

Obstacles to the pedagogical encounter between nursing faculty and students in different educational contexts¹

Jouhanna do Carmo Menegaz²
Vânia Marli Schubert Backes³
Katheri Maris Zamprogna³
Margarete Maria de Lima³
Taís Pereira da Costa²

Abstract

In teaching, the teacher reasons and acts pedagogically, with a view to transforming the disciplinary content into learning. In an educational context, however, rather than by the teacher's intention, learning is produced by the ability to establish a dialogical relationship between teachers and students. With this in mind, this collective case study with a qualitative approach is aimed at analyzing obstacles to the pedagogical encounter between teachers and nursing students of public and private universities in the South of Brazil. Two university professors from the nursing area and the students from the disciplines they taught participated in the study. Data collection took place between April 2014 and July 2015 and involved documents, interviews and observation, outlined in phases guided by Shulman's constructs. The data were analyzed using Strauss and Corbin's constant comparison method, and the results are articulated in the metacategories: pedagogical reasoning and action as an obstacle; understanding and attitude of the student as an obstacle; and denial tactics of obstacles. The phases of comprehension, transformation and teaching of the pedagogical reasoning and action of the teachers are appointed as obstacles; understanding and expectations of students; attitudes of both towards setbacks. Franker sharing of expectations, intentions and evaluations between teachers and students is suggested in order to strengthen the pedagogical encounter.

Keywords

Nursing – Students – Faculty – Learning – Obstacles.

Introduction

1- Translation by Sofie Tortelboom.

2- Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém, Pará, Brasil. Contatos: jouhanna@ufpa.br; taiscosta93@gmail.com

3- Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brasil.

Contatos: vania.backes@ufsc.br, katherizamprogna@gmail.com, margaretelima2@gmail.com



DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634201844176325>
This content is licensed under a Creative Commons attribution-type BY-NC.

To achieve the objectives of higher education in nursing, there is a set of educational policies and guidelines that guide the construction of pedagogical instruments, which are the curricula. Their intention within each discipline is mediated by the *pedagogical reasoning and action* of the teachers, a reflection movement that is articulated in phases, involves multiple knowledge and sources, such as academic training, the wisdom acquired from teaching practice, scientific literature and didactic structures and materials (SHULMAN, 2005).

These sources provide input for seven categories of the knowledge base for teaching: knowledge of content; of the educational context; of the curriculum; of learners; objectives, aims, educational values and their historical-philosophical background; pedagogical content knowledge; general pedagogical knowledge, which subsidize the action and reflection developed by teachers in the phases of comprehension, transformation, teaching, evaluation, reflection and new ways of understanding (SHULMAN, 2005).

The results of the reflection movement carried out by the teachers and represented in the above-mentioned phases, described by Shulman's model (2005), can be observed in the elaborated teaching materials, teaching plans, in the relation established with the students, in the teaching and evaluation strategies elected. Any and all actions of the teachers, whether explicit or tacit, involve *pedagogical reasoning and action* (LOUGHRAN; KEAST; COOPER, 2016) and has the presence of categories of the knowledge base for teaching, more or less influenced by the sources.

In approaching pedagogical reasoning and action, an analogy can be drawn to Newton's third law, which states that for every action there is a reaction. That is, in the case of teaching, the expected reaction to the teacher's action is learning. In an educational context, however, rather than the teacher's intention, it is the dialogical relationship between teachers and students, which we will call pedagogical meeting in this text (RIOS, SCHRAIBER, 2011), which has the potential to produce learning. Pedagogical encounter will be considered as the bond established between teacher and student, with educational purposes, mediated by the educational context and its instruments. Teachers and students are therefore the protagonists of this encounter mediated by the educational objectives embodied in curricula, teaching plans and the pedagogical relationship.

It occurs that, in educational contexts, for different reasons, the protagonists do not entirely drive their own training as, when they enter into higher education, in an undergraduate or graduate course in nursing to teach and learn, they are faced with questions given, pre-established by the educational context, such as the duration of the course, the disciplines that make up the curriculum, the hours of the disciplines, the teachers' work scheme, the students' class schedule, among others.

In addition to the influences the educational contexts impose, teachers and students need to be considered as distinct persons in relation to their trajectories, experiences, knowledge and beliefs about teaching. They differ in their roles of students and teachers, creating prior value judgments, in which these differences can turn the learning production in a pedagogical encounter into something not as linear as Newton's postulate.

In exploring the idea of pedagogical encounter Rios and Schraiber (2012) presented, the idea of obstacles should therefore be analyzed. Knowledge, beliefs and actions that cause unidentified or unsolved conflicts between teachers and students will be called obstacles to the pedagogical encounter in this text (MENEGAZ, 2015). When there is no knowledge or recognition of this aspect, and because of this, the encounter is impeded to a greater or lesser extent, it is assumed that obstacles that have not been overcome hinder the performance and learning.

