

Orality and Textual Production in a Didactic Book: Perspective of *AD Pecheuxtiana*¹

Maria Deusa Brito de Sousa **APINAGÉ***

João de Deus **LEITE****

Janete Silva dos **SANTOS*****

¹ This article is an excerpt from the master's thesis entitled: *The orality axis in the portuguese language textbook: the discursivities between authors and evaluators of collections approved in PNLD 2018*.

* Master Degree in Language and Literature Teaching from the Federal University of Tocantins - UFT (2020). Teacher of Basic Education by the Secretary of Education and Culture of Tocantins - SEDUC. Contact: mariadeusaapinage@educ.to.gov.br

** Doctoral Degree in Linguistic Studies from the Federal University of Tocantins - UFT (2015). Adjunct Professor III - UFNT. Contact: joadedeus@mail.uft.edu.br

*** Doctoral Degree in Applied Linguistics from Unicamp (2010). Associate Professor II - UFNT. Contact: janetesantos@uft.edu.br

Abstract:

In this article, from the theoretical perspective of Discourse Analysis conceived by Pêcheux, we analyze how the teaching axes of Portuguese Language *Textual Production* and *Orality* are discursivized by the evaluators, through the review, within the scope of the Textbook Guide. Apart from the review made by the authors/editors of the work, which only highlights the possibilities/advantages of the volumes, the review by the evaluators seeks to indicate, to Basic Education (EB) teachers, both the qualities and limitations of the collection, emphasizing the relationship between the axes with the demands of official documents for Basic Education. These discursivizations are related to the collection *Spheres of languages*, by Maria Inês Batista Campos and Nivia Assumpção, published by FTD and approved in the National Program for Books and Textbook Material (PNLD) 2018. In order to achieve that, we started with an analysis of the constitution, formulation and circulation processes of the textbook, in the light of the following fundamentals: conditions of production and social division. We realized, from the analysis, a social division of unequal meanings between the *Textual Production* and *Orality* axes.

Keywords:

Teaching axes. Social division of senses. Discourse analysis.

Signum: Estudos da Linguagem, Londrina, v. 26, i. 1, p. 37-51, Apr. 2023

Received on: 01/08/2023

Accepted on: 03/15/2023

Orality and Textual Production in a Didactic Book: Perspective of AD Pecheuxtiana

Maria Deusa Brito de Sousa Apinagé;
João de Deus Leite;
Janete Silva dos Santos

INITIAL REMARKS

In this article, bearing in mind the theoretical perspective of Discourse Analysis (hereinafter AD), based on Pecheuxtian, we analyze how the *Textual Production* and *Orality* axes, which constitute the teaching of the Portuguese Language, as an object of teaching and learning, are addressed by the evaluators of the didactic collection *Spheres of languages*, approved in the National Book and Didactic Material Program (PNLD) 2018, in the edition aimed at teachers. This assessment takes place in the review that integrates the Guide to Textbooks, which is aimed at basic education teachers. The purpose of this Guide, within the scope of the PNLD, is to assist you in the textbook selection process, given the possibilities of the collections approved in each PNLD. We are interested in the following inquiry: to what extent does the treatment dedicated to orality in textbooks, as hinted at by the evaluators' position, interfere with the question of the social division of meanings between the *Textual Production* and *Orality* axes?

Theorizing this social division between these axes is significant, as we begin to think whether the discursiveness of the prevalence of writing over orality reverberates or not in didactic materials, such as the textbook (LD). If it is known that this division is marked in and by historicity, with the imaginary and symbolic force that it has, resorting to significant objects, such as the textbook, can bring into play the discursive functioning of this division; and thus, create conditions for re-signification processes to be formulated.

The textbook is a symbolic object that is passed around in many classrooms in Brazilian schools, especially public ones. According to statistical data from the National Education Development Fund (FNDE)², in 2018, 31,137,679 students from 117,566 schools benefited, with a total of 153,899,147 copies. The purchase price for these copies was R\$ 1,467,232,112.09. Produced to help students and teachers in the teaching and learning process, this pedagogical support often ends up being the main resource used by the teacher. To this extent, we realize the relevance of research that intends to investigate the discourses of this pedagogical component that is so present in the lives of students and teachers.

As far as this symbolic object is concerned, an extremely relevant factor that must be taken into account is its production conditions, that is, the circumstances in which this object is produced. From the publication of the Invitation to Bid in the Federal Official Gazette, the registration process begins for publishers interested in submitting their didactic works to the PNLD. The enrolled works are submitted to the pedagogical evaluation carried out by public universities under the coordination of the Secretariat of Basic Education (SEB/MEC). These universities are selected through public competition.

The evaluated works, in accordance with the criteria established in the public notice, receive opinions prepared by the technical teams, indicating "approval", "approval subject to the correction of specific flaws pointed out" or "failure". After making the corrections established by the reviewers, the approved didactic works make up the Textbook Guide.

² Available in: <https://www.gov.br/fnde/pt-br/aceso-a-informacao/acoes-e-programas/programas/programas-do-livro/pnld/dados-estatisticos>. Accessed on: 22 Mar. 2023.

The Textbook Guide is made up of reviews of the approved works, as well as the principles and criteria that guide the pedagogical evaluation, the analysis sheets that serve as a parameter for the professor at the selected institution when evaluating the book and the *hyperlink* to complete visualization of approved works. These questions help the teachers and other employees of the school participating in the PNLD in choosing the didactic work.

