

EDUCATIONAL SCENES: A PRODUCTION OF THE "NON-LEARNING" SUBJECT
IN SCHOOL

*CENAS EDUCATIVAS: UMA PRODUÇÃO DO SUJEITO "NÃO-APRENDENTE" NA
ESCOLA*

*ESCENAS EDUCATIVAS: UNA PRODUCCIÓN DEL SUJETO "NO APRENDIZ" EN
LA ESCUELA*



Eliziane Tainá Lunardi RIBEIRO¹
e-mail: elizianetainalr@gmail.com



Leandra Bôer POSSA²
e-mail: leandrabp@gmail.com



Joacir Marques da COSTA³
e-mail: mc.joacir@gmail.com

How to reference this article:

RIBEIRO, E. T. L.; POSSA, L. B.; COSTA, J. M. Educational scenes: A production of the "non-learning" subject in school. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 19, n. 00, e024008, 2024. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v19i00.18091>



| Submitted: 23/05/2023
| Revisions required: 22/06/2023
| Approved: 18/09/2023
| Published: 15/01/2024

Editor: Prof. Dr. José Luís Bizelli
Deputy Executive: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

¹Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM), Santa Maria – RS – Brazil. Student of the Postgraduate Course in Education Doctorate Level, teacher of Basic Education in the Municipality of Santa Maria/RS.

²Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM), Santa Maria – RS – Brazil. PhD Professor at UFSM in the Postgraduate Programs in Education and Public Policies in Educational Management. Leader of the Study and Research Group on Special Education and Inclusion GEPE/UFSM (Advisor).

³Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM), Santa Maria – RS – Brazil. Adjunct Professor at the Federal University of Santa Maria - UFSM. Leader of the Research Group "Rizoma - Policies, Curriculum and Education" /CNPq. Professor/Advisor in the Postgraduate Program in Education (PPGE/UFSM) and in the Postgraduate Program in Public Policies and Educational Management (PPPG/UFSM) (Co-advisor).

ABSTRACT: The text enhances the analysis of clippings of educational scenes in which it seeks to give visibility to the expansion of the production of students who, as discursive territories/body, constitute themselves in, what we will call: "non learners". It is pointed out that as effects the production of these subjects is constituted in the "blurring" of the frontiers of subjects that participate in the learning process characterized in the normality of the classifications: "normal students" and the students produced as target audience of the Specialized Educational Attendance (AEE). The problematization developed in the text seeks to move clues to try to understand: how the discursive practices of educational scenes invent and agency "non-learning" subjects? Thus, the school is considered operating with the notions of performativity and production of subjects indicating that the production of "non-learning" students is characterized in another category of subjectivation processes operated at school and in the "so-called" pedagogical practices.

KEYWORDS: School. Subject production. Non-learners.

RESUMO: O texto potencializa a análise de recortes de cenas educativas em que se busca dar visibilidade para o alargamento da produção de estudantes que, como territórios discursivos/corpos, constituem-se em, os/as quais chamaremos: "não aprendentes". Sinaliza-se que como efeitos a produção destes sujeitos constitui-se no "borramento" das fronteiras de sujeitos que participam do processo de aprendizagem caracterizados/as na normalidade das classificações: "estudantes normais" e os/as estudantes produzidos/as como público alvo do Atendimento Educacional Especializado (AEE). A problematização desenvolvida no texto buscar movimentar pistas para buscar compreender: como as práticas discursivas de cenas educativas inventam e agenciam sujeitos "não aprendentes"? Desse modo, considera-se a escola operando com as noções de performatividade e produção dos sujeitos, sinalizando que a produção de estudantes "não aprendentes" se caracteriza em uma outra categoria de processos de subjetivação operados na escola e nas práticas "ditas" pedagógicas.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Escola. Produção de sujeitos. Não-aprendentes.

