

*Sława Grzechnik*  
University of Gdansk

## Discursive Construction of Knowledge in Line with the Logic of the Development of Pupils' Male Habitus in the Classroom

Progress is not immediate ease, well-being and peace.  
It is not rest. It is not even, directly, virtue. [...] It is the  
Consciousness of all that is and all that can be.

P. T. de Chardin, *A Note on Progress*

The issue of the function of language and the “philosophy” of its use is of primary importance for understanding how it is acquired and how it is initially used. The manner of speaking is picked up as a tool of control of both joint attention and joint action. These functions are reflected in the very structure of language, and in the process of its acquisition by pupils of both sexes. Gender-related hierarchy observed in the language of subjects of education is not a linguistic “innateness”, but a set of specific properties of attention, human action, the manner in which language is used, and the dimension of seeing and understanding the surrounding reality in and through language (Bruner 1975). Development being the aim of education (Kohlberg, Mayer 1972) along with the process of the linguistic construction of knowledge rooted in the algorithm of the development of the male habitus, is in a particular way related to virtue, understood as the progress of subjects of education in the area of the perception of the discourse of the school modality of possibilities and compulsion.

The primary place in the reflections on the explanation and interpretation of empirical material, based on critical discourse analysis, along with the gender-hierarchized language, is occupied by the subjects that are related to it and entangled in the field of the classroom. The foundation for the construction of knowledge in the classroom is the communicative teaching and learning environment, in which the teacher plays the supervisory function. The teachers having a traditional attitude to pedagogical activities identify their three main tasks. The first one is the transmission of “ready”, “absolute” and closed knowledge, often limited, due to the teacher’s recklessness, to a monologue rather than dialogue. The second, probably favourite, task of the teachers is the daily execution

of their pedagogical effectiveness in the maintenance of discipline in the classroom, which is directly related to the evaluation and criticism of the status of knowledge, as well as all the actions and behaviours of the pupils. Finally, the last, efficient and effective action, which teachers of both sexes fail to notice, is the discursive consolidation of gender polarization together with the construction of the gender habitus of girls and boys in the process of the “specific” creation of knowledge during classes.

Research results show that gender-related differences and similarities are not only a consequence of home-based socialisation, but also of a “grammatical” socialisation in the school space involving the (un)awareness of teachers and their lack of careful control of their own communication practices in this scope (Howe 1997, p. 44; Swann 2008, p. 625; Sunderland 2000, pp. 149–173; Karwadowska, Szypra-Kozłowska 2005, p. 139; Bochno 2009, p. 181; Putkiewicz 2002, p. 107; Pankowska 2004, p. 99; Kruszewski 1993; Konarzewski 1991, p. 144). It is worth underlining that according to Aleksander Szejnberg, under the conception of student-centred learning, teachers try to facilitate learning (Szejnberg 2006, p. 17). Therefore, their actions are directed at the construction of knowledge by girls and boys and the usefulness of this knowledge in the “ethnographical museum” of the school discourse.

The present research project grounded in the ethnography of communication covered mainly pupils of both sexes aged 12–13 years. Didactics cares for what happens to children in the period of formal operations, when such children are able to solve abstract problems using logic, and verify hypotheses at the verbal level along with the anticipation of their consequences (Piaget 1996) in the process of teaching and learning. Therefore, the question arises in what way do teachers construct the sensitivity of their pupils’ senses to knowledge, aspirations, and motivations?

An atmosphere of humiliation is not conducive to increasing the motivation either of teachers or pupils. The words and elements they are accompanied by, carrying along with them the potential of causing the suffering of the person they are directed to, are a manner of address that interpellates, determines, labels/positions, and establishes a concrete subject. By way of the said insult and the accompanied intentions, the disregarded and humiliated person, pupil, future man, is placed and introduced to a place/point in the social spacetime determined by the logic of subjugation (Foucault 2009). Such an act limits the possibility of social existence – the possibility that a given interpellation excludes. It is almost immediately, simply by being said, that illocutionary acts effectively perform whatever is spoken out.

T/F<sup>2</sup>: What sort of a man will you be!?

<sup>1</sup> “Ethnographical”, because empirical studies are based on the ethnography of communication delivered in the classroom.

<sup>2</sup> T/F – teacher/female, T/M – teacher/male, letter/M (male) after a slash – boy (student) or teacher, e.g. J/M, letter/F (female) – girl (student) or female teacher, e.g. N/F.

The perlocutionary act presented above can potentially cause effects that will emerge later than upon the instance of making the utterance. This leads to certain consequences, which are not the same and do not directly describe the effects that are to show later on.

