Culturally Hybrid Zones and School Literacy Practices

Irando Alves **MARTINS NETO***
Ana Lúcia de Campos **ALMEIDA****

* PhD in Language Studies at State University of Londrina. Teacher at Federal Instituteof São Paulo. E-mail: irandomartins@gmail.com.

** PhD in Applied Linguistics at State University of Campinas. Professor at State University of Londrina. E-mail: analucpos@gmail.com.

Abstract:
Based on data generated for an ethnographic research carried out in 2018 - which aimed at comprehending how literacy practices developed in Portuguese lessons delivered to senior-year students of a public high school dialogue with literacy practices in which such students participate outside school -, this paper proposes to present and discuss the concept of "culturally hybrid zones". The proposal discusses Erickson's concepts of "cultural borders" and "cultural boundaries" and is grounded on Bakhtin's notion of textual "hybridization" as well as on Bhabha's understanding of "cultural hybridity". In order to achieve the goal, this paper analyzes reading and writing activities taught in the classroom that was observed, and literacy practices produced by students outside school. The outcomes show educational practices more and less responsive to the students' linguistic culture. The conclusions point out the possibility and the urgent need of establishing critical dialogues between linguistic knowledge that is traditionally taught in school and the knowledge that is built/utilized by students in other social instances.

Keywords:
Literacy; Education; Culturally Hybrid Zones.

Culturally Hybrid Zones and School Literacy Practices

Irando Alves Martins Neto; Ana Lúcia de Campos Almeida

INTRODUCTION

Proposals for bringing together school and non-school knowledge are not new. In the area of teaching reading and writing, Paulo Freire's literacy method is a practical example of this: through generative words, the educator proposes not only the reading of the word, but also that of the world, when relating teaching and learning mother tongue to the daily life of students. Thus, Freire argues that the promotion of awareness and emancipation is made possible through an education that does not rupture with aspects of the students' social life, including those related to work. Another example is the development of literacy projects, discussed by authors such as Kleiman (2000) and Tinoco (2008), whose principle is to propose the teaching of reading and writing based on real interests in the lives of students, thinking of actions that involve not only the school, but also their social environment. In literacy projects, reading and writing texts are not an end, but a means to achieve an end: the development of an action with (and for) the community.

Therefore, the proposal to think about "culturally hybrid zones", explained later in this text, does not concern the creation of a new concept, but a process of reconceptualization linked to the production of a pedagogical approach based on existing concepts and reasoning with the data that emerged in the development of our research. We start from the concepts of "cultural boundaries" and "cultural borders" (ERICKSON, 1987), as well as "cultural hybridism" (BHABHA, 2019) and "textual hybridism" (BAKHTIN, 1981). It is a proposal elaborated from the analysis of school and non-school literacy practices, that is, the concept of "culturally hybrid zones" was thought taking into account the teaching of reading and writing at school.

The data that led to the elaboration of the proposal come from a field research of ethnographic orientation developed in 2018, whose main objective was to understand how literacy practices developed by high school students from a public school in Portuguese language classes dialogue with literacy practices that these students develop in a non-school context. We observed, in the same school class, 79 Portuguese language classes from February to September 2018, the same period in which we analyzed the textbook used in such classes. We also applied questionnaires and informal interviews to students, in addition to observing reading and writing practices of these students, out of school, more specifically on social media. In line with André (2012), we therefore use data generation techniques traditionally associated with ethnography: participant observation in the field, intensive interview, document analysis, constant interaction between researcher and object/subjects researched, emphasis on process and field research.

The data obtained in the classroom reveal approaches to teaching reading and writing aimed at both "cultural borders" and "cultural boundaries", while the writing models produced/shared by students on social media are presented as a starting point to think about teaching reading and writing based on "culturally hybrid zones". These are the three concepts that guide the categories of analysis organized in this article, presented after a brief theoretical discussion that we consider necessary.

LITERACY AND TEACHING

Similar to Street (2014), Kleiman (1995), and Barton and Hamilton (2000), we understand literacy as the (social) uses of reading and writing. The use of parentheses in the term "social" occurs for two reasons: the first is that reading and writing practices (like any manifestation of language) are always social. In this sense, the addition of such an adjective seems to be unnecessary (and even pleonastic). But we understand, in the second reason, its need: there is, not only in common sense, but also in academic discourses, the idea that there is (or, at least, that there should be) only one (correct) type of writing, the one guided by the standard norm of the language. In this case, the fact that language (power) varies according to the context of production would be true only for orality. Therefore, the redundancy is necessary in order to emphasize that the concept of literacy defended by us and by the authors mentioned in this paper includes any and all manifestations of written culture: textual models that require the use of the standard norm of the language (scientific reports, journalistic news, etc.) or not (chatting on digital platforms, graffiti etc.). It is, therefore, about recognizing the diversity and complexity of the written language, just as sociolinguistic studies recognize the diversity of orality (but, generally, only of it). In this sense, we agree with Santos and Menezes (2010) who pay attention to the fact that every social experience produces (and also reproduces) knowledge. Lending this position to the field of literacy, we conclude that every writing model created in social interactions belongs to a type of knowledge. However, we also agree with Santos and Menezes (2010) when they point out that there is an attempt to validate certain types of knowledge and invalidate others. In the case of writing, the standard norm is generally seen as the only valid model by institutions such as the school, and we consider that both a mistake and a social injustice, since it generates mechanisms of exclusion (FOUCAULT, 1996).

Such conception of literacy converges with the Bakhtinian concept of language, presented as a social, interactional, historical, ideological, dialogic, polysemic, dialectic, multifunctional, changeable, interindividual and intersubjective construction. Despite being a common agreement, in the field of language studies, that the act of reading and writing is not limited to technical, motor and cognitive skills, we consider it important to emphasize that its social character is not limited to a naive interaction between two or more social beings. The word by one read and written (such as heard and spoken) produces meaning based on complex aspects that permeate the lives of readers and writers (speakers and listeners): power relations, comprehension of signs (worldviews), identity positions, social roles etc.

Therefore, understanding the uses of reading and writing by a given social group means understanding not only the immediate context in which these uses occur, but also broader and more complex issues that structure them. On the subject, Barton and Hamilton (2000) lead us to comprehend that literacy texts and events are starting points for understanding something more complex, literacy practices. Literacy events ─ interaction situations in which written text is a central element, such as in a classroom conversation circle in which teacher and students discuss a literature book ─ can be understood more broadly if the social, ideological and historical factors that support them are considered.

