Experiences of families in public schools, a territorial analysis in the municipalities of Guarulhos and São Paulo

Adalberto Diré Adão
PhD student in Education at UNIFESP, Master in Education at UNIFESP, Graduated in Pedagogy at UNIFESP.
Department of Education, Graduate Program in Education, School of Philosophy, Languages and Literature, and Human Sciences, Federal University of São Paulo-UNIFESP, Brazil.

ABSTRACT
This study was developed in the Master's Degree in Education of the Graduate Program in Education of the Federal University of São Paulo. The objective of this study was to identify and problematize some of the relations between Family and School, seeking to understand manifestations through the territorial dimension of their configurations. To this end , we interviewed teachers and family members of elementary school students from a municipal school in Guarulhos-SP and another in São Paulo-SP. The families, as well as the teachers interviewed, experience the place from different points of view, but the vision of both appears permeated by the social relations established with the place. In this work, we will discuss the conceptions of the researched families about the school and the place.

Keywords: Families, Schools, Municipalities.

1 INTRODUCTION

This article is the result of an investigation carried out in the field of education in the area of teacher training[1], in which we seek to identify relations between family and school from a territorial perspective in the municipalities of Guarulhos and São Paulo, through a comparative case study. In this work we will deal with the conceptions of families about the school and the place in which they are located.

In this sense, we seek to understand how people relate to the place and in which social spheres such relationships are established. The evidence indicates that these relationships appear in an accentuated way in school practices, as well as the fact that families and the school develop a relationship in which two modes of socialization undertaken in different spaces and times are evidenced, but which converge in the school space, impacting on the teaching and learning processes.

In this context of an intricate network of correlations, with regard to teacher training, we realize that our view of the school has been changing to the point of thinking of it as a phenomenon that can

---

[1] Master's dissertation entitled Relations between Family and School from a territorial perspective in the municipalities of Guarulhos and São Paulo, developed in the Graduate Program in Education of the Federal University of São Paulo. Carried out between 2014 and 2017.

also be understood if we take into account its location and its impacts on the relationships that unfold between the subjects that constitute it.

Mediated by these contexts, this work exposes ideas of Bourdieu (1996), (1998), (2007) about the processes of schooling, which focuses on how individuals develop different trajectories from the place in which they are located. To these considerations, we add other readings and reflections focused on the understanding of the school institution (bearer of a web of relationships between different subjects) and the aspects related to its locations.

These considerations, in turn, provided questions and reflections about how the school institution is disposed in relation to families and the place they occupy in society, instigating us to questions and reflections in two orders, which are articulated. The first concerns how the school institution is disposed of in terms of its relations with families. Does the school know its students and their families? Is this relationship relevant for the school to organize its formative actions with the students? How does this happen? Is this relationship an agenda point in the continuing education of teachers in their working hours? The second is about the location of the school, that is, does the place in which it is located impact the trajectories of families, teachers and students? Does the school consider its insertion in the neighborhood, in the countryside and in the areas of occupation, that is, in the context in which it is inserted, in order to think about the educational processes?

Still analyzing this path, in relation to the educational experiences that caught our attention, we had the opportunity to teach in the municipal school systems, in the cities of São Paulo and Guarulhos, in the initial and final years of elementary school, in addition to an experience in Guarulhos with early childhood education and with the education of young people and adults. In these experiences, among our observations, we were struck by the ways in which the school is seen by families and appropriated by students in different ways at each educational stage and that the same content taught in different schools, located in different locations, represented us to be developed with numerous differences, among them, the understanding of locational characteristics and their impacts on students' learning processes. It is worth noting that in these experiences we were also able to observe relationships developed in different ways by the students' families with the school institution.

In these experiences, we observed that in each educational modality there is a public that differs in its relations with the school and with knowledge. Some of our observations allow us to infer that in all modalities, with greater or lesser intensity, there is an expansion of the sphere of the public school, going beyond teaching, being used as a space for the implementation of social policies, converging this observation with the arguments of Nóvoa (2011), when analyzing the situation of the school:

> [...] it refers to an overflowing school, a utopian school that seeks to compensate for *the deficiencies of society*, calling upon itself all possible and imaginable missions (NÓVOA, 2011, p. 537).

We noticed that there is a distancing of the school in relation to the reality of the students, with a difficulty in adapting the teaching practices to the public served. We also noticed that there is a conflict between the school reality and the students' reality, evidencing what was pointed out by Nóvoa (2011), when analyzing the school's relations with knowledge and students.

> Today, all students are in school, but not everyone has access to knowledge. There are many students who do not want to learn, who do not have any school project, and the school is totally lost in the face of this reality. We don't know what to do with this *mass* of students who don't respect us, for whom school has no meaning (NÓVOA, 2011, p. 538).

When we relate our observations to each specific educational modality, we notice that, in early childhood education, there is an expansion of the sphere of the public school, going beyond teaching, being used as a space for the implementation of social policies. In youth and adult education, we noticed that there is a distancing of the school from the reality of the students, with a difficulty in adapting teaching practices to the public served.

In elementary school, where most of our experiences were developed, we noticed that there is a conflict between the school reality and the students' reality, and in relation to the construction of knowledge, we observed that students often do not understand what the school designates as knowledge, as well as other social practices related to human formation.

Still in this movement of rescuing our observations about the school routine, we were able to observe, in the meetings of parents and teachers and in the entrances and exits of students, some characteristics related to the relations between families and schools, calling our attention to how these relationships become increasingly tenuous with the advancement of the educational stages. We also noticed that in each location where we worked, the school was arranged in a different way, and in some places it appeared as an island, in others it was integrated into the landscape and in others it was shown as a fortress far from the local reality.

In order to elucidate our inquiries pointed out so far, we searched the academic literature for analyses and approximations about these points observed and verified that such questions occupy a place in the reflection of important thinkers in the area of education studies. Many researchers, including Vigotsky (1991), Bourdieu (1998), Thin (2006) and Luria (2010), have drawn attention to the role that the bonds between family and school play in pedagogical practices, in learning processes and in how relationships are established between families and schools, which are also determining factors in children's school life.

By looking at the school through the arguments of researchers in the field of education, who seek to trace a bias between the territory and the school, such as Kaztman (2000), Cavalcanti (2005) and López (2008), we address the question of how the territory is inserted in the social relations between the institutions of family and school.

