

**SPEECH INTERACTIONS BETWEEN LITERACY AND TEACHING ENGLISH IN CLASSROOMS OF THE FIRST YEAR OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

***INTERAÇÕES DISCURSIVAS ENTRE A ALFABETIZAÇÃO E O ENSINO DE INGLÊS EM SALAS DO PRIMEIRO ANO DO ENSINO FUNDAMENTAL I***

***INTERACCIONES DISCURSIVAS ENTRE LA ALFABETIZACIÓN Y LA ENSEÑANZA DEL INGLÉS EN LAS AULAS DEL PRIMER AÑO DE LA ESCUELA PRIMARIA***

Alessandra Moreira CAVALIERI<sup>1</sup>  
Fábio Schwarz Soares dos SANTOS<sup>2</sup>  
Claudia Regina Mosca GIROTO<sup>3</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** This study is organized in a speech perspective and aims to discuss curricular guidelines with a view to undertaking ways of teaching the Modern Foreign Language - LEM - in the first year of Elementary School. Establishing dialogical relations with literacy. Nowadays, Foreign Language - English for Elementary School - is not included in the official document guiding Brazilian school curriculum, the Common National Curricular Base (BNCC). In view of what has been exposed here, the relevance of this study lies in the presentation of possibilities for dialogical relationships between the teaching of LEM and literacy, since LEM is offered in Elementary School I and presented in a speech perspective in the municipal curriculum analyzed in this article. This work is based on the theoretical assumptions of Enunciation theory and Historical Cultural Psychology.

**KEYWORDS:** Teach. Curriculum. English. Dialogism. Literacy.

**RESUMO:** *O presente estudo, organizado numa perspectiva discursiva da linguagem, subsidiado pelos pressupostos teóricos da Psicologia Histórico-Cultural e pela teoria da Enunciação, tem como objetivo discutir orientações curriculares de uma rede municipal do interior paulista, com vistas a empreender modos de ensino da Língua Estrangeira Moderna no primeiro ano do Ensino Fundamental I, estabelecendo relações dialógicas com a alfabetização. Para a geração dos dados utilizou-se a pesquisa documental, porém, a compreensão dos dados aqui considerados remete à análise das diretrizes para o ensino de inglês apresentadas no Currículo Comum da Rede de ensino de um município de médio porte do interior paulista e na BNCC. Os dados evidenciaram, a partir da análise e organizados em eixos de discussão, convergências entre o Currículo e as diretrizes da BNCC e relações dialógicas entre o ensino da LEM e alfabetização. Apontaram ainda dissonâncias entre*

<sup>1</sup> São Paulo State University (UNESP), Marília – SP – Brazil. Doctoral student in the Postgraduate Program in Education (PPGE). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6163-7783>. E-mail: [alessandra.cavaliere@unesp.br](mailto:alessandra.cavaliere@unesp.br)

<sup>2</sup> São Paulo State University (UNESP), Marília – SP – Brazil. Doctoral student in the Postgraduate Program in Education (PPGE). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9964-4129>. E-mail: [fabioschwarz85@gmail.com](mailto:fabioschwarz85@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> São Paulo State University (UNESP), Marília – SP – Brazil. Professor at the Department of Education and Human Development, Pedagogy Course, and at the Postgraduate Program in Education (PPGE). Doctorate in Education (UNESP). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6267-8085>. E-mail: [claudia.mosca@unesp.br](mailto:claudia.mosca@unesp.br)

*pressupostos teóricos-metodológicos, objetivos e conteúdos presentificados no documento municipal.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** *Ensino. Currículo. Língua inglesa. Dialogia. Alfabetização.*

**RESUMEN:** *El presente estudio, organizado en una perspectiva discursiva del lenguaje, sustentado en los supuestos teóricos de la Psicología Histórico-Cultural y en la Teoría de la Enunciación, tiene como objetivo discutir los lineamientos curriculares de un sistema municipal en el interior de São Paulo, con miras a emprender métodos de enseñanza de Lengua Extranjera Moderna, en el primer año de la Escuela Primaria I, estableciendo relaciones dialógicas con la alfabetización. La investigación documental se utilizó para generar los datos, sin embargo, la comprensión de los datos aquí considerados se refiere al análisis de los lineamientos para la enseñanza del inglés presentados en el Currículo Común de el Sistema de Enseñanza de una ciudad mediana del interior de São Paulo y en el BNCC. Los datos mostraron, a partir del análisis y organizados en ejes de discusión, convergencias entre el Currículo y los lineamientos del BNCC, y relaciones dialógicas entre la enseñanza de LEM y la alfabetización. También señalaron disonancias entre los supuestos teórico-metodológicos, los objetivos y los contenidos presentados en el documento municipal.*

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** *Docencia. Plan de estudios. Inglés. Dialogía. Alfabetización.*

## Introduction

Currently, the teaching of Modern Foreign Language - English (LEM), in the initial series of Elementary School, faces many challenges, especially in public schools, due to a number of sociopolitical and historical factors, among which we can highlight three that directly affect the teacher's pedagogical action.

