

**THE DEAF STUDENT AND THE ALPHABETIC WRITTEN LANGUAGE:
BETWEEN MODES OF THOUGHT REPRESENTATION**

***O ESTUDANTE SURDO E A LÍNGUA ESCRITA: ENTRE MODOS DE
REPRESENTAÇÃO DO PENSAMENTO***

***EL ESTUDIANTE SORDO Y LA LENGUA ESCRITA: ENTRE MODOS DE
REPRESENTACIÓN DEL PENSAMIENTO***



Ezer Wellington Gomes LIMA¹
e-mail: ezer.lima@ufr.edu.br



Luiz Antonio Gomes SENNA²
e-mail: senna@uerj.br

How to reference this article:

LIMA, E. W. G.; SENNA, L. A. G. The deaf student and the alphabetic written language: Between modes of thought representation. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 18, n. 00, e023076, 2023. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v18iesp.1.18475>



| 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

¹ Federal University of Rondonópolis (UFR), Rondonópolis – MT – Brazil. Adjunct Professor UFR/ICHS. Doctor in Education.

² State University of Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil. Full Professor of Applied Linguistics at the Graduate Program in Education at the State University of Rio de Janeiro UERJ/PROPED.

ABSTRACT: Considering the current educational situation of deaf individuals, here mostly concerning to the numerous aspects pertinent to the representation of writing skills, and due to a lack of stimuli appropriate to their cognitive, socio-affective, linguistic and political-cultural potential, many of them may have suffered considerable losses in the development of learning. This study aims to contribute to the understanding of some factors that may lead to severe constraints on the development of writing skills by deaf students, therefore, contributing to the field of literacy. One finds herein a theoretical review of concepts, ideas and ideologies, which reveals that the difficulty faced by the deaf person in written texts production is beyond the school's methodologies and/or pedagogical actions employed ordinarily applied in the teaching of written language.

KEYWORDS: Deafness. Education. Writing. Modes of thought.

RESUMO: Considerando a atual conjuntura educacional dos sujeitos surdos, principalmente os inúmeros aspectos pertinentes à representação da escrita, verificamos que, por não receberem estímulos adequados ao seu potencial cognitivo, socioafetivo, linguístico e político-cultural, muitos desses estudantes têm sofrido perdas consideráveis no desenvolvimento da aprendizagem. Posto isso, este estudo visa contribuir para a compreensão de fatores que concorrem para a difícil relação do surdo com o desenvolvimento de produção de texto na escola com o objetivo de cooperar para o processo de alfabetização, levando em conta suas dificuldades e perspectivas. O enfoque da pesquisa é de ordem teórico-conceitual, por centrar-se na (re)construção de conceitos, ideias e ideologias necessários ao aprimoramento dos fundamentos teóricos já desenvolvidos sobre a temática. Os dados obtidos na investigação revelam que a dificuldade que o surdo enfrenta ao produzir textos escritos na escola está para além das metodologias e/ou ações pedagógicas empregadas no ensino da língua escrita.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Surdez. Educação. Escrita. Modos de Pensamento.

RESUMEN: Teniendo en cuenta la situación educativa actual de las personas sordas, aquí principalmente en lo que respecta a los numerosos aspectos pertinentes a la representación de las habilidades de escritura, y debido a la falta de estímulos adecuados a su potencial cognitivo, socioafectivo, lingüístico y político-cultural, muchos de ellos pueden haber sufrido pérdidas considerables en el desarrollo del aprendizaje. Este estudio tiene como objetivo contribuir a la comprensión de algunos factores que pueden conducir a graves limitaciones en el desarrollo de las habilidades de escritura por parte de los estudiantes sordos, por lo tanto, contribuyendo al campo de la alfabetización. Se encuentra aquí una revisión teórica de conceptos, ideas e ideologías, que revela que la dificultad que enfrenta la persona sorda en la producción de textos escritos está más allá de las metodologías y/o acciones pedagógicas de la escuela empleadas ordinariamente aplicadas en la enseñanza del lenguaje escrito.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Sordera. educación. escritura. modos del pensamiento.

