Academic Literacy and Teacher Education: Reading/Writing of the Genre Lesson Plan

Maria do Socorro **OLIVEIRA***

* Post-Doctorate (2006-2007) and PhD (1994) in Linguistics at the Campinas State University (UNICAMP). Professor of the Postgraduate Program in Language Studies at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN). Contact: msroliveira.ufrn@gmail.com.

Abstract:

This study presents a pedagogical experience focused on the teaching of reading/writing of the genre 'lesson plan' in the context of teacher education - Language Course. The work is based on the contributions of academic literacy studies (CARLINO, 2003, HYLAND, 2004; LEA; STREET, 2006; MARINHO, 2010, 2011), on approaches to textual genres affiliated to the new rhetoric (BERKENKOTTER; HUCKIN, 1995; SWALES, 1998; BAZERMAN, 2005), and on the contributions of studies on teacher education from a critical perspective (GIROUX, 1997; BORGES, 2002). The research is qualitative with a critical ethnographic nature (THOMAS, 1993). The analysis is based on data generated in seminars developed in the discipline Linguistics IV (Language Course/UFRN) from the perspective of the ethnography of writing (DEVITT; REIFF; BAWARSHI, 2004), and in questionnaires applied to undergraduate students of Language Course. The study points to the challenges and possibilities of promoting the appropriation and proficiency in academic-professional genres, highlighting the relevance of the ethnographic approach in this work.

Keywords:

Academic literacy; Genre; Lesson plan; Ethnography of writing.

Academic Literacy and Teacher Education: Reading/Writing of the Genre Lesson Plan

Maria do Socorro Oliveira

INTRODUCTION

Reading and writing are life practices located in all domains of a graphocentric society. Through them, people act, discursively, in the different worlds of literacy (in the family, at school, in the community, in the academy, at work, in professions, etc.) and give meaning to what they do in their lives. Given their social and agentive nature, these practices are always associated with social purposes and dispositions which regulate the way they are constituted and organized, as well as used and valued in the various spheres of human activity. From them, too, humankind builds their cultural memory, their knowledge and their own image. Reading and writing are, therefore, literacy practices of an identity character (IVANIČ, 1998) that are woven and intertwined from social, historical, cultural and, above all, humanistic threads, since they are activities of human making. In the field of work, writing is an essential professional tool. To act as good lawyers, doctors, engineers, teachers, everyone needs to be competent readers and writers. It is through written texts that each professional signs up and remains as a member of a disciplinary community. In it, the professional accesses the typical knowledge of the area, adopts and manages their professional practices, updates their own knowledge and also offers their personal contributions (MORALES; CASSANY, 2008).

That is why the task of learning to write professional texts is so relevant and imperative. We emphasize, however, that it does not happen in a simple and natural way. On the contrary, it requires a lot of cognitive work, time, personal dedication and, above all, practice. One learns to write, writing. This learning certainly needs to be accompanied, built in a systematic, explicit and, above all, with institutional value. It is a demand for initial and also ongoing training to be faced by higher education institutions.

In this perspective, this study[1] analyzes a pedagogical experience focused on the teaching of reading/writing in the professional genre *lesson plan* within the scope of university education - Language Course. To do so, it assumes, theoretically, a sociocultural view of these language practices proposed in academic literacy studies (CARLINO, 2003; HYLAND, 2004; LEA; STREET, 2006; MARINHO, 2010, 2011), in the approach of textual genres affiliated to the new rhetoric (BERKENKOTTER; HUCKIN, 1995; SWALES, 1998; BAZERMAN, 2005) and in the contributions offered by teacher education studies from a critical perspective (GIROUX, 1997; BORGES, 2002). Methodologically, the research is qualitative and of a critical ethnographic nature (THOMAS, 1993). The analysis is based on data generated in seminars[2], developed in different semesters (2017.2, 2018.1 and 2019.2)

---

[1] This study is part of a larger research project entitled 'Access and mastery of textual genres in worlds of academic literacy' which highlights the importance and the need to work on textual genres (oral and written) through didactic devices that enable the undergraduate student in language course the domain of literate practices in the academic world, access to disciplinary knowledge and awareness of the epistemic value of reading and writing in professional training (PVC14756-2017).

[2] Although several seminars have been developed in the curricular component Linguistics IV, which dealt with different textual genres, including those from the domain of teaching, in this study, our analysis is centered on the seminars on the specific genre 'lesson plan', presented by sixteen (16) students enrolled in these components in different periods (2017.2; 2018.1 and 2019.2).

in the discipline Linguistics IV (Language Course/UFRN) under the perspective of the ethnography of writing (DEVITT; REIFF; BAWARSHI, 2004), and in questionnaires applied to undergraduate students of different periods (2010.1 and 2016.2)[3].

In order to reflect on this teaching-learning experience related to the comprehension and production of academic-professional textual genres, we will initially outline a picture of difficulties that undergraduate students in language course go through with academic writing. In the following, we will point out the epistemes that underlie this work and, later, we will present a literacy experience with a focus on the textual genre 'lesson plan', which will be done from an ethnographic perspective. We conclude by pointing out the contributions of this work to the teaching-learning field of academic writing in the disciplinary and professional domains.

