SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN FOOD ENGINEERING COURSE ON THE RELATIONSHIP-PROFESSOR STUDENT

REPRESENTAÇÕES SOCIAIS DE DISCENTES DO CURSO DE ENGENHARIA DE ALIMENTOS SOBRE A RELAÇÃO- PROFESSOR ESTUDANTE

REPRESENTACIONES SOCIALES DE DISCENTES DEL CURSO DE INGENIERÍA ALIMENTARIA SOBRE LA RELACIÓN - PROFESOR ESTUDIANTIL

Marinalva Lopes Ribeiro iD

Alexsandra de Santana Soares Silva iD

ABSTRACT

The article presents results of a descriptive research with a qualitative approach, whose general objective was to understand the meanings attributed by students to the professor-student relationship. The specific objective aimed to highlight the organization of the content of the professor-student relationship representations. In the production of data, we have applied a questionnaire to 53 students of the Food Engineering Course, using the free association of technical words (TALP). In the analysis of the data we have used simple statistical operations, which helped to organize the structure of the subjects' representations. The results show that for some students, the professor-student relationship has a sense of friendship, respect, understanding, empathy, while for others it has a sense of distance, hierarchy, difficulty, which leads us to conclude that such discrepant representations are historical-social products related to the practices of individuals, which can directly influence the students' learning process.

KEYWORDS: Professor-student relationship; Social Representation; Teaching-learning.

RESUMO

O artigo apresenta resultados de uma pesquisa descritiva de abordagem qualitativa, cujo objetivo geral foi compreender os sentidos atribuídos por estudantes para a relação professor-estudantes, e o objetivo específico visava destacar a organização do conteúdo das representações de relação professor-estudantes. Na produção de dados, aplicamos um questionário a 53 estudantes do Curso de Engenharia de Alimentos com a Técnica Associação Livre de Palavras. Na análise dos dados usamos operações estatísticas simples, as quais ajudaram a organizar a estrutura das representações dos sujeitos. Os resultados apontam que para alguns estudantes, a relação professor-estudantes tem sentido de amizade, respeito, compreensão, empatia, ao passo que para outros têm sentido de distanciamento, hierarquia, dificuldade, o que nos faz concluir que tais representações discrepantes são produtos histórico-sociais relacionados às práticas dos indivíduos, que podem influenciar diretamente o processo de aprendizagem dos graduandos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Relação professor-estudantes; Representação Social; Ensino-aprendizagem.

RESUMÉN

El artículo presenta los resultados de una investigación descriptiva con un enfoque cualitativo, cuyo objetivo general fue comprender los significados atribuidos por los estudiantes a la relación profesor-estudiante, y el objetivo específico estuvo dirigido a destacar la organización del contenido de las representaciones de la relación profesor-estudiante. En la producción de datos, aplicamos un cuestionario a 53 estudiantes del área de Ingeniería de Alimentos utilizando la Técnica de Asociación de Palabras. En el análisis de los datos, utilizamos operaciones estadísticas simples, las cuales ayudaron a organizar la estructura de las representaciones de los sujetos. Los resultados muestran que, para parte de la población de estúdio la relación profesor-estudiante tiene un sentido de amistad, respeto, comprensión y empatía, mientras que para otros tiene un sentido de distancia, jerarquía y dificultad; lo que nos lleva a concluir que tales representaciones discrepantes son producto históricos- social relacionados a las prácticas de los individuos, que pueden influir directamente en los procesos de aprendizaje de los graduandos.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Relación profesor-estudiantes; Representación social; Enseñanza-aprendizaje.

INTRODUCTION

The relationships between professors and students (theme of this article) are important for student motivation, and can contribute for student engagement, besides learning development, as defended by some authors (RIBEIRO, JUTRAS & LOUIS 2005). On the other side, it can also contribute for student's rejection to curricular components and professors, factors which account on academic' evasion (OLIVEIRA *et al*, 2014; AZEVEDO, 2018).

