

# Narratives of teacher educators: pedagogical practices in teaching with orality and writing from the perspective of Multiliteracies<sup>1</sup>

*Neide Castilho de Araújo Teno*<sup>2</sup>

*Edinéia Leite dos Santos Oliveira*<sup>3</sup>

*Maristela Zeviani*<sup>4</sup>

## ABSTRACT

This study is linked to the project “Teachers' memories: dialogues on Literacy and the teaching of the Portuguese Language - stage II” aiming at a reflection on the teaching of the Portuguese language in public schools. Analyzes the teaching of orality and writing as a teaching practice from the perspective of multiliteracy. It aims to understand the pedagogical practices of teachers undergoing training in Letters, through the analysis of fragments of oral and written narratives of these teachers. Bardin's (2013) content analysis methodology was used for data analysis with a focus on the relationship between teaching and pedagogical practice, teaching practice of oral and written texts, orality and writing. We used the theorists Bakhtin/Volochinov (1997; 2014), Tfouni (2010), Josso (2010), Marcuschi, (2001), among others. As a result, it was found that teachers dominate observations of orality and writing with multimodal genres in the construction of meaning, relating them to the social uses of language and articulation between experiences lived in the classroom.

**KEYWORDS:** Teachers' narratives. Orality and Writing. Multiliteracies.

---

<sup>1</sup> English version by the authors.

<sup>2</sup> PhD in Education/Literature/Senior Researcher. State University of Mato Grosso do Sul-UEMS/ Dourados /Campo Grande, Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5062-9155>. E-mail: [cteno@uol.com.br](mailto:cteno@uol.com.br).

<sup>3</sup> Master in Letters. State University of Mato Grosso do Sul-UEMS/Campo Grande, Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1973-4090>. E-mail: [edineia-leite@hotmail.com](mailto:edineia-leite@hotmail.com).

<sup>4</sup> Master's student in Literature. State University of Mato Grosso do Sul-UEMS/Campo Grande, Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4418-7378>. E-mail: [maristelazeviani@hotmail.com](mailto:maristelazeviani@hotmail.com).

*Narrativas de formadores de docentes: práticas pedagógicas en la enseñanza con oralidad y escritura desde la perspectiva de las multiherramientas*

**RESUMEN**

Este estudio está vinculado al proyecto “Memorias de los profesores: diálogos sobre la alfabetización y la enseñanza de la lengua portuguesa - etapa II”, cuyo objetivo es una reflexión sobre la enseñanza de la lengua portuguesa en las escuelas públicas. Analiza la enseñanza de la oralidad y la escritura como práctica docente desde la perspectiva de la multialfabetización. Tiene como objetivo comprender las prácticas pedagógicas de los docentes en formación en Letras, a través del análisis de fragmentos de narrativas orales y escritas de estos docentes. Para el análisis de datos se utilizó la metodología de análisis de contenido de Bardin (2013) con un enfoque en la relación entre la enseñanza y la práctica pedagógica, la práctica docente de textos orales y escritos, la oralidad y la escritura. Utilizamos a los teóricos Bakhtin / Volochinov (1997; 2014), Tfouni (2010), Josso (2010), Marcuschi, (2001), entre otros. Como resultado, se encontró que los docentes dominan las observaciones de la oralidad y la escritura con géneros multimodales en la construcción del significado, relacionándolas con los usos sociales del lenguaje y la articulación entre experiencias vividas en el aula.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Narrativas de los profesores. Oralidad y escritura. Multiliteración.

*Narrativas de professores formadores: práticas pedagógicas no ensino com a oralidade e a escrita na perspectiva dos multiletramentos*

**RESUMO**

Este estudo vincula-se ao projeto “Memórias de professores: diálogos sobre o Letramento e o ensino da Língua Portuguesa - etapa II” objetivando reflexão acerca do ensino da língua portuguesa nas escolas públicas. Analisa o ensino da oralidade e escrita enquanto prática docente na perspectiva do multiletramento. Objetiva compreender práticas pedagógicas dos professores em formação em Letras, por meio da análise

de fragmentos de narrativas orais e escritas desses professores. Utilizou-se metodologia da análise de conteúdo de Bardin (2013) para análise dos dados com recorte para relação ensino e prática pedagógica, prática de ensino de textos orais e escritos, oralidade e escrita. Utilizou-se os teóricos Bakhtin/Volochínov (1997; 2014), Tfouni (2010), Josso (2010), Marcuschi, (2001), entre outros. Como resultado, constatou-se que os professores dominam observações da oralidade e da escrita com gêneros multimodais na construção de sentido relacionando-os aos usos sociais da linguagem e articulação entre experiências vivenciadas em sala de aula.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Narrativas de professores. Oralidade e Escrita. Multiletramento.

