

ENCHANTMENT AND FASCINATION: THE SEDUCTION DIMENSIONS IN EDUCATION

Carlos Aberto Figueiredo da Silva

Universidade Salgado de Oliveira, Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Sebastião Josué Votre

Universidade Gama Filho, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

Abstract

The aim of this study was to describe the phenomenon of seduction in the educational relationship. The ethnomethodology was utilized as a theoretical and methodological referential for data analysis. This is a case study, with a qualitative approach. The sample was intentional and consists of three university students. The study concludes that the phenomenon occurs incessantly in the educational area. The reports revealed two polar categories. There is a dimension of enchantment, where individuals interact and constructing a relationship based on autonomy. There is also a dimension of fascination, where the discernment of a party is compromised.

Keywords: Physical Education – Power – Violence

Introduction

In the book *Ethnomethodology and Education*, Coulon (1995b) refers to the first interactionist work in education: a study by Waller (1932) in Chicago. The objective was to study the daily life of school and social interactions that took place there.

Waller (1932) noted the context in which the school was entered and checked the links that were established between it and the community. He used techniques such as life history, case studies, diaries, letters and several personal documents. Among several findings, one of them referred to the constant interactions that put the game of seduction in an active context, both by teachers and students.

In addition to considerations of Waller (1932), which served as the impetus for the issues raised in this study, Gauthier and Martineau (1999, p. 50) warn that

Education, as interactive work, needs to continually refer to games of seduction. These games may have positive or negative consequences and, therefore, deserve careful examination.

According to Postic (1989, p. 27), for the student, the teacher has "the knowledge of the secrets of life and a power over events. The master appears to him wrapped in a halo of mystery and magic. Hence the attraction and seduction related to them".

This is a case study with a qualitative approach. The theoretical and methodological framework was based on ethnomethodology 1. Thus, we sought to understand how social actors 2 saw, described and proposed to set a definition of the phenomenon.

This study, of an ethnographic nature, attempts to make a thick description, from the interactions that arose in the interviews. According to reports collected, it was found that the teacher deals with students in an environment that promotes the integration and expansion of intense emotions, with ways of specific cognitive and affective reactions. Thus, we sought to describe relations of seduction carried on between teachers and students of a training course for Physical Education teachers.

All names used in this work are fictitious. Reproductions of the interviews were done with the permission of interviewees. After completion of the analysis, a second meeting was effected in order to combine the analysis with the views of respondents, and amend them where necessary.

We decided not to work with a case defined a priori. The conduct of the researcher was a participant-as-observer 3. The group interviewed consisted of three students.

A basic collection of data was by means of open interviews in order to develop a life narrative, allowing the researcher to capture experiences that are memorable to the respondents (Macedo, 2006). The common language was appreciated, as she says, describes and constitutes reality, which is described in people, in view of the ability to report and who have reflexivity (Garfinkel, 1992).

The ethnomethodological proposition believes that knowledge is constructed in action. Therefore, the interview itself, i.e. the way it went, the unpredictability factor, overthrows, reconstructions of speech are research objects and not only the data collected by it. We

tried to interact with the interviewees so that the categories, definitions, propositions of intervention, problems etc., were built together.

For the interviews, we used only those that have brought significant material to enter the study and be examined. As pointed by Postic (1989, p. 51):

The interviews do not bring material to the examination unless the subjects agree to play the game before a party that instigates them, and unless they feel the desire to explain for themselves what they are feeling.

Coulon (1995a) agrees with Postic (1989), stating that:

Contrary to what sometimes intended, ethnomethodologists do not take as descriptions of social reality, the reports of their actors. The analyses of these reports are not useful except to the extent that shows how the actors re-cast a fragile and precarious social order to understand and be able to exchange. (COULON, 1995a, p. 46).

Thus, the interviews in which there was involvement and effective participation of the interviewee in the search for themselves were selected, in which the respondent took over their form of expression, and reconstructed as they spoke and interacted with the interviewer.

We focused on the micro approach, taking into account the interactions that arose in the interviews fell into broader institutional frameworks, influenced by them while they change.

Sedución y poder

Nassar (1994), Silva (1994) and Cunningham (2003) extol the charm and passion as important processes in the pedagogical relation to learning to occur effectively. Silva (1994) believes in the power of passion in the relation between teacher and student for learning to occur significantly. Nassar (1994) believes in seduction as an essential factor in the relation between teacher and student to achieve educational goals. Cunningham (2003) confirms the inevitability of seduction in the pedagogical relation and tries to see it as a way to

attract students to knowledge.

