

# Pedagogias culturais e conhecimentos escolares: interpelações à educação contemporânea

ODAILSO SINVALDO BERTÉ  
RAIMUNDO MARTINS

## Resumo

Este artigo busca problematizar modos como as pedagogias culturais estão relacionadas aos conhecimentos escolares. Em consonância com diferentes pesquisas do campo da educação da cultura visual, o texto articula argumentação teórica que aproxima as perspectivas das pedagogias do prazer, da pergunta e do conflito. Fundamenta proposições pedagógicas que avancem da valoração crítica da cultura para considerações sobre o corpo, as experiências, os afetos, as práticas de uso de imagens e os artefatos culturais com o intuito de articular formas criativas e emancipadoras de ensinar-aprender.

**Palavras-chave:**

Pedagogias culturais, corpo, conhecimentos escolares

# Cultural pedagogies and school knowledge: questions to contemporary education

ODAILSO SINVALDO BERTÉ  
RAIMUNDO MARTINS

## Abstract

This article aims to discuss the ways in which cultural pedagogies are related to school knowledge. In line with different research of the visual culture education field, the text articulates theoretical arguments that approach the pedagogies of pleasure, question, and conflict. It grounds pedagogical proposals that advance from a critical assessment of culture to considerations about the body, experiences, affections, practices of image's uses and cultural artifacts in order to articulate creative and emancipatory forms of the teaching-learning processes.

**Keywords:**  
Cultural pedagogies, body,  
school knowledge

# Pedagogías culturales y conocimientos escolares: cuestionamientos a la educación contemporánea

ODAILSO SINVALDO BERTÉ  
RAIMUNDO MARTINS

## Resumen

Este artículo busca problematizar de qué forma las pedagogías culturales están relacionadas a los conocimientos escolares. De acuerdo con diversas investigaciones en el campo de la educación cultural visual, el texto articula argumentos teóricos que aproximan las perspectivas de las pedagogías del placer, de la pregunta y del conflicto. Y, fundamenta propuestas pedagógicas que vayan de la valorización crítica de la cultura a consideraciones sobre el cuerpo, las experiencias, los afectos, las prácticas del uso de imágenes y los artefactos culturales, con la intención de articular formas creativas y libertadoras de enseñar-aprender.

**Palabras-clave:**

Pedagogías culturales, cuerpo,  
conocimientos escolares

## **The contemporary setting**

Modern-day education has been constantly lagging behind, whether regarding its teachers and students, the physical structures and public spaces in which educational processes take place, the structure of educational policies and curricula or the pedagogical procedures involved in the teaching-learning relationship. Being a teacher is no longer considered a dream, a calling or a life plan to be pursued; becoming a football player, for instance, seems to warrant much more profit and respect. We have watched appalling scenes through the media, such as the episode which took place in Curitiba, Paraná state, in April 2015. When protesting for their rights, teachers were violently repressed by the police, under the authority of government officials. We have also seen several episodes of students hitting teachers and classmates or damaging school property, which often finds itself in a critical state due to budget misappropriation or cuts.

The present-day educational setting in Brazil does not seem encouraging or stimulating. On the contrary, it is disappointing to such an extent that it becomes alarming. We start off this reflection by establishing, albeit broadly, such drawbacks and circumstances, not aiming to discourage those who decide to invest their knowledge and efforts in this field, but to raise their awareness. Despite the problems found in the educational scenario, we can safely say that it remains a fertile ground for challenges and for changes to be brought about by individuals who still believe and hope that education may contribute to a better world. We emphasize the importance and the need for the field of qualitative research to reflect on these realities. This is what researchers (AGUIRRE, 2009; 2011; BERTÉ, 2015; MARTINS, TOURINHO, 2014; SÉRVIO, 2015) have been doing

in the field of visual culture and its intersections with other areas of knowledge. On this assumption, we chose, in this article, to share theoretical reflections based on different investigations conducted in such perspective.

The school may be regarded as a second home where children, teenagers, and even adults spend a considerable amount of their time. Society still relies on the school's responsibility as a place that instructs and forms individuals for social life, for the job market, for civic participation, for decision-making, and for taking up critical viewpoints. Towards achieving that, the school organizes a series of bodies of knowledge, practices, and procedures that are considered appropriate for educating individuals who attend it daily in their search for knowledge. The curriculum is viewed as the main tool to list, organize, and pass on the school knowledge required for the development and training of its individuals – the students. However, even though this may sound obvious, it is important to remember that students are not empty, passive, or inert when they start attending school; rather, they are available and open to acquiring school knowledge.

Individuals – in this case, students – are not a “*tabula rasa*” (PINKER, 2004), a blank sheet, an empty and harmless vessel-like body, predisposed in such a way that the school, its pedagogies, and teachers pour over and inscribe in them summaries, formulas, and contents that are organized and, therefore, considered appropriate for their education. Despite sounding obvious to some and strange to others, education deals with bodies, and, by stating this, we are not only referring to dancing, drama, and physical education lessons. As hooks (2001, p. 115) claims, “[some] individuals enter the classroom to teach as though only the mind is present, not the body”<sup>1</sup> – a legacy of the body versus mind dualism established in the early days of modernity –, without accounting for the fact that it is bodies attending the classroom, bodies which think and feel. Bodies which, even though most of us have ignored or not reflected on the issue, may be viewed as mediums of information, images, and knowledge that educate them outside school grounds.

According to Greiner and Katz (2001), when certain pieces of information and images are presented and divulged by mass media forms such as television, radio, newspapers, Internet, etc., the immediate result is their rapid propagation. By perceiving the body as a form of media or mediation, Greiner and Katz (2001) argue that the information which reaches it

or with which it establishes contact contribute to its design, to its way of being, acting, thinking – in other words, such information (trans)forms and changes the body, (re)designing various interface forms. Through these processes, the authors claim that the human body may be regarded as an example, a media form for seeing itself and for thinking about these constant interactions. Katz and Greiner (2005, p. 130) bring forth the concept of mediabody, according to which the body is not simply a means of conveying or receiving information “because every piece of input information begins a negotiation with the information that is already there.”<sup>3</sup> The body selects and reconstructs the information with which it relates in its living environment. In this relationship with the environment, the body constructs itself and is also constructed and, as society, culture, and context affect it, it also affects them through the ways in which it reacts, reconstructs, responds or resigns itself. Therefore, we may view the body as a media form of the processes and information which comprise it.

