masters in Anthropology from the University of Brasilia in 1974 and a PhD from USP in social sciences. He is currently Professor Emeritus at the Federal University of Uberlândia, for his work in the field of anthropology, education, and popular culture, having been awarded Commander of Scientific Merit for the last by the CNPq. <[http://www.trabalhosfeitos.com/ensaios/Biografia-carlos-rodrigues-brand%
c3o/1015533.html](http://www.trabalhosfeitos.com/ensaios/Biografia-carlos-rodrigues-brand%c3o/1015533.html)>. Accessed on Sept. 24th, 2014.

14 This prominent anthropologist is a writer, lecturer and newspaper columnist. He graduated in History at the Fluminense Federal University. He has a Masters and a PhD from Harvard University and was a professor of the Social Anthropology Program of the National Museum of the UFRJ. He is Emeritus Professor at the University of Notre Dame in the United States and Full Professor at PUC-Rio. He has conducted ethnological research and is a renowned thinker on Brazil. He was awarded the honor of Commander by the Rio Branco Order of Merit. <http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roberto_DaMatta>. Accessed on Sept. 24th, 2014.

15 The Getulio Vargas Foundation is an institution in the area of public and private sector management that has developed research and trained professionals in this field since the 1940s.

Research by Maria de Lourdes Fávero (2001)¹⁶ shows the trajectory of the IESAE, which as part of the FGV, started a master's degree course in education in 1971, at the height of the repression by the military dictatorship. In its conception, the IESAE was assuring the continuity of Anísio Teixeira's work.

What I would like to emphasize here, lest it be forgotten, was the presence of Roberto DaMatta assuming the discipline of Anthropology in the MA in Education at this institute.

The political and cultural context at the time of the creation of the PPGE/PUC-Rio and IESAE/FGV

The creation of the Graduate Program in Education of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PPGE/PUC-Rio) between 1965 and 1966, the so-called lead years in Brazil, is part of an era marked by the military regime, which began with the coup of 1964 and drastically extended until 1979, when it finally ended with the Amnesty Law.

The implementation of the PPGE/PUC-Rio and IESAE/FGV should be analyzed as part of a concrete reality and of a more general problematic, as the historian Maria de Lourdes Fávero writes, "during a period in our history marked by strong repression, by political and ideological control by the Government in relation to educational and scientific institutions" (2001:1). We should also remember Institutional Act number 5, AI-5, the so-called the "coup within the coup" in 1968, when the President of Brazil was given extraordinary powers, suspending existing institutional guarantees and closing Congress, further aggravating a period of persecution and censorship.

In contrast, there was the effervescence of Brazilian popular music, the presence of Elis Regina, Chico Buarque and the Tropicália

¹⁶ She attended the Recife College of Philosophy and soon began participating in the Catholic University Youth (JUC). In 1962, she started working for the Movement for Basic Education (MEB). In 1970, she was hired by PUC-Rio to work in undergraduate studies, where she also began her master's degree, which she completed in 1972.

movement, with Caetano Veloso and Gilberto Gil;¹⁷ the changes in behavior and customs; the feminist movement and the advent of the pill; changing roles and relations between men and women; the political struggle, in which high school and university students were involved in opposing the military dictatorship; the work of intellectuals “within the cracks” in the system; and numerous other cultural characteristics. In short, somehow there were still spaces to challenge the regime, which enabled a certain transgression of arbitrarily established rules.

Universities were strictly controlled spaces, but simultaneously areas undergoing intense struggles and discussions, not only political, but also concerning the production of knowledge. According to Gilmar Rocha and Sandra Pereira Tosta (2009:48-49), around 1980, a movement began in the areas of humanities for relative criticism of the quantitative research methods that had predominated up to that time, as they also had in education research. The movement proposed opening up to qualitative methods, without underestimating statistical indicators as sources of data and problems. According to the authors, research in education gradually began to conduct case studies, action-research and “controversial” ethnographic research.

The reader will have the opportunity to acknowledge these assertions below, through the works of the researchers mentioned, as a social and historical condition in a specific situation, that is, the PPGE/PUC-Rio.

The “lived memory” – Vera Candau and the inclusion of the discipline of anthropology and education in the PPGE/PUC-Rio

With the expression “lived memory,” Vera Candau, one of the founding professors of the PPGE/PUC-Rio, starts our dialogue. Or rather,

17 Elis Regina, a singer/songwriter of Brazilian popular music (MPB), who first appeared in the music festivals of the 1960s. She actually sang several genres: bossa nova, samba, rock and jazz, and was elected the second best Brazilian voice by Rolling Stones Brasil magazine, in 2013. Chico Buarque is another great name of MPB, a singer, composer and author. Caetano Veloso and Gilberto Gil are singers, musicians and composers, and two of the principal names of the Tropicália movement, which occurred at the end of the 1960s and had an important impact on Brazilian culture. Caetano is also newspaper columnist and Gil was the Minister of Culture during the government of President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva.

restarts it, because as coordinator of the “Founders Project”—the construction of the memory of the Graduate Program at PUC-Rio (2011)—, I have been interviewing the pioneers of the program, including Vera Candau, a researcher and teacher and one of the most prominent and influential figures and leaders in the fields of research and education in Brazil. She is known for her works in the specific fields of pedagogy, multiculturalism and teacher training (which she introduced into the PPGE), school daily life and cultural diversity, human rights and public policies, all products of her academic life as a full professor and 1A researcher of the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq).

Vera Candau was the academic supervisor for my MA in Education, pursued in the 1970s in the PPGE/PUC-Rio. Later, we transformed a relationship of power, i.e. that of supervisor and student, intrinsically hierarchical and asymmetric, into a friendship. By mentioning the relationship, I attempt to objectify and relativize the degree of subjectivity/objectivity that our dialogue contains, in a movement of controlling one’s own interpretive and approximate intent (Geertz 1989), of knowledge and self-knowledge (Velho 1986:18), while penetrating the academic life of my work universe.

My position as interviewer and researcher, in this case, could be thought of as a radicalization of the “strangeness of the familiar” (Velho 1978:36), since I have been working with colleagues and friends for over twenty years. Issues of neutrality and impartiality could come to the fore, but I start from the perception of the very relativity of these notions. The “strangeness of the familiar” seeks a more complex vision of what is “real,” capturing the “viewpoints” of the actors involved in the problematic studied, their versions, interpretations, codes, values, beliefs, everyday life and ideologies.

In light of that discussed above, interviewing Vera Candau constitutes a dialogical situation in which our subjectivities (Velho 1986:17), our daily experiences at the university and beyond, our academic and existential problems, intimacy and differences, are all placed in the contact situation, in the “interview,” in which our “dialogue,” at my request, follows precise parameters: the “backstage,” the why and how of the insertion of anthropology and education as a core discipline in

the graduate and undergraduate programs in education. This meant the introduction of anthropology within the university system in the area of education, considering all levels of teaching, research and academic supervision. This was yet another pioneering decision by the Department of Education of PUC-Rio, since the master's degree in education was first to be established, before similar courses at federal or state universities (Dauster 2014a).

Before presenting the dialogue with Vera Candau, it is worth noting that the development of this text traverses the boundary between the construction of the memory of the PPGE /PUC-Rio and the inclusion of anthropology and education. While I speak of the introduction of this discipline at PUC-Rio, I necessarily rely on a life history or even an autobiography, for this history is mine too.

This text is thus a product of both my role as a researcher and the construction of a part of the memory of the anthropology and education discipline in the PPGE/PUC-Rio, without the mediation of a researcher. This part of memory falls to me as professor and researcher for over 20 years, with a CNPq scholarship and grants from the Rio de Janeiro Research Foundation (FAPERJ). I also find myself in the role of the narrator of my own trajectory (Queiroz 1988:23) and, consequently, exercising a double role.

