DOI: 10.5433/2237-4876.2021v24n2p83

Brazil's 2018 "National Textbook Program-Literature" and Teacher-Support Materials: An Analysis of Proposals for Teaching Literature

Marcos Vinícius **SCHEFFEL***

* Ph.D. in Literary Theory (UFSC-2011), Master Degree in Brazilian Literature (UFSC-2007). Professor of Didatic of Portuguese Language and Literatura (UFRJ). Professor of PROFLETRAS (UFRJ). E-mail: marcos.scheffel53@gmail.com

Abstract:
The 2018 edition of Brazil's National Textbook Program – Literature (PNLD-Literário) established new criteria for the selection of literary works to be read by public school students. Unlike its predecessor (National School Library Program – PNBE), its focus has shifted from labeling some literary works as "highly recommended" and into merely excluding problematic works from a larger list of books of potential interest to each school's educational context. Teachers thus have become responsible for the final choice of books, and their work now relies on the aid of teacher-support materials which accompany literary works, as suggested by the program's public call. These materials are expected to propose ways to contextualize authors and books, to motivate reading, to justify books' literary value, and to provide activity proposals which include pre-reading, post-reading steps, and discussions about themes and contents addressed by each work. This article analyzes the assumptions about teaching literature contained both in the program and in the activities proposed by teacher-support material by engaging in a dialog with Colomer's (2007) and Cosson's ([2006] 2012) concepts and practices about teaching literature which seem to support these proposals.

Keywords:
Reading programs; Teaching literature teaching; Teaching materials.

Received on: 26/03/2021
Accepted on: 31/05/2021

Brazil's 2018 "National Textbook Program-Literature" and Teacher-Support Materials: An Analysis of Proposals for Teaching Literature

Marcos Vinícius Scheffel

Introduction

In 2018, the Brazilian federal government launched a public call for the National Textbook Program – Literature (Programa Nacional do Livro Didático Literário – PNLD Literário). This ensued the relative end of the National School Library Program (Programa Nacional da Biblioteca da Escola (PNBE),[1] which had until then been responsible for guiding the acquisition of literary works for distribution to schools. PNLD-Literário is in some respects different from PNBE. Its main innovation lies in the fact that works reviewed can no longer be awarded a "highly recommended" label. Reviewers for the new program are expected to discard problematic works – which also happened in PNBE – and to compile a comprehensive list of works to be chosen by basic education teachers and schools – which did not happen in PNBE. The new program's guidelines (*Guia digital do PNLD-Literário de 2018*) clearly describes the leading role assigned to teachers:

> And you as a teacher have an important role in this process. So it is fundamental for you to engage with and commit to it, analyzing and discussing with your work team all the important aspects to be considered in the choice of the literary books to be adopted by your school. [...]
> In this sense, these guidelines have the essential purpose of assisting your qualified choice. The literary works submitted to your selection in these *Digital guidelines for PNLD-Literário 2018* have been reviewed and approved by a team of experts in the field of Language, Literature, and Education. Now it is your turn to choose those most suitable to your school network and your school's educational project. (BRASIL, 2018, p. 9).

The program assumes a notion according to which the quality of a work may vary depending on learning goals, and only teachers inside their schools are able to define which works must be read in each context. The quality criteria previously present in PNBE are nearly erased by the fact that schools are no longer provided with only highly recommended works. Evaluation criteria in PNLD-Literário promote the exclusion of works which do not comply with at least one of the following features:

> a. literary character (the work is not a teaching book);
> b. literary and aesthetic quality of the work and its contribution to reader education;
> c. absence of gross or recurring linguistic errors;
> d. absence of defense of prejudice, moralism, or stereotypes of doctrinaire, partisan, or religious character acritically explored by the work;
> e. suitability to the category under which the work was submitted to the program;
> f. suitability to the theme(s) declared upon submission;
> g. suitability to the literary genre(s) declared upon submission;

[1] According to Fernandes (2017, p. 221) "PNBE worked for nearly two decades before being suspended in 2015".

> h. presence of preface or introduction providing a brief contextualization about the work and its author (this item was not a justification for excluding works for Early Childhood Education, categories 1, 2, and 3, as per the public call). (BRASIL, 2018, p. 15).

The *Digital Guidelines for PNLD-Literário 2018* (BRASIL, 2018) claim that the program aims at guaranteeing the ethical and aesthetic quality of works while providing "a broad and diverse collection of literary works" (p. 15) with the purpose of fostering literary reading practices. Aesthetic quality is addressed by items "a" and "b", and ethical quality, by item "d" – all three of which enable a wider margin of reviewer subjectivity. Reviewers are thus considerably less likely to disqualify a work, which would require it to be "not literary" and "not to contribute to reader education".