However, Santos (1993) considers the discourse of passion and love as a quest for internal balance to the tensions caused by the moral demand and by the evil school system. Morgado (2002) says that the student are overwhelmed to be loved, as in the original relation between the child and his parents, there is a bias authority with a superego, which renews the relationship with teachers. For this author, the seduction undermines educational performance, this relationship should be broken by a competent authority, it is an obstacle to the teaching-learning process to occur properly.

To Lafon (1992), it is important not to let the lure in the thoughtless field; he says it is necessary that the teacher recognizes the position they occupy and the possibility of manipulation of the students. Gauthier and Martineau (1999) state that it would be a mistake to deny the seduction in the educational field and stressed that "not only the teacher should be aware of the dangers of seduction, but they must also understand and exploit the huge opportunities it offers" (p. 50).

Given these positions, we ask: to what extent does seduction influence the development of critical capacity and autonomy? Is the student is capable of analyzing the content being put across or do they let themselves be influenced by the personality of the seductive teacher? Does one need to seduce in order to teach?

Results and discussion

The interviews have ratified that the phenomenon of seduction happens constantly in the pedagogical relation. For the interviewed students, there is a positive and a negative, good or bad, healthy or not, directed or spontaneous dimension. It has also shown that a component of sensuality and sexuality is present in the interactions. The respondents reported that some teachers have the power to attract them and that this attraction was given mainly by the way of speaking, the gestures, the look, the charm.

However, a dilemma presented itself: on one hand the teacher who seduces their students do not have difficulty to arouse interest in their discipline, on the other hand, those who do it can induce and manipulate.

Two categories were then constructed after the analysis of the

interviews, namely: charm and fascination. Charm is seen in this study as a phenomenon in which there is freedom and detachment between teacher and student, emerging, from this relationship, autonomy. The student is able to move within the relationship and to differentiate the object of charm. The allure is understood in this study as a phenomenon linked to an intellectual or sexual overvaluation, in which the teacher is idealized and becomes an object of fascination. In fact, categories are fuzzy. Fascination and charm are intertwined. The effort to bring them into discrete categories was to try to describe the phenomenon.

The phenomenon would then possess an aesthetic dimension that would hold the awakening of a sensibility that was asleep; on the other hand, as Mezan understands (1988), seduction possesses an ethical dimension, which refers to the process in which the seduced one is carrying an "unless", i.e. "luring is doing so with guile, to gain power over the object of seduction, and put the latter to serve the purposes of the seducer" (p.90).

These two dimensions of seduction are understood as coming from the identifications that took place during the life of the individual. According to Laplanche (1988, p. 226), in an identification what

is at stake is to be like the other to whom one is identified, i.e. the individual assimilates an aspect or quality of the other and "becomes" wholly or partly, on the lines of this person.

Freud (1921/1950) examined the phenomenon of sexual overvaluation, in the case of romance, saying that a leader, by following the mass, will be subject to the same mechanism:

The ego becomes ever weaker and more modest and, in turn, the object becomes more and more beautiful and precious, to take possession of all the love the ego felt for itself, a process that naturally leads to voluntary and complete sacrifice of the ego. You could say that the subject consumed the ego (p. 57).

In this case, the subject would cancel themselves out for the other. Freud (1921/1950) also says that "conscience does not apply to anything that is done for the object" (p.57), i.e. when a considerable

amount of narcissistic libido overflows to the object and the beloved object to be treated as their own ego, because we

love them because of the perfection that we seek for our own ego and now would like to acquire this indirectly, as a means of satisfying our narcissism (p.57).

All the features of the object of love are then brought to perfection and the tendency to fake the trial, according to Freud (1921/1950), in this case, is the idealization.

Freud (1920/1950) makes a distinction between identification and state of enchantment:

It is easy now to define the difference between the identification and the development of such an extreme state of being in love, which can be described as "fascination" or "servitude". In the first case, the ego has enriched itself with the properties of the object, it "introjected" the object in itself (...). In the second case, it is impoverished, surrendered to the object, replaced its most important constituent for the object (p.57).

However, Freud (1920/1950) says that this type of description creates categories that are contradictory and have no real existence. For him, this is not enrichment or impoverishment, and in order to better serve the essence of the question, he says:

In the case of identification, the object was lost and abandoned, so it is again built into the self and this makes some change in himself, along the lines of the lost object. In another case, the object is maintained and one gives it its hypercathexis for his ego and at the expense of the ego (Freud, 1920/1950, p.57).

