

DOSSIER

Literacy and Curriculum: between the establishment of meanings and the experiments that create fissures and make other ways of life possible

Curriculum and literacy¹: meanings in dispute in the search for other possibilities***Currículo e alfabetização: significações em disputa na busca de outros possíveis***

Maria Carolina da Silva Caldeira^a
mariacarolinasilva@hotmail.com

Rita de Cássia Prazeres Frangella^b
rcfrangella@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Tensions between curriculum and literacy have become increasingly evident in recent years. Whether in the field of practices developed at school or in the scope of educational policies, both fields have interconnected and mutually questioned each other. Curriculum policies in recent years have taken literacy as a strategic field for promoting the named “quality of education”, producing disputes about what it means to learn how to read and write. At the same time, policies that focus on literacy discuss issues dear to the field of curriculum, such as: what should be taught? What counts as knowledge in the literacy process? Who is the subject that learning how to read and write and who is teacher that teaching how to read and write? In this sense, this article aims to discuss the approximations and tensions made possible by dialogue between two fields. We argue that both literacy and curriculum are involved in the process of struggle for meanings and, in this process, can create the fixation of meanings, but it can also enable fissures and creation of other ways of life.

Keywords: Curriculum. Literacy. Curriculum Policies. Teacher Training.

RESUMO

As tensões entre currículo e alfabetização têm se tornado cada vez mais evidentes nos últimos anos. Seja no campo das práticas desenvolvidas na escola, seja no âmbito das políticas educacionais, os dois campos têm se interconectado e questionado um ao outro mutuamente. As políticas curriculares nos últimos anos tomam a alfabetização como um campo estratégico para a promoção da nomeada “qualidade da educação”,

^a Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brasil.

^b Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil.

¹ In Portuguese, there are two terms used for the process of developing the ability to read and write: “*alfabetização*” and “*letramento*”. In short, “*alfabetização*” concerns learning written letters and symbols; and “*letramento*” deals with the social function of reading and writing (Soares, 2018). However, in the English language, there is one term for both processes: “literacy”. Therefore, in this text, when we talk about “*alfabetização*”, we use the terms “teaching how to read and write”/“learning how to read and write”, and, when we talk about “*letramento*”, we use the term “literacy”.

produzindo disputas sobre o que significa ser alfabetizado/a. Ao mesmo tempo, as políticas que se debruçam sobre a alfabetização discutem questões caras ao campo do currículo, como: o que se deve ensinar? O que conta como conhecimento no processo de alfabetização? Quem é o sujeito alfabetizado/a e quem é o/a professor/a alfabetizador/a? Nesse sentido, este artigo tem como objetivo discutir as aproximações e os tensionamentos possibilitados pelo diálogo entre os dois campos. Argumentamos que tanto alfabetização como currículo estão envolvidos no processo de luta por significados e, nesse processo, podem criar a fixação de sentidos, mas também pode possibilitar fissuras e criação de outros modos de vida.

Palavras-chave: Currículo. Alfabetização. Políticas Curriculares. Formação docente.

Introduction

Teaching how to read and write and curriculum: How to tense this pair, not always placed in relation? It was around this issue that we began our discussions to propose this dossier. As researchers who have sought to articulate these two objects and their respective theoretical fields, we have noticed that the dialogs between them are sometimes closer and sometimes distant. On the one hand, discussions in the curricular field, when turning to the analysis of curricular policies, have, in general, taken such policies in broad sections, relating to the stages of basic education and/or disciplinary fields based on the mobilizations of epistemic communities. When focused on the discussion of practices, analyses of the curricular field provide varied approaches, whether discussing issues in disciplinary areas, as occurs in policy analysis, or approaching themes related to cultural diversity, such as race-ethnicity, gender, sexuality, among other identity markers. Thus, issues related to teaching how to read and write in the curricular field are subsumed into more general discussions or take this learning just as a stage in the schooling process.