The category of gender is related to the manner in which masculinity and femininity are presented and constructed and the playing of the related roles (Barker 2005, p. 519). Gender is one of the main notions in the area of understanding the social reality, as well as the field of the creation of the male gender habitus. The theory of social learning explains that the development of gender proceeds just like other types of learned behaviour. Therefore, we may assume that it would be good to categorise gender among those behaviours which are acquired rather than biologically determined (Brannon 2002). The process of the shaping of masculinity begins when a male individual is born and lasts throughout his life. The form and range of the male habitus category are heavily affected by a set of communication practices produced, and even, more importantly, reproduced in the classroom. The gender habitus comprises permanent, translatable dispositions and structured structures with a structuring potential, which function as generators defining and creating practices and imaginaries. Their "content" is related to a goal which does not have to be consciously recognised by individuals, but which should simultaneously predestine them to master instructions and manners enabling the achievement of that goal. The goal is entangled in the objective regularity, control, and collective setting (Bourdieu 2008).

Habitus dispositions are established and effectively implanted by possibilities and impossibilities, liberties and necessity, permissions and bans. The pupil is rooted in the school logic of the discarded, which promotes following what seems to be unavoidable. Objects functioning in the social field, their intuitions, courage, fear and the operating mechanisms are "only" and "as much as" socially-constructed constructs. The medal, which has an engraved "naturalness" on one of its sides, and the "sense of place"<sup>3</sup> lit with the lantern of performative acts on the other, is a prize offered by symbolic violence for accepting the "illutio"<sup>4</sup>. It was this practical belief which was harnessed to participate in this cooperation aimed at the implementation of the politics of the male habitus, being the guarantor of its high quality and effectiveness. While reflecting on the habitus, we cannot overlook the fact that it is a product of history and the schemes it presents. Both the individual and the collective practices together with their elements take place owing to the active presence of past experiences in the form of schemes of perceiving, thinking, and acting.

T/F: Basia, are you Patryk? **For God's sake!** When you are to speak, you keep quiet, and when you are not to utter a sound, you keep **blabbing** without being asked to.

<sup>3</sup> Habitus, a sense of one's place

<sup>4</sup> *Illutio* or social illusion – a category belonging to Bourdieu's social theory, tantamount to a well-established belief (good faith) that what one does is good and that actions of other subjects of social field are also appropriate and consistent with the field's logic.

In the above fragment of a teacher's utterance, we may hear irritation combined with a highlighted phenomenon of the pupils' insubordination: "When you are to speak, you keep quiet, and when you are not to utter a sound, you keep blabbing without being asked to". Moreover, the utterance constructed in this way and the learning atmosphere possibly call for serious reflection on the part of the teachers rather than for "God's sake". Basia dared to take a voice without putting her hand up, which the teacher might perhaps accept in relation to a boy pupil, but not a girl pupil.

Interaction between pupils of both sexes and their female teacher, and between knowledge and authority takes place through daily repeated consolidation of the disciplinary order (Foucault 1995) consistent with Michel Foucault's conception of "subjugation" of the subject. The order, similarly to capillary vessels, permeates everything situated within the field of the classroom treated as a social field as understood by Pierre Bourdieu's social theory. The category of "everything" includes behaviour in the classroom, punctuality, constructed gender habitus, consolidated gender hierarchy, manner of speech, and, above all, the manner in which pupils of both sexes generate knowledge.

When looking at the traditional paradigm in which masculinity is entangled, we can spot some cracks and crumbling elements of its structure. Evidence behind this process includes a "significant relativisation of the category of masculinity"<sup>5</sup> [Melosik 2006, p. 9]. If we assume that the crisis of masculinity is a social fact, it would be good to search for its causes outside the emancipation of women and ponder on the way the category is constructed in the classroom. It would be very likely that it is rooted in the manner of the everyday, regular construction of the male habitus in the school field, based on the repetitiveness of communication practices.

N/F: I will only say that he was unable to stick to any work.

P/M: Really?

N/F: It is also his weakness. But within such a short time...

T/F (interrupting): [...] So he **cannot see a place for himself**, can he? [...] This is what life is about: **not to become too tired in life and perform your tasks well**.

The above fragment may reflect a frustration and inclination to depression of men who sometimes find it hard to find their own place in the social reality. Together with a cognitive dissonance, this process is accompanied by an emerging resistance on the part of pupils, who in the context of the relativisation of the category of masculinity outside school walls, feel frustration (Galasiński 2008a,

<sup>5</sup> In his paper *Kryzys męskości czy szansa dla mężczyzn? Przegląd problematyki badań* [Crisis of Masculinity or a Chance for Men? A Review of Research Problems] Krzysztof Arcimowicz stated that this category refers to the transformations and evolution, and is a product of a discourse which does not deserve to be called a real problem. This belief was presented during the National Interdisciplinary Scientific Conference "Sexuality, Masculinity, Education. The 2013/2014 Moral Panic – Reconstructions" in Gdansk on 05.10.2014.

pp. 153, 176) and an aversion to school (Melosik 2006, p. 8). It is highly probable that such emotions are translated into the way male pupils – future men – look at their personal and professional life (Galasiński 2008b, pp. 71–72).