RESUMEN: El texto potencia el análisis de recortes de escenas educativas en las que se busca dar visibilidad a la expansión de la producción de alumnos que, como territorios / cuerpos discursivos, se constituyen en, lo que llamaremos: "no alumnos". Se señala que como efectos la producción de estos sujetos se constituye en el "desdibujamiento" de las fronteras de los sujetos que participan en el proceso de aprendizaje caracterizado en la normalidad de las clasificaciones: "alumnos normales" y los alumnos producidos como público objetivo de la Asistencia Educativa Especializada (AEE). La problematización desarrollada en el texto busca mover pistas para intentar comprender: ¿cómo las prácticas discursivas de las escenas educativas inventan y agencian sujetos "no alumnos"? Así, se considera que la escuela opera con las nociones de performatividad y producción de sujetos, indicando que la producción de alumnos "no aprendices" se caracteriza en otra categoría de procesos de subjetivación operados en la escuela y en las "llamadas" prácticas pedagógicas.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Escuela. Producción de sujetos. No aprendices.

To begin...

The possibility of experience and the constitution of subjects, in relationships and by themselves (students, teacher, woman/man/transgender...), say of a self that, “not directed to an interiority, but to an exterior, [...] is organized around the ability to give shape to this surface that is the self” (Vilela, 2010, p. 245, our translation). A form and surface that is a body that conducts itself and, therefore, a body that organizes itself in a way of conducting itself in the world. Thus, establishing a study that raises questions about the school, the bodies and surfaces of oneself that inhabit it, encourages us to think about the ways in which we act with bodies, their surfaces, in this institution. Thinking about the contours that outline these bodies and surfaces that, in this text, are in the possibility of understanding political and social processes that lead to the form of action of each and every one in relation to the production of certain students who are invented and named/ as “non-learners”.

There are not just any subjects who do not learn, as many of them are already invented, as is the case of students with “so-called” learning difficulties, those who already have reports and diagnoses, etc. We think, therefore, about the invention/production of students who assume for themselves a way of being a body and conducting themselves in the face of discourses that the school directs to them. It is an understanding that relates not to subjects who suffer external actions, but to subjects who take actions and who, when they do so, assume to conduct themselves from the experience with which they were described and identified by others. An experience that was not interrupted at school, but propagated by it, in automatisms and naturalizations.

The school as a subject-forming institution can be a space in which discursive practices can be welcomed without [and/or with] the exercise of interrupting the thought that governs naturalizations. Another thought that, more slowly, can mobilize other modes of production and that through meaning conceive, in detail, the experience of invention and naming of subjects. Discursive practices, by inventing, giving identification and identity to things, people and processes, also organize the existence and ways of conducting the bodies that will be assumed by the subjects.

These assumed practices can be authoritarian, violent, impartial or resistant (Vilela, 2010), but, in order for them to constitute experience, they need institutions such as schools to, as practices, act as the production and invention of new subjects and their positions in the social and cultural group they are part of. The intention of reflecting on the discursive practices that mobilize the experience of producing subjects at school, in this text, therefore, is to show that

these discursive practices, in school scenes, are producing bodies and ways in which each person is conducted and conducts themselves as a student and people at school, understanding that these discourses, within the scope of research in and with the school, need to be stopped/interrupted/suspended, to be felt and perceived as producing meanings through experience.

The subject of experience is form and becoming, multiple relationships, continuous and indefinite movement; it is not identity, unity or uniqueness, but assumed relationship and transformation. It's the experience a way of constituting a policy of ourselves and how we conduct ourselves in the different instances of our existence, perceiving what we have naturalized and converted into truths and, at the same time, identifying the possibilities of there being something singular, casual and non-arbitrary in what we It is the educational policies that attest to what is mandatory and necessary to be fulfilled.

That said, in this writing we propose to question governmentality strategies in educational policies and to suspend the status of truth that we bring within ourselves, as teachers, to shape school institutions, bodies and subjectivities – ours and those of those those on whom our conduct affects.

We seek the possibility of the ethical experience of a gesture of fracture that involves questioning and transforming the role assigned, the conditions of possibility of knowledge-power for the teacher self, the practices of thinking about the school and the students. Understanding that we are the effect of knowledge-power, we can, in criticism, have an attitude of refusal of the truth and find space to resist and not be governed, conceiving singularity and difference as part of life, which also implies understanding that criticism is not a simple exchange of epistemic order, but as an ethical decision, which leads us to think with Foucault who,

Perhaps the objective today is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine and build what we could be to free ourselves from this political “double constraint”, which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization typical of modern power structures. [...] The conclusion would be that the political, ethical, social and philosophical problem of our days does not consist in trying to free the individual from the State or from the institutions of the State, but rather to free ourselves both from the State and from the type of individualization that it entails. We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this type of individuality that was imposed on us several centuries ago (Foucault, 2010, p. 283, our translation).

