



MECHANISMS OF POWER AND MANIPULATION IN THE LANGUAGE: SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF AN INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE FROM FRENCH FILM *ENTRE LES MURS*

Juana Valentina Mora Oquendo¹

Enlace ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5496-1923>

Luis Fernando Arévalo Viveros²

Enlace ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9560-7443>

Fecha de Recepción: 23 de Agosto de 2023

Fecha de Aprobación: 1 de Diciembre de 2023

Abstract

The main purpose of this text is to analyze the manipulation processes that shape power relations in the classroom in the French film *Entre les murs* in order to identify how they make up the institutional discourse. For this purpose, it is used the discursive semiotics of Greimas and Courtes (1990), Fontanille (1998), Arevalo (2010) and the theory of Candela (2001) and Jackson (1992) regarding power relations as a theoretical and methodological basis. Thus, this interpretative exercise inquires about the manipulative strategies that influence the dynamics of social structures presented in the educational institution through discourse, reflecting on educational practices and the need for their restructuring, as well as the usefulness of semiotics to recognize them.

Keywords: classroom, discourse, power, manipulation, semiotics. language.

¹ Degree in Literature and Spanish Language, member of the CUYCANO Research Group, Universidad Industrial de Santander.

² Doctorate in Langues, Littérature et Civilisations Romanes, Université d'Aix-Marseille. Director of the CUYNACO Research Group, professor at the Language School of the Universidad Industrial de Santander.

MECANISMOS DE PODER Y MANIPULACIÓN EN LA LENGUA: ANÁLISIS SEMIÓTICO DE UN DISCURSO INSTITUCIONAL DEL CINE FRANCÉS ENTRE LES MURS

Resumen

El presente texto tiene como propósito fundamental analizar los procesos de manipulación que configuran las relaciones de poder en el aula dentro de la película francesa *Entre les murs* en función de identificar cómo componen el discurso institucional. Para ello, se usará como base teórica y metodológica la semiótica discursiva de Greimás y Courtés (1990), Fontanille (1998) y algunos aportes de Arévalo (2010) así como la teoría de Candela (2001) y Jackson (1992) respecto a las relaciones de poder en el aula. Así, este ejercicio interpretativo indaga acerca de las estrategias manipulatorias que influyen en las dinámicas de las estructuras sociales que se presentan en la institución educativa a través el discurso reflexionando en torno a las prácticas educativas y la necesidad de su reestructuración, así como la utilidad de la semiótica para reconocerlas.

Palabras Clave: aula, discurso, poder, manipulación, semiótica. lenguaje.

MECANISMOS DE PODER E MANIPULAÇÃO NA LINGUAGEM: ANÁLISE SEMIÓTICA DE UM DISCURSO INSTITUCIONAL DO CINEMA FRANCÊS ENTRE LES MURS

Resumo:

O objetivo principal deste artigo é analisar os processos de manipulação que configuram as relações de poder na sala de aula no filme francês *Entre les murs*, a fim de identificar como eles compõem o discurso institucional. Para tanto, utilizar-se-á como base teórica e metodológica a semiótica discursiva de Greimás e Courtés (1990), Fontanille (1998) e algumas contribuições de Arévalo (2010), bem como a teoria das relações de poder em sala de aula de Candela (2001) e Jackson (1992). Assim, este exercício interpretativo explora as estratégias de manipulação que influenciam a dinâmica das estruturas sociais que ocorrem na instituição educativa através do discurso, reflectindo sobre as práticas educativas e a necessidade da sua reestruturação, bem como a utilidade da semiótica no reconhecimento das mesmas.

Palavras-chave: sala de aula, discurso, poder, manipulação, semiótica, linguagem.

1. INTRODUCCIÓN:

As social subjects, we recognize the world through language and we relate to each other through acts of language developed in social interaction that generate discourse. Within this, the processes of construction of meaning are involved, that means, the significance of the reality that each one creates and expresses through the enunciation in which discursive events are generated.

