

A ATUALIDADE DO DEBATE EPISTEMOLÓGICO EM EDUCAÇÃO: UM ESTUDO COMPARADO ENTRE FREIRE E SCHÖN

*THE CURRENT STANDING OF THE EPISTEMOLOGICAL DEBATE IN EDUCATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN FREIRE
AND SCHÖN*

LA ACTUALIDAD DEL DEBATE EPISTEMOLÓGICO EN EDUCACIÓN: UN ESTUDIO COMPARATIVO ENTRE FREIRE Y SCHÖN

TADDEI, Paulo Eduardo Dias ¹ 

PALUDO, Conceição ² 

RESUMO

O objetivo deste artigo foi o de aclarar as propostas epistemológicas de Donald Schön, dado a aceitação da categoria de práxis reflexiva, e a proposição de Paulo Freire, cuja categoria central é a práxis educativa. Trata-se de uma pesquisa bibliográfica, cuja abordagem analítica foi o Materialismo Histórico Dialético. A conclusão central aponta para a relevância das distinções epistemológicas, pois remetem para entendimentos do papel social da educação e do trabalho pedagógico realizado pelos professores. A sua clareza é fundamental para a qualificação de processos educativos, ampliando as possibilidades de colocar a educação no âmbito das transformações econômicas e socioculturais.

Palavras-chave: Freire; Schön; Epistemologia; Prática reflexiva.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this article was to clarify Donald Schön's epistemological proposals, given the acceptance of the reflective praxis category, and Paulo Freire's proposition, whose central category is educational praxis. This is a bibliographic study, whose analytical approach was Dialectical Historical Materialism. The core conclusion points to the relevance of epistemological distinctions, and how they refer to understandings of the social role of education and the pedagogical work carried out by teachers. Its clarity is essential for the qualification of educational processes, expanding the possibilities of placing education within the scope of economic and sociocultural transformations.

Keywords: Freire; Schön; Epistemological proposal; Reflective praxis.

RESUMEN

El objetivo de este artículo fue esclarecer las propuestas epistemológicas de Donald Schön, dada la aceptación de la categoría praxis reflexiva, y la proposición de Paulo Freire, cuya categoría central es la praxis educativa. Se trata de una investigación bibliográfica, cuyo enfoque analítico fue el Materialismo Histórico Dialéctico. La conclusión central apunta a la relevancia de las distinciones epistemológicas, en tanto se refieren a comprensiones del rol social de la educación y del trabajo pedagógico realizado por los docentes. Su claridad es fundamental para la calificación de los procesos educativos, ampliando las posibilidades de ubicar la educación en el ámbito de las transformaciones económicas y socioculturales.

Palabras clave: Freire; Schön; Epistemología; Práctica reflexiva.

¹ Instituto Educacional de Educação Ponche Verde – IEE PONCHE VERDE – Rio Grande do Sul – Brasil.

² Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul – UFRGS – Rio Grande do Sul – Brasil.

INTRODUCTION

The present work aims to carry out an analysis of the training proposals of Paulo Freire³ and Donald Schön⁴. The study of the conception of “reflective practice”, by Donald Schön, and “educational praxis”, by Paulo Freire, is relevant to Education, as, apparently, they are proposals that are similar due to the emphasis they give to practice in the construction process and socialization of knowledge of the educational phenomenon, but they move away from an epistemological analysis.

The motivation for this analysis is the repeated discussions in initial and continuing training about the relationship between theory and practice in the field of education. We return to the old debate but under a new epistemological scenario: the “postmodern scenario”. By epistemology, we understand the broader theoretical approach that supports practical propositions, in terms of theories of knowledge, which lead to different methodological propositions for educational processes. In this way, epistemology is also associated with the purpose of knowledge and science, the social function they perform in society (TROUT, 2011).

The new focus of the discussion between theory and practice, in this scenario, has to do with the dispute paradigm between the postmodern and the modern in the Brazilian academic space. Although there is no strict uniformity among the thinkers ‘labeled’ as postmodern, their treatment of epistemology is different from that given by modern thinkers. Lyotard (2009), for example, in “The postmodern condition”, mentions a new stage of knowledge, which is no longer modern, but rather postmodern. In effect, key concepts of the modern era, such as “subject”, “reason”, “totality”, “emancipation”, “progress”, “justice”, and “truth”, enter into crisis. Thus, the postmodern “scene” is constituted by “epistemological pragmatism”, “ontological skepticism”, “the perishing of the modern subject” (HALL, 2014, p. 17), “disbelief in objective reality”, and “delegitimization of emancipatory utopias”, through the classification of “scientific knowledge as a form of discourse” (LYOTARD, 2009). This is a form of “autobiographical”⁵ knowledge (SANTOS, 2001, p. 54), in which the methods of modernity give way to “language games”, with knowledge having a merely narrative function. The “cord” that connects the multiple perspectives brought together under the term “postmodern umbrella” is the critique of the “grand stories” of modernity.

