

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18764/2178-2229v33n1e27548>

Literacy Pedagogical Practice: constitutive aspects in the teaching and learning process in the Pandemic and Post-Pandemic context

Lucimar Gracia Ferreira

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2152-735X>

Giovana Cristina Zen

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6405-9843>

Abstract: This article aimed to identify the constitutive aspects of teachers' pedagogical literacy practices during the pandemic and post-pandemic context. Three literacy teachers from 1st and 2nd grades of public elementary schools in the municipality of Itapetinga (BA), participated in this research. Semi-structured interviews were used to explore the topic under study. Data analysis was performed using content analysis. The results revealed that pedagogical literacy practices were modified during the pandemic and post-pandemic periods. These practices inherit limitations and denial of knowledge construction by students, hampered by the schooling methods available during the health crisis, as they were directed according to the ordering of students' cognitive aspects. The learnings of teaching that comes from training, practice, experience, takes place daily in the classroom, through culture, diversity and transformation. Therefore, investment is needed in training and in the pedagogical practice of literacy teachers, as they have the responsibility of teaching reading and writing from the perspective of reading the world.

Keywords: teaching learning; pandemic and post-pandemic context; pedagogical practices; teaching and learning process; literacy teachers.

1 Introduction

We are part of an education based on social reality, because it is in this *locus* that our knowledge and educational knowledge are immersed; it is in this place that the teaching-learning-research process is materialized through pedagogical practice, imbricated in the actions of teachers, the driving force of the educational context, whose effects may or may not contribute to learning happening in the classroom. And for these results to be perceived, it is necessary to reflect on the practice, as it is full of intentionalities that focus on the student's learning.

In this context, the aspects related to pedagogical practice are expanded in this study as those related to literacy and teachers who work in this stage, which has its bases from training, experience, teaching and knowledge that are from various sources. Thus, the pedagogical practices that involve the literacy teacher stand out in



Esta licença permite que outros distribuam, remixem, adaptem e criem a partir do seu trabalho, mesmo para fins comerciais, desde que lhe atribuam o devido crédito pela criação original.

educational discussions, especially when based on the conceptions of literacy transcribed in the various Brazilian official documents (Brasil, 2001; 2007; 2012; 2014; 2018; 2019; 2020), when referring to which pedagogical proposal to use in the classroom in the student's teaching and learning process, concerning reading and writing.

From this perspective, changes in literacy pedagogical practices will need to be reflected in specific literacy knowledge and expertise, as the literacy teacher teaches a language, the mother tongue. Thus, “[...] language is made by interaction. [...] the teaching of a language must encompass aspects related to the social contexts and the diversity in them to promote reflections in the participants of this process” (Ferreira, Lucimar; Ferreira, Lúcia; Zen, 2020, p. 284). It is in the context of the exercise of the profession that the learnings of teaching are also revealed and made visible, highlighting their origins: personal life, professional life, daily life in the classroom, planning, among others.

The aim of this research was to identify the constitutive aspects of teachers' literacy pedagogical practices in the pandemic and post-pandemic context. The methodological path for this investigation was the qualitative/exploratory approach, being carried out in the municipality of Itapetinga (BA) with teachers of the 1st and 2nd Year of Elementary School of public schools.

In this context, the literacy teachers participating in the research were identified as: Maria Montessori, Emília Ferreiro and Antonieta de Barros. We emphasize that all the names mentioned (attributed by us) pay homage to three women who made history in the field of education, leaving a legacy of struggles and achievements.

Two schools that served literacy classes were visited, and the teachers were invited to participate in the research. These should be working in literacy classes and have more than five years of experience in teaching. Five met this profile and contributed to this investigation, here we present the data of three of them. The instrument used for data production was the semi-structured interview. As an analysis technique, the Content Analysis Technique was chosen (Bardin, 2010).

Thus, this text is structured as follows: first, an initial presentation of the theme and methodology is carried out; later, a theoretical discussion regarding pedagogical practice and literacy in the pandemic is raised. In continuation, "Learning Teaching in Literacy" becomes the focus, with perspectives on teacher training and practice. Next,

the results of the research are presented in the section "Characteristics and transformations of pedagogical practices". Finally, the final considerations, with a summary of the findings and recommendations.

2 Pedagogical Practice and Literacy

Since the early days of Brazilian education when schooling was thought only for the elite, excluding the majority of the population, many changes have occurred in the educational system. Thus, traditional methods gave way to other proposals that innovated/innovate pedagogical practice, in addition to the insertion of technology in the school space.