Without the comprehension of these phenomenas it is usual to fall in the inconsciencia of our acts. Esto se debe a que existe una fuente de creencias e ideas que son el movimiento de nuestros actos y lo que los compone hace parte de los actos discursivos. En otras palabras, nuestras convicciones son discursos que viven dentro de nosotros y que se reflejan en nuestro modo de vivir y de actuar. Ocurre no solo en lo que refiere al individuo, sino a comunidades, sociedades, instituciones, etc.

En esta ocasión, nos interesa profundizar en el discurso educativo cómo ese se constituye, cómo interactúan los sujetos y de qué manera las dinámicas sociales pueden o no reconstruir el modo en que se

establecen las relaciones entre los actores a través de las relaciones de poder y los actos de manipulación.

In view of this panorama, the present work proposes to investigate around the questions: How does this fluctuation or construction of power relations occur in educational practices? What are the manipulation mechanisms used by the actors? Are these relations maintained or do they fluctuate? Why think about institutional discourse from the perspective of semiotics?

Based on these questions, it's made a semiotic analysis of the film *Entre les murs* will focus on the manipulation mechanisms used by the language teacher and the student Koumba for the construction of power relations in the classroom.

For this purpose, elements of the semiotic theory of communication of Greimás and Courtés (1990) and Fontanille (1998) will be used. In addition, the theory of Candela (2001) and Jackson (1992) will be considered with respect to power relations in the classroom. This will be developed from two main sections: sociocultural contracts and dynamic structures. Likewise, a reflection will be made about educational practices, the role of semiotics and what it allows us to identify with regard to the transforming

needs in the institution. Authors such as Paulo Freire (1990), Carretero (2000), among others, will shed light on freedom and autonomy in the classroom. Finally, the pertinent conclusions will be drawn.

2. MARCO TEÓRICO

In the course of these, Arévalo (2010) tells us, "Manipulation processes characterized by dynamic structures, socio-cultural contracts and identity proposals that attempt, successfully or unsuccessfully, to produce transformations in the subjects on whom the action of the discourses falls" (p.2) In this sense, the manipulative act in semiotic studies does not have the pejorative charge attributed to it in the usual sense. On the other hand, it is inevitable in all discursive interaction. There will always be a tendency, a *meaning* that will be proposed by a subject within a discourse.

This manipulative process occurs, in essence, through the communicative act. For his part, the *communicative act* is understood as a succession or sequence of states or transformations of subjects and objects that, by means of different discourses, are found within a potentially conflictive situation framed in a *narrative trajectory* - NT - (Greimás and Courtés, 1990). Each context has a NT composed by a scenario,

actors and roles that relate to each other under an *implicit contract*. This occurs naturally, the interaction is not initially questioned by the subjects, they give themselves to a way of being: to be a parent, to be a child, to be a teacher, to be a student, to be a citizen. These roles are taken upon entering a space with such a narrative and accepted as their own.

In this sense, in order to maintain the NT in its established logical order, different communicative strategies should be used to convince the subjects not to impose themselves and break the structure. Then, manipulating will be the action of a subject signifying the schemes of the other (passional, axiological, semiotic and cognitive) through different modalities that will intervene to maintain or modify the *actancial role* of the subject. These are: *to know, to be able, to want and to have*. The different combinations of these modes are the mechanisms to signify the doing and being of the other (to be able to do, to want to do, to want to be, to have to do, to be able to be, etc.). Therefore, Greimas and Courtés (1990) refer to manipulating as a *make-do*, in the pragmatic sense, and a *make-be*, in the cognitive sense. In other words, the aim is to influence not only the actions of the other, but also the way in

which the world is represented, trying to make him/her accept the role he/she wants to acquire in the narrative.