The tone of this article lies in the need to demonstrate that the disjunction between Freire and Schön is more structural than punctual in nature. The emphasis on practice is not new; however, it has gained more followers in the past forty years or so, in which a process of retraction of the theory has been perceived in the context of the theoretical crisis of progressive thought, resulting from the emergence of neoliberalism.

³ Paulo Neves Freire needs no further comments due to his intellectual production, spread across the world, and his activism in the fight against oppression and exploitation. He is the Patron of Brazilian education, author of several works translated into several languages, who passed away in São Paulo on May 2, 1997. By coincidence, his birth took place on the same date, but in a different year, as the birth of Donald Schön, with whom he dialogues in this work. The great mark left by Freire is the binomial oppression-liberation and is one of the great names in education.

⁴ Donald Schön is an American pedagogue, born in Boston, Massachusetts, USA, on September 19, 1930, and died in Boston, Massachusetts, USA, on September 13, 1997. Graduated in philosophy in 1951 from Yale University, he pursued a master's and doctorate at the Sorbonne and the Paris Conservatory. He also studied philosophy at Harvard and taught at Queens University, NYU, UCLA, and the University of Kansas. One of Schön's greatest legacies is the concept of “reflective practice”, which is the object of study in this article.⁵ “The scientific explanation of phenomena is the self-justification of science as a central phenomenon of our contemporaneity. Science is, therefore, autobiographical.”

The methodological approach used is historical and dialectical materialism, which consists of the procedural exploration of a materiality, in its concrete totality, through an ideal reproduction of the real movement of the object.

This study was exclusively bibliographic and qualitative. To conduct it, we adopted the following procedures: a) exploratory reading of the authors' work; b) selection of works, also using their commentators; c) analysis, strictly speaking, of the proposed epistemological concepts. The works will be cited during the exhibition of the results of the conducted research.

The first item of our study, of a more descriptive nature, seeks to highlight the core issues of the approaches under study, as well as the general considerations of an epistemological nature. The second item, of a more analytical nature, deals with the main differences in the authors' approaches, in relation to what this study proposed – specific differences – between the educational proposals of Freire and Schön. Finally, the conclusions on this issue are presented.

THE PEDAGOGICAL-EPISTEMOLOGICAL PROPOSITIONS OF FREIRE AND SCHÖN

Schön's main epistemological influence is the American thinker John Dewey, especially with regard to the concept of reflection. Schön's educational proposal, according to Alarcão (1996), is most used in the area of teacher training, which is strange, considering that his work revolves around three main axes: a) the concept of an efficient professional; b) the relationship among theory, practice, and reflection; and c) education for reflection. It is an integrated mix of science, technique, and art. In short: a creativity that is called artistry.

In this sense, Alarcão (1996, p. 11) states:

This insistence is all the more surprising given that D. Schön's interests have not centered on teacher training and he has not published books or articles in magazines on this topic. The only work we know of him in this area is the plenary conference he gave at the Congress of the American Educational Research Association, in 1987, under the title "Coaching Reflective Teaching", and which was later published in Grimmer and Erickson (1988).

Regarding the methodology used by Schön, Feitosa, and Dias (2017, p. 14) add: "From a methodological point of view, the researcher defines his investigation as being a '[...] phenomenological approach to the study and teaching in architectural design" (1984a, p. 131, our translation).

Regarding Schön's training proposal, Neto and Fortunato (2017, p. 7) say that [...] "Schön proposes training that values experience and reflection on experience based on the epistemology of practice".

As previously mentioned, Dewey (1989) is Schön's influence in the elaboration of his pedagogical-epistemological proposition. There is, however, a subtle but important distinction between the two regarding the moment in which knowledge is obtained. While "for Dewey, knowledge is obtained through reflection on action, after the event; for Schön, knowledge is acquired during

action, reflecting on it” (FEITOSA; DIAS, 2017, p. 13). In any case, for both, this action belongs to the individual, devoid of any intention other than to qualify the teacher's own action, practice, or experience during the exercise of the educational process, developed in any space in which education takes place, whether public or private, with the most different publics participating. In this way, they clearly point to an epistemology not linked to the broader sociocultural context and to the neutrality of knowledge, education, and instruction itself. It disregards, for example, the immense social inequalities, from which the proposed instruction occurs.

