

LITERATURE TEACHING TRENDS IN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE COURSES

TENDÊNCIAS DO ENSINO DE LITERATURA NAS LICENCIATURAS EM LETRAS

TENDENCIAS EN LA ENSEÑANZA DE LITERATURA EN GRADO EN LITERATURA



Caio Augusto Martins FURTADO¹
e-mail: caio.martins@unesp.br



Sérgio Fabiano ANNIBAL²
e-mail: sergio.annibal@unesp.br

How to reference this paper:

FURTADO, C. A. M.; ANNIBAL, S. F. Literature teaching trends in languages and literature courses. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 19, n. 00, e024127, 2024. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v19i00.18955>



| Submitted: 22/01/2024
| Revisions required: 17/03/2024
| Approved: 05/04/2024
| Published: 21/10/2024

Editor: Prof. Dr. José Luís Bizelli
Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

¹ State University of São Paulo (UNESP), Assis – SP – Brazil. Master's student in the Graduate Program in Language Studies.

² State University of São Paulo (UNESP), Assis – SP – Brazil. Assistant Professor, Department of Education. Professor/Supervisor, Graduate Program in Language Studies. Doctorate in Education (UNESP).

ABSTRACT: This article, through documentary research and analysis of Teaching Plans (PE) of Bachelor's degrees in Languages and Literature of public universities, aims to enter the conceptions of literature teaching adopted in teacher education. Thus, this investigation is positioned in order to understand how the field of Literature understands the teaching of Literature and how these pedagogical documents can shape the education of teachers in the area, based on different theoretical-methodological conceptions. Therefore, this article aims to identify and classify the trends that emerge from the analyzed documents to better visualize the functioning of the Literature and Education interface. Three tendencies and a transversal element, common to all categories, are characterized among the results. As final remarks, the authors emphasize the importance of the analysis undertaken to elucidate the educational and language fields' internal logics and their possible resonances from teacher education.

KEYWORDS: Teacher education. Literature teaching. Syllabuses. Literature curriculum.

RESUMO: *O presente artigo, por meio de pesquisa documental e das análises de Planos de Ensino (PE) de licenciaturas em Letras de universidades públicas, visa a adentrar as concepções de ensino de literatura adotadas na formação docente. Assim, essa investigação se posiciona com o intuito de compreender como o ensino de Literatura está representado no campo das Letras e como esses documentos pedagógicos podem moldar a formação de professores da área, partindo de distintas concepções teórico-metodológicas. O objetivo desse artigo é, então, identificar e classificar as tendências que emergem dos documentos analisados, para melhor visualizar o funcionamento da interface Literatura e Educação. Dentre os resultados, caracterizam-se três tendências e um elemento transversal, comum a todas as categorias. Como considerações finais, os autores ressaltam a importância da análise empreendida para elucidar as lógicas internas dos campos educacional e das Letras, e suas possíveis ressonâncias a partir da formação de professores.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Formação de professores. Ensino de literatura. Planos de ensino. Currículo de Letras.*

RESUMEN: *Este artículo, a través de la investigación documental y el análisis de los Planes de Enseñanza (PE) de las titulaciones en Letras de las universidades públicas, pretende profundizar en los conceptos de enseñanza de la literatura adoptados en la formación del profesorado. Así, esta investigación pretende comprender cómo el campo de la Literatura entiende la enseñanza de la literatura y cómo estos documentos pedagógicos pueden configurar la formación de docentes del área, a partir de diferentes conceptos teórico-metodológicos. El objetivo de este artículo es, por tanto, identificar y clasificar las tendencias que emergen de los documentos analizados, para visualizar mejor el funcionamiento de la interfaz Literatura y Educación. Entre los resultados se caracterizan tres tendencias y un elemento transversal, común a todas las categorías. Como consideraciones finales, los autores destacan la importancia del análisis realizado para dilucidar las lógicas internas del campo educativo y de la Literatura, y sus posibles resonancias en la formación docente.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Formación de profesores. Enseñanza de literatura. Planes docentes. Plan de estudios de literatura.*

Introduction

This article, written based on research funded by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), aims to contribute to discussions regarding representations of literature teaching in Brazil. To this end, we cataloged and analyzed the teaching plans (PE) for literature courses in public universities that addressed, in some measure, the teaching of literature and/or the relationship between literature and education. We created an inventory of these plans, including objectives, program content, syllabi, and bibliographies. Subsequently, we outlined the trends that emerged from the pedagogical documents in question.

