



ISSN: 2310-0036

Vol. 1 | Nº. 9 | Ano 2018

Hermenegilda Correia

Universidade Católica de Moçambique

ecorreia@ucm.ac.mz

José Alves

Universidade Católica Portuguesa

jalves@porto.ucp.pt

Pedagogical Training of Higher Education Teachers and their Implications in the Teaching Mode

A Formação Pedagógica dos Professores do Ensino Superior e as suas Implicações no Modo de Ensinar

Abstract

The present study seeks to address the pedagogical training of higher education teachers and the implications for the ways of teaching. The study was conducted at a faculty of a Mozambican university, hereinafter referred to by the pseudonym João Luís Cabral University. Thus, our research seeks to understand how the pedagogical training practices of higher education teachers are characterized and what implications are recognized and can be observed in the way they teach. In order to answer our starting question, we chose to conduct our research by means of a case study, since the phenomenon occurs in a context of its own specificity. We also chose to approach the study in light of the interpretative paradigm. This option is due to the fact that it fits in with our concern of seeking to understand the pedagogical training practices of teachers. Given the nature of our study, we selected the following data collection techniques, namely: semi-structured interviews, focus group and classroom observation. Next, in order to answer our questions, we selected not only a number of subjects directly involved in pedagogical training, but also some direct beneficiaries of this training, ie students, teachers, trainers and the director of the University. Pedagogical training was perceived by our interviewees as an essential and indispensable tool to be able to properly guide the teaching-learning process, although their practices express a contrary tendency, as there was a poor application of the feedback method and an excessive predominance of the expository method, making evident the use of a transmissive didactic model more focused on the fulfillment of the teaching program than on learning.

Keywords: teacher education, professional development, teaching professional knowledge.

Resumo

O presente estudo procura debruçar-se sobre a formação pedagógica dos professores do ensino superior e as implicações nos modos de ensinar. O estudo foi efectuado numa Faculdade de uma Universidade Moçambicana, avante designada sob o pseudónimo Universidade João Luís Cabral. Assim, o objecto da nossa investigação procura compreender como se caracterizam as práticas de formação pedagógica dos professores do ensino superior e que implicações são reconhecidas e podem ser observadas no modo como eles ensinam. Para responder à nossa questão de partida optámos por inserir a investigação num estudo de caso, uma vez que, o fenómeno ocorre num contexto de especificidade própria. Optámos também por abordar o estudo a luz do paradigma interpretativo. Esta opção deve-se ao facto de este se enquadrar na nossa preocupação, em procurar compreender as práticas de formação pedagógica de professores. Tendo em conta a natureza do nosso estudo, seleccionámos algumas técnicas de recolha de dados, a saber: entrevistas semi-estruturadas, focus group e a observação em contexto de aulas. Na sequência, de forma a responder às nossas questões, seleccionámos quer alguns sujeitos envolvidos directamente na formação pedagógica, bem como alguns beneficiários directos desta formação, ou seja, alunos, professores, formador e director da Universidade. A formação pedagógica foi percebida pelos nossos entrevistados como uma ferramenta essencial e imprescindível para poder orientar adequadamente o processo de ensino-aprendizagem, muito embora, as suas práticas expressem uma tendência contrária, na medida em que, verificou-se deficiente aplicação do método feedback e uma predominância excessiva do método expositivo, tornando evidente o uso de um modelo didático transmissivo mais focado no cumprimento do programa do que nas aprendizagens.

Palavras-chave: formação pedagógica de professores, desenvolvimento profissional, conhecimento profissional docente.



Rua: Comandante Gaivão nº 688

C.P.: 821

Website: <http://www.ucm.ac.mz/cms/>

Revista: <http://www.reid.ucm.ac.mz>

Email: reid@ucm.ac.mz

Tel.: (+258) 23 324 809

Fax: (+258) 23 324 858

Beira, Moçambique

Introduction

At the level of education, 'quality' has become the most prevalent concept on the agenda for almost everyone, especially as reflections on the skills of educational institutions, as well as their teachers and graduates, increase. There are situations wherein teaching institutions there are teachers teaching without a minimum of training in pedagogical matters. The fact that they come from not only the field of education but also for other scientific disciplines and enter teaching as teachers (without necessarily having a didactic-pedagogical knowledge), imposes on them a number of limitations in terms of proficiency.

