

*THE MULTIVOICED PRODUCTION OF A TOOL FOR EDUCATIONAL
MANAGEMENT CHANGE*

A PRODUÇÃO MULTIVOCALIZADA DE UMA FERRAMENTA PARA A
MUDANÇA NA GESTÃO EDUCACIONAL

Monica LEMOS

(Helsinki University - Faculty of Educational Sciences/ Center for
Research on Activity Development and Learning, Siltavuorenpenger,
3A, +31626865889)
monica.lemos@helsinki.fi

ABSTRACT: *The objective of this paper is to analyze the role of multivoicedness in the production and evaluation of a tool, the management plan, for educational management change. For this purpose, instrumentality (Engeström, 1997; 2006) and multivoicedness (Bakhtin; Voloshinov, [1929]1977; Engeström, 1999) are considered as guiding theoretical concepts. The data setting comprises a survey in an educational context; the contents and the meaning of the management plan; and the video recordings of three formative meetings in which the participants - the educational managers - produce and evaluate the management plan. The discursive analysis comprises elements of voice positioning and voice interconnection, which enables depicting the use of different voices for the production and evaluation of the management plan. As a result, we discuss the possibility for educational management change by voicing different educational system stakeholders.*

KEYWORDS: *Educational Management Change; Instrumentality; Management Plan; Multivoicedness.*

RESUMO: O objetivo deste artigo é analisar o papel da multivocalidade na produção e avaliação de uma ferramenta, o plano de gestão, para a mudança na gestão educacional. Para tanto, instrumentalidade (Engeström, 1997; 2006) e multivocalidade (Bakhtin; Voloshinov, [1929] 1977; Engeström, 1999) são consideradas como conceitos teóricos norteadores. A configuração dos dados compreende um levantamento em contexto educacional; o conteúdo e o significado do plano de gestão; e as gravações em vídeo de três encontros formativos nos quais os participantes - gestores educacionais - produzem e avaliam o plano de gestão. A análise discursiva compreende elementos de posicionamento de voz e interconexão de voz, o que possibilita retratar o uso de diferentes vozes para a produção e avaliação do plano em foco. Como resultado, discutimos a possibilidade de mudança na gestão educacional, dando voz a diferentes atores do sistema educacional.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Mudança na gestão educacional; Instrumentalidade; Plano de gestão; Multivocalidade.

0. Introduction

When working with educational managers in Brazil, it is common to hear them using the metaphor of firemen to describe their work. They often state that there are so many things to do at the same time and so many urgent issues pops up that they get overwhelmed and lose the track of the activities that are essential to develop their educational managers most important functions. Besides, as a result of evaluation systems, educational managers become more concerned about grades, reports and aims instead of teaching and learning, and transformation of communities (Lemos and Engeström, 2017; Liberali et al., 2015).

However, this does not seem to be an issue only in Brazilian educational scenario. Weiner (2014), in the study about why and how principals selected members for their instructional leadership team, pointed to the tendency of management to focus on non-instructional issues, such as revising school budget or distributing report cards rather than focusing on teaching and learning. Concerning the development of tools, Hauge et al. (2014) focus their study on team leadership's tools, design and report on the evolution of a collective approach to leadership for school improvement. The authors state that culturally developed artefacts have a special status as fundamental mediators of actions, relating subjects and the object of activity in a dynamic three-way interaction.

Nevertheless, as stated by Sannino and Nocon (2008), educational reforms are typically top-down changes initiated by authorities either at the local municipal scale or at the regional or national scale. They usually focus on overall change of the school system and do not address specific and/or localized practices. On the other hand, educational innovations are typically small-scale changes initiated by groups of practitioners and/or researchers who want to experiment with novel ideas that usually focus on specific and localized practices or sets of practices that do not cover the entire school system, but only particular aspects of it. The authors state that they are bottom-up changes that depend on the commitment or involvement of local teachers and can be completely initiated and constructed by the practitioners themselves. This type of initiative can fade away if there is no engagement of the whole school community.

In the same line, (Engeström, 2008) argues that school change is too often understood as a singular process, and researchers too often seek to uncover an assumed singular explanation for school change. Regarding the notion of voice, Weiner (2014) suggests that the conceptualization of voice is essential to a new practice of more

participatory process of decision making in an instructional leadership team.

The studies discussed above emphasize the importance of the development of tools by different educational stakeholders in the process of school change. This article contributes to such discussion by presenting the analysis of multivoiced production and evaluation of a tool in a process of educational management change, in which educational managers struggle to move from a top down to a more horizontal (Engeström, 2003) production of tools. Bearing such problematic in mind, I address the following question: What are the dynamics of voices in the production of a new tool for educational management change?

Therefore, this article argues for the production and evaluation of new tools for educational management change processes. The approach is developed under the realm of Cultural Historical Activity Theory (Vygotsky, [1934] 1978; Leontiev, [1977] 1978; Engeström, 1987). The specific tool analyzed - the management plan - was produced during formative meetings in the Manager in Creative Chains Project (Liberali, 2012) that aimed at the reorganization of educational managers' activities as a way of better planning, evaluating and implementing activities in a more conscious and informed perspective. The project took place in a municipal educational system in São Paulo, Brazil (Liberali et al., 2015; Liberali, 2012).

The article is organized as follows. The first section discusses the conceptual framework of this study, which stems from Cultural Historical Activity Theory from now on referred to as CHAT, focusing on instrument, instrumentality and multivoicedness. After that, the research context, the methods and analysis are presented, and the final sections report and discuss the results. Initial results suggest that multivoicedness is present in two ways. One relates to voice positioning, different voices positioning for the production of the management plan and the second relates to how different voices of the educational system (educational managers) are brought into the plan. Both ways lead to a more critical perspective over the production of the instrument in order to transform managing activities.

