

THE ORDER OF DISCOURSE IN ACADEMIC CONTEXT AND ITS REPRESENTATIONS - A NEW PROPOSAL FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF SENSES

Wellington Amâncio da Silva

Universidade do Estado da Bahia -UNEB/PPGEcoH

Abstract

The main objective of this work is to discuss the meanings reproduced through discourses, shared in contexts of teaching and the way in which these guide the way of thinking and acting of the subjects involved in the face of experience and criticize these same speeches. This production is from the research: social representations of the teaching profession: speeches, papers and (re) production of senses, developed at the University of the State of Bahia-UNEB, Campus VIII between the years 2012 and 2013. Finally, there is the optimisation of the intersubjective discourse aspects and their representations, through discourse analysis, as accessible to subject teaching while productions of his own, emphasizing the autonomy, critical and emancipatory conscience present in these languages used by teachers.

KEYWORDS :

Discourse analysis, Intersubjectivity, social representations, teaching.

INTRODUCTION:

Was made an approach about the speech of the professionals of pedagogy, but specifically of teaching speech to permeate your entire practice and that is present in their interstices, as a mediator of knowledge and powers, while fighting field representing, production/reproduction of senses and materiality, specifically with regard to the discursive positions created by the pedagogic discourse to the discursive subjects at school. Were studied here through the French discourse analysis, in particular of Foucault studies approach (2002, 2004, 2007, 2009, 2010a, 2010b) issues of "speech of power." Yet the conditions under which are reproduced as true, Lyotard (2008), the considerations about the "language banks" in Derrida (2011, 2013) and Hall (2006) on the relations of the subject as speech, considering, when possible, the theoretical aspects of the *speech as an ideological instrument of Pêcheux* (2009, 2010), and Orlandi (1996, 2007 and 2012) just to highlight critically oppositions of discursive subject of modernity with the subject of discourse in this basic authors. It is important to highlight that in relation to differences between Foucault and Pêcheux there is one issue, namely the the notion of power linked to knowing how to analyze power relations within the speeches, for example, according to Orlandi (1996), both the *order of discourse* (Foucault) regarding *language order* (Pêcheux) have your order feature, worked in various schemes. The question of the subject^[1] is also treated differently by each of the two authors; in Foucault, this is not a substance, but a way of being in the face of an epistemological truth; for Pêcheux, the subject is the traditional of modernity, that is, one subject, is passive foreign structured

conditions.

Beyond discourse analysis, Sought the theoretical contributions of contemporary Social Sciences, especially of social representations, the theory of hegemony and against Human Agency of Giroux (1995, 2011a, 2011b) and, to the extent possible, interconnecting the authors' discussions, seeking paraphrase with sobriety and synthesizing the ideas keys, pointing the axis of the work and thought of authors, respecting what they "really say".

Therefore, this work arises as a result of extensive research entitled "social representations of the teaching profession: speeches, papers and (re) production of senses", held at the University of the State of Bahia, Campus VIII, between the years 2012 and 2013. The objective of this study was to investigate interdisciplinary way, the power of choices of models of professional practices and its autonomy from social representations and discourses in municipal public schools – where should occur greater freedom of action-reflection on the practice of teaching autonomy and emancipation. We used injections of Ethnomethodology, both collecting the speeches, how to consider them in directions assigned by those who speaking.

1 ANALYSIS OF THE SPEECHES OF TEACHERS

According to Foucault (2010a), speech is the "set of statements that relies on the same training system [knowledge]; for example, "clinical speech, speech, speech of natural history, psychiatric discourse" (FOUCAULT, 2010a, p. 122) and other speeches related to the areas of knowledge, where subjectivities "appear" with greater autonomy, speaking for itself in the research, making sense in everyday life, that is, the "subjectivity of individuals interacting with the objectivity of the world" (FERRATER MORA, 2005, p. 1550); Thus, in the *lógos* of speak, embodies a intersubjective power, as an essential condition of language (GADAMER, 2012, p. 497), which predates the subjectivity of the speakers that sustains it (HABERMAS, 2010, p16). Therefore, the need for an approach [...] "about the need for a science of writing, about their conditions of possibility, about the critical work you should open your field and raise the epistemological obstacles". (DERRIDA, 2010, p. 19-20), in the various contexts of communication, where the intersubjective.

The analysis of discourse takes language as a mediator between the natural and social environment, between "presence [of life] as formal essence of meaning [in the speeches that she give directions]" (DERRIDA, 2013, p. 22), and truth as a more adequate representation of reality (GUMBRECHT, 2010, p. 75-78). "don't Park in the interpretation, works its limits, its mechanisms, as part of the processes of signification" (ORNANDI, 2012, p. 26), having the speech as a means of interaction determined. In the face of the characteristic that he exercises power (FOUCAULT, 2002), called contexts are configured in the face of situations of social communication, so "the social life is constructed through language: not the grammarians and linguists, but of everyday life" (COULON, 2007, p. 26) and this is confirmed because "we exist as such in the language, and everything we do as human beings we like different ways to work in language" (MATURANA, 2001, p. 130).