In a reflection on these relationships based on the realities experienced by the families, we ask ourselves: Do the families know the places in the neighborhood where they live? Do you know the places in the school where your children study? How do they think about their places of residence? How do they get around, work, and play where they live? How do they conceive of their relationship with the school? Do they feel like they belong in the school territory? These questions allow us to point out that identifying where these families live and what meaning they attribute to each place in which they establish relationships helps us to think about their territorialities, that is, their sense of belonging to the place.

We understand that the location and distribution of teachers, students, families and others in the school environment, as well as the neighborhood, contribute to determine the various processes that delineate the school in its daily life, especially with regard to the teaching and learning processes. In this sense, it is worth noting that the term "territorial" in the present work does not refer to an object, but rather to "a way in which the subject identifies the ordering of the things that make up the place" (Santos, 2016, p. 32).

Thus, from a territorial perspective, we seek to consider that the locations of schools and families are central to our work, developing teaching and learning processes in these institutions, thus constituting factors to be considered with regard to the bonds of belonging of the individuals involved.

Instigated by such experiments and studies, we developed a research in which the act of getting to know the families constitutes an important foundation to reflect on the teaching and learning processes, as shown by Thin (2006) when he relates school learning to that carried out in the context of primary socialization[2]. Still in this line of thought, we are guided by the ideas of Szymanski (2009) when analyzing how this relationship occurs in the family and school spheres, making the family and the school socializing institutions, therefore, partly responsible for a portion of the construction of this identification with the place, taking into account the experiences of families and the professional practices of teachers. From this perspective, the presence of families is fundamental in the learning processes of children, as well as teachers through their teaching practices, so that recognizing who teachers are and what they think enables us to have a greater understanding of how the bonds of families with the school and the place develop.

In this sense, we researched families and teachers with the objective of identifying relationships between family and school, seeking to understand how families attribute meanings to the places where they live and to the school where their children study, as well as to recognize the meanings that teachers attribute to the place where the school institution is located and whether this recognition is included in their teaching practices. To this end, we focus on the early years of elementary school, which will be discussed later.

To this end, we considered two public elementary schools of municipal education networks, one in the Parque Alvorada neighborhood, located in the district of Pimentas, in Guarulhos, and the other in the neighborhood of Penha, in São Paulo.

2 THE SEARCHED FIELD

The municipalities selected as the field of research are both located in the state of São Paulo in Brazil, a country with a territorial extension of 8,514,876 square kilometers, which corresponds to 48% of the total area of South America, currently with more than two hundred and fourteen million inhabitants (Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística Projection of the population of Brazil − IBGE, 2022).

tag. The city of Guarulhos is the second largest municipality in the state of São Paulo considering its population and economy. It is located in the northeastern portion of the metropolitan region. It has an estimated population, according to preliminary data from the 2010 Census (Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics − IBGE, 2010), a total of 1,221,979 inhabitants, of which 626,936 are women and 595,043 men. On the economic level, according to IBGE data, it is in 9th place in the country, considering the Gross Domestic Product – GDP (Prefeitura Municipal de Guarulhos – PMG, 2006).

The city of São Paulo, capital of the state of São Paulo, has an estimated population, according to preliminary data from the 2010 Census (IBGE, 2010), of 11,253,503 inhabitants, of which 5,924,871 are women and 5,328,632 are men. In the economic plan, according to IBGE data, it is in 1st place in the country, considering the Gross Domestic Product – GDP.

Analyzing data from the IBGE and the State Data Analysis System Foundation (SEADE), which provides the São Paulo Social Vulnerability Index (IPVS), both municipalities have a high economic development, despite having areas in a situation of vulnerability; they are bordering, densely inhabited, have large municipal elementary school networks and constitute two of the largest economies in the country.

The location of elementary schools, located in municipalities with high economic development, but in neighborhoods with characteristics of great social vulnerability, instigates us to think about the different ways in which people build their feelings of belonging to places and thus, inserting themselves or not within processes that demarcate their territorialities.

In this sense, it is worth noting: when dealing with vulnerability, we refer to Kaztman's positions, which understands the concept of social vulnerability as follows:

> By social vulnerability, we mean the ability of a person or a family to take advantage of the opportunities available in different socioeconomic spheres, in order to improve their well-being and prevent its deterioration. As the waste of opportunities implies a weakening of the

process of capital accumulation, situations of vulnerability usually trigger social degenerative processes that tend to progressively worsen (KAZTMAN, 2000, pg.281).

Therefore, when we refer to situations of vulnerability, we are directly referring to the relationship that families establish with the opportunities that the place provides them, thus creating conditions for analytical densification of the meanings of being where they are.

Thus, the concept of vulnerability is linked to the segregation of families in such a condition, which directly impacts their expectations regarding what is expected of the school, as corroborated by the position of Silva, Batista and Alves when dealing with the issue.

> A complex phenomenon par excellence, its explanations emphasize both characteristics of the supply of services and of demand. Among the investigations that focus on the characteristics of demand in the construction of the effect of socio-spatial segregation on school inequalities are those that focus on the characteristics of families, especially on their ethical and cultural dispositions and on their school expectations (SILVA, BATISTA & ALVES, 2014, p. 124).

We propose this approach in a comparative way because this method allows us to understand social events breaking with their singularity, as Schneider argues:

> Comparison, as a moment of cognitive activity, can be considered inherent to the process of knowledge construction in the social sciences. It is by using a type of comparative reasoning that we can discover regularities, perceive displacements and transformations, build models and typologies, identifying continuities and discontinuities, similarities and differences, and making explicit the more general determinations that govern social phenomena (SCHNEIDER, 1998, p.1).

In this way, it seeks to consider the locations of families, schools and their respective teaching and learning processes in order to understand the meaning of the reasons why they are there and how this determines their forms of existence.

3 A LOOK AT SCHOOL AND FAMILIES.

By looking at the school using different scales of observation and through fieldwork that implemented data collection and analysis, in which we sought to dialogue with the arguments of researchers in the field of education, who seek to trace a bias between the territory and the school, such as Kaztman (2000), Cavalcanti (2005) and López (2008), We address the issue of how the territory is inserted in the social relations between the institutions, family and school.