The non-mandatory nature of the Modern Foreign Language (LEM) subject in Elementary School, which, according to the Law of Directives and Bases (LDB) of 1996, Article 26, deals with Foreign Languages, and establishes that the teaching of the English language is offered from the 6th grade (Middle School), in line with the guidelines of the Common National Curricular Base (BNCC) (BRASIL, 2018). This lack of regulation for the teaching of LEM in the early years may attribute to this curricular component a status of less importance in relation to the other components present in the curriculum, given the reduced workload of classes offered compared to other subjects.

The precariousness of training policies for teachers of LEM to work in the early years of Elementary School is configured in another challenge that may be due to the lack of official regulation, because, although it is not a mandatory subject, in some municipalities of the state of São Paulo the LEM is offered in public Basic Education - early years, thus

entailing the need for theoretical and methodological guidelines to the teacher. Thus, since the BNCC (BRASIL, 2018, p. 247) offers the guidelines of the LEM organized for the final years of Middle School, the document leaves to the municipalities the organization of the curricula for the early years.

Thus, the third challenge presents itself to the teacher, bringing the responsibility to select the best materials and the best ways to teach LEM from 1st to 5th grade, considering the literacy process underlying the first year of Elementary School.

Given this context, we can observe, currently, in the early years of Elementary School, a mode of production of pedagogical practices for teaching LEM coming from the spontaneous and ideological conceptions of each teacher, often based only on the structure of the language or, in other words, practices focused on oral training, centered on the improvement of fluency, to the detriment of other knowledge.

In this sense, this study is organized in a discursive perspective that aims to discuss curriculum guidelines of a municipal network of the interior of São Paulo, in order to undertake ways of teaching Modern Foreign Language - LEM - in the first year of Elementary School, establishing dialogical relations with literacy.

This choice is since the Municipal Education Network in question has developed its own curriculum, based on the theory of Cultural-Historical Psychology (PHC) and Bakhtinian assumptions of language, which came into force in late 2016, and whose theoretical foundations guide the present study.

Thus, we understand that by assuming a theoretical position with its roots in Cultural-Historical Psychology, such curriculum brings political implications to the school environment, under a different look than the traditional one for learning and teaching language.

In addition, the teaching of LEM for the 1st year of primary school, in this city, was recently implemented in 2018, constituting, still, an arid and challenging path, eager for didactic-pedagogical guidelines, since it is immersed in the theoretical context of the curriculum, which proposes enunciative-discursive practices in the classroom.

Regarding the organization of this article, we present, in section 1, the methodological route, establishing the relationship between the BNCC and the Common Curriculum of a Municipal Education Network. In section 2, the dialogical relations that can be established between the teaching of LEM and literacy. Finally, we make the final reflections.

## **Methodological Course**

The methodological approach included document analysis research, in which the Municipal Common Curriculum of a school network of a city in the interior of São Paulo and the BNCC (BRASIL, 2018) were used as a source of data. The choice for this data took place given that the BNCC is a guiding document of Brazilian curricula, published in 2017, and the municipal curriculum considered here has as theoretical foundation, the assumptions of Vygotskian and Bakhtinian, also observed in this article.

Data were generated from the analysis of two axes of discussion, based on the theoretical and methodological guidelines of the two documents, publicly available on the internet (BNCC and Municipal Common Curriculum), more specifically considering the BNCC (BRASIL, 2018) the guidelines presented for the development of Brazilian curricula of the English Language subject and the Common Curriculum of the municipal network the content and theoretical and methodological guidelines for the teaching of English Language, which presuppose a theoretical foundation in the discursive perspective of language.