However, nothing second, Moscovici representations of everyday life without language (p. 219) and his speech is his "main vector", since "language is all speech" (FOUCAULT, 2007, p. 132). But, if "the profound interdependence of language and the world thinks he's undone" (*Ibid*, 2007, p. 59), the social representations discusses attempts to re-connect the interdependencies (2001 JODELET, MOSCOVICI 2003), through the "convencionalization", and the categorization of languages (and other abstract objects) as well as the world, through, in particular, the speeches that give intelligibility as another aspect that interested "speech power". First of all, and still considering those aspects of "convencionalization ", you must put it, "the first Convention, [is] to which they refer immediately to the order of natural and universal meaning, would produce as spoken language. The written language would fix conventions, which would link to each other other conventions ". (DERRIDA, 2011, p. 13).

Therefore, the theory of social representations was used for analysis and interpretation of data, taking into account their own gestures of interpretation which it considers as an act in the field of symbolic (ORNANDI, 2012, p. 26), i.e. the speeches and their meanings present in the interviews as representations of experiences and reflections of the teaching staff in relation to their profession.

In view of this Severino (2012) "reinforces [that] the speeches may be those already given in the different forms of communication and dialogue with those obtained from questions, via interviews and

testimonials" (p. 122). Thus, wonders here, therefore, to what extent the pedagogical discourse observed, seeks to establish the illusion that there are static senses, ensuring thereby the idea and consequently the practices of power over subjects where their power to cut its huge penetration. This question comes from the theoretical critical pedagogy itself itinerary that "States that there is a need for a critical language, a questioning of assumptions" (placed above); and to constitute a "language of possibilities [that] goes beyond criticism to elaborate a positive language of human empowerment" (GIROUX, 1999, p. 20.21) and, in a first step, recognize possibilities "that language carries in itself the need of its own critique" (DERRIDA, 2011, p. 414) as a condition of opening and emancipation. But is that enough? Now, on the other hand, faced with the critical perspective of modernity (Marxism, structuralism, social theory, etc.), as the subject entry modes, until then, think of the "power in terms of restrictions which dominate, repress and deny the subjectivity" (GIROUX, 1999, p. 20.21). But it is precisely its opposite little studied, i.e. the "processes of subjectivation" (FOUCAULT, 2004) "and its action methods on people" (ROSE, 2011, p. 140), while "creation, modeling and utilization of human beings as subjects" free (*cf.* ROSE, 2011, p. 211), where they established the illusions of autonomy, which intimidates the critique of representations of freedom experienced.

For What Foucault calls "principle of rarefaction of discourse" (2002, p. 26), behold the author himself as "principle of grouping, unit, origin of their meanings and the focus of its coherence", which works in the spaces where the speeches are not restricted. As a result, unlike Foucault, the hypothesis of Pêcheux (2009) is that the subject of the speech are affected by *illusions* of freedom when they think they have autonomy over their statements; one of them is the illusion of the subject as a source of speech, from the condition of individual speaker (order of the language).

Hall (2006) cites Saussure when he argued that we are not, in any sense, the "authors" of what we do or the meanings that we express in the language. (HALL, 2006, p. 40).

There is, in all instances of society, a wide variety of speeches, set out in various ways, but that often doesn't understand "its meaning or its effectiveness" as attributed to one or another author (FOUCAULT, 2002, p. 26). It is said that speeches are reproduced and accepted, especially by the strength of the impression of being written by subject that the States, however, are older than those guys speaker and interlocutor. According to Derrida, (2011, p 262), "the word is never proper to its author or its recipient", but is rendered and WINS sense through the collective voices of subjects involved that echo in their meanings. On the other hand, the dominant discourses require a monologue and, in this way, *re*would force a crystallized sense, ideologically interested to words, which means a hermeneutic facilitation (say, translate, explain) in its intelligibility to the maintenance of a "logical conformism" (Durkheim), homogeneous and the *regulatory* reality experienced and reproduced that inevitably would respond to the same interests that "knowledge and set of techniques that allow you to talk the signs and find out their meaning" (FOUCAULT, 2007, p. 40).

Is valid remember that the authorship of a speech, where they proceed, give real status or "mistrust". About it, Foucault tells us "the speeches and status and function of real speeches – is from the *truth* that sustains the power of legality and of their adoption. In the West, it is the scientific discourse "(FOUCAULT, 2008b, p. 258) as a first condition of truth. His "breeding pairs" (LYOTARD, 2008), would strengthen its veracity from consensus closed conceptual, theoretical and technical. See, e.g., testimony of a teacher interviewed:

[...] When concludes my degree [...] those all theories and schools of thought with its many authors have helped me a lot in order to see better the field of education. And this is reflected in my work, in my contribution and benefits achieved for me and for everyone. (A.B.).

Beyond that, it was observed that teachers believe having conditions of full autonomy and scientific theories *opened* on his speeches and affirmative actions, because their practice and reflection, in face of the complexity and dynamism of the everyday education, it is always from the perspective of a "balance conflicting [2]" (MAFESSOLI, 2010a, p. 39), that is, that never solves hic et nunc, which is always and necessarily keep, why not *simplify or reduce*.

Since the speech can be told in many ways [3], another *illusion*, second Pêcheux (2009), is the originality of the subject's speech: its meaning is special and unique in relation to other speeches; they not only use of the senses has data for your communication, but also believe interfere in them and some

have autonomy.