Although abstract, these factors are observable in literacy practices, which are understood as social uses of reading and writing associated with specific cultural contexts and constituting personality (STREET, 2014). In a conversation circle about a book, for example, issues such as the power relations between teacher and students as well as the role of the school can be highlighted. It is a literacy event in which the teaching discourse can be more valued, so that the meanings it builds about the text are considered "the right ones". In the discussion of a literary classic that will be required in a test of access to higher education, the reasons why the event happens may be directly related to the imposed labor market model, meritocracy and the social exclusion system, guided by a neoliberal logic of which the

Brazilian school is often part. But the literary classic can also be the basis for a discussion that relates the plot and characters to the participants' interactional experiences, so that the power relations between them are reduced. It is a literacy event based on human development and a school concept that aims to listen to its audience. Therefore, Literacy Studies advocate researching local, situated reading and writing practices and understanding them in a global context.

This local-global movement allows us to understand what literacy means for different people, social groups, communities, etc., without a previous value judgment about what literacy is (PARDOE, 2000). Souza (2011), for example, analyzes how young people belonging to hip hop groups appropriate school literacy models, but subvert them, generating what the author calls "literacies of reexistence", later endorsed by Kleiman and Sito (2016, p. 180) and explained as "(...) creation, reinvention or transformation of dominant practices and knowledge by groups whose aim is to subvert a situation of subordination. In this way, the reexistence actions not only resist the dominant practices, but encompass and transform them". Based on an ethnographic work developed at *Complexo do Alemão*, a community in a situation of social vulnerability located in the North Zone of Rio de Janeiro, Maia (2017) investigates how residents of the *Complexo* use digital technology to expand their possibilities of social mobility and citizen participation. The researcher understands the posts on social media that he analyzes as one of the "weapons" of the residents of *Alemão* in their daily struggle for survival. For Maia (2017, p. 35), the posts evidenced in his ethnography are characterized as surviving literacies: "(...) hybrid at their core, encourage and support the production of counter-narratives, statements capable of creating ruptures in the cohesive articulations that are established between hegemonic literacies, such as those practiced by large media corporations".

Researches such as those by Souza (2011) and Maia (2017) make us problematize educational proposals aimed at teaching and learning languages that exclusively include a model of writing, one guided by the standard norm of the language, usually with (false) promise of socioeconomic mobility from the acquisition of such a variety (STREET, 2014). Developing proposals that deny the existence of written diversity does not seem to us to be the most just, ethical and socially committed way of thinking about language teaching in basic education. If literacy practices are made up of identities (MOITA LOPES, 2013) and personhood (STREET, 2006), invalidating the uses of reading and writing that students build and participate in outside of school is to deny/silence the students' identity positions.

Therefore, we defend the need to propose a more diversified and less homogeneous teaching and learning of reading and writing, considering the "heterogeneity of writing" (CORRÊA, 2001). However, it would be naive to celebrate the innumerable varieties of the written language, as if, in practice, they were equally valued (HERNÁNDEZ-ZAMORA, 2019). To teach written diversity at school without debating its social (dis)prestige is to create the false argument that there is no prejudice and social exclusion based on literacy models. Thus, we defend the teaching of written diversity in a critical way, showing, for example, the relationship built between standard norm and the labor market, as well as linguistic prejudice in relation to vernacular writing models.

Cultural Borders and Boundaries in the Field of Education

Coined by Barth (1969), the notions of cultural borders and cultural boundaries are interpreted by Erickson (1987) in the field of Education.

Erickson (1987) presents the two concepts in order to argue in favor of a school based on a "culturally responsive pedagogy". It is, for the researcher, an educational approach marked by mutual trust and respect between teacher and his/her students. Based on a field study in the classroom, the author

observes a correlation between respect for the students' linguistic identities, by the school, and acceptance, by the students, of the proposed school content. Similarly, the researcher finds a correlation between denial of the students' identities, by the school, and resistance, by the students, to the proposed content.

This finding implies a fact that is not new: the school, as a "specific place" (CHARLOT, 2013), presents cultural aspects that are different from those built by students in extra-school daily life. For Erickson (1987), in isolation, this manifested presence of cultural differences between different social groups (such as the pronunciation, or not, of final consonants in English words) is a politically neutral phenomenon, as there is no difference in rights and obligations to people who act in different cultural ways. However, the author explains that, in situations of intergroup conflict, the political neutrality of such a phenomenon can be (and, we would add, usually it is, due to the power relations nurtured in social interactions) broken. In this case, rights and obligations are allocated differently, depending on the type of knowledge that certain people have, the type of cultural group to which certain people belong. According to Erickson (1987), cultural boundaries are politically neutral cultural differences, whereas cultural borders are cultural differences marked by the judgment of value.

It is important to point out that Erickson (1987), when proposing a "culturally responsive pedagogy", criticizes teaching instructions based on a cultural border perspective and defends a pedagogical approach based on a cultural boundary perspective. It is also important to clarify that, when proposing a "culturally responsive pedagogy", the author debates about school success/failure and students' engagement/resistance. Thus, Erickson's (1987) discussion recommends a "culturally responsive pedagogy", that is, a relationship of mutual trust and respect between teacher and students, as a tool that minimizes students' resistance to the content proposed by the school in a context in which that students' culture differs from their teacher's.

Culturally Hybrid Zones in the Field of Literacy

The "culturally responsive pedagogy", by Erickson (1987), is relevant to the field of Education as it proposes a school that respects the (linguistic) culture of the students. This approach foresees, as previously stated, that teaching based on cultural boundaries tends to generate students' engagement in relation to a given school content. As a result, the engaged student tends to apprehend what is taught by the school. In "culturally responsive pedagogy", there is an ethical and moral commitment based on mutual respect between different cultures. Erickson (1987) defends the need to respect the student's culture for an obvious matter (different cultures must be respected) and because it reduces students' resistance to school content, generating more chances of learning what is proposed to students. In this sense, the author celebrates the acquisition, by students, of school knowledge, which is different from "celebrating" the students' own culture. It is this last point that we emphasize when proposing the concept of "culturally hybrid zones" in the teaching of reading and writing, as we argue that the linguistic culture of the students does not only need to be respected, but also studied at school. It is about providing a critical dialogue between "school knowledge" and "students' knowledge".

