

INSTITUTIONALIST THINKING AND SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY: UNSETTLING THE LOGICS OF EVERYDAY LIFE

Lilian Aracy Affonso Veronese¹; Adriana Marcondes Machado²

ABSTRACT

The challenge of this article is to put into perspective the dispute of institutional forces that act in everyday school life, with the aim of analyzing the work of psychologists at school and reflecting about it. The position that supports this work is based on conceptions developed by School Psychology regarding critical analyzes of the psychologist's practice in schools. We use theoretical-practical tools from the Institutional Movement as a way to access, in everyday relationships, the game of establishment the instituting and instituted forces and the effects of naturalization and normalization of the bodies that inhabit this territory. Based on a situation experienced in the school field, we will analyze some institutional forces that demonstrate the need for the school psychologist to keep on the lookout for everyday scenes in which these effects, of naturalization and normalization, are tensioned.

Keywords: school psychology; institutional analysis; psychologist performance

El Pensamiento Institucionalista y la Psicología Escolar: desasosegando las lógicas del cotidiano

RESUMEN

En este artículo tiene como desafío perspectiva la disputa de fuerzas institucionales que actúan en el cotidiano escolar con el objetivo de analizar la labor del psicólogo en la escuela y pensar sobre él. La posición que sostiene este trabajo parte de concepciones desarrolladas por la Psicología Escolar en lo que concierne el análisis crítico sobre la práctica *psí* en las escuelas. Utilizamos las herramientas teórico-práctico del Movimiento Institucionalista como forma de acceder, en las relaciones cotidianas, el juego de tesitura de las fuerzas instituyentes e instituidas y los efectos de naturalización y normalización de los cuerpos que habitan ese territorio. A partir de una situación vivida en el campo escolar, analizaremos algunas fuerzas institucionales que demuestran la necesidad del psicólogo en la escuela mantenerse a la espera de escenas cotidianas en que esos efectos, de naturalización y normalización, son tensionados.

Palabras clave: psicología escolar; análisis institucional; actuación del psicólogo

O pensamento institucionalista e a Psicologia Escolar: desassossegando as lógicas do cotidiano

RESUMO

Este artigo tem como desafio perspectivar a disputa de forças institucionais que atuam no cotidiano escolar com o objetivo de analisar o trabalho do psicólogo na escola e refletir sobre ele. A posição que sustenta este trabalho parte de concepções desenvolvidas pela Psicologia Escolar no que concerne a análises críticas sobre a prática *psi* nas escolas. Utilizamos ferramental teórico-práctico do Movimento Institucionalista como forma de acessar, nas relações cotidianas, o jogo de tessitura das forças instituintes e instituídas e os efeitos de naturalização e normalização dos corpos que habitam esse território. A partir de uma situação vivida no campo escolar, analisaremos algumas forças institucionais que demonstram a necessidade de o psicólogo na escola se manter à espreita de cenas cotidianas em que esses efeitos, de naturalização e normalização, são tensionados.

Palavras-chave: psicología escolar; análise institucional; atuação do psicólogo

¹ Universidade Nove de Julho – São Paulo – SP – Brasil; l.veronese@uni9.pro.br

² Universidade de São Paulo – São Paulo – SP – Brasil; adrimarcon@uol.com.br



"[...] there are several possible micro universes, as many as there are timelines."

(Guattari & Rolnik, 1986)

Someone who has had the experience of staying for a while, however brief, in a school, in order to observe the dynamics and relationships that take place there, was certainly affected by a diversity of actions happening at the same time, especially at the moments of entry, and exit, lunch or break: children playing, running, screaming, dancing, talking in groups or alone, adults calling, signals ringing, one falls on one side, one gets up on the other, materials on the back, on the floor, in the hands, etc. With everything that goes on in the school territory, busy with the children and adults who are there, an invitation can come surreptitiously and often captures the eye and the observation of what is seen: a certain tendency to focus on exaggerations, strangeness and the faults, naming what seems a lot or what seems little.