In agreement with Katz’s (2010, p. 126) arguments, we believe that the notion of body as a biological organism, on which culture and, in this particular case, the school inscribe their traits, may be challenged by the concept of mediabody, given that the latter “dismisses the idea that first the body is formed and only then it begins to deal with the social features of its surroundings.”<sup>4</sup> For Katz (2010), the idea of inscribing carries the possibility of acknowledging a natural body before a cultural body, because that which can be inscribed – history, culture, education – requires the prior existence of the location – the body – on which to be inscribed. Still in line with Katz, we challenge the idea that there exists a body ontologically different from the culturally constructed body. According to Katz (2010, p. 127), “the Mediabody Theory proposes the non-existence of the body outside of culture, [given that] body and environment determine each other.”<sup>5</sup> Hence it is both possible and necessary to understand that the body – a subject at the same time natural and cultural – constructs itself and is constructed in the movements between nature and culture.

When mediabodies first attend school and find themselves within a classroom, they are neither empty nor passive but, rather, impregnated by affections, artifacts, and situations which are already a part of them. Even if, in certain contexts based on modernist pedagogies, the school and its curriculum, pedagogies, and teachers ignore such a fact, the elements that make up the mediabody are not wiped out once the classroom

door is closed and the learning of school knowledge begins. School knowledge faces information and knowledge which mediabodies – students – already possess and carry with them. Thus, a negotiation process is set in motion between school-based information and knowledge, on the one hand, and, on the other, all that the students already know, have already seen and learned outside school, in other spaces and institutions or through the media. Reconstructions, doubts, and values emerging from such negotiations gradually (trans)form the mediabodies – students –, individuals involved in the educational process.

The school, together with its values and problems, is one among a number of spaces that educate mediabodies. Our intention is not to diminish its importance in educating individuals, but to foster discussions and to endorse educational processes that do not exclude the body and its range of affections and knowledge constructed and acquired outside the school. We wish to think of ways through which education may perceive the individual/student/body in its entirety, considering its vital relationship with the environment/context/culture – the reference scope for school knowledge.

## **School knowledge**

School knowledge as presented in the curriculum is not a set of extraterrestrial pieces from another dimension. It comprises curricular elements derived from social, historical, and cultural settings that act as supporting references. These settings are local, a part of the environment in which individuals live and work, and contribute, directly or not, to the existence and organization of such knowledge. As highlighted by Moreira and Candau (2007), school knowledge is one of the curriculum's major elements, and learning it is an essential factor for socially produced bodies of knowledge to be acquired, critiqued, and reconstructed by students.

In line with Moreira and Candau (2007), we understand that education is capable of providing students with school knowledge that may help them to take charge of their daily lives, to understand their realities, and broaden their cultural universe. Education is an arena of experiences that contribute to training independent, critical, and creative individuals that are capable of promoting transforming actions. For Moreira and Candau (2007, p. 22), “such processes necessarily interact with disciplinary knowledge as well as with other forms of socially constructed knowledge.”<sup>6</sup> For these authors, “school

knowledge” is a construct of the educational environment, a set of bodies of knowledge “produced by the school system and by the broader social and economic context”<sup>7</sup> (2007, p. 22). Such production of knowledge does not stem from an extra-human dimension; instead, it is generated amid relations of power, capital, interests, and bodies of knowledge which bring together the school, the university, the church, and other institutions within the sociocultural scenario.

Also according to Moreira and Candau (2007), school knowledge derives from bodies of knowledge that are socioculturally produced within what is known as reference scopes: universities; research centres; job market; technological developments; sporting and physical activities; artistic production; various forms of civic participation; social movements. In this sense, the school itself, as an institution and a setting also belonging to the sociocultural context, is a space within which its body of knowledge, together with others, may be (re)formulated.

The reference scopes of school knowledge are part of the environment that constantly affects the body and is affected by it. In the teaching-learning relationship, at school or at university, such knowledge should not be approached or treated as unearthly reasoning, as rationalizations stemming from spaces that are disconnected and even opposed to bodies. Rather, as elements originated from the same environment/context/culture as those of the body, they should confirm this relationship which already exists within bodies’ framework of experiences. The modernist aura which furnishes knowledge with rationalizations, reasoning, abstractions, formulas, measurements, and conceptualizations drives it away from bodies, from their affections and environments, as if it did not belong to them, but instead to a world of ideas far away from us.

The educational model devised in modern times – a science based on quantifying, measuring, and abstractly representing things via concepts and measurements which emerged during the Renaissance period, in the 15<sup>th</sup> century – began to characterize the relationship between bodies and the world, the ways to build up knowledge (epistemologies) and the means to educate bodies (pedagogies). Following the argument proposed by Duarte Júnior (2010, p. 110), modernity gradually abandoned the body by replacing data collected by the human senses, by subjecting past experiences to laboratory validity, and hence by denying the fact that “the body knows about the world before the mind has a chance to turn it into



signs representing things, situations, and relations.”<sup>8</sup> School knowledge, derived from sociocultural reference scopes, has been stratified, classified, and separated from its context to such an extent that, when approached or taught, sounds like something from another planet.

Even though the curriculum is sometimes fetishized, i.e. as if possessing extraordinary, transcendental, magic powers from supernatural and superhuman sources that enable it to perform miracles and feats, according to Silva (2003), it is by no means a talisman. It is a socioculturally established instrument that internalizes typically human conflicts, powers, and interests. To quote Silva (2003, p. 10): “the curriculum embodies the links between knowledge, power, and identity.”<sup>9</sup> The author explains that curriculum policies define roles for teachers and students, the ways these individuals relate to each other, as well as which valid bodies of knowledge can verify whether learning has taken place, all leading to “a process which includes certain forms of knowledge and individuals whilst excluding others”<sup>10</sup> (Silva, 2003, p. 11-12). Silva’s critique exposes ways in which school knowledge expressed by the curriculum may value certain contents, situations, contexts, and individuals over others.

