

LITERACY WORKSHOP IN HIGHER EDUCATION: STUDENTS' VIEW OF  
THEIR WRITING AND READING CONDITIONS

*OFICINA DE LETRAMENTO NO ENSINO SUPERIOR: VISÃO DE ALUNOS ACERCA  
DE SUAS CONDIÇÕES DE ESCRITA E LEITURA*

*TALLER DE LETRAMIENTO EN LA EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR: LA VISIÓN DE LOS  
ESTUDIANTES SOBRE SUS CONDICIONES DE ESCRITURA Y LECTURA*



Isabela Jordão de CAMARGO<sup>1</sup>  
e-mail: isabelajordao\_100@hotmail.com



Ana Paula BERBERIAN<sup>2</sup>  
email: ana.berberian@utp.br

**How to reference this article:**

CAMARGO, I. J.; BERBERIAN, A. A. P. Literacy workshop in higher education: Students' view of their writing and reading conditions. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 18, n. 00, e023082, 2023. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v18iesp.1.18482>



| 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>Tuiuti University of Paraná (UTP), Curitiba – PR – Brazil. Master's student in the Graduate Program in Human communication disorders.

<sup>2</sup>Tuiuti University of Paraná (UTP), Curitiba – PR – Brazil. Adjunct Professor at the Graduate Program in Human communication disorders. PhD in History (PUCPR).

**ABSTRACT:** Researches indicate that a meaningful number of people entering in Higher Education (HE) have restricted relationships and knowledge with reading and writing practices. This study aimed to analyze the statements of undergraduate and graduate students about their reading and writing conditions before and after participating in a Literacy Workshop developed in the context of HE from categories that emerged from the answers provided: Discursive Gender, Authorship and Responsive Position. This study was approved by the ethics committee under number 69021617.9.000.8040. This is qualitative research with a theoretical methodological orientation through the analysis of the discourse from Bakhtinian assumptions. The research subjects were 5 students who participated in a Literacy Workshop held in an HE Institution in the State of Paraná. The result of the analyses carried out proves a decrease in the insecurities and sufferings of these students in relation to the texts belonging to the academic genres (AG).

**KEYWORDS:** Academic genre. Literacy. Reading. Writing. Higher education. Education and Speech Language Therapy.

**RESUMO:** Pesquisas apontam que um número significativo de pessoas que ingressam no Ensino Superior (ES) apresenta relações e conhecimentos restritos com as práticas de leitura e escrita. Este estudo objetivou analisar as falas dos estudantes de graduação e pós-graduação acerca de suas condições de leitura e escrita antes e após a participação numa Oficina de Letramento desenvolvida no contexto do ES a partir de categorias que emergiram das respostas fornecidas: Gênero Discursivo, Autoria e Posição Responsiva. Este estudo foi aprovado pelo comitê de ética sob o número 69021617.9.000.8040. Trata-se de uma pesquisa qualitativa com orientação teórico-metodológica por meio da análise do discurso a partir de pressupostos bakhtinianos. Foram sujeitos da pesquisa 5 alunos que participaram de uma Oficina de Letramento realizada numa Instituição de ES do estado do Paraná. O resultado das análises realizadas comprova uma diminuição das inseguranças e sofrimentos desses estudantes frente aos textos pertencentes aos gêneros acadêmicos (GA).

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Gênero acadêmico. Letramento. Leitura. Escrita. Ensino superior. Educação e Fonoaudiologia.

**RESUMEN:** La investigación indica que un número significativo de personas que ingresan a la Educación Superior (ES) tienen relaciones y conocimientos restringidos con las prácticas de lectura y escritura. Este estudio tuvo como objetivo analizar las declaraciones de estudiantes de pregrado y posgrado sobre sus condiciones de lectura y escritura antes y después de participar en un Taller de Alfabetización desarrollado en el contexto de la ES a partir de categorías que surgieron de las respuestas proporcionadas: Género Discursivo, Autoría y Posición Receptiva. Este estudio fue aprobado por el comité de ética con el número 69021617.9.000.8040. Se trata de una investigación cualitativa con una orientación metodológica teórica a través del análisis del discurso desde los supuestos bakhtinianos. Los sujetos de la investigación fueron 5 estudiantes que participaron de un Taller de Alfabetización realizado en una Institución ES en el Estado de Paraná. El resultado de los análisis realizados demuestra una disminución de las inseguridades y sufrimientos de estos estudiantes en relación con los textos pertenecientes a los géneros académicos (GA).

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Género académico. Alfabetización. Lectura. Escritura. Educación superior. Educación y Fonoaudiología.