To understand the data, we analyzed the listed axes of discussion, namely: 1- the dialogic relationship established between the BNCC and the Municipal Curriculum, seeking to understand the guidelines for teaching English Language in literacy classrooms; and 2- the discursive interactions between literacy and teaching of LEM in a discursive perspective, legitimized by official documents, which underpin the pedagogical practice of teachers of the early years of Elementary School. Such data were organized into two axes of discussion, in order to undertake the discursive interactions between literacy and the teaching of LEM, in a discursive perspective. Finally, from the analysis of the axes of discussion, it was also used the textual genres as instruments of language teaching, pointed out in section 3.

## **Results and discussion**

The presentation and discussion here apprehended resulted from the constitutive enunciates of the official documents that guide the planning and practice of the teacher, highlighting the discursive interactions that orbit between such documents, seeking to establish dialogical relations between literacy and the teaching of LEM. For better understanding, we organized the discussions into thematic axes.

## **Dialogical relations between BNCC and Municipal Common Curriculum**

The BNCC (BRASIL, 2018, p. 241) proposes guidelines for the development of the curriculum of Brazilian schools, specifically the curricular component of the English Language that, in this document, assumes the concept of lingua franca, which conceives the English Language not in a hegemonic way, but in its uses by various speakers spread around the world.

Considering all this multiculturalism of language use, the BNCC establishes three implications for the development of the curriculum, in the subject of English Language, in a social perspective.

The first one refers to the social and political functions by which the teaching of English is considered in its uses in different cultures, favoring a linguistic education aimed at interculturality.

The second implication deals with multi-literacies, which can be enhanced through English language teaching by considering social language practices, as well as digital languages and their semiotics, favoring a dialogical and ideological context for foreign language teaching, in which the subject can mean and seek forms of expression outside a legitimated and unique standard.

The need to understand English language teaching from a perspective outside the ideal standard appears in the third implication, as a demand for an attitude on the part of the teacher in welcoming and legitimating the different ways of expressing the language, seeking not an ideal model of speaker, but favoring spaces of linguistic interaction and conditions of intelligibility in a functional context of language use.

Although the guidelines set out in this document focus on the teaching of LEM from the 6th grade onwards, the BNCC leaves it up to the municipalities and states to offer English language teaching in the other segments of Basic Education, thus being able to use such guidelines as a reference for the development of curricula.

We do not intend here to discuss the political and partisan ideology present in the document, nor its influence on Brazilian education, since such aspiration would exceed the limits of this study.

However, we can trace the theoretical bias implied in the curriculum component LEM in BNCC and its interface with the municipal curriculum in question in this study.

Thus, we consider that the three implications are interconnected, but in this study, we will focus on the third implication, in order to approach the teaching of English Language in an enunciative-discursive perspective in literacy classrooms.

The BNCC (BRASIL, 2018, p. 242, our translation) explains concepts related to the teaching and learning of the English language, focused on a discursive perspective, as we can observe in this excerpt that elucidates the option for the treatment of English as a *Lingua Franca*:

This understanding favors a language education focused on interculturality, that is, on the recognition of (and respect for) differences, and on the understanding of how they are produced in the various social practices of language, which favors critical reflection on different ways of seeing and analyzing the world, the other(s) and oneself.

In line with such guidelines, the analyzed Municipal Common Curriculum bases the guidelines for the teaching of English language in a discursive perspective of language, as it is evidenced in this excerpt:

This proposal is based on a conception of language as constitutive of consciousness itself and organizer of thought, and that the subject is constituted in and through social relationships, from significant situations. For its dialogic and situated character, according to Bakhtinian theories, it allows us to realize singular spaces constituted by also singular subjects, and the greater the opportunity and diversity of interactions, the greater the possibilities of learning and development (BAURU, 2016, p. 684, our translation).

It is worth noting that the municipal curriculum was collectively developed and implemented in 2016, with the participation of teachers from various segments of Basic Education, educational coordinators, school principals, technicians from the Secretariat of Education, as well as researchers and professors from the academic field.

The involvement of teachers in the preparation of curriculum guidelines for the component Modern Foreign Language - English shows that most, if not all teachers of the Municipal Education Network, had contact with the theoretical assumptions adopted in this document, which underlies the annual planning of all elementary schools of the Municipal Network in evidence in this study.

Thus, we could consider that such participation, study, and preparation of the document enabled the teacher conditions to plan teaching proposals based on a didactic pedagogical perspective that considers the language as a form of social interaction.

