Educação em Perspectiva / *Education in Perspective*
DOI: 10.22294/eduper/ppge/ufv.v10i0.7130

DOSSIER

The (im)possibility of giving voice to users of public policies: reflections from intersectoral practice

Sobre a (im)possibilidade de dar voz aos usuários das políticas públicas: Reflexões a partir da prática intersetorial

Sobre la (im)posibilidad de dar voz a los usuarios de las políticas públicas: reflexiones a partir de la práctica intersectorial

Roberta Carvalho Romagnoli[2]

Abstract: This paper analyzes the intersectorial practice relations with the families in the Regional Technical Intersectorial Nucleus (NIR-T) Technical Regional Intersectorial Nucleus (NIR-T), in one of the Belo Horizonte's regional, a space for discussion of serious cases of social violation. This study has the intervention research as methodology and the ideas of Deleuze and Guattari and René Lourau as theoretical framework. In the process of the research, we had difficulties to make interviews with the families that could not be listened like planned. We examine this impossibility as an analyzer, which makes visible the tension of the reproduction in the institutions, but also of the production of the new, of which it generates conflict. We noticed the presence of some institutional "not-saids": the change of the city mayor, the protection of professionals and families, passivity, but also the need to support the difference of families. We conclude that the evaluation of public policies by users is essential for the intersectorial practice.

Keywords: Family. Intersectoriality. Psychosocial Intervention.

Resumo: Esse artigo coloca em análise as relações da prática intersetorial com as famílias no Núcleo Intersetorial Regional Técnico (NIR-T) de uma das regionais de Belo Horizonte, espaço para a discussão de casos graves de violação social. Esse estudo tem a pesquisa-intervenção como metodologia e as ideias de Deleuze e Guattari e René Lourau como marco teórico. No processo da pesquisa tivemos dificuldades com as entrevistas com as famílias, que não puderam ser escutadas como planejado. Examinamos essa inviabilidade como um analisador, que torna visível a tensão do que é reproduzido pelas instituições, mas também a produção do novo, do que gera conflito. Constatamos a presença de alguns "não ditos" institucionais: a mudança de prefeito, a proteção dos profissionais e das famílias, a passividade, mas também a necessidade de sustentar a diferença das famílias. Concluímos que a avaliação das políticas públicas pelos usuários é essencial para a sustentação da prática intersetorial.

Palavras-chave: Família. Intersetorialidade. Intervenção Psicossocial.

Resumen: Este artículo pone en análisis las relaciones de la práctica intersectorial con las familias en el Núcleo Intersectorial Regional Técnico (NIR-T) de una de las regionales de Belo Horizonte, espacio para la discusión de casos graves de violación social. Este estudio tiene como metodología la investigación-intervención y como marco teórico las ideas de Deleuze y Guattari y René Lourau. En el proceso de investigación tuvimos dificultades con las entrevistas con las familias, que no pudieron ser escuchadas como planeado. Examinamos esa inviabilidad como un analizador, que hace visible la tensión de lo que es reproducido por las instituciones y también la producción de lo nuevo, de lo que genera conflicto. Constatamos la presencia de algunos "no dichos" institucionales: el cambio de alcalde, la protección de los profesionales y de las familias, la pasividad, pero también la necesidad de sostener la diferencia de las familias. Concluimos que la evaluación de las políticas públicas por los usuarios es esencial para la sustentación de la práctica intersectorial.

Palabras clave: Familia. Intersectorialidad. Intervención Psicosocial.

[1] **Submitted:** 03 Dec. 2018 **- Accepted:** 11 Feb. 2019 **- Published:** 15 Feb. 2019
[2] Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais (PUC Minas) – E-mail: robertaroma1@gmail.com

This article intends to pub into analysis and evince the tensions and forces lived in the un(encounters) with the families whose cases are problematized in the *Núcleo Intersetorial Regional Técnico* [Technical Intersectorial Regional Nucleus] (NIR-T) of a regional secretary in the city of Belo Horizonte, state of Minas Gerais, Brazil. NIR-T is an intersectorial space for discussing the serious cases of violation of rights granted by the health, mental health, social security and education public policies, aiming at expedite and qualify the offer of public services to the demanding population. This space if composed by professionals that seek to ensure the interlocution between the managers of sectorial regional policies, supporting its work in the interventions of the cases brought to discussion, thus supporting the collective and coordinated actions. It is worth emphasizing that what we present here was produced by means of experimentations of an intervenient and committed knowledge production, exercising a nomad attitude, that follows the collectives and believe in their potency; a minority science that aims at knowing at the same time it intervenes.

