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ABSTRACT
This following article is a result obtained from the master's research whose theme was the organization of the pedagogical work (OTP) of the Federal Institute of Paraná (IFPR) and its object was the teaching work, specifically regarding the implications of OTP. It seeks to analyze the implications of OTP for teaching work and training at IFPR - Campus Palmas, in the southwest of Paraná state. The methodology is based on bibliographic research collated with document analysis and the answers of 24 teachers from the institution obtained through a questionnaire. In the analysis, we highlight the category verticalization of teaching as the main implication for teaching and training, since this form of teaching organization requires acting at different levels of education - basic and higher. However, while verticalization is pointed as an implication for teaching work, it is also considered a learning opportunity for this teacher, since alternating between levels of education requires constant development and from this emerges the formative needs. The discussions reveal contradictions regarding OTP, teaching work and training to work in vocational education.
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RESUMO
O presente artigo resulta da pesquisa de mestrado cuja temática foi a organização do trabalho pedagógico (OTP) do Instituto Federal do Paraná (IFPR) e teve como objeto o trabalho docente, especificamente no referente às implicações da OTP. Busca analisar as implicações da OTP para o trabalho docente e formação no IFPR – Campus Palmas, na região sudoeste do estado do Paraná. A metodologia baseia-se em pesquisa bibliográfica cotejadas com análises de documentos e das respostas de 24 docentes da instituição obtidas por meio de um questionário. Nas análises, destaca-se a categoria verticalização do ensino como a principal implicação para o trabalho docente e formação, uma vez que essa forma de organização do ensino requer a atuação nos distintos níveis da educação – básica e superior. Contudo, ao mesmo tempo que a verticalização é apontada como uma implicação para o trabalho docente, é também considerada uma oportunidade de aprendizado para esse docente, visto que alternar entre os níveis da educação exige um constante desenvolvimento e disto emergem as necessidades formativas. As discussões revelam contradições no tocante à OTP, ao trabalho docente e à formação para atuar na educação profissional.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE
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La Organización del Trabajo Pedagógico en el Instituto Federal y las Implicaciones para el Trabajo Docente

RESUMEN
El presente artículo resulta de la pesquisa de maestría, cuya temática ha sido la organización del trabajo pedagógico (OTP) del Instituto Federal de Paraná (IFPR) y ha tenido como objeto el trabajo docente, específicamente en lo que se refiere a las implicaciones de la OTP. Busca analizar las implicaciones de la OTP para el trabajo docente y formación en el IFPR – Campus Palmas, en la región sudoeste de la provincia de Paraná. La metodología está basada en pesquisa bibliográfica cotejadas con análisis de documentos y de las respuestas de 24 docentes de la institución obtenidas por medio de un cuestionario. En el análisis, se destaca la categoría verticalización de la enseñanza como la principal implicación para el trabajo docente y formación, una vez que esa forma de organización de enseñanza requiere la actuación en los distintos niveles de la educación – básica y superior. Sin embargo, al mismo tiempo que la verticalización es apuntada como una implicación para el trabajo docente, es también considerada una oportunidad de aprendizaje para este mismo docente, visto que alternar entre los niveles da educación exige un constante desarrollo y de esto emergen las necesidades de formación. Las discusiones revelan contradicciones en el tocante a la OTP, al trabajo docente y a la formación para actuar na educación profesional.

PALABRAS CLAVE
Introduction

Discussions concerning university autonomy, privatization of education, inseparability between teaching, research and extension, expansion and expansion of access to higher education, the social responsibility of the university have, to some extent, spurred debate and relative research to higher education. Notably, there is a significant tendency to prioritize the themes described above, leaving aside the discussions related to the organization of pedagogical work, which, in turn, directly implies the work and training of teachers who work in higher education institutions. In this sense, we are responsible for investigating the organization of pedagogical work at the Federal Institute of Paraná, which offers courses in basic and higher education.

Thus, we face the need to apprehend the activities developed in the institution and how it is organized, which directly implies the work of the teacher and the training of professionals who work in it¹.

We understand that we cannot talk about the teaching work without addressing the formation. In this sense, the investigation pointed and discussed the implications of the organization of the pedagogical work for the continuous formation. We emphasize that through training or experience, teachers acquire knowledge and manifest it via work in the classroom. However, this is inserted in a context full of laws, regulations, resolutions and internal ordinances, procedures and guidelines that must be followed.

The educational institution (Federal Institute for Vocational, Scientific and Technological Education) in which research is being developed is still considered new. All functions are fulfilled by public tender and we note that many of the servers that join it are unaware of its dynamics. This needed to present the complexity of the organization of education in the Federal Institutes (FIs), noting that such educational institutions offer integrated high school courses², technology courses, undergraduate and postgraduate, ie, basic and higher education, requiring adequacy from professional to different educational levels and student profiles. Thus, it is expected that the teacher goes beyond the simple fulfillment of content, object of the areas of knowledge to be taught, and the process of learning assessment, and assume the social commitment according to reality, adapting their work to the context of institution in which it is inserted.

These questions led us to the following problem: how is the organization of pedagogical work organized at the Federal Institute of Paraná - Campus Palmas and what are the implications for teaching work?