Schön argues that certain learning only takes place in the dimension of “learning by doing”. According to him, in professional learning, there is always a central aspect that cannot be learned through classroom methods. Considering the example of a “practical reflective class”, Schön claims (2008, p. 123):

Design, both in its narrower architectural sense and in a sense that is broader than professional practice, is a form that must be learned by doing. No matter how much students can learn about the design process from readings or lectures, there is always a component of design competence, indeed its core aspect, which they cannot learn in this way. A practice with a design character can be learned, but not taught, using classroom methods. And when students are helped to learn to design, the interventions most useful to them are more like instruction than teaching, as in a reflective practical class.

Regarding the concept of design, he claims:

Design is a holistic skill. In an important sense, one must understand it as a whole to have any understanding of it. Thus, you cannot learn it in a molecular way, learning first to develop small units of activity and not bringing these units together in a single design process, because the pieces tend to interact with each other and produce meanings and characteristics from the entire process in which they are involved (SCHÖN, 2008, p. 124).

What does “reflective practice” consist of? Perrenoud responds as follows:

Reflective practice, as its name indicates, is a practice whose mastery is achieved through practice. Of course, it is important to name it, to encourage adherence to this particular professional figure. However, the decisive step is only taken when reflection becomes a lasting component of the habitus – this “second nature”, responsible for the fact that, beyond a certain limit, it becomes impossible not to ask more questions, except after of a short detox (PERRENOUD, 2002, p. 63).

Another important aspect in Schön's theoretical-methodological perspective is the separation of the concepts of instruction and teaching. The “reflective practice” class is more of an “instruction” than a “teaching” itself. The instructor is also linked to the idea of coach. Teaching concerns the transmission or socialization of knowledge. Instruction is linked to the idea of steps to be procedurally followed to perform a given task. The first is more linked to the intellectual aspect; the second is focused on a practical activity. Simply put: teaching gives the idea of “knowing”, of instruction, of “doing”. Thus, based on what was written, it can be said that, for the author, education and instruction are not confused: the first is more theoretical, instrumental, linked to technical rationality; and the second is more practical, aimed at solving immediate everyday problems.

Schön reports on the role and status of an instructor in reflective practical teaching:

In reflective practice teaching, the role and status of an instructor precedes that of a teacher, as these are generally understood. The instructor's legitimacy does not depend on his academic relationships or his proficiency as a lecturer, but rather on the artistry of his instructional practice. For a vocational school to give central place to instruction, it must shape its incentives and career plans, its criteria for promotion, salary, and academic positions, in order to provide institutional support for the instruction function (SCHÖN, 2008, p. 227).

He questions the science and technique offered by universities, claiming that “in the last twenty-odd years, the problems of real-world practice have not presented themselves to professionals with well-defined structures. In fact, they tend not to present themselves as problems, but in the form of indeterminate chaotic structures” (SCHÖN, 2008, p. 16). He says that if “the unique case transcends the categories of existing theory and technique, the professional cannot treat it as an instrumental problem to be solved by applying one of the rules from his stock of professional knowledge” (Idem, p. 17). He also states: “The case is not in the manual. If he wants to treat it competently, he must do so through a kind of improvisation, inventing and testing situational strategies that he himself produces” (Ibidem). He talks about the crisis of confidence in professional education and in the professionals themselves: “The crisis of confidence in professional knowledge corresponds to a similar crisis in professional education” (Idem, p. 18). He says there is a dilemma between rigor and relevance and that “the problem-solving tools – in universities – are based on systematic knowledge, preferably scientific” (Idem, p. 19).

His concern is with singular, unique, unusual problems, which, according to him, cannot always be solved with the theoretical-instrumental arsenal provided by universities. He refers to this knowledge as rigorous and instrumental knowledge, which is unable to address the problems that emerge in the “indeterminate zones of practice”, which must be problematized by their relevance, in their concreteness, not by the rigor of the “canons of technical rationality”. Regarding these issues, he claims, verbatim:

These indeterminate zones of practice – uncertainty, singularity, and conflicts of values – escape the canons of technical rationality. When a problematic situation is uncertain, technical problem solving depends on the prior construction of a well-defined problem, which is not, in itself, a technical task. When a professional recognizes a situation as unique, he or she cannot deal with it merely by applying techniques derived from his or her professional knowledge. And, in situations of a conflict of values, there are no clear ends that are consistent in themselves and that can guide the technical selection of means (SCHÖN, 2008, p. 17).

