



Educação & Realidade

ISSN: 0100-3143

ISSN: 2175-6236

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul - Faculdade de Educação

Dias, Rosimeri Oliveira; Costa, Eduardo Antonio De Pontes
Modos Autogestionários e Pistas Investigativas na Formação de Professores
Educação & Realidade, vol. 47, e117549, 2022
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul - Faculdade de Educação

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-6236117549vs01>

Available in: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=317272515042>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's webpage in redalyc.org

UFRGS
redalyc.org

Scientific Information System Redalyc
Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America and the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal

Project academic non-profit, developed under the open access initiative

Self-Managed Modes and Investigative Clues in Teacher Formation

Rosimeri Oliveira Diasⁱ
Eduardo Antonio De Pontes Costaⁱⁱ

ⁱUniversidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro/RJ – Brazil

ⁱⁱUniversidade Federal da Paraíba (UFPB), João Pessoa/PB – Brazil

ABSTRACT – Self-Managed Modes and Investigative Clues in Teacher Formation. The paper discusses the importance of self-management modes that are woven into the relationship between research practices considered problematizing and the field of inventive formation, together with Basic Education teachers. Operator-concepts, ethical-aesthetic-political, support theoretical and empirical work and think about what is produced in formation practices. Such operator-concepts polemicize the domain of the notion of subject, produced by the dichotomous Cartesian scene, generating investigative clues created by gestures, practices, and knowledge within the experience of forming teachers through the perspective of invention. Thus, it seeks to potentiate forms of resistance and counter-hegemonic modes that singularize the paths of teacher formation.

Keywords: Research Intervention. Production of Subjectivity. Self-Management. Institutional Analysis.

RESUMO – Modos Autogestionários e Pistas Investigativas na Formação de Professores. O artigo discute a importância de modos autogestionários tecidos na relação entre as práticas de pesquisa consideradas problematizadoras e o campo da formação inventiva, junto aos professores da Educação Básica. Há conceitos-operadores, ético-estético-políticos, que sustentam o trabalho teórico e empírico, para pensar sobre o que se produz nas práticas de formação. Tais conceitos-operadores polemizam o domínio da noção de sujeito, produzido pela cena dicotômica cartesiana, gerando pistas investigativas criadas por gestos, práticas e saberes, com a experiência de formar professores perspectivada pela invenção. Busca, assim, potencializar resistências e modos contra hegemônicos que singularizam caminhos de formar professores.

Palavras-chave: Pesquisa Intervenção. Produção de Subjetividade. Autogestão. Análise Institucional.

Introduction

The training of teachers¹, thematized by varied theoretical currents (Barros, 2005; Dias, 2011), is based on two plans of force, clearly identifiable by a linear sphere of time in the history of Brazilian education. From a macropolitics perspective, there is a line of force named “classical”, which is the guider of the conservative discourse of traditional pedagogy, in which the subject is determined by the effect of discursivity based on the mode of teaching and learning/apprehending, considered normative and unquestionable (objective dimension) and producers of truths (subjective dimension). The second plan, from a micropolitics perspective, introduces lines of force named “progressive”, in which intervention proposals arise from the social critique of the contents, from liberating and libertarian thinking of Education, suggest a new formation aligned with collective modes of teaching that give way to invention and creation, as potent elements in the intense and dense effort of, by singularizing, finding the way to differ from what we are.

In these terms, for Barros (1997), we have macropolitics fabricating technical competence and awareness and a micropolitics movement, that brings the formation of teachers as the creation and production of different subjectivities.

We start from the understanding that each line of force or thinking presents a field of knowledge associated and claimed by it, as a bundle of discourses, rules and relationships, disputes, based on its theories and social practices. In this process, the formation, therefore, produces discursivity, subjects and realities.

Considering these modes of assemblages as producers of discursivity, and recognizing that we are affected by these lines of thoughts, we begin from the idea and the bet – understood as ways of experimentation of a non-linear time – of a permanent exercise of “thinking” the formation and ourselves.

From this angle, we propose in the present text, as an interlocutory scene², to speak of a line of thought that puts in evidence (that makes us see and speak) an inventive formation of teachers (Dias; Rodrigues, 2020; Dias, 2012; 2019), dialogued with the ethical-aesthetic and political paradigm (Guattari, 1992) to think about formative practices. In this sense, intending to problematize the social production of existence, or even what we call subjectivity as production, means to deconstruct, therefore, the notion of an individual, so dear to Cartesian logic and to the ways in which the modern world works, especially when our field of intervention is that of teacher formation.

In this way, and affected by these paths, we proceed with what we consider as the driving questions: 1. Of which research are we talking about in the sphere of modern and positive scientific thinking? 2. Resisting the logic of the subject that is constituted only in scientific data, according to Deleuze's (2001, p. 94) criticism of empiricism and subjectivity, and understanding that our actions are also producers of relations and effects of force, how to operate a mode of research that pro-

duces thought for the field of teacher education? 3. How to think about life or of our jobs in formation through the micropolitics of everyday life? 4) What are the clues forged by these meetings between professors, trainers and researchers from different regions of our country?

To think about these and other questions, the article is divided in three moments, namely: school and formative processes; formation and research; and, finally, inventive formation and experience. Such moments are forged as a self-management gesture (Lourau, 1993) of the meeting between two professors from public universities, to think about and produce training and some clues that link researching-forming-inventing.