In a reflection on these relationships based on the realities experienced by the families, we ask ourselves: Do the families know the places in the neighborhood where they live? Do you know the places in the school where your children study? How do they think about their places of residence? How do they get around, work, and play where they live? How do they conceive of their relationship with the school? Do they feel like they belong in the school territory? These questions allow us to point out that identifying where these families live and what meaning they attribute to each place in

which they establish relationships helps us to think about their territorialities, that is, their sense of belonging to the place.

We understand that the location and distribution of teachers, students, families and others in the school environment, as well as the neighborhood, contribute to determine the various processes that delineate the school in its daily life, especially with regard to the teaching and learning processes. In this sense, it is worth noting that the term "territorial" in the present work does not refer to an object, but rather to "a way in which the subject identifies the ordering of the things that make up the place" (Santos, 2016, p. 32).

Thus, from a territorial perspective, we seek to consider that the locations of schools and families are central to our work, developing teaching and learning processes in these institutions, thus constituting factors to be considered with regard to the bonds of belonging of the individuals involved.

Faced with the complexity of the factors involved in learning processes, Vygotsky (1991, p. 93) proposes "that the development of one capacity promotes the development of others". We can understand that from this dynamic, individuals create specific neural structures to deal with the different issues that the environment presents to them.

> Just as the instruments of work change historically, the instruments of thought are also transformed historically. And just as new instruments of work give rise to new social structures, new instruments of thought give rise to new mental structures (BERG apud VIGOTSKY, 1991, p. 149).

Thus, the learning process results from a dialectical interaction between the individual and the social environment, that is, from the transformation of everyday concepts into scientific concepts, building reasoning from previous knowledge. Cavalcanti (2005), when analyzing the contributions of Vygotsky's ideas to the teaching of Geography, which seems to us can be extended to other curricular components of the early years of elementary school, the author argues that:

> The idea to be emphasized here is that man's higher mental functions (perception, memory, thought) develop in his relationship with the sociocultural environment [...] (CAVALCANTI, 2005, p.187).

Still thinking about the issue of the development of these mental functions in the socioeconomic and cultural environment, in which the individual is inserted, Luria, in his work also based on the ideas of Vygotsky, proposes that:

> The modes of generalization, typical of the thinking of people living in a society in which their activities are dominated by rudimentary practical functions, differ from the modes of generalization of formally educated individuals. The processes of abstraction and generalization are not invariable at all stages of socio-economic and cultural development. On the contrary, such processes are a product of the cultural environment (LURIA, 2010, p. 46).

When analyzing how the relationship between individuals and the sociocultural environment takes place, taking into account the school learning processes developed during these interactions, Bourdieu tells us that:

> [...] the interest that a listener may have in a message, whatever it may be, and, even more, the understanding that he or she may have of it, are, directly and strictly, a function of his "culture", that is, of his education and his cultural environment [...] (BOURDIEU, 1998, p. 62).

Thus, part of the learning processes is a result of the evaluations about a given subject, which are products of the relationships that the individual establishes with the sociocultural environment in which he is inserted, constituting the school a social environment in which different evaluations about the most diverse subjects are related.

We developed a research in which the act of getting to know the families constitutes an important foundation to reflect on the teaching and learning processes, as shown by Thin (2006) when he relates school learning to those carried out in the context of primary socialization[2]. Still in this line of thought, we are guided by the ideas of Szymanski (2009) when analyzing how this relationship occurs in the family and school spheres, making the family and the school socializing institutions, therefore, partly responsible for a portion of the construction of this identification with the place, taking into account the experiences of families and the professional practices of teachers. From this perspective, the presence of families is fundamental in the learning processes of children, as well as teachers through their teaching practices, so that recognizing who teachers are and what they think enables us to have a greater understanding of how the bonds of families with the school and the place develop.

In this sense, in line with the study of this relationship, Bourdieu (1998) argues that knowing the family demographic characteristics, that is, knowing how families are distributed over the territory and in what context this distribution occurs, helps us to understand how the hopes of families regarding their children's school life are projected.

Resuming the discussion about the axes around which this research was developed, the family constituted a relevant axis, since, according to Martins (2006, p. 148), "The family is one of the richest sources to know the influence of the connection of two, three or more people on human development." When dealing with the concept of family, Sarti (2004) points out that:

> The family is not defined, therefore, by the individuals united by biological ties, but by the signifiers that create the links of meaning in relationships, without which these relationships fall apart, precisely because of the loss, or non-existence, of meaning. (SARTI, 2004, p.18)

---

[2] Primary socialization is the first socialization that the individual experiences in childhood, and by virtue of which he becomes a member of society. Secondary socialization is any subsequent process that introduces an already socialized individual into new sectors of society's objective world (Berger and Luckmann, 1978, p. 175 apud Barbosa, 2007, p. 1064).

Thus, we consider that the idea of family goes beyond biological relations, inserting itself in the field of social relations from a symbolic order, as the author points out.

Thinking about the place where families and schools are located allows us to formulate questions that can reveal the nature, that is, the essence of the relationships established between the institution and the people involved with it, but we need to pay attention to how different visions about the place of residence and the school institution are developed, since families in their most varied configurations constitute an entity (philosophical concept of everything that exists) up to then distant from the school reality.

Sarti (2004) helps us to think about this question when he considers that the family as a social sphere has suffered external interference over time, by showing that the events linked to it are more than merely biological responses, configuring social and cultural responses available to men and women in specific historical contexts.

These ideas of the author in focus are important, since, when we reflect on this argumentation, confronting the data collected in the field, we can infer that the families are linked to the place, here understood as territory (sense of belonging) for the most diverse reasons and that this exerts influence on how they organize themselves.

When analyzing the relationships that families establish with the school, it is necessary to understand how they conceive such an institution and how they incorporate the values transmitted by it, converting them to their realities and desires, understanding the role that the school occupies in the social logic of such families. Thin considers that in the relationship between families and the school:

> [...] the effective relations of parents with the school institution occur according to the way they appropriate their children's schooling and the meaning they attribute to it, taking into account family socializing practices, since the correlations that we can establish between practices and school capital constitute the manifestation of the lasting effects of socialization exercised by the school (THIN, 2006, p. 212).