The document also deals with methodological guidelines, pointing the teacher to the need to transition from a practice focused on grammatical structures to one that considers enunciative-discursive practices in the classroom, valuing real communication situations (BAURU, 2016, p. 708).

However, deviating from the theoretical assumptions presented in the Curriculum itself and in the BNCC, the teaching objectives defined in the document, which guide the work of teachers with LEM in the early years of elementary education in the Municipal Education Network, present structuralist foundations of the language, diverging from the Cultural-Historical approach present in the Curriculum.

We can observe, both in the general objective and in the specific objectives, key terms that refer to the need of (re)contextualization of teaching situations, as they are based on vocabulary acquisition, object classification and command execution, diverging from the perspective enunciated by the document.

Playfulness is present in the objectives and becomes necessary, especially in first year classrooms, which receive many children aged five and up. Therefore, the 'role play' is still fundamental in the development of children, but it is observed that the "playfulness" announced in the document is linked to the methodology and not to human development and the appropriation and use of oral and written language in its historical and social aspects.

Figure 1

OBJETIVO GERAL	OBJETIVOS ESPECÍFICOS
Aprender a língua inglesa de forma lúdica e com atividades significativas ( <i>meaningful learning</i> ), desenvolvendo no aprendiz o gosto pela língua e a motivação para continuar aprimorando o idioma.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrar compreensão e executar comandos orais;</li> <li>• Reconhecer e produzir vocabulário oralmente em contexto lúdico, próximo à realidade dos(as) aluno(as) de forma contextualizada e significativa;</li> <li>• Cantar;</li> <li>• Cumprimentar em inglês, em situações contextualizadas de ensino;</li> <li>• Classificar objetos do contexto diário por cores;</li> <li>• Classificar brinquedos com o atributo forma;</li> <li>• Utilizar as diferentes linguagens (corporal, musical, plástica, oral e escrita) ajustadas às diferentes intenções e situações de comunicação de forma a compreender e ser compreendido.</li> </ul>

Source: Adapted from Bauru (2016)

Regarding the contents, we can observe that they are divided into themes, grammatical structures, and vocabulary, and should be addressed in the 1st and 2nd semesters in the first-

year classrooms. This division of contents by semester shows an attempt to reduce fragmentation of teaching, something important in teaching LEM to children, however, the contents are divided by themes out of real communicative situations, and discursive genres could situate the communicative need in the classroom.

**Figure 2**

1º ANO			
Semestre	Temas	Estrutura relacionada	Vocabulário
1º semestre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greetings</li> <li>Magic Words</li> <li>My family</li> <li>Colors</li> <li>Numbers (0-3)</li> <li>Toys and Games</li> </ul>	Hello. What's your name? Who is she/he? What color...? How many...? What is this?	Hi/ Bye-bye/ You're welcome/ Come in/ Stand up/ Let's go/ Be quiet/ Silence please/ Please/ Thank you/ Come here, please/ Mom/ Dad/ Blue/ Red/Numbers: zero - three/ Car/ Doll/ Ball/ Bike/ Video Game
2º semestre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At School</li> <li>Food and Drinks</li> <li>Animals</li> <li>Body and Face</li> <li>Celebration: Birthday</li> </ul>	What is it? I like... I don't like. The cat goes meow... Touch your... Happy Birthday.	Pencil/ Eraser/ Notebook/ Apple/ Banana/ Hamburger/ Hot-Dog/ Milk-Shake/ Ice-Cream/ Milk/ Dog/ Cat/ Legs/ Arms/ Head/ Shoulders/ Knees/ Toes/ Cake/ Candles/ Party/ Balloons

Source: Bauru (2016, p. 65)

This progressive continuity of the contents proposed in the curriculum may enable the teachers of LEM, in the first year of elementary school, to organize them around the discursive genres. However, dealing with the structural content of the language inherent to the genre, covering the theoretical assumptions that guide the teaching of such content, and creating teaching conditions that place children in real discursive situations so that they constitute meaning when producing texts, considering the discursive perspective, are challenges faced by the teacher of LEM.

In this context, facing all the theoretical and methodological apparatus manifested in the documents, we establish the following question: how can we establish dialogic relations between the teaching of oral and written language (literacy) and the teaching of Modern Foreign Language - English, in the classrooms of the 1st year of Elementary School, so that such practices interact discursively?

Based on this questioning, we will discuss literacy and teaching of Modern Foreign Language - English in the next topic.