¹ This research stems from the discussions and investigations carried out in the research group - Higher Education, Training and Teaching (GESFORT), which develops the project “Training and teaching at different levels of education” whose objective is to analyze policies aimed at training, and to the teaching work in the different levels and modalities of the teaching, problematizing the specificity of the pedagogical work in the initial formation processes as well as in the processes of teaching performance.

² These are high school vocational education courses integrated into high school, designed so that the student completes high school along with a technical vocational qualification. The level of education required to enter integrated high school courses is elementary school and the average duration is 3 to 4 years.
Knowing the organization of pedagogical work in that institution means understanding how it articulates the activities and participation of the people involved, and how this implies the daily work of teachers and their formation. Thus, the objective is to analyze the implications of the organization of pedagogical work for teaching work at IFPR - Campus de Palmas, southwestern Paraná.

To answer the problem and achieve the research objectives, we used the literature search, document analysis and applied a questionnaire to 24 teachers of the institution. The analyzes are based on the contributions of research by Charlot (2008), Azzi (2005), Pimenta (2005), Saviani (2007, 2014), Freitas (2002), Antunes (2009), Paro (2000), Contreras (2002, 2012) and others. The study was constituted as a qualitative research, as it explored, analyzed and discussed a reality deeply and specifically. However, we cannot discard the quantitative data that are part of the survey and presentation of the institution, such as: number of teachers, number of campus courses in which the research took place, number of licensed teachers, number of bachelors, among others.

Data were collected through questionnaires with open and closed questions about teaching, training and OTP. The application of the previously qualified research instrument occurred at a time previously scheduled between researcher, campus teaching coordinator and faculty. Of the 130 faculty members of the Palmas campus collegiate, those who met the following criteria participated in the research: to be effective teacher at IFPR, to work in vocational high school and higher education, to accept the terms presented in the IC.

At the time, there were 24 teachers who met the study criteria and agreed to participate in the research. So, we got 24 questionnaires answered.

The analysis of the collected data is based on the triangulation of data - laws (LDBEN 9394/1996, law No. 12.014 / 2009, law No. 13.415 / 2017, law No. 11.892 / 2008 Creation of Federal Institutes) and internal regulations -, answers of the questionnaires compared with the theoretical references worked. Thus, through the articulation between the documentary analysis, answers of the questionnaires related to the theoretical references, it was possible to extract the explored categories.

The methodological procedure adopted was based on the theoretical-contextual reflection. In it, we draw a brief overview of the expansion of the Federal Network of Professional, Scientific and Technological Education (RFEPCT) and the creation of IFs. We could also identify the component elements of the OTP, contemplating the verticalization of teaching and the limits and possibilities of the organization of pedagogical work for teaching work and continuing education.
The Federal Network of Professional, Scientific and Technological Education

To investigate teaching work and the organization of pedagogical work in FIs, we consider it important to contemplate professional education and its representativeness in society.

The Federal Network began in 1909 with the creation of nineteen Apprentices and Craftsmen Schools, at which time a popular and class mobilization occurred seeking better living and working conditions. Thus, teaching and educating young people in socially vulnerable situations, these schools were associated with the qualification of the workforce.

This model of professional education aimed at training solely aimed at the realization of a specific profession. As a means of diverting young people without social conditions to study the paths that could lead to inappropriate actions in society, the intention was to train them for the job market.

Over the years and according to the policies of each government, vocational education institutions have undergone changes in nomenclatures: Artisan Apprenticeships (1909), Industrial High schools (1930), Industrial and Technical Schools (1942), Federal Technical Schools (1959) and CEFETs (1978).

Until the effective creation of FIs, it was necessary to have a set of policies in relation to professional education, such as the expansion of the federal network; cooperation between states, municipalities and the federal government to expand the offer of integrated technical courses; the policy of supporting the increase in the titling of professionals from federal institutions; and the defense of the increase of workers' education through the National Program for the Integration of Professional Education with Basic Education in the Youth and Adult Education Modality (Proeja). (PACHECO, 2011).

After this period, Law 11.892 / 2008 establishes the RFEPCT and creates the FIs, which initiate the expansion, internalization and consolidation of the Federal Network, covering the entire national territory. Thus, on December 29, 2008, the 31 CEFETs, the 75 Decentralized Teaching Units (UNEDs), 39 agricultural schools, 7 federal technical schools and 8 university-linked schools, disappeared and became Federal Institutes of Education, Science and Technology (IFs).3

The Federal Institutes of Vocational, Scientific and Technological Education come up with a different proposition from the one that vocational education had in its early days. Pacheco (2011, p. 17) says that the creation of Federal Institutes is a

---

3 The public call of the Secretariat of Professional and Technological Education of the Ministry of Education (Setec / MEC) 002/2007 established a period of 90 days from its publication, for the presentation of the proposals of the federal institutions wishing to integrate with the FIs, since joining this project was optional. In 2007 and part of 2008, Setec / MEC worked hard to get as many federal institutions as possible to join the FIs.
A progressive project that understands education as a commitment to transform and enrich objective knowledge capable of modifying social life and giving it greater meaning and scope in the whole of human experience, a proposal incompatible with a conservative view of society. It is therefore a strategy of political action and social transformation.

Based on this, we understand that the FI creation movement points to the generation of conditions necessary for educational and socioeconomic development. We observed a purpose focused on social development, increasing the education level of young people and workers, that is, a form of inclusion through education. These institutions emerge seeking to overcome the hegemony of economic power over public education, that is, as public policy seeks to establish a dialogue with other policies.