## Introduction

For the right to Higher Education (HE) to be effective and, therefore, for students to have a quality academic-professional training, it is necessary for them to be able to dialogue with the knowledge that is approached during this process and, for that, to have reading and writing conditions that allow them to assume a critical, reflective and responsive position (SOUZA; BASSETTO, 2014; PAN; BRANCO, 2016; DONIDA; SANTANA, 2019). However, large-scale national and regional studies show a significant number of HE students with limitations and restricted relationships with reading and writing texts belonging to the so-called academic genres (AG) (INSTITUTO ABRAMUNDO, 2014; SOUZA; BASSETTO, 2014; PAN; BRANCO, 2016; DONIDA; SANTANA, 2019; BISCOUTO *et al.*, 2020).

It is important to emphasize that despite the advances in relation to the expansion of accessibility to admission to this level of education, which occurred especially in the mid-2000s (SEMESP, 2015), the education that precedes HE has not, historically, guaranteed the constitution of readers and writers able to assume a dialogical and authorial position in relation to the texts that mediated their academic and professional training.

This problem can be apprehended in a study called “Scientific Literacy Indicator (CLI)”, carried out by the Paulo Montenegro Institute, by the Non-Governmental Organization Ação Educativa and by the Abramundo Institute, in 2014, with HE students from nine Brazilian states and the District Federal. Results of this research, whose objective was to determine the degree of proficiency in the Scientific Literacy scale levels, point to the existence of a significant number of students with restricted reading and writing conditions (INSTITUTO ABRAMUNDO, 2014).

It should be noted that the results of that study are surprising as they reveal that only 11% of students who completed HE had a proficient level of scientific literacy, which consists of being able to evaluate proposals that require mastery of scientific concepts and terms in situations involving different contexts; develop arguments about the reliability or veracity of formulated hypotheses and learn about issues related to the environment, health, astronomy or genetics (INSTITUTO ABRAMUNDO, 2014).

With regard to reading and writing practices, a distance can be seen between the demands inherent to higher education, the expectations of teachers and the real conditions of students (PAN; BRANCO, 2016; PÔRTO; MASSI; GUARINELLO, 2020). Such distance is linked to the ways in which, hegemonically, such practices have been addressed in the Brazilian educational process, that is, normative aspects of language, uses and evaluative functions and

reading and writing are privileged as a means of assimilation and reproduction of contents. To this extent, the restricted and negative relationships experienced by students in relation to written language and, especially to AG, is mainly due to the fact that in basic education students are required to read texts, which are generally fragmented, from materials decontextualized from reality, which results in an instrumental and mechanical relationship with these texts (GERALDI, 2013; PAN; BRANCO, 2016; DONIDA; SANTANA, 2019).

The fact that students do not establish significant relationships with written language during their school trajectory means that, in HE, when faced with interactions and academic activities mediated by written texts belonging to AG, they experience negative feelings, in particular, of incompetence and displeasure, as well as restrictions on comprehension, interpretation and production of texts (PAN; BRANCO, 2016; DONIDA; SANTANA, 2019; BISCOUTO *et al.*, 2020).

Donida and Santana, when talking about the difficulties experienced by HE students, also mention that:

Perhaps this occurs because higher education professors are also not prepared to receive/identify students who have reading and writing difficulties. Students who often experience difficulties, do not speak and, embarrassed by the image they create of themselves and what a university student is, isolate themselves or even drop out of the course (DONIDA; SANTANA, 2019, p. 5, our translation).

The lack of recognition by teachers of the restricted conditions for reading and writing texts belonging to the academic context, on the part of HE students, implies, among other problems, the aggravation of feelings of impossibility and incompetence. Without familiarity and knowledge about the particularities of the referred texts, the students, although they feel powerless in the face of such a situation, are required to, alone, face the reading and writing of texts belonging to the AG, such as: articles, reviews, final works of course (PAN; BRANCO, 2016; DONIDA; SANTANA, 2019; BISCOUTO *et al.*, 2020).

It is worth mentioning that if students have knowledge/experiences of and with texts belonging to other genres, such as those that mediate their daily relationships (notes, e-mails, lists, information manuals, posts on social networks, recipes, etc.). They, in general, are unaware of specificities of texts belonging to the academic sphere. It is emphasized that people always dialogue from and with discourses/texts that establish connections with activities and social relations and, therefore, are connected with a certain time and space involving different interlocutors and objectives (FIORIN, 2016).

