

Foucauldian interfaces in teacher education: pathways of knowledge, power, and subjectivation in educational public policies¹

*Interfaces foucaultianas na formação de professores:
percursos de saber, poder e subjetivação nas políticas públicas educacionais*

*Interfaces foucaultianas en la formación docente:
recorridos de saber, poder y subjetivación en las políticas públicas educativas*

Vidiane Casimiro da Silva²
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul

Marcello Ferreira³
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul

Abstract: This theoretical essay aims to analyze Michel Foucault's philosophical concepts and their possible implications for public policies on teacher education in Brazil. From a Foucauldian perspective, it seeks to understand how discourses, power devices, and truth regimes influence the constitution of the teacher-subject, educational practices, and the design of training programs. Grounded in the concepts of archeogenealogy, biopolitics, governmentality, discourse, and subjectivation, the text proposes a critical reflection on the structures that support institutional models of teacher education—both initial and continuing.

Keywords: Teacher education; Foucault; Public policies; Knowledge-power-subjectivity.

Resumo: Este ensaio teórico tem por finalidade analisar os conceitos filosóficos de Michel Foucault e suas possíveis implicações para as políticas públicas de formação de professores no Brasil. A partir de uma perspectiva foucaultiana, busca-se compreender como os discursos, os dispositivos de poder e os regimes de verdade influenciam os modos de constituição do sujeito professor, as práticas educativas e a formulação de programas formativos. Fundamentado nos conceitos de arqueogenealogia, biopolítica, governamentalidade, discurso e subjetivação, propõe reflexão crítica acerca das estruturas que sustentam os modelos institucionais de formação de professores – continuada ou inicial.

Palavras-chave: Formação de professores; Foucault; Políticas públicas; Saber-poder-subjetividade.

Resumen: Este ensayo teórico tiene como objetivo analizar los conceptos filosóficos de Michel Foucault y sus posibles implicaciones para las políticas públicas de formación docente en Brasil. Desde una perspectiva foucaultiana, se busca comprender cómo los discursos, los dispositivos de poder y los regímenes de verdad influyen en la constitución del sujeto profesor, en las prácticas educativas y en la formulación de programas formativos. Basado en los conceptos de arqueogenealogía, biopolítica, gubernamentalidad, discurso y subjetivación,

¹ Tradutora: Vidiane Casimiro da Silva, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, (RS), Brazil. E-mail: vidiane.silva@capes.gov.br.

² PhD student in Science Education, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, (RS), Brazil. E-mail: vidiane.silva@capes.gov.br; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1438031912834403>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-4914-7896>.

³ PhD in Science Education, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, (RS), Brazil. E-mail: marcellof@unb.br; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/3108824986425884>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4945-3169>.

propone una reflexión crítica sobre las estructuras que sustentan los modelos institucionales de formación docente —inicial o continua.

Palabras clave: Formación docente; Foucault; Políticas públicas; Saber-poder-subjetividad.

Received on: July 02, 2025

Accepted on: June 21, 2026

Introduction

The formulation of public policies aimed at teacher education in Brazil is intertwined with complex dynamics involving the production of knowledge, the creation of regulatory devices, and the constitution of teacher subjectivities. These policies are not established within a neutral or merely technical field; rather, they emerge from a discursive space permeated by power relations that shape the ways in which educational work is conceived, conducted, and evaluated. Rather than representing a harmonious set of pedagogical guidelines, teacher education policies are articulated through disputes over legitimacy and hegemony within the educational field (Mainardes, 2006, p. 52).

Given the complexity surrounding the analysis of educational policies, it is essential to question the conceptual foundations that underpin research in this field. This need becomes even more evident in the Brazilian context, where studies related to public policies in education face significant epistemological and methodological challenges.

Reflection on this approach is particularly valuable in the Brazilian context, since the field of educational policy research in Brazil is relatively recent and has not yet been consolidated in terms of consistent analytical frameworks. Moreover, it remains marked by the uncertainties arising from the paradigm crisis affecting the social sciences and humanities in contemporary times. In addition, to date, few scholars have discussed or sought to delineate more specific analytical frameworks for research on public, social, and educational policies (Mainardes, 2006, p. 48).