Therefore, the acquisition of didactic-pedagogical knowledge makes the teacher, from a technical point of view, more competent. Therefore, it is unanimous that without a qualification from the perspective of pedagogy, the teacher faces difficulties in conducting the teaching and learning process. For this reason, it is not enough to be a teacher with an academic background (in Economics or Law for example, or with mastery over the contents to be taught), it is necessary to acquire specific skills in the psycho-pedagogic area. Thus, for Roldão (2007), all professions that have been established over time by the recognition of full professional status, such as doctors, engineers, architects, among others, are recognized and affirmed, being distinguished and legitimized socially as such, by possessing their own, specific and exclusive knowledge that distinguishes them from other professionals. The teaching profession also requires a professional specificity for the teacher, since one of the defining characteristics of any profession is its specific knowledge, without the mastery of which the activity cannot be exercised.

For purposes of illustration only, our so-called João Cabral University, has been developing psycho-pedagogical training practices over the past two years, with its target group being its teachers in order for them to reflect on their academic experiences and institutional and educational outcomes of their students. To address this, our overall objective will be to analyze the pedagogical training practices of higher education teachers and their implications for teaching.

Theoretical framework

Professional teaching knowledge

Being a teacher is a demanding task that requires an increased responsibility on the part of those who want to be teachers, because the exercise of the activity without specific knowledge of the area can lead to poor training of students. Therefore, the teacher is required to have an

appropriate qualification and to understand psycho-pedagogical knowledge. It is this competence that allows the student to learn effectively, especially if we consider that the act of teaching must have a bilateral character between teacher/student that manifests itself in the act of learning. As emphasized by Roldão (2007, p.47):

The knowledge that characterizes the professional function of teaching is necessarily what we will call here educational knowledge. This particular knowledge - which allows the professional to perform the function expected of him - cannot be assimilated to the mere mastery of scientific knowledge related to school contents, nor reduced to the scientific and methodological knowledge of the field of educational sciences, even if it requires them. Nor can it be limited to pragmatic practicalism directly resulting from mastery of teaching techniques and routines.

Shulman (1986), one of the authoritative authors on the issue of professional teacher recognition, excelled in addressing this theme by stating the distinctive elements of knowledge, namely: a) knowledge of content; b) general pedagogical knowledge; c) knowledge of the curriculum; d) pedagogical knowledge of the content; e) knowledge of and characteristics of students; f) knowledge of educational contexts; h) knowledge of the purposes, purposes and philosophy of education.

The didactical knowledge of the content highlighted by Shulman (1968) appears as one of the central elements of the teacher's knowledge, since it is the element that allows the transmission of contents, so that the student can clearly assimilate them in a clear and comprehensive manner. Although teachers demonstrate knowledge at the level of content, they need didactic knowledge, because without it, they lack proper strategies and techniques for teaching. To this end, it is necessary to find teaching mechanisms which allow students to assimilate the subject. According to Perrenoud (1999, p.9) "professional competences clearly lie beyond the academic domain of knowing how to teach, they encompass the didactic transposition in class, the organization of the work of appropriation, the evaluation, the differentiation of teaching" among others.

The fact that today, in developing economies, a considerable amount of research indicates levels of education below the desired quality, especially in the way it is taught, makes it relevant to find strategies that result in better student outcomes. The figure of the teacher, one of the key actors in the teaching-learning process, assumes equal relevance in the search for this goal (Alves, 2006; Rangel, 2013). As the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Report (2005) points out, the factors relating to teachers' professional action in teaching constitute one of the most important influences on pupils' learning. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged by the report that there are very important aspects in the teachers' profile that are not taken into account by the general indicators for their absorption into the labor market, namely the