In this order, the power of one subject over the other is involved. *Power* being understood by Greimás and Courtés (1990) as one of the possible predicates of a modal statement over a descriptive statement (to do or state). It is modal, insofar as it has the power to rule over other statements, a way of being. Thus, the one who in the discourse exercises this modality on *being* or *doing*, in himself or in another, configures his identity and acts in the *narrative trajectories*, as the *manipulator* on a *manipulated*. Thus, *asymmetrical* power relations are created (of non-equivalent level) where one subject manipulates the other according to their roles and functions. However, in order for the *contract* to be maintained, persuasion must be achieved throughout the entire process. If a subject does not identify himself and does not grant the meaning corresponding to the functions granted to him, the *contract* will be subject to dynamics that will modify it according to the manipulation mechanisms used by the two actors (Dell Hymes, 1964).

In the case of educational practices, communication develops between two main subjects:

the teacher and the students. This interaction takes place as a relationship of communication or mandate in which one is who commands or induces another to fulfill a certain task, and the other is the one who receives the order to fulfill the task. These are found within an institutional *narrative trajectory* in which they are configured as actors with specific functions, thus assuming *actantial roles* that create an identity; this is called *syntactic structure* (the position they occupy). Whether or not such a structure is maintained within the *implicit sociocultural contract* established in the *trajectory* will depend on the subjects and the manipulation mechanisms they use to persuade each other.

In this sense, these notions of narrative trajectory, manipulation, and social structures will serve as the foundation for conducting an analysis of the excerpts from the film "Entre les murs" (The Class). To do so, the results will be presented concerning how the institutional structure is organized, what the stable elements are, and what the dynamic elements entail.

3. RESULTADOS

Stable structures or sociocultural contracts: How do they manifest themselves in the teacher-student relationship?

First of all, it is necessary to bring up the concept of *narrative trajectory* (NT). Greimás and Courtés (1990) define it as "a series of narrative programs, simple or complex, logically linked in such a way that each NT is presupposed by another presupposing NT" (p. 233). At the level of education, the presupposition is the *implicit contract* (or sociocultural) that subjects accept when they enter this *trajectory*, the classroom and even the institution itself: "once enrolled in a *narrative trajectory*, syntactic subjects are susceptible to being defined by the position they occupy in it and by the nature of the objects of value with which they enter into junction" (ibid, p. 278).

The aforementioned process occurs through *exteroception*, what is found in the natural world (socio-cultural contracts, signifiers, etc.) and *interoception*, which is the subject's response to the stimulus (Fontanille, 1998). Thus, a *proprioception* (semantics) is created, the subjects create a narrative scheme in

which they ascribe their meaning of life in the identity they acquire, the doing in which they realize that identity and the sanction (retribution and recognition) that "guarantees the meaning of their acts and establishes them as a subject according to being" (ibid, p. 275). This is the product of a process of signification in which sense and meaning come together to create concrete situations by means of a specific space, determined roles and acts that forge the functioning of the established path.

Spatial programming

In the first instance, the structure of the *narrative* is determined by the space in which the act takes place. The organization of the space, that is, the *spatial programming*, conditions the behavior of the subjects in relation to the organized objects. In a classroom, as observed in the film, there is a universal prefiguration proper of the institutional speaking. Even if we accept that there's in the actuality some changes, it is not essential, "an institution is, in her essence, based on the relation between the master, the student and the learning conditions, focus and certified in the learning define as relevant by the society" (Donoso, 2014). We can observe that in the movie.

Image 1.



Source: <https://youtu.be/rJpSM3DaaOA>

The *manipulator* subject is positioned in the image as the guiding axis. The control of expression is subject to his decision, the objects at his disposal (blackboard, desk) determine that his voice is active; in other words, it will be communicated and heard by a mainly passive audience. From this it can be inferred that he possesses a unique position in the classroom, since there is no other subject who possesses the same elements or is positioned in the same way; in other words, he possesses a power of knowledge and control of the discourse. Contrary to the subjects positioned in the direction of him: they are aligned and agglutinated with equal desks. The elements on which they transmit their discourse (notebook) are only seen by themselves, their voice and control of the discourse is passive or measured by another. Only the one with the

blackboard, which is there to be observed by all, will be the one who can exercise power from what is referred to in the discourse; that is why he/she is configured as the *manipulator*. While the others, those who attend to what is expressed, are organized in such a way that they end up being the *manipulators*.