On the other hand, discussions about teaching how to read and write often focus on aspects related to its different ways of teaching, teaching methodologies, teacher training, school success/failure, and evaluation processes. In the field of teaching how to read and write studies, discussions regarding curriculum are often not held, as it is considered that this is already defined. Curriculum is taken as a fact, as the organization of knowledge that has already been established and about which there is no need to discuss. There is, thus, a distancing between the two fields, which often take each other for granted and not as discursive processes in constant struggle for the production of meanings.

However, it should be noted that the issues involved in teaching how to read and write mobilize debates about the knowledge necessary to teach literacy, school success/failure, the relationships that are established between disciplinary fields, the senses and meanings associated with teaching how to read and write... Likewise, issues related to curriculum are involved in the production of meanings about what it means to be literate, the meaning of teaching/learning how to read and write itself, about how teachers should conduct themselves in the various practices related to literacy. Depending on the way each of these concepts is constructed, the relationships between them can be more or less explicit. Furthermore, both teaching how to read and write and curriculum are directly involved in discussions about the quality of education. Both end up appearing as an indication of crises, problems and/or success of pedagogical models, mobilizing discourses

that infer meanings to what is understood by education, quality and training. In this regard, so many examples can be cited, from news published in mass circulation newspapers about the results of systemic evaluations to success cases – terminology used by non-governmental organizations – about practices that align with a given sense of quality, in the association success-performance-effectiveness that is expressed in evaluations, thus becoming exemplary practices.

In the set of policies created in recent years, teaching how to read and write and curriculum are identified as strategic fields for the changes that are intended to be introduced in Brazilian education. Teaching how to read and write is seen as fundamental to overcoming economic inequalities in our country (Brasil, 2019). The standardized curriculum is presented as essential so that minimum learning is guaranteed to all Brazilian students (Brasil, 2018b).

The issue of teaching how to read and write has historically been a motto for proposing curricular policies both for basic education and for teacher training, understood as the “base” of educational projects, as a boundary delimiting entry into school or not, as a guaranteeing element of a given conception of citizenship achieved through mastery of reading and writing. Therefore, there is an important relationship between the two fields when we look at teaching how to read and write and curriculum as discursive processes that dispute, negotiate and signify different education projects. It is possible to infer this entanglement by observing how curricular policies have increasingly focused on issues related to teaching how to read and write in recent years. An example is Law no. 11,274, of February 6, 2006 (Brasil, 2006), which changed the wording of articles 29, 30, 32 and 87 of Law nº 9,394, of December 20, 1996, which establishes the National Education Guidelines and Framework, providing for the duration of 9 years for Elementary School, with mandatory enrollment from the age of 6 years. The intention of including 6-year-old children in the first grade of Elementary School is a strategy to guarantee the completion of the Elementary School stage at 14 years old, relating the appropriation of reading and writing to the possibility of a broader trajectory, in which learning how to read and write occur at the “right age”.

Another policy that articulates curriculum and teaching how to read and write is the *Mais Alfabetização* [More Literacy] Program, created by Ordinance nº 142, of February 22, 2018 (Brasil, 2018a), which aimed to strengthen and support school units in the process of students regularly enrolled in 1st and 2nd grades of Elementary School to learn how to read and write, considering the provisions of the Brazilian Common Core State Standards [*Base Nacional Comum Curricular – BNCC*] (Brasil, 2018b), recently promulgated at the time, about learning how to read and write taking place in the first two grades of Elementary School. If we turn to policies for the training of literacy teachers, understanding “teacher training as an instance of curricular production and not as a related issue” (Frangella, 2016, p. 111), it is possible to list several policies that entangle teaching how to read and write and curriculum. We can mention, to stick to more recent examples, the National Pact for Literacy at the Right Age [*Pacto Nacional para a Alfabetização na Idade Certa*] (Brasil, 2012), and the actions of the Time to Learn Program [*Programa Tempo de Aprender*], linked to the National Literacy Policy [*Política Nacional de Alfabetização – PNA*] (Brasil, 2019) that invest in the training of teachers, and, at the same time, constituting an instituting movement of curricular production for teaching how to read and write.