School and Formative Processes

Between formative processes and school, our web connects states and regions of a country with continental dimensions to make us go through northeast and southeast in order to think about clues and self-management practices. And as Lourau (1993, p. 14) tells us: we operate under heteromanagement; that is, we are managed by others and, generally, we experience heteromanagement as something natural. Self-management we don't know, for it is always under construction. There's a paradoxical dimension in this, in the existence of self-management, because, the self-management that exists takes place within the realm of heteromanagement.

We are public university professors forging a nomadic writing: in a word, forging delicate and firm paths of a peasant woman, as suggested by Clarice Lispector (2004). School and formative processes woven in the meetings with teachers – and producers of new questions – allow us to stress the normatized sayings in pedagogical practices, in the sense of analyzing the purpose in education, that indicates other records of references likely to producing consistency in the face of the unusual, the vibrating time, to “[...] affirm, in the formative paths, the variability of moments, the forms of appropriation of knowledge over time and the work of renormatization that is typical of men”, as Barros (2005, p. 75) emphasizes.

The “variability of moments” can evoke in us a tensioning view at the normatized sayings in pedagogical practices and seeks to promote ruptures in the face of the discursive and non-discursive practices that are applied by the teacher formation institution. In these ways of thinking, being and acting, accessed by micropolitics of desire, self-management or self-management modes allow us to pose new questions (other analyses) of the process of invention in the face of established management models, bureaucratized and crystallized in school spaces (Lourau, 1993; Ardoino; Lourau, 2003). In a certain dimension, taking teacher formation as an analyzer means operating as well, and here we are borrowing the concept of analyzer formulated by Félix Guattari (1992, p. 187), gears in the spaces instituted to “free ourselves from seri-

ality”, and activate an ethic and an aestecthic of existence in the face of what seems not to allow the “variability of moments”, and, in a certain way, the unpredictability of a libertarian life.

From this perspective, in the subtlety of the capture and as an expression of the production of subjectivity (Dias, 2014), there’s a theoretical investment that underlies a set of prescriptions or norms based on guidelines and curricular references for teacher formation; this set of prescriptions aligned – it cannot nor should be ignored – with the production processes that are in course in the working world, by technological innovations, by the media and digital education languages.

As codes of conduct, these same prescriptions or norms lead us to an understanding of formation that is not limited to discussing different modes of transmission of knowledge or the methods that produce these processes, according to Barros (2005), but, fundamentally, to put into practice a way of thinking about formation, displacing it from previously codified, stratified and instituted territories in school spaces. In this sense, the author proposes, in the face of these questions, to problematize “[...] these modes from their foundations and products, because there are always political-ethical assumptions based on the will to make part of the cultural heritage of a generation pass through the other, from one person to another” (Barros, 2005, p. 74).

Such intervention and analysis proposal has important implications not only for comprehending the teacher formative processes, but also for questioning what we are doing with our pedagogical practices. And because of the set of prescriptions or norms, from the perspective of the will to say-do, which is given by the transmission of values and norms that were edited and petrified by a “cultural heritage”, the tradition of individual and nature does not break, therefore, with the notion of consciousness linked to Western thought. In this way, *individual* refers to undivided, essence, human nature, something that takes subjectivity as a synonym of subjective, as opposed to objective, or a “fact”, as Deleuze (2006) says.

By effect, school and formation, transversalized by this logic, present themselves dichotomized in man versus world, teacher who teaches versus receptive student, a school inhabited by different subjectivities, each one bringing “in itself” its narratives, its conditions of existence, its dilemmas and challenges. The classifications, based on watchwords, fabricate modes of subjectivation, modes of submission, of all orders in the spaces of the classroom. In this context of norms, students, in the condition of subject-form, breathe polarizations: is it a too slow or too accelerated mode? Apathetic or violent? Adequate or inappropriate? How to diagnose it?

In the composition between school and formation, it is fixated, in this field of sayability, the linearity of a certain presenteeism whose dilemma on the Education plateau, or, even better, in the desire to say-do from the school, Education professionals, concerned with paying attention to each one, affirm the model that serves as an evaluative sieve of

what goes on in the conscience “of people”. It relates, actually, to what people lack when facing the standard. In this cadence of, apparently, “a single note”, we deal with a school and a formation that are fragmented into isolated units, as it is proposed in textbooks, being itself isolated from the network of public institutions with which it should make alliances and, above all, produce ruptures in the face of the fragmentation of subjects and knowledge.

This “fragmentation” follows a route, and, respecting the circumscribed spaces of appropriation, very close to that of Deleuze (2006, p. 23), when he examines the Ontology of Sense, in Jean Hyppolite. Deleuze goes on to say that anthropology, the object of Jean Hyppolite’s criticism, wants to be a discourse “about” man – that is, it presupposes the empirical discourse of man, in which “[...] the one who speaks and that of which one speaks are separated. [...]”. As evidence, therefore, it is established, in Western thought, the idea of “compartmentalized” knowledge.