In this sense, the study made by Cavaca *et al* (2010) shows that this relationship, based on values as communication and mutual respect, contribute for the undergraduate learning quality. However, when this connection is based on attitudes as instructor's arrogancy, intimidation, and repression, the consequences for scholars rebound in learning, and in the forthcoming workplace.

Azevedo (2018) and Oliveira *et al* (2014) had also presented similar results as Cavaca *et al* (2010). For these authors, it is evident the existence of a power relationship in the university classroom, as far as the communications at this environment are based in distancing, and lack of dialogue between the individuals.

In addition to this, Oliveira *et al* (2014) highlights that the students' adaptation in the university environment depends upon valuing the dialog channel with professors, beyond professors' theoretical and didactic instrumentation. Also, it should be important the valuing of undergraduate's career orientation, and other themes that could contribute for individuals satisfaction.

Said that, it is possible to agree with Day (2011) whom defends that the emotions are fundamental to teaching, as it can generate positive and negative effects on the professor's

emotions, and on the classroom climate. These aspects will consequently influence scholars' learning. Due to these, this author proposes that positive emotions shall overcome the negative ones, so the individuals can feel themselves valued and liked.

In front of all this, and having in mind that teaching has became a complex profession, it was presumed that Cunha (2006) was right while evidencing that nowadays professors face many deadlocks. These do not correspond to the mastering of specific contents in their formation, but to challenges that require other knowledges.

Nóvoa (2002, p. 23) refers that the relation with a student is one of the aspects that turns teaching a complex profession because, different from what occurs with other professionals, "the professor's work depends upon the student collaboration. […] Nobody can teach someone who does not want to learn". In such a way, the relation professor-student can generate tensions or produce rewards and gratifications, depending on the receptivity of the student with the learning act.

Agreeing with Nóvoa (2002), Masetto (2012) has showed himself favorable to interactions between the aspects emotional-affective, cognitive, and formation of attitudes. That is, the human and professional abilities in the student's learning. It guarantees the necessity of the professors to understand the scholars and their reality, striving in the orientation of individual and collective activities, beyond partnerships focused in their apprenticeship. In this sense, Masetto (2012), p.60) highlights:

> It is important that the professor develops a partnership and co-responsibility attitude with the students, that they can plan the class together, using classroom technics that favor the student participation, besides considering them as adults that can co-responsibilize for their professional qualification period.

This affirmation from Masetto (2012) emphasizes the importance of the university docent to overcome a formation focused only in the cognitive aspect, once the society expects the professionals concluding graduations courses to master not only technical abilities, but also to be ethical citizens, and responsible for the development of their communities.

Pereira (2017) contributes to this dialogue about the professor-student relationship, defending that it presents direct correspondence with the quality of the teaching-learning process. In addition, he says that the quality on the docent mediation can produce positive or negative effects in that process, and that the effectivity cannot be analyzed isolated from cognition.

In this same reasoning line, Ribeiro (2010) emphasizes that the affectivity is important for the educative relation, because it is through the affective way that student's cognitive learnings are built. If this argument is suitable, the docents cannot neglect the feelings and emotions involved in their practice. This is so because there are two factors that can account on the transformation of the learning difficulty into better academic and formative results: first of

all, the demonstration of professors' interest, care and concern; the second, how and why do the knowledge's production processes happen at the student's.

In addition, Souza (2016) and Mota (2017) reveal that an affective professor is close, supportive, welcoming, careful, respectful towards cultural differences, devoted to the career, friendly, sensible, flexible, and kind while dealing with students' cognitive and affective difficulties.

Beyond these particular characteristics, Ribeiro, Juntra and Louis (2005, p. 38) put that the affective professor is: "human, close, affectionate, secure, patient, pacific, maternal, understanding, humble, empathetic, studious, respectful, confident, open to criticism and dialogue". Moreover, "realize the students' needs and makes himself available to help".

Thun, these study results have driven us to question about which feelings would be expressed by Food Engineering students on the established relationship with the professors in the classroom.

To answer that question, a research was performed with the intention of comprehending the meaning assigned by Food Engineering undergraduates at State University of Feira de Santana (UEFS) about the professor-student relationship – a specific objective was to focus on the representations' content organization for this relation. The reason behind this course's choice was due to it include a significative number of students that have extended the duration of the course, or are about to give up.