The first item is more feasible, since many of the works submitted have educational purposes, such as a *cordel*[2] aimed at teaching mathematics without emphasizing its features as a literary creation: the sextains, the rhyme scheme, and the relationship with woodcut carvings. The second item is unachievable, because even an aesthetically questionable book may contribute to reader education, which makes it nearly impossible for reviewers to evaluate this aspect.

Another problem lies in the lack of clarity as to the education of literary readers and their contact with quality works, as indicated by Cosson and Paiva (2014, p. 497) in their assessment of PNBE's criteria concerning the works' school purposes: "The challenge in this case is preventing the concern with aesthetic value from erasing the need to support reader development and vice-versa, preserving the balance between diversity and literary quality in works." PNBE emphasized the provision of various genres, authors, relevant themes, but this could not hinder the supply of quality literature, as subjective as this term might sound. This was the basic meaning intended in the label applied to "highly recommended" books.

The remaining terms of PNLD-Literário refer to editorial quality and to compliance with the public call's requirements, such as suitability to the genre and theme declared upon submission. The prevailing idea in this case is approving most works and putting basic education teachers in charge of choosing. Choice is decentralized, but the underlying criteria for selecting works are not submitted to a wider debate, since, as warned by Cecília Bajour (2012, p. 27), one must anticipate several reading situations:

> As we choose what will be read with others, we are imagining the way we may introduce texts in literary conversations, the way other readers will be introduced, which encounters and mismatches the debate may lead to, the way we will help them with these findings, the way we will preserve the possibility that the text itself may help with some answers or raise new questions, the way we will interfere without restricting meanings.

Bajour (2012) refers to the works chosen by teachers considering several situations of literary mediation. That is, teachers choose based on what they have access to, on what they consider relevant to students, and on which texts offer some resistance to readers in their learning process. The ones in charge of choosing works for a national program, in turn, must think of works which may be chosen by teachers (based on the books submitted by publishers through the aforementioned public call) and which comply with the most diverse needs involved in reader education, with diverse levels of familiarity with literary texts, and which will still undergo scrutiny by teachers, librarians, educators, and school management.

The *Digital Guidelines for PNLD-Literário 2018* (BRASIL, 2018) value the role of teachers as mediators and describes the possibility of resorting to teachers' knowledge at the moment of

[2] Cordel is a traditional literary genre from Brazil which is usually bound using artisanal techniques and sold in street stands, where they are hung on the strings after which the genre is named – in Portuguese, cordéis.

recommending books to be purchased. This point reveals a significant change in comparison with PNBE, which was more focused on the manifold aspects of literary reading. The new program claims works must contribute to the achievement of the lessons provided by the Common National Curriculum Base (Base Nacional Comum Curricular – BNCC) and, in the case of high school education, the National Curriculum Guidelines (Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais – DCN). The program's guidelines use terms and expressions also present in these documents, such as "inclusion into literate culture" and "enjoyer-readers", which reveals a more pragmatic approach to reading.

Teacher-support materials seem to play the role of textbook teacher manuals, but they are not mandatory for publishers participating in the 2018 public call. However, many publishers did produce these materials, expecting them to become mandatory in subsequent calls. These materials provide notions about teaching, about school readers, about the roles of literature at school, as well as publishers' attempts to comply with the public call's requirements. In order to evaluate these aspects, we shall analyze the teacher-support material submitted to the program along with Lygia Bojunga's *Angélica*, a work approved by reviewers. Our choice was based on Bojunga's reputation as a celebrated author from the children literature canon, whose works are often approved by reading programs, presenting features valued by teachers, educators, and researchers in children's literature. The book's undisputable quality enables the analysis to focus exclusively on the supporting material.

The following sections discuss the guidelines provided by PNLD for the production of this kind of material, as well as some concepts about teaching literature implied by these recommendations. Followingly, we analyze the supporting materials of *Angélica*, by Lygia Bojunga, in light of contemporary theories about teaching literature.

