Meanings produced by teachers and students involved on a learning support program in the state of Paraná[1,2]

Significados produzidos por professores e alunos envolvidos no programa Salas de Apoio à Aprendizagem no estado do Paraná

Significados producidos por profesores y alumnos involucrados en el programa Sala de Apoyo al Aprendizaje en la provincia de Paraná

Francismara Neves de Oliveira, Carlos Toscano[*]

Universidade Estadual de Londrina (UEL), Londrina, PR, Brasil

---

---

[*] FNO: PhD, e-mail: francis.uel@gmail.com
CT: PhD, e-mail: ctoscano@uel.br

Abstract

This work investigated the proposal of the state program of Paraná government for learning support rooms. Of qualitative character, on the modality of descriptive and interpretative, the research relied on studies of Rockweel and Speleta (1986); Moysés and Collares (1996); Lahire (1997); and Aquino (1997, 1998), with the goal of understanding the work developed on those performance spaces in two public schools of Londrina, PR, through the following questions: *Which are the meanings of students and teachers about the teaching and the learning and about the support room? What are the meanings of the room to support learning? Which meanings are present on the guiding documents of the program*? In order to achieve this goal, the following methodological Significados produzidos por professores e alunos envolvidos no programa Salas de Apoio à Aprendizagem no estado do Paraná procedures were adopted: documentary research, observation and interview. The results include: 1) the existence of this program signals the recognition of the problem of not learning is systemic, however, their actions are focused on providing a new opportunity for other classes only in Portuguese Language and Mathematics, perceived by students as they were identical to the regular room and not understand; 2) assigning blame for not learning is very dependent on the place occupied in context and so sometimes may involve the teacher or the student and/or his family.

Keywords: Education. School life. Teaching and learning. Learning support room. Teacher and students meaning.

Resumo

Este artigo analisa as significações de ensinar e de aprender produzidas por professores e alunos de salas de apoio à aprendizagem em duas escolas estaduais em Londrina (PR). De caráter qualitativo, adotando a modalidade descritiva-interpretativa, a pesquisa apoiou-se nos estudos de Ezpeleta e Rockwell (1986), Moysés e Collares (1992), Lahire (1997) e Aquino (1997, 1998), com o objetivo de compreender o trabalho desenvolvido nesses espaços de atuação. As perguntas de pesquisa foram: Quais as significações de alunos e professores a respeito do aprender e das dificuldades de aprender? Como a sala de apoio à aprendizagem é significada? Que significações estão presentes nos documentos norteadores do programa Salas de Apoio à Aprendizagem*? Para sua realização,*

adotamos os seguintes procedimentos metodológicos: revisão bibliográfica, pesquisa documental, observação e entrevista. Dentre os resultados obtidos, destacamos: 1) a existência do programa Salas de Apoio à Aprendizagem sinaliza o reconhecimento do problema do não aprender como algo sistêmico; entretanto, suas ações são concentradas na oferta de salas de apoio somente para as disciplinas de Língua Portuguesa e Matemática, cujas aulas são, via de regra, percebidas pelos alunos como idênticas às que tiveram na sala regular e não compreenderam; 2) a busca de certa culpabilização dos sujeitos pelo não aprender é muito presente e, a depender do lugar ocupado nas relações, a culpa pode recair sobre o professor, sobre o aluno e/ou sobre sua família.

Palavras-chave*: Educação. Cotidiano escolar. Ensinar e aprender. Significações de professores e alunos. Sala de apoio à aprendizagem.*

Resumen

El trabajo analizó los significados del enseñar y aprender producidas por profesores y alumnos de la sala de apoyo al aprendizaje en dos escuelas provinciales situadas en Londrina-PR. De carácter cualitativo, en la modalidad de estudio descriptivo-interpretativo, la pesquisa se apoyó en los estudios de Rockweel y Speleta (1986); Moysés y Collares (1996); Lahire (1997); y Aquino (1997, 1998), con el objetivo de comprender el trabajo desarrollado en estos espacios de actuación. Como problema guía preguntamos: ¿Cuáles son los significados de alumnos y profesores a respecto del aprender y de las dificultades de aprender? ¿Cómo la sala de apoyo al aprendizaje se entiende? ¿Qué significados están presentes en los documentos orientadores del programa? *Para su realización, adoptamos los siguientes procedimientos metodológicos: revisión bibliográfica, pesquisa documental, observación y entrevista. Entre los resultados obtenidos destacamos: 1) la existencia de que ese programa señala el reconocimiento del problema de no aprender como algo sistémico, mientras tanto, sus acciones son concentradas en la oferta de una nueva oportunidad de otras aulas solamente en Lengua Portuguesa y Matemáticas que son, en general, percibidas por los alumnos como idénticas a las que tuvieron en la sala regular y no las comprendieron; 2) la búsqueda de cierta culpabilidad por el no aprender entre los sujetos es muy presente y la de depender del lugar ocupado en las relaciones puede involucrar al profesor, al alumno y/o a su familia.*