> What we wish to say, rather, is that collective bodies always have fringes or minorities that reconstitute equivalents of the war machine - in sometimes quite unforeseen forms - in specific assemblages such as building bridges or cathedrals or rendering judgments or making music or instituting a science, a technology [...] (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1997, p. 32).

Seeking to build bridges and to make associations, intersectoriality is a strategy need for public policies, since it articulate subjects of different sectors, with distinct knowledge and powers, aiming at solve complex problems. More than a concept, it is a social practice that has been constructed from the dissatisfaction with the responses from each sector, how Warschauer and Carvalho (2014) remind us. Monnerat and Souza (2011) also emphasize the indispensability of an intersectorial coping, by the construction of a social protection net, especially in a country with great structural limits and social inequalities. The interventions called from that domain surpass the competency of a unique govern sector or public policy area given its complexity.

Despite being considered essential, the intersectorial practice presents a series of difficulties and challenges for its institutionalization. In that context, NIR-T tries to fill that gap. Instituted in the studied regional in 2013, it is organized in a permanent team composed ty three professionals that the policies of social security, health and education, and also by mobile teams, which are composed by professions working on the devices of those same policies, that request the discussion of a specific case being attended and quite often demand the presence of professionals from other devices, whenever needed for the elaboration of referrals. In that context, NIR-T's permanent team organizes its monthly schedule and when a team of professional has difficulty with a given case, it requests and call to the meeting the responsible for all devices that work with the family in question.

The strategies for health care and social welfare, as well as the fighting against social exclusion are goals not only of the policies and compose the Nucleus, but also of the set of public policies, unveiling the need for a joint intervention. Policies whose core are the family

in its daily actions, a privileged and irreplaceable *locus* of primary protection and socialization. However, the relation between the teams and the families happens in a conflictual and challenging way, in complex, multidetermined very precarious realities, especially in a highly unequal and heterogeneous society as our Brazilian, and with singular familiar groups that are unlike the dominant model of nuclear family. Traversed by the survival vector, those groups possess other organization logic, as alternatives for coupling with abandonment and social exclusion, often unknown by the professionals.

All those case discussions of NIR-T gravitate around the problems reported by the families, generally very vulnerable and weakened ones. Neglects of several forms, death threats, constant abuse of crack, alcohol and other drugs, refusal of proper treatment for mental disorders, aggressions an violence of all kind, lack of familiar or community support for sick and deficient members, non-observance of the conditionality of *Programa Bolsa Família* [Family Allowance], infrequency at school for problems related to drug traffic, among others, appear in the daily work of those groups, leaving the teams impotent in front of those problems they always comes in association between one another. In that scenario, there is also the risky of naturalization of misery without problematizing the perverse production of social exclusion in Brazil, as pointed out by Oliveira and Heckert (2013). Forgetting other conditions that also produce the daily lives of that families, the professions can exert a management of those subjectivities, normalizing them, chasing them for the correction of its deviances. Worried about the disciplinarization and regulation of family's modes of existence, Santos, Heckert and Carvalho (2017) denounce strategic biopolitics in which the power invest in the govern of the population and life management, by means of that group.

In that context, we set out to listening those families about the intervention they underwent, about what they thought of the intersectorial actions and of how they evaluate the teams, betting on the potency of life, for beyond the vulnerability designed by the policies addressed to those groups. Part of the tensions resulting of that proposal are presented in this study.

The process of knowing/intervening

Taking into consideration the forces that compose reality, as well as the social demands for real academic contributions, this study is inserted in intervention research line. When discussing the ways of doing research in social field, Amador, Lazzarotto and Santos (2015, p. 230), point out that this research modality "[…] is affirms itself as a given approach policy of the very social, that is, as a given way of conceiving and problematizing it". That conception is supported by the idea that the social is not gave *a priori*, but it is constructed and produced by our practices, inclusively the scientific one, being exercised in a processual way. In that sense, it undoes the dichotomies subject-object, theory-practice, joining researcher and research population in a collective knowledge production, for "[…] it is always carried out by means of a dive into the experiment that agencies subject and object" (PASSOS; BARROS, 2015, p. 17). Such immersion puts at the same plane knowing and

transforming, creating devices for broaden the relation with reality, with the people we study and with the social practices, on which there are no ready rules, but a coproduction that requires inhabiting the research field and the constant analysis of the implication of the researcher. We understand, thus, that getting to know is producing realities, interfering at and moving them at the same time that we, researchers, also destabilize ourselves, creating zones of indignation and other forms of subjectivation. Surely, to go beyond the given, seeking the difference is a need becoming, a trace that leads to the lines of virtuality, in the cluster of forces that accompany a given situation. The difference, as multiplicity process, is revealed as a plan for beyond the normalization and standardization of life, a consistence plan, that group heterogeneities and possibilities.