This is the stable structure that manifests itself in the spatial analysis of the classroom. It is worth asking why the subjects do not question or modify the space to eliminate the asymmetry in which the functions and positions are organized? This is because space symbolizes the *implicit contract*, understood as the "set of prior issues that underlie the intersubjective structure" (Greimás, p. 88). Therefore, their permanence in the space implies that they recognize the prior questions, as Jackson (1992) points out, "sitting in front of a table the student is in readiness to do something. The teacher's task is to state what that something will be." (p. 22). Thus, this contract involves *propositions*, the will of S1 for S2 to do something; and *commitments*, the will or duty of S2 to take charge of the suggested action. The educational institution, in this sense, determines power relations by granting actantial roles in which the teacher will be the *manipulator* and

the student the *manipulated*. Let us talk then about what these roles consist of.

Actantial roles determined: when the teacher determines the discourse

According to Candela (2001), the teacher maintains manipulation over the student based on three premises. First, the students do not know: *I could stop being demanding and let them do whatever they want, but they will never get far* (min 26:17). Here, the teacher is identified as the one who, from *be able and know-how*, has the power to influence the student's competencies, that is, *to be able to do*. Without it, they would not be able to achieve fulfillment. Furthermore, it is assumed that in the student's role "to go far" is to learn and acquire competencies in the institution.

Secondly, only the teacher has the right to control the speech of the other, ergo, to exercise power. In this case, linguistic correction is given as a form of coercion that positions him in his *know-how*, so he seeks to *make-do* the student according to the *must-do* that a classroom implies. That is to say, a correct verbal expression: *speak correctly, eh? Try, how am I?* (Min 29:13) Thus, she tries to maintain her role by preventing (*make not do*) the *manipulated* from

misaligning the contracted actantial roles. This is observed throughout the film in the teacher's constant attempt to regulate the students. In the image, for example, numerous students are seen raising their hands as a gesture of request to be able to express themselves.

Finally, says Candela (2001), only the teacher asks and evaluates. Two things should be noted here. First, although the social contract determines that "only the teacher asks" within the traditional teaching scheme, it can be noted throughout the film that the teacher does not seek to prevent student participation, but rather to maintain the identity of the teacher as the student's *manipulator*:

Q: *That's not true, I just want you to read. I think I have the right to ask you to read.*

K: *No.*

Q: *Don't you think I have the right?*

K: *Keep silent*

(Min 29:31)

This dialogue shows that the teacher does not sanction the student for his participation or interruption, but intends to postulate his actions as appropriate and

necessary from the position he occupies by means of positive objects (the established cultural values).

Secondly, evaluation could be associated with *sanction* as retribution and recognition (Greimás and Courtés, 1990, p. 275). When the student Khoumba refuses to participate in class, the teacher calls her to record the offense she committed and to understand the reason for the act. However, it is all done from the position of the sanctioner: *I want you to apologize. I want an apology for what you did* (min 40:42). The teacher demands retribution to restore his identity, to reestablish the role as the one who can *make-do* on stage.

The teacher always seeks to perpetuate his or her power figure in the classroom through strategies that allow him or her to keep it. Khoumba, the student with the most problems, recognizes this power over her and her peers: *"Teenagers learn to respect their teachers little by little. Because of their threats or for fear of getting into trouble."*(min 47:48). This reveals that the teacher's main manipulation strategy is the *intimidation* he generates in students who cannot fight against a system that puts them as an inferior link within the power chain in the classroom. This is so, moreover, because the *not-being-able-to-do* involves the *must-do*

that the teacher imposes in the educational scenario.

This example not only shows us that the teacher is capable of influencing the *make-do* and the *make-not-doing*, but also the *make-being*, since he intends to have an impact on Khoumba's way of being in his relationship with him, so that he rejects her rude behavior and influences it to be polite. The value of the word lies not only in pronouncing it, but in doing so with frankness; only in this way, he will be able to emphasize his complete power over the manipulated subject.