From law no. 11.892 / 2008, with regard to the creation of FIs, we highlight, among the purposes and characteristics of FIs listed in Article 6, the provision of vocational and technological education, in all its levels and modalities, and the promotion, integration and verticalization of basic education to vocational and higher education, optimizing infrastructure, staffing and management resources (BRASIL, 2008). This is because vocational education is directly related to the implications on teaching work.

Based on the objectives contained in the legislation, we note that the purpose was to offer society a complete institution, allowing students graduating from elementary school and EJA the opportunity to prepare themselves for the job market, if they wish, through technical secondary education. integrated and able to study from undergraduate to postgraduate in a single public institution.

In this sense, it is necessary to understand and explain how the organization of pedagogical work in IFPR - Campus Palmas occurs and analyze its implications for teaching work.

The Verticalization of Education in Federal Institutes: Developments for the Organization of Pedagogical Work

Knowing that work is the main activity of the human being, we understand the importance of such activity in our lives, either to ensure our survival and that of our family, to evolve or to satisfy ourselves professionally and personally. Saviani (2007) says that a defining trait of the human being is work, not because the work is natural to him, but because the person is what is according to his work, an activity given to him by human beings. Therefore, the individual / work relationship is given by us in our socio-historical process.

According to Antunes (2009, p. 141), work “is the fundamental, simplest and most elementary form of those complexes whose dynamic interaction is the specificity of social being”. So, we understand that work comprises our main activity, by which we transform nature and relate to other individuals, and thus we also transform ourselves through work.
We are not a ready, finished being, but an individual in constant construction, formation. We are constituted through the interaction and appropriation of what surrounds us, knowledge, values, culture, relationships with others, in short, through everything that has already been produced by humanity in the historical process, because work is at the center of the process of humanization of the human being. (ANTUNES, 2009).

For Saviani (2014, p. 10), the individual “it enters into relationship with other men not occasionally, mechanically, but neatly, through organisms of different kinds. And it comes into relationship with nature not simply because it is nature itself, but actively through work and technique.”

In the course of our evolution, work has been changing, changing society and our relationships, so that we can adapt to new forms of work and, at the same time, changing the environment and work to meet new needs.

Thus, analyzing the organization of pedagogical work implies becoming aware of the reality of which we speak, as changes in activity occur as society changes. Work changes and takes responsibility in the face of reality, that is, the needs of the society in which it is inserted. Such a society is determined by a form of organization that, in a way, conditions the organization of pedagogical work. Thus, we seek to explain how the organization of pedagogical work in IFPR occurs from the verticalization of teaching.

Regarding the purposes and characteristics of FIs, we point out item III of Article 6 of Law no. 11.892 / 2008: “Promote the integration and verticalization of basic education into vocational and higher education, optimizing physical infrastructure, staffing and management resources”. Thus, this form of operationalization - at this time we refer to the use of personnel - can represent a challenge for teachers regarding the performance of their work, as they work in basic and higher education.

To understand the concept of verticalization of teaching in FIs, we sought Pacheco (s / d.), Remembering that this same conception appears in institutional documents.

[...] As a principle of organization of curriculum components, verticalization implies the recognition of flows that allow the construction of training itineraries between the different courses of professional and technological education: professional qualification, technical, undergraduate and postgraduate technological. (PACHECO, s / d., P. 18).

Deepening the reflection on the verticalization category, we build on Quevedo's (2016) research on the conception (or conceptions) of verticalization in FIs. Their results point to three distinct conceptions of verticalization. The first one understands that verticalizing education is related to the offer of courses in the same area and / or axes at different levels, in the same unit, so that students have the opportunity to study from high school to postgraduate, without changing institutions. The second concept comprises verticalization in the same sense but adds advantages and challenges of teaching performance at different levels of education.
Finally, the third conception deals with a formative path in which costs are optimized, which guarantees everyone the right to quality public training in accordance with the mission of the FIs.

In this research, we treat verticalization as offering courses in basic and higher education, of the same technological axis, in the same unit; adding the opportunity for students to study from high school to graduate school and the limits and possibilities of teaching work in this format.

The figure below elucidates the way we understand the verticalization in this study, which shows the itinerary that can be traveled by students at different levels of education, considering that the same teacher acts at different levels and modalities.

**Figure 1. Verticalization of education in Federal Institutes**

Since the guidelines and the organization of pedagogical work at different levels of education are different, it is worth considering the working conditions to which teachers are subjected. We understand that the complexity of teaching work in this form of organization implies the methodological approach used at different levels, decision making regarding the teacher's own organization and time management outside the classroom due to the different demands, among others. others.

Thinking about whether or not there is a distinction in OTP at different levels of education, we ask teachers whether they identify this distinction and what the differences would be. Of the 24 participants, only 1 thinks there are not. However, for the others, methodology, didactics, legislation, approach, maturity and ability of students, practical activities, assessments, organization of the subjects of each level of education and the student's own interest are some of the differences, pointed out. Therefore, teachers clearly demonstrate that the existence of differences in OTP at different levels of education entails responsibilities.
Note that under IFPR, not all campuses face this reality. Many have only recently been implemented and / or are advanced campuses, meaning that courses and modalities are offered gradually according to the region’s demand.