Introduction

The dilemmas about alphabetic writing and its implications for learning, very present in everyday school life, consist of an invitation to reflect on a specific group of students, the deaf, enrolled in different schools in the country. Indeed, the written production of these students has been the subject of national and international research³ due to recurrent stories of school failure and the difficulties of educators, due to the lack of specific training, to provide adequate appropriation of the structure of written language and its respective uses. The presence and use of written language in the school environment are constant, so it is common to qualify this space as a representative of literate culture, which acquires strength and representativeness, at an ideological level, from a level of knowledge. In this sense, the relationship with knowledge and with the school is, at the same time and inseparably, a social and subjective relationship.

It cannot be denied that the deaf, like other subjects, make up a group of students who, for some reason, have numerous difficulties accessing alphabetic writing. This discussion takes into account not only the difficulties presented by the deaf in relation to the written language, but also the reflections that permeate their unique way of seeing and, therefore, of representing the world.

Thus, having as motivation the context presented, the question that is pressing and drives this study is: *how is it possible to understand the mental properties that the deaf, in their different levels of hearing loss, transfer to writing, which make that your texts are not recognized as such?* This central question is presented as a guideline to the knowledge of scientific paths, together with the legal, cultural and political aspects that appear to constitute the deaf, deafness and the cost for a cohesive and adequate writing in the eyes of scientific culture.

In this sense, the methodological focus adopted in this study is of a theoretical-conceptual nature, as it focuses on the (re)construction of concepts, ideas and ideologies necessary for improving the theoretical foundations already developed on the subject. To obtain data, a variety of books, theses, dissertations, specialized journals, annals of scientific meetings and research in the Thesis Bank of the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) were reviewed in order to observe the advances and dilemmas related to the acquisition of writing by deaf students.

³ Among the vast bibliography that deals with the subject, it is possible to mention the studies by Lodi *et al.* (2002), Fernandes (2003), Midena (2004) and Gesuelli (2006).

That said, the study imposes itself as a source of evidence to organize the growing number of information, interventions and scientific discoveries. This type of research makes it possible, in general, to gather a large number of results from other studies, whether empirical, dissertations or theses, in order to analyze differences that deal with the same object.

The challenge of the deaf student: writing

In order to advance in the analysis of aspects related to inclusion practices, especially with regard to the written textual production of deaf students, it is understood the need to relativize the rigorism of positivist thinking regarding subjecting the deaf student to a process that merely imposes a standard form of language to the detriment of the whole complex process of approaching the use of a totally new and unknown grammatical system. However, even if the violence of the mechanistic processes of literacy and mother tongue teaching is questioned, one cannot lose sight of the fact that, even today, deaf individuals, even those completing basic education, do not dominate alphabetic writing and its uses at levels comparable to hearing individuals (LODI; LACERDA, 2009; LEBEDEFF, 2010). Since the written language is not just a code of expression, but a language of culture and citizenship practices, the difficulty of basic education in effectively teaching the deaf individual to read and write causes significant damage to training and integration social resources (SENNA, 2021).

Fernandes (1989) presents data about the comprehension of texts written by 40 profoundly deaf people (over 18 years of age, with education ranging from the fourth to the eighth grade of elementary school). After reading two texts, these students were instructed to reproduce what they read orally or in sign language. Then, they should make a written production about the presented text. The investigation results showed that the participants had much more difficulties in written production than in oral reproduction or in sign language. At the end of the investigation, it was found that only about 50% of the research participants adequately understood the text or, at least, the central idea of the textual proposal. However, the vast majority showed limitations in written reproduction. According to that author, the deaf, in general, are not prepared to perform text comprehension activities, possibly due to the absence of this activity in school situations.

