


**STUDENT TRAJECTORIES OF THE PEDAGOGY COURSE: EXPERIENCES
AND EXPERIENCES OF LGBTQIAPN+ STUDENTS** <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2025.019-025>**Carlos Eduardo da Cunha Pereira¹ and Adan Renê Pereira da Silva²****ABSTRACT**

The trajectories of the undergraduate course for LGBTQIAPN+ subjects are still full of challenges. The present research focuses on one of these places of training, the Degree in Pedagogy of the Federal University of Amazonas. The objective is to understand how students interpret the experience in the course, focusing on the LGBTQIAPN+ identities they have. To this end, qualitative research was undertaken, with five participants chosen by the criterion of purposeful sampling, explaining about the aforementioned trajectories, through the focus group methodology. The results point to violence suffered by students of the course, who, between the absence of initial and continuing education, feel the reproduction of prejudices and do not have equitable treatment by professors of the University and the schools they attend in the field of practice, in addition to not having their demands understood by undergraduate professionals, considered fundamental for training in the aegis of human rights. That said, it is hoped that the study presented here can provide subsidies for social transformation, with investment in protective factors that combat the vulnerabilities to which students are subjected, which may even lead to school dropout.

Keywords: Inclusion. Sexual and gender diversity. Equity. Pedagogy.

¹Academic of the Pedagogy Course at the Federal University of Amazonas. Scientific Initiation Project scholarship also for the Pedagogy course at CNPq.

²Permanent Professor of the Graduate Program in Society and Culture in the Amazon (PPGSCA) and Postdoctoral Fellow in Sociology. Adjunct Professor at the Faculty of Education of the Department of Theories and Foundations of Education (DTF/FACED). Advisor. Dr. in Education. All degrees and performances are from the Federal University of Amazonas (UFAM).



INTRODUCTION

This work is based on an intersectional reading of oppressions in a colonized country like Brazil. The idea that the aforementioned colonization is over does not find support in the scientific literature and in the social inequalities originated from the concentration of income, capitalism and colonization, even bordering on any defense of an alleged "equality", denialism and *fake news*. Racialized people, LGBTQIAPN+, women, especially black women, suffer the most diverse denials and violations of rights in social spaces. Freedom cannot be conceived other than as a constant struggle, as Angela Davis (2011) argues. Let us develop an example. Lélia González (2022), when reflecting on the (non) access to education by black and brown people, points out that:

Another dimension of racial inequalities is constituted by access to the educational system and schooling opportunities. Considering people aged five years and over on the reference date, the proportion of literate non-whites (40%) is almost double that of whites (22%). The degree of educational inequality experienced by blacks and browns increases rapidly when the highest levels of education are considered. The white group has a 1.55 times greater chance than non-whites of completing between five and eight years of schooling and a 3.5 times greater chance of attending nine or more years of schooling (Gonzalez, 2022, p. 115).

This debate helps to think about how the production of school failure is a project of subordination and pauperization of blacks and other social minorities, considering that the intersections between race, class, gender and territorialities are powerful in the production of oppression and exploitation. If the Marxist theoretical elaboration has very properly pointed to the division of classes throughout history, intersectionality highlights that the working class is not a homogeneous bloc. Far from disputing "who is more oppressed", it is understood that it is important to scrutinize the differences in order to understand their specificities and better combat the inequalities that become violence. Or does a white man, who is directly affected by exploitation at work, suffer from the same violations of rights as a trans, black, poor woman who will suffer transphobic offenses after a tiring day at work, if she manages to be employed?

These propaedeutic aspects are indispensable for us to be able to think about science with social commitment, helping the Pedagogy course at the Federal University of Amazonas, the object of study here, to strengthen its LGBTQIAPN+ students, so that they continue in the course without dropout, after all, if education is not the panacea of the world, neither can it be despised in its potentialities. Currently, the Degree in Pedagogy course has, according to 2024 data, 588 students, 277 in the morning shift and 281 in the afternoon shift. No information was found on self-declarations in the field of sexuality and gender.

That said, the present research asks: how do LGBTQIAPN+ students (who exist in the course with their gender identities and varied sexual orientations) understand their schooling trajectories in the Pedagogy course at the Federal University of Amazonas? To answer the guiding question, the objective was to understand how the participants conducted the debate from the perspective of a focus group.

The students were invited by the authors of this text through an active search, and the main inclusion criterion was to feel comfortable to participate in the study, which is part of a scientific initiation research with pecuniary resources from CNPq. From this active search, five students were willing to collaborate with the enterprise: a heterosexual transsexual student, a bisexual cisgender student, a lesbian cisgender scholar, and two gay cisgender students. All of them preferred anonymity, which is why they were treated by pseudonyms and without providing further information about the period of the course in which they were enrolled, ages or any other elements that could result in identification. In fact, this is already an important first fact: why, within the academic environment, do students prefer not to be identified? Can one conjecture a possible fear of reprisals?

The group was led by the academic who is one of the authors of the research, so that no one would feel embarrassed by the presence of the advisor professor. In general, the axes for debate revolved around what the course represents, the reason for having chosen Pedagogy, how future teachers deal with diversity issues and the main challenges and perspectives of training from the beginning to the current moment of the degree.