There is a credibility problem in Schön's criticism, since science and technique are not used to solve exceptions. The curricula contain a wide arsenal of subjects, with systematized knowledge to meet the daily demands of each specific professional activity. Science is built from a set of principles, values, methods, theories, laws, etc., in a cumulative manner, and its postulates are controlled by the scientific community. Thus, the solution of exceptions, singularities, and concrete problems must be based on the application, in the specific case, of accumulated general knowledge, provided by science. We do not deny that perplexities do not occur when exercising a profession, especially in the

first years of its exercise. However, we do not see how it would be possible to create a specific curriculum to solve problems that lie in the “indeterminate areas of practice”. We understand that Schön's proposition disregards, to a certain extent, systematized knowledge, collectively constructed by humanity, replacing it with an “epistemology of practice”, which will produce “tactical knowledge”, based on the researcher's personal experience, through that which he calls “knowledge-in-action” and “reflection-in-action”.

The training of the reflective teacher, a category used by Schön, is based on the premise of “learning by doing”. From this perspective, this learning takes place within the scope of the teacher's own pedagogical practice, when he reflects on his practice, which, to a certain extent, presupposes self-education.

Gandin (1999, p. 122) shows his concern with “epistemological pragmatism”, in the field of education, stating:

We live in a period of great questions about the theoretical foundations of social sciences, what has been called a crisis of paradigms. In the sphere of education, this crisis has had a very worrisome consequence. Those involved in education have been tempted, in the face of the crisis, to say that “the time has come to discuss less and act more”.

In Schön, the following categories are central: “epistemology of practice”, “knowledge-in-action”, “reflection-in-action”, “reflection-on-action”, “reflection-on-reflection-in-action”, “competence”, “reflective practice”, “reflective teacher”, “learning by doing”, among others.

The epistemology of practice, for him, must be built “in” and “on” concrete professional practice, by the reflective professional, through reflective practice.

Schön's epistemological perspective is concisely presented, based exclusively on the analysis of the work⁵: SCHÖN, Donald A. Educando o profissional reflexivo: um novo design para o Ensino e Aprendizagem. (Translated by Roberto Cataldo Cost., 2008), we now move on to a brief presentation of Freire's educational epistemology.

FREIRE AND THE PEDAGOGICAL-EPISTEMOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OF EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

Paulo Freire's thought is founded on the articulation of philosophical perspectives, which are conflicting in certain aspects. Regarding the foundational bases of Freire's thought, Aranha claims (1996, p. 206):

First and foremost, Paulo Freire is a Christian. His Christianity, however, is based on a liberating theology, concerned with the contrast between poverty and wealth that results from social privileges. Keeping the faith, his intellectual formation changed over time, initially influenced by neo-Thomism.

⁵ The aforementioned work reiterates and deepens previous writings and presents new features in parts 2, 3, and 4. “It seemed necessary to address here some of what has already been explored in *The Reflective Practitioner*, as my argument about reflective education and practice depends on epistemology of the practice articulated in the previous book. Thus, the first two chapters present, in a revised version, the vision of professional knowledge already presented there. The design construction model presented in Chapter 3 appears in full in *The Reflective Practitioner*. However, the discussion of the project studio as reflective practical teaching in Part 2, the examples and experiments described in Part 3, and the treatment of conditions for professional education in Part 4 are substantially new” (SCHÖN, 2000, p. viii).

He then follows the paths of phenomenology, existentialism, and neo-Marxism. His first book, *Education as a Practice of Freedom* (1965), still presents an idealistic vision marked by Catholic thought. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), he takes a dialectical approach to reality, whose determinants are found in economic, political and social factors.

First and foremost, Paulo Freire is a Christian. His Christianity, however, is based on a liberating theology, concerned with the contrast between poverty and wealth that results from social privileges. Keeping the faith, his intellectual formation changed over time, initially influenced by neo-Thomism. He then follows the paths of phenomenology, existentialism, and neo-Marxism. His first book, *Education as a Practice of Freedom* (1965), still presents an idealistic vision marked by Catholic thought. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), he takes a dialectical approach to reality, whose determinants are found in economic, political and social factors.

It should be noted that Freire does not automatically adhere to one or another theoretical tendency. The assertion that the human being is a being “thrown” into the world, a “being in the world”, is characteristic of existentialism. Freire, influenced by Marxism, defined the existential situation of being in the world, adding that this world is a world of oppression and exploitation. Furthermore, one cannot deny, for example, the accentuated presence of Marxism in Freire's thought, precisely from the *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (1987), albeit in a superstructural dimension. The infrastructural analysis will be presented based on “African writings”.