Faced with these observations about the textbook production and evaluation process, it is evident, in the wake of Orlandi (2012, p. 137), that “[t]he senses are, therefore, parts of a process. They take place in a context, but are not limited to it. They have historicity, they have a past and they are projected into the future”. In this case, it is imperative to consider the conditions of production, the historicity, the exterior; In other words, it is necessary to consider not only the product, but the process it goes through, its mode of operation.

Historicity, in AD, does not mean thinking chronology as in history, what matters are not the dates, but the modes of constitution, formulation and circulation of meanings in a given discursive formation³. “When we speak of historicity, we do not think of the history reflected in the text, but we deal with the historicity of the text in its materiality. What we call historicity is the event of the text as discourse, the work of the senses in it” (ORLANDI, 2015, p. 66). Hence the inseparable character between the linguistic and the historical, aspects that constitute the materiality of language.

1. THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Orality and writing are constitutive language skills. Such skills enable the appropriation of knowledge and promote interlocution, as well as decision-making. In this sense, the importance of recognizing the problems related to the teaching practices of these modalities is undeniable, as well as the need to understand how the axis that deals with such modalities has been discussed in the didactic materials that are being used in the classrooms of Brazilian schools.

These two modalities of the same language have their peculiarities, however, a dichotomous or segregation relationship should not be established between them. According to Marcuschi (2007, p. 9), “[t]he proximities between speech and writing are so close that there seems to be a mixture, almost a fusion of both, in a very large overlap both in textual strategies and in the contexts of awareness”. However, it should be noted that, for AD, the subject is always from the unconscious and, thus, the “textual strategies” are not always conscious, and the “contexts of awareness”, in AD, would refer to the immediate and mediate production conditions. However, orality and writing are often seen as opposites, predominating the notion of supremacy of writing to the detriment of orality. As Marcuschi (2007, p. 16) points out, “[t]oday, [...] the position prevails that orality and literacy can be conceived as interactive and complementary activities in the context of social and cultural practices”. In the wake of this discursivity, it is understood that both the written and oral modality are significant and deserve the same space and the same dedication both in the school environment and outside it.

Nonetheless, even though they are interactive and complementary activities, there is an abyss that has widened since the Middle Ages between these two modalities, which, traditionally, the school designates as orality and writing. This abyss refers to cleavage, to what Pêcheux (2014, p. 61, emphasis added) calls a *social division of reading work*. In his own words: “[i]t is this social division of *the work of reading* that is currently being completely reorganized, going deeper: it is understood that, from different perspectives, the powers get ‘interested’ in the sciences of the treatment of texts”. We verify, in this process of social division of reading work, a relationship with the division of intellectual work with writing as opposed to orality. This division and, respectively, the overlapping of writing to the detriment of orality, is not a new event and produces effects from the functioning of discursive memory.

Since the Middle Ages (5th to 15th centuries), writing was an exclusive activity for a privileged part of society (clergy), and the popular strata did not have access to this cultural asset. Literary manifestations,

³ [...] we will [c]all, then, *discursive formation* what, in a given ideological formation, that is, from a given position in a given conjuncture, determined by the state of class struggle, determines *what can and should be said* (PÊCHEUX, 1995, p. 160).

both with regard to prose and poetry, as well as theater, achieved popularity because they were told or sung. Due to the fact that writing was not very widespread at the time and was only accessible to a small privileged part of society, it is possible to consider that orality was the most accessible means for the underprivileged. Hence, perhaps, the social division between orality and writing arose. The first is considered as informal, unsystematic, disorganized and belonging to the popular classes, and the second is considered as formal, systematic, organized and belonging to the privileged class of society. Today, in the middle of the 21st century, this social division of intellectual work that separates orality and writing into two parts seems to be attenuated, and the practice, effectively, of teaching orality is marginalized. These two modalities are separated by their production conditions, by their historicity and seem to be part of two worlds: writing represents the erudite language of cultured people, while orality represents the language of the illiterate.

The asymmetrical and dichotomous way in which the social division of labor between writing and orality is naturalized is crossed by the discursive memory that reproduces and preserves effects that have already crystallized and stabilized in our society. This process of naturalization of the social division of labor with these two modalities of language use circumscribes, on the one hand, the writing represented by literate, cultured and legitimate peoples to think logically, to dominate; on the other, illiterate, lay and legitimate subjects are inscribed as disqualified to think logically. The operation of this process of overvaluation of writing and, therefore, of the subjects who dominate it, makes it resound like an echo in the school space, the means through which knowledge operates, as well as subjects and meanings.

We present, below, a summary table that best exemplifies the division between orality and writing, synthesizing what has been exposed up to this point on this matter.

Chart 1 - Division of the intellectual work of writing as opposed to orality from a dichotomous perspective.

Writing	Orality
Formal	Informal
Systematic	Unsystematic
Organized	Disorganized
Belonging to the privileged class	Belonging to the popular classes
Power	Servility
Literate people	Illiterate people

Source: table prepared by the authors.

The picture shows a biased and mistaken view, the result of a discursive characterization that dichotomizes orality and writing. According to Pêcheux (2015, p. 126; emphasis added), “the essential unhappiness of our society resides in the separation of languages, thus reducing the class struggle to the old idea of a ‘conflict’ between dialects or jargons of class”. The chart exemplifies the mistaken way in which orality is seen in the studies discussed in this section, because both written and oral language can be formal or informal, systematized or not, organized or not. This dichotomy presupposes that both remain in a constant duel, each seeking to show greater value and prestige in relation to the other, however, the relationship between these two modalities is interdependent. Although orality and writing have their particularities in their modes of constitution, formulation and circulation, they are complementary and inseparable, as we defend in discursive terms.