1. Mediating instruments in Cultural Historical Activity Theory

The understanding of the development and use of mediating instruments and their relation to educational management is essential to our reflection upon their dynamics on the cultural-historical activity movement in educational management change. For this reason it is necessary to go back to Marx (1993), Vygotsky (2001), Wartofsky (1979), to obtain more sustainable support for the discussion. According to Marx (1993:285), an instrument is defined as a thing or a complex of things that the worker interposes between

himself and the object of his labor and which serves as a conductor, directing his activity onto the object. Therefore, it is important to highlight Vygotsky's insertion of an instrument between the subject and object regarding the mediated activity.

The use of signs leads humans to a specific structure of behavior that breaks away from biological development and creates new forms of a culturally based psychological process. The author also understood that signs can be psychological tools. In the same line, Wartofsky (1979:200-1) points out that the production of instruments is distinctively human in a way that it can promote different ways in which men and animals develop activity. A tool may be any artifact created for the purpose of the successful production or reproduction of a means of existence. The author also states *that the instrument is for the cultural evolution what the gene is for the biological evolution*

Expanding the notion of instrument, Engeström (2006) states that epistemic tools in complex work settings are not understandable as singular mediating entities, in this perspective they are produced in a constellation of mediational means. The mediating instrument presented in this research, the management plan, was created as a mediational tool to organize educational managers' activities, bearing in mind the needs behind the activities and envisioning the fulfillment of such needs.

Therefore the management plan can also be understood in its instrumentality, a system that includes multiple cognitive artifacts and semiotic means used for analysis and design (Engeström, 2001).

1.1 Instrumentality

The notion of instrumentality enables opening up the participation of different subjects in production of the management plan, which is important in order to analyze the organization of the management plan with the raise of needs and study of the object for further planning of activities. Instrumentality means making different parties conceptually aware of and practically responsible (Engeström, 2001) for the coordination of different needs towards the objects and the organization of different activities to reach them.

Engeström (2001) argues that the very complexity of the setup means that the instrumentality is constantly evolving; old tools are modified, new tools are created and tested in action, as instruments would be changed into a new mentality. The author also states that epistemic tools in complex work settings are not understandable as separate mediational entities. They tend to form integrated tool constellations or instrumentalities (Engeström, 2006).

Hence, the need is what justifies the activities; it refers to the past, to the reasons why activities should take place and why the objects are moving. The discussion of need and object as motive is very

much present throughout the activity theory discussion. Vygotsky (1978); Engeström ([1987] 2015); Uznadze (1966) and Leontiev (1978) define needs as the impulse for the subject to act. According to Uznadze (1966), needs can be substantial or functional, as something to be satisfied, like hunger that can be satisfied by food or fatigue by rest. Another type of need produced by man in social relations, by culture, is addressed in this work with the Vygostian discussion of drama as an act of volition, a human decision about the conduction of one's historicity (Delari Junior, 2011).

Uznadze (1966) and Leontiev (1978) also agree that man is never in a state of immobility; on the contrary, human beings are in constant movement. Therefore, activity must not be conceived only as a group of actions but also as the relations between subjects with needs that motivate and determine objects. In this case the object of activity is the key for such a movement. When organizing the management plan educational managers must consider the needs of their educational communities, as a trigger to project the object of the activities they are organizing.

The need is strictly connected to the object as the object is the driving force of the activity (Engeström, 2008). The drama, need, triggered by motive which directs the object, are essential to the projection and development of activities to overcome different types of crisis. In this article the relation need and object is essential as the driving force for the production and evaluation of the management plan.

Object refers to the desire of transforming the need into concreteness by the organization of different activities. As Engeström (1994) states objects define the horizon of possible actions; it embodies the motive and the meaning of the collective activity. In complex activity systems and complex organizations, as the educational system in which the formative intervention studied in this paper takes place, it is difficult for practioneers to construct a connection between the goals of their ongoing actions and the more durable object/motive of the colletive activity system. In addition, objects resist and bite back; they seem to have lives of their own (Engeström, 1995). But still, according to Engeström (1995), objects and motives are hard to articulate, they appear to be vague, fuzzy, multi-faceted, amoeba-like and often fragmented or contested. The paradox is that objects/motives give directionality, purpose and meaning to the collective activity, yet they are frustratingly elusive (Engeström et al., 2003).

The management plan has the double function of object and instrument, it is an object in the moment it is been produced and it is an instrument when it is used to organize the activities in the different levels of the educational system. Another important factor to comprise the instrumentality studied in this article is the contribution of different voices in the constitution of the needs and the object, and the

production of the management plan.

2. Multivoicedness

In his studies of philosophy of language, Bakhtin (2001) defines voice as represented by an utterance which is produced in a dialogue. According to Bakhtin/ Voloshinov ([1929] 1977), if the speech is the motor of linguistic transformations, it doesn't concern individuals; indeed, the word is the arena where contradictory social values reflect the conflicts of language and the class conflicts within the system: semiotics community and social class do not overlie. Verbal communication, inseparable from other forms of communication, implies conflict, relations of domination and resistance, *adaptation or resistance to hierarchy*, use of language by the ruling class to reinforce their power, etc. (Yaguello, 1977:13).

For Bakhtin/ Voloshinov ([1929] 1977) the word can only be produced through the contact of one person to another; and this production suffers from the tension of different values, contradictions, and ideology produced socially, culturally and historically. Bakhtin (1981) deals with multivoicedness under the optics of literature, he refers to multivoicedness to show different voices in the romance, the author's, the narrator's and the characters' voices, there is also the influence time and space, the chronotopus, take over how the multiple voices are.

Discourse, according to the author, is constituted by different voices built up historically in social relations. Hence, multivoicedness is evoked through historicity in the relations the subject stabilishes in different activities, with other subjects in different time and space. Such historicity offers different subjects the possibility of experiencing the individual in the totality (Ilyenkov, 1982) discursively

Historically, policies, demands and tasks are often developed in a top down manner (Liberali et al., 2015) encapsulating educational management (Lemos et al., 2015). In the context of this paper, the Municipal Secretariat of Education delivers the demands to Regional Boards of Education, which follows the instructions spreading the demands to schools, as a transmission-like and univocal process (Freire, 1970; Wertsch; Smolka, 1994).