Thus, if Marxism gained space from the *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, consolidating itself as an important philosophical basis in the body of Freire's work, Christianity, personalism, existentialism, and phenomenology never ceased to be part and parcel of the body of his work, that is, a genuine thought.

Freire's educational proposition is the result of his praxis: reading the context intertwined with reading the text, both “soaked” by life experience, or, as Freire (2006, p. 393) says: “Paulo systematized, as we can see, his ideas and praxis in books”. Praxis, in its permanent development, is affected by ruptures and resilience, which is positive, as only dogmatic, closed thinking is incapable of transformation. It is a praxis that develops with criticism and self-criticism, within the scope of a concrete reality, which demonstrates Freire's epistemological humility, which extends into epistemological curiosity.

In “Teacher yes, aunt no: letters to those who dare to teach”, Freire speaks of “the practice of which we are aware”, emphasizing the relationships between production, technique, and science:

Science, the human thing to do that occurs in History that women and men do with their practice, is not, for this very reason, an a priori of History.

The practice of which we are aware demands and generates its science. Hence, we cannot forget the relationships between production, the technique essential to it, and science (FREIRE, 1993, p. 104).

Freire is not hostile or aloof from scientific knowledge, despite his respect for “experience-based” knowledge. In the same work (FREIRE, 1993), Freire deals with the relationship between theory and practice in training processes, talks about how we should think about practice so that we

have a better practice and the role of epistemological curiosity in the construction of knowledge, which is the result of unity between theory and practice:

For Freire, educational practice, for both students and teachers, is gnosiologic and the role of the progressive educator is to provoke the student to overcome naive curiosity and share critical-epistemological curiosity, as a means of unveiling reality. He claims:

As a teaching and student practice, education is a gnosiologic practice by nature. The role of the progressive educator is to challenge the student's naive curiosity in order to share criticality with them. This is how educational practice asserts itself as unveiling hidden truths (FREIRE, 1995, p. 79).

According to Freire: "This gnosiologic certainty, that of learning the object, or the content, passes through the apprehension of the object, through the assumption of its reason for being, and it accompanies me in all stages of my practice and my theoretical reflection on practice" (FREIRE, 2001, p. 59). Reflection on practice in Freire is "theoretical reflection on practice"; It is not based, therefore, on an epistemology of practice, which generates tacit knowledge, an important caveat that needs to be made. In this way, tacit knowledge, if we can approximate it with the knowledge of "constructed experience", is taken by Freire as a starting point and not as an arrival point.

Freire does not dichotomize "educational practice" from "educational theory". For him, it is not possible to separate what is inseparable, intertwined, making it clear, however, that theory cannot be confused with "verbalism" and practice with "activism".

He also mentions, showing the importance of the theoretical context in the production/socialization of knowledge, that:

Paying attention to the school space as a context open to the exercise of epistemological curiosity should be a concern for every serious educational project. (FREIRE,1995, p. 78),

Freire (1995) does not share the technical model of education, focused on instrumental training of the student, as if the act of educating was neutral, excluding the political dimension of the educational act. "In addition to being an act of knowledge, education is also a political act⁶. That is why there is no neutral pedagogy" (FREIRE, 1986, p. 25).

For Freire (1977), since education is a gnosiologic situation, educating is simultaneously producing and knowing. "And another issue is that when we separate producing knowledge from knowing existing knowledge, schools easily transform into spaces for selling knowledge, which corresponds to capitalist ideology" (FREIRE, 1986, p. 19). Epistemology and pedagogy form a dialectical unity, since, according to Freire (1996, p. 29), "Teaching requires research". For him, however, in the expression "research teacher", "researcher" should not be seen as an adjective, but as an indispensable practice of those who teach⁷.

Education is praxis, which develops in the history of men and women, in interpersonal relationships and with nature. Thus, the world and human beings offer themselves simultaneously,

⁶ "For Paulo Freire, the politicacy of the educational act is concomitant with the educability of the political act. Education is (always) political and political activity educates (contains a pedagogy)" (SCOCUGLIA, 1999, p. 89).

⁷ "Therefore, Freire considers that only in the dialectical unity between action and reflection, practice-theory, can one can overcome the alienating character of social practices" (SCHWENDLER, 2001, p. 117).

in a dialectical process, forming a unity. In this relationship, history is constituted and, with history, culture, from which epistemology and pedagogy emerge.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF SCHÖN AND FREIRE'S PROPOSALS: CONCLUSIONS

From the item above, in which we sought to explain the epistemological approach of the authors studied, we now proceed to carry out an analysis, with the central aspect being the comparison of propositions and some conclusions.