To investigate the Food Engineering students' social representations brings forward social relevance, as it can encourage others researchers to work with similar perspectives, with the aim of comprehending how is the relationship between docents and student set. Based on research results, Higher Education institutions can feel committed in stimulating the planning, and institutional policy, focused on the personal development of the professors. These facts may turn the classroom environment to be based on affective relationship, providing the joint commitment for an integral learning of graduating students.

This article is divided in four parts. In the first, an approach was made about the Theory of Social Representations. In the second, there are described the methodologic processes employed for this research. Then, the results and discussion were presented, starting from the analysis of four table frames that allows us to visualize the content of representations about the professor-student relationship, besides its structure: the possible central core, the intermediary contrast, and peripherals elements. At last, there are put some conclusive considerations.

SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS THEORY

Social representations (SR) are defined as "a form of knowledge, socially elaborated and shared, with a practical objective, that contributes for the construction of a common reality to a social group." (JODELET, 1989, p.22). The author adds that it is a common sense knowledge, "a naive knowing", differentiated from others, mainly developed from science. However, Jodelet (1989) says that this knowledge is lawful for the value it has for social life, as it rules our relationship with the world, and with other people.

As mentioned by Rateau, Moliner, Guimelli and Abric (2012), the social representations present the features of being organized, that is, their elements interact among them; they are shared for a given social group; are produced by the collective; have utility for the social group, allowing the comprehension and the interpretation of the social environment, prescribing, justifying and legitimating certain conducts, and the social communications. In other words, as discussed by Abric (1997, p.13), "the representation is a guide for the actions, it guides the actions and the social relations". Abric (1993) emphasizes that the SR are stable and dynamic, rigid and flexible, at the same time; they are consensual, but also marked for strong interindividual differences.

Besides that, the SR interfere in many processes, as the knowledge diffusion and assimilation, of people's identity definition, and social transformations (JODELET, 1989). To conclude, the SR "embody ideas in collective experiences and behavior interactions" (MOSCOVICI, 2003, p. 48). How alludes Arruda (2003), it is worth to point that SR emerge in social environment from interactions. It conforms values and practices that are alive. Through own communication, the SR fade and transmute, reappearing as new representations, in an endless process.

Serge Moscovici has proposed, in 1961, the The Social Representations Theory (SRT), published in his study *La Psychanalyse, son image et son public*. This it was focused in the communication processes, in the social group production, and in a sociopsychological perspective. The researches based on SRT generated a transdisciplinary field which is present in the whole world, and has been developed within three approaches or orientations: the psychogenetic, the structural, and the sociodynamic. For the present work, it was decided to resort of the structural orientation, which will be briefly described.

The Central Core Theory (CC), created by Abric and Flament, proposes that in the elements' image composing a representation, some perform different functions, forming a structure. Therefore, the CC plays a meanings generator role, and presents an organizational function, as all other elements – called peripherals – organize around it. While the CC elements are understood as an abstract part, the peripheral ones are the concrete and operational part, as it

works as a chart of situations experimented by the individuals. It is worth to highlight that these two systems are different but complementary.

For Abric (1993), the central system shows some properties: it is linked to the collective memory and to group history; defines the homogeneity of this group; it is, at the same time, stable, coherent and rigid; it is not sensible to the immediate context; it is the locus where the representation consensus can be found. The peripherical system allows the integration of experiences and the individuals histories; prescribes behaviors; supports the nonhomogeneous portion of the group; shows itself to be more flexible; supports contradictions; it is more sensible to immediate context; although it protects the central core as a bumper, it is the first to absorb new information capable to reach the CC.

According to Gilly (1989, p.364), the interest in studying the SR in order to comprehend educational themes is due to the fact that the SR "guide attention about the role of social meanings organized sets in the educative process". Having in sight that the classroom is a social interactive system, its operation is related to other general systems of social representation of which they are dependent. Besides that, the SRT can help in a more accurate analyses related to the pedagogic communication in the classroom, "in the perception of how the representations are built, evolve and transmute inside of social groups". For our case, the representations of students in Food Engineering course. Thereby, this text focus the structural arrangement of representational elements in the professor-students relationship.

METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

For the purpose of reaching the our objective, "comprehending the meaning assigned by Food Engineering undergraduates at State University of Feira de Santana (UEFS) about the professor-student relationship", we have decided for developing a research with a qualitative and descriptive approach. It has focused in the structural orientation, that helped us to detail the semantic contents that were evoked on the professor-student relationship.

The data collection and production has occurred in November and December of 2019, during the classes of Food Engineering course, and in a meeting of the Academic Directorate with the scholars of the so referred course.

The study has counted with 53 collaborators that were registered between the third and the ninth semester. The procedure for the data production was the application of Free Association of Words Technique (FAWT), considered relevant because it allows to emerge the constituent elements of individuals' representations and its organization.

The FAWT has a projective disposition and shows itself appropriate to investigate both the qualitative and quantitative approaches, as it allows the researcher to access the internal structure of the representation about a determinate object. It also gives visibility to the relation between every element with the other ones, stressing the structured group from which each signification emerges. In this game, according to Rouquete and Rateau (1998), each piece only makes sense when contributes for the group signification. Therefore, the answers provided by the participants of FAWT, from inducing stimuli, bring latent dimensions about the object, and are organized with the format of an associative network of evoked terms (NÓBREGA; COUTINHO, 2003).

In this research, the inductive expression "professor-student relationship" was used. From this starting point, each person wrote the first four words that came up to their minds, that is, synonyms, substantives, adjectives, verbs or words related with the inductive terms. Besides that, personal data was requested, with the objective of drawing a students' profile: age, genre and semester in course.

To detect the content of the SR, and underline its organization, the frequency of associated items and its appearing order were used as indicators. So, the more frequent words, and those which were firstly evoked, were considered more significant for the social representation structure, compared to posteriorly mentioned and less frequent terms.

From the FAWT, all the words and expressions wrote by the participants were collected and organized in alphabetic order, composing a dictionary with 104 words and expressions - aside each word it was pointed its frequency and its evocation order. In order to analyze this material, the words that appeared more than 4 times were extracted out of the 104 word sample space, representing 12,5% of it. Thus, the more frequent words used by the students were detached, agreeing with other researches, as the Moscovici's, for which "the 'complex' term appears as the most frequent in the mobilized vocabulary in the purpose of Psychoanalysis. […] It is a direct consequence expected from theory, having in sight that, as organizational principles, the core cognitions are easily accessed than the others." (ROUQUETTE and RATEAU, 1998, p.38). Then, the median for frequencies and mean evocation order were calculated, obtaining as result, respectively, 7 and 2.26. From these calculations, there were generated four table frames (Table 1), which will be presented further in the results and discussion section.

It is important to bounce that the free association allowed the simultaneous access to the elements that constitute the semantic universe of the inductive term "professor-student relationship", to the content of this representation and its organization (internal structure), and to the elements of the central core (hierarchy).

It shall be emphasized that this study is directly related to the research called: "Relationship between professor and student in the university", which still is being developed at the Group of Studies and Researches about University Pedagogy (NEPPU), UEFS. At last, we inform that all ethic protocols related to the human being were respected, and that the collaborators have signed a form of free and clear consent, before the data production step.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It was found a preponderance of women, with 72% women and 28% men, among the 53 participants. This information leads us to infer there is a certain feminization at this engineering field, a course of the Applied Sciences branch, whose curriculum is mainly formed by components related to calculus: Vector Algebra and Analytical Geometry, Physics I and II, Differential and Integral Calculus II, Differential Equations I-E, General and Experimental Physics III, Physical Chemistry I and II, General Mechanics, Numerical Methods Applied to Engineering I, Thermodynamics Applied to Food Engineering I, Physical and Chemical Methods for Food Analysis, Probability and Statistics. Lombardi (2006) affirms that, although the female presence in workstations does not exceed 15% of the total of formal jobs, female enrollments are growing in the last decade.