In discussing literature teaching within the Brazilian context, we draw on recent research to confirm the hypothesis that there are issues related to teacher training; the teaching of literary history; working with literary texts; and the gap between official discourse and teachers' problems, as highlighted by Oliveira (2008). Furthermore, one of the dilemmas to be emphasized is the conception of literature teaching, which, according to the author, is ingrained in many educators. This conception holds that presenting biographical data about writers, along with literary historiography facts, would be sufficient for understanding literature. Another issue raised by Oliveira is the teaching approach that involves working with literary fragments, which would hinder a full exploration of the text's potential.

Thus, based on the researcher's findings, it is suggested that teaching efforts focus on facts and elements peripheral to the text itself, potentially instrumentalizing it. As such, literature does not occupy the center of teaching with its own systems, complexities, forms, styles, and constructions but is used to emphasize other didactic concerns such as grammar, spelling, and history.

Focusing on the accessories of the literary text rather than its essence may impede the mobilization of cultural capital specifically related to the literary field (Bourdieu, 1998). Therefore, it is possible to think that the contact students have with literature, when they do not mobilize this capital, resembles, as illustrated by Plato's allegory of the cave, the same as the man's experience with the shadows of the external world from within the cave.

Rezende (2017), in turn, reinforces the discussion about the use of elements peripheral to the text itself and asserts that when the teacher positions themselves as a transmitter of historical data about literary periods, they detach from literary reading. Instead of aligning with Candido's (2012) formative idea concerning the humanizing function of literature, they end up perpetuating students' reluctance toward literature classes.

Therefore, to understand the pathway that leads some teachers to this detachment, it is essential to access the teaching plans of the universities that train them, with the aim of understanding the representations (Chartier, 1991) they have regarding the act of teaching literature and the role that literary text plays in the development of knowledge.

When discussing literature teaching, we must necessarily link this concept to the curriculum, which we understand as “[...] a form of representation that constitutes a system of moral regulation and control [...]” and “[...] is both a product of power relations and social identities and a determinant of them,” as defined by Lopes and Macedo (2002, our translation) in their examination of Brazilian curricular thought.

With this in mind, it is essential to understand how these documents can provide insight into a broader and more comprehensive curricular perspective on literature teaching, as they may constitute part of this perspective. These curricular documents (plans) may offer indicators regarding trends and influences related to this cultural instrument that, as Lopes and Macedo aptly state, determine or are determined by power, which, in our view, directly impacts the planning and implementation of pedagogical actions.

After introducing the discussion of literature teaching and its relationship with the concept of curriculum, supported by the structuring concepts of Chartier and Bourdieu, we assert the importance of investigating official and pedagogical documents to understand the dynamics within the Educational and Literary fields concerning literature didactics. We then proceed in this article to the methodology, discussion, and concluding considerations.

Methodology

The teaching plans used as sources for this article, being part of the Pedagogical Projects of their respective courses, are characterized as official documents and fall under what Laurence Bardin (1977, p. 95, our translation) refers to as the pre-analysis of content, a stage in which “[...] *the selection of documents for analysis is made, the formulation [...] of objectives, and the development of indicators [...].*” It is worth noting that these pedagogical documents were selected based on the following descriptors: *literature teaching, literature and teaching, and literature and education*. This selection is justified by Ludke and André’s (1986) argument regarding the unit of record, a subtype of the unit of analysis. In other words, selecting specific segments—namely, the aforementioned terms—is necessary to verify their frequency and ensure a coherent content analysis process.

Initially, we aimed to catalog the teaching plans for courses focused on literature teaching to access their trends. Subsequently, we established a research corpus based on the cataloging performed on the teaching plans from thirty public universities in Brazil, covering all five Brazilian regions (North, Northeast, Central-West, Southeast, and South). We also listed the authors cited in the bibliographies of these plans to highlight and discuss the main concepts of literature teaching present in these documents and to categorize the methodologies and theoretical approaches used.

The methodological procedures followed were based on Document Analysis of a qualitative nature, according to Ludke and André (1986). Additionally, this was aligned with the framework established by Laurence Bardin (1977) regarding Content Analysis, with a focus on the notion of categorization.

To organize the data collected from these documents, we developed an analysis protocol, highlighting specific information that provided verbal and semantic material for understanding how literature teaching in these specific degree programs was structured. To manage the volume of information gathered and to maintain confidentiality by avoiding naming the Higher Education Institutions, we chose to distinguish the documents numerically, adding the letter P: P1, P2, ... up to P22.