Another reason that led the researchers to opt for the focus group was the possibility of collective exchange, of sharing anguish, of ventilating hopes because it is perceived that suffering is not isolated or private, but socially constructed. When taken to the collective, there is an instillation of welcome and support networks can be powerful alternatives. By perceiving themselves as victims of violence – which can be discovered in these situations of dialogue – the students mobilize to strengthen themselves in the group, fighting the technician and neoliberal teaching reigning in the university, which places on the subjects responsibilities that are not a lack of competence or "merit", which might not be possible to verify if we worked with individual interviews.

Tradi I (2009) highlights that the focus group helps to focus research and formulate more precise research questions, subsidize the elaboration of research instruments, with depth and participant observation, guiding the researcher to a field of investigation and to the local language, evaluating a service or program and developing research hypotheses for other studies. One of the most important steps is to establish the purpose of the session.



In our case, the purpose was to reflect on the trajectories within the Pedagogy course according to the specificities of the LGBTQIAPN+ population.

As resources, a field notebook was used for notes of significant speeches and impressions, a recorder for later transcription of the speeches, in addition to the reservation of a classroom only for the group, so that no noise or interference in communication would hinder the progress of the research. The focus group lasted an average of two hours, and was conducted by one of the researchers, openly LGBTQIAPN+, which facilitated the adequate establishment of *rapport*.

Regarding the points of debate, the three main ones ended up expanding, as the students felt at ease: the meaning of the Pedagogy course for the interviewees, challenges for the permanence of the course, preparation or lack of preparation on the part of the teachers and the support group with the other classmates could be debated articulating reason and affectivity. Because they were academics from various periods, it was perceived that the different experiences catalyzed the debate. Ethically, the research was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Federal University of Amazonas, CAAE: 64651822.2.0000.5020, and all participants signed the Informed Consent Form, consenting to experience the focus group.

GETTING TO KNOW THE NOT-SO-KNOWN "DIVERSITY": THE DEGREE IN PEDAGOGY AT THE FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF AMAZONAS

In a work that deals with the historical paths of the construction of the Faculty of Education of the Federal University of Amazonas, Cavalcanti (2022) highlights that there has been, over the years, an expansion of gender debates, with the formation of the "Work, Education and Diversity" nucleus. One of the axes is "gender as a category of analysis". Nevertheless, in the statements from the focus group, the lack of knowledge of this axis prevails, perhaps because a discussion about the category of woman stood out. But which woman is being talked about? The "universal" woman? White, middle class, heterosexual and cisgender? Given the lack of knowledge of the focus group participants during the debate, it is believed that the question is pertinent. We agree with Luciano *et al* (2022), for whom a possible way out of this impasse – ignorance or even non-identification – would be to overcome and break with certain internal mechanisms, with emphasis on excessive bureaucracy that generates conflicts, impasses, lack of planned information, and wear and tear between different times, processes, and internal negotiations. It is necessary to have an attitude of humility, openness to the new and academic self-criticism with regard to

content and methodologies in the face of bureaucratic processes. It is thus hypothesized that the categories of gender and sexual diversity could be more pluralized and welcoming.

In addition, it should be remembered that the historical construction of science was made by divisions. Body-mind, reason-emotion, intellect-affect are the results of a positivist predominance that saw in human beings machines that could be explained by laboratory studies with animals, as well exemplified by behaviorist experiments (Bock *et al*, 2002). As a counterpoint, bell hooks (2021) highlights the difficulty of talking about love as a way to access people. According to her, when explaining this feeling to men and women of her generation, hooks discovered that they were scared or nervous, especially when the author commented that she didn't feel loved enough. Terrified, with a certain phobic feeling, they advised bell hooks to seek therapy.

We chose not to theoretically reflect on this text based on statistics. Data from Antra – National Association of Transvestites and Transsexuals (2023) and the Gay Group of Bahia (2023) do not present news: Brazil continues to be the country that kills the most of its LGBTQIAPN+ populations, especially transvestites and transsexuals. By refusing to call students by their social name or prohibiting the use of the bathroom according to gender identity, there is no school dropout: there is, rather, expulsion from educational environments. The school is hostile, the university is hostile to these groups. If these data are initially shocking, it seems that they are soon lost in everyday life. We need to talk about love that is expressed in different ways: in friendship, in relationships, in empathy, in looking with genuine respect for the differences that constitute us. The members of the focus group did not tire of signaling this painful absence: the Faculty of Pedagogy is described as "cold".