\* \* \*

## Introduction

The Teaching of Portuguese Language, especially those of orality and writing, has been the subject of many studies and exposed to several transformations in accordance with the new perspectives of contemporary teaching, with this the role of language gains more complex contours. This theme does not represent a new study that is conjectured, on the contrary, it is a discussion present in teacher education and in academic environments. Teachers, increasingly immersed in the multiplicities of language and society transformations, are looking for other ways of acting and interacting, particularly in relation to Portuguese language teaching. Different segments of the school, in turn, also engage in social relationships and interactions as important aspects for the learning process of speaking and writing.

We developed a research at the master's level that involved professors who attended a course, also a master's degree, from a public institution, and developed activities in different public schools in the Municipality of Dourados/MS. The methodology used, Bardin (2013) content analysis, constituted a technique that enabled the systematization of messages and allowed inferences to understand

the knowledge emanating from the production and reception (inferred variables) of the reported experiences. We used the phases indicated by Bardin (pre-analysis, material exploration and treatment of results and inference and interpretation), and in possession of the categories, we selected three for analysis: teaching relationship and pedagogical practice, teaching practice of oral texts and writing, orality and writing and other dimensions.

The selection of these categories subsidized the understanding of pedagogical practices with the teaching of orality and writing of teachers in training, in the Literature course, based on their narratives, the objective of the study. Some sayings are common in the speeches of these Portuguese Language teachers considering that the written text is more important than the oral one. This is seen as a belief in good writing, on the one hand the cultured norm, as a modality that is only learned at school, in the genres of literature considered as examples of a written text. On the other hand, there is orality, of an informal nature, whose student learns in any environment. Which suggests to say that, in the counterpoint between the formal/informal, cult/standard, there is the rigor of writing as a cult/standard level. Faced with this impasse, it is important to inquire about the role of the school. Has the educational institution been aware of teaching orality and writing from the perspective of multiliteracies?

The advancement of technologies has required from teachers an education that goes beyond the subjects' school universe and is also anchored in everyday life. This implies knowledge of multiliteracies, allowing individuals to use more elaborate skills such as the linguistic resources present in various digital media. Within this context, teaching requires other practices from the teacher, it requires adaptation, re-signification of pedagogical practices. We can say of a new conception of teaching in which teachers seek reflections on multiple literacies, which discuss competences and skills as necessary requirements in a learning situation and can provide the formation of critical readers as a

transformation of teaching. It is on these studies that we base ourselves to reflect on this challenge of current education.

The scholar Bazerman (2007) defends reading, orality and writing as a discursive articulation, caused by the hybridity of language (multiliteracies) in addition to being, in a way, part of the subjects' social practices. These sociocultural practices, in the context of schools, as mediating agencies of literate practices, are ways to ensure the interactional and cognitive development of subjects, providing autonomy and expanding learning. This study intends, therefore, to combine with other researches already carried out diverse information about the teaching of orality and writing, in order to understand pedagogical practices with the teaching of orality and writing of teachers in training, from the Literature course, from of their narratives.

We used the readings of scholars such as Bakhtin/Volochinov (1997; 2014), Tfouni (2010); Marcuschi, (2001), Rojo (2009), Rojo and Almeida (2012), among others to support the reasoning and reflections on the practice of orality and writing. The study's concern is to understand multiliteracies as fundamental in the current context of teaching and a possibility for interaction with different texts in the teaching of orality and writing.

In order to understand the studies of oral and written practices, we searched for subsidies in the multiliteracy that have been receiving differentiated treatment from language scholars in the field of linguistic and language sciences. Both literacy and multiliteracy are linked to knowledge of reading and writing and can group the practices of using writing in different contexts. Thus, as social and commercial relationships changed families and schools, society has followed these changes throughout history, and with that other concepts arise in language teaching, of what it means to be literate and what is necessary to appropriate the use of writing throughout life (KLEIMAN, 2005).

While orality seeks speech and writing in social practices for communicative purposes under various textual genres in various contexts,

literacy involves other writing practices in society ranging from the graphonemic (alphabet units, such as letters, tildes, signs, punctuation) , because the most literate, from the moment he identifies the bus license plate, recognizes complex calculations, knows how to distinguish goods by brand, however he does not read magazines and newspapers. Those who participate significantly in literacy events are considered literate and not those who only formally use writing (KLEIMAN, 2005).