External to the subjects and ourselves, these fields of knowledge operate, producing a truth to the other about the “self-awareness”, producing a life inscribed and marked by the truths of the other, by the narrative of the eternal return of the “same.” In this sense, and in terms of knowledge and practices, and as the subject of what is “enunciable”, we have, on the one hand, the individual of reflection and, on the other, the being (Deleuze, 2006). In the face of these structuring effects, such an approach makes it challenging to analyze the modes of institutional functioning and their effects, that is, the subjects taken as singularized forms in the mixtures of socio-political-economic-cultural conditions. Analyzing the traditions, practices, prescriptive models, etc., refers to the problem of “experts,” habituated “researchers,” and their corresponding political and discursive field of intervention. Effectively, and questioning these intervention modes, teacher formation is thought through reconnecting with other forces and eliminating dichotomies and subject/object polarizations. “Reconnecting with other forces” in the capillary networks of power, so that these same forces can produce other universes of reference, singularizing us in the face of the gears of instituted spaces, is what Guattari emphasizes (1992, p. 202).

We know that, traditionally, the notion of subject to philosophy and human sciences is something found as an *être-là* (being there), possessing a supposed essence or nature. What we intend is to try to forge other ways of operating in the formative processes of teachers who are not imprisoned in a fatalistic, eternal dimension, positioning us in a micropolitical dimension of formation.

In what senses do we perceive teacher formation in a micropolitical stance? Why do we problematize and divert them from macropolitical practices? There is a lot to ask when one wants to bring formative processes closer to the school. In particular, our emphasis is intensified in circumstances, when these are not thought of by those who build the day to day of the classroom, leaving teaching to one side and learning

to the other. We understand that micropolitics are an exercise that can only be done by and with those involved in the situations.

Félix Guattari and Suely Rolnik (2000), through micropolitical analyses, intend to escape this binary logic that was determined from successive individualizations, from fragmenting totalizations presupposed “in itself”, suggesting traces, footprints, movements, clues. The power to act pinches life in the middle, in between people, people and things, that is, as a movement in a permanent productive tension by multiple forces, multiple intensities (Deleuze; Guattari, 1996).

These questions, therefore, unfold and lead us to readings of our implications that, in micropolitics, refer to a field notion that is not invisible, after all, *what has not yet been thought isn't less real*. The proposal is to risk expanding a certain field of analysis and intervention. In this way, we direct our focus to the intensities that are produced between people, in the collective formation of desire, understanding desire as a force, as a potency that not only affirms life, but expands it. We can affirm, then, that by borrowing the notion of desiring-machines, formulated by Deleuze and Guattari (2011, p. 61-62), that, in the collective formation of desire, which links school and teacher formation,

In desiring-machines everything functions at the same time, but amid hiatuses and ruptures, breakdowns and failures, stalling and short circuits, distances and fragmentations, within a sum that never succeeds in bringing its various parts together so as to form a whole. That is because the breaks in the process are productive, and are reassemblies in and of themselves. [...].

From this perspective, the school and the formation cease to be a set of problem cases (an approach that speaks in it's nature, of people) to constitute a socially produced field of forces that manifests itself in different ways and that we can approach through the collective analysis of the habits, the naturalization of events, the centralized and vertical organization of the education system. The school and the formation are seen, then, as a network of intensities of collective implication that can invest in routine, mainly through lament, as well as it can agency forms of resistance, of fighting, building other ways of institutional life.

In this line of thought, Barros (1997) believes that forming education professionals implies dialogues of knowledge and social practices, a permanent learning. That also means highlighting the bet that the author proposes, placing formation as a project of invention, production, and not discovery. There is no formation. There is a formation process, from which we relate to the Brazilian socio-political reality, in the sense of reflecting on advances and limitations for the educational field. Such investment reaffirms the articulations in the micropolitics plane – and, at the same time, calls our attention to them.

For Guattari e Rolnik (2000, p. 132), the micropolitical analysis is situated at the intersection between different ways of apprehending a problem. They also warn that these modes “[...] are not just two: there

will always be a multiplicity, as there is no subjectivity on one side and, on the other, the material social reality [...]”. And even more, “[...] it is in these agencies that it is convenient to appreciate what are the articulations between the different levels of subjectivation and the different levels of relation of molar forces. [...]”.

Perhaps, at this point, in order to affirm the ways in which we have been working on formation and in articulating with the basic school, it is necessary to reposition formation in the sphere of the singular relationships that inhabit us, form us and transform us. This would be one of the first clues in composition, made by two university professors who take their formation and intend it, collectively, to singularize routes and paths to be explored: linking formation-deformation-transformation to map the gaps and operate within them and with them and others.

Formation and Research

In this section, we venture to think of the relationship between formation and research as a path that does not produce forms of subjugation, of imprisonment. Producing lines of thought or self-management modes in school spaces is, of course, being able to speak of a “collective agency of enunciation”, produced in our research practices with public school teachers (Dias, 2012; Dias; Rodrigues, 2019; Dias, 2019). It is from these relations of forces that we question: what research are we talking about in the sphere of modern, positive scientific thinking? Resisting the logic of the subject constituted only in scientific data, according to Deleuze’s (2001, p. 94) criticism of empiricism and subjectivity, and understanding that our actions also produce relations of force effects, how to operate a mode of research that produces thought for the field of teacher formation?

