

NOTES ON FAILURE AND DIVERSITY: MEANINGS OF LEARNING AND NOT LEARNING IN SCHOOL

NOTAS SOBRE FRACASSO E DIVERSIDADE: OS SENTIDOS DO APRENDER E DO NÃO APRENDER NA ESCOLA

NOTAS SOBRE FRACASO Y DIVERSIDAD: LOS SENTIDOS DEL APRENDER Y DEL NO APRENDER EN LA ESCUELA

Maria Letícia Cautela de Almeida MACHADO¹
Paula da Silva Vidal Cid LOPES²
Luiz Antonio Gomes SENNA³

ABSTRACT: This paper results from studies held on UERJ's nucleus *Linguagem, Alfabetização e Letramento*, held by research group *Language, Human Cognition and Educational Processes*. Based on a theoretic survey, it presents a contribution to the debate concerning theories that, even though presented as interdisciplinary approaches for Education, tend to overvalue a clinic and most biological perspective of scholar learning, spite of schools being intrinsically associated to different forms of diversity. Herein, it is defended that interdisciplinary approaches oriented to Education must highlight cultural diversity and its role on school processes of overcoming and inclusion. A survey is presented in three parts: critical analysis of so called biological theories of school failure, with emphasis on their role on the stigmatization of school subjects; analysis of the contribution of cultural studies to the advance of comprehension about school failure, and; description of discursive notions that impact the comprehension of knowledge construction under the perspective of cultural diversity.

KEYWORDS: Teaching-learning. School failure. Cultural diversity. Discourse.

RESUMO: Este artigo é resultado de estudos produzidos pelo Núcleo de Linguagens, Alfabetização e Letramento da UERJ, no contexto do Grupo de Pesquisa Linguagem, Cognição Humana e Processos Educacionais. Em formato de relato de pesquisa de base teórico-conceitual, tem-se como objetivo apresentar uma discussão que contribua para o debate acerca das proposições teóricas que, embora se apresentem como um olhar interdisciplinar da Educação, acabam por supervalorizar uma perspectiva clínica e biológica da aprendizagem em contexto escolar, a despeito de ser esta marcada por diversidades em diferentes formas. Defende-se aqui que o olhar interdisciplinar direcionado aos sentidos da aprendizagem e da

¹ Rio de Janeiro State University (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil. Adjunct Professor in the Department of Studies Applied to Education. Doctorate in Education (UERJ). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9500-1625>. E-mail: maria_leticia2005@hotmail.com

² Rio de Janeiro State University (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil. Associate Professor in the Department of Studies Applied to Education. Doctorate in Education (UERJ). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2170-0546>. E-mail: paulacidlopes@gmail.com

³ Rio de Janeiro State University (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil. Full Professor in the Postgraduate Program in Education and in the Department of Studies Applied to Education. PhD in Applied Linguistics (PUC-Rio). Researcher for the PROCENCIA (UERJ/FAPERJ) and CNE programs of the FAPERJ Foundation. Scholar of academic productivity of the Foundation CECIERJ. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1086-8829>. E-mail: senna@uerj.br

não aprendizagem deve dar relevo à questão da diversidade cultural e sua relação com os processos de superação e inclusão no âmbito escolar. O estudo encontra-se dividido em três partes: análise crítica das assim chamadas teorias biologizantes do fracasso escolar, com ênfase no papel que desempenham no processo de estigmatização do sujeito escolar; análise do papel dos estudos culturais para o avanço na compreensão do fracasso escolar, e; descrição conceitual das noções discursivas que contribuem para a compreensão dos processos de construção de conhecimento sob a perspectiva da diversidade cultural.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Ensino-aprendizagem. Fracasso escolar. Diversidade cultural. Discurso.*

RESUMEN: *Este artículo resulta de estudios producidos en el Núcleo de Lenguajes, Alfabetización y Letramento de la UERJ, en el ámbito del Grupo de Investigación Lenguaje, Cognición Humana y Procesos Educativos. En forma de relato de investigación de basis teórico-conceptual, se tiene acá por objetivo presentar una discusión que contribuya en el debate de las teorías que, aunque se presenten como aportes interdisciplinarios para la Educación, concentran-se en una perspectiva clínica y biológica del aprendizaje escolar, a pesar de que esta sea caracterizada por diferentes formas de diversidad. Defiende-se que el ojeo interdisciplinario direccionado a los sentidos del aprendizaje y no aprendizaje debe poner en relevo la diversidad cultural, así como su relación con los procesos de superación e inclusión en ámbito escolar. El estudio encuentra-se dividido en tres partes: análisis crítico de las teorías del fracaso escolar conocidas como biologizantes, con énfasis en su papel en el desarrollo del proceso de estigmatización del sujeto escolar; análisis del role de los estudios culturales para el avance en la comprensión del fracaso escolar, y; descripción conceptual de nociones discursivas que contribuyen para la comprensión de los procesos de construcción de conocimiento bajo la perspectiva de la diversidad cultural.*