It is understood that researchers, when dealing with the theme of LGBTQIAPN+ trajectories at the university, choose to bring productions that focus exclusively on this universe, that is, scrutinizing authors who debate solely from the perspective of sexual and gender diversity. Nevertheless, agreeing with Angela Davis (2011), for whom freedom is a constant struggle, it is understood that we need to bring several strategies to combat oppression, after all, no one will be free as long as everyone is not. To justify the above, Carla Akotirene's (2019, p. 19) reflection on intersectionality as a useful theoretical-conceptual instrument to reflect on the various oppressions of a capitalist, colonial, and patriarchal society is presented:

It arises from the black feminist critique [the intersectionality] of the anti-discrimination laws subscribed to the victims of patriarchal racism. As a concept of critical race theory, it was coined by the African-American intellectual Kimberlé Crenshaw, but after the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Forms of Intolerance, in Durban, South Africa, in 2001, it gained academic popularity, moving from the originally proposed meaning to the



dangers of emptying. Intersectionality aims to give theoretical-methodological instrumentality to the structural inseparability of racism, capitalism, and cisheteropatriarchy – producers of identity avenues in which black women are repeatedly affected by the intersection and overlapping of gender, race, and class, modern colonial apparatuses.

As can be inferred from the articulation between capitalist, colonialist, patriarchal, racist and LGBTQIAPN+phobic society, the "top" of the social pyramid does not include everyone. The base is wide, the top is not. Thus, still following Angela Davis (2011), the ideal would be to extinguish social hierarchies, so that isonomy would be a reality.

From Louro's (2013) perspective, if compulsory cis-heteronormativity were not a colonial reality, the discussion about gender and sexuality would be something discussed in everyday life, understood away from moral panics. However, it would be necessary to create the habit of undoing the taboo of the theme anchored in Judeo-Christian fundamentalist readings. This type of activity – frank, open debate – can be a way to start education with classes and within universities. Louro (2013), for example, explains that works with clay can make visible the plurality of bodies, as well as myths and cultural representations related to the bodies of men and women. The findings of family differences in the naming of the penis and vulva should favor the understanding of cultural plurality. A climate of respect and mutual help between boys and girls in the work of pairs that does not emphasize gender binarisms should also be encouraged. Anticipating body knowledge is excellent for working with puberty, which even many boys and girls are experiencing when they enter university.

Throughout this writing, black authors, women who research gender and sexuality in education, and theorists of intersectionality lead us to think about the intertwining between oppressions and how focusing only on school violence lacks greater complexity. Clóvis Moura (2003) explains about a "fear syndrome", in which the psychological wear and tear of oppression creates a state of permanent panic, as well illustrated by examples of the recent history of *fake news* of "cock bottle" (used in the presidential campaign that elected Jair Bolsonaro) or of an unreal "gender ideology" potentiated by the "School without Party Movement" (catapulting the conquest of positions in the Legislature and deepening the setback in the field of rights humans). For Moura (2023), the obsession with violence leads persecutors to a true "neurotic state", a "paranoia" of blacks against whites, religious fundamentalists against LGBTQIAPN+, men against women.

Intersectionality, for Connel and Pearse (2015), adds what has been separated: talking disassociatively about gender or race is not enough to densify the experiences of silencing and invisibilization in such an unequal and violent society, given that they interact

with each other. From the position in which we write, in the Amazon, the territory itself is fundamental, given the knowledge of blacks, indigenous, quilombolas, riverside dwellers, who have transformed the "body-territory" into a memory of ancestry.

He remembers a lecture by Professor Danielle Munduruku, experienced during the Pedagogy Week at the Federal University of Amazonas. In her explanation, the professor was emphatic in explaining that the idea of a "body-memory" is not a metaphor. During menarche, her mother advised Danielle to collect the menstrual fluid in a gourd. Once this was done, the matriarch presented her daughter with a plant, rue, and advised: "water it with the water you harvested. If the rue gets sick, its uterus may have gotten sick too." This shows that the dichotomies already presented here do not hold up from the perspective of cultures fighting against colonization. Human beings, plants, animals are one. And this is revolutionary, countercolonial, to use the term of Antônio Bispo dos Santos (2024). In fact, entangling indigenous thought with the quilombola, one can think with Santos (2024) that exploring the systemic struggle needs to lead us to see other forms of life without the crossing of racism. Nêgo Bispo explains that there is a lot of talk about racism, however, only within the human species. The breadth of the question is lost:

[...] Just think of the varieties of fish we had at that time [referring to another moment in the community] and how many we have today. Today, when we talk about fish, we talk about tambaqui and tilapia. The other fish, which are not bred in captivity, are no longer considered fish in some places. When you offer a freshwater fish, caught by hand, people don't want it. They only want tambaqui or tilapia, fish that have been synthesized. If you offer purple banana or plantain, people don't want it, they just want pacovan or silver. Fruits are reduced to one or two types. Racism happens against all lives. Against the fruit and fish races, and also against wild animals, which have been decreasing (Santos, 2024, p. 81-82).

The use of "racism" to deal with the predatory exploitation of human beings in the environment causes some discomfort. We understand that the author is probably pointing out the problem of speciesism, the separation that human beings have made with nature. Caveats aside, the fact is that the criticism, keeping the due proportions, is valid in the sense that colonization really conditions the palate and standardizes tastes that gain airs of "nature", even if they do not withstand a deep analysis that highlights the Eurocentrism that abundantly built the patterns that spread throughout the "exotic" world.