There are no problems in dealing with the importance and necessity of writing for the contemporary world, the problem lies in the fact of placing it as superior to orality and approaching it hegemonically in language teaching and learning. After all, as Marcuschi (2007, p. 60) hints at, “[s]peech and writing are two ways in which language works, and not two properties of different societies”. The fact that orality and writing have peculiar and different characteristics does not justify the division between them, but rather the need for specific teaching, so that they constitute the student’s education as integral modalities in the use of language.

We live in a graphocentric society, that is, a society centered on writing, which hinders marginal cultures that are associated with orality. The culture of valuing writing is linked in the most diverse spaces, among them, in the textbook, material that helps in the continuous formation of the teacher and in the citizenship formation of the student. Because it is a training material, the textbook should not segregate the oral language from the written language and both should not be dissociated in the teaching of the Portuguese language, just as the Portuguese language should not be dissociated from life, but fundamentally focused on it.

There is a division of labor with the Portuguese language. This division is considered, by official documents and teaching materials, as the way in which the Portuguese language is organized⁴: Reading, Literature, Text Production, Orality and Linguistic Analysis, axes that guide the teaching of LP. However, this division becomes a problem from the moment that, in the classroom, or even in textbooks, some axes are accentuated and others are muted. One of the factors that can determine the accentuation or silencing of a certain axis is the identification of the subject with a certain discursive formation. As Leite (2015) points out:

[...] The taking of a position is anchored in processes of identification that constitute the teacher, making the exercise of a given discursive-enunciative position in the classroom erupt. Therefore, it is up to the teacher to integrate or not the discursiveness that the official guidelines contain – an instance of theoretical identification – to the classroom space – procedural identification (LEITE, 2015, p. 138).

Still in this perspective, let's see what the PCN emphasize in this regard:

The subject in LDB nº 5.692/71 was divided into Language and Literature (with an emphasis on Brazilian literature). The division had repercussions on the curricular organization: the separation between grammar, literary studies and writing. Textbooks, in general, and even the entrance exams, reproduced the division model. Many schools have specialist teachers for each subject and there are even specific classes as if reading/literature, grammatical studies and text production were not related to each other. We witnessed situations in which the student's notebook was thus divided (BRASIL, 2000, p. 16).

However, this way of organizing the LP divides and silences some axes and accentuates others. This separation without interlocution accentuates a hierarchy in teaching between the areas and their contents. In this regard, let's see what the coordinators of the 2018 PNLD Assessment Program, Simone Bueno Borges da Silva (Doctor in Applied Linguistics) and Júlio Neves Pereira (Doctor in Portuguese Language), both from the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA), point out. in a recent approach about the Portuguese language textbooks for high school approved in the PNLD 2018. Here are the words of the referred authors:

To complete our observations about the axes that guide the teaching of the Portuguese language, we need to address *orality*, traditionally almost invisible in the sense of the language, or treated peripherally. In this sense (the observance of orality as a teaching axis), we see some progress, resulting, we believe, from the very evaluative processes that establish the work with the production of oral texts as one of the evaluation requirements. But, without a shadow of a doubt, this is the axis that is most groped for ways to realize what it is, and why teach oral genres, and how to put the student in the practice of orality. It is observed that the genres worked are those belonging to the school sphere, with a clear emphasis on the debate. There is no work that really aims to place orality alongside writing, as a modality as important as this one. Other than that, there are no discussions about the relationship between orality (and not oralization) being a social practice such as literacies and, in many cases, related to them. From an ideological point of view, allowing

⁴ In this article, we are considering this discursive circumscription on the Portuguese Language, since the didactic collection in focus is not yet aligned with the National Common Curricular Base (BNCC) of the Portuguese Language, even as a matter of the period of formalization of the BNCC.

the student – especially those from underprivileged schools, whose social contexts are mostly composed of oral practices – to use the oral modality in Portuguese language activities, is to make the classroom a place of diversity, of tolerance, respect and, above all, the deconstruction of hegemonies led by the idea of supremacy of the written language that overshadows the symbolic value of oral tradition and the effective place of orality in social and contemporary activities (SILVA; PEREIRA, 2018, p. 40, authors' emphasis).

Given these considerations, we highlight the unsystematic and restricted way with the work carried out on orality by didactic works. As it is one of the evaluative criteria established by the public notice, the treatment given to this modality happens as the fulfillment of an obligation and not as a responsible, systematic work and concerned with citizenship education. Still following this reasoning, the same authors focus on:

When analyzing the proposals for the production of oral texts in didactic works, no clear and effective guidelines were found on the construction of the textual plan of oral genres, nor on their evaluation. The activities, as a rule, do not provide guidance, for example, on the criteria for selecting arguments and hierarchizing information, nor do they address general organization standards, nor cohesion resources, etc. [...] Another aspect linked to the issue of orality is listening. This skill is still little treated in collections in a more systematic way, although the Curricular Parameters, thirty years ago, recommend that the classroom be the place of critical speech and listening. There are few activities that are structured and designed to contemplate the capacity for attentive and understanding listening, and encourage the student to develop it (SILVA; PEREIRA, 2018, p. 40).

As Orlandi (2012, p. 50) hints at, the treatment given to orality by the school is marked by silencing. This silencing, still so present today, has a historicity. If we go back in time, elsewhere, we will see how much education is intrinsically linked to religion. This religious foundation brings some consequences for education, among them, the teaching and practice of orality in the classroom. Although, in the early days, teaching in educational institutions took place orally, the teacher was seen as the one who could speak, who dominated knowledge, and the student, as the one who listened and had nothing to say, to question. In the wake of considerations by Celso Ferrarezi Júnior (2014, p. 23), “public school groups throughout Brazil favored rewards in the form of grades to those students who managed to remain silent and conform to their *status quo* of assumed ignorance. Any objection was condemnable”.