In this context, we highlight the pandemic period as one that caused profound and radical changes in the world and, especially, in education (Nóvoa; Alvim, 2021). Social distancing forced us to stay longer at home, directly impacted the educational system, because the school, for example, is a space for physical and personal contact and also very conducive to the proliferation and spread of the virus. As stated by Nóvoa and Alvim (2021, p. 36, our translation):

In early 2020, the world was stunned by COVID-19. Suddenly, in a few days, what was considered impossible became possible: the untouched space of the classroom gave way to a diversity of learning spaces, especially at home; school schedules, which could not be changed due to the organization of family life and work, became volatile; classroom-centered teaching methods disappeared and a diversification of approaches occurred, mainly through remote teaching, and so on. The need prevailed over inertia, albeit with fragile and precarious solutions.

The change in education happened without prior planning, envisaging a new way of teaching, still precarious, without access to technologies for all, causing social inequality. The rupture of the school space required reconfigurations, which implied the construction of a new social, economic, pedagogical and technical order. Also, we observe the requirement of “[...] new forms of personal relationship, unprecedented practices of interaction, differentiated conditions of learning and, above all, a previously unthinkable structure of school functioning” (Colello, 2021, p. 4). Therefore, with the suspension of face-to-face classes, the only alternative found to continue the schooling of thousands of students was the implementation of Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT).

Thus, the pandemic caused changes in the scope of social and cultural policies that triggered reflections in the school space, which welcomed and led to the (re)construction and mobilization of systematized knowledge. Thus, the teaching and learning process encompassed behaviors instituted in the teacher-student relationship, as teaching and learning are individual and intrinsic processes of each subject that internalizes knowledge and expertise, inherent to the condition of being and being in the space they occupy (Kubo; Botomé, 2001).

Therefore, teaching in the educational context is a complex process that will require from the teacher specificities of knowing how to teach, which begins with initial training and develops in the classroom space, through prior planning with regard to teaching guidance. Faced with this understanding, “those who teach learn by teaching and those who learn teach by learning. Those who teach teach someone something” (Freire, 2020, p. 25, our translation). Therefore, the entire teaching process will emanate from the teacher's pedagogical practice and from their own point of view related to their profession.

In this context, changes in the way of thinking critically about the knowledge built and systematized throughout the teaching career allow the identification of objective and subjective situations of pedagogical practice, validating their knowledge whenever they prove to be significant for the teacher-student (Veiga, 2008). According to Franco (2012), pedagogical practices are social practices carried out with the intention of materializing them in the pedagogical process. Also, according to the author, Pedagogy is directly related to pedagogical practices, as they are surrounded by social practices, which:

[...] seeks to organize/understand/transform educational social practices that give meaning and direction to educational practices. [...] the concept of pedagogical practices, I consider them practices that organize intentionally to meet certain educational expectations requested/required by a given social community (Franco, 2012, p. 153-154).

On the other hand, pedagogical practices are afflicted with the impasses that occur in the social environment that represent them, mediating their definitions collectively. Thus, collectively, pedagogical practice is (or at least should be) organized to meet the demands imposed by society, because in case these practices are not perceived and understood from the perspective of the totality, it becomes insufficient

and loses the meaning of the teaching and learning process that happens between educator/student (Franco, 2012).

From this perspective, “pedagogical practice is actually a theoretical-practical activity, that is, it formally has an ideal, theoretical, idealized side while formulating longings where human subjectivity is present, and a real, material, properly practical, objective side” (Veiga, 2008, p. 17). Therefore, for pedagogical practice to become a teaching practice, it needs to be fed daily, through constant training that improves and innovates teacher professionalization, their knowledge and practice.

In addition, “the theoretical discourse itself, necessary for critical reflection, must be so concrete that it is almost confused with practice” (Freire, 2020, p. 40). This is important because many teaching challenges need to be overcome in the exercise of the profession, therefore, teaching needs to involve actions that should provide the teacher with reflective pedagogical practice.

Thus, a reflective practice is consistent with literacy pedagogical practices, when these practices are related to “[...] decisions that precede classroom practice” (Franco, 2012, p. 155), that is, it involves planning, which explains knowledge and teaching materials that will be used and that will support the pedagogical proposal. In other words, they are decisions that teachers must make *a priori* to go beyond the limits of the classroom.