If we argue that it is not the teachers' pedagogical reasoning and action that produces learning, but rather the relation established in the pedagogical encounter, we understand that the students and faculty members' understanding and participation in the different contexts mobilize actions that can be beneficial or harmful to this encounter, especially if they are mutually very opposed. Reflection efforts the faculty members mobilize in the pedagogical reasoning and action and their expectations regarding the development of what they planned for a given discipline are not always directly returned in strength and intensity neither by the educational context nor by the students. Sometimes, the teachers do not perceive and consider the students' reflection efforts, more particularly their understanding and expectation.

Departing from the acknowledged relevance of the pedagogical encounter in the educational contexts and the presence of obstacles to its effective occurrence, aiming to evidence them in the development of that encounter in higher nursing education, the objective of this text is to analyze obstacles to the pedagogical encounter between nursing faculty and students at a public and a private university in the South of Brazil.

Method

This is a collective case study (STAKE, 2007) with a qualitative approach, on the pedagogical reasoning and action of nursing professors from a public university and a private university located in the South of Brazil. Approval by the Ethics Committee in Research was obtained under CAAE 32937214.2.0000.0121.

Two female professors, one from a public university and one from a private university, participated in the study, as well as 78 undergraduate and graduate students linked to the courses they taught and two professors who served as course coordinators, totaling 82 participants. Of the total, 66 participants are affiliated with a public university and 16 participants with a private university. The difference in the number of participants is justified by the specificities of each case.

To facilitate the reader's understanding of the different participants and preserve anonymity, we will call the teachers "cases" in case of a general reference, or "public case" and "private case" in specific references. The same logic will apply to the other participants, being called coordinators and students in case of a general reference and adding the words "public" or "private" when in a specific reference, followed by the order in which they were inserted and codified in Atlas.ti.

The data collection was carried out from April 2014 to July 2015 and had a deductive design, guided by the concepts of knowledge base for teaching, categories of

the knowledge base for teaching and Shulman's model of pedagogical reasoning and action (2005), which turned into themes, as suggested by Stake (2007).

The themes originated three phases and, in each phase, the multiple sources of data were considered, namely documents, interviews and observation. The cases participated in all phases, the coordinators in the first and the students only in the second phase.

The first phase occurred from April to July 2014. It involved the identification and insertion in the study sites, interviews with coordinators and identification of the cases. After the contact with the coordinators of the nursing courses and their acceptance of the research development, an interview was scheduled, in which they identified the cases, requesting that they appoint one of the teachers of the teaching staff for his/her knowledge of the pedagogical course project (PPC) and good pedagogical practice. During this meeting, the coordinators were also asked to provide the PPC.

After indicating the cases, an initial discussion was held to present the proposal to the teachers, who expressed their acceptance by signing the Informed Consent Form (TCLE). Next, interviews one (focus on the teacher's trajectory) and two (focus on the description of the sources, basic knowledge and phases of comprehension and transformation) were conducted with the cases and the teaching plans of the subjects to be taught in the subsequent semester were requested. These documents and the PPC were analyzed in this stage.

The second phase occurred from August to December 2014 and involved the observation of the classes the cases taught, interviews three (focus on the teaching phase) and four (focus on the assessment and reflection phase) with cases and with fifteen selected students.

Undergraduate and graduate classes of the public case were observed. At the undergraduate level, it was a discipline in the second year of the course, related to nursing practices. At the graduate level, classes in a compulsory research discipline were observed. As the class schedule of the subjects was shared with other teachers, only the classes the case taught were selected for observation.

The duration of the undergraduate classes was one hour each, against three hours for the graduate classes. There were sessions when the class was concluded at a different time or canceled though. Thus, six undergraduate classes with an average duration of one hour and nine graduate classes lasting three hours were actually observed, totaling 33 hours of observation. For the private case, only undergraduate classes were observed, in a discipline related to first aid. The duration of the classes was one hour and fifteen minutes each. Seventeen classes with an average duration of one hour were effectively observed, totaling seventeen hours of observation.

The number of disciplines and the difference in hours observed are justified by the cases' hours of teaching in the course during the semester in question. Part of the classes was recorded with video camera help and all classes in a field diary for theoretical or methodological operational notes. The most relevant records were transcribed.

All students regularly enrolled in the subjects taught by the cases signed the TCLE and were observed. Only fifteen were interviewed though. The selection considered characteristics that indicated diversity: students formally employed or not, holding a secondary education degree in nursing and with perceived greater or lesser participation

in the classes. For the graduate students, the characteristics considered were graduation at the place of study and at other universities, with and without teaching experience, research grant and employment contract. This information was surveyed by means of a questionnaire, applied at the start of the phase, and by means of observation.

In phase two, a new interview was conducted with the cases to deepen interviews one and two. At that moment, aspects of the trajectory or description of sources or categories of the knowledge base for teaching the researchers did not fully understand were addressed. In this phase, classes, tests and papers of the disciplines observed were also analyzed.

Finally, in phase three, which occurred from January to August 2015, the interviews carried out in the previous phases were validated and interview five (focus on the new forms of comprehension phase) was held with the cases. Again, the teaching plan, classes, tests and papers of the disciplines observed in the previous semester were requested.

The data analysis was carried out concomitantly to the collection process, guided by the constant comparative method of the grounded theory and organized in the software Atlas.ti, version 7.1.7. In summary, the analysis process consists of three steps: open coding, axial coding and selective coding (STRAUSS, 2008).