READING AND WRITING IN THE ACADEMIC CONTEXT: EXPECTATIONS AND DISPOSITIONS

The task of reading and writing in the academic context has been a source of concern not only for those who face the communicative demands requested in the different disciplines of university courses but also for teachers who claim to deal with the low level of reading and writing competence revealed, generally speaking, by university students. It is common for teachers to comment that most students do not know how to read or write, as expected at the university. On the other hand, students enter university courses, especially in language course, with the hope of improving the reading and writing skills acquired in basic education. The following testimonies[4] reveal this hope:

"When I started the course, I hoped to deepen my knowledge of the Portuguese language ... I hoped to acquire a more in-depth knowledge of reading and writing skills ... I expected a lot of textual production materials" (GR, 16);
"At first, learn more grammar, understand it better, and write well" (GR, 16);
"I hope that the course will help me to deepen my knowledge of the Portuguese language and enable me to write better" (GR, 10);
"Supply essential reading needs as well as assist in the art of writing" (GR, 10).

These testimonies correspond to the expectation that the language course has the mission of offering opportunities to the student to learn to write well, in order, supposedly, to be able to teach Portuguese well, since it is a language course. These are statements that reveal the understanding that in the transition from high school to higher education, there is a kind of mere *continuity*. What has not been learned, satisfactorily, in basic education, will be learned upon entering university. They say that the *mastery of writing* results from the mastery of grammatical standards, that is, if I learn grammar, consequently, I will write "*well*", which translates a conception of teaching-learning of the language focused on the *mastery of grammar* from a vision retrospective[5], not projective, which naturally interferes in the process of appropriation and mastery of writing.

---

[3] The 2010.1 questionnaire was applied in the classroom manually and not electronically. For the elaboration of the 2016.2 questionnaire, the google forms tool was used. This last questionnaire entitled 'Worlds of academic and academic literacy', in addition to asking for information about personal data of undergraduates, asks about aspects related to academic and academic literacies as well as the worlds of literacy in the field of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics (see in https://goo.gl/forms/yr6wVXdKU2p7gmmZ2).

[4] These written testimonies were extracted from the two questionnaires applied to forty-five (45) undergraduate students of Letters from different periods (2010.1 (26 students) and 2016.2 (19 students).

[5] Taking a retrospective view on language teaching corresponds to adopting the understanding that the student needs to learn grammar first, and then apply that knowledge to the text. The projective view, on the contrary, foresees as relevant to the writing process the awakening of the writer to the conditions of textual production (OLIVEIRA, 2009).

These provisions may presuppose the existence of a linguistic *deficit* on the part of the students at the time when they allow corroborating a *compensatory function* of teaching writing (also reading) in the process of developing reading and writing competence in the context of the university. It is based on this function that many of the Language Teaching Programs at the university plan to offer students regulatory criteria for textual formulation, studied in the light of an explicit teaching approach, to compensate for this supposed *deficit*.

These verbalizations and the academics' own performance, demonstrated in reading and writing tasks in the disciplines, make us think about the way knowledge construction is conducted in university courses, particularly in language courses (teacher training). In this direction, the questions are: how do these students enter the world of academic writing; what are the obstacles that hinder this initiation? What can the university and language teachers do to meet these expectations and dispositions?

We believe that facing this problem requires considering, in addition to other aspects, what students feel when writing at the university. What are the concerns, expectations and dispositions regarding the practice of writing in this discursive domain? In this regard, studies (CARLINO, 2003, 2005; MARINHO, 2011) reveal that the task of writing at the university is not easy. Faced with this demand, students demonstrate a real "dread" to the act of writing. In addition to fear, students allege other difficulties when they face the task of writing textual genres linked to the academic domain in general:

1) *the presupposition of a linguistic knowledge already dominated by the students*. In the initial periods of the curricular subjects of higher education courses, it is common for students to face demands for writing for which they do not feel prepared. There are many occasions when teachers, interested in the construction of disciplinary knowledge, ask students to produce reviews, summaries, records, articles, reports, assuming that, because they have already undergone an educational training process (basic education) and evaluation (contests and exams) over the years of schooling, students already have sufficient reading and writing skills to handle such discursive demands. As a result, these requests are not usually accompanied by an explicit instruction about what the teacher wants with the production of these textual practices and how they are organized in linguistic materiality. The following passage indicates that the student does not always have a clear conception of the composition of academic genres:

> "The disciplines should be more focused on teaching, designed to be worked on or help with work in the classroom. In addition, there should be disciplines that present academic texts and how they should be done. Because teachers require critical reviews, records, etc. without us knowing how to do it [...]" (GR 16).

It is also revealing of the need to promote, in the university, a curricular transformation that includes the teaching of academic genres in the formative process, paying attention to its various specificities (scientific, professional, occupational), and considering that the genres present configurational variation in different disciplinary domains.

2) *the lack of knowledge of specific lexical choices in each area of knowledge*. When students start in a new disciplinary field, many difficulties arise from the fact that they do not know or do not know how to use words specific to a specific area of knowledge. In this regard, Marinho (2011), in his text "'The difficult words have arrived': the entry of traditional groups in the universe of academic writing", comments that this is the main "stone in the way" of these students. The author explains that this difficulty is not due to the lack of knowledge of many lexical items present in the texts, but because of the students' lack of knowledge of the meanings of these items, produced by the textual and discursive context in which they fit. In this regard, Bakhtin's statement is illuminating:

When we choose a word during the process of drafting a statement, we do not always remove it from the language system, from lexicographic neutrality. On the contrary, we usually take it from other statements and, above all, from statements related to ours by genre, that is, by theme, composition and style: we select words according to the specifics of a genre (BAKHTIN, 1997, p. 311)

This aspect, it seems, is not clear to either students or teachers.