In working with “memory,” I base myself on Myriam Lins de Barros¹⁸ (2009), a scholar of Maurice Halbwachs. According to de Barros, “memory” is defined as a social phenomenon, a social construct and as such, there are relations between the individual and collective memory and the place of those who narrate. From this, we infer that between the narrated memory and the reconstruction of the past, relativizations have to be made. Through the work of Michel Pollack, de Barros (2009) shows that narrated “memories” are versions that also possess markers and express ideas, codes and social places. It is worth emphasizing the

18 She graduated in Sociology and Politics from PUC-Rio (1973), obtained her Masters in Social Anthropology (1980) and PhD in Social Anthropology (1986) both from the UFRJ. She is professor at the School of Social Services, at the UFRJ. She has experience in anthropology, with emphasis on urban anthropology, acting in the following themes: family, old age, life history, memory, gender and generation. <<http://buscatextual.cnpq.br/buscatextual/visualizacv.do?metodo=apresentar&id=K4797041E6>>. Accessed on Sept. 30th, 2014.

words of Gilberto Velho¹⁹ concerning the meaning of “the importance of memory as organizer of subjectivity and relationships between individuals” (2011:173).

I cannot help but refer to the relationships among “memory, identity and project” (Velho 1994:99), which are behind these ideas, for the events reported herein involve my own memory, career and identity construction, in a “field of possibilities” (Velho 1994:100). In this sense, it is understood that “project and memory” “are articulated, when giving meaning to the life and actions of individuals, in other words, to identity” (Velho 1994:101). Not only is the subject’s memory nonlinear, it is selective and fragmented.

Let us move on to the dialogue with Vera Candau, which revealed the facts that led to the introduction of anthropology in the PPGE.

Tania Dauster: Vera, please tell me about your experience with anthropology and education in the context of PUC- Rio.

Vera Candau: Well, the development of research on education in the 1970’s, particularly that linked to Graduate courses, because the Graduate program began in 1965, but the first thesis are from the beginning of the 1970s or so, were very distinctive. I believe research was strongly linked to the quantitative methods with different approaches, surveys, experimental approach, etc., but up to that point, doing research implied in doing empirical research of a quantitative nature. If

19 Born on May 15th, 1945 and died on April 14th, 2012. He was Brazilian anthropologist and a pioneer of urban anthropology in the country. He obtained a degree in Social Sciences from the Institute of Philosophy and Social Sciences of the UFRJ (1968), and a Masters in Social Anthropology, UFRJ (1970). He specialized in urban anthropology and complex societies at the University of Texas in Austin (1971). In 1975, he obtained his Doctor of Humanities from USP. He worked in the areas of urban anthropology, anthropology of complex societies and anthropological theory. He also held several academic positions: coordinator of the Graduate Program in Social Anthropology (PPGAS) of the National Museum, UFRJ, head of the Department of Anthropology, president of the Brazilian Association of Anthropology (ABA; 1982-84), president of the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Social Sciences (ANPOCS; 1994-96) and vice-president of the Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Science (1991-93). As a member of the Board of Advisors of the National Historical and Artistic Heritage Institute, he was registrar of the first instatement of a *Candomblé terreiro* as a heritage site in Brazil, the Casa Branca in Salvador. He was also a member of the Federal Council of Culture (1987-88). In 2000, he became member of the Brazilian Academy of Sciences. He was awarded the Grand Cross of the National Order of Scientific Merit (2000) and the Commendation of the Order of Rio Branco (1999). He was a collaborator and visiting professor at several Brazilian and foreign universities. He supervised around 100 dissertations and doctoral theses. Up to his death, he was a Full Professor and Dean of the Department of Anthropology of the National Museum, UFRJ. <http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gilberto_Velho>. Accessed on Sept. 30th, 2014.

we were to analyze the first dissertations from our department, they were either surveys, even the ones I supervised, or they were very much linked to the experimental method, with a control group, an experimental group, controlled variables, this type of approach. In the 1980s, a dialogue with qualitative research begins to emerge here at PUC. I think Marli [Eliza Dalmazo Alfonso de] Andrézo had an important role in introducing the perspective of qualitative research. The book she wrote with Menga²¹, in 1986, I'm still surprised to this day to see how often it is a reference in doctoral theses and master's dissertations. Thus, the perspective of qualitative research begins to emerge.

TD: Ok, but here at the PUC or here within the departmental program?

VC: I'm talking about the department, and more specifically about the PPGE, because it was more closely linked to the issue of research. And it was important to have another viewpoint, since the very nature of education presupposes looking closely at the subjects involved, so that different readings are made of the meanings attributed by them. This movement begins to assert itself in the area of education as a whole. And more concretely in the PPGE, but not without struggles and difficulties, including discussions that continue up to this day. These are very specific, on point types of research, whether they involve only one group, or a certain number of subjects, and questions arise, such as to what extent can this be generalized, or whether the research results are representative and can be generalized. We were still very attached

20 She obtained a degree in Languages and Literature from the University of São Paulo (USP; 1966) and in Pedagogy from the Santa Ursula University (1973). She completed her Masters in Education at PUC-Rio (1976) and her PhD in Educational Psychology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (USA) in 1978. She is a retired Full Professor for the School of Education at USP and since 2000, forms part of the graduate studies program in Education: Educational Psychology at PUC-São Paulo. She develops studies in the areas of teacher training and educational research methodology. <<http://buscatextual.cnpq.br/buscatextual/visualizacv.do?metodo=apresentar&id=K4781569Ho>> Accessed on Sept. 30th, 2014.

21 Menga Ludke – Bachelor in Philosophy at USP, PhD in Sociology at the Paris West University, post-doctorate at the University of California, Berkeley and at the Institute of Education, University of London. She was a Guest Researcher at the Jules Verne University, Amiens, France and at the Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge. Full Professor at PUC-Rio and at the Petropolis Catholic University (UCP), she has research experience in education, on problems of training, research and teaching, professional socialization and school evaluation. She coordinates the Study Group on the Teaching Profession (Grupo de Estudos sobre a Profissão Docente, GEPROF), with graduate and undergraduate students of the PUC-Rio and UCP, and is currently studying the problems of supervised internships as the weakest link in teacher training, with a CNPq grant (Lattes Platform, Oct. 1st, 2014)

to these categories, categories stemming from quantitative type of research. I'm not criticizing; it's just that each research approach has a certain logic. So, in this discussion, it seemed to me that one of the limits we had working with the issue of qualitative research was that we weren't articulating with the area of anthropology, because this area is extremely important for studying specific situations, certain human groups, within this logic of seeing how the subjects situate themselves and the meanings attributed by them. In this search, it seemed important to incorporate the anthropological perspective within this dialogue. However, in my view, it was not about just bringing someone from anthropology to join the department; we needed someone who already had a dialogue with the field of education, who, therefore, would not be the odd one out. The idea was to promote dialogue between anthropology and education.

This was what I wanted. That it should be an interlocution between the field of education and the field of anthropology, establishing dialogues and even confrontations. So, in this sense, I was looking for a person who could create this dialogue, based on their experience and training. It was right about then that I ran across Pedro [Benjamin Garcia]²² one day and asked him what you were doing, since you had studied your master's degree with me, and I knew you had graduated in philosophy, had a master's degree in education and had worked with education, that is, you were also versed in the area of education. Also, at that time, you were doing a PhD in anthropology. Therefore, you had the professional profile that I think is important, which is a person who moves through the disciplines, who is by nature interdisciplinary, and has experience in education. So, you were a person who could promote the interlocution between anthropology and education. So, as I recall, this was what motivated us. This new vision of anthropology. It was an entire process of showing that anthropology offers theoretical references and methodological perspectives that allowed us to think about education. And anthropology is an area of knowledge in which the question of

²² Professor and co-coordinator of the Graduate Program in Education at the Catholic University of Petrópolis, retired professor of the UFRJ and CNPq researcher. PhD in Social Anthropology at the National Museum-UFRJ. Author of books on education and literature-poetry.

culture is fundamental. And looking at educational processes as cultural processes was becoming increasingly urgent. In my opinion, this was the process that led us to invite you to become part of the faculty of the Department of Education of PUC-Rio.