This article proposes the following questions: if school knowledge stems from reference scopes that make up the vast sociocultural environment in which bodies and organizations coexist and confront each other on a daily basis, to what extent may it consider and relate to forms of knowledge established in the contexts of cultural pedagogies? How can this dialogue help to enhance students’ critical and creative thinking when faced with the complexities of their sociocultural environment?

## **Cultural pedagogies**

Slandered and often feared in certain educational environments, cultural pedagogies parade freely through many spaces, contexts, and routines without asking for permission or authorization from schools, universities or other institutions. These pedagogies are present in the lives of children, teenagers, and adults in highly engaging, effective, and affective ways.

Through the considerable economic and technological resources they mobilize and their – generally – commercial purposes, they [cultural pedagogies] come forth, unlike the academic and school-based curriculum, in a seductive and

irresistible way. They appeal to emotion and fantasy, to dreams and the imagination: they mobilize an affective economy [...]. The sheer force of such an investment on affection and emotion is precisely what makes their “curriculum” such a fascinating object.” (SILVA, 2007, p. 140).

Comprising the vast multimedia apparatus of cultural pedagogies are soap operas, films, programs, websites, social networks, advertisements, images of various sources and formats, characters, artists, celebrities, products like CDs and DVDs, application programs, electronic devices, clothes, accessories, and several other types of artifacts. In their complexity, cultural pedagogies are not aimed solely at children and teenagers, but affect different social and cultural groups, contexts, and individuals. From a pedagogical point of view, as stressed by Silva (2007, p. 140), “it is not simply a question of information or entertainment”<sup>12</sup>, but, in both cases, of forms of knowledge which influence people’s behaviour in crucial and even vital ways.

Steinberg and Kinchloe (1997, p. 17) highlight that cultural pedagogy

[...] refers to the idea that education takes place in a variety of social sites which include, but are not limited to, schooling. Pedagogical sites are those where power is organized and deployed, including libraries, TV, movies, newspapers, magazines, toys, advertisements, video games, books, sports, etc.<sup>13</sup>

Steinberg and Kinchloe (1997) claim that education, far from being restricted to the contours of the school as an institution, spreads through vast and complex cultural scenarios. In sites where power relations are organized and brought to the fore, such relations being different ways of influencing bodies, particular forms of teaching i.e. pedagogical situations arise. Steinberg and Kincheloe (1997) problematize a kind of “cultural curriculum” through which cultural pedagogies act, forming identities and producing as well as legitimating forms of knowledge. Religious, political, and commercial institutions – the school ranking among them – share this broad cultural curriculum which strives to influence and seduce bodies through different strategies, discourses, and images.

Kincheloe and McLaren (2010) reflect on how certain studies often consider cultural production as a form of education. In these studies, significant emphasis is given to the media, to

social networks, to television, to product commercialization and consumption, to marketing and advertising, to images and their strategies of power, oppression, control, and domination. Though we do not dismiss the ensuing implicit and explicit power relations, we believe that such a critique fails to stress the dominant and domineering roles played by institutions like the school, art, the church, and politics (parties and governments) through old and new ways to manoeuvre, terrorize, abuse, violate, dichotomize, and discriminate bodies and their various forms. Little is said about perverse forms of cultural pedagogy, i.e. castrating, elitist, and dominant forms bred by high culture, because the media, the Internet, images, and popular and mass culture have become the order of the day.

Given our understanding that cultural pedagogies go beyond all that is popular and mass-oriented, an understanding in line with Aguirre's (2009, p. 165), we consider cultural pedagogy "a set of formative contents which are not managed by the standard means of formal education, but basically by mass media."<sup>14</sup> Like Aguirre, we have come to perceive just how much the school and other established institutions abominate these cultural contents which currently instruct "ethical and aesthetic values in our young people"<sup>15</sup> and reveal to the juvenile imaginary the extent to which school and life are distant scopes "which turn their backs on each other"<sup>16</sup> (AGUIRRE, 2014, p. 165).

Aguirre (2014, p. 250) points out that cultural pedagogies may include not only products, images, and artifacts that are commercialized and consumed, but also "practices of cultural production"<sup>17</sup> that may be visual, narrative, poetic, popular, ethnic, etc. Forms of cultural production arise from the relationship between equals, through learning strategies that take place "side by side". By alluding to the experiences of certain groups, ghettos, movements, and communities with various backgrounds and objectives, Aguirre (2014) stresses that such cultural practices act towards challenging the conventional, dichotomous relations between master and apprentice or between experienced and novice. In line with Aguirre's (2014) analysis, we understand that cultural pedagogies are more than sociocultural strategies that instruct and/or dominate bodies, for they may also be regarded as a form of cultural production, i.e. "[a] way of producing knowledge, identity, and values"<sup>18</sup> (AGUIRRE, 2014, p. 250).

Like Aguirre (2014, p. 250), we believe these forms of cultural production in line with cultural pedagogies, by involving subjectification processes, may prove to be "a political response"<sup>19</sup>

given by bodies (children, teenagers, adults) to “established educational alternatives”<sup>20</sup>, given that they are “cultural practices”<sup>21</sup> that such bodies “fulfil and through which they fulfil themselves.”<sup>22</sup> Echoing Trend (1992), Aguirre (2014) states that what we perceive – often in a general way – that culture may be viewed as a set of productions which we, as bodies, shape and adapt every day as ways of communicating, consuming, and building the world around us. We construct culture, but it also constructs us. Hence cultural pedagogies provide stimulating and creative challenges for us to think about and review certain pedagogical methods and curricular notions that separate school knowledge from its reference scopes, distancing it from bodies’ lives, experiences, and affections.

