

MEDICALIZATION OF EDUCATION AND THE MEANINGS OF NOT LEARNING DISCURSIVIZED IN PEDAGOGICAL DOCUMENTATION: A LOOK AT SCHOOL DISCOURSE

MEDICALIZAÇÃO DA EDUCAÇÃO E OS SENTIDOS DO NÃO APRENDER DISCURSIVIZADOS NA DOCUMENTAÇÃO PEDAGÓGICA: UM OLHAR PARA O DISCURSO DA ESCOLA

MEDICALIZACIÓN DE LA EDUCACIÓN Y SIGNIFICADO DE NO APRENDIZAJE DISCURSIVIZADO EM LA DOCUMENTACIÓN PEDAGÓGICA: UMA MIRADA AL DISCURSO ESCOLAR

Claudia Regina Mosca GIROTO¹
Jaqueline Belga MARQUES²
Amanda Trindade GARCIA³

ABSTRACT: In the field of education, there is a network of medicalizing and pathologizing explanations that seek to justify not learning, under which diseases of not learning proliferate attributed to students in the initial phase of the formal process of writing appropriation. Based on such ideas, the present study aimed to understand the meanings about not learning in the written speeches of an elementary school, in a medium-sized municipality in the interior of São Paulo, designated as the one with the largest number of teachers with complaints about students who do not learn. From documentary research, the process of generating and understanding the data considered here refers specifically to the situation of two children enrolled in classes of 1st and 2nd years, respectively. The results, based on the statements discursivized by the school, in this documentation, indicated a process of subjecting these children to the process of appropriating this language modality, as well as the naturalization of meanings of not learning constituted under medicalizing and pathologizing tendencies of educational processes.

KEYWORDS: Medicalization of education. Diseases of not learning. Written language.

RESUMO: No campo da educação, há uma rede de explicações medicalizadoras e patologizadoras que buscam justificar o não aprender, sob a qual proliferam doenças do não aprender atribuídas a alunos em fase inicial do processo formal de apropriação da escrita.

¹ São Paulo State University (UNESP), Marília – SP – Brazil. Professor in the Postgraduate Program in Education (PPGE) and the Department of Special Education, College of Philosophy and Sciences (FFC). Professor in the Postgraduate Program in School Education (PPGEE), College of Sciences and Letters (FCLAr / UNESP) - Araraquara. PhD in Education (UNESP). CNPq Project Process no. 406241/2016-3. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6267-8085>. E-mail: claudia.mosca@unesp.br

² São Paulo State University (UNESP), Araraquara – SP – Brazil. Master's by the Postgraduate Program in School Education. CNPq Project Process no. 406241/2016-3. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1735-5276>. E-mail: jackchagas@hotmail.com

³ São Paulo State University (UNESP), Marília – SP – Brazil. Master's by the Postgraduate Program in Education. CNPq Project Process no. 406241/2016-3. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7092-7395>. E-mail: trindade.amanda@gmail.com

Com base em tais ideias, o presente estudo objetivou compreender os sentidos sobre o não aprender nos discursos escritos de uma escola de Ensino Fundamental apontada, num município de médio porte do interior paulista, como a que possui o maior número de professores com queixas sobre alunos que não aprendem. A partir de pesquisa documental, o processo de geração e compreensão dos dados aqui considerados se remete especificamente à situação de duas crianças matriculadas em classes de 1º e 2º anos, respectivamente. Os resultados, pautados nos enunciados discursivizados pela escola, nessa documentação, indicaram um processo de assujeitamento dessas crianças do processo de apropriação dessa modalidade de linguagem, bem como a naturalização de sentidos do não aprender constituídos sob tendências medicalizadora e patologizadora dos processos educativos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Medicalização da educação. Doenças do não aprender. Linguagem Escrita.*

RESUMEN: *En el campo de la educación, hay una red de explicaciones medicalizadoras y patologizadoras que buscan justificar el no aprender, bajo la cual proliferan enfermedades del no aprender atribuidas a alumnos en fase inicial del proceso formal de apropiación de la escritura. Sobre la base de estas ideas, el presente estudio ha tenido como objetivo comprender los sentidos sobre el no aprender discursivizados en la documentación pedagógica utilizada en una escuela de Enseñanza Primaria designada, en un municipio de mediano porte del interior paulista, como la que tiene el mayor número de profesores con quejas sobre alumnos que no aprenden. A partir de la investigación documental, el proceso de generación y comprensión de los datos aquí considerados se remite específicamente a la situación de dos niños matriculados en clases de 1º y 2º años, respectivamente. Los resultados, pautados en los enunciados discursivizados por la escuela, en esa documentación, indicaron un proceso de asunción de esos niños del proceso de apropiación de esa modalidad de lenguaje, así como la naturalización de sentidos del no aprender constituídos bajo tendencias medicalizadora y patologizadora de los procesos educativos*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Medicalización de la educación. Enfermedades del no aprender. Lenguaje escrito.*