The analysis of each case was conducted separately. In the open coding of the public case, 154 codes were produced and, in the private case, 142. In the axial coding, these codes were grouped based on the themes, which became the categories of basic knowledge sources for teaching, knowledge base for teaching and phases of Shulman's (2005) model of pedagogical reasoning and action. In this stage of the analysis, there were 28 and 27 categories, related to the public and private case, respectively.

In this text, twelve codes are presented, which in the selective coding originated the metacategories: pedagogical reasoning and action as an obstacle; understanding and attitude of the student as an obstacle; and tactics of denial of obstacles.

The first metacategory contains the codes: episodes that reaffirm an understanding; understanding phase; processing stage; teaching phase; general pedagogical knowledge; pedagogical content knowledge; and knowledge of learners and their characteristics. The second contains the codes: student ethics; teaching phase; and evaluation phase. Finally, the third involves the codes vision of self and vision of self: students. The code limits of the pedagogical relation is inserted in all the metacategories.

Results

The public case is a nurse who graduated from a private university, a professor of higher nursing education for 32 years, who taught at a private and state-owned university before she settled at the place of study, where she was working as a full-time undergraduate and graduate professor. She obtained her Ph.D. in nursing from the university where the study was carried out and did not have experience as a clinical nurse. She was active in the undergraduate course on basic fundamentals for professional care, in the second year of the nursing course, with a total duration of five years, and in the graduate course, in a doctorate subject related to research methodology.

In the observations of the public case in the undergraduate course, the class consisted of 38 students, some of whom already held a high school or even higher education diploma in nursing. Some of them worked and were family heads, but most of them did not work, lived with or were financially supported by their parents and took an undergraduate degree in addition to monitoring, research or extension activities at the university, on a grant. The graduate group was composed of 27 students.

In the graduate subject, not all held a nursing degree because interdisciplinarity is a characteristic of the program. None had a grant from funding agencies because, at that moment, the course had no quotas and could not meet the demands. Thus, those who awaited a scholarship worked at the place of study as substitute teachers or distance-learning tutors, and those who were not awaiting a scholarship were mostly teachers of the federal teaching network or the private network.

Among the eleven students interviewed in the public case, nine were female and two male. Of the five undergraduate students, four were professionally active, some at the university, one in nursing and another in commerce. Of the six graduate students, two had graduated at the place of study, four had obtained a master's degree there and one student was foreign. As for the affiliation, two were awaiting a research grant and four were teachers at other educational institutions, one being private.

The private case is a nurse graduated from a public university, who has been a professor of higher education for eighteen years, two as a substitute professor at a public university, sixteen at the place of study, also working as a supervisor of the internship at another private institution in the region in the last two years, both paid by hour. She has 28 years of experience as a nurse at the State Health Department, a master's degree in nursing, and graduated from the place of study of the public case. During the data collection, she worked in the undergraduate program in an interdisciplinary subject related to first aid.

In the class observed in the private case, twelve students participated in the subject. Seven were nursing students, two in dentistry, one physical therapy, one medicine and one in physical education. Nursing students attended the second and third periods of the course. Among the nursing students, five worked and studied, two held a secondary education degree in nursing and one was engaged in scientific initiation without a scholarship. Of the four interviewees, two worked, one in the nursing area, and all had already tried to take other undergraduate courses, such as physiotherapy, nutrition and medicine, before starting nursing.

Pedagogical reasoning and action as an obstacle

Considering that the cases serve as mediators between curriculum and teaching in their disciplines, in the scope of pedagogical reasoning and action, the most important obstacle is the cases' understanding about how to teach and how students should learn. Shulman's model (2005) rests on sources and knowledge underlying teaching so that, when referring to a phase, it will almost always be related to one or more sources and categories of knowledge base.

Within the scope of the comprehension phase, the learners' knowledge, their characteristics and their general pedagogical knowledge stand out as obstacles to the pedagogical encounter. Background knowledge, as a result of the experiences they had in other semesters, that is, the result of the wisdom gained from practice, made the public case start the discipline with a pre-judgment of what was expected of it from the beginning of the teaching phase. If some part of her understanding, within the boundary of the expected, did not happen, the feeling of instability, conflict and dissatisfaction was predominant in the evaluation phase.

It seems that you got rather untypical semesters. I would also call the graduate semester untypical [...]. It's a discipline I always end with great satisfaction, that's why I say it's not typical. [...] this semester I did not finish with much satisfaction. And at graduation it seems that the same thing is happening, because it was a semester that started very well. (Public case, interview 4, 20:74).

The aim of the graduate discipline was to "appropriate the onto-epistemological, methodological, ethical and political foundations of qualitative research" and related more to the knowledge than to the attitude dimension, necessarily. Nevertheless, she expressed that she wanted the students to speak in the classroom, argue among themselves, disagree from her provocations as, in her opinion, this was the attitude of a doctor.

As this understanding and expectation were not fulfilled, however, the feeling of frustration prevailed, which the public case maintained in relation to the students in the following semester. Even before the beginning of the semester, as part of the understanding phase, knowledge of learners and general pedagogical knowledge supported the development of the transformation and teaching phases.