TD: Very well. Thanks, Vera, I think that's pretty much what I wanted to know. But tell me one thing, was there a lot of negotiating to get the department's acceptance?

VC: No, I don't think so. There was the advantage that you had attained your master's degree here, so you were already versed in the area of education. So, there were not that many problems, because you seemed to be someone who could develop this dialogue.

TD: And you didn't think about someone from the social sciences?

VC: Not at that time, precisely because I was thinking about someone who had something to do with education. (Interview given to Tania Dauster at PUC-Rio, May 2014)

As the reader can see, Vera Candau's comments on educational research in the 1980s show a certain exhaustion of the quantitative model of research in the area of education. Her vision concerning the interdisciplinarity between anthropology and education indicates the change in theoretical perspectives of the time and the dissatisfaction with the prevailing research model. It raises the issue of working with the concept of culture as a relevant renovation, something that currently pervades a large part of the investigations in the PPGE. Another point worthy of attention is the vision of the pedagogical processes as cultural processes. These are some reasons for the incorporation of anthropology as fundamental to investigations in this area. To end this comment, I want to highlight that great transformations occurred that may be studied at another time, regarding both the approach and the themes and contents of the research conducted by the PPGE from the 1980s to the present day.

Interdisciplinarity and the construction of knowledge along the boundaries

The practice of interdisciplinarity, that is, moving along and crossing disciplinary boundaries, is common to both anthropology and education. Whether working with one or the other, the complexity of the construction of the object under study leads to examining it from different angles.

Thus, given my doctoral studies and my choices, urban anthropology became the basis for my research problems. I begin with the statement by Gilberto Velho (2011:177), that urban anthropology is a huge universe, not a subarea, rather “a meeting point for research and analysis, in which the universe of symbolism and representations is increasingly incorporated into research and public policies.” According to the anthropologist, the importance of crossing disciplinary boundaries follows on from this, without falling into a crude eclecticism, rather as a concept of intellectual work for research **in** and **on** the city, or for other dimensions of the production of knowledge. The author himself mentions, at different points in the text, the connections made among Marxism, Existentialism, Interactionism, authors difficult to classify, Brazilian authors, novelists and social scientists, as well as the classics of anthropology, as sources in his academic training and in his point of view as a researcher.

Given my interdisciplinary training, graduation in philosophy, MA in education and PhD in social anthropology, I “naturally” identified with this style of acquiring knowledge and with the “challenge” of establishing the area of anthropology and education at PUC-Rio. Thus, it came about that I entered belatedly, but with much excitement, into academic life, no longer as a student, but as a professional.

My intention was to show the pedagogical phenomena, practices and representations, without reducing them to the merely pedagogical, since they emerge from historical and social contexts. Therefore, the so-called educational phenomena are cultural phenomena. This relativizing aspect, working the phenomena as social and historical constructs, transforms the construction of the object education, whether

in the context of school or outside it, by emphasizing sociabilities and other cultural and historical processes. The issue of research in school is transmuted, since another theoretical-methodological arsenal is activated to observe and interpret it.²³ I call this a hybrid, interdisciplinary work, undertaken along the boundaries of these areas. In my view, this goes beyond having a reference science to constructing another research object that signifies the junction of two areas, like an amalgam of these.

At this point, without penetrating too deeply into the issue, I want to mention my reading of a Zaia Brandão's work (2008:211) on the identity of the educational field. According to the researcher, Teixeira struggled to develop education as one of the "great scientific arts," citing the examples of medicine and engineering. His work at the CBPE sought to bring educators and social scientists closer together (Brandão 2008:210). It was permeated with the development of the so-called source-sciences of education, as occurs in medicine, which is supported by biology and other sciences (Brandão 2008:211).

Within the curriculum organization that has as core disciplines, sociology, philosophy, history, psychology and, finally, the last one to enter Brazilian programs in education at the university level, anthropology, I discern reflections of this concept of education as something between "art" and "practice," which seeks a source-science as a reference.

I would like to digress momentarily and register the curiously recurrent use of the category "art" in the language of professionals separated by decades, cultures and training, to lend meaning to their practices, as did the educator Teixeira and later, the anthropologist Timothy Ingold: "This sensibility to the strange in the close-at-hand is, I believe, one that anthropology shares with art" (2008:84). There is in fact nothing new in the use of "art" as an attribute of numerous professions, designating a special capability, an ability in the field of human knowledge. This is a social category that can also be applied, for example, to medicine.

23 For this discussion see: OLIVEIRA (2013)

In short, it is said that the educational representations and practices, as presented herein, are worked in all their diversity and heterogeneity, with anthropology as the basis. In my view, a work of articulation crosses the boundaries between these areas, from the inside. Something beyond having anthropology as a reference science, I was seeking an amalgam, an interdisciplinarity.

It is important to state that public education policy formulators have been making significant demands for anthropological knowledge; the education of indigenous Brazilians and that of *quilombolas* are examples of the need for this knowledge. This is a factor for change in both disciplines. Finally, even when maintaining their specificities, both anthropology and education are in meeting processes, considerable disquiet, as well as historical, methodological and conceptual transformations.

The anthropology and education interface is highly heterogeneous. Classifications vary, as some call it the “anthropology of education.” I believe they have different meanings. Having started this area in an education department and as the result of the arguments above, I decided to accentuate the meaning of the interface and the construction of hybrid knowledge, denominating the area I opened up as anthropology and education. Thus, I was seeking the “art” of the interlocution between anthropology and education.

Mediation, culture and ethnography at the PPGE/PUC-Rio

A theory-based educational investigation was developing, under my proposal, from a perspective grounded in the practice of “participant observation, open interviews and direct personal contact” (Velho 1978:36), stemming from a concept of culture and a vision of ethnography as epistemology.

On this journey, I considered the importance of remaining aware that there are several concepts of ethnography (etymologically - writing on culture), and that these understandings have distinct consequences when describing the universes under study. This perspective, which emerged with Bronislaw Malinowski’s foundational text on

ethnography in the 1920s, is taken as reference, particularly regarding its methodological and foundational properties. The text places the reader inside the world of anthropological research, with unforgettable passages on the organization of its knowledge, such as experiencing the daily life of the universe being studied, the search for regularities and extraordinary aspects, the native's point of view. Among other lessons, this text remains indispensable for entering the world of anthropology.

Even so, without going any deeper into this debate, I would like to emphasize the political position of the anthropologist João Pacheco de Oliveira on conducting ethnographic research today. Based on his own experiences with native Brazilian tribes, he distances himself from the parameters of the pioneers in anthropology. He presents ethnography as an exercise in "sharing and communication," in contrast to the so-called colonial practices of anthropology (2013:47).

I also structured myself based on Clifford Geertz's position (1989:15): "In anthropology, or anyway in social anthropology, what the practitioners do is ethnography. And it is in understanding what ethnography is, or more exactly *what doing ethnography is*, that a start can be made toward grasping what anthropological analysis amounts to as a form of knowledge."

Finding our feet (Geertz 1989:23), seeing things from the point of view of the other on their own terms, capturing their categories, values, beliefs, worldviews, symbolic actions, this necessarily cannot be reduced to a question of techniques. According to Geertz (1989:15), it is a matter of "thick description." This author thus defined what ethnography is for him, very briefly, it "is not a matter of methods" (1989:17), but of understanding "cultural categories," which allow the researcher to differentiate, for example, an automatic blink from a conspiratorial wink. It is finding our feet in the culture being studied, in other words, in a "web of significances," believing, like Max Weber, "that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretative one in search of meaning" (Geertz 1989:15). This is the semiotic concept of culture in

the paradigm of interpretive anthropology. Such understandings can assist in the author's reading and in the reader's interpretation.