These elements also highlight how teaching to read and write and curriculum are currently intertwined in disputes about what the quality of education means. When investigating this movement, we are interested in highlighting how teaching to read and write discourse expands beyond the borders of its own field, focusing not only on theoretical references regarding the acquisition of reading and writing, methods for teaching reading and writing, epistemological perspectives of teaching how to read and write, but about the political discourse of the very meaning of education, knowledge, teaching and also curricular policies for teaching how to read and write. Likewise, the discourse of the curricular field also feeds the field of teaching how to read and write, through different discursive productions about what counts as valid knowledge for children, young people, adults and the elderly who are learning how to read and write. As previously argued, we take curricular policies as a process of articulation/production of meanings, highlighting their discursive dimension, and observing the effects of meaning disclosed and produced in these policies empowers us to understand clashes and negotiations underway in the struggle for the meaning of teaching how to read and write itself (Caldeira; Frangella, 2023).

In this sense, we seek to understand teaching how to read and write and curriculum based on the post-structural discursive approaches mobilized in the studies we have developed, triggering language games that set meaning processes in motion. We understand that both teaching how to read and write and curriculum have been the target of various disputes, materialized in policies and practices that sometimes tend towards the centralization and closure of meanings, and sometimes point towards expansion and experimentation. In this direction, the establishment of the *BNCC* (Brasil, 2018b) – which aims to establish meanings around curricular practices – and the *PNA* (Brasil, 2019) – whose focus is to define the way in which teaching how to read and write should be carried out in the country's classes, for example, exemplify attempts at homogenization. The different curricular practices carried out by teachers in the country, which emphasize the specificities, differences and characteristics of students, show the possibilities of escape and cracks in these attempts of standardization.

In summary, the understanding that teaching how to read and write and curriculum are involved in power relations that seek to establish meanings for schooling mobilized us in organizing this dossier. In addition to that, our own trajectory as researchers in the area blurs the boundaries between curriculum and teaching how to read and write. We are researchers in the field of curriculum who, within its folds, negotiate and articulate such curricular problematizations with teaching how to read and write, blurring boundaries that seek to delineate precise limits of what belongs to each field, a micropolitical insurgency, as Rolnik (2021) explains, which makes these indiscernible borders and which, in the resonance produced by this network of multiple relationships and connections woven with/in this dossier, enhance other meanings for curricular productions for teaching how to read and write.

In other words, we could say, based on Bhabha (2001), that we move in the liminality of the border, not as a demarcation of an inside/outside, but inhabiting an interstice, an in-between place of flows, articulations and ambivalences. Thus, “[...] it is in this sense that the border becomes the place from which something begins to be present in a movement not dissimilar to that of the

walking, ambivalent articulation [...]” (Bhabha, 2001, p. 24), and which allows us to observe how teaching how to read and write is becoming a curricular issue.

Because we perceive the relationships that are forged between the two fields in policies and practices and, at the same time, we notice that there is not such a direct discussion in the research carried out in the two theoretical fields, we seek to call researchers who have mobilized these themes in their research to publicize them and give more impetus to the discussions that have been held in both fields. The significant number of papers we received for evaluation, as well as the variety of topics they cover, show how our initial suspicions that there is much more to say in the dialog between the two fields were correct.

The reading of the papers that make up this dossier shows that the possibility of articulation between the fields is due, among other factors, to the expansion of understanding of what teaching how to read and write is and what curriculum is. If there is a significant movement around the attempt of closure of the meanings of the two terms, there is also an expansion of the contexts in which curriculum and teaching how to read and write can occur. In the movement towards attempting to close the meanings, we see, in recent policies as well as in the theoretical field, the discussion of the need to clarify what has been understood about teaching how to read and write, particularly to distance it from other terms that have been used to refer to the initial learning processes. Soares (2018) states that “[...] in tradition, in common sense, in current usage, and even in dictionaries, *alfabetização* [learning how to read and write] is understood as, strictly, the learning of the alphabetic-orthographic system and the conventions for its use”. In this perspective, teaching how to read and write has its meaning reduced to practices that involve the initial learning of written language. This way of thinking is present in curricular documents, such as the *BNCC* and the *PNA* and, to a certain extent, the current Literated Child National Commitment [*Compromisso Nacional Criança Alfabetizada*]. However, despite numerous criticisms, we have also seen an expansion of the conception of what teaching how to read and write is, both broadening the understanding of what it means to become literate and showing that learning how to read and write can occur in different contexts.

