

Arts, Linguistics, Literature and Language Research Journal

LANGUAGE AND SILENCING: AN ANALYSIS OF THE TREATMENT GIVEN TO THE MOTHER TONGUE IN PRIMARY EDUCATION BASED IN NARRATIVES OF PORTUGUESE LANGUAGE TEACHERS

William Soares dos Santos

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro –
UFRJ

Debora Mazzeo Caputo

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro –
UFRJ

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: This research aims at analyzing some of the difficulties faced by Portuguese language teachers in the production of an epistemologically based, multicultural and aggregating mother tongue teaching in the context of peripheral realities of basic education. Thus, based on the analysis of the narratives of Portuguese language teachers working in the Elementary two and High School segments of certain public schools located in suburban areas of the state of Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), we propose to build reflections on the subjectivities of their discourses and identify the possible components that hinder the production of a heterogeneous and epistemologically based language teaching. Due to the nature of the research (essentially qualitative and interpretative), the analysis was elaborated from the theoretical pillars proposed by Narrative Studies and Interpretative Analysis. It was possible to observe that the narratives of the Portuguese Language teachers were constructed in order to explain some of the challenges faced by them in relation to the integration of linguistic variation in the current teaching methodology, such as: dichotomy between the view of language as a substantiated epistemological object and a vision of language as a normative object; performance of pedagogical instruments in the perpetuation of prescriptive teaching; inconsistencies between official guidelines and professional performance and the existence of linguistic prejudice in the school environment.

Keywords: Mother tongue's teaching and learning; Narrative studies; Applied Linguistics

INTRODUCTION - THE LANGUAGE THAT LEADS

In 1960, sociolinguistics emerged in the educational field, as a counterpoint to structuralist and generativist currents in language teaching. In this way, the teaching of Portuguese as a mother tongue gave rise to debates that are perpetuated until the present time and presents itself as a great challenge for Portuguese language teachers in basic education segments in Brazil.

According to Gorski and Coelho (2009), the current L1 teaching methodology is not efficient in terms of the commitment to train citizens who build their ideas and are able to express themselves in different linguistic contexts of use, in society "In terms of teaching, With regard to a conception of language and grammar, language, in general, is seen as a homogeneous system, therefore historically and socially decontextualized since it is immediately disconnected from its users." (Gorski and Coelho, 2009, p.74).

Mattos and Silva (1989) point out that the teaching of Portuguese in basic education segments exclusively focused on a homogeneous and unique grammar concept, called Traditional Grammar, and guided by the standard-norm, generates a significant distance between students and students. its respective object of study, the mother tongue itself, in addition to contributing directly to the maintenance of a historically elitist system of linguistic domination.

If we transpose to today that which traditional grammar refers to, we can see that it reinforces the "elite dialect", that it reinforces patterns of use which are typical of a dominant class, that its teaching (whether well or badly) does to silence all other uses (Mattos e Silva, 1989, p.89).

In this scenario, the teacher and their respective teaching resources used in Portuguese classes (in this context, the

normative grammar of the Portuguese language), assume the role of holders of linguistic knowledge, often erasing the knowledge belonging to their students, who are also native speakers of Brazilian Portuguese.

In this way, students are considered only receptors in the teaching-learning process and the teacher-student relationship is established in a vertical way, without the student elaborating linguistic reflections or using his experience of the world as a contribution to the learning built in the classroom. According to Franchi (1988), the treatment reserved for linguistic variation in current Portuguese language teaching is still guided by judgment standards imposed by the prescriptive teaching methodology and has not moved towards the construction of a scientific language teaching that recognizes the Linguistic semiosis of Brazilian Portuguese.

It was accepted out of comfort and without reflecting that language and grammar were really a place of oppression and rule, perhaps stimulated by the mistaken and unfortunate attribution of a fascist coloring to natural languages, as a system of rules. Every effort at traditional systematization, in linguistics, came under suspicion, as they did not understand its purposes (Franchi, 1988, p.36-37).

The present article aims at investigating the treatment given to linguistic variation in the practice of teaching Portuguese, and to investigate, through the analysis of the narrative of two Portuguese language teachers from the Public Education Network of Rio de Janeiro. The narratives are focused on the difficulties in integrating of the faces of linguistic variation in Portuguese classes in the second segment of Elementary School.

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF NORMS: A SOCIO-HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

As a starting point for the discussion on linguistic studies adopted in the Teaching of Mother Tongue in Brazilian schools, it is important to clarify the historical emergence of norms linked to the national language, a process unknown to many Brazilian Portuguese speakers.

Faraco (2005) explains that the conceptualization of linguistic norms arose from the understanding that linguistic variation takes place as a concrete and essential component of any natural language. Thus, the need arose to capture the different forms of language manifestations, since each language has, necessarily, diversities that constitute them, which are directly related to the political and social aspects of the societies they integrate.

Faraco (2005) [8] defines linguistic norm as “the set of linguistic phenomena (phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical) that are current, customary, habitual in a given speech community” (Faraco, 2005). The author states that each and every norm is organized and is present in different communities of practice. It is possible to define the concept of community of practice as “a locus of engagement in action, interpersonal relations, shared knowledge and negotiation of enterprises” (Wenger, 1998, p. 85). Therefore, if a speaker’s utterance is based on a norm of one of his communities of practice, it is unfounded to characterize his expression as an error, or to analyze it from the systematic perspective of another norm.

[...] By this we mean that languages are always on the move, but never lose their systemic character and never let the speakers down. In other words, languages change, but they continue to be organized and offer their speakers the necessary resources for the circulation of meanings in society (Faraco, 2005, p. 14).

Therefore, Portuguese, like all other so called natural languages, is intrinsically heterogeneous. Each group within a community has particular characteristics in its linguistic manifestations that differ from other groups. Such manifestations can be understood as linguistic varieties, defined by Faraco as “(...) the different modalities of language existing within a given society.” (Faraco, 2005, p.10).

During the 15th century, in Europe, there was a linguistic search for a normative linguistic instrument, essentially political, with the objective of reducing regional and social linguistic diversity, which was later called “standard norm”.

According to Faraco (2005), it is possible to understand as a standard norm, the one referring to the models present in normative grammars. The concept of this norm is a partially abstract, social and historical denomination taken as a reference for the attempt at linguistic standardization, that is, an abstraction representative of the neutralization of the many varieties present in the language: “A relatively abstract codification, an extralinguistic beacon of the use real to serve as a reference, in societies marked by accentuated dialect, to projects of linguistic uniformity” (Faraco, 2005, p.12).

According to the author, the designation “cultured” was historically constructed, based on the appropriation of written culture by groups of speakers belonging to the speech communities of a particular norm. These, from the privileged positions they occupied in the economic and social structure, generated the construction of labels, such as that of “more cultured” speakers, transforming the language into an instrument for the perpetuation of power and social domination.