This concept of culture, its connotation as a system of symbols and shared significances, was contrasted with other definitions from other paradigms. Deliberately, however, it reinforced the perspective of a symbolic action that needed to be interpreted, such that its meaning is captured in the context studied, in a relation of alterity.

Besides Clifford Geertz's above-mentioned stance, Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira (1998:17) also inspired me, when he pronounced:

the specificity of anthropological work (...) is in no way incompatible with the work conducted by colleagues in the other social disciplines, particularly when, in the exercise of their activity, they articulate empirical research with the interpretation of their results.

His text on the anthropologist's craft (1998:17) sheds light on the work of an ethnographer, which is summarized as: "look, listen, write." On the one hand, the looking and listening concentrate the capturing of reality in empirical research, while the writing is thought as a graphic act, a "cognitive act" (Cardoso de Oliveira 1998:31-32). For another perspective on "anthropological writing" and "textual strategies," one should read Geertz (2002).

Cardoso de Oliveira (1998:33) highlights the ethnographic craft through two attitudes: "participant observation" and "relativization" contrasted with ethnocentrism, expanding our understanding of ethnographical practice. Amid other discussions, authors, issues, readings, through these "clearings," I sought to create the mediations between the anthropologist's craft and the field of education.

At this level of discussion, the work of Timothy Ingold (2008) stands out. Anthropological practice is an epistemological and cognitive "invention." Through its action, it "educates," because it forms other modes of seeing the world, creating other forms of "seeing, listening and writing." Anthropological practice, as an "outdoor action," remembering Franz Boas (Laplantine 1988) and Malinowski (Laplantine 1988), goes beyond providing knowledge of other universes, people and societies (Ingold 2008). Through its *modus operandi*, "an education in

anthropology, therefore, does more than furnish us with knowledge *about* the world – about people and their societies. It rather educates our *perception* of the world” (Ingold 2008:82). Again, I insist it is also formative and transformative, in intellectual, subjective and communicative terms. For Ingold, anthropology implies a relationship of active and dialogic alterity, as the “world” becomes what we understand of it with the “other” and not about the “other” (Ingold 2008:83). We learn that everything can be lived and symbolized in different ways. We go to encounter cultural diversity. He declares that ethnography, liberated “from the tyranny of method” (2008:84) “is a practice in its own right—a practice of verbal description” (2008:88). As a description of a way of life, it has its own meaning.

The task to be undertaken required that master’s and doctoral students dive into this intersection, and discuss the anthropologist’s craft. My action as an anthropologist was to produce a contact situation between the two disciplines to create an interdisciplinary experience, through a process of mediation, seen as movement between these two worlds, lifestyles and differences, observing the pertinent issues that emerged through the students’ practices and representations. We have moved between these universes in classroom situations and research groups. The communication thus established made epistemological transformations possible, along the disciplinary boundaries (Velho 2001:20;27).

This was my way of responding to the tension between anthropology, which seeks the knowledge of cultures in their diversity, and the proposal of intervention and transformation that is, largely, a characteristic of education. This contrast expresses distances and differences in the practices and representations of anthropology and education.

Pursuing “inside” knowledge. Research, however, should be based on questions, problems, conceptions and practices elaborated in contact with anthropological literature. Thus, another way of writing and thinking was forged that aggregated cultural categories and meanings from the “other’s” point of view, in a relation of alterity. Additional research objects thus emerged, seen as social and historical constructs, and other attitudes and practices of educational research.

Ways of Working

Returning to Gilberto Velho (1978), the adopted practice underscores the possibility that sharing cultural legacies with those we live with must not blind us to discontinuities and differences, generated by different paths, choices and lifestyles. For the anthropologist, researching in large cities and metropolises reveals the heterogeneity that the social division of labor, institutional complexity and cultural traditions express in differentiated and even contradictory worldviews.

From a more traditional perspective, it could be said that this is what allows the anthropologist to carry out investigations in his own city. That is, that there are clear internal cultural distances in the urban settings we live in, allowing the “native” to conduct anthropological research in groups different from theirs, even if they are basically close. (Velho 1980:16)

This approach requires the researcher in education to adopt a certain attitude of “strangeness” while working in their own city, and to think according to different reference systems, that is, according to other forms of representing, defining, classifying, and organizing reality and daily life, other than their own terms.

Another aspect is worthy of attention. In his analyses, Velho (1981) warns of the risk of observing social segments as if they were independent, self-contained and isolated units. Reflecting on the urban context, he signals to the social heterogeneity that the notion of a complex society carries with it and asks a crucial question: “How can sufficiently significant experiences be found to create symbolic boundaries?” (1981:16). On the other hand, what can be communicated and shared, what are the values, what are the limits of the symbolic negotiations? (1981:18-19)

These questions are equally relevant to educational practice and to thinking about other versions of the phenomena that interest the educator, in other words, they generate boundary knowledge, hybrid knowledge between anthropology and education, which are present in institutional research, dissertations and theses.

The choice of the empirical field focused on the school²⁴ and the university, as well as other social spaces, such as networks of graffiti artist, filmmakers, writers, while questions linked to training and education in a broad sense have remained.

The dilemmas that may exist cannot be obstacles to the teaching of anthropology in education, even considering the risks of trivialization or misinterpretation and the distance between the different ways that authors and schools of anthropology are appropriated, whether the reader is situated inside or outside the social sciences.

Roger Chartier (1990) says that the works do not have a single, intrinsic meaning and that they are appropriated by plural practices and concrete readers, which lends them to contradictory and different meanings, according to their trajectories, competencies, positions and dispositions. How do anthropological authors and texts migrate to other areas? What is read? How is it read? How does the articulation between these fields happen?

The courses, both graduate and undergraduate, were organized with texts and articles by anthropologists. My MA and PhD graduate students have read the area's literature intensively. Supervisory meetings were used to indicate authors pertinent to the ethnographic data that emerged during the fieldwork, and described in the field diary. Moreover, these were occasions to value the cultural categories and the "native" point of view, in their own terms, "interpretations" to construct other interpretations. The objective of this practice is to achieve what I call an "epistemological conversion" in the investigative strategy and demanded an intense supervisory relationship.

In other words, ethnography forged in the subject, since it is a theory, a practice and a way of knowing, through participant observation, field diary, the exercise of relativism, contrasting with ethnocentric attitudes, the foundations for establishing an "epistemological conversion." I see ethnography as a profound experience, which modifies being in the world and the vision that is constructed of the context in which we as investigators are inserted. This is how I was training researchers

24 For other interpretations and classic anthropological methodology, see the works of Yvonne Maggie (2006).

in education, capable of thinking strategically like ethnographers while conducting their research. In other words, incorporating an other logic of actuating and representing the social universes in their diversity; a contextualization, focusing on the social relationships and on the emerging significances, eschewing ethnocentric attitudes, capturing “cultural categories” and meanings.

It is about learning another language, another code, that allows the professional to discover other questions about the so-called educational phenomena inside and outside the school, as well as exercising another kind of fieldwork.

Research groups that include undergraduate and graduate students constitute a training practice. This academic sociability offers theoretical growth and a collective construction of the object. Over the years, I conducted the institutional research projects that stem from a teaching and investigative project, supported by the CNPq, by research grants and an undergraduate research scholarship, and by financial resources from agencies that support the development of research in this country, such as FAPERJ. The basis of this was an academic context in which the teaching/research relationship has value. Taking these conditions into account, it could be said that institutional research is an important part of the academic supervision and formative practices of researchers. According to the university statute, candidates should enroll in one of these projects: master’s students for a semester; doctoral candidates for the entire academic year; and undergraduates for the period determined by their undergraduate research grants. Many of the graduates remain in the study group for the period they are pursuing the course, and others, even after having completed their degrees, maintain ties with the group.