Palabras Clave*: Educación. Cotidiano escolar. Enseñar y aprender. Significados de profesores y alumnos. Sala de apoyo al aprendizaje.*

Introduction

When we reflect on the issue of learning is necessary to recognize at first instance that the complexity of school, the processes involved are marked by differentiated trajectories, evaluated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. In this context different expectations interact in relation to the school content domain and acquisition of knowledge. As locus of so many expectations, it is understandable that schools produce inadequate, discontinuity, labeling and fragmentation relationships coexisting with the valued as assertive, pedagogically correct, and scientific.

In the school environment we find a demands and expectations context around who "learns" and at the same time, anxiety and distress afforded by the lack of understanding of the processes involved in teaching and learning.

The verification of processes that do not result in student learning, in most cases, has produced stigmas and stereotypes that affect the family, students, teachers and the school itself. The learning process engenders multiple possibilities and its success or failure depends on construction or reconstruction conditions that are not located separately in the individuals involved in the process, or in the environment, not even on the study objects that promote the appropriation of historically and culturally accumulated knowledge. These constructions and/or reconstructions are much more marked by "and" that by "or", which demonstrates the complexity of this phenomenon.

In this study, our discussion did not fall on definitions, nomenclatures, classifications or assessments of usually called "learning difficulties". We seek, in the context of a program to support school learning, identifying the meanings about the non-learning, produced by students and teachers in the actions promoted in this scenario. In this sense, we became interested in the visible "the look" of teachers who work in this environment and "the look" of the students who attend the same environment: the learning support room.

Theoretical notes

Schools occupy a prominent place in the civilizing project. In it what is taught is considered essential to the humanization process in modern society. Reading, writing, counting, interpreting, formulating and solving problems having as references the historically systematized knowledge do not constitute natural processes of human development.

Within them interact requirements and expectations derived from educational policies, the learner's expectations regarding the school environment, the teacher on the compliance of the student to the school goals, both regarding the educational content domain and acquisition of knowledge which will need to be demonstrated both in internal and external evaluations, among other aspects.

Addressing this issue implies recognizing the school as an environment which refers to multiple issues to be studied such as the meanings assigned to teaching and learning. If on one hand this reflection has mobilized significant researches in education and related fields, on the other is still, in the daily school, a challenge that is revealed in the superficial understanding of the problem and the consequent impossibility of performance in overcoming it, making propagate the "impotence" of the school that sees itself "unprepared" to deal with the arising situations.

The ways of understanding and dealing with the students´ academic failure are in most cases permeated by stigmas and stereotypes that besides reaching the family and students, reach teachers and school. From this perspective, it is highlighted the student´s behavior that is considered, in most cases, inappropriate (AQUINO, 1997).

Andrada (2003, p. 15) about the issue, argues:

> What do the terms students with problem "or" learning disability mean? There are several possible answers, multiple possible meanings of buildings on the terms, without one being truer than another. So we cannot previously believe that students are problems or families are inadequate, or that teachers are authoritarian. We need to see a "puzzle", the parties and altogether!

It is well known to those who work in school education that, within the school, non-learning has often been associated with a very controversial figure: the "student-problem". Aquino warns us (1998, p. 2):

> The student-problem is taken, in general, as one who suffers from certain alleged "psycho/educational disorders"; disorders that can be of cognitive (such "learning disabilities") or behavioral nature, and in this latter category fits a wide range of actions that are usually called 'undisciplined'. Therefore, indiscipline and low students achievement would be like two sides of the same coin, representing the two great evils of contemporary school, school failure generators, and the two main obstacles to teaching.

In everyday school life is common to come across the perplexity of teachers with the called "learning difficulties". It is also observed an increase in "demand" of students sent annually to educational support services, after-school activity, psycho-pedagogical, phonoaudiologic and psychological services, in addition to referrals made annually by schools to medical professionals (MOYSES; COLLARES, 1992).

It is worth mentioning that this is not necessarily a criticism of such services, but the fact that the teacher is often taken to selecting and sending students whose academic performance is unsatisfactory to other professionals to do what the teacher considers out of their reach, or because they do not view the conditions for the actions they deem necessary. This process favors the disregard of the pedagogical dimension in the referrals carried out and in the ways to deal with the non-learning in school.