Paulo Freire's educational perspective, which, as we know, is rarely developed in Brazilian public schools, constitutes an important contribution to the advancement of education for the working classes, through its focus on categories, such as oppression, problematization, awareness, dialogicity, ethics, and liberation. Freire's proposal is “drenched” in reality, because “experienced knowledge” is at the basis of the process of construction/socialization of knowledge. It starts from the reality in which the student is inserted to construct his proposal for liberating education. In this way, in addition to preparing for work, like Schön's, it is aimed at forming students' critical consciousness, so that they understand reality and, as subjects of history (not objects), are able to work collectively for its transformation of reality.

Schön's proposition is reductionist, since, at the very least, it takes away from one of the fundamental aspects of education: intellectual training, which has its foundations in systematized knowledge, collectively constructed by humanity. Socializing this knowledge is the responsibility of teaching, not instruction, and, according to Saviani (1989), it is the main purpose of school. The American pedagogue's educational proposal overvalues individual practical knowledge, to the detriment of theoretical knowledge, which, to a certain extent, is negative for the popular classes, as it restricts the possibilities of access to systematized knowledge, destroying the possibilities of full training. There is, therefore, serious damage to the cultural dimension of students. It is training for “practice” and not for “praxis”, even less for a revolutionary praxis. An education characterized as neutral serves the interests of the dominant classes. Even if this is not the author's intention. It is negative because it is conforming, domesticating and uncritical; It is not aimed at raising awareness among the sons and daughters of male and female workers about the reality in which they are immersed and the possibilities for its transformation.

Theoretical reflection, combined with individual practice or experience, which always occurs linked to contexts, such as that proposed by Freire, is essential in order to uncover the multiple dimensions of reality, as it can only be transformed if known. For Schön, on the contrary, it begins and ends in the space of education or training of students, preparing them to solve professional problems in a decontextualized and apolitical manner.

Schön's technical education can contribute, at most, to the training of students to compete for a place in the job market, which is important, especially at this stage of high unemployment rates, but which, when it comes to education, is merely a part of the process. Freire's concept is more conducive to the demands and needs of public-school students, as it is engaged in the struggle for liberation from oppression. Students – most of whom come from the poorer classes – will be trained

for life, for citizenship, for the exercise of the ontological vocation of being more. The public school, from this perspective, is a space/time of hope, a niche of awareness, to understand utopia as a denunciation and an announcement. This is where the transition must be made from a magical consciousness – naive at best – to a critical consciousness, a place for liberation. Free, public, and quality education, in addition to its cultural and gnosiologic dimension, is also a political act.

The main specific impact of reflective practice in public schools, from its conceptual perspective, is the training of students to construct practical knowledge to be used in solving everyday problems. The general intention is to maintain the dichotomous framework of education, educating students incapable of questioning the status quo, accepting their socioeconomic condition as natural and, therefore, immutable. The limited appreciation for theory contributes to the legitimization of the disqualification of Human Sciences in the Basic Education curriculum, according to the propositions of current Brazilian educational policy (MORAES, 2001/2009); (DUARTE, 2010).

The central specific effect of Freire's perspective is the formation of students qualified to assume the responsibilities inherent to the condition of citizen, on the one hand, and that of a person qualified to carry out a work activity, on the other. The general effect is to form people aware of their condition as historical and social subjects, who understand history as a space of possibility and not of determination in order to realize the ontological vocation of being more.

The dialogue that is established in the relationship between the two, based on Schön's "reflective practice" and Freire's "praxis", is relevant for the education of male and female workers, as it is inserted in the context of the theoretical crisis of progressive thought (HOBSBAWM, 1992; EAGLETON, 2011). On the one hand, there is the relationship between individual subjective knowledge, based on everyday experience, while on the other there is scientific knowledge, systematized historically by humanity. The debate between the two propositions demonstrates that Freire's theory contributes to the awareness of workers, based on reading the world and reading the word, reading the context and reading the text, and the unity between action/reflection, in a teleological and transformative praxis. Schön's theory contributes to the construction of practical knowledge for workers, enabling them to solve problems of a professional nature, located in undetermined areas of practice. This produces "gnosiologic and functionalist autonomy", acquired in the construction of tacit and useful knowledge, based on subjective experience at the heart of a reflective practical class. The former produces "gnosiologic and political autonomy", acquired through awareness in a dialogical classroom, whose educational practice is critical and problematizing.