The research group activities included weekly meetings, readings with critique preparation, bibliographic surveys, participation in fieldwork and in the interview process, participation in the analysis of participant observation data, writing reports and articles, and taking part in seminars. I integrated myself into every step, seeking to develop a dynamic process, where the object of research is collectively constructed, while considering the heterogeneity of the students.

A practice was outlined that was quite distant from the ethnographic concept of an eminently personal experience. It was a complex experience, in which the individual and collective were mixed, until the students withdrew to write their theses and dissertations, while remaining in tune with their institutional projects.

There were several orders of limitations, like time limits or difficulties in apprehending and interpreting the ethnographic data, and restrictions on the prolonged contact situation that is expected in an ethnographic research project. The investigation was fragmented into multiple daily activities. For institutional reasons, the research groups suffered periodic changes in their composition due to changes in their membership.

These constraints were partly compensated by a fluctuating observation, a permanent state of alertness, in which the intellectually positioned team captures the significant data in contexts of relationships of alterity. The anthropological elaborations and interpretations during group meetings were genuine exercises of orality, argumentation and debate, and constituted a production of social knowledge that was understood as collective authorship. The image that comes to mind is one of an “orchestra,” where the professor-researcher is the “maestro.”

The fruits of the work

In the “Presentation” of the translation of Howard S Becker’s article *Studying urban schools*, which included another of his articles *Research in urban schools*, Ana Pires do Prado²⁵ and Ludmila Fernandes de Freitas²⁶ remark that Becker, a sociologist from the United States, is widely known in Brazil with several works on urban anthropology published here. However, they underscore that his works on schools and their social actors are barely known among us.

In this work, published in 1983 in the United States, the sociologist speaks of several impasses affecting ethnographic research in schools,

25 Professor at the Faculty of Education at UFRJ.

26 Doctoral student at Graduation Program in Sociology and Anthropology (Programa de Pós-graduação em Sociologia e Antropologia, PPGSA), UFRJ.

which I recognize from my experience. They include a reserved attitude from the institutions, concerns about possible failures, apprehension about evaluation, the researcher's desire to understand the institution in its entirety, and generate feelings of resistance in the professionals in the field under investigation. Besides those mentioned, the institutions also show a certain exhaustion, nowadays, in terms of being a subject of research and not getting anything useful in return.

An overview of the research conducted may help the reader to understand the dynamics of the work carried out and the interpretation of its meanings.

In the early 1990s, Marilut Mata (a former teacher at PPGE/PUC-Rio) and I conducted an ethnographic study in a school in a *favela* in the southern zone of Rio de Janeiro. The issue of "school failure" is a recurring theme in educational research, especially when it comes to the working classes. The intention, however, was to find the "strangeness" in the problematic, and to research understandings different from those disseminated within the school system, particularly the experiences of the students, their families and their surroundings, looking for values, attitudes and behavior seen as symbolic action.

During the fieldwork, the contact situation involved children from seven years old upward, who attended school and came from families constituted mostly by informal workers, as well as the teachers. During the participant observation, semi-structured interviews were conducted on the daily lives of the students, trying to dive deep into the universe of children who defined themselves as "poor," "workers" and "students."

Relativizing the focus on "school failure," understanding it as a social construct, transformed our initial view of this phenomenon. The relation between school and work, in the lives of these students, appeared as the expression of meaning-filled values in their survival strategies. This way of life reminds the concept of "the brief childhood," proposed by Ariès (1981), which still persists among part of the working classes, supposedly excluded from success in school by the educational logic.

According to Ariès (1981) the place where education happens is fundamental regarding the so-called “childhood feeling.”²⁷ This is why I argue that the child who works and studies remakes the image of childhood of the *Ancien Regime*, experiencing a dense sociability in the *favelas*, which requires another understanding of school organization. Without generalizing, the paths of relativism lead to an impasse between educational logic and the ways of thinking and acting of this community sociability, which are not guided by this “childhood feeling.” This is because it lends an other meaning to childhood experiences and has a different concept of the child and childhood founded on distinct rules and familial organization. This clash of worldviews produces the exclusion of these children from the world of school. On the one hand, we have the school, based on the model of a “long childhood,” which drives this student away. While on the other, in the relationships established between work and school, concrete social relations emerge among a portion of students, parents and the school that I call, paraphrasing Ariès, “the short-term school”. Since learning only the rudiments of reading and writing are considered enough by the families, and child labor is an imposing reality, dropout rates from school are high (Dauster 1991;1992).

Ethnographic research is approximate, interpretative, and encourages the researcher to look for other problematics. Thus, an interest in researching the themes of reading and writing present in the school emerged, viewing these as cultural and historical artifacts, rather than reducing them to the educational angle. In this context, an interface was constructed with the work of Roger Chartier (1990), providing a referential to illuminate the practices and representations of reading, as well as of those of literacy.

From then on, the research projects were marked by the encounter with the work of Roger Chartier, in other words, with cultural history.

I transported issues that cultural history has confronted to the ethnographic situation, namely: the relationship between reading and

27 The English translations of Ariès use the term “idea” for *sentiment* (original in French: “*sentiment de l’enfance*”), which literally means “feeling.” I prefer the latter, since it provides a more precise idea of the concept, especially associated with children. (N. RT. Dayse Ventura Arosa).

writing and the individual's way of life, the representations and practices of reading and writing, their social uses and their meanings in different social universes, such as school, university, digital classrooms, networks of writers of youth and children's literature, and networks of award-winning writers. Thus a research program was constituted, generating theses and dissertations. Gradually, a group of researchers formed who defined themselves as the Study Group in the Anthropology of Reading and Writing (*Grupo de Estudos da Antropologia da Leitura e da Escrita*, GEALE). It is worth emphasizing that a broad view of education was adopted since the group was about interpreting anthropological processes for training readers.

The purpose was to identify and research *ad hoc* the social construction of these categories, given the historical and social variability of the figure of the reader/writer. Ethnographic descriptions revealed values, attitudes, tastes, competences, techniques, representations and practices differentially for adults, youths and children, in relation to crafts, activities and social background. How did these subjectivities and identities transform into the relationships between the practices of reading and writing?

With these questions disentangled from cultural history, we were interested in encountering "readers" in their concrete practices. A public primary school (elementary school today), situated in a neighborhood of the southern zone of Rio de Janeiro²⁸ was fertile ground for fieldwork. Participant observation lasting months was undertaken in a 3rd grade class (now the 4th year), involving 38 students who lived in a nearby *favela*, with the same characteristics of the students of the first research mentioned. Their ages ranged between 8 and 14 years old, which showed the existing learning gap, according to the standards that prevailed in the school system. The fact that these pupils from this *favela* study outside it, marked a difference from the students in the first study, since it meant that their families had other material and symbolic resources conducive to other interests, investments in the schooling of their children and opening horizons, which allowed them relative distance

28 Daily life, social practices and values among working class urban sectors – the differential diffusion of writing and reading and the meaning of the image among the youth. PUC-Rio/CNPq. 1991-1994.

from their own social environment. A certain hierarchy was established among children studying inside or outside the *favela* community, with a view to a broader social experience.

Without going into physical and social descriptions of the space, I will comment on the social and educational uses of reading. The school's goal is to produce an educated individual. How is this education achieved? Students performed individual and group tasks that imposed other desk and chair arrangements. Notebooks, mimeographed exercises and a few literature books were passed around. The blackboard, a constant reference in the classroom.

The girls' interactions with their personalized notebooks and diaries were significant, revealing, according to Ariès (1991), signs of other relationships of the subject with herself, specific to the advent of modernity. The handling of these notebooks decorated with collages, drawings, thoughts and facts revealed the importance given by the girls to the expression of feelings, affections and recording of valued facts.

Participant observation demonstrated that students read and write according to distinct practices and sociabilities. A pleasant reading can be one involving reading a poem or article aloud. Silent reading, however, can be thought of as a laborious activity, when each student reads to him or herself, spelling, deciphering letters and enunciating words to expand their own understanding of the text. These social processes show school reading as exercise, work, training, identification of signs and meanings, constraint and surmounting.