It seems to us that the analytical question of Barros (1997) is fundamental when it poses the following question: a. How to think about formation processes that aren’t tied to specialists, to the technicality of education, and that seek to maintain and naturalize what is “specifically” pedagogical of what is “specifically” political? We understand that this process happens through the denaturalization of aseptic places of knowledge and of specialists; in the search for different ways of learning what is “real”, by different subjects and, therefore, in constant movement; in the understanding of where the observing-doing of the trainee and the educator is not neutral, but implied (Lourau, 1993).

In this way, thinking about the relationship between formation and research is being able to think of it as a space of resilience, a place of invention and creation of other ways of affirming an immanent life. In this territory of affections and percepts, our way of thinking about this relationship does not represent seeking meanings of an object to be investigated.

For this, we exercise a fundamental critique, a ‘negative’ aspect, which requires: emancipating the thinking ex-

ercise from the logical model of truth; denouncing the doxological matrix of this model, that is, denouncing the tracing of the limiting form of common sense that is determined as rational [...] (Tadeu; Corazza; Zordan, 2004, p. 64).

By this way of composition, we activate a sensitive view of producing knowledge, whose *formation* syntagma, based on Barros's considerations (1997), assumes a theoretical-political analytical focus. This approach expresses ways of questioning and description that inquire the universalizations, totalizations and naturalizations and, at the same time, resist the logic of hermeneutic thinking as a way of thinking about the different aspects of reality.

Resisting the regimes of truths, just as the orchid does not re-edit the wasp's decal, but, on the contrary, starts to compose a map with the wasp in the bosom of a rhizome (Deleuze; Guattari, 1995, p. 22), formation and research transversalize territories, mapping other geographies in the micropolitics of school spaces. Implicated and rhizomatic, they are inscribed in the fabric of a cartographic way of thinking-doing that allows us to question the processes of subjectivation that "cut" the field of formation for the teaching of Basic Education.

In this scenario, the research practices, as analytical of "displacements" as stated by Deleuze (1997) are not confused with the origin of the facts sought about life, determined by a self-consciousness. Escaping the modes that seek to decipher the effects of teacher formation, we bring to the scene traces of "desiring maps" through the eyes of the micropolitics of meetings.

In the irruption of a body-experiment, and establishing a parallel with the becoming-child challenged with the game of "pick-up sticks", we appropriate this game by grabbing the notion of bundle produced by the sticks. As they're dropped at random onto a surface, the becoming-child is challenged to put in evidence a body-balance, a body-concentrated. Leaving the shackles of a certain psychologism and pedagogism, theoretical correspondents of this playful field, our research practices, intertwined with affections and percepts, do not start to compose something, as a "bundle of sticks", let's say, but set a body-experiment that allows us to produce other ways of feeling – of vibrating, of touching – the variations that expand sayings and actions through the perspective of cartographic research.

In the research-intervention with its cartographic modes, as well as in maps, desires move, envelop, in anguish, fear, in the un/certainty of the event, in the gaze that moves as "[...] in a machine of strangeness que has the desert as location [...]" (Deleuze; Guattari, 2011, p. 255). In this "diagonal" movement, we bet on narratives in permanent tension with the teachers' speeches, because, here, it is important to reaffirm, with Deleuze and Guattari, that the expression is what gives the procedure. In this sense, Rolnik (2011, p. 51) considers "anguish" as production, as a potency of acting in the Spinozian sense, that is, "This anguish generates an attempt, always restarted, to abolish ambiguity. This is

what will define the different strategies of desire. [...] You can say that this anguish is the energy of the source of worlds”.

Passos and Barros (2012, p. 17) tend to consider that “[...] object, subject and knowledge are co-emerging effects of the research process”. In this direction, they understand cartographic research as an intervention-research method, a concept theorized by René Lourau (1993).

For this author, the intervention-research constitutes as political action and enables an analysis of institutional daily life, in the sense of producing other analyses, new practices. And as a process of permanent production of new modes of existence, according to Lourau (1993), it seeks to analyze, among some fields of knowledge, the instituted place of Psychology and Education, allowing the activation of triggers in school spaces determined by measurements, evaluations, prescriptions and modelations in the pedagogical say-do will. In this plan of approximation with the field, moving the “figure of the analyst to one of [sic] event”, as suggested by Aguiar and Rocha (2007, p. 656), is to produce a mode of researching that is not confused with the “Cartesian” view of research or “researcher-interpreter”.

Researching the virtual or non-historical part of the Event implies, therefore, in treating concepts as events and not as general notions, as singularities and not as universals, not to determine what a thing is (essence), but by the circumstances of it: in which cases, where and when, how etc.? (Tomaz; Corazza; Zordan, 2004, p. 67).

The ways which we “risk” other methodological paths allow us to affirm that the public dimension in education is associated with the constitution of a common plan, a heterogeneous-common one, implied with the constitution of a world that contains differences. By making a “common” in education, we weave a double sense of sharing and belonging, as already pointed out by Kastrup, Passos and Tedesco (2008). It is an aesthetic and political bet to think about the importance of the ways of executing teacher formation that can establish different ways of being in university.