## Interactions between Literacy and LEM: in search of a discursive perspective

To answer such questioning, we will seek to contextualize the current literacy practices and LEM in order to glimpse some propositions of work with language discursively.

Contextualizing language teaching, be it mother tongue or foreign, in an enunciative-discursive perspective, leads us to a theoretical and methodological deepening culturally referenced. Thus, we seek in Abaurre, Fiad and Mayrink-Sabinson (1997), Volochínov/Bakhtin (2017), Geraldi (2012), Smolka (2012), Bakhtin (2016) and Goulart (2019), subsidies to circumscribe some conceptual aspects, since the space here would be insufficient to go deeply into the theory, demarcating all its historical and social process.

Thus, according to Goulart (2019), when considering the discursive perspective of literacy, it is understood that the processes of language production are spaces of constitution and transformation of subjects and ways of looking at reality.

In this sense, the teaching and learning process proposed by us is inserted from the social interactions, as an interlocutive act that is constituted in actions of meaning production and has in the activities of writing and reading its materialization through language.

In the words of Smolka (2012), the acquisition of oral and written language resides in discursive moments, constituted and constituting in/of social interaction, which presupposes the presence of subjects involved in a *chain of verbal communication*.

This *verbal communication* process, according to the propositions arising from Bakhtinian thought, considers the other as an integral part of the discursive situations. These situations also include English as LEM (of the other), or as an international language. Thus, Abaurre, Fiad and Mayrink-Sabinson (1997, p. 40, our translation), anchored on Bakhtinian postulates, consider that:

The place of this process is the interlocution between subjects who constitute themselves in others for their interlocutors, thus constituting them as subjects, in a constant movement: a movement that implies in incorporating/taking the word of the other while it moves away from it, opposing itself to it to make it word.

Thus, it is in the interdiscursive movement itself, when worked in a space of enunciative interaction in the dialogic relationship between children, that the teacher can enable them to operate in and through language, articulating various voices to then assume their singular voice (SMOLKA, 2012, p. 135). Thus, it becomes of paramount importance that the individual circulates freely in the environment in which he or she is inserted, i.e., in classrooms, languages and distinct social languages, particular ways of expressing themselves

through language, which carry with them specific values, ways of conceiving and relating in the world, uniting around them specific social groups, both in LEM and in the mother tongue.

However, this inter and intra-discursive relationship is also constitutive of the work with orality and writing. It is the oral and written texts by children that will provide rich evidence to the teacher of the processes of subjectivity and intersubjectivity constituted by students.

In this context, we insert the teaching of LEM - English in literacy classrooms, more specifically the 1st year of Elementary School, considering the discursive perspective, in which we have the text as a teaching unit, where language is materialized through discursive genres.

Therefore, based on Bakhtinian assumptions, how can the teacher create teaching conditions for students to occupy their places as subjects of their discourse in English classes? For Bakhtin (1998, [1934-1935]), when oral or written language teaching processes are based on social referential practices, this approach makes subjects freer and more creative, constituting enunciates and active respondents in verbal communication situations.

According to Rocha (2009, p. 264, our translation), it is essential that varieties of languages and social languages circulate freely in the environment in which literacy students are inserted, i.e., in classrooms:

[...] particular ways of expressing themselves through language, which carry with them specific values, ways of conceiving and relating in the world, uniting around themselves, specific social groups, both in foreign language and in mother tongue.

Thus, when the teaching of reading and writing is disconnected from sociopolitical and historical reality, the relationship with the mother tongue or foreign language becomes simplistic, artificial, technical, based on instrumentalism (GOULART, 2019), opposing the whole enunciative-discursive approach. Thus, the child will not enter the social phenomenon of verbal interaction, in which the language is performed, if not through the discursive genres, because, for Bakhtin (2016), taking the word is not only the repetition of lexicons or acquisition of grammatical structures, but an active responsive attitude in a concrete situation of discursive communication.

Based on such assumptions, the teaching of LEM in the 1st year of elementary school should consider students as subjects who occupy particular discursive spaces, in an individual appropriation of knowledge that is based on a collective construction of distinct social languages. Thus, according to Rocha (2009), to be guided by such premises implies,

therefore, the impossibility of addressing any linguistic resource or materiality separated from its context(s) of use.

About the disconnection of language from its social use, Dufva (2013) highlights three consequences arising from the structuralist view of LEM teaching: the first is the internalization of the formal knowledge of the English language by the student, the second is the treatment of language outside its current use, and the third is based on the use of memorization for learning grammar and word lists.

