

ARTICLE

## IDENTIFICATION PROCESSES AND DEFERENCE BEHAVIOR IN SCHOOLBOOKS FOR YOUTH AND ADULT EDUCATION

ANDERSON DE CARVALHO PEREIRA<sup>1</sup>

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1485-0095>

**ABSTRACT:** Many schoolbooks aimed at Youth and Adult Education show a range of guidelines as a kind of deference behavior, which focuses on ways of positioning in debates, lessons on honesty and manners to respect one another. In this research, it is presented in which ways some evidences, or, some of these directive marks proposed by such materials, establish a relation among certain identification processes with speeches that circulate in the environment of the mentioned educational modality. Therefore, nine specific books adopted by Youth and Adult Education programs have been analyzed, based on inductive paradigm, the concept of deference behavior and the French school of Discourse Analysis. This paper shows that these identification processes are stated from fragments of meanings of daily life placed in the imaginary that supports an evidence of the target subject's position.

**Keywords:** schoolbooks; young adult education; discourse; identity.

## PROCESSOS DE IDENTIFICAÇÃO E COMPORTAMENTO DE DEFERÊNCIA EM MATERIAIS DIDÁTICOS PARA EDUCAÇÃO DE JOVENS E ADULTOS

**RESUMO:** Vários materiais didáticos utilizados na Educação de Jovens e Adultos (EJA) trazem orientações fundamentadas em comportamentos de deferência que indicam: modos de se portar em um debate, lições sobre honestidade e modos de respeitar o outro. Nesta pesquisa, mostramos de que modo alguns indícios, algumas dessas marcas diretivas de orientação propostas por esses materiais, estabelecem processos de identificação a discursos que circulam em meio ao universo desta modalidade de ensino. Para isto, foram analisados nove livros utilizados na EJA, conforme o paradigma indiciário, o conceito de comportamento de deferência e alguns aportes da vertente franco-brasileira de Análise de Discurso. Mostramos que estes processos de identificação se estabelecem a partir de recortes dos sentidos do cotidiano em um lugar do imaginário que alimenta uma evidência de posição do sujeito-EJA.

**Palavras-chave:** livro didático, material didático, EJA, discurso, identidade.

---

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Estadual do Sudoeste da Bahia (UESB). Itapetinga, BA, Brasil. <[apereira.uesb@gmail.com](mailto:apereira.uesb@gmail.com)>  
Educação em Revista | Belo Horizonte | v.37 | e235056 | 2021

## PROCESOS DE IDENTIFICACIÓN Y COMPORTAMIENTO DE DEFERENCIA EN MATERIALES DIDÁCTICOS PARA EDUCACIÓN DE JÓVENES Y ADULTOS

**RESUMÉN:** Diversos materiales didácticos utilizados en Educación de Jóvenes y Adultos (EJA) brindan orientaciones basadas en conductas de deferencia, que describen situaciones como: las maneras de comportarse en un debate, lecciones sobre honestidad y maneras de respetar el otro. En esta investigación analizamos cómo algunos indicios, algunas de esas marcas directivas de orientación propuestas por estos materiales, establecen procesos de identificación en medio del universo de esta modalidad de enseñanza. Para ello, fueron analizados nueve textos utilizados en la EJA desde el paradigma indiciario, basados en la noción de comportamiento de deferencia y en el análisis del discurso en su versión franco – brasilera. Mostramos que estos procesos de identificación se establecen a partir de recortes de los sentidos cotidianos en un lugar del imaginario que alimenta evidencia de la posición del sujeto – EJA.

**Palabras clave:** materiales didácticos; educación de jóvenes y adultos; discurso; identidad.

### INTRODUCTION

The teacher position and the students' approach are aspects much debated in the field of Youth and Adult Education (hereafter, YAE; see VOVIO, 2008; VENTURA; BONFIM, 2015; SOARES; PEDROSO, 2016). This scenario is invariably crossed by the use of teaching materials, through which identity processes are configured at the arrival of the learner and during the course, indicating in part what social place is this, *subject to*<sup>2</sup> this teaching modality.

We argue the material to be used already marks a reading (interpretation) of this place, a place for a possible position that can contribute to highlighting the uniqueness in the processes of identification and identity. It is not a neutral place, nor does it establish full isonomy. In fact, it can reinforce even more the reproduction of inequalities of opportunities for this part of the population or, on the contrary, offer other possibilities for taking a society position.

Identity begins to be here understood as identification processes and affiliation and/or removal maneuvers from discursive places; places determined by the material efficacy the imaginary exerts (PÊCHEUX, 1993) on the positions these subjects occupy and/or could occupy in the midst of a sociohistorical context.

The nature of such assumption about the relation between imaginary and material base, which also considers a game of representations (between teacher, student, material), can be understood by the notion of imaginary formations. Psychoanalytically, the imaginary is the place of the subject relating to fantasized objects and also the place of doubt, of vacillation (PÊCHEUX, 1993). This notion helps to understand how evidence is intertwined about a position already occupied in the interactive trajectory of the YAE<sup>3</sup> subject and appears to be the only possible position to be occupied, given the projection of a field of possible positions to be occupied. It is the estrangement about the evidence of meaning and of a subject position. It is worth asking in an introductory way: by what mechanisms do some teaching materials used in YAE cut meanings in language and make evident some positions? How do they build identification and identity processes of a subject-position?

The Pecheutian assumption, which suggests that identification derives from an imaginary material efficacy, forces us to rescue the Lacanian axiom, in which the subject is inscribed in the symbolic

---

<sup>2</sup> This marking in italics is intentional, because to approach the concept of subject, affiliated to a Lacanian psychoanalytic and discursive theory of Pecheutian orientation, in Discourse Analysis (hereafter, DA), means to consider Lacan's re-reading of Freud and Althusser's re-reading of Marx (1999); the latter pointing out that the individual is interpellated in subject. Because of that, we use the notation YAE-subject, since it is about marking that a subject place (subject, determined by a social and historical context) relative to an analyzed position (which does not disregard other possible ones) and that does not reflect reality directly.

<sup>3</sup> We will use this denomination so as not to incur in the concept of person, nor of individual, which in our view tends toward an idealistic subjectivism (BAKHTIN, 1988).

order by a place of the other (named little other, in the imaginary register) that is constituted by the Other (big Other) guardian of a signifiers' treasure. Thus, more important than a characteristic of the empirical individual or of a sociological category, the position of the discourse subject (also named subject-position) emerges as a place *subject (our italics)* to interpretation. Therefore, a place that cries out for interpretation (amidst the drift of meanings) and depends on the meaning sedimentation to mark a sayable position. So, the subject-position evidences the reproduction of meanings already established in the imaginary and also signals ruptures with this evidence. This shows that the discourse, paraphrasing Pêcheux (1993), displaces effects of meaning (interpretation) between interlocutors in the structure of language through at least one signifying chain, located in a sociohistorical context.

In this study, therefore, the subject of discourse's position is discussed considering that the configuration of deference behaviors established by the analyzed material acts in the imaginary formations register.

Through this route, our general objective with the present research was to investigate how some teaching materials used in YAE distribute meanings about ways of behaving (including deference behaviors) through which the YAE subject is assigned a discursive position in a process of identification.

## **THEORETICAL ASPECTS - A FORWARDING OF THE ANALYSIS**

At first, during the first contact with the material analyzed here, our attention was drawn to the presence of some sections (activities, tips, comments) which signify the YAE-subject as one who needs to enter a ritualistic field, respect, and learn about ways of interacting with others, in a spectrum of deference behaviors.

Since in Discourse Analysis the material description (from which the linguistic-discursive analysis *corpus* is formed and to which we will return in this text) is already a type of interpretation by the analyst (researcher), we proceeded to identify our main question. Thus, our path was to investigate how these descriptions, tips, comments directed to the target audience (YAE-students) contained in didactic materials can be taken as a linguistic-discursive *corpus* that configures deference marks through which identification processes and YAE-subject positions are built.

It is worth explaining the general objective includes the investigation of the tensions between these discourses and their forms of interpretation. In DA, such investigation is conducted by the materiality analysis of meaning (*corpus*), in which discursive positions surround the place which the YAE student-subject is supposed to occupy and the place he should come to occupy. We are interested in discussing more acutely this movement of subject-positions discourse in the *corpus* analysis section.

