

**PRACTICE OF ORALITY IN THE CLASSROOM: FOCUS ON THE FULL  
DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDENT**

***PRÁTICA DE ORALIDADE EM SALA DE AULA: FOCO NO DESENVOLVIMENTO  
PLENO DO EDUCANDO***

***PRÁCTICA DE LA ORALIDAD EN EL AULA: ENFOQUE EN EL DESARROLLO  
INTEGRAL DEL EDUCANDO***



Damaris de Sales Costa Santos ROCHA<sup>1</sup>  
e-mail: damarisyn@gmail.com



Terezinha RICHARTZ<sup>2</sup>  
e-mail: terezinha@unincor.edu.br

**How to reference this paper:**

ROCHA, D. S. C. S.; RICHARTZ, T. Practice of orality in the classroom: Focus on the full development of the student. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 18, n. 00, e023071, 2023. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riace.v18iesp.1.17459>



| Submitted: 22/03/2023  
| Revisions required: 15/05/2023  
| Approved: 29/07/2023  
| Published: 19/09/2023

**Editor:** Prof. Dr. José Luís Bizelli

**Deputy Executive Editor:** Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

<sup>1</sup> Vale do Rio Verde University Center (UninCor), Três Corações – MG – Brazil. Master in Management, Planning and Teaching

<sup>2</sup> Vale do Rio Verde University Center (UninCor), Três Corações – MG – Brazil. Professor of the Professional Master's Degree in Management, Planning and Teaching. PhD in Social Sciences (PUC-SP).

---

**ABSTRACT:** This article aims to reflect, through a qualitative analysis, on the role of the current school which, inserted in a society undergoing constant transformations caused by globalization and advances in technology, is still one of the only sectors of society not belonging to digital culture and paradoxically sees itself in the demand to provide the development and preparation of students for work and exercise of citizenship. With regard to teaching Portuguese, the objective is a more effective and critical participation in contemporary language practices, considering the new multiliteracies and practices of digital culture. The research is oriented towards the challenges that correlate curriculum and learning, involving culture, language and identity - as an important basis for establishing orality. It is considered that the points highlighted in this work are fundamental for reflection on an education that is more coherent with the complete formation of the student.

**KEYWORDS:** Practice of orality. Language. School. Education.

**RESUMO:** *Este artigo reflete, por meio de uma análise qualitativa, sobre o papel da escola atual que, inserida numa sociedade globalizada e de uso crescente das novas tecnologias, ainda não absorveu totalmente os benefícios dessa realidade, porém, paradoxalmente, deve propiciar o desenvolvimento e o preparo dos alunos para o trabalho e exercício da cidadania. Nos estudos da língua portuguesa, a demanda é favorecer uma participação mais efetiva e crítica nas práticas contemporâneas da linguagem, considerando os novos multiletramentos e práticas da cultura digital. A pesquisa se orienta para os desafios que correlacionam o currículo e a aprendizagem, envolvendo cultura, língua e identidade, como base importante para o estabelecimento da oralidade. Considera-se que os pontos destacados neste trabalho são fundamentais para a reflexão sobre uma educação mais coerente com a formação plena do educando.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** *Prática de oralidade. Linguagem. Escola. Educação.*

**RESUMEN:** *Este artículo reflexiona, a través de un análisis cualitativo, sobre el papel de la escuela actual, si bien inserta en una sociedad globalizada y con el creciente uso de las nuevas tecnologías, no ha absorbido en su totalidad los beneficios de esta realidad, sin embargo, paradójicamente debe propiciar el desarrollo y preparación de los estudiantes para el trabajo y el ejercicio de la ciudadanía. En los estudios de lengua portuguesa, la demanda es favorecer una participación más efectiva y crítica en las prácticas lingüísticas contemporáneas, considerando las nuevas multiliteracidades y prácticas de la cultura digital. La investigación se orienta hacia los desafíos que correlacionan el currículo y el aprendizaje, involucrando la cultura, el lenguaje y la identidad, como una base importante para establecer la oralidad. Se considera que los puntos destacados en este trabajo son fundamentales para la reflexión sobre una educación más coherente con la formación integral del educando.*

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** *Práctica de oralidad. Lenguaje. Escuela. Educación.*

---

## Introduction

Article 205 of the Federal Constitution establishes that “Education, a right of all and a duty of the State and the family, will be promoted and encouraged with the collaboration of society, aiming at the full development of the person, his preparation for the exercise of citizenship and his qualification for work” (BRASIL, 1988, p. 109, our translation). The recognition of the right to education, as a founding guarantee of citizenship, by the 1988 Constitution (BRASIL, 1988), represents an achievement, after many struggles, discussions and efforts that permeate the history of Education in Brazil, in favor of the right and equality of access for all Brazilian men and women to school.