This apparent inability of the teacher refers to multiple factors inherent to the complexity of a process that involves their training and, therefore, the theoretical framework on which their conceptions and their practice materialize, the actual conditions of teaching and educational policy that impose directions reaching the school organization and the pedagogical work.

Starting from misleading or insufficient premises of hasty diagnosis, the identification of "learning difficulties" and consequently the referrals carried out lose consistency both in prevention and in their repair by the school. As part of the same process, the blame and victimization of the teacher are also produced, veiled by the appropriation of the discourse that justified by not knowing how to handle it, the segregation practices of those who do not correspond to the expectations and idealizations (COLLARES; MOYSÉS, 1986; GOFFMAN, 1988).

The characteristics and standards that define normality in the teaching-learning process and the consequent pathologization of those who do not fit to them are, to some extent, anchored in the scientific literature. The problem, however, is still perceived punctually and located in the student, reaffirming stigma and prejudice (LUGLI; GUALTIERI, 2012; PATTO, 1999; SOUZA, 2008).

Being opposed to this view, in school life they can be perceived in interdependence relationships, the student and teacher´s conditions, labor relations, school factors, extracurricular factors that shape certain favorable and/or unfavorable context when teaching and learning (BRITO, 2009; EMÍLIO, 2004; EZPELETA; ROCKWELL, 1986; LUZ et al., 2011; MERCADO-MALDONADO, 2002; PANIAGO, 2005).

Lahire (1997) also questions the figure of the student-problem in finding that the actions and reactions of the student have no meaning outside the social relations that they are linked. Even though within the family group or close people who deal with them, there is a universe of objects linked to such social relations. In this sense, the author considers that the student socially located in the school environment, does not "reproduce" necessarily and directly, the ways of acting of his family. Their actions are previously reactions that "rely" on the adults' actions with whom they have contact and, without knowing it, "draw, outline environments of behavior and possible representations for them" (LAHIRE, 1997, p. 17). Therefore, the processes involving the teaching and learning and the significations that are produced in them bind to the senses from other contexts and interactions.

Recognizing the contextually articulated elements offers other possibilities to assign meaning to non-learning in school. Recognizing that teaching and learning are a dynamic, complex and many-sided process, Fagali (2001, p. 22) proposes several questions for reflection:

> [...] What is learning, looking at the existence of people, their needs for exchange and socialization, ethical issues of human respect and values in the face of new perspectives of existence? What is learning, given the increasing diversity of information that is imposed with increasing acceleration in the mad rush, facing the challenges of survival? And the teacher's character? What is the place they occupy and the possibilities to occupy other places? [...] In view of these possibilities of transformation, what are the qualities of educational experiences that should remain and that may make sense to human needs? What should be changed and improved, for not responding to our changing needs anymore in this historic moment in our culture?

By analyzing different social settings and relating them to the results obtained in tests performed by students originated from the popular media, Lahire (1997, p. 18) considers that "the conditions of existence of an individual are first and foremost the coexistence conditions", and only then, we can avoid "all forms of reifications of these existing conditions in the form of properties, capital, abstracted resources (from the actual social relations)".

According to this author,

> [...] We tend to reify the behavior of children in character or personality traits, [...] [but these] do not appear in a vacuum of social relations: they are indeed the product of a past socialization and also the form of social relations through which these traits are updated, are mobilized (LAHIRE, 1997, p. 17).

Such understanding invites us to think about the constitution of the individual in their own interrelationships when teaching and learning. Thus, learning is conceived as a process and not as a state (result or

product) and school as an important institution (not just physical, but of interactions) for the development of knowledge.

Given the above, in this study we focus on the significations produced by students and teachers about the non-learning in the specific context of a program supporting school learning. At first the study sought to identify the inferred significations from the normative documents that reveal the policy and its agents, the guiding principles constituents of the learning support program. Later, we became interested in understanding the daily work developed in this context and the significations produced by the participants.

Study characterization

This study involved initially the study of legislation that defines the support room program in the state system and establishes various procedures in everyday school life. Secondly, with respect to the field study, it was guided by the parameters of a qualitative research, in the form of a descriptive and interpretative study (GIL, 1999). Therefore, the survey included the observation of everyday support rooms from two state schools in Londrina Paraná State, for two months, eight hours a week, being four hours in each school as well as involving interviews with teachers and students in this context. For the data collection we developed a field diary to record our observations and made a tape recorder at the time of the interviews.

Results and discussion

We present and discuss the data of our study organized into three analytical focuses: general characterization of the learning support program; issues related to program operation and, finally, the

significations produced by teachers and students about the non-learning and the support classroom.