To this end, we will address some questions that are essential to deepen the debate on the place determination of the YAE-subject. Next, we will detail aspects of the historical-discursive context of the look, of the meanings' attribution to this subject by the subject-teacher place who may come to make use of this material.

This perspective can be understood as an interpretative view submitted to the legal discourse, in the sense of an interpretation control in a level that runs in the subject absence, given by Haroche (1988). The author explains the modern subject was constituted by injunction of the interpreting way of religious, juridical, and scientific discourse, rearranged in a circle of decisive historical contingencies to establish the belief of an illusory but necessary freedom to speak about oneself and interpret reality.

In short, a look that has History and that fails. This is because the subject-position is inscribed in ideological formations (from the field of representations that establish relationships between "part" and "whole" of the statements) and discursive formations, which in turn delimit what can and what should be said (PÊCHEUX, 1993). However, discursive formations do not delimit everything that is said. After all, something fails in this ritualistic process. Part of this flaw can be indicated in the analyzed didactic material. The meanings clipping is also established by these flaws and by the ways in which they are filled in by evidence of meaning.

One of the assumptions in DA and in Psychoanalysis is that a causation, the implication of a contingency between ways of saying/acting, occurs independently of direct access to the conscious. The subject never perceives himself entirely, does not locate himself precisely on the basis of another's gaze, nor does he define himself precisely by an entirely rational and full apprehension of reality. Because

of this, part of the material production conditions interferes in the effects of meaning (interpretation) found in the analyzed material.

In DA, the production conditions (PC) are materially based and entail a heterogeneity of positions according to a sociohistorical conjuncture, since "[...] the class of hypotheses formulated under the title of PC discourse ensures the continuous history passage (the conjuncture and the social relations state) to discourse (as typologies that manifest themselves in it) *through the mediation of a psychosociological characterization* (the relations of the individual with the group) of an enunciation situation [...]" (COURTINE, 2014, p. 50, italics in the original)

These PC define, by means of the sayings already established in this Education field, in its history, marks, erasures, interdictions, silences, and resumptions of direction and course, subtended and implicit places that interfere in positions already established and in the set of possibilities of positions to be established. It is not a matter of an ordered planning perspective that foresees a position to be occupied, but of showing in what way something that has already been said and built in this imaginary cutout of reality (re)produces and sustains effects of meaning. To follow the debate, therefore, we must clip part of the YAE sociopolitical spectrum in the most recent historical conjuncture in Brazil.

## YOUTH AND ADULT EDUCATION: MULTIFACETED EXCLUSIONARY PROCESSES

A search in *scielo* indexer allowed us to list some works in the field of teacher training and Public Policies for YAE. Since this is a discursive perspective research, we privileged the debate on the historical-discursive conjuncture and the presentation of these thematic axes interfacing with the identity processes question. However, we note that of 91 papers resulting from the search for the keyword "Youth and Adult Education", carried out between November 2019 and February 2020, no papers appears with the intersection of YAE with the keyword "textbook" and only one paper in the intersection with the keyword "teaching material" (FÁVERO, 2007) whose focus does not establish a direct relationship with the issues raised here.

In DA, the enunciation is initially analyzed by reference to what is most linearly accessible, in linguistic superficiality. However, a greater value resides in what this initial mark brings as a trace of a broader spectrum of what has already been said or what has not yet been possible to say about a discursive *locus* (a place of enunciation). In this case, either from the teacher's position projecting an image/place in the student's position, or from the place of the State or the materials focusing on a gap in this process.

It is essential to present the production conditions of this analyzed material in a conflicted field between state and civil society, since YAE in Brazil is closely related to structural failures of the State and mechanisms of State power games (ALTHUSSER, 1999) that produce social exclusion and whose resolution attempt lays at the disguise operated by the State itself in relation to this production of social exclusion. This results in a course of actions and guidelines that mask historical-discursive processes that return to this masking, which causes a circular, almost paradoxical effect<sup>4</sup>.

In the core of a broader panorama of the superstructural field of conditions for producing what is possible to be said for sedimenting a place for the YAE-subject, we go through some milestones of this influence, marked by structural flaws of the State power. That is, the production conditions are neither just an enunciative scene nor just positions directly reflected from the conjuncture, but result from constant dispute for the sociohistorical situated sense (COURTINE, 2014). But what is this place?

These structural State failures bring us back to the historical analysis made by Patto (1999), for whom the advent of the Republic did not bring radical changes from the social, economic, and political point of view in a way that did not allow collective aspiration to the libertarian craving of oppressed people, including the non-democratic posture of the middle class in several historical moments. The absence of deeper structural changes brought about a "permanent situationism" (author's expression) that indicates a spirit of Republic with deep social segmentation and opportunistic decisions of a strong

---

<sup>4</sup> In recent reports there are data proving the abrupt cut of investments in YAE, especially from the year 2019. For this, see <https://www.redebrasilatual.com.br/educacao/2019/12/bolsonaro-orcamento-YAE/>; access on 5/2/2020; as well as in interview analysis by specialists in the area such as professors Roberto Catelli Jr, Sônia Couto Feitosa, and Miguel Arcaño Caetano on the dissolution of the Secretariat for Continuing Education, Literacy, Diversity, and Inclusion (SECADI), see <http://www.deolhonosplanos.org.br/100-dias-de-bolsonaro-YAE/>, access on 5/2/2020.

executive, invariably further separating social strata to manage oligarchic interests such as servility, favors, underemployment, minimum quantity of voters and unpaid domestic work aggregated to rich families.

The private sphere inheritance in the promiscuous relation of privatist interest over collective interest is that "the Republic was born under the sign of public order. Heirs of political-philosophical conceptions of evolutionist nature that naturalized the social, intellectuals and military who founded the Republic defended the thesis of orderly progress. (PATTO, 1999, p. 170).

More specifically, it is crucial to remember that, during this historical process, a disciplining refinement led to a popular layer disqualification, which according to Patto (1999, p. 183) resonates in school even today:

The very efficient ideological domesticating artifice that was articulated in this period, in close relationship with the scientific discourse, was the dissemination of a negative image of the poor by the social body, a powerful virus that naturalized the social condition of a class in everyone's eyes and justified economic exploitation, the harshness of the repressive apparatus, and the oligarchic exercise of power. It was from then on, that racial theories began to play the role they had been playing in Europe.

This scientism resulted in the cheapening of public coffers for lower classes' education since the Empire and is based on the supposed incapacity of the poorest and the need for State supervision for all improper and uncivilized habits to be domesticated (PATTO, 2007). This posture of State tutelage appears in the current reality of funding and management of Youth and Adult Education.

Volpe (2013) denounces this funding qualified as cheapening, naming it "crumbs". The author analyzes the YAE financing in the state of Minas Gerais between 1996 and 2006 and reports that the precariousness in the financing of this modality brings fragility marks in the democratization of the Brazilian State. In the case of a modality that should receive the schooling right treatment from the State, however, an imprudent focus on welfarism that seems to only mitigate social exclusion is observed.

Soares and Pedroso (2016), in turn, also report the training courses, which are rushed and marked by welfarism with contents that do not dialogue with the young and adult public reality; even though some advances have occurred, such as the YAE National Curricular Guidelines, which have advanced the educator's training for this more specific reality, the rushed formation of YAE learners and the educator's training failures for this modality remain until today.

As it is seen, the construction of a discursive place for the YAE student-subject is affected, therefore, by a State spectrum of discontinuity, propagandistic opportunism, neglect, and formal indicators, as analyzed by Ventura and Bonfim (2015) and Soares and Pedroso (2016).

Thus, Ventura and Bonfim (2015) analyze the precariousness of State's assistance to a population whose Education right has been denied, and that is marked by severe social exclusion, namely:

...] it is impossible to ignore the fact the State, historically at the service of private interests, is well aware of the educational process possibilities which, when committed to the teacher and the concrete Brazilian reality, seeks the roots of the issues to be overcome. Paradoxically, part of the current production on Youth and Adult Education is based on the potential of this modality in training for an abstract citizenship, capable of mitigating the capitalist society class antagonisms and overcoming the historical tradition of compensatory education" (VENTURA; BONFIM, 2015, p. 223)

This training failure, crossed by private interests and compensatory education, resonates in a simplism that partly determines the network conjuncture of meanings about the place of the teacher-subject and the support material to be used, which is covered by common sense, consensus manufacture and superficiality in addressing the complex reality that surrounds the Brazilian YAE reality. With this reservation, we anticipate that this determination is understood from the discursive point of view as an effect of "exteriority" that sustains a design, almost a destiny for this subject-position.