Inspired by Michel Foucault's contributions to the field of discursive formation, this essay proposes a critical reading of teacher education policies through the categories of discourse, knowledge, power, biopolitics, governmentality, and subjectivation. It constitutes a theoretical effort aimed at understanding how such policies operate in the constitution of the teacher-subject, not merely as a transmitter of knowledge, but as an object and effect of normative discourses that shape, classify, and regulate it. From the perspective of Foucauldian

archaeogenealogy⁴ (Foucault, 2000; 2008a), the teacher emerges as a discursive and historical construction, produced amidst struggles over truth and institutional practices.

By drawing on the Foucauldian approach, this study departs from the traditional view that conceives teacher education as a linear and cumulative process. Instead, it investigates the regimes of truth that sustain educational practices, as well as the dispositifs that establish a particular pedagogical rationality. Such rationality is translated into mechanisms of evaluation, curricular prescriptions, and performance requirements that transform teacher education into a space of subject capture and normalization (Foucault, 1979a; 2008b; Ferreira, 2018; Ferreira et al., 2022).

This theoretical foundation is justified not only by its prominence in the humanities, but above all by the analytical power of its concepts to problematize the epistemological and political foundations of education. To think about teacher education from a Foucauldian perspective is to recognize that the educational field is permeated by knowledge-power dispositifs that regulate ways of teaching and of being a teacher. This requires shifting the analytical focus from institutionalized structures to the discourses that legitimize them and sustain their authority (Foucault, 2012; 2024; Ferreira et al., 2022).

In this sense, understanding teacher education as a political practice implies viewing the teacher as a subject in a continuous process of subjectivation, traversed by multiple demands, norms, and expectations. The central concern, therefore, is to critically reflect on the effects of educational policies on the constitution of teacher identity, observing the ways in which power becomes inscribed in educational processes and pedagogical practice. The Foucauldian perspective thus invites suspicion, problematization, and resistance toward discourses that seek to define, once and for all, what a teacher ought to be (Ferreira et al., 2022).

2. Discourse, Knowledge, and Power: Foucauldian Foundations

The production of knowledge, particularly within the field of education, cannot be understood outside the networks of power and the discursive practices that sustain it (Ferreira, 2018). In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (2008a), Michel Foucault proposes an analytical shift that breaks with the linearity of traditional histories of ideas. Rather than seeking the origin of concepts or the intentions of an author, the focus is redirected toward the conditions that make the emergence of certain discourses possible to the exclusion of

⁴ Foucauldian archaeogenealogy is presented as a methodological approach that articulates historical analysis and a critical examination of discursive practices (Foucault, 2000; 2008a).

others. Such an archaeological approach makes it possible to denaturalize knowledge and to recognize its historical, contingent, and political constitution.

The conditions necessary for the appearance of an object of discourse, the historical conditions that make it possible to 'say something' about it and for different people to say different things about it, the conditions that allow it to be inscribed within a domain of relations with other objects, enabling it to establish relations of similarity, proximity, distance, difference, and transformation with them, are, as can be seen, numerous and significant. This means that one cannot speak of anything whatsoever at any given time (Foucault, 2008a, p. 50).

According to Foucault, discourses are neither mere reflections of reality nor mirrors of universal truths. Rather, they operate as practices that produce knowledge, establish exclusions, and regulate what can be said and by whom within a given field of meaning. Thus, discourses do not simply communicate ideas; they construct the very objects of which they speak, define subjects, and establish regimes of truth. In this regard, the educational field is profoundly shaped by these discursive practices, which normalize the figure of the teacher, school knowledge, and forms of teaching. Teacher education, therefore, is traversed by discourses that delineate the contours of what is understood as professionalism, pedagogical competence, innovation, and other notions that are central to contemporary educational policies. Such notions do not emerge spontaneously; rather, they are produced within discursive networks and institutional practices that operate through classifications, hierarchies, and exclusions. This discursive network also constitutes a space of power and subjectivation:

The way we have become accustomed to conducting research in education [...], the dispositifs we employ, and the forms of knowledge we construct for and as a consequence of such practices are not neutral. They are situated within a field of determination of knowledge, a space for the exercise of power, and a zone of subject constitution. It is the attempt to organize these correlations that we seek to find in Foucault, through the perspectives of being-knowledge, being-power, and being-with-oneself (Ferreira, 2018, p. 6).