PALABRAS-CLAVE: *Enseñanza-aprendizaje. Fracaso escolar. Diversidad cultural. Discurso.*

Introduction

The article presented here is the result of studies produced by the *Nucleus of Linguagens, Alfabetização e Letramento*, in the context of the *Research Group Language, Human Cognition and Educational Processes*, both located at the College of Education/Campus Maracanã, Rio de Janeiro State University. Over more than twenty years, this Research Group has invested efforts in academic formation, at the undergraduate and graduate levels, which underpins the democratic and inclusive principles of the public school to scientific and qualified production in the area of literacy and formation of readers and writers, children, youth and adults.

In a theoretical-conceptual research report format, the objective is to present a discussion that contributes to the debate about the theoretical propositions that, although they advocate an interdisciplinary view in Education, end up overvaluing a clinical and biological

perspective of learning in school context, which is, however, marked by diversities in different forms. The interdisciplinary look directed at the meanings of learning and not learning must, however, start and arrive at the converging point of overcoming and the processes of social inclusion: cultural diversity.

Everything that is lived in the school is part of the processes of social inclusion, because, in addition to contents, methods and formulas, the school today takes on other urgencies, marking itself as a space of resistance and legitimacy of rights. It is possible to exemplify this urgency when we see changes that are imposed on schools and teacher formation by changing the political profile of public management.

In the current context of Education in Brazil, we can cite as an example the National Literacy Policy (BRASIL, 2019a) and the recent Common National Base of Initial Formation for Basic Education Teachers (BRASIL, 2019b). Such documents proclaim the support in “scientifically proven theories”, considered as absolute truths and subject to generalization so that there are models of students, as well as models of teachers to be imitated.

When learning models are chosen, it is common to adhere to generalist theories that explain non-learning in the false idea that complex processes such as learning can be easily elucidated, through a single lens for reading phenomena, which ends up motivating, the supposedly saving, drug use for not learning.

Assuming the school as this space of transdisciplinary learning, as Japiassu (2006) dreams, we give historical-cultural studies the privileged reference in the elaboration of the arguments that are constructed here and that refute the biologizing vision of processes as multiple as those of human learning.

The construction of this perspective, in this article, occurs through three congruent ways: a) Biological theories and the perpetuation of stigmas of non-learning; b) Historical-cultural studies and overcoming the notion of subject of school failure; c) Interdiscursivity as a way to produce meanings in school learning.

Biologizing theories and the perpetuation of non-learning stigmas

Over the past few decades, in Brazil, we have accompanied an increasing number of students who, because they do not meet the school's expectations regarding learning and the mastery of the written language, have been referred to health units for specialized care. According to Garcia (2004), this movement has taken on such a proportion that the problem begins to be understood as a public health issue.

These referrals are carried out by teachers and ratified by groups of professionals working in the fields of Education and Health, who, in general, take unconventional modes of writing and reading as symptomatic and attribute their causes to deficiencies inherent to the subject. In this way, students who do not learn what and how the school proposes to teach are previously labeled as having a disorder or dysfunction. The deviant, or immature, subject thus appears as an effect of the pedagogical and medical discourse and its normalization devices.

Such devices are the result of a process of medicalization of Education, which, in turn, is part of a broader mechanism for the medicalization of life and society, which began almost two centuries ago. Moysés (2008) states that such a process turns historically constructed human and social phenomena into individual issues, so that what escapes the norm, what escapes the rule, what does not work as established, is transformed into disease, into a problem individual biological.

Moysés and Collares (2013) explain that medicine constituted its status as a modern science, in the transition between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, attributing the competence to legislate and regulate what comes to be health or disease - which means defining man model. Thus, adopting a generic scientific discourse, applicable to all people, because neutral, medicine relies on the invariance of man's biological determination to establish what is normal and what is pathological.

It is necessary to emphasize that the field of normativity of medicine extends to the school environment, precisely in this turn of the century, when the political and economic transformations resulting from capitalism demand new forms of society organization and occupation of spaces, emerging with new cities problems, with diseases standing out from the start. In this context, as Moysés (2008) points out, medicine, in tune with the demands of hegemonic groups, attributes the disease to the population's ignorance and chooses the school as a privileged place to fight it. In this way of conceiving the health-disease process, there is no room for socio-political determinants, such as precarious living conditions, inequality of opportunities or absence of public policies, with all instances of power being exempt from responsibility.