In the private case, the learners' knowledge the teacher expressed in this phase was based on the wisdom acquired from the teaching practice and influenced, in turn, the transformation and teaching phases in relation to the selection of what methodology to be used. The understanding of the private case, about what could develop in the teaching phase, that is, the expression of her pedagogical knowledge of content, based on a lack of knowledge of learners, made it difficult when the semester was in fact ongoing to connect and adapt the teaching strategies to the real demands of the students, which were practical exercises of first aid, discussion of action in real situations, characterizing the understanding of the private case, as well as the public case, as a potential obstacle.

[...] I would like to do a class like this, today I will talk about that thing and the student already has knowledge, to have a discussion, to discuss the subject, to raise a discussion and to take what they have managed to absorb on the subject. It's just that, if you give the content for the student to read in advance, he will not read it. (Private case, interview 2, 3:69).

The connection between general pedagogical knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge, demonstrated in this example that discussion is only possible based on reading, so that the discussion cannot be used as a pedagogical strategy because the student does not read, can also be characterized as an obstacle for pedagogical reasoning and action.

Understanding and attitude of the student as an obstacle

In addition to the pedagogical reasoning and action of the public and private cases, the student's understanding of himself, the teacher's role, his/her teaching and the way he deals with that also represented obstacles to the pedagogical encounter.

In my opinion, the teacher has to come motivated to teach. [...] we get a little tired in class. So many times you are here, but the body is wanting to be at home sleeping, especially a college student who works during the day. So when the teacher interacts a lot with the student, he does not let you lean back in class, but when the teacher leans back ... I think that the teacher, he has to go at the students so that the student does not get nonchalant in the classroom. I think the student too, especially here he would have to charge more and work harder. (Student 4, private undergraduate course, Interview 3, 42:25).

Just like the cases had expectations, the student had expectations about what he would achieve and experience in a discipline. Frustrated expectations or preferences about what the development of the discipline or the teacher's behavior towards the people, the group, or the activities should be like also represented obstacles. One obstacle encountered with the private case was the lack of sharing of the students' desire to develop more practical actions, generating dissatisfaction in the evaluation phase of the discipline.

Students linked to the cases' disciplines generally had a set of expectations. In both, at the beginning of the semester, a space was created to present the discipline, the people and the expectations of teachers and students for the semester that would begin. In a pedagogical meeting, students and teachers have responsibilities. In very simplistic terms, we could say that it is up to the teacher to choose and prepare for the methodological approach chosen, to propose means of evaluating the learning, to accompany and assist the students in the course of the discipline; the student should be able to comment on the proposal, be present, be aware of and comply with the proposed activities or suggest adjustments to them in favor of their learning. The students were not always fulfilling the agreed responsibilities and this was detrimental to the progress of the activities planned.

The class is practical, in the laboratory today. Most students do not pay attention to the fact and wait in the room where theoretical classes take place. The teacher arrives at 5:30 p.m. and calls who is in the room, as there is nobody in the laboratory, and also puts a notice on the board. (Private case, Field notes, undergraduate subject, 09/01/2014, 29:20).

Teacher: In the next practice class, I'll make you assemble the report. Because then, because like that, it can count as one point in the test. No, elaborate a report. Because like, now we are in a practical class, I am here to clear the doubts, but other people, others in those moments are doing nothing. (Private case, undergraduate observation, 09/01/2014, 38:1).

Obstacle denial tactics

There seemed to exist an important relation between the obstacles the teachers and students raised and the motivation, signaling the subjective load in the pedagogical encounter. The expression and resolution of obstacles would seem to be the most appropriate route, but it was the least adopted. In that sense, teachers and students had their own tactics to survive the obstacles.

The cases had multiple reactions that ranged from verbal reporting of frustration in view of their limitation in making students demonstrate the attitudes they considered appropriate to shock and disappointment at the students' attitudes. They noticed the use of the cell phone and the maintenance of open notebooks during the class, parallel conversations, loud laughter, the study of materials unrelated to the discipline, non-verbal demonstrations of annoyance, adopting a style of avoidance and denial of the obstacle raised.

A student tinkers with her cell phone while she talks. She notices, she comments, and the student plays dumb. A colleague emphasizes to the student that the teacher was talking to her. She does not seem to care. (Public case, Field notes, undergraduate subject, 11/08/2014, 33:12).

[...] when they feel in the other's place, in the opposite position, perhaps he can perceive what an unpleasant situation this is. So, I say. That's what we do at the undergraduate level. Now are you going to expect this to happen in a doctorate? If the teacher makes such a request, I get up immediately and sit in the front, no matter who it is. If a student is up front presenting a seminar and telling me this, I'm the first one I get up to meet his request, you see? That is respect for the person. These things I do not know if it's a clash between generations. These things bother me and sometimes we even play, it's time to retire really, because the clash between generations starts, we do not seem to find expression anymore in the conversation [Public case, interview 4, 20: 90].

From the students' side, in view of an obstacle, they also adopted a posture of avoidance. When they disagreed with some argument, they simultaneously commented aloud, as follows "she does not know what she's talking about" or "Professor X runs rings round her".