Charaudeau's semiolinguistics (2012, p. 29) claims that the conditions of subject of the speech are the "fact we belong to a particular social community and share with its members experiences of various types" in terms of "collective representations" and the use of concepts and *slogans* that give meanings to us and to the everyday world, in speeches.

One can define the Speech as the field of power where the social representations are played, winning directions, perpetuate, turns, acquire status of truth and create places where certain truths are established provisionally. But there's no denying that relations between discourse and the conditions of reproduction of these speeches give themselves in the field of socio-cultural relations of power struggle where circulating various interests, as they materialize in the speech – these relationships and conditions, so to speak, make up the well-known historical materiality of speech, because "the symbolic speech work underpins the production of human existence" (ORNANDI, 2012, p. 26) and thus becoming "speech pronounced or written thing material". (FOUCAULT, 2002, p. 8), as well as power; occurs while "form of intelligibility historically dependent on which requires for its continued support a set of mutual understanding" (ROSE, 2011 p. 243), built on consensus or dissent.

To paraphrase Foucault (2002), we say that the conditions of production of speech are directly related to the social and historical instances of power of the subject of the speech (speaker) in your specific environment. Power relations and the place of the subject of the speech, in the face of its interlocutors, it is that determines the strength of the speech, the degree of truth from him and, consequently, its acceptability. This struggle, this "will to truth" (FOUCAULT, 2002, p. 14-20), which stated that, if legitimate in their own speech and through him, conditions your mediator production of knowledge and powers.

One of the conditions of production of the discourse on Modernity, according to Foucault, is a kind of ideology of control, that is, to "determine [...] its operation [...], to impose on individuals who pronounce certain number of rules" (*Ibid*, 2002, p. 36), (in the case of the teaching profession, the level of education achieved, the "pedagoging "of their worldview," discursive environment ", the University), because one cannot speak of" anyway "because, for which some speak, others should just listen to them and welcomes them, like truth, as ideal representation of social reality; in maintaining this power of *rarefaction of the subject*, i.e. "do not allow everyone has access to them [...]. If it satisfies certain requirements" (*ibid*, 2002, p. 37) is necessary to plow it by means of these conditions of academic training, so that they are approved and obtaining the" freedom of speech ", so that the majority-which would give meaning and confirm its veracity as agents of their re-production is more listener and that such access does not become a genuine inclusion in the given context [4]. Because, the author warns us about the "care" with the speech-which focus on the rules that guide teaching practices, when assumes that

In every society the production of speech is controlled at the same time, selected, organized and redistributed by number of cases which have the function to conjure his powers and perils, dominate your random event, Dodge his heavy and fearsome materiality. (FOUCAULT, 2002, p. 9).

This gives us part of the clarification necessary to trace, as "random event" to the speech established, contra-speeches actions that affirm the teaching profession in the perspective of autonomy, emancipation, inclusion and multiculturalizada freedom to speak and think. In this perspective, the speech in addition to being a field of struggle constantly accessed, where the teaching aspects can be affirmed anti-hegemonic through a contradiscurso, he is in itself an instrument of struggle for the construction of a public contra-sphere (GIROUX, 1995, 1999, 2009). In relation to the concept of resistance, "contra-hegemony implies a more political understanding, more theoretical and more critical, not only in the face of nature of domination, but also the type of active opposition which should engender" (GIROUX & MCLAREN. In. MOREIRA & SILVA. 2009 p. 132) by means of a drive against the power, featuring a contradiscurso, which first and foremost question "every single way of thinking, which means introduce suspicion about representations of reality based on stable and objective truths" (HERNÁNDEZ, 1998, p. 33)-as the very concept of resistance is this word is very usual in social discourses. Facilitates the maintenance of the *status quo*. Won another meaning between the lines of the

speeches: why do you want to represent and if understood as static, not fighting attitude reinvents itself, or creates possibility, only affirms its denial, their opposition, forcing the opponent to immobility, but not advancing.

Indeed, the speech "is not simply what translates the fights or the systems of domination, but what that fight, the power of which we want to seize" Foucault (2002, p. 10). So, even though the conditions of production of speech if effect through the socio-cultural position of privileged subject discursive, these conditions do not cease to be available to "non-discursive" seen that already enable face the speech said "hegemonic", even reproducing "typically" Socialist concepts as

[...] our class, education workers, should be above all engaged to claim everything you long for and that we are sure they are ideal for the common good of the school and society. It's our word against theirs: the truth will prevail and the society as a whole will support us, because the bonus is for her too. (J.U.S.). [5]

We should not forget one more time of your ideological "aspects" that seek to determine conceptually representations of "ideal", of "common good", of "truthfulness" and "interests" for the subject your audience as discursive and *real desire* (FOUCAULT, 2002, pp. 15-21). With regard to these social representations of power institutor significations here examined, "his movement [becomes effective] through the speech, which constitutes its main vector". (MOSCOVICI, 2003, p. 215).