That was how the Child Care movement and the School Health Service (originally called School Hygiene) emerged, which, according to its own understanding, aimed at breaking with the ignorance of parents, responsible for the lack of hygiene habits, and ensuring appropriate health conditions for learning. Supported by these supposed goals, medicine started to regulate and legislate on educational issues that ranged from the standards of construction of school buildings, the dimension of corridors, the height of steps, school furniture and its spatial

distribution; even the curriculum, what the student should or should not learn, working and recreational hours; and, finally, the ways of behaving, teaching and learning at school (MOYSÉS, 2008).

Patto (2008) points out that the school health hygienist discourse was impregnated by racist and eugenic ideas, having an affinity with the dominant ideology. Even before the effective democratization of education in Brazil allowed access to school to the children of the working class, medicine already warned, a priori, that they were poor, debilitated, malnourished, ill-cared children and, therefore, would have problems to learn, unless there was a medical intervention. In this way, prejudice (social, racial, gender, and even linguistic) was scientificized, made up by genetic and sociological theories, related to biological reductionism and social Darwinism. The author notes that:

The prejudiced view, with deep social roots, finds support in the results of research that substantiate the affirmations of a science that, having an alleged objectivity and neutrality as an alibi, elevates an ideological world view to the category of knowledge (PATTO, 2008, p. 420, our translation).

On this issue, Hobsbawm (1982), already stated that it would never be easier for common sense to mobilize the universe to confirm its own prejudices. For the author, social Darwinism and racist anthropology belong not to 19th century science, but to its politics.

In this way, under the pretense of scientificity, the concepts that underlie biological determinism were applied to the school, the student and the object of school learning, everything being reduced to the world of nature, allowing the teaching, and learning processes to become analyzed through criteria pervaded by positivist science and naturalistic thinking. Thus, as Moysés (2008) points out, the subject came to be seen only as a biological body - not his body, but a generic, abstract and universal body - and learning became one of the constituent elements of this entity, acquiring the same features. In other words, transformed into an element of a biological body, also learning and, mainly, non-learning, was taken in the process of abstraction so that the clinical view could become effective with all its rationality and objectivity.

From this, the diagnosis of issues that did not fall within the field of medicine was incorporated into the medical act, without conflicts. Learning, behavior, language, intelligence are just examples of issues that have been incorporated into medical thinking and performance. And so,

From the initial proposal to standardize, legislate and monitor compliance with the recommended standards to guarantee health and healthy learning, a

quick turn of the eye will enable the creation of learning diseases, or rather, the diseases of not-learning (MOYSÉS, 2008, p. 4, our translation).

Therefore, as a result of the increased demand for health services specialized in solving these diseases of not learning, the medical-pedagogical field was established. With this, a body of specialists was created, classification systems were defined and a positive medical theoretical paradigm was established that would support both the formation of specialists and the performance in the face of these diseases, persisting in a hegemonic way until today.

Thus, when medicalizing education, socio-political, pedagogical, institutional, linguistic or affective problems were transformed (and still are) into biological, strictly individual issues. From then on, the artificial construction of nosological entities began to explain not learning in school. Moysés (2008, p. 11, our translation) reveals that:

Without any basis, empirical or theoretical, even going against all the evidence to the contrary, constantly posed by reality, an addicted spiral was formed, in which, from a look based on a belief, reality is deformed and the deformed reality is now presented as the empirical proof of belief.

And so, over more than a century, since 1896 when the first speculation about the disease that would prevent the child from learning - congenital verbal blindness - appeared in England, “explanations and names have followed one another, always without proof; with each criticism, it becomes an entity, with more sophisticated pathophysiological explanations, omitting the absence of scientific foundations” (MOYSÉS, 2008, p. 11, our translation). Congenital verbal blindness gave way to strephosymbolia, which in turn became specific evolutionary dyslexia and, finally, developmental dyslexia; on the other hand, minimal brain damage was replaced by minimal brain dysfunction, which gave rise to attention deficit disorder, which, more recently, gave way to attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).

Specifically in relation to the learning of the written language, several nomenclatures have been used to refer to the difficulties presented by the students: learning disorder, dyslexia, dysortography, dyscalculia, dysgraphy, among others. However, regardless of the nomenclature used, the problem is ordinarily located in the subject's body, obscuring a whole series of aspects that can interfere in a counterproductive way in the learning process.

This is because the causal explanations for reading and writing difficulties were developed by the health area, far from the school context, based on aphasiological studies. From this, a pathology called acquired dyslexia, related to adult subjects suffering from brain injuries, seems to have served as support to determine a mistaken view that takes linguistic facts associated with the process of learning and using the written language as signs of a disease.