Clóvis Moura (2016) points out that Brazil inherited the patriarchal family structure from Portugal and the price of this inheritance was paid by black women, not only during slavery. Even today, the black woman, because of her condition of poverty, lack of social status and total helplessness, remains the easy victim, vulnerable to any sexual aggression by the white. Thinking intersectionally, it is not surprising that trans women and transvestites are also vilified. How to get jobs in the job market, if the school refuses to call them by their

social name and give access to bathrooms according to gender identities? How can we achieve dignified workspaces if the few trans people who enter university are kept in the cycle of colonial violence against their "dissident" bodies? If they are trans women, black, poor, without the so-called "passability", is it a question of dropping out of school or expulsion from a cis-heterocentric school? In order to try to answer this question, we agree with Minayo (2014), for whom sociologists of science need to carry out investigations with clear, strategic social objectives, aimed at better understanding problems, improving services, evaluating social intervention programs and others. In other words, in addition to producing socially referenced knowledge, it is also necessary to transform reality.

In fact, the systematic prejudice against LGBTQIAPN+ populations also in the university environment comes from the set of segregationist and material ideological bases that (feed back) failure and maintain certain social functions to demarcate who succeeds and who should "give up" (psychologizing social problems). One of the ideological instruments used in the educational system to classify the performance of subjects and make inequality invisible is the school curriculum. This instrument is fundamental to define the subjects that one wants to form and the ideology that one wants to maintain and build (Cavalcanti *et al*, 2023). I remember the words of the transvestite academic Maria Clara Araújo dos Passos (2021), when she felt out of place in a university that claimed "there was no demand for a social name", which she would use, to the detriment of the "dead name". How to stay in a place like this?

From the perspective of teachers, there is a feeling of "harassment". Without continuing education, many believe in the existence of a "gender ideology" and go out spreading moral panic among students and families. The gender and sexuality agenda remains incipient. Teachers interviewed give a glimpse of good will in their practices, however, the scenario does not seem to be the most favorable. Teachers encounter resistance to implement the content of the training on the inclusion of sexual and gender diversity as part of the teaching practice. There seems to be the purchase of the discourse of "moral panic" of what conservative sectors call "gender ideology". The data obtained point to multiple variables involved, such as religious issues in two biases: both the faith that teachers profess, and that of the students' families (Silva, Mascarenhas; 2021).

It is understood that it is important to reflect on the crises that take place in a context of such fierce and fierce disputes. The subjects feel lost: while members of dissident genders and sexualities pay, often with their lives, for the lack of care. In this sense, the words of Louro (2015, p. 29) are precise:



School, curricula, educators cannot situate themselves outside this history [of the debates on gender and sexuality]. They are almost always perplexed, challenged by questions to which they seemed to have, until recently, safe and stable answers. Now, certainties escape, models are shown to be useless, formulas are inoperative. But it is impossible to stop the issues. There is no way to ignore the "new" practices, the "new" subjects, their contestations to the established. The normalizing vocation of Education is threatened. The yearning for the canon and reliable goals is shaken. The immediatist and practical tradition leads to the question: what to do? The apparent urgency of the questions does not allow any answer to be anticipated; First, it is necessary to know the conditions that enabled the emergence of these subjects and these practices.

It is not too much to emphasize the resistance of teachers to work with the theme. In research by Neves and Silva (2015), the researchers point out teacher discourses that recognize the existence of sexual diversity in an educational context. They agree that they need to work on the issue, regardless of what they think. However, by verbalizing that they do not agree with the theme – consequently, would they not also agree that LGBTQIAPN+ people have the right to exist with dignity? -, the subjective process of not complying with the educational legislation that requires such transversal content, since they are present in the educational regulations, is always present. Thus, the antagonistic feeling of contradiction of what teachers think, what they think they need to say and what (not) to do is characterized. Is it possible for education to work in the midst of so many obstacles?

In general, we have witnessed the impacts that debates on gender and sexual diversity have caused in formal education environments. For many, especially in common sense discourses, people tend to interpret work as "gender ideology", "bar forcing", "homosexualizing children" (Silva; Mascarenhas, 2021). However, with each new statistic brought by groups such as Antra and the Gay Group of Bahia, it is clear that time is running out. It is necessary to resume ethics and respect for people in their specificities. And, to combat prejudice, it is necessary to give a name to oppressions. Deaths, violence, isolation, homophobia, *bullying* remain gigantic challenges for a public, free, universal education that brings a plurality of ideas, as required by article 205 et seq. of the Federal Constitution (Brasil, 1988).

"I FEEL LIKE I DON'T EXIST. AND I PREFER TO CONTINUE LIKE THIS. I FEEL ASHAMED WHEN I'M WITHOUT A MASK AND PEOPLE SMILE AT MY 'CHAYOTE'"

To begin the debate held in the focus group, we would like to highlight the initial moment that triggered the discussions. One of the participants, a trans woman, arrived in the room with an N95 mask. When asked if she had the flu, the answer was surprising: "no, I came with this mask because I didn't have time to shave. I feel ashamed when I'm without a mask and people smile at my "chayote". "Chuchu" is a pajubá term used as a synonym

for beard. Although painful, it cannot be denied that the sincere outburst had a positive effect on the group. Everyone felt part of a life enclosed by prejudice and empathy was automatically installed among those present.