The age of contributors varied between 18 and 29 years, and was distributed in the following age groups: 11% had 18 or 19 years old; 62% were in the range from 20 to 23 years old, and 27% were between 24 and 29 years old. That reveals that more a half of the surveyed people are young between 20 and 23 years old.

Below there are presented and discussed the four table frames composed by central and peripheric elements, forming an associative network about the professor-students relationship. In the upper left quadrant, assigned as the organizational elements of representations about the professor-students relationship, there appears the hypothesis of the Central Core. It has an organizational function, and is composed by three tuned elements, *teaching-friendship-learning*, defining a conception of *teaching* ruled in a relation of *friendship* between professor and students, which would favor the *learning*. Besides these three components, there is a fourth one that clashes and compromises this harmonious triad: the *distant* relationship between docent and student, which influences negatively the process of teaching and learning.

The analysis of CC, represented by the terms *teaching, friendship, learning* and *distant*, lead to the observation that the first and the third terms sign for the pedagogic dimension of the teaching-learning process, while *friendship* and *distant* are related to the affective dimension. Those dimensions unfold in the other quadrants. In this perspective, terms as *respect, understanding, hierarchy, attention, difficulty* and *empathy* embody the affective dimension, in proportion that *study, knowledge* and *test* translate the pedagogical dimension. Notoriously,

the two dimensions are connected. This ratifies some studies that value friendship and respect in the professor-students relationship (AROEIRA; MERLO, 2012; OLIVEIRA *et al* 2014; MOTA, 2017; BARROS, 2017).

Table 1. Structure of social representation of the professor-students relationship for Food Engineering students, UEFS, 2019.

CENTRAL CORE			1st PERIPHERAL		
Average: ≥7		**OME: ≤ 2,26**	**Frequency: >7**		**OME: >2,26**
Words	**Freq.**	**OME**	**Words**	**Freq.**	**OME**
Teaching	10	2,2	Respect	9	2,33
Friendship	10	2,1			
Learning	8	1,62			
Distant	7	2,0			
CONTRAST ZONE			2nd PERIPHERAL		
Average < 7		**OME: ≤ 2,26**	**Frequency < 7**		**OME: >2,26**
Words	**Freq.**	**OME**	**Words**	**Freq.**	**OME**
Study	6	2,0	Knowledge	6	2,33
Hierarchy	5	1,0	Difficulty	5	2,60
Understanding	4	2,0	Attention	4	3,67
			Empathy	4	2,5
			Test	4	3,5

Source: Data obtained with FAWT
Legend: Freq. = frequency; OME = Mean Order of Evocation

Other studies also discuss this subject, as Veras and Ferreira (2010); Ribeiro, Jutras and Louis (2005). The participants' speeches for these studies show that a positively affective professor has personal, pedagogic, and professional characteristics as: good-humor, patience, comprehension, humanity, closeness, valorization of students' previous knowledge, interest for their learning, students' mobilization for reading, understanding the relation between subject's contents and scholars' context, variation of didactic resources, among others. With this climate, the students feel more stimulated for the studies and, consequently, for the learning.

Ribeiro, Jutras and Louis (2005) says that a positively affective relationship strengthens the bond between students and professors, creates a reliable environment, and contributes for the students' positive self-image. At the end, these assume a compromise with themselves and with the professor, participating actively in the classes, improving their implication with the learning, and decreasing the chances to quit.

However, there exists a contra point in the professor-student relationship that is expressed in this research, when participants' social representations had evoked the *distant* relationship, and also at other studies (CAVACA *et al.,* 2010; AZEVEDO, 2018). For these, it is evident that this relationship is also marked for students' lack of interest, for little investment in reading and studying, for lack of self-regulation, besides other questions that make the professors dissatisfied. In addition, the studies emphasizes the existence of a power relation by the university professors, which makes the interaction *distant,* and with little space for dialogue.

Oliveira *et al* (2014) highlight how the lack of professor's receptivity, the authoritarianism, the inaccessibility, and the superior and rigid attitude can effectively contribute for the *distancing* in the professor-students relationship. This contributes for the establishment of fear, and what the academics call "terrorism", which turns the scholar academic adaptation to be difficult.