This article, however, moves towards a qualitative analysis, in which theorists and documents that form the curricular basis of Brazilian education were brought to support the investigations that are oriented towards the understanding of issues that involve orality as an essential genre for the development of subjects who experience learning spaces and society.

Thus, in this investigation, studies are aligned that are directed towards ideas correlated to the following topics, in order to support theories that raise the social importance of oral genres: orality, student, social subject, interculturality, multiliteracies and digital media.

Therefore, the starting point for this reflection was the question about what is the role of the school today, which has “[...] as a horizon of meaning the formation of the modern subject, who has the necessary cognitive and ethical skills to the exercise of democratic citizenship” (CANDAU, 2014, p. 35, our translation), and the importance of orality in this training.

It is considered that, despite appearing as one of the axes for teaching Portuguese in the National Common Curricular Base (BRASIL, 2017) and involving a set of skills and abilities necessary for communication in various social interactions, it is worth mentioning that the approach of orality at school is still insufficient. According to studies developed by theorists such as Marcuschi (2001), Magalhães (2007), Leal, Brandão and Lima (2012) and others, discussions around the oral axis are still new, requiring further investigation.

In this sense, when observing the National Curricular Parameters (PCN) of the Portuguese Language area, the ways of working with oral language at school need to open up to the uses of formal and conventional language in the social environment, since the language in question requires “a more conscious and voluntary control of enunciation, in view of the importance that mastering the public word has in the exercise of citizenship” (PCN, 1998, p.

67, our translation). Such factors open up fields of possibilities for bringing oral genres, which, unlike what is often assumed at school, despite the fact that students already arrive at the institution communicating, greater access to the universe of orality use outside the classroom cannot be inhibited inside the school.

Also considering that school constitutes a permanent process of social construction, according to Dayrell (1996), the question that arises is: what actions are necessary for it to fulfill its social function of contributing to the construction of a fairer society and more egalitarian? This perspective is valued by the BNCC (BRASIL, 2017, p. 19, our translation) when it proposes the practice of competence nine (Empathy and Understanding), which comprises:

Exercise empathy, dialogue, conflict resolution and cooperation, making oneself respected and promoting respect for others, welcoming and valuing the diversity of individuals and social groups, their knowledge, identities, cultures and potential, without prejudice of origin, ethnicity, gender, age, ability/need, religious conviction or of any other nature, recognizing themselves as part of a community to which they must commit.

Thus, in this article, we sought to reflect on the relevance of orality as a language practice in an intercultural perspective and on the role of the current school, as a space in which the conception of the student is that of a sociocultural subject, taking into account taking into account the multiliteracies and practices of the digital culture in which students are involved. As Dayrell (1992) points out, it is in the social media that significant learning takes place. In this sense, he argues that:

It is the social relations that truly educate, that is, form, produce individuals in their unique and deepest realities. No individual is born a man. Therefore, education has a broader meaning, it is the process of producing men in a given historical moment [...] (DAYRELL, 1992, p. 02, our translation).

With these questions in mind, the practice of orality is defended as a legitimate object of teaching, with the observation “[...] of the oral language practices explored at school and a characterization of the linguistic specificities and practical knowledge involved in them” (DOLZ; SCHNEUWLY, 2004, p. 140, our translation); taking into account, above all, the importance of orality as an interactive social practice (MARCUSCHI, 2001), thus constituting this language modality in a privileged space for the construction and sharing of meanings and cultural values, with the objective of contributing to the full development of the student,

considering that “[...] it is in language and through language that man constitutes himself as a subject” (BENVENISTE, 2005, p. 286, our translation).

Following this line of discussion, our research is oriented towards presenting the importance of enunciating the relevance of language, anchored in genres of orality that can value the knowledge of the student – moving towards proposing new perspectives, in times of multiliteracies and technologies, in order to place the oral genre on the same level as writing, providing opportunities for students to master orality inside and outside the learning spaces.

### **A school and curriculum focused on the subject**

What is the school for nowadays? From the historical-critical perspective, the school is the place where systematized knowledge should be offered, and according to Saviani (1991, p. 19, our translation):

The school exists, therefore, to facilitate the acquisition of instruments that allow access to elaborated knowledge (science), as well as access to the rudiments of this knowledge. Basic school activities should be organized around this issue. If we call this curriculum, then we can say that it is based on systematized knowledge that the elementary school curriculum is structured. Well, systematized knowledge, erudite culture, is literate culture. Hence, the first requirement for access to this type of knowledge is learning to read and write. In addition, it is also necessary to know the language of numbers, the language of nature and the language of society.