But, according to Lyotard (2008), his interlocutors usually only take the many aspects of the speech as true if started in the training system where these circulating, as is the acquisition of technical and scientific terms of the disciplines by means of academic initiation in such area of knowledge related to legitimize and play us interlocutors the truths of speech (LYOTARD, 2008). In relation to how that proceeds, Kuhn (2009) clarifies these aspects by stating that

Only after several such transformations of vision is that the student becomes an inhabitant, seeing what the scientist sees and responding as the scientist responds. However, this world in which the student enters is not fixed once and for all [...] (KUHN, 2009 p. 148).

Indeed, long before the Academy, this conditioning would by "arrangement of announcers and the receiver to accept or *believe* what is said" early on in the school institution. (BOURDIEU, 2009b, p. 53). So, science makes appeal to education as a necessary complement. As is required when a recipient scientist that can, in turn, be a sender, who is a partner. (LYOTARD, 2008, p. 45).

Soon, when the question of partnership Bourdieu (2011) States that in face of the your "condition of communication" (p. 207), these "recipients" are "endowed with a homogeneous programme of perception, thought and action, constitute the most product-specific educational system (p. 206). Thus, the school might be understood as "the set of institutional mechanisms or usual for which it is ensured that the transmission between generations of culture inherited from the past (that is, the accumulated information)". (BOURDIEU & PASSERON. 2009a, p. 31-32). Still, according to Lyotard (2008), forming equal subjects, the truth of speech becomes more easily convincing, that by force of theoretical training, unanimity through the acquisition and reproduction of speech at the Academy, school, teaching, pedagogy (teaching contract), and so on, whether within their "principles of coherence due" wants to express the representations, i.e. "cognitive schemas, attitudes and cultural models and standards, positioning" (MOSCOVICI, 2003).

Although, a radical critique of science, its constitutive environment and their interests should be discussed in the same spaces where they give themselves, so that they can construct together paradigms to support the vision of the world from the perspective of contra-hegemony (GIROUX & MCLAREN, *apud* SCOTT, 2009, p. 125-134), based on a "language of possibilities" (GIROUX & MCLAREN. In. MOREIRA & SILVA. 2009 p. 129), but do not underestimate the critical languages.

In other words, about the condition of production of speech, cited above, Pêcheux (2010, p. 87) complements the speaks of Lyotard (2008) by reinforcing that "it is possible to define a source conditions of production" of these speeches in their symbolic relations, the local instance, and status field where they are produced. The place where the truth is proven and the consensus arising ".

(LYOTARD, 2008, p. 45), where it is criticized, denied, reinvented and contradicted. Anyway, this place must be a field where the criticism of the subjects made aware of the fact, can "take root" (radical) in the sense of gaining spaces, and then to contra-pointer to the dominant discourse.

Yes, it's "also studying the conditions of ownership [of these] speeches, [which] is faced with the analysis of social formations" (FOUCAULT, 2010a, p. 232). Note what Lyotard still unveils the question of "truth by unanimity in the group" so that "it must therefore form equal." (*ibid.*, 2008, p. 46). In the field of training (at the Academy), he still tells us that "the truth of a statement and the competence of the enunciator [subject of speech] are subject to the assent of the collectivity of equal in competence". (*ibid.*, 2008, p. 46).

As a matter of fact. However these "equal" in their competence may also deny certain truths made previously. It's at school, at University, at the centers of various formations, formal and informal, where the discourse of knowledge takes shape of real status, i.e. normative regulation of truth, finding announcers and interlocutors; also, these sites are denied: its regularity is faced coercive and are loving their regulatory problems. These are the places and those contexts where "the origin of production conditions". In these environments of speech mediator of knowledge and powers, "the didactics ensures this reproduction" (LYOTARD, 2008, p. 46) and even other didactic "models" are ensured, because the "objective" issues go beyond questions of meaning (ADORNO 2009, p. 179-195), seeking to undo this once hegemonic power talking, meaning, to represent, anyway, of being and being.

Ultimately, the discourse environment is the place where he's legitimized, recognized and negotiated, accepted or not, while "scientific knowledge training game" (Ibid., 2008, p. 46). About it all, that is, about the scope of control of the speeches by the educational institutions, Maingueneau (2008) notes that "when it comes to speeches tied to technical skills with controlled purposes, the discursive legitimation takes place in good part by the acquisition of diplomas". (MAINGUENEAU, 2008 p. 132), as "the whole system of education is a political way to maintain or modify the appropriation of the discourses. [...] What is a teaching system but a ritualized fashion the word? ". (FOUCAULT, 2002, p. 45).

For investigation of these claims is needed here to analyze the present categories in the polls this article as what they represent.

3 ISSUES RELATED TO PARADIGM

The first tricky issue is that the speeches, the social representations tend to be understood through the "dichotomization" of reality (right/wrong, good/bad, science and myth, knowledge/ignorance) as simplifications (rationalization) of the everyday world; are contributions of intelligibility of the social world offers as a representation "(BOURDIEU 2009b, p. 86), from the Great Social Theories, and that has raised the image of the" Opposition "and" Antagonism "between things and consequently results in fights between the" incessant "fruits of these opposites infinite conditions inherently wrong headed, caricatures of the phenomena of everyday life. For example, regarding the psychosocial experience of dichotomy, Wallerstein (1999) States that "they indicate a split within the Group [social], and not the unit of this group (which of course is the basis of the division between groups)" (WALLERSTEIN, *apud* FEATHERSTONE, 1999, p. 42).