In DA, this designation refers to the question of designation by the referent and has to do with alterity. An alterity addressed according to a discussion of the unconscious and ideology and which is surrounded by the inquiry about the place that the Other (in the Lacanian sense of big Other) authorizes and delimits as a position. The subject discursive position depends on the sociopolitical superstructure

value, on how the production conditions intervene both in the "destined" place to the educational professional in this modality and the "destined" place to the YAE learner.

In other words, an "outside" that is not outside and is amalgamated to the discourses, causing effects of meaning and reading (interpretation), even without a direct connection with its enunciative place. This network is sustained in a linearity, such as the teacher-subject who is supported by the material and offers a simplistic and reductionist attribution of meaning, leading to the belief, for example, that this subject does not know how to behave (because he would not know deference behaviors) and through which the student-subject place to be occupied is mirrored. The evidence of these positions configures a reading mosaic about oneself and about the Other that profiles identification processes that we will analyze more rigorously based on some discursive assumptions.

## **DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: SOME CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TREATMENT OF THE QUESTION**

This teaching modality panorama, which addresses the correspondence between an infrastructure and social positions distribution based on professions for the YAE-targeted audience, dialogues from the superstructural point of view (ALTHUSSER, 1999) with the State failures pointed out above and is also projected in the activity's characterization (including photos, exercises, etc.) seen in the analyzed material. Roughly speaking, as we see in several materials of this modality and in the collection analyzed here, we have conveyed images of professions of lower wage payment and social prestige (SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013a). This is because: "The reproduction of the production conditions is social, and not merely economic; the symbolic reproduction requires the materiality of the technical apparatuses inserted in the social dynamics. The school trains, but this training tends to follow the market" (CHATAIGNIER, 2017, p. 792).

This symbolic reproduction reread here through the pecheutian prism requires explaining that the symbolic, in DA, considers that the meaning unfolding in paraphrases ensures the maintenance of the *status quo* by the subjection to the unconscious and to ideology. The subject demands choice, but the unconscious undermines him; he demands social change but is beforehand determined by a projection that is apparently only virtual, but decisively material that precedes and surpasses him, like a hook line that dangles over the course of desire and the projection of the place he believes he must occupy when he perceives himself seen for/by the Other. In this case, in a place authorized and legitimized by the Other who wants him to be an YAE student, in a prism of rituals and social places demarcated by deference behaviors to be attended to.

However, an explanation restricted to the socioeconomic material base would not be able to show how the social positions maintain relations that are not fully coincident with the discursive formations that, even if subjected, puts the subject to enunciate from a place of evidence. This is the contribution of Pêcheux (1993) in relation to Althusser (1999) we will explore.

To account for an analysis that considers several dimensions of the YAE teacher training process and the mirrors made between positions that pass through the materiality analyzed here, we must also mention it as part of the production conditions of these discourses, although it is not our analysis focus.

The notion of production conditions in DA considers that the discursive processes are engendered through a constant resumption of "already said" that, in a way almost explicitly, is anchored in evidence. Thus, the subjection we dealt with before indicates there are several subject-effects as a result of the various possible effects of meaning in relation to what is covered up in the interdiscourse, in a possible universe of sayings and meanings whose most consistent effect is found, above all, in the deletions that result from several ideological formations, discursive formations, and therefore, several subject-positions.

The production conditions of these ways of saying, which sustain positions, point to a constant inflection point between the place of enunciation and the interlocution. They arise from an anteriority of the individual-form interpellated into subject, which also includes a fantasized reality (in the inseparable sense from the value of truth as fiction); from a syntax analysis not only as a product of

linguistic nature, but of the meaning path (COURTINE, 2014). As we may notice, the production conditions depend on the constitution of a network of meanings entangled by the interdiscourse.

In short, the production conditions indicate something that, when left unsaid and unapparent on the linguistic surface, continues to produce tension spaces and, therefore, effects of meaning and subjection that open more or less restricted spaces of saying to the other. Nevertheless, this other is constantly cut off by the Other gaps, in the Lacanian sense of the signifier subjection reach, showing that what is erased launches a handle of meaning range that escapes the subject intention.

In these terms, what can be enunciated and said in a material destined for YAE about how to behave indicates subject-positions that result from the complexity of the discursive processes. That is, it also depends on trying to look at the place of the one who mirrors to the student-subject's place, the "trained" YAE teacher.

These aspects discussed here are taken as clues about points from which the YAE subject can be seen from the look (reading) of the Other. A possible analysis that we bring here is the identity processes from what has already been said (by laws, materials, etc.) that brings pre-constructed elements from which a network of meanings (interdiscourse) authorizes a material to approach the YAE student-subject within a given evidence field on who they are and what they should learn; and, finally, how to teach them to behave. This evidence field appears problematized in discursive sequences (DSs) taken from the analyzed material here. Courtine (2014) teaches that DSs are extracted from the *corpus* through a "discursive field of reference" (COURTINE, 2014, p.54, italics in the original), which is drawn from a meaning dispute around reasonable homogenization.

The emphasis on this point recalls our strangeness before the material to be analyzed, strangeness that sought to outline more specific objectives of this research: Which education procedures by behavior orientation, habit, and conduct (to be defined, according to HAROCHE, 2005, as deference behavior) appear? Whom do they serve? Which other information aspects of the YAE student-subject's formation are left aside?

## **DEFERENCE BEHAVIOR: A BRIEF RETROSPECTIVE**

In YAE, we assume in a Freirian way that the subject already presents "knowledge" of their daily life in interface with their "reading of the world". It is certain that in this game between the image that they make of themselves through the Other's image, and which allows the latter the framing of a social place, other questions cross, questions that accompany our debate, namely: What knowledge would they have, or should they have? This is the focus of our analysis in terms of imaginary formations because the analyzed material indicates paths of this assumption presented by the didactic materials.

As we have already explained, these pillars are approached here through a discursive reading that also considers relationship aspects between public and private and between appearance and social recognition. It is this game that also constitutes the imaginary (HAROCHE, 1988; PÉCHEUX, 1993).

This imaginary game, between the hidden and the conveyed, can also be discussed through the contribution of Goffman (2011) on the claim of a social place of the facade preservation (a place mirrored by historical conjunctures) and ways of appropriation and incorporation of a deference behavior (acting, greeting, debating, dressing, negotiating); it can also be deepened with the contributions of Haroche (1998) on lineage and belonging, heritage of the connotation of physical and symbolic space in the courts (HAROCHE, 2005).

In the analyzed material, the materiality attempt to impose a mosaic of behaviors considered appropriate in the expectation that students do not know it and when presented to it, comply with those, leads us to discuss the type of deference involved there. For Goffman (2011), deference should be analyzed in terms of the constancy of use of the same ritual in different situations and/or the plurality of rituals that a social place issues to a recipient.

Haroche (1998) assigns deference behavior a special place in the study of the inheritances of social places at court, the lineages weight, the adornment and clothing pattern, provenance rituals, etiquette, civility, and politeness, whose roots go back to a self-governmentality to preserve oneself from disorder. Order by gaze, whose roots go back to the king's display to impose a form on the social body.

Although the behavior theme gained prominence between the 16th and 17th centuries, it was neglected from the middle to the end of the 19th century and is now coming back to the forefront. At that time, to be oneself master and to be loved and respected by a chain of mastery, posture, appearance and restraint went through humanist treatises full of civility (from the 16th to the 18th centuries), the Puritan manuals (from the 16th and 17th centuries), and manuals of princes conduct that became a reference for mirroring along with the social body. (HAROCHE, 1998). In short, deference historically appears as ceremonial aspects that reveals the other's presence/absence according to the social body fulfillments, its excesses, and faults. Nowadays, in the "celebrities" era, rituals persist about who represents whom in a wedding, graduation, funeral ceremony, etc.

