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ABSTRACT
The present work intends to investigate to what extent neoliberal control over teaching work – and in a relational way, over society – opens space for the emergence of new forms of control of a conservative nature. In order to explore the proposed context of analysis, this study will take as its object the constitution, action and propositions of the Escola sem Partido movement. The methodology will be based on the analysis of theoretical contributions and collection of data and information about the Escola sem Partido movement, based on systematic investigations into its digital social networks.
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RESUMO
O presente trabalho pretende investigar em que medida o controle neoliberal sobre o trabalho docente – e de forma relacional, sobre a sociedade – abre espaço para o surgimento de novas formas de controle de caráter conservador. De maneira a explorar o proposto contexto de análise, este estudo tomará como objeto a constituição, a ação e as proposições do movimento Escola sem Partido. A metodologia se dará pela análise de aportes teóricos e coleta de dados e informações sobre o movimento Escola sem Partido, a partir de investigações sistemáticas em suas redes sociais digitais.
1 INTRODUCTION

The last two decades of the 20th century were characterized by significant processes of restructuring of the capitalist system worldwide (DALE, 2004). The intensification of the phenomenon of globalization has led international economic relations to conform to a new form of capitalism, neoliberalism. By associating less political and economic emphasis on state institutions with the reinforcement of a logic of competition and the market, neoliberalism consolidates itself as the primary force in the delimitation of political and social orders and in the subjective construction of individuals (DARDOT; LAVAL, 2016).

The reformulation of the role of States around the world and the neoliberal advance on economic structures have their consequences on educational policies and the reality of teaching work. Previously strengthened by a bureaucratic-professional model of organizing educational policies, the State and teachers maintained, respectively, centrality in the decision-making processes regarding the educational system and autonomy in delimiting their own work (MAROY, 2011). With the neoliberal emergence, States need to articulate its demands with those of various private actors, in a context of educational governance (BALL, 2010). Teachers have limited capacity to define and organize their own work, so that they can be met economic demands and a constant growth in profit/productive use in the educational sphere. Increasingly greater control is established over the work of teachers, who must always act with the intention of increasing production and better performance, thus having their professional identities and subjectivities reworked according to market standards, in the image of a company (BALL, 2002).

Neoliberalism and its structures of control over State institutions and subjects have established themselves as a solid basis for the emergence of new forms of social, political and cultural control. With strong moralistic and religious traits, neoconservative rationality gained ground throughout the first decades of the 21st century and has
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consolidated itself as an important political force in several countries, as a worldwide “wave”. Closely linked to neoliberal agendas, such as the defense of the free market, free enterprise and competition, neoconservative rationality adds values of defending the family and nationalism and criticizing cultural and sexual diversity, in the effervescent political dynamics of the neoliberal world (BROWN, 2019).

The emerging form of neoconservative control scales its effects to different social conditions and realities, including, very emphatically, on teaching workers. In addition to restrictions on teachers' autonomy over their work and the growing demand for better performances, neoconservative control imposes demands on teachers regarding non-transgression of certain moral and religious limits when teaching. Such control is very evident in the propositions of the Escola sem Partido (ESP) movement, which in the apparent defense of neutral teaching, aims to impose controls and gags on teaching freedom, so that teaching meets the retrograde and moral interests of families of students and from a conservative portion of society (PENNA, 2016).

Based on this contextualization, this article seeks to highlight how the form of neoliberal control constitutes a basis for forms of neoconservative control and allows these to also be coercive forces on teaching work. Furthermore, the forms of intersection between these forces in the delimitation, control and restriction of autonomy over teaching workers and the consequences of these processes for their professional identities, subjectivities and teaching action itself will also be highlighted. In order to exemplify this reality in the Brazilian context, digital social networks, congressional bills and the ESP movement website will be analyzed.

2 TEACHING WORK FROM A NEOLIBERAL PERSPECTIVE

The advance of neoliberalism, as a current onslaught of the capitalist model, has important redistributive aspects, but also has a strong emphasis on the creation of categories, terms and ideas that circumvent the world and construct realities that are subjectivized by individuals (SILVA, 2015). By defending discourses, notions of the world and forms of control over them, neoliberalism consolidates itself as a rationality that imposes various transformations on subjects, social relations and institutions, always
giving priority to defending the ideals of free market, individual freedoms and free initiative.