General characterization of the learning support program

SAA is a program that is part of the educational policies of Paraná State Government and has been operative since 2008. This program seeks to develop actions to face the problems related to student learning, the basic contents of the Portuguese Language subjects: speaking, reading, writing and mathematics: spatial forms, basic and elementary operations (PARANÁ, 2011c, 2012).

According to Resolution No. 1690 (PARANÁ, 2011a), SAA is part of the Curriculum Enrichment Activities Program in after school activity in Basic Education, which was established from the year 2011 on a permanent basis in state schools.

Its operation is in the period contrary to the student´s enrollment and its opening is automatic for students enrolled in 6th and 9th grade of Elementary School and may be required for the students attendance of the 7th and 8th grade, since there is reasoned justification from the school, accompanied by the opinion of the Regional Education Center and analysis by DEB/Integral Education Coordination (PARANÁ, 2011, 2012).

The support rooms, according to the instruction, are organized in groups of maximum twenty students per group, being its operation conditioned to the appropriate physical space, the frequency of students, attendance of a teacher and a Teaching Work Plan integrated to the Pedagogical Political Project of the school.

The diagnostic process and referral is indicated to be carried out by the regular classroom teacher with the students who are not following the learning satisfactorily. After diagnosis, the regular classroom teacher

has to fill out the Referral Form[3], in its respective discipline and indicate, together with the pedagogue, the groups' composition.

According to Instruction No. 007/2011 (PARANÁ, 2011b), it is the pedagogue responsibility to guide families about the program, informing about the importance of the student´s participation. It is also foreseen that the SAA's teachers develop the teaching plan suitable to overcome the difficulties presented by the students as well as being responsible for the students´ attendance and participation record. All professionals responsible for the operation of the Learning Support Room (regular classroom teacher, support classroom teacher and pedagogue) should perform the record of the work results performed in this environment on a semi-annual report to be submitted to the education regional center.

Aspects that impact the functioning of the SAA program

A program that aims to answer questions related to school failure assumes a set of initiatives that need to be articulated in order to create actions of various areas in favor of school learning. Such actions begin in the legislation which introduces the program in schools and unfolds in designs that embody the pedagogical cause in specific situations in different areas of the SAA. In this sense, we will analyze the aspects that affect the context and which together characterize the fulfillment process, having as a reference the legislation that regulates this program. (Resolution No. 1690). We will highlight the following aspects: responsibility for not learning; assignment of tasks; defining criterion of student´s residence time in the program; limitation in the choice of knowledge areas to be

---

[3] The referral form and student assessment can be accessed at the website *Dia a dia Educação*, Paraná government, at: <http://www.gestaoescolar.diaadia.pr.gov.br/arquivos/File/pdf/ficha_lingua_portuguesa.pdf> and <http://www.gestaoescolar.diaadia.pr.gov.br/arquivos/File/pdf/ficha_matematica.pdf>.

worked out; assessment of students by regular classrooms teachers and support classrooms, both with respect to referrals and the program exit.

The guidelines of the learning support room program, unique project throughout the state system, assume that the responsibility for non-learning (recorded in the school failure statistics and evasion from Elementary Education) belongs to schools and consequently to teachers, however, the concern for sustaining theories of teaching labor is a missing dimension in the referred program as well as other issues related to the conditions on which the same work is done.

As regards the student residence time in the SAA, it is highlighted the lack of definition of a minimum term, which in the investigated schools, took a place restricted to the operation of the SAA organization, to the detriment of the teaching-learning process developed there. We sometimes verified students remaining in the program for a shorter time than a school two month period. Such procedure was justified by the need to increase the number of students enrolled in the program during the year and it was also related to limited vacancies offered in each class. This procedure, in our view, could help to strengthen stereotypes, give rise to segregation when legitimizing the understanding that the problem lies solely on the student, considering that it was made possible to the student to experience the program actions and the results would indicate their lack of taking advantage.

Associated to the factors already indicated we find that the duties of the members involved in this work are aimed more at the administrative than the pedagogical level and focus on filling out evaluative records, addressed to various members and instances of the educational system. Such predominance of the administrative on the pedagogical level is also evident in the absence of continuing education, although foreseen in official documents, lack of specific public contests to select who will act in the support classroom, or frequent meetings that seek to promote, together, a reflection on the functioning of the program and the results obtained. In this context, it is not uncommon and sometimes appropriate

to assign to the teacher and to the used methodology or to the student and their family (seen as not involved), the failure of learning.