Introduction

The learning of writing understood as a complex cultural activity takes place in the use of language present in life, in the interaction between the subjects inserted in the most diverse social practices, considering that the subject is constituted in the social relationship with the other, in a permanent dialectical and dialogical movement. Being alive and dialogical, a product of human interaction and, therefore, constitutive of the subject, written language, as a social and discursive practice, presupposes someone who says something to someone, through constitutively dialogical statements, whose historicity refracts and is refracted in the production conditions (GERALDI, 2013). The other, as constitutive of the subject, assumes a decisive relevance in the constitution of consciousness and in the subject's relationship with

his reality, with the world of life (BAKHTIN, 2011; VIGOTSKI, 2012; VOLÓCHINOV, 2017).

Vigotski (2007; 2012), in seeking to understand how social experiences formulate or constitute the human mind, learning and development, and in pointing out the importance of the other in the constitution of the subject, emphasizes that the learning process takes place through the interaction between the child, the environment and its partners, in a process of collaboration between people. In this perspective, it is possible to understand that the student's human formation is not the result of school experiences alone, but of various voices and subjects that permeate their relationships.

Under this understanding, learning does not have an individual, evolutionary or externally controllable character, because, when indicating that learning mobilizes internal processes and new appropriations through interaction with other people, Vigotski (2007, p. 118) states that learning and child development, even if directly linked, do not take place in parallel, in the same way that development never accompanies school learning, and the appropriation of knowledge is not linear, since,

Learning awakens several internal developmental processes that can operate only when the child interacts with people in his environment and when in cooperation with his peers. Once internalized, these processes become part of the child's independent development acquisitions (our translation).

In this sense, educational action should focus on what Vigotski (2012) calls the zone of near development, which is configured by what the child is not yet able to do independently but can do with the help of other more experienced partners. When engaging in an activity that initially extrapolates its possibilities of autonomous realization, under the mediation of such partners, the child is prepared to, in the near future, perform it independently. From this perspective, every attempt initially and apparently without a solution to something has the possibility, later, of success.

The understanding of writing as a complex cultural activity makes it possible to think of the school as a place of appropriation of the culture historically created by man, through experiences and contacts with different types of knowledge that, under mediation, promote the elaborated knowledge, constituted in/by social use of language present in life, to the detriment of mechanical teaching that predominantly provides monological activities of formation, repetition and memorization, devoid of the fundamental dialogism and necessary for the appropriation of this language modality.

Similarly, educational work needs to be understood as “[...] the act of producing, directly and intentionally in each singular individual, humanity that is produced historically and collectively by the group of men” (SAVIANI, 1991, p. 19, our translation). The educator's work demands scientificity, as it is not common sense. It needs to enable the child to write about, considering the complexity of the elaborated knowledge and the singularities inherent to the different modes of appropriation of this language modality. Activity is understood here as “[...] the action provoked by a need that guides and regulates” that, related to the appropriation of writing, demands the proposition of the activity as a process “[...] that creates a need in the student, so that he seeks an object that satisfies this need” (GARCIA, 2019, p. 25, our translation).

In turn, the child needs to be considered as a historical and cultural being, who apprehends his humanity through his activity in the world (VIGOTSKI, 2007). From this perspective, the child is a culture-producing subject, since “[...] the subject is not a thing, as he speaks, he is aware that he expands to receive another awareness that also expands. Without the language of man, the human of man is not constituted”. Therefore, “[...] language is the mediation between another and a Self, and language is the constitutive activity; dialogue is the constructive place” (MIOTELLO, 2012, p. 153, our translation).

Unfortunately, the school has often been understood as a mere place for the transmission of information, with little space for the materialization of the characteristic dialogism necessary for the appropriation of writing, just as its professionals, to a large extent, have understood educational work under a technician and monological character, in which the child assumes a passive role, with little opportunity to think and act on/in writing, submitted to a process of individualization of responsibility for both learning and not learning. Still, mechanistic activities predominate, devoid of meaning, with an excessive focus on the mere teaching of letters and on the domain of motor, phonetic/phonological and/or auditory skills, to the detriment of the need to understand writing as an interactive and discursive process, whose conditions of access, production and appropriation are linked to historical and collective determinants (VIGOTSKI, 2012; VOLÓCHINOV, 2017).