Neoliberal reforms of educational systems and teaching work catalyze the processes of subjective and institutional changes around the market discourse. The standardization and massification of forms of administration of school systems and their pedagogical structures are based on the argument of state inefficiency and the need to adopt technical solutions to solve problems. The endorsement of freedom of school choice in the public system, the decentralization of power from the State to other actors over educational governance and the establishment of a culture of evaluation/ranking are political reflections of the neoliberal engendering in education, as solutions to the problems of public school (NORMAND, 2008). And at the culmination of this entire phenomenon is the attribution of the teacher as the main person responsible for student and school performance (OLIVEIRA, 2004).

The demand for achieving educational goals resulting from the consolidation of a culture of school evaluation reverberates its effects as demands and control over the performance of the teaching worker. Performance is characterized as:

 [...] a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that uses criticism, comparisons and exposures as means of control, friction and change. Performances (of individual subjects or organizations) serve as measures of productivity and income, or displays of ‘quality’ [...] (BALL, 2002) (free translation).

Considered largely responsible for the good quality of education, teachers are required to be accountable for their performance and strive to constantly improve their students' grades. The effectiveness of their work performance becomes a relevant element to certify the academic “success” or “failure” of their students, conditions that are summarized in grades, data to be measured. Such evaluative results serve as governance instruments, indicating the quality of education in a certain school system. Measuring and controlling their performances is an important element in conducting educational systems from a neoliberal perspective (NORMAND, 2008).
The creation of new teaching subjectivities permeated by the meanings of neoliberalism is supported by demands for certain performances. Teachers are recognized as entrepreneurs of their own work, and who must always improve their productive capacity and quality of work. Teaching staff, in this way, internalize the forms of control imposed on their work, reproducing self-monitoring in line with the system of rules, evaluations and goals that are required of them. The teaching subject is devalued and gradually emptied, which makes room for business objectivity that always aims to improve and intensify work performance. The teacher's subjectivity is modulated, his professional identity is reworked along the model of a company (BALL, 2002).

The imposition of control over teachers based on charging for certain performances is linked to what is structured as being the best for the needs of schools, taking into account the educational market. Within the processes of this market (both private markets and quasi-public markets), measuring teaching performance is essential for providing information that supports consumer choices (BALL, 2022). The consolidation of the evaluation culture provides (and is facilitated by) an acceptance of charging for performance as a pact that, if properly fulfilled, makes it possible to reward and recognize good-performing teachers. This phenomenon conditions teaching workers to exercise their jobs in contexts of low professional autonomy, in addition to constituting fertile ground for new forms of control over their work and subjectivities (NORMAND, 2018).

Restricting teachers’ autonomy over their work is a critical point in modulating their subjectivity and subordinating them to other forms of control. Understanding autonomy as a “condition of participating in the conception and organization of one’s work” (OLIVEIRA, 2004, p. 34) (free translation), the management of teaching work can then be seen based on demands for certain performances as means of limiting the capacity of teachers to participate in the delimitation of their professional functions. The need to meet certain goals, to improve the numbers on student assessment scales, places restrictions on the teacher's freedom in the construction of pedagogical work (NORMAND, 2018). The emphasis given to the effectiveness and performativity of teaching work:
[...] accompanies an increased distrust regarding the professional autonomy of the teaching staff, if not 'framed' by new systems of evaluation of their practices and results. Trust in professionalism is cracking and professional autonomy no longer seems to be a sufficient guarantee of the quality of the educational service offered (MAROY, 2011, p. 34) (free translation).

The defense of the autonomy of teaching workers is, at times, antagonistic to the movement to defend school autonomy, a phenomenon dear to neoliberal reforms in education. In line with the processes of decentralization of educational policies, school autonomy, based on market logic, is well-liked as it facilitates the construction of educational markets, given the possibility of private actors entering the management of school institutions and structures. School autonomy, through a socio-community logic, favors a perspective of collective construction of the pedagogical phenomenon in a school environment, which opens space for decisions of a more democratic and participatory nature. In a corporatist logic, school autonomy is seen as problematic due to its limiting potential on teaching autonomy, given the fact that it increases the number of non-teaching actors with the power to participate in the conception and organization of teaching work, whether through market bias or community (BARROSO, 2004). Regardless of the context that justifies the heteronomic imposition on the organization of teaching work, the more unable teachers are to participate in the definitions of their own work, the more they find themselves subjected to other forms of delimitation and coercion of their work activities (MAROY, 2011).