Next to the central core, at the upper right quadrant, there is the element of first peripheral: *respect.* It represents a 9 frequency, higher than for the terms *learning* and *distant* (situated in the CC). However, the term *respect* has showed an OME higher, what indicates that it was remembered later. The term *respect* can be interpreted with a mutual perspective, as the dignity recognition of the other, that this other is bearer of a knowledge and a project that deserves to be recognized by Higher Education docents. As peripheral element, the *respect* opens the possibility of change in the representation, and innovation of the relations between the persons involved in the educative process. It is worth adding that the term *respect,* although is not generally present yet in persons' practices, it appears in the representations of others groups, as in the case of the researches published by Cavaca *et al* (2010), Ribeiro, Jutras and Louis (2005), and Cosso (2018). It shall be noticed that, while at Cavaca *et al* (2010), the mutual *respect* appears together to the accessibility and availability to dialogue, for the last two works, *respect* is part of the CC of collaborators' representation.

The contrast zone, situated at the left bottom quadrant, brings together elements that present a low frequency. On the other hand, they were readily evoked as some elements situated in the CC. They indicate the existence of subgroups that present other organizing elements of representations. So, the professor-students relationship can be marked by *hierarchy,* that interfere in *comprehension* and *study.* Such representations will dialogue with the results presented by Cavaca *et al* (2010), when it evidences a certain fragility in the relationships between professors and students, as so many students and professors highlight, at their narratives, the relations marked by superiority or arrogance, authoritarianism, and even by intimidation imposed by some docents. These attitudes end up damaging the construction of knowledge.

At the second peripheral there are situated other peripheral schemes, farther from CC. These can be related to informations, judgments, stereotypes, and beliefs. In this sense, the students possibly inform that the established relationships with their professors would have the lack/presence of *attention, empathy,* or could be centered in *learning* and in *test.* The element *test* can be far from favoring the relation among professor and students. This observation corroborates the results presented by Mota (2016), while detecting a stress and discomfort level in students, caused by the application of exams, in the Physical Education course, at UEFS, locus of the present research. Professors from this course have negatively marked the students, and unintentionally indicated them as rejected models for future professors.

As the representations are symbolic, probably the students would be describing situations experienced by them with their professors, as *difficulties* related to *knowledge,* lack/presence of *empathy.* At this point, we shall remind that the peripheral elements represent the concrete and operational part of the representation. Thus, it would be necessary to ascertain such hypothesis through other studies.

Having in mind that the research includes a creation room for the researcher, the terms that compose Table 1 suggest diverse readings. So, we will present a possible reading, starting from the interrelationships of the terms. As the CC elements of a representation present an organizational and generator power for meanings, as quoted before, it was suggested to associate *teaching* and *learning* to positive feelings of the professor-students relationship: *friendship, respect, comprehension, attention* and *empathy.* Besides that, *teaching* and *learning* can be associated to attitudes generated at this relation: *study, knowledge, difficulty* and *test*. It is possible to associate the term *distant* (other element from CC) to *hierarchy*. This should point that besides a proximity relation, the Food Engineering students' representations on professor-students relationship are built upon *hierarchy* between docents and academics. This implies in the generation of conflicts and/or difficulties for the students in this relation.

In addition, Rouquette and Rateau (1998) refers that a representation's CC may present two different dimensions: the functional dimension, which is important for an assignment realization, and the normative dimension, which is directly implied with socio-affective, social or ideological dimensions. In this sense, *teaching* and *learning* would be related to assignment realization of professor-students subject, while *friendship* and *distant* could be related with the socio-affective dimension of representations.

The representations on the professor-students relationship, revealed by this work, bring up subtle aspects brought by the participants through their experiences and daily classroom constructions at the Higher Education. Such representations can influence their learning, and

also rebound in their professional practice, as indicated by Moscovici (2003), who says that the representations are strong guides to social practices.