The Guidelines for Producing Teacher-Support Materials and their Possible Understandings About Teaching Literature

The provision of teacher-support materials was an innovation of PNLD-Literário. Its section concerning the evaluation of teacher-support materials[3] features three items to be observed by publishers upon producing them:

> Regarding the evaluation criteria used for approving support materials, it is important first to emphasize that the process of analysis and evaluation is based on the Public Call 02/2018, issued by the General Coordination of Book Programs (Edital de Convocação 02/2018 - Coordenação-Geral dos Programas do Livro – CGPLI), which provides on how to submit support materials for works for Early Childhood Education, for the first years of Elementary Education, and for High School. The main dimension to be evaluated is based on the consistency and coherence of the material submitted, considering:
> I – the information presented to: (1) contextualize works and authors; (2) motivate students to read, and (3) justify the suitability of works to their corresponding theme(s), category, and literary genre; (4) subsidies, guidelines, and proposals for activities.
> II – the guidelines for Portuguese or English lessons (according to the language of each work) which prepare students before reading their corresponding works (pre-reading support materials), as well as for reviewing and problematizing them (post-reading materials).
> III – the general guidelines for lessons of other subjects or areas to use works' themes and contents in an interdisciplinary approach (BRASIL, 2018, p. 16-17).

[3] It is worth highlighting that the call did not treat the production of these materials as mandatory. In current calls, it is already mandatory.

The analysis of the elements in these terms reveals the influence of two works often quoted in the field of literature education in Brazil: *Andar entre livros: a leitura literária na escola*,[4] by Teresa Colomer (2007), and *Letramento literário: teoria e prática*,[5] by Rildo Cosson (2006). The former was recommended by the 2013 edition of PNBE for teachers. As for the latter, its author participated in PNBE between 2006 and 2015 as either a coordinator or as a commission member.

Both authors discuss the need for contextualization. For Colomer (2007), it happens through guided reading, which differs from free reading (which students do of their own will). The only device provided in free reading is incentive to reading. Guided reading, on the other hand, is shared, and its meaning is to be negotiated with the reading community. This kind of reading "requires the implementation of teaching activities in accordance with the goals proposed" (COLOMER, 2007, p. 185-186). Still on guided reading, the author states:

> The guide **[in this case, the person recommending the work, the mediator]** has the role of showing how to overcome difficulties with the work's meaning, providing the information necessary to understand certain obscure aspects and throwing light on other aspects, which lead to unexpected questions or new and more complex interpretations. That is precisely the field of work of mandatory school. (COLOMER, 2007, p. 183, emphasis added).

Cosson (2006) also thinks of classrooms as spaces for negotiating meaning and forming a reading community. According to him, "Reading literature requires assistance, because it has a purpose, a goal to fulfil, and one cannot lose sight of this goal" (COSSON, 2006, p. 62). Both authors claim teachers cannot dismiss the specific work conducted by schools with literature books and authors.

As for contextualization, defined by Cosson (2006, p. 86) as "using the contexts featured in the work to deepen the reading" and indicates some kinds of contextualization, namely: theoretical contextualization (the ideas behind some work); historical contextualization (relevant facts from the time when the book was published); stylistic contextualization (focused on literary periods); poetic contextualization (the work's structure or composition); critical contextualization (the way the work was interpreted by critics in different periods); presentifying contextualization (connecting the work to the present); theme contextualization (themes addressed by the work – according to the author, one of the most used strategies in our school tradition) (COSSON, 2006, p. 85-91).

Motivation for reading, according to Cosson (2006, p. 77), consists of "activities to prepare and introduce students to the universe of the book they will read". Cosson's examples for both basic and expanded series[6] recommend activities that somehow engage students and have a ludic aspect. Motivation activities should not be long, so as to prevent student distraction, and should be previously planned by teachers. Cosson's book as a whole has a normative character as it provides more stable ways for basic education teachers to work with literature in the classroom (which rather resembles the role of teacher-support materials in PNLD-Literário).[7]

[4] Walking Among Books: Reading Literature at School, not available in English.

[5] Literary Literacy: Theory and Practice, also not published in English.

[6] These terms were used by Cosson to define a methodology for teaching literature. They consist of the following stages: motivation, introduction, reading, interpretation, and expansion. The difference between basic and expanded series lies in the latter's complexity level. This methodology, disseminated by the author in the book Literary Literacy: Theory and Practice, became very popular among basic education teachers and made the book a best-seller – which does not often happen to books from this field in Brazil.

[7] Although Cosson's proposals help organize the work of teaching literature in some contexts, and many teachers have adhered to them for their lack of practical consequences, the overuse of these sequences is tiresome for both teachers and students in basic education. Method variation is in our view the most recommendable way to think of teaching literature.