This situation has been a fertile ground for the school to organize itself in line with a network of explanations that seek to justify not learning, recurrently under the bias of school failure. What has led to a greater discursiveness about children and not learning supported by a process of subjecting the child to the appropriation of this language modality. This discursivization, as proposed by Giroto, Araújo and Vitta (2019, p. 808, our translation), is understood here as “[...] the process of discursive construction loaded with social, historical

and ideological values refracted in/by the speeches”, in this case, that circulate in the school about not learning, that disregard the heterogeneous character of students enrolled in educational systems and the singularities that constitute the different modes of appropriation of this language modality.

Concerning this discursivization, we are interested in considering two aspects:

- the naturalization, resulting from this discursivization, of the constitution of meanings about not learning, from the medicalizing and pathologizing tendencies of educational processes, which promote, within the school, the proliferation of patients and diseases of not learning; and
- the mistaken understanding of pedagogical documentation, understood as a mere record of information about students, instead of being valued as a place for the constitution and circulation of educational memory, therefore of a dialogical nature, when contemplating the multiplicity of voices that are discursivized and that discursivize about the child.

The naturalization of the constitution of meanings about not learning, under the medicalizing tendency, occurs to the extent that collective, social, political, economic, cultural, linguistic issues are reduced to organic/individual aspects, consequently displaced to the medical field, featuring a process of medicalization of education (COLLARES; MOYSÉS, 2010; 2013). This process, which comes largely from the diffusion of medical knowledge in the social fabric, is linked to the reduction of technical control over life and in line with an idealized model of health, founded on a standardized concept of normality, by assuming a standardizing and homogenizing character of different ways of being and acting, learning and behaving (GUARRIDO, 2010; FREITAS; BAPTISTA, 2019).

In turn, the pathologizing tendency amplifies the reductionist understanding of not learning, especially on the part of areas related to medicine, by being characterized as an effect of the resonance of technical-scientific reductionism in the educational field and, consequently, promoting the pathologization process of education that, in a broader sense, not linked to a specific area of knowledge, refers to the attribution of sick status to subjects who manifest singularities that distance them from idealized learning patterns, to the point of occurrences foreseen in the schooling process become predictive criteria and/or manifestations of diseases of not learning.

At the same time that learning is reduced to idealized models, circumstantial to normative expectations (in fact unattainable), not learning, under the predominantly biological

and technical bias, starts to be conceived as a deviation from the idealized norm. When extending this understanding to the educational field, once these expectations are idealized, it is expected that they will be fulfilled, being given the condition of norms. Under this bias, when not learning, then, the place of school failure and inadequacy to the schooling process remains.

Such a situation constitutes a fertile ground for learning and, consequently, not learning to be faced apart from its multiple determinants, which end up silenced and/or erased in the face of the process of stigmatization of subjects who cease to be understood in their complexities and specificities and in relation to the sociocultural dynamics they experience in a given time and place.

Understanding not learning as a synonym for school failure, detached from socioeconomic, political-ideological determinants, configures it as an abstraction, circumscribed to merely individual aspects, which distances it from the understanding that both its origin and solution lie in the close relationship with social inequalities and unequal working conditions to which most of the Brazilian population is subject (PATTO, 2000).

Under the processes of: normalization, here understood as a simplification of the different ways of being and acting in the world; homogenization, as a result of such simplification, from the erasure of constitutive singularities; and the normative expectations to achieve such homogenization, the predictive (prophetic) characteristics aligned and/or resulting from such processes have taken on significant importance, often expressed in documents that bring the data of students considered as those who do not learn in the school environment.

We add here that the documents in isolation do not constitute pedagogical documentation, that is, they do not bring the power to make “[...] visible the tracks of each person, each group, each family in their passage through school” (SOLÁ, 2007, p. 40, our translation).

Pedagogical documents can be used for reflection and analysis of educational processes to highlight “[...] the ways in which children build knowledge, to strengthen their own identity in the education of young children, and to build the quality of educational contexts” (PINAZZA; FOCHI, 2018, p. 14, our translation).

However, these materials have often been reduced to documents under the term medical records and/or reports, whose use in the school environment can be taken as an example of the subjectification of medical discourse by education, in which they appear, in addition to medical information and copies of exams, vague records on educational

trajectories, often supported by common sense, whose narratives invariably address difficulties presented by children.

