

The curricularization of extension in the voices of college professors: between discursive tensions and contradictions

*A curricularização da extensão nas vozes de docentes
do ensino superior: entre tensões e contradições discursivas*

*La curricularización de la extensión en las voces de los docentes
de la educación superior: entre tensiones y contradicciones discursivas*

Andréa Bier Serafim^I

Márcia Aparecida Amador Mascia^{II}

Luciana Aparecida Silva de Azeredo^{III}

ABSTRACT

Anchored in the theoretical-methodological perspective of Discourse Analysis, this article aims to problematize Resolution CNE/CES No. 7, of 2018, in relation to the effects of meaning that emerge from/in the statements of college professors regarding the curricularization of extension and the manner in which it has been operationalized in the institution that constitutes the locus of this research. The corpus consists of semi-structured interviews with three professors from a Higher Education Institution in the southern region of Brazil. The context of the production of Resolution CNE/CES No. 7/2018 is presented, as well as the context of the locus institution. The results of the interview analysis point to effects of meaning that highlight the constitutive tensions and contradictions of discourse, manifested through the clash between two discursive formations: one aligned with governmental and institutional discourse and another related to the problematization of the role of hourly professors with regard to remuneration and evaluation.

Keywords: Resolution CNE/CES No. 7, of 2018. College professors. Discourse Analysis. Curricularization of extension. Education Policies.

RESUMO

Ancorado na perspectiva teórico-metodológica da Análise do Discurso, este artigo tem como objetivo problematizar a Resolução CNE/CES n. 7, de 2018, no entrecruzamento dos efeitos de sentido que emergem dos/nos dizeres de docentes do Ensino Superior a respeito da curricularização da extensão e da forma como ela vem sendo operacionalizada na instituição *locus* desta pesquisa. O *corpus* consiste em entrevistas semiestruturadas com três professores de um Centro Universitário da região Sul do

^IFAE Centro Universitário, Curitiba, PR, Brazil. Email: andrea.serafim@fae.edu  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2003-6601>

^{II}Universidade São Francisco, Itatiba, SP, Brazil. Email: marciaaam@uol.com.br  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5305-7332>

^{III}Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil. Email: luciana.azeredo@cefetmg.br

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3709-2597>

Brasil. Apresentamos o contexto de produção da Resolução CNE n. 7/2018 e, também, o contexto da instituição *locus*. Os resultados da análise das entrevistas apontam para efeitos de sentido que evidenciam as tensões e contradições constitutivas do discurso e que se manifestam através do embate entre duas formações discursivas: uma alinhada ao discurso governamental e ao institucional e uma de problematização da atuação do docente horista em relação à remuneração e à avaliação.

Palavras-chave: Resolução CNE/CES n. 7, de 2018. Professores do Ensino Superior. Análise do Discurso. Curricularização da Extensão. Políticas de Educação.

RESUMEN

Basado en la perspectiva teórico-metodológica del Análisis del Discurso, este artículo tiene como objetivo problematizar la Resolución CNE/CES n.º 7, de 2018, en contraposición con los efectos de sentido que emergen de los discursos de los docentes de la Educación Superior sobre la curricularización de la extensión y la forma en que se está implementando en la institución objeto de esta investigación. El corpus consiste en entrevistas semiestructuradas con tres profesores de un Centro Universitario en la región Sur de Brasil. Presentamos el contexto de producción de la Resolución CNE n. 7/2018 y también el contexto de la institución objeto. Los resultados del análisis de las entrevistas señalan efectos de sentido que evidencian las tensiones y contradicciones constitutivas del discurso, manifestándose a través del enfrentamiento entre dos formaciones discursivas: una alineada con el discurso gubernamental y el institucional, y otra que problematiza la actuación del profesor que cobra por horas con relación a la remuneración y la evaluación.

Palabras clave: Resolución CNE/CES n.º 7, de 2018. Docentes de la Educación Superior. Análisis del Discurso. Curricularización de la extensión. Políticas de Educación.

INTRODUCTION

With the general aim of investigating higher education public policies, the specific object of this article is the integration of extension¹ subjects in the curricula of undergraduate courses, hereinafter referred to as curricularization. A discursive approach is employed to discuss the Resolution of the National Council of Education (*Conselho Nacional de Educação — CNE*) and the Higher Education Chamber (*Câmara da Educação Superior — CES*) No. 7, of 2018, based on higher education professors' reports.

The 1988 Federal Constitution establishes the inseparability of research, teaching, and extension in higher education. Since its enactment, the debate on the role of extension has intensified, as observed in the Law of Guidelines and Bases (*Lei de Diretrizes e Bases — LDB*) and the National Education Plans (*Planos Nacionais de Educação — PNE*). Initially, the debate was limited, culminating in the inclusion of extension activities in the 2018 curriculum with the publication of Resolution CNE/CES No. 7/2018, which is the focus of this article. The Resolution provides for the implementation of extension in higher education curricula by 2021. However, the deadline was postponed to 2023 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Few studies were identified in the survey of existing research on extension curricularization based on the discursive theoretical-methodological framework adopted in this study. The keywords used were extension curricularization, discourse analysis (DA), and university professors' discourse. A summary chart of the studies that met the inclusion criteria is presented below (Chart 1):

1 University extension is also known as university outreach and Community engagement.

Chart 1 – Summary of the State of the Art.

Title	Author/year	Some notes
University missions, including university extension or third mission, in relation to market/mercantilization	Sguissardi, 2019	It proposes a discussion of the university, understanding extension from the standpoint of mercantilization.
Higher Education in Brazil: a study on the university extension curricularization policy	Serva, 2020	It develops an analysis based on Ball's policy cycle (1994) and concludes that curricularization represents an achievement and may promote transformative education.
University extension practices and perspectives: a study with education professors	Vargas, Konageski and Araújo, 2021	It presents a Discursive Textual Analysis of a sample of 116 higher education professors who responded to a questionnaire. Concludes that professors recognize the principle of inseparability between teaching, research, and extension; however, their practices remain focused on teaching and research.
Resolution CNE No. 7/2018 and the bureaucratization of higher education: notes on the guideline exclusively related to university extension	Wociechoski and Catani, 2022	It examines the bureaucratization of higher education regarding university extension by analyzing Resolution CNE No. 7/2018 and indicates that it was developed by professors linked to the extension cause but lacked participation from students and society.
A discursive analysis of extension evaluation in Resolution CNE/CES No. 7: the Big Brother	Serafim and Mascia, 2022	Based on a Foucauldian framework, identifies elements of surveillance and control in aspects of the Resolution concerning actions developed by institutions, professors, and students.
Curricularization of University Extension: Possibilities and Dilemmas at Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro	Wociechoski and Catani, 2023	It analyzes the implementation of extension curricularization in undergraduate programs at Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) through document analysis and interviews with professors. Concludes that the institution chose not to increase course workload, instead creating two curricular insertion mechanisms: Supplementary Curricular Requirement: (<i>Requisito Curricular Suplementar</i> — RCS)/Curricular Extension Activity (<i>Atividade Curricular de Extensão</i> — ACE) and hybrid courses.