In intervention research, reality is processed through forms and forces that coexist in the daily routine of the knowledge production process. Forms have a binary and excluding functioning, working through homogenizing models and norms, that organize and classify the daily routine of the research, corresponding to what is instituted and tends to repeat itself. The forces seek for agencies, velocities and heterogeneous, functioning in a connective way by means of destabilizations produced by the relations, by the practices, by the encounters that make all involved in the research to dare experiment new ways of actuation. The experiments with that "outside" (outside ourselves, the university, the sectors, of our training, of the usual…) that the destabilization bring to us, disturb us, cause us estrangements and uneasiness, put us in crisis. Those experiments throw us in states that bear nothing in common with the dominant and instituted forms in which we recognize ourselves, since they are its limit: they refer to what scape to our models, of the models of the people we get to know/intervene and that can lead to its transformation (DELEUZE, GUATTARI, 1995).

With such ethical-political bid to base us, we boarded in a nomad and ambulant production that had as general objective to analyze intersectoriality from the stablish relations in NIR-T afore mentioned, emphasizing the management way of social work among the sectorial policies, in the teams and with the families in order to favor the invention new forms of expression in those groups. By meetings those groups, participating in the meetings, of the individual and collective interviews, of the affections, and analysis and implications, among others, we seek to analyze the effect of the practices on the institutional every day, deconstructing sedimented and reproductive forms and favoring the collective creation of other actuations.

Using the methodology of intervention research, we worked in two simultaneous lines for the production of data. The analysis field consisted of a collective reading and discussion of the ideas of Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, Michel Foucault and René Lourau, which give support to the choice for intervention research on this study, and Brazilian scholars that work on that branch. We also carried out a study of intersectoriality, focusing on social inclusion, rights violation and, the user families. The intervention field consisted in a collective work plan with the staff that integrate NIR-T, traversing their demands, difficulties and conflicts, including reflections upon the politic-institutional dimension (work organization, relation between sectors and teams, relation with the families, decision power in front of the procedures) and the socio-assistive dimension.

With the team we analyzed the ignorance of each sector concerning the work of other sectors, the impact of serious cases on the subjectivity of the staff, the disbelief of the professionals not only with intersectoriality, but with their own interventions, o traversing of the tutelary council, among others. Difficulties that coexisted with the emergence of the Nucleus as a potent construction space of collective solutions, of discussion that strengthen them in a group sharing of their anguishes, a place that create distinct views that defocus the reading of the problem-case, enlarging the knowledge of everyone involved, not only of the questions discussed, but also of the policies and their programs, of the territories and their singularities.

Along the research we hoped also to listen to and intervene with the families, sure that they could not be approached in their totality or universality, mas counting on the individual meetings to get to know them, longing to produce knowledge on the relation, to intervene on their ways of life. In fact, getting to know and intervene supports a process that reveals that there is not neutrality on that production and that the researcher involved is also produced by the institutions that traverse her, circulates among the academy and what she intends to study, engendering and being engendered by those models and forces. Under that perspective, the analysis of implication is inherent to the process of knowledge production. That analysis consists in questioning the institutions that traverse us in the contact with the intervention field, that always produce effects on the researcher (ROMAGNOLI, 2014). That is to say, the contact with the teams and the families have produced restlessness and unease, that recall to our history, to our ethic-political positioning, to the power system of the academy, including the very place of the historian, as well as to the commitment to the fostering agencies.

In the data production, we had a relative success with the team who were very collaborative and have participated actively in the restitution process. The restitution, from the Institution Analysis, consists in the process of data analysis of what is made together in the researched population and Monceau (2012, p. 30, free translated by the author) confirms that "[…] allows for [testing] the interpretations, but also, and can be above all, to ensure that the work pact keeps alive among all the participants"[i]. Amador, Lazarotto and Santos (2015, p. 235) also based in the ideas of René Lourau, reinforce that "Restitution and participation, under that perspective, do not constitute a concession, but an analytical strategy of that way of intervene-research that makes necessary the composition movement of a researchers collective". The restitution made together with the NIR-T team allowed for the professionals to express what they perceived of the reality they lived in that space, and what the observed in their daily work, and such perceptions were used for the collective reflections and pointed above. In what concerns the effects of the research on that space, as far as we observed, there were a greater knowledge on that device, tracing the difficulties and elaborating solutions. However, we know we could have had invisible results that were appropriated by the staff and that keep traversing the way they do their work.