The pedagogical documentation should enable a school of diverse narrations, of uncertain narrations, in which the scripts are written based on the voices in the relationships of each one. Itineraries that live building stories based on participatory contexts (SOLÁ, 2007).

If we consider that the teacher's work demands scientific work, based on his studies and observations, the pedagogical documentation that takes place in the context of elementary education is not characterized as such, as it does not include the construction of educational memory. By reducing the discursivization process to mere records, it does not enhance this practice as a possibility of welcoming subjectivities and daily dialogue about the pedagogical practices undertaken, particularly in relation to children considered as those who do not learn and present diseases of not learning.

Under the premise that the discursivization that naturalizes the medicalized and pathologized meanings of not learning, materialized in medical records and reports, based on the mistakes and reductionisms under which the pedagogical documentation has been understood by the school and its professionals contributes to the promotion of a demand for health services produced under the discourse of abnormality, a question is necessary: what meanings of not learning circulate in these documents produced at school, their implications and consequences?

Faced with this premise and questioning, the present study aimed to understand the meanings about not learning present in the written speeches of an elementary school, in a city in the interior of São Paulo, as the one with the largest number of teachers with complaints about students who do not learn, which refer specifically, in the present article, to the situation of two children enrolled in classes of 1st and 2nd years, respectively, at the beginning of the formal appropriation of writing.

Methodological path

The methodological path comprised a documentary research, in which the speeches written in school documents were used as a source of data. The choice for these data occurred because we consider that school records are of great importance in the production of subjectivities, as they can be characterized as practices that update the discourses and produce the student's ways of being and learning, while revealing the school culture under which

students and their different ways of appropriating knowledge are understood (MARQUES, 2018).

We started from the previous indication of a Teaching Directorate that identified, in a city in the interior of São Paulo, the school with the highest number of complaints, by its teachers, of children who do not learn. Then, we obtained the indication, by the manager of that school, of teachers who worked in the early years of elementary school who had the largest number of complaints of this nature. Two teachers were considered here who, in turn, identified, in their respective classrooms, the child with the greatest difficulty in learning. Students with medical reports that linked them to pre-existing diseases were not considered.

In this way, we had access to the documents of two children, hereinafter presented as: Júlia, with six years of age and enrolled in the 1st year of Elementary School I, and Amanda, with eight years, in the 2nd year. We opted for this period of schooling, as we understand it as a critical period, when children are initiated in the systematic formal process of appropriation of written language, in which, generally, the labels of not learning appear, or are announced, more frequently (GIROTO; ARAÚJO; VITTA, 2019). The data presented here are part of a research approved by the Ethics Committee, under process No. 64007416.3.0000.5400.

The generation of data took place from all types of documents mistakenly identified by school management as pedagogical documentation for these children, consisting of medical records, reports, exams and referrals, as well as using a script, with a view to systematizing this data, which included: the child's past and current school history; previous and current complaints from teachers, information of a clinical nature (exams, reports, medication, referrals); school actions aimed at pedagogical practices undertaken to assist the child in the process of writing appropriation; explicit and/or implicit conceptions about writing, child, school, educational work, role of the teacher. Access to said documentation took place at the school, at a time previously agreed with the school manager.

For the understanding of the data, we consider the statements written about these children as constitutive of the school's discourse, since they are, recurrently, legitimated, institutionally, as the statements about these children and their different modes of appropriation of writing, used in meetings between professionals and parents, in justification of referrals and, sometimes, with the children themselves.

From this point of view, in the analysis we seek to apprehend the meanings of not learning explicitly and/or implicitly refracted in/by the school discourse that orbit about Júlia and Amanda, understanding that it is necessary to take into account the values that the words carry, because “[...] the word is always loaded with content or an ideological or experiential

meaning” (VOLÓCHINOV, 2017, p. 99, our translation). This discourse was valued, therefore, not only as a simple textual record, since it was constituted in the relations established before and during its production, as the meaning processes do not arise through a single voice, but are configured from different voices, under different points of view, and it is precisely because of this discursive condition that words inevitably show up in a struggle of voices.

Results and discussion

The presentation and discussion now undertaken resulted from the statements taken as constitutive of the school's discourse and as revealing evidence: the subjection to which Júlia and Amanda are subjected, in their process of formal appropriation of writing; and the naturalization of the senses of not learning that orbit about them, discursivized under the medicalizing and pathologizing tendencies.

Júlia: between invisibility in the classroom and subjection of/in educational processes

The written records generated by the school are crossed by speeches that produce knowledge about children, their behaviors, their capacities and their difficulties. Sometimes these speeches are explicit and sometimes implicit.