[...] Because boys are sort of more **sensitive as far as their pride is concerned**. When a girl makes a mistake, she will smile and go, and when a boy makes a mistake, he instantly feels silly, because the girls saw that he **was like a moron**. Maybe it is the way I feel as well, so maybe that is that, maybe. (WH/M)

[...] They are so limited by all the things around. (WP/F)

As a part of the “official pedagogical discourse”, teachers of both sexes succumb to a network of stereotypes, acting in consistence with the “silent politics” of the construction of the male habitus (Kopciewicz 2003). School is a place where some pupils are asked to keep quiet and not think, while others are encouraged to talk and be intellectually active, and where a thick line is drawn between a female pupil without much mathematical talent and an intelligent male pupil talented in the area of the exact sciences (Kopciewicz 2007, pp. 13–14).

In the field of the classroom as a part of the discursive reproduction of male gender in keeping with the traditional socialisation “grammar”, two simultaneous processes take place: the development of the female habitus, and the construction of the male habitus. The teachers’ share in the acquisition of these gender roles lies in the direct, everyday interactions between the pupils and the teacher, which constitutes an important socialisation factor of the school education (Barnes 1982). Their behaviour and communication practices are significant for the creation of the gender habitus and consolidation of gender roles as a part of the process of pupils’ school socialisation (Melosik 2006, pp. 188–189), and for the quality of the knowledge developed at school.

The gender-hierarchized language limits knowledge, imposing limits to the possibility of assigning meanings and determining a set of “correct” meanings, which are beyond discussion, at the same time defining a set of banned meanings. The adopted manner of the use of language defines the ways of the acquisition of knowledge, and shapes cognitive tendencies determined by the laws of perception. The teacher who manages the situations of talking is able to effectively use them as stimuli to develop the pupils’ competences.

T/F: **Sometimes I have a feeling that the older you are...**

P/F: **...the less we use our minds. [teacher is nodding]**

[...] You can see their preparation, as there are a couple of pupils, maybe two or three, who claim, and their parents confirm this, that they really do always prepare themselves, but they are just not successful with certain things, they can’t do anything. Well, they have been working on it, but they still miss something to have better results. (WS/F)

**And there are immediately these insults that he is stupid and dim-witted, that how can you fail to know this, how can you spoil it, after all it is so simple, and they**

**seem to judge themselves** without saying anything more, they don't see that when they go to the blackboard they don't do everything well as well, **so this is the problem: they don't see that thing in themselves but they see it immediately in others.** (WS/F)

Usually at school female pupils are assumed to have little cognitive curiosity, and for this reason it is the boys who are more effectively activated to show off their knowledge, which, however, should be constructed in compliance with the teacher's guidelines. Independence in the process of the pupils' self-learning in the classroom is a "rare commodity"<sup>6</sup>, of which female pupils are almost completely deprived. The teachers managing the "activity" of knowledge in the classroom seem to be supervising critics rather than consultants encouraging pupils to take the initiative and develop their free spontaneity in search of ways of assigning meaning to the picture of the reality which they get to know – a picture they construct every day.

[...] that it is not only **knowledge that is transferred via the textbook only**, [...] so everything obviously depends on the topic, on what issues are discussed, as let us be open about it, [...] pupils completely fail to understand poetry. (WP)

D/M: I know.

T/F: Anyone else? How about you, Oliwia?

P/M: I know it, too.

A male pupil interrupts a female pupil and verbally signals that he knows something, although he was not asked about it. In a way, he "invaded" the communication space of the classroom.

O/F: I understand, although I don't know if this is **correct**.

The female pupil speaks in a quiet and shy voice, as if knowing that her understanding and knowledge are inconsistent with the teachers' expectations. The girl's insecurity concerning her knowledge/drawing of conclusions and her own communication competences is very clear.

O/F: That is this rich knight. [with doubts in her voice]

T/M: No, no. You are doing well, but you have lost yourself somewhere on the way.

O/F: And this Bogart, the knight, the vassal, vassal of this, this...

T/M: You have possibly got confused.

What is missing is the teacher's leading of the girl to the right tracks (O/F). Perhaps the teacher should let her finish her utterance with a success, which might reflect the teacher's good will and/or methodological abilities.

---

<sup>6</sup> A notion from the language of economics. It is used to refer to a commodity which is hard to obtain due to its price and availability.

O/F: And they cannot do what they want.

T/M: Fine. I like **your** [plural] line of reasoning.