qualification, experience and tests of academic ability above all. There are characteristics of teachers that are difficult to measure but vital for students' learning, including the need to enhance the ability to communicate ideas clearly and convincingly; create an effective learning environment for different types of students; foster a productive teacher-student relationship; create enthusiasm, be creative and work effectively with colleagues and parents. According to Marcelo (2009), teachers, as well as the schooling process and the respective pedagogical issues, significantly influence students' learning and the effectiveness of the educational institution, that is, good teaching leads to good student learning, regardless of the social context in which the student belongs. Student learning depends mainly on the degree of knowledge teachers have and what they can do in the classroom to help students who face learning difficulties, as teacher knowledge significantly influences student learning. . It is the teacher's responsibility to try his best to promote and ensure students' learning, as Roldão (1998, p.5) states: "the teacher is always a teacher because he teaches, he is a teacher because the work expected of him is to generate and manage ways of learning, even if sometimes he can't do it successfully." In this regard, Formosinho, Machado e Mesquita (2014, p.20) state that "compensating for the difficult is the teacher's task for students with learning difficulties". This idea corroborates the aforementioned authors, Bordenave and Pereira (2015, p.23) through the following comparison: "Just as the doctor's problem is getting his patients cured, the teacher's problem is getting his students to learn "

In the same line of thought Luck (2009) emphasizes that:

Well-informed and well-trained teachers are fundamental to the competent guidance of their students. Your performance with your students should be open, with strong leadership and positive prospects for success. Teachers with high expectations to make a difference in the learning of each and every student are those who contribute most to their training. (p.21).

The massification of teaching covered "the classrooms of students with different motivations and dispositions to learn, different capacities and diverse socio-cultural backgrounds. Teaching is therefore a complex process" (Day, 2001, p. 17). Institutions admitting pupils from different social backgrounds and levels of knowledge require teachers to pay more attention to the individual characteristics of each student, so it has become difficult to manage such high diversity in the classroom. As can be seen, it is necessary to emphasize the need for solid and continuous pedagogical training, since it is assumed that to be a good teacher, it is not enough to have scientific training in the field in which one teaches, but also at the level of pedagogical skills.

Thus, there seems to be a consensus around the idea that pedagogical competence is indispensable in teaching. It is therefore essential that teachers acquire specific knowledge that is fundamental to the exercise of their function.

Teaching professional development and its contribution to the improvement of teaching practices

The achievement of educational outcomes is dependent on school management and teaching functions. However, the professional deficiencies faced by faculty lead to limitations, the improvement of which involves increasing mastery of their competences so that the teacher can perform his or her tasks. This requires schools to invest in the training of teachers, bearing in mind that its success will always depend on the *a priori* level of teachers' knowledge. According to Day, the teaching professional development constitutes:

A process that includes all natural learning experiences and those that, planned and conscious, attempt, directly or indirectly, to benefit individuals, groups or schools and contribute to improving the quality of education in classrooms. It is the process whereby teachers, alone or accompanied, review, renew, and develop their commitment as agents of change, with the moral purposes of teaching, and acquire and develop knowledge, skills, and emotional intelligence essential to professional thinking, planning and practice with children, young people and their peers throughout each stage of their lives as teachers.”(1999, p. 4).

Following the same line of thought, Formosinho defines professional teaching development as:

A continuous process of teacher-centered improvement of teaching practices or a group of interacting teachers, including both formal and non-formal moments, with a view to promoting educational change for the benefit of students, families and communities. This definition presupposes that the great purpose of professional development processes is not only personal enrichment but also student benefit. It predicates the search for practical professional knowledge on the central issue of the relationship between the teacher's professional learning and the learning of his students, focusing on the professional context. (2009, p. 226).

Further, Marcelo (2009) emphasizes the perspective presented above, considering teacher professional development as a process that aims at modifying teaching and learning practices and changing teachers' attitudes, in order to improve their performance and, consequently, improve their performance, school results for students. Therefore, it is understood that by improving their performance, the teacher will in some way contribute effectively to the development of the school.

Since development implies learning, assuming that it only happens when behavioral changes occur, professional development in teaching should lead to changes in action, allowing the improvement of teaching practices, since the goal of professional development is performance

that will culminate in improving student achievement. Based on this logic, Garcia (1999) argues that the teacher's professional development and the improvement of the school institution are two sides of the same coin, thus highlighting the need for a joint and simultaneous path between training and change. Thus, a perspective of change to the improvement of education that is not, in itself, enabling and generating new learning is hardly defensible.