In charm, the object is not idealized, but lost and abandoned to be rebuilt by the subject, with some traces of the object. In the case of the allure, the object is idealized and the expense and sacrifice of the ego are the target of a hypercathexis.

The interview with Loir

Here's an example collected in interviews. One student interviewed named Loir, says:

E: Was there any teacher who was important to you?

Loir: Yes, there was.

E: Why was he important?

Loir: Oh, I don't know! His attitude, sympathy; super charismatic.

E: He's the guy you, like, (abrupt interruption)

Loir: Worship!

E: Worship?

Loir: Like. He is my king.

Loir says she worships the teacher. Worshiping has the sense of venerating, worshipping idols, or an excessive love, an exaggerated passion. She ratified the image with the figure of the king. The king is a person who exercises absolute authority, he is the sovereign. Loir shows that the teacher is conceived as the concept of idealization. Thus, the quality and value of the teacher were brought to perfection.

At this stage, Loir admits that she never caught herself thinking.

E: Have you ever caught yourself thinking about it?

Loir: No!

E: Never? Why?

Loir: Because... whatever! He shows a domain of knowledge.

E: Does he seduce you?

Loir: Maybe.

E: What is it that seduces you in him?

Loir: Well, the putting across the knowledge, the possession of it.

Loir refers to the transmission of knowledge and the (physical) size of the teacher. Then, she says he is cute and good-looking. She made a categorization. For her, the seducer can be conscious and unconscious of their actions. Regarding the unconscious seducer, she says that in this case, the student can even go out of seduction.

E: You say that the teacher who seduces unconsciously is super valid and that the conscious is dangerous one?

Loir: Yeah, I think so. Because the student can suddenly ... well ... get out of the seduction of the unconscious! Is that right? Now I think the conscious doesn't talk the student... into thinking. Sometimes, I think he more of talks them into to guiding.

At the end of the interview, she seems aware of the influence of the teacher.

Q: So this person is so powerful that he can move into your structures?

Loir: Absolutely.

E: Would you be able to change the course of your life because of him?

Loir: (Silence) ... (Laughs). Not that much though, I don't know (laughs). You know, I think I would change it. It does change, it changes everything.

E: What power is this? How do you explain this phenomenon?

Loir: It's inexplicable. (Laughs) Ah! I don't know (laughs).

Subsequently, Loir was surprised at herself and, from reconstructions of speech, started recalling experiences. This can be seen through the pauses, silences, laughter and contradictory discourse, for example, when she was asked if there was any possibility to change the course of her life because of the teacher, Loir starts saying, "I don't think so", and then "well, Ah, I don't know (laughs)". Then she attempts to weaken the answer: "You know! I think I would change it". But in the end, her answer is emphatic: "It does change, it changes everything".

To Loir, the phenomenon differs from the motivation (giving a reason, causing) in the sense that in charm/fascination, there is no reason or predefined goals, what is happening is a game, a challenge, a jump into the unknown, the mystery, the enigma.

The vision that Loir has of the teacher is good, no hard feelings. Her look reveals a caring, despite not being matched in her loving feelings. This is because she believes the lure of the teacher is unconscious. The teacher's influence is significant in her behavior. She even said she has changed conceptions because hers were in conflict with the teacher's.

Loir highly values the teacher's knowledge. She does it to such an extent that she understands this knowledge as his property and that it is generously passed on. Thus, she believes that knowledge is not discovered and does not see that it also is built on the interaction; that is why she idealizes the teacher.

The interview with Tom

Tom was at the time with 33 years of age. It was his second college. He speaks primarily of two teachers: Professor Fox and Professor Oscar. Tom lived with Professor Fox since his adolescence. Professor Oscar was part of a group of teachers who began to live more recently with Tom.

Tom is keen to take early on responsibility for the speech; he uses the pronoun "I" several times. Thus, the pronominal voice prevails over the passive and active.

Tom describes the context in which it could be found the faculty at that right moment: the institution was unable to develop the course, there were missing plants, those that existed were in poor condition, missing material, the students claimed improvements; Professor Oscar having to give an account of pressures of the students unable to be inconsistent with the school. There was also a pressure from the teachers. Tom says that some of them "deified" themselves and could mislead students, but over time some students discovered the truth.

Tom's experience has a similarity with that of Loir's, even though he has experienced the phenomenon with a teacher of the same gender. In Tom, the process of seduction can be understood in the realm of fascination. He believes Professor Fox was conscious of his actions. To Tom, Fox is a being who desperately struggles to dominate the way we understand life and frame the other in their dependence, in his words: "He always uses the philosophy of life, but the philosophies of his life. It was that philosophy of I'm the best, I'm very good, I did this course in that country [...]".