Source: Elaborated by the authors (2024).

No studies using DA as a theoretical framework or presenting a corpus composed of semi-structured interviews with professors directly involved in the new extension curricularization policy were identified. This indicates the need for further debate on the topic. Thus, the relevance of the proposed theme is established, both academically and socially, as this article advances the study of ongoing extension curricularization.

In light of this, the aim of this article was to discuss Resolution CNE/CES No. 7 of 2018 through the lens of DA, focusing on the effects of meanings emerging from higher education professors'

reports on extension curricularization and on how it has been implemented in the institution where this research was conducted.

The theoretical-methodological framework adopted is based on French-Brazilian DA, whose main authors include Pêcheux and Orlandi. The corpus consists of semi-structured interviews with three university professors regarding their experience with extension curricularization.

To develop the problematization, the article is structured as follows: this introduction and three additional sections — a brief historical overview of university extension and the macro-level conditions of production² of Resolution CNE No. 7/2018; the theoretical-analytical framework and the micro-level conditions of production, that is, at the level of the institution studied, including analysis of the interviewees' reports; and concluding remarks.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION AND RESOLUTION CNE NO. 7/2018: MACRO PRODUCTION CONDITIONS

Extension activities originated in European universities. Rocha (1984) highlights the importance of countries such as France, Belgium, Italy, Germany and England in offering university services to communities. In Latin America, according to Freitas Neto (2011), the origins of university extension are identified in a student movement against church interference in education in Argentina in 1918.

In Brazil, Rocha (1995) and Cunha (2007) identify Universidade Popular Livre of São Paulo as the first institution to record extension activities, offering open courses to the local community from December 1914 to 1917.

Between 1931 and 1963, many extension activities were developed in universities, mainly aimed at the popularization of sciences, arts, and languages (Sousa, 2010). After the *coup-d'état* of 1964, extension began to be used for political purposes. The main project of that period was the Rondon Project, in which students worked in communities focusing on political action rather than on the needs of the population.

The 1980s were marked by the resurgence of social movements. The 1988 Constitution reflects this context in its essence (Sousa, 2010). This period required debate, which led to the creation of the Forum of Extension Vice-Rectors of Brazilian Public Universities (*Fórum de Pró-reitores de Extensão das Universidades Públicas Brasileiras* — FORPROEX) in 1987; the National Forum of Extension and Community Action of Universities and Community Higher Education Institutions (*Fórum Nacional de Extensão e Ação Comunitária das Universidades e Instituições de Ensino Superior Comunitárias* — FOREXT), established in 1998; and the Forum of Extension of Private Higher Education Institutions (*Fórum de Extensão das Instituições de Ensino Superior Particulares* — FOREXP, created by private institutions in 2002).

From 2014 to 2024, university extension gained greater prominence, and its implementation was incorporated into curricula. This was established in Goal 12.7, which states: "Securing at least 10% (ten per cent) of the total curricular credits required for graduation in university extension programs and projects, guiding its action, mainly to areas of great social relevance" (Brasil, 2014, p. 11).

In this context, Resolution CNE/CES No. 7 was published on December 18, 2018. The Resolution defines the foundation and procedures for the development of university extension, emphasizing the requirement to allocate at least 10% of the curricular workload of undergraduate courses to extension activities.

2 In DA, production conditions refer to factors that shape production, circulation and interpretation of discourses. *Macro* production conditions are related to wider and broader determinations such as social, economic and cultural structures, while *micro* production conditions emerge from immediate factors and contexts, which affect directly education and understanding of discourses and include the interlocutors' characteristics, speakers' relationships, and the specific situational context.

A committee of CES was created, including members from federal and state public universities, as well as private and confessional Higher Education Institutions (HEI). Those members were qualified in different areas, such as sociology, philosophy, physics, and economics. However, there were no members from the field of education. In addition, to support the development of the Resolution, subcommittees were created to assist the work of the main group (Brasil, 2018a).

Next, a summary chart of the Resolution development process is presented (Chart 2).

Chart 2 – Development of Resolution No. 7, from Technical Opinion No. 608.

February 16, 2017	Start of the debate to establish extension guidelines.
April 6, 2017	Meeting of the committees with the presence of CNE members and representatives of the forums to define the schedule of subsequent actions.
June 2, 2017	Second enlarged committee meeting, in which priorities and the immediate need for university extension regulations were highlighted, particularly regarding interaction with evaluation and regulation dimensions, as well as standards and criteria for extension promotion.
September 28, 2017	Conclusion of the proposal for the opinion and resolution, when key concepts of university extension were defined and became the first agenda to be discussed.
September 28, 2017	National forum meetings to discuss the agenda. The extensive discussion enabled the detailing of extension activities and institutional policies.
December 18, 2017	Resolution approval.

Source: Elaborated by the authors (2024).

In Resolution CNE/CES No. 7, the concept of extension curricularization appears in Article 3, emphasizing the integration of university extension into the curriculum as one of its components:

The Brazilian Higher Education Extension Guidelines regulate academic extension subjects in undergraduate courses, as a component in their curricula, considering them in the aspects they are linked to the students' qualification, as provided for in Institutional Development Plans (*Planos de Desenvolvimento Institucionais* — PDIs), and Institutional Political Projects (*Projetos Políticos Institucionais* — PPIs) of education institutions, according to the graduates' profile, as set in the Course Pedagogical Project (*Projetos Pedagógicos dos Cursos* — PPCs) and other specific norms (Brasil, 2018a, p. 1).

Wociechoski and Catani (2022) highlight that the bureaucratization of the extension curricularization process is intrinsically linked to institutional documents. Such documents include a variety of records that must be documented, monitored and continuously assessed. For example, the registration of student documentation is part of this process. Furthermore, based on Foucault (2008), this approach shapes the behavior of both students and professors, according to the specific guidelines of the institutions in which they operate. This theme was explored in detail in the thesis that originated this article (Serafim, 2023).

University extension activities, as defined in the Resolution, directly involve the external community, bringing it closer to higher education institutions. Such activities may include institutional programs, including government initiatives aligned with municipal, state, district, and national policies. They are subject to continuous critical self-evaluation, must be linked to teaching and research, must contribute to the education of students and professors, and must establish relationships with society

and partners. These academic dimensions are essential for the development of the areas covered by Resolution CNE/CE No. 7, which include communication, culture, human rights and justice, education, environment, health, technology and production, as well as social activities in general.

The areas described above reflect the Resolution's inspiration in international documents, particularly Agenda 2030 (UNESCO, 2016), in which education is considered a pillar of development that directly affects national economies through the qualification of students. Through education, individuals are expected to promote social and economic transformation and contribute to the eradication of poverty, protection of natural resources, and promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies, among other objectives, in accordance with the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) established in Agenda 2030 (Morosini and Mentges, 2020).

In summary, Resolution CNE/CES No. 7, of December 18, 2018, the object of this study, establishes guidelines for extension in Brazilian higher education and regulates the provisions of Goal 12.7, Law No. 13,005/2014, which approves the 2014–2024 National Education Plan, in line with the principles advocated by international agencies.