The point of view that closes the previous paragraph is not entirely new, but it deserves to be expanded and conceptualized. Several researches in the field of Literacy, especially those methodologically oriented by action research (LIMA, 2015; SILVA E LINO, 2018; PEREIRA, 2020), present discussions and results that emphasize the need for dialogue between the school and other social instances. In general, these researches propose reading and writing tasks as a means for the development of a social action/ intervention, with a view to building, with the student, a critical understanding of reality and/or, ultimately, transforming the community of which students are part. Therefore, it is common to propose readings

and textual productions considering models of texts belonging to dominant spheres and, therefore, in accordance with the standard norm of the language. For example: students aim to produce a newspaper or organize a round table on social problems that affect the school environment. Such work is important because it not only contributes to the formation of students' critical sense, but also gives them a voice. In addition, they favor the development, in a significant way, of the standard norm of language, a language model required in various social instances. We argue that works in this perspective establish a critical dialogue between school knowledge and students' knowledge and, therefore, are an example of what we are naming "culturally hybrid zones". However, we understand that not only social aspects pertaining to students' daily lives can be addressed in the classroom, but also the language used by students in non-school literacy practices.

It is important to clarify that "literacy projects" do not propose the exclusive teaching of the standard norm of the language. At its heart is the debate of real interests of students, which is done through reading and producing texts. What we pointed out in the previous paragraph is that, in general, the works developed in this perspective have emphasized, as a means to debate the interests of students, models of texts belonging to the dominant sphere (especially journalistic texts), in line with one of the objectives of the Portuguese language subject: to teach the standard norm of the language. Although we defend the importance of proposing works like these, we argue that it is also important not to lose sight of the concept of literacy that supports the projects: social uses of reading and writing.

Understanding literacy from a sociocultural perspective implies understanding that there is not only a current model of writing. Working only with the standard norm of the written language in the classroom is to silence the various existing literacy models and, thus, to silence students' own cultural identity. In this sense, we advocate for a school that includes, in its educational practices, language models produced by students in their daily lives, outside the school context, in order to establish a critical dialogue between such models and the models of language historically considered as scholarly (literary canon, journalistic texts, etc.). It is the establishment of this dialogue that we name culturally hybrid zones, taking into account the concepts of textual "hybridization" (BAKHTIN, 1981) and "cultural hybridism" (BHABHA, 2019).

According to Bakhtin (1981, p. 63), textual hybridization is "(...) a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of a utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from each other by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor". For the author, it is this process of hybridization that explains, for example, the lexical evolution that occurs in every language. Hybridization generates a new product, which does not necessarily mean the formation of a new signifier, as this mixture also concerns the reinterpretations of linguistic signs, that is, the understanding that a subject builds of/in the world.

The issue of linguistic hybridism runs through the whole Bakhtinian concept of language. The definition of discursive genres as relatively stable types of utterances, for example, recognizes the complete lack of rigidity of texts, which, in their constitution process, carry an "individual style" of the producer. In addition, for Bakhtin (2011), the utterance is the result of an active and responsive comprehension, so that the speaker/writer produces his/her texts based on previous social interactions, mediated by language. In this sense, what a particular speaker/writer enunciates is, at the same time, another and the same "thing". The new (sign) is constituted by previous meanings that are enlarged, contested, silenced. Therefore, the linguistic sign is always hybrid.

Like the sign, all cultural representation is hybrid. This means not only that a given cultural group is made up of a certain hybridity, but the different cultural groups are also hybrid within each other. Thus, cultural differences are not seen in a polarized way. Bhabha (2019) defines cultural hybridization

as one *place in between*, as a result of a product that is neither one nor the other, but is, at the same time, both. According to Bhabha (2019, p. 188), "hybridity is a problem of colonial representation and individualization that reverses the effects of colonialist refusal, so that other 'denied' knowledge infiltrate the dominant discourse and make the basis of its authority — its rules of recognition[1]".

Considering the concepts of Bakhtin (1981) and Bhabha (2019), we defend culturally hybrid zones, in the context of teaching reading and writing at school, not as the construction of a third language, a mixture between school and non-school text models that would result in a new language. It is a matter of relativizing vernacular and dominant models of literacy, so that they are neither one nor the other – neither school nor non-school, but are both at the same time.

The proposal for culturally hybrid zones differs from the concept of "culturally responsive pedagogy", by Erickson (1987), in two aspects that characterize it and that complement each other: critical dialogue and political resistance.

The "culturally responsive pedagogy", based on the concept of "cultural boundaries", proposes the acceptance of the student's culture, but does not envisage a space for this culture at school. It is precisely this space that we defend when we propose an establishment between "school's knowledge" and "students' knowledge". We argue that this dialogue deserves to be built in a critical way, as we understand, like Hernández-Zamora (2019), that celebrating all forms of literacy as equals is to hide the social privilege that certain models of writing have, as well as all existing linguistic prejudice. Therefore, issues like these also deserve to be addressed in language teaching. In addition, the "culturally responsive pedagogy" contributes to the maintenance of the *status quo*, since, implicitly, it suggests that only certain types of knowledge – those traditionally considered as scholarly – should be contemplated in schools. Erickson (1987) defends respect for student culture, but does not take a position in relation to the study, or not, of such culture at school. In this sense, the reception of culturally hybrid zones in school literacy establishes a form of political resistance that aims to eliminate the hierarchy that exists between different uses of reading and writing.

Therefore, we understand that a work which takes into account culturally hybrid zones has the potential to put into perspective what "school knowledge" — that historically contemplated by the school — and "non-school" are. The perspective of cultural hybridity validates literacy practices in which students participate outside school and, in doing so, recognizes such practices as scholastic. In this way, the culturally hybrid zone not only breaks with the "cultural divide", but also makes the "cultural boundaries" more permeable, proposing a school as diverse as its audience (MARTINS NETO, 2020).

Cultural Borders and the Teaching-Learning of Reading and Writing

When we started the field research in the classroom, in February 2018, we found out that the teacher, as well as the other public school teachers, should follow, according to the determination from *Diretoria de Ensino*, a series of didactic materials sent to the school by *Secretaria de Educação* of the State of São Paulo, the main one being the *Cadernos* (*do Professor* and *do Aluno*), the practical part of the Official Curriculum of the public school system of São Paulo. It consists of textbooks composed of reading, writing, text interpretation and grammar exercises. Thus, we consider it essential to include these textbooks in the generation and analysis of research data.