In the case of the Palmas campus, which started its activities in 2010, we verified the existence of verticalization, so much so that, as stated in the methodology, acting in basic and higher education is one of the criteria for the selection of participants in this study. In summary, it is explicit that teachers clearly understand that there is a distinction between acting in basic education and acting in higher education, consequently requiring a differentiated OTP, which also indicates a relationship with the student's own profile at each level.

In this sense also, we understand that the research sought to know and display the point of view of teachers about the policy of verticalization in FIs and, therefore, we asked them to evaluate it. One of the teachers considers verticalization important “for the region, because it allows the maintenance of students for a longer time in the institution seeking training” (P18). It is worth remembering that the verticalization provides the opportunity to enter high school and stay until graduate school. Therefore, it can be considered a way of keeping students for a longer period of time in the city / region.

Verticalization is also seen as a learning opportunity, as another teacher states: “I believe that the opportunity to work with MS and undergraduate courses allows the assessment of theory and practice when working with undergraduate students” (P11). In this sense, Pacheco (2011, p. 26-27) writes that

The curricular organization of the Federal Institutes provides education professionals with a unique space for knowledge construction. The possibility of dialoguing simultaneously, and in an articulated manner, from basic education to postgraduate education, bringing vocational training as a nuclear paradigm, makes this action eventually consolidate the principle of verticalization. These professionals have the possibility, in the same institutional space, to build bonds at different levels and modalities of teaching, to seek methodologies that best apply to each action, establishing the inseparability of teaching, research and extension.

The author conceives verticalization as an opportunity for teachers and, to a certain extent, consistent with the competence of FI education professionals.

Although verticalization is considered positive by the majority of the research participants, there are needs of teachers related to training to work in both levels of education.

It is worth reflecting on the need for specific training to perform the teaching work in the Federal Institutes of Education, Science and Technology, since we must remember that the teachers, as well as the other servants of the institution, enter through a public contest, existing the possibility of having little or no classroom experience and, as a result, face many difficulties in the face of differences in performance with different audiences.
Given this, we present the results related to the limits and possibilities of acting in basic and higher education. The main limitations in the different teaching modalities on the Palmas campus, according to the teachers' answers, are: the high number of subjects to be taught by the teacher, many activities for the same teacher, the schedule of the days and the preparation of classes for the different ones. levels and curriculum components, this last item specifically because it makes insufficient the time allocated to the maintenance of teaching, as the following answer highlights: “Preparing classes for different levels and subjects requires extra time” (P12), which may end up affecting the quality of activities.

This question leads us to reflect on the organization of time and curriculum space linked to the teachers' hiring regime. A teacher is hired for 20 or 40 hours for teaching disregarding the particularity of each level of education. Such practice has resulted in the fragility of the didactic-pedagogical referrals necessary for the teaching work. That is, as significant as it may be to work with basic education and higher education as integrated dimensions, these require differentiated teaching activities to meet the particularities that each subject at each level requires.

In this scenario, we identified the intensification of teaching work. Contreras (2002) points out that the intensification of work contributes to the proletarianization of teaching performance, preventing reflective work by the excess of activities to be fulfilled. According to the author, “intensification is thus related to the process of intellectual disqualification, of the degradation of teachers' professional skills and competences, reducing their work to the daily survival of coping with all the tasks they must perform”. (CONTRERAS, 2002, p. 37).

Another limiting factor for working at different levels relates to the students' ability to understand is “not to forget the difference in abstraction capacity and the objectives of the course” (P2). Another teacher points out as “limits: recognizing the stages of cognition of each phase of the human being” (P21). For the latter, we could understand not as a limit, but as a challenge, since, to develop their work at both levels of education, it is necessary to recognize, evaluate and adapt their classes to meet students' expectations and the objectives of the program. institution.

There are numerous and varied difficulties that teachers face to satisfactorily respond to expectations placed on their work. The ability (or inability) to give these answers may vary depending on work experience, educational level, and subjective factors such as self-confidence and tolerance, among others. (OLIVEIRA, 2016, p. 71).

Regarding the possibilities, we believe that the teacher's work in this form of organization - verticalization of teaching - can be enriching, given the opportunity to deal with the different ages and precepts of life, which can be productive and the projectors of relevant debates. This is demonstrated by the teacher, who says it is a form of “personal improvement in view of the diversity of the demands of the courses and students” (P23).
We highlight here subjective questions expressed as possibilities in this form of action, since the need for adaptation to the context is considered a form of learning for the teacher since it needs to have discernment and resourcefulness to plan / deal with different age groups, goals of course, approaches, didactics, assessment, among others. According to Azzi (2005, p. 40), it is “in the exercise of teaching that the teacher aims, builds and participates in the construction of the educational process within the society in which it is inserted”.

Starting with the understanding of teaching work in its general category - work -, we sought the contribution of Azzi (2005, p. 39-40), which is expressed as follows:

We understand that the term teaching work derives from a work adjective (as a general category), giving it a delimitation (teaching), while pointing to a specificity. Teaching comes to be seen as work from its professionalization, which still has a number of social, economic, political and cultural limitations. Historical synthesis of the evolution of teaching, the construction of the concept of teaching work demands an analysis of the teacher's activity, which changes together with the development of society, and, consequently, of the capitalist mode of production.