As can be seen here, the consensual idea that professional teacher development contributes to the development of teachers' professional skills and to the improvement of their practices through both formal and informal experience seems to gain expression. On the other hand, this activity aimed at modifying practices to improve teachers' skills, dexterity and attitudes, culminates in improving the quality of classroom education and student achievement.

Evaluation in the teaching-learning process

Evaluation is inherent to the human being and is an indispensable component for the analysis of the various processes with which the human being becomes involved. In education, evaluation plays an extremely important role in the teaching-learning process. It is through evaluation that one can gauge the extent to which previously defined objectives have been achieved or not. It is also through this that both the teacher and the student become aware of the real situation in which they find themselves, thus enabling the reformulation of pedagogical practices by the teacher in order to improve students' school performance. It is important to stress that one of the key factors in pupils, evaluation, also makes it possible to reformulate their learning strategies. It is based on this logic that Piletti (2006) understands evaluation as a means to verify to what extent the objectives are being achieved, identifying the students who need individual attention and reformulating the practices with the adoption of procedures that allow them to overcome identified deficiencies.

Since the goal of the teaching process is focused on the promotion of learning by students, we will focus our attention on the reflection around the formative evaluation. For Hadji (1994), the formative function of evaluation has essentially a pedagogical purpose, having as its main feature its integration into the teaching-learning process. Thus, it is generally characterized by focusing on the teaching-learning process and not on its results, or on the verification of the necessary prerequisites of new learning. Therefore, according to Pacheco (1994, p. 71), it is "an evaluation modality that has the function of improving, guiding, regulating and not certifying, proving".

Reflecting on the communication that is established between the student and the teacher in the teaching-learning process, Sant'Anna (1999, p. 39) points out that this type of evaluation has a formative or controlling function, as “it informs the student and teacher about the results being achieved during the development of the activities; improves teaching and learning; locates, points out and distinguishes deficiencies and shortcomings in the development of teaching and learning to eliminate them; provides action feedback (readings, explanations, exercises, etc.)”. Hadji (2001) further reaffirms that, of the various functions of formative evaluation, he considers the principal purpose as that of informing the participants of the teaching and learning process about the results of the evaluation, thus providing constructive feedback on how they can improve the results obtained and allow reflection on the causes of failures and their subsequent correction so as to avoid making the same mistakes in subsequent evaluations. In this regard, Sadler (1989) states that the feedback the teacher receives from students provides critical information needed to identify the current state of student learning, enabling the teacher to design intervention strategies to improve learning outcomes. It is in this context that Fernandes (2008) recommends that feedback should provide clear instructions to students about their current state of learning, as well as providing them with information to help them overcome their difficulties, to improve their performance. Until feedback provides clear instructions to help students overcome their difficulties, feedback is not taking on a formative role.

Since formative assessment aims to improve students' learning by regularly monitoring their progress and the difficulties they face throughout the school career and then eliminating them, they can never be intended solely for grading. Understanding the formative assessment in this sense, Rabelo (1998, p.81) is expressed as follows:

Evaluation cannot be confused with grades, let alone allowing to continue to use the term grade as a synonym for evaluation. A grade is just one of many ways to express the results of an evaluation. We simply need to understand that evaluation can and should constantly feed the dialogue between students and teachers, allowing both a dialectical relationship, information about doing and learning increasingly meaningful for both. The teacher needs to support the student with information that can enlighten, encourage and guide him/her about possible successes and failures, enabling them to better situate themselves on their student journey.

Moreover, Rabelo (1998) also warns that if formative assessment is only a tool of terror, a labeling element that is concerned only with classifying people, referring to how much they are worth in numerical terms, it would be better if it did not exist, since that would not be at the service of student progression. However, it is necessary to know what information conveys the grade. If the information conveyed by the grade allows the teacher to make the point in order to diagnose the students' real difficulties in order to support them, then it is the place on the scale

of knowledge that matters and not their merely numerical outcome. From this perspective, it can be understood that:

What makes any formative assessment is not the technique or the specific instrument that is used, but the way the information obtained from that instrument or technique is used. If a teacher uses information from an evaluation to track learning, provide feedback to students, and adjust teaching strategies to move them toward learning goals, the teacher is conducting a formative evaluation (Lopes & Silva, 2012, p.21).