What we mean is that, by linking formation and research, our desire is to expand modes of research that reposition teacher and student in a space of transformation in their own workplace. In this sense, it is possible to say that, in order to form while putting in perspective research practices in the daily activity of teaching, it is not necessary to know first to then transform. There are, however, a series of analysis and intervention tools that open a potency field to forge a path of transformation and knowledge, as Cecília Coimbra³ (apud Rocha; Aguiar, 2003) has already stated. In these terms, the second clue links formation and knowledge to expand our practices and forge a policy of cognition that operates through devices and opens itself to the invention of oneself and of worlds (Kastrup; Tedesco; Passos, 2008; Dias, 2011). A clue that seeks to make people see and speak that knowing and formation involve a position in relation to the world and to oneself, an attitude, an *ethos*.

Inventive Formation and Experience

Teachers' inventive formation (Dias, 2012) as a problematization that contemplates, at the same time, constancies and mutations, can, perhaps, be constituted as a key-idea for our path. The formation to which we refer does not come from laws and/or constituent norms: it is inscribed in the very lives of students and teachers.

What would be, exactly, to think and do a formation through the terms of invention? What meanings are possible to express when we take invention as a way of being/doing in university? How to think of an unaccommodated way of being in school, in university and in formation?

There are authors who view formation as *giving shape*, what can be considered, then, as a level of reality that translates into lived experience, understood as a closed totality, as a predictable system, since stable, linear, in which the future, contained in the present, is determined by the past. However, there are authors who will defend that formation is not just that, that is, that we can deform, transform ourselves. They view the notion of formation as a rupture, as an inquiry, affirming an open, multi-referenced system, that is, with many access routes for its understanding, a system that organizes itself with each movement, which varies according to the circumstances, excavating the present, making it last. If, in the first dimension of formation, time does not pass, in this second, to quote Cazusa, "time does not stop"!

In short, teachers' inventive formation is thought as a paradox (inside/outside at the same time), stating that history is inscribed in the present, in the different intensities that provoke the routine that apparently had been unfolding in a balanced way. This sense also shows that the small ruptures, which are not always lost, at a given moment start to modulate the movement of our lives differently, the movement of collectives, the movements of society and that it is necessary to make the time last, as to enable the analysis and production of new outputs. This is the enhancing path of the teacher, of the organization and the fight for public production that includes the common and other ways of forming, doing, inventing oneself and the world.

To continue our trajectory, we can affirm that creative formation moves in experience. Here is another fundamental concept to delve into micropolitics. Experience is what tensions the false, provisional judgment, the overgeneralizations, being incompatible with a certain utilitarianism, that is so present in neoliberal times, since living experiences creates conflicts, not confirming expectations, wrinkling, pleating a formation that seemed linear, evolutionary in its causes and effects. Jorge Larrosa (2014) says that experience is what touches us, happens to us, is what reverberates in subjects, it is not what happens, but what affects us, if we prefer Espinoza, with Espinoza by Deleuze. Michel Foucault (2010) tells us that experience is something that makes us come out transformed. This means that experience implies duration of time – duration in us, intensifying the present through affection. Time,

therefore, does not pass in a linear and expected way in the past, present, future order, but it is inventive, intensive, as it makes mixtures and operates change. Virginia Kastrup (2008) states that the experience circumscribes the variations that were woven in the course of daily work to make cognition policies emerge. The policies subjectivize, they are ways of doing and being at the same time.

And the notion of subjectivity enters the scene and it is important to intertwine it in what we have been discussing.

Inventive formation is a paradox and it is constituted by/in the practices in which values, principles and possible ways of being/doing/thinking of a time in society are present, evidencing that, beyond reproducers of the hegemonic scientific paradigm, we live experiences and manage singular forms of producing actions, concepts, ways of educating, social practices and conversations that create space-times of openness to support the emerging experience of encounters with others.

It is important to point out that the notions of society and history considered here are not an external totality in which we insert ourselves, building an identity; we are not a seed thrown into the social soil to germinate from liberating or repressive exchanges. What we mean is that man and environment, the social and the psyche are not two separate things. This binary was produced in the western philosophical tradition, producer of the form-subjectivity we call the individual, a result of overvaluation of the subject of Cartesian rationalism, in which subjectivity presents itself at the same time as universal (human nature) and as internalized (part x whole).

Returning to the micropolitical perspective, we want to emphasize that, in the analysis of desire formation, the emphasis is not placed on the ends of these poles (subject x subject, subject x object, man x society), but found *in-between*, where lives are singularized by the mixtures of conditions, circumstances, intensities of affections, in the encounters we have with people, things, ways of doing and meeting.

The *in-between* we talk about here is a challenge brought by the shifting of the “about”, the “with”, the “in”, to move between school and university with no previous script, but with a lot of questions. To point out the senses and not the pencils, to avoid the records accuracy and better feel what goes on between university and school. *In-between* isn’t simply a naive term or a preposition that indicates the space from one place to another. It is essential as it indicates a relationship formed at the intersection of different territories: school and formation, close but also distant, although having the production of knowledge as an object. Its dimensions, times, modes of functioning are constituted in similar and different ways. *In-between*, they resemble and distance themselves.

Many of us have already experienced these territories in different ways, as students and teachers and managers and researchers and interns, and, and, and... We emphasize that the work of inventive formation is with the school, outside the dichotomous dimension that separates subject and object, school and university, to learn or not to

learn, to produce or apprehend knowledge etc. Being *in-between* doesn't allow the use "or this or that", "or" that excludes, nor of "and" as a sum of overlapping elements, but speaks of an "and" that is the meaning of becoming another.