3 ANTAGONISMS AND CORRELATIONS BETWEEN NEOLIBERALISM AND NEOCONSERVATISM

Pierre Dardot and Christian Laval construct an interpretation of neoliberalism, through the lens of Foucauldian biopolitics, as being a new dominant rationality, the basic reason for social relations. For the authors, neoliberalism transcends the conception of a mere economic model or political ideology and is consolidated as a “set of discourses, practices and devices that determine a new way of governing men according to the universal principle of competition” (DARDOT; LAVAL, 2016, p. 14) (free translation). Neoliberalism, as a rationality, gives the shape of human existence, imposing a logic of
generalized competition that is reflected in the construction of subjectivities and social relations. Individuals, then transformed by market dynamics, are governed by multiple forms of regency and coercion, sometimes subtle or naturalized, of their conduct. Subjects learn to think, act and see themselves, no longer as autonomous subjectivities endowed with rights, but as forces that generate capital, like companies (DARDOT; LAVAL, 2016).

The control over individuals based on this process of subjectivation from a business perspective is strongly reflected in the world of work. Teachers, education workers, as well as other individuals dependent on income from work, live with increasing demands for intensifying their productivity, improving their performance and increasing their work capabilities to achieve increasingly greater goals. The subject, as his “own company”, produces capital from his work, therefore, improving his working capacity is to intensify the productive gains of “his company”. Its own and acquired characteristics that enable the production of income are considered “human capital” which, within an economic logic, the more one invests (improves, strives, seeks to produce with greater goals), the more one can earn (FOUCAULT, 2008).

These multiple forms of control that condition subjectivities and actions to the corporate vision, and that even induce self-control on the part of individuals, are recognized as neoliberal governmentality. This is based on a broader normative framework, of a global nature, in the justification of defending individual freedoms. To a greater or lesser extent and with local specificities, forms of neoliberal government over subjects are the norm in the globalized world. And the perennial transformation of individuals into companies of themselves is a process concomitant with the transformation of political and social institutions, such as the State and the democratic model of institutional government. The State, as a key element in the process of disseminating the new reason for the world, is also subjected to the logic of competition and has its structures reworked based on market models (DARDOT; LAVAL, 2016). Despite suffering attacks and being restructured, the State, in general, remains a relevant actor in political processes, even for neoliberal engendering, for collaboration between public and private spheres or for its use for private purposes. The structures of liberal and
constitutional democracies, in turn, are emptied of their political substance, leaving only the procedural garments and technical devices. The dialogical, collective and public character of democracies is transformed in the sense of adapting to the new prevailing rationality, giving value to the neutral regulations of competition and individuality. The value of inequality, underlying the logic of competition, replaces the notion of equality, an element dear to the political character of liberal democracies (BROWN, 2015).

The phenomenon of emptying the political quality of democracy and valuing an essentially unequal model, named by philosopher Wendy Brown as dedemocratization, catalyzes the emergence of new groups and rationalities in struggles for power. According to the author, who bases her studies on the American reality, these new discourses and subjects are equally contrary to the political, egalitarian and collective aspects of democracies, not due to an amoral conception of competitive normativity, but due to moralistic, traditional and, in general, values, with strong religious appeal. A new rationality is gaining ground, neoconservative, which attempts to guide society towards moral values linked to Christianity, Western supremacy and with an emphasis on defending the traditional family institution. Neoconservatism represents the privatization of society in moral values (BROWN, 2006).