---

[1] "O hibridismo é uma problemática de representação e de individualização colonial que reverte os efeitos da recusa colonialista, de modo que outros saberes "negados" se infiltrem no discurso dominante e tornem estranha a base de sua autoridade — suas regras de reconhecimento".

In this paper, we analyze three tasks from *Caderno do Aluno*, taking into account the concepts previously presented. Let us begin with the commands for such tasks[2]:

(1) Zeca started working as a cafeteria manager. He enters at 2 pm and stays until closing. He leaves a note explaining the main events to his boss, Seu Raimundo, who opens the cafeteria early the next day. It turns out that Zeca, in the job selection interview, said he wrote well and clearly. However, there have been some problems. This is especially true when the boss arrives at the cafeteria the next day and simply cannot understand the note the manager wrote. Neither he nor the other employees. Other times, he understands, but is offended by the careless way in which the note is written. One of the notes that Zeca wrote said the following [...]. Seu Raimundo was very angry when he read the note, he couldn't even pay close attention to what Zeca proposed [...]. In the place of Seu Raimundo, what would you do? What problems does Zeca's writing present? [...] In pairs, rewrite Zeca's note on a sheet of paper, observing the following criteria: orthographic adequacy: is the text written according to the orthographic rules of the standard norm of the Portuguese language? [...]; numerals: are numerals used properly? [...]; formality: is the text formal or informal to the appropriate extent? (SÃO PAULO, 2014)

(2) Rita works for a travel agency. She is going out for lunch and needs to leave a message for Samantha, her supervisor, who has not yet returned from her lunch break. Read [...]. What did you think? Is the note appropriate for the situation? How could it be rewritten? Do this using the same criteria applied in the preparation of Zeca's note (SÃO PAULO, 2014).

(3) Read the note that Marialva wrote to her boss, at the bank where she works [...]. If Dina sees that note, she will fire Marialva. So, save her job by rewriting the note in accordance with the standard Portuguese language (SÃO PAULO, 2014).

In the three tasks, four points in common are easily identified: i) verbal interaction in the workplace, ii) teaching of "note" genre; iii) the strong relations of power between the interlocutors; and iv) the need for "adequacy" of the written language. Such points, which dialogue with each other, allow us to highlight two other common characteristics among the activities: i) promises of socioeconomic mobility through the acquisition of writing taught at school; and ii) denial of students' identity positions. Let us be guided by the easily identified marks.

The commands for the tasks establish a clear relationship between school literacy and the labor market. In the three cases, we note that the jobs of Zeca, Rita and Marialva are at risk, because they do not write according to the standard norm of the Portuguese language, a writing model taught at school. This model is considered, by the textbook, as **the** good writing, the only one that can be understood, which can be seen, for example, in task (1), in "it turns out that Zeca, in the job selection interview, said he wrote well and clearly". Because the alleged manager of the cafeteria does not follow the standard norm, the student is led to seek opposites of "good" and "clear" to describe Zeca's writing, tending to characterize it as "bad" and "confused" - regardless of the production context - and insufficient to acquire a position in the labor market.

Despite not being written according to the standard norm of the Portuguese language, the note is clear and objective. What we find, in Zeca's text, are mainly orthographic deviations ("*funsionário*" instead of "funcionário", for example), most of them commonly present in informal texts in the digital sphere

---

[2] Originally in Portuguese language, the commands were translated into English as a way of providing the reader with a fluid reading.

("*keru*" instead of "*quero*"; "*educaçaum*" instead of "*educação*" etc.). Therefore, we identified that "writing well" and "clearly", according to the textbook, have little relation with understanding, but with structural elements. Insomuch that Seu Raimundo "didn't even get to pay close attention to what Zeca proposed". It is as if the actions taken by the cafeteria manager the day before mattered less to his boss than how the actions were reported. Considering the commands of the three tasks, we observed that the textbook, like Zeca's alleged boss, is also more concerned with form than with content. Much so is that a possible discussion about the content of the notes is left out at the expense of the exclusive textual correction.

In addition to the orthographic issue, we observed an exaggeration in the way the textbook, when presenting a text produced in the form of a note exclusively for educational purposes, elaborates the opening and closing of the notes present in tasks (1) and (2):

(1) "Seu Raimundo: What's up? At the closure of the cafeteria, I held a meetin' with the emplois [...]. Dig it? Alright, then! Bossman, you're cool, bro! Zeca[3]".

(2) "Sá: You ok? I went to lanch. It's half past noon. I'll be back at two thirty. I have two urgent message for you [...] XOXO, RRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRita[4]".

Among other aspects, we highlight the interactional rules. The textbook implies the idea that a certain writer (speaker) of a language, when does not master the standard norm, ignores the basic rules of an interaction. Therefore, we identified an implicit cause and consequence relationship defended by the texbook: those who do not know how to write "well" and "clearly" do not know the rules of interaction in different contexts. In this sense, there is also a relationship between mastery of the standard written code and cognition: those who can read and write "well" are more cognitively developed than those who do not know. This type of view on literacy is close to the great divide theory, criticized by authors such as Street (2014) and Hernández-Zamora (2019), as it seems to establish a correlation between "good" writing and mental progress as well as between "bad" writing and cognitive impairment. In other words, one who does not master standard writing would be unable to recognize interactional patterns in the workplace. This issue is not problematized by the textbook, since the emphasis of the tasks is on the correction of the text by the students so that they avoid the same "problems" of Zeca, Rita and Marialva when they need to write a note to their boss.

In fact, the choice of the discursive genre also deserves to be discussed. It is not for nothing that the textbook contemplates the note in the tasks. The commands for such tasks create the sense that it is important (and even necessary) to know how to appropriately write a note to the boss in order to guarantee employment. Task (3), for example, proposes that the student "save" Marialva's job by rewriting the text according to the standard norm. Therefore, the textbook shows the belief that it is necessary to know how to read and to write certain genres, such as the note, which will be needed in the job market. It turns out that there are countless discursive genres related to the field of work, so the school needs to select only a few of these genres. Such a choice reveals the type of social position that the school foresees for its students, as a cafeteria manager, bank employee or tourist agency employee. The didactic textbook tries to convince students that the writing model taught at school is essential for them to have a position in the job market, but fails to propose a debate about the limitations of such writing models.