Thus, it is important for HE students to have access to and experience with different types of academic texts and that these are significantly mediated by professors. Based on Geraldi's (2013) formulations, we understand the appropriation and uses established with written language as continuous processes, without beginning, middle or end, from which subjects, singularly and collectively, act on language and on the world, according to the quality and familiarity established with the different speech genres. In this direction, the author draws attention to the fact that writing and reading a text presuppose, in addition to codification, decoding and apprehension of meanings, the analysis of its production and circulation conditions (GERALDI, 2013). Finally, for whom, for what purpose, when discourses are produced and where they circulate define such conditions, which, in turn, imply different textual structures (compositional, thematic and style aspects), called discourse genres (BAKHTIN, 2016, 2017).

According to the author's formulations, it can be said that aspects that characterize the context of production of texts belonging to AG need to be addressed and analyzed, so that in reading and writing students can take the place of interlocutors/authors, capable of to understand the relatively stable characteristics of such texts. That is, to understand that AG refer to oral and written discourses/texts that are produced and circulate within the HE to mediate the dialogue between teachers, researchers and students, with different purposes such as, for example, production and exchange of knowledge, dissemination of research, summary of ideas, activity reports (FIGUEIREDO; BONINI, 2006; SOUZA; BASSETTO, 2014).

It is noteworthy that the knowledge and reading and writing conditions of academic texts/genres decisively interfere with the success or failure experienced by students throughout their HE training, as the relationships and uses established with oral and written language, in this context, establish a close relationship with the modes of participation in the teaching-learning processes. It is through these language modalities that students and teachers interact, have access, exchange information and knowledge, present and defend points of view and conceptions, share or build worldviews, produce and share knowledge (SOUZA; BASSETTO, 2014; MORETTO, 2017; BERBERIAN; GUARINELLO; FERLA, 2022).

Considering the relationships established with and from texts belonging to AG, which aim at the elaboration, systematization and sharing of theoretical-methodological references, concepts and arguments, the dialogues established with these, in general, demand more than just a single reading and/or writing, but some re-readings and rewritings. This demand is related to the fact that the relationship with texts belonging to this genre, when conducted from an

emancipatory teaching-learning conception, summons its interlocutors to a critical analysis and a responsive position and authorship.

Assuming such a position presupposes agreeing, disagreeing, interpreting, establishing associations and questioning around what is “said” in the referred texts and, therefore, understanding that it is not just about being able to understand, express or reproduce contents, nor about decoding and codify writing as a communication tool. Assuming a responsive and authorial position with the texts that mediate academic and professional training presupposes putting oneself in dialogue with these productions, analyzing intentions, values, ideas, conceptualizations.

The possibility for students to assume such a position is related to their literacy conditions, which, according to Soares (2017), involve a state or a condition that allows the establishment of meaningful relationships with the different oral and written discourses/texts that mediate the academic relations and the analysis of their production conditions, involving: what, how, when and for what purpose (SOARES, 2017).

It is important to clarify that, like Soares (2017), we understand that the conditions or “literacy levels” are a result of the different and unequal social and historical conditions in which people are inserted. This is because we conceive of language as a constituted and constituent social practice, based on material and subjective conditions, which cross ideological values and forms of social organization (BAKHTIN, 2016, 2017). Therefore, the constitution of readers and writers, their literacy conditions, are not established from the capacity and/or individual abilities inherent to the subjects, or related to the domain of an instrument-code language, but result from the lived experiences and the quality of the interrelations established with, and from, the different texts and, therefore, with the different discursive genres.

Based on such assumptions, we consider that the modes, functions and types of reading and writing, traditionally proposed and experienced in Higher Education, deprive students of a position of authorship, which, according to Bakhtinian principles, would allow them to understand “the great force that moves the universe” of reading and writing, understood as cultural practices:

[...] are precisely the socio-evaluative positions placed in a dynamic of multiple responsive interrelationships. [...] In other words, every cultural act moves in an intense axiological atmosphere of responsive indeterminations, that is, in every cultural act an evaluative position is assumed in relation to other evaluative positions. [...] The author-creator is, therefore, the one who gives form to the content: he not only passively registers the events of life, [...]

but, from a certain axiological position, cuts them out and reorganizes them aesthetically (FARACO, 2012, p. 38-39, our translation).

It is understood that assuming an axiological position means responding, in a responsive way, to the discourse of the other and, to that extent, it is about assuming an ethical commitment, with our own acts/discourses, theoretical and practical positions, without an alibi, however, always dialogically. In other words, this means that the speaker and the writer, to elaborate a discourse, consider the other's discourse, which is present in their own, thus “[...] every discourse is inevitably occupied, crossed, by the other's discourse. Dialogism is the relationships of meaning that are established between two statements” (FIORIN, 2020, p. 22, our translation).