It is relevant to highlight that HEIs may implement extension curricularization in different ways: as a curriculum component (academic subject), as part of a curriculum component, or as an extension activity validated by the institution. According to the Resolution:

Art. 8 Extension activities, according to their characterization in pedagogical political projects of courses, are inserted in the following modalities:

- I - programs;
- II - projects,
- III - courses and workshops,
- IV - events,
- V- services (Brasil, 2018a, p. 2).

At the institution where this research was conducted, among the curriculum components offered in undergraduate courses, there are those related to extension, called Labs, which include classes and a specific evaluation system. They are regulated by an Ordinance, and the institution requires impact projects that address societal demands and are properly documented and disseminated through the institution's communication channels.

Regarding the specific evaluation system for curriculum components with extension activities, several assessment tools, in addition to tests, are suggested, but no one is mandatory. However, at least one individual assessment is required and may take any form. Depending on the development of extension activities, other tools are suggested, such as reports, templates, oral examinations, written examinations, exercises, presentations, and participation in project design, among others.

Following this brief presentation of the transformations in extension that resulted in Resolution CNE/CES No. 7, of December 18, 2018, and considering how it has been implemented in the investigated institution, the theoretical-analytical framework employed is presented, followed by the analyses conducted in this study.

THEORETICAL-ANALYTICAL DEVICE AND MICRO PRODUCTION CONDITIONS

This is a qualitative and interpretivist study whose corpus derives from semi-structured interviews³ on the relevant theme, using discourse analysis.

3 The project comprises practices set forth in the applicable law, including Resolutions 466/12 and 510/16 by the National Health Council, which regulate research ethics, and was approved by the institution Research Ethics Committee, with number 4400345, dated 12/11/2020.

From the standpoint of methodological devices or procedures, French-Brazilian DA theory and methodology were adopted, whose main authors are Pêcheux, in France, and Orlandi, in Brazil. DA presents itself as an “interdisciplinary field” (Orlandi, 2007), developing in parallel with the so-called Human Sciences as an interpretive reading practice since for Pêcheux (2002, p. 44), “any fact is already an interpretation.”

Two concepts support this theoretical-analytical perspective, namely, discourse and subject. Discourse here is not language or linguistic expressions, but rather what is materialized in/through language. For Orlandi (2007, p. 15), “discourse is the word in movement, language practice: when studying discourse, one observes the individual speaking.” Thus, analyzing discourse means “understanding language making sense, as symbolic work, part of the general social work, constituting human beings and their history” (Orlandi, 2007, p. 15). In other words, the challenge proposed by the theoretical-methodological approach adopted in this study is “carrying out critical and reflective readings that neither reduce discourse to analyses of purely linguistic aspects nor dissolve it into a historical work on ideology” (Brandão, 2004, p. 103).

Starting from the linguistic materiality of a corpus, the discourse analyst must reach an understanding of how meanings are organized and produced. According to Fernandes (2007, p. 81), such a corpus appears as a “discursive universe marked by instability, which reveals individuals’ movements and restlessness.” In sum, discourse analysis examines how text signifies and occurs in the intertwining of description and interpretation.

Interpretation can be said to occur in a double dimension, that is, the intradiscourse (discursive materiality) and the interdiscourse (discursive memory), which will be discussed later, since DA works with an object inserted in the relationship between language and history (Ernst-Pereira, 2009).

Another aspect is that discourse and subject are closely linked, considering that “discourse is the effect of meaning between speakers” (Orlandi, 2007, p. 21). For DA, individuals are not owners of what they say; rather, they are constituted through their insertion in language and are determined by exteriority, ideology, and interiority, that is, the unconscious. Therefore, the individual/subject is understood as a subject position, and this position must be filled by different subject positions under certain conditions or Discursive Formations (DF). Meanings are produced, understood, and interpreted by subjects within certain DFs that affect them and constitute them as subjects of that DF.

DF can thus be understood as what can be said or understood “in a given socio-historical context” (Orlandi, 2007, p. 43), bearing in mind that a DF “reveals ideological formations integrating it [...] [and that] all discursive formation contains, within it, the presence of different discourses” (Fernandes, 2007, p. 50-51). Thus, according to Orlandi (2007, p. 43), “words have no meaning by themselves, they extract their meaning from the discursive formations they are inserted in.”

The DFs in which interviewees are situated, such as that their words produce certain effects of meaning, are linked to production conditions and are constituted by interdiscursive relations (interdiscursive threads) intertwined in the intradiscourse. The recognition of certain meanings and not others is possible when observing the discourses that constitute the memory of the interviewee-enunciator, that is, their discursive memory, which for Pêcheux (1988) is constituted by what has already been said. This enables interdiscourse to be understood as a place of meaning construction, which often goes beyond the subject-interviewee’s intentionality.

In summary, discourse comprises a collectivity of subjects sharing sociocultural and ideological aspects, remaining in opposition to other discourses. The discourse analyst must track discursive memory (interdiscourse) and question how and why a given utterance/discourse appears rather than another. Based on linguistic materiality (intradiscourse), the aim is to disentangle the complex interdiscursive thread, identifying speech regularities that point to the heterogeneity constituting

subject and discourse. These are effects of meaning that resonate when what has been said is retrieved, or the interdiscourses to be pursued when analyzing interviews.

The fundamental concepts of DA guide analysts throughout the analysis, enabling the selection, organization, and segmentation of relevant corpora according to research objectives and/or questions. It is important to note that, in DA, there are no pre-defined categories; these are constructed by the analyst while examining the corpus. Analysis is thus an interpretative process aimed at identifying effects of meaning and their materialization into language, therefore:

Each material to be analyzed requires from the analyst, according to the question raised, the use of concepts that another analyst would not refer to, due to their (different) questions. One analysis is not equal to another because it uses different concepts and this has crucial results in the material description. [...] What defines the analytical device type is the question proposed by the analyst, the nature of the material analyzed and the analysis objective (Orlandi, 2007, p. 27).

The analysis is then carried out by means of segments, considered discursive units, which represent parts or fragments related to the whole. Such segments seek to reveal the relationships between the language system and the subject's possible interpretations, while remaining connected to the corpus (Pêcheux, 2002). "This is about the selection of fragments of the corpus for analysis; that is, when analysts choose their object of analysis, they also need to select small parts, chosen for keeping semantic relations, considering the study objectives" (Fernandes and Sá, 2021, p. 86).

Analyses proposed by DA do not seek to be conclusive, since the corpus is understood as constantly reconstructed through new interpretations, considering both linguistics and historical-social analyses. The analyst must bear in mind that several interpretations may be possible, but not all, as pointed out by Pêcheux (2002), and must listen attentively to the corpus, considering the conditions under which it was produced, observing discursive regularities that emerge during analysis, referring to theory, and complementing it as needed to better interpret and analyze the material.