3) *the lack of eligibility to say what he wants*, understood as an aspect resulting from theoretical immaturity. Students believe that, given the fact that they do not have sufficient theoretical background, they do not feel confident to express themselves. Such inhibition also stems from the feeling of not feeling authorized or legitimate to defend their points of view in the text. We have heard students say: who am I to say that? The absence or limitation of theoretical knowledge affects not only the textual production but also the pedagogical conduct itself in the classroom. In this regard, they ask themselves: what am I going to do with this theoretical knowledge in my classroom? In short, the questions asked fall into the question of theoretical and didactic transposition. We are here understanding this transposition as a way of (re) voicing the word of others echoed in academic interactions.

4) *the (re) voicing of theory*, whether with regard to didactic practice or with regard to work with writing and reading, proceeds from a dispersed knowledge passed on in the classroom via an expository practice guided by individual theoretical choices, selected by each teacher, without the student even being aware of which theoretical place the teacher is talking about and where these sources of information are located:

"Nós recebemos um ***conhecimento pulverizado*** em sala de aula. Alguns professores valorizam o conteúdo teórico outros estão interessados na prática docente. Mas o curso é de licenciatura! Nós estamos aqui para aprender a ser professor de língua portuguesa." (GR,16)[6].

In many courses, this information is often passed on to students in textual fragments organized in handouts and loose, photocopied texts, made available by teachers, often without bibliographic indication. The information thus arrives second-hand. The teacher behaves as a depository of knowledge, and the student only as a passive recipient of knowledge.

5) *the teacher in the role of reproducer of the knowledge* produced at / for university and the student in the condition of assimilating this knowledge not intended for him (CARLINO, 2005). Even though many teachers seek to implement innovative didactic practices in the classroom or make use of digital tools to attract more students' attention (PowerPoint, blog, YouTube), it is still perceived, in the daily life of the university, the implementation by teachers of a disciplinary work plan centered on the transfer or exposure of theoretical information that has been produced, not for students, but for researchers from a particular scientific community. They are books, collections, articles, essays written for peers and not for didactic use[7].

These scientific texts are made available to students, with the objective of prior reading for presentation and later discussion in the classroom. Although access to this production is a positive resource for the construction of knowledge (we have no doubt about it), the way it happens ends up not allowing the student to build learning in a more active, critical and reflective way. The transfer procedure removes from the student the possibility or the power to build knowledge in a conscious and dynamic way. Their learning is, still, of little significance as he does not know the bibliographic sources from which the texts are extracted for them to be passed on.

---

[6] Although the observation of the student is related to the pedagogical question – teacher training, the transfer of loose information also affects the writing process.

[7] This points to the need to publish collections, books or other written materials for didactic purposes.

In the questionnaire applied to undergraduate students of the language course (semester 2016.2), of 19 students, 14 responded that they were unaware of sources of dissemination/publication (printed or electronic) related to the area of Applied Linguistics. This data reveals that the information that arrives in the classroom is generally second-hand, that is, provided by the teacher or searched on internet sites, often unreliable, in terms of the quality of the information. Look at the data:

"I do not know any sources of dissemination in this area" (GR, 16).

"I know few sources, only the one mentioned by the professor of the discipline, such as the magazines Odisseia, ANPOLL and Delta" (GR, 16).

"The teacher showed some publications in class, but I don't know any, because she has to see the works in the publications and see if she has something interesting to read ... as access is difficult and the time we have is short ... .I do not read texts from these publications, I prefer to read other texts that are already of interest to me"(GR, 16).

There is no doubt that it is up to the teacher to mediate knowledge in the classroom. We think, however, that this process should be carried out in a more interactive way, in the light of collaborative teaching-learning approaches that give the student and the teacher the opportunity to act together, as *agent mediators*[8] (OLIVEIRA, 2010, p. 51).

It is known that all pedagogical practice is informed by a theory. It is important that in undergraduate courses the teacher in initial training knows theories about reading and writing, however, this theory cannot overcome practice. There must be a two-way relationship in this regard.

6) *the little emphasis given to the practice of writing*. It has been observed, even in the disciplines dedicated to the teaching-learning of reading and writing, a strong tendency to emphasize in the classroom the exposure by the teacher of theoretical topics[9] in detriment of a practice of writing to be potentiated in the student-student interaction. In another dimension, this pedagogical procedure seems to be allied to the old language teaching practice sustained in the relationship between sentence-level grammar x proficiency in the language. Now, in a broader sense: it consists of the idea that the knowledge of grammar of the text or of textual mechanisms (cohesion and coherence) triggers the mastery of the written modality. It is known, however, that one learns to write, writing and not just appropriating metalinguistic knowledge, either at the sentence level or at the text level[10]. It is seen in the speech:

"Reading and producing texts is something that should accompany the student throughout the course. You can only learn to read and write by practicing, reflecting on the reading and writing process. The Literature student is bombarded with texts in all disciplines, but he produces very little himself. Less reading and more text production" (GR, 16).