Cultural production practices to be carried out using elements from cultural pedagogies may be linked to art lessons, but we have observed that they are not restricted to this field of study. The ways through which cultural pedagogies cover aesthetic, media, political, historical, economic, social, geographical, and tourist issues, among others, lead to an approximation and involvement between contents and bodies of knowledge addressed by different subjects and fields of study. However, what we conceive as pedagogical possibilities for employing cultural production practices do not seek to make curriculum-based school knowledge equate to or be replaced by knowledge from cultural pedagogies. They involve, rather, making associations, establishing interactions and interconnections based on the premise that both cultural pedagogy knowledge and school knowledge stem from the sociocultural contexts in which the mediabodies in the classroom – teachers and students – live in.

The standpoint of Cultural Studies and Education, and particularly of curriculum theory (SILVA, 2007), helps us to think of ways through which to bridge the gap between “academic and school-based knowledge”<sup>23</sup> and the “daily knowledge”<sup>24</sup> of popular and mass culture. In this respect, a television program, an art exhibition, a history book, and a fashion magazine may all be regarded as cultural artifacts which establish pedagogical forms and may set in motion, each in its own way, processes that (trans)form mediabodies. According to Silva (2007, p. 142), it is important to employ forms of “permeability” capable of regarding “both the cultural industry and the school curriculum as cultural artifacts”<sup>25</sup> as “signification systems involved in producing identities and subjectivities.”<sup>26</sup>

In line with Silva's arguments, it should be stressed that one of the distinctive sociocultural features of contemporariness – strongly marked by revolutions in information and communication systems, like the Internet – is: “[the] bringing down of barriers between institutions and spheres previously viewed as different and separate”<sup>27</sup> (SILVA, 2007, p. 141). In this sense, keeping apart bodies of knowledge produced in daily life, in mass culture, and in the school or university may be seen as problematic, as a source of cognitive asepsis, as a chasm between school and life, as well as a haziness within the reference scopes shared by knowledge and bodies even before such knowledge is organized by the school curriculum.

### **Cultural pedagogies and school knowledge: possible permeabilities**

In this paper, we propose the possibility of establishing permeability between school knowledge and cultural pedagogies in order to bring together other forms of education that acknowledge the body-environment relationship, affections, daily routines, and various cultural artifacts involved in the experiences and education of mediabodies – students and teachers. The pedagogical propositions that emerge from this perspective seek to “treat students as bearers of diverse social memories with a right to speak and represent themselves in the quest for learning and self-determination”<sup>28</sup> (GIROUX, 1995, p. 85).

This educational proposition concerns itself less with validating, assessing, and adapting cultural artifacts than with the ways in which bodies of knowledge, texts, images, and cultural products are used by individuals. We are in agreement with Giroux's (1995) claim that pedagogy becomes a space in which students can share and challenge, perceive and analyze, consider and recreate, critically and creatively, their preferences, affections, and the meanings they attribute or assimilate in their daily experiences with discourses, practices, media images, advertising, Internet, and other means. We see possibilities of “taking up pedagogy as an act of decentering”<sup>29</sup> (GIROUX, 1995, p. 94), a form of transit, a dissolution of borders, dialogue, exchange, and communication between different bodies. Therefore, the educational process can be regarded as a space, among many others, which reveals the body's ability to be both the contaminated and the contaminator, as well as exposes

culture as “an open system capable of contaminating the body and becoming contaminated by it”<sup>30</sup> (GREINER; KATZ, 2001, p. 72-73).

Conceiving an education that takes bodies and affections into account involves, for instance, not turning curricular content into a set of rules, formulas, and finished-off concepts that are decontextualized from the body-environment relationship. Giroux (1995, p. 97) emphasizes the need for “linking curriculum to the experiences that students bring to their encounter with institutionally legitimated knowledge.”<sup>31</sup> The resulting pedagogical implication is a review of established disciplines which merges them with knowledge comprising, for instance, mass culture, pop culture, youth culture, among other cultural traits and niches that make up students’ knowledge and the underrated status of common sense. Reviewing discipline borders which separate common sense from sensibleness, cultural pedagogy knowledge from school knowledge, aims above all to view these cultural phenomena, artifacts, and interactions from new critical and creative perspectives.

These elements support the construction of other forms of knowledge which go beyond the conventional forms, usually based on prior theorization, on distancing between subject and object, and on researcher “neutrality”. Knowledge construction processes are not sets of decontextualized or intangible representations. They are connected to the environment and to bodies. They are actions organized by mediabodies through the intense interaction, supplementation, and partnership of their sensorimotor and mental procedures. Knowledge is intimately linked to the meanings that bodies attribute to the world and its elements. Whatever the field of study or discipline, educational processes cannot do without bodies, despite dualist discourse’s insistence in this regard.

Following Giroux (1995, p. 100), pedagogy may be viewed and experienced as a “cultural practice” that is open to textual, verbal, gestural, and numerical knowledge which give evidence of their originating processes and contexts. These are forms of knowledge through which people may learn more about themselves, as well as widen their understanding of their sociocultural contexts and of the ways they interact with the “other”, with environments, and with the cultural artifacts on which they invest their affections.

The permeable paths we have made out between cultural pedagogies and school knowledge revolve around three

pedagogical propositions: the “pedagogy of pleasure” (GIROUX, 1999); the “pedagogy of conflict” (SANTOS, 1996); the “pedagogy of the question” (FREIRE; FAUNDEZ, 2008).

Conceiving possible ways of decolonizing the body by understanding popular and mass culture as a pedagogy of pleasure and meaning, Giroux (1999, p. 213) argues: “pedagogy must be attentive to ways in which students make both affective and semantic investments as part of their attempts to regulate and give meaning to their lives.”<sup>32</sup> To include popular culture within pedagogy, according to Giroux, provides us opportunities to discover ways through which students can make affective investments on certain sociocultural forms and practices; to understand how a policy of pleasure can help students rebuild their relationships – often contradictory ones – with education and everyday life. In Giroux’s view, if pedagogy concerns itself with understanding how students’ identities, cultures, and experiences may offer solid grounds for learning, it must also consider the range of elements that organize their subjectivities.