The competitive amorality and satisfaction of desires through achievements of individual merit, typical of neoliberal rationality, is antagonistic to the repressive and sublimating order of neoconservative rationality. However, the consequences of neoliberal governmentality for democratic structures allow neoconservative forms of government to become a relevant force and for both to intersect and reinforce each other. Both neoliberalism and neoconservatism produce and feed on the devaluation of subjects' political autonomy; the individualization of social problems, with solutions that are no longer dialogical and collective, but ready and standardized by the market; the production of a consumer-citizen subject to a high degree of government and control of their actions and; the legitimization of statesmanship along the lines of a company, which facilitates State actions aimed at private economic and/or moral ends (BROWN, 2006).
4 THE NEOLIBERAL AND NEOCONSERVATIVE INTERTWINING IN EDUCATION AND THE ESCOLA SEM PARTIDO MOVEMENT

Based on an analysis focused on the context of educational policies that emerged in the United States at the end of the 20th century - but which is also perceptible in a global context -, educator Michael Apple pays attention to the confluences and reciprocal strengthening of neoliberal and neoconservative forces in political conflicts around education. The author identifies that this “alliance” is made up of several political forces, which despite being oriented to the right on the ideological political spectrum, are, at times, antagonistic to each other. However, they unite in favor of a common project aimed at building political and economic hegemony over society, to the detriment of progressive trends. Apple gives the name “conservative modernization” to the set of agendas promoted by this alliance (APPLE, 2003).

Composed of neoliberal, neoconservative groups, religious fundamentalists and public technocrats representing the “new” middle class, this conservative alliance imposes and prominently publicizes its agenda of valuing the private sphere, valuing biblical precepts adopted by family members in education and an offensive against teachers and unions. Specifically, regarding teaching workers, the actions of this conservative alliance have favored:

[...] growth of state regulation regarding teachers. There has been an increasing shift from ‘permitted autonomy’ to ‘regulated autonomy’ as teachers’ work becomes highly standardized, rationalized and ‘policed’. [...] Under increasingly frequent conditions of regulated autonomy, teachers' actions are now subject to much more rigorous scrutiny in terms of process and outcomes. [...] Failure to follow these specified ‘appropriate’ methods places the teacher at risk of administrative sanctions. This control regime is not based on trust, but on a deep suspicion of teachers' motivations and competence. (APPLE, 2003, p. 62) (free translation).

The construction of a hegemonic order, in addition to increasing the economic power of groups promoting conservative modernization, is a fundamental objective of the alliance. Thus, “[...] control of society’s cultural apparatus, both the institutions that produce and preserve knowledge, and the actors who work in them, is essential in the fight for ideological hegemony” (APPLE, 1989, 32). This is the basis for the constant
impositions contrary to the freedom of action of teachers in the construction of a
democratic and emancipatory curriculum, for the purpose of maintaining the status quo
of domination of the conservative alliance in society, through school structures.
Consequently, the conservative alliance tends to promote “[...] increasingly direct attacks
on the school curriculum - and on teachers - , for its supposedly anti-family and anti-free
enterprise bias, for its 'secular humanism', its lack of patriotism and its neglect of 'values'
and 'Western tradition’” (APPLE, 2000, p. 155) (free translation). The agendas defended
by the alliance, which are accompanied by a discursive and justifying structure defending
freedom, political neutrality, protection of student subjects and quality of education, in
fact, do not challenge deep social inequalities, but always accentuate them with the
objective of increasing political and economic control of education and its institutions
and subjects (APPLE, 2015).

Apple recognizes that, through the constitution of a pretentiously “neutral”
curriculum and the withdrawal of autonomy from teaching workers for its legitimization,
systems of domination and exploitation are perpetuated in society, so that the subjects
involved in the process do not necessarily have awareness of the ideological precepts that
support such oppressive systems (APPLE, 1989). It is worth mentioning that, often, the
aggregation of groups and individuals to the movement in favor of conservative
modernization agendas is consolidated, not by a firm and well-defined position in relation
to liberal or conservative ideas, but by fear of change, fear of what is different. Not
everyone who directly or indirectly supports the conservative onslaught is, in fact, a
subject in the fight for uniformity of thought. Many are parents who were not met in their
demands and questions by educational institutions, education professionals and public
authorities, but had their interests welcomed and added to the process in favor of a
reactionary transformation (APPLE; OLIVER, 1997). Just like Dardot and Laval (2016),
with their notes on the subjective transformations caused by neoliberal governmentality,
Apple shows how the forces of the right are able to mobilize together to change the
understanding of everyday life, restructure the subjects' common sense about the most
varied aspects of human life, based on its constellations of common interests that revolve
around the valorization of individual freedoms and the free market, to the detriment of collective, egalitarian and political constructs (APPLE, 1993).