Regarding to the subjects chosen as the work subject, the program is repeated, similar to what occurs in regular school, the overvaluation of the Portuguese Language and Mathematics areas disregarding other knowledge areas of the curriculum. As a result the scope of the teaching work to be performed is restricted. Furthermore, we sometimes observe repetition of content and methodology employed in the regular classroom: it was asked to read texts in which each student read a passage aloud (usually in a bad way, which prevented everybody´s understanding) as well as the copy of the responses recorded by the teacher on the board, interpretative issues and mathematical problems were dictated to students so that they answered them in their notebooks.

In relation to the referral of students to the support classroom, we found similarities in the way they were made in the two school units investigated. In the first weeks of the school year the learning support classrooms were set up, based on the 6th grade regular classroom teachers' indications. The maximum number of vacancies determined in the legislation (20 students per class) was divided by the number of 6th grade classrooms in the school.

We found in the observed universe that not even the criteria for selection of students, focusing on the low grades, was used in choosing the group that started attending the support classroom in the first school two month period. In the third week of class, students had already been sent, therefore, before the regular evaluations of the two month period. In interviews with the teachers, we could verify that the criteria used for the referral of the students involved: empathy or not with the student, teacher's feeling, observation of the student behavior at the beginning of classes (indiscipline), information about the student´s family and previous years events.

According to the data obtained, the student began attending the support classroom due to their inadequacy against the idealized model. They were sent as a "student-problem" because they had impossibilities

to learn. In this context, as soon as the student met their "passage" by the support classroom, they could return to the "normality" of the regular classroom. Some students attended the support classroom only two weeks and they "were allowed" to leave the program. We exemplify with an observed situation in one of the school units, in which a student was included in the support classroom in the penultimate week of the 1st school semester because he had shown indiscipline in the classroom.

The evaluation of the performed activities indicated that schools, when receiving the visit of the evaluation team, those responsible report the progress of the work, however, often receive the assessment feedback when the year is over, with no assistance of the students over the period and without directions to the teachers (from the regular and support classroom) about a follow-up process with the students.

According to Paro's alert (2003, p. 41-42):

> For the failed students, the absurdity of the situation is not only waiting for a whole year for verifying that the process did not work out (which is no longer of low gravity); the absurd is also where nothing is done to identify and correct what went wrong. This is not exactly an evaluation, but the student´s condemnation, as if only they were blamed for the failure. As if the process was not part of the student, the teacher (or teachers) and all the conditions under which education is performed in school.

The presentation of some issues relating to the operation of the support classroom allows us to affirm that there is a gap between the provisions of the normative legislation or between what was "thought" for the support classroom and the objective conditions to perform the work in the school routine. The actions observed in this environment are woven in the integrative relationships of various dialogues and articulate multiple interests which allow the production of different significations when not learning in this context, which we will discuss below.

Significations produced by teachers and students
about non-learning and the support classroom

In the interviews we had with the teachers (identified by Teacher
1, 2, 3 and 4) we seek to investigate how meant the problems related to
their students´ learning through issues involving: what they consider to
learn and not learn; what the main characteristics of students who attend
the support classroom are; what factors they attributed to non-learning.

In relation to what they consider learning, we highlight the
teacher's 1 response:

> *Learning is a reaction of interest, reaction to everything that arouses interest*
> *of every citizen and even a child. They learn since they are interested. On the*
> *other hand, non-learning, i.e., the learning difficulties, in my opinion: it can*
> *be extracurricular issues that greatly affect the learning ability: the student´s*
> *lifestyle they have, family problems, financial difficulties, finally, several situ-*
> *ations that affect learning. Learning itself is a knowledge absorption of what*
> *is important to them. Learning goes far above what he lives.*

It can be seen in this speech an indication that non-learning is
produced by factors that are exclusively out of school, or located in the in-
dividual and/or their family, while school is disregarded as co-producer of
the phenomenon. This thought about non-learning according to Bissoto
(2009) is possible because learning is perceived dissociated of knowledge
and the process relevance of knowing for the humanization of the indi-
vidual. According to this author:

> Knowledge has, for the human species, vital value, it is essential for
> the adaptability of individuals to the environment. Thus, for learn-
> ing, it is necessary that the learner accepts knowledge as something
> important to their ontogeny, for their efforts of inserting themselves
> in the world. [...] The human being becomes human as they social-
> ize, that is, as they are introduced and become part of the network of
> meanings which sustains the life of a community. Meanings forming a
> background of socio-historically constituted knowledge, and without

it mankind would not have met conditions of evolution. The establishment and maintenance of peer relations, cultural and historically situated, are essential for the integral development of the individual and cannot be relegated by school (BISSOTO, 2009, p. 93-94).