The second question refers to the choices of specific bibliographic published on the subject, since there are many literatures, however, distance themselves as far as the approach epistemically worldview, and own sources searched for the elaboration of this literature. So, it is very evident concern with a theoretical construction, through the bibliography to justify the formulation of the topic and its problematization.

In other words, aimed at the construction of a theoretical framework that justified the line of research related to books and authors could corroborate epistemically research, aiming at the paradigmatic relationship of bibliographical sources with the theme.

An example of epistemological contrast would be to use the approach of historical materialism / dialectic, which would present the subject in conditioning - a structural way - the history, the work and the social class to which it belongs - *conditio sine qua non* to be a historical subject (the a greater objectivity to subjectivity plan), "contrasted" with ethnomethodology adopted here, in which the subjectivities "appear" with greater autonomy, talking for itself in research,

gaining meaning in everyday life, *ie*, the "subjectivity of individuals interacting with the objectivity of the world" (Mora, 2005, p.1550); *logos* on the tongue, embodies itself a power of intersubjective, that is prior to the subjectivity of speakers and maintains (Habermas, 2010, p16). And these are presented according to Garfinkel (1967), through autonomous choices and the differentiation in the face of the common world model established. This " relationship between various subjects , given the knowledge give rise to the 'intersubjectivity' or 'intersubjective', that is, [as] bridge between subjectivity and objectivity " (Mora, 2005, p.1550), when the the subjectivity each becomes important benchmark for the other as communicative base and intelligibility of the world, *ie*, taking into account the communicative interaction between the subjectivity of how to measure supplementing the possibilities of communication and action (communicative action), and still , what they "share in common cognitively" (Schutz,2012 , p.346).

4 METHODOLOGICAL RESEARCH ITINERARIES

The way of thinking and acting is a reflection of the scientific paradigm adopted. As a set of modular representations, is contribution of knowledge and if it does identify the characteristic form as the judgments dealing with him, and as a guide to actions and beliefs (LYOTARD, 2008), (BECKER 2002).

Accordingly, the character of this research is qualitative approach whose purpose is to engage interactively, that in many ways the processes of this dialogue with the reality in question, that to understand the conditions under which it is given and perceived as possible to be transformed through the contributions of the researcher/researched which are mutually and voluntarily, a reactive position, in its development, so, the data collected in various stages, are constantly analysed and evaluated. What would be the necessary conditions to investigate, on its ethical dimension, the "subjectivity of the subject" in front of everyday life, of belonging, of the world of labor relations, symbolic interactions, discursive and inter-subjectively shared "" (HABERMAS, 2012. p. 40), the collective meaning of the world through the social representations and discourses, where the researcher and the researched subjects, in its ethical dimension, are constantly interacting and influencing.

The methodology adopted for this work is based on the paradigms of Ethnomethodology, since as its own characteristics, "advocates a logic suitable for the study of human and social phenomena, looking for the meanings of the facts in the concrete context in which they occur."(CHIZZOTTI, 2008, p. 12). In other words she studies the career of the man, in his characteristic course, [in order to] to discern, though its nature, permeating ". (GEERTZ, 2011, 38).

At first the work was accomplished by means of bibliographical research, in order to find the best theoretical foundation researched issues. The data collection instruments used was at first a closed questionnaire, which aimed to raise the most recurrent expressions in teaching speech; then, structured interviews and questionnaires first questionnaire-based open. At the end of the survey content analyses were made based on the work of Bardin (1979) and the categorizations that these analyses enabled.

Therefore, the field research was chosen from bibliographical research and inter-retroactive (MORIN, 2003, p. 18, 30, 144, 195) influenced all the time on continuity of bibliographical research. To do this, as has been said, were applied 427 small quantitative questionnaires closed with a question that evoked four words in order of importance "which best specialized educational work". Secondly, as the largest occurrence of four words of the earlier inquiry, these were offered to respondents as interviews theme generator. This aiming, which says Rodrigues (2006, p. 169), as to the use of sampling techniques, since each element of the population should have the same chance of being chosen, ensuring the sample character of representativeness.

The subjects of the research were in all 20 teachers of municipal schools in the municipality of Delmiro Gouveia-Alagoas. These teachers were observed in the last two years, in the exercise of their profession, and these, to the extent that was possible, were also participating in the second interview written (open questionnaire developed from the first) being collected their considerations (and also about the research process itself). Despite the questions set and standardized, the respondent could write how much I wanted to about the issues presented. 10 taped interviews and tours for other teachers who did not participate in the interviews 20 written.

5 Search results: analyzing some points

Social representations, second Moscovici (2003) and Jodelet (2001), enable communication between the subjects and the intelligibility of the speeches reported formalizing senses, since she is characterized by a "rating system and denotation, allocation of categories and names", therefore not fixed. According to Moscovici, (2003, p. 62), "where each object and must have a positive or negative value and assume a certain place in a clear hierarchical scale".