The central points presented in the focus group will be presented in three axes: 1. Expectations and realities of the Pedagogy course; 2. Experiences as people with dissident sexuality/gender and 3. Violence and reactions to rights violations in education. The code names will be presented in order to maintain the requested anonymity: Rosa (trans student), Girassol (bisexual student), Cravo (lesbian student), Chrysanthemum (gay student) and Comigo Nobody Can (gay student). The focus group was held on November 27, in one of the classrooms of the Faculty of Education of the Federal University of Amazonas.

Flor was the student who entered the room with the N95 mask. As he was already taking the floor, the space was arranged in a circle to facilitate face-to-face interaction. We took advantage of the fact that she was already talking about the discomfort with transphobia, and we entered the first topic for debate - expectations and realities of the Pedagogy course:

Yes, for me, Pedagogy is a way to make a difference, I don't know. I want to be a teacher to, you know, show children and adolescents that they have a different way of loving, that they have a different way of being, that the world is far beyond now, here. Because, look, we, as LGBTQIA+ people, have already suffered so much for not having positive representation, right? So I think I can be that reference that I didn't have. When I was at school, it was very difficult, people already referred to lesbians as the "macho woman", a horrible thing I heard from a teacher. Already understanding myself as trans and without many people to explain to me if a trans person could be a lesbian, there was that feeling of maladjustment in the world: do I exist? Who am I? A monster? Is this space mine? Is it for me?

When Flor brings this concern, the person responsible for conducting the focus group welcomes the affective demand, which is promptly followed by the other members. At the supervisory meeting, one of the points of debate was about how the "provocation" of prejudiced people is a potent strategy to generate inadequacies in sex-gender-dissident people. Flor verbalizes this emphatically, and the question asked: "do I exist? Who am I? A monster? Is this space mine?".

A first point to be ventilated is that, according to Fávero and Abrão (2006), the discourses conveyed in a given culture organize rational strategies through which we exercise our judgments and position ourselves before the world. When Flor feels comfortable talking to her peers, she remembers the classic speech from Sojourner Truth: "and I'm not a woman?" (Nascimento, 2022), which provokes listeners to give an answer to such a mobilizing pain. And she, Flor, can't be a teacher?

Flor's questions refer to the research of Luma Andrade (2015). Studying transvestite women in school contexts, the researcher uses the term "involuntary evasion". In the book, transphobia was pointed out as a problem experienced by all the transvestites investigated, reproducing a disciplinary framework of cis-heteronormativity. Therefore, the absence of transvestites in school is not surprising, for some reasons listed by Andrade (2015): impediment of access to the women's bathroom, non-recognition of the transvestite's female name in attendance and at other times of school daily life, lack of training for the school community on diversity in education, especially with regard to transvestites. The colonization of bodies is maintained through watertight binarisms between "man" and "woman".

Flor's speech also scrutinizes the insufficiency of thinking about people only from the perspective of class. In the case of the participant, gender is the main social marker. Louro (2014) reflects the issue with perspicacity. For her, understanding the effects of the various social markers requires a review of one of the most common ideas in critical social theories, that is, that there is a central, fundamental category – in general, social class – that would be the basis for understanding all social contradictions. If we accept that subjects are constructed in multiple identities, or if we affirm that identities are always partial, not unitary, we will find it difficult to point out a universal explanatory identity. Different situations mobilize subjects and groups in different ways, provoking alliances and conflicts that are not always capable of being understood from a single central motive, such as class antagonism.

Girassol takes advantage of Flor's speech to report situations of biphobia in the Pedagogy course. He reports the case of a teacher who, "in a joking tone" (sic), asked when his indecision would pass: "I always see you with women, what is this bisexuality?" Although Sunflower smiled, the effects were ominous. Thanks to biphobia, he felt vehemently embarrassed in front of the class and, in front of the collective laughter, he never commented to anyone about his bisexuality again.

Flor feels comfortable talking to her peers, but perhaps she did not feel that way with teachers, probably for the same reason as Girassol. In this case, both gender and sexual orientation stand out and need to be ethically, legally and scientifically debated.

After the intervention of the researcher responsible for conducting the focus group, a thoughtful student was noticed closer to the corner of the room. In a delicate way, she asked if he would like to say something. He was Chrysanthemum, a homosexual student who exposed that he had already felt like Flor, albeit in a more subtle way, because he was read as someone "discreet". The speech turns back to violence:

[...] I'm just listening to your report there... I kept thinking and the only thing that came to me was the cliché phrase in my head that, for me, Pedagogy represents the possibility of changing the world. I believe that, as educators, we have a responsibility to show that there is plurality in life and that respect is essential for the development of children and especially young people, which is where *bullying* starts with everything. But listening to Flor's speech, we are very violated. Parents look at us suspiciously, thinking we are a bad influence, evangelical teachers try to convert us. And then I ask you here in the room: do we need to suffer these types of violence? Because I'm not going to report it, I'm sure the professors of the course will be against me and I don't want to give up the course, it's the only chance I have to get a job in the future.