The movements built daily are guided by question marks. Everyday pedagogical practices are disturbing, to the point of realizing the precision of thinking about school, the

subjects that are produced in it, from other places. Then, based on the “questions/concerns”, we began to take on the research methodologically by writing episodes captured with the experiences of school spaces. In this text, we highlight the selection of scenes that we consider relevant for the production of discussions and theorizations in the sense that:

To find is to discover, capture, steal. But there is no method to find out, just a long preparation. Stealing is the opposite of plagiarizing, copying, imitating or doing the same. The capture is always a double capture, the robbery a double robbery. This is how you create, not something mutual, but an asymmetrical block, an a-parallel evolution, nuptials, always <<outside>> and <<between>>. A conversation would be precisely that (Deleuze; Parnet, 2004, p. 17, our translation).

Given the above, a problematization is invented to move some clues and shuffle them in the writings: **how do the discursive practices of educational scenes invent “non-learning” subjects?** With this, the general objective is: to analyze how the discursive practices of educational scenes invent and manage “non-learning” subjects.

Scene possibilities

In school institutions, there is a “type of literal record” of situations that occur in everyday life, the record of a specific moment in which the complexity of the moment of those involved in the scene is transferred to paper, in discursive practices that speak of the pedagogical. The discourses that circulate, arrange and prohibit meanings, through school rules and procedures, make it possible (from an analytical point of view) to place in suspension and suspicion what is commonly taken as the unharmed truth.

[...] discourse is not a narrow surface of contact, or confrontation, between a reality and a language, the intricacy between a lexicon and an experience; I would like to show, through precise examples, that, analyzing the speeches themselves, we see the apparently strong ties between words and things breaking down, and a set of rules emerging, typical of *discursive practice*. [...] no longer treat discourses as a set of signs (significant elements that refer to content or representations), but as practices that systematically form the objects they speak about. Certainly speeches are made of signs; but what they do is more than using these signs to designate things. It is this more that makes them irreducible to language and the act of speech. It is this more that needs to be made apparent and that needs to be described [...] (Foucault, 2020, p. 59-60, emphasis added, our translation).

With this, the constitution of the analytical materiality, for the construction of the scenes, emerged from the School Minutes of several schools, without them needing to be named or identified. Non-identification is related to an epistemic position that understands the school as

an institution of society and, therefore, does not refer to a school, but to the school that in each society has a regime of truth, which embodies itself us

[...] types of discourse that it welcomes and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances that make it possible to distinguish true from false statements, the way in which one is sanctioned from the other; the techniques and procedures that are valued for obtaining the truth; the status of those who are responsible for saying what works as true (Foucault, 2019, p. 12, our translation).

The notion of a regime of truth, in accordance with the “current” legal model in our society, can also be presented as a model of regulation in school practices. For example:

Two boys are sent. Each person brings a “witness”. Until the authority arrives, everyone talks at the same time, a lot of discussion, swearing, accusations, [...] in short, the accusations don't stop. To begin the conversation, silence is requested, so that first one party can be heard, then the other, however, the accusations do not stop. The witnesses are removed from the room, thus leaving only the two directly involved in the physical and verbal attacks. The parties are interrogated, the versions of the stories are different, so the first objective becomes to discover who is telling the “truth”, so that what happened can be recorded. In addition to discovering the “so-called” truth, other questions and problematizations are proposed, but are ignored, as the objective of both is for the guilty party to be punished and punished. Another authority quickly seeks to find out what is going on and immediately signals that the culprit should really be punished, to serve as an “example” for others (Notes, s/Ano, s/p.).⁴ quickly seeks to find out what is going on and immediately signals that the culprit should really be punished, to serve as an “example” for others (Notes, our translation).⁵

The following questions could be asked: Is this a “crime” situation? Are they police “authorities”? Who are those involved? Who are the witnesses? What will be the punishment?