Although this role of the school seems obvious, it is possible to state that modernity requires the resignification and expansion of the school's contribution to today's society. What contents, skills and values to choose in such a multicultural society? What makes sense to learn in such a heterogeneous and changing world? From this perspective, the existing relationship between life in society and the content to be contemplated is evident. Thus, “[...] what is taught, suggested or forced to learn expresses the values and functions that the school spreads in a concrete social and historical context” (SACRISTÁN, 1998, p. 159, our translation).

The current school, such as it is, strongly represents modernity, according to Vera Candau (2014) and, in it, the subjects of education are seen as equals, being destined to acquire a common, fundamental culture and, in this sense, for the construction of a national identity. Inserted in a scenario marked by globalization and market demands, impacted by new technologies, education has been the target of a range of curricular proposals and initiatives in an attempt to adapt teacher training to the new reality. In this context, according to the author,

the school presents a growing malaise that points to a demand for its resignification in contemporary times.

Dealing with this issue, according to Candau (2014), cannot happen superficially and simply believing that a solution to this impasse can be reached with the adequacy of pedagogical methods and techniques, incorporation of Digital Information and Communication Technologies (TDIC) educational processes or adapting the school to the so-called market and modernization logic. In this sense, the author argues,

We think that the crisis of the school is located at a deeper level, it questions the very model of society in which it is located, marked by the modernity in question and the emergence of new models of societies and subjects, in the perspective of what has been called post-modernity, an expression that is certainly polysemic but full of concerns and new problematizations. In these approaches, the theme of differences constitutes one of their central axes (CANDAU, 2014, p. 35, our translation).

Vera Candau (2014) draws attention to the conception of knowledge existing in school which, according to the author, has an essentialist character and conceives knowledge as an accumulation of facts and concepts that, taken as truth, are socially legitimized and not usually questioned. The aforementioned knowledge, considered universal, is based, in turn, on Western and European culture, considered to bear the universality that is questioned by multicultural issues, with regard to the way of approaching different knowledge, school and general.

A question to be asked and discussed by the aforementioned author is: what universality is this? The reductionism of school knowledge to a given cultural field should be avoided, however, this would represent the denial of the possibility of building something jointly and negotiated between different subjects.

The knowledge construction process and the implications of the power relations implicit in this process stand out in the eyes of the French philosopher Michel Foucault, who clarifies,

Rather, we have to admit that power produces knowledge (and not simply favoring it because it is useful or applying it because it is useful); that power and knowledge are directly involved; that there is no power relationship without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor knowledge that does not presuppose and at the same time constitute power relations. These “power-knowledge” relations should not, therefore, be analyzed from a subject of knowledge that would or would not be free in writing to the system of power; but it is necessary to consider, on the contrary, that the subject who knows, the objects to be known and the modalities of knowledge are so many effects of these fundamental implications of power-knowledge and its historical transformations. In short, it is not the activity of the subject of

knowledge that would produce knowledge, useful or aloof from power, but the power-knowledge, the processes and struggles that crosses it and that constitute it, that determine the possible forms and fields of knowledge. (FOUCAULT, 2007, p. 27, our translation).

In his analysis of curriculum theories, Silva (2011, p. 147) highlights the importance of a combination of critical and post-critical theories for understanding the processes through which, through relations of power and control, people become involved, because they are the ones who teach that the curriculum is a matter of knowledge, power, truth and identity.

With critical theory, one learns that the curriculum is a space of power — the knowledge embodied in the curriculum bears the marks of social power relations; social construction — social invention such as nation, religion, football, etc., and the result of a historical process. As a social construction, an important issue raised by critical theory is that the important question regarding the curriculum is not “what knowledge *is* valid?”, but rather “what knowledge is *considered* valid?” (SILVA, 2011, p. 148, emphasis added).

Post-critical theories, in turn, expand and, at the same time, modify what critical theories teach, extending, for example, the understanding of what the processes of domination are. As demonstrated by the author, the “[...] analysis of the power dynamics involved in gender, ethnicity, race and sexuality relations provides us with a much completer and more complex map of social relations of domination” (SILVA, 2011, p. 146, our translation). In this perspective, power is not centralized, but spreads throughout the social network; its relationship to knowledge is not one of opposition but an inherent part of power. According to the author, after the understanding made possible by the theories presented, the reflection on the curriculum can no longer be done simply from concepts such as teaching and efficiency or learning and development, nor being considered as a curriculum or list of contents:

In short, after critical and post-critical theories, we can no longer look at the curriculum with the same innocence as before. The curriculum has meanings that go far beyond those to which traditional theories have confined us. The curriculum is place, space, territory. The curriculum is a power relationship. The curriculum is trajectory, journey, path. The curriculum is autobiography, our life, curriculum vitae: our identity is forged in the curriculum. The curriculum is text, speech, document. The curriculum is an identity document (SILVA, 2011, p. 149-150, our translation).