In addition to the comments, facial expressions of disapproval during class were commonplace, when the cases said things that students did not agree with or proposed activities they did not want to do, like what happened in the private class, when the students were asked to check each other's blood pressure. Observations about the cases in the corridors were also common, ranging from their clothing to their pedagogical behavior. At times, some students even adopted a disrespectful demeanor. This particular issue was most striking in the private case.

It's a test day and the teacher calls a student saying she's stuck in traffic, she's going to be late. Students conjecture different things. About the format of the test, a student says, "I'll punch her if it's entirely discursive," which reminds me of a practical class during which, along, talking, one student said "she was not crazy" to set the test on the same day as the test of another discipline.

Some are outraged, stating that, if she was in traffic, she probably left the center late. They discuss whether or not to call her, telling her not to come. A girl complains about being there since three o'clock just for that test, and says that she should have left. When the teacher arrives, no one speaks up. (Private Case, Field notes, 10.09.2014, 29:23).

And in the corridors, it was during the break that we talked, that's when, it that so because she really thinks that, because she does not master the other, the other type of study, so it's easier to talk like that, or, I do not know, but kind of, if you avoid comments like that, because we know it reaches the teacher's ear and, to what extent it's going to be positive, I do not know (Graduate student, interview 3, 44:21).

In both classes, but especially in the private case, it was common for the students to miss class or arrive always late and that close to the scheduled closing time, when the teacher turned the projector off, the noise of the backpacks closing and chairs being moved was heard. In addition, there is the fact that, when in the classroom, the students spent most of their time doing tasks from other disciplines, talking or on the mobile phone. The impression was that any spare class time was a joy, because they could do other things.

Discussion

By mentioning that they already know the students, the way they behave, the characteristics of the class that seem to entail good work during the semester, and that they determine the didactical resources, the teachers suggest that they substantially rest on the knowledge base source of the wisdom gained from teaching practice (SHULMAN, 2005). The use of the wisdom gained from teaching practice as a source of knowledge is relevant, as this is the most accessible source to the teacher, being produced and regulated by experience, constructed and appreciated by the cases' capacity of reflection. The potential of this source can be reduced, however, if its assessment is not submitted to a new scrutiny of the experiment and of the reflection on reflection in action (SCHÖN, 1998).

With the years of teaching experience, both have experienced many situations, have had contact with different profiles of students, taught in different ways, trained themselves by practice, which led to a certain understanding about teaching, which Shulman (2005) calls general pedagogical knowledge. This general pedagogical knowledge, produced by experience and supported by the wisdom acquired from teaching practice, has a relevant weight and can even help to determine how this source will be appreciated and used in teaching practice. The passage of time and accumulation of experiences seem to crystallize the pedagogical knowledge of content, limiting its molding to new situations (CORREIA et al., 2012).

If the general pedagogical knowledge, the knowledge of the learners and their characteristics and the pedagogical content knowledge, constructed based on the wisdom acquired with the teaching practice are appreciated as a recipe and not as part of a possible repertoire (SCHÖN, 1998), there is a risk of losing their long-living potential to provide

relevant learning (TARDIF, 2012) for teaching practice. This is particularly important if we consider the stages of Shulman's model of pedagogical reasoning and action (2005) and its starting point, the comprehension phase, presented here as an obstacle.

The comprehension rests on the knowledge base (SHULMAN, 2005) and, as observed in the results, the understanding of the cases is supported by certain and distinct categories of the knowledge base: general pedagogical knowledge and knowledge of learners and their characteristics, explicit in statements that suggest absolute truths, such as that small classes are more governable and that undergraduates do not read previously sent texts. This background understanding, the fruit of the wisdom gained from teaching practice, directs the choices they make in the transformation phase (LOUGHRAN; KEAST; COOPER, 2016).

What they have learned from other experiences, other classes, over the years, may even establish a pattern of characteristics of the nursing students' profile at that university. This may not be true though, that is, that students flee from this pattern and that teachers do not realize this because they are immersed in the knowledge they already have. Even if students have a common profile, of things that are similar and repeat each semester, each group of students is private and, more than a group, it also contains individuals whose particular characteristics also need to be considered in the choice of teaching strategies (DRAGANOV; SANNA, 2013).

In this sense, understanding acts as an obstacle, as the way in which teachers understand the teaching and learning not only of students, but their own, limits their appreciation each semester, not contextualizing and challenging their reflection on the action in the transformation and teaching phase, and consequently atrophying their capacity to develop pedagogical content knowledge.

If the wisdom gained from teaching practice is uncritically adopted as a source, the knowledge constructed about the students will be partially obsolete and, if it is used as the basis for the mobilization of pedagogical content knowledge, a category that expresses the multiple possibilities and resources the teacher has to teach a content, it will be a prototype. No matter in what class, the way of teaching the cases will always be very similar.

This limitation resulting from the comprehension can be harmful both for the students and the teachers' motivation, because it establishes a way of teaching decontextualized from the target audience. When we suggest that learners' knowledge further supports the transformation and teaching phases, we are not arguing that the teacher should give the students what they want, how they want it, as that would possibly be a reduction of learning potential (MEIRIEU, 2007).