In this sense, we understand that this heritage was transmitted from generation to generation, and the practice of the oral modality, until today, is complex. On the one hand, the teacher thinks that letting the student express himself is losing control of the class, on the other hand, the student prefers to remain silent so as not to challenge the teacher and not run the risk of losing a grade for lack of behavior. After all, “[the] good student was the one who entered the school silently and left the school even more silently, who strictly complied with all the orders issued by the teacher”. (FERRAREZI JÚNIOR, 2014, p. 24). It seems contradictory, but there were, or still are, teachers who divide students' grades between the items: behavior and participation. How to participate if the student has to remain silent? In fact, this participation does not include the student's oral expression, but having in the notebook all the activities, written, done.

Still following this premise, Apinagé, Santos and Leite (2020, p. 154) assert that, in the school context, “[t]his happens because the school starts from the understanding that the student already knows how to speak, when one arrives there; therefore, it invests exhaustively in the teaching of writing, without operationalizing the systematic work with orality.” Another possibility of investment in the teaching of writing by the school is the demand for participation and approval of students in external tests, which demand knowledge of the written language in their questions. Also, following this reasoning, Schneuwly and Dolz (2004) point out that: “Although oral language is very present in classrooms (in daily routines, reading instructions, correcting exercises, etc.), it is often said that it is not taught, except incidentally, during diverse and poorly controlled activities” (DOLZ; SCHNEUWLY, 2004, p. 125).

Notwithstanding the studies developed on the teaching of the Portuguese language and the official documents point to the importance of carrying out a more effective approach to orality, the school has been giving little importance to the teaching of this modality, considering it without relevance as a didactic activity. Hereof, Marcuschi (2007) considers that: “Orality would be an interactive social practice for **communicative purposes** that presents itself in various forms or textual genres based on sound reality; it ranges from a more informal realization to a more formal [sic] in the most varied contexts of use” (MARCUSCHI, 2007, p. 25, emphasis added).

According to this author, orality can be understood as an interactive practice, which is experienced in everyday social interaction, and is present in our lives since our birth. In the discursive perspective, to which we subscribe, a language is not just “for communication purposes”; far from it, equivocation is constitutive of language. In each enunciative situation, we have a different engagement, and what determines the type of language we are going to use will be the production conditions.

Finally, it is worth discussing, from the perspective of Courtine (2014), the preconstructed. According to him, this device designates:

[...] a previous construction, an independent exterior as opposed to what is constructed in the enunciation. It marks the existence of a discrepancy between the interdiscourse as the place of construction of the preconstructed, and the intradiscourse, as the place of enunciation by a subject. This is the discursive effect linked to the syntactic fit: an interdiscourse element is nominalized and inscribed in the intradiscourse in the preconstructed, that is, as if that element were already there. The preconstructed thus refers to the evidence by which the subject sees oneself attributing the objects of one's discourse: “what each one knows” and simultaneously “what each one can see” in a given situation (COURTINE, 2014, p. 74, emphasis added).

In other words, preconstructed approaches are sayings that, due to their recurrence, were crystallized in society and taken as truths.

At this point in the work, we begin to mention the way in which textbooks have been undergoing certain changes, especially in relation to the orality axis approach. With regard to the quality of the textbook, Azevedo (2019) asserts that:

Although the MEC has made interventions through programs with regard to the making and quality of the Textbook, these interventions were not always systematic and effective in the sense of guaranteeing the production of material that presented a satisfactory level of quality, whether technical or didactic pedagogical (AZEVEDO, 2019, p. 86).

The advances, with regard to textbooks, and, more specifically, in the work with orality, are gradually gaining notoriety. According to what Magalhães (2018, p. 31) asserts, orality has been gaining ground in textbooks.

Although there is a significant amount of research on orality and that this modality has been gaining space in textbooks, it is still necessary to bring theory and practice closer together and to work systematically in teaching this modality, which, as Dantas points out and Marine (2018, p. 39), still occupies a secondary place in Brazilian school classrooms.

There are educational stereotypes that are difficult to deconstruct, as is the case, for example, of the dichotomy between orality and writing, as well as the overvaluation of the latter to the detriment of the former. Although orality is gradually conquering its place in the space of textbooks, the way in which it has been worked on is still a challenge that necessarily needs to be better worked on. Therefore, there must be an understanding that the oral modality, as well as writing, enables the circulation of discourses used in the most diverse situations of social life.

2. THE TEXTBOOK IN THE CURRENT CONTEXT OF BRAZILIAN EDUCATION AND ITS PRODUCTION CONDITIONS

In this section, we present aspects of the textbook production conditions, within the scope of the PNLD's educational policy, in view of the constitution, formulation and circulation of this significant materiality. In a context of globalization, excessive technological influence and an intense amount of information, the textbook continues to be the main resource used by the teacher. It is undeniable that this instrument is the main means by which the teaching objects of all disciplines reach most classrooms in Brazilian schools, especially public ones.

According to statistical data from the FNDE, in 2018⁵, a total of 153,899,147 copies were distributed to all regions of the country. Books are distributed directly by publishers to schools, through a contract between the FNDE and the Brazilian Post and Telegraph Company (ECT). This stage of the PNLD is monitored by technicians from the FNDE and from the state departments of education. Books are expected to arrive at educational institutions between October and the beginning of the school year. In rural areas, the works are delivered to the headquarters of the city halls or municipal education departments, which must deliver the books to the schools located in these areas.