What is reading? For the teacher interviewed, not all students showed the ability to read, because for her, the meaning of the act of reading is the sense that is given to what is read. Many of the students were merely decoders of words and phrases. According to the teacher, the process of becoming a reader is constituted by several different stages, and its basis is decoding.

In my view, the opportunities that these students have for developing "silent reading" are precarious, whether in the classroom or other spaces of sociability, such as the familial space. This happens because the opportunities they have for contact with and handling books are rare, as are the opportunities for the use and the appropriation of books. At this

point, we should recall what Roger Chartier's work indicates, that the practice of silent reading, among other data, is what opens up the paths of intellectual work and develops other forms of subjectivity, interpretation of the world and the construction of individuality.

One of the main arguments raised, resulting from this observation (Dauster 1994; 2003), resided in the following perspective: while admitting that "the reader is born" in the public school, he or she is forged in a constrained and limited way by his or her own life conditions and by the opportunities the school system offers. Without generalizing, I know there are examples of individuals who had the same kind of school experience and overcame these obstacles and difficulties in their life experience. However, in the games of inclusion and exclusion that weave the webs of society the chances that these students have to develop silent reading as a practice and to have contact with so-called good literature are rare. It is interesting to note the instigator role of women, mothers and guardians, in the valuation of reading habits and the education of children.

In the wake of the questions raised about the representations and practices of reading in the urban setting, through anthropology and cultural history, I contacted writers of youth and children's literature who defined themselves as professional writers²⁹. I used Gilberto Velho's (1986) dialogue-research, actuating through a network, as one writer indicated another I should interview. A collection of data sprung from these interviews in the line of life history and perceptions about the formation of a reader and the meaning of school from this other point of view. Some significant points emerged, as I will now narrate: for the interviewees, the reader is formed by contact with people who have an emotional effect on them, through identifications, values and gestures; the taste for reading does not follow a formula, and thus literary books should not be used as learning material. The writers question the use of files, inserts and evaluations when it comes to the reading of literature; on the other hand they believe that the school could create access

29 The role of school in forming readers. PUC-Rio. CNPq. 1994-1997. Professor Pedro Benjamin Garcia and I organized a book titled *Web of Authors*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2000, awarded by the Fundação Nacional do Livro [National Book Foundation] as Highly Recommended, containing the interviews with these authors.

mechanisms to libraries, newspapers, museums, cinemas, weaving the web in which the reader is formed; following this line of thought, reader training should be part of the context of public policies, in that it is the school's responsibility to avoid a purely affective, pleasurable discourse in relation to reading. It is not a matter of discarding the pleasure of reading, much to the contrary, but to provide situations for debate, the exchange of ideas and collective discussions about texts and books. Finally, for writers, the act of reading implies liberty, autonomy and the option to choose as fundamental devices when discussing the social and differential construction of the reader. In short, "education" and the formation of the reader occur in diverse sociabilities, as can be glimpsed from what the writers expressed above and briefly presented here (Dauster 2003).

With no intention of exhausting the subject of PPGE research projects, I will continue, however, to briefly discuss the investigations that unfolded concerning the practices of reading and writing in the context of the university, the basis of my craft as professor and researcher, demanding a posture of the "strangeness of the familiar" (Velho 1978) during the investigation.

Another problematic appeared that is rooted in the preceding studies, which is the progressive enrollment of students from the so-called working classes at a private university thought of as elite. The enrollment of these students after having passed the entrance exam, but facilitated by a scholarship program, represented a social transformation and a significant conquest for these students. However, another side to this conquest appeared that was distressing due to tensions and provocations, which are worth mapping, since these involved impasses in social contact among students from different social strata. The diversity could be felt in terms of color, codes, attitudes, clothing, and other social markers.

I present a brief discussion the research entitled "University students - lifestyle and reading practices" (PUC-Rio/CNPq, 1998-2002), about the relationship between students and literate culture, in this context. One of the questions on the agenda focused on the way the enrollment and permanence of these students was experienced at the time.

I concentrated on 19 students, between the ages of 20 and 40 years old, from the courses in education, history and social services, that made up a highly heterogeneous group in terms of color, living conditions, education and religion. The majority of these students took the so-called “pre-entrance” exam community courses, and having passed the entrance exam, all of them obtained scholarships, the condition for their entry and permanence in the institution.

The conflicts and tensions manifested themselves in feelings of discrimination stemming from colleagues from the more economically privileged backgrounds and some of the teachers. The students complained of the stigma attributed to public schooling, through accusations of a decline in the quality of teaching at the university and due to their own difficulties with reading and writing. From the point of view of non-scholarship students, there were attitudes of avoidance in relation to scholarship students with regard to group assignments. Among these, complaints about a decrease in the value of their diplomas were current, and criticisms were made related to class dynamics due to the presence of the supposedly less academically prepared scholarship students in carrying out the assignments.

In short, the inclusion of the working classes was experienced in a tense, prejudiced manner, and provoked several forms of distancing from less economically favored students by those better off, for example, when constituting groups for work assignments. Other constraints revealed were related to the use of certain spaces in the university where the scholarship students did not feel at ease. Symbolic boundaries stemming from feelings brought about by social and cultural differences and life styles were part of the reason for the complaints and processes of incompatibility. Even so, these behaviors were not uniform, there were exceptions. Both teachers and students sought to facilitate mediations and meetings, trying to surmount these social obstacles.

The so-called “de-elitization of the university,” far from being a linear process, was transforming academic relationships (Dauster 2004). At the time, access to the university for the working class people was primarily concentrated in the areas of education, history, geography and social services. On the other hand, it is important to mention that the narratives

of the teachers interviewed allowed us to relativize the commonly cited stereotype that only students from working class backgrounds suffered difficulties with the educated norm (Dauster 2007;2007). Numerous students from more economically privileged backgrounds presented similar predicaments.

During another research project,³⁰ I interviewed nine teachers, men and women, working in the areas of humanities, social sciences and technical scientific, aged between 39 and 70 years. The contacts were made through my own acquaintances and through indications from teachers answering the survey at the same university. From the result of these interviews, I highlight only some recurring points that compose the *ethos* (Geertz 1989: 103), that is, the lifestyle, behavior and social values of this universe: the idea that the production of knowledge has an ethical and social function, the importance of transmitting various reading and writing practices in the training of students, the teaching relationship inspired by dialogue, together with digital technology practices, which imply other writings and readings. Intense cultural changes were observed due to the use of computers for communicating between teachers and students, and comments on the multiple roles exercised by teachers (teaching, research, supervision, administration and lecturing) and the emergence of new academic styles, due to the introduction of digital techniques that changed the tasks of teachers and students (Dauster 2007).

The continuity of studies on the representations and practices of reading, in this same universe, led me to observe and perceive facets of the uses of the so-called “educated norm” and its relationships with handwritten and digitally written texts.³¹ This observation was conducted over more than a semester, in a discipline called Teaching Practices I, directed at undergraduates, gathering together a female universe of education students. The heterogeneity of the group lay in their varied insertion in terms of economic and sociocultural situations and

30 Research “The symbolic field of the university – the teachers, cultural diversity and academic excellence.” PUC-Rio/CNPq, 2003-2005.

31 Research “Writing in the university: university students and the relationships between reading and writing” PUC-Rio/CNPq, 2005-2008.

in their relationships with the digital world, since not all of them had a computer at home. The course had a twofold objective: competence in computing and teacher training in education. The organization of the classes consisted of sending texts and consulting texts online, a characteristic that partially changed the relationships between teachers and students. These texts were classified as “conferences” and “documentation,” they were “mandatory” and “complementary” and the students comments were made online. At that time, around 2005, teachers began to demand that all student assignments be delivered typed. Part of our course was held in the computer center, to allow all the students to have access to a computer, and it was said that the practice occurred in a “classroom without borders.” The written representations of the undergraduates expressed their relationships with the machine and with the digital world. Thus, a distinction was noted between digital and non-digital writing, voicing distinct meanings between one activity and the other, from the students’ point of view. The students’ interpretation, for example, was that “academic,” digital writing was for university use, while the “personal,” on paper, was used to express their emotions (Dauster 2010).