Therefore, the analysis of these written speeches was a challenge, as we seek to emerge the multiple voices and also the silences, which here, refer to the school assuming or not its responsible act, its responsibility as positioning in relation to the condition faced by these children, pointed out by their teachers like those who do not learn at school. Trying to understand how subjectivities have been constructed generates a practice of reconstruction, in a movement of understanding that goes beyond the written records themselves, since they also refract, among other aspects, the conceptions of writing, school, educational work, children and the teacher's role in mediating knowledge appropriation.

At the outset, it is necessary to emphasize the misunderstanding of how the pedagogical documentation is understood by the school, insofar as such documentation refers to the child's medical record that gathers an enrollment form, the teacher's report registered in a school development form, exams and/or reports and referrals, used in a very similar way to health services, with a more prescriptive/informative character and, invariably, disjointed each year of records, depending on the length of schooling. The enrollment form includes the

child's personal data and does not include enough elements to make it possible to know their history of relationship with writing, as it gathers data that are very close to a clinical anamnesis, from the gestational phase until the moment of entering school. In the school development form there is space about the report about difficulties presented by the child, but there is no place for the teacher to report what the child is able to accomplish, her advances, the activity about/in/with the writing itself.

Cristofari (2014, p. 113, our translation), when pointing out the importance of school records as a dialogical locus for reflection and dialogue, mentions that, "The school has a historical practice that consists of preparing written records, which are crossed by speeches that produce knowledge about the students". From this point of view, it is possible to consider that, both the types of documents and the information valued in the school's discourse, about the children considered here, reveal that this documentation is not used as an object of reflection and space for dialogue.

There is little information in Júlia's form, as there are still no records of the current year (1st year), at the time of the research, only from the previous year, when she was studying in Pre II. The Pre II teacher recorded only: "[...] *student not very participative in the class, shy, absences in excess*" (our translation), these justified by health problems, without any additional information that refers to any commitment of an organic nature and/or any referral and use of medication. The report goes on to explain that, "[...] *she has little progress in the development of learning, thinking is not very creative*" and concludes with "[...] *hypothesis of pre-syllabic writing*" (our translation).

What caught our attention is that this child is at the beginning of the formal process of appropriating writing and is so early understood as a child who does not learn, even before showing what she already knows and what she can learn. The narrative about her school trajectory is poor and devoid of elements that can subsidize such understanding, since it only appears that she attended Pre II before entering this school. Even at the beginning of the formal process of writing appropriation, Júlia already seems to be subject to the processes of individualization of responsibility both for learning and for not learning, as well as for homogenizing ways of being and acting, since the individual characteristics mentioned probably gained relevance for diverging from the idealized student model.

Individualization in the sense that, associated with demotivation for participation in classroom activities, their individual characteristics gain relevance in the school's discourse, being indicated, albeit implicitly, as probable causes for such demotivation, since she is discursivized as timid and little participatory. Accountability because these characteristics

already seem loaded with the blame attributed to her in/by the school discourse, as these characteristics do not correspond to the expectations of her teacher, as they generate “[...] *little progress in the development of learning*” (our translation). Homogenization insofar as, in articulation with the processes mentioned above, it is already classified under indications of understanding of the appropriation of writing under which the idea that everyone learns everything, at the same time and in the same way (GIROTO; ARAÚJO; VITTA, 2019; FREITAS; BAPTISTA, 2019).

Favorable aspects about Júlia, on her journey through school, are not indicted, nor is there any mention of her living conditions, whether socioeconomic, family, cultural. It does not seem interesting to the school to know who Júlia is! Where does she come from? What sociocultural references she brings with her? Now, if the child needs to be understood as a producer of culture and considering that learning drives development, it is necessary to consider that the child's learning does not happen from the child's entry into school, the production of knowledge and the construction of her history begins with the birth (VIGOTSKI, 2007; 2012).

In the case of Júlia, the school's discourse seems to reveal that this is not taken into account, as if Júlia only existed when she entered the school. What does Júlia have to say? there are reasons for that? There is listening? The work with writing, in the classroom, implies that, to write, the child needs to have something, some reason and someone to whom she will say something, as well as strategies that enable the constitution and sharing of meanings, made possible by the expansion of the child's insertion in the culture and in educational practices (GERALDI, 2013).