Based on this definition, what can be expected from families in relation to the school is a position formed by the set of what is left of these family members from the school processes of which they were part, as well as the role that society currently attributes to the school. Also in this definition, the concept of school capital refers us to the school knowledge itself, transmitted during the processes of school socialization, sometimes distant from the socialization that occurs in the family environment, as Bourdieu points out, bringing the following question:

> It is no coincidence that the opposition between "scholarly" (au "pedantic") and "worldly" is at the centre of debates on taste and culture at all times: in fact, through two ways of producing or appreciating cultural works, it designates quite clearly these opposing modes of acquisition, and at least the same way of acquiring them. for the present time, two different relationships with the school institution (BOURDIEU, 2007, p. 67).

Still analyzing the role of families in the face of such socializing practices, Martins points out the following:

> Another important action that is part of the role of the family is to insert its children into the social world. From an early age, children are sent to daycare centers and schools so that their mothers can go to work, and this ends up contributing to the family in its socializing role. There is, in fact, a support network for families in the task of educating and socializing their children, such as the church of which they belong, the formal educational system and the neighborhood (MARTINS, 2006, p. 152).

Therefore, in these relationships, what we analyze according to Thin's words is that:

> It is not, therefore, only cultural capital or school capital that are at stake; it is the set of socializing practices of families that are implicated in the relationships between parents and teachers, and these practices must be understood by their distance from the school mode of socialization, rather than by the school capital of the parents (THIN, 2006, p. 212).

Also when analyzing the relations between the family and the school and how they reflect on the construction of knowledge, Bourdieu (1996, p. 35) argues that "The reproduction of the structure of distribution of cultural capital occurs in the relationship between the strategies of the families and the specific logic of the school institution."

When we define the family as one institution and the school as another, when we try to identify which relationships the two institutions maintain with each other. Szymanski (2009), when dealing with the relations between family and school, argues that both are institutions aimed at preparing the individual to enter society, providing them with an adequate education to become a citizen.

We note that the socializing logics implicit in such relationships go beyond the school environment, residing in the families' expectations about what the school represents and what it should provide, influencing the school practices and the social practices of these families.

Based on the considerations presented in the previous lines, we can understand that this strong link between school practices and family social practices demarcates different territorialities, as well as the various ways in which families establish relationships with the school institution through inquiries, understandings and silences about the reasons for pedagogical referrals constitute factors of greater or lesser establishment of links with the place where their children study and where they study Live.

4 METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

The approach to the rural schools took place primarily through contact with the directors and coordinators of the institutions, to whom the research intention had been presented. Next, we present our research to teachers. Based on the teachers' adherence to this work, we scheduled interviews with a teacher from the second and one from the third year of each institution, and 4 teachers were

interviewed. In the next stage of the research, we interviewed two family members of students from each of the classes related to these teachers, and 8 family members were interviewed, totaling 12 interviews conducted in the research.

Data collection was carried out in the field schools, inside the classrooms, before the start of classes. The teachers were interviewed one week before their families, and each teacher was interviewed individually. To carry out the interview with the family members, a date was scheduled through the teachers, and the family members were interviewed individually, inside the classrooms, at the time before the beginning of classes.

In the case of a qualitative research, in which we tried to identify, recognize and listen to families and teachers, verifying what they think about the school, using semi-structured interviews as an instrument for data collection, André (2003) points out that from the instruments of this nature it is possible to perceive the ways in which the subjects interpret their reality and the meanings they attribute to the given situation. thus being able to express themselves through different languages.

The realization of semi-structured interviews allowed us to obtain data through an interaction between interviewer and interviewee, with the presence of conditioning factors that directly influence the result of the research, such as questions, answers and interpretations that vary according to the participants and their experiences and conceptions. Manzini (2004) proposes that semi-structured research consists of a larger conceptual spectrum, which is the interaction itself that occurs at the time of collection. In this sense, for us, the interview can be conceived as a process of social, verbal and non-verbal interaction, which occurs face-to-face between a researcher, who has a previously defined objective, and an interviewee, who, supposedly, has the information that makes it possible to study the phenomenon in question and whose mediation occurs, mainly, through language. Therefore, if the research is a process of social interaction and the interpretation of data, the social nature of such information must be taken into account.

First, we listened to the research participants, in order to understand how families and teachers relate to each other and understand the place where they live, taking into account how they represent their belongings[3].

In this same movement of listening, which is based on a narrative developed during the interview, constitutes, as Thompson argues when analyzing the importance of this rescue of the[4] interviewee's oral history, that:

> We have as much to learn from memory reformulation as we do from facts—and in this case, both come from oral recollections. The theme of memory will always be a fundamental issue

---

[3] This sense of belonging refers to how the individual understands himself as an integral part of something, a group, a place, as Santos (2016) points out.

[4] Thompson defines oral history as "[...] the interpretation of history and of changing societies and cultures by listening to people and recording their memories and experiences" (THOMPSON, 2002, p. 9).

for oral historians, but I think we should approach it positively, with confidence in the *dual* force of oral history, both objective and subjective (THOMPSON, 2002, p. 23).

This rescue is one of the points to be considered about the conception of family members and teachers about the school and the place where they are located. Based on this premise, Thompson proposes that:

> There is no doubt that much can be learned from reading interviews with this kind of sensitivity. It is very surprising, for example, the differences in language and style of a life story [...] (THOMPSON, 2002, p. 24).

Continuing this process of listening to the research participants, we sought to identify how the families also represent the relationship they establish with the school and the teachers with their educational practices, thus seeking to assess how the relationship between school development and the family's proximity to the school occurs. In this sense, in line with the study of this relationship, Bourdieu (1998) argues that knowing the family demographic characteristics, that is, knowing how families are distributed over the territory and in what context this distribution occurs, helps us to understand how the hopes of families regarding their children's school life are projected.

When we refer to school development, we are putting the discussion in a perspective of the human formation of individuals, that is, thinking about this relationship beyond the simple improvement of performance in school assessments, but in how the construction of knowledge enables them to understand and act effectively in society, referring us to Young's (2007) ideas about the construction of powerful knowledge.