The distribution of didactic materials is specific for students and teachers of rural schools that offer the initial years of elementary education in classes organized in a multi-grade, graded and by learning segment, that integrate the municipal, state and state education networks. Federal District and that are participants in the PNLD, according to the conditions and specifications contained in the Public Notice and its annexes. The objective of producing specific material for this region is to provide opportunities for the development of teaching and learning in a contextualized way, focused on the reality of the field in line with scientific knowledge and the knowledge of the community.

With regard to works intended for High School, the principles and criteria established for the evaluation carried out, within the scope of the PNLD 2018, were disclosed through Call Notice 04/2015 – CGPLI (BRASIL, 2015). To subsidize the evaluation process, the Notice specified two sets of criteria: one set refers to the elimination criteria common to all areas of knowledge, the other relates to the specific elimination criteria for each curricular component.

The works, in general, to be approved, needed to meet the following criteria:

[...] respect for legislation, guidelines and official norms related to Secondary Education; the observance of ethical and democratic principles necessary for the construction of citizenship and republican social life; the coherence and adequacy of the theoretical-methodological approach assumed by the work, with regard to the explicit didactic-pedagogical proposal and the intended objectives; respect for the interdisciplinary perspective in approaching the contents; correcting and updating concepts, information and procedures; observance of the characteristics and specific purposes of the Teacher's Manual and the adequacy of the work to the pedagogical line presented therein; and adapting the editorial structure and graphic design to the work's didactic-pedagogical goals. (BRASIL, 2017, p. 13).

It is expected that this set of criteria will be taken into account by the evaluators in the evaluation process of all curricular components of all areas of knowledge directed to High School. With regard to the eliminatory criteria directed specifically to the Portuguese Language curriculum component, each teaching axis was considered: Reading, Literature, Text Production, Orality and Linguistic Analysis.

The works assessed and approved are listed in the Textbook Guide. From this stage, it is the teacher's turn to choose the books. For this purpose, reviews of each curricular component and *online* access to the entire

⁵ We mobilized these formulations, based on the year 2018, having as reference the year to which the textbook under analysis in this article belongs.

teacher's manual are available as an aid. The school must register the choice in the Interactive PDDE System (Programa Dinheiro Direto na Escola – Direct Money at School Program) in order for it to be accepted by the PNLD. For each curricular component, two options should be chosen, 1st and 2nd from different publishers. If the FNDE is unable to negotiate with the 1st publisher requested, the books of the 2nd option will be delivered.

Thus, due to the imperative presence of the textbook in most Brazilian schools, the curriculum, objectives and teaching contents of the Elementary and Middle levels end up being established by it. Given this, we believe that any research that intends to study the influence of textbooks and pedagogical practice in Basic Education in the country is of great importance. After all, “the textbook is just an object until it is accepted for dialogue by teacher and student.” (KLEIMAN, 2018, p. 14).

2.1. Characterization of the review

In this section, we detail, through the reviews contained in the Textbook Guide, the way in which the evaluators present the textbooks approved in the PNLD. The review is a resource of the PNLD, made available through the Textbook Guide, a constant requirement of Public Call Notice 04/2015 – CGPLI (BRASIL, 2015). Reviews of didactic works are essentially descriptive texts with an evaluative character and are intended to present information that may help teachers in the “choice” of works to be adopted in school units, showing their relevant points and deficiencies. As determined by the Public Notice:

6.5.1. The Textbook Guide will contain the reviews of the approved works, the principles and criteria that guided the pedagogical evaluation, the models of the analysis sheets and the hyperlink of the approved works, to subsidize the choice of didactic works by the teachers and directors of the schools participating in the PNLD. **6.5.1.1.** The Textbook Guide will be made available on the internet in order to assist teachers in choosing textbooks (BRASIL, 2015, p. 8, our emphasis).

The discursivities presented in the Public Notice regarding the objective of the reviews contained in the Textbook Guide produce the sense that teachers and school leaders have the “freedom” to “choose” the textbooks that best meet their needs. However, the clashes that occurred between the publishers from the registration process, through the evaluation, to the stage of the presentation of approved titles, as well as the mark of a relationship of forces that determines the entry of books in the school, are erased. This lack of information leads to the impression of a false neutrality in the position of the Ministry of Education directors and to the illusion that teachers are free to “choose” the works that best adapt to the school reality. In fact, they are free to “choose” among those that have already been determined by these power relations.

From the publication of Call Notice 04/2015 – CGPLI (BRASIL, 2015), in the Official Gazette of the Union, on February 2, 2015, the evaluation process of the PNLD 2018 began. This document guides publishers for the registration of didactic works that will be submitted to pedagogical evaluation. For the evaluation process of these works, some public universities were selected through public competition Notice 42/2016 (BRASIL, 2016) and under the coordination of the Secretariat of Basic Education (SEB/MEC). For each curricular component, a team responsible for the evaluation was designated, among them, the evaluators, one of the main characters in the analysis of this work. The Guide, the result of the above-mentioned announcement, contains the names of the fifteen evaluators selected for the evaluation of the Portuguese language curriculum component, as well as information about their respective institutions of work and their qualifications.

Based on the data provided, two facts draw our attention: the eleven curricular components that make up the Textbook Guide (Biology, Philosophy, Physics, Geography, History, Spanish, English, Portuguese, Mathematics, Chemistry and Sociology), only in relation to the History component, the evaluators' degrees are not mentioned and only the Portuguese Language and Philosophy components have their entire staff composed of evaluators with the title of Doctors. It is interesting to point out that the number of evaluators varies in each curricular component.