---

[3] "Seu Raimundo: Tudo blz? No fechamento da lanchonete, promovi uma reuniaum com os funsionário [...]. Gostou? Entaum tá! Chefia, tu é da hora, veio! Zeca".

[4] "Sá: Belê? Fui almossá. São meio dia e meio. Volto duas e meia. Tenho dois recado urgente pra vc [...] Beijus, RRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRita".

The two points discussed so far (interaction in the context of work and teaching the note genre) show evidence of a school literacy that reveals itself in a tone of promises of socioeconomic development, implying that writing according to the standard norm of the Portuguese language would be a matter of choice by those students interested in achieving a job.

However, writing according to the standard norm, in the context in which the field research was carried out, means, for many students, a change in their writing practices: from vernacular to standard. This is not necessarily negative, since the school is, for many students, the only space in which they have contact with privileged varieties of the language. But it is also not necessarily positive, depending on the teaching approach. The goals of the three tasks of the textbook we analyzed here are very evident: its creators imagine students of the third year of High School who would commit linguistic deviations similar to those contained in the notes presented to them. In other words: the objective is that the students of this school year, about to finish basic education and possibly look for a job, avoid the same "mistakes" when working in the job market.

In this sense, the textbook argues in favor of a "suitability/adaptation" discourse, as it can be seen in the following questions: "are the numerals used properly?"; "Is the text formal or informal to the appropriate extent?"; "Is the note appropriate for the situation?" However, these are pretentious questions that avoid a broad debate on the topic, as they suggest that students answer "no" to then propose that they rewrite the notes in an "appropriate" manner, that is, according to the standard norm.

The three tasks show (but do not debate) a phenomenon intrinsic to language: the power relations that permeate social interactions. In the case of the "situations" presented in the notes, the bosses exercise power over the employees and can sack them for not knowing how to write according to the standard norm of the Portuguese language. Would Seu Raimundo have the right to "get very angry" when reading Zeca's note? Did Dina have the right to "fire Marialva"? Why is it the employee who has to "adapt" to the language model used by the boss and not the other way around? Without debating issues such as these, the textbook avoids critical language teaching and legitimizes the *status quo*, while coinciding with one of the purposes of High School established by the Law of Guidelines and Bases of Brazilian Education: "the basic preparation for the work and citizenship of the student, in order to continue learning, in order to be able to adapt flexibly to new conditions of occupation or further improvement[5]" (BRASIL, 2018, p. 24).

These two aspects, the need for adequacy and power relations, are related to identity issues. The lesson aimed to be taught is that, on the one hand, it is the students' decision, as a future employee, to accept what belongs to the "other" and adapt to it; on the other hand, it is the students' decisions, as a future boss, to reject writing models in disagreement with the standard norm of the language and to sack employees for that reason. In both cases, we observe that, in this context of school as preparation for the job market, the future is emphasized and the present is canceled. Thus, we need to agree with Dayrell (2003) when he argues that the school tends to treat young people as "a process of becoming something", a plan for the future, reducing youth to a transitional phase of life between childhood and adulthood. The frequent question "what do you want to be when you grow up?" seems to summarize this point of view: the child and the youth would be nothing, as they do not yet have a profession; they don't serve the job market yet. The verb "to be", an indicator of identity positions (the subject **is** male, female, bisexual, heterosexual, white, black, etc.), is commonly interpreted, in this case, as a synonym for "being professionally". It goes without saying that this way of seeing the subject does not belong exclusively to the school. The subject's position in the labor market is a broad social concern. The

---

[5] "a preparação básica para o trabalho e a cidadania do educando, para continuar aprendendo, de modo a ser capaz de se adaptar com flexibilidade a novas condições de ocupação ou aperfeiçoamento posteriores".

school, as Falsarella (2018) reminds us, does not exist in a social vacuum. Therefore, it is not a reflection of society, but part of it.

We consider that the three tasks establish "borders" between the knowledge taught by the school (in this case, the writing of notes in the standard norm of the Portuguese language) and the possible knowledge of the students (considered as inappropriate for the job market). This is because such activities generate value judgment in relation to certain writing models, considering them: liable to anger ("Seu Raimundo was very angry when he read the note"); unsuitable for the labor market; elaborated by cognitively inferior writers (it would be necessary to master the standard norm to know interactional rules between employee and employer).

CULTURAL BOUNDARIES AND TEACHING-LEARNING OF READING AND WRITING

The same textbook mentioned in the previous item proposes a task in which students are asked to produce an anthology about Modernism in Brazil and Portugal. In book format, this anthology would be formed by four textual genres: poems, short stories, chronicles and critical biography of the writers and characteristics of their style. When faced with such a proposal, the teacher whose classes we observed in the field research consults us about the feasibility of such an activity in his work context and reveals to be interested in changing it. Thus, instead of a book, the teacher divided the room into five groups, each responsible for an author belonging to Modernism, and proposed the development of an activity centered on oral practice. In a previous work (MARTINS NETO, 2020), we characterized this task, due to the results it presented, of "creation literacies". In this paper, we analyze one of the activities carried out by students as a result of this proposal, but based mainly on the cultural relationships established between school and non-school knowledge.

The task was thus proposed: each of the five groups would read texts by a certain author belonging to Brazilian/Portuguese Modernism with a view to producing three discursive genres: i) declamation of a poem; ii) theatricalization of a narrative text; and iii) oral autobiography (determined student would characterize himself/herself as the studied author and tell his/her own life story). Thus, the task proposed by the teacher provided students in the school class whose lessons were observed a significant contact with various texts of classical literature. To select which texts to be used for each of the three oral genres they were asked to produce, the groups carried out research and read poems, short stories, chronicles and/or novels by the authors studied. Instead of theatricalization, one of the requested genres, some students proposed a video recording, which was accepted by the teacher. One of these videos is described and analyzed from the next paragraph.

The group responsible for Carlos Drummond de Andrade made an interpretation, recorded on video, of "*Poema do Jornal*", whose verses narrate: "The fact is not over yet/ and the already nervous hand of the reporter/ turns it into news./ The husband is killing the woman./ The bloody woman screams./ Thieves break into the safe./ The police dissolve the meeting./ The pen writes./ Sweet mechanical music comes from the linotype room[6]" (ANDRADE, 2013).