From the documentary survey conducted at Brazilian public universities, we identified only those with courses on literature teaching, totaling twelve institutions. It is noted that, out of the twenty-two courses found, ten are elective, and twelve are compulsory.

Among the thirty selected plans, only nine contained a complete bibliography, that is, with listed works allowing us to establish categories. Within this set of documents, three were identified as relating to pedagogical courses: P14, P17, and P18. Therefore, for this text, we chose to focus on six teaching plans from the specific area of Letters, identified as P2, P13, P16, P20, P21, and P22.

The creation of the research corpus for this article provided us with data on the authors utilized in literature teaching courses across different universities and offered insight into the perspectives on this teaching. To better understand how these teaching trends are sustained, we will discuss how they are presented and contend for space within the field of Letters. To support this discussion, we will elaborate on the recurrence of these authors' usage, the approaches to teaching literature, and the categories emerging from these authorial and methodological indications. Consequently, we aim to identify paths toward types of didactics or methodological thoughts on the subject.

Results and Discussion

To present the data collected and analyzed throughout the research, we chose to establish categories according to Laurence Bardin's framework. The categorization of teaching plans contributed to understanding the literary and pedagogical trends utilized in these pedagogical documents.

Thus, we arrived at three categories: a) *Teaching Literature and Children's Literature*; b) *Teaching Literature and Literary Criticism*; and c) *Teaching Literature and Its Practices*. Additionally, we observed the need to establish the presence of a transversal element that intersects the plans, which we named *Literary Reading*.

In the category "Teaching Literature and Children's Literature," we included teaching plans that discuss Literature Teaching from a perspective that prioritizes Children's Literature and specifically addresses an audience in the early years of Basic Education. Accordingly, the plans identified as P2 and P20 align with this conception and feature bibliographies emphasizing this focus. These plans include references to authors such as Maria da Glória Bordini and Vera Teixeira de Aguiar; Nelly Novaes Coelho; Maria Dinorah; Lúcia Pimentel Góes; Tania Rosing; Regina Zilberman and Ezequiel da Silva; Jean Piaget; and Betty Coelho, among others.

While P2 is more subtle in its objectives and syllabus, referring broadly to literature teaching and incorporating this specificity in its bibliographic references, P20 is more explicit about the children's and youth niche, mentioning it in the objectives, program content, and syllabus. In the proposed contents, two of the three listed topics specifically emphasize the teaching of children's and youth literature as a focus of this specific literature course.

The relationship between Literature and Children's Literature, according to Coelho, a prominent author in these plans, is viewed as follows:

Children's literature is, above all, literature; or rather, it is art: a phenomenon of creativity that represents the world, humanity, and life through words. It merges dreams and practical life, imagination and reality, ideals and their possible or impossible realization [...] (Coelho, 2000, p. 27, our translation).

From this perspective, it is possible to see a connection between Coelho and Candido, who are also present in these plans, as they address the humanization of literature and its role in the formation of citizens. Furthermore, these ideas align with one of the functions proposed by the critic for literature, which is to fulfill the needs for fiction and fantasy in individuals'

everyday lives. Thus, the formation of the literary reader, according to these pedagogical documents, begins in childhood, which is the phase to which they devote the most attention.

We observed a discrepancy between the syllabus and the bibliography of P2. On the one hand, the syllabus addresses the teaching of literature in high school: "The teaching of Brazilian and Portuguese literature in high school. Methods and techniques. Linguistic theories applied to literature teaching" (P2, 2021, our translation). On the other hand, the theoretical foundation explains issues related to the Early Years of Elementary Education and the initial years of Elementary Education, where the target audience for works aimed at the so-called "children and youth" segment can be found. It is important to note that, despite its significant relevance, we will not address here the issues related to the conceptualization of the term "children and youth," which is often overlooked in favor of the terms "child" and "youth."

Additionally, another point we highlight is the friction observed, as we aim to draw attention to the importance of drafting and providing pedagogical documents. It is within this institutional space that we present our representations of the teaching and learning object and often articulate our certainties and inconsistencies, establishing a panorama of what we genuinely intend with theoretical and methodological discussions.

In constant dialogue with the epistemological formulations of Reception Aesthetics, authors such as Luiz Costa Lima, and the Reception Method, as discussed by Bordini & Aguiar, are also represented in these plans. Consequently, issues such as the importance of reception, the gaps in the text, and the reader's horizon of expectations become central in the proposed discussions. It is within the Reception Method, where the reader is seen as a co-author of the literary text, and where their horizon of expectations is initially met and then disrupted, leading to an expansion (ISER, 1996; 1999).