So if, for example, a teacher uses a quiz, a questionnaire, a written assignment, or any other activity to check student learning, then he uses the data collected to support students in what they are doing, to show difficulties and to inform them of the progress they have made so far, in which case they are conducting a formative evaluation. In contrast, if the teacher uses the same evaluation tool or technique for the sole purpose of gathering data, classifying, punishing and labeling students, he or she is performing summative evaluation (Lopes & Silva, 2012). Therefore, we consider, as do the authors Lopes e Silva (2012, p.6) that “although evaluations continue to be labeled formative and summative, what determines whether the evaluations are formative or summative is how the results are used. Thus, the most radical difference between formative and summative evaluation lies in its purpose.”

Therefore, it is possible to verify that the evaluation approach to be adopted is interdependent on the wealth of methodologies used in the teaching-learning process. However, the method in the learning aspect represents the way learning is conducted, seeking the integral development of the student, through a precise organization of procedures that favor the achievement of the established purposes (Libâneo, 1994; Sant'Anna & Menegolla, 2013). In the same vein, Barbosa (1996) classifies four types of methods, namely: expository, active, interrogative and demonstrative. Libâneo (1994) presents the following types of methods: teacher exposure method, independent working method, group writing method, group working method and special activities.

Considering that there is a wide range in the diversity of teaching methodologies, our perspective is to agree with Libâneo's (1994, p.152) idea that:

There is no single teaching method, but a variety of methods, the choice of which depends on the content of the subject, the specific didactic situations and the socio-cultural characteristics and mental development of the students. For example, the teaching of reading can be done through isolated syllables or complete words, which are, among others, specific methods of teaching the Portuguese language; but these specific methods are embedded in general methods such as verbal explanation, independent work, or group writing work. The choice of the most appropriate methods depends,

therefore, on the teacher, both the mastery of the principles and laws of the teaching process applicable to all subjects, and the mastery of the contents and methods of each.

Methodology

Since our research aims to study the pedagogical training of higher education teachers, as well as their work strategies, we chose to use a qualitative methodology for the case study, applying an interpretative approach, as we intend to understand through our interviewees the implications of the pedagogical training in the context in which they perform their teaching functions. Our choice is in line with Vilelas (2009, p.106), stating that “qualitative research focuses on the way human beings interpret and attribute meaning to their subjective reality”.

Given the real context that we intend to study, the main interest of the researcher is based on an interpretative framework, making it possible to generalize (Amado, 2014; Bogdan & Biklen, 1994). In this way, we intend to individualize our selected case in order to study it in detail in view of our objective (Stake, 1998). Guijarro and Velazquez (2007, p. 181) state that “a case study is a particularly appropriate type of research to study a case or situation with some intensity in a short period of time”.

We have thus opted for an interpretative paradigm, since it is intended to understand and interpret a particular phenomenon (Erikson 1986, cited by Stake, 1998). The paradigm under study fits our concern to try to understand the pedagogical training practices of teachers. As Amado (2014, p.40) points out, “[...] it is the understanding of intentions and meanings - beliefs, opinions, perceptions, representations, perspectives, conceptions, that humans put into their own actions, in relation to others and the contexts in which and with which they interact”.

In addition, for the reasons already given, as we could not study all universities, we selected one of the faculties belonging to one of the universities located in the city of Nampula (province of the same name, in northern Mozambique), which is henceforth identified by the pseudonym at the same time, we select some of the actors in the teaching-learning process to understand the process by which people construct meanings and describe how these meanings consist (Bogdan & Biklen, 1994). We worked with a small group of teachers, students, trainer and the University Board. Thus, the interview survey technique was applied to 9 teachers, 1 trainer and the faculty director to collect different perceptions simultaneously. We opted for the focus group technique applied to 24 students.

Interview and group surveys can be helpful in transporting the interviewer to the subject's world. In this situation, several people together are encouraged to talk about a topic of interest (Bogdan & Biklen, 1994).

As interviews do not exclude observation techniques, as both procedures can be combined without any difficulty, obtaining much more reliable and broad information (Vilelas, 2009), we opted for an *in loco* observation during the classes of selected teachers in order to observe the way they teach, specifically the methodologies they use to teach, the way they evaluate and conduct feedback.