The teaching profession is constantly facing challenges, whether due to social, cultural and political changes, the numerous norms, resolutions and guidelines that must be fulfilled, or the transformation that is taking place regarding the role of the school and the teacher in today's society. In view of this, we highlight an excerpt from the Institutional Development Plan (IFPR, 2014, p. 29) in relation to what is expected of the professor at the institution:

The IFPR teacher needs to be clear that by stimulating student autonomy, their experiences broaden and reach the exercise of learning more quickly. Thus, the role of the teacher also changes: from a faithful expositor of a knowledge already elaborated to a mediator of learning situations, in which the appropriation of the already known is a preliminary stage for the production of new meanings and knowledge.

In this context, we are aware of the changes related to the possibilities and limitations for the teacher's classroom work in the institution, especially regarding the production of new meanings and knowledge, which makes the activity gradually challenging, in view of the numerous unique situations that may arise, that teachers are exposed daily as well as non-compliance with favorable or unfavorable conditions for carrying out their work. Charlot (2008) states that success in meeting everyday challenges depends on how the school is organized and the conditions given to teachers to fulfill their role, providing society with what it expects from the school institution.

Being a teacher requires going beyond the ability to identify a problem, deciding on previously developed methods. More than a mere reproduction of knowledge, it is necessary to understand the set of specific circumstances of each reality so that the teacher can, through his actions, contribute to social transformation.

Society is increasingly devaluing the work of this professional, who invests years to graduate and needs to seek constant improvement in order to cope with the numerous daily
challenges of which he is aware, but still strives because he believes in change through your job.

In this sense, we should approach the search for recognition of teaching activity as a profession, which permeates the lack of understanding of society itself about what teaching is. As Azzi (2005, p. 38) points out, “teaching work is often described but not always understood”.

According to Oliveira (2016, p. 71), “at present, teachers face many challenges to assert themselves as professionals, including sustaining an authority and professional power that could guarantee their social legitimacy”. Regulations, rules, laws, principles and values, charging for results, need for constant qualification, intellectual work that extends beyond the school institution, are some of the demands and impositions of the teaching profession market.

To contribute to the discussion about the teaching profession, we sought Contreras (2002; 2012), which deals with the themes professionalism and professionality, suggested as a form of resistance to the proletarianization of teaching work. The author points out that the basic thesis of proletarianization theory considers “that teachers, as a category, have undergone or are undergoing a transformation, both in the characteristics of their working conditions and in the tasks they perform, which increasingly bring them closer to the conditions and interests of the working class”. (CONTRERAS, 2002, p. 33).

Contreras (2012) also discusses the ambiguity of the term professional when referring to teaching professionalism. In an attempt to escape proletarianization, on the one hand, teacher professionalism is the confrontation with the loss of quality of work and, on the other, the confrontation with the loss of status or remuneration, as other professionals have. The claim of teachers for professional status is linked to the desire for social recognition of their work as we usually see in other professions and, as a consequence, the reach of working conditions, the recognition and the possibility of continuing education and, to a certain extent, autonomy in carrying out their activities.

Oliveira (2016) also points out that the teaching profession was a movement resulting from ambiguity. That is, teachers fight for professional status that allows greater autonomy, as well as that of liberal professionals, while seeking to enjoy the condition of public servants.

In this sense, in an attempt to escape from the negative that can express the term professionalism - ideas of corporatist nature -, when referring to the educational work, some authors opted for the term professionalism.

For Contreras (2012), professionality is the set of qualities of teaching professional practice due to the demands of educational work. He points out that teaching professionalism is not only “describing the performance of teaching work, but also expressing values and pretensions that one wishes to achieve and develop in this profession”. (CONTRERAS, 2012,
Understanding this, we can think of the teacher as the professional defending values, qualities and professional characteristics according to the requirements of teaching practice.

While professionalism initially refers to sociologically defined characteristics for a profession, professionalism can be understood as the development of competences for acting as well as the motivations and desires related to that profession, in this case teaching. Contreras (2012, p. 80) points out that

> When defending the professionalism of teachers, a consonance is also required between the characteristics of the workplace and the demands that the dedication to educational tasks brings with it. Claiming is not reduced to a desire for higher status. It also claims greater and better training, ability to cope with new situations, concern for educational aspects that cannot be described in norms, personal integrity, responsibility in what you do, sensitivity to sensitive situations, commitment to the community, etc.

Therefore, professionalism is not only linked to the formal knowledge acquired through initial training, since the teacher is no longer seen as the holder of knowledge whose main concern revolves around the content to be seen; but it is also linked to subjective aspects such as behavior, attitudes, skills, aspirations as a professional and how the teacher himself sees himself in the exercise of his profession, which influences the way he conducts the teaching and learning process. Hobold (2004, p. 39) points out that “it can be seen that professionality is built from the most varied dimensions of a teacher's life. School experiences and even family experiences make up a teacher's 'know-how' repertoire.”

The harsh criticism about the work and the teacher himself so present make it even more challenging - and somewhat discouraging - to enter or remain in the profession, as well as the devaluation of the category, since this professional is much expected and charged without consider the context in which it is formed, finds itself and needs to act.

Oliveira (2016) states that teachers face many difficulties to meet the expectations set about their work, and answering them will depend on professional experience, training and subjective factors, such as how to deal with students, patience, ability to deal with conflicting situations, among others. But in order to meet these expectations, the teacher also needs to recognize himself as a professional and have social recognition of his profession.