In the interview conducted with the students' relatives, the questions aimed to obtain information about the interviewee regarding the age and family relationship with the children. Next, the questions sought to establish the proximity of the families to the school institution and their view of the school, because according to Thin (2006) part of the socializing logics are established from the relationships between the families and the school.

As the author points out, the family and school socializing logics sometimes come into conflict, constituting socializing practices organized and experienced in different ways, with a clash of greater or lesser intensity between the socializing logics of the family and the school, according to the school experiences of the family in relation to the school. Still in relation to the proximity of families to the school, Bourdieu (1998, p. 50) argues that "Cultural capital and *ethos*[5], when combined, contribute to define school behaviors and attitudes towards school", bringing us the question of how the cultural capital of families influences this proximity according to its adequacy to what the school defines as legitimate knowledge.

---

[5] The definition of *ethos* according to Bourdieu (1998, p.42) it refers to a "[...] an implicit and deeply internalized value system, which helps to define, among other things, attitudes towards cultural capital and the school institution."

Still regarding the interviewees, we understand that each one constitutes an individual on whom a reflection is developed, and that when we look at the family, as Sarti (2004) points out, it is possible to visualize this:

> [...] As a reality that is constituted by language, socially elaborated and internalized by individuals, the family becomes a privileged field to think about the relationship between the individual and the collective, therefore, between me and the other. (SARTI, 2004, p. 13)

The family and school environments constitute a promising field of observation of social interactions.

As for the number of interviewees based on Ludke & Andre's arguments about the universe studied, they point out that:

> [...] it is preferable to reduce the universe itself (and therefore the scope of the analysis) in order to ensure greater relevance and greater consistency of what is really important to highlight and deepen in the study in question (LUDKE & ANDRE, 1986, p. 54).

We understand that because this is a qualitative research, in which we seek to broadly understand the positions of the participants, we opted for a concise approach of a group that was not very extensive, but that had representatives of the different social spheres analyzed within the scope of the selected educational stage, since the reflection on each individual is aligned with our research questions. seeking in the group of interviewed participants to delineate social relations through their discourses.

With regard to the interview, according to the guidelines of the Research Ethics Committee, we guarantee the anonymity of the participants, since this procedure allows the interview process to have a greater breadth of information collection from the interviewee, as pointed out by Ludke & Andre, when they point out that:

> In the interview situation, this issue becomes particularly relevant, because the guarantee of anonymity can favor a more relaxed, more spontaneous relationship, and consequently the disclosure of data that may compromise the interviewee if his or her identity is not protected (LUDKE & ANDRE, 1998, p. 50).

To ensure the anonymity of the individuals surveyed to the family members, fictitious names were assigned, in Guarulhos Nair and Julia, refer to the families of the second-year students and Iara and Leda refer to the relatives of the third-year students. In São Paulo, we will treat the families of the second-year students as Tais and Bia; and Luis and Geni, the families of the third-year students.

5 WHAT FAMILIES TELL US

When we analyzed the answers of the interviewed family members, we found that the average age of the family members is 34 years, ranging from 23 to 44 years. In Guarulhos, half of the

interviewees live in rented residences, while in São Paulo only one of the residences is rented, and there is an indication of a different relationship with the place in the respective municipalities, as will be seen later. The length of time living in the area is also a factor to be analyzed: while in São Paulo most families do not spend more than five years in the neighborhood, in Guarulhos the minimum time of residence in the region is five years.

It is also possible to detect in the discourse of the family members interviewed in the city of São Paulo that, due to the installation of the school studied, the families that lived in the region where the school was installed, were relocated close to it, and such action was unconditional to the will of the people, but being related to political issues, since where the school was previously installed there was a land occupied by several families and with the arrival of the school this community was moved to the vicinity of this place, as we can see in the statement of the family member Tais, when asked about the changes in the neighborhood:

[...] when I arrived, there was no CEU, Taquara and Etec[6]; And it's changed quite a bit.

Analyzing the relationship that family members establish with the place, families in the city of São Paulo demonstrate that they establish a more assistentialist bond with it, in a chronic way related to the situation of vulnerability in which they find themselves. This fact is notorious in the discourse of these family members when asked about the reason for living in the neighborhood and whether they would like to live elsewhere. As we can see in the statements of the Tais relatives, when referring to the reason for living in the place:

[...] It's a neighborhood that's close to everything, close to the market, the hospital, it gives you access to everything.

And from the familiar Geni:

[...] It's good here, there's everything we need, school, hospital, bus.

We note that these are linked to the advantages that the place provides them, and there is no feeling of belonging to it, but rather a bond of dependence.

In Guarulhos, the families say they chose the place to settle because it presented possibilities for development. This placement allows us to approach Cavalcanti's (2013) considerations that when individuals settle in a place, they seek possibilities of social interactions that, in addition to enabling

---

[6] The CEU Taquara to which the interviewee refers is the Unified Educational Center in which the field school in São Paulo is located and received this name because it is on the banks of the Taquara River, which flows into the Tietê River. The referenced Etec is located next to the field school.

the formation of an individual space, provide the realization of a public space, which has multiple meanings for society by virtue of habits and customs, as well as a more stable housing condition.

As evidenced, in part, in the response of the family member Iara:

> My house is financed by Caixa, we have lived here for more than five years, we chose here because of the financing.

Demonstrating a deeper bond between the families of Guarulhos and the region, as we can see in the response of the family member Julia:

> I have been renting for five years and I chose this neighborhood because other family members are nearby and the rent is cheaper than where I lived before in downtown Guarulhos.

Still in the speech of this relative, when asked if she was thinking of moving, she pointed out that:

> [...] Yes, because the house is not mine, I intend to buy my house, but I really like this neighborhood, I want to move house, but continue here.

Since, these families understand this territory as being their conquered and established place, as we can see in the speech of the familiar Nair:

> [...] I have lived here for 15 years and despite the difficulties, I consider it a good neighborhood to live in.

Belonging to a place shows the level of social relations that an individual projects onto space, the deeper these relations take place, the more evident this belonging becomes. Valdés (2009), when dealing with this belonging, states that this feeling is a relevant factor to understand how social groups deal with the space they occupy.

When we asked the family members about the origins of their families, we found that the sample was predominantly descended from the northeastern region of Brazil. Among the families in the city of São Paulo, all said they came from the northeast region of the country. In the municipality of Guarulhos, in addition to an ancestry from the northeastern region of Brazil, the presence of immigrants from other countries appeared in the sample.