Presentation and Discussion of Results

The data collected resulted from the interconnection of information acquired through the theoretical framework and the empirical sources selected at university level. To facilitate the analysis, the results will be presented in four categories: a) professional teaching knowledge; b) teaching methods; c) professional teaching development; d) evaluation in the teaching and learning process.

Professional Teaching Knowledge

Asked about the teachers' professional knowledge, our interviewees highlighted the pedagogical training and the knowledge of the subject they taught, as the two essential elements that the teacher must have in mind during the teaching and learning process, so that the student appropriates of knowledge. However, pedagogical training was perceived by all teachers as an essential and indispensable tool to properly guide the teaching-learning process.

The data obtained from the interview with the director of the faculty also indicates this valorization of the pedagogical training, because it recognizes that it is thanks to this training that the quality of the teaching can be improved. Therefore, faculty management understood the concern to train its teachers in pedagogy, as their contribution to the promotion of significant improvements in student learning is unquestionable, as well as to the professional development of teachers by attributing them a differential in their form of professional practice. The vision shared by the faculty management seems to be in line with the vision proposed by Marcelo (2009), when considering professional teaching development as a process that aims at the modification of teaching and learning practices, the modification of teachers' attitudes in order to improve their performance and consequently the students' academic results.

Similar to the director, the teachers also made clear the idea that the psycho-pedagogical component is highly valued in the institution under study, since faculty management defines it as

an essential requirement of the faculty to provide pedagogical training. Notwithstanding this appreciation and recognition of pedagogical training, some practices observed, in the classroom context, reveal a limited impact of this training, since relevant aspects, which tend to promote students' learning, such as feedback, differentiation of teaching, formative evaluation, are quite inchoate. This is evidenced by the observations made in the classroom environment, under the direction of the teacher.

Therefore, although it is clearly a concern of the faculty management to train its teaching staff every 2 years, a significant part of the teachers do not put into practice the didactic-pedagogical tools acquired.

Although the training provided teachers with knowledge, this is not reflected by necessary changes in their classroom practices which leads us to understand that the pedagogical training seems to have been assimilated only on a theoretical level by the teachers.

One possible explanation for this situation may be that learning during training was not meaningful and/or active. According to Ferreira (2009), the emphasis on active learning goes beyond the mere accumulation of theoretical knowledge. Above all, it is important to develop skills that enable the individual to put into practice what he has learned. Therefore, effective learning will have to lead to behavior change. As Roldão (2007, p.47) argues, "making learning happen presupposes the awareness that learning occurs in the other and is meaningful only if he actively appropriates it."

This situation requires not only that pedagogical training be promoted in the context of professional teacher development with a view to improving pedagogical practices so that behavioral change occurs in teachers, but it is also necessary to change mentalities in order to allow teachers can unlearn the previous concepts, giving way to the acquisition of new learning and practices.

Teaching methods

The participatory method emerges as the method that has gathered broader consensus among teachers. However, *in loco* observations of classes and the students' testimony when contrasted with the teachers' testimony, showed a predominance of the expository method.

On the other hand, another group of teachers maintains the preference for the participatory method, and although the observation data show a predominance of the use of the essentially teacher-centered expository method, this was due to the manifest lack of interest in an active participation on the part of the students.

However, classroom practices seem to indicate that the focus of teaching continues to be more focused on teaching than on learning which is a position strongly defended by Roldão (2010). We noted a visible concern with the transmission of knowledge to the detriment of the effective promotion of learning by students.

Professional Teaching Development

According to the testimonies of the teachers interviewed, they report that the training carried out by the institution where they work aims to consolidate the teaching techniques, which gives them some confidence in their teaching task. Like the teachers, the director and the trainer emphasized the relevance of the pedagogical training as having contributed to the improvement of the quality of teaching. Since we were unable to verify teachers' performance before training, we needed to interpret this with some caution.

Although we do not have data on teachers' classroom teaching methods that preceded the training, the data acquired through the observation of the classes, it seems possible to say that there is still a long way to go in the professionalization of teachers. The teachers' reports show that the training carried out aims to provide them with strategies that allow them to effectively convey the contents of their subjects.

