The place of ludicity in literacy practices:
a reflective look from mandatory internships[1]

Laila Hamdan[2]

Brenda Terezinha Pinheiro Benicio[3]

Daniele Cristina Teixeira[3]

ABSTRACT

The ludic activities in elementary school become enablers of child development and, by the school experiences to which we were submitted in supervised internships, it is noted that teaching, at this stage, has been conducted by mechanical and artificial actions. In view of this concern, this study aims to emphasize the relationship between literacy and ludicity, presenting a reflection of ludic literacy practices, and the place that these actions take in the practice of teachers who deal with teaching in the early years of elementary school. We highlight, through bibliographical research, in a qualitative approach, the relevance of the ludic as a methodological strategy in the literacy process. Subsequently, these theoretical foundations were considered for analysis of the reports of mandatory internships of the Pedagogy course. The results obtained confirmed the initial hypothesis that the teaching conducted in this phase, notoriously, does not include ludic actions in favor of the student's learning process.

KEYWORDS: Literacy. Elementary School. Literacy. Ludicity. Teaching Practice.

---

[1] English version by Fernanda Vieira de Sant' Anna. E-mail: fernandavieira@ikamiaba.com.br.

[2] Post Doctor. State University of Minas Gerais. Divinópolis. MG. Brazil. Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2827-1593. *E-mail:* laila.alvim@uemg.br.

[3] Bachelor in Pedagogy. State University of Minas Gerais. Divinópolis. MG. Brazil. Orcid: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6203-0991. *E-mail:* brendabenicio05@gmail.com.

[3] Bachelor in Pedagogy. State University of Minas Gerais. Divinópolis. MG. Brazil. Orcid: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7912-0974. *E-mail:* daniteixeira1203@gmail.com.

O lugar da ludicidade nas práticas alfabetizadoras: um olhar reflexivo a partir dos estágios obrigatórios

RESUMO

As atividades lúdicas no Ensino Fundamental tornam-se propiciadoras do desenvolvimento infantil e, pelas vivências escolares a partir dos estágios supervisionados, nota-se que o ensino, nesta etapa, tem sido conduzido por ações mecânicas e artificiais. Diante dessa inquietação, este estudo tem como objetivo enfatizar a relação entre alfabetização e ludicidade, apresentando uma reflexão das práticas alfabetizadoras lúdicas, e o lugar que estas ações ocupam na prática dos professores que lidam com a docência nos anos iniciais do Ensino Fundamental. Destacou-se, por meio da pesquisa bibliográfica, em uma abordagem qualitativa, a relevância do lúdico como uma estratégia metodológica no processo de alfabetização. Posteriormente, estes fundamentos teóricos foram considerados para análise dos relatórios de Estágios obrigatórios do curso de Pedagogia. Os resultados obtidos afirmaram a hipótese inicial de que o ensino conduzido nesta fase, notoriamente, não abarca ações lúdicas em prol da aprendizagem do educando.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Alfabetização. Ensino Fundamental. Letramento. Ludicidade. Prática docente.

El lugar de la ludicidad en las prácticas de alfabetización: una morada reflexiva de las etapas obligatorias

RESUMEN

Las actividades lúdicas en la Educación Básica se vuelven propicias para el desarrollo del niño debido a las experiencias escolares a las que fuimos sometidos en las pasantías supervisadas, se ha realizado mediante acciones mecánicas y artificiales. Ante esta inquietud, el presente trabajo de conclusión del curso tiene como objetivo enfatizar la relación entre alfabetización y lúdico, presentando un reflejo de las prácticas alfabetización lúdica y el lugar que estas acciones ocupan en las prácticas de los docentes que se ocupan de la enseñanza en los primeros años de la enseñanza fundamental. Destacamos, a través de la investigación bibliográfica, en un enfoque cualitativo, la relevancia del lúdico como estrategia metodológica en el proceso de alfabetización.

Posteriormente, estos fundamentos teóricos fueron considerados para el análisis de los informes de prácticas obligatorias del curso de pedagogía. Los resultados obtenidos afirmaron la hipótesis inicial de que la docencia realizada en esta fase, notoriamente no incluye acciones lúdicas a favor del aprendizaje del alumno.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Alfabetización. Escuela primaria. alfabetismo. Ludicidad. Práctica docente.