Note: professor M.A.^[6], plays a professional profile meaning, that is, the speech typical of how the professor is characterized, speaks and behaves. Soon, this issue of "profile" (one of the instances of the process that establishes identification) is a way of framing the subject within certain categories to better interpret them, that is, what they are and what they are not, and yet, of how they relate. The profile is a generalization device and a concept dear to the intelligibility of the world ordered; typical keyword of modernity, in the lexicon of the great Social Theories. Corroborates the professor M.A. when he says that relative to its group and society. It should be noted:

[...] There is a whole way of being teacher's identity and to practice their professional function permanently. [...] Everything can be based on the way he behaves, how he treats students, plan, assess, teach and give up, everything is very clear and all professionals realize with ease, because they understand the same functions. There is a strong collection about all this. (M.A.).

Thus, in the face of the statement above, a human habit must be taken into consideration: "before you see and hear the person we have to judge (sic!); We've graded and created an image of it" (MOSCOVICI, 2003, p. 58), we fit the person in a given group and profile to better understand each other, so cancel its complexity in benefit of the ease of ordering, cataloging and conventionalize things, transferring them to a consensual world, circumscribed and reviewed" (*ibid.*, 2003, p. 60).

Her objectification, from the perspective of discourse analysis, is a device of regularization, standardization and control that the subjects are used to signify and take ownership of the objects once inaccessible to the senses and therefore "empty" of meanings; through the objectification there is an attempt to fix the senses of the words and images of speech and social representations

Therefore, with regard to research conducted in the course of this work, the words found in questionnaire are categories of analysis that build paradigmatic concepts that form certain profiles or when not simple slogans. These are presented here together with numbers in parentheses that indicate its repetition in the speech of the teachers interviewed, namely: "dedication" (73%), of "responsibility" (78%), "engagement" (51%), "compromise" (52%), of "professionalism" (82%), of "competence (73%) and" earnestness "(18%), which we will introduce further with the subtitle of" teaching context keywords investigated: Dedication, Responsibility, commitment, competence and Professionalism ".

These numbers represent the number of cases in which those words were chosen as teacher identity keyword to 251 teachers and professors and 176 people involved directly or indirectly with education. They had the option to choose between three words or add another that wasn't fast in the questionnaire prepared by the author of this work. On the development of this questionnaire, see the chapter on "data collection instruments" where the author describes the entire process.

It's good to remember that the authorship of a speech, according to certain scientific rules, that is, where they come, give real status. Foucault tells us "the speeches and status and function of real discourses. In the West, it is the scientific discourse ". (FOUCAULT, 2008b, p. 258). Beyond that, it was observed that the teachers have full autonomy and conditions of scientific theories about his speeches. But there are also more common types to think these speeches. See, e.g., testimony of a teacher interviewed:

[...] When concludes my degree [...] those all theories and schools of thought with its many authors have helped me a lot in order to see better the field of education. And this is reflected in my work, in my contribution and benefits achieved for me and for everyone. (A.B.).

This gives us part of the clarification necessary to trace contra-discursive actions that affirm the

teaching profession in the perspective of autonomy, emancipation, inclusion and multiculturalizada freedom to speak and think. In other words, and still according to Foucault (2002, p. 10), the speech "is not simply what translates the fights or the systems of domination, but what that fight, the power of which we want to take over". So, even though the conditions of production of speech if effect through the cultural position of the subject of the privileged speech these conditions do not cease to be available to subjects which enable to speech said "hegemonic", because,

[...] our class, education workers, should be above all engaged to claim everything you long for and that we are sure they are ideal for the common good of the school and society. It's our word against theirs: the truth will prevail and the society as a whole will support us, because the bonus is for her too. (J.U.S.). [7]

For the second interview, we take as inductive expressions four key words most frequent in the first questionnaire. Each of these words evoked specific meanings and images (socio-affectives, politicians, for example) according to the "identification" that those involved have with them. This happens by means of conceptual meanings they give to these words; social relations they denote and connote, in the vices of conceptual meaning individuals "reproduce" them. These are constructed in school and specialize during subsequent training. Because, these possibilities grading lexical meaning of a word is also where they reveal the possibilities for positive social representations school, that to promote their social and significant immediate and subsequent needs.

These keywords serve as social representations that anchor senses translated into discourses through slogan, "concept" or general idea of these keywords . Here are the results of free recall these words from the question " expressions which characterize the work of the teacher ," namely , professionalism (82 %) , responsibility (78 %) , Skill (72 %) , Dedication (73 %) and Commitment (52 %) and engagement (51 %) .

The occurrence of the term responsibility (78%), in the situation where outside raised (the General Assembly of the SINTEAL- *Sindicato dos Trabalhadores em Educação Alagoas*), can be an indication of reproduction of a neoliberal discourse (SANTOMÉ, 2003; GENTILI & SILVA; 2010) that uses morals to justify in their speeches that social work faculty representation.

The professionalism is also a qualitative and quantitative aspect of the work of the teacher through the teaching-learning process and aggregate the assignments he roughly: Do school planning, daily fill, attend parent-teacher meetings, School Board meetings, the elaboration of the *Political Pedagogic Project*, lectures, projects and their "apogee", and even of visitations to the home stay of pupils; It wasn't clear the concept of professionalism, except when associated with emancipation and economic autonomy of teachers and students, such as "integration into the labor market" (m. a.), because the professional education "should contribute to the formation of the citizen, with main objective in education for life and work" (j. j. a.).