It should be clarified that the space and the corporal disposition of the actors have a great incidence. This works because in the scene it can be observed that the teacher hides under the object that has more power in the classroom: his desk, place of evaluation and judgement. That is to say, it is an object that represents an intimidating power since through it he exercises an action that endangers the objects of value that the students possess (approve). In addition, Khoumba is much demurer and shyer when she is in an empty classroom, which makes it easier for her to give in to the teacher's intimidation.

Image 2

Source: <https://youtu.be/rJpSM3DaaOA>

This is affirmed when, at the end of the scene, Khoumba expresses freedom to reject the strategy of intimidation that she intended influenced by a *must-do*, because just after she is located on the border between the classroom and the hallway she expresses: "*I didn't mean it*" (min 41:49), referring the apology she offered to the teacher. Thanks to this, dysphoria is evidenced in him due to the disjunction between the identity he has of control and the reality of not being able to exercise it. This is evidenced in the kick he delivers to the desk chair as a sign of frustration. Thus, we see that it is not always the teacher who represents the complete power in the actors within the RT.

The dynamic structures of power relations: when the student has the power

Candela (2001) states that there is another range within this interaction that corresponds to the *local*

range in which power is configured through social variables whose meanings are particular to a given community, such as popularity or the ability to argue,



observed that in some scenes there is a dysphoria, loss of meaning, of the *manipulator*, who in this case is the teacher, with respect to his *ideal narrative program*. The atmosphere in the classroom is tense, it clashes with the disposition that is necessary on the part of the students for the educational practice to develop and for the teacher to be able to exercise in the student's *make-know*.

It is possible to observe, for example, that the students refuse to participate in the class, and even, in several moments, tired students appear on the scene during the class time. In one of the scenes that we contemplate for the analysis, the teacher makes fun of the poor concentration capacity of his students, thus exercising a strategy of manipulation by *provocation*, but this manipulation is rejected at first by the student Khoumba who objects "*He is a little out of line with these jokes*" (min 26:03), then supporting her argument

that this is a collective thought of the class, that is, a thought that enjoys popularity.

Should exist in all this structure an argumentative effort from part of the two actors (Marafioti, 2003). Thus, Khoumba takes the role of the manipulative subject and tries to influence the teacher's *make-not-do*, this through *intimidation*, in which it is presented that if the teacher continues to make such jokes the students might lose the positive attitude and comfort in his class. The teacher's power is called into question since his act goes against the ideal of the role he should fulfill, an ideal imagined by the students. In the face of this, the student who takes the position of the punisher will influence classroom interaction and reject the manipulator.

Thus, the teacher would fail in his attempt to influence the *make-do* of the students and thus truncate the ability to exercise in their *make-know*, weakening himself as a figure of power. This also shows that the teacher's manipulation strategies are not effective, since the principle of manipulation highlighted by Greimas and Courtés (1990) is forgotten, that the manipulating subject must recognize which are the *objects of value* of the manipulated.

Students can direct the meaning of discourse by temporarily acquiring power, as long as they can circumvent the teacher's manipulations and know how to take advantage of their own manipulative strategies. Khoumba is a clear example of this, for in the scene in which the letter she writes to the teacher is recounted, even though she recognizes and yields to the teacher's strategy of *intimidation* in the face of her *must-to-do* and *must-to-be*, she does so under a precept of *pride*, which according to the theory presented to us by Greimas and Courtés entails *impotence* (*not being able to do*) and *independence* (*being able not to do*), so that Khoumba recognizes that she cannot disobey the teacher's demands regarding her attitude in class, but she also recognizes that she has the independence not to yield to the *axiological values* that the teacher intends to instill in her regarding the submission of the students to the figure of power that he represents. It is then when she decides to sit in the background and not to look at the teacher because of the impotence of not being able to express herself for fear of causing conflict with the teacher.

Thus, although this act corresponds to the manipulated being's own interpretation, she responds even from a manipulative mechanism of *provocation* by

saying to him: *Unless you come looking for it. I admit that I can be insolent, but only if I am provoked* (min 48:29). Moreover, the indisposition he manifests towards the class interrupts the teacher's function of teaching. Thus, as Candela (2001) says, although the teacher has the "legitimate" power in the classroom given his institutional role and his greater knowledge of the subject, the possibility of realizing his identity as a teacher depends on the student, because if he resists learning, the teacher will be unable to teach.