Machado and Signor (2014) explain that, based on a traditional clinical reasoning, which assumes that if X causes Y, Y can only be caused by X, medicine assumed that if a brain injury in adult subjects could cause difficulties to read and write, so difficulties presented by children who are in the process of literacy should be caused by neurological damage. Based on this reasoning, children who did not learn to read and write as the school would like started to be diagnosed as having dyslexia. And so, the difficulties in learning the written language started to be explained from an organicist approach, associating neurological, genetic, anatomical, metabolic or functional explanations to such conditions.

However, Moysés (2010) states that there is no scientific basis to prove, in fact, the existence of this disease. The author demonstrates, from a scientific analysis, that there is no evidence of anatomical changes in the brain and argues that there are no precise elements for this diagnosis, nor minimum criteria of objectivity. And she strongly defends this position:

It is professed that there is a neurological disease that would compromise only written language and the diagnosis is made using only written language. Sorry, but this is not a diagnosis, in the medical sense, this is a labeling process, in which the child disappears in the process; the child and the adolescent cease to be a subject, with all the complexity that constitute them, and become just a patient. Of an illness never proven! (MOYSÉS, 2010, p. 14, our translation).

Machado and Signor (2014), add, besides that, correlating, as has been done in most studies in neuroscience, particular models of neurophysiological functioning of the brain with what has been considered deviations from writing is not a sufficient argument so that linguistic facts can be explained in neurophysiological terms. This is because, for the neuroimaging exam to detect the activity in the reading area, it needs to be activated and for that, tasks are used with the written language itself, so that if the subject does not master it, the exam itself has no reason to be, as Moysés (2010) explains:

An American researcher did the following: he applied the Pet to good American readers by giving them an English text to read; the Pet's result was normal. Then, he repeated the exam giving a text in Spanish, which they did not know, and the result of the Pet was "dyslexia". What now? What does the exam evaluate? It assesses brain activity in the area of reading when I know how to read a text given to me. If I have no command of written language, the exam loses its meaning. Therefore, neuroimaging does not prove that dyslexia exist (MOYSÉS, 2010, p. 18, our translation).

It is not a matter of saying, lightly, that there are no diseases that, when interfering in the habitual activities of an individual, also affect intellectual activities, as well as learning. Nor is it denied the growing number of subjects who, despite years of schooling, do not reach a

degree of literacy that enables them to effectively experience social and professional practices involving the written culture. What is questioned in this article is the biological origin of the latter problem.

We reiterate the confrontation against what Moysés (2001) calls the myth of school failure, from which the idea is spread that organic issues are responsible, at least in part, for school failure. According to the author, the health problems of students overlap with the morbidity profile of the population in general: issues of basically social origin. However, the explicit myth is that the Brazilian school subject will suffer from diseases that, however, do not harm their extra-school activities. They are children, “normal until they enter an exclusive school, they are taken as incapable of learning, hostages to non-existent diseases, to failures that are not theirs, and finally imprisoned in invisible institutions” (MOYSÉS, 2001, p. 36, our translation). It is a silent exclusion, hidden by the modes of meaning and production of meanings present in medical and pedagogical discourses on human development and subjectivity.

Historical-cultural studies and overcoming the notion of subject of school failure

As indicated, the hypothesis of a biological determinism for school problems is supported by naturalistic positivist paradigms that have been influencing the concepts underlying the learning of the written language. From these paradigms, what is observed is the transfer of the field of language investigations, as a symbolic, individual phenomenon, to the field of natural and biomedical sciences, treating it as a strictly biological, stable and universal phenomenon. These studies, by assuming language as a biological system and a universality in its acquisition and development, led to the mistaken idea that modes of reading and writing that do not coincide with normative scales would be the result of a problem intrinsic to the subject - since such development would be biologically determined.

In contrast, historical-cultural studies show that the human mind and mental production - in short, language - have a diverse nature and cannot be confused with the neurophysiological aspect of the mind, that is, with the functioning of the brain - a natural physical phenomenon. The mind and language, as symbolic phenomena, despite being constituted from a human condition, are organized culturally, varying, therefore, from person to person. Studies such as de Vygotsky (2007) and Bruner (1986) corroborate this understanding by pointing to the implications of the cultural environment in the functioning of the mind and in the constitution

of language, allowing the understanding that different subjects interact and conceptualize writing in different ways, one since they present unique mental organization and operation, which, in turn, imply different forms of interaction with the world, with the other and with written culture.