* * *

Introduction

When one thinks about ludicity as an educational device in the process of teaching/learning, there is normally a frequent association of the word with the child education. This statement is present in unaccountable academic works, scientific research and documents that conduct that stage of education. However, it's important to highlight that ludicity has an important role in children's social and cognitive development in the early years of Elementary Schools, especially during the literacy process. Despite the contributions and theoretical discussions on the subject, it was possible to identify, during the supervised internships of the Pedagogy undergraduate course, the difference between the methodologies adopted in Early Childhood Education and in the early years of Elementary School. So, from this context, the following proposition is taken as a problem: Are the educational practices in the observed schools, in the classes of the initial years of Elementary School, inserted in the ludic context when it comes to the literacy process?

Therefore, the research arises from the need not only to explain the importance of these approaches, but also to relate the ludicity in the process of construction of reading and writing by the child and the aspects that affect their global development. The general objective that guided the research was to analyze the place of ludicity in the teaching practice of teachers in the early years of elementary school, specifically, during the literacy process.

Literacy: the methodological question

The literacy process has been the target of many discussions that bring fundamental arguments around the urgency of modifying the pedagogical practices of literacy teachers. Usually, those practices are deeply rooted in a traditional education style, that is, supported by methods that value memorization, repetition and copying of information. Given the current educational context and its implications, this study seeks to highlight the importance of ludic literacy practices, which contribute to making the process more enjoyable and effective.

Thinking about teaching methodologies and its implications on the process of building the acquisition of the alphabetic system poses a challenging issue in the education field. That happens because the choice of one method over another can define the development or not of a fundamental competence for the conscious insertion of subjects in society. The discussion about which method is more efficient to promote literacy is not a recent problem, because many authors present and defend their conceptions, perspectives and theories that support the literacy practices present in literacy studies.

Contrary to what can be mistakenly idealized by many literacy teachers, there is not a definitive and magic method for literacy. As much the literacy theories as the practices seen in schools, one may conclude that the literacy process is built as of individual particularities that cannot be summarized in an only and exclusive pedagogic intervention in a preset time interval. Each child that finds themselves in a specific level of psychic, physic, motor, emotional and social development, requires an individual view to specific necessities. Therefore, it is not fitting that a pattern of time and much less an adherence to a single method to promote and enable the child's acquisition of writing. Furthermore, it's important to stress that when choosing the most adequate method to that situation, even if it

presents new, consistent, and efficient alternatives, its utilization doesn't guarantee success in the literacy process. The interaction between the alphabetical code and the appropriation of the writing system by the child requires the teacher's intercession and intervention - which can or cannot contribute for the process to happen efficiently.

These considerations reveal the complexity of literacy. They demonstrate that literacy practices capable of ensuring that all children, regardless of race, economic, social and family status, are fully literate at the right age, as predicted by the National Common Curricular Base [Base Nacional Comum Curricular] (2017), is still a major challenge. Nevertheless, this study does not aim to approach and differentiate the literacy methods, though it is necessary to have a perception that some of the strategies used in the Brazilian educational path can be characterize as most effective alternatives to accomplish the goal of teaching literacy to children up to Elementary School.

Historically, a predominance of the traditional model of teaching and learning is identified in the context of Brazilian education and this configuration was made and is present at the time of children's literacy. Situations that require mechanical repetition, memorizing in a decontextualized way, mere copying and the excessive performance of exhaustive exercises are some of the examples found in this perspective. In addition, a passive posture of the students is characteristic of the approach, who receive all the information in a ready and finished way, transmitted by the teacher.

It is possible to identify the inefficacy or not of this methodology, though it cannot be denied that its contributions to the educational process help it stay till this day, in the most miscellaneous scholastic contexts, promoting the shaping of subjects. About the problem of failure in learning and, more specifically, in the context of literacy and that reality's possible causes, Soares (2004, p.9, our translation) says that

> Certainly, this lack of specificity in literacy is an explicative factor - apparently, not the only one, but one of the most relevant - of the actual failure in learning and, that's why, the failure in teaching of the written language in Brazilian schools is still reaffirmed and widely denounced.

This scenario presented by Soares (2004) shows the urgency of building new literacy practices, not only to decipher codes, but also to provide the subjects the ability to "read the world", interpreting it in the most distinct social contexts. That's because "learning to read and write, in a literate society, has the meaning of appropriation of power, of an instrument that allows one to participate in society as a full citizen, not as half citizen (FERREIRO 1990, p. 69 apud FLORES, 2017 p.664, our translation). Therefore, what is defended here is that ludic literacy, in a really complex process that is literacy, can be a methodologic way to change Brazil's illiteracy rates.

Alphabetization or literacy?