This accurate game, but also subject to failure and imponderable, stirs up the pretension of equality, adding contempt to those similar and feeding admiration to those considered superior. More recently, in the liberal democracy era, societies seek at all times to provide us with a "self-notion" based on the inferiority/superiority binomial, mixing austerity with self-sufficiency (HAROCHE, 2005).

We also bring this historical mark mechanism as a background of the production conditions of statements of this material in relation to the YAE-subject; for the other, according to the teaching material, he should behave as an admirer of a conduct manual that would serve him as a north, as reference, indicating how to behave and devaluing his interactional history. The material would guarantee equity conditions by defining what is substantial and what is negligible in the ritual and ceremonial (GOFFMAN, 1974 *apud* HAROCHE, 2005).

This constitutive unevenness is deepened by discursive mechanisms as we shall see and is marked by co-optation forms that seem to offer little as a singular place for the subject. Because of this, there is an interface between the issues of deference and the concept of subject in DA, so that we may question: why and how does this didactic material enunciate, from DFs that subject the YAE student-subjects to a conduct of deference? Why teach them "X" this way and not the other way? Why teach them to say 'good morning' at the beginning of a seminar and teach a considered "honesty" conduct in everyday life? What knowledge do they have, or could they have about these aspects of daily life that are disregarded as possible non-knowledge of the YAE-subject? These questions, reflective for now, are presented here because they emerged in the stage of organizing the material for a *corpus* of analysis formation.

### **Methodological aspects - formation of the *corpus***

When we got in touch with the YAE didactic material, we found it strange that in some sections there were comments and guidelines on how to behave in a discussion, on what the appropriate response to a certain debate situation or to approaching of others in everyday social interaction should be.

This investigation direction has precedents in our contact with the book "É bom aprender - edição renovada" by FTD, published in 2013, in three volumes, namely: volume 1 - literacy; volume 2 and volume 3 - early years of elementary school (SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013 a,b,c).

As the first and challenging moment of interpretation for an analyst (researcher) is the arrangement of the initial questions, we set out to organize a linguistic-discursive *corpus* that was able to indicate a reasonable repetition and regularity of these orientations present in the didactic material mentioned above. The describing moment is already interpretative and puts the initial questions in some analysis direction.

As this pre-analysis indicated deference marks through questions about honesty (see, for example, cutout 2) we started to look for other books that also brought some kind of orientation to the students about the posture, the behavior, the ritual or the role to be fulfilled in a given situation.

Through this search, we came across the book "Alfabetização de jovens e adultos: livro do alfabetizando" by Multimeios (ANTUNES et al., 2008), produced with the technical cooperation of Paulo Freire Institute (which does not contain guidelines on deference behavior), and the collection (from 6th to 9th grade) entitled "EJA moderna: educação de jovens e adultos", a work produced collectively by Editora moderna. In the latter, the symptomatic presence (in the psychoanalytic sense of a repetition) of

guidelines on the posture of students in debates, seminars, in short, activities of oral expression, caught our attention.

This initial clue caught our attention because it seeks to frame these subjects in a kind of *script*, a ritualistic conduct manual, which seems heir to the profusion of "instruction manuals" in national education as we researched previously (PEREIRA, 2016, 2019). The detection that this "instructional" frame is spread in other discursive materialities was one of the paths for the present research, a research affiliated to a broader project. Another aspect to be explored and which was not part of the present research is the repercussion of the valorization of ways of expressing oneself orally and by the cultic norm of the Portuguese Language in the national curriculum parameters.

This estrangement movement, material selection, and elective fragments exercise fits into what we call the *corpus* formation, namely:

a set of discursive sequences, structured according to a plan defined in relation to a certain state of the discourse production conditions. The constitution of a discursive *corpus* is, in fact, an operation that consists in making, by means of a material device of a certain form (that is, structured according to a certain plan), hypotheses issued in the definition of the objectives of a research (COURTINE, 2014, p.54).

In case of discourse analysis associated to the indiciary paradigm, several questions can unfold from the initial ones. In this research course, the specific objectives pointed out above were added to the following ones: What are the purposes of a conduct guidebook (orientation) for YAE learners? Which discourses (meaning effects, of interpretation) are at stake? Which expectations, based on which aspects of alterity (the Other presence), mark these deference behaviors (HAROCHE, 2005)?

Regarding the selection of the analyzed material, we noticed that an initial contact with the material of the Program "Todos pela Alfabetização" (TOPA) of Bahia (PEREIRA; TFOUNI, 2020) led us, by location proximity of the collection, to the books for YAE, organized by Aoki (2013) and published by Editora Moderna. From this contact, the volumes for the 6th and 7th grades were highlighted because they contain sections in which deference behaviors are noted. Next, possible similarities were sought in other publishers.

To synthesize and visualize the researched material the Chart 1:

Chart 1- Overview of the material consulted, in chronological order.

Year	Editor responsible for the material	Publisher	Section on deference behavior
2008	Antunes [et al].	Multi-media School	No
2009	M.B.C. Elias	Modern	No
2013	Souza, Passos; Passos. Collection "É bom aprender", vol.1	FTD	Yes
2013	Idem, vol.2	FTD	Yes
2013	Idem, vol.3	FTD	Yes
2013	Aoki/book for 6th grade	Modern	No
2013	Aoki/book for 7th grade	Modern	No
2013	Aoki/book for 8th grade	Modern	Yes
2013	Aoki/book for 9th grade	Modern	Yes
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

Source: Elaborated by the author

We noted that not all of the consulted material presented sections and/or items or themes for the presentation of deference behaviors. This is the case, for example, of Editora Escola Multimeios, the "TOPA material from Bahia" (PEREIRA; TFOUNI, 2020) and the volumes for the 6th and 7th grades, organized by Aoki (2013) of Editora Moderna. Because of this, these last two appear in our table and in the bibliographical references, but without analysis. The other materials consulted and that, however, do not carry deference marks, appear in the bibliographic references as consulted material. We emphasize that this research is not an evaluation of the use of this material, nor is it a study of textbooks used in this teaching modality, as we see in Fávero (2007).

For this, the analysis material (here called *corpus*, in a linguistic-discursive perspective) is not reduced to the value of teaching material (instrument). Displaced from this dominant sense, it is

understood as part of the meaning materiality; as part of the socio-political body issue, such that it indicates, according to the notion of clue or evidence in Ginzburg (1989) taken up in Tfouni and Pereira (2018), issues of a discursive nature.

These questions derived from our general objective, resumed here: to investigate in what way this didactic material, by establishing conduct parameters, engenders identification processes in the subjects of this teaching modality.

## **CORPUS ANALYSIS**

To present the analysis, we organized the *corpus* in clippings (R1, R2, R3), in the sense given by Orlandi (1984, p. 14), of a "discursive unit" in which fragments establishing complex relations between text and discourse are framed, fragments we understand as possible to be seen as what Courtine (2014) called discursive sequences (DSs). This unit results from a possible, and not unique, reading (interpretation) around a question or a discourse "object". This interpretation indicated the name we gave to each clipping, from the slippages of meanings analysis noted there.

In R1, oral presentation is highlighted and there are repeated mentions to the YAE subject about the "look position" and "body presentation" in a report. Therefore, there is a semantic family around the meaning distribution about body (eye contact, look, hand position). In R2, there is a relevant process of substitution of the signifiers "how did you manage" for "attitudes" and for "honesty", throughout the three collection volumes. Therefore, we gathered this repetition and named the clipping "how did you manage: attitudes and honesty", since, in this methodology, the analyst names the clippings, as well as can name ideological and discursive formations. Finally, in R3, we named "respect and opinion" and we have a distribution of senses about "ways of speaking".

It is necessary to explain that this is a universe of sense dispute around these signifiers highlighted in quotation marks. Later on, we will see, in a more particular way, the ideological and discursive formations and the subject-positions in question in this dispute, from the remission to the interdiscourse, that is, to a network of meanings about: gaze positioning; body presentation; attitudes, and honesty; respect, and opinion.

Then, we proceeded to the presentation of fragments cut from each of these universes of meaning dispute. In each cut, we highlight the analyzed DSs (COURTINE, 2014).