[...] one consequence is that language learning is seen as a process of internalizing formal knowledge, for example grammatical rules and lexical items. Another consequence is that the knowledge is often represented in a decontextual fashion: language knowledge is detached from the actuality of situated language usages. In this way, the object of language learning becomes identified with memorizing the formal description of language: a grammar, or a list of words. Here, dialogical thinking suggests a diferente solution [...] (DUFVA, 2013, p. 4).

In this regard, Rocha (2009) also highlights the importance of addressing language as a social practice, taking into account the specificities of the infinite social situations that integrate everyday life, in its various fields and spheres, observing, among other factors, how language works in these events, especially in relation to the LEM, which discourses and voices circulate in them, the individuals who participate, their social positions, possible values and worldviews, the purposes and forms of interaction, its resources and means.

The Bakhtinian approach helps us to rethink guidelines and actions aimed at the teaching of LEM in the first year of Elementary School, in order to transcend practices based on the automated repetition of vocabulary, in ready-made activities for coloring, or artificial dialogues detached from a concrete communicative situation, to move towards pedagogical action, based on historical and culturally referenced situations, which brings school practices as close as possible to everyday social practices of language.

Because proposing the teaching of literacy and LEM using the genres of discourse as tools for teaching oral and written language requires the teacher to plan in line with the theoretical assumptions that underpin the curriculum of the Municipal Network and the creation of teaching conditions that dialogue with such purposes, in a complex reality such as the classroom.

Bakhtin (2016) considers that the heterogeneity of discourse genres is as vast as the types of human relations in society. Thus, through the discourse genres we can establish dialogic relations between literacy and the teaching of Modern Foreign Language - English, using them as tools for teaching the mother and foreign languages.

## Discourse genres as a tool for English language teaching

Considering the language teaching in a dialogical context between literacy and LEM, we will present here possibilities of teaching LEM using the discursive genres as tools for literacy and English language learning, as governed by the municipal document anchored in Bakhtinian assumptions:

Different genres of discourse should be explored when planning lessons, initially using authentic materials from the student's life, such as labels, tickets, menus, thus making learning meaningful and functional (BAURU, 2016, p. 711, our translation).

The Common Curriculum of the Education Network in question brings as methodological assumption for literacy and the teaching of LEM the organization of the teaching of orality and writing in real communicative situations, through discursive genres.

Thus, when referring to literacy students - children who are in the process of appropriation of formal written and oral language - who at the same time are learning LEM, so that they are placed as authors of discursive processes, we resort to the activity theory of Leontiev (2001). The author states that, to be in activity, students need to have a reason, that is, something that makes them attribute and constitute meaning, in this case, in oral and written verbal discourse. Thus, for the teacher to generate the need for writing, it is essential to have a situation of concrete verbal interaction, for this, role plays in this phase can and should be used, because they are important constituent moments of a wealth of relations and verbal and non-verbal interactions, oral, written, among so many possibilities.

Vygotsky (2007), Leontiev (2001) and Elkonin (2009) are theorists who substantiate the role of play in a cultural-historical approach to human development. According to the periodization of development, according to Leontiev (2001), in relation to the main activity of the child when entering elementary school, it still has playing as its main activity until the study activity is constituted. Thus, it is through the role-playing games that the child imitates social situations, which he/she witnesses daily, and seeks to understand the world by representing roles based on personal experiences.

Regarding the game, Elkonin (2009, p. 80, our translation) states that it is related to child development, given its historical and social constitution in society:

This game is born during the historical development of society as a result of the changing place of the child in the system of social relations. It is therefore of social origin and nature. Its birth is related to very concrete

social conditions of the child's life in society and not to the action of innate, internal, instinctive energy of any kind.

When the child reaches elementary school, around six years of age, the roleplaying game needs to remain present until the study activity becomes the main activity, in order to consolidate teaching strategies, because the child still needs the game as an activity that promotes learning and, consequently, development, in order to create situations that cause abstraction and symbolization, so necessary for the acquisition of reading and writing.

Thus, the literacy teacher can propose, along with the LEM teacher, real situations that require students to take oral and written positions in interaction with each other. For example, a veterinary consultation game within a previously planned role-playing situation, in which some students assume the social position of veterinary doctors and the others the social position of clients, restaurant games, sales, ceremonies, house games, among others, which the children themselves imitate.