Such evidence leads us to consider that Júlia has been understood outside the educational processes, under the condition of subjecting the process of appropriation of writing. She is only in the first year and the school continues to maintain and repeat the speech of little progress in learning to write, since she was pointed out by the Pre II teacher as a child who does not learn. Stigmatized as incapable of learning, there seems to have been no effort by the school to reflect and face the demotivation apparently presented by this child in the classroom.

Educational work requires considering its scientific character, not from a purely technical perspective, but under the view that it is necessary for the educator to do intentionally for the learning to happen through the proposed activities articulated in/through interaction with the products of culture. In this sense, the learning path offered by the school is often not attractive for some children, who need different teaching strategies. In this way, a

process of non-learning begins, being crucial, therefore, that any learning considers the students' interest (VIGOTSKI, 2010).

Amanda: from silencing attempts to naturalization of medicalizing and pathologizing explanations of not learning

Amanda, in her relationship with writing, is discursivized, in her path, at Pre I, as: “[...] *aggressive student, grumpy, who does not relate to colleagues, does not accept rules, refuses to the proposed activities and to wear prescription glasses, constant absences*”. In subsequent years these statements are repeated, having been added, in Pre II, that “[...] *recognizes only her name and few letters of the alphabet, only primary colors and numbers up to 3*” (our translation). That same year she was referred and attended by a speech therapist and psychologist in a program of welcoming children with learning difficulties.

In the reports of these professionals, attached to the medical record, the speech therapist stated that Amanda participates in “[...] *phonation project, presents behavior problems, does not respect rules and resists carrying out the proposed activities*”, just as the psychologist stated that child has “[...] *relationship difficulties with peers, is aggressive, cannot deal with emotions, therefore requires medical evaluations and the family needs guidance*” (our translation). Regarding phonation problems, the speech therapist did not characterize them, and, regarding relationship difficulties, the psychologist did not present considerations that would allow us to understand such an evaluation, considering that it only reinforced what the school already discoursed about Amanda.

Subsequently, in the 1st year, it was reported that Amanda received tutoring twice a week, in the same period of classes, being removed from the classroom for this purpose. The behavioral complaints were repeated, plus “[...] *she does not recognize all the letters of the alphabet, she does not make copies, she cannot write and read by herself*” (our translation). During this period, she was referred for evaluation with a neurologist, pediatrician, ophthalmologist and continuity of psychological therapy, however, we did not find information to justify these referrals, nor whether they were carried out. In the 2nd year there was still no record.

The behavioral issue appeared recurrently in the school's discourse about Amanda, linked to the search for explanations from the medical/clinical field. Just as the statements linked to the relationship between student and teacher, student and health professional were recurrent. Indiscipline seemed, then, indicated by both teachers and health professionals

linked to not learning, associated with the expectations of the correspondence school to a pattern of homogenization of the ways of being and acting, possibly underlying standards of normality that, although not expressed directly, they are unveiled by the relentless search for medicalizing and pathologizing explanations that justify both not behaving and not learning. As well as the use of expressions from the medical field are subjectivized by the school, like the medical records and reports, which make up what the school understands as pedagogical documentation. The senses about not learning seem to refract and be refracted as producers of the abnormal condition.

According to Freitas and Baptista (2019, p. 800, our translation), “[...] the impact of the diagnosis is pervasive and has multiple effects with the potential to produce the subject's suffering”. In this sense, “[...] distancing our gaze from the "disorder" will allow us to look at the incarnated, dated subject, building in relation” (p. 795, our translation).

Contrarily to this, the school, as an institution that is configured as an element in the formation of subjectivity, ends up creating pedagogical actions directed only to the production of normalized individuals and, consequently, labeled and in a condition of subjection (COLLARES; MOYSÉS, 2010; 2013).

Garcia (2019) attributes to this situation, among other aspects, the need for the school to fulfill literacy by the end of the 3rd year of elementary school, which, consequently, raises the concern to accelerate the process of appropriating writing so that school complies with the law. However, this acceleration does not follow the particularities of each child and the one that does not correspond to the imposed learning ends up being labeled as sick, inattentive, agitated, in Amanda's case, aggressive and grumpy, characteristics that assume importance in the school's discourse under the status of labels.

Marques (2018) asserts that the school environment is a major producer of labels. Children are always evaluated and are framed by various classifications. The school discourse then classifies them in a positive or negative way.

Also worthy of note is the list of school activities mentioned as not attended by Amanda, indicating a mechanistic perspective of conception and performance with writing. Emptied of meaning, these activities hardly provide the child with conditions for interaction and dialogue, as well as their performance in/with/about this language modality.