In this way, Khoumba is presented as a subject who can exercise effective manipulation strategies on the teacher. In addition to the above, this is evidenced when she tries to intercede in the situation of her classmate Souleymane, who is about to be expelled from the institution. In this case, space takes on vital importance when outside the classroom, since it is there where the figure of the teacher as the manipulator par excellence is established. In this case, the space in which the conversation takes place is closer to the student: the playground, a world that throughout the film is focused from the periphery to the moment when the teacher must talk to the students and, therefore, descends from the panoptic teachers' room.

Image 3



Source: <https://youtu.be/rJpSM3DaaOA>

Image 4



Source: <https://youtu.be/rJpSM3DaaOA>

At this point, Khoumba has an advantage, not only because he is in his space, but also because due to the error the ideal figure pre-accepted by the *manipulated-subject* is distanced from his real figure, causing loss of power. This is why it is easier for him to take the role of *manipulative subject*, since he recognizes that the teacher has an important role in the decision to expel his classmate, and it is then, through a strategy of persuasion by *compassion*, he tries to influence the teacher's *actions*. Thus, he presents the

complex situation that the character could suffer in the following way: "*If Souleymane is expelled, he will send him back to his village [...] He will, he will go back to Mali*" (1:42:00 min). After these words, the teacher is affected, accepts the manipulation and becomes a *manipulated subject*. Thanks to that, it's also possible for the students to take some autonomy in and freedom in the actions across argumentative tools (Plantin, 1998).

It is clear, then, that within the film the social structures of power in the classroom are not static, but rather dynamic, as sometimes the students will take the role of the *manipulator* and sometimes that of the *manipulated*; and the same will happen with the teacher. However, the latter enjoys a clear permanence as a figure of power, since even when social interactions generate variations in the power relationship, through manipulation strategies, the teacher has an indisputable advantage over the students, since, as mentioned by Jackson (1992), the teacher is configured as the center of the educational act since it is he who controls the discourse of knowledge and therefore the *make-know*, so that in the end he has the power over the minds of the students. However, if the teacher is completely detached from his

ideal figure within the NR, the students will break the *implicit structure* and demand a restructuring. In a way, the maintenance of these structures of power and manipulation in the classroom will be subject to the mutual demand of the subjects to correspond to the role they agree to adopt when entering into the discourse.

The language and the education

In discussions about education, recognizing semiotic contributions will allow us to reflect and modify practices. In this film, it is possible to identify an educational model typical of traditional education. Different documents of the Ministerio de Educación de Colombia, as The *Lineamientos Curriculares del Área del Lenguaje, Derechos Básicos de Aprendizaje y Estándares Básico de Competencia del Lenguaje*, propose a pertinent analysis in this regard. Citing Carretero (2000) and Ausubel (1990), they present the need to restructure the idea of a monodirectional discourse in which the teacher controls communication in the classroom, in order to recognize that learning is a constructive process in which both teacher and student contribute to the creation of knowledge. This is even supported in any semiotic analysis of NT, whether the subject is the manipulator or the manipulated, both

construct the relationship and interaction in the classroom, this is part of the pedagogical models of constructivism that understand the need of dialogue and equal interaction (Ocaña, 2013). In this case, there must be a transformation beyond paper, to practice, where students acquire a leading role (Ayuste, 2010).