The idea as to make that same process with the families, starting with individual interviews, and thus mobilizing them for the collective interviews, on which we hoped for a group movement, since that in the collective there are questionings, what does not occur in the individuals, for the families are afraid to lose the benefits of the public policies

(ROMAGNOLI, 2018). Besides, we believed that the group would be an antecessor not only for sharing narratives and experiences among the family members, but especially to call the collective, since the subjectivity is invented at this dimension, through agencies, connections with the non-me elements, interlacing images, affects, becomings, objects, information, histories, emotions, among others. In that process occur experiments that bring the forces, the intensive, present on the situations (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1995). That was what we intended to search. However, that stage of the research did not work out as we expected.

Data production: (re)producing realities

At the period reserved for the families, despite innumerable attempts, we had many obstacles to get in contact with those people. Initially the family members were indicated by the permanent team of NIR-T, using as criteria the case have been discussed in that intersectorial space and the family members being able to give interview, a point always recalled by the technicians that gave us a name list. In the initial contacts we made with the family members, that list was shrinking: many had changed their phone numbers, of address, of regional. We schedule one more meeting with the technicians and redid the list. We got to make the first three individual interviews for later make the collective interviews. Our plan was to make 10, 12 individual interviews for them to get to know us, get to know about the proposal and later make two collective interviews with 5 to 6 members each. One of those three interviewee refused to participate of the collective meeting. Thus, we had only two people willing to participate on the group interview. We made three more attempts, now contacting directly the technicians we knew from the flying teams. We had several impediments both to get in touch with them and to convince them to help us: difficulties to talk with the technicians, questionings about the project, about the kind of family we wanted, about how the interview would be. We explained all those points. More indications that we would not be able to get in touch… The permanent team intervenes again, trying to mediate the situation. More names, more difficulties for contact. Time goes by… the research, in its schedule, head to the end. We had to accept the unviability to get to know/intervene with the families, despite our uneasiness with the lack of inclusion of the user's view on the public policies studies. There is too much talk about the teams, the staff, but the one who, in fact uses the policy and its devices seldom evaluates or criticizes it.

We could not produce a reality in which the families could have a voice, make associations, and make arrangements that give vent to the collective force, of which we expected to be intercessors. Foucault (2004), in his text "Genealogy and Power", when defending genealogy, moving away from universality and from the idea of truth sedimented in modernity, says that it has two characteristics: the local character of criticism and insurrection of the subjugated knowledge. Prudence we thought would follow us in our research processes. By approaching what we studied, our field partners, ourselves, requires a singular positioning that moves away from totality and generalizations. By putting our bodies on the research, we need to pay attention to the institutions that speak through us, as Lourau (1990) affirms, listening to our voices and of the others', that for many time were disqualified

by our scientific discourses, also giving consistency to the small marks that rise from us and scape standardization, of the traces of insufficiency, of impossibility, of the risky always present those groups live. We understand that the opinion of the users would allow for broaden the analysis of the exercise of care in intersectorial practice, of the movements for accessing the services, of the bound stablished and the construction and effectiveness of the referrals and other questions, that have surely emerged from the meeting with the families. Besides the experiment-interventions supported by the collective.

We know that by making research with the staff and the families, calling other compositions among us, we did not have the control over what we planned. Life has its own rhythm and destabilize us all. "Knowledge construction is processed as activator and producer of intervention in life and happens on that blending, on that dyeing of the researcher with the field" (ABRAHÃO *et al*., 2013, p. 134). Thus, dyed by the field, we accept its autopoiesis. Reality has autonomy and happens by its own movements giving birth to situations that are also data not foreseen in the research project and not in its schedule. Analyzing happenings in institutions that are constitute in the game of instituted forces that tend to conserve what exists and instituting forces that seek the freshness of the new. Coexistent forces that generate crisis, conflicts, contradictions, breaking through in practices, situations denominated analyzers, result from the confront between what you want to keep and what we want to change. The analyzers produce deviants, questionings, unveiling those hidden forces (LOURAU, 2004).

Under that perspective, we understand the access difficult of the users of public policies as an analyzer, that expresses some of the institutional "not told", some of the production conditions of that impossibility, seeking in our analysis to investigate them. Scanning the "not told" denaturalize some truths and generate effects that can come to produce agencies, giving passage to the complexity of production of other existence modes. That denaturalization shakes our truths and create questionings that can operate other practices for caring and intervene with those families.