In this way, the teaching of literature is conceived as a progression through five stages, where the student moves from a previously known text (Jauss, 1994) to a literary work unfamiliar to them. In this system, the unknown text would have aesthetic value and be emancipatory (Bordini; Aguiar, 1993), whereas the already known work is understood as conformative, aligning with what the reader is familiar with, or their familiar universe.

In the second category, titled "Teaching Literature and Literary Criticism," which focuses on the relationship between literature teaching and literary criticism, plans P21 and P22 can be included. These pedagogical documents are supported by a theoretical framework that lists authors such as Brazilians Flávio Aguiar, João Alexandre Barbosa, Alfredo Bosi, Ecléa Bosi, Antonio Candido, Câmara Cascudo, Marisa Lajolo, Neide Rezende, Luiz Roncari, Maria

Thereza Fraga Rocco, Tânia Rosing, and Regina Zilberman; and international figures Theodor Adorno, Roland Barthes, Walter Benjamin, Italo Calvino, Wolfgang Iser, Hans Robert Jauss, Vincent Jouve, Anatol Rosenfeld, among others.

Plan P22 aims to explore how the relationship between literature teaching and literary criticism functions as a specific discipline within the Language Arts course and how theoretical issues of literature contribute to the educational process. It encourages a critical perspective on the text and engages with critical fortune related to the work; it is worth noting that when pedagogical engagement with the literary work occurs, it generates criticism of this aesthetic object, prompted by this didactic arrangement.

Plan P21, on the other hand, focuses on addressing literature teaching and literary criticism from a perspective specifically related to high school education. This plan emphasizes methodologies derived from established didactics in Basic Education for teaching literature, establishing a direct dialogue with the Basic Education curriculum and textbooks, thus reflecting a mode of thinking about teaching and learning at this stage of education in the field of codes and languages.

Both Teaching Plans are constructed based on Candido's concepts, such as the literary system, humanization, which posits that literature "humanizes in a profound sense because it brings life" (1999, p. 85, our translation), and the right to literature, as well as considering his assumptions in the analysis of literary texts. However, they do not restrict themselves to this author alone but also incorporate concepts from Benjamin, such as his theories on the figure of the narrator; Adorno, who examines how emancipation is developed in the educational context and the technical reproducibility of the artwork; Iser and Jauss, with elements from Reception Theory; and Zilberman, who discusses the crisis of reading in schools. Additionally, the presence of Roland Barthes' *The Pleasure of the Text* contributes to the construction of a significant body of authors that underpin these disciplines, specifically bringing elaborations such as the "death of the author," "signification," and "relevance" in the field of reading.

It is noteworthy to highlight Zilberman's (1988) perspective, present in P21 and P22, on the conception that governs the presence of literature in schools—the humanist view—which sees it as a set of aesthetic models constituting cultural heritage. According to the author, the elite both creates and consumes this production and is responsible for defining what can be considered "literary." Zilberman asserts that this notion still persists in the educational field.

From the author's considerations, we reflect on the formation of the concept of canon and how canonical values can be perpetuated through pedagogical discourse. Thus, we also

observe that pedagogical discourse, by implementing a didactic approach that contrasts and highlights the flows and circulation of literature, opens possibilities to question this canonical perpetuation, allowing readers, through pedagogical actions, to envision and perceive the living grandeur expressed in artistic work with language, where one of the aesthetic results is the literary text.

The dialogue between literary works; the interaction between different arts, such as music, cinema, literature, visual arts, theater, among others—as evoked by the curriculum content of P22 and the syllabus of P21—and the centrality of the contemporary and its surrounding issues constitute forms of notable relevance in this category.

Upon focusing specifically on the items listed above, we note that the first serves to help the reader or student understand how each literary artifact constructs a sequence of ideas and reflects a narrative and/or poetic construction; we can add that there is a structural logic or coherence, reminiscent of Todorov's legacy in *Narrative Structures* (2008).

The second, on the other hand, appears to enable the understanding of concepts such as adaptation and addressing, as well as discussing and building knowledge regarding the structures of cinematographic production, a song, etc., and the significations proposed by these works of different materialities, while maintaining a link or interface with the literary product.

Thus, the third observed form, related to the present time, corresponds to the role that literature assumes in contemporary society, revealing the conflicts occurring in social and cultural contexts, as well as in literary systems or the literary field.