The study of oral language is concerned with the speech situation, which makes it an object of analysis. Within its context of use, oral language involves the practices of use in society, creating conditions for studies of textual linguistics, as it is at this moment: “[...] that favorable conditions are created for the emergence of a linguistics of text/ discourse, that is, a linguistic that deals with the linguistic manifestations produced by the speakers of a language in concrete situations, under certain conditions of production” (VILELA; KOCK, 2001, p. 412).

The teaching of orality at school has been restricted to the identification of errors and distanced itself from the conception of linguistic variants, a restriction that can justify the school failure of many students and may be related to the way teachers deal with orality and writing in school. Students bring their own way of speaking to school, with reduction of phonemes, diphthongs, abbreviations, using expressions from the informal context and accepted by the standard norm, although it is not usual in formal language.

### **Some reflections on orality and writing**

The relationship orality and writing had its moment of supremacy when compared to each other. The prevailing idea was that the concept of orality was concentrated in informal contexts, while writing was used exclusively for formal situations. Given this idea, speech was seen as “mutable, heterogeneous” and writing was considered to be of a more

“rational, stable, homogeneous” system. Complements Rojo and Schneuwly (2006), who

[...] speech would be unplanned and writing planned and permanent; speech would be the space of error and writing, the space of rule and norm, while writing would serve to communicate at a distance in time and space; speech would only happen face to face; writing would register, speech would be fleeting; speech is a uniquely sound expression; writing, solely graphic (ROJO; SCHNEUWLY, 2006, p. 464)<sup>5</sup>.

This tradition permeated, for some years, not only society, but also schools, which had the belief that orality constituted something unplanned and acceptable as a way indifferent to social media. The studies by Kleiman (2005, 2003) and those by Street (2004, 2010) on literacy brought a new vision to school practices, official documents and textbooks. The studies of these scholars also brought to orality and literacy significant considerations in social practices, and the value that orality and writing occupies in the most diverse situations, bringing down the myth of the supremacy of writing, and gaining strength in the teaching of orality as a way to recognize what students know and what is possible to learn.

The scholar Josso (2010) highlights the importance of analyzing teachers' narratives, because they report, based on their experiences, how they use their training in the classroom. Thus, the narratives start to constitute material for the object of study with significant experiences to bring to reality learning and representative itineraries that constitute formative knowledge.

Life and training experiences were the subject of reflection and study of narratives as an object of research as an educational intercession. Born from life experiences and training, the narratives have already been widely used in different training contexts to understand the training relationships of subjects and rethink about the experience lived by these subjects (JOSSO, 2010).

Regarding teachers' knowledge about teaching, scholars Souza and Abrahão (2006) find study strategies in the narratives, which reveal all

---

<sup>5</sup> Our translation.

knowledge of consciousness, learning, beliefs that the subject experiences, in addition to placing the subject as a researcher of its own story. In this way, we consider the narrative approach a methodology that enables strategies to understand the pedagogical and cultural practices of the subjects in training.

To understand the importance of the study, it is necessary to reflect a little on some issues related to orality and its relationship with writing from teachers' narratives. Other researchers take a stand on this relationship and confirm that orality occupied a place of superiority over writing and this remained for a long time in the linguistic environment, causing many studies since researchers began to see them as practices different social backgrounds. This position is defended by Marcuschi (2001), for example, explaining that nowadays:

[...] prevails the position that one can conceive orality and literacy as interactive and complementary activities in the context of social and cultural practices. Once we adopt the position that we deal with literacy and oral practices, it will be essential to consider that languages are based on uses and not the opposite (MARCUSCHI, 2001, p. 17).<sup>6</sup>

This disposition of the scholar reveals the dynamism of language and its constant transformation, by the subjects who use it, and the appropriations they make through a continuous process of use. He looks in Street (2004, p. 2) for an explanation to justify the dimension of the term literacy and non-literacy, since he cannot confuse the “diverse social manifestations of literacy with writing as such, as this would be nothing more than a forms of literacy, that is, pedagogical literacy”. For new visions of literacy, it is important to situate reading and writing in their social contexts, a position recognized as fundamental to understanding that there is not only literacy, but literacy.

---

<sup>6</sup> Our translation.

This dimension refers to what Tfouni (2010, p. 21) postulates about the affinity between writing and orality, as it understands that it is a relationship of non-dependence on each other, “but it is rather a relationship of interdependence, that is. that is, both systems of representation influence each other equally”. First of all, it is necessary to consider that orality and writing are activities that are learned both at school and in society, with a communicative character and situated practices.