Giroux (1999, p. 219) goes on to emphasize how popular cultural forms may help mark people’s place in history and bring about experiences of “pleasure, affect, and corporeality.”<sup>33</sup> Through combinations of “corporeal and ideological meanings”, popular cultural forms – historically constructed practices – may produce affective effects. Giroux (1999, p. 219) explains that the ways through which popular cultural forms are mediated and taken up, their ways of constructing particular forms of investment, may depend less on the production of meaning than on “affective relations which they construct with their audiences.”<sup>34</sup> Hence popular cultural relations should not be dismissed as ideologically incorrect or simply as a reflex of market-oriented systems. In the process of structuring individuals’ affective investments on popular cultural forms, Giroux (1999, p. 219) highlights the importance of the semantic and the affective because they provide “new theoretical categories for linking the domain of the everyday with the pedagogical processes at work in the notion of consent.”<sup>35</sup>

In line with Giroux’s emphasis on the importance of affective investments, desire, pleasure, and everyday experiences on pedagogy, we aim to challenge pedagogy as it is solely based on abstract rationalism and discourse acts. Giroux (1999, p. 226) goes on to state: “pedagogy also constitutes a moment in which the body learns, moves, desires, and longs for affirmation.”<sup>36</sup> The author’s questions suggest “[a] rejection of the pedagogy of modernism”<sup>37</sup> in which “the tyranny of discourse becomes

the ultimate pedagogical medium”<sup>38</sup> and the embodied “talk” becomes “a logic abstracted from the body itself”<sup>39</sup> (p. 226). Giroux firmly questions how the body and its affections have been absent “in previous theorizing”<sup>40</sup>, as well as highlights the body’s ultimate importance “for a critical pedagogy”<sup>41</sup> (p. 226).

Santos (1996) seeks to fight back the banality of suffering, oppression, and discrimination by stressing the importance of an education that promotes the abilities for resistance, indignation, and defiance. By challenging the educational systems which conform to modern science and its hegemonic model of cognitive-instrumental rationality, he proposes the pedagogy of conflict. This mode of seeing, thinking, and making pedagogy is grounded on a “liberating educational project”, in other words,

[...] a project of learning conflicting knowledge that aims to produce, through it, radical and unsettling images of the social conflicts which they conveyed in the past, images capable of potentiating indignation and defiance. An education oriented, hence, towards resistance, towards a kind of subjectivity which submits the repeating present to a hermeneutics of suspicion, which rejects the trivialization of suffering and oppression, and sees in these the result of inexcusable choices. (SANTOS, 1996, p. 17-18).<sup>42</sup>

Santos’ approach must be resistant itself, and learning, in turn, must be conflicting. Therefore, the classroom must be “[a] field of possibilities of knowledge”<sup>43</sup> (SANTOS, 1996, p. 18) within which students and teachers are allowed to make choices, ones that may not overlap or be considered irreversible. Choices are based on “emotions, feelings, and passions that confer inexhaustible meanings to curriculum contents”<sup>44</sup> (p. 18). According to Santos, “knowledge only inspires resistance insofar as it becomes common sense, the evident knowledge that does not exist apart from the practices which confirm it”<sup>45</sup> (p. 18). Such an education will raise awareness on the conflictuality between alternative common senses, between non-resistant and resistant practical knowledge, as well as between knowledge-as-regulation and knowledge-as-liberation.

Also according to Santos (1996, p. 25), “[the] pedagogy of conflict is a pedagogy of considerable risk, against which there are no insurance policies.”<sup>46</sup> The ensuing pedagogical conflict arises between contradictory forms of knowledge,



knowledge as order and colonialism and knowledge as solidarity and chaos, which support alternative forms of sociability and subjectivity. Santos (1996, p. 25) states: “it is up to the pedagogical field to experiment, both by imagining practice and by practicing the imagination, these alternative sociabilities and subjectivities, broadening the possibilities of the human.”<sup>47</sup> According to him, pedagogy must install conflicts at the heart of the curriculum, above all cultural ones (cultural imperialism and multiculturalism).

The liberating pedagogical field evoked by Santos (1996) consists in using the imagination to create a conflictuality rejected by hegemonic models, as well as unsettling images from cultures, groups, individuals, and issues that have been dominated, marginalized, silenced, and made invisible. According to Santos (1996), these images have the potential to promote pedagogical spaces for an alternative model of intercultural relation, that of multiculturalism. Santos (1996) believes that the criteria for constructing good or bad learning are the ways in which conflicts may have a place within pedagogical experiences: destabilizing dominant epistemological models; remembering inexcusable past injustices and sufferings so they may not occur again in the present or in the future; creating unsettling images capable of broadening the critical eye and the defiance of students and teachers; encouraging emerging models of enlightening, liberating, and multicultural relations among bodies of knowledge, people, and social groups.

Freire and Faundez (2008, p. 54), by devising “a pedagogy of the question”<sup>48</sup>, affirm the challenging nature of this pedagogy which may be viewed as a provocation. Regarding hierarchical relations, the authors put the notions of authorship and authority into perspective and remark: “asking questions is not always convenient”<sup>49</sup> (p. 46). Questions are disturbing, interrupt linearity, and cause processes to acquire new nuances, as well as enhance and make flexible the processuality of relations. The question “What does asking mean?”<sup>50</sup> is posed by Freire and Faundez (2008, p. 47) in their dialogue book on the pedagogy of the question. According to them, “[the] heart of the matter does not lie in producing an intellectual game with the question ‘What does asking mean?’, but in living the question, living indignation, living curiosity”<sup>51</sup> (p. 48). Through dialogue form, Freire and Faundez comment on topics like the origins of knowledge, of the teaching process, of pedagogy.