This educational need implies problems both in the disposition and in the conceptions that remain within the students themselves. The question arises: Are both students and teachers willing and open to take up education with freedom? Freire (1990), in his Letters and in his notes on the pedagogy of questioning, presents the need of transform the vertical orientation of the interaction in the classroom. Cornejo, I. (2022), explain us that Freire's dialogical approach is considered to seek to create the liberation of the oppressed being through listening in education. In this case, we can associate the oppressed with the manipulated who remains eternally so in a discourse. The intention is that in the dialogue, not the imposition of a voice is enacted, but that the other "expresses him/herself from his/her own agency and names" (p.62). In this order, the voice in the students is a recognition of an autonomous attitude in students (Crispin et al., 2011). For this, they must take control of

their oral and written discourse, of their enunciative act itself; that is, they must mark a conscious identity in it. And it must be recognized that, as Gutiérrez (2014) says, every enunciative act supposes "a discourse permeated by sociohistorical, cultural, political, etc. elements" (p.28). This is being already situated in a given NT; however, what semiotics reveals to us is the need to recognize where the discourse is going and why? What subjects are being formed?

4. DISCUSIONES Y CONCLUSIONES

In conclusion, we find that pedagogical practices develop in a narrative path that assumes an implicit contract between the actors. Within this, hierarchical power structures are established, that is to say, asymmetrical structures that will determine a *manipulator* and a *manipulated*. There is also a kind of local microstructure of power relations in which the dynamics that occasionally vary the roles exercised in the *narrative trajectory* are developed.

For these fluctuations to occur or not, the actors must have a relationship with their function, the role they assume within the NT in which they find themselves. This means that their actions must be coherent with the *implicit contracts* they accepted while

belonging to that NT. If they are separated from it, conflicts and disjunctions will arise, which will create a tension to decide who will or will not reach the object of value; that is, who will have the power to *make-do* the other according to their interest. Under that, students as subjects who are and do consciously, have the power to manipulate. In effect, since they do not correspond to the *implicit contract* established in the space they occupy, conflicts grow and adequate communication is not achieved. The question is, with this, do they achieve power?

We find in this analysis that even though the manipulated subject sometimes exercises manipulation over the other, this does not imply that he obtains power, but rather that he will be determined by the implicit contract accepted by being enrolled in the educational scenario. He cannot restructure such a contract, but can only either abandon the space, the role that corresponds to him and with which he does not want to identify, or adapt to the role, or stop exercising the discourse altogether, that is, abandon any possibility of power that will manifest itself in different modes of communication since human interaction itself is a constant staging in which we are all actors and creators of meaning.

However, in case the actors go against the imposed ideal, or the should-be with respect to their role, there will be a demand for transformation among actors. Because of this possibility, semiotic studies are recognized as a way that enables the analysis, reflection and transformation of social interactions. In this case, the understanding of how an institutional discourse is constructed will give way to its reconstruction by considering the freedom, autonomy and critical thinking of the student through discourse.

Finally, through this work it is possible to find that the awareness of the language has a power. There are innumerable contexts and narrative trajectories that are created daily among people: friendships, love relationships, work, politics, etc. One is always being part of a *NT* within which specific roles and scenarios are determined that assume pre-established knowledge about the role that each subject has; otherwise, chaos would be formed and the possibility of communication would be annulled.

Why talk about this and what does it make possible? Semiotics makes it possible to recognize the mechanisms and narrative construction of each scenario by creating awareness of the forms and modes that are acquired in the interaction with fellow

human beings. Only from this recognition can we have clarity about the communicative, even social and political problems that underlie both micro and macro narrative schemes. Not only the institutional discourse is subject to this, but all discourses that, through manipulative mechanisms of language, create realities as certainties, realities that can be modified through knowing what, how, when and where power tensions are generated.

The principle of the education should not be repression but freedom, students who think for themselves and propose the transformation of their surrounding world aiming at a fair construction of society. In this way, the discursive act will not be the mere effect of socio-cultural configurations, as Atorresi and Eisner (2021) say, "we are agents capable of negotiating our identities through writing" (p.15). That institutional discourse in which it will be given, should be analyzed and considered in order to fill it with the identity of each student and teacher desired in order to build an autonomous, meaningful and authentic education (Calderón, 1987). Finally, if we think about the evaluation, we need to consider as educators the formative evaluation, that allows this kind of dynamics in the teaching and learning (Popham, 2014).