In the field of curriculum, the attempt to close meanings to define “what a curriculum really is” has encountered a series of resistance, despite recognizing, as Macedo (2015, p. 903-904) points out, that “[...] there is, in curriculum, as in every practice of signification, a desire for control, a reduction of an infinity of meanings to those made possible by games of power”. The author still argues that they are partial significations, although the efforts to contain the possibilities of differing are constant. The desire to define what curriculum should be/contain in common for all, based on the idea that this equality would guarantee democratic practices, ends up erasing singularities and is governed by a universalizing logic that ignores difference and produces more inequality than equity/quality in education. Lopes and Borges (2017), in a discussion about a normative conception of curriculum, which, based on the centrality of knowledge, invests in control through knowledge, argue that “[...] curriculum is not limited to being a set of declarative or theoretical statements, but involves the possibility of the performative as a promise of something that is never fully established”. Although common sense also has the idea that curriculum refers to a list of subjects, the discussion carried out in the field understands that curriculum is not restricted to the school space, and also

densifies the discussions by showing that curriculum is a discursive production, involved in the production of meanings and significations. Thus, school curriculum is not restricted to subjects, but it encompasses the different processes that take place at school and that enter into the dispute for the production of meaning, such as curricular policies, teaching materials, practices developed in the classroom and theoretical discussions. Curriculum enters the dispute to define what counts as true knowledge and in the definition of ways of being and existing in the world. We align ourselves with this conception, which displaces curriculum, conceiving it as movement, uninterrupted production, signification, cultural production... or using Paraíso's (2022) words about the theorization produced by Sandra Corazza, another curriculum specialist who returned to the relationship between teaching how to read and write and curriculum, curriculum is a space for "creating education" (Paraíso, 2022, p. 3).

In this sense, our proposal with this dossier is to show the diversity that exists in the meanings of curriculum and teaching how to read and write that have circulated and, at the same time, to highlight how the articulation of research objects (curriculum and teaching how to read and write) and theoretical fields (which are characterized by a multiplicity) can produce fissures in the meanings that we try to fix and help in the construction of other ways of thinking about education. We understand that, between the fixation of meanings and experiments that create fissures and enable other ways of life, this dossier gives visibility to the different ways in which teaching how to read and write and curriculum can be thought, problematized and constructed in contemporary educational research. The papers gathered here show this plurality and demonstrate how thinking about teaching how to read and write and curriculum as cultural products and productions refreshes both fields and enables multiple and diverse articulations.

Thus, the first of the texts, entitled *Alfabetização e cultura: por possibilidades outras de significação dos processos de aprendizagem da leitura e da escrita* [Literacy and culture: for other possibilities of meaning in the processes of learning to read and write], written by Rosalva de Cássia Rita Drummond, Bonnie Axer and Jade Dias, based on post-structural references, seeks to show the tension that is established in the attempt to define meanings for teaching how to read and write and curriculum in recent education policies. The authors advocate that this attempt to establish a single meaning for teaching how to read and write brings "[...] with it a compensatory and salvationist character, reducing other possibilities of meaning in the processes of reading and writing beyond what is currently being proposed". Taking the work "*Cabo de Guerra*" [Tug of War], by Ivan Cruz, as their starting point, the authors show how there is a dispute (which does not always go in opposite directions, as in children's games, but which often dissipates in several directions) about what, how and when learning how to read and write should take place. To get out of this attempted fixation, the authors once again turn to Ivan Cruz, in the work "*Várias brincadeiras*" [Several games], showing how plurality can be much more powerful than the dispute between just two sides.