The evaluations of the collections approved by the responsible institutions were made available in the Textbook Guide through the reviews, as well as the novelty of the PNLD of access to the complete content of the teacher's manual. The texts of the reviews of the selected works bring indications that allow the teacher to recognize the aspects that are closer to the reality experienced by their students and to make a conscious, participatory, democratic and responsible "choice". Let's see what were the criteria established in the evaluation form that the evaluators should follow "rigorously" to verify if the work met the proposal for the development of the orality axis.

10. Do the proposed activities contribute significantly to the development of the student's oral language?

10.1. Do they work on the relationship between oral practices and genres, paying attention to issues such as discourse, ideology, authorship, social sphere, relationship between interlocutors?

10.2. Do they explore oral genres suitable for different communicative situations in the production (interview, spoken newspaper, work presentation, debate, etc.)?

10.3. Do they explore the oralization of writing (expressive reading, staging, recitation of poems, minstrels, etc.)?

10.4. Do they contemplate the capacity of attentive and understanding listening and encourage the student to develop it?

10.5. Do they explore the relationships between oral and written modalities of language in different social practices and in different genres?

10.6. Do they guide the construction of the textual plan of oral genres (selection criteria and hierarchization of information, general organization standards, cohesion resources, etc.)?

10.7. Do they discuss and guide the use of language appropriate to the situation (prosody, cohesion resources, lexical selection, morphosyntactic resources, etc.)?

10.8. Are they free of prejudices associated with oral varieties?

10.9. Do they guide the use of audiovisual resources as auxiliaries to oral production (poster, panel, slide, among others)?

Produce an evaluative synthesis on the activities of the Axis of Orality proposed in the collection under analysis. Analyze the collection taking into account the items: 1. consistency and methodological sufficiency; 2. Diversity and clarity in the formulation of proposals, with adaptation to the level of education; 3. articulation and balance in relation to the other axis; 4. Consistency with the work's pedagogical proposal; 5. progression and systematization of strategies and procedures involved in the development of orality (BRASIL, 2017, p. 95).

From these observations, it is evident that the evaluators are limited to making their considerations within what is established by the Guide. That is, the evaluators carry out the evaluation controlled by the Guide, and the teachers make their "choices" controlled by the evaluators. Both teachers and evaluators are subject to a relationship of forces that resonates higher and that overdetermines them.

The books that will be chosen will accompany teachers and students over the course of three years, currently. Therefore, even with the existing constraints, it is important to pay attention to the guidelines presented in the reviews, so that the choice of didactic work, as far as possible, is the most appropriate to the school context. Full reviews feature the following sections, each with a specific purpose: 1) Overview; 2) Description of the work; 3) Analysis of the work; and 4) In the classroom.

- 1) Overview: in this section, basic information about the collection is presented, as well as the way it is structured, the theoretical foundation on which it is anchored and the objectives it seeks to achieve.
- 2) Description of the work: here, the organization of the three volumes of the Student's Book, the Teacher's Manual and the audio CD are presented in more detail, as well as the proposed thematic units, sections and subsections.
- 3) Analysis of the work: in this part, the adopted theoretical-methodological issues are addressed, the graphic-editorial project is evaluated and the way in which written comprehension/production, oral comprehension/production and linguistic elements are approached.

- 4) In the classroom: where some relevant contributions are recorded, with regard to the use of the material.

The axis Orality, Reading, Literature, Textual Production, Linguistic Knowledge, as well as the Teacher's Manual, are included in the "analysis of the work" section. With the help of the reviews and in the light of the school's political-pedagogical project, the teacher can compare the works presented and select the one that best fits the reality of the school community.

3. THE SOCIAL DIVISION OF LABOR BETWEEN THE TEXTUAL PRODUCTION AND ORALITY AXES IN THE COLLECTION *SPHERES OF LANGUAGES*

In this section, we analyze how the axis of Textual Production and Orality, which constitute the teaching of the Portuguese Language, are approached by the evaluators of the aforementioned collection. Bearing in mind that, in the theoretical perspective in which we subscribed, we did not work exhaustively, it was necessary to construct a section of the material we collected. In the case of this work, the *corpus* was presented in the RD format. We call RD what we cut out of a wide range of material, in this case, the reviews, with the purpose of working in a more punctual and detailed way with the material cut out. Let's see, below, the respective discursive clippings (RD):

RD – 1

TEXT PRODUCTION

Text production activities explore the relationships between practice, reading and genre. As, in the structure of the chapters of this axis, reading activities are the basis for reaching writing, it is possible to point out an articulation between these axes. The articulation between written production and linguistic knowledge is also successful, as, for example, the resumption resources are explored in dialogue with the textual production. These activities are guided by expository texts interspersed with activities on characteristics and examples of genres and their different discursive spheres, as well as specific production proposals. Most of these proposals offer a preparation and realization roadmap. The guidelines for production include the indication of the theme, with or without guidance for prior research, definition of the reader's profile, general guidelines on the language to be used (sometimes with recommendation of grammatical strategies that can be used, in view of the target audience), the place of circulation, the support and the establishment of criteria for publication: periodicity, content and format. The stages of writing are also indicated: planning, writing, revision and rewriting. The selection of texts that serve as a reference for the production of the studied genre brings themes relevant to the age group and the formation of the student's writing competence, although the promoted reading does not always present the desired depth. In the third volume, there is a significant number of activities centered on school compositions, with a view to preparing for the different entrance exams, although there is little exploration of specific genres related to the world of work. Thus, in this collection, textual production activities contribute significantly to the development of proficiency in writing.