Analyzing how this movement is related to the schooling process, Algebaile, in rescuing a little of the history of how the expansion of basic education in Brazil took place, argues that:

> Throughout the history of the expansion of the basic educational offer in Brazil, one of its most important aspects concerns the fact that the expansion of access has brought to school segments of the population whose integration into the most modern nuclei of the country's social and economic life had not only taken place, but, to some extent, it was not effectively "foreseen" (ALGEBAILE, 2009, p. 146).

Taking due care with regard to generalizations, it is not that such a position reflects the reality of all the family members interviewed, but in a certain way, it is related to the brief life history described by them. Pointing out how the school comes to integrate the various population profiles under the same socializing logic.

Still analyzing how this process of schooling impacted the formation of Brazilian society, Algebaile analyzes that:

> The expansion of supply did not become, after a certain point, the accompaniment of population growth. It has persisted and updated itself as a saga of slow and precarious social insertion of "poorly integrated" segments of the population, whose profile has been partially redefined with each new economic and political conjuncture, but whose presence in the Brazilian societal formation is structural and far from having only residual weight (ALGEBAILE, 2009, p. 146).

Thus, based on the author's arguments, the questions about the role of the school as a socializing institution and how the school has dealt with the distances between the family and school socializing logics, in the face of the new social realities that are presented, are resumed.

In relation to the choice of school, the family members, in the midst of their arguments, present the issues of the proximity of the school to their homes and the quality of the school, which is clear in the discourses of the family members interviewed in both municipalities, as we can identify, for example, in Leda's statements:

> Because they tell me it's a good school and because it's close to my house.

And Geni:

> In the eyes of the family it is the best school in the neighborhood and it is close.

In Guarulhos, the quality of the school appears in the sampling as the main reason for choosing the institution, however, the issue of proximity predominates in the sampling of the city of São Paulo, which leads us to infer that the choice of the school institution is due to the ease of access, with a regionalization of the public served. Algebaile, when analyzing the expansion of access to schools, argues that:

> [...] the expansion of access to school is not limited to the increase in the supply of vacancies, but involves changes in the organization of this offer, which included, among other aspects, the forms of territorial distribution of vacancies (ALGEBAILE, 2009, p. 123).

This means that we are talking about a public policy referenced in the ordering of the territory, according to the grouping desired by the public power, that is, the sectorization of certain areas, aiming

at the supply of public services proportional to the demand of the place. When it comes to a policy of expanding the school offer, Algebaile brings us the following idea:

> The arrival of the school in the places "maintained a correlation with the demographic density and age of the geographical regions it reached" (Lima, 1983, p. 80). But this did not mean that the same type of school reached everywhere (ALGEBAILE, 2009, p. 126).

Thus, the school is constituted in this perspective, an extension of the State over a portion of the territory, ordered through a public policy of expansion and school access. Leading us to the question of which type of school is being accessible to which population.

Regarding the children's participation in school life, we sought to recognize what the families think of the pedagogical referrals offered by the school.

The family members indicate that the two main bonds established between the family and the school are the parent-teacher conferences and homework, as shown in the statement of the family member Nair, when asked if she attended the parents' meetings:

> I go whenever I can, I think it's very important to be present at the meetings, because I show interest in the study and monitoring of the child.

This argument is repeated in the discourses of the other interviewees, in which in their arguments they seem to use part of the time they spend with the children developing the activities that they bring to be performed at home, as we can see in the statement of the family member Bia, when we asked if she helped the child with any school task:

> In all of them, I try to help with some homework that my son has difficulty with.

Still in relation to the proximity of family members to the school, the parent-teacher meetings appear as the main bond, where the teacher establishes direct contact with the family members, who in turn see in such meetings the possibility of receiving an opinion regarding the children's performance in classroom learning. as well as knowing more details about the children's school behavior and social life, as we can detect in the argumentation of the family Tais:

> [...] What they address is very important both inside the school and outside the school, namely, the behavior in the classroom and if there are any doubts, we ask them at the time of the meeting.

The family members do not show that they know the pedagogical proposal of the school, as summarized in the statement of the family member Bia:

> No, I haven't actually participated in this school's teaching proposals yet.

As pointed out by several authors, among which we highlight the positions of Veiga (1995) and Paro (2012), the pedagogical proposal constitutes an important foundation of school democratic management, since such proposal constitutes a document elaborated in the school environment, provided for in the L.D.B. − Article 12, item I, of the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (Law 9394/96), provides that:

> [...] educational establishments, respecting the common norms and those of their education system, have the task of elaborating and implementing their pedagogical proposal (L.D.B. 1996).

In the pedagogical proposal, the educational objectives and action strategies are foreseen, in addition to guiding the functioning of the school, taking into account the diversity of its structures and functions, and this proposal is expressed through a pedagogical political project, which is configured in a guiding document regarding the functioning of the school.

Regarding the construction and importance of the pedagogical political project, Veiga argues that:

> [...] It must be built in the school and for the school, with the participation of all those involved in the educational process, management team, teachers, staff, parents and students. Therefore, the same is part of school planning and management. The main point of planning is to express the ability to transfer the planned to the action. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the Political Pedagogical Project to operationalize school planning in a constant movement of reflection, action and reflection (Veiga, 1995, p.13).

Still in relation to the construction of the pedagogical political project, taking into account approximations with school administration issues, Paro brings us the idea that:

> The proposition of objectives identified with social transformation and their effective achievement are two inseparable aspects of School Administration as a transformative practice, since it is the very organic link that must exist between theory and practice and the necessary mutual determination between idea and action (PARO, 2012, p. 209).

Rescuing what was pointed out by Veiga (1995) in relation to the construction of a project with the participation of all those involved in the educational process, Paro, when dealing with how such action is established in the face of a democratic management of the school, points out that:

> The "coordination" of the efforts of employees, teachers, technical-pedagogical staff, students and parents, based on collective participation, is extremely important in the installation of a democratic administration within the school (PARO, 2012, p. 212).