At this point, the notion of imaginary formations is considered, as it constitutes discourse. For DA, any discourse is unconsciously guided by the image the subject has of themselves, of others (interlocutors), and of the objects addressed in speech. These are images and representations that individuals possess and through which meanings are anticipated, which "allow individuals to go from empirical situations — subject positions — to the positions of subjects in discourse" (Orlandi, 2007, p. 40). Such positions acquired meaning in discourse and are linked to the socio-historical context of what has been said. These formations are observable in relations of meaning and force (the place from where one speaks, with whom one speaks, etc.), through traces left in discourse. Therefore, such formations are necessarily part of the language functioning, not residing solely in the meaning of words, but rather "before and beyond them" (Orlandi, 2007, p. 42). However, there is an illusion that what is said and how it is understood can be adjusted and controlled. Another relevant aspect is that all subjects can experience this process, that is, they can place themselves in the position from which their interlocutors "listen" to their words, thus anticipating the meanings their words may produce. Additionally, from the interplay of imaginary formations, utterances are formulated (Orlandi, 2007).

Imaginary formations are significantly manifested in the research corpus, since the interviewer is a member of the group of professors at the studied institution and is also the coordinator of the university extension sector, with a full-time workload (40 hours per week), that is, positioned above the interviewees in the institutional hierarchy. One interviewee is also a full-time professor and holds a pedagogical management position related to teaching, research, and extension, in addition to teaching at the institution. The other two professors are part-time employees who teach various curricular components, while one of them also works at another institution.

Before beginning the analysis of the discursive segments selected for this article, it should be noted that the institution where the research was conducted is located in southern Brazil and is a Community University Center. It is an institution with nearly 70 years of history, which has undergone changes since its foundation. Initially, it offered only three programs: Administration, Accounting Sciences, and Economic Sciences. Currently, it offers more than 20 programs, including innovative ones such as Digital Business and Digital Communication, among others. Its teaching staff comprises approximately 200 professionals, all under the CLT regime (Brazilian Labor Law Consolidation), some working full-time and others part-time.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with three professors from the institution, who were assigned pseudonyms to preserve their identities and are presented below. All had previously developed curricularized extension activities. The interviews were conducted in 2021, using Google Meet due to the pandemic. Therefore, this study focuses on a specific institution and on how it implements the provisions of the Resolution, based on the effects of meaning emerging from the discourse of professors working in that institution.

The semi-structured interview questions addressed extension curricularization as implemented in the institution where the research was conducted and as established in the respective Resolution.

After presenting the theoretical-analytical framework guiding the analysis and the context of the institution and interviews, the next session presents the discourse analysis, seeking to unveil the effects of meaning in the interviewees' discourse and how they are expressed through language.

EFFECTS OF MEANING OF UNIVERSITY EXTENSION CURRICULARIZATION ACCORDING TO PROFESSORS: BETWEEN TENSIONS AND CONTRADICTIONS

For the analysis, cross-referencing was conducted between the Resolution provisions, their operationalization in the institutions where the study was developed, and the effects of meaning emerging from professors' reports of this process. Therefore, the analysis is supported by three axes, which intertwine and imply one another, namely, the governmental, the institutional, and the teaching staff. The latter is divided into two sub-axes, that is, the professor who also occupies a position in pedagogical management, like the interviewer, and two part-time professors (Chart 3).

Chart 3 – Participant subjects.

Participant-subject	Degree	Area of work
Fred	Degrees in Administration and Business Logistics, with MBA and PhD in Production	At the time of the interview, he taught undergraduate and graduate courses in the administration area and held a pedagogical management position at the institution. Work regime: 40 hours/week
Jaqueline	Degree in Administration, MBA, and PhD	She taught subjects in the administration area and had previously worked under a 40-hour regime at the institution. Work regime: part-time
Helena	Degree in Language, MSc in Education, PhD student in the Communication and Language Program	She taught in bachelor's and teacher education programs at the institution studied and at another institution. Work regime: part-time

Source: Elaborated by the authors (2024).

The interviewer (administrator, MBA in Administration, and PhD in Education), besides teaching in the administration program, occupies a management position at the institution, coordinating the university extension center. It seems relevant to highlight that, in the perspective adopted in this study, no discourse is entirely neutral and imaginary formations are at work in discursive practices. In other words, however carefully the interviews data may have been collected in terms of listening to the participating professors, it may have caused, without the interviewer's knowledge, some discomfort and/or censorship in their statements.

Before reporting the analyses, it seems relevant to emphasize that the model adopted for extension curricularization was developed by the teaching vice-rectorate alongside course coordinators and the extension coordination. Monitoring of activities developed in the Labs is carried out by the extension coordination, as well as by the coordination to which the Lab is linked. Every semester, professors are invited to take part in workshops that support their activities, aiming to enable them to work in a way that avoids complaints and/or student dropouts, among other issues, due to a lack of transparency and/or disorganization on the part of professors when developing extension activities and failure to meet the objectives of the Lab courses. Furthermore, there is the opportunity for individual assistance whenever needed, upon prior appointment. However, it is worth mentioning that they were not invited to participate in the selection of the model to be adopted by the university center, nor in the way it is implemented and managed.

When Fred was asked about his view of extension curricularization based on his experience, he used metaphors to explain it.

RD1 (Fred)

I see extension curricularization as a trigger for extension actions; it truly provides a foundation in higher education qualification. It's not something separate that you choose.

They are pillars to build the little house of student's higher education, do you understand? So now, in fact, it is a pillar. It's not an outbuilding.

[...] Yes, it was beneficial, it's challenging because it breaks the whole model of content and exams we are used to. Look at the assignments, and extension has always been, as I said, something separate, right? But it is... But... currently, what happens is that, through the extension mandatory nature, we have to think of it as a part of the house. Wait a minute, so I'm bringing the outbuilding into my kitchen. So, I want to make a nicer kitchen, I want this barbecue grill.

According to the interview, Fred had already been working with extension and had already started this work within the curriculum. Thus, he begins his speech by associating this new model with a "trigger," as something capable of setting off, in this case, "actual extension." For him, this is a fundamental theme in higher education, mainly because extension is not considered something separate from teaching but rather an integral part — something that must be carried out. The linking of curricularization to the term "foundation" suggests that it should not be seen as something optional, but rather as mandatory, the basis of professional education, just as a foundation is the base of a house.

The interviewee's metaphorical reasoning suggests that extension loses its characteristic of being accessory, as an outbuilding is in relation to the main house, and is brought inside and attached to the kitchen, thus becoming an integral part of the house, that is, "a nicer kitchen" with a "barbecue grill," in his words. The resulting effect of meaning is that extension curricularization is not only positive, but also enriches the curriculum and, consequently, students' qualification.

Thus, the mandatory nature of extension linked to the curriculum, as established by Resolution CNE/CES No. 7, of 2018, which is the focus of this article, is seen as both “beneficial” and “challenging.” Moreover, it is pointed out that the extension curricularization policy “breaks the model of content and exams we are used to.” Again, a term appears whose meaning suggests structural changes: “break.” It is argued that the terms “trigger” and “break” belong to the same lexical field, which gives the discourse an effect of meaning of rupture with the way extension had been developed, that is, the view of extension as an “outbuilding,” something accessory in some houses, but not in others, and whose designs can be highly varied.