Still in the field of analyzing policies that attempt to close the meanings of teaching how to read and write and curriculum, the paper *Políticas curriculares no campo da alfabetização no Brasil: dos avanços teórico-epistemológico-didáticos ao apagão contemporâneo* [Curriculum policies in the field of initial reading instruction in Brazil: from theoretical-epistemological-didactic advances to the contemporary blackout], authored by Solange Alves de Oliveira-Mendes and Carlinda Leite analyzes

the meanings of learning how to read and write and literacy present in the *BNCC* and in the *PNA*. Starting from a resumption of discussions about teaching how to read and write, the authors show the differences in conception that permeate these two documents, as well as the dispute that is established between them. They also show how there was a “[...] historical-epistemological-didactic blackout of production that preceded the *BNCC* and the *PNA*”. Thus, they argue that it is necessary, in teaching how to read and write policies, to “[...] ensure curricular stability and flexibility and guarantee the effective participation of the main segments involved”.

In *Letramento/s em Políticas Curriculares de Alfabetização: sentidos em disputa* [Literacy/Literacies in Curricular Literacy Policies: meanings in dispute], Andréia Mello Rangel, based on Derridean spectrology, shows the always impossible attempt to define the meaning of something, particularly of literacy, an aspect attempted by curricular policies, such as the *PNA*. The author shows how, alongside the attempt to restrict the meanings of literacy, there is also a movement to “[...] disqualify the experiences produced in municipalities, in school units, in a movement that seeks to say that the work carried out in schools does not favor an education of ‘good’ quality”. Thus, both curriculum and literacy go through this process of trying to surround the meanings, a process that, from the theoretical perspective adopted by the author, does not have the possibility of actually occurring.

Andrea dos Santos Gabriel and Sandra Kretli Silva take different macro policies as their object (such as *BNCC*, *PNA* and the recent Literated Child National Commitment) to problematize them based on a Deleuzian perspective, in the paper *Currículos e alfabetização: entre códigos, desvios e experimentação* [Curricula and literacy: among codes, deviations, and experimentation]. Furthermore, using conversation networks with teachers from the state of Espírito Santo, the researchers show that micropolitics are activated by teachers in the daily life of the school and also in what way they create “[...] life-affirming collective curricular movements, in an exercise of thought that opens up to the new, to the unthinkable, splitting postulates and inventing other ways of (re) existing, with art”.

It is worth noting that the *PNA* established a series of actions in addition to the document that defines what should be taught for those who are learning how to read and write. All of these actions can be understood as curricula, and this is what the paper *Diálogos [inter]ditados: formação de professores no âmbito da Política Nacional de Alfabetização e o currículo [im]posto* [[Inter]Dicted dialogues: teacher training within the context of the national literacy policy and the [im]posed curriculum] highlights. Turning its analysis to the Time to Learn Program, a teacher training action proposed by *PNA*, particularly for the Literacy Practices Course and the materials “*Práticas de Alfabetização: Livro do Professor Alfabetizador – Estratégias*” [Literacy Practices: Book of the Literacy Teacher – Strategies] (Brasil, 2021) and “*Práticas de Alfabetização: Livro de Atividades*” [Literacy Practices: Activity Book], Jânio Nunes dos Santos and Adriana Cavalcanti dos Santos show, based on the discursive perspective of Bakhtin and Volochinov, how *PNA* intends to impose a discourse that takes steps backwards in teacher training, by limiting the teaching how to read and write practices to phonic instruction. The training proposed by this course builds meanings that disregard teaching how to read and write as a discursive practice, at the same time that it proposes a light and superficial training for teachers. However, the authors defend that literacy teachers “[...] by engaging with the

ideological signs that integrate the *PNA* in defense of the discourse of innovation, scientific evidence, and effectiveness regarding systematic phonetic instruction and curriculum prescription, they can reconfigure them in the manner of the created word, the self-alien word". They argue, therefore, that there are possibilities for openness in the meanings, despite all attempts to restrict them.