Colomer's (2007) discussion, on the other hand, has a more theoretical nature, as one can see in her discussion about motivation in a chapter entitled "The school's link with literary reading":

> Terms like "incentive", "intervention", "mediation", "familiarization", or "enacting" are constantly associated with reading at schools, libraries, or other public institutions and are ceaselessly repeated in educational discourse. All of these terms refer to the intervention of adults in charge of "presenting" books to children. (COLOMER, 2007, p. 102)

Throughout the chapter, the author proposes approaching motivation for reading in a broader sense by considering for example literature as social learning, and thus "shared reading as the basis for educating readers" (COLOMER, 2007, p. 106).

Due to its less pragmatic nature, Teresa Colomer's (2007) work seems to play a lesser role as a basis for the recommendations contained in *Digital guidelines for PNLD-Literário 2018* (BRASIL, 2018). Recommendations 3 and 4 focus more on issues pertaining works' themes and genres, as well as the provision of activities to address them. The following item in turn mentions pre-reading and post-reading activities, which cover both works in English and in Portuguese submitted to the public call. This mixture of recommendations for books in Portuguese and for foreign language books, which often have very educational purposes (broadening vocabulary, introducing new linguistic structures, presenting the culture of another language) can cause a certain confusion. Pre-reading activities for foreign languages, for example, have for a long time been connected to reading for specific purposes and to familiarizing students with a certain subject. This might lead the editors of teacher-support materials to adopt this perspective.

Cosson (2006) states that motivation activities should happen before reading the work (a kind of pre-reading), and that, after the teaching series, students should produce a more critical reading, a comparison with other works, or a written composition, because "schools emphasize writing, which is their language of record" (COSSON, 2006, p. 114). This reveals the idea of a post-reading activity, which nevertheless, as stated by Cosson (2006), is something valued by school culture, by official documents, besides being a way to assess reading. Also, it reveals the influence of an understanding of teaching Portuguese which draws from Brazil's National Curriculum Parameters (Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais), which propose activities of language use and of reflection about use to be followed by a new and more elaborate use, consisting of an oral or written composition by students.[8]

This connection with school becomes even clearer when the guidelines to PNLD proposed that the works' themes and contents be used in interdisciplinary approaches. The emphasis on curriculum issues in a reading program which became an appendix to the National Textbook Program may lead to uses which inflate themes and contents, writing down the idea of a literary education, that is: "a richer and brighter socialization of individuals, such as experimenting a kind of literary pleasure which is built along the process" (COLOMER, 2007, p. 29). The analysis of one of these guides aims to assess the impact of these guidelines on the materials produced by publishers.

The Support Material for *Angélica*, by Lygia Bojunga

With over twenty works for children and teenagers published and several national and international awards won, including the Hans Christian Andersen Award (1982), Lydia Bojunga has had many books acquired by reading incentive programs, and nearly all of her works have earned a "highly recommended"

[8] According to Leonor Werneck dos Santos (In: PAULIUKONIS; SANTOS, 2006, p. 60), the assumption USE-REFLECTION-USE, present in official documents, can lead to teaching Portuguese more productively.

label from Brazil's National Foundation for Children and Youth Books (Fundação Nacional do Livro Infantil e Juvenil – FNLIJ).[9] *Angélica*, the writer's second novel, was the first book to achieve the foundation's most prestigious rank as "best for children" in 1975. The collections of PNBE[10] have also featured Bojunga's works in 2006 (*Meu amigo pintor*), in 2009 (*A bolsa amarela, Corda bamba, A casa da madrinha, Aula de inglês*), in 2010 (*O abraço*), in 2011 (*Querida*), and in 2013 (*Paisagem*).[11]

The teacher-support material, entitled *Digital Teacher Guide* (*Manual do professor digital*), cannot be found on the publisher's website, which also does not mention the fact that the book has been selected by the program. This fact is unusual, since publishers usually highlight the recommendation of their books by a government program. The teacher guide has 12 pages and is opened by the following information:

Figure 1: Heading to the *Digital Teacher Guide*, from the book *Angélica*, by Lygia Bojunga.

Title	Angélica
Pages	160
Author	Lygia Bojunga
Illustrator	Vilma Pasqualini
Language	Portuguese
Category	5
Theme(s)	Self-knowledge, feelings, and emotions; Family, friends, and school; Facing difference; Fun and adventure;
Literary Genre	Novel
Interdisciplinarity	Social Sciences, History, Portuguese, Geography, Biology, Politics, and Psychology.

Retrieved from: http://www.casalygiabojunga.com.br/pt/paginas-conteudo/manualAngelica.pdf. Access: 5 mar. 2021.