From the understanding that a quality education in HE presupposes, among other aspects, that students are aware that: - in any of their experiences and relationships, the discourses that cross them are loaded with intentionality, purpose and specific interests and that, therefore, its characteristics will be diverse; - reading and writing consist of social practices from which we assume evaluative positions related to our worldviews; - the positions and places they occupy as speakers, writers and readers in social/dialogical relationships define modes of participation in different spheres and social relationships and, therefore, in those involving the teaching-learning processes specific to higher education.

Considering that a significant number of students do not have access to theoretical-practical knowledge that allows them to analyze such aspects, since they establish reductionist and functional relationships with written language, attention is drawn to the incipient number of researches that, based on a social and historical conception of language and teaching-learning processes, prioritize the discussion around cultural, economic, educational determinants involved with such a problem, capable of offering elements for the implementation of institutional interventions that, collectively, aim at promoting literacy (PAN; BRANCO, 2016).

Having made these considerations, it is highlighted that the objective of this study was to analyze the views of undergraduate and graduate students about their reading and writing conditions before and after participating in a Literacy Workshop developed in the context of Higher Education.

## Methodology

This study was approved by the ethics committee under number 69021617.9.000.8040. This is qualitative research with a theoretical-methodological orientation based on Bakhtinian assumptions (BAKHTIN, 2016, 2017).

Five students who participated in a Literacy Workshop held in an HE Institution in the state of Paraná took part in the research. The inclusion criteria of the participants were: being an undergraduate or graduate student and having participated in a Literacy Workshop for at least a year and a half.

It is noteworthy that the objective of the Workshop was to promote a space for dialogue, listening and expansion of reading and writing experiences lived in the academic context. It should be clarified that such a workshop, based on a social and historical perspective from which written language is conceived as a practice of a dialogical nature and constitutive of the subject, is linked to an extension activity developed since 2017. The meetings take place weekly, the based-on activities of reading and writing texts of different discursive genres, lasting 90 minutes.

To identify the participants, fictitious names were assigned, as shown below.

**Lana**, aged 46, is currently studying the eighth period of the Speech Therapy course; **Sarah**: 20 years old, currently studying the seventh period of the Speech Therapy course; **Priscila**: 55 years old, currently holds a Master's Degree in Communication Disorders and works as a Special Education teacher; **Débora**: 26 years old, works as a speech therapist and is studying the first year of her doctorate in Communication Disorders; **Ivan**: 31 years old, currently in the eighth period of the Speech Therapy course.

As for the procedure adopted for carrying out the field research, an online interview was carried out at scheduled dates and times, individually and orally, through the *Zoom platform*, lasting approximately 40 minutes. The interviews were recorded and transcribed in full in Portuguese. After transcription, they were sent again for the participants to approve or make changes when they deemed necessary.

During the interviews, the following questions were addressed: How was your relationship with reading and writing before attending the Workshop? Did you identify limitations and/or difficulties in relation to such reading and writing practices? If so, which ones, and how did you deal with them? What reasons led you to participate in the Workshop? Can you notice changes in your relationship with reading and writing after attending the



Workshop? If so, what changes have taken place? What actions developed at the Workshop had an impact on the relationships established with reading and writing?

The answers were treated from the Dialogic Discourse Analysis (BRAIT, 2006), focusing on the categories that emerged from the participants' answers: Discursive Genre, Authorship and Responsive Position. It is also noteworthy that such analysis will be carried out from the selection and presentation of representative excerpts that emerged with greater recurrence, in the responses provided by the participants, considering the objectives of this study.

## Discussion and Results

As for the relationships established by the participants with reading and writing before their participation in the Workshop, the reasons that led them to join and the changes that occurred from this experience, it can be seen that restricted, negative and suffering relationships and experiences with texts belonging to the AG were mentioned by all participants and mobilized them to seek greater understanding and actions capable of contributing to overcoming this problem.

In this sense, Sarah mentions that the insecurity in developing academic activities that require reading and writing texts stems from little or no experience with AGs:

Sarah: “[...] when I arrived at the university, **I came across a different genre, a genre that I had no affinity for and had never seen before**, I somehow came across an unknown. [...] I started to feel a little more apprehensive about this topic and that's why I entered the workshop. [...] I thought the idea was super cool, [...] **this group within the academic environment, which is a medium that many people are faced with this difficulty**, so that's why I started participating in the Workshop from the beginning of the first year of college (authors' emphasis, our translation).