What should be the object of reflection and changes in pedagogical practices leads to the stigmatization of initially healthy children, who incorporate the label, feel sick, act like patients. They become sick. Their self-esteem, their self-concept are compromised and then, yes, their chances of learning are reduced (COLLARES; MOYSÉS, 2010; 2013).

As with Júlia, in Amanda's documentation there is no evidence of dialogue with the family. Specifically, reference is made to the need for guidance by the psychologist, but the reasons that apparently motivate such need are not mentioned. It appears from the referred documentation that, quite possibly, such guidelines are linked to behavioral aspects, given the fact that these aspects gain such relevance in the school discourse about this child. To what extent is Amanda already aware of the way she is discursivized by the school and its teachers? What is said about and for Amanda in this medicalizing and pathologizing context?

Volóchinov (2017) clarifies that in every statement one can perceive the other's words hidden or semi-hidden. The statement is a complex phenomenon, if analyzed in its dialogical relationship between the author (speaker) and the other statements. It poses itself as a response to previous statements within a given sphere, refuting, confirming, completing, based on these others that also constitute it, in a chain of meanings and communication that is present in language.

It is possible to suppose that Amanda is in distress, not finding anyone that hears her in her school path, given the persistence of this way of acting and the condition of subjection to which she is subjected. Expropriated from educational practices, as she does not fit the idealized model of a student obedient to the norms, she seems to resist the normative logic. What does Amanda's behavior say?

Vygotsky (2010) refers to meaning as the combination of all psychological events that the word awakens in our consciousness. Therefore, the meaning is configured based on the concrete experiences that the individual lives and, in this way, the meaning, besides being private, is built collectively. From this point of view, it is possible to assume that, each year of more schooling under this dynamic and discursivized from the place of those who do not learn because they do not behave, the negative sense that they carry with themselves accumulates negative experiences with writing in the school environment.

In this context, while Júlia is silent and participates little, seeming to conform to the invisibility to which she was relegated, Amanda still seems to resist, precisely trying to become visible. The statements expressed in the records of the school considered here denounce, then, the subjection of these children to the process of appropriation of writing, when they are emptied of their singularities, as they distance themselves both from the idealized pattern of students and from learning, amid pedagogical practices also emptied of meaning for these children, in a continuous naturalization of the non-apprehension understood under the pathologizing logic, not only by health professionals, but also by the school and its teachers.

We resume here the statements that orbit Júlia and Amanda about how they (do not) learn and how they (do not) behave in school. Júlia is portrayed as shy and not very participative, while Amanda is aggressive and grumpy. These individual characteristics were treated from the place of disqualification, with no space for reflections on such characteristics. Particularly in Amanda's case, the statements were repeated year after year, given by education and health professionals, which will probably be repeated in Júlia's educational trajectory, depending on the maintenance of this school culture, apparently rooted in teaching and pedagogical practices.

Final considerations

Understanding the meanings about not learning discursivized by/at school about the children considered here characterized the focus of the present article, in the search for showing how these meanings are constituted and produce subjects' conceptions and places. From this perspective, we present theoretical elements that referred to the understanding of writing as a complex cultural activity, under which the school and its actors assume fundamental relevance in proposing and carrying out pedagogical activities that guarantee protagonism to children in the formal process of writing appropriation.

In the same measure, we assume that the pedagogical documentation should be considered as a locus of dialogue, therefore, a locus of interaction and dialogue about the ways of being and acting of these children in their relationship with writing; at the same time, as a discursive possibility of and among school professionals to give visibility to the processes experienced, not as a mere bureaucratic record of decontextualized information, but as an interlocutive exchange that allows education professionals to contribute, with their educational and scientific work, to the expansion of the insertion of culture in school and of children in culture.

Studies in the field of early childhood education demonstrate another way of documenting children's learning processes, which differs from this format of accountability for families and for the institution itself. This reveals the importance of thinking, also in elementary school, that the documents that accompany the child's journey in school need to respond to the perspective of pedagogical documentation as a vital tool for the creation of a reflective and democratic pedagogical practice in the construction of meanings, instead of its use for the subjectification of medical discourses by education without an informative power to understand the process and plan future actions.

We seek to discuss, by showing discursivized statements about the two children considered, both the naturalization of the meanings of not learning constituted under the medicalizing and pathologizing tendencies, under which they were understood in terms of subjecting the appropriation of writing, as well as the lack of importance attributed, by the school, to the pedagogical documentation, since it was not understood as a dialogical possibility, but used as an institutionally legitimized discourse by this institution. In other words, the pedagogical documentation was not built when registering the narratives about children, but because of its misuse in legitimizing labels under which children have been continuously imprisoned and stigmatized.