There is great resentment on the part of Tom, perhaps that is because of the understanding that he has today that Fox's actions were conscious. Unlike Loir, who knew the teacher as unconscious of his actions.

For Loir, there is no resentment. However, Tom feels hurt, used and manipulated. The most important speech of Tom refers to the

degree of unreality that the seducer and the seduced present. Several times, Tom said that there are people who are asleep and do not wake up.

Tom: Many will be graduated, if they graduate, they are in the market and still sleep (...) continuing sleeping is you not colliding with reality (...) there are people who sleep and do not wake up (...) I think it's a lack of responsibility or even a disability.

For Tom, the person may have a disability. Lowen (1983) describes narcissism as a cultural and psychological condition: "At the individual level, it indicates a personality disorder characterized by an excessive investment in the image of oneself at the expense of the self" (p. 9).

To Lowen (1983), narcissists are more concerned about how to show and present than with what they feel. They are selfish, concerned only with their own interests. "Acting without feeling, tending to be seductive and cunning, endeavoring to obtain power and control" (Lowen, 1983, p. 9).

There is therefore an overestimation of the image. The narcissist identifies with the idealized image, losing track of his real self-image, because that is unacceptable to him. Like in a mirror, he does not see his true self, but a simulacrum, an image.

For Tom, people who allow themselves to be fascinated and allured, and do nothing to change that, are sick, have a disability. Lowen (1983) says that "the narcissism denotes a degree of unreality in the individual and in the culture. The unreality is not just neurotic, it borders on psychosis" (p.10).

Tom's speech condemns fascination.

Tom: (...) this can be good or be bad ... you know. Usually, it is bad, in my view, because ... you do not need to seduce anyone to ... appear or to show you're there. You simply exist, and, in your existence, you will win people over if you have merit.

Tom felt unable to fight with the forces present in its symbolic relationship with Professor Fox. The contact with Professor Oscar helped him deal with the problem and no longer accept domination

and dependence.

The interview with Esther

Esther was at the time with 38 years of age, and felt like she related to the research subject, being very willing to cooperate with the construction of ideas about the phenomenon.

She says there is too great a proximity between teacher and student, and that the phenomenon is a constant in these relations. He said he experienced the process many times and in different ways. For her, it refers to the phenomenon as seduction, it makes people more vulnerable and this vulnerability does not mean weakness, but purity. Let's see what Baudrillard (1992, p. 94) says about:

Seducing is weakening. Seducing is faint. It is through our weakness that we seduce, never by strong signs or powers. It is this weakness that we put into play in seduction, and that is what gives it its power. We seduce by our death, our vulnerability, the void that haunts us. The secret is knowing how to play with your death despite the look, despite the gesture of knowledge of meaning.

Esther also created two categories. She said that there is a positive side (healthy seduction) and a negative one. There is a sensual/sexual dimension present in her speech on the phenomenon, several times she mentioned it. Her opinion of value is the idea of the purpose for the intended process. If the teacher is in love, she says, he must surrender to this passion, because it is a human being and should not repress something pure and true. However, it is important that you have the ability to know the difference, in order to direct the seduction.

Esther insists that the figure of the teacher is very important. Several times she focused on the ethos of "the Professor" and "a teacher". There is a power that is granted by the system, but there is also the symbolic power. Thus, you can use that power in different ways. Esther also says that there are teachers who use their hierarchically superior position, to sexually harass students, and even threaten them with reproaches. Despite this report, sexual harassment was not considered as charm or fascination, because it is not the

game of seduction, or persuasion, only coercion.

For Esther, seduction is inevitable. What you can do is overcome it and use it for personal growth. For Esther

1. The phenomenon exists in the pedagogical relationship, since this context provides a greater involvement between people;
2. People in the educational context, are more vulnerable and therefore more alluring because of the "purity" that develops in the relationship, because there is an intense play activity. People charm and fascinate not by their strength and power, but by their weaknesses;
3. The teacher seduces, but students do it too. Teacher and student are enchanted and fascinated, it is not one-sided;
4. The teacher should only eroticize the relationship if he is in love with the student, otherwise he must sublimate libidinal drive in this relationship and direct it into something positive;
5. There is no avoiding the meeting with seduction. The teacher should then be able to assess their real feelings and decide to launch themselves at the challenge and mystery, but conscious and responsible for the acts therein carried out.

Esther concludes his thoughts saying: "If it's healthy, I think it's wonderful, it must exist not only in physical education, but in all fields of human life."