The students chose to place the poem in the form of a television news. The video starts with the vignette on duty used by the Rede Globo television channel. Next, the video shows the foreground of the interpretation: in an environment that represents a news stand, a student, characterized as a presenter, appears sitting at a desk on which we can see some sheets of paper and an open laptop. He wears a long-

---

[6] "O fato ainda não acabou de acontecer/ e já a mão nervosa do repórter/ o transforma em notícia./ O marido está matando a mulher./ A mulher ensanguentada grita./ Ladrões arrombam o cofre./ A polícia dissolve o meeting./ A pena escreve./ Vem da sala de linotipos a doce música mecânica."

sleeved shirt. Before beginning his speech, a background voice recites the first three verses of the poem: "the fact is not over yet and the nervous hand of the reporter has already made it into news". Then, the anchor makes the call, which is an adaptation of the other lines of the poem: "Hello! Good Morning! The man is killing his friend. The bloody friend screams. Thieves break into the safe. The pen writes. The police dissolve the meeting. Sweet mechanical music comes from the linotype room. It's up to you, Paulo Lopes". Subsequently, the video shows his background, in which another student, standing, playing the reporter, wears clothes slightly less formal than the presenter, uses a microphone and notes on papers that serve as support for the case report. The reporter says: "Oops! Good morning, Filipe Alves! Good morning, all the people who are watching me. The murder took place in the city of Presidente Epitácio, in the Jardim Real neighborhood. A hooded man allegedly murdered his friend with several knife blows to the body. The killer remains at large. Check the images of the event now". Subsequently, the last shot of the video is presented: one student, representing the victim, runs while a second student, representing the hooded killer, follows him and, upon reaching him, simulates hitting him with several knife blows. After that, the criminal runs while the victim is anguishing while lying on the floor. Finally, the video features the same opening vignette as a closing.

We verified that students include not only the poem in the work, but also aspects related to their identity positions. We found that, despite being a fictitious situation, in the representation of the presenter and the reporter they use their real names (in this paper replaced by fictitious names, for ethical issues related to confidentiality regarding the identities of the research subjects), demonstrating not only the authorship of school work done by them, but also belonging to the reported situation, since the scenario chosen for the murder is Jardim Real, a neighborhood where the group's students reside. In fact, it is a peripheral neighborhood with a high rate of violence, which shows that students speak of their own reality. The group does not distance from the theme of Drummond's poem, describing both everyday violence and the work of the journalist in relation to it. However, they need to make a change: thieves do not break into the safe, because the likelihood of residents of Jardim Real, a poor neighborhood, having material goods that need to be kept in safes is low. The theme of the poem makes sense to the reality of the students, but the example constructed in Drummond's poem does not. Thus, the activity, which was presented to the entire classroom, breaks with a common silence in Brazilian schools with regard to the students' social environment. The video puts the lives of the students themselves at the center of the classroom. In this way, the students' sociocultural aspects are not a starting point to get to another place, as is the case with the notes analyzed in the previous item. In such tasks, the textbook starts from the students' reality, imagining that they could make the same "mistakes" presented in the notes, to teach them to do differently: write notes according to the standard norm of the Portuguese language. In the case of the video, we found the opposite: the teacher's proposal enabled students to first read texts by literary authors consecrated by academic critics so that they could then use their own language to interpret/speak about such texts. As a result, the students also spoke of themselves, registering their identity positions in the literacy event.

Therefore, we consider that the task approach proposed by the teacher establishes a "cultural boundary" between knowledge taught by the school and the knowledge constructed by students in other social spaces. This is because students are free to express their identity positions while studying a variety of texts belonging to classical literature. Instead of denying the student's culture, we observe a teaching approach that promotes acceptance and embracing of the student's culture. As a result, students engaged in the task proposed by the teacher.

Culturally Hybrid Zones and the Teaching-Learning of Reading and Writing

As mentioned in the introduction to this paper, in the field research carried out from February to September 2018, the data was generated in the classroom, but also outside it. In an out-of-school environment, we participated in two WhatsApp groups and also observed the status of students on the same platform as well as their Facebook posts. The choice to generate data through such digital platforms was based on the responses of students participating in the research to a questionnaire on literacy, which revealed that they read and wrote, in an out-of-school context, especially on digital social media. During the generation of data, the students participating in the survey published: 595 WhatsApp status, 4,856 messages in the two WhatsApp groups in which we participated and 2,730 Facebook posts. For analysis, we discard the status and messages sent in one of the WhatsApp groups, emphasizing the 1,800 messages sent in the WhatsApp *3 A* group and the 2,730 Facebook posts.

The data showed that the texts read, produced and/or shared by students on digital social media have many similarities with literacy practices in Portuguese language classes with regard to thematic and ideological content. In both cases, we verified themes and concepts such as meritocracy, adaptation, job market and self-help. However, from a linguistic point of view, the language models identified inside and outside the school space were quite different. The language used by the students was, in general, assessed as inadequate in relation to the models that the school intends to teach, especially in the tasks proposed by the textbook. In non-school literacy practices, we observe the frequent use of: multimodal texts — especially with *emojis* —, common abbreviations in digital social media, short texts, vernacular variety and labyrinthine exchange of shifts.

The screenshot shown in Photograph 1, identified on Facebook of one of the students participating in the research, brings some of these characteristics. In it, we read a text whose communicative purpose is to promote a service: formatting computers. The publication consists of two parts: a main text and a caption text. In the main text, there is information about the value of the service, as well as ways of contact. The caption text not only emphasizes the service (formatting computers) but also makes it clear, through the use of the first person singular ("*to*", in English "'m"), that it is the student himself who performs the service. The caption language is very informal, since the announcement is made, through Facebook, to a network of friends. Thus, the student uses terms such as "*Aê*" ("Hey", in English), "*pessoal*" ("folks", in English), "*to*" ('m, in English), "PC" (abbreviation for "personal computer") and "pv" (abbreviation for "private"). In addition, there is no monitoring of the punctuation.

We verified that it is a text belonging to the sphere of work, as well as the "notes" proposed by the textbook used in the classroom and analyzed earlier in this paper. We found that the ad published by the student on his digital social media allows a writing model that is presented, by the textbook, as inappropriate. There is even the use of the same abbreviation for "*você*" ("*vc*") — in English "you" — that the student, at school, needed to "correct", but, some time later, used it, in practice, in the work environment. This shows that it is necessary to put into perspective the ideas of "adequate" and "inadequate" when it comes to linguistic varieties.