However, studies of a naturalistic developmental nature were not able to verify such diversity by predetermining the standard way of writing and reading, as well as its stages and time of development. This is because the theoretical body developed by these theories has as its research subject the Cartesian subject - idealized, timeless and universal - who judges the world, structures and makes use of language based on logical-formal parameters. Such a subject cannot be identified with real subjects, students of Brazilian public schools - especially those who have been referred to as subjects of school failure.

On this aspect, it is necessary to consider that in human sciences, observational empirical research does not operate on material data, however, on realities intuited by the researcher based on the observed (IANNI, 2004). Senna (2012) adds that the starting point of hypotheses in human sciences are values ordered in certain paradigms and not material states definitively verifiable in the reality of the world. The problem results from the fact that the phenomenological construction of the object to be investigated, that is, language, does not undergo the observation process, since this phenomenon consists of symbolic matter, therefore, existing in the world of ideas and mental representations.

This implies that being in field research in language, does not necessarily mean being in front of real subjects or students, since the researcher's conceptual paradigms continue to prevail over observation and over all the experimentation that takes place. More specifically, when defining what is normal or pathological in terms of written language, the researcher's judgment always prevails, influenced by conceptual paradigms. What leads a researcher or a professor to characterize as a mistake a given writing form or mode of reading that are outside the standards of the canonical norm of alphabetic writing and its cultural uses, above all, it is the inability to analyze them (or assimilate them, in terms of Piaget's theory) from their theoretical foundations based on what we have been calling positivist paradigms. As it is not possible for them to explain such deviations as phenomena derived from fully justifiable factors, they can only explain them as pathological deviations, the result of abnormalities. Looking at these facts of the literacy process from the historical-cultural paradigm provides the opportunity to appreciate them as explainable phenomena, fully predictable and justified based on determinant facts. Anyway, the lens is changed and reality is transformed.

Anchored in the historical-cultural perspective, it is possible to affirm that the diversity of writings has such a proportion that it cannot be taken as deviations or symptoms of neurophysiological pathologies. This diversity is due to the historical-cultural plurality that constitutes not only school subjects, but Brazilian society. The consideration of such plurality implies advancing a theory about the mind that opposes the supposed socio-cultural neutrality of universalizing naturalistic theories.

Machado (2013) discusses a theory about the mind that highlights the different ways in which subjects from different cultures structure and make use of writing and speech. According to the author, subjects belonging to a culture with a high level of literacy, in which writing is present in their daily lives as an ordinary and necessary factor, develop a scientific way of thinking and can easily formulate writings that approach standard writing. This is because to produce a formal written text, the subject needs to have a mode of mental organization that allows him to operate on logically ordered data, causally and temporally, previously planned and not contextualized in concrete. That is, standard writing is associated with a scientific way of thinking.

On the other hand, according to Machado (2013), subjects belonging to cultures in which orality prevails over written culture, since they are charged with restricted access to cultural goods constructed by humanity, tend to favor a narrative way of thinking and can produce unique writing modes, with graphic symbols that appear incidentally and casually, with a morphosyntactic organization with marks of their orality, revealing a low level of planning and control of variables. The more peripheral the condition of the social subject in relation to the Cartesian world, the more distant his writing will be from the standard norm.

However, the manifestations of writing that differ from the standard norm cannot be interpreted as signs or symptoms of a pathology intrinsic to the subject, on the contrary, they should be seen as indicative of the diversity of ways of appropriating, elaborating and representing writing. In this sense, it is necessary to de-pathologize human learning processes, understanding it as a complex phenomenon that involves a multiplicity of factors, which can never be reduced to a question of a simply biological nature.

From this perspective, it is also necessary to consider that learning the written language involves much more than its conceptualization and use in the most varied contexts of production, since it is the very constitution of the subject's identity as a subject of the written culture. This constitutive process is constantly changing, depending on the subject's history of interaction with writing and with the adults who mediate such a process, so that interdiscursivity is a *sine qua non* issue.

Interdiscursivity as a way to produce meanings in school learning

At the borderline between the processes of mental representation that guarantee us unique learning paths and the alphabetical model of the conventional writing system is the experience of school education.

Time, space and what is lived in school is explained by cultural, scientific, and historical bases woven for centuries, but always subject to new meanings that validate them in contemporary times. In this way, formal school learning processes are always redefined because they are explained contextually, as in all sectors of life: family, professional, commercial and gender relations, among many others. Everything is explained by the complexity and the tangle of many ways of making a presence and a voice in the world.

Regarding the elaboration of knowledge formalized and selected by the school, this does not happen differently or apart from the contextual ways of reading the world. On the contrary, the school has the challenge of promoting transit between cultures even though they have their origins in different principles.