Now, this will to truth, like other systems of exclusion, rests on institutional support: it is at the same time reinforced and redirected by a whole set of practices [...], it is also redirected, more profoundly without a doubt, by the way knowledge is applied in a society, how it is valued, distributed, shared and in a certain way attributed. [...] I still think about the way in which a group as prescriptive as the criminal system sought its support or justification, first, it is true, in a theory of law (Foucault, 2014, p. 16-17, our translation).

Regarding the transcribed scene, it is another afternoon at school, in which two students, after fighting during recess, are sent to the school's educational guidance. Discourses about

⁵Fragments of writing that appear in this text are the authors' notes, based on school minutes that have been cut out and that constitute a database of postgraduate academic research at the Doctorate level.

right/wrong, truth/lie, are omnipresent in school practices and are even incorporated as practices by the students themselves.

How to think “outside this box” and binaries? The scenes that make up the episodes of a daily school script provoke us to try to look at school as a dynamic space-time in which the experience around other ways of thinking about practices can be mobilized as resistance to what has historically been organizing the school and the discourses that ultimately can, through the production of subjects, [re]produce and maintain acceptable and useful levels [in a given society] of inequality, discrimination, segregation, separation and hierarchization.

The practices that make up the school are constituted by “truths” which, as Foucault helps us think, can be said to be regimes of truth. And so, thinking about how ideas and truths were thought of, what productions they give existence to and what effects of truth they have on the objective and subjective constitution of individuals, the naturalization of how certain situations became common. Foucault provokes us to think by focusing on a specific effect of truth, seeking to understand the process that built this regime of truth, which is temporal-historical, into a regime about a given event. The analytical work of discursive practices in a “pedagogical environment” reverberates in the provocation about how relationships between teachers re /produce regimes of truth, such as:

Colleagues sitting in the teachers' room, in a half circle, to talk about specific situations that were forwarded to the coordination and SOE. A conversation begins about the performance of 6th year students. Within minutes, the conversation turns into a huge argument; After all, a colleague from the Portuguese class states that:

“The problem is that they arrive here without knowing anything, we can't handle it!”

Immediately, a colleague responds: “How come you don't know anything? With me, he learned, only if he is unlearning with you!”

Then, other colleagues begin to speak out, each one speaking their point of view, and everyone trying to “find the culprit”. [...] Continue the discussion! (Notes, our translation).

As Larrosa (2003) explains in *The art of conversation*,

[...] you never know where a conversation can lead... a conversation is not something you do, but something you enter into... and, when you enter into it, you can go where you hadn't anticipated...and that is the wonder of conversation...that, in it, you can say what you didn't want to say, what you didn't know how to say, what you couldn't say... And, even more so, the value of a conversation is not about whether or not an agreement is reached in the end...on the contrary, a conversation is full of differences and the art of conversation consists of sustaining the tension between the differences...maintaining them and not dissolving them... and also maintaining

the doubts, the perplexities, the questions... and that is what makes it interesting... that is why, in a conversation, there is never the last word..., for a conversation doesn't end, it simply stops... and moves on to something else [...] (Larrosa, 2003, p. 212-213, our translation).

The daily life of the school environment provokes productions of subjects and even “naturalizations” of others, as in the case of students who are said to “not succeed”. These are not the target audience for Special Education students, but they also do not learn according to the norm/rule. Such a norm/rule stands as a regime of truth, and, if a student “does not learn”, he/she is held responsible for his/her performance, since it escapes a certain methodology or pedagogical practice. Thus, when subjects “do not fit in” as AEE students or as students of the “norm”, another subject is created, which we will call: “**non-learner**”.

Scenes: “blurring”

The subject we call “non-learner” is produced from “trial and error” practices at school. When the student is evaluated and the “label” is not “fixed”, the “non-learner” student emerges in another branch, between the student produced as being from AEE and the student /a that fits the “norm”. Therefore, it is clear that the production of these “non-learning” subjects constitutes a “ blurring ”, among so many others that may exist. This “ blurring ” emerges between the knowledge taken as regimes of truth, the practices based on these regimes and the place in which individuals do not fit. Understand how these subjects are manufactured in school territory, through analysis of everyday situations, problematizing clues of what makes up the idea of so-called truth about the production of “non-learning” subjects at school.