Silva (2011) presents us with the range of representations about the curriculum, indicating that, in addition to other specifications, it is “trajectory, journey, route”, connecting to the thinking of Candau (2014, p. 40, our translation) who stresses the need to observe the

historical and constructed character of formal knowledge and its close relationship with its social contexts of production:

Bearing in mind the historical and social anchoring of the so-called curricular contents is essential. It involves analyzing its historical roots and the development it has undergone, always in close relationship with the contexts in which this process takes place and the power mechanisms present in it. At the same time, it requires recognizing the plurality of knowledge present in society and promoting dialogue between them. This is a fundamental dynamic for us to be able to develop curricula that are coherent with interculturality. In this perspective, working on the intersection of cultures present at school is also a requirement that is closely associated with it.

Valente (2018), with a slightly different theoretical alignment from that brought by Candau (2014) and Silva (2011), although dealing with the student as a subject in movement and who can transform himself according to the changes of the time in which he lives, calls the attention to the contemporary school student when reflecting on how digital technologies are changing and how they alter the teaching and learning processes, noting that “[...] the student is no longer the same and does not act as before [and that] it is necessary to consider that society is becoming increasingly complex” (VALENTE, 2018, p. 18, our translation). These are positions that can guide the paths of teaching towards a more energetic attention to orality practices, recognizing their importance in the context of social relations, mainly with regard to the formation of students, as it is necessary knowledge to interact with the world, also outside of school.

Therefore, and bringing to this field of discussion that puts orality in evidence, it is seen that the expository class may have lost ground to the digital medium, but it has not ceased to be fundamental for the teaching practice that, without giving up the knowledge of today, seeks to connect and forward the teaching-learning processes with dynamism.

In this bias, it is observed that the student's attention is no longer focused on the teacher, but on something of their interest, which can articulate the reality and cultural environment of that student, on what is in line with their place of speech, their reality when this teacher starts to consider it. For which, it is expected to have access to the necessary information in a detailed way and with resources that facilitate its understanding, and that, many times, can only access and elucidate questions with the support and support of the teacher, who presents a cultural reading and domain epistemic that make learning something rich and interesting.

On the other hand, it is necessary for individuals to be prepared to deal with the growing complexity in which today's society is inserted and which involves an infinity of information



and new situations that are emerging. The so-called “professions of the future” are changing according to technological advances, which are becoming part of everyday life in the most diverse areas. Even in agriculture, where little formal preparation was required, today the use of relevant information and combinations with other data is increasing, through the use of technology, making it necessary for the rural producer to be prepared to know how to interpret, give meaning to such information and make appropriate decisions.

Considering the multimodality of texts in contemporary times, for Rojo (2013b), texts are less and less written, and the written text is no longer the main thing in some genres. In newspapers, for example, the layout is more sophisticated, a noticeable change due to the non-use of letters, but the support of images to present written texts. In communication, there are formats that take into account the relationship between image and writing and even between image and movement. These changes propitiated the idea of multiliteracies, which encompass the literacies of the letter, image and sound and which, according to the author, are related to the reflection on the convenience of a Pedagogy of Multiliteracies:

The need for a Pedagogy of Multiliteracies was, in 1996, stated for the first time in a manifesto resulting from a colloquium of the New London Group (hereinafter, GNL). [...]

In this manifesto, the group affirmed the need for the school to take responsibility (hence the proposal of a “pedagogy”) for the new emerging literacies in contemporary society, largely – but not only – due to the new ICTs, and that take into account and include in the curricula the wide variety of cultures already present in the classrooms of a globalized world and characterized by intolerance in coexistence with cultural diversity, with alterity, with the other (ROJO, 2012, p. 11, our translation).

It is not a question of a teaching method or approach, but of thinking about education in a way that is appropriate to contemporary times, especially language education. Regarding the definition of multiliteracies, Rojo (2013a, p. 14, our translation) clarifies that:

The concept of multiliteracies, articulated by the New London Group, seeks precisely to point out, right from the start, through the prefix “multi”, to two types of “multiples” that contemporary literacy practices involve: on the one hand, the multiplicity of languages, semioses and media involved in the creation of meaning for contemporary multimodal texts and, on the other hand, the plurality and cultural diversity brought by contemporary authors/readers to this creation of meaning.

Valente (2018) questions the teaching currently offered to students in school institutions, stating that it is not something very different or innovative: “On the contrary, they

still offer a traditional education, based on the information that the teacher transmits and on a curriculum that was developed for the era of pencil and paper” (VALENTE, 2018, p. 18, our translation).