These situations will require students' verbal interactions, both orally and in written language. All involve a need for language appropriation, since, by assuming social positions, the social discourses that integrate such situation are presented to children, thus making it a great challenge of interlocution mediated by linguistic signs.

To enter the world of signs, according to Pajéu, Miotello (2018), is only possible through the word, either in the learning of reading written in the Mother Tongue, or in the LEM. It is in the context of human relationships that the discourses are produced, in this case, in the classroom as a space of verbal interaction, where students appropriate the knowledge historically and socially produced, is that the dialogicity is constituted, which is based on the production of language. In the words of Pajéu, Miotello (2018):

The penetration in the world of signs is only possible through verbal interaction, through the word, and so only through it the human being raises his history while is raised by it within a necessary intimacy; of a symbiosis, of a subject-subject and subject-world interaction through language. This social event that we call language houses a mutual relationship of constitution of the self and the other, therefore, the subjects, and is built on given ideological determinations, which makes the subjects are not constituted only by discursive action, but by all human activities that offer meeting spaces of constitution of subjectivity by the composition of the senses, that is, by culture. This means that the processes of disposition of culture are determined by this dialogicity that settles in the construction of language, in the most varied genres of discourse that subjects use to communicate, experience, and realize their ethical acts.

Thus, for Bakhtin, the process of language production is also the space of the subject's constitution; thus, by experiencing communication situations from the most everyday language to the most formal ones, the child will have awakened the desire to enter other possible worlds, to use the most varied forms of language, and it is in this process of mutual constitution that language learning takes place.

Thus, it is up to the teacher the attentive look, the sensitive listening, to create teaching conditions that make the learning process of LEM and literacy an instrument of power, seeking to overcome the barriers of social inequalities.

In this way, inserted in situations of discursive interaction, students will use the enunciates collectively constituted during the relation with the object of knowledge and through proposed activities, as well as constituting enunciates in a singular way through interaction with peers, developing and expanding the knowledge of the world, in a dialectical relationship between word, culture and the OTHER.

According to Bakhtin (2000), the positions socially assumed are key pieces that outline the intentionality that lies behind every discourse, so that the speaker always anticipates the one to whom the enunciation is intended. Thus, in the school context, for children who are in the literacy process have conditions to assume their social position of enunciator, it is necessary to insert them in a living language practice, where there is room for mistakes, trials, hits, confrontations, refractions, etc.

It should be noted that the goal of teaching situations, from this perspective, goes far beyond filling out forms and/or repeating words and phrases, anchored in hit and miss, but consists in providing a situation of concrete verbal interaction in which children can perform their social discourses through discursive genres socially constituted and used in the mother tongue and in LEM.

Only then will it be possible to overcome conceptions of teaching and language that lead to an action for the submission of the subject, the silencing of their voices, the denial of multiculturalism existing in school and as a result of the different modes of speech, thus organizing the relationship of the subject with the language based on the structuralism of the language; thus, the use of the word becomes verticalized, and a powerful instrument of control, totally opposing the conception of word announced by Pajéu, Miotello (2018):

[...] seductive, ideological, dialogical word, which preserves impenetrable secrets that do not satisfy the finished probabilities that reside in the fantasy universe of the senses and, therefore, makes itself mysterious by representing also the ineffable side of the world constituted by the subjects in their uniqueness.

In this way, we glimpse a discursive reality in classrooms, as a working space mediated by dialogical relations, mobilizing the teaching, and learning of LEM and literacy beyond the simple transmission of content, but from the human and cultural point of view, promoting a dialogue between literacy and LEM.

Under these theoretical and methodological premises, we aim to achieve dialogue between curriculum, literacy and LEM, so that the teaching of language is not fragmented and socially and historically displaced, but configured in a way that conceives the language as a form of social interaction, based on a perspective that values the real situations of communication, based on an enunciative-discursive theory of language.

### **Final considerations**

The teaching of LEM and the literacy work carried out in first-year classrooms of elementary school, when based only on the structure of the language, detaches it from the historical-cultural movement in which it is generated and used, and obscures all the complexity of verbal interactions, whether oral or written (GOULART, 2019).

On the other hand, from an enunciative-discursive perspective of language, the teaching of LEM and mother tongue, considering language as a historical and social artifact, will use concrete situations of verbal interaction, which will mobilize creative and linguistic acts of interacting subjects.