One must highlight the fact that the guide published by the company does not mention its own author. Category 5 refers to books aimed at fourth and fifth graders. Both themes and interdisciplinary items suggest the use of the work at school and are pre-requisites to be followed by publishers. Books thus must fit into previously defined themes, while publishers have to indicate potential interdisciplinary connections for the works they submit.

The following pages of the guide are thus ordered: "Note to teachers"; "Who wrote the story"; "Diving into the book"; "Pre-reading"; "Activity proposals"; "Post-reading"; "Interdisciplinarity"; "To learn more (books and websites)". This division strictly follows the public call's requirements: information about author, context, pre-reading, and post-reading activities. The material starts with a remarkable way of addressing teachers:

[9] Highly recommended books are selected among those listed in the basic collection of FNLIJ. Since 1975, the label is conferred upon ten works from each category – children, youth, image, poetry, reference, translation (children, youth, and information).

[10] PNBE launched a public call for 2015 and even evaluated books, but the Ministry for Education did not acquire the works. The discontinuation in the program violently shook Brazil's publishing market.

[11] Except for My Friend the Painter, the remaining books listed have not been published in English. Their titles read respectively The Yellow Bag, On the Tightrope, The Godmother's House, The English Lesson, The Hug, Dear, and Landscape.

> Dear teacher, *Angélica*, the book you have in your hands, provides an opportunity to discuss important themes with children, such as the construction of identity, their place where they live, work, bullying, desires, diversity, ethnicities, ethics, and much more. (CASA LYGIA BOJUNGA, 2018, p. 1)

Once again the text reveals a concern with matching the call's requirements, emphasizing the themes approached by the work rather than its composition as a literary work. The concern with its fictional character is featured under the section "Diving into the book", although it returns to a theme-based perspective:

> The engaging, colloquial, and fun language typical of Lygia Bojunga's literature makes Angélica's story a rich and timely reading for our days, when debates about valuing identities, origins, and respecting differences are constantly promoted. It also encourages up-to-date reflections about work, bullying, feminism, self-esteem, and abusive relationships, as well as about depression and family relationships. (CASA LYGIA BOJUNGA, 2018, p. 3)

The emphasis on themes tends to write down the work's literary value. The use proposed for the book is so pragmatic that, if applied, it may make reading a mere school task, erasing other aspects involved in contact with literary texts (aesthetic pleasure, cultural features of the book as an object, and reader's subjectivity). The entire section "Diving into the book" (p. 3-7) clearly demonstrates a perspective which summarizes the work and provides teachers with finished information, always highlighting themes upon the introduction of each character. Another passage approaches the issue of teaching literature (and literary language) by focusing on the way Lygia Bojunga turns metaphors into concrete images and uses this resource in other works (p. 4). However, this kind of proposal is not present in "Diving into the book", which turns out to be a "dive into themes".

"Pre-reading" activities – twelve in total – are worthy of attention due to their diversity (to the array of abilities mobilized), because they encourage research activities (1, 8), new readings (4, 9), writing activities (3, 11, 12), oral activities (6), cultural activities (10), and the artistic aspect (2). The latter activity involves the production of a self-portrait (in writing or drawing), relating to a structural issue in the book, namely the way characters struggle to build their images, and also directly referring to a scene from the story. They are activities aimed at stimulating reading and familiarizing readers with themes and situations addressed by the work which strongly resemble Cosson's (2006) activity proposals. It is worth noting that it consists of a list of recommendations to be selected or adapted by teachers according to their context. Going to the theater to watch a children's play, for example, is unlikely to happen in most Brazilian cities, but is feasible in some of them and may be something very significant and connected to an important part of the book – the staging of the play about Angélica's life.

The following section in the material provides seventeen "Activity proposals" which resume some pre-reading activities, but now assume that the book has been read and that readers have matured and become able to think, discuss, and debate several issues raised by the book. In other words: they are activities for oral or written records about the reading. Both Cosson (2006) and Teresa Colomer (2007) value the relationship between reading and writing. For Cosson: "possibilities for recording the interpretation are diverse and depend on the class, the texts chosen, and the teacher's goals" (COSSON, 2006, p. 69). Still according to Cosson (2006, p. 68): "It is important for students to have the opportunity to reflect about the work read and express this reflection in an explicit manner, enabling the establishment of a dialog between readers and the school community."