Next, we quote the study by Góes (1996), who, when analyzing the textual production of deaf people aged between 14 and 26 years old, in supplementary education, identified that the written texts were produced over several months, from activities in which students could resort to the help of the teacher. The texts showed certain deviations from the written language

construction rules, namely: inappropriate use and omission of prepositions; verb ending not corresponding to person and tense; inconsistencies between past and present; inappropriate gender inflection (adjectives, articles); and incorrect use of the personal pronoun. The texts were also analyzed in terms of textual cohesion, verifying the use of ambiguous references, taking into account personal and possessive pronouns, the absence of which causes impairment in interpretation.

The textual production of the students investigated by Góes (1996) showed certain compromises, not only due to the inappropriate use of cohesive aspects, but also due to the inclusion of invented words, with unconventional meanings, as well as due to the lack of connection between the parts of the text. This author then concluded that, even having gone through a long period of schooling, the deaf have numerous difficulties with writing, difficulties resulting from the restricted use of written language by this population in their daily lives.

In turn, Quadros (1997) mentions that teaching Portuguese to the deaf, regardless of the level of hearing loss, has always been based on methodologies designed for teaching hearing children and that, for this reason, the results were considered a failure. In the wake of this discussion, Silva (2001), in his text entitled “Construction of meaning in the writing of the deaf”, justifies that most of the texts written by these subjects are superficially evaluated. The author states that, in the writing of the deaf, “there is an immense underlying area”. In addition, he explains that, in order to extract meaning from this type of production, “[...] it is necessary to resort to various systems of knowledge and activation of processes and cognitive and interactional strategies” (SILVA, 2001, p. 50, our translation). For the author, it is therefore necessary to consider all these aspects, reaffirming that the “meaning of the text” goes beyond an “observable product”.

Through a study carried out by Azevedo, Giroto and Santana (2015), it is possible to have an estimate of the national scientific production on deafness. The authors mapped the articles published in the “Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial” since its creation, in 1992, until 2013, with the objective of following the trajectory of deafness and its specificities, as well as the treatment given to it. The research revealed 49 articles for the analysis of the authors, which considered: the annual distribution of this scientific production; type of authorship; authors' training area; used textual genre; type of surveys carried out; themes related to deafness; therapeutic and educational approaches used. These articles point to a growing trend in the production of studies whose theme “Literacy” was the most linked to deafness, while

“Bilingualism” was the most emphasized approach. According to the authors, different researchers deal with:

Literacy and deafness: featured in 13 articles, with reflections on the various aspects of the process of appropriating written Portuguese as a second language (L2), by people with deafness, in addition to the discussion on techniques and assessments, having been the most recurrent theme in the total number of articles analyzed (AZEVEDO; GIROTO; SANTANA, 2015, p. 468, our translation).

As we can see, the concern with aspects related to the production and practice of writing by deaf people has somehow been the subject of numerous scientific investigations over the last few years. However, the really significant results that guarantee the deaf person full access to the Portuguese language are scarce or infrequent, so that their social needs related to the use of alphabetic writing are met.

Ways of representing thought

In the school scenario, specifically, the written language figures, at the same time, as a goal and a means of learning, to the detriment of the oral language, rarely listed as an object of school teaching. This situation is particularly harmful, as it makes it difficult to legitimize writing as a communication tool to be used in everyday life, assuring the gap between teaching and the students' reality.

In this context, it is also necessary to understand that oral language and written language constitute linguistic codes that are autonomous from each other, which characterizes them as languages distinct from one another. However, it is important to highlight that in the use of written language there are direct speech interferences when both are used within the same linguistic community. They are “[...] interference typical of situations where languages are in contact” (SENNA, 2019, p. 47, our translation).

With regard to language, Neves (2012) states that its motivating complex lies between the conceptual component and the discursive component. The author also says that the general components related to the sender and receiver, form and meaning, figure and background, encompass the linking of certain aspects that are determinant for the composition of the language, namely: cognitive, when a phenomenon of biological characteristic is based on perspectives, that is, in the subject's individual prerogatives; pragmatic actions, which are very close to the discourse, cultural and symbolic appropriation; syntactic-semantic, properly related to linguistic phenomena; to a structural system designed for a specific purpose. Such aspects of

describing the language in use, of the language in function, are implied, because “[...] the consideration of linguistic structures is guided by what they represent in the organization of the linguistic means that express the functions that language serves” (NEVES, 2012, p. 51, our translation).