### **R1 - gaze positioning and body presentation in a news report**

DS1 - With the teacher's help, organize a report presentation to the class. One member of the group will be the reporter's voice, and the others the interviewers' voices. As in television, present the book, publisher, and images that illustrate the report. This activity aims to develop speaking skills. This also requires planning. With the report text in hand, think of interesting and creative ways to present it. If there are audiovisual aids available, use them to enhance the presentation. Tips 1) Remember to use appropriate intonation and voice volume, body posture and facial expressions. 2) Speak the text at an appropriate pace, so that it is clear to the listeners. 3rd.) Maintain eye contact with the audience, looking at the audience as you speak." (Taken from Section "public speaking", Modern YAE, SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013a, p. 32)

We see, in this R1, a distribution of meanings on the body in a reportage. We know that the body, often read from a Foucauldian perspective, is an important issue for school education. In this first SD1, there are prescribed norms to be followed, by means of "tips", which highlights "intonation", "rhythm" and "eye contact". The tip mobilizes the evidence of a path, a direction that would indicate the "correct" path, but still to be revealed; it mobilizes the colloquial expression "I'll give you a hint", through which someone indicates the correct and unknown path, which, known in a subtle way, certainly will not be discarded. Therefore, it appeals to a subject subjected to anonymity, not valued in his singularity.

This is because the teaching material sometimes demands an empty body of meaning, since it can be filled by "any region of meaning" (our expression); sometimes demands a saturated body, that is, full of meaning, as if this were possible. The material, therefore, slips and aims at an "ideal" subject and indicates it by disguising the contradictions and the failures of the rituals of filling this body recommended by the discursive ritual formations delimiting modes of expression of the social and discursive body. In short, therein lies a saturation that interdicts a taking of the subject's position.

Moreover, the use of the resource description attributed to television as a marker of alterity draws attention; it is the Other's voice in the discourse (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1998) for the interlocutor, in this case, the YAE subject: "As on television, present a book, a publisher, images that illustrate the report".

As it is seen, the goal would be the improvement of speaking skills through a reporting activity. However, why affiliate with the television model? A report can be presented in the form of a documentary, a university debate, an investigative report, in a classroom format. The value given to the television news captures the common subject, the common sense, it fabricates a place of obviousness for a position that is believed to be already occupied by the YAE subject; not to mention that, on television, many times "book, images, publisher that illustrate the report" are not shown. Therefore, the discursive position of who prepares the material is unaware, in the Althusserian sense of ideological interpellation (PÊCHEUX, 1993), of the reality of the target audience (interlocutor), which may explain, in part, the gap between the subject praxis in everyday life and his erasure of himself in textual productions (oral and/or written).

After all, why mirror yourself in television? Why this alterity if it is known that Brazilian television has not opened space for debate and polemics in its reports? It is also known that television programs convey the writing discourse, the one that feeds the illusion of beginning, middle and end, which gives it strength and power from the materiality illusion of thought and completeness of speech (TFOUNI, 2010). Even broadcast in oral form, the written discourse is what predominates in radio and television (GALLO, 1994).

Because of the identification with the subject of common sense, we see in this DS the evidence of sense that manufactures a place of subject reproducer of paraphrases. From the discursive point of view, the paraphrase is not seen as "deviation, error", but as part of the discourse constitution. Therefore, it is not an "incorrect" identification, but one that is sustained through a subject erasure. It is not about assuming that the subject-position "YAE-student" already knows or should know how to behave in a debate, at the same time that this analysis does not dismiss the value of School Education in presenting several forms of debate.

However, the evidence that calls our attention converges to a field of expectation, readings, and anticipations of the position which this subject may come to occupy that may make him believe the report format would guarantee the debate. Studies from the discursive perspective have shown that a format (or typology) of apparent polemic, as in the debate's case, radio expression or television debate does not guarantee polysemy, that is, the dispute for the senses. On this subject, see Orlandi (1987), Gallo (1994) and Pacífico (2002).

The concern with "interesting and creative ways", in turn, indicates a refuge in a cliché and simplistic expression, because there is the expectation this subject would not be able to deal with controversy and debate. He would be an anodyne subject, a reproducer of media models. This is what we also see in DS2, in which a debate scene description reminds us of the arenas or stages often used in election debates. The symptomatic emphasis (in the psychoanalytic sense of repetition) to bodily aspects as debate's credibility guarantors and the erasure of issues linked to the argumentation quality, stylistic resources, and remission to alterity to support an argument, for example. Let us see:

DS2 - The debaters are usually positioned so that everyone can see each other and be seen by the audience, or in groups according to the members' positioning. The moderator strategically places himself to interact with the participants or even stand between them [...] Armed with arguments, one must pay attention to aspects related to public speaking, which gives credibility to what is being said and holds the audience's attention. Intonation is one of these aspects. It can be used to highlight or emphasize certain parts of the speech in order to, among other things, reinforce an important opinion or word. Occasionally, you can read the notes on the matter, but you must then look at the other debaters and the audience. Eye contact helps to convey confidence to the audience and to check whether the presentation is pleasing or not. (Taken from Sections "characteristics of the regulated debate" and "important aspects for participation in the regulated debate", Modern YAE, SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013a, p. 42)

As in DS1, there is repetition to emphasize the "eye contact", which leads us to highlight what is the value of repeating what seems obvious, since we are in a society organized by the gaze

discipline (FOUCAULT, 2004). In DS2, there are also descriptors of television talk shows that give a spectacular character to the debate. Indications like "can see each other and be seen", "stand strategically", "stand between them" signal a symptomatic description of body posture with corrective value following a Pedagogy of instruction by the gaze, as can be understood from Foucault (2004).

Furthermore, there is a formulation of the type "X because Y". In short, it seems obvious in "intonation is one of those aspects" that resumes "help give credibility to what is being said". We will name "there is credibility" as "X" and "there is intonation" as "Y", so that: "There is credibility, because there is intonation". This emphasis on the voice tone and on bodily aspects also leaves out the relevant aspects of a debate: argumentation, content, researched source, etc.

In DS3, for example, there is a tip for saying "good morning or good afternoon", which leads us to question the real need for this warning to an adult student. In DA, the "real things to be known" dimension (PÊCHEUX's term, 1997) and the place that may come to be occupied by the subject is never predictable or neutral; what seems necessary comes from an evidence in the imaginary formations' plan that creates expectations to manufacture a subject that, quietly, will reproduce apparently literal and obvious senses of mode and who will ratify dominant senses without realizing it, which hinders its possibility of changing its position, to see:

DS3 - Tips. 1st. Greet the interviewee to start the interview. Say good morning or good afternoon and thank them for their willingness to accept the invitation. 2nd. Try to ask the interviewed the question naturally. To do this, practice with colleagues as follows: read the question silently, then look at your colleague and ask them the question out loud, without looking at the paper. 3rd. Pay attention to your voice tone, try to speak clearly and at an appropriate volume for the situation. 4th. During the rehearsal, try to create new questions to practice improvisation, in case a new subject appears during the interview, which you may or may not have thought about in advance (Taken from Section "to speak in public", Modern YAE, SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013b, p. 48)

There is, in this DS3, a ritualistic aspect of mechanical nature, because there is a training recommendation in "train with colleagues", which cuts, in the interdiscourse, a network of meanings already established through pre-constructed sayings (PÊCHEUX, 1993) by the Skinnerian Behaviorism in Psychology. Along with the fact that the moment of an exhibition or debate may bring unforeseen events never fully calculated by the participants, positions are also at stake; positions mirrored in identification process about other positions that these subjects occupy or may come to occupy. Thus, the apparent meaning openness in "naturally" erases any possibility of spontaneity, because even improvisation is trained. After all, how is naturalness possible in a training? This contradiction captures a subject already framed in a training program *script*, a program that has steps ("tips"). There is debate as long as it is "regulated" (as it appears in the name of the section highlighted by the textbook).

It also means that the reading of the teacher-subject resonates in a material which, as presented, ignores a sociohistorical conjuncture complex, knocks down a life path, interlocution and even imposes a conduct standard. It is worth remembering here that we consider that this reading is crossed by pedagogical discourse which, according to Orlandi (1987), erases the referent and leads the "object" of the enunciation by a control agent that, in the dispute of meanings, ensures the non-reversibility of positions. The dispute object tends to fade away, to appear absent in order to fabricate consensus. One way to prove this position mark is to notice the absence or the way in which references to the Other are made in the didactic material; which would also not prevent us from noticing a mark reversal with the material in use, depending on the teacher-position that presents different referents and installs a polemical discourse.