It is interesting to note how Sarah, in addition to referring to having no “affinity” with texts belonging to AG, states that she “never” saw them and that, therefore, they were “unknown”. Considering that school education is oriented based on knowledge formulated in the academic-scientific context, it is noteworthy that Sarah has no record of reading and writing with texts belonging to this context throughout her schooling. It is noteworthy that carrying out scientific research in the classroom is a learning practice proposed in the National Common Curricular Base (BRASIL, 2018). Pedagogical practices that aim at the appropriation of knowledge around the scientific method and research elaboration are presented in this document

aiming to provide, especially to high school students, the acquisition of new knowledge that allow logical, systematic and analytical thinking about the everyday facts and the resolution of practical problems, as well as recognizing the importance of scientific knowledge-method and its role in the development of a critical and reflective position (BRASIL, 2018).

It is also possible to apprehend, in the excerpt described above, that the existence of a group, with people who share “difficulties” around reading and writing, represented a relief for Sarah. Finally, she seems positively surprised by the fact that the university promotes a collective action, in short, a welcoming space where students and professors meet to face difficulties and challenges related to their reading and writing conditions in the context of Higher Education.

It is also interesting to highlight the surprise reported by Priscila, one of the participants, a master’s student at the aforementioned University and a professor of Special Education, faced with “difficulties” in the written production of her dissertation:

Priscila: “[...] **I am a person who works with writing**, because I am a teacher, **I write documents, I write reports, student opinions and I didn't master writing!** [...] **but I didn't realize how difficult it was for me to start writing in another genre. Not the one in your everyday life** (emphasis added, our translation).

Difficulties in writing her master's thesis made Priscila rethink her condition as a reader and writer, and recognizing such a condition goes beyond the domain of the normative system of the language, otherwise, once she knows how to write “reports” and “student opinions”, she would be able to write any text and, therefore, his master's thesis. It can be seen in Priscila's statements that she refers to limitations and inability in the face of texts belonging to AG.

It is interesting to analyze how, despite the lack of access and experience with such texts, negative positions and meanings come to be experienced and referred to by the participants. Lana's report, like other participants, allows analyzing which disqualifications and feelings of incapacity were incorporated from speeches and, therefore, from visions of the other(s) (FIORIN, 2020), in the case of teachers who participated in their school training processes

Lana: “[...] **a teacher asked for a paper** and when I went to hand it in, she said 'No, **this isn't a job! What is that?** But how so?' She surprised me by saying: 'What do you mean! **I cannot accept this !** I kept looking like this... **I said: 'What do you mean? What do you want?'** She said: 'I want a job, this isn't a job!'" (emphasis added, our translation).

The teacher's statement *"this is not a job"*, in response to the text produced by Lana, contributed to the destitution of her place of authorship, since her text was not taken as a discourse capable of promoting dialogue between her and the teacher, since his writing was only evaluated as not "text-work".

Another recurrent position regarding the participants' view of their conditions as readers and writers can be seen when Priscila mentions that before participating in the Workshop, she read and wrote texts belonging to AG in an uncritical way. That is, believing that one should believe in what was already written, accept it as truth, without questioning the positions and knowledge formulated by the author.

Priscila: "[...] **I had it in my head that the author's opinion is the definitive one. I think that when I became a writer I also wanted to use this maxim** . [...] I realized that I **ended up reading as if what was written was a maxim and that I could not argue with this author.** [...] I cannot argue with him, because **what is written is correct. And today that has changed, I argue.** [...] During the reading, this was a practice that I acquired at the Workshop that was not mine." (our translation).

The above excerpt allows us to notice that, after her participation in the Workshop, there was a shift in relation to Priscila's position, that is, the notion that reading and writing implies reproducing already produced/written knowledge, without her having to assume a responsive and responsible evaluative position in relation to the texts, for the understanding that the reading and writing of the academic text presuppose a dialogical relationship between interlocutors who negotiate positions and worldviews (FARACO, 2012).

Evidencing, also, changes that occurred after participating in the Workshop, Débora mentioned that she did not understand that the course completion work (TCC) should be produced considering that her interlocutors were especially professionals in her area of training. Finally, that your text should be addressed to a certain audience and that, therefore, it would be published in an academic journal in your area and placed in interaction/dialogue with professionals in the area.

Débora: "Regarding the TCC, I thought I had to say what the area was, about the area that I am explaining what it is. **I thought that several people were going to read my work, but no, then I understood that it was going to be published in a magazine that was in the specific area.**" (emphasis added by the authors, our translation).