The teacher training proposals promoted by *PNA* are also discussed in the paper *O Tempo de Aprender e o silenciamento do letramento no processo de alfabetização* [The *Tempo de Aprender* programme and the silence of literacy in the process of reading and writing], by Darlize Teixeira de Mello and Ramona Graciela Alves de Mello Kappi. Based on the contributions of Stephen Ball, the authors show the contexts of influence and text present in the *PNA* and problematize the way in which the Teaching how to Read and Write Practice Course silences the concept of literacy, while at the same time restricting the learning how to read and write to phonic instruction. Therefore, there is an emptying of teacher training that hides knowledge that was considered important in other training proposals.

However, other ways of thinking about teacher training for teaching how to read and write are possible, in addition to those established in major curricula. Alexandre Cougo de Cougo, Sílvia Adriana Rodrigues and Márcia Regina do Nascimento Sambugari show this in the paper *A narrativa como eixo mobilizador do currículo de um curso de formação continuada de professoras alfabetizadoras* [Narrative as the mobilizing axis of the curriculum of a continuing Education program for literacy teachers]. Taking as an object of study a continuing education course for literacy teachers in the state of Mato Grosso do Sul, on Brazil-Bolivia border, the authors analyze the course completion work carried out by literacy teachers and construct two analytical nuclei based on the narratives produced. The first nucleus shows the practices of the literacy teacher as a curriculum based on her professional experience. The narratives, in this sense, explain the experience of a curriculum that permeates teaching knowledge and constructs the way they are and exist in the profession. The second, entitled as the self-writing curriculum, highlights how the narrative proposed by the specialization course made the teachers give new meaning to certain practices and constitute their professional identity. The narratives in a training course go in the opposite direction to those prescribed in major curricula and allow us to think about other meanings for being a literacy teacher, activating different types of knowledge that enable the production of other ways of being.

If the previous paper analyzed an experience on Brazil-Bolivia border, the eighth paper that makes up the dossier, *A imigração venezuelana e o contexto da alfabetização de crianças brasileiras e venezuelanas em escolas municipais de Boa Vista, Roraima, Brasil: um olhar para as considerações da gestão* [Venezuelan immigration and the context of literacy of brazilian and venezuelan children in municipal schools in Boa Vista, Roraima, Brazil: a look at management considerations], by Leila Adriana Baptaglin, Gabrielle Oliveira, carries out an ethnography in two schools and interviews with various actors involved in the process of teaching how to read and write in order to understand the issues that permeate the teaching of reading and writing to Venezuelan immigrant children. The analysis shows how there is a centralized curriculum proposal, which follows the principles of the *Alfa e Beto* Institute, which leads to teaching how to read and write based, above all, on phonics instruction. It also highlights the many challenges posed by the issue of linguistic differences, the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and the existence of structural problems that arise from various

social factors. Even though the paper does not operate with the idea of intersectionality, it is implicit how this is an important dimension in the process of teaching how to read and write.

Issues relating to Early Childhood Education in its intersection with teaching how to read and write were also discussed in the papers of the dossier. The presence of textbooks at this level and the effects this can have on children and the curriculum are the object of study in the paper *O PNLD 2022 e a curricularização da alfabetização na Educação Infantil* [The PNLD 2022 and the literacy curricularization in early childhood education]. In it, Eliana Borges Correia de Albuquerque, Ana Catarina dos Santos Pereira Cabral and Maria da Conceição Lira da Silva analyze the two most chosen collections of textbooks for children aged 4 and 5 in some cities in the state of Pernambuco. The analysis shows that the book proposals are close to what the PNA establishes: teaching how to read and write in a phonic perspective, and the conception of Early Childhood Education as a preparatory stage for learning how to read and write. The authors conclude by saying that it is essential to guarantee a curricular organization for Early Childhood Education that does not deny “[...] children the teaching of written language involved in literacy practices, without losing sight that these experiences consider play and interactions”.