The cultures that operate with writing - which is, due to its properties, history and social functions, a more stable and permanent reality than the spoken language

- develop a language pattern, which, codified in grammars, cultivated by the literate and taught by schools, acquires a status of stability and permanence greater than the other varieties of the language, consequently functioning not only as a restraint of changes, but mainly as a reference point for the image that speakers build of the language (Faraco, 2005, p. 15).

During the 19th century, the imposition of a standard Brazilian norm took place as a reaction to the ideas of romantic authors. This movement had as secondary objectives to achieve cultural and literary independence and autonomy, generated from the initial political independence of Brazil in relation to Portugal. Simultaneously, criticisms of this ideal were elaborated by Portuguese intellectuals, who judged the linguistic manifestations carried out by Brazilians as erroneous or deficient manifestations of European Portuguese and who did not see them from the aspects of Brazilian Portuguese, which differed from those constituents of European Portuguese.

At that moment, the various differences between the two varieties, European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese, were already observable, especially at the phonetic-phonological level. Due to this, the characteristics of spoken Brazilian Portuguese, when transposed to writing, came to be considered as linguistic deviations, which culminated in the vision of a Brazilian Portuguese that represented a deficient reflection of European cultured Portuguese.

With this, the diffusion of an ideal of refusal to the manifestations of the originally Brazilian cultured Portuguese began, through the implementation of a strong system of incentive to school education focused on European cultured Portuguese, taking this as the only reference norm. This aversion to the linguistic manifestations of Brazilian Portuguese, spoken by literate speakers, according to Bagno (1997), demonstrates the

dependence and subordination status that Brazil still maintained with Portugal, despite having passed, until that moment, many years since its independence.

The Portuguese language is very well, thank you, spoken and written by more and more people, it has produced an internationally known literature, it is also propagated at an international level due to the great prestige that MPB (Brazilian Popular Music) enjoys. And the avalanche of foreign words has to be analyzed from the perspective of the political-economic (and consequently cultural) dependence of Brazil (and Portugal) on the world centers of power (Bagno, 1997, p. 23).

It is necessary to understand that such prejudiced positions belonged to the political project of part of the Brazilian elite, which sought the construction of a homogeneously white society and propagator of European values and standards of the time, while denying the Brazilian socio-historical roots, representatives of a completely distinct from that of European industry.

It is the same clumsy conception according to which Brazil is an underdeveloped country because its population is not a pure race, but the result of a - negative - mixture of races, two of which, black and indigenous, are inferior to the white European. Now, a long time ago, science destroyed the myth of pure race, which is an absurd concept, with no possibility of verification in the reality of any people, however isolated they may be. Thus, a race that is not "pure" could not speak a pure language (Bagno, 1997, p. 21).

Finally, according to the author, this elitist linguistic perception was structurally adopted by society and also by the Brazilian educational system and, in this way, contributed to the construction of a mother tongue teaching that is perpetuated to the present, defined as univocal, that is, focused only on a linguistic norm and, in turn, excluding.

TYPES OF L1 TEACHING

Bagno (1997) [19] criticizes the Brazilian educational system by stating that it presents itself as utopian and inefficient in terms of training language users. According to the author, these are consequences of an abstract L1 teaching, in which judgments about the varieties of Brazilian Portuguese occur based only on what is prescribed by the standard norm, which also encourages the perpetuation of extreme social judgments of correctness and errors, and as a consequence, it generates interpretations that attribute a pejorative character to the linguistic manifestations of popular varieties.

The traditional methods of teaching Portuguese in Brazil aim to train Portuguese teachers! The teaching of stricter normative grammar, the terminological obsession, the attachment to nomenclatures - nothing serves to form a good user. We, yes, teachers, have to know in depth the hardware, the complete mechanics of the language (...). We therefore need to redirect all our efforts to develop new ways that allow us to make our students good users of their programs (Bagno, 1997, p.108 - 109).

Thus, by restricting the teaching practice, based only on the standard norm, the teacher establishes a teaching process that does not value linguistic reflection. Because it is uncritical, it does not prioritize the relationship between the school education system and the development of skills aimed at life in a democratic society. In this context, with the objective of elaborating reformulating pedagogical reflections that relate linguistic diversity to the social realities they represent, it is important to clarify fundamental notions of distinction between prescriptive, descriptive and productive language teaching.

According to Travaglia (2009), prescriptive teaching is predominantly present in the current scenario of the Brazilian educational system and aims to replace the linguistic uses

practiced by students, usually considered as erroneous manifestations compared to standardized and socially institutionalized manifestations as acceptable.

[...] Prescriptive teaching aims to lead the student to replace their own patterns of linguistic activity considered wrong/unacceptable, with others considered correct/acceptable. It is, therefore, teaching that interferes with existing language skills. It is at the same time prescriptive, as each 'do this' corresponds to a 'don't do that' (Travaglia, 2009, p.38) [22].

On the other hand, the author explains that descriptive language teaching aims to demonstrate the linguistic functioning of a given natural language, through real linguistic facts, based on concrete data of the reality experienced by teachers and students in the classroom. This perspective thus encourages the linguistic investigation of skills already acquired by students, without the purpose of modifying them, while simultaneously provoking reflection on the possible contexts of use of these manifestations:

"Descriptive teaching [...] skills already acquired, without trying to change them, but showing how they can be used. In this type of teaching, the mother tongue plays a relevant role because it is the one that the student knows the most. It deals with all varieties" (Travaglia, 2009, p.39).

For Bakhtin (2003), when understanding language as a mere communicative instrument, some important characteristics intrinsic to it are erased, such as the manifestation of students' personal identity, which can also prevent it from being used as a means of social transformation. Through this perspective, the author states that it is from the recognition of the numerous grouped identities that students become active in the learning process, becoming bi-dialectal citizens and subjects of their own discourses.

Because discourse can only really exist in

the form of concrete utterances by certain speakers, subjects of discourse. Discourse is always fused in the form of an utterance belonging to a given subject of discourse, and outside this form it cannot exist. As different as the utterances are in terms of volume, content, compositional construction, they have peculiarities as units of discursive communication (Bakhtin, 2003, p. 274-275).

Soares (2002) emphasizes that the attempt of a strictly descriptive teaching, directed exclusively to linguistic use, would also collaborate to maintain the gap in the current system, because when opting exclusively for a language study perspective to be applied in practice teaching, there is the exclusion of knowledge about normativity and prestige variables. In this way, the teaching of Portuguese would remain inefficient, as it would not form bi-dialectal citizens, that is, those who are aware of the value of all linguistic manifestations in society and capable of using them effectively in different contexts of use.

The most widely adopted stance from the perspective of dialectal differences is that of bi-dialectalism: speakers of the non-standard dialect must learn the standard dialect, in order to use it in situations where it is required: that is, the educational solution would be a functional bi-dialectalism (SOARES, 2002, pg. 49).