Alphabetization can be defined as the ability to appropriate the alphabetic system, to encode and decode the conventional symbols present in the alphabet, giving them meanings. Which in the words of Rojo (2010, p. 23, our translation) means "mastering a rather complex system of representations and correspondence rules between letters (graphemes) and speech sounds (phonemes) in a given language; in our case, Brazilian Portuguese." According to Soares (2008 apud OLIVEIRA, 2012) the act of reading and writing, "constitutes the 'mastery' of the 'mechanics' of the written language; in this perspective, alphabetization means acquiring the ability to encode the oral language into written language (to write) to decode the written language into oral language to (read)." Literacy, on the other hand, represents a practical assignment for writing based on the

social activities developed, in other words, it is characterized as the ability of the subject to interact meaningfully with the most varied situations in which writing is present, interpreting their reality from the meanings that are continuously being built, since their first days of life, by their interaction with the literate world. About the term, Rojo (2010, p.26, our translation) argues that

> (...) the term "literacy" seeks to cover the social uses and practices of language that involve writing in one way or another, whether socially valued or not, local (within a specific community) or global, covering diverse social contexts (family, church, work, media, school...), in culturally diverse social groups and communities.

Another important point to discuss is that the literacy process alone does not ensure that the subject is literate, that is, being able to encode and decode the alphabetic code does not mean the competence to interact socially with reading and writing in everyday practices. Therefore, knowing how to read and write is not enough for a person to exercise their full and conscious role as a subject in society, which can be assured with literacy activities.

Although they are introduced as distinct terms, with their own meanings and attributes, the issue of alphabetization and literacy today requires a pedagogical work that contemplates both modalities. For Soares (2004), the most appropriate alternative is for the two processes to be developed together and simultaneously. Connecting alphabetization and literacy provides the child, who is being taught, a greater awareness of the social function of writing, making literacy more meaningful.

According to official education documents, literacy practices in the school environment should begin in Early Childhood Education. According to the Common Curricular National Base [Base Nacional

Comum Curricular] (BRASIL, 2017), children should be fully literate by the second year of Elementary School, since in the third year of schooling, the activities developed are focused on the study of spelling issues. This way, literacy is characterized as a continuous improvement that needs to manifest itself also in the school environment, providing ways for children to be able to interpret the written language in the social practices that are required.

During the alphabetization process, the child goes through several levels of recognition of writing, which, according to Ferreiro (1999), goes from pre-syllabic to syllabic-alphabetic, when the child begins to create assumptions to interpret the written language until they are fully literate. This process tends to be constructed by the child, through measurements outlined by the educator. However, it is important to emphasize that the process of learning the written language is not simple and can be a complex period for the children and the literacy teacher.

Still on the alphabetization process, Soares (2004, p.11, our translation) argues that "learning occurs through a progressive construction of knowledge in the child's relationship with the object of the written language". That is, learning happens through interaction, either with the environment or with the other. It is valid to state that a literacy teacher needs to know in advance the stages of child development, understanding that the child has a representation of the language at each stage, which, little by little, will develop and improve, according to their psychological and motor level. Furthermore, they should pay attention to the practices that enable more positive results for the literacy process, considering the historical-social profile of their students. In this context, it is understood how promising is the ludicity, regardless of the characteristics noted in children, because this resource adds meaning, movement, creation, and construction of knowledge to the literacy process.

For literacy cycles, ludicity allows the child to move, create, play and, in this way, build important requirements for the acquisition of writing.

And, for the student to awaken the taste for reading and learning, it is necessary that these experiences leave the mechanical. This is because repetition and traditional approaches lead the student to assume an essentially passive attitude while the teacher acts mechanically, offering a ready and finished knowledge. Literacy practices that use resources that do not bring the social function of language for learning become meaningless for children. It is necessary to consider all resources in which the written language circulates, all textual forms, providing a variety of works, dynamic approaches, allowing space for creativity, autonomy and affording security. According to Hamdan (2018), dealing with words should make them become more attractive and not objects of prison of thought. Also, they should be part of an exciting game, open to the participation and construction of all those involved in the process.

Literacy and ludicity

Due to the contemporaneity in society, it is considered essential to rethink the directions of education, taking into consideration the social-historical present. Therefore, with the goal to well articulate the educational proposals to the modern world standards, it is up to educators to guarantee quality education to students and to achieve the preset goals in the official Brazilian educational documents. Although, studies show that beyond methodological and pedagogical questions, teachers have to deal with several factors that influence, directly or not, students' school performance, such as the socioeconomic, affective, family, cultural matters and others that contribute to the composition of a challenging educational scenery.