Débora's reports allow us to analyze that, before participating in the Workshop, she did not understand that in order to read and write texts belonging to AG, it is necessary to consider

the interlocutors involved, the purpose of the speech/text and its means of circulation, Finally, analyze your production conditions. This lack of knowledge is related to the fact that Débora mentions difficulties for the development of the writing of her research, in particular, regarding the compositional structure of the text, the way in which the parts should be interconnected, the progression and directionality of these parts.

Débora: “The teachers always said that **you have to write a paragraph and [...] you have to sew with the bottom one [...]** **I think that was my difficulty, because I would skip to another subject. [...]** **the introduction I think is a difficult part to write and the discussion**, because the rest, the methodology [...] you are just describing what you did, now the discussion is the analysis and I think that it's one of the most important parts of a job, so for me the hardest were those.” (our translation).

In Débora's speech, difficulties can be seen in introducing and analyzing the results of her research because, unlike the methodology, which is descriptive and has a more defined structure, these parts of the text invite the author to take ownership of a compositional structure proper to the referred genre. Therefore, it is about having knowledge and experience that allow the writer to produce an argumentative text that, with textual and theoretical coherence, explains the concepts, arguments and references adopted to address the problem and the objectives of his study.

Ivan, an undergraduate student, also mentions having to face difficulties related to the particularities of AG, whether due to lack of knowledge of terms and vocabularies specific to the specific area, or in relation to the reader's ways of reading. In this case, he began to recognize that the relationship with texts belonging to the AG requires “going in”, “reading very carefully” and “reading several times”.

Ivan: “Ah, basically difficulties with different words, even more scientific terms, right? **So in that sense we debated a little, right?** Having to read it several times [...] I understood that **this issue of the article is much deeper [...]** **for you to really get into it, head first, and read it very carefully [...]** **But it's really hard, having to reread it many times [...]** **You have to look many times for the meaning of those terms, right?** ” (emphasis added, our translation).

It is important to emphasize that when asked about the actions developed in the Workshop that had the greatest impact, all participants reported that they started to establish pleasant and meaningful relationships with this language modality during all the meetings, however they stated that the writing of their stories in relation to reading and writing came to prominence. The proposal for each participant to write a biographical narrative about the ways

in which, throughout their lives, relationships with and from reading and writing practices constituted their conditions as a reader and writer, was accepted by all.

The participants refer that the countless rewritings and re-readings, produced and shared collectively, as well as what to write and their stories in the book *Entre(Laços): rewriting stories, promoting literacy in higher education* (BERBERIAN *et al.*, 2021), allowed the recognition of who has what to say and, therefore, of taking a position as an author. The writing of the narratives represented a way of collectively facing suffering built up throughout life, due to negative experiences with written language and, more specifically, with academic practices involving reading and writing, as can be seen in the excerpts below:

Lana: [...] **you start working with people**, who are wonderful, teachers, students, friends [...] **you start writing a book**, a biography, and **this book is not just any book, it has part of the story of my life, and writing this makes me emotional!** [...] For me, writing this book was for my heart, it was for my soul. [...] **It was very difficult... it was wonderful, a delight to be with the partnerships there, with the people together with me**, and with my soul sister, Débora, who was nice the counterpoint of our story, in which she she said she had nothing to write about, and here is our book (emphasis added).

Débora: **I only wrote because of someone else, which was Lana**, and if that other hadn't been there to say: 'No, let's write together!', maybe I wouldn't even be here talking to you, so I think that [...] we don't do anything alone, **we don't live alone and we can only move forward in any direction you think, writing, reading from the other** (emphasis added, our translation).

It can be observed that for Lana and Débora belonging to a group promoted by the university, where it was possible to write and rewrite, based on the dialogues and analyzes established with and between its participants, their stories and experiences with reading and writing, allowed them to they occupy the place of readers-writers-interlocutors in the academic context.

According to Josso (2007, 2010), the participants' positions regarding the development of written biographical narratives allow us to reiterate the importance of implementing theoretical-practical approaches involving narratives of students enrolled in HE. For the author, students, when narrating and sharing life stories during the formative process, can identify how political, cultural, economic and educational dimensions are involved in the constitution of people, as well as in relationships and forms of social organization. Institutional and collective actions that allow HE students to understand how singular histories are linked to broad determinants, can oppose visions that individualize problems and difficulties experienced and

enhance visions committed to the analysis of the complexities, contradictions and structuring inequalities of the modern societies (JOSSO, 2007, 2010).

According to the author, we believe that theoretical-practical approaches, focused on the production of biographical writings by HE students, as well as the one developed with the aforementioned Workshop, contribute to the understanding that personal experiences and trajectories of academic-professional training they are intertwined and conditioned from material and subjective conditions of life, affecting the choices and modes of insertion and participation in literacy and learning processes.