After a longer time at school, there is a danger of being convinced that what was named would reveal something of what was seen, leading us to the idea that we know who is the "most agitated", who "lacks politeness", who is the "most timid", who is the "led" and who is "leading", who "behaves badly" and who is "behaved well", and so on, endlessly. We are talking here, therefore, of a tendency that operates and is objectified in the school context, triggering a certain way of thinking that revolves around a measure that establishes what would be right and what would be wrong to do in this space, that is, the way suitable to be there. We get used to what we call normal and abnormal. This fact occurs almost inevitably, as it is the result of an intense gear present, also, in the schooling processes that constituted a way of understanding the school and the events that unfold there as similar to a certain idea of natural events. This naturalization is present in the way the school is organized and in the relationships that are configured in the school field and is engendered in exercises of normalized, stigmatized and meritocratic practices. This article is driven by the consideration that these ways of understanding the school are established and inhabit this context in a hegemonic way and with absolute value.

We propose, at first, to mark and clarify a position that composes our criticism in the analysis of the exercise of *psi* practice in schools in Brazil from problematization proposed in the field of School Psychology. Then, we will move on to a brief presentation of the institutionalist theoretical-practical tools in the definition of the concepts of institution, instituted and instituting, so that, finally, it is possible to use this tool to discuss a situation experienced at school, in which they are at stake the role of the psychologist and the historically

established places between students and teachers. With this path, we seek to experience a way of thinking about the school territory in its everyday multiplicity, through the articulation of some elements present in the theoretical-practical positions of School Psychology and Institutionalism.

MARKS OF THE DOINGS OF PSYCHOLOGY AT SCHOOL

We know that a conception of Psychology that frequently appears in requests and offers present in the school field is related to a way of acting that seeks to solve problems that concern the behavior of undisciplined students and with some type of difficulty in the schooling process. This conception is based on the idea that *psi* practices are characterized precisely by taking care of what teachers do not handle. In general, the interventional offers of *psi* professionals in the school were engendered in the requests of the teachers, or in a state need for the government of childhood (Lima, 2012).

For those who inhabit the neighborhood between Psychology and Education, whether concretely, in the school territory or in academic studies, it is not new that the participation of Psychology influenced, and still influences today, the conceptions about the issues that surround teachers, students and their families with regard to conflicts that emerge at school (Machado & Souza, 2010).

The technical apparatus of Psychology enters the game of analysis of school issues and problems to clarify, illuminate the issues, causes, solutions and unveil certain secrets that prevent a certain ideal of student development, shifting the analyzes to the enigmatic airs of subjectivity and psychological problems. In the words of the author Julio Groppa Aquino (2014) "it would be plausible, therefore, to admit that there is an incessant colonizing onslaught of educational practices by *psi* discourses, especially in recent decades" (p. 6). In this way, there are some important points to be rescued, not only because they mark the encounter between these two fields, but also because they culminate in practices that are concretely carried out in school today, affecting people's lives.

In the first half of the 20th century, a logic of intervention of Psychology in the school territory was formalized. At that time, equipment was instituted that operated as a public education policy, called Serviços de Higiene Mental Escolar¹ - SHME (Lima, 2012). The issues that appeared in the school were understood as a problem that could be solved by the action of a professional with specialized knowledge from the application of a technique on the individual and his psychic functioning – the personality secrets. The

¹ School Mental Hygiene Services.

understanding that prevailed had the subject as the central axis of the problem and what was previously resolved through different forms of punishment was being shifted to an understanding of therapy, cure, restitution or obtaining a “normality”. From a diagnosis of school performance, the maladjusted subjects were determined who, for this reason, should be treated, in order to adapt to what was expected of a student in the schooling process. The difficulties expressed in students with low academic performance were understood as abnormal characteristics of the subject and, for this reason, demanded treatment. The problems presented at school became, therefore, “therapeutic” (Lima, 2012). The success of the SHME intervention was verified from the modification and overcoming of the school behaviors of those considered maladjusted.

This action, which aimed at the individual dimension as a way of working with the problems demanded by the school institution and, ultimately, by the State and society, lasted as a practice, via the SHME, from the mid-1930s to the beginning of the 1970s. The configuration of the intervention took place, in this way, with the objective of solving and suppressing problems that hindered the progress of schooling and the harmony in the school routine. For that, the work needed a foundation, a pattern of adequacy that would guide the adaptation of the students to a dominant way of conceiving the school about discipline, pace of learning, apprehension of the contents, correct reading and writing and verification exams.