Ae pessoal to formatando PC só chamar no pv

Formatação
Sem Backup R$40,00
Com Backup R$50,00

formatação Telefone de Contato/Whatsapp
Endereço Rua \   Casa de esquina.

👍 Like   💬 Comment

Source: Research data (2018).

Based on the writing models present in the texts read, written and/or shared by the students during the generation of data for the research, we present three proposals that exemplify works that can be carried out with a view to establishing hybrid cultural zones in Portuguese language classes: i) study of textual models familiar to the students, but not necessarily produced by them; ii) linguistic and thematic analysis of texts produced by the students themselves outside the school environment; and iii) inversion of the frequent "inadequate x adequate" approach.

To exemplify the first proposal, we used the tweets below, published by councilor Carlos Bolsonaro and deputy Joice Hasselmann on October 20, 2019:

Photograph 2 – Non-verbal language and political offense.

Source: *Revista Fórum* (2019)[7].

In both cases, these are texts that use exclusively non-verbal language, more necessarily emojis, very present in the texts read and written by the research participants. Therefore, we note that it is a model of recurrent language in the current times, in which intellectuals and political, religious and business leaders use digital social media frequently.

_____
[7] Adapted from: <https://revistaforum.com.br/politica/carlos-bolsonaro-e-joice-hasselmann-se-atacam-em-codigos-no-twitter/>. Accessed in: July 15, 2020.

The tweets previously reproduced were published by Bolsonaro and Hasselmann in a context in which both politicians, formerly political allies, had just entered a conflict that divided the Social Liberal Party (PSL). Angry at the deputy, the councilman uses ideograms that, in this context, have a sexist character. The image of a pig, for example, refers to Peppa Pig, a cartoon character with which Bolsonaro supporters compared Hasselmann, due to her physical appearance. He also uses the image of a chicken which, in the Brazilian context, suggests that Hasselmann has romantic relationships with several partners. In response, the deputy attacks the councilman with images of deer, a reference to rumors that the councilor had a homosexual relationship with a cousin.

We found that, in order to understand the tweets, the reader needs to know who the producers of the texts are, the relationship between them – from allies to political enemies – and the problems that occurred within the PSL. In other words: when proposing, at school, the study of these tweets, students would need to seek and understand other texts. In addition, it is an opportunity to work not only on the subject of politics, but also on sexism and homophobia. And this is done in order to contemplate text models that belong to the students' literacy practices.

Regarding the second proposal — linguistic and thematic analysis of texts produced by the students themselves in an out-of-school environment—, we consider it possible, for example, a pedagogical practice that studies, through grammatical concepts commonly taught at school, linguistic models used by students in everyday life. The letter "h" to indicate accented vowel is a possible example, as in "*eh*" and "*neh*" ("é" and "né" in standard Portuguese). The expression "*kkk*" (which indicates laughter) and the abbreviation for "*gente*" in "*gnt*", among other examples, can be a way of studying the formation of terms whose vowels are omitted because they are implicit in the name of the consonant letters. It is possible to study, with the students, the functions of emojis in their texts (substitution of words, indication of punctuation, softening of the tone of the message, etc.). Teachers and students can develop a glossary or dictionary based on terms used by students in their daily lives in order to understand, for example, word formation. In addition, these language teaching alternatives that we point out can be related to social aspects, such as transience and non-linearity (of language and the contemporary subject).

In the third proposal, we rethink how the school has referred to what is considered "adequate" or "inadequate" in terms of writing. It is common to observe an approach to teaching writing that, based on the standard norm of the language, presents the student with a text with linguistic "deviations" and then proposes its reformulation. This is the case of the tasks proposed by the *Cadernos* that we analyzed earlier. Generally, the idea between the lines of such proposals is that the model of writing presented is not wrong, but is inappropriate to certain contexts. In this sense, it is up to the student to make such "adaptation", which is, in fact, a training of textual models in line with the standard norm. It is a kind of "pedagogy of the but": it is right, but it is inappropriate for the situation. However, the school generally does not provide a space to study such textual models in their "adequate" context. We argue that it is possible to invert this logic by proposing the transposition of texts traditionally contemplated in the Portuguese Language discipline (from the literary and journalistic spheres, etc.) by textual models that belong to the students' social practices. For example, it is possible to propose that a note be redone in the form of an instant message (written or spoken). A news could become a tweet or a meme, allowing a work with summary, synthesis, humor, social criticism etc. We believe that this inversion is positive, because it does not characterize vernacular writing models as "inadequate". On the contrary, it emphasizes that such models are suitable in certain situations and genres. In addition, in this inversion, the student has the chance to work, effectively, with a diversity of textual models.

Final Remarks

The theoretical framework that supports this article comprises literacy as social uses of reading and writing, which means that there is not only one type of writing. Literacy practices are numerous, as are linguistic varieties. Despite this, it is common sense that the school tends to teach only one literacy model, one guided by the standard norm of the language. It is even recommended the complete respect for the different linguistic varieties, considering them adequate or inadequate. However, the constant emphasis on the dominant models ends up generating a stigma, in which the variety used by the students always appears as inadequate, through a profusion of exercises that propose to transform it into an adequate one, that is, conform it to the standard model. This fact not only avoids contemplating the student's linguistic culture effectively, but also contributes to the maintenance of the *status quo*, which denies the many varieties of writing. Thus, it is also denied the very cultural and linguistic identity of many students in the Brazilian public school, who, in general, do not use, in the various fields of human activity in which they participate, the standard variety of language. In this sense, the presented proposal to adopt the concept of culturally hybrid zones linked to a pedagogical approach – which has as its central idea the establishment of critical dialogues between school and non-school literacies – is a form of political resistance. It is also an attempt to break ─ or at least minimize ─ with differentiation between "school knowledge" and "non-school knowledge".

Although we have proposed a pedagogical approach to teaching reading and writing from the adoption of the concept of culturally hybrid zones based on texts belonging to the digital sphere, we clarify that it is not necessary to limit oneself to that sphere. The examples given in the course of the work are based on literacy practices observed in our field research in 2018, which emphasized, outside the school environment, uses of reading and writing on digital social media. However, we consider it possible to work with other writing models, depending on the specific characteristics of the students in each school. Language models present in rap and funk lyrics, for example, seem to be a possible path in the establishment of this link, to be continually renewed due to the sociocultural changes and the creativity of the teachers.