Therefore, we understand that to talk about literacy practices is to recall the historical aspects we went through, and the changes in conception and pedagogical proposal directed to it. In addition to changes in conceptions, literacy pedagogical practices are also changed, involving reading and writing in the social context. According to Freire (2020, p. 26):

When we live the authenticity required by the practice of teaching-learning, we participate in a total, directive, political, ideological, gnosiological, pedagogical, aesthetic and ethical experience, in which beauty must go hand in hand with decency and serenity.

Thus, there is an understanding that it is necessary for the teacher to experience the reality of practice, having access to new knowledge, articulating theory-practice and the teaching and learning process, constituting educational practice as the perfection of right thinking and the way of seeing the world (Freire, 2020). However, “[...] discussions on literacy practice have focused on the controversy over the methods used: analytical methods *versus* synthetic methods; phonetic *versus* global, etc.”

(Ferreiro, 2011a, p. 31). Thus, the mobilization of which method was the best for literacy, focused on the ways of how to teach and not to whom to teach. According to the author, much emphasis was placed on discussions on literacy practices, but “[...] children's conceptions of the writing system” were not taken into account (Ferreiro, 2011a, p. 32).

Thus, for teachers to know the reality of their students, it is necessary to dialogue and interact, as these are literacy practices that make it possible to know what the child knows about reading and writing, since it is the “[...] starting point of the learning process” (Cagliari, 1998, p. 53), considering that the child is not a blank paper, a blank slate, she learns in the family and social space. Hence the importance of practice being linked to the social dimension (society, education, subjects).

According to Cagliari (1998, p. 34), “[...] no educational method guarantees good results always and anywhere; this is only obtained with the teacher's competence”. With this understanding, Ferreiro (2011a) speaks coherently about literacy practice:

It is useful to ask through what type of *practices* the child is introduced to the written language, and how this object is presented in the school context. There are practices that lead the child to the conviction that knowledge is something that *others* possess and that can only be obtained from the mouths of *others*, without ever being a participant in the construction of knowledge. There are practices that lead one to think that ‘what exists to know’ has already been established, as a closed, sacred, immutable and non-modifiable set of things. There are practices that lead the subject (the child in this case) to be ‘out’ of knowledge, as a passive spectator or mechanical receiver, without ever finding answers to the ‘whys’ and ‘what fors’ that he no longer even dares to formulate aloud (Ferreiro, 2011a, p. 32-33).

From this perspective, the teacher who conducts the literacy process with practices rooted in traditional conceptions, becomes a prisoner of his own uncertainties, not providing an opportunity to reflect on the changes, and also not allowing himself to understand how the child learns, limiting his knowledge and placing himself at the center of the teaching process. In addition, “no pedagogical practice is neutral, all are supported in a certain way of conceiving the learning process and the object of knowledge” (Ferreiro, 2011a, p. 33). Therefore, to limit oneself to a single pedagogical conception, and even if it is not in line with the student's reality, is to build for oneself anchors that will reflect on one's own performance in the classroom.

The aspects that circumvent the literacy pedagogical practice discussed here are related to the training (initial and continuing) of teachers that covers specific

knowledge and skills for the teaching and learning process that involves the linguistic knowledge of the acquisition of written language (Poersch, 1990; Pires; Ferreira; Lima, 2010; Cagliari, 1998; Ferreira, 1990; 1999; 2011a; 2011b; 2013). Therefore, relating the aspects of the training process and the specificity of literacy will require a “[...] articulation between theory and practice, as well as valuing the critical-reflexive attitude within the scope of literacy pedagogical practice” (Santos; Brito, 2012, p. 3). Thus, according to Ferraz, Ferreira and Ferreira (2019, p. 223):

It is through his educational practice that the teacher also produces himself, through the relationships established, especially those with students. This transformation in the teacher's perspective requires continuous training that allows the construction of innovative experiences causing changes in the school, in the pedagogical project and in the teacher himself, so the investment in the person of the teacher and in his profession must seek an appreciation of his personal-professional development. This change should, however, privilege the historical-cultural conditions of this development, since it is understood that subjectivity is formed by concrete subjects who, despite their uniqueness, are historically and culturally constituted.