A first traversing worth mentioning, and that often it gets hidden on the researches on public policies field, refers to the changing of the city management with the entrance of a new mayor, a period when those who enter bring instituting questions and many times disregard the instituted, longing for fighting the precedent govern, creating a restructuring period. Caught in the macropolitical disputes, the team has to be recomposed, disabling old programs, inaugurate new ones, readapting itself to the new managers and we are obligate to review our terms and reestablish the bound with the teams, asking permission again for the study. We have lived that reorganization exactly in the beginning of the stage destined to the interviews with the families. In that process, I hear that university has few partnerships with public institutions, but is not easy to handle them. Macropolitics, the majority traversing the micropolitics, minority. That is to say, we perceive the indissociability of those two dimensions in which the administrative and documental formalities that order and classify ally to less visible questions that happen in the relations stablished daily on the services. When studying politics in Deleuze and Guattari, Balconi (2018) show how it is a practical imperative exerted by complex agencies that happen in micropolitics. The author also makes

a distinction between the majority that seek the standardization and that holds the normalization power and the minorities that appeal to different ways of live. Majority and minority that concern the processes of sociopolitical and institutional life.

The families, as minorities, are thus secluded from our study, engendered in the formalities of the majority that transits in us and through us, institutional functioning that oppress, the incapacitate in the interface of the productivity required by the Post-Graduation programs of Brazil and by the tessiture with the new city management. They also move away by the feeling that runs through them of not having what to talk about. "Why do you want to hear us", a feeling of questioning, now ours, when we invite them to give them our impressions. In the trail of incompetency, we need help. All of us. We all feel incapable: of doing research, of being a family that can rise its children, of continuing the daily work after so much change in the city hall, of being a technician that makes the difference. We are set apart from our potency. Of our part, the porosity of our researcher body suffers, tired of getting to know/intervene only with professionals in our researchers: we cannot tense the instituted in what concerns the users, though the process with the team has been very rich. The bounds with the new team are yet incipient and fragile, in a moment we needed it to mediate the access to the families.

Talking with one of the professions of NIR-T team, we questioned why we could not get the approximation with the families. We begin also to question, besides the macropolitical crossing, what passed between the technicians and the families. She thought that they did not want to researchers to see their working, thought they were afraid of criticism, for that they did not make easy the contacts. Besides, they needed to protect the work they were involved in. When studying the obstacles for the materialization of intersectoriality, Cavalcanti and Lucena (2016) referred to the overload of charges of the professional in their sectors, favoring the maintenance of the conservatism in the actions. Many professionals, in fact, feel vulnerable in their actuations, as Romagnoli (2015) emphasizes when studying the effects of daily work with vulnerability. The author points out in her study that vulnerability "[…] finds reverberations in certain positioning of the teams, that very often feel insecure, demotivated and resented in dealing with the family […]" (ROMAGNOLI, 2015, p. 456). That power could have been another "not told" activated by the search for the users.

Even though that has been the reading of one of the researchers concerning the fear about the interviews with the families, we observed in the technicians, more than an effort to protect themselves, an attempt to preserve those groups through the power of the expert, of its place in the services. That is, the protection was not for themselves, since the majority of the professionals we very prepared and committed to their work, but for the families, for the service users. While we waited for the indications, we heard the following speeches that sounded as protection for the groups: "This is not a good time for talking", "Now they are in a very big crisis", "Let's try another family, for that one we indicated is very fragile". Those sentences build barriers against the researches collective, anticipating impediments for the interview to take place, since they were very vulnerable families, with complex cases the traverse all the intersectorial net. But why this need for protection?

At the moment in Belo Horizonte, the technicians protect the users from the judicial power. By a misunderstanding of the *Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente* [Children and Teenagers Statute] (ECA), the vulnerable mothers are losing the custody of their children. It has been happening since July, 2016, fulfillment of 3/2016 Ordinance. In those documents, the maternity hospitals of Belo Horizonte are obliged to call the Children and Teenager Civil Law department, within 48 hours, counted by the child's birth, when there is evidence or prove that the mother is a drug addicted and/or lives in the streets (TRIBUNAL DE JUSTIÇA DO ESTADO DE MINAS GERAIS – TJEMG, 2016). That resolution triggers in the services a need for helping the mothers that want to keep the custody of their children, and demand that from the bound they have with the technicians, though it is not necessarily the public of NIR-T. But the climate is impregnated with a sense of urgency for defense. That "not told" slips into the research and they need to protect the family from us. Protecting even from the university as an institution of knowledge and power that can threaten from its place of hierarchy of knowledge. When leaving a restitution meeting in which participate for the first time the manager of one of the secretaries, she says, without realizing I am listening: "We have to be careful with the university". What danger we offer?