The management plan, however, carries the possibility of a multivoiced tool when produced in formative intervention bearing the needs and the envisioned object of the educational managers activities in mind. Such multivoicedness is constituted by the different subjects that produce the management plan, the ones involved in the formative activities in the management plan and in the future transformations in different contexts where the management plan will be implemented. Therefore, producing educational management tools in a multivocal organization in opposition to a univocal one provides the chance of a more horizontal

educational system organization, rather than a top down or bottom up one.

2.1 Constructing multivoicedness: Voice positioning and voice interconnection

An activity system contains a variety of different viewpoints or 'voices', as well as layers of historically accumulated artifacts, rules and patterns of division of labor. This multivoiced and multilayered nature of activity systems is both a resource for collective achievement and a source of compartmentalization and conflict (Engeström, 1994).

As we speak we position ourselves in relation to the other and we do so by using different linguistic artifacts to produce and exchange discourse. Voice positioning reveals the different ways participants engage, are engaged and engage others during the production and evaluation of the management plan. Moghaddam and Harré (2010:2) claim that *positioning is about how people use words and discourse of all types to locate themselves and others* in the discourse. The authors also refer to position as a way to track people shifting views in certain situation.

It is also important to consider voice positioning as a discursive category so we can analyse how teacher educators assume or not responsibility over the production and evaluation of the management plan. The utterance reponsibilization in this process indicates how voices are brought about in the discourse. Voice interconnection reflects the way participants connect other voices in the discourse, which contribute to the development or non development of the discourse. The use of pronouns, time and space markers are some of the linguistics cues that highlight the interconnection of voices. Elements of controversy and agreement are also essential to analyse the movement of voice interconnection supported by different types of argument.

According to Leitão (2011) controversies are generated every time there are different points of view towards the same topic. Liberali (2013) points out that, a disagreement or controversy can be placed by an opposite point of view, by a controversial question or by a mirroring as disagreement request. Agreement on the other hand, supposes what is accepted by the listeners (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, [1988] 2005).

Liberali (2013) argues that a focal aspect of argumentation is the way ideias, position, viewpoints are introduced, contrasted, supported or agreed upon in the discourse. The author categorizes different possibilities of articulation that may contribute to the analysis of voice interconnection, such as different use of pronouns, direct and indirect speech, and active and passive voice. This analysis is important because it supports the deepening of the production and

evaluation of the management plan analyzing who takes responsibility over the production and evaluation of the management plan and how.

3. Material and Methods

The material used in this paper comprises the tool management plan developed in the different levels of the Educational Municipal System. In spite of that, a case selected from a specific Regional Board of Education (RBE) management plan was selected to be analysed in terms of production and evaluation. I analyzed a school surrounding survey based on (Liberali, 2008), which was used as the basis for educational managers identifying the school drama and object. After that, I analyzed the first version of the management plan drafted in power point slides. Finally, I analyzed two meetings, one in November, 2011 and the other in April, 2012, for the evaluation of the management plan.

Table 1 - Theoretical concepts, research questions, data and methods

Theoretical concepts/ Research questions	Phases of analysis	Data	Method
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mediating instruments in CHAT • Instrumentality • Multivoicedness • Constructing multivoicedness: Voice positioning and voice interconnection <p>RQ1. What is the role of the survey in the organization of the drama?</p> <p>RQ2. What is the role of multivoicedness in the production and evaluation of the management plan?</p>	Drama and object	Survey	Multimodal and content analysis
	<i>The first and second drafts of the Management Plan</i>	MP1 drafts and comments	Multimodal and content analysis
	<i>Evaluation of the Management Plan</i>	MP2 as written document	Analysis of discursive episodes

Source: elaborated by the researcher.

3.1 The context: Production process of the Management plan

As the objective of this article is to analyze how the different voices are considered during the process of production and evaluation of the *Managing plan*, we analyse two meetings involving teacher educators from the thirteen different boards of education in the city focusing on the production of the Management plan of one Regional Board of Education. Both meetings lasted four hours each and focused

on the evaluation of the management plan. The first one happened in November 2011, in the beginning of its production, and April 2012, before its implementation.

First of all, this study is part of formative intervention, led by the consultant researcher (Liberali, 2012), denominated more specifically as critical collaborative research methodology (Magalhães, 1990, 2011, 2016) which contrasts with experimental research, because the latter keeps a distance from transformation issues and, at the same time, ignores what interventionist research identifies as contesting grounds, full of resistance, reinterpretation, and surprises (Engeström, 2000).

In this perspective, the process of formative intervention presupposes that researchers and the participants develop their expertise in critical collaboration with each other. Formative interventions also presupposes that participants take responsibility for the transformation they are going through and develop it with their partners in contexts other than the researched one. One thing must be very clear: interventionist researchers who are involved in educational contexts are not supposed to do social work, they are supposed to work with knowledge and improve knowledge of people who work with education so they can develop tools and strategies in order to contribute to the communities' transformation as well as that of the schools they are in.

The analysis of how multiple voices are organized in the activity is essential to understand the transformations in the educational management setting. First of all, a narrative-description of the data provides the historicity movement in the production of the management plan, it provides the temporal and spacial dimensions where the different voices engage. Besides, elements of voice interconnection and linguistic cues offers basis for analysing the multivoiced construction of the management plan.

The educational system involved in the project comprises different educational managers with different positions mainly: secretary of education, principal of elementary and high school. The pedagogical team in the Municipal Secretariat of Education (MSE) level; director; pedagogical director, supervisor, and teacher educator (TE) in the Regional Boards of Education (RBE) level; and principal, principal assistant, pedagogical coordinator (PC) in the school level.

The pedagogical director manages teacher educators who, in turn, provide training for pedagogical coordinators, and teachers from the different Boards of Education. At the school level the pedagogical coordinator is in charge of working with the needs of teaching education, the students, and parents.