This view is corroborated by Sacristán (2013) who, when reflecting on the pertinence of educational objectives in relation to the curriculum, stated that “[...] it is necessary to insist what the meanings of educational objectives cannot be limited to the contents of the limits established by accumulated traditions in school subjects.” (SACRISTÁN, 2013, p. 23, our translation), considering that such traditions and their contents result from other traditions that can and should be subject to revisions and modifications. Regarding subject contents, Valente (2018, p. 19, our translation) opines that:

The question, therefore, is not to change the disciplinary contents, but rather the way in which they should be worked on. The classroom must have a dynamic that is coherent with the actions we develop on a day-to-day basis – increasingly mediated by digital information and communication technologies (TDIC). These technologies are already part of our lives and have already transformed the way we deal with, for example, trade, services, production of goods, entertainment and social interaction.

The changes caused by the use of technologies and the internet have transformed the world and the way people interact and interact with the world. These transformations affect not only what each one is, how he is, but what he does as an individual and as a society, constituting what has been called digital culture.

Valente (2018) states that, although almost all segments of society are part of this new culture, education is still one of the sectors that do not belong to digital culture, despite the fact that most students already have technologies and use them to accomplish practically everything. What are you doing. In this sense, the author draws attention to the expression “digital divide” (BUCKINGHAM, 2010 apud VALENTE, 2018, p. 24, our translation), which refers to “[...] the abyss that exists between the child’s world outside school and the practices of educational systems”. The author also highlights the characteristics of skills that should be considered in school; in this perspective:

21st Century skills will include a mix of cognitive, intrapersonal and interpersonal attributes such as collaboration and teamwork, creativity and imagination, critical thinking and problem solving, which students will learn through hands-on activities carried out with the conceptual support developed in different disciplines. This is the competence expected of professionals working in digital culture (VALENTE, 2018, p. 24, our translation).

In the same direction pointed out by Valente (2018), who addresses the new cognitive attributes as skills of the 21st century, Rojo (2012) indicates that, in contemporary times, a linguistic education suitable for multicultural students from the perspective of multiliteracy should offer students projects for the future that contemplate three aspects: productive diversity, referring to the work environment; civic pluralism in the context of citizenship; and multifaceted identities, in relation to personal life.

Thus, in this direction that connects skills required for these new times, thinking about a curriculum that can favor teaching that deal with oral genres could be the key to being able to introduce questions of a greater breadth of knowledge about the environment we live in, society, the culture and the subject himself.

### **Situationality of orality**

When investigating the connection between representation and culture, Stuart Hall (2016) brought important clarifications about the role of language in this relationship and about the concepts of representation and culture, which are relevant to this work. For Hall, language is defined as a privileged means by which meaning is given to things, a space for the production and exchange of meaning. In this sense, the author states that “[...] meanings can only be shared through common access to language. Thus, it becomes fundamental for the senses and for culture and has been invariably considered the key repository of cultural values and meanings” (HALL, 2016, p. 18, our translation).

In the semiotic approach, one of the main constructivist models and strongly influenced by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, meaning is constructed in and through language. Ferdinand de Saussure, considered the “father of modern linguistics”, was born in Geneva in 1857, worked mainly in Paris and died in 1913. According to Hall (2016), the language model created by the linguist guided the semiotic approach to the problem of linguistics representation in a wide variety of cultural fields and influenced his discussion of the social-constructivist view of language and representation.

By separating language into a social part and an individual act, Saussure broke with the notion that language comes from the sender and that whoever speaks or writes would be the author or creator of meaning, in an intentional model of representation. In the Saussurian perspective, each authorial statement only becomes possible because the author shares, with

other language users, common rules and codes of the system, which allow them to communicate with each other meaningfully. Language is therefore a social phenomenon, not an individual one, its source lies in society, culture, our shared cultural codes and language system.

We are born into a language, its codes and meanings. Language for Saussure is, therefore, a social phenomenon, which cannot be an individual matter, since it is not possible to invent the rules of language individually, for ourselves. Its source resides in society, in culture, in our shared cultural codes, in the language system – not in nature or in the individual subject (HALL, 2016, p. 62-63, our translation).

Marcuschi (2001) highlights the importance of culture as a fact that makes human beings special in the context of living beings, but in this regard, the fact that they have an articulated symbolic language stands out which, much more than a classification system, is it is also a practice that allows different or overlapping beliefs and points of view to be established about the same things.

Whether in written or spoken form, the construction of categories for theoretical reflection or for classification are a reflection and are also reflected in language, always being constructed interactively within society. In this sense, the author states that “[...] what determines linguistic variation in all its manifestations are the uses we make of language. It is the forms that suit the uses and not the opposite” (MARCUSCHI, 2001, p. 16, our translation).