5. REFERENCIAS:

- Arévalo, L. (2010). Manipulación discursiva: la compasión en Diles que no me maten de Juan Rulfo. *Revista S.* v. 4, p.p. 127-134. https://revistas.uis.edu.co/index.php/revistaS/article/view/1958/2330?fbclid=IwAR270hI082PoXQ4v3erxNg_97wB359rhNWBDruIoxJ4DBnAQxwhudZQb7P0
- Atorresi, A. y Eisner L. (2021). Escritura e identidad: perspectivas socioculturales. *Revista Universidad distrital, Enunciación.* Vol. 2, número especial, pp.14-35. ISN 0122-6339. <https://revistas.udistrital.edu.co/ojs/index.php/enuncDOI:https://doi.org/10.14483/22486798.17128>
- Ausubel, D. (1983). *Psicología Educativa.* Trillas.
- Ayuste (2010). *Pedagogía sociocrítica.* Recuperado de: <https://es.slideshare.net/Ciclosmisi/pedagogia-socio-critica-7105192>
- Calderón, D. (1987). *Prácticas Pedagógicas y Evaluativas en Lenguaje: Concepciones y Posiciones.* Colombia: Editorial UD.
- Candela, A. (2001) Poder en el aula: una construcción situacional. *Discurso, teoría y análisis,* 23-24,2001, México D.F., pp. 139-157. ISSN: 0188-1825
- Carretero, M. (2005). *Constructivismo y educación.* Progreso.
- Crispín et al. (2011). *Aprendizaje autónomo : orientaciones para la docencia.* Universidad Iberoamericana: http://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/Mexico/dcsyp-ua/20170517031227/pdf_671.pdf

- Dell Hymes. (1964). *Language in culture and society*. Harper and Row Publish.
- Donoso, S. (2014). La escuela pública y la promoción de la mejora social. Reflexiones a partir de Latinoamérica. *Educación*. vol Especial 30 aniversario. pp. 139-155. <https://educar.uab.cat/article/view/v50-esp-donoso-diaz/pdf-es>
- EducarChile. (2016). *Evaluación formativa, propuesta para docentes*.
- Fontanille, J. (1998). *Semiótica del discurso*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Greimas & Courtes (1990). *Semiótica, Diccionario Razonado De La Teoría Del Lenguaje*. Gredos
- Gutiérrez, M. (2014). Tesis doctoral, *Concepciones y práctica sobre la oralidad en la educación media colombiana*. Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas.
- Jackson (1992), P. W. (1992). *Los afanes cotidianos. La vida en las aulas*. Madrid, España: Ediciones Morata. S.A.
- Marafioti, R. (2003). *Los patrones de la argumentación: la argumentación en los clásicos y en el siglo XX*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos.
- Ministerio de Cultura Colombia. (2003). *Lineamientos del Plan Nacional de Lectura y Bibliotecas*, Bogotá: Ministerio de Cultura-Departamento Nacional de Planeación.
- Ministerio de Educación Nacional. (2006). *Estándares Básicas de Competencias del Lenguaje*. Recuperado de https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1759/articulos-116042_archivo_pdf1.pdf
- Ministerio de Educación Nacional. (2015). *Derechos Básicos de Aprendizaje*. Recuperado de <https://es.calameo.com/read/005236808c2f24ce7fe26>
- Ocaña, A. (2013). *Modelos Pedagógicos y Teorías del Aprendizaje*. Recuperado de <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KbBtdG43z3XSkcgTP90UjBDnOiNtaZlm/view>
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la ciencia y la cultura. (2005). *Laboratorio Latinoamericano de Evaluación de la Calidad de la Educación. Competencias para la vida en las evaluaciones de lectura y escritura*. Recuperado de https://drive.google.com/file/d/10SB9gfZTDu1a80YixR2KW_Qm3ZuokKOc/view
- Plantín, C. (1998). *Introducción: La argumentación entre enunciación e interacción*. *Escritos, Revista del Centro de Ciencias del Lenguaje*. (17-18), p. 7-21.
- Popham, W. (2014). *Evaluación trans-formativa: El poder transformador de la evaluación formativa*. Narcea Ediciones.