Since those family are capable of coupling with so much deprivation, social exclusion, serious daily problems, are so they really so fragile they could not stand a research interview done with all care and respect to the ethical precepts? Could not those technicians imagine that fragility goes beyond that? Fragility/capacity come from the daily chocks, not from talking about them. I believe there here we have to risky of turning protection into guardianship, and move away from the autonomy that public polices propagate. Even though we could not intervene with and in the families, we followed many of them in the NIR-T discussion, and caught our attention the suffering potency of those groups. For Deleuze (2002), in his use of Spinoza, the interactions of the bodies, the relations established produce a field of variable effects, according to the compositions made.

When the bodies meet, that encounter can be compatible and compose a more potent whole, constituting a new relation, but can also be incompatible and de-empower, intoxicate. Thus, when a body is convenient to mine, its potency is added to mine, increasing my potency of action, allowing for life to be done in its essence. However, when a body is inconvenient to mine, exactly for its potency being opposed to mine, the encounter makes to flourish my suffering potency, which sets me apart from life.

That suffering appears in the discussions of the cases traversed by complex problematics, supported by deprivations and miseries, in which is needed a joint, intersectorial action for trying to construct possibilities for those groups that live the intervention in a passive way and that most of the time do not even know that their family arrangement is being discussed in an intersectorial nucleus. Those are ways of existence that inhabit sedentary and reproductive territories, precarious in several dimensions. It is a life experimented as fatality and not as becoming, caught in inert points, producing stigmatized families, contoured by social exclusion, failed in their insertion on society. On the other hand, Paulon and Romagnoli (2018) based on Nietzsche and Spinoza's ideas, affirm that there is potency in the vulnerable. Beyond readings based in a hierarchical moralism, they emphasize

that this potency can be conquered in the meetings between technicians and families, a life producing relational logic, no more rigid points, but lines which when run through create, invent.

The families are also living nets of production, nomad groups that can inhabit other territories. Those are the families we are interested in, that have joys, hold pains and disfavors, encounters with alterity, differences that support conflicts. Not the docilized families at the individual interviews that make nothing but praising the services. "Since I found the services, it changed a lot, it improved a lot", "When there not existed the service, it was very complicated", "I do not know what would be of me with F." (CREAS technician). Those are some of the sentences we hear at the individual interviews. It is not that the services are not important in the life of those people, however they talk about certain passivity and dependency of the services for continuing their lives, moving away from the autonomy preconized by the public policies.

By mapping the families in situation of social vulnerability concerning the service received by the *Centro de Referência em Assistência Social* [Social Assistance Reference Center] (CRAS), Andrade and Morais (2017) emphasize how those groups still have an assistentialist mentality, finding it hard to recognize their social rights and identifying the significance of the device in the territory. In their evaluation the families perceive more positive points related to the attendance, to the activities and to the benefits than the negative points related to physical structure, localization and technicians turnover. That same attitude was perceived by Romagnoli (2018) in the interviews carried out with families that make use of social assistance policies, not appearing any critical questioning from them. Are not the families still thinking they are receiving favors, updating the historical line of charity and boons that for so many times was part of the assistance to the social excluded in Brazil? Is there not any tension or mismatch on the services? Why who uses a service cannot evince the conflicts present in them which do not question the very conditions of vulnerability production?

In our path towards getting to know/intervene there was an uneasiness always present of trying to release the multiplicities that are hardened in the vulnerability vector, caught in molds of constant disqualification and blame, performed inclusively by the very families. Every people and group have capacity for invention and construction of solutions for the daily confronting of their existences, in the fight for survival and we need to acknowledge that. By the examination of the working of psychology with the families that do not meet the requirements for *Bolsa Família*, Souza and Marin (2017) support the importance of hosting in order for the teams to be intercessors towards autonomy. Undoubtedly, the technicians host, help, but in certain circumstances, generally without being aware of that, they care, invade, condemn, expropriating the families and themselves of their potency.