The position of this scholar is that of not maintaining the affinity of orality and writing, and filtering the issues of errors that refer to speech facts from written texts, even because "there is no closed question about what literacy is" (TFOUNI, 2010, p. 31). In the author's words, literacy encompasses the "social-historical aspects of writing acquisition", and is intended to describe what happens in the social context, more than that, it is intended to "investigate not only who is literate, but also those who are illiterate, and in this sense, disconnect from checking the individual and focus on the social" (TFOUNI, 2010, p. 12). Furthermore, we can think that, from the socio-historical and discursive perspective, values about orality can be questioned by discrediting one over the other, that is, devaluing orality in relation to writing.

In this area, we can look at the construction of the narratives of teachers in training, when when narrating about teaching issues and orality, they construct sayings in order to conquer their interlocutors through the effects of meaning ensuring authorship, "the sense of complicity between the narrator and reader/listener, or even the creation of a suspense effect, would be fulfilled by the author-function" (TFOUNI, 2010, p. 55). Thus, it is possible to find authorship in the discourses (called narratives) through the effects of meaning.

Likewise, Marcuschi (2001) completes that, in the model of society we have, writing, being a formal requirement of society, favors the emergence of many types of literacy, including because it goes beyond literacy and computerization. The fact that orality has become so necessary to society, this

already gives it characters that make it with a strong tendency to superior status. However, according to the scholar, this does not make speech superior to writing, nor does it admit the conviction that speech is primary.

With regard to orality and writing, Vilela and Koch (2001, p. 454) make important contributions highlighting that the different types of texts produced in our society are textual productions that are situated in a “typological continuum, at whose ends they would be, of a on the one hand, formal writings and, on the other, spontaneous conversation”. Therefore, one can speak of more conversational texts such as (tickets, family letters, humorous texts), as well as spoken texts closer to formal writing (conferences, professional interviews, administrative minutes), in addition to said texts mixed or intermediary groups present in the social environment.

The elaborated construct shows that the practice of teaching oral and written texts cannot be seen under a single theory. Every understanding of social, cultural facts manifested in language in oral and written texts must be considered by various theoretical currents.

### **Literacy and Multiliteracies**

The concept of literacy is already present in different discourses of society and school in official education documents such as the National Curriculum Parameters (PCNs), so much so that we find many studies involving this theme. It deals with a concept used by different areas of knowledge, including: applied linguistics, education, didactics, the history of reading, involving the uses of orality in reading and writing. Therefore, the concept of literacy forms the background of the activities proposed in this research.

Kleiman's (2003; 2005) studies on literacy address important considerations about what literacy is not. The first principle alerts to the question of literacy being a teaching method or not. It is positioned that literacy is not a method, but a professional practice, a set of activities that the teacher appropriates with a view to understanding reading and writing. It

deals with another way of seeing the role and impact of spoken and written language in society, these are the new relationships in different spaces that teachers need to establish in their daily lives.

This term literacy brings as a counterpart new perspectives and professional knowledge, where the uses of language and its ways of organizing reality are possible, observing the different social contexts, according to Kleiman (2005). This bias makes room for a new way of conceiving the relationship between written and oral, as a relationship of continuity and expansion of the textual universe, which suggests the teacher to include in his planning a teaching that goes beyond the textbook, providing students with new genres and new social practices.

Rojo and Almeida (2012, p. 8) agree with Cope and Kalantzis (2000) when defending a Pedagogy of multiliteracies given the diversity of languages present in society, and define multiliteracies as being “the use of new communication and communication technologies. information ('new literacies') [...] of genres, media and languages [...]”, in a way that involves the student with a range of varied texts/discourses, in order to broaden cultural knowledge and acquisition of other literacies.

The practice of teaching Portuguese language involving new technologies requires students and teachers who have skills and competences to deal with these technologies. Rojo and Almeida (2012, p. 19), in their studies on multiliteracies, explain the importance of reading “texts composed of many languages (or modes, or semiosis) as a new teaching practice” and exemplifies with multimodal texts or multisemiotics, citing, videos, commercial pamphlets, advertising, journalistic advertisements that circulate in society and in digital contexts. These scholars question:

Why address the diversity of languages at school? Is there space for multisemiosis studies? Why propose a pedagogy of multiliteracies? From this perspective of thought, the following proposal was drawn up: is it possible to practice reading oral and written texts at school? What do teachers narrate about teaching

the practice of reading oral and written texts from the perspective of multiliteracies? (ROJO; ALMEIDA, 2012, p. 19).<sup>7</sup>

Narratives from professionals involved in teaching bring personal reflections, but also address enunciative issues from different spaces where, for example, the university has been. The utterances will constitute marks of writing, which in the words of Bakhtin (1997, p. 294) “will be marks of the voice of authority or a utterance invested with authority” that will emerge in teacher training, enter the pedagogical practice of these teachers in order to legitimize their doings.