Thinking about the continuing education of the literacy teacher from the perspective of daily practice means considering the knowledge built within the scope of the various experiences, necessary to meet the sociocultural changes for the reconstruction-construction of practices. Therefore, it is necessary to always remember that the teacher is an active professional and must be in constant formative learning, because at all times they deal with challenges that arise from the political, social, educational and cultural contexts that end up reverberating in the performance of the classroom concerning their pedagogical practice. These contemporary and contextual changes will require the teacher to reflect critically on their training and performance of the teaching and learning process that permeate school spaces, in addition to their experience to face the contexts of educational professional crises.

3 Teaching Learning in Literacy

Reflecting on education in Brazil implies considering new teaching perspectives and pedagogical practices that seek concrete foundations to promote knowledge and expertise from experience with a focus on teaching learning. In this context, the knowledge bases necessary for the professional practice of teachers have stood out in the last three decades with studies that show their importance (Mizukami, 2004; Cardoso; Reali, 2016).

Thus, to understand how the knowledge base for teaching materializes, it is necessary to understand its various meanings, its “[...] skills and dispositions that are necessary for the teacher to provide processes of teaching and learning, in different areas of knowledge, levels, contexts and modalities of teaching” (Mizukami, 2004, p. 38) and for this, professional experience and reflection on practice, as a means and end, is necessary. Thus, according to Cardoso and Reali (2016, p. 224):

[...] the knowledge base involves the entire set of skills, knowledge, experiences and relationships considered necessary for the exercise of teaching in specific situations of the teaching and learning process. It also covers three fundamental concepts: knowledge of specific content (basic knowledge of a given discipline); general pedagogical knowledge (knowledge that encompasses more general aspects, such as objectives, goals, class management, educational purposes, content, teaching and learning); and pedagogical content knowledge.

It is worth noting that the knowledge base for the construction of teaching learning is not constituted overnight, or/and only through initial and continuing education, it is a production that involves continuous formative processes related to the teacher's performance. We emphasize that appropriating specific knowledge to literacy is a process of professional development and long-term and continuous learning, which will require the literacy teacher to take unique responsibility,

[...] because it enables the learning and development of children in all its dimensions: physical, moral, intellectual, that is, it teaches Portuguese, mathematics, history, geography, science, art, physical education, reading, writing, solving problems, knowing the reality that surrounds us, in addition to teaching students to think, to know how to express themselves, to have opinions about things and facts, to know the culture that surrounds them and those that are more distant. From this perspective, literacy teachers need to mediate their actions and knowledge so that children/students develop integrally, aiming to make them increasingly humanized (Radvanskei; Hagemeyer, 2022, p. 472).

The learning of/in teaching in the context of literacy implies a redefinition of pedagogical practices aimed at acting in the classroom. The activities developed in this space will require autonomy from the literacy teacher to make decisions that may occur individually and collectively for their implementation. It also involves reflecting on what and for whom to teach, how one teaches and how one learns, and how teaching will have repercussions in the educational and social sphere, based on what was learned in school.

Thus, it is known that the school is a training space, therefore, it is not unique. Teaching learning goes through this, and also through other spaces for the construction

of knowledge, therefore, referring it only to the formative process is to limit it, “[...] disregarding all other conditions that allow the construction of being a teacher and being in the teaching profession” (Ferreira, 2021, p. 63), but it is necessary to recognize that it is in the classroom that teaching learning is more unveiled.

However, “[...] assigning to the school the place of knowledge construction requires the understanding that this place will only materialize to the extent that we consider the shared activity as a promoter of meaningful learning” (Bolzan; Millani, 2013, p. 192). Therefore, we cannot romanticize the learning woven in these spaces, as they are full of challenges, uncertainties, contexts of crises that are inherent to the practice and performance, but that reflect in the pedagogical practice of the literacy teacher, such as those arising from the political, curricular, economic, social and cultural spheres.

In addition, the daily/routine aspects that provide the construction of literacy teaching learning can be seen in detail in school planning, in the sharing and exchange of knowledge, in the dialogue with their more experienced peers in the teaching profession. Still, the school space, although not unique, is one of those that constitutes itself as formative, as it allows “[...] to socialize – to learn to teach, to learn about being a teacher, about the beliefs and values of the profession, about professional culture” (Ferreira, 2021, p. 68, our translation). Teaching learning involves the knowledge necessary for teaching, initial and continuing education, encompassing professional development.