Knowing how to ask oneself, knowing which questions encourage and stimulate society. Essential questions which stem from everyday life, because it is there that questions lie. If we learned to ask ourselves about our own daily existence, all the questions that demanded answers and all this question-answer process which constitutes the path to knowledge would begin with ordinary questions about our daily lives, about these gestures, about these corporeal questions which the body asks of us [...]. (FREIRE; FAUNDEZ, 2008, p. 48).<sup>52</sup>

By challenging the transmission of knowledge as a ready-answer pedagogy, Freire and Faundez (2008, p. 46) believe that “the teacher should [...] teach students how to ask questions [because this is] the start of knowledge.”<sup>53</sup> Through real-life examples based on students’ experiences, the authors believe they should be encouraged “to ask questions regarding their own practice”<sup>54</sup> (p. 49). Therefore, in a pedagogy of the question, the teacher is viewed as someone who encourages students to create the habit of being amazed, of asking questions, of taking chances, of imagining and being curious about things. In the body, “a person’s permanent questions about the world constitute the mass with which he/she shapes him/herself”<sup>55</sup> (KATZ, 2005, p. 16). Given that a question is an action which causes actions, movements, and displacements, the body-subject, by asking itself and by being asked about the world, about its interactions with and in the world, shapes itself and is shaped with questions, hence organizing, setting in motion, and establishing modes of existence.

In summary, the pedagogy of pleasure, the pedagogy of conflict, and the pedagogy of the question highlight the importance of the body, of affections, of pleasure, of desire, of daily experiences, and of cultural practices and their relations with school knowledge included in the curriculum. Hence resistance, debate, critique, curiosity, and creativity emerge as pedagogical practices and procedures capable of broadening individuals’ independence and/or liberation in relation to dominant systems, epistemologies, and pedagogies. Cultural pedagogies may contribute to defetishise the curriculum and to raise awareness of the power and knowledge relations that may promote school knowledge. Cultural pedagogies and the cultural production practices stemming from them point to ways in which knowledge, representations, and their meanings may be constructed and modified by the relations that bodies as subjects establish with their contexts and environments.

According to Giroux (1999, p. 220), “the content of popular culture cannot be understood as prespecified content”<sup>56</sup>, and students’ affective investments on popular culture “cannot be determined simply through an analysis of the meanings and representations that we decode in them”<sup>57</sup> (p. 228). Giroux (1999) claims: “affective investments have a real cultural capacity and may be indifferent to the very notion of meaning itself as constructed through the lens of the ideological”<sup>58</sup> (p. 228). The author also stresses that important political and pedagogical principles arise from these investments, e.g. attention to the policies that regulate, establish, constitute, and express desire in order to understand students’ relations with popular cultural forms; the political construction of the idea and experience of pleasure, so that the body is a subject of pleasure, not its object; acknowledgement of popular culture as a field in which students are able to appropriate cultural artifacts, questioning their tastes and ways of using these artifacts, increasing their critical and creative possibilities.

In line with Greiner (2010), we believe that education can be like friendship: it may establish a network of affections and perceptions. Education stemming from the body is profane, does not believe in pedestals and hierarchies or delve deep into the master-student duality. Such form of education is grounded on the principle that everybody learns together, which indicates an autonomous literacy in which we are all encouraged to discover and use our own words and gestures without reproducing empty knowledge, ready-made formulas, and stigmatized meanings. Moreover, this form of education understands that the human body is neither passive nor inert, because it acts even before an action is under way; it communicates even before becoming aware of its own communicability, and feels whilst processing its thoughts (GREINER, 2010).

By emphasizing experiences, contexts and affections of mediabodies (students and teachers), our investments in the linking of cultural pedagogies and school knowledge do not disregard the ways that some artifacts and advertising images (SÉRVIO, 2015), such as film and television media, which are proper of the cultural pedagogies, are projected to deliberately capture our affections and get success in mobilizing emotions (such as fear, boredom, loneliness) in favor of various ideological interests, influencing behaviors. The considerations about affection and pleasure proposed here do not emerge armored against critical reviews, but envision

to argue in favor of positions that go beyond depreciative and rancid discourses aiming critical-creative actions that questions, challenge and reinvent problems, situations and experiences that contribute to impede separation and hierarchies in the relations between subject, student, context, and body, or yet, mind, nature, and culture.

According to Aguirre (2011, p. 73) the pedagogical understanding that guides us is built upon the “recuperation of the attention to emotional and affective questions for an education centered in the work with visual culture”<sup>59</sup>, considering ways of “political emancipation based on capacitation”<sup>60</sup> and not only on forms of discursive “consciousness”, at times disembodied. With Aguirre (2011, p. 72), we invest in the perspective of “advance from a position”<sup>61</sup> grounded only “in the critical valorization of culture”<sup>62</sup> to positions that open spaces to the “diversity of uses and experiences”<sup>63</sup> related to affects and sensibility. By proposing teaching-learning relations permeated by pedagogies of pleasure, questions and conflict, we emphasize formal training as a space where students may review their cultural experiences not as a kind of demonization but through a critical and creative appropriation.

As we perceive the already existing crossings between cultural pedagogies and school knowledge, the mediabodies can: make new forms of crossings; attend and question their tastes and ways of using and consuming different cultural artifacts; broaden their meanings about those artifacts analyzing how such artifacts may capture their affects, mobilize their emotions, and influence their behaviors; perceive that not all mediabodies react in the same manner towards cultural pedagogies interests; understand that each mediabody, through context/history/experiences, can receive, reconstruct, and re-signify, in an unpredictable way, the cultural pedagogies and school knowledge.

The debate we have brought forth seeks to encourage alternatives to a messianic education, the only one capable of saving humans from the evils of the world, the only one capable of distinguishing between appropriate bodies of knowledge and those to be demonized. We have devised certain propositions which may create dialogical and pleasurable spaces for the mediabodies to experience studying – a pedagogical act – i.e. the teaching-learning process as a suitable environment for establishing critical and creative negotiations between school knowledge and cultural pedagogy knowledge, given that these emerge from the vast sociocultural field which students,

teachers, and the school belong to. In short, we believe in an education that does not separate the five senses from the many meanings bodies may produce, neither the educational from the vital, nor school from life.