Therefore, the objective reality of the professor-students relationships at university, in everyday life classroom, was rebuilt by the students who have been part of this study. For it, in a discursive, social, and ideological context, the students have acted as authors in the representation processes. Indeed, they have expressed knowledge about reality, and also values and norms systems, besides memories that have guided them.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The results of this research show the coexistence of disparate representational perspectives about the professor-students relationship, keeping in mind that the representations are historic-social products related to the individuals practices. Thereby, according to the students' values, interests, belongings and experiences, for both Basic or Higher Education, the professor-student relationship can represent oppositions. For some people, this relation was represented as a synonym of *friendship, respect, comprehension, empathy,* whereas for other students it was represented negatively: *distant, hierarchy, difficulty.* This makes us to question about who are such students and professors, which were mutually affected in the social interactions.

From the feedback given by these students about the relationship, it is clear that the contemporaneity requires teachers/professors to invest in relations ruled by cognitive aspects (*studies, knowledge, difficulties, test*), but also by affective aspects (*friendship, comprehension, attention* and *empathy*).

Furthermore, if the CC of a representation is responsible for the meaning, for the internal organization, for the stability, and for the resistance to changes, we may wonder that, although *teaching, friendship* and *learning* compose the core of investigated representations, the word *distant* also does it so. Because of this we think that some action needs to be developed in order to change these representations. This will create a classroom climate for which *hierarchy* does not difficult the professor-student relationships, and consequently hinder the students' learning process.

Even if the objective of this research was contemplated, we may evidence some limitations, as the fact that the data had been collected only with the participation of students. It has failed in listening the meanings assigned by professors for the relation professor-students, as they also are part of such a relation.

Besides that, we shall remind what Moscovici (2003, p.219) says about the central core elements: it "has a stronger resistance to the pressures of communication and change […]

express the permanency and the social uniformity". So, if the term *distant* occupies a center position for students' representations, it can be there for a long time, requiring new conversations and actions that may enable changes in this knowledge that still is intertwined in the professor-students relationships. We shall also point that the university is such a complex human environment, and we may hope that the professionals coming out of this context can take with them other knowledges, and contribute for the transformation of personal relations.

To conclude, we suggested other researches to be made, covering docents of the so investigated course, in order to identify and analyze their social representations about the professor-students relationship. The data examined in here may favor the creation of institutional professional development programs for professors, in order to contribute effectively with the improvement of their performance in the didactic and pedagogical fields, extending their knowledge related to the affective dimension.

REFERENCES

ABRIC, Jean-Claude. Central system, peripheral system: their functions and roles in the dynamics of social representations. **Papers on Social Representations** – Textes sur les représentations Sociales (1021-5573) Vol. 2 (2), 75-78, 1993.

ABRIC, Jean-Claude (Org.). **Pratiques sociales et représentations**. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1997.

ALMEIDA, Ângela Maria de Oliveira. Abordagem societal das representações sociais. **Sociedade e Estado**. Brasília, v. 24, n. 3, p. 713-737, set./dez. 2009.

AROEIRA, Kalline Pereira; MERLO, Francyne Wolkartte. Relação professor e aluno no ensino superior: reflexões no contexto de formação de professores de Educação Física. In: **XVI ENDIPE** - Encontro Nacional de Didática e Práticas de Ensino – UNICAMP, Campinas, 2012.

ARRUDA, Ângela. Viver é muito perigoso: a pesquisa em representações sociais no meio do redominho. *In*: COUTINHO, Maria da Penha *et al* (Org.). **Representações sociais**: abordagem interdisciplinar. João Pessoa: Editora universitária, 2003.

AZEVEDO, Rayanne Linhares. **De quem é a Universidade**? Um estudo sobre a relação de poder na interação aluno-professor. 2018. 152f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Processos de Desenvolvimento Humano e Saúde) Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2018.

BARROS, Flávia Regina. **Impactos afetivos das práticas pedagógicas no ensino superior**: o olhar dos alunos. 2017. 278f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação), Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Faculdade de Educação, Campinas, SP, 2017.