The recommendation in "ask him the question out loud without looking at the paper" does not have the relevance it appears for an interview. Famous journalists look on paper, scribble, rephrase, read.

The repetition of the recommendation to speak "good morning or good afternoon", as it appears in DS3, together with the description ("intonation, the hand gestures, the body posture") indicates us an "ideal standard", place of an ideal model subject to few mistakes and to be reached by an YAE subject whose transit through the archives (in the sense of a semantic universe organized on a given

issue, cf. PECHEUX, 2014) is left aside. The emphasis on body posture takes the place of access to the archives, of the transit through the networks of meanings that underlie the debate arguments.

Moreover, the very mention of television as a voice of authority is questionable. After all, famous figures in national and world politics news, on or off television, always carry in their appearances spontaneous afflictions about where to put their hands. Those who appear outside this fabrication do not escape the rigid fabrication of a physical restraint that also does not guarantee preparation access for a debate.

In summary, we have a discursive formation at stake (PÊCHEUX, 1993), that is, a place which delimits what can/should be said, and shows, through an ideological formation, it is "natural" that the YAE subject does not know how to behave in a debate. A consequence of the affiliation to this DF that "knows how to behave in a debate" (our expression) would occur as long as the subject submits to the corporal discipline of the teaching material text for YAE in question, which can also refer to the discursive memory of manuals of early childhood education (PEREIRA, 2016) and reading manuals (PEREIRA, 2019).

R2 - how you did it: attitude and honesty

For this cut, we highlight that the first clues' sequence which caught our attention has already been highlighted: the use of the signifier "got it" (section "exchanging ideas" of the collection *É bom aprender*) and that, in the sequence of our view, can be chained to the signifier "attitude" value (in the section "oral production" of the same collection) and "honesty" (from the section "the value of honesty"). The myriad of meanings around "getting something", which is subdivided into taking an "attitude" and acting with "honesty" and which is organized in this linearized way throughout the material, draws our attention to what Pêcheux (1993) discussed in terms of the discourse thread, that is, a linearity, an appearance of linear chaining, with a feedback effect that would only be presented in this way.

This effect of linearity and organization thus focused on a signifiers resumption affiliated to the same semantic universe indicates an ideological effect and also disguises the flaws, the misunderstandings, the drifting points to which a language fragment is subjected. This implied linearity effect, which we indicate and through which we align "how you did it" (DS4), "attitude" (DS5) and "honesty" (DS6), indicates a subject place affiliated to the ideological formation of "know how", of "knowing how to do it".

Also, there are several possible meanings for "honesty" and "attitude" that erase a plural subject, a multiplicity of possibilities about what it would be to have the "attitude" and "honesty" that one expects and believes they may not have. Therefore, there are prescriptions based on everyday scenes through which, as noted in the SDs below, the YAE-subject would learn deference behavior. Let us see:

DS4 - How did you get the job you have today or one you have had? What do people do when they want to look for or offer a job? The following texts are named Classified Ads. Read them<sup>5</sup>. (section "exchanging ideas", collection *É bom aprender*, vol. 1, SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013a, p. 68)

DS5 - Seriously analyze each of the situations presented below and choose one of the options. A) you are invited to visit an island and find beautiful shells and rocks. Your attitude is: - not take anything away to preserve the place, so that other people have the same right to know the natural beauties that are there. - take several shells and stones to take back as a souvenir. After all, there is still plenty left for those who want to know the place. (section "oral production", collection *É bom aprender*, vol. 2, SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013b, p. 18)

DS6 - You get on the bus and only the preferential seats are free. Do you sit on one of them, even knowing they are reserved for the elderly, pregnant women and people with disabilities, or do you stand still? You need to pay for a product in a supermarket, but the line at the checkout is long. You realize, however, that there is a friend ahead of you. Do you go to him and "cut" the line, or do you wait your turn by getting in last place? - Cite examples of everyday situations in which people do not act with honesty - Tell your classmates about some experience

---

<sup>5</sup> In this passage from the book, DS4 highlights the following job offers Ads: "Residential condominium", "housekeepers", "chef needed for daytime"; "baker and confectioner offers to work", arranged in a newspaper page layout (SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013a, p. 68). This recalls our initial comments about the lower-paid and socially prestigious professions printed in books for YAE.

of yours, or of people close to you, in which an act of honesty has occurred (chapter "the value of honesty", collection *É bom aprender*, vol. 3, SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013c, p. 74)

DS7 - "Many people depend on public transportation in our country. Do you use this kind of transportation? In which situations? What kind of attitudes should we have when using public transportation? Do you respect the lines and preferential seats? Talk with colleagues about these questions. (chapter "the value of honesty", collection "*É bom aprender*", vol. 3, SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013c, p. 127).

Taking an attitude to get something (like a job, in SD4) or how to use something public (transportation, in DS6) mobilizes and displaces the networks of meanings of corruption, rascality and "jeitinho" (BARBOSA, 1992) in the Brazilian scenario. To get deeper into these issues, we present these four DSs in a *continuum*, which even respects the order in which the scenes are presented throughout the collection and pagination advancement. We also notice that, on page 127 (DS7), a question is asked ("what kind of attitude should we take when using public transportation?") which resumes scenes from the previous DSs in highlight. We see this as a sense of cumulative learning, by inculcation, along the lines of what Paulo Freire (1983) called banking education.

The attempt to rescue, like a mnemonic listing, all the attitudes to be taken "correctly" depends on a recall of what was presented in this same section, pages, and previous volumes (DSs 4,5,6). A subject open to polysemy and debate is erased, and a YAE-subject of prescription is fabricated. Pertinent conditions to the debate are erased. After all, one could ask: how to respect a rule of cordiality, both in the sense of a rite of deference (HAROCHE, 2005), and of respect for the collective interest (BARBOSA, 1992) if, even though it is a known rule, one may come across, for example, insufficient numbers of seats in a bus, with overcrowding, in precarious conditions of urban mobility? The subject, aware of these rules, may try to preserve the collective interest and not be able to do so. Even so, this situation is not contemplated by the didactic material.

In DS4, the emphasis on the repetition of "how" as an operator of following prescribed norms indicates a subject of "know how". The DSs in the sequence indicate that this "know how", "how to get" and "how to do" only succeed if they respect some attitudes and norms of honesty. There is an expectation they do not know it and would not respect it.

This is what we see in DS5, which seems to carefully present the notion of public space. But why thinking that students would not know? The question, in an implicit form, mobilizes a "not knowing". We could ask: why inform them that it is not appropriate to take the shells? The dichotomous way in which the question is presented imposes a notion of a rational, centered subject, the *deficit* subject. Vigilance is built on the individual and the possibility of a wider and deeper debate about "environmental degradation", for example, is distanced. The possibility, therefore, of indicating to the subject a possibility of changing the reading (interpretation) of individual responsibility and collective commitment to a broader scope of the issue is closed.

The activity, for example, does not distinguish an environmental crime from the value given to this surveillance, whose focus is on the individual. Added to this is the fact that these questions should be asked after reading and discussing the text "a view on responsible tourism" to be read by the teacher. DS6, in turn, was taken from a section of the book that is presented right after a report about a couple of homeless people who found money on the street and gave it back, and the fables "the honest woodcutter" (p. 82) and "the fox and the bee" (p.86).

This DS6 is populated by an imaginary about knowledge and use of rules that refers to the fine line between corruption, rascality and "jeitinho" (BARBOSA, 1992). One may notice, in the imaginary, an expectation of success to be conquered, based on an exemplary moralization. Another possible reading indicates that morality in the example to be followed indicates a subject manufactured in the manner of self-help that, according to Chiaretti (2013, p. 170), is molded in the contemporary wave of entrepreneurship and individual success, "which does not ask questions, does not relativize or strange external imperatives"; this is what occurs in both DSs 5 and 6. Moreover, the directions "cite examples of everyday situations in which people do not act with honesty" and "comment with colleagues on some of your experiences" refer to the sense of honesty imposed by the text and do not allow an opening to polemics.