These aspects lead us to believe that the entry of these students into the universe of academic literacy and the consequent development of reading and writing skills in the academic sphere shows delicate situations that deserve to be analyzed from new epistemes, and should not only pay attention to normativity linguistic and /or structural organization of texts. One option would be to build new ways of working with language with students, instrumentalized by different theoretical constructs and didactic approaches.

---

[8] The agentive mediator acts as "a resource mobilizer, attentive to the needs, potential and knowledge of the members of the learning community and focused on building the learners' autonomy" (OLIVEIRA, 2010, p. 51).

[9] These topics are generally derived from Textual Linguistics.

[10] We are not saying, therefore, that normative grammar or concepts arising from Textual Linguistics are not important. We believe, however, that this knowledge is only useful when brought to the practice of writing in a reflective way, in real situations of use.

Teaching Reading and Writing in the Academic Domain: Theoretical Constructs and Didactic Approaches

An alternative that allows reorienting the teaching of language in the academic domain is the assumption of reading and writing as social practices that, as such, do not happen in a vacuum or are only attached to the classroom environment. They circulate like a network in social life, being engendered by the representations that people build about what they produce socially and by the axiological values crossed in them (CHOULIARAKI; FAIRCLOUGH, 1999, p. 22).

The localized, reflective and relational nature of social practices explains, by extension, why *literacy practices* are multiple, situated, relational, historical, and loaded with ideologies. They correspond, in the words of Baynham (1995, p. 39), to

> [...] culturally accepted ways of using reading and writing which take place in literacy events. They involve not only what people do, but what they think about what they do and the values and ideologies that underlie these actions (BAYNHAM, 1995, p. 39).

Constituting themselves as the observable counterpart of literate practices, *literacy events* are understood as "any occasion in which part of the writing is integrated with the nature of the participant interactions and their interpretative processes" (HEATH, 1983, p. 83).

The consideration of literacy as a plural construct is an important starting point for understanding that different *worlds of literacy* coexist in a kind of network (BARTON, 1993). In addition to the private world of the family, there are also several worlds of public literacy, defined by the social institutions in which we participate: school, university, companies, church, official institutions.

This look allows us to understand that writing at the university is different from writing in the school context of basic education. It is not a mere continuity in the sense that what has not been learned in basic education will be dominated in higher education. In the world of academic literacy, different writing practices are demanded of students according to the purposes of the courses and the disciplines to which they are linked. Thus, when they write in this context, they need to reframing the act of writing, placing it within the dimension of practice (LEA; STREET, 2006), which requires them to be aware of the conventions that regulate the texts to be produced by them in that specific world literacy.

In this sense, it is necessary that the teacher in training starts with academic literacy, understood as "a form of initiation to new discursive modes and to new ways of understanding, interpreting and organizing knowledge" (CARLINO, 2003, p. 410). In other words, it consists of appropriating certain writing practices through an acculturation process, specific to each *disciplinary culture*, since it focuses on "consensual ways of building, negotiating and communicating knowledge at the university" (HYLAND, 2004, p. 11). In the teaching-learning of reading-writing, it is worth understanding that "knowledge about genders is transmitted through a process of acculturation, as learners become socialized with the ways of speaking in disciplinary communities" (BERKENKOTTER; HUCKIN, 1995, p. 4).

Access to these literate practices, therefore, depends on the appropriation and proficiency in textual genres. As this is a complex and multidimensional entity, studies on gender are in a dispersing field in which interpretive lenses are intertwined and different epistemes cross. In this study, we assume certain constructs and criteria for analysis, arising from the perspective of New Rhetoric, which we believe to be potent for the theoretical/didactic treatment of genres in the teaching of reading and writing at the university.

In this perspective, we highlight the definition of gender postulated by Bazerman (2006). He defines it as "acting in a typical way within a *system of activities* that takes into account participants, roles,

activities, organizations /disciplinary field /community" (BAZERMAN, 2005, p. 31). The view of gender as a means of "agency" and the emphasis given by the author to this network of dimensions are highly useful for working with writing in initial and continuing training courses and for the development of the teacher in the work context.

With a view to the discussion that we undertake here, it is opportune to ask: 1) What pedagogical approach centered on the field of gender studies can help us to work on reading and writing from a more productive perspective, would I say better, contextualized perspective? 2) What conception of "teacher" could support, in a more significant way, the work with academic writing in the professional sphere?

Regarding the first question, we believe it is important to highlight the role that academic genres play in professional contexts. This requires inserting the undergraduates in a "textgraphic" work (SWALES, 1998), that is, in a true "ethnography of writing", as postulated by Devitt, Reiff and Bawarshi (2004). The adoption of such an approach leads the teacher to assume a new *learning culture* (BENSON, 1994 *apud* FLOWERDEW; MILLER, 1996, p. 122, 138) that treats the text as a "trace or element of a social situation that also includes the values, rules, meanings and attitudes as well as models of behavior of the participants or producers and recipients of texts"(FLOWERDEW, 2006, p. 04).

Believing in the important role that ethnographic research can play in understanding the cultural dimension of genres, Devitt, Reiff and Bawarshi (2004) offer a grid of functional categories, proposed to guide the critical-analytical reading of textual genres. They are: 1. Collect samples of the genre; 2. Identify the scene and describe the situation in which the genre is used; 3. Identify and describe patterns related to gender aspects; 4. Analyze what these patterns reveal about the situation and the scene. The contribution of this approach in the teaching-learning of reading-writing is evidenced in the following section of this study in which the genre 'lesson plan' will be explored based on this theoretical-methodological bias.