According to Travaglia (2009), the approach called "productive education" proposes that the concept of L1 be treated in the teaching-learning process as a set of linguistic varieties, in order to develop a better critical understanding of social value of the different norms of Brazilian Portuguese, recognizing and valuing those that are used by students in their speech communities. On the other hand, it would also carry out scientific criticism of the pre-established standard norm in the Portuguese language, in addition to pointing to possible reformulations in the context of teaching.

Productive teaching aims to teach new

language skills. [...] does not seek to change standards that the student has already acquired, but to increase the resources he has and to do so in such a way that he has at his disposal, for proper use, the greatest possible scale of potential of his language, in all different situations in which you need it (Travaglia, 2009, p.39-40).

In relation to the productive teaching of L1, Travaglia (2009) points out that it is the role of the school to develop and stimulate the language skills of students, in a movement that leads to the expansion of linguistic resources according to social interaction needs. Travaglia (2009) argues that contemplating the descriptive and productive dimensions of language teaching would therefore be a viable option to start the reformulation of teaching Portuguese as a mother tongue. Because in this way the study of linguistic inter and intravarieties would be established, starting from the perspective that a language represents a set of varieties, the author recommends that grammar be studied as a “scientific doing” subject to reflections, criticisms and reformulations elaborated together.

Travaglia (2009) points out that the most effective way to establish an emancipatory language teaching would be to work together with teaching approaches in the classroom: “[...] purpose of obtaining the best possible result: the expansion of the students’ linguistic resources, in order to maximize their expressive, communicative and interactional possibilities” (Travaglia, p. 201).

Therefore, the author states that these approaches should be used by teachers in a complementary way to each other and according to the objective that is intended to be achieved, also creating the opportunity for students to refuse the position of mere passive in the teaching-learning process and initiate their respective participation in an active way in the linguistic studies produced in the classroom.

THE INVISIBILITY OF KNOWLEDGE

According to Pereira (2011), it is possible to observe different didactic-methodological conceptions in the current teaching of Portuguese language, which are defined by Almeida Filho (2005) as “a set of recommended procedures to teach a language well and that are explainable by a of assumptions” (Almeida Filho, 2005, p. 63). Thus, due to the lack of a harmonious system regarding the objective, method and linguistic assessment, educators assume different pedagogical standpoints in the production of language teaching. When considering the above perspective, it is possible to perceive the gap between theory and practice in the educational field. Graduate professors sometimes fail to establish a dialogism between practice and “learned” theoretical linguistic studies, as they tend to perceive these two dimensions separately, instead of conceiving knowledge as the intelligible product originated from simultaneous and continuous work, without the need to delineate separatist borders.

According to Tardif (2002), it is possible to observe that the teaching profession presents itself as epistemologically plural, since a teacher is formed by several different types of knowledge, such as personal and family knowledge; knowledge from school training; knowledge from training in the teaching profession; knowledge from textbook programs and the requirements of the basic curriculum; knowledge from professional experience. Therefore, it is an ethical mistake to expect the educator to offer his students a univocal teaching, based only on one of his knowledge areas to the detriment of all the others. However, the educational system insists on perpetuating an incompatible Portuguese language teaching, and on inducing the Portuguese teacher to deal with a pedagogical paradox, because while

the educator receives guidance from official documents of pedagogical guidelines, such as the National Curricular Common Base, which suggests adding the diversities and linguistic knowledge of its students, it needs, simultaneously, to work with normative instruments that still serve as Ideological State Apparatuses; such as, for example: external and school network assessments that prioritize the standard norm based on the proposal of strictly metalinguistic activities and textbooks that perpetuate a univocal knowledge of the language.

In this way, when these requirements are fulfilled, one or more knowledges of the educators are erased in the elaboration of the learning construction, and consequently, the quality of the education offered is automatically compromised so that the determinations of a system, which is, in turn, outside the classroom, formed by education departments and administrative bodies, are met (Tardif, 2002, p.82). Therefore, the State, by not adopting the principles of educational sociolinguistics as a basis for the formation of literate students, perpetuates a teaching of Portuguese language incompatible with the reality of the speakers, and forces the Portuguese teacher to deal with a pedagogical paradox, which generates the mutual invisibility of those who should be protagonists of the educational process, that is, teachers and students, in favor of the centralization of teaching in an abstract linguistic frame.

CONTROL OF TEACHING WORK

According to Apple and Tielbaun (1991), it is possible to observe the existence of a system of intensification of the functions performed by teachers, which directly affects the quality of teaching offered in the classroom by making it impossible for educators to offer a broadly qualitative teaching due to the focus on in quantitative teaching, concerned

with deadlines to be followed, goals to be achieved, number of tasks to be performed, which disregard the reality of teaching that is built by teachers and students: “Instead of professionals who care a lot about what do, and because they do, we can have executors alienated from other people’s plans” (Apple and Tielbaun, 1991, p.67).

For Lemos (2011), these issues are considered more than just educational issues, as they prove to be “(...) contributing factors to the process of illness of the teaching professional” (Lemos, 2011, p. 22), in which this, due to the lack of guidelines and professional valorization, needs to deal with the paradoxes that exist in the educational field; comply with all the numerous functions assigned to it; dedicating significant time outside the classroom to the development of theoretical material; lack of time to invest in continuing education and dedicate themselves to leisure.

Lemos (2011) describes as characteristics of the phenomenon of the precariousness of teaching work in public school units: the work overload that generates the teachers’ loss of control (about this, see also Reis & Santos, 2019) over their academic projects and the damage to continuing professional training due to the multiplicity of tasks they are assigned to. forced to assume responsibility, which sometimes causes these professionals to become ill and to waste time devoted to improving their work and personal activities.

NARRATIVES AND NARRATIVES IN INTERVIEW

Labov (1972) established himself as the forerunner of narrative studies in real contexts and he identified that through the act of narrating it is possible to point to component aspects of the social structure, as well as “recreating our own individualities, giving life to the characters with whom we interact in the

everyday life” (Labov, 1972). In the Labovian conception (1972), the narratives follow a fixed and common structure and are, at first, introduced through the Summary, they are developed through the Orientation. After the presentation and contextualization of the main narrative elements, the development of Complicating Actions takes place, a moment in which, frequently, the narrator performs Evaluations regarding the central events of the narrated story. Finally, at the end of the narrative occurs with the presentation of the results or resolutions obtained after the complicating event and is marked by the Coda, the final statement that indicates the conclusion of the story.

Ricoeur (1980) argues that every narrative has two dimensions that act in different proportions, one corresponding to the chronological time of the narration, that is, the sequence of narrated events, while the other would be the one corresponding to the significant units that would attribute meaning to the plot. Ricoeur understands temporality as the structure of existence that reaches language through narrativity, and this, in turn, as the structure of language that has temporality as its final referent (Ricoeur, 1980).