There is a debate to be held between corruption, rascality and “jeitinho”. To ignore it would be to assume an ideal subject. Not every act of rascality, of improvisation, is necessarily dishonest, because it can result from a survival strategy and not have an individualistic character, as Barbosa (1992) explains. Therefore, in DS6, we see a paraphrase effect. An exemplary event is announced, in which supposedly there would be only dishonesty (as opposed to an idealized definition of honesty) and then, the request for an example leads the subject to a paraphrastic effect of interpretation. The demand for an "experience of your own" ratifies what Chiaretti (2013) defends as a model coming from self-help, in which the subject is hostage to "outside imperatives" (the author's expression).

The question "what kind of attitudes should we have when using public transportation?" would open the debate, but the answer is already expected to be specific. In this way, we have an erasure of reference; a place is already designated, which should be repeated by the subject. It is also an approach to a dilemma about approaching or distancing from the other, a question of familiarity or strangeness, therefore, of alterity. This is what also appears in:

### R3- respect and opinion

DS8 - "You are visiting a region of our country where people speak in a very different way than you do. When talking to the locals, you: -Try to speak the same way they do, as a matter of respect and also to get along with them better. -Respect the way people speak, because each region has its own way of using the language, but still speaks in your own way.

Talk with your classmates and teacher about each option you have chosen. Explain your choice and listen to the explanations given by your classmates. During the discussion, be aware of the following tips: - Respect everyone's opinions, even if they are different from yours and you do not agree with them. After all, everyone has the right to their own opinion. - Try to be silent while colleagues are expressing their points of view. (section "oral production", collection *É bom aprender*, vol. 2, SOUZA; PASSOS; PASSOS, 2013b, p. 19)

Once again, there are "tips" and again we find strange the warning "try to be silent", because it supports the expectation that the YAE student-subject has to be reminded to respect the turn of speech ("while the colleagues are exposing their points of view"). Along with this imaginary formation, this expectation about the subject place, there is a topic that deals specifically with distancing, this reference of the Other alterity, namely: the distance between speaking the "same way they do" and "in his own way".

There is a meaning opening at this point, after all, what would it be to speak the "same way as them", to imitate their accent, intonation, body posture and some words? What is this other represented in these "tips"? The other to be imitated, copied by the value of alterity? Why questions about how the YAE subject would react if someone imitated him were not asked?

There is, in this imaginary formation, the expectation that the YAE subject imitates someone to be admired, whose position is uneven in relation to the arrival in foreign territory, in which he would not know how to behave. A place is created for an YAE-subject, who would not know how to be a tourist.

To explain how deference acquires symbolic value and is directed to an interlocutor, Goffman (2011) first discusses that the facade is a place resulting from historical contingencies and claiming a place amidst the interaction rituals. The performance of a pattern (line) in a face-to-face interaction or in the expectation of it occurring in the future implies a facade, an attribution of approved social values that results in camouflaging some of these attributes (grooming) by a negotiation to save the facade. Driven to follow a code, the subject may belittle the other or try to "neutralize incidents" (GOFFMAN, 2011, p.22) in this quest to preserve the facade, cooperating with the other and becoming a prisoner, "jailer" (author's expression) of himself. Thus, his conduct can be guided by "appropriate" behaviors, either because he must comply with rules of conduct as an obligation or because he must comply with them indirectly according to a moral standard to meet expectations, such as these "appropriate" in a "responsible tourism".

According to Courtine (2014), the approach of Goffman (2011), although relevant, has its limitation, because it can be deepened when we deal with the linguistic-discursive marks that indicate

evidence of these positions crossed by the unconscious and ideology. In other words, to a great extent, the YAE-subject does not realize this following of a standard line in the identification process.

These formulations, again presented as prescribed steps, can be analyzed according to the affiliation to a Discursive Formation (DF) which delimits that only the YAE-subject sees the other as a stranger and seeks to imitate him or her or to distance himself from the expectation that the other, in this imaginary, would not do so. What about the imitated YAE subject? There is the marking of a gap about who is reference for the subject. This DF that delimits "who imitates whom" is affiliated to the Ideological Formation which makes one believe the YAE-subject always arrives somewhere as a stranger, in unknown and foreign territory. Why couldn't there be a place where the YAE-subject is imitated by someone from the place this subject approaches? There is an ideological ignorance at play, where the "not knowing" about the other ratifies the dominant position.

Because of these orientations made to the YAE subject, there is the incidence of an "outside", an "exterior" to the subject on which depends the construction of an identification process. It is an exteriority that is not causal, but driven by an instituted and naturalized place that, according to Vóvio (2008) can be aggravated by the way the agents involved in the educational process appropriate symbolic objects considered legitimate through discursive maneuvers.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we present our research on some of the ways in which teaching materials used in YAE distribute meanings identified with deference behaviors. These paths are rigid and presuppose an ignorance of the YAE subject such that he is assigned a position subjected to the Other's knowledge and whose ideal model ratifies aspects such as mechanical reproduction, copy and prescriptivism of conduct in a simplified way. Thus, the YAE subject enunciates, from an ideological subjection, behaviors of deference whose expectation is of "not knowing" the material expects from this subject-position.

Therefore, the material makes one believe that this is a failure in the course and/or in this student education. The attribution of meaning to this "failure" has several dimensions. By masking the complexity of this supposed failure and cutting out meanings, the teaching material disregards a possibility of listening to the subject in his daily life; therefore, gaps are filled in so that it does not seem strange to consider teaching "body posture, honesty and respect" and thus naturalize a position affiliated to this "not knowing".

Thus, identification processes of a subject position of the discourse with little possibility and maneuver of movement in this materiality and in its network of senses follows from this, since the deference behaviors's orientation meets an expectation of sociopolitical immobility and also of erasing the ethical and political dimensions of the formation of the YAE-subject. These last dimensions are not approached in a critical way that provides the possibility of taking a position, since the subject erased by the frame of the prescriptions, either by an empty region or full of saturated senses, demands a type of citizenship participation reasonably limited by these prescriptions.

\* The translation of this article into English was funded by the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais – FAPEMIG – through the program of supporting the publication of institucional scientific journals

## REFERENCES

ALTHUSSER, Louis. Ideologia e Aparelhos Ideológicos de Estado. In: ZIZEK, S. (Org.). **Um mapa da ideologia**. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto. 1a reimpressão, 1999, p. 105-142.

AUTHIER-REVUZ, Jacqueline. **Palavras incertas: as não coincidências do dizer**. Campinas/SP: Ed. da Unicamp, 1998.

BAKHTIN, Mikhail. **Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem**. São Paulo/SP: Hucitec, 1988.