In the official guidelines for teaching the Portuguese language, the centrality of the text is taken as a work unit and the enunciative-discursive perspective in its approach, in order to relate the texts to their production contexts and the development of skills for the meaningful use of language in reading, listening and text production activities in various media and semiosis (BRASIL, 2017, p. 67). It is up to this curricular component, then, to provide students with experiences that contribute to the expansion of literacies, in a way that allows them to participate significantly and critically in the various social practices permeated/constituted by orality, writing and other languages.

The Orality Axis comprises the language practices that occur in an oral situation with or without face-to-face contact, such as a dialogued class, web conference, recorded message, campaign spot, jingle, seminar, debate, radio program, interview, recitation of poems (with or without sound effects), theater play, presentation of songs and songs, commented playlist of songs, game vlog, storytelling, different types of podcasts and videos, among others. It also involves the oralization of texts in socially significant situations and interactions and discussions involving themes and other linguistic dimensions of work in different fields of activity (BRASIL, 2017, p. 79, our translation).

The treatment of oral practices comprises: consideration and reflection on the conditions of production of oral texts that govern the circulation of different genres in different media and fields of human activity; comprehension of oral texts; production of oral texts; understanding the effects of meanings caused by the use of linguistic and multisemiotic resources in texts belonging to different genres and the relationship between speech and writing (BRASIL, 2017).

About the relationship between speech and writing, Marcuschi (2001) brings important clarifications. Until the 1980s, orality and writing were examined as opposites, while the notion of the cognitive supremacy of writing prevailed.

This vision has changed and the current conception is that of orality and literacy, with interactive and complementary activities in the context of social and cultural practices, with literacy seen as a process of social and historical learning of reading and writing in informal contexts and for utilitarian uses. It is observed that, from the most central point of human reality, it would be possible to define man as a being who speaks and not as a being who writes, and presents the following question: what kind of value is given to writing and orality in daily life? In this case, thinking of the subject as a student inside and outside school, language learner as a human construction and its orality codes.

For Marcuschi (2001), whatever the answer, it must be based on two assumptions. First: speech and writing are communicative activities and situated social practices; second: in both cases we have a real use of language. This is because the subject needs to communicate internally or externally to the school network, the environment in which the student body is inserted will demand these skills from him and the school needs to equip itself to equip him with this support, pointing out paths that connect the different genres discursive elements to the varied intjections of digital elements and the multiplicity of possibilities for interaction and understanding of the world in which we currently live.

Although the curriculum guidelines at the BNCC (BRASIL, 2017) are that Portuguese language content is not taken as an end in itself, but that it allows the expansion of language/languages use skills in situated language practices, Rojo (2013a) shows the existence of a rooting of school literacy practices sedimented in schools and teaching materials. Unlike the concept of multiliteracy, which points to the cultural multiplicity of populations and to the semiotic multiplicity that constitutes the texts, through which today's society receives information and communicates, literacy proposals have a normalizing, regulating and objectifying character of the social writing form. The search for the norm and for the form has

been a priority, both in reading and textual production (with discursive approaches and active replication in the background), as well as in activities of reflection on the language which, according to the author, are guided by normative grammar and are based on the cultured form of the standard language, not exploring in this work the different social and geographic variants in use. Rojo (2013a, p. 16, our translation) points out that:

All these findings show that school proposals for literacies ignore and hide oral social forms in favor, decidedly, of scriptural forms. This approach is presented to a school population rooted in oral social forms of interaction, even if they are woven into literate forms – above all, in urban centers –, such as, for example, the wide preference for television journalism, instead of print; by the soap opera on TV, instead of reading the novel; by music instead of poetry; by oral instruction (on customer service telephone services), instead of reading instruction manuals.

For Mendonça and Buzen (2015), attention to literacy practices includes knowing that individuals' particular motivations in the use of reading and writing are related to many language capabilities activated in these activities, "with the unique paths of schooling of individuals", emphasizing that "motivation and consolidated knowledge about the use of texts in specific contexts (school or not) are the starting point for planning the necessary interventions".

Orality defined by Marcuschi (2001, p. 24, our translation) as "[...] interactive social practice for communicative purposes that presents itself in various forms or textual genres based on sound reality", has been neglected by the school, according to the author, and this has caused serious problems, since it is directly related to the way in which writing is perceived. The author considers "[...] quite interesting to better reflect on the place of orality today, whether in contexts of use in daily life or in contexts of formal school education" (MARCUSCHI, 2001, p. 24, our translation).