CAVACA, Aline Guio *et al*. A relação professor-aluno no ensino da Odontologia na Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo. **Trab. educ. saúde**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 8, n. 2, p. 305-318, Out. 2010. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1981-77462010000200008>. Acessed in Jan., 14, 2019.

COSSO, Esther. **Representações sociais de professores e alunos do ensino superior sobre relação professor e aluno**. 2017. 89f. Tese (Doutorado em Psicologia Educacional) Centro Universitário Fieo, Osasco, 2017.

CUNHA, M. Isabel. A universidade: desafios políticos e epistemológicos. In: CUNHA, M. Isabel. (Org.). **Pedagogia universitária**: energias emancipatórias em tempos neoliberais. Araraquara, SP: Junqueira&Marin, 2006.

DAY, Christopher. **Pasión por enseñar**: La identidad personal y professional del docente y sus valores. Madrid: Narcea, 2011.

GILLY, Michel. Les représentations sociales dans le camp éducatif. In: JODELET, Denise. (Dir.). **Les représentations sociales**. Presses universitaires de France, 1989. p.363-384.

JODELET, Denise. **Les représentations sociales.** Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1989.

LOMBARDI, Maria Rosa. A engenharia brasileira contemporânea e a contribuição das mulheres nas mudanças recentes do campo profissional. **Revista Tecnologia e Sociedade**, Curitiba, n. 2, p. 109-131, 1. sem. 2006.

MASETTO, Marcos Tarcísio. **Competência pedagógica do professor universitário**. 2. ed. rev. São Paulo:Summus, 2012.

MOSCOVICI, Serge. O fenômeno das representações sociais. *In*: MOSCOVICI, Serge. **Representações sociais**: investigações em psicologia social Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2003. p. 29 - 109.

MOTA, Clebson dos Santos Mota. **A influência da relação afetiva entre professores e estudantes do curso de educação física da UEFS no processo de formação acadêmica.** 2017. 154f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação), Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana, Feira de Santana, 2017.

NÓBREGA, S. M; COUTINHO, M. P. L. O Teste de Associação Livre de Palavras. In: COUTINHO, M. P. L. (Org.). **Representações sociais**: Abordagem Interdisciplinar. João Pessoa: Editora Universitária, 2003.

NÓVOA, A. **A Formação de professores e trabalho pedagógico**. Lisboa: Educa, 2002.

OLIVEIRA, Clarissa Tochetto de et al. Percepções de estudantes universitários sobre a relação professor-aluno. **Psicol. Esc. Educ.**, Ago 2014, vol.18, no.2, p.239-246. ISSN 1413-8557.

PEREIRA, ALEXANDRE BRITTO. **Afetividade na relação professor-aluno:** uma pesquisa bibliográfica exploratória. 2017. 144f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Psicologia) Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2017.

RATEAU, P., et al. Social Representation Theory. *In*: VAN LANGE, P. A. M.; KROGLANSKI, A. W.; HIGGINS, E. T. (org.). **Handbook of theories of social psychology**, v. 2. London: SAGE, 2012.

ROUQUETTE, M.; RATEAU, P. **Introduction à l'étude des représentations sociales**. Saint-Martin-d'Hères (Isère): PUG, 1998.

RIBEIRO, M. L.; JUTRAS, F.; LOUIS, R. Análise das representações sociais de afetividade na relação educativa. **Psicologia da Educação**, São Paulo: 20, 1 sem. de 2005, p. 1-163.

RIBEIRO, M. L. A afetividade na relação educativa. **Estud. psicol**. (Campinas), Set 2010, vol.27, no.3, p.403-412. ISSN 0103-166X.

SOUZA, Cleudinéte Ferreira dos Santos. **Relação afetiva entre professora e estudantes do Ensino Superior:** sentidos, desafios e possibilidades. 2016. 171f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação), Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana. Feira de Santana, 2016.

VERAS, Renata da Silva; FERREIRA, Sandra Patrícia Ataíde. A afetividade na relação professor-aluno e suas implicações na aprendizagem, em contexto universitário**. Educar em Revista** (em linea) 2010, (setembro – dezembro). Retrieved from <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=155018477015> Acessed in: May, 7, 2019.