Witnessing “non-learning” as a so-called problem, realizing that teachers are focused on discursive practices that manage a “place” for subjects who do not learn and that mobilize a “notion of learning”, a notion that which states that learning is: learning the content, getting good grades in assessments, following the rules of behavior, etc. We understand that these “notions of learning” permeated pedagogical practices and school minutes as a way of “official” recording the characteristics of “non-learning” students, their notions of “learning”, the demands in relation to “knowledge” of content, modes of behavior, etc.

When analyzing speeches from School Minutes, as a way of capturing (attempted to capture) the ways of recording practices in the school context, we understand them as valid as other theoretical-methodological ties are enhanced, which produce meaning, doubts, understandings, about the production practices of “non-learning” students. That said, the details of the movements necessary to construct writing through clues mobilize questions that make

up a network of possibilities, movements that were part of the process and also indicated other pertinent paths.

It is important to understand that the school's discursive practices, even under a certain dualism included/excluded, end up including the excluded in another regime of truth, no less or more correct. In other words, the discursive practice that is created here goes beyond “the subject is incapable”, “the teacher is incompetent”, and positions the subjects in another norm.

[...] normalizing discourses sculpt and shape the ways in which schools select, interpret, and translate specific aspects of policy initiatives and policy mandates. Once again, based on Foucault (1979), normalization has to do with the establishment of criteria against which everyone should be measured and everyone should be evaluated and judged. Normalization goes beyond any binary of good/bad (Ball; Maguire, 2016, p. 182, our translation).

The imperative in the school to “solve” problems and thus become a “good” school is a “[...] production of a compatible institution – “good school” / “good teacher” (Ball; Maguire, 2016, p. 181). Discursive attempts work to “produce” what the school is. To achieve the expected result, institutions implement a wide range of activities, events, and disciplinary mechanisms that help support meanings and beliefs, with the purpose and tasks of doing school (Ball; Maguire, 2016).

The school subject in pedagogical discourse is captured as being within a certain “norm/rule”, which has as a reference a classificatory place that varies on a gradient from normal to abnormal. The so-called “limitations/differences” are not in the individual, but produce them as subjects of educational scenes at school. The principle of producing a “good student” is the certainty that, if the student has high expectations of himself/herself, he/she can achieve success. If a student is motivated, believes in himself and behaves well, it seems that success is confirmed (Ball; Maguire, 2016).

In this sense, the student, captured by these strategies constructed in the discursive game of pedagogical practices, is constructing and being constructed in the plot of the “good student”, the “bad student”, the “missing student”, of the “undisciplined student” and the “non-learner” to remain in the school context, even if it is through exclusion/inclusion and/or being on the borders, being part of the “blurrings” built in daily practices.

Scene: “non-learning” subjects

After all, who are the “non-learners”?

“04/12/2019 The mother, [...], of the student, [...], of class 21 and the teacher, [...], came to school to talk about the student, about learning. The student is intelligent, but does not learn, the teacher constantly tries alternatives to help him, but the student does not respond. The teacher explained to the mother the importance of attention and relationships with colleagues. Regarding homework topics, the teacher has been looking for oral alternatives to fix the content. The student remains disorganized, crosses out, tears up the notebook, the student is still very anxious, exhibiting unusual behaviors. He has ease with numbers, but he needs to practice calligraphy [...].” (Notes, our translation).

From the “naturalization” of a subject who learns and one who “does not learn”, the “object of research” emerges through the readings of the Minutes, namely: **the production of a “non-learning” subject at school**. Why? We realize that pedagogical practices are produced at school that become naturalized as a norm and, thus, reverberate in certain modes of classification, addressing and invention. About this,

“10/30/2019 A lady [...], the student's mother [...], came to school to talk about the student and collect her report card, [...] she is underperforming and needs to focus on pay attention, make more effort so that she can recover her grades and pass the year, as the student is already completing the seventh year for the second time. The mother stated that she will support the student so that she improves [...].” (Notes, our translation).