Teacher formation can gain consistency through the experience that provokes thought, leading us to create the time that produces new concepts basing our practices on its singularity – each one of us is a unique way of expressing the multiplicity that makes up the field of forces we call social; we are a social bend, a permanent bending/unbending, we're a singularized social, built through a life of experiences, potentiated, or not, by the intensive encounters (again, we aren't speaking about relations, but on a plane of affection, in between).

What we want to affirm is that existence is delimited at the intersection of different vectors of subjectivation and this, according to Felix Guattari and Suely Rolnik (2000), says less about identity (fixed and stable form) and more about singularity, modulations in the ways of being/living. Thus, the concept of subjectivity is less marked by an identifying mark than by the ways of reacting to different situations, by the variation of forms that it can assume in different circumstances. This does not mean that there are no chronifications amidst the hegemonic forces of a time, of a society. We are also characters: "the good teacher", "the woman", "the hyperactive", "the mother", "the intern"... an infinity of "the", definer article of the successive cuts already made in our culture, in our society, but we are also forces in tension – more or less, depending on the situation and how much it defies the consistency of our shells, of our armor, making, as Rolnik (2011) says, the body vibrate. Teacher or learner? It depends on the situations and questions that make up our experiences, each moment bringing us more or less closer to teaching or learning. So, teacher *or* learner: we would say both, that is, teacher and learner – this is the existence that takes place between the extremities.

Guattari and Rolnik (2000) evidence that singularity is an existential concept while identity is a concept of a circumscribing of reality to frames of reference. Maybe, with an existential dimension, it is possible to affirm that a teachers' inventive formation (Dias, 2011; 2012; 2019) is an experience of producing subjectivity, with intensive, vibrating bodies and affections, which bring us closer to a micropolitics.

The question of micropolitics – that is, the question of an analysis of the formations of desire in the social sphere – concerns the way in which the level of broader social differences (which I called molar) intersects with what I called 'molecular'. Between these two levels, there is no distinctive opposition, that depends on a logical principle of contradiction. It sounds difficult, but it is necessary to simply shift the logic. In quantum physics, for example, it was necessary for physicists to one day admit that matter is both corpuscular and undulatory at the same time. Likewise, social struggles are, at the same time, molar and molecular [...] (Guattari; Rolnik, 2000, p. 127).

For this, we adopt the micropolitics bias, that means emphasizing the analysis of the circumstances in which we produce ourselves, of the modes of subjectivation, a multiplicity of molar and molecular forces in tension: molars, designated from extensive forces that take shape in the representations we know, in the cuts already carved out of chaos, such as classes, genders, family, school, profession; moleculars, called intensive forces – degree of affection, of disruptive potency of determined places, roles, functions that demarcate fixed modes of existence, that weaken the already established divisions, makes the event resonate in us, destabilization, launches us to problematizations, sensitive body...

Back to schools and to teacher formation, it means that what is initially identified as a defect of a body, a deviation of bodies, is now seen not as a cause but as an effect of a process, effects of a certain mode of production of education for which multiple forces compete, that need to gain visibility, time to analyze the collective implications with the construction of life that takes shape. From this perspective, there is no place for causal linearizations, for evolutionism, for blaming subjects, as we undo subjects in socio-political-institutional processes. This is shining a light at the processes, at the links between the subjects, because we are affected in ways of feeling and thinking, in gestures!

It is instigating to think about the paradox between fragility and potency! We ask ourselves: extensive or intensive? Molar or molecular? Such dimensions, although different, are inseparable in the organization of our existence. There isn't a world solely made of crystallized lines or of pure becoming, but it is the different states of these lines that, intricately, modulate and rearrange the cartography of a life, of a formation, of a school, of education.

With this link between the inventive formation of teachers and experiences, the third clue that takes shape, at this moment of collective writing, is favorable of implication analysis (Lourau, 1993), denaturalization, which makes a field of forces vibrate with what is constituted in the effective encounter between student and teacher, between knowing and living, between school and university, between forms and modes of constitution of the self. This means saying that the bets and clues in modes of singularization become effective in constitutive practices that allow teachers and students to make, by themselves, a certain number of cognition policies, in order to produce in them a transformation, a modification, and the achieve a certain activism of oneself towards oneself, self-managed, which would have at least one common effect, that of connecting, through meetings and conversations, ways of thinking, being, acting and living in the world, open to the self-invention. A clue that is also an invitation to adopt a way of being in the world, of inhabiting the existential territories of the school and university, and placing oneself in the relationship of knowing, refusing that it – knowing – is, supposedly, represented. We assume, therefore, that the self and the world are effects of our cognitive practice and continuous agency.

Final Considerations

With this collective composition-writing, between two professors from public universities, from different regions of Brazil, we created a close link between teacher formation, formation processes, research, invention and experience. A commitment to work that connects, at the same time, formative processes, self-management and involvement with practices of production of subjectivity at school and university. A question that encourages us to continue to affirm that forming teachers is also deforming and transforming. With this collective writing, however, we forge three clues that work in favor of what we have been doing in our formation practices.