It does not mean either that the teacher should yield the pedagogical authority to the students, or let them choose and define everything. The question may be the sharing of responsibilities, built on the dialogue and the true recognition of the other as he presents himself. Not based on other students, but on these, which did not occur in either case. The relationship between teacher and student is asymmetric, however much one might want to argue that a democratic relationship exists. The teacher is responsible for all choices and for taking a prominent position in the classroom. This gives, of course, greater power to the teacher than to the student (QUADROS et al., 2010). The teacher can establish a pedagogical relationship marked by a dialogical and reflexive tone though, paving

the way for new possibilities, creating pedagogical spaces that stimulate the student's autonomy and critical and reflective attitudes (LIMA et al., 2016).

The lack of a frank dialogue, of the establishment of contracts, of more frequent evaluation moments (MERIGHI et al., 2014), in addition to different expectations of teachers and students, may end up becoming an obstacle to the pedagogical encounter, as observed between cases and students. The reports of dissatisfaction and demotivation presented in the results may be related to the lack of openness between teachers and students. In this sense, another aspect of the teacher's pedagogical reasoning and action demands reflection: the evaluation phase.

The evaluation phase, according to Shulman (2005), involves the teacher's appreciation of students' understanding at the end of a discipline and the teacher's own performance. Beyond Shulman's proposal (2005), we understand that evaluation should not occur only after the teaching phase and in order to evaluate the past, when, faced with obstacles, there is nothing else to do but to regret. It should be simultaneous to the teaching phase, taking into account the teacher's and the student's perceptions.

The actual development of pedagogical content knowledge would presuppose the existence of evaluation in the teaching phase and the teacher's ability to adapt what was necessary to enhance the possibility of student learning (MENEGAZ, 2015). In order to do so, particularly in the face of obstacles, the teacher would need to be willing to incorporate into his reflection the reason for students' resistance, the reason for their evasive behavior, establishing dialogue as an instrument of mediation, being willing to question themselves as to whether it would be productive to insist on a method of teaching that is despised; what is the measure to establish what the teacher thinks is good for the students and what the students need (POULOU, 2017).

Again, understanding can be an obstacle to this attempt if the teacher understands that his role is to transform students. Shulman (2005) calls this desire knowledge of the objectives. In her interviews, the private case reported the desire to transform the nurses' daily practices. The public case expressed desires for broader education, changes in society, in the students' worldview. No matter how legitimate those desires, would these be the desires of the students? The intention may be fair, but a difference between the expectations of teachers and students may be one of the main obstacles to the pedagogical encounter (LAPPONI, 2017).

Particularly in higher education, what is the limit and the way to establish teaching agreements between teachers and students? Does the student want to be always subjugated by the teacher's understanding? Would that not go against the autonomy, the stimulus to creativity? We understand that rethinking these issues is relevant to nurses' education based on curricular guidelines that guide the preparation of critical, creative and reflective professionals. How can we stimulate the development of these competences if we do not really share the learning objectives? Can we give up building the other without giving up educating him? (MEIRIEU, 2007).

Meirieu (2007) addresses the paradox of education as manufacturing, establishing as an example the paradox of master and slave, in parallel with the relationship between teacher and student in the perspective of transforming the other.

In addition to the teachers and the questions that may constitute obstacles on their part, in a pedagogical encounter, the students need to be present, satisfied and committed, who have their own demands, goals and expectations in relation to teaching and about the teacher (WENTZEL et al., 2017). Some studies suggest ways to promote student engagement, while others address the factors that hinder academic learning and performance.

Engagement can be understood as the time and energy that students devote to teaching activities and influence the level of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student-teacher interaction, meaningful educational experiences and a welcoming environment (KUH, 2002). With regard to engagement, according to Kuh (2002), what the students do during schooling has more weight than who they are or where they study. This suggests that quality does not only reside in the university and that the effort to design teaching strategies that favor students' engagement, as well as the academic routine and the relationship with colleagues and teachers are relevant (BARDAGI et al., 2012). For this to happen, however, the teachers' focus and time need to be considerably focused on teaching activities.

Considering that most teachers of private universities are hourly paid (INEP, 2013), as is the private case, and that public university teachers have more and more responsibilities, characterizing a scenario of work overload (LEMOS; STEPS, 2011) and prioritization of research activities (SILVA JUNIOR et al., 2013), how will they do this? The clash between generations should also be taken into account, that is, the estrangement caused by distinct forms of understanding and doing between generations.

Although generation Y, the current generation of undergraduate nursing students, is greatly affected by the multitasking culture, which provides for the execution of more than one activity at the same time without loss of efficiency and effectiveness, it is observed that there are negative effects for the learning and academic performance (KIRSCHNER; KARPINSKI, 2010). In this scenario, social media have a great potential for negative influence (JUNCO, 2012). This behavior was observed in the students who, while in the classroom, were also on Facebook or studying other subjects.