Assuming literacy classes requires knowledge that goes beyond language teaching and pedagogical resources. As it is a challenging task and one of the permanent problems of education in Brazil, it is essential to have experienced teachers. This is due to the fact that this function involves complex tasks that a beginning teacher may not be sufficiently prepared to face, such as “[...] assistance to students, explanations to parents, choice of methodologies, lesson planning, assessments, curricular organization, among so many demands” (Bolzan; Millani, 2013, p. 190). These are some of the explicit tasks that literacy teachers will have to deal with on a daily basis, not to mention those hidden tasks that show up as they arise and emerge from the demands of the teaching profession.

Therefore, it is essential to understand the learning of literacy teaching within a continuous formative context, which integrates theory and practice through action

and reflection. In addition, it is necessary to seek autonomy in the construction of didactic situations and in the making of decisions that require intentional postures and changes in the methodologies of literacy practice, with the objective of promoting both the professional development of teachers and the learning of children.

4 Characteristics and transformations of pedagogical practices

The teaching profession is one of the oldest in the world. In our country, it dates back to colonization, when Jesuit priests settled here to catechize the Indians and convert them to Catholic doctrine. Since then, there have been several changes in the teaching profession, counting on its regularization, conquering its space in the educational and social context.

Thus, according to Nóvoa (2009), in recent years, the teacher resumed a prominent role in education that had become invisible due to other problems that marginalized these professionals in the educational process. The author states that only at the end of the twentieth century, after international studies on learning, was there an awakening to the importance of the teaching profession.

In concrete terms, being a teacher in the 21st century means dealing with the uncertainties of political, social, educational, economic and cultural changes. In addition, it is also necessary to deal with the challenges and difficulties that involve the teaching profession, teaching, practices, knowledge, expertise and moments of crisis. This is a professional who is constantly developing in the educational and social environment, this also implies the construction of the identity process, also arising from teaching. Thus, “[...] it is essential to reinforce the person-teacher and the teacher-person” (Nóvoa, 2009, p. 39), so that the transformations that have occurred/occur in education serve as a basis for the construction of the teacher's identity to continue through processes of becoming a teacher.

In this context, all pedagogical practices described here refer to the pandemic and post-pandemic period. The literacy teachers participating in this research refer to aspects of the educational scenario, marked mainly by the limitations and transformations of practices. The constitutive aspects of literacy practices are taken in this text, as a result of the daily changes of reality, and have the intention of being promising to prospect advances from them. These constitutive aspects will be categorized here through the teachers' narratives.

Each student has their time, they do not learn in equal ways, each has a way of learning and a different time of learning. We need to respect. Although the system does not give them the time they need, the system is cruel, because it has the units to fulfill, it has the school year that starts and ends. But so, within my possibilities in the room, I try to work by level. That's my practice. I'll see it done. Through evaluative activities, I make a diagnosis, then I see how the learning levels and writing levels of my classroom are. I cannot close my eyes to this and work only with the class that is well developed and forget about the others, because I will be generating, I will be contributing so that the boy does not learn and passes from one year to the next without learning, I have to take care of the situation. I cannot focus only on the one who does not know, because the one who has already mastered the knowledge of literacy and literacy will feel unmotivated. So I need to work with different activities in the classroom, activities focused on each learning level, reading and writing level, I need to work with activities like this. My own room was divided into three levels, because they were on those three levels: an advanced level that boys who already mastered reading and writing; another level that was still and who already knew the alphabet, mastered reading the alphabet and writing; and the other that had not yet made the acquisition of mastering a written reading of the alphabet. So, I worked like this, bringing activities that would developed (Emília).

Emília's speech refers to the separation of groups of students by levels of learning. Is this a characteristic of pedagogical practice? We do not consider it to be, but we understand that it is the narrative about the action of separating groups that reveals these characteristics to us; it reads the world to account for differences. For Ferreiro (2012, p. 91):

Transforming known and recognized diversity into a pedagogical advantage: this seems to be the great challenge for the future. We are learning to do this in the case of literacy, but it is necessary to take this to the ultimate consequences in critical situations: literacy by transforming age differences in the same group, dialectal differences, differences in language and culture into pedagogical advantages.

Emília (teacher) draws attention to the issue of the real and concrete diversity of the classroom as a pedagogical advantage, but, at first, what she says/does is not to be conceived as an advantage that the author (Ferreiro, 2012) proposes. This is not the pedagogical advantage if we do not look between the lines and between the place, we can be mistaken with such teacher-directed practices as improved learning.