In this sense, the interventions intended to adjust what seemed to exceed in individuals the expectation of progress and responses for a good functioning of the classroom and the school. This logic became hegemonic in health practices that bordered on education, so that the grammar of the scientific discourse present in Psychology had a profound impact on the definition of individuals in themselves, operating on a plane of understanding of the subjects isolated from the social and political. It is, therefore, under the effect of individualization that a primacy of the comprehension of the psychological aspects is established as a way of understanding the problems that emerge from the school. Regarding the definition of decisive aspects of normality and abnormality, in Foucault’s (2001) work *Abnormals*, we find articulations that relate the strength of psychiatric knowledge in the argumentation and production of truth about the subject and its relationship with delinquency (Foucault, 2016). It is from the survey of characteristics since childhood what is configured, in terms of Foucault (2001), would be *the individual to be corrected*, demanding disciplinary domains, such as Pedagogy and Psychology.

In an attempt to break with the idea that there is something in subjects that must be repaired, adjusted

and corrected for the schooling process to work, Patto (2012), Machado (2009), Machado and Souza (2010) and Rocha (2002) formulated criticisms by explaining a conception of Psychology that contributed, and continues to contribute, massively to the responsibility of the problems of an entire institutional system in a single subject, be it the student, the teacher, the mother, the father. What was presented as the practice of the *psi* professional in relation to requests and interventions at school began to be questioned and analyzed in the reflection of theorists linked to the area of School Psychology. Not that there was a School Psychology, as well as a Hospital or Family one. This nomination, which outlines a certain area – School Psychology – created a field in which it was possible to dispute conceptions about the action of psychology in school contexts.

In the wake of the criticism of a way of thinking present in the psychologist’s performance, the main effort was to make a conception that understand the school as a multiplicity field, refusing to individualize the issues of the school, social and political context. as to blaming the subjects in which the problems manifest themselves (Eizirik, 2009). This field of knowledge of Psychology made a turn on the understanding of the school and the subjects that compose it.

Understanding and composing with reflection about the criticisms produced in the area of School Psychology invites us to problematize the psychologist’s way of doing at school: how to act from *psi* knowledge without perpetuating a logic established in everyday life? Reflecting about this issue implies including the effects produced by the practice of Psychology at school from a criticism, or even a refusal, to the maintenance of a practice that isolates the historical, political, economic and social crossings from the analysis of the entire school field.

Considering the scenario presented, the elaboration of this article is animated by the challenge of strengthening, in our analyses, the institutional movement in the orientation of the work of the psychologist in the school. For this purpose, we will use some knowledge of the theoretical current of Institutionalism.

THE INSTITUTIONALIST MOVEMENT AS INSPIRATION

The central idea present in the current of institutionalist thought, also called the Institutional Movement, is the constant search to break with totalitarian ways of thinking about human relations. According to Baremlitt (2002, p. 54), “institutionalism is the expression of a questioning of the hegemony of scientific thought as such”. It is a perspective composed of diverse theories, experiences and practices, always linked to the commitment to social transformation.

Institutional Analysis, the Operative Group technique, Institutional Psychotherapy, Institutional Pedagogy and Schizoanalysis are part of the Institutional Movement (Pereira, 2007).

Institutionalism defends the fertility of all knowledge that is presented in a practical state, that is, activities that are carried out in everyday life, according to the conception that everything is socially and historically constituted (Baremblytt, 2002; Rodrigues, 1999). This conception seeks to break with the naturalization of experiences, of the phenomena we experience and the institutions that constitute us as a society and also as individuals. By institution, it is understood a series of values, an order and several rules that can be declared concretely or not, but that, in any case, aim to govern the subjects' lives.