From this perspective, teacher education must be understood as a political and discursive practice that not only transmits content or techniques but also constitutes teacher-subjects in accordance with specific ideals of governability and efficiency. The pedagogical knowledge circulating within teacher education curricula and continuing professional development programs is permeated by norms that establish what is considered desirable, acceptable, and valued in teaching practice. Such forms of knowledge are, therefore,

profoundly regulatory (Ferreira et al., 2022). Moreover, educational discourse is implicated in a series of dispositifs, a central concept in Foucauldian thought.

Dispositifs are heterogeneous assemblages composed of discourses, institutions, norms, practices, tactics, calculations, forms of knowledge, and statements that aim to govern conduct and produce effects of truth. In the context of teacher education, they materialize through regulatory and funding mechanisms, curricular guidelines, the selection of themes, the definition of materials and methods, performance assessment instruments and indicators, partnerships with private entities, international organizations and institutions, incentive policies, digital learning platforms, among others. All these elements participate in the constitution of a pedagogical rationality that guides and disciplines teacher education and the ensuing practices of educational professionals.

By understanding discourses as operative elements of power, Foucault provides tools for thinking about teacher education beyond the technical domain. Through his analyses, teaching can be envisaged as a discursive construction that takes shape at the intersection of knowledge and power. Pedagogical knowledge, in this sense, is not a neutral accumulation of information, but rather a set of regulated practices that sustain teachers' authority and define the margins of their action.

The articulation between knowledge and power, so strongly emphasized by Foucault (1979a), reveals that there is no knowledge outside power relations. As a subject of knowledge, the teacher is inserted into a field of forces that simultaneously grants authority and subjects the individual to norms of conduct and evaluation. The production of discourses concerning what constitutes a good teacher is thus linked to power games that seek to capture teacher subjectivity and orient it toward specific political and economic objectives. This understanding also enables a critical reading of teacher education policies, which often present themselves as neutral or technical under the guise of scientific management and purported ideological neutrality. Far from being neutral, such policies are embedded in discursive regimes that seek to produce subjects who conform to the standards of governmentality demanded by contemporary society. Educational practices, therefore, do not merely qualify individuals for the teaching profession; they fabricate ways of being a teacher that serve the hegemonic interests of the State, the market, and educational institutions.

It is therefore essential to recognize that pedagogical discourse, and the policies derived from it, play a central role in the production of teaching as both a way of life and a professional identity. Curricular guidelines, competency standards, quality indicators, and assessment dispositifs are statements that circulate within school and academic spaces, disciplining practices and defining the limits of teachers' actions. These discourses are not

homogeneous; rather, they coexist through tensions, disputes, and displacements. Consequently, analyzing the discourses that organize teacher education requires careful attention to the historical and political conditions that made them possible, the effects they produce on subjects, and the forms of resistance that may emerge from them. Foucauldian thought invites us to denaturalize pedagogical knowledge and to problematize the ways in which it participates in constituting teachers as normalized, efficient, and responsive subjects aligned with institutional expectations.

It is essential to recognize that discourses do not merely construct the world; rather, they do so in multiple ways, traversed by inequalities, exclusions, and possibilities for reinvention. By shifting the analytical focus from essence to practices, Foucault offers the field of education a powerful lens through which to destabilize certainties and open pathways for constructing alternative ways of thinking, teaching, and forming subjects.

3. Governmentality and the Governance of Teacher Education

The notion of governmentality, developed by Michel Foucault in his lectures at the *Collège de France* and consolidated in *The Government of Self and Others* (Foucault, 2009), constitutes a relevant theoretical framework for the analysis of public policies on teacher education. Through this concept, Foucault shifts the classical understanding of power as mere repression, proposing instead a mode of governing the conduct of individuals and populations through regulatory dispositifs, subtle norms, and political rationalities operating at both institutional and subjective levels. In this context, governmentality is understood as the art of governing, not only in the sense of state administration, but also as the governance of conduct that leads to the production of subjectivities capable of self-regulation according to socially legitimized values.

In the field of education, governmentality manifests itself as a set of practices aimed at shaping teachers' conduct in accordance with pre-established standards of competence, productivity, innovation, and responsibility. Within this framework, teacher education is not limited to the transmission of technical and pedagogical knowledge; rather, it functions as a field of normalization and control in which teachers are interpellated by institutional expectations that position them as subjects of duty and self-surveillance. In this way, power does not operate coercively but insinuates itself into everyday practices that induce desirable forms of conduct. Power is not merely restrictive; it is also productive.