T/M [after a moment's break]: Perhaps after today's class Weronika will be able to make sense of it.

T/M: It is a chapter that will require thinking and reasoning from you.

D/M: Oh myyyy. Think. Everyone will have a headache.

T/M: Tough luck. Life requires sacrifices. (LH)

E/M: And did a small five-month old baby work as well?

T/M: E/M, think before you ask a stupid question.

E/M: But... [the teacher interrupts].

T/M: Really do think before you ask a stupid question.

E/M: So since what age did you have to work?

T/M: I don't know. Borrow *Code of Hammurabi* and read.

The utterances quoted below show various ways of seeing the same illustration, remaining in the same space of a teacher's non-acceptance.

D/M: It looks like a rounded rectangle.

J/M: Like an ellipsis.

T/F: **A rounded rectangle? [with great astonishment and dissatisfaction].**

According to the researcher, it was just the right way to describe the shape of that something, but it was not consistent with the teacher's way of seeing things, which was the only legitimate way. The teacher's astonishment and dissatisfaction was a negative reinforcement for pupils' further thinking processes. Getting nearer the truth in the words "Like an ellipsis" may have been less inappropriate, but did not deserve to be accepted, either. According to the teacher, the children did not know what to adequately call the shape they saw in the illustration, although they knew what a rectangle, a circle, and an ellipsis look like and they tried to build their look at it on this knowledge. The teacher's criticism, dissatisfaction, and "negative" astonishment effectively stifled the stream of spontaneous mental acts constituting "water" for the "thirsty" knowledge.

The knowledge generated at school does not deserve to be called "proper" interpretative knowledge, as the latter, according to teachers, is not marked by critical reflection, a "fresh" observation of the complexity of the world, the noticing of the non-clear cut status and implications of various states of things, and the controversy of judgements (Klus-Stańska 2002, p. 120). The fragment presented below quite clearly illustrates what the teacher thinks of the potentiality of her pupils' thinking processes:

**They do not get prepared. If they put their hands up, they do it as they have some sort of knowledge, from life or something, or a feeling,** because maybe they will manage to get a plus and nothing wrong will happen anyway. (WS/F)

**There is no thinking, abstract thinking, they cannot imagine certain things**, they have to have **concretes**, this looks so now and here, and if they cannot touch, then it is because of such tangible things. (WP/F)

The “managers” of the communication space in the classroom fail to notice the pupils’ ability of abstract thinking, as well as their ability “to imagine certain things”. Additionally, “if they cannot touch” the studied reality, they can only move in the world of “concretes”.

Yet another category revealed in the empirical material, taking the form of an “interesting” combination of acts of speech, is a subsequent factor which fails to promote calm, and an unrestrained, and spontaneous construction of knowledge in the classroom.

T/F: And if we really like something, if we are in a **really beautiful place**, then we try to remember it for as long as possible and this also gives us strength to act. **I feel that it is water off a duck’s back for you, that you just don’t have some feelings, some emotions** [these acts of speech were followed by silence lasting for several minutes].

School teaches the use of “discursive contrast”, and in the above fragment of a teacher’s utterance we may notice the combination of an enchantment with “a beautiful place” and a stream of criticism concerning the (in)ability to feel certain emotions by the pupils: “it is water off a duck’s back for you”. The structure and content of this combination of acts of speech is not a joyful and inspiring factor encouraging active intellectual effort. We can spot a similar contrast in the following fragment of a teacher’s utterance:

T/F: This happens when we don’t know something, that is, when we have these fears and anxieties, because we never know, we don’t, what this world looks like in reality. Even if we have some **knowledge from books, experience sometimes verifies what we know anyway**, doesn’t it? **Someone who is gifted not only has a rich knowledge, but also is intelligent and can use their mind, that’s it. And I have a feeling that you are...** [teacher suspends her voice], even I don’t know.

The way the teacher transmits knowledge to the children is “just the passing, just as much and nothing more”: a simple, undisturbed transmission of knowledge through the provision of ready descriptions, judgements, reflections, interpretations, and meanings, as pupils’ minds “are not prepared for refined” teaching methods that could promote the “attractive” construction of knowledge combined with an independent assignment of meanings.

T/W/F: [...] I have a feeling sometimes that it is, well, just the **passing**, just as much and **nothing more**.

The knowledge teachers present to their pupils does not serve the equal and sustainable development of boys’ and girls’ ability to one day become citizens of



the global democracy, aware of the physical, spiritual, and cultural aspects of life outside school (Giroux 2010, p. 97). Therefore, the ways of seeing and understanding the behaviour of knowledge at school, within teachers' and pupils' intellects, are set in a hierarchical order: from knowledge resulting from following the teacher's way, to dreams of other manners of treatment of pupils, and a network of meanings assigned (non)independently to the surrounding reality.