In view of these arguments, we can infer that the participation of family members in the elaboration of the pedagogical proposal is fundamental and that their knowledge is necessary for an effective participation in its elaboration and application, because, as Veiga (1995) points out, the main issue when we talk about planning is to put what was planned into practice. In the statements of the

family members, it is evident that they are unaware of the Pedagogical Political Project of the schools, pointing to a direction that goes in the opposite direction to what was idealized about it, thus hindering the effective transposition of planning into action.

Regarding the importance that family members attribute to school, what we noticed is a vision of preparation for the job market and a generation of greater possibilities of professional success, a discourse observed in both schools, as we can observe in the statements of the family members Leda:

> It is very important for her future, so that in the future she will become a quality professional.

Luis:

> [...] It is the path for your development, of your life as well as in study and work.

Geni:

> [...] It's important because it's a place to learn all things, for work and the future.

As well as the familiar Tais, saying that:

> [...] The education of the school, which is the basis of the child, his character and development, is the formation and learning of him, to be a successful person in the future at work.

However, the statements of two family members, one from Guarulhos and the other from São Paulo, present a variation, the family members Julia and Bia presented arguments in which there is a concern with the individual's education, without referring to a market-oriented education, as we see in their statements, Julia says that:

> The school is of great importance due to the construction of an individual full of knowledge, learning and interaction with the collective life and society. It is a foundation for the development of wanting to be what you want to be when you grow up, stimulating choices and improvements in your daily life.

The family member Bia argues that the school is:

> [...] Very important in everything, in teaching, in education, in knowing how to socialize with other schoolmates. School is essential in the social development of my son and all the other students as well.

A relevant point to be observed in the analysis of the statements of the interviewed family members is that all of them consider the school important, but a predominant concern with preparation for the job market predominates in the sample, when it does not appear as a space for social coexistence, as it appears in the statements of the interviewees Nair, attributing importance to the school:

[...], because he learns social and moral life.

And Iara, saying that:

School is important for a child's learning and social development.

It is also noteworthy that in the Guarulhos sample, social interaction appears in three of the four interviews, while in São Paulo only one family member touched on the issue of social interaction. This leads us to reflect on how the vision and expectations about the school process change according to the observer's point of view.

Still in the discourse of some family members of the children in the city of São Paulo, what appears with some frequency in their discourse is that when they are at school, the children stay away from the streets, as appears latently in the discourse of the family member Geni, when asked about the importance of school, she says:

[...] It is important because it is a place of learning all things, for work and the future, it leaves the child off the street.

Attributing to the school a function of physical and mental protection of the children in the face of the harsh social reality of the place they inhabit.

We can notice in the discourse of the interviewed family members that the school constitutes the most diverse functions, occupying in the above excerpt a place in the vision of this family member of a safe space, free from the harmful potentialities to which these families are exposed in their daily lives.

Equating the social function of the school, we note that it goes beyond the transmission of knowledge properly scholarly, it helps us to think about this expansion of the school spectrum, Algebaile when analyzing this expansion of the functions of the public school, proposes that:

The school in Brazil took place in an unforeseen way, "it flew off the wing". And even though this "flight" does not have the poetic dimension of the canoeist's flight, even if it refers to a melancholic panorama, it is still the creator of an original reality, defining the "unboundedness" of expansion as an axis of production of this school (ALGEBAILE, 2009, p. 148).

In an analysis based on this perspective of expanding the supply of public schools in Brazil and how this process took place, Libâneo (2012, p. 23) points to public schools as being "[...] characterized by its assistance and welcoming missions (included in the expression inclusive education) becomes a caricature of social inclusion."

Based on these positions, when we analyzed the statements of the interviewed family members, considering the ideas discussed by the authors about what constitutes the public school. We observe a

school that goes beyond teaching, which is inserted in the social life of families in different ways, constituting a space for the implementation of public policies, as Silva (2014, p. 4) adds, "The social function of the school institution, to mediate the processes related to human development, has been delineated to a large extent by public policies of various natures." Impacting such policies on the construction of knowledge and on the place socially constructed by the school in the face of the reality of these families**.**

6 INTERIM CONCLUSIONS

The families interviewed demonstrate a clear sense of belonging to the place, however, this feeling occurs in a very different way in the schools of the municipalities surveyed.

While in São Paulo the bond with the place seems to be more linked to the product of an absence of options and opportunities, in Guarulhos this bond seems deeper, since the families who settled there did so in search of a definitive place to consider as their own, regardless of welfare ties arising from a situation of vulnerability. as we can see when comparing the discourses of family members from São Paulo and Guarulhos, since, while those from the capital of São Paulo point to palliative assistance works and aid scholarships as the main reason for living there, in Guarulhos the main argument is that they were born there and intend to remain there, being close to their families, and it is evident in their speeches that they have established roots in the place, understanding this not only in the condition of providing them with something, but where families can build their place, just as it builds them, in a mutual relationship integrating individuals and the place in which they live.

In both cities, families see in the school the possibility of both social and economic change, with the majority of the interviewees seeing the school institution as a preparation for the job market. We noticed that in the discourses the school was pointed out as a place of physical and mental protection of the children, constituting a safe space for coexistence.

Still in relation to the school, the family members describe in their speeches a participation in the accomplishment of homework and an attendance at parent-teacher meetings, referring us to school learning processes that develop in the family environment, which leads us to how families enter school and providing an indication of one of the ways in which the family is inserted in the learning processes.

This research allowed us to understand one side of the spectrum of how the territory is inserted in the teaching and learning processes, enabling us to understand some of the relationships that individuals establish with the place, considering the interaction between families and the school.

REFERENCES

ALGEBAILE, Eveline. Escola pública e pobreza no Brasil: a ampliação para menos. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, Faperj, 2009.

ANDRÉ, M. O cotidiano escolar, um campo de estudo. In: PLACCO, V. M. N. S.; ALMEIDA, L. R. O coordenador pedagógico e o cotidiano da escola. São Paulo: Loyola, 2003.

BARBOSA, Maria Carmen Silveira. Culturas escolares, culturas de infância e culturas familiares: As socializações e a escolarização no entretecer destas culturas. *Educ. Soc.*, Campinas, vol. 28, n. 100 - Especial, p. 1059-1083, out. 2007.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. Razões praticas: Sobre a Teoria da ação. Tradução: Mariza Correa. Campinas, SP: Papirus. 1996.