Letícia Santos da Cruz, Patrícia Corsino and Ludmila Thomé de Andrade, in turn, analyze how Early Childhood Education and Elementary School teachers at the Rio de Janeiro Municipal Department of Education conduct their practices on teaching how to read and write, based on the curricular documents of the network. In the paper *Práticas docentes em tensionamento: produção de falsetes pedagógicos a partir das propostas curriculares de leitura e escrita da Educação Infantil e do Ensino Fundamental* [Teaching practices in tension: pedagogical falsettos’ production by teachers of the Early Childhood Education and the Elementary Education], the authors work with Bakhtin to show how there are compasses and mismatches between curricular guidelines and teaching practices and how the teachers respond using pedagogical falsettos to act on this existing polyphony. They argue that the teaching statements show “[...] the contradictions present in the field of Brazilian teaching how to read and write itself, which materialize in curricular proposals that are not very consistent and that slip into different conceptions of orality, reading and writing without taking a position”.

In the search for consistent guidelines that can support curricular productions for literacy, Carina Venanzetti and Mónica Baez in the article *El objeto de enseñanza en la alfabetización inicial, un campo de controversias y disputas* [The object of teaching initial literacy in Primary Education schools, a field of controversies and disputes], a field of controversies and disputes defend theoretical-methodological perspectives that give meaning to the conception of literacy understood as a process individual psycholinguistic, as a sociocultural practice and as a right.

The Education of Young People, Adults and the Elderly is covered in the paper *Investigações sobre o currículo para a alfabetização de jovens, adultos e idosos: o que dizem as propostas?* [Investigating literacy discipline matrices developed for youngsters, adults and elderly individuals: what do their propositions suggest?]. The focus is on the proposals for municipal networks in the State of Rio de Janeiro. In the triad, *Educação de Jovens e Adultos – EJA* [Youth and Adult Education], curriculum and teaching how to read and write, Jaqueline Luzia da Silva shows how curricular proposals are often aligned with the *BNCC*, which indicates an erasure of the characteristics specific

to this modality. The specificities of the elderly are also ignored in many of these proposals, as well as specific teacher training for Youth and Adult Education. Thus, the author advocates the need for “[...] an important reflection on the recognition of a curriculum that breaks the limits of training for the construction of necessary, valid and useful knowledge towards a curriculum conceived as a practice of enunciation of meanings”.

The paper that closes this dossier articulates different categories for thinking about the process of teaching how to read and write. Entitled *Currículo, alfabetização e interseccionalidade na educação de pessoas surdas* [Curriculum, literacy, and intersectionality in the education of deaf people], the text problematizes reports and situations in an Youth and Adult Education class in the city of Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil, to show the intersectional relationships of disability, gender, social class, work and race in teaching processes of reading and writing for deaf students, in the light of post-critical curriculum theories. Based on the reading of the short story “*Circuito fechado*” [Closed circuit] – by Ricardo Ramos –, Cláudio Eduardo de Resende Alves, Rebeca Cristina Nunes Lloyd Gonçalves and Luciana Aparecida Guimarães de Freitas do an articulated work to (de)structure the language and also the intersectional categories addressed. Thus, it highlights the possibility of showing how “different social markers can cross curricular practices, providing opportunities for other compositions and other readings of the world”.

We hope that reading the papers gathered here will be an invitation to produce other ways of thinking about teaching how to read and write, curriculum and interaction between them. It was possible to realize that, based on the most different theoretical perspectives and experiences from different parts of the country, the analysis of the pair, which, as we pointed out at the beginning of this presentation, is often not put in relation, is very useful for us to think about education beyond what the major curricula define. Our desire with this dossier is to disclose some meanings and significations that, far from being homogeneous and harmonious, show the richness of the debate and open up ways for us to think about education in other ways.

References

BHABHA, Homi. *O local de cultura*. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2001.

BRASIL. Lei nº 11.274, de 6 de fevereiro de 2006. Altera a redação dos arts. 29, 30, 32 e 87 da lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. DF: *Diário Oficial da União*, p. 1, 7 fev. 2006.