The activities recommended include writing reviews (which cannot be overused so as not to become repetitive), the request for an extra chapter for the work, the change of the place or time in which the story is set, and the inclusion of new characters. The latter activities underline a more ludic, creative, and literary aspect, that is: learning literature by making literature. Such relationship – literary learning and literary writing – is emphasized by Colomer (2007, p. 162):

> We know that reading and writing are two sides of the same coin with the purpose of enabling access to written culture, as expected from schools. In the case of literary reading, students to be sure read more literature than they write it. But, if reading literature favors learning in general, writing literature also fosters domain over written expression; in practice, writing literature – short stories, poems, individual and collective narratives – enables children to understand and enjoy more the structure and the expressive strength of both their own texts and the texts they read.

One of the ways to learn literature is literary writing. Students leave the position of mere admirers of a work – in a contemplative reading – to assume the role of writers based on a work or motivated by it. It is what Houdar-Mérot (2013) considers a subjective appropriation of literary texts, which values the "writable" aspect of literary reading. Every interpretation is an act of inscribing the reader upon the text (HOUDAR-MÉROT, 2013). Incentive to literary writing may develop readers' maturity as to the devices of literary creation. Only theorizing about these mechanisms would be an exhausting and little productive activity. Starting with the use of these devices to then reflect on them could be more productive, and this is what Colomer (2007) proposes.

Do the "Activity proposals" from the *Digital Teacher Guide* provide for this? Let us look into three of the eighteen proposals which most seem to resemble Cosson's and Colomer's understandings:

> 1. Use magazine, newspaper cutouts, or illustrations made by students for the characters in *Angélica* to create a board denouncing bullying and its consequences. It can also contain tips, such as: are you feeling bad about some name you were called? Talk to your teacher; Or sentences such as: If your friend cried, they did not like the joke. Respect your classmates. Kindle students' creativity to create campaign slogans;
>
> 3. Ask students to write a review of the book but also give their opinions: what did they like? What would they change? Which characters would they like to be?;
>
> 12. Ask them to create poems based on the characters or on scenes from the book; (CASA LYGIA BOJUNGA, 2018, p. 8-9)

The first activity proposes something school teachers are very familiar with – setting up a board – and operates in the realm of the work's themes by shedding light on bullying issues. One should remember that bullying was not a common term in the 1970s, but it is coherent with the events in the book, amounting to what Rildo Cosson (2006, p. 89) defines as presentifying contextualization. As for the board, one may consider that the genre is feasible in several social contexts (a building, a neighborhood association, a company, a students' union facility, etc.), and the form proposed, with campaign slogans, has the potential to engage students. It is similar to the activities proposed by Rildo Cosson (2006) when his book establishes a link between literary genres and other genres (news, advertising, etc.).

The second proposal is also exposed by the author, who discusses the importance of reviews, but also the need to avoid making it the only repetitive activity. We believe that students need to practice review writing more often, including its many production and reception contexts. Little attention is

usually given to them as a genre which leads to other readings and as a final stage of achievement when reading a work. As a result, few students in higher education know this fundamental genre, and many courses have to nearly introduce it to students who should already know it. The proposal at issue, aimed at first to fifth graders, asks students to state their opinions and suggest changes in the book, or decide which character they would like to be. These items are obviously not featured in a review, but they are equally valid as a way to approach the book if one considers the grades for which the activity is proposed. The entire course of elementary education should readopt the practice of writing reviews, with other levels of complexity, in a spiraling movement which always returns to the genre (DOLZ; NOVERRAZ; SCHNEUWLY, 2004).

The two final parts of the *Digital Teacher Guide* (CASA LYGIA BOJUNGA, 2018) are called "Post-reading" and "Interdisciplinarity". Post-reading activities bear a direct – but rather superficial – relation with BNCC and with the themes declared upon submission:

> BNCC states that education plays an active role in the promotion of values and activities with a positive influence in the transformation of society into a more just, humane, and ecological place (BRASIL, 2018).
>
> Reading the book *Angélica* and the activities proposed in the manual will certainly help the development of collective awareness in students, which will make them reflect about "who I am", "who is around me", and "how we can live together in harmony". The experiences will provide new and essential knowledge for their learning and development (CASA LYGIA BOJUNGA, 2018, p. 10).

This point clearly reveals an attempt to meet the public call's requirements, making use of its own terms to justify the adoption of the work. So much so that it understands the term "post-reading" as school contents and as the themes indicated upon submission, which draws attention from literary learnings, which could also be promoted both in writing and in reading. This might be due to the digital guide's vagueness about the meaning of the terms "pre-reading" and "post-reading" (BRASIL, 2018).