For the Swiss psychologist Bernard Schneuwly, considered one of the greatest scholars on the Development of Orality, speech genres would have a direct application in various fields of social life, and in an interview with Nova Escola magazine in 2002, he stated that "[...] it is up to the school to teach the student to use oral language in different communicative situations, especially in the more formal ones" (RATIER, 2020, p. 01, our translation).

Why do we teach what we teach? Why do children learn what they learn? For Geraldi (1984), when it comes to the teaching of the Portuguese language, the answer to what is asked

encompasses a conception of language and also an attitude related to education. Fundamentally, there are three conceptions of language that are described by the author.

In the first conception, language is seen as an expression of thought and, in it, if someone cannot express himself, it means that he does not think either; in the second conception, which is linked to the theory of communication, language is seen as a communication tool and language as a useful code for the transmission of messages.

In the third conception of language, considered as a perspective for the author's discussions, language is a form and place of human interaction. "Through it, the subject who speaks and practices actions that he would not be able to practice if not by speaking; with it, the speaker acts on the listener, constituting commitments and bonds that did not pre-exist before speech" (GERALDI, 1984, p. 43, our translation).

In this conception, a differentiated educational posture is demanded, because in it the speakers become subjects and the language is situated as a place of social relations. The existence of language, therefore, is only justified in the game that is played in society and where it functions: it is within its functioning that the rules of this game can be established. Students, therefore, when managing orality within the school, in Portuguese language classes, for example, will be able to learn skills that will put them in full harmony with the demands of the outside world: at work, with their family, on the social network, in religion, politics and other demands.

### **Final remarks**

Considering art. 205 of the Federal Constitution (BRASIL, 1988), which deals with the Right to Education, this article sought to address the demands and challenges imposed on the contemporary school, which needs to offer the student a quality education that meets the needs current teaching and learning. The concern about which curriculum should be adopted is a crucial point in this reflection, as it was observed that the development of curricula consistent with interculturality can enable a work with the intersection of the different cultures present in the school.

In this sense, it is important to understand that it is through relations of power and control that the individual becomes who he is. These relationships teach that the curriculum is a question of knowledge, power and identity. In this way, reflection on the curriculum must

necessarily lead to the questioning of what knowledge should be really valid in the educational process.

Another important point in this study is the fact that culture depends on its participants interpreting what happens around them and giving “sense” to things in a similar way. The relations between language and culture contribute, then, to the construction of meanings in the world and in reality. The so-called “cultural meanings” are not simply in people's minds, but also organize and regulate social practices and can only be shared through common access to language, which is fundamental, therefore, for the senses and for culture.

Through language, it is believed, the recognition and appreciation of the different cultures that orbit in the school and the establishment of relations of justice, equality and equity should be sought, and also the implication of these relations in the construction of the identity and humanity of each subject, since in and through language the constitution of man as a subject takes place. It is concluded, then, that orality is essential as a social practice that contributes to the full development of the subject, recognition of their cultural identity and their citizenship, and implies in the very constitution of society. In this sense, the practice of orality is configured as a social divider and expression of a social right that cannot be denied to subjects undergoing training at school.

## REFERENCES

BENVENISTE, E. **Problemas de lingüística geral I**. 5. ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 2005.

BRASIL. Constituição (1988). **Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil**. Brasília, DF: Senado, 1988. Available at: [https://www2.senado.leg.br/bdsf/bitstream/handle/id/566968/CF88\\_EC105\\_livro.pdf](https://www2.senado.leg.br/bdsf/bitstream/handle/id/566968/CF88_EC105_livro.pdf). Access: 24 July 2021.

BRASIL. **Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais: língua portuguesa**. Secretaria de Educação Fundamental. Brasília: DF, MEC / SEF, 1998. Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/seb/arquivos/pdf/portugues.pdf>. Access: 24 July 2021.

BRASIL. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular: BNCC**, versão aprovada pelo CNE, novembro de 2017. Brasília: DF: MEC, 2017.

BUCKINGHAM, D. Cultura Digital, Educação Midiática e o Lugar da Escolarização. **Educação & Realidade**, [S. l.], v. 35, n. 3, 2010. Available at: <https://seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/educacaoerealidade/article/view/13077>. Access: 10 July 2022.

CANDAU. V. M. F. Ser professor/a hoje: novos confrontos entre saberes, culturas e práticas. **Educação**, Porto Alegre, v. 37, n. 1, p. 33-41, 2014. DOI: 10.15448/1981-



2582.2014.1.15003. Available at:

<https://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/faced/article/view/15003>. Access: 24 July 2021.