As we have seen, it is difficult to attribute results to the efforts of the faculty management in terms of the training available to its faculty, so that it can develop professionally, since the effort undertaken is not, however, proportional to the teachers' real performance. In fact, the training does not seem to have the desired effects, since the themes developed in the training are, in our view, mostly not applied by the teachers. Given these findings, it is important that faculty management make concentrated efforts, at the management level, to understand the real motivations that lead to the occurrence of such a situation.

Evaluation in the teaching and learning process

The empirical investigation of the teachers' discourse revealed that most of them use formative evaluation. However, the data from the classroom observations and the testimonies of the students contradict this discourse of the teachers, above all, as they show a predominance of the use of summative evaluation, at the service of classification. These findings make clear the persistent predominance of a didactic model of the transmissive type, focusing only on teaching, whose central concern focuses on the fulfillment of the teaching program, to the detriment of student learning, as argued by Roldão (2010). Therefore, the preference for summative evaluation is justified, as this modality is presented to teachers as the most viable for the

fulfillment of their program. However, these data, by focusing their relevance on summative assessment, show that formative assessment has been proclaimed, above all, from the point of view of political and ideological discourse, as a mechanism that can induce improvements in student performance without however, it becoming effectively put into practice.

Regarding feedback, the empirical data revealed the theoretical knowledge of the relevance of this component, but the data obtained from observations in the classroom allowed us however, to verify poor feedback methods, as most teachers do not provide frequent feedback and therefore do not demonstrate the errors made in a given task, thus preventing the student from becoming aware of their failures. Practical feedback from teachers at the level of the educational institution where the surveys were carried out would help to avoid repeating the same errors in subsequent work. Feedback is proclaimed at the level of political and ideological discourse as a promoter of improvements in learning, but not put into practice. These findings denote the lack of convergence between the practices and the rhetoric of the formative agents.

Conclusion

In the light of the data obtained through the analysis of the discursive content of the interviewed subjects, linked to the observation of classes, it seems possible to state that the pedagogical training carried out at the level of the studied institution aims at improving the teachers' performance, translating this into improvement of student achievement. Although the discourse of most subjects revealed the professional knowledge of teachers, it was not possible to observe in the classroom the application of this theoretical knowledge acquired within the scope of the training, ie, the triangulation of all data collected, gave us grounds for systematic doubt regarding the effective impacts of pedagogical training, which may jeopardize its effectiveness.

Regarding the teaching methodologies used by the teachers, the discourse analysis of the interviewed subjects, as well as the observation of the classes, allowed us to conclude that there is a predominance of the use of the expository method, of diffuser type and essentially centered on the teacher.

Regarding the mode of evaluation, from the data we obtained and analyzed, it was found that most teachers do not use formative evaluation in the classroom, so there is a predominance of summative evaluation at the service of classification, a fact that seems to contribute to poor student performance.

Finally, the data obtained from the interviews with teachers seemed to indicate the practice of giving feedback as a mechanism for the promotion of learning. However, the testimony of some students and the observation of the classes contradicted the testimony given by the teachers,

which allowed us to conclude that the feedback is neither effective nor valued as a didactic-pedagogical practice.

In general, by analyzing the data obtained in the field and the theoretical framework adopted in this research, it seems possible to conclude that there is still a long way to go in the professionalization of the teachers who work in this teaching unit. It also allows us to infer that the pedagogical training developed will probably have to be rethought, as its effectiveness seems to be problematic. The development of the quality of teaching and learning necessarily involves the design and implementation of training programs in action and an institutional appreciation of pedagogy as the basic foundation of the teaching profession. It is important that the unit's management demonstrate a real commitment to the regular monitoring of teachers, with the aim of supervising their pedagogical practices, as well as the degree of implementation of the knowledge acquired in the training exercises.

Therefore, for pedagogical training aimed at improving teachers' performance to be really efficient and effective, it will be necessary to obtain commitment from teachers so that they are willing to fully implement the knowledge acquired in order to consolidate, in the classroom practices that promote student learning. Thus, teachers' adherence to pedagogical training and the implementation of knowledge derived from this training are indispensable for academic success.