Dialogue is also important, as it was characterized that the retreat of theory is result, on the one hand, of the expansion of neoliberalism, in the socioeconomic field, characterized, basically, by production relations, and, on the other hand, by the "post" agenda, in general, and in particular, by postmodernism, neopositivism, and neopragmatism, in the field of culture⁸, such as law, justice, politics, ideology, education, science, etc.

Schön prefers to use the concept of "instruction" instead of teaching, and "training" instead of formation. He is not sympathetic to technical-scientific knowledge, built in universities. He calls it "esoteric knowledge".

⁸ Referring to culture, in this particular, only in its superstructural dimension.

Donald Schön proposes a kind of “didactic-pedagogical activism” linked to an “epistemological pragmatism”, in which all teaching and learning, both in the field of experience of action and reflection “in” and “on” action, finds its foundation based on “know-how”, in action, in practice, in experimentation through action, etc. The process begins, is developed, and ends in action and reflection “in” and “about” the action.

He is pragmatic, as has already been said, influenced by Dewey. Its epistemological basis is founded on neopragmatism, postmodernity, New Schoolism, and functionalist positivism.

Freire's formative proposition is not restricted to the narrow limits of Professional Education. Freire worked with Popular Education, Youth and Adult Education, and School Education. Education, according to Freire, is a gnosiologic situation: whoever educates is educated, “in” and “through” the act of educating, and whoever is educated educates “in” and “through” the act of learning. The spheres of production and transmission/socialization of knowledge constitute a dialectical unity.

In summary, the study makes it clear that we are dealing with two epistemologies that start from different assumptions, which refer to different understandings of the social role of education and the pedagogical work carried out by teachers in schools. The clarity of these distinctions is essential for the qualification of educational processes of an emancipatory nature.

REFERENCES

1. ARANHA, Maria Lúcia de Arruda. **Filosofia da educação**. 2. ed. rev. ampl. São Paulo: Moderna, 1996.
2. ALARCÃO, Isabel. Reflexão crítica sobre o pensamento de D. Schön e os programas de formação de professores. ALARCÃO, Isabel. (Org.). In: **Formação Reflexiva dos Professores: estratégias de supervisão**. – Porto: Porto Editora, LDA, 1996, p. 9-40.
3. ALARCÃO, Isabel. **Professores reflexivos em uma escola reflexiva**. 8. ed. – São Paulo: Cortez, 2011. (Coleção Questões da Nossa Época: v. 8).
4. EAGLETON, Terry. **Depois da teoria: um olhar sobre os Estudos Culturais e o pósmodernismo**. 3.ed. Tradução de Maria Lúcia Oliveira. – Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2011.
5. DEWEY, John. **Como Pensamos**. Barcelona: Paidós, 1989.
6. DUARTE, Newton. O debate contemporâneo das teorias pedagógicas. MARTINS, LM., and DUARTE, N., orgs. (In) **Formação de professores: limites contemporâneos e alternativas necessárias** [online]. São Paulo: Editora UNESP; São Paulo: Cultura Acadêmica, 2010.

7. FORTUNATO, Ivan; SHIGUNOV NETO, Alexandre. Donald Schön e o “professor reflexivo”. In: SHIGUNOV NETO, Alexandre; FORTUNATO, Ivan (Orgs.). **20 anos sem Donald Schön: o que aconteceu com o professor reflexivo?** – São Paulo: Edições Hipótese, 2017, p. 5-12.
8. FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia do Oprimido**. 17. ed. – Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.
9. FREIRE, Paulo. **Professora sim, tia não: cartas a quem ousa ensinar**. – São Paulo: Editora Olho d'Água, 1993.
10. FREIRE, Paulo. **Extensão ou comunicação?** Tradução de Rosisca Darcy de Oliveira. – Rio de Janeiro: Terra e Paz, 1977.
11. FREIRE, Paulo. **Cartas à Guiné-Bissau: registros de uma experiência em processo**. 2. ed. – Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1978.
12. FREIRE, Paulo. **Educação como prática da liberdade**. 28. ed. – Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2005/1.
13. FREIRE, Paulo. **Conscientização: teoria e prática da libertação; uma introdução ao pensamento de Paulo Freire**. 3. ed. – São Paulo: Moraes: 1980.
14. FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da Esperança**. 6. ed. – Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1992.
15. FREIRE, Paulo. **À sombra desta Mangueira**. 2.ed. – São Paulo: Olho d'Água, 1995.
16. FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da Autonomia**. 31.ed. – São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.
17. FREIRE, Paulo. **Política e educação**. 7. ed. – São Paulo: Cortez, 2003. (Coleção Questões da Nossa Época; v. 23).
18. FREIRE, Paulo. **A Educação na Cidade**. 7. ed. – São Paulo: Cortez, 2006.
19. FEITOSA, Raphael Alves; DIAS, A. M. I. Décadas do surgimento do praticum reflexivo: por teoria(s) e prática(s) articuladas na formação e na ação docentes. In: SHIGUNOV NETO, Alexandre; FORTUNATO, Ivan (Orgs.). **20 anos sem Donald Schön: o que aconteceu com o professor reflexivo?** São Paulo: Edições Hipótese, 2017, p. 13-32.
20. FREITAS, A. L. Donald Schön e Paulo Freire: um diálogo fecundo na formação de uma professora-pesquisadora. In: SHIGUNOV NETO, Alexandre; FORTUNATO, Ivan (Orgs.). **20 anos sem Donald Schön: o que aconteceu com o professor reflexivo?** – São Paulo: Edições Hipótese, 2017, p. 4.