About the characteristics of the student who attends the learning support classroom, we highlight three responses:

Teacher 1: *It is always that student who has extra room problems: family problems, lack of parental monitoring, parental disinterest of following their children´s school life. So I guess that makes it very difficult.*

Teacher 2: *They are students who have difficulties to concentrate, they are very restless and the main thing is the interpretation, because many go well in grammar rules, they can memorize and when they come to the interpretation they cannot focus.*

Teacher 3: *Or they are too shy or impulsive or aggressive or scattered.*

Regarding the causes of non-learning, they expressed:

Teacher 1: *The main cause is that, I always relate the family with the student. So if they have a family that follows them, which is always attentive, being part of their school life, it helps to eliminate these difficulties.*

Teacher 3: *It is a matter of concentration of the student, when they want it, because currently what competes with the school are things we cannot reach, for example, videos, Internet, television is all, so the competition is very unfair. They have access to many things that provide more pleasure than school, they have to stop to focus and it's all very fast, internet provides quick and ready answers, they do not need to reason a lot. Now, in school they have to stop, concentrate and think and then the mental laziness prevails. Difficulties in learning, assimilating and modifying.*

Although there is a recognition of different elements composing the learning process, we found that it is still dominant the understanding

that non-learning is the student's responsibility and a set of attributes (negative) assigned to the student, seem to take on a permanent basis and this would prevent them from acting, thinking and learning.

This way of understanding, however, was not the only one that came up in our research. Teacher 4 showed an understanding that did not disregard the integration of school, student and family:

> *Learning is a process. It does not help I speed up the contents if the reasoning does not follow them. You cannot ignore in learning, other dimensions related to their life history. See here (he shows students) they are different histories, marks that interfere. The process of each one will be different. We question more what they do not know and a little what we can do for them as school. If they do not learn, it is not only because they have a difficult life. School also does not meet their learning need... it is all together, school, student, family.*

In this talk we observed another look directed to individuals, because they are carriers of a history that is not only theirs. There is the consideration that we are constituted as social and cultural individuals who are presented within the school in the interactive processes between the individuals who participate in it, what brings us to the observation of Roustang (1990 apud LAHIRE, 1997, p. 18), "each trait we attribute to the individual is not theirs, but corresponds more to what happens between them and something else (or someone else)".

Regarding the significance of the support classroom role, participating teachers were unanimous in emphasizing its positive value, but in the context that a new opportunity is being offered to students. As an example, we highlight the speech of one of our individuals, Teacher 3:

> *I tell students and their families that the state is paying a private teacher for them and if they do not valorize it, nothing more can be done. It depends on them (students and family) overcome or not the difficulties they have. This opportunity that the government is giving is very important because their families could never pay for it.*

It is observed here, although in another way, the understanding reaffirmation that learning would only be responsibility of students and their family. Consequently, one would expect the solution for their 'non-learning' be searched by them.

With respect to significations of non-learning from the students, we investigated if they like the support classroom; the similarities and differences in school activities compared to the regular classroom and the support classroom; why they think they were chosen for the support classroom; what kind of student they think they are; what the teacher, family and friends think about they participate in the support classroom.

The students' answers indicate that they would be incorporating the discourse that blames them. In our view, failure in school is materialized in the resulting contexture of the individuals´ interactions which constitute the school routine, locus of sense production about themselves, others, learning processes, imposed demands and the perceived capacity for meeting them. From the 25 students interviewed in the two support classrooms (from now identified as S0l, S02, S03, ..., S25), most of them considers they are undisciplined (bad behavior) and therefore "deserves" to be in the support classroom. Although they claim that the support classroom is a privileged place for learning, they show many similarities and few differences between the support classroom and the regular classroom, what would be consistent with the observed: content, proposals and methodology repetitions in both environments. Some of their responses:

> S03: *What they teach is equal, boring because it repeats the lesson.* S06: *The desks, teaching, they use the book, the mess.*
> S13: *Copying from the board, the teaching way.*
> S21: *The mess, the subjects.*
> S17: *The activities, reading.*

When asked why they were chosen for the support classroom, they emphasized how bad students they are, how they see themselves incapable of learning. Here there are some responses:

S02: *I am very weak and here they help to recover.*
S11: *I live with my aunts, grandparents and mother, I think they do not encourage.*
S25: *At the time* [she refers to the time she was communicated that would go to the support classroom] *I felt nothing, I knew I had to come and even though I was a good student I would be chosen. The teacher picked on me and I was really bad.*

The statements we highlight are revealing how the blaming process has reached these students, making them to incorporate the speech that they have a problem themselves, or in their families. The way these students indicate to realize their participation in school and in the support classroom calls the attention to the fact that the experiences in the school context are essential to the internalization of behavior cultural forms considered appropriated or inappropriated for the school demand. This gives the individual a sense of belonging or alienation and abandonment of the schooling process itself. In allusion to the student's sense of belonging to school, Bissoto (2009, p. 83, original's highlights) analyzes:

> The greater the sense of *belonging*, in fact to the school institution, less alienated of this process the student will be. The alienation of the educational process is understood here as the distancing or *estrangement* attitude that the student develops in relation to academic learning processes or the socialization processes, which happen in schools. *This attitude interferes decisively in the allocation and meanings that the student produces concerning the school knowledge and ways of being valorized by the school; and it is, thus, on the basis of (not) appropriation that they will produce of these knowledge and behaviors.* This estrangement process underlies the phenomenon emergence of school failure.