One of the most recurring points we hear in our experience with works with families refers to their incapacity of exerting the care and the difficulty of raising their children. We do not believe this, though it is a region with high rates of infra-family violence. We never found a family that did not care of its members, even in a non-dominant way, that did not established care relation in its singularity, in their peculiar ways of existence. The question is

that often the care is not marked by affection, hygiene, politeness, but by violence, aggression, imposition, among others, generally perpetrating transgenerational ways of relating. And it is up to the technicians to host those crystallization of patterns that make life precarious, but also, and above all, that include capacities coping with instable, arduous and heavy situations. When problematizing care and mental health in their relation with the families, Ferreira *et al.* (2018, p. 98) reminds us: "the openness for the bids the users make, daily in their way through life calls us to problematize the need of thinking care as a construction of spaces for listening and recognition of the other". Other-alterity, brutal difference that destabilize us with its estrangement.

In the relation with the families we have to sustain the difference as a way of open ourselves to divergences, to the potentials for multiplicity, of life. We think difference as a processual flow broader than the pretense totalization of unity of the being it himself (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1995). A world of relations and forces that scape from the molds. A difference as what is beyond the transcendent models, of the ideal forms of relating and compose as a family, as a professional. It is a political bid in the minorities, in the individuals and in the families that possess singularities that the institutions attempt to capture at all costs. That singularity can persist in the scape from any form of power, of normalization of life. In fact, this is a bid on the people's capacity of re(invent) themselves.

Final conclusions

This text brings more questions than answers, uneasiness that are manifested in the process of intervention research we carried out, problematizing situations that arouse in the encounter with the research field, concerning the families' participation. Thus, it is about unpredictability and the challenges that rise when we are producing knowledge **with** and not **about** the populations we are studying. Surely the investigative exercise deals with uncertainties and the unforeseen which in fact are the threads of knowledge production with which we weave our researches. In the collective of actors that destabilize us and make us problematize, we live the impasses of how to getting to know, destabilizing our logics of power.

Public policies are essential for granting rights, for the rescue of citizenship and autonomy of their users. However, we could still observe in our study a difficulty for appropriation of those policies by the actors that daily live them, whether as executive, or as target public. In that scenario, collective actions can trace displacements to that inapprehension, many of them supported by the intersectorial practices. Collective actions among the teams of different sectors, among the professionals of the same team, and especially with the family that demands the intersectoriality. To investigate that intersectorial practice is also, and above all, listening to the users that are active in the process of construction of their lives and of their confronting. To avoid running the risky, always present, of stablishing asymmetric relations with those groups, in which we want the other to be cared within what we understand and in order that our view of the families not be predictable. The families produce dynamics, ways of existence surely full of tensions and

problems, but are also living nets of life production and we cannot move away from their multiplicities.

References

ABRAHÃO, Ana Lúcia *et al.* O pesquisador in-mundo e o processo de produção de outras formas de investigação em saúde. **Lugar Comum**, n. 39, p. 133-144, 2013.

AMADOR, Fernanda Spanier; LAZZAROTTO, Gislei Domingas Romanzini; SANTOS, Nair Iracema Silveira dos. Pesquisar-agir, pesquisar-intervir, pesquisar-interferir. **Revista Polis e Psique,** Porto Alegre, v. *5*, n. 2, p. 228-248, 2015. Disponível em: http://seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/PolisePsique/article/view/58180/pdf_26. Acesso em: 22 mar. 2018.

ANDRADE, Anne Graça de Sousa; MORAIS, Normanda Araújo de. Avaliação do atendimento recebido no CRAS por famílias usuárias. **Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão**, v. 37, n. 2, p. 378-392, 2017.

BALCONI, Lucas Ruiz. **Direito e política em Deleuze.** 1. ed. São Paulo: Idéias e Letras, 2018.

CAVALCANTI, Patrícia Barreto; LUCENA, Carla Mousinho Ferreira. O uso da promoção da saúde e a intersetorialidade: tentativas históricas de integrar as políticas de saúde e educação. **Polêmica,** Rio de Janeiro, v. 16, n. 1, p. 24-41, jan./mar. 2016.

DELEUZE, Gilles. **Espinosa**: filosofia prática. São Paulo: Escuta, 2002.

DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. Introdução: rizoma. *In*: DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix (org.). **Mil Platôs**: capitalismo e esquizofrenia. Tradução Aurélio Guerra Neto e Celia Pinto Costa. Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34, v. 1, 1995. p. 11-37.

DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Felix. Tratado de Nomadologia: A Máquina de Guerra. *In*: DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix (org.). **Mil Platôs**: capitalismo e esquizofrenia. Tradução Peter Pál Pelbart e Janice Caiafa. Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34, v. 5, 1997. p. 07-95.