According to the teacher, as can be assumed from the fragment quoted below, as well as the tone of the voice and facial expressions, a 12–13 years old female pupils' interest in fashion raises doubts, but not as considerable as the pupils' interest related "even to some sexuality". Continuing the way of thinking about the female pupils' interests, it should be stressed that the girls do not have a "perception of the world" which would be marked by parameters approved by the teacher.

It seems to me that **there is no look at the world**, that they have their own **interests** [...], some of them related to fashion, others **even to some sexuality**, to the extent that, that, no, these horizons are not, you know. (WP/F)

Therefore, analysing the above collection of fragments of utterances, we might say that what is imposed here is didactics "contaminated" with the category of knowledge resulting from following the teacher's way, which is what most pupils have (Klus-Stańska 2002, pp. 120, 123–124), in consistence with the logic of the field, in which they function influenced by objective forces. Configured on its basis, the logic of the interaction of communication actions taking place in the pupils' minds constructs meanings remaining in a cohesion relationship with the teachers' professional *illusio* ("practical belief"), which not only is a justification for certain pedagogical practices (Bourdieu, Wacquant 1992), but also a certain "pass" enabling the consolidation of habitus-related social inequalities (Kopciwicz 2007, p. 107).

The specific nature of the construction and enlivening of knowledge during religion classes is no different than its trajectory during other lessons. In the light of what Church representatives say, teachers of religion very much want to acquaint pupils with problems related to family, God, and faith. The construction of knowledge on God and a relationship with God, which children are taught not only at home and in church, is presented in the fragment below:

Z/M: Why don't I believe in God?

TR/M<sup>7</sup>: Calm down!

Z/M: What do I risk?

TR/M: You'd better...

During a religion class, a grade six pupil (a boy) asked the teacher a question of ecclesiological provenance: "Why don't I believe in God?", expecting a constructive answer. After a moment, he was given an unsatisfying reply: "Calm down!".

<sup>7</sup> TR/M – teacher of religion, male.

The meaning of the above response is highlighted by the exclamation mark, which symbolized the answerer's raised voice combined with his tension and dissatisfaction. In reply to the reply constructed in this way, the pupil generated another question: "What do I risk?". He asked what the risk was for asking questions related to an absence of faith in God in a young person. The order to calm down is not a satisfying answer to such a question, as it does not offer the pupil any knowledge on what his risk might be when courageously asking "inappropriate" questions. The pupil heard: "You'd better...". Very possibly, the dialogue thus-constructed by the teacher did not facilitate the construction of any knowledge on God, or, less still, the young Christian's relationship with God.

TR/M: [...] What material commodity do we, people, want?

C/M: A **good brain**.

TR/M: **Knowledge [with reflection]**.

In the spirit of ecclesiological reflections, the teacher asked his pupils: "What material commodity do we, people, want?". The girls kept quiet, but one of the boys said that "the material commodity that he wanted" was a "good brain", i. e. a brain, which, together with the intellect, would independently construct knowledge and assign meaning to the surrounding material and "ecclesiological" reality.

J/M: It is best during maths.

In the case of the mathematics class, we can talk about a high degree of concentration of almost all the pupils on their task. The teacher was involved in the children's every mathematical step. Mathematicians perceive boys as more gifted in this area, and this is why a male pupil states above that as far as the teachers' communication with the pupils is concerned, "it is best during maths".

### The placement of *illusio* in the discursive construction of knowledge within the space of the building of the male habitus

The human brain is formed socially and it is simultaneously closed within its own limitations. Marx called them boundaries of the system of categories, which were "imprinted" into one as a part of the social education process (Bourdieu, Wacquant 1992). It is due to these socially constructed boundaries that subjects cannot comprehensively perceive and understand situations when under the pressure to act. The language of school determines the framework of the knowledge pupils acquire, and it is this framework which hints how one should see the reality and which imposes an interpretation of effects of the learning process. The framework undergoes constant and ceaseless agreements (Kwaśnica 1987, p. 56). Pupils perform their "self-configuration" in the social field in consistence with the socialisation grammar, which should not disturb the pupil in an independent as-

signment of meanings, modified by individual optics. Everything humans can see and transmit through language depends on the language itself, but also on the individual every pupil is (Kwaśnica 1987, p. 56).

There are children who are conscious and **whatever you tell them, they will accept**, digest, and perhaps draw conclusions. [...] we teach, [...] if we manage to inculcate certain things with the help of consistence, then they will do it **automatically** [...]. They will then notice **how much they know and how diverse is the knowledge they have**. (WH/M)

An individual's "linguistic awareness" probably reduces the limitations brought about by the world of symbols and gives one a chance to notice the reasons behind the poor acuity of not only the school's picture of the world (Bourdieu, Wacquant 1992). Victims of language and its limits are its users, who (in a more or less conscious manner) approve the fact that these limits also cover the understanding and assignment of meanings (Bruner, 1996, p. 19) as a part of a basic belief (*illusio*) that everything happens in consistence with the pragmatic order of subjugation.