Regarding the last question, we are interested in reflecting on the *role* of the teacher in conducting the process of appropriation and proficiency[11] in textual genres. In this work, we defend that the role of the teacher as a knowledge reproducer, usually triggered by the practice of transmission, should give way to that of an *agent mediator* driven by *political commitments*. We refer to a work in which the construction of knowledge is implemented in a collaborative way, distributed in a system of activities in which the subjects work as a team (ENGESTRÖN, 2001). Learning is, in this sense, a condition and an evolutionary form of belonging to a social community; it involves a process of engagement in a community of practice (LAVE; WENGER, 1991).

In this system, the *division of labor* comprises the way in which the community is organized and how tasks are distributed among the subjects who are part of the activity. This way of analyzing the activity helps to understand: a) the development of the apprentice "as a result of a 'collective doing' and of an 'agentive transformation' and not just cognitive" (OLIVEIRA, 2010, p. 48), and b) the role the teacher as the *agent mediator* who is responsible for managing the different voices that circulate in the classroom, promoting stories of action and protagonism (OLIVEIRA, 2010, p. 51).

In the political sphere, the role of the teacher corresponds to that of a *critical intellectual* (GIROUX, 1997) who seeks to promote the articulation of theory and practice through research and critical reflection. To do so, it needs to assume an investigative attitude towards work with reading-writing focused not only on aspects inherent to the text but on a democratic and emancipatory practice, centered on relationships of trust, openness, debate and discussion, which encourage the development of critical reading competence and autonomous textual practice (BORGES, 2002).

---

[11] According to Wertsch (1998, p. 50), the appropriation process consists of "taking something from the other and making it your own". The notion of domain corresponds to "knowing how to use a cultural tool."

An Academic Literacy Experience:
the Textual Genre *lesson plan*

As an illustration, we report in this article an academic literacy experience, conducted to explore reading and writing at the university as useful tools to develop procedural, conceptual and dispositional skills related to academic-professional textual genres and to support the construction of teaching professional identity. It is an inclusive approach in the sense that it involves several analytical dimensions, all aimed at the construction of "generic"[12] knowledge in the context of training, but embedded in the teacher's practice as a professional.

The interest in this experience was to fill the gap that exists between what is learned/taught at the university and the knowledge necessary for the teaching work, specifically, with regard to the condition of the teacher as a writer - someone whose occupation requires the exercise of writing to fulfill the most varied purposes - of registration, planning, systematization, execution of activities, etc. In this work, it was important to make the teacher aware of the crucial role that writing plays in the workspaces. Currently, in view of the numerous demands of informational, technological, occupational nature, professionals in all areas increasingly need to write complex texts in / for work, depending on their reading and writing skills and their effective engagement in important activities at the same time. craft and professional development.

In this sense, we assume that, given the scope of the task, this purpose would not be achieved if the pedagogical work with reading and writing, seen here as teaching-learning objects for professional practice, was restricted to the analysis of the linguistic materiality of the genres textual. On the contrary, the central concern was to look at this object from a transdisciplinary perspective, which meant: 1) to relate several keys of analysis from different fields of knowledge - textual genres/literacy/ethnography/ rhetoric /theories of discourse /education ; 2) reconfiguring the work of the triad – teacher /student / teaching-learning object, and 3) considering reading and writing activities to be inseparable.

In line with these positions, we take as a point of attention the critical-analytical[13] reading of the lesson plan genre, although we consider that reading and writing are activities that cannot be separated, except for analytical[14] purposes. In our understanding, the process of understanding of genres prepares students for the practice of textual production and this does not happen without the practice of reading. The analysis is based on: 1) empirical data generated by students for oral presentation in a seminar, literacy practice widely used in the university context, made possible by resource of the power point, and 2) procedures of information search used by them for this presentation oral.

The initial procedure was to work in a transdisciplinary way – to explore the concept of textual genres in their relationship with literacy studies situated in AL. This was the reason why the discipline Linguistics IV was organized into three didactic units to be developed in the following order: Tasks and research in the field of LA; Key concepts of literacy studies; Textual genres as objects of study and objects of teaching: different approaches.

The intention was to make students aware that genders are communicative events (SWALES, 1990) and, as such, do not happen in a vacuum nor can they be learned/taught in the distance from expository classes, through the use of transmission; they need to be embedded in social life. They are discursive events that are situated in vivid literacy practices that occur in people's daily lives (in this case, teachers). A lesson plan, for example, is not a dead text to be morphologically dissected into constituent parts to be apprehended. Rather, the lesson plan is part of the teacher's language tasks, which is driven, in

---

[12] The term "generic" knowledge refers to knowledge about textual genres.

[13] Critical reading is based on careful, active, reflective and analytical reading (KURLAND, 2003).

[14] The clipping that we do here is justified for analytical and methodological reasons.

turn, by the need to participate in activities that are proper to their profession – planning didactic actions that serve as a guide for the development of classes.