The ESP movement is an important Brazilian example of the consolidation of this interactive phenomenon between neoliberalism and neoconservatism within educational structures and on their constituent subjects. Founded in 2004, by lawyer and former São Paulo prosecutor Miguel Nagib, ESP defines itself as a “joint initiative of students and parents concerned about the degree of political-ideological contamination of Brazilian schools, at all levels: from basic education to higher education” (ESCOLA SEM PARTIDO, [2020]). Based on the premise that the Brazilian educational system is strongly affected by progressive and left-wing forces on the ideological spectrum, many teachers would be “infiltrated” political activists willing to propagate their world views and, thus, ideologically indoctrinate students for physiological purposes. In this way, the movement fights for the predominance of the values of supposed political neutrality in the school environment, but starting from an admittedly conservative position (PAULINO, 2018).

In defense of conservative and moralistic ideals, ESP seeks to promote the primacy of private interests, to the detriment of public and collective conceptions of education. In this sense, Penna understands the movement as a reading key to understanding the recent transformations undergone in education. For the author, this key of interpretation presents four essential characteristics: 1) the movement promotes a specific conception of schooling, linked to the transfer of neutral content, without political or ideological valuation. Education, understood as a moral and subjective construction of individuals, is the sole responsibility of the family, with the school being just a space for transmitting content; 2) there is a repeated effort to disqualify teachers, seen as indoctrinating agents who take advantage of the captive classroom environment to disseminate their ideological perspectives; 3) in defending its ideals, ESP adopts fascist discursive practices, such as the creation of an enemy that needs to be fought and the valorization of moral and family precepts; 4) and as the apex of private logic, there is a defense of the total power of parents over their children, as properties. The State, through
indoctrinating teachers, would be infringing the parents' right to property, when themes are discussed that go against their political perspectives and worldviews (PENNA, 2017).

ESP's actions aim to impose new ways of controlling educational policies, from broad and normative perspectives of national education, as well as the actions and relationships of subjects in the nuclear spaces of school institutions and classrooms. His propositions, according to Macedo, were precursors in the defense of conservative demands in debates on educational policies in the country, such as the processes of construction of the National Common Curricular Base (BNCC). Previously, the conflicts referred to demands for social justice as opposed to neoliberal accountability policies. After a certain strengthening of ESP on the public education agenda, moralistic interests became a delimiting force in the document's guidelines, closely linked to market interests. This was already beginning to occur within the debates present in the preparation of state and municipal education plans since 2014 (MACEDO, 2017).

The entry of conservative demands into the political game regarding national education did not happen by chance. Since 2004, Nagib has worked constantly to denounce what he considers to be abuses of the freedom to teach by militant teachers. Its first form of action was through the creation of a website – still in operation – in which the leader of the movement published complaints received and wrote about his perceptions about education, teaching and politics (ROMANCINI, 2018). When focusing on the emergence of the ESP movement, Luis Felipe Miguel notices the confluences of anti-Marxist forces, the movement's first front of action, with liberal perspectives - closely associated with the relations between Nagib and important private institutions for the dissemination of neoliberal ideas such as free markets, competition and economic freedom – and religious fundamentalists, valuing family interests and an innatist, repressive and naturalizing view of sex and sexuality. This thematic expansion of the range of its defenses exponentially increased the resonance of the movement's speeches (MIGUEL, 2016).

As a result of the formation of these political alliances, several congressional bills began to emerge in numerous legislative houses across the country – in municipalities, states and the National Congress – proposing the institutionalization of the movement's
precepts and militancy against sexual diversity. This ESP action front seeks to transform what is understood as the right to education in the country, and it takes place at three levels: making changes to the body of the National Education Guidelines and Bases Law (LDB) (9394/1996); approve the maximum number of bills in federated entities and; encourage litigation among teachers (XIMENES, 2016). The first two bills were presented, in 2014, by Flávio Bolsonaro, at the time state deputy of Rio de Janeiro, and Carlos Bolsonaro, councilor of Rio de Janeiro, sons of the ex-president of the Republic, Jair Bolsonaro. Miguel Nagib himself wrote them at the request of the Bolsonaro clan and made an online model available for reproduction throughout the country (PAULINO, 2018).