Thus, according to Nóvoa (2017, p. 1127), “[...] being a teacher is not just dealing with knowledge, it is dealing with knowledge in situations of human relationship”, that is, it is using the in-between place, the action that is not perceived, but is performed. The place that is between one thing and another, not always at sight, but it exists. So, by separating the groups, we renounce interaction, which is one of the principles of pedagogical advantage, socialization and inclusion. But how to find this

in-between place in a situation as it is exposed in the narrative? It takes a pedagogical maturity to see this.

How does this reveal itself in Emilia's narrative? It is revealed in hybridity, between what is done and what is not done. The characteristic of the practice is in understanding, in what Emília believes she is doing with the best of intentions, but which have misunderstandings. And where to intervene in situations like these? In the practice that separates the groups of students taken as possible by the teacher, providing students to learn from the perspective of absences (of interaction, socialization and inclusion). In fact, a possible intervention must occur exactly in the specificity, in the between-place revealed by practical actions that allow us to see right and wrong, positive and negative aspects, absences and permanences, distances and approximations.

Therefore, literacy is not an easy task, as it involves a process full of tensions and specificities, individualities and collectivities, concreteness and absences, objectivities and subjectivities. However, even in the face of limitations related to teacher training, the conditions of service to literacy students and the material resources available, literacy has occurred.

In addition, literacy should be more than just learning how to read and write; it should include the ability to interpret the world for life, transforming realities, after all, “what you learn at school needs to be meaningful for life. Reading the world to handle the world, that is the great challenge” (Demo, 2007, p. 19). From this perspective, teacher Emília guides her practices.

Emília values the time and the way each student learns. However, the way she conducts her practice, separating students into groups to achieve the desired learning levels for that year, does not align with equity in teaching, as it does not provide plurality or value the different ways of learning of each one. This way of teaching refers to Certeau (2009) and the inventions of everyday life, in which the teacher guides his practices through the aspects of reality in which he acts and builds his action according to the needs of the students. These, which are of different orders, induce the ways of learning, therefore, also the ways of teaching. Working with groups separated by learning levels does not allow inclusion in the classroom context. According to Ferreira, Barreto and Souza (2020, p. 92), “[...] inclusive practices are social practices, therefore, instruments of intervention”. With inclusive practice, students and teachers learn. The

authors also emphasize that "including also implies changes in values, attitudes, posture, way of thinking and acting. It implies social transformations and values" (Ferreira; Barreto; Souza, 2020, p. 92).

Given this understanding, working on teaching from diversity highlights what each student knows and does not know and what they need to learn to advance in their literacy process. Emília, being attentive, was able to identify what the children knew about writing and what they needed to learn. Why did Emilia get it? For having read the world, which made it possible to re-signify and reconstruct his practice of teaching and learning. Thus, in the best of intentions, she tried to organize, to make groupings, but at these times, the teacher still could not put heterogeneity at the service of learning. This is exactly where the specificity of the practice lies. The heterogeneous classroom is a producer of culture and the diversity present in it needs to be encouraged with ways of teaching and learning.

Marques (1999) speaks of knowledge as being a symbolic capital of great importance, those that students already bring, need to be valued and considered for content learning. The classroom is a space for the construction of expertise and also of knowledge that is "[...] built through a network of complex relationships, which permeate our living, our feeling" (Marques, 1999, p. 46), therefore, it goes beyond the simple fact of being systematized knowledge or the textbook. It involves knowing how to look, listen, experience and use the experience to your advantage. Therefore, the insight is something that transcends the learning of reading and writing, enabling sensitization, awareness and change. The gaze calls for the search for improvements and for the transformation of practices. Emília was open to all this, she not only reveals aspects of her way of teaching, but also of evaluating what she was learning and transforming her practice, involving diagnosis, process and the differentiation of activities.

In this same perspective of Emilia is Maria who, in her narrative, calls our attention to her ways of doing things:

Within this method I adapt to my class. I try to use a little of everything. What do I mean by everything? For example: I use all the methodology requested by the city hall, but what I believe for years of profession and it works. So, I always make a wedding, not so much, not so little. We will work on literacy, look, the methodology now is to work with texts. Everything has to be inserted in the text, yes, what else? Because I need to understand that I have a room that is not unique, it does not have a single level of writing and I cannot use a single ready and finished method. I need to hit everyone. So, my plan is to