A class is a literacy practice typical of teaching. For its accomplishment, the teacher is inserted in several activities (reads, writes, analyzes, researches, questions, notes, makes use of material artifacts and technological supports, etc.) and uses a network of genres (annotations, parameterization documents, book textbooks, articles, theoretical works, collections, etc.). All of this within a disciplinary field that, in turn, is intertwined in a network of other fields, for example, that of LA. In teaching-learning situations, this interrelation must be clear to students and teachers.

The connection of what is external (other practices, in this case, those of literate cultures) to what internally constitutes the textual genre, has also led us to use other interpretive lenses for the analytical-critical reading of this construct. We speak of the orientation of ethnographic bias called "ethnographic writing" (DEVITT; REIFF; BAWARSHI, 2004). From the analysis categories proposed in this approach (described in the previous section), it was possible to reframe the practice of reading the lesson plan genre[15]. Let us see what was based on them.

The category Collecting samples of the genre provided the repositioning of students to the condition of language researchers or 'textographers', in the words of Swales (1998), previously restricted to the role of listeners or receptacles of theoretical information. The teacher ceased to assume the task of selecting gender models to be presented in the classroom for later reproduction by the students and distributed this responsibility to them. In this displacement, it was up to the students, organized in groups[16], the job of researching, in various sources and supports (on the internet, in pedagogical magazines, at school (archives), with co-workers, on blogs), lesson plans to be presented and discussed, collaboratively, with the class. The constructed sample and the involvement in the activity enabled the identification and description of the enunciative scene (presented below) that portrays the literacy event - production of a lesson plan.

In the category Identify the scene and describe the situation in which the genre is used, the students sought to understand the "hidden dimensions" (STREET, 2010) in the process of writing the lesson plans. The relevant questions in this reading were: In what environment does this genre appear? When teachers[17] produce this genre, what are they about? What roles do teachers play in writing this genre? Under what circumstances is this genre written? Who are these texts for? For what purposes are they used?

The analysis of the collected sample revealed that, although these texts are intended for use/consumption in the school environment, they are usually produced in the teacher's home context, and are also produced in the institutional context, when prepared by teams, in a pedagogical meeting. In this condition of production, the teacher generally plays the role of planner who fulfills the function of selecting curricular content and activities focused on disciplinary content (Portuguese, biology, mathematics, music, etc.), in addition to mobilizing resources and potentialities necessary for the construction knowledge located in different fields of knowledge.

The task, therefore, occurs individually, carried out in the home environment, or collectively, when it happens in planning meetings at school, and deals with the disciplinary contents that make up the curricular matrices of basic education. They are usually produced on the computer, or even in planning notebooks, in a handwritten form, the latter being very common to teachers of the first cycles

---

[15] In addition to the lesson plan, other genres were also studied – report, memorial, course plan etc.

[16] Each group was responsible for discussing one of the professional genres selected by the students for critical reading (report, memorial, course plan etc.).

[17] The term "teachers" refers not only to teachers and pedagogues already in office, but also to teachers in initial training, that is, undergraduate students.

of elementary school or to those little used to the resources of computerization. Traditionally, it was common to use forms to record lesson plans, organized and filed in wooden boxes made especially for this purpose. As a tangled practice, the lesson plan interacts with other textual genres – notes, class diaries, pedagogical political project (PPP), pedagogical reports. In it, past /present /future fit together, since it works as a preliminary outline for acting in the present and predicting redirects in the future.

To successfully produce this genre, teachers need to be able to search, select and rework relevant information in an accurate and reflective way, in the most varied sources – textbooks, school files, digital platforms, blogs, websites - despite the production conditions to which they are subjected in their long working hours. This cognitive effort is justified thanks to the requirement that this text is intended for the reading of other professionals (teachers, coordinators, supervisors, directors) who fulfill the function of monitoring, evaluating and, often, responding for the pedagogical experiences of this writer / teacher in classroom. In these situations, the lesson plan works as a document that allows the assessment of the teacher's performance.

These texts are guided by different social purposes. If for the teacher, the lesson plan has the purpose of functioning as an agenda or a work guide to be, methodologically, followed in time for their class (even if there are flexibilities in this process), for the pedagogical coordinator or for the school director, he can perform a function of monitoring the teaching action or control, when it serves as a document that can support the school's political-pedagogical actions (PPP), in cases of institutional/bureaucratic inspection. For this reason, they sometimes follow certain formal restrictions arising from discussions in the school council, or even from deliberative agencies (Education Departments).

In the category Identifying and describing patterns related to aspects of gender, students faced the task of highlighting, in linguistic materiality, salient features of the organization of this gender. They observed that it is a short text, whose syntactic complexity is simple (direct ordering, short periods), varying in terms of the level of the class to which it is intended or the subjects to which it is linked. It is organized in the form of topics, listed, horizontally, in tables and charts, or vertically, when in a linear text, in a clear and objective language, and of a deductive character, since it makes use of propositions that try to demonstrate probable premises (almost always).

In its textual configuration, contextualizing elements of the rhetorical situation and of the enunciative scene are usually presented – identification of the name of the teacher, the school, the series and the discipline to which they are intended, temporal indicators (date and time), objectives, program content, competencies and skills required, procedures and activities, resources, forms of assessment and sources of consultation (bibliographic references). According to the collection of texts made by the group of students and the results evidenced by questionnaires applied by them to some teachers, there was variation in the use of these rhetorical movements (for example, bibliographic references are not always indicated. and expected skills and competences are made explicit). However, the study was not concerned with discussing the recurrence of these functional variables.