The school arranges itself, manages itself, also producing inequalities, because from the moment that situations called “age-grade distortion” arise, the school then starts to propose other ways for the student to remain at school, inventing a new “rule” to that student who escapes the rule of the “correct” age, in the “correct” school year, of good learning, etc. This needs to be reallocated in a new rule, in a new “niche”, to hide the difference, but maintaining it.

And still,

“09/24/2019 The mother of the student [...] from class 21, the teacher [...] came to the school to talk about behavior problems, absences and learning. He is a disorganized, agitated student, cannot keep up with the class's learning pace, has stagnated and is not progressing [...].” (Notes, our translation).

In this sense, words operate in the construction of discourses that enable thoughts, practices, words to be re /ordered, re /combined, silenced and even excluded. Discourses that, for Foucault (1980, p. 2008-2009, our translation) “[...] are the set of conditions according to

which a practice is exercised, according to which this practice gives rise to partially and/or totally new statements, and according to which it can be modified”.

Thus, in pedagogical discourses, the “good/ideal student”, “schooling purposes”, “effective learning” is produced as a model for managing behaviors and standards, contributing to the “sovereign sense” of legitimizing a discursive gradient that makes up the other possibilities of students, because in the discursive constitution, there is no uniformity; there are weaknesses, “gaps, voids, absences, limits, divisions” (Foucault, 2009, p. 119).

That said, we activate the notion of performativity⁶ in pedagogical practices as a strategy for organizing ways of managing subjects, using mechanisms of control, individualization, competitiveness, competition in relationships with oneself and with others. With this, the notion of performativity is recognized as a summary political technology to promote the principles of a contemporary rationality⁷ of managerialism in everyday life and ways of being in the world, constituting relationships and processes of production of subjectivities in the institutional space of schools (Scherer, 2021).

Technologies such as performativity carry out a complex work of change in interpersonal practices, resulting in the production/identification of “other subjects”. This means that, when identifying subjects who are “fit” and “not fit” for the required performance, those who do not meet are agencyed and, therefore, need to be “relocated”, being, therefore, “performative” in other gradients of the educational context.

To this end, performativity is configured as an effect of business machinery, in which educational quality is based on lower costs, better results and better *rankings*. Ball (2010, p. 41) points out that, as a second-order effect, “ educational democracy is redefined as consumer democracy in the educational market” (Ball, 1998, p. 132). Therefore, managing the “good student”, the “bad student”, the “absent student”, the “undisciplined student” and the “non-learner” in the classification gradient, establishing a version and/or way of saying students, is

⁶ According to Ball (2010), he took the concept of performativity from the work of Jean Lyotard (2009, p. XXIV), who conceived it as “the optimization of performance by maximizing what comes out (benefits) and minimizing what comes in (costs)”. Ball (2010), however, gradually moves beyond the Lyotardian perspective, assuming this conception through the nomenclature of performativity as “a system of measurements and indicators (signs) and a game of relationships” (p. 41, our translation). According to the author, through a series of measures of inspections, evaluations and self-reviews, *ranking*, results and goals, according to a very controllable and objective perspective, applied in daily work, the aim is to guarantee the final quality of the service, in this case, education (Scherer, 2021, p. 166, our translation).

⁷As contemporary rationality we understand the school's immersion in a neoliberal rationality, which can be discussed in other texts. See: LAVAL, Christian. The school is not a company: neoliberalism in attack on public education. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2019.

an effect of the process of individualization of subjects and their accountability and their performativity at school.

Such discourses, mobilized in the practices of normalizing the presence of students at school, materialize policy and governmental movements in conducting conduct and ways of being, based on individual and collective regulation mechanisms, as they appear in the school documents. Each subject is produced in gradients and objectified based on how their conduct is read and how their subjectivities are potentially narrated.

Scene: performativity /fabrications

Accordingly, one can perceive practices and relationships centered on the individualization of subjects,

Discourses that speak of individual policies also contain within them sets of practices that produce “school”. As already noted, discourses construct the object they talk about, here the student, the school, the teacher, and they are produced in this, [...] they have outcomes or effects of power. They define and establish what is “true” in particular moments” and these truths work to displace other constructions and versions (Ball; Maguire, 2016, p. 177, our translation).