think of a whole. I'll work on the text, but what do I pull in there? I will work from oral interpretation, words, syllables, initial letter, final letter, middle syllable. So, I have to get the whole thing. Because I need to reach the whole class. So, when I'm going to plan for the 1st year and the 2nd year, which are the initial classes, I always look at the whole thing. My goal is to reach from the one who has not yet read to the one who is reading. So for me, whatever program the city adopts, it doesn't have to follow that to the letter. I can't work on just this if I don't have a homogeneous room. I have a diverse room, I need to work in a diverse way. I need to assist everyone, I can't assist just a few. My work, when I am planning, I look for what will meet the needs of my students. If at that moment I need to meet the needs of students who are not reading, then I have syllable games, alphabet games and I will use them. If my students have difficulties in mathematics, I will use the golden material, the domino. So, I'm going to use resources that can first attract their attention, so that then it comes to another part, put into practice what was the theory. So, I try to diversify according to the needs of the class (Maria).

Maria, like Emília, organizes her pedagogical practice based on the students' learning levels, valuing what everyone should learn. However, we evoke Perrenoud (2000) for this dialogue by referring that each student must have their training needs met, according to their level and learning style, as each subject is unique and learns differently.

Working with texts is part of the specificity of Maria's practice. The text that dialogues with the context; the text with its own language; the text that speaks for itself and of itself. But a text that also needs to dialogue with everyone, that is not prejudiced and exclusionary, therefore, a text that is the result of critical planning and that respects the students' learning levels. In addition to carrying out a very specific planning, from a differentiated look, from a diagnosed context, Maria signals an evaluation corresponding and coherent with this way of looking. All this is reflected in the execution, in the action, in the intentional teaching, promoting an environment that allows students to be literate.

However, the development of practices that Maria believes are inclusive to literacy, allocating each individual according to their cognitive production potential ends up revealing the classification of individuals. This practice sounds contradictory when referring to what it considered to be intentional and positive. Regarding the idea that to divide is to include, in this specific case, it is not. Such practices are also related to literacy pedagogical practices that converge in many factors with teaching decisions, "[...] formed by a complex and multifactorial set. The teacher in the classroom acts based on decisions already made or not; based on convictions already structured or not" (Franco, 2012, p. 156). It is important to highlight that decisions made in advance

about student learning should not be ready and finished, proving to be unique for all students. The teacher who reflects on their practice tends to perceive that the students have different levels of learning and, therefore, it must be diversified and non-classifying, respecting the time of each one, and if this time is within the learning development process.

Therefore, when the teacher reflects on his/her literacy pedagogical practice and understands it in its entirety (Franco, 2012), recognizing that the child's teaching and learning process needs to occur collectively, he/she needs a careful and critical look at that student who needs specific assistance, because in the classroom each subject is unique, heterogeneous, and each has its life story and way of learning. It is necessary to take into account that each child has their own learning pace, this variation may also be related to learning difficulties and aspects that involve vulnerability/social inequality, especially in the pandemic and after it, implying minimum learning incomes. It is necessary for the teacher to be attentive to the behaviors of each student, and what she expects from him/her — according to the age, the year of schooling — and the desirable level of learning for this stage of teaching.

Another aspect present in Emília and Maria's narratives concerns the knowledge about her role as a teacher and her responsibility for the student's teaching and learning process, therefore, the development of critical sense. They refer to their ways of doing things even when they are required to do others. I return here to two statements by Emília: 1) “[...] the system is cruel, because it has the units to fulfill”; 2) “I cannot close my eyes to this [...], I will be contributing so that the boy does not learn [...], I have to take care of the situation [...]”. And one of Maria: 1) “So for me, whatever program the city adopts, it [the practice] does not have to follow that to the letter. I can't work on just this if I don't have a homogeneous room. I have a diverse room, I need to work in a diverse way [...]”.

The speeches highlighted point to limiting aspects of the practices, that is, the system, the plastering of contents, the obligation to comply with programs to the letter, the obedience without autonomy of teaching, mechanical reproduction, the lack of relevance of certain knowledge for the student and the classroom, among others. Practices do not need anchors, as Moysés, Geraldi and Collares (2002) assert about the act of knowing, they need possibilities of movement. It is from the latter that the

specifics of many of them are unveiled. Therefore, often, making use of other devices can be configured in a way to direct the practice.

However, pedagogical practice cannot be seen as something that is practiced in the exercise of the profession in a mechanical and repetitive way, transmitting to the students contents that do not contemplate them for a social life, but must have as vehemence, a constant teaching action, with the intention and objective of reaching a certain place, as emphasized by Franco (2016, p. 535), when he says that “[...] there are teaching practices built pedagogically and there are teaching practices built without the pedagogical perspective, in a mechanical action that disregards the construction of the human”. The syllable game is a good example of a mechanical act.