Due to the commitment of the authors of Institutional Analysis, the concept of institution is therefore different from other meanings that are apparently synonymous with it, such as establishment and organization (Rossi & Passos, 2014). The institution is precisely a network of regulated practices that is preserved over time, instituting ways of living; it is what we understand as a unique way of relating to the experiences we have in life, for example: work, marriage, the police, the hospital and the school itself. For authors who think about institutionalism, the institution is composed of forces that act concretely in reality, based on the tension and dispute between the instituted and the instituting. The action of these forces reveals the institutional dimension of social relations that is in constant movement.

The instituted is understood from the rules that are preserved throughout history, engendering the practices that are exercised in the social field. From this perspective, the conception that the teacher as a subject would have total knowledge about his students admits a relationship of knowledge that is totally hierarchized between one subject and another, both at school and in other educational spaces. This hierarchy names the way in which the teacher-student relationship is understood when we discuss learning, schooling, indiscipline and school difficulties, carrying in itself an example of the dimension established in the Education field. In this sense, the established force manifests itself from a social order established from historical values that tend to preserve the usual procedures of economic, social and political prediction (Lourau, 2004).

On the other hand, by instituting is understood the force that drives the questions, the conflicts and dislodges what is already instituted. The instituting force is the one that operates changes in the contours of institutions, being marked by the constant creation and rupture in practices and ways of thinking that tend to perpetuate themselves over time. Thus, Institutionalism offers a very relevant instrument to analyze and reflect

about what is being conserved, becoming natural in the practices and knowledge of the social field and, therefore, as part of the same movement, what is creating ruptures, contestation. and modification processes.

The tendency of the instituted to maintain itself shows us the tensions that the instituting operates when producing ruptures. In this sense, the instituted is not taken as bad and the instituting as good, but what tends to remain and what forces derives is highlighted.

Discussing what is called the institutional dimension brings up tensions that refer to a game of forces between what is historically established and that creates a way of thinking and that, in the functioning of the game itself, allows ruptures and inaugurations in the structure of social relationships. These tensions refer to a constant movement between instituted and instituting forces and to the care in relation to the captures carried out by the metamorphoses in the strategies of domination in which a new institute tends to be an incendiary act that, in fact, can become "the harbinger of a future headquarters of the Fire Department" (Rodrigues, 1999, p. 177).

As part of what is established in everyday life, we understand that the naturalization process is a characteristic effect in the institutional movement, which uses a certain notion of nature to explain the phenomena that happen to us. Machado (1994) helps us to understand this effect when he explains that naturalization is a way of stagnating relationships and affirming that what is manifested in subjects is original and spontaneous, that is, it would manifest itself naturally, regardless of any type of crossing or influence external to the subject's own body. It is precisely in this sense that a certain institutional logic operates: the idea of effect is removed and replaced by a causal or natural explanation of the assisted events. Thus, the subject is held responsible for everything that does not accommodate them to the school rules, henceforth demanding treatment for such inadequacy. The naturalization effect, therefore, goes back to the historical production as something to be answered or justified via a supposed nature of the subject, which would become, in the case of the psychologist's work at school, the focus. The strong individualizing tendency that permeates the formation of the Psychology professional and the standardizations present in the schooling process make students, teachers and the functioning of families feel the need to identify psychic problems in them. Naturalization is a force in the institutional game and is instituted denying that what is presented in everyday life would be the effect of this game itself.

The institutionalist proposal seeks to review the relationship between the object and the practices, in order to destitute the naturalized statute of the object

taken by the instituted actions. It is then necessary to question the role and position that the psychologist can occupy in this relationship, which is an agonistic relationship, that is, “at the same time, one of reciprocal incitement and of struggle” (Foucault, 1995, p. 245). In this territory, we support a work direction for the psychologist at school.

Considering and accessing the institutional movement demands understanding the political and historical implications engendered in everyday practices and their link with the effects produced concretely in the relationships of subjects at school. The perspective of the Institutional Movement defends analysis and action from the political direction of a position that is involved with the production of the world it inhabits. For this perspective, the school is understood from the logics and games present in everyday life and what underlies the interventions is precisely the possibility of provoking and causing disaccommodation what is taken for granted, revolving the historically established places and starting from the assumption that the naturalization of processes requires that we even question the way in which our knowledge is established and produces effects.