In front of the responsibility of offering an education that allows the integral formation of the subject, contemplating the most diverse aspects that make up the human being, the importance of a ludic education as an essential tool in pedagogical practice has been strongly defended for some years. The

large bibliographic collection on the importance of ludicity in teaching evidences its relevance in the educational process, so it is necessary to rethink and seek to identify its place in the daily life of the classroom.

Facing the teaching methodological issues, Almeida (1994) affirms that ludic education is a possibility of contribution to a teaching that attends to the educational necessities and that, if well applied, might solve bigger school problems, such as failure and evasion, besides enabling the students' critic shaping and a better relationship between them and society.

Thus, teaching by contemplating the most diverse ludic possibilities is becoming more and more associated with school success, because starting at ludic tools, the students end up having more pleasure in learning, and more interactions with the knowledge in an active, creative and autonomous way. The positioning which is defended is that the ludic established in education amplifies the sensibility and world vision reflecting the skillful handling of the words in interactive process, into a playtime that doesn't end. (HAMDAN, 2018)

Ludic education is historically turned solely onto younger children, which could justify its presence in Early Child Education. In the first grades of Elementary School classrooms, there is a significant change on the organization of school spaces, including the table arrangements, availability of toys and also on pedagogic actions, which can betray certain absence of ludic methods on the learning process. Meantime, ludicity, as a pedagogical instrument plays a fundamental role on cognitive, motor, social and creative development.

In the same approach, Kishimoto (2005) highlights that playing develop intelligence, facilitating the studies. For that reason, it began to be a part of educational contents. About the valorization of ludic aspects in educational practice, Rau (2011, p.25, our translation) says that "many professionals of this area use ludicity as educational resources because the utilization of ludic resources, such as games and playing helps the transposition of contents to the student's world". Having that said, it's

necessary to take into consideration that ludic teaching should permeate not only in the initial phase of Elementary Schools, once that the children are still in a biological process that forbids having a more abstract capacity well defined.

Literacy for ludicity allows a more pleasurable learning to the students, being able to facilitate the process of writing appropriation. Thus, the discourse that pedagogical work with ludic practices is a naive conception destined to occupy free time, without any theoretical basis and characterized as a purely fun moment, is no longer suitable. On the contrary, studies have already proven that playing, in addition to being characterized as a pleasurable action, contributes to the formation and construction of the subject in all its aspects.

In this context, it does not fit the idea that ludic education is devoid of educational intentions and that it does not exercise an important role in the educational process Although, used in an inefficient and disconnected way to the theoretical assumptions that support this teaching modality, its results can compromise the subjects' school education.

Thereby, the use of games and playing, in addition to mediating the teaching-learning process, will also allow and favor the collective practices essential in the process of children formation, as playing provides moments of socialization and exchange of knowledge between children. However, it is necessary to point out that ludic literacy practices lack theoretical foundations and specific planning by educators. They cannot be used to occupy free time or to substitute a specific content on the curriculum. On the contrary, pedagogical games must be carefully planned by the teacher, based on purpose of the class, on the competences to be worked and on on what students are expected to learn from these ludic interventions. Evidently, the professional formation to a ludic education is important and, in that regard, Almeida (1994, p.43, our translation) argues that

> It is really important that the teacher does not jump into practice with insecurity or unfamiliarity. It is necessary to invest in their own formation, reading, conversing, researching, seeking out alternatives, recreating. The more knowledge one has about the subject, the more secure one will be in application and work execution.

Still according to the author, the teacher that intends to literate and teach in a ludic manner needs to know very well the nature of ludicity so that it doesn't fall on self-indulgence of playing without pedagogic intention.

Methodology

This study is organized from bibliographic research with a qualitative approach of descriptive character. It seeks to identify and analyze the insertion or non-inclusion of ludic practices in the literacy process as a pedagogical tool in the early years of Elementary Education. This study also seeks to make evident, based on theoretical foundations, the importance of ludicity in the literacy process. To explore the subject, authors who postulated studies about the ludic in teaching and the aspects related to the development of the written language were used. Among them it is emphasized: SOARES (2004), FERREIRO (1999), ALMEIDA (2003), KISHIMOTO (2005), RAU (2011), HAMDAN (2018). These authors contributed to the analysis of the topic, correlating it with the aspects experienced in the supervised internships of the academic training in Pedagogy course. The eight analyses included a critical listing of data on the reports of the supervised internships described by the authors. These analyses emphasize the ludic aspects presented during all the experiences and contacts with public institutions in the cities of Divinópolis and Nova Serrana - Minas Gerais, especially in relation to the literacy of children in Early Childooh Education and the early years of Elementary School.