More specifically on the aspects that encompass the language, especially from the grammatical/linguistic point of view, the author states:

Language cannot be described or explained as an autonomous system (GIVON, 1995), immune to a relationship with external activation factors: although the linguistic system exhibits some degree of arbitrariness, it is activated motivated by external factors (NEVES, 2012, p. 51, our translation).

The author contributes to the understanding of the functioning of language as a broader space of understanding and the function of grammar based on linguistic phenomena. Thus, understanding the idea of the linguistic composition of written language and all the functions it represents makes us reflect on speech from its specificities and on written language from its organization, structure and, above all, its social function.

In the text “*Morphology: The words of the language*”, written by Fromklin and Rodmam (1993), the authors discuss general aspects of the language emphasizing the pronunciation, the form and the concept of the linguistic sign (the word). They discuss the linear chain of the sound of words, as well as the idea of the word, which starts from prior linguistic knowledge, from internalized grammars. According to the authors: “The child's oral productions are not words linked by mere chance, since from a much earlier sentence they reveal the acquisition of principles” (FROMKLIN; RODMAM, 1993, p. 358, our translation). Therefore,

[...] as children acquire more and more language, they increasingly approach adult grammar and begin not only to use words with syntactic and grammatical functions, but also to acquire the inflected and derived morphemes of the language. Finally, all the inflections are acquired, together with the rules of syntax, and the children's oral productions end up being similar to those produced by adults (FROMKLIN; RODMAM, 1993, p. 358-359, our translation).

In the evidence of the facts that reveal the process of acquisition of the written language by the deaf student, especially the one with profound deafness, it is evident, therefore, such difficulty that the subject has to access the written code, mainly due to the absence of speech. Obviously, it is important to always reaffirm that speech and writing make up autonomous systems, however, in terms of form, they are similar in certain aspects.

It is worth emphasizing that the signs executed by the deaf, users of Libras, in their daily lives, present global characteristics of a three-dimensional order, due to their visuospatial organization, as they combine different elements of understanding and meaning. However, both oral and written language have very similar organizational characteristics from the point of view of segmentation and sentence linearization.

Fromklin and Rodmam (1993) emphasize the importance of contact between oral and written languages when they mention that phonological and morphological rules appear in the individual very early, still in childhood. For them:

The child's ability to generalize patterns and form rules is also evident in their phonological development. In the early stages of language acquisition, children may not distinguish, for example, between voiced and unvoiced consonants. But, when they start to establish the contrast in a set, that is, when they learn that /p and /b/ are different phonemes - they also start to distinguish between /t/ /d/, /s/ /z/, and so on. These phases and fixed patterns support the notion that language acquisition means grammatical construction (FROMKLIN; RODMAM, 1993, p. 363, our translation).

According to these authors, the child's oral productions are not words linked by mere chance, on the contrary, from a very early age “[...] reveal the acquisition of the principles of phrase formation” (FRONKLIN; RODMAM, 1993, p. 358, our translation). In other words, it means to say that, by mastering speech, the child increasingly approaches the grammar of the adult and, from then on, begins to use words with syntactic and grammatical functions, as well as to acquire inflected morphemes and derivatives of language.

All these statements, in addition to the confrontations and contrasts between oral language, written language and Libras, are concentrated on the deaf subject, especially those with profound deafness, who do not have any command of the oral language, but who, on the other hand, have the domain of Libras and communicates perfectly with his peers, however, he does not write. So the following question arises: what attention has the school, in general, been giving to this subject?

The answer to this question is established through an understanding based on the hypothesis that different modes of thought interfere in the mental representation that deaf individuals make of alphabetic writing, causing an impact on the production of written texts. Thus, it becomes important here to distinguish and operate only with the two modes of thought and their respective social subjects, which are symbolically represented by: “narrative” mode of thought and “scientific” mode of thought (BRUNER, 2002).