To talk when they already know something, and **sometimes they know very little**. They have few opportunities to show off that they know, and then they would like to talk a lot and as soon as they know something. (WP/F)

If a child only learns the things that were covered during a lesson, if a child learns, then the context is much smaller, so if I ask a question in a different way, it may turn out that the child does not know, because I did not ask from the side from which they learnt [...]. (WP/M)

[...] We might allow ourselves making references to **some experience, but there is this topic that organises our lesson unit**. (WP/F)

In the above fragment, the teacher turns attention to the fact that in her opinion, pupils might benefit during the education process from "some experience", "but there is this topic that organises our lesson unit", which means that time is meant to be used for the topic of the lesson rather than "references to some experience". In the pupil's "concealed" understanding, the use of their own mind is a process as a part of which the mind can be used in a way they chose. Therefore, the meaning assigned to this category by the teacher in the field of the classroom is not conducive to the development of independent learning, or taking decisions concerning the manner of reaching one truth and many truths by way of a free choice of a set of algorithms leading to them rather than just a single algorithm. The implementation of the monologue-based "paradigm" in the discursive classroom field, as present in the above fragment, also takes place on the basis of a constructed silence consistent with the logic of the field. Additionally, we should remember that in almost every act of speech of the teachers, pupils are required to be

“obedient” in thinking and in the expected and allowed assignment of meanings (Klus-Stańska, 2002, p. 94).

T/W/F: We do not force them to perform any **thinking or make any intellectual effort**.  
J/M: They don't feel like thinking. [pupil about his friends]

T/M: So far you have been making a good impression, and you have got this potential, but one can clearly see that you don't learn. These are very simple things, you know?  
(LH1/M)

The above fragment of a teacher's utterance contains a critique of a pupil's laziness, but not his intellectual capacity, as is the case in relation to the girls.

T/F: **O/F! Don't think, just write. What did you think, you thought that what?**  
O/F: That we would conjugate verbs.

T/F: **O/F? Why are you so mute today?**  
M/F: There are wiser girls.  
J/M: I don't think so.

T/F: Yes. The nose is by the heart. Old age with the height. **Everything is again mixed, mixed up, and is only good for, for, eee...**  
M/M: **For a soup.**  
T/F: **For a soup. But we are not cooking a soup. We are creating a description.** (LP1)

J/M: Success.  
T/M: **No. Why?** [silence]  
T/F: **Develop this utterance... This is the way grade three children speak, I don't know, maybe even...**  
T/F: You need to be handed everything on your plate, Iza. I feel that you wait for something ready to be provided to you, only the cutlery and start eating. Is there just one J/M in the class? And is the text so complex? Listen. **We are past the first month of school, and instead of it being better after this time, it is worse with you. I really don't know. Maybe we'll end up in April taking Lego bricks and building something? Maybe this will interest you?** [speaks in a raised voice]. **You are looking at me as if I was an alien from space.** [J/M raises his hand] (LP/F)  
T/F: What has happened?  
K/M: He read the mandatory book!  
T/F: Weeell. Krzysiu, boast a little, tell me what you have done. I thought that you had something on your conscience. And instead I can hear such beautiful things. Well, that's good.  
P/F: The entire book?  
T/M: **You learn on a concrete example, not a general example** [irritated]. What did I say? What are you underlining? You are supposed to underline things of your choice.  
T/F: **The whole one, indeed. So, you can see. P/F. He was absent yesterday. Perhaps he needed one more day.** (LP/F)

Interpretative knowledge should be based on what pupils already know about the school field and the broad social world. The particular elements of the studied field are interrelated in a more or less close manner in compliance with the logic of Bourdieu's social field, which refers both to the "trajectory" of discourse, and behaviour in its knowledge space.

The dominating, gender-hierarchized manner of the use of language in the classroom predominantly sketches the significant in the area of the patriarchal logic of the roles fulfilled by women and men both in the private and public spheres, and the collective rather than the individual. Its additional value lies in the fact that it provides potential enabling of the growth/emergence of the expected meanings. What has an ordering influence on what, when and how is said, is the characteristics of social relations, rigour of the subjugation of individuals, imposing on them the position and pathways to femininity, masculinity, and the style of life and work in the broadly understood social field. Male pupils are taught a genderised linguistic code, which places them in the space of chances for making a choice from among the huge range of syntactic forms and using it in hundreds of ways in compliance with the logic of male domination. However, the choice made by pupils is limited, as it does not fully result from the "little researchers'" conscious search, and is additionally grounded in the "magic of [cultural] parameters" rather than in a set of genetic factors.