It requires understanding that the teaching work is linked to the pedagogical work itself, as it involves the alignment of methods, techniques, reflections and actions, as well as the involvement of different education professionals, in an attempt to reach the goal: knowledge. Paro (2000) helps to understand that pedagogical work does not include material work, that is, the result of this work is intangible, it is a service.
In this sense, the activity developed by teachers, educators, student assistants, principals, coordinators, etc., in the school, which involves everything from the content to be taught to the possibility of producing humanity in the individual, is defined as pedagogical work.

Considering that the OTP has a broad sense that covers both the institutional context and the reduced to the classroom space, it is appropriate to present the results of the data collected with the teachers in relation to their conceptions about the subject.

In general, teachers objectively present their conceptions, which revolve around the planning and organization of teaching work. For example: subjects, schedules, assessments, research and extension activities, student support and setting objectives for curriculum components, class preparation time, and so on. Some answers demonstrate a broader understanding of OTP, as educational process technicians are also cited as participants in the process, and OTP is also described as a form of support for teachers and students. Thus, we see the confirmation that OTP is characterized by a process that involves all the professionals of the institution who are involved with teaching.

The identification of elements listed by the teachers as composing the Palmas campus OTP helps to clarify how such an organization occurs. The answers are related to activities of responsibility of the teacher and other professionals involved in the teaching process. The regulations, the preparation of subject menus, the class council, teaching plan, political-pedagogical project (PPP), course plan, discussions with teachers and students, teacher training, pedagogical meetings, teaching professionals, time Research, preparation of classes, work plan and opening hours of the library are mentioned as elements of the OTP.

With this in mind, we seek to understand how teaching work can be affected by OTP. To this end, the teachers evaluated the implications of this organization for their work. Thus, we need to consider the conditions of teaching work, whether related to the educational system, the school, the organization of pedagogical work, whether related to the limits and possibilities of daily life, their initial and continuing education, among others.

To reflect on this, we sought Azzi (2005, p. 36), which says:

\[
\text{The teacher has a more immediate decision-making space - the classroom. Such a space needs to be occupied or even perceived by the teacher. This often presents a pragmatic-utilitarian behavior, not as a result of the division of labor in the school, but by limitations linked to their qualification and the conditions of their work development, imposed by an educational policy that devalues the teacher and disrespects the work, main element of education - the student.}
\]

Given the above, we understand that teachers face many daily contradictions, because, while realizing the need to perform the work according to the premises of the institution, they are faced with workloads assigned to different activities not consistent with the goal and results. At the same time, they need to deploy to be able to plan classes, they find themselves
involved in various work groups and bureaucratic activities, reducing this time of study, preparation and preparation of classroom activities, resulting in the extra work time mentioned by teachers as a limit to work in different teaching modalities.

It is in this sense that we can infer that these aspects, evidenced by the teachers, are considered here as implication for the accomplishment of the work, relating to OTP. However, not all teachers interpret and evaluate situations in the same way and, consequently, do not manage them by the same values or meanings (CONTRERAS, 2012). Thus, we cannot view actions as totally right or totally wrong, since each one acts according to what he knows and considers as ideal for each circumstance.

We believe that teachers feel a need for effective support in matters they are responsible for carrying out. That is, it is necessary to think about training that contributes to their work, that enables them to do it, to achieve the expected results and, fundamentally, to attend the main element of education: the student.

Thus, considering the constant need for teacher training, we present below the implications of OTP for continuing education in the educational institution in which the research was developed.

The Limits and Possibilities of Teaching Work and the Need for Continuing Education

Assuming that training is also a personal development and should be permanent, and knowing the importance of qualification for teaching, it is appropriate to address continuing education and the implications from OTP.

Teacher education comes in two forms: the first concerns vocational training at the undergraduate level (initial education), understood as the “training that will enable the professional to enter the profession and should guarantee a specific preparation, with a body that allows the professional to master the pedagogical work”. (ANFOPE, 1998, p. 28-29). The second, understood as continuing education, corresponds to the pursuit of the development of those who are already teaching and remain in the path of professional education. According to ANFOPE document (1998, p. 35), continuing education refers to the continuity of vocational training, that is, “[...] a process of permanent construction of knowledge and professional development”. Thus, being a teacher is constituted by constant

---

4 The 1st Brazilian Education Conference (CBE) created the National Committee for Educator Training, which in 1983 was renamed the National Commission for the Reformulation of Educator Training Courses (CONARCPE). At the 5th National Meeting in 1990, CONARCPE became the National Association for the Training of Education Professionals (ANFOPE).

In line with its historical trajectory, ANFOPE has been continually making efforts to intervene consequently in educational policies and contributing to the collective construction of a training project for education professionals, which includes inseparably the initial and continuing education conditions. decent work, career and fair pay as conditions for improving the social quality of basic education. (ANFOPE, 2018).
training and reconstruction of his practice, which are considered as continuing education, our focus in this work.

According to Freitas (2002), from the teachers' movement, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, more specifically in the 1980s, there is an attempt to overcome technical thinking. With regard to education, socio-historical conceptions arise, the need for a broad professional, aware of the reality of his time, with critical awareness to interfere and transform the conditions of school, education and society. "As an important part of this theoretical construction from the concrete transformations in the field of school, built the concept of professional education that has in teaching and pedagogical work its particularity and specificity." (FREITAS, 2002, p. 139).