The path of analysis in this study adopts the studies by Bardin (2013) as a reference, which uses content analysis to answer the questions initially listed in the research. It is a study methodology that involves procedures such as: 1) pre-analysis, 2) exploration of the material and 3) treatment of results, inference and interpretation. The first phase is the one that organizes the material to be analyzed, systematizing according to the proposed objective. The second consists of the coding and identification system of registration units and units of meaning, aiming at the frequency of registrations and the analytical description. The third phase corresponds to the treatment of results, giving space for inference and interpretation. At this stage, the researcher can condense the data and highlight what is relevant to the study, a moment of intuition, reflective and critical analysis.

From the cut made for this study, it was limited to analyzing the narratives of two Portuguese-speaking teachers, trained for more than ten years who develop their teaching activities in public elementary schools. We look for explanations about the reconstructive process of reading in the multiple knowledges, in the voices of the teachers, of their practice both in oral and in writing. The named subjects are fictitious in order to preserve the subjects' privacy. It was restricted to analyzing categories that involved the practice of reading with multimodal texts and their relationship with orality and writing. Thus, we chose three categories, namely: teaching relationship

---

<sup>7</sup> Our translation.

and pedagogical practice, teaching practice of oral and written texts, orality and writing, and other dimensions.

### **Relation between teaching and pedagogical practice**

In the narratives about the relationship between teaching and pedagogical practice developed throughout teaching, teachers report different beliefs and attributed the failure of their teaching practices to the organization and precariousness of the school. So they narrate:

**Luciana:** There is no way to demand quality education when we don't have the basics at school. There is a lack of space to set up the library, a lack of lunches, a lack of goodwill from the government. My workload is distributed in two schools, with very different realities, while one students attend the library, handle books, attend the court, [...] the other the conditions are terrible, in fact the teacher has to adapt everything and according to the reality. I even have ideas to bring different teaching to the students, but the school doesn't help. You never have money for anything, the coordination doesn't offer a bond, a photocopy, a different book. Now the internet has arrived. I even have ideas to bring a different teaching to the students, but I don't. And if you think about it, the student keeps all elementary education with the teachers and knows the school well.

**Pedro:** I think my training was good, I learned how to deal with students, how to organize a plan. What I find difficult is the school, which doesn't provide anything, there are days like the fan. We don't have a computer room, we don't have computers for students, and the library is in an adapted space. We teachers do not have support to develop a good class. I know how to do it, but I lack stimulation. In the teachers, we live a lot with the students for a long time and sometimes even throughout elementary school and we can see the student's growth during that time.

The teachers' narratives denounce the structure of the school and the molds of a “scrapped” society in education. The teacher's teaching practice is limited to “nothing can, nothing”. In this environment, they describe the impossibility of a different teaching given the conditions

found in schools. A teaching practice as an estrangement from innovative activities, “knows how to do but lack encouragement”. It emphasizes autonomy and knowledge as a means of practice that make them restricted from moving towards a new practice, as stated by Novoa (1992, p. 23) that “[...] innovation belongs to the very teacher who is at the heart of the educational activity.” There is a recognition that there is a new practice “I even have ideas to bring different teaching to the students”, there is a recognition of the need for learning as explained by Novoa (1992) that they strengthen the teaching exercise in the locus of the classroom, but it is also in this space that the teaching practice is evaluated by the teacher as improbability and concerns.

They bring the narratives of Luciana and Pedro excerpts that testify to the time that the student is under the responsibility of the teachers:

**Luciana:** the student has all elementary education with the teachers and knows the school well.

**Pedro:** teachers We live a lot with students for a long time and sometimes even throughout elementary school and we can see the student's growth during that time.

Given these situations exposed by the teachers above, it is assumed that they also assume the role of researchers, as they observe and study what each student does with orality and writing within the context in which these uses occur. Without forgetting that these teachers attribute the failure of their teaching practices to a situation of disorganization and precariousness in schools.