Structurally, the lesson plan is molded, basically, from injunctive sequences in which the commands are effected from notional verbs that, because they are used in the infinitive – to present, do, discuss, observe, define, conceptualize, remember –, evoke a procedural character. Correspondingly, nouns that carry this same semantic hue are also used – presentation, discussion, introduction, explanation, exposition, resolution etc. As the author of these texts, the teacher seeks the use of a formal language, marked by intertextuality that manifests itself through paraphrastic discourse. The lesson plan is a genre that always takes up other genres (textbook, curricular guidelines, parameterizing documents), but recreates them from an explanatory voice.

In addition to the aspects highlighted in the previous section, which are allusive to the dimension of the logos, rhetorical appeals concerning ethos and pathos are also relevant to the understanding of the lesson plan. Regarding ethos, the production of lesson plans gives the teacher an image (self) of credibility. It demonstrates that they base their pedagogical practice with study and research, which links to their image characteristics of competence, responsibility, commitment, compromise and seriousness at work. These attitudes embedded in the task of writing, in turn, show a taste for writing, revealing interest in the teaching-learning process (pathos), feelings that naturally affect school work and the consequent development of the student (but also the teacher).

In the category Analyze what these patterns reveal about the situation and the scene, the analysis shows that making use of the lesson plan helps the teacher to monitor their work in the classroom in a safe and systematic way. It allows the flexibility of pedagogical actions as it allows reorienting disciplinary work according to the circumstances revealed in the teaching-learning process (e. g., differences in student performance, everyday events that may interfere in the process). It offers greater security in the process of assessing the appropriation and proficiency in disciplinary contents, since the information on the activities carried out is fully recorded. It allows follow-up by readers interested in enjoying school work and encouraging actions that can improve it, in addition to crediting the teacher with ethical attitudes: responsibility and commitment to the development of students, and to the school's pedagogical political project.

It is important to note, however, that the apprehension of the genre 'lesson plan' through an ethnographic bias was only possible due the relationships established between the triad: teacher/student/object of study. In this pedagogical experience, the student became a literacy agent[18] capable of mobilizing knowledge and resources to understand the language. The teacher, based on a different learning culture, assumed the role of agent mediator, collaborating in the joint construction of knowledge, and in the transformation of the student who abandoned the role of listener and assumed proactive attitudes towards learning.

The object of study – the lesson plan – created body; ceased to be an inert text, to be dissected morphologically, to be something vivid, present in the daily interactions of those who produce it – the teacher. In terms of approach, it was inserted in the context of training, in a new meaning, because it was taken from the dynamics of the teaching work where it circulates. It also allowed theory-practice articulation because it had as a starting point a situated textual practice whose investigative view of undergraduate students as language researchers produced insights for their understanding. In this investigative movement, the interpretive look of the students oscillated, like a pendulum, between the different plans – practice/theory/practice.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The discussion that we developed in this work focused on the critical-analytical reading of the lesson plan genre, with the objective of building with the undergraduate students of language course knowledge about the academic genres located in the professional sphere. As a result, we developed a pedagogical work plan based, theoretically and methodologically, on information from various fields of knowledge: Applied Linguistics, Literacy, Textual Genres, Ethnography, Discourse Analysis, Education. The intention was to look at language practices located in the academic-professional sphere in a transdisciplinary way, bringing constructs that could satisfactorily explain writing for/in teaching.

---

[18] For Kleiman (2006, p. 82-83), a literacy agent is "a mobilizer of the relevant knowledge systems, resources, capacities of community members [...] a promoter of capacities and resources of its students and their communicative networks so that they participate in the social literacy practices, the practices of use of the located writing, of the diverse institutions ".

In this sense, we were interested in highlighting what teachers do when they write, what they think when writing, the challenges they face in this task, whether in terms of teaching or in terms of learning, and the values and feelings that are attributed to the teacher's writing, and to the teacher as someone who performs the act of writing.

In this initiative, we also intended that were clearly established the relationships between: reading/writing; theory/practice; textual genre/literacy, and teaching/learning. Therefore, we divided our reflection into three moments, in addition to the introduction. In the first, we present a picture of the difficulties experienced by undergraduate students of language course in academic writing. In the second, we point out the epistemes on which the work was based, and, in the last, we analyze a literacy experience with a focus on the textual genre 'lesson plan'. In the development of this experience, we took as a theoretical framework for the pedagogization of academic genres the approach of 'ethnographic writing,' proposed by Devitt, Reiff and Bawarshi (2004).

The treatment given to the data, generated in seminars developed in the discipline Linguistics IV (Language Course/UFRN) under the ethnographic perspective and in questionnaires applied to undergraduate students of language, allowed to understand the potential of this approach in the analysis, interpretation and explanation of the processes of understanding and production of the textual genre in focus. The holistic character of this trend made it possible to go beyond the linguistic dimension of the lesson plan genre. It led to an understanding of the rhetorical situation and the psychological scene that constitutes it. It made the students understand the importance of this genre in the teaching work and the role that the teacher plays when producing it. Hence the importance of reading it, critically and carefully.