THE PSYCHOLOGIST’S WORK AT SCHOOL: EVERYDAY LIFE AS AN OPPORTUNITY

By promoting questions about the role of the psychologist in the school from a certain problematization that Institutionalism makes in relation to the game of forces that operates in everyday life, we propose to make an institutionalist view work in the analysis of a situation experienced at school and that allows us to perceive, in the role of the psychologist at school, the attitude of looking for possible gaps in a certain established rationality that prevents the perception of constant movement in the creation of situations. Methodologically, we chose to present this situation in a narrative format, bringing some scenes² in which the instituted and instituting forces impel and drive the relationships that are established with the subjects. This narrative was built from an experience³ in which, in the game of direct school agents, there was a teacher and a psychologist who accompanied and reflected on the schooling process of one of the students of Elementary School I.

² The situations presented refer to moments lived with a student in a private school in the city of São Paulo, in which one of the authors played the role of school psychologist. The complete narrative, as well as the discussion it provided, is in its entirety in the dissertation *A prática do psicólogo escolar: um olhar institucionalista para as pequenas-grandes recusas* (Veronese, 2016).

³ The text is presented in first person, referring to the psychologist’s voice.

f approached Daniel about the length of his hair, suggesting that he cut it, the boy, at the start, warned: “*I have a secret! I can’t cut my hair...*” The teacher did not understand and asked some questions to continue the conversation. Daniel asked her to bend down and said in a low tone, very close to her ear, the secret.

“*Daniel won my respect*”, that’s what I heard from this teacher who was dealing with what to do with her student in the classroom. A nine-year-old boy, the youngest son of a couple who worked in a bank branch; third year student of the school’s Elementary School; long curly hair that fell in his face, thin, tall, big blue eyes, red mouth and big teeth; patient of a psychiatrist, psychopedagogue, speech therapist, neurologist and geneticist.

He entered the school in the second year of Elementary School, rehearsed literate writing and his teachers took advantage of the moments when he was awake in the classroom to try to develop some pedagogical activity. Daniel took a lot of medication and studied in the afternoon, he felt very sleepy, when he was awake he paid attention to the colorful and flashy material his colleagues had: sharpeners, pencils and pencil cases; mainly from girls.

Fact is, being a student is not easy: activities, schedules, willingness to be in a group, new information, being evaluated all the time and, still, developing in the expected way. The fact is also that Daniel’s presence at school – an environment that has the gears regulated to a fair extent – brought the need to deal with certain unpleasant intensities. He arrived late, slept in the classroom, could not wake up and, still, did not write in the activities that were proposed to him.

Often, the impression we had was that his body didn’t fit there. He was like a boy with “shaggy hair” in the midst of others who were very well “haired”. The presence of this child, added to the functioning of the school, invited us to think in an antagonistic way: the others and Daniel. His posture and behavior provoked in the technical team conclusive thoughts that flirted with the idea of lack of motivation and unwillingness to learn. Several meetings with the teachers – who kept in touch with the student – were filled with statements that could easily be summarized in the need to involve them in their learning, as well as their family, that is, they were faced with the lack of something. That was what he lacked, implication. The doubt as to what to do called for the need to discover a cause and,

consequently, identify the causative agents. Who were responsible for our doubts?

The referrals found and, therefore, possible to be thought by the technical team reacted to the doubt as someone who answers a question in order to close it. As an effect, the requests produced by the school were massively addressed to the student's family: one more change of clothes, systematic monitoring of homework, daily study of what had been dealt with in the classroom and even a visit to the hairdresser to fix the "boy's" vision. We seemed to need these arrangements to work with Daniel.

"Nothing is natural, everything is socio-historically established"⁴ (Rodrigues, 1999, p. 172). It is by resuming this premise that we begin the course of this discussion. In the words of Patto, highlighted by Coimbra (2011, p. 581), there are daily practices that are equivalent to "small everyday murders", when governed by a logic that serves as a statute of truth, subtly or blatantly establishing norms, measures and standards for the existence of subjects.