It is from this place that historical-cultural studies motivate dialogic, intercultural and interdiscursive paths that prioritize pedagogical practices in which *learning with the school* becomes more significant than the limitation of learning of any content or skill in isolation. *Learning with* represents here the meaning of experiences because there is interaction, there is conversation with the object of learning, there is mediation between cultures, since it is the dialogue with life and with the other that can make the object worthwhile and, thus, be attributed of meaning.

It is precisely because of the urgency of including subjects commonly typified as those of school failure that we seek to analyze teaching practices from the contexts of the world and the lives of these same subjects. Then, the Enunciation Theory is used, as well as Discourse Analysis, so that coherent principles can be thought of in the development of more inclusive school processes. Smolka (1999), when dealing with literacy based on interaction and dialogue, justifies the choice of these two theories in the consideration of pedagogical issues.

First, because, for me, literacy implies *reading and writing* that I see as *discursive moments*. Second, because the acquisition process itself also takes place in a *succession of discursive moments*, of interlocution, of interaction (SMOLKA, 1999, p. 29, authors' highlights, our translation).

This is only achieved through the consideration of interdisciplinary studies that assume the subjects of school learning beyond categories determined biologically, psychologically or neurophysiologically. Therefore, the discursive dimension is considered here, which, although

it occurs as an individual experience, is always permeated by the discursive experience also of others, in processes of interaction and interlocution. Bakhtin (2016, p. 54, our translation) states that “the individual discursive experience of any person is formed and develops in a constant and continuous interaction with the individual statements of others”.

It is possible to affirm, therefore, that the senses of learning, directly related to social experiences, are built in the daily life of schools (but not only in them), in the personal logic that is put into play whenever the subjects are challenged to think, to share their hypotheses, to refute others, to explain how they came to a certain answer and, equally, to listen about how the other thought, what hypotheses the other elaborated, how the other interacts with this same object of learning.

The meanings of learning and not learning, therefore, are constructions of the whole life and not something that can be taught. They are not ready, they are not unique, as they are redefined with each new reading of the world, each new intercultural experience and are also influenced by school and scientific traditions - these are also subject to reconceptualization all the time.

Interdiscursivity is, therefore, a theoretical-pedagogical principle that meets the demand for integrated subjects, in full cognitive and social activity, all the time. The superior psychological functions, as elucidated in Vygotsky (2007), are explained by social circumstances and motivate specific forms of thought organization because they allow signs to be not only used, but created and, therefore, do not manifest themselves unrelated to world contexts. And more than that, they are connected to the processes of meaning elaborated by others - partners in the processes of learning -, which justifies that, in this article, the discursive processes are perceived to be validated if they are related to others and, therefore, they become interdiscursive.

The linguistic representations of school subjects are elaborations that go through social relations and that are fundamentally connected to the constitutive function of language and its relationship with human thought. Likewise, academic production, materialized in readings and writings in the most different areas of school knowledge, tries to answer questions of daily life, body and life. What we want to highlight here is that the body that studies, that learns, that elaborates concepts and that gives meaning to all of that, experiences world readings beyond what it does at school.

Such considerations are listed in this article because life is not explained in isolated factors and technically explained only by the areas of Education or Health, as well as what is lived in school also does not allow simplifications. Thus, any and all agents that mediate school

learning, with the intention that the school becomes an instrument of inclusion, will be able to seek principles of action that approach the meanings of these two pillars, without which there is no learning: the subject, with all culture and social brands; the school as a way of interacting with contemporary scientific culture - both for the purpose of social inclusion.

In a philosophical analysis that proposes to think of the text (oral or written) as an immediate reality and its place in the humanities, Bakhtin (2016) presents the human attitude as a potential text, which only can be understood in a dialogical context of the time itself.

The human sciences are the sciences of man in their specificity and not of a dumb thing or a natural phenomenon. Man in his human specificity always expresses himself (he speaks), that is, he creates text (albeit potential). Where man is studied outside the text and independently of it, it is no longer a question of human sciences (but of the anatomy and physiology of man, etc.) (BAKHTIN, 2016, p. 77, our translation).

The school scientific tradition for many years based its practices on teaching methods rooted in pre-determining theories of learning that, based on a subject model, choose learning behaviors for each of its stages, as skills that evolve with each new challenge. It happens, however, that every methodology precast in evolutionary phases is based on a certain subject profile. As discussed in the previous sections, these methods end up reinforcing the notion of homogeneity of ways of learning at the expense of the notions of diversity and individual representation of the world, both inherent to the human species in a historical-cultural perspective.

Hence the pedagogical character of interdiscursivity for the production of meanings in learning: the option for teaching practices aimed at the elaboration of multiple processes of reading the world and not just the appropriation of content produced under deterministic bases and not subject to criticism or questioning. To be multiple, the processes of reading the world presuppose the relationship between discourses, which justifies the school and its role in expanding social experiences.