Allied to Ricoeur’s (1980) perception, Mishler (2002) states that linear temporality does not correspond to the hybrid, subjective and mutable character of the experiences lived by social beings and the contexts in which they are inserted. For him, the social subject, when narrating his/her experience, is continually attributing new meanings and reliving the narrated moments in a way that is not similar to the way he experienced them for the first time. He argues that in narrative research one should build looks that contemplate the perception of psychological, historical, cultural and social elements that integrate, in turn, the act of narrating. In

addition to considering that, among the gaps in a narrative, there are also meanings in what is not said, since the act of narrating presupposes choices.

According to Clandinin and Connely (2008), narrative research contributes to the development of studies in the educational area by recognizing the complexities of educational experiences and presenting itself as a way to understand them, since this process would also imply getting to know life closely. itself, as Dewey (1938) does when he states that “Life is Education. We learn Education by thinking about life, just as we learn about life by thinking about Education” (Dewey, 1938). It is possible to observe, therefore, from the perspective of Dewey (1938), that the concepts of life, education and experience are closely related, which allows the research to be directed towards subjective aspects of the relationships existing in the classroom that, generally, are not considered and investigated by traditional science.

Barkhuizen (2008) states that teachers are professionals familiar with the act of storytelling, since their professional practices involve the creation and use of narratives so that the qualitative development of the educational experience occurs. Thus, the author suggests that narrative research can be adopted as a tool through which teachers reflect on their past and future professional experiences, as well as on their respective roles in the construction of their students’ educational experience.

To Bruner (1997) the narrative is an essential resource to organize the educational experiences of those who experience them, at the same time that it helps the subjects of the educational process “to create a version of the world in which they can envision a place for themselves, a personal world” (BRUNER, 1997, p.81). In parallel, Santos (2012), based on the analysis of narratives in an educational

context, observes that it is possible to understand the ways in which the characters of the educational experience, students and teachers, located in a given socio-historical context, project their social identities relative “[...] both in its micro aspect (the discourse production environment) and in its macro aspects (its relationship with the different environments)” (SANTOS, 2012, p.254). In this way, subjects become capable of conveying, through narratives, their expectations, frustrations and other feelings. In another investigation, Santos (2013) points out that “the perception that people use narrative not only to (re)construct past events, but, among other objectives, so that such events are also interpreted according to the representations of the past is central. they want.” (SANTOS, 2013, p.24). In this way, an individual’s social identity, even if not explicitly contested, can be expressed from the adaptations made to the social structures in his narrative.

Based on the above considerations, it is important to note that the present study is aligned with a research model of a qualitative and interpretive nature and intends to observe how the participating teachers narrate their affective experiences. The analyzed narratives, in turn, will be consolidated through semi-structured, co-constructed interviews, considering that the subjects with whom knowledge is constructed must be enrolled in the practice of knowledge production (MOITA LOPES, 2006). It is important to point out that the data generation instrument chosen for this research was the semi-structured interview, due to the adopted understanding of the research’s discursive directiveness, that is, the perception that the generated meanings must be constructed during the research process. interaction between interviewer and interviewee, and should not pursue preconceived analysis expectations (MISHLER, 1991).

The present work uses the interview as a methodological research tool, understanding this, according to Bastos & Santos (2013, p.11), “[...] as an interactional event in which participants use different discursive elements in order to create and maintain social interaction”. Based on this assumption, the interview, when used as a methodological instrument, through which an essentially interactive event emerges, requires mutual engagement on the part of the interviewer and the interviewee during the process of its construction.

According to Bastos & Santos (2013), interviews act as favorable contexts for the emergence of narratives, which, in turn, are also characterized as co-constructed processes through the discourse produced by the narrator together with the interpellations made by the interlocutor (BASTOS & SANTOS, 2013). Therefore, it is concluded that the researcher is inscribed in the historical, social and cultural context in which the interview takes place and presents himself as an agent in the process of construction of meanings. Therefore, the authors guide the researcher of narrative analysis not to behave as if he obtained the privilege of distancing in relation to his object of study, nor with superiority of knowledge in the development of his function, which corresponds to the creation of intelligibility about the narrative act.

PROFILE OF THE INTERVIEWEES

It is important to clarify that we chose to assign pseudonyms to both professors in order to preserve their respective civil and professional identities.

Maria, forty-six years old, has been teaching Portuguese for seventeen years and has been working for eight years at a high school belonging to the State Education Network in the outskirts of Duque de Caxias city, located in the west side (outskirts) of Rio

de Janeiro State.

Nina, fifty-two years old, has been working for eighteen years as a Portuguese language teacher in elementary school 2 (6th to 9th grade) of the Municipal Education Network, in a school located in the Vila da Penha neighborhood, a suburb of the city of Rio de Janeiro.

FIRST ANALYSIS

At the beginning of the interview, Maria introduces her speech referring to her career time, building a kind of initial setting to legitimize her place of speech as an educator: “<Well::> ... I’ve been teaching::no::: for many years and I’ve been working in teaching for eight years at the fundamental two” (line 2).

The introductory question is intentionally asked in order to develop the narrator’s reflection on the main difficulties encountered by students in the teaching process - learning Brazilian Portuguese, her natural language.

In her answer, the teacher constructs an equivalence of meanings between learning the mother tongue and teaching normative grammar. Thus, when stating that language teaching is the same as grammar teaching, she disregards the students’ previous linguistic knowledge: “And they (students) have a lot of difficulty in learning grammar these days. Portuguese classes are always a double challenge, much more than literature and writing classes” (lines 2-3).

The educator shows indignation in relation to her students’ failure to understand the normativity of grammatical matters, such as pronominal placement. “they sometimes reach the eighth” and ninth grades without learning pronominal placement” (line 5-6).

According to Faraco (2005), the pronominal placement model expressed in traditional Portuguese grammars is still based on the phonetic and linguistic pattern of European Portuguese speakers and does not

correspond, in turn, to the natural linguistic manifestations used by any class of native speakers of the Portuguese language. Brazilian portuguese.

Why do we still insist so much that the enclisis, that is, the placement of unstressed pronouns after the verb, should be considered as the correct position of these pronouns in the sentence, if the natural position of oblique pronouns in Brazilian Portuguese is, in fact, the proclisis? Why are our real manifestations considered wrong? (Faraco, 2005, p.43).

Maria demonstrates a prescriptive methodological and pedagogical stance, in which she seeks to replace the linguistic use of her students with manifestations considered grammatically correct, as she states in the following excerpt: “But the teacher’s role is to correct, because if we say that it is acceptable, they continue to reproduce the language in such a way, they will not be able to obey the rules of grammar.” (lines 43-44).