In the intersubjectivities between trans student, bisexual student and homosexual student, a common point: discredit, fear, silencing as an (lack of) alternative. In an essentialist view, people are judged by their genders and sexual orientations, which say nothing about the technical and human knowledge of students. An interesting point is the positive nods that take over the room: everyone agrees, as if to say that reality is general, to the extent of its specificities. In this sense, the group moderator demonstrated fundamental preparation, as he had sensitivity and common sense to lead the group in order to keep the focus on the interests of the study, without denying the participants the possibility of expressing themselves spontaneously (Trad I, 2009). An example of this was when, upon realizing that the entire group would cry, the moderator argued: "Oh friends, I love you! Thank you so much for supporting me, and I'm sorry for what you've experienced both inside and outside the university!"

At this moment, when treating everyone in the feminine, the laughter infected the team and "broke" what could be a hindrance for the focus group to continue developing. As one of the agreements was that each participant spoke without interrupting the other colleagues, the sequence pointed out here was fortunate to be done in an organized way. In the Amazonian context in which the focus group was held, a guideline for indigenous research could be put into effect here: sharing.

To explain better, for Smith (2018), sharing is a research responsibility. The technical term for this is the dissemination of results, which is often too boring, too technical, and too cold for non-researchers. For indigenous scientists, sharing refers to demystifying knowledge and information by speaking in simple terms to the community. The community meetings provide a very intimidating forum in which to talk about research. Oral presentations are adapted to cultural protocols and expectations. Generally, the audience needs to get emotionally involved with issues such as deep reflection, sadness, anger, challenges, and debates. A qualified speaker is one who can share openly, at that level, within the community rules.

When preparing for the focus group, this reading was one of the keys for us to not only put the participants at ease, but also to enhance a way of dissipating barriers arising from internalized homophobia. As can be seen in the next excerpt, Comigo Ninguém Pode (With Me No One Can Do It) felt mobilized, since, unlike Chrysanthemum, he was read as an "effeminate" student. We are in the second axis, the violence experienced by members with dissident sexualities:

Yes, there's this thing of invisibility. And I also think that the comments, even those that seem "joking", weigh a lot. Like, some jokes that sometimes people think are good, but for us they hurt. Even more so for those who had a horrible time at school. But with the support of friends, we take it. But then to say that it is easy, it is a great abyss. One day, while I was on the internship, a father arrived with a Bible and a student. He whispered something while looking at me and left. The activities continued. The student, during the break, came to me. He asked: "uncle, why do you like to wear loose shirts, similar to a dress?". In fact, they were African gowns. I just said that it's because I like it. He continued: "Uncle, my father said it's clothing. I think your blouse is very beautiful. Am I a too?"

A pause and a few disapproving looks followed. One of those present teared up and the moderator asked if anyone would like to speak. In general, the verbalizations were encouraging, in palliative tones – after all, can you relieve pain? The suffering has certainly not ended. And the child, what must he be thinking of his own sexuality with a parent who goes to school with a bible under his arm and speaks in these homophobic tones?

This leads us to reverberate state secularism as a counterpoint to violence. For Silva (2024), the aforementioned secularism needs to be encouraged in the school environment (from schools to universities), in addition to the debate on sexual and gender diversity being ensured, even in the face of pressure from family members, education professionals, and conservative religious people. It is the freedom of professorship, together with the pluralism of pedagogical conceptions and scientific knowledge that can ensure the construction of an effectively democratic, plural society, in which differences are preserved and seen as something inherent, positive to/for human beings. And this is part of the national legal system, and should be defended by the operators of the Law as a value and part of the legal norm, including during the hermeneutic exercise, when LGBTQIAPN+ subjects denounce violence in society, especially in schools and at the University, the epistemic territory of this research.

Realizing that she hadn't said much, Cravo, a lesbian student, decided to share her concerns. Moved by the absurd criticism of the colleague who wore the gown, she decided to unite two points of the debate: the meaning of Pedagogy and the violence experienced by it:

[...] Man, I was also afraid to be myself at first. It's the combo, right? The fear of going to college, fear of the future, and still fear of showing myself as a lesbian. And that's it, I'm not very feminine, so there was already a strangeness. But over time I got to know some friends who supported me, and that made me more comfortable. However, I also met prejudiced people who even insinuated corrective rape. Walking with a group of boys, they asked me if I had never been with men. When answering no, they said: "hey, and how can you know you don't like it if you've never tasted it?" My body froze. In a quick defense, I replied: "You must not have stayed with boys either. Should I ask if they need to prove it to be sure?" Thankfully, they had no way to argue. I was really afraid, the UFAM bush can be a great hiding place for another LGBT body.

Carnation's speech highlights gender stereotypes: how a man and a woman should dress, which had also been perceived with Comigo Ninguém Pode. However, even this does not appease the sexual desire of a cisgender and heterosexual man. Domination is an element that justifies, in the rapist's mind, the pleasure of subjecting someone to carnal intercourse. Cravo had a shrewd reading of the meaning of psychological violence. Nevertheless, how many people without this information have not been victims of even more cruel violence?