The analyzed reports deal with aspects related to the educational practices seen in teaching internships conducted during the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th semesters of the course of Pedagogy, at the State University of Minas Gerais (UEMG) - unit of Divinópolis-MG, in the disciplines of Mandatory Supervised Internship [Estágio Supervisionado Obrigatório] I, II, III and IV. They embrace the critical look about the ludic literacy performed in public schools of the municipal education system during the years of 2018 and 2019.

In order to deal with the guiding problem of the research, internship reports were selected and analyzed, in which the experiences in Early Childhood Education classes and the first years of Elementary School were highlighted. In this way, pertinent and relevant comparisons were established regarding the literacy process in these stages of education, according to the theoretical foundation adopted as a support.

Mandatory internships report's analysis

The main purpose of the analyses was to identify the place of ludic in the literacy process of children in Early Childhood Education and the early years of Primary School, as well as to bring relevant comparisons between the pedagogical practices adopted by teachers and their implications on learning. Three analyses were selected for presentation in this study.

Classroom 1

This report refers to the observations registered in a 1st year class of Primary School, consisting of 24 students. The internship was developed during the first semester of 2018. At first, the classroom space will be presented, highlighting important aspects for the literacy process.

As in the majority of elementary school years, the environment was composed of letters of the alphabet fixed high up on the wall, some

informative posters with the children's full names, the vowels, a calendar, the birthdays of the month, the seasons, the agreements, the daily assistant and activities produced by the children, such as drawings, collages and others. There was also a panel indicating the "Reading Place", however, the books were not there.

Regarding the physical aspect of the classroom, it is worth noting that it was a precariously adapted room, which made a better space organization impossible. The place used was a pastoral center of a church, since the school building did not have the structural conditions to attend all the children. This reality represents a significant impasse in the educational process because the children did not have some fundamental conditions for a quality education, which has a direct impact on the literacy journey. This is because, "(...) children who live in environments rich in experiences of reading and writing are motivated to read and write." (MORAES and ALBUQUERQUE, 2004, p. 168 apud FLORES, 2017, p. 665, our translation). However, if the environment does not have instruments that provide the incentive for reading and writing, how will it be possible to work with alphabetization? And how will literacy be refined?

The head teacher used, most of the time, photocopied activities as material for literacy classes. Although the instrument used may present some limitations, the way the classes were conducted, especially at times when the literacy process was more present, revealed a dialogical dynamic that allowed interaction among students, who, in groups, built some fundamental assumptions for the acquisition and incorporation of writing. The organization promoted the exchange of knowledge between students, and the children who appear to be in more advanced stages of writing could assist those at earlier stages.

Apart from these activities, on some days the children were organized into small groups to participate in a puzzle game in which they had to associate an image with its writing. However, these moments often happened in a decontextualized way and without the teacher's

intervention. In this sense, although the game itself offered learning moments, the children dispersed, and the activity would lose its purpose. Thus, it is visible that the game is often used without a previously elaborated pedagogical intention, and it only occupies a free time during the lesson. The fact represents contradictions in relation to what should be the objective of play in literacy, because

> The educator must define in advance, the amount of time that the ludic activity will occupy in the daily routine of its pedagogical practice, the spaces where these activities will be developed, the objects and toys to be used, as well as respect the singularities of the children, promoting inclusion so that everyone participates in the activities at the same time. (BARBOSA 2003, p.19 apud SANTOS, 2014 p.13, our translation).

In this school, there was a reading project called "Travelling bag [Sacola viajante]", which aimed to encourage reading and to provide a moment of interaction between those responsible by the child and the children through children's books. Each child had their own bag containing their full name, a children's literature book and a register notebook. Every Friday, the bag was given to the children so they could read with their families over the weekend and make a record of the part of the book that most caught their attention, with drawings or rewriting parts of the story. During the internship experience, it was noticed that few children brought the requested activity, and frequently the book was not read or even taken out of the backpack. Furthermore, there was not, during the classes, a specific moment for the socialization of the reading experiences experimented by the children.