In the excerpt above, there is also an expectation on the part of the interviewee to be understood and to have his meanings validated by the interviewer. These are imaginary formations in action in/through speech, influenced by the positions occupied by both Fred, as a member of institutional management, and the interviewer, the extension coordinator at the same institution. This suggests an intention to align his speech with extension curricularization as proposed by Resolution CNE/CES No. 7, of 2018, and with how it is operationalized by the institution where both work. This interpretation is reinforced by the use of “right?” and “do you understand?” at the end of sentences, producing an effect of approximation between interlocutors and potentially requesting agreement from the interviewer, who is also a colleague in institutional management. In other words, the speech is bound to an institutional discursive formation, specific to a private and confessional HEI in southern Brazil.

It seems relevant to mention that “right?” was also recurrent in the other interviews. This indicates that the three interviewees’ reports navigate between what they think of themselves, of the interviewer, and of the object of the interview, through a play of images resulting from projections from discursive spaces occupied in the social formation and from previously stated discourses elsewhere (Ferreira, 2001).

Focusing on the effects of meaning emerging from Fred’s reports, the excerpt below was analyzed.

RD2 (Fred)

Then, in fact, extension made me think about this project more carefully, organize better projects, then, I already had this more applied characteristic, but it made me plan better, for example, right? Search for literature that gave me the step-by-step of the project.

In RD2, the presence of a DF related to Fred’s field (administration and logistics) is observed when he states that the new extension format led him to “plan” and “organize.” These verbs refer directly to the management field, as does the noun “project,” used twice. Moreover, the excerpt signals guidance of conduct (Foucault, 2008), based on self-management and self-accountability, as proposed in the reflections reported by Han (2017) in *The burnout society*. According to that author, in the current neoliberal regime:⁴ “I willingly exploit myself, believing that in doing so I can fulfill myself [...]. The freedom of individual capacities ends up producing even more constraints than disciplinary obligation” (Han, 2017, p.116-117), since the latter has a limit, unlike ability, which is, according to Han (2017, p. 117), constantly and incessantly “unlimited.” It is also worth mentioning that subjects in the current performance regime are always in competition with others, but mainly with themselves, and are “forced to constantly overcome themselves” (Han, 2017, p. 99). In the excerpt above, this effect is materialized by the repetition of the adjective “better,” thus signaling that the subject is driven to perform better than before and, to achieve this, seeks a recipe, a “step-by-step” guide in the “literature.”

4 For a deeper study on extension curricularization and neoliberalism, see Serafim and Mascia (2022).

Unlike the first interviewee, who views curricularization from the standpoint of learning, as a gain, Jaqueline, the next interviewee, views it from the perspective the professor's role, that is, she engages with a DF of part-time professors (those who are paid a wage per hour of work rather than a fixed monthly salary) who, often work in more than one education institution and spend many hours in the classroom as a result.

RD3 (Jaqueline)

[...] you have to spend that time in extension or something like that, then, it is necessary to think how that time contribution would occur, and sometimes even the professor's pay, that is, for those who develop these practices, isn't it? Those who plan the activities and seek companies that have ideas to make it work. The fact is, it works... and works well, but nowadays there is much more a thing like... let's say, the professor's pay is much more dependent on the number of hours they are hired for. Then, since there isn't necessarily a remuneration for those developing extension practices, a bonus, right? For better extension practices, hashtag here's a tip, I don't think mine are the best ones, then, don't worry, I'm not trying to monetize, but it was an insight into how we don't have that. So, in a way it ends up being comfortable, you fulfill your protocol there, which is to create your syllabus, and the extension can take a back seat, right?

RD 3 raises a delicate issue that is not clearly addressed by Resolution CNE/CES No. 7, of 2018, or by the institution investigated at the time of the interview: how extension curricularization may affect the workload of part-time professors, both in terms of time dedicated to teaching and in relation to wages. At the investigated institution, extension activities — which require thorough planning and monitoring of every class, contact with the community and institutions in general, and the record of “evidence” of activities developed by students, among others — are compensated with the same workload as any other subject, which might be 36 or 72 hours.

Another aspect is that registration in the institutional academic system alone is no longer sufficient; visibility must be given to what has been done, including engagement on social networks. By mentioning “#here's a tip,” imaginary formations are again observed. Although the interview was conducted for an academic purpose, the professor-extension coordinator relationship is noticeable, including when the interviewee states that she is “not trying to monetize,” a recurrent term in social media referring to the fact that greater visibility — measured by likes, views, and/or followers — increases the likelihood of generating income. The negation in “not trying to monetize” suggests a “veiled” demand from the professor (interviewee) to the extension coordinator (interviewer) regarding remuneration for her work in extension activities.

When suggesting a “bonus” for those developing the best extension practices, her speech reveals an expectation of standing out in relation to other work performed at the institution, even when she states, “I don't think mine are the best ones, then, don't worry.” It should be recalled that she is addressing someone higher in the institutional hierarchy, one of those responsible for extension, who may convey such “tips” or “suggestions” to higher levels. When referring to “better practices,” she alludes to the growing number of contests, frequently sponsored by media or financial agents, such as the LED Movement⁵ by the Roberto Marinho Foundation, which promotes competition, meritocracy, and continuous improvement among educational actors. This remark

5 “The prize aims at mapping, recognizing, amplifying, disseminating and illuminating innovative practices which optimize the future of education in Brazil.” Source: <https://www.frm.org.br/conteudo/educacao-basica/noticia/conheca-o-premio-led-2023>. Accessed on: Apr. 9, 2026.

reveals neoliberal reasoning and points to “a type of ‘economization’ of social life and the creation of new profit opportunities” (Ball, 2020, p. 25). Thus,

the neoliberal rationality disseminates a model of market for all domains and activities of social life (life economization), also configuring the subjects’ subjectivity, as a strategy of conduct management, following behavior norms and patterns derived from the market competition (Araújo, 2023, p. 4).

When addressing part-time professors’ wages, as noted by the interviewee, compensation remains the same in extension activities, regardless of whether they are part of the curriculum. Time spent planning, recording, and evaluating extension activities has no specific remuneration provided by law or institutional bylaws. Therefore, the effect of meaning identified in the interviewee’s speech is that of denouncing an increase in professors’ workload without a corresponding change in remuneration and/or work regime.

Thus, in RD3, the meaning evoked regarding extension curricularization is linked to time and pay, such that, in the linguistic materiality, these two lexical fields are closely related due to the repeated occurrence of the terms “time” and “number of hours,” as well as “remuneration,” “pay,” and “bonus.”

Considering the mismatch between time dedicated to extension curricularization and remuneration, Jaqueline concludes that extension activities may take a back seat, only after the professor has “fulfilled their syllabus,” which would be more “comfortable.” This leads to the inference that, when possible, professors may choose not to engage fully in the new extension format due to the additional work without remuneration. In short, it is perceived as a loss in employment benefits.

As previously mentioned, the Resolution does not provide for professors’ work or remuneration. However, it requires that extension information be systematized, as observed below:

Sole paragraph. Extension activities must be systematized and monitored, with proper documentation, as well as recorded, promoted, and evaluated by duly established institutional administrative bodies, as outlined in their own regulations (Brasil, 2018a, p. 4).