The teacher is responsible for rethinking the social meaning of learning a LEM, as well as the meaning of literacy: it is not only about teachable content, but the relationship between world knowledge and linguistic knowledge, which in this perspective deprecate an author, creative and thinking subject who acts on language and through language in various discursive contexts in the classroom and socially.

### **REFERENCES**

ABAURRE, M. B. M.; FIAD, R. S.; MAYRINK-SABINSON, M. L. T. **Cenas de aquisição da escrita: o sujeito e o trabalho com o texto**. Campinas: Mercado das Letras, 1997.

BAKHTIN, M. **Estética da criação verbal**. 3. ed. Trad. Maria Ermantina Galvão. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2000.

BAKHTIN, M. O discurso no romance. **In Questões de literatura e de estética: a teoria do romance (1934-1935)**. 4. ed. Trad. Bernadini *et al.* São Paulo: Unesp, 1998. p. 71-210.

BAKHTIN, M. **Os gêneros do discurso**. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2016.

BAURU. **Currículo Comum do Ensino Fundamental**. Bauru: Prefeitura Municipal, 2016. Disponível em:

[https://www2.bauru.sp.gov.br/arquivos/arquivos\\_site/sec\\_educacao/curriculo\\_ef2.pdf](https://www2.bauru.sp.gov.br/arquivos/arquivos_site/sec_educacao/curriculo_ef2.pdf). Acesso em: 29 jun. 2020.

BRASIL. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular**. Brasília: MEC, 2018. Disponível em: [http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/BNCC\\_19dez2018\\_site.pdf](http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/BNCC_19dez2018_site.pdf). Acesso em: 29 jun. 2020.

DUFVA, H. **The encyclopedia of applied linguistics**. Edited by Carol A. Chapelle. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2013. DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0072

ELKONIN, D. B. **Psicologia do jogo**. 2.ed. Trad. Álvaro Cabral. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2009.

GERALDI, J. W. Concepções de linguagem e ensino de português. *In: GERALDI, J. W. et al. (org.). O texto na sala de aula*. São Paulo: Anglo, 2012.

GOULART, C. M. A. Alfabetização em perspectiva discursiva. A realidade discursiva da sala de aula como eixo do processo de ensino-aprendizagem da escrita. **Revista Brasileira de Alfabetização ABALF**, v. 1, n. 9, p. 60-78, 2019. Disponível em: <http://revistaabalf.com.br/index.html/index.php/rabalf/article/view/334>. Acesso em: 29 jun. 2020.

LEONTIEV, A. N. Os princípios psicológicos da brincadeira pré-escolar. *In: VIGOTSKI, L. S.; LURIA, A. R.; LEONTIEV, A. N. Linguagem, desenvolvimento e aprendizagem*. 7. ed. Trad. Maria da Penha Villalobos. São Paulo: Ícone, 2001. p. 119-142.

PAJÉU, M. H. MIOTELLO, V. A compreensão da cultura pelo ato responsável e pela alteridade da palavra dialógica nos estudos bakhtinianos. **Cad. Est. Ling.**, Campinas, v. 60 n. 3 p. 775-794, set./dez. 2018.

ROCHA, C. H. A língua inglesa no ensino fundamental e público: diálogos com Bakhtin por uma formação plurilíngue. **Trabalho de linguística aplicada**, Campinas, v. 48, n. 2, p. 247-274, dez. 2009. Disponível em: [https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S0103-18132009000200006&script=sci\\_abstract&tlng=pt](https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S0103-18132009000200006&script=sci_abstract&tlng=pt). Acesso em: 29 jun. 2020.

SMOLKA, A. L. B. **A criança na fase inicial da escrita**: a alfabetização como processo discursivo. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

VIGOTSKI, L.S. **A formação social da mente**: o desenvolvimento dos processos psicológicos superiores. 7.ed. Organizadores: Michael Cole *et al.* Trad. José Cipolla Neto, Luís Silveira Menna Barreto, Solange Castro Afeche. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2007.

VOLOCHINOV, V. **Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem**: problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2017.



### **How to reference this article**

CAVALIERI, A. M.; SANTOS, F. S. S.; GIROTO, C. R. M. Speech interations between literacy and teaching english in classrooms of the first year of elementary school. **Rev. EntreLínguas**, Araraquara, v. 7, n. 00, e021111, 2021. e-ISSN: 2447-3529. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29051/el.v7i00.15823>

**Submitted:** 01/09/2021

**Required revisions:** 25/10/2021

**Approved:** 07/11/2021

**Published:** 11/11/2021