FERREIRA, Thayane Pereira da Silva *et al.* O reconhecimento do saber do outro como válido: as apostas que os usuários fazem sobre sua vida x a decisão dos trabalhadores de saúde sobre a vida do outro. *In*: MERHY, Emerson Elias *et al.* (org.). **Avaliação compartilhada do cuidado em saúde**: surpreendendo o instituído nas redes. Rio de Janeiro: Hexis, 2016. p. 96-99.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Microfísica do poder**. 20 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 2004.

LOURAU, René. Implication et surimplication. **La revue du Mauss.** Paris, n. 10, p. 110-119, 1990.

LOURAU, René. Objeto e método da Análise Institucional. *In*: ALTOÉ, Sônia (org.). **René Lourau:** analista institucional em tempo integral. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2004. p. 66-86.

MONCEAU, Gilles. Tecchiques socio-cliniques pour l'analyse institutionnelle des pratiques. *In*: MONCEAU, Gilles (Org.) **L'analyse institutionnelle des pratiques**: une socio-clinique des tourments institutionnels. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2012. p. 15-35.

MONNERAT, Giselle Lavinas; SOUZA, Rosimary Gonçalves de. Da seguridade social à intersetorialidade: reflexões sobre a integração das políticas sociais no Brasil. **Revista Katálysis**, Florianópolis, v. 14, n. 1, jun. 2011.

OLIVEIRA, Clever Manolo Coimbra; HECKERT, Ana Lúcia Coelho. Os Centros de Referência de Assistência Social e as artes de governar. **Fractal: Revista de Psicologia**, Niterói, v. 25, n. 1, p. 145-160, abr. 2013.

PAULON, Simone Mainieri; ROMAGNOLI, Roberta Carvalho. Quando a Vulnerabilidade se faz Potência: notas acerca de um conceito polissêmico nas políticas públicas. **Interação em Psicologia,** v. 22, n. 3, p. 178-187, dez. 2018.

PASSOS, Eduardo; BARROS, Regina Benevides de. A cartografia como método de pesquisa-intervenção. *In*: PASSOS, Eduardo; KASTRUP, Virgínia; ESCÓSSIA, Liliana da **Pistas do método da cartografia**: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2015. p. 17-31.

ROMAGNOLI, Roberta Carvalho. As relações entre as famílias e a equipe do CRAS. **Fractal: Revista de Psicologia**. Niterói, v. 30, n. 2, p. 214-222, maio/ago. 2018.

ROMAGNOLI, Roberta Carvalho. Problematizando as noções de vulnerabilidade e risco social no cotidiano do SUAS. **Psicologia em Estudo.** Maringá, v. 20, n. 3, p. 449-459, jul./set. 2015.

ROMAGNOLI, Roberta Carvalho. O conceito de implicação e a pesquisa-intervenção institucionalista. **Psicologia e Sociedade.** Belo Horizonte, v. 26, n. 1, p. 44-52, abr. 2014.

SANTOS, Keli Lopes; HECKERT, Ana Lucia Coelho; CARVALHO, Silvia Vasconcelos. Família e mulher como instrumentos de governo na assistência social. **Psicologia e Sociedade**, Belo Horizonte, v. 29, e158080, p. 1-10, 2017.

SOUZA, Xismara Rodrigues de; MARIN, Angela Helena. Intervenção com famílias em descumprimentos das condicionalidades do Programa Bolsa Família. **Saúde e sociedade**, São Paulo, v. 26, n. 2, p. 596-605, jun. 2017.

TRIBUNAL DE JUSTIÇA DO ESTADO DE MINAS GERAIS - TJEMG. Portaria 3/2016. Dispõe sobre o procedimento para encaminhamentos de crianças recém-nascidas e dos genitores ao Juízo da Infância e da Juventude, assim como oitiva desses, nos casos de grave suspeita de situação de risco, e sobre o procedimento de medidas de proteção. **Diário do Judiciário Eletrônico,** Belo Horizonte, MG, 22 de julho de 2016.

WARSCHAUER, Marcos; CARVALHO, Yara Maria de. O conceito de "Intersetorialidade": contribuições ao debate a partir do Programa *Lazer* e *Saúde* da Prefeitura de Santo André/SP. **Saúde e sociedade**, São Paulo, v. 23, n. 1, p. 191-203, mar. 2014.

Notes

[i] In the original, «(…) permet de «tester» des interprétations mais aussi, et peut-être surtout, de s'assurer que le pacte de travail reste actif entre tous les participants.»

Thanks:

CNPq e FAPEMIG.