When considering the institution investigated, part of the task of collecting and managing extension information is assigned to professors. Since curricularized extension is operationalized as a curriculum component, professors must go beyond the work inherent in their activity and plan activities that can be duly registered and evaluated during visits by representatives of the Ministry of Education (*Ministério da Educação* — MEC). This relates to the problematization proposed by Sparkes (2007), who addresses crucial issues in the academic world and its demands, particularly what is termed the “audit culture,” which imposes higher demands on professors/researchers. To survive and coexist in this environment of numbers, statistics, and metrics, these professionals must develop skills typically expected of businesspeople, such as organizational abilities, self-promotion strategies, and networking, as observed in the excerpt above.

Also aligned with a DF related to the part-time work regime, Helena, like the other interviewees, presents another relevant issue regarding extension curricularization and its relation to her teaching practice, namely, assessment.

RD4 (Helena)

Assessment is unknown, isn’t it? [...] Because, when you propose something that takes you away from the content, that you stop being content-focused, you’re going towards a differentiated curricularization activity. What happens is, you also have

a movement, a shift, the way students learn is also different. So, consequently, the assessment process also needs to be reviewed.

So, for example, since we have a rigid structure in the formation of the hundred points and one of the marks needs to be based on a test, I have to propose a test and the rest of the mark I will certainly ascribe to this process of activities that are developed in the curricularization.

In RD4, on the one hand, a change in the form of assessment is mentioned and, on the other, the maintenance of the current grading system and the test instrument is reported. The latter is not mandatory, but it is included in the institution's regulations, entitled "Evaluation of Learning of Extension Curricular Components," as a modality to be used.

The term "unknown" at the beginning of the excerpt, referring to the "new" assessment process resulting from extension curricularization, is noteworthy. "Unknown" refers to something mysterious or yet to be defined and learned. Regarding extension activities, this process does not occur only in the classroom, as it involves implies interaction with society and services rendered to the external community, as established in the Resolution. However, Helena's speech also indicates continuity of learning linked to numerical grading (marks in higher education institutions usually range from 0 to 100, while 60-70 points required for approval without final exam) and the maintenance of a test even in the new extension format. This is materialized in "rigidity in the way the hundred points are calculated, and one of the marks needs to be based on a test," even though the education field has long recognized that much of what is learned cannot be reduced to a numerical mark. In other words, although there is an alleged shift in the rationale of the activities developed — aimed at benefiting society — these cannot be adequately assessed through tests. As indicated by the interviewee, there remains uncertainty regarding how to measure the social impact of the actions developed and how to assess students' involvement and learning.

Helena emphasizes the issue of not focusing on "content," but this does not fully occur in practice, since once subjects become part of extension, they retain the syllabus to be followed and operate under the assumption that practice cannot occur without theory. In fact, this does not represent a complete change; rather, there is an increase in practical activities to be prepared, conducted, and assessed by the professor.

Regarding the "rigidity" of the evaluation process, it is relevant to note that, according to the institution's internal regulations, the evaluation process must lead to a final project in the subject, which may take the form of a product, service, podcast, webpage, blog, content channel, event production, or workshop, among others. The entire process of developing the final project may be used as an evaluation tool, whether through reports, templates, oral tests, written tests, exercises, presentations, or participation in project design, among others. The restriction lies in the mark to be assigned and the number of instruments to be used. Students must obtain a grade of 7.0 in each two-month period. In the first period, the assessment must include three evaluation instruments (each not exceeding 4.0 points), selected from those listed above, with at least one applied individually. In the second period, at least two evaluation instruments must be used, with at least one carried out individually. If students do not achieve 7.0 points in each period, they must take a theoretical test that substitutes the lowest mark obtained. It is argued that assuming a theoretical test can replace what was not achieved in an extension activity is contradictory. One possible justification for maintaining the traditional system — studying and taking a test — particularly in this private institution, is to minimize complaints and student dropout. The remaining issue is the mismatch between a theoretical test and what is advocated by the Resolution regarding students' protagonism and their relationship with society, among other aspects. These and other questions emerge from the operationalization of the Resolution in the academic context, particularly in the setting analyzed.

Another relevant point observed in RD4 and RD5, analyzed below, is the use of pronouns by the interviewee. In RD4, “you” appears five times in sequence, “we” appears once, and, at the end of the speech, “I” is used, indicating that the interviewee gradually positions herself as the subject of the discourse. The use of “you” may imply at least two effects of meaning: establishing a dialogical relationship with the interlocutor (the interviewer, also a professor and extension coordinator) and/or universalizing the subject as any extension professor in that position. Subsequently, the use of “we” includes others in the discourse, either the interviewer or other extension professors. The linguistic materialities “you” and “we” function as effects of meaning aiming to ensure that both interlocutors share the same discursive formation. When Helena begins to use “I,” she positions herself more explicitly as the subject of the discourse, concluding with “I have to propose a test, and the rest of the mark I will certainly assign to this process of activities developed in curricularization.”

Also, regarding assessment in the new extension format, Helena adds:

RD5 (Helena)

It's exhausting because sometimes you clash with students because, what happens is, the traditional way is easier. The student has the assignment to hand in on such and such a day, done! Present on such and such a day, done! And the final exam. Okay! In curricularization, in extension activities, it's constant, every class, every moment there's construction. So, there's the student who says, “Oh, I prefer not to participate.” So, there are these issues that we also need to take into account.

“Exhausting” and “the traditional way is easier” refer to the relationship with the new type of work in curricularized extension, in which both professors and students — accustomed to traditional assessment through tests and scheduled assignments/presentations — must adapt to a continuous assessment format that occurs “every class,” “every moment,” as an ongoing “construction,” involving at least five assessment instruments, as recommended in the internal guiding document. In practice, this implies more activities to be carried out, which, for part-time professors, may represent increased workload without additional pay.

It is relevant to note that the assessment described in Resolution CNE/CES No. 7, of 2018 does not specify how professors should evaluate, but rather how institutions are assessed regarding compliance with the regulation. The aspects analyzed include the 10% workload for extension activities, integration with teaching and research, and the requirement that extension activities be guided by a specific professor. According to article 15 of the Resolution:

Extension activities must have their proposal, development and conclusion duly registered, documented and analyzed, so that it is possible to organize work plans, methodologies, instruments and the knowledge generated (Brasil, 2018a, p. 4).

Rigorous control is observed regarding the new format of extension to be carried out at the institutional level, which ultimately increases professors' workload, as previously discussed. The curricularization offer, pursuant to Article 15 above, must go through three steps — the proposal, development, and conclusion — and each step must be “duly recorded.”

Although it seems that assessment must undergo “a displacement,” and that “the way students learn is also different,” according to Helena, in practice, when opting to develop extension as curricular subjects with reports, numbers, and statistics, there is no change in the assessment logics. In fact, it becomes more strongly impacted by indicators originating from neoliberal rationality, as discussed by Serafim and Mascia (2022).