### **Teaching practice oral and written texts**

When narrating about the practice of teaching oral and written texts, teachers report on the activities they carry out with oral and written texts in the classroom, and many categories came up in the

statements. The narratives speak of sung, sung, group, dramatized readings as a different way of teaching practice. So they narrate:

**Luciana:** I take it to the classroom with many texts in different genres. I find it difficult to separate orality from writing, I think one is linked to the other, it's very complicated to teach writing without orality. One activity I always do is ask them to report an event they saw, I ask them to defend an idea, their position on a point of view. I ask to ask a question to each other. I do all this as a teaching practice with orality. I take poems, songs, tongue locks. In orality, I have the opportunity to show the popular and cultured norm to the student, we don't write as we speak. I use oral texts a lot in the classroom because I know that students learn to speak and live well outside of school.

**Pedro:** Always starting by working with orality, students greatly appreciate oral texts, especially if the genre has an image complementing the text, the more colorful, the more they like it. Collective reading, oral reading, jogral, is one of my practices with orality, students bring advertising texts and we do readings in different ways. In reading and interpreting texts, students talk about all the composition in the texts, talk about color, image, recognize drawings.

The excerpts from the narratives demonstrate a pedagogical practice of a study that does not abandon the importance and need to teach the standard norm at school, "in orality, I have the opportunity to show the cultured and popular norm to the student" (BORTONI-RICARDO , 2004, p. 74), but it is necessary to observe the student's speech, as they arrive at school already knowing how to compose well-formed sentences and communicate in different situations. But they still do not have a very wide range of communicative resources that allow them to carry out complex communicative tasks that require a lot of monitoring. It is the school's role, therefore, to facilitate the expansion of students' competence, allowing them to "appropriate the necessary communicative resources to perform well, and safely, in the most distinct linguistic tasks" (BORTONI-RICARDO, 2004, p. 74).

For Marcuschi (2001, p. 25), the narration that "uses oral texts in the classroom because he knows that students learn to speak and live well

outside of school”, leads to a teaching practice under the bias of literacy, as there is a recognition of learning for life, with a social value, however there is an outstanding consideration for the importance of teaching with orality in different social contexts. The understanding that orality is learned in social relationships is a different practice, a communicative situation, since the context has a strong influence on the type of language that should be used. Thus, the practice of orality is a form of cultural insertion and socialization, which, also according to Marcuschi (2001, p. 25) “[...] deals with an interactive social practice for communicative purposes that presents itself in various forms or textual genres[...] from more informal to more formal in the most varied contexts of use”.

When the deponent narrates, pointing out the different genres in his teaching practice and starting with orality to reach writing, there is recognition of the importance of continuing teaching with oral and written genres. We infer in this narrative the mutual interdependence of oral genres, when they enter the context of the classroom, to achieve textual production, a teaching that presupposes the oral, so "there is always speaking to write, writing to speak, the writing to write and speaking to speak" (SCHNEUWLY, 2005, sp), showing the interdependence of one genre and another, as well as of other genres, which contributes to understanding the intertextuality between texts.

### **Orality and writing and other dimensions**

This category highlighted in the analyzes involves pedagogical practice in other dimensions such as computer room, textbook, newspapers, magazines. Other dimensions were also extended as other modes of reading.

**Luciana:** One activity in the classroom, which I carried out with the students on their cell phones, was searching for Mother's Day advertisements, poems, images on websites. Students both read and gave opinions about the image they were looking at. It was a moment that orality

and exchange of readings were present. Some students related the website's image to the objects on the market. In the production of cards, students had moments of rewriting to improve the language used and be closer to the cultured norm. All production was accompanied by illustrations, drawings, icons.

**Pedro:** I resorted to textual genres from the textbook to work on the elements of organization of the oral text, the pauses, the intonations, the truncation of speech, the hesitations in repetitions. For the mastery of orality, I believe in pedagogical practices aimed at situations that encourage students to speak, expose and debate on various social topics. Exposing different genres to students, such as: pamphlets, advertisements, interviews, comic books, is a way to show the difference between oral and written. I know that every teacher must be aware of activities with the oral language in the classroom, which show the student not only the importance of using the standard norm, but also learning the need for this use in different social contexts.