Obviously, we do not intend with this article to generalize the misunderstanding and use of pedagogical documentation by schools and education professionals, but we take the data indicated here as a warning, to schools and their professionals, about the implications and consequences of the ways on how these meanings are discursivized at school and become determinants in the educational trajectory of children, in general, and those that are considered as those who do not learn, here particularized.

REFERENCES

- BAKHTIN, M. **Estética da criação verbal**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes. 2011.
- CHRISTOFARI, A. C. **Modos de ser e de aprender na escola: medicalização (in) visível?** Orientador: Cláudio Roberto Baptista. 2014. 173 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2014.
- COLLARES, C. A. L.; MOYSÉS, M. A. A. Preconceitos no cotidiano escolar: a medicalização do processo. *In: Medicalização de crianças e adolescentes: conflitos silenciados pela redução de questões sociais a doença de indivíduos*. Conselho Regional de Psicologia em São Paulo. São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo, 2010.
- COLLARES, C. A. L.; MOYSÉS, M. A. A. Medicalização: o obscurantismo reinventado. *In: COLLARES, C. L.; MOYSÉS, M. A.; RIBEIRO, M. F. (Org..). Novas capturas, antigos diagnósticos na era dos transtornos*. São Paulo: Mercado de Letras. 2013.
- FREITAS, C. R.; BAPTISTA, C. R. Mais rápidas que a escola: crianças referidas como hiperativas no contexto escolar. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 14, n. esp. 1, p. 791-806, 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v14iesp.1.12207>
- GARCIA, A. T. **Como os processos de medicalização respondem às políticas públicas e avaliações externas: um olhar a partir do discurso de uma escola de alto IDEB**. 2019. 116 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Estadual Paulista, Marília, 2019.

GERALDI, J. W. **Portos de passagem**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2013.

GIROTO, C. R. M., ARAÚJO, L. A.; VITTA, F. C. F. Discursivização sobre “doenças do não aprender” no contexto educacional inclusivo: o que dizem os professores de educação infantil? **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 14, n. esp. 1, p. 807-825, 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v14iesp.1.12208>

GUARRIDO, R. A Biologização da vida e algumas implicações do discurso médico sobre a educação. *In: Medicalização de crianças e adolescentes: conflitos silenciados pela redução de questões sociais a doenças individuais*. Conselho Regional de Psicologia; Grupo Interinstitucional Queixa Escolar. São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo, 2010. p. 27- 40.

MARQUES, J. B. **Os sentidos do não aprender na perspectiva de alunos do ensino fundamental I, professores e familiares**. Orientador: Claudia Regina Mosca Giroto. 2018. 158 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação Escolar) – Universidade Estadual Paulista Araraquara, 2018.

MIOTELLO, V. Algumas anotações para pensar a questão do método em Bakhtin. *In: GRUPO DE ESTUDOS DOS GÊNEROS DO DISCURSO – GEGe. Enfrentando questões de metodologia bakhtiniana*. São Carlos, SP: Pedro & João Editores, 2012.

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

PINAZZA, M. A.; FOCHI, P. S. Documentação pedagógica: observar, registrar e (re) criar significados. **Revista Linhas**, Florianópolis, v. 19, n. 40, p. 184-199, 2018.

SAVIANI, D. **Pedagogia histórico-crítica: primeiras aproximações**. São Paulo: Cortez/Autores Associados, 1991.

SOLÀ, M. B. A arte do pintor de paisagens. **Pátio Infantil**, Porto Alegre, v. 4, n. 12, p. 40-42, 2007.

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

VIGOTSKI, L. S. Aprendizagem e desenvolvimento intelectual na idade escolar. *In: VIGOTSKY, L. S.; LURIA, A.; LEONTIEV, A. N. Linguagem, desenvolvimento e aprendizagem*. 11. ed. São Paulo: Ícone, 2012. p. 103-116.

VOLÓCHINOV, V. **Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem: problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem**. Ensaio introdutório de Sheila Grillo. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2017.

How to reference this article

GIROTO, C. R. M.; MARQUES, J. N.; GARCIA, A. T. Medicalization of education and the meanings of not learning discursivized in the pedagogical documentation: a look at school discourse. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 15, n. esp. 5, p. 2932-2949, Dec. 2020. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riace.v15iesp5.14567>

Submitted: 10/01/2020

Required revisions: 25/05/2020

Approved: 30/10/2020

Published: 01/12/2020