However, it is possible to observe in his speech, the failure of the implementation of this method, since despite the corrections consecutively made by the teacher, after some time, students intuitively return to using the same manifestations that were previously part of their linguistic repertoire:

And no matter how many times you teach the correct form, many still persist in the same error, you know?! You spend three classes working on pronominal placement exercises, and then a few hours after the course is over, they’re there saying “for me to do” again and you need to correct it again (lines 8-10).

According to Bagno (1997), the shortcomings of the prescriptive teaching methodology continue not to be recognized by the Brazilian school system. In this way, students, as the characters with the least symbolic force in this scenario, are blamed for the difficulty in understanding and using

1	Debora:	Do you observe difficulties in the relationship between the students and the mother tongue taught in class? If yes, what would they be?
2	Maria:	<Well:> ... I've been teaching::no:: for many years and I've been working in teaching for eight years at the
3		fundamental two And the::y:: ((students)) have LOTS of difficulty in learning
4		grammar these days::s ... Portuguese class is always a do::ble challenge,
5		MU::ch mo::re than literature and writing ... they sometimes reach the eighth
6		and ninth grades without learning pronominal placement or without knowing the difference in usage
7		of the pronouns me and I ... >And no matter how many times you< teach the correct form
8		many still persist in the same error, you know:: - you pass::: three::s::, four classes
9		working on pronoun placement exercises, and:: afte::r a few hours after::is
10		that the subject was closed, they are THERE saying "for me to do" again and you
11		need to fix it AGAIN... which ends up being:: completely inefficient
12	Debora:	Why do you consider it ineffective?
13	Maria:	For many facto::rs, YOU SEE:: ... Youth:: from, from to::day is totally technological:: and::
14		they:: are increasingly being discouraged from reading... ? and when they read >only read<
15		nonsense on the internet, with all:: of this abbreviation system - which, sometimes,
16		we found them using EVEN on EVALUA::TIONS... Many of them were never:: rammed into
17		a library to study or read some machadian ¹ work or wrote postal ca::rds,
18		>this is what we used to do<, they only reproduce what they have contact with,
19		and often::s ... the family itself does not have a degree of education and does not know
20		even what is a Machado de Assis... The thing is:: - is:: ... COMPLICATED ((laughs))
21	Debora:	And during these classes... you seek the contribution of the prior linguistic knowledge
22		that they have for the development of the explanation
23		of the grammatical subject?
24	Maria:	They ... ? Rarely participate when called upon... Some are more
25		smart, more daring, and sometimes contribute by talking or correcting colleagues who
26		were somehow wrong in the answer, you know:: ... But anyway, I,
27		particularly, I opt for a more expository class:: because otherwise::, it becomes a mess, >you can understand that, right? <
28		... and also to prevent them from causing embarrassment between them
29	Debora:	Because of the corrections they make to each other?
30	Maria:	::exactly::: but not always ... Sometimes it's also positive that:: ... because they
31		demonstrate that they are able to grasp the content ... When they do these
32		corrections naturally... Sometimes... they do it to impress and end up getting it wrong
33		when trying to correct their classmates ((laughs)) There was a day, where a student said "Did the
34		Geography TEACHER COME? I ain't see him today" And another corrected "I didn't see:: him::
35		TODAY" In general, I cut them so they don't become a reason for more serious things or
36		originate problems >Adolescents can be cruel< right ((laughs))
37	Debora:	You:: ... consider that this methodology of correction of the linguistic manifestations
38		of students have linguistic prejudice interference?
39	Maria:	I think::: ... that unconsciously the way you do it creates PREconceptions ((gestures
40		quotation marks)) about your scholastic training and your social origin... I believe that
41		<depending on the situation> there are cases where they correct their colleagues to
42		belittle them and other cases, which is when and::: they just want to show:: that they know

1. Reference to the work of Brazilian writer Machado de Assis (1839-1908), considered for many scholars one of the most important Brazilian writers of all times.

43		the correct form because they managed to learn the given content... >But< the role
44		of the teacher is to correct ((the students)), because if we say:: we believe it is acceptable
45		for them to continue reproducing the language in such a way, they will not be able to obey
46		the grammatic rules::
47	Debora:	So, in your opinion, how would you be :: an efficient Portuguese language teaching?
48	Maria:	I believe::: that::: > could be better < ... I miss::: Lack of guidance about
49		how to proceed in certain pedagogical situations and I believe that there should be a
50		link between Portuguese:: and students, YOU SEE::? ... And these innovations from Pcns ²
51		and Bncc ³ are still very:: abstract... Because when we enter to teach, in the end, what
52		we have to do is to teach grammar if that's what will be asked for in college entrance
53		exams... >and everything out there<

1	Debora:	Do you observe difficulties in the relationship between the students and the mother tongue
2		ta::ught in class? If yes, which ones would they be?
3	Nina:	Yes:::m, in fact ... With ma:::ny years of teaching, I have always identified that the greatest
4		problem in the classroom is they do not identify themselves in what is passed to them
5		... With Portuguese, >for example<, they put in their heads what? they have to
6		learn everything from scratch, as if they were blank sheets = So::: I don:::t like
7		Very much of using some textbooks... because grammars, >mostly<,
8		don't make it clear:: that Portuguese is the opposite of everything they
9		do:::, spea::k, write ... I prefer to produce autonomous materials, but this is very
10		hard right ... because you:::we have to follow the net: planning, so:::o ALWAYS is
11		It's a race against time and the teacher has to turn around in fifi:::ty
12	Debora:	So::: you::: consider that THIS is the main reason for the difficulty of
13		the students in classroom learning...
14		I believe so ... < I belie:::ve so > They are taught that the language
15		they use it's not legitimate >For various reasons::: colleagues in the profession end up
16		reproducing the archaic speech, employed by grammars ... or rather, by whom
17		produces them, Isn't that...? Students become demotivated >to learn< because they
18		don't know the language that is there... Besides:::, there are other social factors that
19		directly influence them to want to be anywhere else <less there>,
20		in class, listening to things that they think aren't really going to <use:::,
21		follow and learn ::r>
22	Debora:	And::: ... what would be the other factors?
23		Hmmm... Here we work with a portion of the working-class population...
24		They are boys who go through economic and social difficulties < ? They are not
25		students from Santo Agosti:::nho> who go to class well fed and energized
26		to undergo an automating teaching and achieve the objective of being
27		approved for college... They are boys who come to class with their heads full
28		of things, do you understand?... They don't leave at the same starting point. NE:::VER, BUT,
29		NE:::VER ... and we ... teachers ... are also treated like robots by this
30		controlling system, >which takes away our autonomy< But sometimes we are forced
31		to reproduce with them what they tell us... Hence::: there are teachers that you see that
32		<arrives in the room, dictates rules and disregards who they are, the language they