Beyond the standard characteristics of generation Y, part of their multi-tasking behavior can be reinforced by the university itself and the society that requires them to do and be much, overloading them with a myriad of daily tasks (HIRSH et al., 2015), something that can be extremely violent for teenagers and young adults. Would their personality and maturity be sufficiently consolidated to enable them to make the choices they face when entering a profession? Is this accelerated characteristic not further enhanced by the discourse of success, by the valuation of the economic dimension?

The motives that may lead students to express a certain behavior should support our reflection, but should not serve as labels. One should also try to understand if and to what extent the university environment itself reinforces this. Due to the study participants' attitudes, in addition to openness in dialogue and the establishment of pedagogical contracts that recognize the student, it is necessary to discuss the ethical dimension of education, under penalty that nothing discussed thus far be sufficiently relevant to remove obstacles to the pedagogical encounter.

This refers to the discussion of the students and teachers' roles have demonstrated expectations on both sides that, when not shared or carried out, frustrate, immobilize, generate culprits and diverse reactions. Correia and collaborators (2012) use the expression defensive ideologies, which we will call tactics of denial here, to refer to these systems and cognitive dispositions the teachers construct to cope with difficulties they experience in the daily routine of their professional practice.

In relation to the students' denial tactics, then, their behavior transcends discontent and dissatisfaction, feelings they are entitled to, and turns into disrespectful behavior towards teachers. Managing the development of attitudinal aspects has shown to be a new responsibility of teachers, even though they have not been trained to do so (NUNES; OLIVEIRA, 2017).

The cases have an academic background in the subject they teach and have teaching experience. Nevertheless, as appointed by the public case, they perceived limitation in the face of a generational clash which they do not feel prepared to solve, as neither the *stricto sensu* education nor the continuing education offered by universities, usually centered on didactics and technique, is capable of providing this preparation.

Another study reveals findings of unethical behavior by students, linking it to the use of social media (SMITH; KNUDSON, 2015). The non-confrontation of the students' unethical behavior, which, in the cases observed, particularly in the private case, was predominant among the students, is detrimental to the nurse's professional training.

As future nursing professionals, the students will be submitted to the code of professional ethics, which among other things, appoints as a responsibility the grounding of the relations in law, prudence, respect, solidarity, diversity of opinion and ideological position (COFEN, 2017), elements hardly observed in the students' posture towards the cases. Therefore, regardless of the divergence, there are behaviors that should not be denied in the relationship established between teachers and students, and may expand or extend to the professional-patient relationship. Openly discussing such conduct would be the first step in finding solutions.

Final considerations

In analyzing the obstacles to the pedagogical encounter of public and private college teachers and students, the role of the cases' pedagogical reasoning and action is highlighted, especially the comprehension phase, and the non-confrontation of the denial tactics used by both, as generators of obstacles. There seems to be rigidity in the reflection that guides pedagogical practice, frustration over unmet expectations and positions of denial of conflict sustained by unethical behavior. There may also exist a generational component that implies a greater burden of difficulty.

Although this case is located in the area of nursing, some general reflections can be established. Faced with obstacles, how can one reflect on teaching and the training of teachers for higher education based on new relationships in such dynamic times? Is it still possible to focus teaching on content at the expense of attitude development? Will higher education, similar to what has been demanded in elementary school, take on the

need to train not only technically capable professionals, but also citizens who are ethical in their relations?

As an initial movement, it seems relevant to overcome the ideas of neutrality in the pedagogical relationship, as well as the notion that the teacher teaches and the student automatically learns. Thus, it may be possible to make teachers and students aware of their actions and responsibilities in the construction of the pedagogical encounter. In this sense of mutual help, the relationship, in order to be healthy, should cease to be vertical and become horizontal, therefore requiring maturity and respect. Dialogue and pedagogical contracts can be important tools in this process.

References

BARDAGI, Marucia Patta; HUTZ, Claudio Simon. Rotina acadêmica e relação com colegas e professores: impacto na evasão universitária. **Psico**, Porto Alegre, v. 43, n. 2, p. 174-184, 2012.

COFEN. Conselho Federal de Enfermagem. **Código de ética dos profissionais de enfermagem**: resolução n. 564 de 06 de novembro de 2017. [S. l.]: Cofen, 2017.

CORREIA, José Alberto; PEREIRA, Luísa Álvares; VAZ, Henrique. Políticas educativas e modos de subjectivação da profissão docente. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 42, n. 146, p. 388-407, 2012.

DRAGANOV, Patricia Bover; SANNA, Maria Cristina. Avaliação das competências de professores de enfermagem para desenvolver programas educativos para adultos. **Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem**, Brasília, DF, v. 66, n. 4, p. 543-549, 2013.

HIRSH, Carolina Domingues et al. Preditores do estresse e estratégias de coping utilizadas por estudantes de Enfermagem. **Acta Paulista de Enfermagem**, São Paulo, v. 28, n.3, p. 224-229, 2015.

INEP. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais. **Exame nacional de desempenho dos estudantes**: relatório síntese enfermagem. Brasília, DF: Inep, 2013.

JUNCO, Reynol. The relationship between frequency of Facebook use, participation in Facebook activities, and student engagement. **Computers & Education**, Boston, v. 58, n. 1, p. 162-171, 2012.