It was frequent to hear complaints from teachers about the lack of time to prepare activities and the excess of work they had to do, as they often worked in two different schools on the same day. So, the textbook was the main guide for all pedagogical planning and the classes almost

always followed the same expositive format. In dialogue with the head teacher and the school managers, it was noticed that ludicity is seen as an important element for the learning process as a whole; however, in practice, little was observed of the presence of ludic instruments or a methodology that promoted ludicity

Classroom 2

The second report corresponds to a Fourth-Grade classroom, with 30 students. The time of observation was approximately two months, in which the last two weeks were destined to the pedagogic intervention project application whose collected material will be relevant to the discussion here presented.

Different from the time and space organization of the Early Childhood Education and the three first years of Elementary School classrooms that resided in said school, there was little to no material exposed on the walls and the activities were developed in a short interval. According to the regent teacher, the reason for this was that there was a lot of content to be taught during classes. The ambience was composed of a lot of chairs to support the number of students and consequently, there was little space for possible educational games and ludic activities. Observing the dynamics in the classroom, it was clear that the teacher's methodology was closer to the traditional teaching methodology, which has predominance of expositive classes, copying from the board, memorization and mechanic realization of book or photocopied activities. In one of the dialogues with the teacher, she says she recognizes the difficulties she has in arranging a more dynamic class utilizing materials other than book-chalk-board.

When managing a Fourth-Grade class it is expected that the students have completed their literacy process, as BNCC proposes, and in this stage questions related to grammar and orthography would be executed. It's foreseen that all students were properly alphabetized up to

Second Grade and that they would be able to "meet different genres and genre carriers, demonstrating comprehension of the social function of writing and recognizing reading as a source of pleasure and information" (BRASIL, 2017, p.55, our translation). On the contrary, two kids in this class couldn't even identify some letters of the alphabet and only recognized the ones that constituted their names. Those students had great difficulties to execute the activities proposed in the classroom and would frequently do other activities brought by the teacher, which by the way, tried to help them the best as she could in the process of literacy, even if it was in a precarious manner. The tutor stated that sometimes the school would have someone to do activities especially related to the literacy process with those children. Except that those "tutoring" classes were taught at the same time school did. As a result, the children were affected adversely since they would have to miss their lessons to do the past grade activities.

At that stage, an activity was proposed to build a literature line. For that activity, the children would write poems, letters, notes, and other genres, demonstrating the feeling of friendship to a friend. After the activity, an intern would be able to read all the collected material and observe the biggest difficulties the students had elaborating a text. There were lots of spelling, cohesion, and grammar issues, some texts couldn't even be read and/or comprehended. In addition, during the writing of the texts the students always asked for the intern's help as well as the teacher's to write some phrases on the board because they would not known how to write them. Those issues show and reveal education's precariousness, which cannot guarantee that every child is going to be fully literate at the right age.

Generally, the ludic aspect was not a part of the educational context of this classroom. Possible causes for that absence can be associated with the lack of continued professional education from the teacher because she highlighted the desire to modify her methodological practices and complained

about not being able to prepare a ludic lesson. Even the excess of curriculum contents that was developed daily, which meant that the activities happened at a fast rate, among other possible reasons.

So, even if it deals with a Fourth-Grade class, ludicity makes itself important so the literacy process can continue and, specially, so it can provide a more pleasurable, more dynamic and more significant ambiance for the children. Indeed, the ludic action can be an instrument capable of attending the necessities of those who haven't successfully achieved the reading and writing levels expected of the year grade they are in.

Classroom 3

The third observation report presents the experiences of a 2nd year class of Elementary School with 23 children. Like the other internships, the observation time of the school space, and more specifically, of the classroom, corresponds to approximately two months, being developed during the second semester of 2019.

The physical environment was composed of several informative posters and children's productions. There was also a small cabinet in the room with some teaching materials, which were mainly used during Portuguese Language and Mathematics classes. The head teacher reported that all these objects were provided and even made by her, so it was not a teaching resource provided by the school, and therefore not all students had access to it. Observing the teacher's pedagogical practice, it was possible to identify that the classes followed the expository-dialog format, with the effective participation of children.

The activities were usually developed in pairs or small groups, what allowed a greater interaction among students. Regarding reading and writing activities, it can be said that the ludic was very present in the literacy teaching context, since the teacher allowed dynamics that were far from the traditional model commonly found in schools. Thus, she developed activities

such as the "syllable ice-cream shop [sorveteria das sílabas]", in which children should build words using syllabic popsicles, and the children's story theater with a puppet show, among other activities.

The class also developed a literature project called "The Postman Arrived [O carteiro chegou]", that allowed an approximation of writing to the social situations it requires. This way, the literacy process, fundamental during alphabetization, was strongly present.