Although the three levels of the educational system are subdivided into managers directly involved in the process of management plan production and evaluation as Teacher Educators (TE) on the Regional Boards of Education. The focus on Teacher

Educators is due to the fact that they are in between the Secretariat of Education and schools. They respond to Secretariat of Education in terms of evaluation, assessment and receiving rules and regulations, while they are also in charge of spreading these rules and regulations at schools, and working with school educational pedagogical.

4. Findings and Discussion

In the beginning of the formative intervention educational managers were invited to list the activities they were involved to find out their roles as school managers (they realized many of the activities and actions were not related to their positions). Such list would help to set up the historicity of their activities and the relations to their current needs and joint object.

In order to reorganize educational management activities, the consultant researcher proposed the management plan based on *studying, training/implementing, and monitoring* moments, which served as principles for planning the activities, comprising the instrumentality of the management plan. First of all, the management plan was guided by a problematic situation, the drama that corresponded to the needs, and the envisioned joint object.

In the first semester of 2011, the teacher educators discussed the different activities which they were responsible for, mainly with regard to the pedagogical coordinators' education. At that time a group of pedagogical coordinators from a RBE were organizing their activity network when some questions were raised. Many of them noticed they did not have any control over unplanned activities and events that happened in their professional lives (Liberali et al., 2015). The consultant researcher developed three categories to organize the manager educators' work named as moments of Studying, Educating and Monitoring. These categories were produced based on indicators provided by a self-evaluation instrument, a demand from the MSE filled up by the pedagogical coordinators. Participants had then to organize the activities according to each moment.

Excerpt 1 was selected from a meeting that happened in the RBE-TB in June 2011. That was the first meeting in which the CR introduces the organization of the management plan and she referred to activities that are taken up from indicators that are basis for an evaluation PCs have to do about their own job.

Excerpt 1

3. CR. We set up some activities that could be related to the indicators. If you look at the indicators you can raise thousands of other activities. What did we do? We comprised some that we think that are basis for what there is there (in the evaluation process). They are for PC and for everybody. We focused at the activities network that involves the teacher with PC and PC within the institution. The idea here, from those

we brought, is to think like this: Do you think these activities are forming the network that you have to evaluate...? You have a network to evaluate at the end of the year. I just got it, but it could have been anything else. We chose it because it is institutionally placed for you. So if we take this network of activities how would we classify each one of them? Would we classify it as a studying moment of the teacher? A moment of educating that the PCs are doing with their team, or an instrument for monitoring? So the idea is that we can sort this out by looking at them. (RBE, June 10, 2011)

It is important to mention the meetings were educating moments in the perspective of the Municipal Secretariat of Education director and Pedagogical Team members and studying moments for Teacher Educators who were getting prepared to work with Pedagogical Coordinators from the schools they managed. Besides, the process happened in the different levels of the educational system: Municipal Secretariat of Education, Regional Board of Education, School, classrooms, and in some cases with the school and community. However, my focus for this study is on a specific Regional Board of Education, named RBE-XX.

The Consultant Researcher (CR) started the meeting of October 2011 by recovering the definition of educational management. She asked Teacher Educators (TE) if they had the possibility of working with the concept - definition of educational management - in their Regional Boards of Education and discussing it with their Pedagogical Coordinators (PC). Some TE exemplified how they had been working with the definition, by building up their own Regional Board of Education definition and exchanging how each Pedagogical Coordinator worked with it in their schools: *Set of actions that organize work in a participatory, democratic and co-responsible way in order to reach collective goals, taking the context into account, by making decisions, **studying, planning, monitoring, educating** and evaluating.*

CR then, explained how the definition process happened at RBE-XX. After that, teacher educators shared, presented and discussed, the possibility of discussing the plans they had organized. From the thirteen Regional Boards of Education two of them had prepared a plan and presented it. Teacher Educators were supposed to present and comment the educational management plan in the perspective of the Pedagogical Coordinator considering the components of the activity system (Engeström, 2015).

First of all Teacher Educators had to decide upon which activities they would focus and plan for 2012 e.g., pedagogical meeting, pedagogical journey, classroom observation. The components of the focal activity, subjects, instruments, rules, division of labor, community and object, should be considered during the planning with focus on the instruments, they should also convey for example the texts they were going to use as well as which classes

they were going to observe.

Bearing these guidelines in mind, the CR presented a fictitious plan based on a school situation of a TV series. After that, the RBE - XX, presented a management plan they had created previously to organize their own work. Some teacher educators expressed their difficulties in discussing the plan at their Regional Boards of Education, due to their difficulty in understanding which activities should be in moments of **studying, educating and monitoring**. Besides, they also expressed difficulties in raising the **drama** to be worked on.

For the following meeting, educational managers were invited to survey about their schools and communities to go beyond only teaching and learning issues on the management plan. In November 2011 Teacher Educators worked in groups with two different Regional Board of Education representatives. Each group was in charge of evaluating a third group management plan considering: the coherence between the drama and the object; the coherence between drama and Pedagogical journeys - weekly meetings organized by pedagogical coordinators to work with specific topics at school. The difference between pedagogical meeting and pedagogical journey is that the first one is for all the school team to discuss general school topics, while the pedagogical journey are for certain teachers who are involved in some specific school projects, teachers who participate in the journeys earn extra working studying hours,

During the months in between December 2011 and April 2012 teacher educators had to work with the production of the management plan with their teams in the RBE. In April they had another meeting to a final evaluation of the management plan. The same guidelines for evaluation used in November 2011 were used in April 2012, but with different evaluators. The Regional Board of Education Teacher Educators that produced the management plan also participated in the discussion.

4.1 Survey

I start this section by discussing how teacher educators organized the drama, very often called need, and shared object. Educational managers were invited to survey about their schools and communities as mentioned before, to go beyond only teaching and learning issues on the management plan. The following questions based on Liberali, 2009, were used as guidelines to further raise of the needs and project the shared object.