2. National curriculum parameters.

3. Common national curriculum base.

33		speak, all their history until that moment> ? >There is no way to be motivated to learn
34		after one of these, right? < What does Portuguese end up turning? One more= problem for them...
35		(.) Because it demonstrates:: that it is formulated FOR THAT, to fail them > ?
36		to say they don't know
37	Debora	In your classes... do you:: seek to consider::r their linguistic repertoire?
38	Nina	<I always try to consider> ... I always try to start from the knowledge of the world that
39		they have, yes... And not to say that what they know is not valid... For example:, I try
40		to justify that they know the Portuguese language, but::s that there is a Portuguese for
41		each type of situation they experience with different degrees of adequacy... E < ?
42		whenever I can > I bring materials with linguistic contextualization and::
43		HISTORICAL to stimulate discussion in the classroom, as I did when I noticed that
44		most part of a seventh grade class did not mark the nominal agreement... brought::: a
45		text adapted for discussion the reson they do this and realize that < in the
46		grammars> there is always agreement between >arti::cles, nouns and adjecti::ves<
47	Debora	Based on your experience as a teacher, how = teaching Portuguese would be::ma::is
48		efficient?
49	Nina	I believe that [that:: my goal as a teacher is to establish a language teaching
50		in what their linguistic use is ? legitimately recognized and explained, and that they
51		study and reflect on the standard, dominant variety, so that they become subjects
52		of their your own speeches... But I would like:: this to be implemented in the
53		educational system, >that the offer< of meaningful language learning be: the
54		main goal

a norm, called a standard, which appears to them to be abstract and artificial.

Thus, instead of looking for the causes of the teaching difficulty in the methodology used, in the differences in aptitude or in the competence in applying the teacher's pedagogical methodology, it is much more comfortable to blame the student or the innate linguistic incompetence of the Brazilian (Bagno, 1997, p. 92).

Gorski and Coelho (2009) state that the problem of the current language teaching system is not found in the proposal for learning the standard norm, but in the way in which teaching is predominantly established in schools, where the adoption of a system occurs. of uncritical norms, exempt from scientific reflection, and which, consequently, generates non-significant language learning for students.

From a pedagogical point of view, it is not enough to say that educated Portuguese is the language of the school, the student must be motivated to use the language of the school. What is expected, then, of the Portuguese teacher is to work on the gap that exists between the variety brought by the student from home (which should never be treated as a mistake) and the other standardized norms (Gorski; Coelho, 2009, p. 84).

It is possible to observe that the narrator, when pointing out the reasons for the inefficiency of language teaching, builds a discourse based on Bernstein's Theory of Linguistic and Cultural Deficiency, which blames the students' poor performance on the cultural and social environment in which they are taught. are inserted.

Maria justifies that students belonging to socio-economically underprivileged classes

do not receive the necessary stimuli to achieve success in school performance. “They only reproduce what they have contact with, and often the family itself does not have a degree of education and does not even know what a Machado de Assis is. The thing is (pause)... it’s complicated.” (lines 17-18).

Soares (2002) states that the discourses linked to the precepts of the Theory of Linguistic and Cultural Disability of certain teachers have built a kind of “pathologization of poverty” within the school environment, which collaborates to build a teaching offer contaminated by linguistic prejudice. .

In Brazil, from the mid-seventies, when the ideology of cultural deficiency arrived here, the school failure of children from the lower classes began to be attributed, both in the official discourse of education and in the pedagogical discourse, to the poverty of the environment. cultural and social aspects of these children and the resulting deficiencies: affective needs; cognitive difficulties; linguistic deficit. And this ideology is still present among us, not only in the official and pedagogical discourse, but is also widely disseminated in the practice of schools and teachers (...) (Soares, 2002, p.20).

Labov (1972) in his sociolinguistic and narrative study carried out with children from ghetto communities in New York City, concludes that “difference is not disability” (LABOV, 1972). The author found that the concept of linguistic deficiency does not materialize in any existing linguistic reality when identifying that children from underprivileged social and economic classes receive stimuli equal to or even superior to those received by children belonging to privileged social classes. In this way, the author demystified the attribution of social and linguistic poverty as a justification for the learning difficulties of speakers of non-prestigious norms of a given language.

The teacher points to the practice of the phenomenon of linguistic hypercorrection,

adopted by her students in the classroom, who, motivated to have their uses replaced, tend to adopt the same prescriptivist posture with their colleagues, in an attempt to correct them. However, as a matter of non-dominance of the standard norm and linguistic insecurity, they fail. “Sometimes they do it to impress and end up making mistakes when they try to correct their colleagues. There was a day when a student said “Did the geography teacher come? - I didn’t see him today! And another corrected: “I haven’t seen him today” (lines 31-32).

Bagno (2013), when defining the phenomenon of linguistic hypercorrection, mentions that this process is mainly motivated by the lack of naturalness perceived by the speakers, when they try to reproduce prescriptive linguistic norms linked, mainly, to the rules of traditional grammars.

Hypercorrection is an interesting sociolinguistic phenomenon that is observed when a speaker or a community of speakers, when trying to approach an imaginary ideal standard of a “good” language, ends up “getting it right too much” and deviating so much from their own grammar. intuitive and normative grammar. That is why it is a hyper- (from the Greek hyper, corresponding to the Latin super-, that is, “over; above; too much; beyond; excessive” etc.) -correction, an excessive, exaggerated correction that ends up slipping, the unwillingly, in the pure and simple error (Bagno, 2013).

However, despite the mistakes made by the students when trying to correct their colleagues, the teacher says that she considers the prescriptivist posture of the students to be positive, as she sees it as a method of probing their learning: “Sometimes this is also positive, because they demonstrate that they are managing to grasp the content (...) When they make these corrections naturally” (29-30).

The educator also admits that the students who speak the varieties - not prestigious,

sometimes become targets of derogatory judgments within the classroom environment and seeks as a solution to this problem to privilege the methodology of lectures, in which the student occupies only the passive position in the learning process. But he reports that he also builds pre-judgments about the level of schooling and the economic and social level of his students by observing their linguistic manifestations “I think that unconsciously the way you speak creates prejudices ((gestures quotation marks)) about their scholastic formation and their social origin” (lines 38-39).

Finally, the educator points to a difficulty in implementing official guidelines, reporting that the guidelines given to Portuguese-speaking teachers in official documents (BNCC and PCNs) are sometimes insufficient:

We didn't learn this transposition of theory into practice in college. And these innovations from Pcn's and Bncc are still very abstract. Because when we come in to teach, in the end, what we have to do is teach grammar, if that's what will be asked for in college entrance exams, and in everything else out there (lines 47-50).