It is in this sense that continuing teacher education, frequently presented as a policy of emancipation and professional valorization, assumes the form of a dispositif of permanent improvement, sustained by assessment mechanisms, performance metrics, and continuous processes of accountability. Such mechanisms operate through the capture of teacher subjectivity, fostering the internalization of norms that come to be experienced as personal choices when, in reality, they derive from broader political strategies. Ferreira *et al.* (2023) highlight this movement in a particularly compelling manner when they argue:

From a processual perspective, forms of knowledge are strategically established insofar as they are linked to existing power relations, from which their emergence and permanence derive. From this archaeogenealogical continuum emerges an intentional displacement through which the subjective dimension arises, no longer referable to a virtually open, entirely wild and untamed intentionality, the locus of a romantic conception of freedom (Ferreira et al., 2023, p. 12).

This diagnosis reveals that contemporary teacher subjectivity is traversed by a political rationality that displaces the notion of autonomy into the sphere of normatively regulated self-management. In other words, teachers are called upon to become entrepreneurs of themselves, in one of the most eloquent expressions of neoliberalism, assuming responsibility for their own development, performance, and effectiveness, often in contexts marked by precariousness, instability, and the absence of adequate material conditions for professional practice (Dardot & Laval, 2016). Whether in politics or within institutions, education continuously relinquishes its condition as a public good and increasingly assumes the character and logic of a commodity, devoid of social references and oriented toward market efficiency, managerial results, and rapid profit, without political or ethical commitment (Laval, 2014).

In this regard, governmentality is inscribed within a management paradigm that transforms education into a field of permanent regulation. Teacher professionalization is articulated as a continuous process of adaptation to the demands of an ever-changing educational market, in which the ideal of the reflective and innovative teacher functions as a normative model guiding educational policies and training practices. The rhetoric of innovation, pedagogical leadership, and excellence replaces the valorization of experience, dialogue, and the collective construction of knowledge (Foucault, 2009, p. 287). In this sense, there is, therefore, nothing genuinely disruptive about these processes.

It is important to emphasize that such constructions do not emerge spontaneously or disinterestedly. Rather, they respond to political projects aimed at producing subjects capable of functioning effectively within a neoliberal logic marked by instrumental rationality,

productivity, and individual accountability. Teachers thus become key actors in the process of educational modernization, not because they are recognized as creative and autonomous subjects, but because of their ability to adapt to institutional demands and perform according to previously defined indicators.

Within this scenario, teacher education is traversed by a dual movement. On the one hand, discourses of autonomy, empowerment, and professional agency are promoted; on the other, dispositifs of surveillance, regulation, and conformity are consolidated, restricting possibilities for experimentation and contestation. Freedom is no longer conceived as an expression of singularity or a space for invention, but rather as the voluntary adherence to imposed norms. Self-surveillance, in this sense, becomes an extension of institutional control, operating through mechanisms such as self-assessment, reflective portfolios, professional development goals, and impact metrics.

From a Foucauldian perspective, this model of education does not merely structure pedagogical practices; it fabricates subjects adjusted to the rationality of the present. The ideal of the effective, committed, innovative, and resilient teacher is not a neutral reality, but a discursive product that guides public policies, curricula, and evaluation systems. Performativity becomes an imperative, and teacher subjectivity is reconfigured according to the logic of management, productivity, and efficiency.

As can be inferred from Foucault's analysis, governmentality does not operate through explicit imposition, but through the constitution of dispositifs that act upon subjects' desires, beliefs, and ways of seeing the world (Foucault, 2009). In the case of teachers, this dynamic manifests itself in the internalization of performance expectations, adherence to standardized teaching practices, and conformity with the objectives of educational institutions. Governmentality, therefore, transforms the field of teacher education into a territory of symbolic struggle, in which what is at stake is not only what teachers should know, but, above all, who they should become.

Understanding teacher education through the concept of governmentality implies problematizing the ways in which teachers are subjected to policies that call them to self-management, continuous improvement, and conformity to standards of excellence. Such problematization is essential for opening space to construct alternative ways of being a teacher, grounded in more democratic, collaborative, and critical educational processes that recognize the complexity of teaching practice and the legitimacy of the forms of knowledge produced in the everyday life of schools (Ferreira *et al.*, 2022).