Performativity is still expressed through *fabrications*. To paraphrase Foucault, *fabrications* are versions of an organization (or person) that does not exist – they are not “outside the truth”, but they also do not deal with a simple truth or direct descriptions, they are produced on purpose to “be held responsible”.

Regarding this, Butler puts

Such acts, gestures, enactments, generically interpreted, are *performative* in the sense that the essence or identity that they otherwise intend to express are manufactured fabrications and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive meanings (Butler, 2003, p. 196, our translation).

When we activate the fabrication of the “non-learning” subject, from the discursive point of view of analysis, we fall back on the invention of another at school. By inventing this other, the school signals to us its capacity to incorporate the normalization of the norm, its capacity (as a section of society) to efficiently manage bodies that try to escape, to escape what has already been said. It is necessary to constantly reinvent performativities!

The school produces and is produced by performing subjects, through actions, constructed collectively and also individually, which are perceived as “tactics” for producing

results and achieving the established goal, by a norm that is constituted by both internal factors as external. Each individual, whether teacher or student, becomes a useful part for the functioning of the “learning machinery”, which takes place in this complex space and time, in which paradoxicality makes up the force systems that permeate the school.

Performativity as an effect of a political regulation mobilized by pedagogical practices, embodies itself, provoking comparisons and exposures, both individually and collectively. In this way, the “non-learner” subject comes to be thought of as a point of instability in the games of forces that make up school discourses.

These “games”, built on indices and numbers, are articulated both to represent the need for improvements, “negative” labels, and to publicize overcoming results, excellence in the institution’s level of education:

[...] there is an imperative to “solve”: to solve the problem of politics becoming a “good” school. This is encoded, disseminated and amplified by the textual and discursive work of the school itself in its attempts to reinvent and improve itself – from how they could not act to these dominant discourses of “raising standards” and “constant improvement” (Ball; Maguire, 2016, p. 182-183, our translation).

Therefore, considering discourse and pedagogical practices as an arena of struggle for meanings, which are composed of layers, and not simply what is on the “surface”, and this is not a harmonious or neutral phenomenon. Amid the production of subjects in the school institution, strategies to “shape” territories/bodies consist of practices that act in the radical conditions of an almost invisible way of being, and others, in an explicit and rigorous way. About it,

[a body that can be subjected, that can be used, that can be transformed and perfected] is docile. [...] In these schemes of docility, in which the 18th century had so much interest, what is so new? It is certainly not the first time that the body has been the object of such imperative and urgent investments; in any society, the body is trapped within very tight powers, which impose limitations, prohibitions or obligations on it (Foucault, 2009, p. 164, our translation).

However, there is the existence of distorted bodies, which are on the border of the groups that make up the school – these are on the borders / “blurring”.

“Non-learners”, other possibilities of subjectivations?

By understanding subjects as produced, manufactured, through school practices, we begin to perceive them in our present time through other subjectivities, such as the student who “does not learn”, by not being detached from the norm, he/she who as a condition starts to occupy another place, other forms, intended to be “existence”, the one who “does not learn”, *but* is educated; “doesn’t learn”, *but* doesn’t mess up; “doesn’t learn”, *but* is hardworking; “doesn’t learn”, *but* is well-behaved; he “does not learn”, but can be placed in the niche of those who “almost go unnoticed, because he is well-behaved, polite. Or even, “doesn’t learn” *and* doesn’t obey; “doesn’t learn” *and* just makes a mess; “does not learn” *and* its context is complicated; “doesn’t learn *and* is rebellious”, is the problem/undisciplined student. Regarding these forms of intervention on territories/bodies, based on school pedagogical practices.

Perhaps the objective today is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine and build what we could be to free ourselves from this political “double constraint”, which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization typical of the structures of modern power (Foucault, 1995, p. 239, our translation).

We propose to think, supported by the Foucauldian perspective, which helps us to understand the conditions of transience and production of subjects at the same time that the school and its practices are produced. School, in our present time, in which we have historically suffered subjectivation and individualization, as well as what we produce with and in our students, not in a paradoxical way (good or bad, false or true), but with the intention of perceiving the intersections, the rhizomatic movements that make up bodies in school institutions. In this way, [...] rediscover the different scenes where they play different roles; and even define the point of their gap, the moment in which they did not happen [...] (Foucault, 2019, p. 15).