Table 2: School surrounding and school description survey

School Surroundings	School
Type of community: Residential, Industrial, Commercial;	Important features in the school project; Essential school principles; Methodological and theoretical approach;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure: (water, light, garbage collection, sewage treatment); • What are people profession and origin? • Are there religious, music or other kinds of organizations? What kind of celebrations are there? • Community values; Important values (necessity/drama) to be developed; • Chosen values to be developed; School members relationship; • Community and school relationship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure (leisure area, reading room, computer room and other spaces); • School time; • School rules; • Students, teachers, employees, supervisors, principals and other participants numbers; • Principle, supervisor, teacher, assistant, student, student's parents or tutors and community roles

Source: based on Liberali (2009:49-52).

After the survey, educational managers should identify their *needs* bearing in mind the question *Why*; to discuss the project, a *shared object* based on the question *What for*. It is important to mention, though, that in certain moments the need was called drama, in a Vygotskyan perspective or problem - as something that needs to be solved. Most of schools that answered the survey mentioned violence as a drama. Henceforth, I share below the description of the Elementary Municipal School M, that is managed by RBE-XX, organized by schools surroundings, school and drama. The collection of the surveys was used then in order to comprise the *shared object* of the management plan.

There are two main dramas that prevail in the school unit activities. One is school violence revealed through conflict resolution among students, characterized by rivalry between communities located in different extremes of the road and by the similarly situation of economical disadvantage of both communities. The other one is in the relation teacher and students, characterized by teachers' demotivation in face to so many issues (violence, learning difficulties) and the necessity of actions that change such reality. (PC, 2011- Total description: 150)

The school surroundings description did not bring up any voice in its production however it makes strong reference to students living characteristics, which has impact on school organization henceforth on the school drama.

4.2 Drama

In the description of the drama Pedagogical Coordinators pointed to elements of the community and students living conditions brought to school by the conflict resolution of two different communities to school, they understood this issue as a drama. The other drama is more internal to school context, teacher educators focused on teachers' demotivation because of violence and learning difficulties.

Although they mentioned that the drama was in the relation to teacher and students, they just pointed out teachers' perspective towards the drama, not the **students'**. Pedagogical Coordinators also pointed the necessity of developing actions to change their reality, however they did not refer to which actions.

The following questions were posed by Teacher Educators to deepen Pedagogical Coordinators description of the drama.

How does violence materialize in classroom issues? Give examples.

Violence that used to happen outside school walls entered school space and it is materialized in two ways: Bullying and disrespect to schools standards. There are individual cases of threaten among classmates, nasty nicknames, and aggression.

How was the insertion of internal grids?

If the question refers to the physical grids, we didn't follow the process of insertion, but there was an advancement at school, because we managed to take out the grids that separated the classrooms from the eating yard.

How are pedagogical aspects articulated to deal with violence issues? Give examples.

The school has the topic "Cultural Diversity and differences: pathways to coexistence and conflicts mediation". The school thought of projects that reaches the main goal of giving school communities, including all professionals and not only students, repertoire to conflict mediation. It is through the projects that students get connected recognizing the school space as theirs, as consequence we expect to reduce the levels of evasion and to improve learning levels.

The survey produced by pedagogical coordinators to teacher educators brought up key aspects to be considered in the organization of the drama. Pedagogical coordinators did not position themselves while describing school and its surroundings, instead they referred to teachers and students when talking about the drama, however focusing more on the reason why teachers were demotivated rather than students'.

Voice interconnection happened through the questions teacher educators made as an attempt to deepen the the discussion about the drama, which expanded pedagogical coordinators description of the school context.

4.3 First version of the management plan

The management plan was produced in power point to be presented during pedagogical coordinators formative meeting in October, 2011 and sent to the consultant researcher so she could comment on the presentation and teacher educators could reformulate it before the meeting. The presentation was entitled *Pedagogical meeting in focus: Pedagogical Coordinators' Actions in Everyday School*, it contained twenty-four slides in which thirteen were related to the management plan. After that, the slides related to the management plan were printed and given to a group in the Regional Boards of Education, so they could be evaluated by other group of teacher educators, during the teacher educators' formative meetings. The deeper analysis focuses firstly on the steps of the management plan referring to main aspects of the context, the drama, and shared object; and on the comments provided by the consultant researcher.

Based on the context description, teacher educators defined the drama *as clarity about the role of critical teaching education* and CR commented: **I** think your dilemma is not clear. Does **it** lack clarity? On which aspects? What happens? What did **you** see? The drama pointed towards a possible problematic situation in the Regional Board of Education, however it did not position other participants in the formative process.

The Consultant Researcher positioned a distance between her, the management plan, and teacher educators by using the pronouns **I**, to refer to herself, **it**, to refer to the management plan and **you**, to refer to teacher educators. The different positioning in the discourse orchestrated then the questions to clarify and deepen the drama. The question *What did you see?* invited teacher educators to relate the drama to what they saw in the survey as she did not mention either people who were involved in the teaching education process.

As to fulfill the drama teacher educators stated the shared object *as to develop actions that are favorable to critical teaching education* - again participants in the formative process were not mentioned. Consultant researcher, then asked: who are **you** talking about here, **pedagogical coordinators, teachers or both?** - inviting teacher educators to refer to participants in the teaching education process. She also invited teacher educators to envision where the shared object could reach by asking *what for? what do you want to reach with teaching education process? where do you want to get with it?*

The first version of the management plan pointed to the initial thought on what teacher educators considered to be the drama and the possible shared object that were going to drive the activities they were going to plan further. The key aspect relied on critical teaching education disregarding activities and other participants in the process. The questions provided by the consultant researcher were essential

to provoke teacher educators' positioning in the process of designing the drama and the shared object on the management plan.