When expressing her projection for efficient teaching, the educator recognizes the need to build a dialogism between the taught content and the subjects of learning, that is, the students, as it is possible to perceive in “I miss guidance on how to proceed in certain pedagogical situations and I believe that there should be a connection between Portuguese and the students, right?” Thus, the teacher admits the existence of difficulties in the implementation of the new teaching guidelines. In this context, she immediately states that her ideal teaching projection would then be the one that proved capable of presenting satisfactory results to the expectations of the methods defined by Bagno (2002) as “paragrammatical methods”, that is,

1 “São Agostinho” or “Santo Agostinho” is a High Class school in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

external exams, such as college entrance exams and competitive exams, which still require Portuguese from a purely metalinguistic and paragrammatical perspective.

Excerpt 2: “They are not São Agostinho¹ boys, they come to class with their heads full of things”

After teacher Maria leaves, Nina, a Portuguese language teacher at the Municipal Education Network in Rio de Janeiro and a participant in this research, enters the room and settles down, while requesting a glass of water. The interviewer then begins the interview by asking the opening question:

SECOND ANALYSIS

Nina answers the initial question, narrating her experience as a Portuguese language teacher, pointing to the contributing factors to the distance present in the relationship between students and the learning of Portuguese.

Yes indeed. With so many years of teaching, I have always identified that the biggest problem in the classroom is that they do not identify with what is passed on to them. With Portuguese, for example, they put it in their heads that they have to learn everything from scratch, as if they were a blank slate (lines 3-6).

Gorski and Coelho (2009) criticize the Portuguese teaching methodology, which tends to disregard the linguistic knowledge of students, who are, in turn, native speakers of Brazilian Portuguese, and therefore, innately knowledgeable and practitioners of the language.

It is known that the child, when going to school, has already acquired the mother tongue. Every native speaker, around 7 to 8 years of age, has already internalized the rules of the system of their language, because they have linguistic competence, that is, they are born with a capacity for language. The student, when going to school,

already masters the rules of his grammar, a knowledge developed independently of the school teachings. It is not, therefore, about teaching the mother tongue to the student, but about teaching him a certain variety of the language (Gorski and Coelho, 2009, p.77).

Throughout the interview, it is possible to observe that Nina defends the methodology of productive teaching of Portuguese, when she develops, in the classroom, the study of the language from the exploration of the axes of adequacy to the contexts of use, as she quotes in “[. . .] I always try to justify that they know the Portuguese language, but that there is a Portuguese for each type of situation that we experience with different degrees of adequacy” (lines 35-37). In this way, the standard norm and other linguistic varieties are recognized and integrated into the learning process, through critical and comparative reflections.

Moita Lopes (1996) defends the exploration of the linguistic axis use - reflection - use as an effective method for the integration of linguistic varieties into the educational system, in addition to linking them to contexts of use in real speech environments.

Meaning, understanding and learning must be defined in relation to contexts of action where real actors interact in the construction of meaning, knowledge and learning, that is, both learning and meaning are defined as a form of social co-participation (Moita Lopes, 1996, p.8).

The teacher reports the difficulty in working with textbooks in Portuguese for basic education, emphasizing that they predominantly favor the standard linguistic aspect and do not tend to recognize and validate the other semioses of Brazilian Portuguese, used by students from lower classes of society. society: “That’s why I don’t really like to use some textbooks. Because grammars, mainly, insist on making it clear that Portuguese is the opposite of everything they do, speak or

write.” (lines 6-8) and reinforces his position by saying:

(...) they are taught that the language they speak is not legitimate. For various reasons, colleagues in the profession end up reproducing the archaic discourse, used by grammars, or rather, by those who produce them, right?! Students are not motivated to learn because they do not know the language that is there (lines 14-16).

Regarding Portuguese-language school teaching materials, Marcuschi (2008) reports that “(...) school texts reveal ignorance and mismatch in relation to the complexity of students’ oral production. They ignore that the student already speaks (masters) the language when he/she enters the school” (Marcuschi, 2008, p. 77).

The narrator mentions the process of intensification of the teaching work in two different moments of her narrative. First, when justifying her choice to work with autonomous material in the classroom, she cites the difficulty in finding time to produce her own quality materials: “I prefer to produce autonomous materials, but this is very difficult, right?! Because we have to follow the network plan, so it’s always a race against time and the teacher has to make do with fifty.” (lines 7-9) Subsequently, the teacher reports the control of teaching work carried out by entities outside the classroom, which gives the teacher an excessive and sometimes utopian workload “And we teachers are also treated like robots by this controlling system, which takes away our autonomy. But sometimes, we are forced to reproduce with them what is passed on to us” (lines 26-27).

Lemos (2011) describes as characteristics of the phenomenon of the precariousness of teaching work in public school units, the work overload that generates the loss of control of teachers over their academic projects and the damage to continuing professional training due to the multiplicity of tasks they are

assigned to. forced to assume responsibility, which sometimes causes these professionals to become ill and to waste time devoted to improving their work and personal activities.

According to Apple and Tielbaun (1991), this system of intensification of the functions performed by teachers directly affects the quality of teaching offered in the classroom by making it impossible for teachers to offer a broadly qualitative teaching because they focus on quantitative teaching, concerned with deadlines. to be followed, goals to be achieved, number of tasks to be performed, which disregard the reality of teaching that is built by teachers and students: "Instead of professionals who care a lot about what they do, and why they do it, we can have executors alienated from other people's plans" (Apple, 1991, p.67).

Antunes (2003) states that the purist teaching of traditional grammar fails in what should be the main objective of language learning, the expansion of students' discursive linguistic competence:

It is not possible to take as a basic teaching unit the practices that result from an analysis of strata: phonemes, words, phrases, phrases - which, decontextualized, which are normally taken as examples of grammatical study and have little to do with discursive competence (Antunes, 2003, p. 23).

Nina points to the relationship between the students' learning process and the social environment to which they are linked, reporting that the current language teaching methodology is flawed precisely because it does not establish a bridge between the language known and used by students and the language that is taught at school. In this way, learning the mother tongue is seen by students as something abstract and unattainable. Nina reports, in turn, the pedagogical strategies she uses in an attempt to reverse this status of abstract and unattainable object acquired by language in Portuguese classes.

I noticed that most of a seventh grade class did not mark the nominal agreement, they brought an adapted text for us to discuss why they do this and realize that in grammars there is always agreement between articles, nouns and adjectives (lines 27-28).

Finally, teacher Nina reports her desire for change in the educational system, by designing a mother tongue teaching that encourages critical reflection in relation to the linguistic object of study and that recognizes the multiple diversities existing in classrooms. Thus, by aggregating the semiosis related to the experience and language of her students, it would be possible to construct, in her words, "a meaningful learning" (lines 30-31).

LAST CONSIDERATIONS

Based on the methodologies described by Travaglia (2009), it is possible to affirm that Maria, a teacher working in the public school system with extensive experience in teaching, maintains a predominantly conservative pedagogical position, and from her expressed positions, it is possible to interpret that produce a prescriptive Portuguese language teaching, still focused on the dominant use of traditional grammar as a normative parameter and pedagogical teaching tool.