Investigating what their friends, the teacher and their family think about their learning, the concept does not differ from that analyzed so far:

S20: *My teacher thinks I'm disruptive, flirtatious.*
S04: *My friends make fun of me, call me dull.*

S08: *My friends think I'm silly.*
S16: *My mother thinks that I must come to become more intelligent;*
S01: *My family thinks I´m bad.*
S12: *They (family) do not like it. They think it is bad I am in reinforcement already at the beginning of the year.*
S24: *She (teacher) doesn´t feel anything because she just shouts at and doesn´t talk to the students.*

We observed from the obtained data the strength of the stereotypes and how they permeate all areas, from the implementation of policies to the way children and relatives see themselves participating in this process, which we believe undermines the objectives for which a learning support environment is established.

In this sense, the study data restates the discussion of the determinants of non-learning starting from the effects caused by the dynamics of the events which grant full responsibility to the alleged disabilities of the individual who learns. What we observe in the students saying results from a process in which beliefs were naturalized so powerfully that it is the own individual that verbalizes, sometimes considering themselves responsible for the obtained results, and sometimes to their socioeconomic conditions and to their families, the reasons for non-learning.

This same process reaches, hence, the teacher who becomes to be considered unprepared, incompetent, emotionally tired out among other stigmas attributed to them. In short, there is no understanding of a multifactorial process of many faces and thus all of them are unable to assume the school failure of a co-responsible form, inserted in school interactions, in the individuals´ life histories and in the institutional relations.

Final considerations

The data analysis of this study pointed to disagreements between the paths taken by the student in the construction of knowledge and what means learning in government proposals, for school and teachers.

The relationship among the normative documents, the labor development and the students´ and teachers´ significations about non-learning in support classrooms allows us to perceive the intermittent presence of an attempt of blaming that permeates the whole learning process marked by the opposite result to its goal. Non-learning in this context, in which the labeling and segregation are placed, ends up not leading to the promotion of a process in permanent (re)construction.

The functioning of learning support classrooms revealed by this study points out, on one hand, the recognition of a systemic problem in which the proposal and implementation of a program focused on this issue seeks somehow to respond. In it, however, the issues involved in issues relating to school learning are analyzed in a dichotomous and disjointed manner so that the process is likely to come down to a "passage ritual".

Non-learning is a problem that requires treatment by educational policies, and the first factor to be taken into account is the own production conditions of school education in our reality. Once produced the school failure, it is necessary to take into account the elucidative elements of the factors interdependence relationships network that generates it.

In this perspective, a program that aims to contribute decisively to change the school failure frame cannot dispense actions that take into account not only the students' learning failure, but also its immediate context (within-school factors) and the mediate (extracurricular factors) that reach the student´s family and his closest social group. It is further necessary to break the vicious cycle of blame and victimization. This disruption requires that a reflection be nurtured by teachers and educational administrators so that knowledge can be produced from contact with new theoretical and methodological fields that enable the overcoming of the ways of dealing with school failure, commonly repeated in daily school. For this, the management of public educational policies should take responsibility for the continuing education of professionals working in school education and in particular in

the analyzed context, in addition to effective monitoring of the process developed in the learning support program.

References

ANDRADA, E. G. C. Família, escola e a dificuldade de aprendizagem: intervindo sistemicamente. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*, v. 7, n. 2, p. 171-178, dez. 2003.

AQUINO, J. G. *Erro e fracasso na escola*: alternativas teóricas e práticas. 2. ed. São Paulo: Summus, 1997.

AQUINO, J. G. A indisciplina e a escola atual. *Revista da Faculdade de Educação*, v. 24, n. 2, p. 181-204, jul./dez. 1998.

BISSOTO, M. L. O fracasso na escola. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, n. 50, p. 81-98, 2009.

BRITO, A. Acerca de um desencuentro: la mirada de los professores sobre los alumnos de la escuela secundaria em Argentina. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación,* n. 51, p. 139-158, 2009.