KIRSCHNER, Paul; KARPINSKI, Aryn C. Facebook® and academic performance. **Computers in human behavior**, Boston, v. 26, n. 6, p. 1237-1245, 2010.

KUH, Georg D. The national survey of student engagement: conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties. **Framework & Psychometric Properties**, Bloomington, p. 1-26, 2002.

LAPPONI, Silvina Funes. Las emociones em el professorado: el afecto y el enfado como recursos para el disciplinamiento. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 43, n. 3, p. 785-798, 2017.

LEMOS, Maithê de Carvalho; PASSOS, Joanir Pereira. Satisfação e frustração no desempenho do trabalho docente em enfermagem. **Revista Mineira de Enfermagem**, Belo Horizonte, v. 16, n. 1, p. 48-55, 2011.

LIMA, Margarete Maria et al. Diálogo: rede que entrelaça a relação pedagógica no ensino prático- reflexivo. **Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem**, Brasília, DF, v.69, n.4, p. 610-617, 2016.

LOUGHRAN, John; KEAST, Stephen; COOPER, Rebecca. Pedagogical reasoning in teacher education. In: LOUGHRAN, John; HAMILTON, Mary Lynn (Org.). **International handbook of teacher education**. Singapore: Springer, 2016. p. 387-421.

MEIRIEU, Philippe. **Frankenstein educador**. 3. ed. [S. l.]: Laertes, 2007.

MENEGAZ, Jouhanna do Carmo. **Ação e raciocínio pedagógico de professoras de enfermagem em diferentes contextos educacionais**. 2015. Tese (Doutorado em Enfermagem) – Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2015.

MENEGAZ, Jouhanna do Carmo. **Práticas do bom professor de enfermagem, medicina e odontologia na percepção dos acadêmicos**. 2012. Dissertação (Mestrado em enfermagem) – Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2012.

MERIGHI, Miriam Aparecida Barbosa et al. Ensinar e aprender no campo clínico: perspectiva de docentes, enfermeiras e estudantes de enfermagem. **Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem**, Brasília, DF, v. 67, n. 4, p. 505-511, 2014.

NUNES, Claudia Pinto; OLIVEIRA, Dalila Andrade. Trabalho, carreira, desenvolvimento docente e mudança na prática educativa. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 43, n. 1, p. 65-80, 2017.

POULOU, Maria. The relation of teachers' emotional intelligence and students' social skills to students' emotional and behavioral difficulties: a study of preschool teachers' perceptions. **Early Education and Development**, London, v. 28, n. 8, p. 996-1010, 2017.

QUADROS, Ana Luiza de et al. Percepção de professores e estudantes sobre a sala de aula de ensino superior: expectativas e construção de relações no curso de química da UFMG. **Ciência & Educação**, Bauru, v. 16, n.1, p. 103-114, 2010.

RIOS, Izabel Cristina; SCHRAIBER, Lilia Blima. A special relationship: a study on teacher-student encounters. **Interface - Comunicação, Saúde, Educação**, São Paulo, v. 15, n. 36, p. 39-51, jan./mar. 2012.

SCHÖN, Donald. **El profesional reflexivo: cómo piensan los profesionales cuando actúan**. Barcelona: Paidós, 1998.

SHULMAN, Lee S. Conocimiento y enseñanza: fundamentos de la nueva reforma. **Profesorado**, Granada, v. 9, n. 2, p. 1, 2005.

SILVA JUNIOR, João Dos Reis; FERREIRA, Luciana Rodrigues; KATO, Fabíola Bouth Grello. Trabalho do professor pesquisador diante da expansão da pós-graduação no Brasil pós-LDB. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 18, n. 53, p. 435-456, 2013.

SMITH, Gloria Copeland; KNUDSON, Troy Keith. Student nurses' unethical behavior, social media, and year of birth. **Nursing Ethics**, Thousand Oaks, v. 23, n. 8, p. 910-918, 2015.

STAKE, Robert E. **Investigación con estudio de casos**. Madrid: Morata, 2007.

STRAUSS, Anselm; CORBIN, Juliet. **Pesquisa qualitativa: técnicas e procedimentos para o desenvolvimento de teoria fundamentada**. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2008.

TARDIF, Maurice. **Saberes docentes e formação profissional**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012.

WENTZEL, Kathryn R. et al. Peer and teacher supports in relation to motivation and effort: a multi-level study. **Contemporary educational Psychology**, Boston, v. 49, p. 32-45, Apr. 2017.

Received on: 02.24.2017

Reviewed on: 11.14.2017

Approved on: 04.03.2018

Jouhanna do Carmo Menegaz holds a Ph.D. in nursing and is an adjunct professor at the School of Nursing of Universidade Federal do Pará. Experience in vocational higher education in nursing, particularly teacher training.

Vânia Marli Schubert Backes holds a Ph.D. in nursing and is a retired full professor in the Graduate Nursing Program at Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Member of EDEN. CNPq researcher 1C.

Katheri Maris Zambogna is a Ph.D. candidate in the Graduate Nursing Program at Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

Margarete Maria de Lima holds a Ph.D. in nursing and is an adjunct professor in the Nursing Department at Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

Taís Pereira da Costa is an undergraduate nursing student at Universidade Federal do Pará.