The first bill of national relevance was 867/2015, already archived, by former federal deputy Izalci Lucas. The bill proposed amendments to the LDB, which intended to remove the provision that ensures freedom of teaching, on the grounds that there is no freedom of expression in the exercise of teaching activities; sought to establish political, ideological and religious neutrality as a principle of national education; and prohibit “political-ideological indoctrination” in a school environment. The bill also aimed to institutionalize an anonymous reporting channel in education departments related to possible violations of this law. As a corollary, the bill required that posters containing the “teachers’ duties” be posted in all classrooms of educational institutions, except for those for early childhood education, in accordance with the Escola sem Partido program:

1 - The teacher will not take advantage of the students' captive audience, with the aim of co-opting them into this or that political, ideological or partisan current.
2 - The teacher will not favor or harm students due to their political, ideological, moral or religious convictions, or lack thereof.
3 - The teacher will not carry out political party propaganda in the classroom nor will he encourage his students to participate in demonstrations, public events and marches.
4 - When dealing with political, socio-cultural and economic issues, the teacher will present to students, in a fair way – that is, with the same depth and seriousness –, the main versions, theories, opinions and competing perspectives on the matter.
5 - The teacher will respect the right of parents to have their children receive moral education that is in accordance with their own convictions.

6 - The teacher will not allow the rights guaranteed in the previous items to be violated by the actions of third parties, within the classroom (BRASIL, 2015) (free translation).

An important point that supports the movement’s propositions is control over teaching autonomy. In order to prevent the much-feared ideological indoctrination, ESP aims to further condition teaching work to a logic of heteronomy regarding its definition and organization. The dictates contained in the “teachers’ duties” contemplate this strong prerogative, as effective forms of control over teachers’ pedagogical and didactic freedom. Within the “captive” classroom environment, teachers must be aware of the tiny possibilities of ideologically “abusing” their students, which tends to intensely condition their speeches. For fear of harming students' family moral education, by possibly presenting versions that conflict with their cultural and moral perspectives, teachers are limited from raising certain debates and are indirectly coerced into addressing certain subjects/themes/lines of thought that go against certain pedagogical constructions. The potential to be recognized as an indoctrinator is a conditioning element for the self-government of one's actions as a worker, a condition that is favored by the less than objective definition of ideology, indoctrination or political-partisan propaganda presented by ESP. The more abstract these concepts are, the broader the control over the teaching subjects and, therefore, the easier and more fruitful the use of their work is.

The conditioning of teaching autonomy is present in ESP’s bills, but it is also constantly reinforced in its digital social networks. As a way of propagating its ideals and gaining support in political endeavors, the movement shares its speeches on political issues, education and, mainly, complaints and propositions regarding teaching workers. A recurring topic in their digital media is the contradiction regarding freedom of expression during teaching:

THERE IS NO FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN THE EXERCISE OF TEACHING ACTIVITY. [...] Freedom of expression is the right to say anything on any subject, regardless of censorship or license. It is the freedom that is exercised on social networks. [...] If the teacher enjoyed this freedom in
the classroom, he would not be obliged to teach: he could spend the entire class time talking about anything on any subject (religion, sex, politics, football, soap operas, gastronomy, private life, etc.) (ESCOLA SEM PARTIDO, 2018) (free translation).

The legal dispute regarding freedom of expression in teaching and freedom of professorship is very expensive for ESP, possibly thanks to the academic training in Law and professional history as a State Attorney of its founder and centralized leader, Miguel Nagib. According to a peculiar interpretation of the Federal Constitution and the LDB, ESP defends that the freedom of the professorship is limited to the teaching of contents considered to be strictly school-based and, if the limits of what can be considered as pedagogical in the movement's view are exceeded, there is abuse of freedom of expression (ESCOLA SEM PARTIDO, 2020). This positioning reflects what Penna highlights about the movement's conception of schooling, which must be strictly content-based and dissonant with the social and political aspects of the educational phenomenon (PENNA, 2017). The indoctrinating teacher, from the perspective of ESP, should not have autonomy in the organization, constitution and management of his own work, so as to avoid the abuse of freedom of expression in teaching activity and, as a possible consequence, the occurrence of ideological indoctrination. As a way of ensuring a certain teaching performance, ESP even proposes a more extensive form of control: the legal possibility of recording classes as material for reporting cases of indoctrination (BRASIL, 2019).