COLLARES, C. A. L.; MOYSÉS, M. A. A. *Preconceito no cotidiano escolar*: ensino e medicalização. São Paulo: Cortez, 1986.

EMÍLIO, S. A. *O cotidiano escolar pelo avesso*: sobre laços, amarras e nós no processo de inclusão. 2004. 252 f. Tese (Doutorado em Psicologia) – Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2004.

FAGALI, E. Q. *Múltiplas faces do aprender*: novos paradigmas da pós-modernidade. São Paulo: Unidas, 2001.

GIL, A. C. *Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa social*. São Paulo: Atlas, 2002.

GOFFMAN, I. *Estigma*: notas sobre a manipulação da identidade deteriorada. 4. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara, 1988.

LAHIRE, B. *Sucesso escolar nos meios populares*: as razões do improvável. São Paulo: Ática, 1997.

LUGLI, G. R.; GUALTIERI, E. C. R. *A escola e o fracasso escolar*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

MERCADO-MALDONADO, R. *Los saberes docentes como construcción social*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2002.

LUZ, S. P. da et al. Formação continuada de docentes do ensino superior: contribuições para a prática pedagógica. *Educere et Educare: Revista de Educação*, v. 6, n. 12, p. 194-207, jul/dez. 2011.

MOYSÉS, M. A. A.; COLLARES, C. A. L. A história não contada dos distúrbios de aprendizagem. *Cadernos CEDES*, n. 28, p. 31-48, 1992.

PANIAGO, M. L F. S. *Práticas discursivas de subjetivação no contexto escolar*. 2005. 205 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Universidade Estadual Paulista, Araraquara, 2005.

PATTO, M. H. S. *A produção do fracasso escolar*: histórias de submissão e rebeldia. São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo, 1999.

PARANÁ. Secretaria do Estado de Educação. *Resolução n. 1690, de 24 de abril de 2011*. Institui a partir de 2011, em caráter permanente, o Programa de Atividades Complementares Curriculares em Contraturno na Educação Básica na Rede Estadual de Ensino. Curitiba, PR, 24 maio 2011a. Available at: <http://www.legislacao.pr.gov.br/legislacao/pesquisarAto.do?action=exibir&codAto=69240&indice=1&totalRegistros=1>. Access: May 20th, 2013.

PARANÁ. Secretaria do Estado da Educação. *Instrução n. 007/2011 - SUED/SEED*. Assunto: critérios para a abertura da demanda de horas-aula, do suprimento e das atribuições dos profissionais das Salas de Apoio à Aprendizagem do Ensino Fundamental, da Rede Pública Estadual de Educação. 2011. Curitiba, 4 jul. 2011b. Available at: <http://www.educacao.pr.gov.br/arquivos/File/instrucoes/instrucao0072011.pdf>. Access: June 26th, 2012.

PARANÁ. Secretaria do Estado da Educação. *Instrução n. 016/2011 – SEED/SUED*. Assunto: Estabelece critérios para o atendimento educacional especializado em SALA DE RECURSOS MULTIFUNCIONAL TIPO I, na Educação Básica – área da deficiência intelectual, deficiência física neuromotora, transtornos globais do desenvolvimento e transtornos funcionais específicos. Curitiba, PR, 22 nov. 2011c. Available at: <http://www.educacao.pr.gov.br/arquivos/File/instrucoes/Instrucao162011.pdf>. Access: July 30th, 2013.

PARANÁ. Secretaria do Estado de Educação. *Instrução 020/2012 - SUED/SEED*. Assunto: Matriz Curricular para os Ensino Fundamental, anos finais, e para o Ensino Médio, da Rede Pública de Educação Básica. Curitiba, PR, 12 dez. 2012. Available at: <http://www.educacao.pr.gov.br/arquivos/File/instrucoes%202012%20sued%20seed/instrucao202012.pdf>. Access: July 2nd, 2013.

PARO, V. H. *Reprovação escolar*: renúncia à educação. São Paulo: Xamã, 2001.

EZPELETA, J.; ROCKWELL, E. *Pesquisa participante*. São Paulo: Autores Associados, 1986.

SOUZA, M. P. R. de. Medicalização na Educação Infantil e no Ensino Fundamental e as políticas de formação docente: retornando à patologia para justificar a não aprendizagem escolar – a medicalização e o diagnóstico de transtornos de aprendizagem em tempos de neoliberalismo. In: REUNIÃO ANUAL DA ANPED, 31., 2008, Caxambu. *Anais*... Caxambu: ANPEd, 2008. Available at: <http://31reuniao.anped.org.br/4sessao_especial/se%20-%2012%20-%20marilene%20proena%20rebello%20de%20souza%20-%20participante.pdf>. Access: July 21st, 2013.