**Resumo do capítulo de Rogoff, B. (2003).**

**“Development as Transformation of Participation in Cultural Activities.”**

 This chapter discuss previous considerations between individuals and their sociocultural environment. The author brings a new perspective, arguing that people and cultural communities are mutually creating each other. This theory leads to an ending of the view of culture *influencing* development but rather consider both as an integrated entity. Human development is thus seen as a process in which people transform themselves through their on-going participation in cultural activities, transforming their cultural communities across generations. The author discusses the influential approaches of the work of Vygotsky, Mead, the Whitings and Bronfenbrenner. Vygotsky's theory has been considered helpful in connecting individual’s thinking with cultural traditions such as schooling and literacy while Mead’s work is presented as a pioneering demonstration that moments of shared activities participate in the development. The Whitings’ psycho-cultural model allowed for a deeper understanding of development with the consideration of individuals’ immediate environment, social partners, and institutional and cultural systems and values. Bronfenbrenner’s ecological system theory considered a changing individual in a changing environment and took into consideration even indirectly impacting settings such as parental working place for instance. Nevertheless, although these perspectives are already pathbreaking regarding previous developmental theories of the time, the author argues that they characterized the relation between individuals and the sociocultural environment in a deleterious way, precisely by defining them as two distinct entities. The author recognizes that conventional, and detrimental, ways of representing the individual-environment relation and defining its interaction may have been outside of the inspiring authors’ scope. Nonetheless, as visual tools are important to communicate theoretical theories and construct our ideas, the author offers a different representation of development considering the indivisible and mutually impacting relation between individuals and their sociocultural environment. Finally, the author further details her view on development. She defines it by a “process of people’s changing participation in sociocultural activities of their communities”. She argues that “culture is not static”, as it ever changes through the efforts of people working together, using and adapting material and symbolic tools, provided by previous generations and ultimately modified for the future ones. This view emphasizes that personal, interpersonal and cultural aspects of human activities are different views on the same ongoing, mutually constitutive process.

**Questões sobre o capítulo de Freire, P. (1996).**

**“Não há docência sem discência.”**

The text left me more with considerations and motivation than questions. It is very interesting how Paulo Freire uses the nature of the words to understand their meanings and their impacts on people. Besides, he reaches the conclusion that words shape people and spread the concept of the indisociable sociocultural nature of every human.

It appears to me as a very elegant illustration of the various ways enabling us to reach an understanding of the world. Indeed, Paulo Freire, through thinking, appears to me to have reached a similar perception of the world than Rogoff and other researchers through eurocentric science. Some of these various ways for knowledge, that I already know, are: traditional eurocentric sciences, philosophy and meditation, literature, living experiences and witnessing. I never realized that I already knew many different ways from eurocentric sciences. Now I can perceive the negation, disregarding and invisibilization of the non-eurocentric sciences or ways to knowledge. And therefore the parallel with colonization makes further sense since this same negation of alternatives has been occurring about colonized peoples and cultures. Decolonizing science is not just freeing ourselves from a dominant, somewhat archaical, and authoritarian view of knowledge in order to discover the world beyond the walls, but it is also about deconstructing the jails where alternative ways of knowledge have been put.

Interestingly, the text of Paulo Freire gives what appears to me as a solution. Decolonizing the world and liberating knowledge could be helped by decolonizing our minds and learning how to construct knowledge together throughout interactions, exploration and interpretation of what may be known. Paulo Freire considers that through the right way of teaching, epistemological curiosity can arise, leading the way to pertinent knowledge construction. And this right way of teaching has to incarnate values of respect, of consideration, of non-discrimination, of humility and certainly many more that are by nature opposite to colonization and unable to maintain it. Teaching in the right way, in the sense of Paulo Freire, would endlessly be forming teachers to be decolonizers whose teaching would enable students, as well as themselves, to think and act in a decolonizing way. The knowledge would not be an end in itself but an emerging product of the process. Decolonization seems to start within ourselves and spread to the world from the inside out.