"Professionalism" is nexted the work in perspective in that it happens currently in our society. Here, it is important to make the distinction between concept and slogan. Concept is an abstract theoretical conception that seeks to define the observed reality or own idealized and things abstract, always based on a distinctive paradigm.

Commitment is the term given to an attitude that always refreshes in pursuit of professional excellence in the face of the challenges that present themselves every day. This attitude always thought and rethought, in motion, will the name of commitment. (A.B.).

A conceptual differentiation between commitment and responsibility, which seeks to transcend that slogan of bureaucratic responsibility as task fulfillment, hierarchical obedience and without criticism, attendance and punctuality, so-only. Commitment, in turn, before her, part of the reflection of the actions that are punctuated by the responsibility. This last is the reply from the commitment to what mobilizes. (etymologically means responsible attitude to respond, give answers to certain action). The "objective reality of his work", being negative, for example, does not interrupt the commitment required

for positive change this reality.

[...] because I feel a teacher committed, even if some don't show as well; just that I fulfill my role within a logic of do the right thing. [...] I particularly am doing my job, because the teacher willy nilly has the power to change the reality of the classroom and society. It is a work of ants and, every now and then when we got there. (G.R.M.).

In observations and experiences experienced in field work, we are convinced that pedagogical practices, in fact, not to stagnate for all those who seek, on a day-to-day basis, update concepts and practices of teacher-learner autonomy in the face of the issues facing consciously, and that, based on new paradigms professionals more consistent with the desire to make education and resign the knowledge, knowledge and skills.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is impossible to experience the education without search. This constant search for ways of theoretical connection with the reality of everyday life is a matter of language that it appropriates the world, but he builds meanings.

Thus, observations of teaching practices carried out in this study were very satisfactory, in relations of empathy and appreciation of the other, otherness. The hearing and the transcript of speeches, reports of social representations; the observation of groups of friendship where the teacher wanted to be together, demonstrated that social groups embrace a cause more by affection for each other than for guiding goals and guidelines of the group. There is still a strong agreement among teachers, moved by the desire to preserve the virtues of their craft. Teachers don't work anyway, there are many aspects of competence and reflection even in the face of the problem which faces education in contemporary times. In these cases the social representations facilitate the interweaving between common sense and scientific knowledge, in addition to the binary perspectives, that in the everyday experiences of signification and reorientation of teaching practices. This opens up a range of possible actions/thoughts of professor for Betterment of their autonomy and even appreciation of various speeches and multicultural practices, as ethnic culture and politics, in the face of otherness and appreciation of the other.

The expressions in the polls and raised here defined (responsibility, commitment, dedication, commitment, competence, professionalism and seriousness) allowed us to recognize recurrent and specific social representations, from each one of them, because they showed be a sort of core speech characteristic in their argumentative consistency.

The reflection is made here in parallel to research categories of analysis (professionalism, dedication, engagement, responsibility and commitment), took place in the context of paradigms that are aimed at transposing the idea of perennial hegemony which nullifies or handles the possibilities of autonomy and emancipation of the school. Such reflection is the proposal to that effect, (teaching practices of the author and of all those who in this work can get some inspiration) through the support of education and the development of research that will bring about the topic, by author.

Therefore, the question of how to "see" is that can determine the strokes and itineraries of lives, because it is through language that we interact with each other and with the everyday world, through the social representations and discourses, and these facilitate our intelligibility and orient our being, how much more about them we have authorship.

Therefore, it is pertinent to state that the school continues showing your chances; the place where autonomy is built through the reconceptualize of the world, in language that translates; and she only has validity in motion, when donor senses intentional meeting with life; its language feature – in addition to the emancipating pedagogies, as is representation of the dynamics of the world presents when you let us participate in their meanings. Thus, the school's reconstruction of space senses (including herself), insofar as it is a place where knowledge and know-how can be experienced as the static dimension of reality.