Therefore, the teaching plans used to develop this category encompass the understanding that the teaching of literature is linked to literary criticism and the analysis of works. In this sense, it would be important to consider critical perspectives for the didactic sequencing of the text, which would contribute to thinking about a pedagogical specificity focused on the literary object, including, undoubtedly, its formative character (Candido, 2002) and its political and didactic space in the curriculum of Basic Education and Literature courses. All this would support the literature teacher in questioning the particularities of the field, or the literary system, concerning the formation of the canon and understanding reading not only as an individual act but also as a social function, among many other aspects.

In the category “Teaching Literature and Its Practices,” we underline how conceptions of practice are strongly marked in two plans within the analyzed set. Thus, this category includes P13 and P16. The first addresses practice from a teaching perspective, emphasizing primary and secondary education in the syllabus. To achieve this, it draws on the reflections of

Cereja (2005), who discusses a dialogical approach to teaching literature; Rouxel, Langlade, and Rezende (2013), who consider Subjective Reading concerning its contribution to the formation of the literary reader; and, predominantly, Cosson (2006; 2014), an important theorist of Literary Literacy, who addresses stages of text treatment to promote access for the developing reader to this aesthetic object. It is noteworthy that, among the methodologies mentioned in P13 and P16, the only one detailed is Literary Literacy.

In this way, we observe in the mentioned plans the detailing of Literary Literacy (Cosson, 2006), which consists of Basic Sequences and Expanded Sequences, each comprising four steps: an initial motivation, an introductory moment, the reading space itself, and finally, its interpretation. Before this, Cosson also emphasizes the importance of selecting the text to be read and the precautions to be taken, such as seeking the work in its entirety. In this understanding, it is assumed that reading is seen as “[...] an experience of making sense of the world through words that speak of words, transcending the limits of time and space” (Souza; Cosson, 2011, p. 103, our translation).

The second document, P16, mentions in the syllabus section the “curricular practices” related to teaching literature and concerns with how it appears in the school context, particularly in Secondary Education. It also highlights the historiography, which, according to Rezende (2013), remains predominant in Portuguese Language classes in Basic Education.

Another point highlighted is the reference to lists of books for entrance exams, which is reinforced by Claudete Segalin Andrade’s work (2001), discussing the established culture disseminated among students in their final year of Secondary Education.

It should be noted that other teaching plans, already categorized, mention the notion of practice under various understandings and frequently, such as P2 and P21 in Teaching Literature and Children’s Literature and Teaching Literature and Literary Criticism, respectively; however, it is P13 and P16, within Teaching Literature and Its Practices, that incorporate the idea of practice as a central aspect, commonly linking discussions of the literary text to classroom practice.

We can point out a similarity in how the teaching plans, gathered in the third category, address Secondary Education and reflect on a notion of “applicability” in the teaching of literature. The documents show an attempt to engage in a more current and bold discussion about teaching literature, as they problematize the following aspects: the use of only fragments of literary texts, the focus on historical contexts in favor of the literary work, and the concealment of the complete text.

The presence of Literary Literacy, therefore, is justified by this category as a way for these documents to present alternatives to counter the prevailing literary historiography in classrooms, for instance. In the effort to question the status quo, Barthes (1988) is mobilized to, among other things, highlight the literary text and avoid interpretations based on biographical readings of works; and Calvino (1993) is used to compare different understandings of the literary canon.

In advocating for Literary Reading as a transversal element, we identify a particularity that spans the previous categories. This crosscutting occurs through reading, which we believe is the structuring element of any methodology for teaching literature, as all efforts, regardless of the methods or techniques employed, aim to bring the reader/student to encounter the literary text. In our view, reading is the cultural skill necessary for this encounter to be successful.

Reading, specifically literary reading, is the space that merges time and space at the moment of reading, as it constitutes a cultural fact and, with that, is imbued with all the marks and uses of its time, both in relation to individual or collective actions. It is a mix of what happens in the sociocultural context and how the reader appropriates these flows and movements in culture. This reflects on language and its relationship with the world, and neither reading nor the reader escapes this movement. Thus, teaching is not immune to these cultural and reading movements; the challenge is how, through didactics, this is incorporated into teaching practices related to literature.