4.4 Second version of the management plan

On the second version of the management plan teacher educators reformulated the plan based on consultant researcher comments: *How to contribute to the management of Elementary school, to pedagogical coordinators' educational proposals*. Although teacher educators had referred to *pedagogical coordinators*, they had not been mentioned them as subjects in the management process but on their educational proposals.

Another point to consider was the interrogative pronoun *How*, because it guided the drama to the instruments that were related to management and not the drama itself. In spite of that, the consultant researcher pointed that was *not a drama* but *themes* they were going to work with. She, then stated in a separate slide: *I like the project a lot but I still see problems in the way to refer to the drama*.

The connective *but* indicates an opposite point of view, in this case regarding the drama, which the consultant researcher remarked that *the drama needs to relate to something that doesn't exist, that needs to be changed, that is a deviation*. Finally she exemplified the drama in her own work: *death by electricity, teenage pregnancy* and emphasized the drama, by using an exclamation mark, in the relation with teachers and pedagogical coordinators: *lack of means to deal with situations in the classrooms, difficulties in working with the relations between the contents and the issues of students' lives*.

Based on the drama, teacher educators defined the object: *to develop ways of managing teaching education by Pedagogical Coordinators, to work with didactic activities that potentiates school work with its community*. The consultant researcher evaluated the plan using a strong word followed by an exclamation mark - *Excellent!* - emphasizing the qualities pointed on the shared object. She also reminded teacher educators by using *watch out!* that *work with community* is not remarked on the definition of what management is for. The definition focused on teaching-learning: *Management is to promote working conditions, so that there is teaching-learning process about concepts, procedures and attitudes for all subjects involved* in the management process.

In the process of defining the need and the possible shared object the voice of the consultant researcher was essential to enable teacher educators to revise the drama and the object not only by making them aware of and practically responsible for the coordination of the needs and objects on the management plan but also to interconnect the other voices of the educational system that were not present on the previous version of the management plan.

4.5 Evaluating the management plan

In November 2011 during the formative meeting for teacher educators in the Municipal Secretariat of Education, teacher educators from different Regional Boards of Education exchanged their management plans, which was evaluated by teacher educators from different Regional Board of Education. So, the management plan produced by teacher educators from RBE-XX, was evaluated by four other teacher educators from other two Regional Board of Education. Excerpt 2 depicts the moment when teacher educators (TE) evaluate the coherence between drama and shared object.

Excerpt 2

14. TE2. **She** wants **us** to point the coherence between drama and...

15. TES. The object (**adition**)

16. TE2. And the shared object. I think the shared object is not contemplated there ... and that includes the barriers, ... (**controversy**)

17. TES. I think we have to put it, right? (**agreement**) Because it only contemplates one, which is the management. (**agreement support**)

18. TE2. So can I put it here? (**agreement support addition**)

19. TES. (xx - nods) (**agreement**)

20. TE2. (xx - writes) (**agreement** To define formative strategies for coordinators, to develop continuing education ... (reading)

21. TES. So **you** take this, that can be a consequence, that may appear in the monitoring moment (**point of view and suggestion**)

22. TE2. That is in **their** action and in the **Pedagogical Coordinators'**. (**agreement and support**)

23. TES. Because, if **they** work educational proposals, which can be there when **they** monitor, **they** will work ... **this teacher educator**, this Regional Board of Education has a monitoring action, **they** may do it, but ot is unclear here in the shared object. x It is unclear. (**controversy**)

24. TE2. (writing) ... It is not clear on the shared object (**otroversy agreement**)

(SME, November 10, 2011, turns 14-24)

TE2 started by pointing out what they were supposed to do on the task by recapitulating consultant researcher's guidelines: **She** wants **us** to point the coherence between drama and... By using the pronouns *she* and *us* they positioned what they were supposed to do on the task.

Participants analyzed the coherence between the drama and the object by stating a controversy related to the shared object -**I think the shared object is not contemplated there**. The controversy was supported by different forms of agreement: agreement expressions, nodding, writing, expressing point of view and suggestion, and agreement with support.

The different forms of agreement were also supported by two different ways teacher educators brought the voices into the

evaluation process: voice positioning and voice interconnection. Voice positioning remarked their point of view regarding how the shared object was stated on the plan - ***I think we have to put it, right? So can I put it here? So you take this, that can be a consequence (...).***

Whereas voices were interconnected with references to *pedagogical coordinators* and *teacher educators*, also mentioned - *That is in **their** action and in the **pedagogical coordinators**; TES. Because, if **they** work with educational proposals, which can be there when **they** monitor, **they** will work ... **this teacher educator**, this Regional Board of Education has a monitoring action, **they** may do it, but it is unclear here in the shared object, It is unclear.*

Excerpt 2 points that the coherence between the drama and the object established by the expansion of a point of view supported by controversy regarding the shared object stated by teacher educators from Regional Board of Education-XX. However, there was no disagreement among the different participants who were evaluating the plan. One example is exemplified by TE2 writing of an evaluation, in which she did not make any question or expressed disagreement with the previous statement.

Excerpt 3 points to the conclusion of the evaluation of the coherence between the drama and the object.

Excerpt 3

99.TES. *So, anyway, the object has to be here, look [pointing to the paper]. The object here I think it has to be or to prepare the observation agenda ...where? where's the drama? Or management? Or the theme (controversial question) So, because here there are a lot of verbs, there are actions that **she** will develop. (negation support) It is not the object. (negation)*
100.TE2. *Wasn't it supposed to be a noun? (controversial question)*
101.TES. *(agrees with gestures) Next. Educaing. (agreement)*
102. CR:*Let's open people! Everyone speaking:!* (controversy)
(MSE, November 10, 2011, turns 99-102)

Teacher educators concluded the drama was not clear by positioning and posing controversial questions *The object here I think it has to be or to prepare the observation agenda ...where? where's the drama? Or management? Or the theme* and the shared object was not contemplated either *So, because here there are a lot of verbs, there are actions that **she** will develop, it is not the object.*

Voice interconnection was remarked by the use of the pronoun *she*, referring to teacher educators, and the negation of what is defined as shared object.