One can apprehend in the excerpts of Lana and Débora the notions that it is in the relationship with the other that we constitute ourselves and that, therefore, from the dialogic exchanges, we produce our narratives and we were able to assume a responsive and authorial position in relation to the writing, speech, academic-professional training and life.

The Workshop, as indicated in Ivan's words, represented a space for listening, welcoming and coping with their restricted and negative reading and writing conditions. Ivan's perception that other people had difficulties similar to his gave him a sense of belonging to the group. By recognizing his "pain" as the "pain of the other", he rescues the social nature of his constitution, as well as his ways and possibilities of facing difficulties in relation to reading and writing.

Ivan: "You have different contact. **You are there reflecting yourself. With several people who have some difficulty too, so you end up seeing like this, that, hell, it's not just me, right, who has difficulty reading an article, for example, and then everyone is walking together and everyone grows together, right?**" (emphasis added by the authors, our translation).

If we were able to verify, like Ivan, that all the participants referred to having re-signified their understandings about their restricted literacy conditions, that is, from arising from individual capacities, they began to conceive them as historically and collectively constituted, it can be noted, also, changes of the participants in the relationships established with the reading practices of the texts belonging to the AG. In this direction, Sarah reports:

Sarah: "[...] **today I look for articles to read**, so, this is very strange, I know, but this way, I look for information in articles that I see are a more reliable source, so, I think, **today I look for what interests me** (emphasis added by the authors, our translation).

Finally, we emphasize that the changes mentioned by the participants, after participating in the Workshop, both related to the re-signification of positions of suffering in relation to

reading and writing, and referring to enhancing their possibilities of reading and writing, reiterate the fundamentals that guided this study. We start from the assumption that people are affected not only by one voice, but by several social voices that are in different relationships and positions with each other. We start from the notion that consciousness is constituted dialogically, always in relation to and with the other; it is therefore, as an unfinished, continuous and dynamic process, tensioned, provoked by different and diverse voices/worldviews (FIORIN, 2020).

Lana: [...] **I found out that I couldn't read and write in college.** [...] When I took the entrance exam, I passed **and started attending the university, some articles were presented to me, I said, 'but, wait a minute?, I read that train, and I'm reading, I'm reading and I'm not understanding!** (emphasis added by the authors, our translation).

Faced with the arena of voices that, announced by Lana, which echoes among ES students, actions and counter-words must be produced capable of breaking with visions and speeches that made Lana believe that *“she was reading, but not understanding anything”* and who *“found out that he couldn't read and write in college”*.

### Final remarks

From the analysis of the research participants' view on the relationship with the texts belonging to the AG, it was possible to evidence the predominance of a restricted and negative view with them when they entered the HE.

Through the Workshop it was possible to verify changes in relation to the position of the participants regarding their ways of reading and writing: from incapable to authors. To that extent, they came to understand that, when reading and writing, they began to put themselves in dialogue with the positions of the authors-interlocutors and to assume evaluative positions in the face of the texts/discourses produced by the authors.

In addition to changes in relation to the subjective position of the participants regarding their conditions as readers-writers, a new perspective on what written language means and, therefore, the acts of reading and writing can be seen. Finally, from a vision initially based on the idea that writing is a code, a fixed and finished system, whose appropriation resulting from the ability to encode and decode it, they began to conceive it as constitutive of subjects, of a subjective nature and dialogical. To that extent, they began to consider that reading and writing means interpreting and producing texts with meanings and senses and that we are different

readers and writers according to the quality of experiences established with and from different discursive genres throughout our lives.

The actions developed in the Workshop allowed for the exchange of experiences and dialogue between the participants, which made it possible to denaturalize the difficulties, initially identified as arising from individual characteristics and limitations. Sharing, writing and publishing life stories around the relationships established with reading and writing allowed the expansion of awareness that negative experiences with this language modality crossed, and marked, the history of each and everyone. The understanding and identification of cultural, economic and educational determinants involved with the restricted literacy conditions of the participants and of a significant portion of the Brazilian population was fundamental for the shift from a subjective position marked by the feeling of incapacity to that of power and authorship.

The study carried out here points to the need to implement theoretical-practical approaches that, developed from collective and dialogical practices in the context of Higher Education, overcome discourses and visions that blame students for their restricted literacy conditions and are able to promote significant practices with texts/discourses on texts belonging to academic genres and, to that extent, contribute to the right to quality academic-professional training.