Narrative thinking addresses the way in which human intentions behave in the most diverse situations. In this sense, the stories created by the deaf, due to their unique way of seeing and representing the world, trace reports of human actions in circumstances of experiences located in a personally defined time and space. On the other hand, the theoretical discourse, where alphabetic writing is constituted, establishes itself beyond particular facts and actions, aiming at broadly abstract formulations, constituted according to scientific thinking.

Thus, as we have observed, the two types of thoughts function differently in relation to the ordering of the individual's personal experience and in the construction of reality. About narrative thinking, in particular, Bruner (2002, p. 140, our translation) pronounces as follows:

Narrativized realities, I suspect, are too ubiquitous, their construction too habitual or automatic to be accessible to easy inspection. We live in a sea of stories, and like the fish that (according to the proverb) are the last to see the water, we have our own difficulties in understanding what it means to swim in stories. Not that we are not competent in creating our narrative accounts of reality – far from it – we are, rather, too knowledgeable. Our problem, on the contrary, is to reach an awareness of what we do so easily and automatically, the old prize de conscience problem.

Bruner's theory coherently incorporates the contributions of maturationism and the contributions of environmentalism. The author believes that it is through one and the other that the child organizes the different ways of representing reality, based on the techniques that his culture transmits to him. According to this theory, the child's cognitive development depends on the use of information elaboration techniques in order to codify the experience, taking into account the various representation systems at their disposal.

For the aforementioned author, the cognitive revolution has been unable to reveal the mysteries of the mind and has offered educational proposals of very limited scope, making it necessary for psychology to once again emphasize the role of culture in the formation of our language and our thoughts. Bruner also comments that it is possible to teach students anything, as long as procedures adapted to cognitive styles and their needs are used.

In this sense, Bruner's theory leads us to (re)think and/or reframe certain school practices, since, during the last decades, many teachers have favored the systematic and universal use of pedagogical strategies that meet a majority of students, to the detriment of a greater balance and diversification of methodologies, in an evident devaluation of the processes of knowledge transmission and of the new methods of multiple learning. Notoriously, quality learning cannot do without either one or the other, especially in the education of the deaf. In fact, any exclusivism can only lead to bad results.

Certainly, believing in the intelligence of the deaf student reflects the understanding of each strange behavior, each error, each attempt at written production, based on the hypothesis of a complex cognitive system, which allows (re)cognition of the subject and his unique way of thinking/acting. Senna (2003, p. 9, our translation), when addressing this issue, states:

For the school, this is very difficult, because its conception of human intelligence is strongly attached to the conception of a model of intellectual behavior, built together with a whole scientific culture of social experience, in which it is agreed to understand certain patterns of behavior as acceptable or correct, to the detriment of an infinity of other patterns of behavior, taken as incorrect, unacceptable, unhealthy, ignorant, etc.

Faced with this argument, seeing in the deaf student an intelligence manifested differently from that agreed in school is necessary, in order to guarantee the redefinition of teaching practice, which, above all, must provide for a daily exercise of tolerance and respect for others, universal and, above all, essential concepts in education.

We must also be attentive to the fact that the deaf person, from the point of view of psychomotricity ⁴, presents traces of a slight disorientation, due to the degree of hearing loss, which makes it even more difficult to understand and apprehend concepts essential to the constitution of written language. Such factors indicate divergences between the deaf subject and alphabetic writing.

To a large extent, the difficulties that the profoundly deaf person encounters in the literacy process result from the fact that they are not given adequate experiences of discovering the properties of a totally unknown verbal expression system, since they have not gone through the speech acquisition process.