In the evaluation of the coherence between the drama and the object the task was accomplished; however there was no deepen of the point of views stated. Teacher educators interconnected and expanded each other's voice but they did not expand the contents of the management plan. They remarked that the drama was not clear

and the shared object was not contemplated, but they did not point out how it could be done.

In April 2012 during the formative meeting for teacher educators in Municipal Secretariat of Education, teacher educators from different Regional Boards of Education had their management plan exchanged and evaluated by teacher educators from different Regional Board of Education. The management plan producers also took part in the evaluation process. Excerpt 4 illustrates the moment when teacher educators evaluate the coherence between drama and shared object on the management plan produced by Regional Board of Education- XX.

Excerpt 4

150. TEA. Yes. **I** think it is a nice exercise from **her**. In this sense of how this text is elaborated []

151. TE1. [**I** am very technical too.]

152. TE1. [Laughter]

153. TEA. **You** have to search for a more critical question (laughter). **(controversy)**

154. TE1. The drama, when **you** put here barriers that made activities more difficult. **You** generalized all barriers, or do **you** have focus? **(controversial question)**

155. TEA. A::::: **(agreement)**

156. TE1. Another focus. **(controversial question addition)**

157. TEA. **We** listed these barriers previously []. **(agreement addition)**

158. TE1. [**Ye:::ss.**] **I** missed your list (laughter); **(agreement with viewpoint expression)**

159. TEA. It is great! **(agreement)** So to clarify a bit more, maybe to list them. [] **(agreement addition)**

160. TE1. **I** don't mean a list, but maybe a parenthesis as **they** did there. You know (referring to the other group). **(disagreement)**

161. TEA. **We** thought about that: But to put it again? **(controversial question)** But what **they** pointed out as something to make things more

162. TE1. But **I** keep thinking about **the reader's** difficulty **(disagreement) (controversy)**

163. TEE. To understand it, right?> [] **(agreement addition)**
(MSE, April 12, 2012, turns 150-163)

In the discussion about the coherence between drama and object, teacher educators also pointed out that the drama was not clear by posing a controversial question- *The drama, when **you** put here barriers that made activities more difficult. **You** generalized all barriers, or do **you** have focus?* Voices were interconnected by a relation between controversy, disagreement and different ways of agreeing: agreement, agreement addition and agreement with viewpoint expression; and different ways of voice positioning by using the pronoun *I* to refer to TE1 herself and express her opinion concerning the way the drama was stated; *you* to refer to TEA, and teacher educators who produced the management plan; *we*, although

TEA speaks she refers to teacher educators from Regional Board of Education-XX who worked on the plan. TEA also mentioned *they*, referring to pedagogical coordinators and TE1 referring to *the reader*.

Differently from the discussion on November, 2011, when teacher educators were more in a mirroring position concerning the evaluation of the management plan, during the discussion on April, 2012 participants took more their voices and encouraged other teacher educators to position and voice their real evaluation about the management plan.

5. Conclusion

The objective of this paper was to analyse the role of multivoicedness in the process of production and evaluation of the the management plan. More specifically the question that guided this study was: What are the dynamics of voices in the production of a new tool for educational management change? Which answers were constructed in different moments of the analysis comprising the description of the characteristics of the management plan, the school survey, the first and second version of the management plan and the comments by the consultant researcher, and finally, the evaluation of the management plan.

In the process of production of the management plan, the relation between need and the object were used to set part of the instrumentality that comprised the management plan. Besides, When teacher educators were in charge of answering the context survey to state school needs and objects, they had to bring up different voices of different levels of the educational system. The preparation to fill up the grid proposed by the consultant researcher and the educational process involving the context description exemplified how multivoicedness was used in the process of planning educational management change.

The educational system then, reorganized their activities as a chain and not as individual disconnected pieces anymore. Such reorganization provided the constitution of a discourse in which the subjects were empowered to reorganize their different activities in the educational system, rather than receiving an instrument that was ready made by the subjects who had more power in the system hierarchy. Using Freire's metaphor of the bank we could say that there was no deposit from the upper levels of the educational system downwards, but there was a collaborative construction of the tool to be negotiated, used and transformed according to the educational system needs. After all, *in these settings, the center just does not hold* (Engeström, 2006). Hence, the *management plan* revealed as an important artifact to voice the different stakeholders in the chain of the educational system, rather than an instrument that was going to be developed and used only for a period of time by a certain group of

LEMOS, Monica. The multivoiced production of a tool for educational management change. *Revista Intercâmbio*, v.XLVI: 61-84, 2020. São Paulo: LAEL/PUCSP. ISSN 2237-759X

educational managers in the system

Bibliographic references

BAKHTIN, M./VOLOSHINOV, V. *Le marxisme et la philosophie du langage*. Paris: [s.n.], 1977.

ENGESTRÖM, Y. *Learning by expanding: an activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. 2. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

_____. Weaving the texture of school change. *Journal of Educational Change*, v. 9, p. 379–383, 2008.

_____. Development, movement and agency: Breaking away into mycorrhizae activities. 1, 1–46. Retrieved from <http://lhc.ucsd.edu/mca/Mail/xmcam>. In: YAMAZUMI, K. (Ed.). *Building activity theory in practice: Toward the next generation*. Osaka: Kansai University Press, 2006. v. 1. p. 1–43. Disponível em: <http://lhc.ucsd.edu/mca/Mail/xmcamail.2008_12.dir/att-0247/Yrjo.dev.pdf>. Acesso em: 15 jul. 2020.

_____. The horizontal dimension of expansive learning: Weaving a texture of cognitive trails in the terrain of health care in Helsinki. In: ACHTENHAGEN, F; JOHN, E. G. (Eds.). *Milestones of vocational and occupational education and training: The teaching-learning perspective*. Bielefeld: Bertelsmann, 2003. p. 153–180.