Pedro's excerpt highlights words such as “intonations, truncations, repetitions, hesitations” which, in a way, builds his practice with the materialization of pedagogical activities based on organizational elements of the conversation: shifts, topics, situation, mode of discourse. Marcuschi (2001) explains this methodology as valuing the presence of textual markers, emphasizing the importance of pauses and tone of voice and disregarding the other linguistic markers that are the look, gestures, body movements as fundamental in interaction and understanding of reading. However, the excerpt highlights the pragmatic factors expressed in “pauses, intonations, truncation in speech, hesitation in repetitions” playing a relevant role in speech and writing. In a way, there is a theoretical confusion between oral and written text, which infers a priority to written text as it states that “these oral activities I consider important because in writing it facilitates the student and he perceives the difference between oral and written”.

Pedro and Luciana's narratives bring with them the concern of teaching with orality and writing, as they propose activities with different

textual genres, certain that from this perspective they are providing knowledge of the use of oral and written language, since the PCNs (BRASIL, 1998) guide the school towards teaching with oral language, guiding the teacher to include in the planning the use of different textual genres such as: public presentations: interviews, debates, seminars, theatrical presentations, as a way of propose teaching situations that encourage the student to use both the oral and the written level, in different situations. “The learning of appropriate procedures for speaking and listening, in public contexts, will hardly happen if the school does not take on the task of providing it” (BRASIL, 1998, p. 26).

The fact that students launch into textual productions risking different resources (colors, icons, shapes, font size) is witnessing the presence of multimodal practices. The textbook has provided an infinite number of textual genres with imagery and visual elements, contributing to the effect of meanings in textual composition.

Costa Val (2004) teaches that, with semiotics, there were changes in the conceptualization of text, expanding the definition of text "as any linguistic production, spoken or written, of any size, that can make sense in a situation of human communication, that is, it is, in a situation of dialogue" (our italics). Within this perspective, we can understand the text as a linguistic practice, (oral or written), as part of communication and also implemented in orality.

The excerpts by Luciana and Pedro bring to light teaching with orality and writing, but add the importance of looking at other modes of representation, which can be defined as multimodality. Dionísio (2007, p. 178) understands the multimodal for both written and oral texts, and highlights others such as oral and sign language, as “words and gestures, words and intonations, words and images, words and typography, words and smiles, words and animations etc.” are characteristics of multimodality.

Some genres such as TV news, soap operas, plays located at the interface between speech and writing are organized to be of oral use, but they are also transmitted in writing. They are media genres, the result of technological advances and in this context we find the so-called hybrid genres, with the aim of innovating, transforming and blending both in form and content. Given their specificity of being oral before being written, they are texts that somehow build different effects within a learning process (PINHEIRO, 2002).

According to studies by Kleiman (2005, 2003) and those by Street (2004, 2010) about literacy, the issue of teaching orality and writing involves social practices and has interactivity as an attribute of any use of language. Therefore, both the oral and the written we find interactive marks. Marcuschi (2001) defends the hypothesis that orality and writing occur within a typological continuum of social practices, which implies that orality and writing are not located at opposite poles, but are considered as complementary modes of enunciation.

The narratives of teachers in training, in this study, provide a sample of knowledge construction teaching, which can be seen from two perspectives: one is in the fact that these subjects narrate their practices through a dialogical relationship between subjects and discourses; and the other to look at how the subject understands and singularizes their narratives. The clippings demonstrate an approximation of oral and written practices in the school context, allowing these practices to be placed in the socio-historical context (encourage students to speak, expose and debate on various social themes). This way of talking about their experience (LARROSA, 2004, p. 129) understands as the meaning of things, a “knowing experience has some essential characteristics that oppose it, point by point, to what we understand as knowledge”.

## Final considerations

The narratives of experiences in the pedagogical practice of teachers in training pointed to the construction of perceptions of the relationships between their practices in the context of the classroom, as shown by possibilities for learning from textual genres. In the analyzed fragments, there is an articulation between teaching and the belief in learning orality and writing based on experiences, as well as the narratives presented as a privileged space for rethinking pedagogical practices and reinterpreting some aspects of training in terms of content that should be prioritized in teaching.

The fragments of the narratives evidenced a teacher's performance with mastery of the observations of orality and writing with multimodal genres, presenting highlights for the set of characteristics that build meaning, the multimodality that go beyond orality and writing, that is, the diversity of languages that constitute the texts. The teaching of orality and writing gains extension as teaching is linked to the observation of semiotic elements, so the subject is supported to understand the intentions, not only alphabetic signs, but also in the imagery and visual elements present in the texts.