- BARBOSA, Livia. **O jeitinho brasileiro**: a arte de ser mais igual que os outros. Rio de Janeiro: Campus. 1992.
- CHATAIGNIER, Gustavo. Educação pela contingência - o não idêntico no seio da instituição. **Educação e Filosofia (UFU)**, v. 31, n. 62, p. 783-809, 23 nov. 2017.
- CHIARETTI, Paula. **Subjetividade e discurso em livros de autoajuda**. 2013. 187 p. Tese (Doutorado em Ciências, Área: Psicologia), Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de Ribeirão Preto. Universidade de São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto.
- COURTINE, Jean Jacques. **Análise do discurso político**: o discurso comunista endereçado aos cristãos. 1.ed. São Carlos/SP: Ed. UFSCar, 2014.
- FÁVERO, Osmar. Materiais didáticos para a educação de jovens e adultos. **Cadernos CEDES**, Campinas, v. 27, n. 71, p. 39-62, abr. 2007. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-32622007000100004> Acesso em 21 jan. 2021.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. **Arqueologia do Saber**. São Paulo/SP: Forense Universitária, 1969/2014.
- FREIRE, Paulo. Educação bancária e educação libertadora. In.: Patto, M.H.S. **Introdução à Psicologia Escolar**. São Paulo/SP: TA Queiroz. 1983, p. 54-70.
- GALLO, Solange. **Texto: como apre(e)nder esta matéria?** 1994. 214p. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística), Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, UNICAMP, Campinas.
- GOFFMAN, Erwing. **Ritual de interação**: ensaios sobre o comportamento face a face. trad. de Fábio Rodrigues Ribeiro da Silva. 2. ed. Petrópolis/RJ: Vozes, 2011.
- HAROCHE, Claudine. Da anulação à emergência do sujeito: os paradoxos da literalidade no discurso (elementos para uma história do individualismo). Tradução de A. N. de Freitas. In: LANE, S.M.T. **Sujeito e Texto**. 1. ed. São Paulo/SP: E.P.U. 1988, p. 61-86.
- HAROCHE, Claudine. **Da palavra ao gesto**. trad. Ana Montoia e Jacy Seixas. 1. ed. Campinas/SP: Papirus, 1998.
- HAROCHE, Claudine. O comportamento de deferência: do cortesão à personalidade democrática. **História: Questões & Debates**. Curitiba, v.42, n. 1, p.115-139, 2005. Disponível em: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5380/his.v42i0.4652>. Acesso em 21 jan. 2021.
- ORLANDI, Eni. Segmentar ou recortar? In: **Revista Linguística**: questões e controvérsias. Série: estudos 10. Publicação do curso de Letras do Centro de Ciências Humanas e Letras da Universidade de Uberaba, 1984, p. 9-26.
- ORLANDI, Eni. **A linguagem e seu funcionamento**. 1. ed. Campinas/SP: Pontes, 1987.
- PACÍFICO, Soraya. **Argumentação e autoria**: o silenciamento do dizer. 2002. 190p. Tese (Doutorado em Ciências, Área: Psicologia), Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras de Ribeirão Preto. Universidade de São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto.
- PATTO, Maria. Estado, ciência e política na Primeira República: a desqualificação dos pobres. **Estudos Avançados**, São Paulo, v. 13, n. 35, p. 167-198, abr. 1999. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-40141999000100017> . Acesso em 21 jan. 2021.
- PATTO, Maria. "Escolas cheias, cadeias vazias" nota sobre as raízes ideológicas do pensamento educacional brasileiro. **Estudos Avançados**, São Paulo, v. 21, n. 61, p. 243-266, dez. 2007. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-40142007000300016>. Acesso em 21 jan. 2021.
- PÊCHEUX, Michel. **Semântica e Discurso**: uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio. 2. ed. Campinas/SP: UNICAMP, 1993.
- PÊCHEUX, Michel. **Discurso**: Estrutura ou acontecimento? 1. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 1997.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. Ler o arquivo hoje. In ORLANDI, E. (org.). **Gestos de leitura: da História no discurso**. 4. ed. Campinas/SP: Ed. da UNICAMP, 2014, p. 57.57.

PEREIRA, Anderson. Memória discursiva e arquivo em manuais de educação infantil de meados do século XX. **Memorandum: Memória e História em Psicologia**, [S. l.], v. 30, p. 82–103, 2016. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufmg.br/index.php/memorandum/article/view/6491> Acesso em: 14 jan. 2021.

PEREIRA, Anderson. Memória discursiva em manuais de leitura de meados do século XX: utilitarismo e individualismo na arte de ler. **Revista HISTEDBR On-line**, Campinas, SP, v. 19, p. e019046, 2019. doi: 10.20396/rho.v19i0.8652665. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/histedbr/article/view/8652665> Acesso em: 14 jan. 2021.

PEREIRA, Anderson; TFOUNI, Leda. O lugar do alfabetizando trabalhador-consumidor no livro didático para alfabetização de adultos do Programa Todos pela Alfabetização (TOPA) do Estado da Bahia. In: TFOUNI, F.E.V.; BERNARDO- SANTOS, W.J. (Org.). **Análise do Discurso e materiais de ensino**. 1. ed. Aracaju/SE: Criação, 2020, p. 13-30.

SOARES, Leôncio; PEDROSO, Ana Paula. Formação de educadores na Educação de Jovens e Adultos (EJA): alinhando contextos e tecendo possibilidades. **Educação em Revista**, Belo Horizonte, v. 32, n. 4, p. 251-268, Dec. 2016. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698161277>. Acesso em 21 jan. 2021.

TFOUNI, Leda. **Letramento e alfabetização**. 9. ed. São Paulo/SP: Cortez. 2010. 103p.

TFOUNI, Leda; PEREIRA, Anderson. Análise indiciária: uma topologia das singularidades. In: TFOUNI, Leda Verdiani; PEREIRA, A. de C.; MILANEZ, N. (org.). **O paradigma indiciário e os modos de decifração das ciências humanas**. 1. ed. São Carlos/SP: EdUfsCar, 2018, p. 121-149.

VENTURA, Jacqueline; BOMFIM, Maria Inês. Formação de professores e Educação de Jovens e Adultos: o formal e o real nas licenciaturas. **Educação em Revista**, Belo Horizonte, v. 31, n. 2, p. 211-227, June/2015. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698127011>. Acesso em 21 jan. 2021.

VOLPE, Geruza. O financiamento da educação de jovens e adultos em municípios mineiros no período de 1996 a 2006: até quando migalhas? **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 18, n. 54, p. 693-716, Sept. 2013. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782013000300010>. Acesso em 21 jan. 2021.

VOVIO, Cláudia. Construções identitárias: ser leitor e alfabetizador de jovens e adultos. **Linguagem em (Dis)curso**, Tubarão, v. 8, n. 3, p. 439-466, dez. 2008. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1518-76322008000300003>. Acesso em 21 jan. 2021.

## Material analisado

ANTUNES, Angela Maria [et al.]. **Alfabetização de jovens e adultos**; ilustrações CECIP. 1. ed. – Rio de Janeiro/RJ: Escola multimeios, 2008.

AOKI, Virginia. **EJA Moderna: Educação de Jovens e Adultos- Livro para o 6º. Ano**; organizadora Editora Moderna: obra coletiva, concebida, desenvolvida e produzida pela editora moderna: editora responsável: Virginia Aoki. 1. ed. São Paulo/SP: Moderna, 2013a. Obra em 4v. para alunos do 6º. ao 9º. ano.

AOKI, Virginia. **EJA Moderna: Educação de Jovens e Adultos- Livro para o 7º. Ano**; organizadora Editora Moderna: obra coletiva, concebida, desenvolvida e produzida pela editora moderna: editora responsável: Virginia Aoki. 1. ed. São Paulo/SP: Moderna, 2013b. Obra em 4v. para alunos do 6º. ao 9º. ano.

AOKI, Virginia. **EJA Moderna:** Educação de Jovens e Adultos- Livro para o 8º. Ano; organizadora Editora Moderna: obra coletiva, concebida, desenvolvida e produzida pela editora moderna: editora responsável: Virginia Aoki. 1. ed. São Paulo/SP: Moderna, 2013c. Obra em 4v. para alunos do 6º. ao 9º. ano, pp. 32-67.

AOKI, Virginia. **EJA Moderna:** Educação de Jovens e Adultos- Livro para o 9º. Ano; organizadora Editora Moderna: obra coletiva, concebida, desenvolvida e produzida pela editora moderna: editora responsável: Virginia Aoki. 1. ed. São Paulo/SP: Moderna, 2013d. Obra em 4v. para alunos do 6º. ao 9º. ano, pp. 48-81.

ELIAS, M.B. de C. **EJA - Educação de Jovens e Adultos:** alfabetização/organizadora Editora moderna: obra coletiva concebida, desenvolvida e produzida pela Editora Moderna: editora responsável Maria Beatriz de Campos Elias - 1. ed. – São Paulo: Moderna, 2009.

SOUZA, Cássia de; PASSOS, Marinez; PASSOS, Ângela. **É bom aprender** – edição renovada: alfabetização: volume 1: Educação de Jovens e Adultos. São Paulo/SP: FTD, 2013a. - (coleção “é bom aprender”).

SOUZA, Cássia de; PASSOS, Marinez; PASSOS, Ângela. **É bom aprender** – edição renovada: volume 2: Educação de Jovens e Adultos – anos iniciais do ensino fundamental. São Paulo/SP: FTD, 2013b. - (coleção “é bom aprender”).

SOUZA, Cássia de; PASSOS, Marinez; PASSOS, Ângela. **É bom aprender** – edição renovada: volume 3: anos iniciais do ensino fundamental. São Paulo/SP: FTD, 2013c. - (coleção “é bom aprender”).

**Submitted:** 12/03/2020

**Approved:** 22/01/2021