_____. Activity theory and the social construction of knowledge: A story of four umpires. *Organization*, v. 7, n. 2, p. 301–310, 2000.

_____. *Activity theory and the social construction of knowledge: a story of four umpires*. San Diego: University of California, 1999.

_____. Teachers as Collaborative Thinkers: Activity-Theoretical Study of an Innovative Teacher Team. In: CARLGREN, I.; HANDAL, G.; VAAGE, S. (Eds.). *Teachers' minds and actions: research on teachers' thinking and practice*. London: Falmer Press, 1994. p. 43–61.

FREIRE, P. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.

HAUGE, T. E.; NORENES, S. O.; GUNN, V. School leadership and educational change: Tools and practices in shared school leadership development. *Journal of Educational Change*, v. 15, n. 4, p. 357–376, 2014. Disponível em: <<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10833-014-9228-y>>.

LEMOS, Monica. The multivoiced production of a tool for educational management change. *Revista Intercâmbio*, v.XLVI: 61-84, 2020. São Paulo: LAEL/PUCSP. ISSN 2237-759X

Acesso em: 20 jul. 2020.

ILYENKOV, E. Dialectics of the Abstract & the Concrete in Marx's. *Concrete*, p. 4-6, 1982.

LEMOS, M. F.; ENGESTRÖM, Y. Collective concept formation in educational management: an intervention study in São Paulo, Brazil. [S.d.].

LEMOS, M.; LIBERALI, F.; TOIVIAINEN, H. The Creative Chain as a possibility of overcoming educational management encapsulation. 2015, Singapore: Research Work and Learning, 2015. Disponível em: <<http://www.rwl2015.com/papers/Paper109.pdf>>. Acesso em: 20 jul. 2020.

LEONTIEV, A. N. *Activity, consciousness and personality*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1978. Disponível em: <http://www.marxists.org_archive_leontev_works_activity-consciousness>. Acesso em: 20 jul. 2020.

LIBERALI, F. Intervention research in a public elementary school: a critical-collaborative teacher education project on reading and writing. *Outlines*, v. 17, n. 1, p. 39-61, 2016. Disponível em: <<http://ojs.statsbiblioteket.dk/index.php/outlines/article/view/24205>>. Acesso em: 20 jul. 2020.

_____. *Argumentação em contexto escolar [Argumentation in school context]*. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2013.

_____. *Gestão Escolar em Cadeias Criativas [School Management in Creative Chains]*. [S.l.: s.n.], 2012.

_____. Gestão escolar na perspectiva da teoria da atividade sócio-histórico-cultural [School management in the social-historical-cultural activity theory perspective]. *A teoria da atividade sócio-histórico-cultural e a escola: recriando realidades sociais*. Campinas: Pontes, 2012a.

_____. Gestão escolar na perspectiva da teoria da atividade sócio-histórico-cultural [School management in the social-historical-cultural activity theory perspective]. In: LIBERALI, FERNANDA; MATEUS, ELAINE; DAMIANOVIC, MARIA CRISTINA (Org.). *A teoria da atividade sócio-histórico-cultural e a escola: recriando realidades sociais*. Campinas: Pontes, 2012b.

_____. *Formação crítica de educadores: questões fundamentais*. São Paulo: Cabral Editora e Livraria Universitária, 2008.

LEMOS, Monica. The multivoiced production of a tool for educational management change. *Revista Intercâmbio*, v.XLVI: 61-84, 2020. São Paulo: LAEL/PUCSP. ISSN 2237-759X

_____.; BORELLI, S.; LIMA, M. E. Gestão escolar em cadeias criativas: um processo para transformações escolares [School management in creative chains: a process for school transformation]. In: SILVA, K. A.; MARISTELLA-DE-ANDRADE, M.; PEREIRA FILHO, C. (Orgs.). *A formação de professores de línguas: políticas, projetos e parcerias*. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editora, 2015. v. 1. p. 93–141.

MAGALHÃES, M. C. C. Theoretical-methodological choices in AL research: critical research of collaboration in teacher education. *Inter Fainc*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 34–45, 2011.

_____. *A study of teacher-researcher collaboration on chapter one reading instruction*. 1990. Disponível em: <<http://hdl.handle.net/10919/39989>>. Acesso em: 20 jul. 2020.

MARX, K. *The Capital*. [S.l.]: Marxists Internet Archive Publications, 1993. Disponível em: <<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch01.htm>>. Acesso em: 20 jul. 2020.

MOGHADDAM, F.; HARRÉ, R. Conflicts and political processes: How the language we use in political processes sparks fighting. *Words of Conflict, Words of War*. [S.l.: s.n.], 2010.

PERELMAN, C.; OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, L. *Tratado da argumentação - A nova retórica*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1996.

SANNINO, A.; NOCON, H. Special issue editors' introduction: Activity theory and school innovation. *Journal of Educational Change*, v. 9, n. 4, p. 325–328, 2008. Disponível em: <<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10833-008-9079-5>>. Acesso em: 20 jul. 2020.

VYGOTSKY, L. S. *A formação social da mente [Mind and society]*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2007.

_____. *A construção do pensamento e da linguagem - trad. Paulo Bezerra*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2001.

WARTOFSKY, M. *Representation and the Scientific Understanding*. Boston: Springer, Dordrecht, 1979.

WEINER, J. M. Disabling conditions: Investigating instructional leadership teams in action. *Journal of Educational Change*, v. 15, n. 3, p. 253–280, 2014.

LEMOS, Monica. The multivoiced production of a tool for educational management change. *Revista Intercâmbio*, v.XLVI: 61-84, 2020. São Paulo: LAEL/PUCSP. ISSN 2237-759X

WERTSCH, J.; SMOLKA, A. L. B. Continuing the dialogue: Vygotsky, Bakhtin & Lotman. In: LONDON (Org.). *Charting the agenda: Educational activity after Vygotsky*. [S.l.]: Routledge, 1994. p. 69–92.