4. Biopolitics and Normalization in Teacher Education

The incorporation of the concept of biopolitics into Michel Foucault's thought marks a fundamental analytical shift in understanding contemporary modes of exercising power. A critical analysis of educational policies requires acknowledging that their formulation and implementation do not arise from neutral technical decisions but are traversed by symbolic disputes, ideological tensions, and power relations. The policy cycle approach proposed by Mainardes (2006) makes an important contribution by highlighting the contradictory processes involved in the construction of public policies within the educational field. As the author points out:

Educational policies are not the result of rational decisions made on the basis of neutral and objective technical knowledge. Rather, they are deeply ideological processes in which different actors, holding distinct political, social, and cultural interests and positions, contest the definition of educational problems and the solutions to be implemented (Mainardes, 2006, p. 51).

This understanding directly resonates with the Foucauldian perspective, insofar as every educational policy may also be regarded as a discursive artifact sustained by regimes of truth and strategies of power. Power is neither localized nor concentrated in a single instance; rather, it is diffuse, capillary, and embedded within social practices (Foucault, 1979a; 2008b). Consequently, teacher education policies are not merely administrative mechanisms, but dispositifs that operate upon subjects, constituting ways of being and acting through the normalization of knowledge and the production of subjectivities. From this articulation, it becomes possible to perceive that the processes of policy formulation and implementation involve asymmetrical power relations expressed through institutionally legitimized discourses. Within this field, teacher education is not merely technical but eminently political and ideological, for it is precisely there that struggles emerge over who has the authority to define what teaching is, what it means to be a teacher, and which forms of knowledge deserve recognition and circulation within educational spaces.

In *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Foucault (2008b) describes how, beginning in the eighteenth century, power ceased to operate exclusively upon individuals, isolated bodies, or territories and came to function at the level of populations. Biopolitics thus inaugurates a mode of governing centered on the administration of life, the regulation of health, the surveillance of behaviors, and the normalization of subjects, all in the name of state rationalization and the maximization of social productivity.

Within the educational field, this biopolitical rationality manifests itself through the constitution of an apparatus of knowledge-power that structures public policies, pedagogical practices, and modes of teacher subjectivation. In this scenario, teachers are conceived as strategic agents in the processes of producing and regulating social life. Their work is governed by norms that establish acceptable conduct, values to be cultivated, performance standards to be achieved, and an ideal professional image to be emulated. Rather than operating through direct coercion, power acts diffusely through multiple dispositifs that shape bodies and orient conduct.

Teacher education, therefore, does not escape this logic. On the contrary, it constitutes one of the principal vectors for disseminating normative dispositifs that guide the constitution of the "good teacher." This figure is not constructed by chance, but results from discursive processes that articulate technical competencies, socio-emotional skills, and relational capacities as desirable attributes. Effectiveness, resilience, innovation, technological proficiency, and commitment to results have, in recent decades, become key imperatives structuring educational policies and institutional models of teacher education.

These processes operate through what Foucault (1979a) refers to as discipline⁵, namely, the regulation of behavior and the standardization of modes of action. When applied to teacher education, discipline takes the form of rigid curricular prescriptions, systematic evaluations, pedagogical protocols, quality-control instruments, and mandatory continuing education requirements. This constitutes a regime of normalization that, by establishing standards, renders singularities, forms of resistance, and locally produced knowledge invisible. Such a normalizing logic operates not only upon what teachers should know, but also upon how they should be. There is a constant demand for self-regulation, conformity to institutional ideals, and responsiveness to goals that frequently ignore the complexities and contradictions of school realities. The diversity of contexts, sociocultural differences, teaching styles, and non-hegemonic epistemologies are often silenced in the name of standardization and efficiency.

As Foucault suggests, biopolitics does not operate through direct imposition but through the internalization of norms, forms of knowledge, and patterns of conduct (Foucault, 1979b, p. 89). Teacher-subjects are encouraged to desire precisely what is expected of them, to voluntarily adjust themselves to criteria of excellence, and to invest in their own education as symbolic capital. Within this paradigm, freedom of choice becomes an exercise guided by invisible norms that determine what may or may not be thought, said, and done within

⁵ Foucault (1979a) conceives discipline as a technology of power aimed at the production of docile bodies and the modulation of gestures.

educational spaces. Control thus operates through risk management, the anticipation of deviations, and the incorporation of expected forms of conduct.