It seems relevant to emphasize that PDI, an internal document, presents several indicators that need to be verified regarding extension curricularization. Those indicators go beyond the simple completion of activities and the recording of the number of activities carried out. They also involve the constant improvement and supervision of professors' work when registering activities. The indicators ensure surveillance and control of the actions carried out at the institution, in addition to raising scores with MEC. In other words, there is a retroactive effect provoked by control mechanisms such as MEC evaluations/visits to institutions to inspect and score them.

According to Cavallari (2005), in pedagogical practice, as well as in religious and legal fields, the function of judging and making decisions about those being assessed — in this case, professors and students involved in extension activities — is in the hands of those occupying power-knowledge positions. In formal assessment practices, subjects are seen as transparent, subject to measurement and change, and must be subordinate to that power-knowledge, which is socially and institutionally legitimate. That author, based on Foucault's principles (2008), explains that there is maintenance of sociohistorically determined knowledge reinforced in/by institutions; a surveillance knowledge, control, and normalization of actions, aiming to determine whether individuals behave as they should, in compliance with rules or not, whether they progress or not, etc. It is also worth mentioning that the "truth" that governs evaluation discourse is linked to the power-knowledge ascribed to the examiner/examination — in this specific case, to governmental and institutional documents and the extension coordination. Such truth legitimates judgement related to the other and is seen as the sole and valid designation of things, in addition to operating through forgetfulness, since it is constituted by language and results from interpretations. Furthermore, the truth about students' or professors' performance is usually linked to binarism (right or wrong, good or bad), with no room for contradiction.

After analyzing excerpts from three professors' reports, unveiling the feelings that arise from their statements about extension curricularization, some considerations are presented below following the analytical effort undertaken.

BETWEEN DISCURSIVE TENSIONS AND CONTRADICTIONS: SOME CONSIDERATIONS

Considering that discourse produces meaning between interlocutors and that the subject is an effect of discourse, this article proposed to examine what higher education professors working with extension curricularization report.

The study began with the contextualization of extension policies from the 1988 Constitution, describing in more detail the process of elaboration and approval of Resolution CNE/CES No. 7/2018, of 1988, the object of this research. After addressing the conditions of macro production, that is, the implementation of the Resolution, the micro production conditions were presented, namely the investigated institution, the interviewer, and the interviewees.

The analysis sought the effects of meaning emerging from/in professors' reports of the extension curricularization implementation process at the institution where the research was conducted, a University Center in southern Brazil. Thus, three points were raised: the governmental discourse, the institutional discourse, and the professors' discourse in relation to the former.

Regarding the governmental discourse, this higher education public policy was found to be a document elaborated without the participation of students, communities, and social movements (Wociechoski and Catani, 2022) and based on neoliberal premises (Serafim and Mascia, 2022), which influence subjects' conduct in managing their lives (Rose, 2010). In this context, the Resolution introduces curricularization into universities, and those activities are guided and developed across all courses, become normalized within higher education institutions. As for assessment, it consists of performance measurement of both students' and universities' work, including scoring.

Before concluding this text, it is important to point out that extension curricularization, as mentioned, aligned with neoliberal rationality, transfers certain state responsibilities to HEIs — whether public or private — regarding social interventions, as discussed in more detail by Serafim and Mascia (2022).

Regarding the institutional discourse, on the one hand, extension activities were organized to meet legal requirements, with the inclusion of 10% of specific extension workload in undergraduate courses. On the other hand, there appears to have been a movement aimed at maintaining the *status quo*. This means that university extension activities became academic subjects, that is, the traditional format was maintained. However, the institution formalized a “different” type of assessment. Additionally, when addressing institutional discourse, Serafim (2023) emphasizes that the change lies in the fact that extension activities tend to focus effectively on the “job market,” considering both students’ employability and the development of projects and actions that result in process improvement, increased sales, and innovation promotion, thus generating or increasing income.

Another factor to be reconsidered is the organization of professors’ workshops to work with extension. They reveal the “rigidity” of teaching practices, which emerged from the report of one of the participants and pointed out issues regarding control, normalization, and regulation of professors’ and students’ conducts.

Regarding professors’ discourse, it seems relevant to emphasize that it is strongly marked by imaginary formations, resulting from the subject positions of the participants, interviewer, and interviewees. Different discursive formations are observed, producing tensions and contradictions inherent to DF in general, which are translated here into the conflict between two such formations: a DF aligned with governmental and institutional discourses, strongly marked by neoliberal rationality and linked to performance, competition, and meritocracy, among others; and a DF expressed by part-time professionals, revealing discomfort and concern regarding the absence of salary increases for professors despite the increased workload resulting from the addition of extension activities, as well as the heightened surveillance and control of such activities, particularly in relation to assessment. However, this DF among part-time professors is also permeated by adherence to the new model, which appears to be based on the imaginary formations related to both the professor interviewee and the coordinator interviewer, thereby revealing internal contradictions within the discourse.

Finally, it is emphasized that there are many issues related to university extension curricularization, as it is a recent development that still requires further examination. Further studies may investigate the implementation of extension curricularization in public HEIs as well as in private institutions and/or analyze different implementation models and their tensions and contradictions, thereby contributing to public policies for education in Brazil.

REFERENCES

- ARAÚJO, Kátia Costa Lima Corrêa de. Competências Socioemocionais e a economização da vida: uma leitura discursiva. **Currículo sem Fronteiras**, v. 23, e1137, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.35786/1645-1384.v23.1137>
- BALL, Stephen J. **Educational reform: a critical and post-structural approach**. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1994.
- BALL, Stephen J. **Educação global S.A.: novas redes políticas e o imaginário neoliberal**. Ponta Grossa: UEPG, 2020.

BRANDÃO, Helena H. Nagamine. **Introdução à análise do discurso**. 2. ed. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2004.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 13.005, de 25 de junho de 2014**. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação e dá outras providências. 2014. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2011-2014/2014/lei/l13005.htm. Accessed on: Aug. 27, 2022.

BRASIL. **Parecer CNE/CES n. 608/2018, aprovado em 3 de outubro de 2018**. Diretrizes para as Políticas de Extensão da Educação Superior Brasileira. 2018. Available at: https://www.gov.br/mec/pt-br/cne/pdf/normas-classificadas-por-assunto/extensao-na-educacao-superior-brasileira/pces608_18.pdf. Accessed on: Nov. 1, 2019.

BRASIL. Resolução CNE/CES n. 7, de 18 de dezembro de 2018. Estabelece as Diretrizes para a Extensão na Educação Superior Brasileira. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, Seção 1, 19 dez. 2018. Available at: https://www.in.gov.br/materia/-/asset_publisher/Kujrw0TZC2Mb/content/id/55877808. Accessed on: Apr. 11, 2026.

CAVALLARI, Juliana Santana. **O discurso avaliador do sujeito-professor na constituição da identidade do sujeito-aluno**. 2005. 218f. Thesis (PhD in Applied Linguistics) – Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2005.

CUNHA, Luiz Antônio. **A universidade temporã: o ensino superior, da Colônia à Era Vargas**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2007.