References

- Amado, J. (Coord). (2014). *Manual de investigação qualitativa em educação* (2ª.ed.). Coimbra, Portugal: Universidade de Coimbra.
- Barbosa, A. (1996). *Jovens e educação da fé*. Lisboa, Portugal: Paulinas.
- Bogdan, R.& Biklen, S. (1994). *Investigação qualitativa em educação*. Porto, Portugal: Porto Editora
- Bordenave, J.D. & Perreira, A. M. (2015). *Estratégias de ensino-aprendizagem* (33ª. ed.). Rio de Janeiro, Brasil: Vozes.
- Day (209). *Desenvolvimento profissional de professor. Os desafios da aprendizagem permanente*. Porto, Portugal: Porto Editora.
- Fernandes, D. (2008). *Avaliação das aprendizagens: desafio as teorias, práticas e políticas*. Lisboa, Portugal: Texto Editores.

- Formosinho, J., Machado, J. & Mesquita, E. (2014). *Formação, trabalho e aprendizagem. Tradição e inovação das práticas docentes*. Lisboa, Portugal: Sílabo.
- Garcia, C. M. (1999). *Formação de professores para uma mudança educativa*. Porto, Portugal: Porto Editora.
- Gaspar, M. I. & Roldão, M.C. (2007). *Elementos do desenvolvimento curricular*. Lisboa, Portugal: Universidade Aberta.
- Hadji, C. (1994). *A avaliação, regras do jogo: das intenções aos instrumentos* (4ª. ed.). Porto, Portugal: Porto Editora.
- Hadji, C. (2001). *Avaliação desmistificada*. Porto Alegre, Brasil: Artmed.
- Libâneo, J.C. (1994). *Didática*. São Paulo, Brasil: Cortez Editora.
- Lopes, J., & Silva, H. S. (2012). *50 técnicas de avaliação formativa*. Lisboa, Portugal: Lidel.
- Luck, H. (2009). *Dimensões de gestão escolar e suas competências*. Curitiba, Brasil: Positivo
- Marcelo, C. (2009). *Desenvolvimento profissional docente: passado e futuro*. Revista de ciências da educação, 8, 7-22. Recuperado em https://idus.us.es/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11441/29247/Desenvolvimento_profissional_do_cente.pdf?sequence=1.
- OECD (2005). *Teachers matter: attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*. Paris, França: Oecd.
- Pacheco, J. A. (1994). *Avaliação dos alunos na perspetiva da reforma*. Porto, Portugal: Porto Editora.
- Perrenoud, P. (1999). *Formar professores em contextos sociais em mudança. Prática reflexiva e participação crítica*. Revista Brasileira de Educação, 12, p.5-21.
- Piletti, C. (2006). *Didática Geral*. São Paulo, Brasil: Ática.
- Rabelo, E. H. (1998). *Avaliação. Novos tempos, novas práticas*. Rio de Janeiro, Brasil: Vozes.
- Rangel, J. V. (2013). *Efeito escola e efeito professor: um estudo dos fatores ligados à eficácia escolar*. Dissertação do mestrado. Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora. Juiz de Fora, Brasil.

- Roldão, M. (2007). Função docente: natureza e construção do conhecimento profissional. *Revista brasileira de educação*, 12 (34), 95. Recuperado em <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbedu/v12n34/a08v1234>.
- Roldão, M.C. (2007) Função docente: natureza e construção do conhecimento profissional. *Revista brasileira da educação*, 34, p.94-103.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). *Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems*. *Instructional science*, 18 (2), 119-144. Recuperado em http://pdf.truni.sk/eucebnice/iktv/data/media/iktvv/Symposium_LTML_Royce%20Sadler_B Formative_Assessment_and_the_design_of_instructional_systems.pdf
- Sant'Ana, I. M. (1999). *Por que avaliar? Como avaliar?* (4ª. ed). São Paulo, Brasil: Vozes.
- Sant'Anna, I. M., & Menegolla, M. (2013). *Didática: Aprender a ensinar. Técnicas e reflexões pedagógicas para a formação de formadores*. São Paulo, Brasil: Loyola.
- Shulman, L. (1986). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), p.1-21.
- Stake, R. E. (1998). *Investigación con estudio de casos*. Madrid, Espanha: Morata.
- Vilelas, J. (2009). *Investigação: o processo de construção do conhecimento*. Lisboa, Portugal: Sílabo.