#### NOTES

1. All translations are the authors'. The original texts are presented as end notes.
2. “[alguns] indivíduos entram na sala de aula para ensinar como se apenas a mente estivesse presente, e não o corpo”
3. “pois toda informação que chega entra em negociação com as que já estão”
4. “invalida o entendimento de que primeiro o corpo se forma e depois começa a lidar com os traços sociais do entorno”
5. “a Teoria Corpomídia propõe a inexistência do corpo fora da cultura, [porque] corpo e ambiente se codeterminam.”
6. “tais processos necessariamente implicam o diálogo com os saberes disciplinares como com outros saberes socialmente construídos”
7. “produzido pelo sistema escolar e pelo contexto social e econômico mais amplo”
8. “o corpo sabe o mundo antes que a mente possa transformá-lo em signos representativos de coisas, situações e relações”
9. “o currículo corporifica os nexos entre saber, poder e identidade”
10. “um processo de inclusão de certos saberes e de certos indivíduos, excluindo outros”
11. Pelos imensos recursos econômicos e tecnológicos que mobilizam, por seus objetivos – em geral – comerciais, elas se apresentam, ao contrário do currículo acadêmico e escolar, de uma forma sedutora e irresistível. Elas apelam para a emoção e a fantasia, para o sonho e a imaginação: elas mobilizam uma economia afetiva [...]. É precisamente a força desse investimento das pedagogias culturais no afeto e na emoção que tornam seu “currículo” um objeto tão fascinante.
12. “não se trata simplesmente de informação ou entretenimento”
13. [...] se remite a la idea de que la educación tiene lugar en diversos sitios sociales que incluyen la escolarización pero no se limitan a ella. Los lugares pedagógicos son aquellos donde el poder se organiza y despliega, incluidas las bibliotecas, la televisión, las películas, los periódicos, las revistas, los juguetes, los anuncios, los juegos de vídeo, los libros, los deportes, etc.
14. “[um] conjunto de conteúdos formativos que não são administrados pelas vias tradicionais da educação formal, mas sim, pelos meios de comunicação de massa, basicamente”
15. “em nossos jovens, valores éticos e estéticos”
16. “que se dão as costas mutuamente”
17. “práticas de produção de cultura”
18. “forma de produção de conhecimento, identidade e valores”
19. “uma resposta política”

20. “alternativas educativas instituídas”
21. “práticas culturais”
22. “realizam e através das quais se realizam”
23. “conhecimento acadêmico e escolar”
24. “conhecimento cotidiano”
25. “tanto a indústria cultural quanto o currículo propriamente escolar como artefatos culturais”
26. “sistemas de significação implicados na produção de identidades e subjetividades”
27. “[o] apagamento das fronteiras entre instituições e esferas anteriormente consideradas como distintas e separadas”
28. “tratar os/as estudantes como portadores/as de memórias sociais diversificadas, com o direito de falar e de representar a si próprios/as na busca da aprendizagem e da autodeterminação”
29. “assumir a pedagogia como um ato de descentramento”
30. “um sistema aberto, apto a contaminar o corpo e ser por ele contaminado”
31. “vincular o currículo às experiências que os/as estudantes trazem para seus encontros com o conhecimento institucionalmente legitimado”
32. “a pedagogia deve estar atenta às maneiras pelas quais os alunos fazem tanto investimentos afetivos quanto semânticos como parte de suas tentativas de regulamentar e dar significado às suas vidas”
33. “prazer, afeto e corporalidade”
34. “relações afetivas que elas constroem com suas audiências”
35. “novas categorias teóricas para se vincular o terreno do cotidiano aos processos pedagógicos que atuam no conceito do consentimento”
36. “a pedagogia também constitui um momento em que o corpo aprende, se movimenta, deseja e anseia pela afirmação”
37. “[uma] rejeição da pedagogia da modernidade”
38. “a tirania do discurso torna-se o meio pedagógico fundamental”
39. “uma lógica abstraída do próprio corpo”
40. “na teorização”
41. “para uma pedagogia crítica”
42. [...] um projeto de aprendizagem de conhecimentos conflitantes com o objetivo de, através dele, produzir imagens radicais e desestabilizadoras dos conflitos sociais em que se traduziram no passado, imagens capazes de potencializar a indignação e a rebeldia. Educação, pois, para o inconformismo, para um tipo de subjetividade que submete a uma hermenêutica de suspeita a repetição do presente, que recusa a trivialização do sofrimento e da opressão e veja neles o resultado de indesculpáveis opções.
43. “[um] campo de possibilidades de conhecimento”
44. “emoções, sentimentos e paixões que conferem aos conteúdos curriculares sentidos inesgotáveis”

45. “o conhecimento só suscita o inconformismo na medida em que se torna senso comum, o saber evidente que não existe separado das práticas que o confirmam”
46. “[a] pedagogia do conflito é uma pedagogia de alto risco contra o qual não há apólices de seguro”
47. “ao campo pedagógico compete experimentar, pela imaginação da prática e pela prática da imaginação, essas sociabilidades e subjetividades alternativas, ampliando as possibilidades do humano”
48. “[uma] pedagogia da pergunta”
49. “perguntar nem sempre é cômodo”
50. “O que é perguntar?”
51. “[o] centro da questão não está em fazer com a pergunta ‘o que é perguntar?’ um jogo intelectual, mas, viver a pergunta, viver a indignação, viver a curiosidade”
52. Saber perguntar-se, saber quais são as perguntas que nos estimulam e estimulam a sociedade. Perguntas essenciais, que partam da cotidianidade, pois é nela onde estão as perguntas. Se aprendêssemos a nos perguntar sobre nossa própria existência cotidiana, todas as perguntas que exigissem resposta e todo esse processo pergunta-resposta, que constitui o caminho do conhecimento, começariam por perguntas básicas de nossa vida cotidiana, desses gestos, dessas perguntas corporais que o corpo nos faz [...].
53. “o professor deveria [...] ensinar a perguntar [pois este é] o início do conhecimento”
54. “a fazer perguntas em torno da sua própria prática”
55. “as perguntas permanentes do homem sobre o mundo constituem a massa com que ele se molda”
56. “o conteúdo da cultura popular não pode ser compreendido como pré-especificado”
57. “não podem ser determinados simplesmente através de uma análise dos significados e das representações que neles decodificamos”
58. “os investimentos afetivos têm uma capacidade cultural real e podem ser indiferentes ao próprio conceito do significado em si, construído através das lentes do ideológico”
59. “recuperação da atenção às questões emotivas e afetivas para uma educação centrada no trabalho com a cultura visual”
60. “emancipação política a partir da perspectiva da capacitação”
61. “avançar de uma posição”
62. “na valoração crítica da cultura”
63. “diversidade dos usos e das experiências”