In a way, some proposals from the educators' movements in relation to teacher training were incorporated by LDBEN, Law No. 9394/1996, specifically Article 61 (amended by Law No. 12.014 / 2009), which refers to the professionals of the education:

Art. 61. Professionals of basic school education are considered to be those who, in effective exercise and having been trained in recognized courses, are:
I - teachers qualified in high school or higher for teaching in kindergarten and in elementary and high school;
II - education workers with a pedagogy degree, with qualification in administration, planning, supervision, inspection and educational guidance, as well as masters or doctorate degrees in the same areas;
III - workers in education, holders of diploma of technical or superior course in pedagogical or similar area;
IV - professionals with notorious knowledge recognized by their education systems, to teach content related to their education or professional experience, attested by specific title or teaching practice in educational units of the public or private network or private corporations in which they have worked, exclusively to comply with item V of the caput of art. 36;
V - graduated professionals who have completed pedagogical complementation, as provided by the National Education Council. (BRAZIL, 1996, s/p).

In the case of FLs, professionals with different academic backgrounds find themselves in a teaching environment to form individuals for life and the world of work. In view of the plurality of teaching knowledge and experience, as well as the complexity of teaching in vocational education, we realize the importance of continuing education as it contributes to the qualification of the teaching and learning process.

Hobold (2004, p. 15) helps to think about teacher education in vocational education when he writes that, in order to value this type of teaching, it is necessary to “discuss about the formation of teachers who work in Vocational Education, one of the possible key points of because these professionals usually come from technology courses and are not prepared to teach”.

Given this, intending to unveil the formative needs of the group investigated, we examine below the teachers' answers regarding the considered priority training.
We note that there is a concern regarding teaching practice in FIs, as the answers to the educational needs are directly linked to teaching. In order to think about the formations considered by the participants of this research as a priority, we must first understand that the pedagogical knowledge is the one built in the teacher's daily life and that allows its relationship with the student, that is, it allows the interaction with the reality of the classroom. It is also necessary to differentiate this pedagogical knowledge from pedagogical knowledge, which is part of initial teacher education, knowledge produced by researchers and education theorists. Therefore, considering pedagogical knowledge, we understand that teaching practice is the expression of pedagogical knowledge. (AZZI, 2005).

Thus, the teachers point out very specific questions in relation to training needs: foreign language, update on legislation and knowledge relevant to the area of initial training, interpersonal relations, methodologies, among others. Still, through the teachers' answers, we realize the impact of verticalization on the teaching work. One teacher points out that the formative needs “are related to work with both high school and undergraduate students, which demands the didactic transposition of content” (P11) and another says that it is necessary “specific didactic training for courses, development of new classroom techniques. Evaluation of activities at different levels of education” (P13).

We verified the presence of verticalization in the answers to the most varied questions, brought along the text of this investigation and at this moment is presented as a reason for continued formation. It is worth remembering that, when presenting the answers about the teachers' evaluation regarding the verticalization policy in the FIs, one of these expresses: “I feel the need to offer training activities for us teachers” (P5), even though it positively evaluates the performance in both levels of education. Confirming this reality, we observed the answer of another research participant regarding the question that dealt with the limits and possibilities of teaching performance at different levels of education: “the limits are more related to teacher education” (P15).

In the answers to the questions presented above, we seek to demonstrate that teachers are aware of the importance of training - be it continuing educational training, or training in pedagogical complementation - and stress that, possibly, this identification starts from a feeling of need for preparation for cater to both audiences.

Based on the analysis of the answers, we highlight the teaching concern for the student as well as the previous answers, in which the teachers clearly demonstrate the difference between the life experience and the maturity of students of basic and higher education, here it is confirmed. the need for training on this topic.

We highlight the response of a participant who says that “the need for continuing teacher education, lack of space / time for various pedagogical discussions in collegiate” (P20). From this answer we deduce that the teacher understands as continuing education not only the courses related to specific subjects, carried out over a period of time, but, by indicating the lack of time and even space for pedagogical debates, understands continuing...
education as a collective construction, which occurs both in everyday situations and moments, as well as in meetings and events designed for this purpose.

In the analysis of the answers related to the considered priority formations, we highlight the one pointed out by a teacher, who says there are needs “in relation to the pedagogical training of the bachelor teachers” (P15). In this sense, it is important to highlight that to perform in basic education will be qualified “graduated professionals who have done pedagogical complementation”, according to item V of LDBEN, included by law No. 13.415 of February 16, 2017 (BRAZIL, 1996, s/P.).

Thus, it is important to consider if the pedagogical complementation formations necessary for acting in basic education, especially in vocational education, are presented as an emergency way of supplying the need for proper pedagogical training.

Because it is the professional and technological education, it is essential to have professionals from the most diverse areas of training (techniques). However, there is a need for training in pedagogical complementation to perform in basic education. However, for acting in higher education there is no such legal requirement. Thus, it is worth highlighting the issue of the acting bachelor teacher in the FIs, since he does not have an initial training to work in the profession, and we must consider that many, at any time, before entering the FIs, did not even think of becoming teachers, but were faced with the opportunity of a public tender.