Regarding the teaching plans, we observe a transversal use of the concept of reading. It appears in various forms, emanating from different shades of understanding reading, which allows us to discuss trends in reading within the mentioned plans. It thus constitutes a macro category, providing a conceptual “umbrella” effect where reading is an instance of reader formation; reading as a methodology; reading as a historical, cultural product; reading as a possibility to educate childhood through children’s and young adult literature; and sociology of reading through the idea of reading the world. We will next highlight how these reading trends were outlined in the plans, primarily through significant and impactful bibliographic references on the subject.

In P2, although a “new reading practice” is proposed, the theoretical support used consists of works and authors already established, as evidenced by the publication dates from the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. The debate encompasses the formation of the reader; the reception of literary texts; the interface between literature and education; and the role of literature in the classroom.

In turn, P13, in addition to drawing on knowledge from Subjective Reading (Rezende; Rouxel, 2013), is strongly influenced by Literary Literacy (Cosson, 2006), which envisions Reading as both an individual and social movement, governed by four components: the reader, the text, the author, and the context (Cosson, 2014). The discussion on Reading Circles, promoted by the same author, can also be found in this plan.

Regarding P16, it incorporates reading memories, drawing on Marcia Abreu (2001) as a reference in discussions about Reading and its history. In this context, a discussion on the importance of reading so-called classical literary works can be observed, anchored in the well-known text by Italo Calvino (1993), *Why Read the Classics?* The concept of literary education is also mobilized in this document, based on the formulations of Leahy-Dios (2000).

P20 is guided by the contributions of Nelly Novaes Coelho with respect to the Reading of Children's Literature. The document also mentions João Wanderley Geraldi and his discussions on the text in the classroom. However, the highlight of this plan is the prominent presence of literary texts, with works by Clarice Lispector and Cecília Meireles, directed at a young audience: *O mistério do coelho pensante e A mulher que matou os peixes*, by Lispector, and *Ou isto ou aquilo*, by Meireles.

P21 considers reading based on the contributions of Lajolo, a key figure in the field for addressing these issues, focusing on the idea of reading the world; the development of reading in Brazil; and the relationship between readers and reading itself, in addition to revisiting the concepts of Zilberman (1986; 1991).

As for P22, it mentions reading practices and the importance of reading poetry in the classroom, examining them through the lens of Reception Aesthetics (Iser, 1999; Jauss, 1994) and the formulations of Vincent Jouve (2002). The presence of Antonio Candido's work *Na sala de aula*, suggests a concern with providing future literature teachers with ways to read and analyze literary texts.

Continuing with the question we raised about reading trends in the studied plans, we will delve more deeply into the idea of reading as a methodology. In this regard, we observe in the analyzed teaching plans the presence of guiding poles related to methodologies that ultimately aim for reading, such as Literary Reading, Subjective Reading, and Literary Literacy. Subjective reading is subtly present in its discussions on the empirical reader, the real reader, the subjectivity of the reading subject, and their repertoire and sociocultural background.

Regarding Literary Reading, these documents reflect an understanding consistent with Rezende and Rouxel (2013). For the first author, the emphasis in reading literature is on the

student and incorporates social and school practice dimensions. In contrast, the second author views literary reading as involving a movement of students' subjectivity, which manifests differently depending on the educational level. For example, in Elementary Education, students emphasize their viewpoints and impressions of the texts they read. Conversely, in Secondary Education, students are more reticent to express these subjectivities due to fear of disagreements about their thoughts and feelings.

In the plans, although they address the reading of literature, the concept, as seen by Rezende, is not the guiding principle for all documents but is mobilized according to the predominant category of the plan. Specifically, while Literary Reading is mentioned, the teaching plans are not fully aligned with its assumptions. Some plans emphasize the role of the teacher rather than focusing on the reception of literary texts by students/readers. When such emphasis occurs, it can be seen as a marginalization of the notions of Subjective Reading, for instance.

Thus, we reiterate that the importance of reading, regardless of the trends it assumes, is evident in all analyzed pedagogical documents, making its classification a transversal element necessary. The concept of literary reading permeates these documents, indicating its relevance and even omnipresence.

Final considerations

This research, methodologically grounded in Document and Content Analysis, aimed to understand, based on the collected corpus, the trends guiding the teaching of literature in undergraduate Language programs at Brazilian public universities. By using descriptors such as teaching literature; literature and teaching; and teaching and education on the digital platforms of these universities, twenty-two pedagogical documents were identified within thirty selected institutions. Subsequently, a deeper analysis was conducted to include only documents with complete bibliographies, which more precisely characterized adherence to the identified trends. This process resulted in a total of six teaching plans.