The manner of the construction of knowledge at school harms both male and female pupils. The teachers' "falsified" interpretation of the potential of discursive space in this scope almost perfectly hides all the assumptions of the "quiet" gender politics, directing the children's thinking towards "paper" equality. The objectified treatment of pupils, in particular female ones, by both male and female teachers leads to a clarity of unambiguous understanding of the roles played as well as their limits. Linguistic entanglement in the imposed trajectory of the development of the young person's identity closes the circle of meanings, which has implications not only in the form of an imposition of an "instruction manual" concerning the construct in the form of knowledge, but, above all, implications in the social and psychological spheres.

The division of children who learn into gender-based groups reflects a premeditated and disciplining configuration of the social field, in consistence with the line of the social division of achievements, activities, and (non)actions. The school manner of using this knowledge and judging it makes it a public phenomenon entangled with the process of distribution and the location of knowledge in the social space. Therefore, we may assume that the school field with its androcentrism creates the "appropriate" conditions not only for the replication of its characteristic power relationship, but also meanings in a precisely determined framing. The framing refers to the teacher's and pupil's executed scope of control, and the determination of the rate and spatiotemporal configuration of knowledge offered and reproduced in discursive genderised pedagogical practices (Bernstein 1990).

Elementary forms of consciousness and intentionality located in the pupil's behaviours and perceptive experiences show that their relation to the school

knowledge remains harmonised with the teachers' traditional way of thinking about the gender-hierarchized algorithm of its "transmission" and control. Every individual is an owner of a network of elements of intentionality showing a collection of mental powers over the manners of interaction with the world, while the dispositions and abilities contained in the habitus of the gender subjects of education build their background. The pupils' resistance as shown in the empirical material is an important theoretical and ideological construct which teachers of both sexes perceive with moral and political indignation. Although the meaning of the oppositional behaviour of male pupils, who more often than girls perform discursive acts of resistance, should not be combined with deviation, pathology, and helplessness, nevertheless teachers do associate it with these features. The teachers' perception of intentionality, consciousness, and meanings constituting the main categories rooted in the logic of resistance (Giroux 2010, p. 137) remains consistent with the traditional "grammar" of school life. The perspective of emancipatory rationality manifested in the pupils' consciousness in parallel processes of the construction of knowledge and the male habitus needs a reliable definition of resistance, a "purification" of the teachers' (in)sensitivity, a new way of seeing the subject, and a free, while simultaneously non-conformist reflection in the context of undistorted basic human values.

### Literature

- Barker Ch., 2005, *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*, Sage Publications, London – Thousand Oaks – New Delhi.
- Barnes D., 1982, *From Communication to Curriculum*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Bernstein B., 1990, *Odtwarzanie kultury* [Reproduction of Culture], PIW, Warszawa.
- Bochno E., 2009, *Stereotyp płci czy płć języka? Szkolne interakcje komunikacyjne nauczycielek z uczennicami i uczniami* [Gender Stereotype or the Gender of Language? School Communication Interactions Between Female Teachers and Pupils of Both Sexes], [in:] *Koniec mitu niewinności. Płć i seksualność w socjalizacji i edukacji* [The End of the Myth of Innocence. Gender and Sexuality in Socialisation and Education], L. Kopiciewicz, E. Zierkiewicz (eds.), Wydawnictwo Psychologii i Kultury Eneteia, Warszawa.
- Bourdieu P., 2008, *Zmysł praktyczny* [A Practical Sense], tł. M. Falski, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków.
- Bourdieu P., Wacquant L., 1992, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Brannon L., 2002, *Gender: Psychological Perspectives?*, Allyn & Bacon, Boston.
- Bruner J.S., 1975, *The Ontogenesis of Speech Acts*, "Journal of Child Language", Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 1–19.
- Bruner J., 1996, *The Culture of Education*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Foucault M., 1995, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, Vintage Books, New York.
- Galasiński D., 2008a, *Dyskurs a nieznośna lekkość psychopatologii* [Discourse and the Unbearable Lightness of Psychopathology], [in:] *Krytyczna analiza dyskursu. Interdyscyplinarne podejście do komunikacji społecznej* [Critical Discourse Analysis. Interdisciplinary