ERNST-PEREIRA, Aracy. A falta, o excesso e o estranhamento na constituição/interpretação do corpus discursivo. In: SEMINÁRIO DE ESTUDOS EM ANÁLISE DO DISCURSO. 1969–2009: MEMÓRIA E HISTÓRIA NA/DA ANÁLISE DO DISCURSO, Porto Alegre, 4., 2009. **Annals [...]**. Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, 2009. Available at: <https://www.ufrgs.br/analisedodiscurso/anaisdosead/4SEAD/SIMPOSIOS/AracyErnstPereira.pdf>. Accessed on: Apr. 9, 2026.

FERNANDES, Cleudemar Alves. **Análise do discurso: reflexões introdutórias**. 2. ed. São Carlos: Claraluz, 2007.

FERNANDES, Cleudemar Alves; SÁ, Israel de. **Análise do discurso: reflexões introdutórias**. Campinas: Pontes, 2021.

FERREIRA, Maria Cristina Leandro. **Glossário de termos do discurso**. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, Instituto de Letras, 2001.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Segurança, território, população**. Translation: Eduardo Brandão. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2008.

FREITAS NETO, José Alves de. A reforma universitária de Córdoba (1918): um manifesto. **Ensino Superior**, Campinas, 2011. Available at: <https://www.revistaensinosuperior.gr.unicamp.br/www.revistaensinosuperior.gr.unicamp.br/artigos/a-reforma-universitaria-de-cordoba-1918-um-manifesto.html>. Accessed on: Aug. 28, 2021.

HAN, Byung-Chul. **Sociedade do cansaço**. Translation: Enio Paulo Giachini. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2017.

MOROSINI, Marília Costa; MENTGES, Manuir José. Organismos internacionais e educação superior: proposições da agenda E2030. **Educação Temática Digital**, Campinas, v. 22, n. 3, p. 632-650, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.20396/etd.v22i3.8659308>

ORGANIZAÇÃO DAS NAÇÕES UNIDAS PARA A EDUCAÇÃO, A CIÊNCIA E A CULTURA (UNESCO). **Educação 2030**: Declaração de Incheon e Marco de Ação para a implementação do Objetivo de Desenvolvimento Sustentável 4: assegurar a educação inclusiva e equitativa de qualidade, e promover oportunidades de aprendizagem ao longo da vida para todos. UNESCO, 2016. Available at: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000245656_por. Accessed on: Feb. 2, 2024.

ORLANDI, Eni P. **Análise do discurso**: princípios e procedimentos. 7. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2007.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. **Semântica e discurso**: uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 1988.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. **O discurso**: estrutura ou acontecimento. 3. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2002.

ROCHA, Roberto Mauro Gurgel. **Extensão universitária**: comunicação ou domesticação. 1984. 220f. Dissertation (Master's in Sociology) – Universidade Federal do Ceará, Fortaleza, 1984.

ROCHA, Roberto Mauro Gurgel. A trajetória da extensão universitária no Brasil. In: BRASIL (org.). **Perfil da extensão universitária no Brasil**. Brasília, DF: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Superior, Fórum de Pró-Reitores de Extensão das Universidades Públicas, 1995. p. 3-7.

ROSE, Nikolas. **Powers of freedom**: reframing political thought. 9 ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

SERAFIM, Andrea Bier. **A curricularização da extensão e o neoliberalismo**: a governamentalidade na resolução e nos discursos de docentes. 2023. 109f. Thesis (Doctorate in Education) – Programa de Pós-Graduação Stricto Sensu em Educação, Universidade São Francisco, Itatiba, 2023. Available at: <https://www.usf.edu.br/galeria/getImage/427/3130579654274102.pdf>. Accessed on: Feb. 8, 2025.

SERAFIM, Andrea Bier; MASCIA, Maria Aparecida. Uma análise discursiva da avaliação da extensão na resolução CNE/CES n. 7: o Big Brother. **Revista Linha Mestra**, v. 16, n. 46, p. 619-631, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.34112/1980-9026a2022n46p619-631>

SERVA, Fernanda Mesquita. **Educação superior no Brasil**: um estudo sobre a política de curricularização da extensão universitária. 2020. 202f. Thesis (Doctorate in Education) – Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho,” Marília, 2020.

SGUISSARDI, Valdemar. As missões da universidade, entre as quais a extensão universitária ou a terceira missão, em face dos desafios da mercadização/mercantilização. **Teoria e Prática da Educação**, v. 22, n. 3, p. 38-56, Dec. 2019. <https://doi.org/10.4025/tpe.v22i3.51381>

SOUSA, Ana Luiza L. **A história da extensão universitária**. Campinas: Alínea, 2010.

SPARKES, Andrew C. Embodiment, academics, and the audit culture: a story seeking consideration. **Qualitative Research**, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore, v. 7, n. 4, p. 521-550, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794107082306>

VARGAS, Rosana Souza de; KONAGESKI, Jamile Tabata Balestrin; ARAÚJO, Maria Cristina Pansera de. Práticas e perspectivas da extensão universitária: um estudo com professores da educação. **Revista Valore**, v. 6, p. 1614-1625, July 2021. <https://doi.org/10.22408/rev6020219021614-1625>

WOCIECHOSKI, Darlan Pez; CATANI, Afrânio Mendes. Resolução CNE n. 7/2018 e a burocratização da educação superior: apontamentos sobre a diretriz relativa apenas à extensão universitária. **Revista de Gestão e Avaliação Educacional**, v. 11, n. 20, e71374, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.5902/2318133871374>

WOCIECHOSKI, Darlan Pez; CATANI, Afrânio Mendes. Curricularização da extensão: possibilidades e dilemas na Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. **Conexão**, v. 19, n. 1, p. 1-13, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.5212/Rev.Conexao.v.19.21213.001>

How to cite this article: SERAFIM, Andréa Bier; MASCIA, Márcia Aparecida Amador; AZEREDO, Luciana Aparecida Silva de. The curricularization of extension in the voices of college professors: between discursive tensions and contradictions. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 31, e310054, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782026310055>

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that they have no commercial or associative interests that represent a conflict of interest in relation to the manuscript.

Funding: The study received no funding.

Authors' contribution: Conceptualization, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing – First Draft, Writing – Revision and Editing: Serafim, A. B.; Mascia, M. A. A.; Azeredo, L. A. S. Research: Serafim, A. B. Methodology: Serafim, A. B., Mascia, M. A. A.

Data availability statement: The research data are available in the Universidade de São Francisco database at: www.usf.edu.br.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

ANDRÉA BIER SERAFIM holds a PhD in Education from Universidade de São Francisco. She is a professor at the Faculdade Católica de Administração e Economia (FAE).

MÁRCIA APARECIDA AMADOR MASCIA holds a PhD in Applied Linguistics from the Universidade Estadual de Campinas (Unicamp). She is a professor in the postgraduate program in Education at Universidade de São Francisco (USF).

LUCIANA APARECIDA SILVA DE AZEREDO holds a PhD in Education from Universidade de São Francisco. She is a professor in the Department of Language and Technology and in the Postgraduate Program in Technological Education at the Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais (CEFET-MG).

Received February 26, 2024

Revised February 15, 2025

Approved April 10, 2025

Editor: Maria Alfredo Moreira  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0699-1197>