In the narrative presented, the doubts that permeated the technical team and, mainly, Daniel's teacher were engendered from ideas that express a historically conceived form about the student and their relationship with the formal contents offered by the school: everything would go well if a student who was in the third year of elementary school could follow the activities proposed in the classroom. If he were already literate and able to signal his confusions and doubts about the content applied, the teacher's task would be to help him face the challenges of learning, following a path to a certain extent already known. This process would express a normal or natural course of the student in the third year that, when interrupted, causes doubt and discomfort. When something escapes what is expected, discomfort summons the strength of the naturalization of processes, opening wide its function of justification and alleviation of tensions (Machado, 1994). In this sense, a doubt, being perceived as a discomfort, is quickly displaced to the scope of the certainties of an already existing knowledge about the other that determines a normalizing and ordering point of singular forms of life: the subject starts to be seen as the one

⁴ We chose to start this part of the text with the phrase that the author Heliana Conde Rodrigues calls the formula of institutionalist thinking, even knowing the warning she herself makes about this synthesis. We understand that this sentence makes it possible to raise the discussion that brings up the effects of naturalization that interest us at this moment, and can contribute to the clarification of the presence of institutional logics in everyday relationships. Rodrigues (1999) points out the phrase as insufficient, when articulating it to the ideas of Deleuze and Foucault regarding the notion of the term institution. About this, see Rodrigues (1999).

who fits or does not fit with an idealized model. Within this key of analysis in which the distance between what is taken as what should be and what is carried out in relationships is a criterion, operations of opposition are promoted, such as: the adequate *versus* the inadequate, the good *versus* the bad, what you learn *versus* what you don't learn and many others (Machado, 1994). The conception that analyzes things from a supposed normal point has, in its history, the function of regulating bodies.

In the narrative, it is possible to perceive how this operation is configured, mainly in the effects resulting from the presence of a student who deviated from the expected. Resuming: "often, the impression we had was that his body didn't fit there. It was like a boy who was "shaggy hair" in the midst of others who were very "haired" – here, an aspect of the boy attracts the explanation for the discomfort and, therefore, becomes fertile ground for the functioning of a logic that ends in the characterization of opposites, which, in this case, produces requests with the purpose of adapting to what it assumes to be correct and efficient.

However, something happens when, in the midst of this functioning, Daniel talks about himself, triggering questions that stop the ideal conception that was in progress. A rupture, the teacher is affected and, in the daily encounter, a possibility is created to assert the singular: the boy announces a secret, speaks and does something. Visibility is given to the multiplicities at play since the presence of this boy at school. An event takes place and unsettles the established places, preventing Daniel from being engulfed by a functioning that automates the relationships that are established in the school in the name of a way of inhabiting this space. Daniel creates an entrance with his teacher and breaks the established conceptions that gave him a place and a purpose to be in that context. Here, the child's doing summons a movement of singularization affecting the teacher, who repositions herself in the game of instituted forces.

The boy's speech summons the teacher to bend down and listen, opening a small breach in the apparently adjusted functioning of the school organization. It is done, then, through the insistence of the singular that carries dramas, dreams, ideas, thoughts, capacities and positions, the opening of another dimension. In this sense, the situation carries in itself the exit of a casing instituted, initially through, the meeting between a teacher and a student. We believe that, there, an instituting force is announced that serves as a trigger to unrest a logic that implies total knowledge about the other, that is, there is a secret. In this way, the existence of a secret is enough to know that you don't know everything.

The singularity, based on the theoretical-practical tools of Institutionalism, is something always present

that, although it is subject to being swallowed up in the game of forces between the instituted and the instituting, does not cease to exist. If something already happens when Daniel's action creates a movement, what else is implied in his speaking when announcing a secret?

There is the presence of a secret and, through this speech, there is an inscription of the child in his place of existence that produces a discursive effect in the institutional logic. The secret enunciated by Daniel carries displacements that make him respected – “*Daniel won my respect*”. In this sense, the boy's action precisely prevents the secret from being thought from its meaning established as an individual dimension, which speaks of the intimate of a subject. The secret told to the teacher displaces everyone, forces the reflection on the involvement of agents and places in the game of relationships and, for this reason, it is an event. Being an event, the secret, which historically was confessed to the psychologist, as it would be up to him to reveal the secrets of the soul and personality of the subject, produces an effect that triggers a possible direction for the work of psychology at school: being on the lookout for scenes that break with mechanisms instituted by the naturalization of processes. It would not be up to the psychologist to be the protagonist of these scenes. The teacher, when reporting to the psychologist that Daniel gained respect, shows the force of derivation in an everyday scene.