## REFERENCES

- BAKHTIN, M. **Os gêneros do discurso**. 1. ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2016.
- BAKHTIN, M. **Para uma filosofia do ato responsável**. São Carlos, SP: Pedro & João Editores, 2017.
- BERBERIAN, A. P. *et al.* **Entre(laços):** reescrevendo histórias, promoção do letramento no ensino superior. Curitiba, Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, 2021.
- BERBERIAN, A. P.; GUARINELLO, A. C.; FERLA, J. B. S. Promoção do Letramento no Ensino Superior: uma proposta de intervenção focada na escuta, no diálogo e em processos de ressignificação. *In: CAPELLINI, S. A. Tratado de fonoaudiologia educacional*. Belo Horizonte: Artesã, 2022. p. 205-218.
- BISCOUTO, A. *et al.* Práticas de Letramento e Promoção da Saúde no Ensino Superior: Efeitos de Intervenção Intersetorial. **Saúde e Pesquisa**, Maringá, v. 13, n. 2, p. 285-293, 2020.



BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular: BNCC**, versão aprovada pelo CNE, novembro de 2017. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2018.

DONIDA, L. O.; SANTANA, A. P. Apoio pedagógico como proposta de educação para todos. **Revista Educação e Pesquisa**. São Paulo, v. 45, e.192527, 2019.

FARACO, C. A. **Linguagem Escrita e Alfabetização**. São Paulo: Ed. Contexto, 2012.

FIGUEIREDO, D.C.; BONINI, A. Práticas discursivas e ensino do texto acadêmico: concepções de alunos de mestrado sobre a escrita. **Revista Linguagem (dis)curso**, Tubarão, v. 6, n. 3, p. 413-446, set./dez. 2006.

FIORIN, J. L. **Introdução ao pensamento de Bakhtin**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2016.

FIORIN, J. L. **Introdução ao pensamento de Bakhtin**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Ed. Contexto, 2020.

GERALDI, J. W. **Portos de passagem**. São Paulo: Martins & Fontes, 2013.

INSTITUTO ABRAMUNDO. **ILC - Indicador de Letramento Científico**: Sumário executivo de resultados. São Paulo: Fundação Carlos Chagas em Parceria com Instituto Paulo Montenegro; Ação Educativa, 2014.

JOSSO, M.-C. A transformação de si a partir da narração de histórias de vida. **Revista Educação**, Porto Alegre, v. 3, n. 63, p. 413-438, set./dez. 2007.

JOSSO, M.-C. Da formação do sujeito. Ao sujeito da formação. In: NÓVOA, A.; FINGER, M. (org.). **O método (auto)biográfico e a formação**. São Paulo: Paulus, 2010. p. 59-79.

MORETTO, M. Tentativas de apropriação da linguagem acadêmica por estudantes universitários: A produção escrita na universidade. **Comunicações**, Piracicaba, v. 24, n. 1, p. 171-186, jan./abr. 2017.

PAN, M. A. G. de S.; BRANCO, P. I. Rodas de conversa: uma intervenção da psicologia educacional no curso de medicina. **Revista Psicologia: Teoria e Prática**, São Paulo, v. 18, n. 3, p. 156-167, set./dez. 2016.

PÔRTO, T. M.; MASSI, G. A.; GUARINELLO, A. C. A relação de alunos de fonoaudiologia com a leitura e escrita a partir de uma oficina de letramento. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 15, n. esp. 5, p. 2985-3000, dez. 2020. DOI: 10.21723/riaee.v15iesp5.14570.

SEMESP. Mapa do Ensino Superior. **Revista Ensino Superior**, São Paulo, dez. 2015.

SOARES, M. **Letramento um tema em três gêneros**. Belo Horizonte, 3. ed. 4. reimpr. [S. l.]: Autêntica Editora, 2017.

SOUZA, M. G.; BASSETTO, L. M. T. Processo de apropriação de gêneros acadêmicos por graduandos em letras e as possíveis implicações para formação de professores/pesquisadores. **RBLA**, Belo Horizonte, v. 14, n. 1, p. 83-110, 2014.

### ***CREDIT Author statement***

---

**Acknowledgments:** To the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel/CAPES for the promotion.

**Financing:** Promotion, PROSUP/CAPES FEE granted to Isabela Jordão de Camargo

**Conflicts of interest:** There are no conflicts of interest.

**Ethical approval:** The work was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Tuiuti University of Paraná.

**Availability of data and material:** Not applicable.

**Authors' contributions:** Isabel Jordão de Camargo: carried out the bibliographic and field research, the organization and analysis of the results, as well as taking care of the written production of the article. Ana Paula Berberian: Participated in the organization and analysis of the results, as well as in the written production of the article.

---

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