21. GANDIN, Luís Armando. O professorado como profissão: que espaço é esse? In: GANDIN, Danilo; GANDIN, Luís Armando (Org). **Temas para um projeto político-pedagógico**. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1999.
22. HALL, S. **A identidade cultural na pós-modernidade**. – Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2014.
23. HOBBSAWM, Eric. Renascendo das cinzas. BLACKBURN, Robin (Org.). In: **Depois da queda: o fracasso do comunismo e o futuro do socialismo**. – Tradução Maria Inês Rolim, Susan Semler, Luiz Krausz – Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1992, p. 255-270.
24. LYOTARD, Jean François. **A Condição Pós-Moderna**. Tradução: Ricardo Correa Barbosa; posfácio: Silvano Santiago. – 12. ed. – Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 2009.
25. MORAES, Maria Célia Marcondes de. **Recuo da teoria: dilemas na pesquisa em educação**. Universidade do Minho Braga, Portugal. Revista Portuguesa de Educação, v. 14, n. 1, 2001, pp. 7-25.
26. MORAES, Maria Célia Marcondes de. A teoria tem consequências: indagações sobre o conhecimento no campo da educação. In: **Educ. Soc.** Campinas, v. 30, n. 107, p. 585-607, maio, 2009.
27. MOSER, Paul K; MULDER, Dwayne H; TROUT, J. D. A teoria do conhecimento: uma introdução temática. Tradução de Marcelo Brandão Cipolla. 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora W. M. F. Martins Fontes, 2009.
28. PERRENOUD, Philippe. **A prática reflexiva no ofício do professor: Profissionalização e Razão pedagógica**. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2002.
29. SANTOS, Boaventura de Souza. **Um discurso sobre as ciências**. 12. ed. – Porto: Afrontamento, 2001.
30. SAVIANI, Dermeval. **Pedagogia histórico-crítica: primeiras aproximações**. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 2013.
31. SCHÖN, Donald A. **Educando o profissional reflexivo: um novo *design* para o ensino a aprendizagem**. Tradução Roberto Cataldo Costa. – Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2008.
32. SCOCUGLIA, Afonso Celso. **A história das ideias de Paulo Freire e a atual crise de paradigmas**. João Pessoa: Ed. Universitaria/UFPB, 1999 (2ª edição).

33. SCHWENDLER, Sônia Fátima. Ação cultural para a liberdade: um encontro com a pedagogia da indignação. (In) SOUZA, Ana Inês et al. (Org.). **Paulo Freire: vida e obra**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2001.

Paulo Eduardo Dias Taddei

Doutor em Educação pela Universidade Federal de Pelotas. Licenciado em Filosofia. Professor de Filosofia. Advogado com especialização em direito ambiental.

Conceição Paludo

Doutora Departamento de Estudos Básicos da Faculdade de Educação da UFRGS – Membro da Coordenação do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação. Coordenadora do TRAMSE – Trabalho Movimentos Sociais e Educação.

How to cite

TADDEI, Paulo Eduardo Dias; PALUDO, Conceição. A ATUALIDADE DO DEBATE EPISTEMOLÓGICO EM EDUCAÇÃO: UM ESTUDO COMPARADO ENTRE FREIRE E SCHÖN. **Reflexão e Ação**, Santa Cruz do Sul, v. 31, n. 3, p. 7-20, set. 2023. ISSN 1982-9949. Acesso em: _____. doi: 10.17058/rea.v31i3.16137.