Escritos de Educação. In: NOGUEIRA, Maria Alice e CATANI, Afranio.(orgs). Coleção Ciências Sociais da Educação. 9º ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1998.

A Distinção: critica social do julgamento. Tradução Daniela Kern; Guilherme. F. Teixeira. M. Titulo original: La Distinction: critique sociale du jugement. Paris, Col. "Le Sens Commun". São Paulo: Edusp. Porto Alegre, RS: Zouk, 2007.

BRASIL. Lei 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. *Diário Oficial da União*. Brasília, DF, v. 134, n. 248, p. 27833-841, 23 dez. 1996.

CAVALCANTI, Lana de Souza. Cotidiano, mediação pedagógica e formação de conceitos: Uma contribuição de Vigotsky ao ensino de Geografia. Cad. Cedes, Campinas, vol. 25, n. 66, p. 185-207, maio/ago. 2005.

IBGE. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. Dados Demográficos e Censitários. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE, 2010.

Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. Produto Interno Bruto dos Municípios 2012. Contas Nacionais, n. 43. Diretoria de Pesquisas. Coordenação de Contas Nacionais. Rio de Janeiro, 2014.

Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. AZEVEDO, Eurico de Andrade. Instituição de Regiões Metropolitanas no Brasil, *Revista Brasileira dos Municípios*. vol. 20, n.79, p.121-200, jul/dez. Rio de Janeiro, 1967.

KAZTMAN, R. Notas sobre la medición de la vulnerabilidad social. Borrador para discusión. 5 Taller regional, la medición de la pobreza, métodos e aplicaciones. México: BID – BIRF - CEPAL, 2000.

LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. O dualismo perverso da escola pública brasileira: escola do conhecimento para os ricos, escola do acolhimento social para os pobres. Universidade Federal de Goiás. *Educação e Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v. 38, n. 1, p. 13-28, 2012.

LÓPEZ, N. A escola e o bairro. Reflexões sobre o caráter territorial dos processos educacionais nas cidades. In: RIBEIRO, L.C.Q.; KAZTMAN, R. A cidade contra a escola. Rio de Janeiro. Letra Capital. 2008.

LUDKE, M. ANDRE, M. E. D. A. Pesquisa em Educação: Abordagens Qualitativas. São Paulo, SP. EPU, 1986.

LURIA, A. R. Diferenças Culturais de Pensamento. Linguagem , Desenvolvimento e Aprendizagem. Tradução de Maria da Pena Villalobos. – 11ª edição – São Paulo: Ícone, 2010. Página 39 - 58.

MANZINI, E. J. Pesquisa semi-estruturada: análise de objetivos e de roteiros. In. Seminário Internacional sobre Pesquisa e Estudos Qualitativos. Bauru, USC. 2004.

MARTINS, Edna; SZYMANSKI, Heloisa. Brincadeira e Práticas Educativas Familiares: Um Estudo com Famílias de Baixa Renda. *INTERAÇÕES*. VOL. XI, n. 21, p. 143-164. JAN-JUN 2006.

NÓVOA, António. Pesquisa em Educação como Processo Dinâmico, Aberto e Imaginativo: uma entrevista com António Nóvoa. *Educação e Realidade*, Porto Alegre, v. 36, n. 2, p. 533-543, maio/ago. 2011. Disponível em: <http://www.ufrgs.br/edu_realidade>

PARO, Vitor Henrique. Administração escolar: introdução critica. 17 ed. verificada e ampliada. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

PREFEITURA MUNICIPAL DE GUARULHOS. Desenvolvimento Econômico de Guarulhos. Guarulhos: PMG, 2006.

PREFEITURA MUNICIPAL DE SÃO PAULO. Secretaria Municipal de Desenvolvimento Urbano/SMDU - Departamento de Estatística e Produção de informação: População Recenseada, Projetada, Taxas de Crescimento Populacional e Densidade Demográfica, consultado em 15/11/2014.

SANTOS, Douglas. O Ensino da Geografia e o direito à escola e ao conhecimento. São Paulo, 2016.

SARTI, C. A. A Família como ordem simbólica. Psicologia USP, 2004, 15(3), 11-28.

SEADE, Fundação Sistema Estadual de Análise de Dados. Índice Paulista de Vulnerabilidade Social – IPVS, São Paulo, 2016.

SILVA, J. L. B.. Estudos Geográficos da Escola Publica e dos Processos de Ensino Aprendizagem: o exemplo do Bairro dos Pimentas, município de Guarulhos na Região Metropolitana de São Paulo. XIII Coloquio Internacional de Geocrítica. El control del espacio y los espacios de control, Barcelona, 5-10 de maio de 2014.

SILVA, Hamilton Harley de Carvalho; BATISTA, Antônio Augusto Gomes; ALVES, Luciana. A escola e famílias de territórios metropolitanos de alta vulnerabilidade social: práticas educativas de mães "protagonistas." *Revista Brasileira de Educação* v. 19 n. 56 jan.-mar. 2014.

SCHNEIDER, Sergio; SCHIMITT, Cláudia Job. O uso do método comparativo nas Ciências Sociais. Cadernos de Sociologia, Porto Alegre, v. 9, p. 49-87, 1998.

SZYMANSKI, Heloisa. A relação família/escola: desafios e perspectivas. 2. ed. Brasília: Liber livro, 2009.

THIN, Daniel. Para uma análise das relações entre famílias populares e escola: confrontação entre lógicas socializadoras. *Revista Brasileira de Educação,* v. 11, n. 32, p. 211-225, mai. ago. 2006.

THOMPSON, Paul. História oral e contemporaneidade. Tradução de Andréa Zhouri e Lígia Maria Leite Pereira. História Oral, vol.5, Belo Horizonte, 2002, p. 9-28.

VEIGA, Ilma Passos Alencar. Projeto – Político – Pedagógico da Escola: uma Construção Coletiva. Projeto Político da Escola: uma construção possível / Campinas, São Paulo: Papirus, 1995.

VIGOTSKY, L. S. A Formação Social da Mente. 4. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes. 1991.

YOUNG, Michael. Para que servem as escolas. Educação e Sociedade, Campinas, vol. 28, n. 101, p. 1287-1302, set./dez. 2007.