The first clue, that connects formation-deformation-transformation, was produced as an effect of the self-managed process of working to be able to map gaps and openings and learn to operate with and in them together with others. This means to say that this clue can, perhaps, help us to constitute formative practices that are sensitive to what emerges from the encounter with a legitimate other, and to continue to affirm that forming teachers is to produce subjectivity – a rare issue in university and school spaces that need mapping and cartographies to increasingly gain visibilities and enunciations (Costa; Coimbra, 2008; Costa, 2015; Dias; Rodrigues, 2020; Barros; Cruz; Zahn, 2020).

In the link between formation and knowledge, we highlight the urgency of expanding the practices that forge policies of cognition in plural, in order to operate devices and open up to the invention of one-self and the world. This second clue, that makes us see and discuss the need of a repositioning in the field of teacher formation, accentuates that the intervention-research operates more libertarian modes of subjectivation that it can transform and get to know.

The third link – inventive formation and experience – stands in favor of practices of denaturalization of the field and can, with it, accompany formative processes open to the invention of itself and of worlds. Rare ways of working in times that are still very dogmatic, such as the postulates of the present. Assuming this position requires a reversal of the naturalized attitude, which requires, in principle, an effort. This, however, can transform, through practice, into a more libertarian attitude, an *ethos*, that repositions teacher and student to strengthen the connection between knowing-living-being-doing.

In conclusion, it is good to say again that one of the great challenges of teacher inventive formation (Dias, 2012) is to keep a problematic field alive. Therefore, we ask: how to think about teacher formation with no totality, open to difference, in a diverse world in which what is most affirmed is the production of the only world? A unique mode constituted by the construction of the individual, by the one who is not divided, who is formed as a block strengthened by standardized qualities: ready to be better quoted in the market of machines that operate in series. Machine-man in machine-school. To invent, to feel, to dream as

logics of desire is the refusal of the “best student”, “best teacher”, “best performance”, of everything that is quantified, numbered and serialized. How to make formation and school work without their individualizing pillars? How to move and make collectives operate by logics in between? How to invent life and knowledge, in institutional territories, when simplifying and reductionist logics of doing school and forming are maintained? Would it be possible to experience and give less explanatory and more problematizing classes in a time like ours, in which everything already comes ready and under a regime of control? How to escape the productivism of formation and school?

In this journey we find many resistances and oppositions, but also good intercessors that gets us out of place and force us to think. Refusals to what is instituted are felt every day, despite the massive investment in its disqualification and erasure. Management, flowchart, regiment, among other modes of framing, have been the responses to the pedagogical logic of standardization and the decline of thought, invention, and collective creation. Erasure, but also fertilization of insubordinations, both at school and in formation, that bring tension between what is not divided, the individual, and what is intertwined, composing collectives. Coercion and the engendering of new resistances. A model of pedagogical practice that requires being looked at through the aversions that point to unauthorized ways of thinking about life or, more than that, ways of affirming life. A movement that affects us, defines the in-between and with it brings us closer. We share with you some of the intercessors of an inventive formation to potentiate resistances, such as art and creation, to keep the problematic field alive and intense in territories defined by the *in-between*.

Received on 9th August 2021
Approved on 25th January 2022

Notes

- 1 This text counts on financing from Support Foundation to Research of the State of Rio de Janeiro (FAPERJ, initials in Portuguese from Brazil).
- 2 This writing inserts itself in two important challenges. The first refers to the approach to teacher education taken from another point of view, that is, of micropolitics. The second challenge, consequently, tells us about the textual production between two professors from public universities, in the northeast and southeast of our country, who work/think teacher formation in the inseparable link between living, researching and acting.
- 3 COIMBRA, Cecília Maria Bouças. Os Caminhos de Lapassade e da Análise Institucional: uma Empresa Possível. *Revista do Departamento de Psicologia da UFF*, v. 7, n. 1, p. 52-80, 1995.