However, these dimensions, hidden in the functional plane of this literate practice, only became visible through the analysis procedures allowed by the ethnography itself. Because of them, the students became language researchers, mobilized knowledge and material resources (texts) and immaterial (dispositions, feelings, expectations, values) to carry out the task. They assumed proactive and reflective attitudes towards more conscious and meaningful learning. They worked collaboratively, sharing cognitive efforts from the teacher and colleagues to jointly build knowledge. The unveiling of the procedural nature of the studied genre also gave new meaning to pedagogical practice. Reproduction was replaced by the shared construction of knowledge, not only regarding the approach of genre, but also in relation to ethical and transformative attitudes in the academic space.

References

BAKHTIN, M. M.; VOLOCHÍNOV, V. N. *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem*: Problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem. Trad. Michel Lahud e Yara Vieira. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1997.

BARTON, D. Preface: literacy events and literacy practices. *In:* HAMILTON, M.; BARTON, D.; IVANIC, R. (org.). *Worlds of Literacy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 1993. p. vii-x.

BAYNHAM, M. *Literacy practices*: investigating literacy in social contexts. London: Longman, 1995.

BAZERMAN, C. Atos de fala, gêneros textuais e sistemas de atividades: como os textos organizam atividades e pessoas. *In*: BAZERMAN, C. (org.). *Gêneros textuais, tipificação e interação*. Trad. Angela Paiva Dionísio e Judith Chambliss Hoffnagel. São Paulo: Cortez, 2005. p. 19-46.

BERKENKOTTER, C.; HUCKIN, T. *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communities*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995.

BORGES, R. C. M. B. O professor reflexivo-crítico como mediador do processo de inter-relação da leitura – escritura. *In:* PIMENTA, S. G.; GHEDIN, E. (org.). *Professor reflexivo no Brasil*: gênese e crítica de um conceito. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002. p. 201-218.

CARLINO, P. Alfabetización Académica: Un Cambio Necesario, algunas Alternativas Posibles, *Educere*, v. 6, n. 20, p. 409-420, 2003.

CARLINO, P. *Escribir, leer y aprender en la Universidad*: una introducción a la alfabetización académica. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2005.

CHOULIARAKI, L.; FAIRCLOUGH, N. *Discourse in Late Modernity*: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 1999.

DEVITT, A. J.; REIFF, M. J.; BAWARSHI, A. *Scenes of writing*: strategies for composing with genres. New York: Longman, 2004.

ENGESTRÖN, Y. Expansive learning at work: toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work*, v. 14, p. 133-156, 2001.

FLOWERDEW, J. Introduction: approaches to the analysis of academic discourse in English. *In*: FLOWERDEW, J. (ed.). *Academic discourse*. London: Longman, 2006. p. 1-17.

FLOWERDEW, J.; MILLER, L. Lectures in a second language: notes towards a cultural grammar. *English for Specific Purposes*, v. 15, n. 2, p. 121-40, 1996.

GIROUX, H. A. *Os professores como intelectuais*: rumo a uma pedagogia crítica da aprendizagem. Trad. Daniel Bueno. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1997.

HEATH, S. B. *Ways with Word:* language, life and work in communities and classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

HYLAND, K. *Disciplinary Discourses*. Social Interactions in Academic Writing. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2004.

IVANIČ, R. *Writing and identity*: the discoursal construction of identity in academic writing. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1998.

KLEIMAN, A. B. Processos identitários na formação profissional – o professor como agente de letramento. *In*: CORRÊA, M. L. G.; BOCH, F. (org.). *Ensino de língua*: representação e letramento. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras, 2006. p. 75-91.

KURLAND, D. *Lectura crítica versus pensamiento crítico*. Cali: Eduteka, 2003.

LAVE, J.; WENGER, E. *Situated learning legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

LEA, M. R.; STREET, B. V. The "academic literacies" model: theory and applications. *Theory Into Practice*, v. 45, n. 4, p. 368-377, 2006.

MARINHO, M. "As palavras difíceis chegaram": a entrada de grupos tradicionais no universo da escrita acadêmica. *In:* SIGET - Simpósio Internacional de Estudos dos Gêneros Textuais, 6., 16-19 ago. 2011, Natal. *Anais* […]. Natal: EDUFRN, 2011.

MARINHO, M. A escrita nas práticas de letramento acadêmico. *RBLA*, Belo Horizonte, v. 10, n. 2, p. 363-386, 2010.

MORALES, O. A., CASSANY, D. Leer y escribir en la universidad: Hacia la lectura y la escritura crítica de géneros científicos. *Revista Memoralia*, v. 5, p. 69-82, ene./dic. 2008.

OLIVEIRA, M. S. A Díade professor/aluno na produção do texto escrito. *Vivência,* v. 12, n. 1, p. 105-112, 1998.

OLIVEIRA, M. S. O Papel do Professor no Espaço da Cultura Letrada: do mediador ao agente de letramento. *In*: SERRANI, Silvana (org.). *Letramento, Discurso e Trabalho Docente*. Vinhedo: Horizonte, 2010. p. 40-55.

STREET, B. Dimensões "Escondidas" na Escrita de Artigos Acadêmicos. *Perspectiva,* v. 28, n. 2, p. 541-567, 2010.

SWALES, J. M. *Other floors, other voices*: a textography of a small university building. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.

THOMAS, J. *Doing critical ethnography*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1993.

WERTSCH, J. V. *Mind as Action*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.