By transferring to the written language, the unit of thought that he represented in the appropriate way for sign language – therefore, not conditioned to the chains of causal and sequential relations required by verbal systems (oral or written) –, the conditions of text production by the deaf make it apparently disconnected and often difficult to understand. It is important to point out that Libras and written language are associated with two different ways of representing the world, neither better nor worse than each other, but with differences that manifest themselves in equally different forms of textual organization. In the case of deaf people, Libras and the way of representing the world that is peculiar to them constitute their symbolic universe, their culture and the way in which they share experiences and meanings of

⁴ Lima, Pereira and Moraes (2011), in their study entitled “Influence of deafness on motor development and balance in children”, pointed out that deaf children showed inferior development in relation to hearing children, based on the postural control task, fine motor skills, global motor skills, balance and temporal organization.

the world. Its entry into the universe of alphabetic writing practices consequently demands the discovery of a new model of representation of the world and cultural practices, something, therefore, that goes far beyond the mere discovery of a written code.

Faced with the practice that consists of using methodologies in which Libras serves as a linguistic framework for the acquisition of written language, Góes (1996) makes the following statement:

[...] such indications strengthen the assumption that the analyzed texts were constructed with partial support in rules for using Libras, which could largely explain the characteristics of the students' writing. As for this possible instruction of signs in Portuguese writing, it is worth remembering that sign languages do not yet have a written system that corresponds to them, given the complexity of representing the three-dimensional structures of the visual gestural medium (GÓES, 1996, p. 11, our translation).

The statements presented by Góes (1996) highlight a very important question for us to think about the way in which the profoundly deaf person organizes, sequences and structures the written text, especially at school. Communication in Libras confirms an interaction process in which the deaf population shares messages, ideas, feelings and emotions, which are organized directly from their beliefs, values, life history and culture.

In general, Libras communicates comprehensively as a whole, that is, once framed by a frame, it is individualized and unique. Through communication by signs, the deaf subject spontaneously relates to the environment and space in his social environment.

Libras is also established through body language, through body movements, facial expressions and hand signals. Written language, in turn, presents itself sequentially, linearly, through causality markers, very specific traits of its linguistic structure. Thus, in an attempt to unite such complex and distinct systems, the deaf student often ends up writing what was indicated, giving rise only to a frustrated attempt to segment a representational universe infinitely larger than the content governed by the alphabetic code.

As we can see, producing texts is one of the most complex activities for a deaf person to perform, as it is typically a matter of spatial organization. For the deaf, the production of texts is, therefore, the production of spatial orders. It is by understanding the ways in which concepts are organized that the deaf subject will become able to understand the way in which the distribution of information is projected.

There is no doubt that language as a structure shows itself, on its inner side, as the outline of thought. And, in this sense, both Libras and speech are associated with certain types of mental representation and/or certain ways of thinking. However, Libras and speech constitute distinct

systems, however, at the same time, very close in terms of their nature – spontaneous and intuitive.

In view of this, it is clear that the possibilities of transferring Libras to written text are limited, since the way in which communication in Libras is established by its users, in a global and three-dimensional way, does not come close to the complexity and abstraction imposed by alphabetical code. This, in a way, justifies the studies that have been published about the difficulty that deaf students have in mastering the written text, especially those that use only Libras, without any other type of reference as support for the acquisition of the written language. In this regard, Senna (2019, p. 495, our translation) reveals that,

[...] Libras, as well as other similar expression systems, are extremely harmful, within the scope of such a relationship with thought, as their structures and forms of organization are not subject to the order of structures that are enshrined in academic culture.

Indeed, there is no more relevant general fact in reference to written language than its nature. It is a phenomenon independent of the subject and its intentionality; an autonomous entity with a strong status of power, considered as the center and pulse of knowledge.

Based on this finding, the clashes and contrasts presented here seek to highlight the difficulty that deaf students, especially those with severe/profound deafness, have had, over all these years, in an attempt to develop a written text that is recognizably validated and legitimized.

At the same time, we seek to show that, unfortunately, the numerous methodologies disseminated to deal with all this problem are still insufficient. In fact, nobody problematizes the central question of the process of acquisition and development of the deaf's writing, nor the individual prerogatives of these subjects. What is most evident are the values imposed on the Brazilian Sign Language, especially in determining the status of the language, which “[...] still persists in a reading of its structure and functioning based on assumptions belonging to the domain of the word” (SENNA, 2019, p. 487, our translation).