In this way, we understand that there is the presence of an instituting force in the scenes presented in the narrative from the emergence of an event that is expressed in Daniel's attitude. It is from the child's speech in an everyday situation that the “secret effect” is produced and, with instituting force, presents itself by displacing the certainties and naturalizations operated in relationships. It becomes, therefore, a clue to the institutional movement, showing us the amplifications, resonances and connections of the processes that constitute what is at stake in the school territory.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Based on the reflections presented in the course of this article, we understand that situations that deviate from what is expected to happen in the school scenario refer to an idealized expectation of the schooling process. As soon as something – a characteristic, a behavior, a speech – breaks into this idealized process, discomfort appears in the expression of a lack. The idea of naming something as a lack – characterized by what should happen, but has not yet happened – starts from the naturalization in which what it means to be a student at school is established.

It is in everyday life, in what is most commonplace in the relationships between subjects, that the entire

social and political game is established and presented. It is understood, therefore, that it is an understanding of everyday life as a great possibility of exercising politics, that is, a field for reflection and recognition of the production of different effects and instituted ways of doing or dealing with the experiences that we have. It is in everyday experiences, therefore, that the conditions for institutional reflection and analysis are presented. In this sense, in any field in which encounters and relationships between subjects take place, the necessary conditions for the exercise of an institutional analysis are presented (Lourau, 2004). If it is in the daily encounter that the effects of naturalization, on the one hand, engender the teacher/student relationships, establishing the positions that summon the subjects, in another way, it is in the expression of these same effects that the field of intervention is configured, via the institutionalist perspective. It is also in this dimension of an ordinary life, in which practices are allowed, that variation can be produced in what Aquino (2014) critically announces as the *psi* legacy that authorizes, in an alleged scientific practice, the anticipation of the construction of the unveiling of what is are the existential itineraries.

Understanding everyday life as an opportunity for the practise of politics means getting involved with what is produced in the world, acting from a call in the social game, committing oneself in all spaces wherever one circulates (Veronese, 2016). Thus, we agree with the analysis that Marazina (2015) presents on positions that distinguish the technique applied in the intervention and what effectively supports it. For the author, who speaks from an institutionalist perspective, “the technical possibility of *doing good* is placed in second place in relation to what sustains an intervention: the political will” (Marazina, 2015, p. 22, emphasis by the author). Intervention devoid of the political dimension tends to technical expertise only, it is restricted to good intentions, to doing good things, as the author emphasizes.

To think about intervention from a political dimension is to refuse to leave out one's position in the face of social calls and institutional, economic and historical crossings to which we are all subject. It is also to reflect on the effects that are produced in the field when one intervenes and, moreover, it is to scrutinize elements that direct the doing, what sustains us in the action. In this sense, carrying out an intervention is also to analyze the implications with the social field in which the practices are engendered.

Finally, we understand that the psychologist's action at school from the institutionalist perspective implies carrying out, in the institutional movement, ruptures, refusals and the very dismissal of the place of specialist and specialty. From a psychology called School, this work

creates a field of action and discussion that, articulating with the political direction of Institutional Analysis, highlights the institutional practices that are established between Psychology and Education (Machado, Lerner, & Fonseca, 2017).