Noticing the discursive discontinuities and their effects/practices on “non-learning” subjects point to provisional productions of our practices, the replacement of productions of truths with possibilities of truths. The school practices produced are crossed by the unexpected that make up everyday life, that is, non-linear processes form and (de)form subjects in schools.

Finally, the methodological-analytical attempt with an emphasis on the discursive practices of the research object - invention of non-learning subjects - is potential for shifting truths in the present and, furthermore, establishes a look at this subject who is “inside outside”, that is, this subject who, when trying to escape, presents himself as resistance to a pre-school

norm. This subject who, again and again, in a regime of truth assumed by the school institution, is drawn into discursive practices that seem, in the everyday script, to commit to wanting to “name” him.

REFERENCES

- BALL, S. J.; MAGUIRE, M.; BRAUN, A. **Como as escolas fazem as políticas**: atuação em escolas secundárias. Tradução: Janete Bridon. Ponta Grossa, PR: UEPG, 2016.
- BALL, S. J. Cidadania global, consumo e política educacional. *In*: SILVA, L. H. **A escola cidadã no contexto da globalização**. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1998, p. 121-137.
- BALL, S. J. Performatividades e fabricações na economia educacional: rumo a uma sociedade performativa. **Educação & Realidade**, Porto Alegre, v. 35, n. 2, p. 37-55, maio/ago. 2010.
- BUTLER, J. **Problemas de gênero**: feminismo e subversão da identidade. Tradução: Renato Aguiar. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2003.
- DELEUZE, G.; PARNET, C. Uma conversa, o que é? Para que é que serve? *In*: DELEUZE, G.; PARNET, C. **Diálogos**. Tradução: José Gabriel Cunha. Lisboa: Relógio d'Água Editores, 2004, p.12-47.
- FOUCAULT, M. O Sujeito e o Poder. *In*: DREYFUS, H. L. e RABINOW, P. **Michel Foucault, uma trajetória filosófica**: para além do estruturalismo e da hermenêutica. Tradução: Vera Porto Correro. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1995, p. 231-249.
- FOUCAULT, M. **Do governo dos vivos**: curso no Collège de France, 1979-1980: aulas de 09 e 30 de janeiro de 1980 / Michel Foucault, São Paulo: Centro de Cultura Social, 2009.
- FOUCAULT, M. “O sujeito e o poder”. *In*: DREYFUS H.; RABINOW, P. **Michel Foucault: uma trajetória filosófica** (para além do estruturalismo e da hermenêutica). Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2. ed., 2010. p. 307
- FOUCAULT, M. **A ordem do discurso**: aula inaugural no Collège de France, pronunciada em 2 de dezembro de 1970. Tradução: Laura Fraga de Almeida Sampaio. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2014.
- FOUCAULT, M. **Microfísica do poder**. 9. ed. Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2019. 432 p.
- FOUCAULT, M. **A arqueologia do saber**. 8. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2020.
- LARROSA, J. Epílogo: a arte da conversa. *In*: SKLIAR, C. **Pedagogia (improvável) da diferença**: e se o outro não estivesse aí? Tradução: Giane Lessa. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2003, p. 211-224.

SCHERER, S. S. Performatividade, trabalho docente e escola pública: principais debates do Brasil. In: MUIRAQUITÃ: **Revista de Letras e Humanidades**, v. 9, n. 2, 2021.

VILELA, E. **Silêncios tangíveis**. Corpo, resistência e testemunho nos espaços contemporâneos de abandono. Porto: Edições Afrontamento, 2010.

CRedit Author Statement

Recognitions: Participating public schools.

Financing: Not applicable.

Conflicts of interest: There are no conflicts of interest.

Ethical approval: The work respected ethics during the research.

Availability of data and material: Not applicable.

Author contributions: Doctoral student Eliziane Tainá L. Ribeiro, under the guidance of Prof^a. Dr. _ Leandra Bôer Possa and Prof. Dr. Joacir Marques da Costa, wrote this article, with the aim of problematizing the production of “non-learning” subjects at school.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.
Review, formatting, standardization, and translation.