We observe, therefore, that the academic success of these students is being related to a pattern of behavior of an individual that is highly centered and prospective in the conception of a mind that thinks, that is, that mind that is capable of establishing an idea of predication, a subjective mind. This, in turn, presents a syntactic organization equivalent to a sequential order, which departs from the rationality of science, typical of community members, who classify themselves as the political-cultural majority.

Considerations

From the discussions raised in this study on education for the deaf and its relationship with the written language, we realize that, despite any attempt to simply present a teaching proposal that is decisive for the literacy of these students, it is necessary to consider the subjects involved in this process, taking into account both the teachers and the deaf students who will be affected by the pedagogical actions that are decisive or not in this process of school teaching and learning.

Access to these students' real situations facilitates the reflection between theory and practice, which, in turn, facilitates the permanence of the deaf subject in school and guarantees him a progressive and quality education. In this sense, the big issue to be addressed in order to deal with the problem of teaching the deaf is not exactly limited to the way of teaching (didactic methods or procedures), but to cover a broad model of representation and systematization of the type of academic discourse conveyed by the education professionals in the act of dealing with the deaf student in their differences. Therefore, it is necessary to define a favorable means for the teacher to be able to effectively equip himself for the exercise of his function, being sensitized as to the need to seek more adequate means for the education of the deaf.

Since writing was idealized by and for a certain subject of Cartesian reason, who first thinks and then expresses himself, it cannot be naturalized and understood as an object of universal character. Therefore, it becomes necessary to know in the student, in particular, here, the deaf student, in the first place, the way in which the inner text is established in him, so that it is possible to recognize the subject in his uniqueness. From there, it becomes possible to develop strategies that are fundamental and specific for gaining some linguistic awareness, from which the understanding of the different types of codes is based.

All this understanding about the singularities of the ways of thinking and operating codes of expression constitutes an adequate foundation for the literacy of deaf students. This – the deaf individual – has the right to an education that assumes what is peculiar to him, including from an intellectual point of view, which demands principles and teaching processes that are equally unique.

It is important to point out that laying low eyes on the written text produced by the deaf subject, focusing only on the expressed content, with a reductionist view, often contaminated by concepts such as disorders, dysfunction, learning deficit, does not contribute at all to its development, except for the reification of the stigma of deprivation of meaning. This type of approach to the textual production of the deaf individual denies him the right to understand the

nature of the facts that are manifested in what is seen as an “error” and, consequently, to understand it as a linguistic fact, and not as a mark of disability.

Even after numerous studies that compose strategies and/or methodologies aimed at the deaf subject, there are few results that effectively achieve progress in the universe of alphabetic writing. However, according to Bruner (2001), it is possible to teach any subject in an honorable way to any child, at any stage of development. In this process, we must always consider the subject's intellectual development, as well as the task of teaching certain content and representing its structure in terms of the student's view of things.

We can say, then, that the redefinition of pedagogical actions also contributes to strengthening the understanding of the content, especially by stimulating the construction of a space for mutual cooperation between the teacher and the deaf student, cultivating empathy between both. By doing so, a relationship of complicity and cooperation is built. Consequently, knowledge is respected and the school environment favors exchange and the search for solutions.

That said, each teacher must consciously evaluate their practice, becoming responsible for that student's learning in a truly broader sense, in order to reconcile the theoretical representation of facts through the written language, as well as the mental representation and intuitive approach of deaf students and their specificities.