In this sense, from the teachers’ answers, we realize their science in relation to the importance of training for acting specifically in the institutions that offer this form of teaching. Azzi (2005) points out that teachers often face complex situations, and it is up to them to solve them, but this is only possible if they are able to understand reality and the broader context.

Thinking that the teacher is also formed through their daily experience, daily challenges and problem-solving skills, the constant search for improvement of their work, adaptation to the environment, reflections on pedagogical practice, we seek the contribution of Pimenta (2005) that builds a theoretical basis on the three knowledge of teaching. According to the author, the knowledge of the experience comes from the experience as students, that is, to know what the teaching is through the contact with its teachers during the whole period that they were students, but “in another level, the knowledges of the experience are those that teachers produce in their daily teaching, in a permanent process of reflection on their practice, mediated by that of others - their co-workers, the texts produced by other educators” (PIMENTA, 2005, p. 20).

The teacher is no longer a mere replicator of content, however, knowledge of knowledge, those related to content that will be taught in the classroom, are essential to the professional and need to be worked not only as information, but “[...] enable students to work on scientific and technological knowledge, developing skills to operate, review and reconstruct them wisely” (PIMENTA, 2005, p. 23).
To complete the tripod of the author's theoretical basis, pedagogical knowledge can be understood as the ability to teach, the ability to make the student understand.

Pedagogical knowledge can collaborate with practice. Especially if they are mobilized from the problems that the practice poses, understanding, therefore, the dependence of theory on practice, because it is prior to it. This anteriority, however, far from implying an absolute opposition to the theory, presupposes a close connection with it. From which follows a first aspect of school practice: the study and systematic investigation by educators about their own practice, with the contribution of pedagogical theory (PIMENTA, 2005, p. 27-28).

In this context, it is worth reflecting on the knowledge of experience the knowledge and pedagogical with respect to the bachelor teachers of the FIs. In their initial education (baccalaureate), they had the opportunity to build the knowledge of the experience, however, if upon joining the FIs without having previously acted as a teacher, from the point of view they are those produced through the reflection of their everyday practice in the classroom, only from there will produce knowledge of the experience.

Already, the pedagogical knowledge, which contributes to the performance in the classroom, produced based on pedagogical scientific knowledge that will help you in practice, due to your bachelor's degree, do not have. And this is where the need for the formation of pedagogical complementation arises.

It is important to say that, of the four bachelor teachers, only 1 did not participate in pedagogical complementation training at IFPR, which indicates compliance with the legislation regarding training for basic education.

An important element problematized in the area in question is the large number of RFEPCT campuses that are being installed in Paraná, offering the most varied courses, both technological and undergraduate, at different levels of education, constantly requiring the admission of unlicensed teachers. Thus, we return to the starting point regarding the complexity of teaching work in FIs, as the guidelines and OTP at different levels of education are different and require professionals to perform a work consistent with the premises of FIs in terms of quality, education.

According to Azzi (2005, p. 36), “the teacher presents and needs a didactic autonomy that is expressed in the daily work, because only then is able to face the challenges of the teaching-learning process and education”. Thus, it is up to us to think about the conditions offered to this teacher so that he can perform his work for these different demands, within the limits and possibilities pointed out.

Final Considerations

In a context conditioned by laws, regulations, resolutions, procedures and guidelines that must be followed, and often fraught with adversity, teachers manifest, through their
work, the knowledge acquired in their training or experience. However, working conditions and the organization of pedagogical work imply directly in teaching performance.

Therefore, considering that OTP has a broad meaning that encompasses the institutional context and the reduced to the classroom space, we seek to establish the relationship between OTP and teaching work. Addressing issues such as the professionalization of teaching and the teaching profession led us to reflect on the answers about the reasons for choosing teaching as a profession, given the difficult working conditions and the challenges present in this activity.

From the answers related to the OTP, there was the verticalization category of education, which refers to the offer of courses in basic and higher education, of the same technological axis, in the same unit, adding the opportunity for students to attend from high school to post -University graduate. However, as pointed out in the surveyed teachers' answers, this implies limits and possibilities of teaching work, since it acts at different educational levels. It is explicit that teachers clearly see the distinction between acting in basic education and acting in higher education, which requires an OTP for each level of education, indicating a relationship with the student profile at each level.

Moreover, addressing the limits and possibilities of the form of organization (verticalization of teaching) in the FIs allowed identifying the intensification of teaching work, since this activity at different levels of education requires different organization, preparation and performance.

The teacher constantly thinks and rethinks about his performance, the scope and result of his actions, fights for better working conditions and, especially, faces challenges to perform his activity in the face of contradictions, limits and possibilities visualized in his daily life, aware that it is facing an educational system that is often managed by people or groups outside the discussions and movements of education. Therefore, talking about quality public education presupposes the right to learn from qualified teachers. However, questioning quality requires considering the factors involved in this process.

So, in this sense, we point out the need for reflection on the teaching profession, since, in order to achieve the goals of education, it is necessary to go beyond formal scientific knowledge, acquired through initial training.

It is necessary to think about training that allows teachers to recognize themselves as such in their daily work, developing professional skills and subjective behaviors that are so important for classroom practice. Similarly, we understand that the right working conditions foster and enhance expectations and aspirations in relation to teaching activity contributing to professionality and, consequently, to the teaching and learning process.
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