Conclusion

What? You seek something? You wish to multiply yourself tenfold, a hundredfold? You seek followers? Seek zeros! (Nietzsche, 1985, p.17).

This study sought, through the reflexivity of three students in a course of Physical Education, identify and describe the phenomenon of seduction in the pedagogical relationship. From the interviews, two categories were constructed: charm and fascination.

It was found that there is balance in charm, the parties challenge each other, the dominance is exchanged, the individuals involved in the process grow emotionally and intellectually, there came an autonomous relationship. In fascination, one party is so powerful that the other is unable to challenge it, to provoke questions to decentralize it. In this case, the discernment of a party is

compromised.

We must reflect on the desire to approach and create worlds, and thinking it so is seeing it as power for knowledge, which opens horizons to (re)think the eroticism of human relationships in the educational field. Education understood as edifying of Eros, of fulfillment and instinctual gratification. Thus, the spell between teachers and students form the basis of informal education desexualized, and, above all, enjoyable and responsible.

Human reason cannot serve as an instrument for the curtailment of happiness, pleasure, delight. Logos and Eros, in the Western tradition, have always been put into opposition. The following question exists within each one of us: does the civilizing process necessarily imply a rational and repressive process? The historical limits of the rational system require us incessant attempt to surpass it and overcome it. This desire comes from Eros, not Logos, so Logos exists only because it comes from our eroticism towards knowledge.

To finish, here is the phrase from one of the interviewees: the great teachers divide and fragment their students so they can rebuild themselves stronger, and not to dominate them (Esther).

References

BAUDRILLARD, J. *Da sedução*. Campinas, SP: Papirus, 1992.

CICOUREL, A. Teoria e método em pesquisa de campo. In: GUIMARÃES, Alba Zaluar (org.). *Desvendando máscaras sociais*. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1995. p. 87-121.

COULON, A. *Etnometodologia*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1995a.

_____. *Etnometodologia e educação*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1995b.

COUTO, M. J. de B. D. *Psicanálise e educação: a sedução e a tarefa de educar*. São Paulo: Avercamp, 2003.

FREUD, S. A. *interpretação dos sonhos*. Buenos Aires: Rueda, 1920/1950.

FREUD, S. A. *Psicologia de grupo e análise do ego*. Buenos Aires:

Rueda, 1921/1950.

GARFINKEL, H. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Blackwell Pub, 1992.

GAUTHIER, C.; MARTINEAU, S. Imagens de sedução na pedagogia - a sedução como estratégia profissional. *Educação e Sociedade*, n. 66, p. 13-54, abr. 1999.

LAFON, J. *De la séduction dans la transmission des savoirs. Vers une gestion de la séduction dans la relation pédagogique*. Bordeaux: Université de Bordeaux, 1992.

LAPLANCHE, J.; PONTALIS, J. *Vocabulário da psicanálise*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1992.

LOWEN, A. *Narcisismo: a negação do verdadeiro self*. São Paulo: Cultrix, 1983.

MACEDO, R. S. *Etnopesquisa crítica, etnopesquisa-formação*. Brasília: Líber Livro, 2006.

MEZAN, R. Mile e quatro, mille e cinque, mille e sei: novas espirais da sedução. In: RIBEIRO, R. J. (org.). *A sedução e suas máscaras*. São Paulo: Schwartz, 1988. p. 83-113

MORGADO, M. A. *Da sedução na relação pedagógica*. São Paulo: Summus, 2002.

NASSAR, S. P. *O professor-ator ou o jogo da sedução na relação professor-aluno*. Rio de Janeiro: Diadorim, 1994.

NIEZTSCHE, F. *Crepúsculo dos ídolos*. Lisboa: Guimarães, 1985.

POSTIC, M. *O imaginário na relação pedagógica*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1989.

SANTOS, M. D. dos. *Compromisso: a proteção do eu*. 1993. 138 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação Física). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Universidade Gama Filho, 1993.

SILVA, M. C. P. *A paixão de formar: da psicanálise à educação*. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1994.

WALLER, W. *The sociology of teaching*. New York: Wiley, 1932.

Recebido em: 23-07-2009

Revisado em: 23-07-2009

Aprovado em: 05-11-2009

Endereço para correspondência

sebastianovotre@yahoo.com

Sebastião Josué Votre

Universidade Gama Filho

Centro de Ciências Biológicas e da Saúde / Departamento de Educação Física

Rua Manuel Vitorino, 625, Piedade

CEP: 20748-900 - Rio de Janeiro, RJ - Brasil