The historical trajectory of methods to teach reading, from those motivated by industrial production modes - which were reflected in repetitive and memorized reading practices -, through scientifically motivated methods and supported by studies of learning psychology or studies of linguistics structuralist, even more heuristic practices developed from the Psychogenesis of Written Language (FERREIRO; TEBEROSKY, 1985), always reveals a convergence between the notions of mind, subject, teaching and learning. Such notions are also evident when analyzing the historical and social context in which each practice is validated in legitimacy and in which the production of science meets the dominant principles.

Since the 1980s, therefore, efforts have been made in the sense that national public policies for the formation of readers and writers take on the issues of discourse as a way of bringing the less privileged social strata of society to the bases of academic and scientific culture. Efforts have since materialized in the Law of Directives and Bases 9394/96 (BRASIL, 1996), in the National Curriculum Parameters (BRASIL, 1997), in the National Curriculum Guidelines (BRASIL, 2013), but they are confused in the National Common Curricular Base (BRASIL, 2018), by bringing together contradictory theoretical principles, already overcome and refuted by studies in the area, in different parts of its document.

It is up to the academic and school communities, therefore, the scientific production that highlights the role of the school as the space for the different ways of learning and the congregation of cultures that produce discourses and variable meanings in the elaboration of reading and writing. These discourses intertwine because they serve subjects integrated into the world and hence interdiscursivity as a way that manifests itself in multiple ways in teaching practices, because it is always new, authorial and to be built. Speeches are not predictable or controllable because they are designed contextually. In this way, the interaction between these discourses takes place with pedagogical intentionality, but not through the choice of a method since this notion presupposes the idealization of a model of the school subject.

The Brazilian reality is uneven in several aspects, with diversity being, therefore, the principle and mainstay for learning issues to be studied in context. There is an ethical dimension involved when it is stated about the failure or success of learning by a school subject, as this analysis is always accompanied by a parameter, a value and a specific place of speech.

Final considerations

The notions of failure, learning and subject constructed and assumed by each school mediation agent outline inclinations for differentiated teaching practices. Thus, when it is assumed that such notions are explained by generalist principles that elect models of subjects and ways of learning, the tendency for teaching practices that reproduce fragments of fixed, absolute realities, elaborated *a priori* and outside socially relevant contexts, is common.

On the contrary, when diversity is assumed as an essentially human principle that gives unique ways of interacting with realities, the notion of failure of the school subject does not apply because the point of arrival is not defined temporally. Learning is explained on the way, on the course, in the hypotheses, in the doubts and, mainly, in the social exchanges motivated by discourses that intertwine and, for this reason alone, produce meaning.

That said, assuming written culture as a register of a social form of language production, which takes shape in a certain form of interaction with the world, the penalization of the school subject as one who fails to learn is a reflection of an excluding culture. As a result of this culture, which was built from segregating scientific bases, the school has been punished by the status that it cannot teach and the school subject by the stigma of those who cannot learn. This double conflict can converge in significant formative experiences through the availability to build a pedagogical ideal that starts from real socio-cultural situations, thus motivating personal identity to prevail in the category of school subject.

To foster reflections that culminate in meaningful learning processes, especially for the social classes victimized by the stigmas of failure, this article ends with the words of Colello (2012):

Understanding the failure of teaching makes the slowness of school transformation clear, a process that always falls short of the most immediate needs of our students. In the oscillation between advances and setbacks, between boldness and resistance, the seeds of knowing and doing are always nourished by initiatives, efforts, reflection and, certainly, by our dreams (COLELLO, 2012, p. 99, our translation).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: This work was partially financed with resources from research funds maintained by the FAPERJ Foundation's Scientists of Our State program (# 202629/2017) and the PROCENCIA program at the Rio de Janeiro State University.

REFERENCES

BAKHTIN, M. **Os gêneros do discurso**. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2016.

BRASIL. **Decreto n. 9765, de 11 de abril de 2019**. Institui a Política Nacional de Alfabetização. Brasília: MEC, 2019a. Available: <https://legis.senado.leg.br/norma/30902116/publicacao/30905492>. Access: 20 mar. 2020.

BRASIL. **Resolução n. 2, de 20 de dezembro de 2019**. Define as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial de Professores para a Educação Básica e institui a Base Nacional Comum para a Formação Inicial de Professores da Educação Básica (BNC – Formação). Brasília: CNE, 2019b. Available: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/docman/dezembro-2019-pdf/135951-rcp002-19/file>. Access: 20 Mar. 2020.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Básica. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular**: educação é a base. Brasília: MEC/SEB, 2018.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais Gerais da Educação Básica**. Brasília: MEC, SEB, DICEI, 2013.