REFERENCES

- Aquino, J. G. (2014). O controverso lugar da psicologia na educação: aportes para a crítica da noção de sujeito psicopedagógico. *Psicologia: ensino & formação*, 5(1), 5-19.
- Barembliitt, G. (2002). *Compêndio de análise institucional e outras correntes: teoria e prática* (5ª ed.). Belo Horizonte: Instituto Félix Guattari.
- Coimbra, C. M. B. (2011). Práticas de estranhamento, indignação e resistência. *Psicologia USP*, 22(3), 579-586.
- Eizirik, M.F. (2009). Dispositivos de inclusão: Invenção ou espanto?. In: C. R. Baptista (Ed.), *Inclusão e Escolarização: múltiplas perspectivas* (pp. 31-41). Porto Alegre: Mediação.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Microfísica do poder* (11ª ed, R. Machado, Org. Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Graal. Publicado em 1979.
- Foucault, M. (2001). *Os anormais: Curso no Collège de France (1974-1975)* (E. Brandão, Trad). São Paulo, Martins Fontes. Traduzido do original publicado em 2001.
- Foucault, M. (2016). *Em defesa da sociedade: curso Collège de France (1975 – 1976)* (M. E. A. P. Galvão, Trad). São Paulo: Martins Fontes. Traduzido do original publicado em 1997.
- Guattari, F.; Rolnik, S. (1986). *Micropolítica: cartografias do desejo*. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.
- Lima, L. A. G. (2012). Ascensão e queda da infância: um estudo sobre a concepção de criança na psicanálise de Durval Marcondes e seus impactos na psicologia brasileira. In: M. H. S. Patto (Ed.), *Formação de psicólogos e relações de poder: sobre a miséria da psicologia* (pp. 81-106). São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo.
- Lourau, R. (2004). O instituinte contra o instituído. In: S. Altoé (Ed.), *Analista Institucional em tempo integral* (pp. 47-65). São Paulo: Hucitec.
- Machado, A. M. (1994). *Crianças de classe especial: efeitos do encontro entre a saúde e a educação* (2ª ed.). São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo.
- Machado, A. M. (2009). Educação inclusiva: de quem e de quais práticas estamos falando?. In: C. R. Baptista (Ed.), *Inclusão e Escolarização: múltiplas perspectivas* (pp. 127-134). Porto Alegre: Mediação.
- Machado, A. M.; Souza, M. P. R. (2010). (Eds.). *Psicologia Escolar: em busca de novos rumos* (5ª ed.). São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo.
- Machado, A. M.; Lerner A. B. C.; Fonseca, P. F. (2017). Movimentos Políticos e Discursivos em Psicologia e Educação: fragmentos de uma história. In A. M. Machado; A. B. C. Coutinho; P. F. Fonseca (Eds.), *Concepções e proposições em Psicologia e Educação: a trajetória do Serviço de Psicologia Escolar do Instituto de Psicologia da Universidade de São Paulo* (pp. 159-172). São Paulo, SP: Blucher.
- Marazina, I. V. (2015). Pensando sobre o operador intervenção. *Vínculo (Revista do NESME)*, 12(1), 19-23. Recuperado de <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1394/139446857004.pdf>
- Patto, M. H. S. (2012). *Formação de psicólogos e relações de poder: sobre a miséria da psicologia*. São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo.
- Pereira, W. C. C. (2007) Movimento Institucionalista: principais abordagens. *Estudos e Pesquisa em Psicologia*, 7(1), 10-19.
- Rocha, M. L. (2002). Educação em tempos de tédio. In: E. Tanamachi; M. Proença; M. Rocha (Eds.), *Psicologia e Educação: desafios teóricos-práticos* (2ª ed., pp. 185-208). São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo.
- Rodrigues, H. B. C. (1999). Notas sobre o paradigma institucionalista. Preâmbulo político-conceitual às aventuras de 'sócios' e 'esquizes' no Rio de Janeiro. *Transversões (Escola de Serviço Social da UFRJ)*, n. único, 169-199.
- Rossi, A.; Passos, E. (2014) Análise institucional: revisão conceitual e nuances da pesquisa-intervenção no Brasil. *Revista EPOS*, 5(1), 156-181.
- Veronese, L. A. A. (2016). *A prática do psicólogo escolar: um olhar institucionalista para as pequenas-grandes recusas* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Instituto de Psicologia da Universidade de São Paulo – USP, SP. Recuperado de <https://www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/47/47131/tde-20042017-152849/pt-br.php>

Received on: July 10, 2019

Approved on: April 11, 2020

This paper was translated from Portuguese by Ana Maria Pereira Dionísio.