Referências

ANDRADE, C. D. *Alguma poesia*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2013.

ANDRÉ, M. *Etnografia da prática escolar*. 18. ed. Campinas, SP: Papirus, 2012.

BARTH, F. (ed.). *Ethnic groups and boundaries:* the social organisation of culture difference. Bergen: Universitetsforlaget; London: Allen & Unwin, 1969.

BAKHTIN, M. *Estética da criação verbal*. Tradução de Paulo Bezerra. 4. ed. São Paulo: Editora WMF Martins Fontes, 2011.

BAKHTIN, M. *The dialogic imagination*. Tradução de Voprosy literary i estetiki. University of Texas, 1981.

BHABHA, H. *O local da cultura*. Tradução de Myriam Ávila, Eliana Lourenço de Lima Reis, Gláucia Renate Gonçalves. 2. ed. 2. reimp. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2019.

BARTON, D.; HAMILTON, M. Literacy practices. In: BARTON, D.; HAMILTON, M.; IVANIČ, R. *Situated literacies:* reading and writing in context. Abingon, Oxon: Routledge, 2000. p. 7-15.

CHARLOT, B. *Da relação com o saber às práticas educativas*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2013.

CORRÊA, M.L.A. Letramento e heterogeneidade da escrita no ensino de Português. In: SIGNORINI, I. (org.). *Investigando a relação oral/escrito e as teorias do letramento*. Mercado de Letras: Campinas, SP, 2001.

DAYRELL, J. O jovem como sujeito social. *Rev. Bras. Educ.*, Rio de Janeiro, n. 24, p. 40-52, dez. 2003.

ERICKSON, F. Transformation and school success: the politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, v. 18, n. 4, p. 335-356, 1987.

FALSARELLA, A. M. *Os estudos sobre a cultura da escola:* forma, tradições, comunidade, clima, participação, poder. Educ. Soc., Campinas, v. 39, n. 144, p. 618-633, jul./set. 2018.

FOUCAULT, M. *A ordem do discurso*. São Paulo: Loyola, 1996.

HERNÁNDEZ-ZAMORA, G. De los nuevos estudios de literacidad a las perspectivas decoloniales em la investigación sobre literacidad. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, Medellín, v. 24, p. 1-24, mai./ago. 2019.

KLEIMAN, A. (org.). *Os significados do letramento:* uma nova perspectiva sobre a prática social da escrita. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras, 1995.

KLEIMAN, A. O processo de aculturação pela escrita: ensino da forma ou aprendizagem da função? *In:* KLEIMAN, A.; SIGNORINI, I. (orgs.). *O ensino e a formação do professor:* alfabetização de jovens e adultos. Porto Alegre: ARTMED, 2000, p. 223-243.

KLEIMAN, A.; SITO, L. Multiletramentos, interdições e marginalidades. *In:* KLEIMAN, A.; ASSIS, J. (org.). *Significados e ressignificações do letramento:* desdobramentos de uma perspectiva sociocultural sobre a escrita. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras, 2016. p. 169-198.

LIMA, J. S. A. *Projeto de letramento:* implicações na autonomia na produção escrita dos discentes no ensino fundamental II. 2015. 140 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Profissional em Letras - PROFLETRAS) ─ Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Curais Novos, 2015.

MAIA, J. O. *Fogos digitais:* letramentos de sobrevivência no Complexo do Alemão/RJ. 2017. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística Aplicada) ─ Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2017.

MARTINS NETO, I. A. *Adaptação, criação e juventude:* diálogos entre práticas de letramento escolar e não escolar. 2020. Tese (Doutorado em Estudos da Linguagem) ─ Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Londrina, 2020.

MOITA LOPES, L. P. Gênero, sexualidade, raça em contextos de letramentos escolares. *In:* MOITA LOPES, L. P. (org.). *Linguística aplicada na modernidade recente:* festchschrift para Antonieta Celani. São Paulo: Parábola, 2013, p. 227-247.

PARDOE, S. Respect and the pursuit of 'symetry'in researching literacy and student writing. *In:* BARTON, D.; HAMILTON, M.; IVANIČ, R. *Situated literacies:* reading and writing in context. Abingon, Oxon: Routledge, 2000. p. 149-166.

PEREIRA, L. *Formação colaborativa de professores e projeto de letramento:* um olhar reflexivo sobre a realidade dos alunos. 2020. Tese (Doutorado em Estudos da Linguagem) ─ Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Londrina, 2020.

SÃO PAULO (Estado). Secretaria da Educação. *Caderno do aluno:* língua portuguesa, ensino médio – 3ª série, volume 1/ Secretaria da Educação; coordenação geral, Maria Inês Fini; equipe, Débora Mallet Pezarim de Angelo, Elaine Aparecida de Aguiar, João Henrique Nogueira Mateos, José Luiz Marques López Landeira. São Paulo: SEE, 2014.

SILVA, M. L.; TOURINO, H. L. Z. Território, territorialidade e fronteira: o problema dos limites municipais e seus desdobramentos em Belém/PA. *Urbe: Revista Brasileira de Gestão Urbana (Brazilian Journal of Urban Management)*, v. 9, n. 1, p. 96-109, jan./abr. 2017.

SILVA E LINO, A. P. *O ensino de língua portuguesa:* contribuições de projeto de letramento com jornal escolar. 2018. 161 f. Dissertação (Mestrado Profissional em Letras - PROFLETRAS) - Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Londrina, 2018.

SANTOS, B. S.; MENEZES, M. P. Introdução. *In:* SANTOS, B.; MENEZES, M. P. (orgs.). *Epistemologias do Sul.* São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 2010. p. 15-27.

SOUZA, A. L. S. *Letramentos de reexistência:* culturas e identidades no movimento hip-hop. 2011. 205 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística Aplicada) - Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2011.

STREET, B. Perspectivas interculturais sobre o letramento. *Filologia e linguística portuguesa.* São Paulo, v. 8, p. 465-488, 2006.

STREET, B. *Letramentos sociais:* abordagens críticas do letramento no desenvolvimento, na etnografia e na educação. Tradução de Marcos Bagno. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2014.

TINOCO, G. M. A. M. *Projetos de letramento:* ação e formação de professores de língua materna. 2008. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística Aplicada) - Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2008.