During my postdoctoral studies in the Graduate Program in Social Anthropology at the National Museum of Brazil (*Programa de Pós-Graduação em Antropologia Social, Museu Nacional, UFRJ*), supervised by Professor Gilberto Velho (2009), it was proposed that I examine the processes of the formation, identity construction and representations and practices of writing, through interviews, based on the life histories of eight award-winning writers.³² They all authorized me to use their names, because their enunciations were both personal and authorial. The writers contacted belonged to several different generations. Since I did not want to be restricted to interviews, to broaden my interpretation, I attended literary events, book signings, lectures, various types of activities in which the writers were the protagonists, and other occasions where they were the theme of the literature. I read articles in newspapers and magazines; I read the authors’ books and texts.

32 “Women and literate culture: an anthropology of the forming award winning writers”. Research Project PUC-Rio/FAPERJ, 2009-2011.

Accompanied by doctoral students (Ana Maria Loureiro, Anderson Tibau and Lucelena Ferreira), I visited the writers' homes, except for Nelida Piñon, who agreed to meet us at the Brazilian Academy of Letters. In contrast with similar circumstances, my feelings led me to think on the particularly dramaturgical character of this contact situation, without doubt due to the dialogism and sense of alterity in being with professional women from the world of writing and fiction.

This research inspired me to formulate the question-problem: How do you "become who you are"? (Nietzsche), which orientated both my inquiry and my interpretations. What emerged from these interviews was the role of family in creating a taste for literature and the arts, the organization of their daily work life as an expression of the place that reading and writing had in their lives, the blurring of genre boundaries regarding the value and the practice of youth and children's literature *vis-à-vis* literature for the adult universe, the value of the classics in the intellectual formation of each individual. Strong emotions linked to the literary world permeated the encounters. References were discussed concerning the meaning of "memory" and "invention" for the craft of fiction writing, recurrently appearing associated with the production of literature. Another relevant point that was discussed, which involves and sustains literary works, is how the practice of research is indispensable to the construction of a considerable part of fictional works and their characters.

I broached the subject of the existence or absence of a feminine writing with the writers. This controversial issue brought up contrary and contradictory positions, both affirmative and negative. From their narratives concerning the feelings involved in writing fiction, the imaginary experience of "living" other multifaceted "lives" emerged. Writing is also living other lives, being embodied in characters that lend meaning to trajectories and identities.

What emerges from all this? Observing the writers' trajectories, fictional works, experiences of other codes, construction of characters and life experiences, I appeal to the notion of metamorphosis (Velho 1994:29) to illuminate my interpretation, since to forge characters and stories is also to have the privilege of living and reinventing other lives,

identities, times, symbolic situations and choices (Dauster 2012).

I am currently working on the project “Founders - the social construction of the memory of the Graduate Program in Education at PUC-Rio (2011-...), the first graduate program in education in Brazil, trying to unveil the background of the implementation of the program, becoming close with the social actors and their points of view concerning the role of the PPGE/PUC-Rio. It falls to me to interpret the nonlinear historical and social processes of the program’s development, views on research, teaching and supervision of the teachers participating in the project, as well as thinking about the social and academic function of the institution during different phases.

Inconclusions

There is no doubt that the school, considering its concrete plurality, is a social invention and represents specific cultures, daily lives full of rituals, values and beliefs. It constitutes a rich territory for observation and ethnographic analysis, along with other situations for sociability that are formative. As an ethnographer, I have worked in schools, universities, professional networks and other social networks. My view of “education” is broadened, for it encompasses other formation processes and observed the codes found in schools and universities as cultural-historical constructs.

Over the last few years, I have seen the expansion and consolidation of the field of anthropology and/of education. There are numerous research projects and reflections to be carried out. To indicate only one, I would raise the issue of the possible differences between theses and dissertations produced at this intersection, when pursued in the social sciences and/or education fields. Is anthropology done outside the social sciences? Or is ethnography done, but not anthropology? In what terms is ethnography done outside the social sciences?

In short, this is an account of a teaching and research experience in anthropology outside the social sciences carried out in a graduate program in education. From its beginnings in 1965, at the height of the military dictatorship, the PPGE/PUC-Rio presented pioneering

characteristics, because, as I have said, it was the first MA in education in Brazil. Another attitude of similar importance was precisely that it was the first to implement the discipline of anthropology and education. It fell to me between the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 21st century, to exercise the role of mediator between these nonlinear boundaries. This narrative should not be read as a linear either, since it indicates styles, aspects, choices and emphases within my own trajectory of teaching, researching and academic supervision. It has the flavor of memory. It cannot hope to be exhaustive on what has been lived, and the work continues in many forms.

Received 1, September 2014, approved 10 February, 2015

Translated from the Portuguese by Barbara Sette

Reviewed by Dayse Ventura Arosa and by Phil Bain

Bibliographic references

- ARIÈS, Philippe. 1990. *A história cultural entre práticas e representações. Memória e sociedade*. Lisboa: Difel.
- BARROS, Myriam Moraes Lins de. 2009. “Memória, experiência e narrativa”. In: Ana Luiza Carvalho da Rocha; Cornelia Eckert (orgs.). *Individualismo, sociabilidade e memória*. Porto Alegre: Deriva. pp. 4-17.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. 1996. “A ilusão biográfica”. In: Marieta de Moraes Ferreira; Janaína Amado (orgs.), *Usos & abusos da história oral*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas. pp.183-191.
- BRANDÃO, Zaia. 2008. “A identidade do campo educacional. Anotações com base em ‘Ciência e Arte de Educar’ de Anísio Teixeira”. In: Zaia Brandão; Ana Waleska Mendonça (orgs.), *Uma tradição esquecida. Por que não lemos Anísio Teixeira*. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Forma & Ação. pp. 205-215.

- CANDAU, Vera. 2014. A memória do vivido. Depoimento dado a Tania Dauster. Maio de 2014. Mimeo.
- ; LEITE, Miriam Soares. 2007. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 37: 132.
- ; MOREIRA, Antonio Flávio. 2012. *Multiculturalismo e práticas pedagógicas*. 9ª ed. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- CARDOSO de OLIVEIRA, Roberto. 1998. “O trabalho do antropólogo: olhar, ouvir escrever”. In: *O trabalho do antropólogo*. Brasília/ São Paulo: Paralelo 15/ UNESP. pp. 17-35.
- CHARTIER, Roger. 1990. *A história cultural - entre práticas e representações*. Lisboa: Difel. Memória e Sociedade.
- CONSORTE, Josildeth Gomes. 1997. “Culturalismo e educação no Brasil”. In: Neusa Maria Mendes Gusmão (org.), *Antropologia e educação - interfaces do ensino e da pesquisa*. Campinas: Cedes/ Unicamp. Caderno Cedes 43. pp. 26-37.
- CORRÊA, Marisa. 1987. *História da antropologia no Brasil*. São Paulo/ Campinas: Vértice/ Editora Revista dos Tribunais/ Editora da Unicamp.
- DAUSTER, Tania. 2014a. “Relatos em uma linha de história de vida: notas para a construção da memória da Pós-Graduação em Educação da PUC-Rio (os bastidores da construção)”. In: Lia Faria; Yolanda Lobo; Patrícia Coelho (orgs.), *Histórias de vida, gênero e educação*. Curitiba: Editora CRV. pp. 85-100.
- 2014b. “O universo da escola e dos profissionais da área de educação: tensões e proximidades entre a antropologia e a educação”. In: Simoni Guedes Lahud; Tatiana Arnaud Cipiniuk (orgs.), *Abordagens etnográficas sobre educação. Adentrando os muros da escola*. Rio de Janeiro/ Niterói: FAPERJ/ Alternativa. pp. 25-39.
- 2014c. “Discutindo a relação - antropologia e educação a partir de uma experiência de ensino, pesquisa e orientação”. In: Sandra Pereira Tosta; Gilmar Rocha (orgs.), *Diálogos sem fronteira: história, etnografia e educação em culturas ibero-americanas*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora.
- 2014d. “Um diálogo sobre as relações entre etnografia, cultura e educação - representações e práticas”. *Revista Linhas Críticas*,