The work performance of teachers from the ESP perspective takes on new contours in relation to that perceived by Ball (2002) and Normand (2008) in the context of neoliberal education reforms. The demand for rising performance of grades/goals within the evaluation culture remains – and is becoming increasingly robust – in this context of neoconservative emergence, but now teachers must pay attention to performance in accordance with certain moral, cultural and religious dictates. It becomes part of a quality education not only to achieve objectives in the form of grades and evaluation measures, but also to respect the dominant moral impositions of conservative modernization. In an opinion article shared on the ESP institutional website in April 2013,
The author justifies Brazil’s poor performance in the International Student Assessment Program (PISA) for what he calls the “ideology of inclusion”:

In international educational tests, Brazil competes for last place with much poorer countries. Last year, for example, in the teaching quality index prepared by the company Pearson, Brazil appears in penultimate place on the list, ahead of only Indonesia, among the 40 countries surveyed, led by Finland, South Korea and Hong Kong., the first three. [...] In Pisa, an international student assessment test from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Brazil ranked 53rd, in a list of 65 countries. This is because Brazilian private schools, even contaminated by the ideology of inclusion and not merit, prevented the country from becoming worse off. If only public schools were evaluated, Brazil would fall to 60th position, behind Kazakhstan (SILVA, 2013) (free translation).

The release of the PISA 2018 results, in 2019, again generated expressions of indignation on the part of ESP. On its official Twitter account, the movement published the following protest text:

This is where militancy and recruitment professionals come into the picture. Like opportunistic bacteria, they take advantage of students' vulnerability, to transform all classes into pleasant “conversation circles”. The problem is that PISA doesn't have a conversation circle [...] (ESCOLA SEM PARTIDO, 2019) (free translation).

Neoliberal and neoconservative rationalities connect and strengthen each other in ESP discourses. The attempt to increasingly control and subjugate teaching work catalyzes the emergence of new forms of government over it. Anchored in neoliberal governmentality which, through the defense of free market ideals and individual freedoms, limits worker autonomy and imposes progressive demands for productivity, forms of neoconservative control expand heteronomy over teaching work and require more delimited performances. The didactic construction and content of pedagogical practices must now, based on the interconnections between these forms of control, be structured within the requirements for productivity and with performances that simultaneously serve the interests of the market and those of the dominant conservative morality.
5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

From the contextualization and arguments carried out throughout the text, it was possible to highlight the political and social aspects of the scenario of neoliberal control over teaching work. The limitation on the ability to define and organize one's own work is sustained by the need that the educational market must impose and demand certain performances from teaching activities. And the very demand for a certain performance, in the eagerness to meet market interests, restructures the teacher's identity as a professional and his own subjectivity, making him a reproducer of practices, discourses and ideals typical of business logic. Such conditioning gives rise to new and different forms of control over the work and subjectivity of teachers.

From a broad perspective, not limited to the educational context and teaching work, it was possible to highlight the similarities and divergent points between neoliberal and neoconservative rationalities. From the effort to analyze the basic theoretical framework of this research, it was possible to perceive those certain central points for neoliberal rationality, such as the valorization of the private sphere, the delegitimization of the public and its political and collectivist quality and the economization of all spheres of life serve as fertile soil for a neoconservative emergence, of a retrogressive and moralistic nature.

In the end, through Michael Apple's theoretical construction, the forms of confluence of neoliberal and neoconservative forces on education policies and teaching work were presented. The ESP movement was used to exemplify this intersectional context and its impacts on teaching workers and their work. From the analysis of PLs, institutional website and social networks of the movement, it was possible to highlight how forms of control of teaching work characteristic of a neoliberal logic, such as the limitation of labor autonomy and the charging for certain performances, suffered the addition of new content of moralistic nature. In addition to demanding goals and results that strengthen educational markets, teachers now need to meet performances based on certain moral and religious values, with decreasing autonomy over what and how to deal with when teaching.
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