RD – 2

ORALITY

This is the axis that is less regularly explored in the collection, mainly due to the incipient systematization of specific work strategies, which leave something to be desired in relation to the guidelines on the construction of the textual plan of the genres. Among the genres explored, there are those that contemplate communicative situations – oral exposition, conversation wheel, storytelling, cordel, debate, staging, dramatic reading, radio program, soirée, seminar and others. However, these are not diversified situations, since there is a prevalence of debates and conversation circles, in a typical

classroom situation, in which themes are debated without specific attention to the treatment of orality genres. Most of the activities are poorly oriented. Exceptions are guidance for holding a seminar, in the first volume, and staging a theatrical text, in the second volume, for example, where detailed guidelines for carrying out activities are found. The occurrence of oral reading or oralization of writing is also recorded. For these reasons, in this collection, the proposed activities only reasonably contribute to the development of the student's oral language.

From RD1 and RD2, we note that the formulation that the evaluators produce, in addition to implying a negative assessment of the way orality appears in the collections, also points to a social division with the work of orality. In the evaluators' formulation "This is the axis explored less regularly in the collection", it is verified that there is a privileged treatment for the other axes and that it does not cover orality. This formulation refers to naturalized preconstructions that orality is inferior to writing and that it does not require work with dedication and guidance.

The formulation produced by the evaluators shows the erasure of orality in the analyzed work. In this formulation, there is an adverbialization relationship, namely, "less regularly", formed by an adverb of intensity and an adverb of manner, respectively, which points to an assessment that is not in accordance with what was expected. Then, other formulations appear, such as "they leave something to be desired", "these are not diversified situations", "without specific attention", "little oriented", "only reasonably"; these formulations, again, signal the erasure of orality. The discursive tone of the evaluation demonstrates the fact that orality is operationalized in an unsystematic and uncompromising way by the evaluated collection. If, on the one hand, it is said that, among the genres explored in the didactic collection, communicative situations are contemplated, on the other hand, it is considered that they are not diversified and do not receive specific guidelines for the development with the work of oral genres. The lack of this orientation is seen by the evaluators and is pointed out in the evaluation.

In a contrary movement, on the one hand, the evaluators affirm that "in this collection, the textual production activities contribute significantly to the development of proficiency in writing". On the other hand, they emphasize that "in this collection, the proposed activities collaborate only reasonably for the development of the student's oral language". We observed, through these discursivizations, as it seems, a contradictory tension, marked by points of distance in the evaluators' sayings with regard to the two axes analyzed.

Although the collection presents a significant number of activities that address oral genres, there is no effective planning to help such activities. This is evidenced by the formulation "Most activities are poorly oriented". The use of the adverb of intensity "little", before the adjective "oriented", in addition to intensifying the adjective, leads to a negative sense with regard to the teaching of orality, that is, even though there is the presence of oral activities in the collection, these are poorly targeted. With regard to Textual Production, the evaluators point out that "Most of these proposals offer a preparation and realization script". This absence of orientation towards oral genres is anchored in preconstructed texts that circulate in society, including in the school environment, which place orality as a natural and spontaneous ability without the need for planned teaching.

These formulations are anchored in historicity. If we go back in time, since the Middle Ages, as we have already mentioned in this article, orality was seen as inferior to writing. Writing was exclusive to a privileged layer, and orality belonged to the popular layers. The latter was seen as disorganized, unsystematic and informal and, from what we have been observing, this fact still seems to be very recurrent and current. This division puts writing in evidence and erases orality, reinvigorating the notion of supremacy of the first to the detriment of the second. The repetition of this preconstructed becomes natural in society in such a way that, commonly, it is thought that orality does not need a systematic and effective treatment as it happens with writing.

It is also worth highlighting another point focused on by the evaluators, with regard to the oralization of writing. Let's see, below, the formulation "It is also registered the occurrence of oral reading exercise or oralization of writing". This note touches on an important point in the construction of meanings about the teaching of orality, which is a work with orality anchored in the oralization of writing. It was and still is recurrent

the representation of orality as an exemplary case of reading aloud. This discursivization ended up producing a negative and stereotyped effect on orality, especially on the informal record.

These formulations answer the question that guided this article, demonstrating that there is a division between these two language modalities, and that writing is treated in a privileged way by the authors of textbooks. We can consider, above all, that the textbook is aligned with this discursive functioning of this unequal division of meanings about orality and writing.

With these two RD on screen, we can construct the following table, trying to think about how this unequal division of meanings is marked, discursively, in the evaluators' textualizations. Among some occurrences, we will contemplate these, since they accentuate a position of the evaluators in the historicity on the axes of the Portuguese Language at stake, in this analysis.

Chart 2 - Discursive inscriptions in the assessment of speaking and writing in textbooks.

Text production	Orality
Successful articulation	Incipient systematization
Contribute significantly	Collaborate only reasonably

Source: table prepared by the authors.

We can highlight that these discursive inscriptions, through the relations of adjectives and adverbialization, work on the social division of meanings about orality and writing. However, in a global analysis of each discursive clipping (DR), this division gains support, from the perspective of the evaluators, by the work with the structuring of the textual genres. We noticed that, in the case of writing, they draw attention to the pedagogical exploration of various genres. And, for that reason, it is enough to be evaluated as a “successful articulation” and that these approaches “contribute significantly” to the student, above all, in relation to their insertion in the world of work. It is not by chance that the orality in the collection is evaluated there as “incipient systematization”. Consequently, the pedagogical exploration of orality will collaborate “only reasonably”. Discursively, there is a difference between “contribute”, as is the case of the Textual Production axis approach, and “collaborate”.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Without the purpose of offering ready and definitive answers or of presenting a model to be followed, this article offers a reading gesture, among other possible ones, for the symbolic object focused in the analysis work. From the discursive perspective of Pecheut's orientation, it was possible to verify that the possibilities of analysis and interpretation of a certain selected *corpus* are not exhausted and can always be others.