## References

- BAKHTIN, M. *Estética da criação verbal*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1997.
- BAKHTIN, M. (V. N. Volochínov). *Marxismo e Filosofia da Linguagem*. Trad. Michel Lahud e Yara Frateschi Vieira. 16<sup>a</sup> ed. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2014.
- BARDIN, L. *Análise de Conteúdo*. Lisboa, Portugal; Edições 70, 2013.
- BAZERMAN, C. *Escrita, Gênero e Interação Social*. São Paulo Cortez Editora, 2007.
- BORTONI-RICARDO, S. M. *Educação em língua materna: a sociolinguística na sala de aula*. São Paulo: Parábola. 2004.
- BORTONI-RICARDO, S. M. *Nós chegemu na escola, e agora?: Sociolinguística e educação*. São Paulo: Parábola Editora, 2005.

BRASIL. Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais (PCNs). *Introdução. Ensino Fundamental*. Brasília: MEC/SEF, 1998.

COPE, B; KALANTZIS, M. (Eds.) *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. Routledge: London, 2000.

COSTA VAL, M. G. Texto, textualidade e textualização. In: CECCANTINI, J. L. T.; PEREIRA, R. F.; ZANCHETTA JR., J. *Pedagogia Cidadã: cadernos de formação: Língua Portuguesa*. v. 1. São Paulo: UNESP, Pró-Reitoria de Graduação, 2004. p. p. 113-128.

DIONÍSIO, A. P. Multimodalidade discursiva na atividade oral e escrita (atividades). In: MARCUSCHI, L. A.; DIONÍSIO, A. P. (orgs.). *Fala e Escrita*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2007.

JOSSO, M.-C. *Experiência de vida e formação*. Natal: EDUFRN; São Paulo: Paulus, 2010.

KLEIMAN, Â. *Preciso ensinar o letramento? Não basta ensinar a ler e a escrever?* São Paulo: Produção Editorial, 2005.

KLEIMAN, Â. (org.) *Os significados do letramento*. Novas perspectivas sobre a prática social da escrita. Campinas, S. P.: Mercado de Letras, 6a. ed. 2003.

LARROSA, J. B. Notas sobre a experiência e o saber da experiência. In: Geraldi, C.M.C; RIOLFI, C. R.; GARCIA, M. de F. (orgs. ) *Escola Viva*. Campinas, S.P.: Mercado de Letras, 2004, p. 113-13.

MARCUSCHI, L. A. Letramento e oralidade no contexto das práticas sociais e eventos comunicativos in: SIGNORINI, I. (org.) *Investigando a relação oral/escrito e as teorias do letramento*. Campinas – SP: Mercado de Letras 2001.

NOVOA, A. *Os professores e a sua formação*. Lisboa, PT: Dom Quixote, 1992.

NOVOA, A. Os professores e as Histórias da sua vida. In: NÓVOA António (org.) *Vidas de professores*. Portugal: Porto Editora, 1992.

PINHEIRO, N. F. A noção de gênero para análise de textos midiáticos. In: MEURER, J. L.; MOTTA-ROTH, D. (org.). *Gêneros textuais e práticas discursivas: subsídios para o ensino da linguagem*. Bauru, SP: EDUSC, 2002. p. 259-290. (Coleção Signum).

ROJO. *Letramentos múltiplos, escola e inclusão social*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2009. 128 p.

ROJO; ALMEIDA, E. M. (Orgs.). *Multiletramentos na escola*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2012, 264 p.

ROJO; ALMEIDA, E. M.; SCHNEUWLY, B. As relações oral/escrita nos gêneros orais formais e públicos: o caso da conferência acadêmica. *Revista Linguagem em (Dis)curso - LemD*, Tubarão, v. 6, n. 3, p. 463-493, set./dez. 2006.

SCHNEUWLY, B. *Gêneros orais e escritos na escola*. Conferência proferida no Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, da UNICAMP, em 20 out. 2005. Campinas: IEL/UNICAMP, 2005.

SOUZA, E. C.; ABRAHÃO, M. H. M. B. (Org.). *Tempos, narrativas e ficções: a invenção de si*. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 2006.

STREET, B. Letramento e alfabetização: as muitas facetas. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, n. 25, Abril 2004, p. 5-17.

STREET, B. Os novos estudos sobre o letramento: histórico e perspectivas. In: MARINHO, M.; CARVALHO, G. T. *Cultura escrita e letramento*. Belo Horizonte: Editora da UFMG, 2010. p.33-53.

TFOUNI, L. V. *Letramento e alfabetização*. 9a. Ed. São Paulo/SP: Cortez, 2010.

VILELA, M.; KOCK, I. V. *Gramática da língua portuguesa*. Almedina – Portugal, março 2001.

Recebido em May 2021.

Aprovado em December 2021.