- Approach to Social Communication], A. Duszak, N. Fairclough (eds.). Universitas, Kraków.
- Galasiński D., 2008b, *Men and the Language of Emotions*, Palgrave Macmillan, UK.
- Giroux H.A., 2010, *Reprodukcja. Opór i akomodacja* [Reproduction. Resistance and Accommodation], [in:] H.A. Giroux, L. Witkowski (eds.), *Edukacja i sfera publiczna. Idee i doświadczenia pedagogiki radykalnej* [Education and the Public Sphere. Ideas and Experiences of Radical Pedagogy], Oficyna Wydawnicza "Impuls", Kraków.
- Howe Chr., 1997, *Gender and Classroom Interaction: a Research Review*, SCRE, The Scottish Council for Research in Education, SCRE, Edinburgh.
- Karwatowska M., Szpyra-Kozłowska J., 2005, *Lingwistyka płci. Ona i on w języku polskim* [Gender Linguistics. She and He in the Polish Language], Wydawnictwo UMCS, Lublin.
- Klus-Stańska D., 2002, *Konstruowanie wiedzy w szkole* [The Construction of Knowledge at School], Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego, Olsztyn.
- Kohlberg L., Mayer R., 1972, *Development as the Aim of Education*, "Harvard Educational Review" Vol. 42, No. 4.
- Konarzewski K., 1991, *Problemy i schematy. Pierwszy rok nauki szkolnej dziecka* [Problems and Schemes. The First Year of the Child's School Education], Wydawnictwo Akademickie "Żak", Warszawa.
- Kopciwicz L., 2003, *Polityka kobiecości jako pedagogika różnic* [The Politics of Femininity as a Pedagogy of Differences], Oficyna Wydawnicza "Impuls", Kraków.
- Kopciwicz L., 2007, *Rodzaj i edukacja. Studium fenomenograficzne z zastosowaniem teorii społecznej Pierre'a Bourdieu* [Gender and Education. A Phenomenographical Study Using Pierre Bourdieu's Social Theory], Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji TWP, Wrocław.
- Kruszewski K., 1993, *45 minut, czyli prawie cała historia jednej lekcji* [45 Minutes or an Almost Whole History of One Lesson], Wydawnictwa Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Kwaśnica R., 1987, *Dwie racjonalności. Od filozofii sensu ku pedagogice ogólnej* [Two Rationalities. From the Philosophy of Sense to General Pedagogy], Instytut Kształcenia Nauczycieli im. Władysława Spasowskiego w Warszawie, Oddział Doskonalenia we Wrocławiu.
- Melosik Z., 2006, *Kryzys męskości w kulturze współczesnej* [The Crisis of Masculinity in Modern Culture], Oficyna Wydawnicza "Impuls", Kraków.
- Pankowska D., 2004, *Wychowanie a role płciowe* [Childrearing and Gender Roles], Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Gdańsk.
- Piaget J., 1996, *Studia z psychologii dziecka* [Studies on Child Psychology], PWN, Warszawa.
- Putkiewicz E., 2002, *Proces komunikowania się na lekcji* [The Process of Communication during Classes], Wydawnictwo APS, Warszawa.
- Swann J., 2004, *Schooled Language: Language and Gender in Educational Settings*, [in:] J. Holmes, M. Meyerhoff (eds.), *The Handbook of Language and Gender*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
- Sunderland L., 2000, *New Understandings of Gender and Language Classroom Research: Text, Teacher Talk and Student Talk*, "Language Teaching Research", Vol. 4, No. 2.
- Sunderland J., 2006, *State of the Art Review Article: Gender, Language and Language Education*, "Language Teaching", Vol. 33, No. 4.
- Swann J., 2008, *Talk Control. An Illustration from the Classroom of Problems in Analysing Male Dominance of Conversation, in Language and Gender*, J. Coates (ed.), Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

Sztejnberg A., 2006, *Profesjonalna baza wiedzy nauczyciela* [Teacher's Professional Database], [in:] *Komunikacyjne środowisko nauczania i uczenia się* [Communicative Teaching and the Learning Environment], Wydawnictwo Astrum, Wrocław.

### Summary

#### *Discursive Construction of Knowledge in Line with the Logic of the Development of the Male Habitus of Pupils in the Classroom*

This article explores ways in which school knowledge structures norms of masculinity and is structured by them. It arose out of an interest in how participation in lessons can serve as a masculinizing practice – a practice that helps shape, reinforce and validate the constructions of certain versions of masculinities – and how boys construct identities that are consonant or at odds with this practice.

### Keywords

gender, knowledge, inequality, habitus, school

*English translation: Anna Moroz-Darska*

Tłumaczenie sfinansowano ze środków Ministerstwa Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego na podstawie umowy nr 661/P-DUN/2018 z dnia 13 lipca 2018 roku w ramach realizacji zadania 1 – stworzenie anglojęzycznych wersji wydawanych publikacji w 2018 roku.

The translation was financed with funds made available by the Ministry of Finance and Higher Education under contract No. 661/P-DUN/2018 of 13 July 2018 as a part of the execution of task 1: the creation of English-language versions of the issued publications in 2018.