After analyzing the documents resulting from this selection, we established three categories for analyzing these documents, namely: a) Teaching Literature and Children's Literature; b) Teaching Literature and Literary Criticism; and c) Teaching Literature and Its Practices. Additionally, we identified a transversal element across these categories, termed

Literary Reading, where we discuss the role this reading occupies in the plans, regardless of the trend to which it belongs.

Regarding reading, we also noted that it could be grounded in epistemological formulations related to Literary Reading, Subjective Reading, and Literary Literacy. This transversality manifests in the established trends, namely, the teaching of Literature and Children's Literature; the teaching of Literature and Literary Criticism; and the teaching of Literature and its practices. While it does not necessarily govern these trends, it permeates and intertwines with them, becoming a structuring element. This is because, regardless of theoretical and methodological vectors, the core lies in the act of reading when discussing the relationship between Literature and teaching.

Thus, we reiterate that in the first category, the role of children's Literature in discussions about teaching Literature signifies its position not as a minor subdivision or one with naive criticism but as Literature of unquestionable aesthetic value and significant relevance in its interaction with the culture that shapes it, evident through its Language. Consequently, this affirmation of value ensures its legitimacy for the dialogue established by the trend with issues related to teaching; in other words, it enables children's Literature to be a subject for discussions on teaching during the teacher training process.

The second category contains reflections on how literary criticism is fundamental and foundational for considering the teaching of Literature and clarifying its specificities, such as the problematization of the literary canon. For example, one can question who constitutes the canon, why it is there, and what it possesses to have that status. Criticism, in this context, emerges as essential to the knowledge required of a literature teacher, as it acts as specialized knowledge, and we risk saying it is directly related to the constitution of the habitus of this professional. From this perspective, it is the way in which teacher training in Language and the teaching of Literature acquire specific, inherent, and understandable contours in the development of the profession of literature teacher.

We understand, in this regard, that this profession is also permeated and constituted by knowledge experienced in professional and academic environments, subject to the passage of time, including updates in the debates surrounding this field of teaching. Consequently, and irrespective of the theoretical and methodological perspectives on this topic, the idea of a qualified approach to working with texts in their entirety in the classroom is evident across all moments and frameworks; it is clear that just as qualified textual work is called for, so too is the emphasis on the centrality of the literary work in teaching.

In the third category, we discuss how the concept of practice is relevant to this trend and how this same idea can mobilize different theoretical paradigms, depending on what the analyzed pedagogical document proposes. In this trend, texts directed towards the methodological possibilities of the teacher's work with literature in the classroom constitute the primary theoretical support. We observed that concerns with teaching aim to understand specific didactics, in this case, that of literature.

Thus, we mapped out these aspects to better understand how these disciplines are organized within the Educational and Language fields in Brazil, through research that gathered teaching plans from various public Higher Education Institutions. The focus was on capturing the social representations conveyed by these documents regarding the Teaching of Literature. We assert that the identified and described categories provided data that allowed us to gain deeper insights into the logics of these fields and how their agents present themselves in the debates on didactics of literature in Brazil, training teachers and disseminating, through a set of bibliographic sources, an understanding of what it means to teach literature. Finally, we acknowledge that other classifications and categorizations may emerge from this and other investigations on the topic, potentially inspiring future research.

REFERENCES

ANDRADE, C. S. **Dez livros e uma vaga**. A literatura e o vestibular. Florianópolis, SC: Editora da UFSC, 2001.

BARDIN, L. **Análise de conteúdos**. Tradução: RETO, L. A.; PINHEIRO, A. [S. l.]: Edições 70, Persona, 1977.

BARTHES, R. **O grau zero da escrita**. Tradução: LARANJEIRA, M. 2. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2004.

BORDINI, M. G; AGUIAR, V. T. **Literatura: a formação do leitor (alternativas metodológicas)**. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: Mercado Aberto, 1993.

BOURDIEU, P. Os três estados do capital cultural. *In: Escritos de Educação*. Tradução: CASTRO, M., NOGUEIRA M. A. Petrópolis, RJ: Editora Vozes, 1998.

BOURDIEU, P. Algumas propriedades dos campos. *In: Questões de Sociologia*. Lisboa: Fim de Século, 2003.

CALVINO, I. **Por que ler os clássicos?** Tradução: MOULIN, N. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1993.