What can be concluded is that the school, the university, as spaces of socialization, of coexistence, value a single type of human being: the man, white, heterosexual, Christian and cisgender. The task of "splitting" this "building" becomes herculean and, considering that there are also LGBTQIAPN+ children, they start to suffer from prejudice from an early age, carrying guilt that can lead to psychopathologies such as depression and suicide. All this is caused by a colonized, patriarchal, capitalist and cis-heteronormative society. Aware of this reality, the subjects of the default identity know how to make use of the privileges that society has granted them.

Continuing with the analysis of speech, it can be corroborated that the heterosexual and cisgender matrix is a painful form of subordination of bodies, minds, affections and desires. In the precise words of Aimé Césaire (2020, p. 24): "No human contact, but relations of domination and submission that transformed the colonizing man into a pawn, a foreman, a jailer, a whip, and the native man into an instrument of domination". For Césaire (2020), colonization is synonymous with objectification. In short: "I am talking about millions of men in whom fear, inferiority complex, trembling, kneeling, despair, servility have been intelligently inculcated" (Césaire, 2020, p. 25).

Nevertheless, Cravo sees in Pedagogy the will to make a difference:

[...] I'm just listening to your report there... I kept thinking and the only thing that came to me was the cliché phrase in my head that, for me, Pedagogy represents the possibility of changing the world. I believe that, as educators, we have a responsibility to show that there is plurality in life and that respect is essential for the development of children and especially young people, which is where *bullying* starts with everything.

It is important to note that Foucault (2017) points out that it is inaccurate that the pedagogical institution imposed silence on the sexuality of children and adolescents. By not speaking, much has been said, even in a hidden way: the themes reached adults and children, in a certain way, direct, "raw", without care. Educators, doctors, administrators, fathers, mothers and guardians entered the debate. Scientific discursivity was the keynote. Therefore, the statements brought here confirm the theories: sexuality has always existed, it has always been debated and the "dissident" subjects, with their bodies and subjectivities, provoke curiosity in children, adolescents and adults.

In other words, the school wall does not prevent "diversity" from entering the classroom. In the absence of education, someone will miseducate or explain in a clumsy way. Is this what is desired as a project for society? In the Pedagogy course, where the subjects who participated in the focus group came from, the critical sense is strong and, thanks to this, the interlocutors can, as far as possible, propose activities in order to try to combat or minimize prejudice. Does the school body participate in the fulfillment of educational legislation? Do you know that these are cross-cutting themes that can be worked on in any discipline? Is the demands for "gendered bodies" something biological or performative? Are watchmen, lunch cooks, janitors also called upon to dialogue on the subject?

Butler (2017) argues that gender cannot be constructed as a stable identity or *locus* of action from which various acts arise. Rather, gender is an identity tenuously constructed in time, instituted in an external space through a stylized repetition of acts. The effect of gender is produced by the subjectivation of the body between a social and social edge and should be understood, consequently, as the commonplace way in which gestures, movements and body styles of various types constitute the illusion of a permanent self marked by gender. This formulation would remove the conception of the genre of the soil from a substantial model of identity, displacing it to another that requires conceiving it as a constituted social temporality.

To conclude the theoretical debate of the focus group, it is worth decolonizing gender and, for this, we make use of African epistemology. Oyewumi (2024) explains that it is not possible to universalize feminist gender discourses. In the case of Africa, the categories are fluid. They do not rely on body type, but on social positioning, which is highly situational. The language of marriage that is used for social classification does not often consist of gender relations, as feminist interpretations of family organization and ideology suggest. Elsewhere, the author says she has argued that the language of marriage/family in some



African cultures is a way of describing the boss/client relationship that has little to do with the nature of the human body. The analysis and interpretation of Africa must result from the organization of social relations, paying close attention to specific cultural and local contexts. Crossing these reflections with experiences such as that of Xica Manicongo (a black trans woman) and Tibira do Maranhão (a Tupinambá indigenous woman vilified by homophobia), one can perceive Brazil as a paradigmatic case: the institutionalization of violence runs everywhere, including a Faculty of Pedagogy.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

As we approach the end of the writing of this text, it is understood that the objective was achieved, that is, to understand how students interpret the experience in the Pedagogy course at the Federal University of Amazonas. Through the collection of data in a focus group with five LGBTQIAPN+ students, some challenges became evident: lack of preparation of undergraduate course teachers, of the schools in which they exercise professional practices, in addition to having to deal with conservatism – including religious conservatism – which affects not only academics, but also students of the schools through which these social subjects transit.

Even so, the participants carry a flattering axiology of Pedagogy, betting on the possibility of decolonizing genders and sexual orientations. However, as attested by the density experienced in the focus group, the process is permeated by pain, uncertainties and a worrying lack of support, which can even lead students to develop psychological problems such as depression and/or suicidal ideation.