REFERENCES

- AZEVEDO. C. B; GIROTO. C. R. M; SANTANA. A. P. O. Produção científica na área da surdez: análise dos artigos publicados na Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial no período de 1992 a 2013. **Rev. Bras. Ed. Esp.**, Marília, SP, v. 21, n. 4, p. 459-476, out./dez. 2015. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbee/a/mpNGysQxgYjSTzGXdCdZNCm/?lang=pt>. Access: 11 July 2022.
- BRUNER, J. **A cultura da educação**. Porto Alegre: Artmed Editora, 2001.
- BRUNER, J. **Realidade mental, mundos possíveis**. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: Artes Médica, 2002.
- FERNANDES, E. **Problemas linguísticos e cognitivos do surdo**. Rio de Janeiro: Agir, 1989.
- FERNANDES, S. F. **Educação bilíngüe para surdos: identidades, diferenças, contradições e mistérios**. 202 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, PR, 2003.
- FROMKIN, V.; RODMAN, R. **Introdução à Linguagem**. Tradução: Isabel Casanova. Coimbra: Editora Almedina, 1993.

GESUELI, Z. M. Língua(gem) e identidade: a surdez em questão. **Educação & Sociedade**, v. 27, p. 277-292, 2006. Available at:

<https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/3XVGL5KrfKmDVvvnRh5MXwL/?format=pdf&lang=pt>.
Access: 25 June 2022.

GÓES, M. C. R. **Linguagem, surdez e educação**. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 1996.

LEBEDEFF, T. B. Aprendendo a ler “com outros olhos”: relatos de oficinas de letramento visual com professores surdos. **Cadernos de Educação**, Pelotas, RS, n. 36, 2010. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufpel.edu.br/ojs2/index.php/caduc/article/view/1606/1489>. Access: 27 Jun. 2022.

LIMA, T. C. S.; PEREIRA, M. C. C.; MORAES, R. Influência da surdez no desenvolvimento motor e do equilíbrio em crianças. **Brazilian Journal of Motor Behavior**, 2011, v. 6, n. 1, p. 16-23. ISSN 1980-5586. Available at:

<http://www.socibra.com.br/bjmb/index.php/bjmb/article/viewFile/25/22>.
Access: 05 jul. 2022.

LODI, A. C. B. *et al.* **Letramento e minorias**. 2002.

LODI, A. C. B.; LACERDA, C.B.F. **Uma escola, duas línguas: letramento em língua portuguesa e língua de sinais nas etapas iniciais de escolarização**. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 2009.

MIDENA, M. C. M. **O surdo e a escrita na clínica fonoaudiológica: um estudo de caso**. Orientadora: Prof. Dra. Maria Fausta Cahyba Pereira de Castro. 2004. 135 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Universidade de Campinas, Campinas, SP, 2004.

NEVES, M. H. M. **A gramática passada a limpo: conceitos, análises e parâmetros**. São Paulo: Parábola, 2012.

QUADROS, R. M. **Educação de surdos: a aquisição da linguagem**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas. 1997.

SENN, L. A. G. O Planejamento no ensino básico & o compromisso social da educação com o letramento. **Educação e Linguagem**. São José dos Campos, SP, p. 200-216, 2003. ISSN: 1415-9902. Available at: http://www.senna.pro.br/biblioteca/plan_letramento.pdf.
Access: 12 Apr. 2022.

SENN, L. A. G. O Estatuto linguístico da língua Brasileira de sinais e a superação do estigma na educação de surdos. **Rev. Bras. Ed. Esp.**, Marília, SP, v. 25, n. 3, p. 487-500, 2019. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbee/a/JX4fq7FNrrp86PRwNd8RmbM/?lang=pt>.
Access: 12 June 2022.

SENN, L. A. G. Bilinguismo cultural: da linguística à agenda de estudos em educação inclusiva. *In*: SENNA, L. A. G. **Bilinguismo cultural: estudos sobre línguas em contato na educação brasileira**. Curitiba: Appris, 2021. p. 15-36.

SILVA, M. P. M. **A construção de sentidos na escrita do aluno surdo**. São Paulo: Plexus Editora, 2001.

CRedit Author Statement

Acknowledgments: Not applicable.

Financing: PROCIENCIA Program and by the FAPERJ and CECERJ foundations

Conflicts of interest: There are no conflicts of interest.

Ethical approval: Not applicable.

Availability of data and material: Not applicable.

Author contributions: The research was carried out collectively and equally.

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