As for the section "Interdisciplinarity", perhaps for being a well-known and mainstreamed term in the field of education, its eight proposals are feasible and coherent with the way schools understand the concept, approaching school subjects and fields of knowledge to be explored in the reading.

> 1. Portuguese – the author's colloquial writing versus standard language;
> 2. Literature – when the same work presents both genres: novel and drama;
> 3. Politics – when we see unemployment issues, the requisites for finding a job, and the emergence of informal jobs;
> 4. Social sciences – by exploring themes such as feminism, bullying, abusive relationships; family relationships;
> 5. Geography – because Angélica comes from a different country, enabling work and research about other regions; and natural landscapes;
> 6. Biology – when it presents different animal species;
> 7. History – when it allows a study of the history of women's emancipation, their entrance into the job market, and their struggle for equal rights;
> 8. Psychology – when we see the characters' search for their identities and when it approaches each one's conflicts over who they are and what others think of them. (CASA LYGIA BOJUNGA, 2018, p. 11)

A close examination of the two proposals concerning teaching language and literature suggests that they might have been the basis for the section "Diving into the book". The way Lygia Bojunga makes

a literary use of several linguistic norms enable what official documents term linguistic analysis. The field of language education could also include a reflection about discourse genres, which pervade all education levels, and even the author's book could be adopted to teach grades in which students have a deeper background for these discussions. The novel, for example, at a certain point shows the staging of a play by the characters. Also, the novel's structure resembles a fable, in which animals speak in a way that represents people's moral behaviors, but in a very critical way, reproaching the sexist behavior of a character by discussing unemployment and family conflicts. Other social genres are also featured in the composition: a restaurant advertisement, a poster promoting a play, and a restaurant menu. Approaching these genres should of course be done carefully so as to depict them as aesthetic uses made by the author which do not prevent the book from remaining a novel. This may be perhaps Angélica's greatest literary lesson.

Conclusion

Despite not being a mandatory requirement of 2018 PNLD-Literário, teacher-support materials are very significant for research. They clearly demonstrate publishers' concern for meeting the public call's criteria, which carry assumptions about the very role of literature at school. Publishers and their teams make an effort to understand what is expected of them, since the public call's terms are not always elucidative: what is understood by pre-reading and post-reading activities? How to approach the themes contained in the work without writing down literary education?

These facts became evident in the analysis of the material produced as teacher support for *Angélica*, by Lygia Bojunga – which, by the way, provides good activities and meets the public call's requisites. Its prevailingly theme-based approach is not wrong, since it follows what is prescribed by the public call in order to avoid being eliminated for not addressing the themes declared upon submission.

As for the way the public call and the materials understand teaching, both refer to notions consecrated by scholars and educators. It might be productive to consider other approaches to literary texts, such as subjective reading, which has been especially promoted by Annie Rouxel's research group (ROUXEL; LANGLADE; RESENDE, 2013). Some of their ideas – many of which are published in Portuguese – value the subjective appropriation of literary works, propose working with reading diaries (joining writing with reading), stimulate literary conversation, reflect about the limits of interpretation, and think about the text's and the reader's rights. Rouxel's essays discuss the tension between using and interpreting works in class, and proposes, based on Roland Barthes and Umberto Eco, that every interpretation is an act of subjective appropriation by readers.

Other significant discussions are started by the Argentinians Cecília Bajour (*Ouvir nas entrelinhas: o valor da escuta nas práticas de leitura*, 2012) and María Teresa Andruetto (*A leitura, outra revolução*, 2017).[12] Bajour (2012) values literary conversations as teaching situations and proposes ways to develop them in class. She favors the choice of strong and vigorous texts as a criterion for ensuring meaningful literary conversations. Similarly, Andruetto (2017) praises difficulty as a way to educate readers:

> There are three pre-requisites for reading not just for the sake of reading, but rather reading as an adventurer. Reading not only as a reader who is able to interpret, but above all as a reader who can allow the text to affect them in their very being, in their intimacy, and to take them to new paths of knowledge and to face that which struggles to become visible, at the risk of transforming us. Reading is not about consuming books, but about turning into a camel, a lion, or a kid at the same time, about moving from

[12] Neither of them has been published in English. Their titles read, correspondingly: Listening between the lines: the value of listening in reading practices and Reading, another revolution.