BRASIL, Ministério da Educação. **Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais para o Ensino Fundamental**. Brasília, MEC/SEF, 1997.

BRASIL. Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. **Diário Oficial da União**: Seção 1, Brasília, DF, n. 248, p. 27833, 23 dez. 1996.

BRUNER, J. **Actual minds, possible words**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

COLELLO, S. M. G. **A escola que (NÃO) ensina a escrever**. São Paulo: Summus, 2012.

FERREIRO, E; TEBEROSKY, A. **Psicogênese da língua escrita**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1985.

GARCIA, A. L. M. Fonoaudiologia e letramento. *In*: DAUDEN, A. T. B. C.; MORI-DE ANGELIS, C. C. **Linguagem escrita: tendências e reflexões sobre o trabalho fonoaudiológico**. São Paulo: Editora Pancast, 2004. p. 15-35.

HOBBSAWM, E. **A era das revoluções**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1982.

IANNI, O. (Org.) **Florestan fernandes: sociologia crítica e militante**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2004.

JAPIASSU, H. **O sonho transdisciplinar: e as razões da filosofia**. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 2006.

MACHADO, M. L. C. A. **A escrita alfabética, sua natureza e representação: contribuições à Fonoaudiologia aplicada à Educação**. Orientador: Luiz Antônio Gomes Senna. 2013. 157 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2013

MACHADO, M. L. C. A. SIGNOR, R. C. F. Os transtornos funcionais específicos e a educação inclusiva. *In*: MARCHESAN, I. Q.; SILVA, H. J.; TOMÉ, M. C. **Tratado das especialidades em fonoaudiologia**. Sociedade Brasileira de Fonoaudiologia. 1. ed. São Paulo: Guanabara Koogan, 2014.

MOYSÉS, M. A. A. Dislexia existe? Questionamentos a partir de estudos científicos. *In*: BENEVENUTO, A. B.; ANGELUCCI, C. B.; BONOLENTA, L; MARTÃO, W. (Org.). **Dislexia: subsídios para políticas públicas**. Cadernos Temáticos Conselho Regional de Psicologia SP. São Paulo: CRP SP. 2010. v. 8. p. 11-23. Available: http://www.crp.org.br/portal/comunicação/cadernos_tematicos/8/frames/fr_dislexia. Access: 20 Mar. 2020.

MOYSÉS, M. A. A. A medicalização na educação infantil e no ensino fundamental e as políticas de formação docente. A medicalização do não-aprender-na-escola e a invenção da infância anormal. *In*: REUNIÃO ANUAL DA ANPED, 31., 2008, Caxambu. **Anais [...]** Caxambu: ANPED, 2008. Available: http://31reuniao.anped.org.br/4sessao_especial/se%20-%2012%20-%20maria%20aparecida%20affonso%20moyses%20-%20participante.pdf. Access: 19 Mar. 2020.

MOYSÉS, M. A. A. **A institucionalização invisível: crianças que não-aprendem-na-escola**. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras, 2001.

MOYSÉS, M. A.; COLLARES, C. A. L. Medicalização o obscurantismo reinventado. *In*: COLLARES, C. A. L.; MOYSÉS, M. A.; RIBEIRO, M. C. (Org.). **Novas capturas, antigos diagnósticos na era dos transtornos**. São Paulo: Mercado de Letras, 2013. p. 41-65.

PATTO, M. H. S. **A produção do fracasso escolar**: histórias de submissão e rebeldia. 3. ed. São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo, 2008.

SENNA, L. A. G. O campo acadêmico do letramento e da alfabetização no Brasil: estados e perspectivas da pesquisa em linguística aplicada. *In*: COLÓQUIO BRASILEIRO EDUCAÇÃO NA SOCIEDADE CONTEMPORÂNEA, 3., 2012, Campina Grande. **Anais [...]**. Campina Grande: UFCG, 2012.

SMOLKA, A. L. B. **A criança na fase inicial da escrita**: a alfabetização como processo discursivo. São Paulo: Cortez; Campinas, SP: Editora da Universidade Estadual de Campinas, 1999.

VYGOTSKY, L. S. **A formação social da mente**: o desenvolvimento dos processos psicológicos superiores. 7. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2007.

How to reference this article

MACHADO, M. L. C. A.; LOPES, P. S. V. C.; SENNA, L. A. G. Notes on failure and diversity: meanings of learning and not learning in schools. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 15, n. esp. 5, p. 2837-2854, Dec. 2020. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v15iesp5.14561>

Submitted: 10/01/2020

Required revisions: 25/05/2020

Approved: 30/10/2020

Published: 01/12/2020