Far from being an exhausted topic or one that would not bring more news, the debate on gender and sexuality in education intersects in promising and necessary ways to nourish other imaginaries about plural existences. Peripheral neighborhoods, neo-Pentecostal religions, lack of compliance with the law: there are several situations that deserve attention in the field of a critical and socially endorsed education. The Faculty of Pedagogy has been in existence for more than fifty years and is based on the oldest university in the country, founded in 1909 – the *Free University of Manaus*. So many years have screamed the urgency of advancing progressive agendas, leveraging the tripod of teaching, research and extension, which characterize the University. These are years and years of Eurocentrism. It is past time to ancestry, to "amazonize" knowledge: it is necessary to aquilombarize, indigenize, blacken, homolesbotranshumanize, to colonize this valuable space for the production of knowledge. Plural, diverse, colorful.



Thus, it is suggested that more studies can be carried out in this axis, in other faculties, with other courses and through other biases, such as quantitative paradigms. After all, it is known that the number of five participants in a focus group thickens the discussion, but has limits regarding the generality of the senses and meanings obtained.



REFERENCES

1. Akotirene, C. (2019). Interseccionalidade. Pólen e Sueli Carneiro.
2. Andrade, L. N. (2015). Travestis na escola: Assujeitamento e resistência à ordem normativa. Metanoia.
3. Associação Nacional de Travestis e Transexuais (ANTRA). (2023). Dossiê dos assassinatos contra a população LGBT. ANTRA.
4. Bispo, A. (2024). A terra dá, a terra quer. Ubu.
5. Bock, A. M. M., & outros. (2002). Psicologias: Uma introdução ao estudo da psicologia. Scipione.
6. Brasil. (1988). Constituição Federal. Congresso Nacional.
7. Butler, J. (2017). Problemas de gênero: Feminismo e subversão da identidade. Civilização Brasileira.
8. Cavalcanti, B. P. B. C. (2022). O trabalho técnico administrativo. In B. P. B. C. Cavalcanti & outros (Eds.), 50 anos da Faculdade de Educação (FACED/UFAM): Histórias e memórias (pp. 187–188). CRV.
9. Cavalcanti, F., & outros. (2023). Fundamentos psicossociais do fracasso escolar: Um olhar no contexto amazônico. In H. Sá (Ed.), Teoria e fundamentos da educação: Perspectivas locais e globais (pp. 133–156). Alexa/Edua.
10. Césaire, A. (2020). Discurso sobre o colonialismo. Veneta.
11. Connell, R., & Pearse, R. (2015). Gênero: Uma perspectiva global. nVersos.
12. Davis, A. (2011). A liberdade é uma luta constante. Boitempo.
13. Fávero, M. H., & Abrão, L. G. M. (2006). “Malhando o gênero”: O grupo focal e os atos da fala na interação de adolescentes com a telenovela. Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa, 22(2), 175–182. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-37722006000200007>



14. Foucault, M. (2017). *História da sexualidade: A vontade de saber*. Paz & Terra.
15. Gonzalez, L. (2022). *Lugar de negro*. Zahar.
16. Grupo Gay da Bahia (GGB). (2023). *Assassinato de pessoas LGBT no Brasil*. GGB.
17. hooks, b. (2021). *Tudo sobre o amor: Novas perspectivas*. Elefante.
18. Louro, G. L. (2013). *Corpo, gênero e sexualidade: Um debate contemporâneo*. Vozes.
19. Louro, G. L. (2014). *Um corpo estranho: Ensaio sobre sexualidade e teoria queer*. Autêntica.
20. Louro, G. L. (2021). *Gênero, sexualidade e educação: Uma perspectiva pós-estruturalista*. Vozes.
21. Minayo, M. C. (2014). *O desafio do conhecimento: Pesquisa qualitativa e saúde*. Hucitec.
22. Moura, C. (2013). *Sociologia do negro brasileiro*. Perspectiva.
23. Nascimento, M. C. (2022). *Transfeminismo*. Pólen e Sueli Carneiro.
24. Neves, A. L. M., & Silva, I. R. (2015). *Diversidade sexual e protagonismo de professores: Uma análise sócio-histórica dos significados*. Martinari.
25. Oyewumi, O. (2024). *Conceitualizando gênero: A fundação eurocêntrica dos conceitos feministas e o desafio das epistemologias africanas*. In O. Oyewumi (Ed.), *Decolonialidade e pensamento afrodiaspórico* (pp. 171–182). Autêntica.
26. Passos, M. (2021). *Pedagogia das travestilidades*. Civilização Brasileira.
27. Silva, A. R. P., & Mascarenhas, M. S. A. (2021). *Gênero, sexualidade e educação: Perspectivas críticas*. Edua/Alexa Cultural.



28. Silva, A. R. P. (2024). Professores em disputa: Um estudo de caso na rede municipal de Manaus. Appris.
29. Smith, L. T. (2018). Descolonizando metodologias: Pesquisa e povos indígenas. Editora UFPR.
30. Tradi, I. L. A. (2009). Grupos focais: Conceitos, procedimentos e reflexões baseadas em experiências com o uso da técnica em pesquisas de saúde. *Physis: Revista de Saúde Coletiva*, 19(3), 777–797. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-73312009000300013>