To do the project's activities, the children had a first contact with reading the book, which was done by the teacher responsible for the subject and, later, they would do tasks guided by the head teacher. As the story of the book takes place through letters delivered by the postman, the project began with the visit of a postman in the classroom so that the children could interview him and learn about his profession. In addition to the example, other practices that reveal the social function of the written language could be found in various activities such as watching the film "Happily N'Ever After 2" and, afterwards, creating the possible recipe used by the witch to poison the apple that Snow White ate, and the creation of invitations requesting the presence of other classes to attend a theater performance organized by the class.

According to the observations, it is possible to state that ludic was an element present in the classroom, being characterized as a fundamental resource for the pedagogical practice of the head teacher. Due to the large investment of time in ludic activities, some conflicts between the teacher and school management were noted, since the class was not following the programmed content for the use of the textbook. However, despite the non-compliance with the programmatic activities established by the pedagogical management for the use of the textbook, the 2nd year class was the only one in the school in which practically all students were literate. The data revealed some interesting information for reflection on the place of ludic in the classroom and its implications for the literacy process.

Results and discussion

The results obtained through the research showed that teachers need to support themselves in studies and practices that focus on a ludic formation, since the observations carried out in the supervised internships of the Pedagogy undergraduate course refer us to data that differ from the theoretical guidelines and conceptions encompassed about the theme. The analyzes call attention to the fact that the discussion about the importance of ludicity in the teaching process is recognized and defended by educators, however, ludic practices are still not, in most cases observed, present in the educational context, as also in the literacy process.

The investigation confirms the hypothesis that ludic manifestations are commonly resorted to Early Childhood Education. In the posterior grades ludicity is less utilized as an educational resource One of the possible justifications, identified in the dialogues carried out with the teachers, may be associated with the amount of curriculum content that must be worked on during the school year.

Many are the challenges of inserting ludicity in the literacy context and they go from the problems related to the classroom's physical structures, to the lack of professional unpreparedness from educators. It became clear from those observations that the classrooms are frequently small and have little to no space for developing dynamic and ludic activities, as well as ways to store the necessary materials needed for the classes. Other point analyzed is that, although the school institution recognizes the benefits of ludic education for learning, it is noted that there is no investment in pedagogical resources that can help the teacher's work. In conclusion, it is up to the teacher to make or even buy the materials required for their classes. Consequently, not all students have access to this teaching format, which may present different results in the school performance of children of the same schooling level.

Ludicity is not generally assured in the school context. The ludic methodology is reserved for some sporadic events, not being used regularly on a daily basis. Besides recognizing the benefits of ludic practices, teachers could evidence ways to promote the acquisition of written language, with the introduction of methods and strategies that provide the development of students from a significant context and well-defined pedagogical intentions. There is an urgent need for the student to be recognized not as a "receiver of content, but as a producer of knowledge and transformer of their own reality and that of those around them." (ANDRADE, 2019, p.398, our translation).

The ludic assumptions established in this research alert that, in teaching, various aspects that lead the child to develop integrally should be used. Such strategies tend to expand the students' involvement in the learning process and make their education richer, in contrast to what is observed in mechanistic approaches. In summary, there is evidence that teachers need to adopt a reflective practice, which provides students to be involved by ludic practices that lead them to enthusiasm and increased interest in their learning, especially regarding literacy. The contribution that ludic represents for childhood, in relation to its development and the particularities that the acquisition of written language covers, requires that it should be guaranteed mainly in the education of the early years of Primary Schools, leading the pedagogical approaches to a more meaningful and enjoyable path.

Final Considerations

From this study, it is understood that teaching literacy in a ludic way is not an easy task. Nevertheless, it is fundamental for the education quality. It is necessary to use play, games, to arouse the interest and concentration of the literacy student.

Therefore, it is also necessary that the professionals commit to their responsibilities in teaching from methods that enable and favor the knowledge-student interaction. Consequently, it is not enough to only provide isolated playtimes or planning to reserve a day of the utilization of toys and games. A pedagogical planning that contemplates the most varied social manifestations of writing allied to playfulness, such as theater, storytelling, literacy games, games, songs, among other diverse possibilities, becomes indispensable. And that it is built from specific objectives of literacy, whose process is the result of a continuous construction, developed inside and outside the classroom, with coherent intentions, connected to pedagogical theories.