It should be noted, as already mentioned in this article, that our selection of the textbook, given the numerous objects to be mobilized and analyzed in the school context, is justified by the belief that it is still a symbolic object that is diffused in most Brazilian public schools, as well as the discursivity that the textbook is constituted as a material for continuing education for teachers. In some cases, this object is the only resource used by teachers and students in the teaching and learning process, both at school and outside it.

On this wise, we started this reflection from a question: “to what extent does the treatment dedicated to orality in textbooks touch the question of the social division between the axes Textual Production and Orality?” We arrived at this point, at the end of this article, with a notion that allows us to answer such a question. From the discursive clippings analyzed, we identified a tone of negative evaluation in the evaluators' speeches, with regard to the orality axis, which points to a social division of work between the *Textual Production* and *Orality* axes.

It is suitable to mention, with regard to the textbook, that, despite the notable advances in recent decades in the process of elaboration, evaluation and distribution of the Textbook, there is still much to be

done on several fronts. One of them, specifically, is the systematization with the work dedicated to orality that still shows discrepancy with the work dedicated to the other axes. When presenting the gaps left by the LDLP, we do not disregard the improvements that occurred in the teaching proposal and in the instrument built to evaluate it, but, in our view, from the analyzed reality, there are many challenges that need to be faced for the production of a consistent didactic material, with regard to the didactic treatment of the orality axis.

REFERENCES

- APINAGÉ, Maria Deusa B. S.; SANTOS, Janete S; LEITE, João D. Livro didático de Língua Portuguesa: análise discursiva do eixo oralidade. *Letras*, Santa Maria, 2020, n. 01, p. 151-173. Edição especial.
- AZEVEDO, Luciano T. *Discurso e leitura: uma análise do livro didático do ensino médio*. Olinda: Livro Rápido, 2019.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Chamada Pública SEB/MEC n. 42/2016*. Chamada de Candidaturas de Instituições Públicas de Educação Superior Brasileira. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2016.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Edital de Convocação 04/2015-CGPLI*. Processo de inscrição e avaliação de obras didáticas para o Programa Nacional do Livro Didático - PNLD 2018. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2015.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretária de Educação Básica. Fundo Nacional de Desenvolvimento da Educação. *PNLD 2018: língua portuguesa – guia de livros didáticos – Ensino Médio*. Brasília, DF: Ministério da Educação/Secretária de Educação Básica, 2017.
- COURTINE, Jean-Jacques. *Análise do discurso político: o discurso comunista endereçado aos cristãos*. São Carlos: EdUFSCar, 2014.
- DANTAS, Sônia A.; MARINE, Talita C. O espaço da oralidade no ensino da língua portuguesa: possibilidades e desafios com o relato pessoal. In: MAGALHÃES, Tânia G.; CRISTÓVÃO, Vera (org.). *Oralidade e ensino de Língua Portuguesa*. São Paulo: Pontes Editores, 2018. p. 39-74.
- DOLZ, Joaquim; SCHNEUWLY, Bernard. *Gêneros orais e escrito na escola*. Tradução de Roxane Rojo e Glaís Sales Cordeiro. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras, 2004.
- FERRAREZI JÚNIOR, Celso. *Pedagogia do silenciamento: a escola brasileira e o ensino de língua materna*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2014.
- KLEIMAN, A. B. Prefácio. In: SILVA, S. B. B.; PEREIRA, J. N. (Org.). *Língua Portuguesa e Literatura no Livro Didático: Desafios e Perspectivas*. São Paulo: Pontes Editores, 2018. p. 7-15.
- LEITE, João D. *Aula de Língua Portuguesa: das identificações do professor à sua prática*. 2015. 248 f. Tese (Doutorado em Estudos Linguísticos) - Universidade Federal de Uberlândia (UFU), Uberlândia, MG, 2015.
- MAGALHÃES, Tânia G. Oralidade e ensino de Língua Portuguesa no Brasil: uma leitura. In: MAGALHÃES, Tânia; CRISTÓVÃO, Vera (org.). *Oralidade e ensino de Língua Portuguesa*. São Paulo: Pontes Editores, 2018. p. 39-74.
- MARCUSCHI, Luiz A. *Da fala para a escrita: atividades de retextualização*. 8. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2007.
- ORLANDI, Eni P. *Análise de discurso: princípios e procedimentos*. 12. ed. São Paulo: Pontes Editores, 2015.
- ORLANDI, Eni P. *Discurso e leitura*. 9. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.
- PÊCHEUX, Michel. Ler o arquivo hoje. In: ORLANDI, Eni P. (org.). *Gestos de leitura: da história no discurso*. 4. ed. São Paulo: Editora da Unicamp, 2014. p. 57-67.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. Língua, “linguagens”, discurso. *In*: ORLANDI, Eni P. *Análise de discurso: Michel Pêcheux: textos escolhidos por Eni P. Orlandi*. Tradução de Freda Indursky. 4. ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2015. p. 121-129.

PÊCHEUX, Michel. *Semântica e discurso: uma crítica à afirmação do óbvio*. Tradução de Eni P. Orlandi *et al.* Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 1995.

SILVA, Simone B. B.; PEREIRA, Júlio N. O livro didático de Língua Portuguesa e a formação do jovem brasileiro. *In*: SILVA, Simone B. B.; PEREIRA, Júlio N. (org.). *Língua portuguesa e literatura no livro didático: desafios e perspectivas*. São Paulo: Pontes Editores, 2018. p. 19-43.