> the mistaken notion of reading as a distraction, when reading is actually about concentrating, about finding one's self. Likewise, writing should not be about revelries, but about the search for mindfulness. Every good book invites us to dive into ourselves. Thus it is not a matter of the amount of books read, although diversity and number are important. It is above all a matter of how to read and how to invite others to read (ANDRUETTO, 2017, p. 81).

This excerpt by the Argentinian author, who also holds a Hans Christian Andersen Award (2012) and has for decades committed to reader education in a context which is very similar to ours, issues a warning: reading literary texts goes beyond merely decoding, consisting rather of an experience between readers and books. For this experience to take place, "good books" are required. Yes, there are good books. It may sound very subjective, it may be very debatable, it may be time-consuming to define quality criteria for this, but the construction of a collection to be recommended to schools cannot be based on merely qualifying criteria – which are nonetheless important to prevent the acquisition of aesthetically, ethically, and editorially poor books by school. The good use of public money is a priority. Quality benchmarks, such as the "highly recommended" seal previously awarded by PNBE, should be comprised by the evaluation of any material directed at educating readers. The erasure of these evaluation criteria is one of the biggest problems in PNLD-Literário, because the works adopted at schools meet different goals which are to be assessed by reader education experts. The program's greatest achievement is the engagement of basic education teachers and school managers in the process of selecting the works students will read in class.

References

ANDRUETTO, M. T. *A leitura, outra revolução*. Translation by Newton Cunha. São Paulo: Ed. Sesc-SP, 2017.

BAJOUR, C. *Ouvir nas entrelinhas*: o valor da escuta nas práticas de leitura. Translation by Alexandre Morales. São Paulo: Pulo do Gato, 2012.

BOJUNGA, L. *Angélica*. 24. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Casa Lygia Bojunga, 2013.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica, Fundo Nacional de Desenvolvimento da Educação. *Guia digital PNLD-Literário 2018*. Brasília: MEC, 2018. Retrieved from: https://www.fnde.gov.br/index.php/programas/programas-do-livro/pnld/guia-do-pnld/item/12103-guia-pnld-literario-2018. Access: 17 Feb. 2021.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Programa Nacional Biblioteca da Escola (PNBE)*, 2013. Retrieved from: http://portal.mec.gov.br/programa-nacional-biblioteca-da-escola/. Access: 19 Feb. 2021.

CASA LYGIA BOJUNGA. *Manual do professor digital* (*Angélica*), 2018. Retrieved from: http://www.casalygiabojunga.com.br/pt/paginas-conteudo/manualAngelica.pdf Access: 5 Mar. 2021.

COLOMER, T. *Andar entre livros*: a leitura literária na escola. Tradução Laura Sandroni. São Paulo: Global, 2007.

COSSON, R. *Letramento literário*: teoria e prática. 2. ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2012.

COSSON, R; PAIVA, A. O PNBE, a literatura e o endereçamento escolar. *Remate de Males*, Campinas, v. 34, n. 2, p. 477-499, jul./dez. 2014. Retrieved from: https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/remate/issue/view/349. Access: 22 Feb. 2021.

DOLZ, J.; NOVERRAZ, M.; SCHNEUWLY, B. Sequências didáticas para o oral e a escrita: apresentação de um procedimento. *In*: SCHNEUWLY, B.; DOLZ, J. et al. *Gêneros orais e escritos na escola*. Campinas: Mercado das Letras, 2004.

FERNANDES, C. R. D. A seleção de obras literárias para o Programa Nacional Biblioteca da Escola – PNBE 2006-2014. *Estudos de Literatura Brasileira Contemporânea*, n. 51, p. 221-244, maio/ago. 2017. Retrieved from: https://www.scielo.br/pdf/elbc/n51/2316-4018-elbc-51-00221.pdf. Access: 22 Feb. 2021.

FUNDAÇÃO NACIONAL DO LIVRO INFANTIL E JUVENIL (FNLIJ). *Página oficial*. Retrieved from: https://www.fnlij.org.br/. Access: 19 Feb. 2021.

HOUDART-MÉROT, V. Da crítica de admiração à leitura "scriptível". *In*: ROUXEL, A.; LANGLADE, G.; REZENDE, N. L. (org.). *Leitura subjetiva e ensino de literatura*. Translation by Neide Luzia de Rezende et al. São Paulo: Alameda, 2013. p. 103-116.

SANTOS, L. W. Práticas de linguagem e PCN: o ensino de língua portuguesa. *In*: PAULIUKONIS, M. A. L.; SANTOS, L. W. (org.). *Estratégias de leitura*: texto e ensino. Rio de Janeiro: Lucerna, 2006. p. 59-68.