Biopolitics redefines the notion of power, no longer centered upon sovereignty or repression, but upon the production of governable life (Foucault, 2008b, p. 137). In the context of teaching, this implies that teacher education ceases to be a space for critical and collective construction (Ferreira et al., 2022) and becomes instead a field of competency modulation and subjection to evaluative regimes (Laval, 2014; Dardot & Laval, 2016). Teacher professionalization is reduced to a process of technical adjustment, performance monitoring, and the incorporation of external indicators, thereby devaluing the ethical, political, and emancipatory dimensions of educational practice. Inserted into contexts marked by precariousness, dispossession, competitiveness, and automation, teachers witness the progressive deterioration of their careers, remuneration, and working conditions, which, in turn, drastically diminishes any potential for resistance.

This mode of managing teachers' lives also produces profound effects on subjectivity. Teachers come to perceive themselves as exclusively responsible for their own success or failure within a meritocratic logic that disregards the structural conditions of pedagogical work. Frustration, precariousness, and illness, frequently experienced by teachers, are treated as individual failures rather than as symptoms of a system that captures life in the form of management and performance (Dardot & Laval, 2016). Biopolitics therefore produces a subjectivity marked by guilt, fear of failure, exhaustion, and an incessant search for institutional recognition.

Moreover, this rationality weakens the possibilities for constructing alternative ways of being and teaching. By transforming the ideal teacher into a widely disseminated normative model, it hinders the emergence of alternative forms of existence and pedagogical practice. It is precisely in the search for openings through which these dispositifs may be problematized that the Foucauldian reading becomes particularly relevant. By historicizing the construction of discourses and revealing their contingency, it invites us to denaturalize the regimes of truth that organize the educational field (Foucault, 2008a). Biopolitics is not totalizing; it coexists with resistances, contradictions, and fissures. Power is everywhere, not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere (Foucault, 1979b). A critical analysis of the ways teachers are constituted may therefore foster the emergence of more plural, ethical, and emancipatory educational practices that recognize teaching as a living, situated, and political experience, ultimately as a parrhesiastic potentiality.

To assimilate the effects of biopolitics upon teacher education is to recognize that subjects are not passive recipients of policies and discourses, but agents capable of creating meanings, questioning norms and taken-for-granted assumptions, (re)inventing practices, and

resisting the capture of life by the logic of scientific management, efficiency, profit at any cost, and the precarization of every autonomous form of existence. Such recognition is essential for constructing an educational project committed to social justice, the valorization of differences, and the dignity of teachers' work. There can be no just and ethical life without the guarantee of human rights, democracy, strong institutions, a free press, and public, free, high-quality, and socially referenced education, all of which ultimately depend upon well-educated and politically engaged teachers, necessarily detached from the enterprise-form.

Conclusions

The analysis of public policies on teacher education through a Foucauldian lens makes it possible to break with naïve interpretations that conceive such policies as purely technical or neutral instruments. On the contrary, these policies should be understood as discursive practices operating within historically constituted regimes of truth, responsible for defining which forms of knowledge are legitimate, which forms of conduct are expected, and which teacher-subjects are deemed desirable. Within this field, power is not imposed solely in a repressive manner; rather, it circulates, shapes, regulates, and normalizes.

Michel Foucault's thought invites us to shift the focus of analysis from essence to the effects of practices, proposing close attention to the ways in which power infiltrates the details of everyday educational life. This change in perspective is fundamental for understanding that educational policies do not merely qualify teachers but actively constitute them. They produce identities, modulate conduct, and direct processes of subjectivation in ways that align teachers with models of excellence, efficiency, and adaptability compatible with neoliberal rationality. At the same time that public policies function as instruments of normalization and control, however, Foucault teaches us that power is never total or omnipresent. Where there is power, there is resistance. In this context, resistance need not be grandiose or violent. It may emerge in small fissures, everyday deviations, and institutional openings that enable the creation of other practices, other voices, and other ways of being a teacher. It is within this space that the possibility emerges for rethinking teacher education on the basis of ethical, aesthetic, and political values that escape the prevailing and dominant model.

Within educational practices, resistance may take the form of collectively reinvented curricula, pedagogical planning that values local forms of knowledge, or even the refusal to adopt standardized assessment tools that render contexts invisible (Ferreira et al., 2022). By historicizing discourses, Foucauldian archaeogenealogy demonstrates that nothing is natural or definitive, thereby opening space for the construction of other forms of truth that are more

plural and situated. This openness to difference as a multiplying force constitutes one of the major contributions of Foucauldian thought to teacher education. Adopting a Foucauldian attitude toward education therefore implies questioning the meanings of the statements that sustain educational dispositifs and rejecting their claim to universality. This does not entail denying the importance of technique or the systematization of knowledge, but rather problematizing the ways in which certain forms of knowledge are privileged to the detriment of others, as well as the exclusionary effects produced by these choices. In this process, teachers become not merely objects but also subjects of knowledge and action.