DAYRELL, J. T. A. Educação do aluno-trabalhador: uma abordagem alternativa. **Educ. Rev.**, Belo Horizonte, n. 15, p. 21-29, 1992. Available at:

[http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S0102-46981992000100004&lng=pt&nrm=iso](http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0102-46981992000100004&lng=pt&nrm=iso). Access: 15 July 2022.

DAYRELL, J. T. A. A escola como espaço sócio-cultural. *In*: DAYRELL, J. **Múltiplos olhares sobre educação e cultura**. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 1996.

DOLZ, J.; SCHNEUWLY, B.; HALLER, S. O oral como texto: como construir um objeto de ensino. *In*: SCHNEUWLY, B.; DOLZ, J. **Gêneros orais e escritos na escola**. Tradução e organização de Roxane H. R. Rojo e Gláís S. Cordeiro. 3. ed. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras, p. 125-155, 2004.

FOUCAULT, M. **Vigiar e punir**. Tradução Raquel Ramallete. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2007.

GERALDI, J. V. **O texto na sala de aula: leitura e produção**. 2. ed. Cascavel, PR: Assoeste, 1984.

HALL, S. **Cultura e representação**. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. PUC, 2016.

LEAL, T. F.; BRANDÃO, A. C. P.; LIMA, J. M. A oralidade como objeto de ensino na escola: O que sugerem os livros didáticos? *In*: LEAL, T. F.; GOIS, S. (org.). **A oralidade na escola: a investigação do trabalho docente como foco de reflexão**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica editora, 2012. p 13-35.

MAGALHÃES, G. T. **Concepção de oralidade: a teoria nos PCN e no PNLD X a prática nos livros didáticos**. 2007. Tese (Doutorado em Letras) – Universidade Federal Fluminense, Rio de Janeiro, 2007.

MARCUSCHI, L. A. **Da fala para a escrita: atividades de retextualização**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2001.

MENDONÇA, M.; BUNZEN, C. **Letramentos em espaços educativos não escolares: os jovens, a leitura e a escrita**. São Paulo: Ação Educativa, 2015. Available at:

[https://acaoeducativa.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/letramentos\\_juventude.pdf](https://acaoeducativa.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/letramentos_juventude.pdf). Access: 25 July 2022.

RATIER, R. Oralidade: a fala que ensina. **Revista Nova Escola**, [S. l.], 2020. Available at:

<https://novaescola.org.br/conteudo/315/oralidade-a-fala-que-se-ensina>. Access: 14 July 2021.

ROJO, R. Pedagogia dos multiletramentos. *In*: ROJO, R.; MOURA, E. (org.).

**Multiletramentos na escola**. São Paulo: Parábola, 2012.

ROJO, R. (org.) **Escola conectada: os multiletramentos e as TICs**. São Paulo: Parábola, 2013a.

ROJO, R. Cenários futuros para as escolas. *In: Educação no Século XXI*. São Paulo: Fundação Telefônica, v. 3, p. 19-22, 2013b. Available at: [http://fundacaotelefonica.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/caderno3\\_multiletramentos.pdf](http://fundacaotelefonica.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/caderno3_multiletramentos.pdf). Access: 04 feb. 2023.

SACRISTÁN, J. G. **Comprender e transformar o ensino**. Porto Alegre: ArtMed, 1998.

SACRISTÁN, J. G. **Saberes e incertezas sobre o currículo**. [S. l.]: Penso Editora, 2013.

SAVIANI, D. **Pedagogia histórico-crítica: primeiras aproximações**. 11. ed. São Paulo: Autores Associados. 1991.

SILVA, T. T. **Documentos de identidade: uma introdução às teorias do currículo**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2011.

VALENTE, J. A. Inovação nos processos de ensino e de aprendizagem: o papel das tecnologias digitais. *In: VALENTE, J. A.; FREIRE, F. M. P.; ARANTES, F. L. (org.). Tecnologia e educação: passado, presente e o que está por vir*. Campinas, SP: NIED/UNICAMP, 2018. Available at: <https://www.nied.unicamp.br/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Livro-NIED-2018-final.pdf>. Access: 22 Nov. 2021.

### ***CRediT Author Statement***

---

**Acknowledgments:** To the Vale do Rio Verde University Center (UninCor), for encouraging research.

**Financing:** Own financing.

**Conflicts of interest:** There is no conflict of interest.

**Ethical approval:** Certificate of Presentation of Ethical Appreciation (CAAE) number 53841021.3.0000.5158 and its approval the opinion number: 5.137.431.

**Availability of data and material:** Data and material may be used by individuals or entities without prior authorization.

**Authors' contributions:** **Damaris de Sales Costa Santos Rocha:** the contribution was to carry out bibliographical research and text writing. **Terezinha Richartz:** participated as advisor and methodological correction of the article.

---

**Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.**  
Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation.