- Dossiê: Antropologia e Educação (org. Amurabi Oliveira) (no prelo).
- DAUSTER, Tania. 2012. “Escrever: formação de identidade num universo de escritoras”. In: Tania Dauster; Sandra Pereira Tosta; Gilmar Rocha (orgs.), *Etnografia e educação*. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina. pp. 69-95.
- _____. et al. 2010. “A descoberta de si: representações e práticas de leitura e escrita de universitárias”. In: Tania Dauster; Lucelena Ferreira (orgs.), *Por que ler? Perspectivas culturais do ensino e da leitura*. Rio de Janeiro: FAPERJ/ Lamparina. pp. 217- 246.
- _____. 2008. “Diversidade cultural e educação. Dimensões de uma ‘revolução silenciosa’”. In: José Marcio Barros (org.), *Diversidade cultural - da proteção à promoção*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica. pp. 125-132.
- _____. 2007a. “Mundo acadêmico - professores universitários, práticas de leitura e escrita e diversidade cultural”. *AVÁ Revista de Antropologia*, 10: 119- 132.
- _____. (org.). 2007b. *Antropologia e educação. Um saber de fronteira*. Rio de Janeiro: Forma & Ação.
- _____. 2004. “Uma revolução silenciosa: notas sobre o ingresso de setores de baixa renda na universidade”. *AVÁ - Revista de Antropologia*, 6: 77-89.
- _____. 2003. “Jogos de inclusão e exclusão sociais”. In: Eliana Yunes; Maria Luiza Oswald (orgs.), *A experiência da leitura*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola. pp. 91-116.
- _____; GARCIA, Pedro. 2000. *Teia de autores*. Belo Horizonte: Editora Autêntica.
- _____. 1994a. “Navegando contra a corrente? O educador, o antropólogo e o relativismo”. In: Zaia Brandão (org.), *A crise dos paradigmas e a educação*. São Paulo: Cortez. pp. 75-87.
- _____. 1994b. “Nasce um leitor - da leitura escolar à leitura do contexto”. In: Paulo Bernardo Vaz; Krieger Olinto Heidrun; Tania Dauster (orgs.), *Leitura e leitores*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Biblioteca Nacional/ PROLER/ Casa de Leitura. pp. 55-77.

- _____. 1992. “Uma infância de curta duração: trabalho e escola”. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 82: 31-36.
- _____. 1991. “Une enfance de courte durée”. In: Eliana Marta Teixeira Lopes (org.), *Cahiers du Brésil Contemporaine*. Paris: Maisons des Sciences de l'Homme. n.15. pp. 55-69.
- DURKHEIM, Émile. 1978. *Educação e sociologia*. São Paulo: Melhoramentos.
- FÁVERO, Maria de Lourdes. 2001. “A experiência do IESAE/FGV: das origens à extinção”. In: Anais da Reunião Anual da Anped, 24, Caxambu, out. 2001. GT Políticas da Educação Superior. Caxambu: Anped. pp. 1-14. Mimeo.
- FELDMAN-BIANCO, Bela. 2013. “Entre a ciência e a política: desafios atuais da antropologia”. In: Bela Feldman-Bianco (org.), *Desafios da antropologia brasileira*. Brasília: ABA. pp. 19-46.
- GEERTZ, Clifford. 2002. *Vidas e obras. O antropólogo como autor*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ.
- GEERTZ, Clifford. 1989. *A interpretação das culturas*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar. _____. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures – selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- GUSMÃO, Neusa Maria Mendes. 1997. “Antropologia e educação: origens de um diálogo”. In: Neusa Maria Mendes Gusmão (org.), *Antropologia e educação - interfaces do ensino e da pesquisa*. Campinas: Cedes/ Unicamp. Caderno Cedes 43. pp. 8-27.
- INGOLD, Timothy. 2008. “Anthropology is not ethnography”. *PROCEEDINGS of the British Academy*, 154: 69-92.
- LAPLANTINE, François. 1988. *Aprender antropologia*. São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense.
- MAGGIE, Yvonne. 2006. “Racismo e antirracismo: preconceito, discriminação e os jovens estudantes nas escolas cariocas”. *Educação e Sociedade*, 27(96): 739-751.
- MENDONÇA, Ana Waleska P. Campos. 2008. “O CBPE: um projeto de Anísio”. In: Zaia Brandão; Ana Waleska Mendonça (orgs.), *Uma tradição esquecida. Por que não lemos Anísio Teixeira*. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Forma&Ação. pp. 43-63.

- OLIVEIRA, Amurabi. 2013. “Etnografia e pesquisa educacional: por uma descrição densa da educação”. *Educação Unisinos*, 17(3): 271-280.
- PACHECO de OLIVEIRA, João. 2013. “Etnografia enquanto compartilhamento e comunicação: desafios atuais às representações coloniais da antropologia”. In: Bela-Feldman Bianco (org.), *Desafios da antropologia brasileira*. Brasília: ABA. pp. 47-74.
- PRADO, Ana Pires; FREITAS, Ludmila Fernandes. 2013. “Apresentação da tradução do artigo *Studying urban schools* de Howard S. Becker”. *Revista Enfoques*, 13(1): 1-14.
- QUEIROZ, Maria Isaura Pereira. 1988. “Relatos orais: do ‘indizível’ ao ‘dizível’”. In: Olga de Moraes Von Simson (org.), *Experimentos com histórias de vida (Itália-Brasil)*. São Paulo: Vértice. pp. 14-42.
- ROCHA, Gilmar. 2011. *Mauss e a educação*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica. Coleção Pensadores & Educação.
- ROCHA, Gilmar; TOSTA, Sandra. 2009. *Antropologia & educação*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora. Coleção Temas & Educação. pp. 11-159.
- VELHO, Gilberto. 2011. “Antropologia urbana: interdisciplinaridade e fronteiras do conhecimento”. *Mana. Estudos de Antropologia Social*, 17(1): 161-185.
- _____. 2001. “Apresentação; biografia, trajetória e mediação”. In: Gilberto Velho; Karina Kuschnir (orgs.), *Mediação, cultura e política*. Rio de Janeiro: Aeroplano. pp. 15-27.
- _____. 1994. “Memória, identidade e projeto”. In: *Projeto e metamorfose: antropologia das sociedades complexas*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. pp. 97-105
- _____. 1986. *Subjetividade e sociedade - uma experiência de geração*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.
- _____. 1981. *Individualismo e cultura. Notas para uma antropologia da sociedade contemporânea*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores.
- _____. 1980. “O antropólogo pesquisando em sua cidade: sobre conhecimento e heresia”. In: Gilberto Velho (coord.), *O desafio da cidade. Novas perspectivas da antropologia brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Campus. pp. 13-21.
- _____. 1978. “Observando o familiar”. In: Edson de Oliveira Nunes (org.), *A aventura sociológica*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. pp. 36-46.

XAVIER, Libânia Nacif; BRANDÃO, Zaia. 2008. “As ciências sociais e a formação dos educadores”. In: Zaia Brandão; Ana Waleska Mendonça (orgs.), Uma tradição esquecida. Por que não lemos Anísio Teixeira. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Forma & Ação. pp. 65-74.

Tania Dauster

Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro

tdauster@puc-rio.br