References

- AGUIAR, Katia Faria de; ROCHA, Marisa Lopes da. Micropolítica e o exercício da pesquisa-intervenção: referenciais e dispositivos em análise. **Psicologia, Ciência e Profissão**, Brasília, v. 27, n. 4, p. 648-663, 2007. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-98932007000400007>. Acesso em: 29 jun. 2020.
- ARDOINO, Jacques; LOURAU, René. **As pedagogias institucionais**. Tradução de João Batista Martins e Heliana de Barros Conde Rodrigues. Rio Claro: RiMa, 2003.
- BARROS, Maria Elisabeth Barros de. Formação em Educação: serialização ou singularização? **Educação, subjetividade e poder**, Porto alegre, v. 4, n.4, p. 63-79, 1997.
- BARROS, Maria Elisabeth Barros de. Formação de professores/as e os desafios para a (re)invenção da escola. In: FERRAÇO, Carlos Eduardo (Org.). **Cotidiano escolar, formação de professores/as e currículo**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2005. P. 68-93.
- BARROS, Maria Elisabeth Barros de; CRUZ, Cristiane Bremenkamp; ZAHN, Jomar. Saúde e trabalho na educação: lutas a partir do Fórum Cosate. **Revista Mnemosine**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 16, n. 1, 2020. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.12957/mnemosine.2020.52686>. Acesso em: 19 jul. 2021.
- COSTA, Eduardo Antonio de Pontes. A pesquisa como construção coletiva: olhares em trilhas para pensar a formação continuada de professores. **Educação Unisinos**, São Leopoldo, v. 19, n. 4, set./dez. 2015. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.4013/edu.2015.193.7915>. Acesso em: 19 jul. 2021.
- COSTA, Eduardo Antonio de Pontes; COIMBRA, Cecília Maria Bouças. Nem criadores, nem criaturas: éramos todos devires na produção de diferentes saberes. **Psicologia & sociedade**, n. 20, v. 1, abr. 2008. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-71822008000100014>. Acesso em: 19 jul. 2021.
- DELEUZE, Gilles. **Crítica e Clínica**. Tradução de Peter Pál Pelbart. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1997.
- DELEUZE, Gilles. **Empirismo e subjetividade**. Ensaio sobre a natureza humana segundo Hume. Tradução de Luiz. B. L. Orlandi. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2001.
- DELEUZE, Gilles. **A ilha deserta**: e outros textos. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2006.
- DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **Mil Platôs**. Capitalismo e Esquizofrenia – Volume 1. Tradução de Aurélio Guerra Neto. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34, 1995.
- DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **Mil Platôs**. Capitalismo e Esquizofrenia – Volume 3. Tradução de Suely Rolnik. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34, 1996.
- DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **O anti-édipo**. Tradução de Luiz B. L. Orlandi. 2. Ed. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 2011.
- DIAS, Rosimeri de Oliveira. **Deslocamentos na formação de professores**: aprendizagem de adultos, experiência e políticas cognitivas. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, 2011.
- DIAS, Rosimeri de Oliveira. **Formação inventiva de professores**. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina/FAPERJ, 2012.
- DIAS, Rosimeri de Oliveira. Vida e resistência: formar professores pode ser produção de subjetividade? **Psicologia em Estudo**, Maringá, v. 19, n. 3, p. 415-426, 2014. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-73722233705>. Acesso em: 13 jul. 2021.

DIAS, Rosimeri de Oliveira. Modos de trabalhar uma formação inventiva de professores: escrita de si, arte, universidade e escola básica. In: DIAS, Rosimeri de Oliveira; RODRIGUES, Heliana de Barros Conde. **Escritas de si**: escutas, cartas e formação inventiva de professores entre universidade e escola básica. Rio de Janeiro: FAPERJ/Lamparina, 2019. P. 13-36.

DIAS, Rosimeri de Oliveira; RODRIGUES, Heliana de Barros Conde. **Escritas de si**: escutas, cartas e formação inventiva de professores entre universidade e escola básica. Rio de Janeiro: FAPERJ/Lamparina, 2019.

DIAS, Rosimeri de Oliveira; RODRIGUES, Heliana de Barros Conde. Pensamento e invenção: por uma formação outra. **Revista Mnemosine**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 16, n. 1, 2020, p. 4-32. Disponível em: <https://www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/index.php/mnemosine/article/view/52676/34293>. Acesso: 24 set. 2020.

FOUCAULT, Michel. Conversa com Michel Foucault. In: FOUCAULT, Michel. **Ditos e escritos VI**: Repensar a política. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2010. P. 289-249.

GUATTARI, Félix. **Caosmose**: um novo paradigma estético. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1992.

GUATTARI, Félix; ROLNIK, Suely. **Micropolítica**. Cartografias do Desejo. 6. Ed. Petrópolis/RJ: Vozes, 2000.

KASTRUP, Virginia. A cognição contemporânea e a aprendizagem inventiva. In: KASTRUP, Virgínia; TEDESCO, Silvia; PASSOS, Eduardo (Org.). **Políticas da cognição**. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2008. P. 93-112.

LARROSA, Jorge. **Tremores**: escritos sobre experiência. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2014.

LISPECTOR, Clarice. **Aprendendo a viver**. Rio de Janeiro: Rocco, 2004.

LOURAU, René. **Análise Institucional e Práticas de Pesquisa**. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro, 1993.

PASSOS, Eduardo; BARROS, Regina Benevides de. A cartografia como método de pesquisa-intervenção. In: PASSOS, Eduardo; KASTRUP, Virgínia; ESCÓSSIA, Liliana da (Org.). **Pistas do método da cartografia**: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2012. P. 17-31.

ROCHA, Marisa Lopes; AGUIAR, Kátia. Pesquisa intervenção e a produção de novas análises. **Psicologia Ciência e Profissão**, Brasília, v. 23, n. 4, p. 64-73, 2003. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-98932003000400010>. Acesso 23 jul 2021.

ROLNIK, Suely. **Cartografia sentimental**. Transformações contemporâneas do desejo. Porto Alegre: Sulina; UFRGS Editora, 2011.

TADEU, Tomaz; CORAZZA, Sandra; ZORDAN, Paola. **Linhas de escrita**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2004.

Rosimeri Oliveira Dias is an associate professor at the Department of Education and at the Graduate Program in Education, Formative Processes and Social Inequalities, at the Faculty of Teacher Training of São Gonçalo, Proscientist at the Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ).

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9250-1010>

E-mail: rosimeri.dias@uol.com.br

Eduardo Antonio de Pontes Costa is an associate professor at the Department of Education Methodology, at the Education Center of the Universidade Federal da Paraíba (UEPB).

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8072-1777>

E-mail: eduapcosta@gmail.com

Editor in charge: Lodenir Karnopp

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International. Available at: <<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>>.