Although the literacy methodologies called traditional are part of a historical educational scenario, responsible for the formation of individuals over time, it is important to recognize the demands of the contemporary world and the need to seek pedagogical training capable of following such dynamics. In this sense, it is necessary that educators take responsibility for seeking continuous training for their pedagogical performance.

Literacy methodologies must be associated with current studies developed in the area, as well as with the context in which literacy is being taught. More efficient methods are proposed as alternatives, the ludic means, which will allow a possibility of achieving the literacy and literacy goals proposed by the official documents of education.

Thus, it is expected that the present research will contribute so that teachers, specifically those who work in the literacy process, have a greater understanding of the importance of ludicity throughout the literacy journey. In this way, through the points of agreement between the authors in the theoretical survey discussed, as well as the critical analysis of the place of play in teaching practice, it is possible to trace more assertive paths, with the objective of guaranteeing a broad literacy process, capable of to promote in students autonomy and the critical exercise of reflection and citizen posture in constant literacy. However,

the practices observed ended up occupying a place that diverged from those that guide the references and theorists such as Soares (2004), who points out that we should not be content with teaching to read and write only, emphasizing that it is necessary to insert our students in an environment of access to the social function of reading and writing, making experiences and learning a necessity and a form of pleasure.

Therefore, the importance of organizing a work proposal capable of providing students with rich and ludic activities is highlighted, in which teachers may be concerned with organizing in advance the ludic activities they will carry out with their students, with that truly contribute to a literacy rich in experiences and that make ludicity a prerequisite for children's learning.

The results obtained in the research reveal the need for further studies in the area, not only in relation to the importance of ludicity, but, specifically, in identifying obstacles, whether structural, methodological or curricular, and proposing solutions for this element to be present in the school environment, as well as in literacy practices. In view of this, a more meaningful and efficient education in the lives of children will be possible, who, by appropriating linguistic knowledge, will be able to act and intervene in society in a conscious way, exercising their rights and duties as free and autonomous subjects - as citizens.

References

ALMEIDA, Paulo Nunes de. *Educação Lúdica*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 1994.

ALMEIDA, Paulo Nunes de. *Educação Lúdica: técnicas e jogos pedagógicos.* 11. ed. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2003.

ANDRADE, Fábio Santos de. *Desafios da prática docente: diálogos com a Educação Social*. Revista de Educação Pública, v. 28, n. 68, p. 393-401, 2019.

BRASIL. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular: Ensino Fundamental*. Brasília: MEC/Secretaria de Educação Básica, 2017.
Brasil. Ministério da Educação e do Desporto. Secretaria de Educação Fundamental. *Referencial curricular nacional para a educação infantil / Ministério da Educação e do Desporto, Secretaria de Educação Fundamental.* — Brasília: MEC/SEF, 1998. 3v.

FERREIRO, Emília. *Psicogênese da língua escrita*. Porto Alegre: Artes médicas,1999.

FLORES, Gelvânia Mailde. Desenvolvimento da leitura e escrita de alunos com dificuldades/Development of Reading and writing of students with difficulties. Brazilian Journal of Development, v. 3, n. 4, p. 661-668, 2017.

HAMDAN, Laila. *Ludismo Verbal e Literariedade*: percursos de letramento. Divinópolis: Adelante, 2018.

KISHIMOTO, Tizuko Morchida. *Jogo, brinquedo, brincadeira e educação*. 8º ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2005.

MILITÃO, Giselda Morais de *Alencar. Alfabetização e letramento: as práticas de leitura como recurso para alfabetização*. 2013. p, 235-249.

OLIVEIRA, Adrielly Silva. *As contribuições pedagógicas no processo de oralidade, alfabetização e letramento*. Anais da Semana de Pedagogia da UEM. Volume 1, Número 1. Maringá: UEM, 2012.

RAU, Maria Cristina Trois Dorneles. *A ludicidade na educação: uma atitude pedagógica. 2* ed. Curitiba: Ibpex, 2011.

ROJO, Roxane. *Alfabetização e letramentos múltiplos: como alfabetizar letrando. Coleção explorando o ensino: Língua Portuguesa: ensino fundamental.* Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica, Brasília: vol, v. 19, p. 15-36, 2010.

SANTOS, Fernanda Cristina Ribeiro dos. *A ludicidade na alfabetização: perspectivas e possibilidades de novas aprendizagens*. 2014.

SOARES, Magda**. *Letramento e alfabetização: as muitas facetas*. Revista Brasileira de Educação, Rio de Janeiro, n. 25, p. 5-17, jan./abr. 2004.