Educational practices, often conceived as mechanisms for transmitting content, can be reconfigured into spaces of sharing, listening, and invention. Within this scenario, the educator is not a transmitter of truths, but an agent who challenges, provokes, and mobilizes alternative possibilities for interpretation and action. Far from constituting a neutral terrain, the field of teacher education should be understood as a political territory permeated by disputes, tensions, and creative potentialities.

By rejecting the notion of fixed subjects or stable identities, Foucault suggests that teachers are always in the process of becoming. This means that professional identity is not something to be achieved once and for all, but something continuously constructed and renegotiated. Such an understanding disrupts the meritocratic and performative logic that has dominated educational discourses and opens space for practices that are more sensitive to the complexity of teachers' experiences.

By problematizing the normalizing effects of teacher education policies, this essay has sought to emphasize the importance of educational practices that recognize the multiplicity of subjects and school contexts. It is necessary to reclaim the value of narratives, experiences, and forms of knowledge produced within the everyday life of schools, which are frequently rendered invisible by demands for performance and productivity. Listening, reflection, and dialogue should occupy a central place in educational processes, replacing technicism with the collective construction of meaning.

Thus, revisiting the concepts of resistance, knowledge, and power through a Foucauldian perspective also constitutes a means of restoring to teachers their condition as producers of knowledge and political agents. By calling into question the discourses that classify, evaluate, and normalize them, possibilities emerge for more ethical, singular, and emancipatory educational experiences. Rather than educating for adjustment, education should foster critique; instead of adaptation, it should cultivate creation.

In times marked by increasing standardization, control, and the erosion of the public meaning of education, adopting the critical attitude proposed by Foucault means keeping alive

the spirit of inquiry, refusal, and imagination. Educational policies need not be reproduced uncritically; they can be contested, reinvented, and reappropriated in favor of a more just and plural educational project, committed to the dignity of teachers' work and to the transformative potential of education.

References

DARDOT, P.; LAVAL, C. *A nova razão do mundo: ensaio sobre a sociedade neoliberal*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.

FERREIRA, M. *Michel Foucault e o ensino de física: veredas*. *Pesquisa e Debate em Educação*, v. 8, n. 2, p.172-193, 2018.

FERREIRA, M.; SILVA FILHO, O. L.; PORTUGAL, K. O.; BOTTECHIA, J. A. A.; LIMA, M. B.; COSTA, M. R. M.; FERREIRA, D. M. G.; OLIVER, N. A. D. Formação continuada de professores de Ciências em caráter investigativo, interdisciplinar e com mediação por tecnologias digitais. *RBPG – Revista Brasileira da Pós-Graduação*, v. 18, p. 1-39, 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21713/rbpg.v18i39.1971>.

FERREIRA, M. *et al.* Referenciais teórico-metodológicos na pesquisa em ensino de física entre 2001 e 2023: metalinguagens e relações saber-poder-subjetividade. *Revista de Enseñanza de la Física*, v. 35, n. 2, p. 117-132, 2023.

FOUCAULT, M. *História da loucura na Idade Clássica*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1972.

FOUCAULT, M. *Microfísica do Poder*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 1979a.

FOUCAULT, M. *História da sexualidade: a vontade de saber*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1979b.

FOUCAULT, M. *As palavras e as Coisas*. Uma arqueologia das ciências humanas. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2000.

FOUCAULT, M. *A Arqueologia do Saber*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2008a.

FOUCAULT, M. *Nascimento da biopolítica*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2008b.

FOUCAULT, M. *Governo de si e dos outros*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2009.

FOUCAULT, M. *A ordem do discurso*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2012.

FOUCAULT, M. *O Discurso Filosófico*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2024.

LAVAL, C. *A escola não é uma empresa*. O neoliberalismo em ataque ao ensino público. Boitempo: São Paulo, 2014.

MAINARDES, J. Abordagem do ciclo de políticas: uma contribuição para a análise de políticas educacionais. *Educação & Sociedade*, v. 27, p. 47-69, 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302006000100003>.