## References

AGUIRRE, I. Imaginando um futuro para a educação artística.  
In: MARTINS, R.; TOURINHO, I. (Org.). *Educação da Cul-*

- tura Visual: narrativas de ensino e pesquisa*. Santa Maria, RS: Editora da UFSM, 2009. p. 157-186.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Entornos da aprendizagem entre jovens produtores de Cultura Visual: traços e características. In: MARTINS, R.; TOURINHO, I. (Org.). *Pedagogias culturais*. Santa Maria, RS: Editora da UFSM, 2014. p. 247-274.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Cultura visual, política estética e educação emancipadora. In: MARTINS, R.; TOURINHO, I. (Org.). *Educação da Cultura Visual: conceitos e contextos*. Santa Maria, RS: Editora da UFSM, 2011. p. 69-111.
- BERTÉ, O. *Dança Contemporânea: corpos, afetos e imagens (mo) vendo-se*. Santa Maria, RS: Editora da UFSM, 2015. 200 p.
- DUARTE JÚNIOR, J. *A montanha e o videogame: escritos sobre educação*. Campinas, SP: Papirus, 2010. 160 p.
- FREIRE, P.; FAUNDEZ, A. *Por uma pedagogia da pergunta*. 6. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2008. 158 p.
- GIROUX, H. A Cultura Popular como uma Pedagogia de Prazer e Significado: descolonizando o corpo. In: GIROUX, H. *Cruzando as fronteiras do discurso: novas políticas em educação*. Artmed: Porto Alegre, 1999. p. 211-240.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Praticando Estudos Culturais nas Faculdades de Educação. In: SILVA, T. (Org.). *Alienígenas na sala de aula*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1995. p. 85-103.
- GREINER, C. Prefácio – A educação amorosa. In: SAITO, C. N. I. *Ação e percepção nos processos educacionais do corpo em formação*. São Paulo: Hedra, 2010. p. 07-08.
- GREINER, C.; KATZ, H. Corpo e processos de comunicação. *Revista Fronteiras: estudos midiáticos*. São Leopoldo, RS, vol. 3, n. 2, p. 65-75, dez. 2001.
- HOOKS, B. Eros, erotismo e o processo pedagógico. In: LOURO, G. L. *O corpo educado: pedagogias da sexualidade*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2001. p. 113-123.
- KATZ, H. *Um, Dois, Três. A dança é o pensamento do corpo*. Belo Horizonte: FID, 2005. 273 p.
- \_\_\_\_\_. O papel do corpo na transformação da política em biopolítica. In: GREINER, C. *O corpo em crise: novas pistas e o curto circuito das representações*. São Paulo: Annablume, 2010. p. 121-132.
- KATZ, H.; GREINER, C. Por uma teoria do corpomídia. In: GREINER, C. *O corpo: pistas para estudos indisciplinados*. São Paulo: Annablume, 2005. p. 125-133.
- KINCHELOE, J. L.; MCLAREN, P. Repensando a teoria crítica e a pesquisa qualitativa. In: DENZIN, N.; LINCOLN, Y. (Org.). *O planejamento da pesquisa qualitativa: teorias e*



- abordagens. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2010. p. 281-313.
- MARTINS, R.; TOURINHO, I. (Org.). *Pedagogias culturais*. Santa Maria, RS: Editora da UFSM. 382 p.
- MOREIRA, A. F. B.; CANDAU, V. Indagações sobre currículo: currículo, conhecimento e cultura. Brasília: *Ministério da Educação*, Secretaria de Educação Básica, 2007. p. 01-48.
- PINKER, S. *Tábula rasa – A negação contemporânea da natureza humana*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2004. 672 p.
- SANTOS, B. S. Para uma pedagogia do conflito. In: SILVA, L. H.; AZEVEDO, J. C.; SANTOS, E. S. (Org.). *Novos Mapas Culturais – Novas Perspectivas Educacionais*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 1996. p. 13-33.
- SÊRVIO, P. P. P. 2015. *Imagens de publicidade e ensino de arte: reflexões para uma Educação da Cultura Visual*. 2015. 359 f. Tese (Doutorado em Arte e Cultura Visual) – Faculdade de Artes Visuais, Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, 2015. Disponível em: <[https://culturavisual.fav.ufg.br/up/459/o/Tese\\_-V\\_Final\\_-Pablo\\_Petit\\_reduzido.pdf](https://culturavisual.fav.ufg.br/up/459/o/Tese_-V_Final_-Pablo_Petit_reduzido.pdf)>. Acesso em: 27 jun. 2016.
- SILVA, T. T. *Documentos de identidade: uma introdução às teorias do currículo*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2007. 154 p.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. *O currículo como fetiche: a poética e a política do texto curricular*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2003. 117 p.
- STEINBERG, S.; KINCHELOE, J. *Cultura infantil e multinacionais: la construcion de la identidade em la infancia*. Madrid: Ediciones Morata, 1997. 255p.

Recebido em: 02/02/16

Aceito em: 18/05/16

ODAILSO SINVALDO BERTÉ

*odaberte@yahoo.com.br*

Professor of the undergraduate course in Dance Teaching from Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, doctor in Art and Visual Culture from Universidade Federal de Goiás, master in Dance from Universidade Federal da Bahia, specialist in Dance from Faculdade de Artes do Paraná, holds a degree in Philosophy from Universidade de Passo Fundo.

RAIMUNDO MARTINS

*raimundomartins2005@yahoo.es*

Titular professor of Faculdade de Artes Visuais from Universidade Federal de Goiás (FAV/UFG), holds two postdoctoral degrees: one in Art and Cognition from University of London (England) and another in Art and Visual Culture from Universitat de Barcelona (Spain).