BRASIL. Portaria nº 867, de 4 de julho de 2012. Institui o Pacto Nacional pela Alfabetização na Idade Certa e as ações do Pacto e define suas diretrizes gerais. *Diário Oficial da União*: seção 1, Brasília, DF, n. 129, p. 22-23, 5 jul. 2012.

BRASIL. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular*. Brasília: MEC, 2017.

BRASIL. Portaria nº 4, de 4 de janeiro de 2018. Institui o Programa Mais Alfabetização, que visa fortalecer e apoiar as Unidades Escolares no processo de alfabetização dos estudantes regularmente matriculados nos 1º e 2º anos iniciais do ensino fundamental. *Diário Oficial da União*: seção 1, Brasília, DF, n. 4, p. 15-16, 5 jan. 2018.

BRASIL. *Política Nacional de Alfabetização*. Brasília: MEC; SEALF, 2019.

CALDEIRA, Maria Carolina; FRANGELLA, Rita de Cássia. Letramento em políticas curriculares de alfabetização: relações de poder-saber em torno do conceito cunhado por Magda Soares. *Revista Brasileira de Alfabetização*, n. 20, p. 1-14. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.47249/rba2023748>

FRANGELLA, Rita de Cássia. Políticas de formação do alfabetizador e produção de políticas curriculares: pactuando sentidos para formação, alfabetização e currículo. *Práxis Educativa*, v. 11, n. 1, p. 107-128, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.5212/PraxEduc.v.11i1.0005>

LOPES, Alice Casemiro; BORGES, Verônica. Currículo, conhecimento e interpretação. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, v. 17, n. 3, p. 555-573, 2017. <https://www.curriculosemfronteiras.org/vol17iss3articles/lopes-borges.pdf>

MACEDO, Elizabeth. Base nacional comum para currículos: direitos de aprendizagem e desenvolvimento para quem? *Educação e Sociedade*, v. 36, n. 133, p. 891-908, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1590/ES0101-73302015155700>

PARÁISO, Marlucy. Currículo e seus Dizeres, Fazeres e Quereres: vontade de potência de uma professora? *Educação & Realidade*, v. 47, e124429, 2022. <https://seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/educacaoerealidade/article/view/124429>

ROLNIK, Suely. *Esferas da insurreição*. Notas para uma vida não cafetinada. 2. ed. São Paulo: N1-edições, 2021.

SOARES, Magda. Letramento. *Glossário Ceale*, Belo Horizonte, 2018. <https://www.ceale.fae.ufmg.br/glossarioceale/verbetes/letramento>

MARIA CAROLINA DA SILVA CALDEIRA

PhD in Education, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil; Professor of the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais UFMG), Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

RITA DE CÁSSIA PRAZERES FRANGELLA

PhD in Education, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Full Professor of Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Author 1 – conception and design of the work; construction and processing of data; analysis and interpretation of data; writing and reviewing the final text.

Author 2 – conception and design of the work; construction and processing of data; analysis and interpretation of data; writing and reviewing the final text.

SUPPORT/FINANCING

CNPq Bolsa Produtividade em Pesquisa 308366/2022-0
FAPERJ - Cientista do Nosso Estado - E-26/200.430/2023
Prociencia UERJ

RESEARCH DATA AVAILABILITY

All data was generated/analyzed in this article.

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

CALDEIRA, Maria Carolina da Silva; FRANGELLA, Rita de Cássia Prazeres. Teaching how to read and write and curriculum: between the fixation of meanings and the Curriculum and literacy: meanings in dispute in the search for other possibilities. *Educar em Revista*. v. 40, e95436, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-0411.95436>

This article was translated by Janete Bridon and revised by Louise Potter, E-mail: deolhonotexto@gmail.com. After being designed, it was submitted for validation by the author(s) before publication.

Received: 10/23/2023

Approved: 05/16/2024

Este é um artigo de acesso aberto distribuído nos termos de licença Creative Commons.