- CANDIDO, A. **Vários escritos**. Rio de Janeiro: Ouro Sobre azul, 1988.
- CANDIDO, A. **A literatura e a formação do homem**. [S. l.]: Remate de males, 2012.
- CEREJA, W. R. **Ensino de literatura: uma proposta dialógica para o trabalho com literatura**. São Paulo: Atual, 2005.
- CHARTIER, R. O mundo como representação. **Estudos Avançados**, [S. l.], v. 5, n. 11, p. 173-191, 1 abr. 1991.
- CHARTIER, R. Defesa e ilustração da noção de representação. **Fronteiras**, [S. l.], v. 13, n. 24, p. 15-29, 2011.
- COELHO, N. N. **O ensino da literatura**. 4. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria José Olympio Editora, 1975.
- COELHO, N. N. **Literatura Infantil**. [S. l.]: Editora Quiron, 2000.
- COSSON, R. **Letramento Literário: teoria e prática**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2006.
- COSSON, R. **Círculos de leitura e letramento literário**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2014.
- EAGLETON, T. **Teoria da literatura: uma introdução**. [S. l.]: Martins Fontes, 2003.
- ISER, W. **O ato da leitura: uma teoria do efeito estético**. Tradução: KRETSCHMER, J. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1999.
- JAUSS, H. R. **A história da literatura como provocação à teoria literária**. Tradução: TELLAROLI, S. São Paulo: Ática, 1994.
- JOUVE, V. **A leitura**. Tradução: HERVOT, B. São Paulo: Edunesp, 2002.
- JOVER-FALEIROS, R. (org.). **Leitura de literatura na escola**. São Paulo: Parábola, 2013. (Estratégias de ensino, 39).
- LAJOLO, M. **Literatura infantil brasileira: história & histórias**. São Paulo: Ática, 1984.
- LAJOLO, M. **Usos e abusos da literatura na escola**. Porto Alegre: Globo, 1992.
- LAJOLO, M.; ZILBERMAN, R. **A formação da leitura no Brasil**. São Paulo: Ática, 1996.
- LIBÂNEO, J. C. **Democratização da Escola Pública: a pedagogia crítico-social dos conteúdos**. São Paulo: Loyola, 1992.
- LOPES, A. C.; MACEDO, E. O pensamento curricular no Brasil. *In: Currículo: debates contemporâneos*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002. p. 13-54.
- LÜDKE, M.; ANDRÉ, M. **Pesquisa em educação: abordagens qualitativas**, 1986.

OLIVEIRA, G. R. **O professor de português e a literatura**: relações entre formação, hábitos de leitura e práticas de ensino. 2008. 317 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2008.

PERRONE-MOISÉS, L. Literatura para todos. **Literatura e sociedade**, [S. l.], v. 11, n. 9, p. 16-29, 2006.

REZENDE, N. L. O ensino de literatura sob o viés da licenciatura. **Literatura e Sociedade**, [S. l.], v. 22, n. 24, p. 114-124, 2018. DOI: 10.11606/issn.2237-1184.v0i24p114-124. Available at: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/ls/article/view/144257>. Access: 30 Aug. 2020.

ROUXEL, A.; LANGLADE, G.; REZENDE, N. L. (org.). **Leitura subjetiva e ensino de literatura**. Tradução: MORAES, A. C. *et al.* São Paulo: Alameda, 2013. 210 p.

SOUZA, R. J.; COSSON, R. Letramento literário: uma proposta para a sala de aula. *In: Caderno de Formação*: formação de professores, didática de conteúdos. São Paulo: Cultura Acadêmica, 2011. v. 2, p. 101-107.

TODOROV, T. **As estruturas narrativas**. Tradução: PERRONE-MOISÉS, L. 5. ed. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2008.

ZILBERMAN, R. Texto não é pretexto. *In: ZILBERMAN, R. (org.). A leitura em crise na escola*: as alternativas do professor. Porto Alegre: Mercado Aberto, 1982. p. 51-62.

ZILBERMAN, R. A teoria da literatura e a leitura na escola. *In: A leitura e o ensino de literatura*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 1988.

Acknowledgements: We would like to express our gratitude to the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) and the São Paulo State University "Júlio de Mesquita Filho" for their support in the completion of this article.

Funding: Yes, provided by FAPESP.

Conflicts of interest: There are no conflicts of interest.

Ethical approval: The work did not undergo an Ethics Committee review; however, it adhered to all ethical standards for documentary research.

Availability of data and material: The data are included in the partial and final reports submitted to FAPESP.

Author contributions: Both authors contributed to the execution of the article, writing collaboratively based on the analyzed data.

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