However, Nina, an elementary school teacher, is concerned with building a productive language teaching, based on an epistemologically grounded language teaching methodology. Therefore, she uses autonomous materials complementary to normative grammar in her pedagogical practice, in order to develop with her students the study and recognition of several variables of Brazilian Portuguese.

Educators also demonstrate different goals regarding language teaching. While the first teacher demonstrates a concern predominantly centered on the teaching of grammatical norms, the second teacher claims to privilege language teaching linked

to a social perspective.

Both teachers recognize that the Portuguese language is treated socially and in the school environment as an object of power and social dominance, through the imposition of polarizing parameters of successes and errors, which prestige a unique variant to the detriment of the recognition of numerous linguistic semioses existing in Portuguese. Brazilian. Therefore, they admit the interference of linguistic prejudice in the educational system.

In this way, it is possible to perceive that the study about the integration of linguistic variation in the classroom proves to be important for the identification of obstacles and challenges faced by teachers and students in the construction of teaching Portuguese as a mother tongue in the midst of existing social diversities and it can, therefore, collaborate for the development of public and educational policies aimed at solving these problems, both in the field of linguistic studies and in the pedagogical field.

REFERENCES

- ALMEIDA FILHO, J. C. P. (2005). *Linguística aplicada, ensino de línguas e comunicação*. Campinas: Pontes editores e Arte Língua.
- ANTUNES, I. (2003). *Aula de Português: encontro & interação*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.
- APPLE, M. (1991). "Controlando o trabalho docente". In: *Trabalho docente e textos: economia política das relações de classe e de gênero em educação*. APPLE, M. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, p. 31-52.
- BAKHTIN, M. M. (2003). *Estética da criação verbal*. Introdução e tradução do russo por Paulo Bezerra. Prefácio à edição francesa de Tzvetan Todorov. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 512 p.
- BARKHUIZEN, G. & WETTER. "Narrative frames for investigating the experiences of language teachers". *System*, v.14, n 3, p.372-387, 2008.
- BASTOS, L. C. & BIAR, L. de A. (2015). *Análise de narrativa e práticas de entendimento da vida social*, D.E.L.T.A.: Vol. 31, p. 12-23.
- BAGNO, M. (2013). *Preconceito linguístico: o que é hipercorreção, afinal?* Disponível em: <https://foaia.blogspot.com/2013/11/preconceito-linguistico-o-que-e.html>.
- BAGNO, M. (2002). *Preconceito linguístico: O que é, como se faz?* São Paulo: Loyola, 2002.
- BRUNER, J. (1997). *Atos de significação*. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas.
- CAMPOS, S. I. (2013). *A entrevista de pesquisa: um empreendimento coletivo*. In: BASTOS, L. C. & SANTOS, W. S. dos (2013). *A entrevista na pesquisa qualitativa: perspectivas em análise da narrativa e da interação*. Rio de Janeiro: Quartet / FAPERJ, 2013, p. 101- 134.
- CLANDININ, D. J. & CONNELLY F. M. (2011). *Pesquisa narrativa: Experiência e História em Pesquisa Qualitativa*. Uberlândia: EDUFU, 211 p.
- DEWEY, J. (1929). *The quest for certainty: a study of the relation of knowledge and action*. New York: Minton, Balch & Company.
- DEWEY, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Nova York: The Macmillan Company.
- FARACO, C. A. (2005). *Linguística Histórica: uma introdução ao estudo da história das línguas*. São Paulo; Parábola.
- FARACO, C. A. & ZILLES, A. M. (2019). *Para conhecer norma linguística*. São Paulo: Contexto.

- FIORIN, J. L. (2000). *Os Aldrovandos Cantagalos e o preconceito linguístico*. Florianópolis: Editora Insular, 2000.
- FRANCHI, C. (1988). *Mas o que é mesmo gramática?* São Paulo: Secretaria de Educação: coordenadoria de estudos e normas linguísticas, 1988.
- GORSKI; COELHO, I. L. (2009). *Variação Linguística e Ensino de Gramática*; Florianópolis, SC. Ensaio acadêmico. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- LABOV, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city – Studies in Black English Vernacular*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Press.
- LEMONS, D. V. (2011). *Precarização do trabalho docente nas Federais e os impactos na saúde: o professor no seu limite*; Salvador, BA. Dissertação de Doutorado, Universidade Federal da Bahia.
- MARCUSCHI, L. A. (2008). Gêneros textuais e ensino de língua. In: MARCUSCHI, L. A. Produção textual, análise de gêneros e compreensão. São Paulo: Parábola, p. 146-225.
- MISHLER, Elliot (1991). *Research Interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MISHLER, Elliot (2002). “Narrativas e Identidade: A mão dupla do tempo”. In: BASTOS, Liliana. MOITA LOPES, L.P. *Identidades: Recortes Multi e Interdisciplinares*. São Paulo: Mercado das Letras.
- MATTOS e SILVA & R. V. (2001). “Da sócio-histórica do português brasileiro para o ensino do português do Brasil hoje”. In: Revista da FAEEBA, Salvador, n. 15, p.23-36.
- MOITA LOPES, Luiz Paulo (2006). *Por uma Linguística Aplicada Indisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.
- MOITA LOPES, L. P. (1996). *Oficina de lingüística aplicada: a natureza social e educacional dos processos de ensino/aprendizagem de línguas*. São Paulo: Mercado de Letras.
- PEREIRA, P. (2011). “As metodologias de ensino de língua materna e as teorias linguísticas contemporâneas: uma interseção necessária”. *Revista Argumento*, n.20, p. 22-52.
- Reis. C. M. B. & SANTOS, W. S dos (2015). *Formação de professores de línguas em múltiplos contextos: construindo pontes de saberes e agenciamentos*. São Paulo: Editora Pontes.
- RICOEUR, Paul. *Narrative time: Critical inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge copyright, 1980.
- SANTOS, W. S. dos (2012). “L'educazione come un sogno: le aspettative di successo in una scuola pubblica brasiliana”. *Rivista Educazione Democratica*, anno II, n 4, giugno 2012.
- SOARES, M. (2002). *Linguagem e escola: uma perspectiva social*. São Paulo: Ática.
- SOUZA, T. R. (2009). *(Com)formando professores eficazes: a relação política entre o Brasil e a Organização para a Cooperação e Desenvolvimento Econômico*, Dissertação de Mestrado em Educação. Universidade Federal Fluminense: Niterói, RJ, 100 p.
- TARDIF, M. (2002). *Saberes docentes e formação profissional*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- TRAVAGLIA, L. C. (2009). *Gramática e interação: uma proposta para o ensino de gramática*. São Paulo: Cortez.
- WENGER, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice – Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.