REFERENCES

- 1.ADORNO, Theodor. Dialética Negativa. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2009. 2.BARDIN, Laurence. Análise de Conteúdo. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1979. 3.BECKER, Fernando. Epistemologia do Professor. 10. ed., Petrópolis: Vozes, 2002.
- 4.BOURDIEU & PASSERON, Pierre e Jean-Claude. A Reprodução. 2. ed., Petrópolis: Vozes, 2009. pp.31-32,
- 5._____. A Economia das Trocas Simbólicas. 7. ed., São Paulo: Prespectiva, 2011.
- 6.CHARAUDEAU, Patrick e MAINGUENEAU, Dominique. Dicionário de Análise do Discurso. São Paulo: Contexto, 2008.
- 7.CHARAUDEAU, Patrick. Linguagem e Discurso. São Paulo: Contexto, 2012.
- 8.CHIZZOTTI, Antônio. Pesquisa em Ciências Humanas e Sociais. 9. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2008. 9.COULON, Alain. L'ethnométhodologie. 5. ed. Paris: PUF, 2007.
- 10.DERRIDA, Jacques. A Escritura e a Diferença. 4. ed. São Paulo: Perspectiva: 2011. 11._____. Gramatologia. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2013.
- 12._____. Mal de Arquivo, São Paulo: 2. ed. Estação Liberdade, 2010
- 13.FERRATER MORA, José. Dicionário de Filosofia. 2. ed. São Paulo: Loyola, 2004/2005. 14.FOUCAULT, Michael. A ordem do Discurso. São Paulo: Loyola: 2002.
- 15._____. Arqueologia do Saber. São Paulo: Forense Universitária, 2010a. 16._____. As Palavras e as Coisas. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2007. 17._____. Microfísica do Poder. São Paulo: Graal: 2010b.
- 18._____. Segurança Território e População. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2009.
- 19._____. A Hermenêutica do Sujeito. 1. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2004.
- 20.GADAMER, Hans-Georg. Verdade e Método I. 12. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012. 21.GADOTTI, Moacir. Pedagogia da Terra. São Paulo: 2000
- 22.GARFINKEL, Harold. Studies of Etnomethodology Social. 2. ed. UK, Policity Press: 1967.
- 23.GENTILI & SILVA. Pablo A.A., Tomaz Tadeu. Neoliberalismo, Qualidade Total e Educação. 13. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes: 2010.
- 24.GEERTZ, Cliffford. A Interpretação da Cultura. Reimpressão da 1. ed. Rio de Janeiro: LTC, 2011. 25.GIROUX, Henry. Cruzando as Fronteiras do Discurso Educacional. Porto Alegre: Artmed,1999. 26._____. Radical pedagogy as cultural politics: beyond the discourse of critique and anti-utopianism In: MCLAREN, Peter. Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture - Oppositional politics in a postmodern era. London, Routledge: 1995.
- 27._____. Formação do Professor como uma Contra-Esfera Pública: A Pedagogia Radical como uma Forma de Política Cultural. In. SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da.(org.) Currículo, Cultura e Sociedade. São Paulo: Cortez, 2009.
- 28.GUBRECHT, Hans. Produção de Presença – O que o sentido não consegue transmitir. 1. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. PUC, 2010.
- 29.GUTIÉRREZ, Francisco. Educação como Práxis Política, São Paulo: Summus Editorial, 1988. 30.HABERMAS, Jürgen. O Futuro da Natureza Humana. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2010. 31.HARVEY, David. Condição Pós-Moderna. 12. ed. São Paulo: Loyola, 2011.
- 32.HABERMAS, Jürgen. Teoria do Agir Comunicativo – Racionalidade da ação e racionalização social. Vol. 1. 3. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2012.
- 33._____. O Futuro da Natureza Humana. 2. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2010.
- 34.HERNÁNDEZ, Fernando. Transgressão e Mudança na Educação. Porto Alegre: Artmed: 1998.
- 35.JODELET, D. Representações Sociais: um domínio em expansão. In: JODELET, D. (Org.) As Representações Sociais. Rio de Janeiro, Eduerj, 2001.
- 36._____. Les Représentations Sociales. Paris, PUF: 1993.
- 37.JOVCHELOVITCH, Sandra. Os Contextos do Saber – Representações, Comunidade e Cultura. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2008.
- 38.LYOTARD, Jean-Francois. A Condição Pós-Moderna. 10. ed. José Olympio Editora, Rio de Janeiro, 2008.
- 39.MAFESSOLI, Michel. Saturação. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2010a.
- 40._____. O Tempo das Tribos. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2010b

-
41. MATUTANA, Humberto. *Cognição, Ciência e Vida Cotidiana*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2001.
42. MAINGUENEAU, Dominique. *Gênese dos discursos*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2008.
43. MORIN, Edgar. *Ciência com Consciência*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2003.
44. MOREIRA & SILVA, Antônio Flávio, Tomaz Tadeu (orgs.). *Currículo, Cultura e Sociedade*. 11. ed. Cortez. São Paulo: 2009.
45. MOSCOVICI, Serge. *Representações Sociais*. 4. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes 2003.
46. ORLANDI, Eni Puccinelli. *Análise do Discurso*. 10. ed. São Paulo: Pontes, 2012.
47. _____. *As Formas de Silêncio*. 6º Ed. São Paulo: Editora UNICAMP, 2007.
48. _____. *Interpretação. Autoria, leitura e efeitos do trabalho simbólico*. Petrópolis; RJ; Vozes; 1996.
49. PÊCHEUX, Michel. *Semântica e Discurso*. 4. ed. Ed. São Paulo: UNICAMP, 2009.
50. RICOEUR, Paul. *Hermenêutica e Ideologias*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2008
51. ROSE, Nikolas. *Inventando Nossos Selfs – psicologia, poder e subjetividade*. 1. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011.
52. SANTOMÉ, Jurjo Torres. *A Educação em Tempos de Neoliberalismo*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2003.
53. SEVERINO, Antônio Joaquim. *Metodologia do Trabalho Científico*. 23. ed. São Paulo: Cortez. 2012.
54. SILVA & MOREIRA, Tomaz Tadeu da e Antônio Flávio.(org.) *Liberdades Reguladas*. Petrópolis: Vozes. 1999.
55. SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da.(org.) *Currículo, Cultura e Sociedade*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2009.