Therefore, we understand that there is a hybridity in the process of understanding the specificities present in pedagogical practice. While identifying the characteristics, there are also the continuities of conservative pedagogical practices. Changing these practices requires the teacher to take a close look at the development of awareness, built from a solid theoretical background. For Freire (2013), awareness is a potential mode for the construction of knowledge in a critical, reflective and autonomous way, which allows us to progress to change our thinking, which tends to move the construction of a teaching committed to social transformation.

We also highlight the learning of teaching and the knowledge base for the exercise of the profession, focusing on how these learnings occur for the performance of teaching practice. According to Mizukami (2004), there are studies that reveal that the knowledge necessary to teach is “[...] built throughout professional life and those acquired in initial training courses and/or continuing education programs”. Others that involve cognitive processes, related to the activities planned by the teacher; others that consider this knowledge to come from the “contents of their thoughts — [...] the student, the curriculum, pedagogical theories, educational purposes and goals”. These studies have been important to understand “[...] what the teacher thinks and how he learns to be a teacher” (Mizukami, 2004, p. 34).

In this perspective, teaching learning is mainly based on a knowledge base for teaching, which will require from the teacher a knowledge framework that will allow him to elaborate several activities for daily actions. Thus, “[...] those who form are formed and re-form when forming and those who are formed are formed and formed when being formed” (Freire, 2020, p. 25), that is, the teacher is the protagonist of his own

formative process, enabling its construction/deconstruction/reconstruction/ construction of the knowledge necessary for his practice.

Revealed by Emília and Maria in pedagogical practice, these learnings are drivers of the pedagogical work they develop. The specificities revealed in the teachers' pedagogical practices showed that they know how to look, act, develop, walk with the student, modify, re-elaborate, level the class, uneven the class, include, teach reading, teach writing, choose texts, select, etc.; they present that they know how to be teachers, that they learn every day, that in each context they react pedagogically, according to the needs of the students. Thus, their teaching validates and legitimizes many of the learnings they exhibit while also enabling the construction of others.

Therefore, the pedagogical practices of teachers Emília and Maria developed in the context of the classroom allowed us to unveil the characteristics/specificities of the practices intertwined in the between-place; between the realized and the unrealized. This was only possible because both, although they showed to know the paths that allow learning and the means to reach them, revealed the maintenance of certain conservative practices. Thus (Moysés; Geraldi; Collares, 2002, p. 91):

If you can look, look. If you can see it, see it. Learning how to look, I learn that this is the challenge of knowledge: the pain of assuming that everything I know, that I know, can be disassembled, reassembled, replaced, stabilized and even madly fixed for a while.

To know, it is necessary to look (with the eyes, hands, soul), because, “learning to look, I learn that this is the challenge of knowledge” (Moysés; Geraldi; Collares, 2002, p. 92); looking provides learning that which has no mastery, is something instigating, but dangerous. Therefore, exposing the knowledge learned and apprehended can cause ruptures, such as “[...] the pain of assuming that everything I know, that I know, can be disassembled, reassembled, replaced, stabilized and even madly fixed for a while” (Moysés; Geraldi; Collares, 2002, p. 92). So, we know, but we deprive ourselves of knowing and knowing that we know. It is an individual, hidden knowledge, without letting this knowledge be perceived by the other. We limit our own knowledge when it is also limited by others.

It is in this process of knowing that Emília innovates her practices after remote teaching that forced her to reinvent herself, even unintentionally and without her having previous knowledge about the future.

The things I do contribute a lot, they think, they say I invent a lot of things. Yesterday I read a letter that the girl turned to the other and said: the teacher is here, she invents a lot of new and good things, I really like my teachers, just like that. Because we invent, bring different games, they think they are playing, it brings a fun, colorful activity, they are doing the activity, they are learning, but they think they are playing. I will work with songs, I put on the song, they know what the difference is from song to song, I put on the song, we sing, and I bring the song for them to hear, if the proposal is a joke, they play in the room, I put them in the movement, they like the way it is conducted, they like different things. You can't every day be with a different activity, a different technique, but within my possibilities I take it and they like it. They learn in a playful way (Emília).

Drawing limits to the literacy process was not in Emília's pedagogical practice, as she had a sensitive look at the importance of proposing activities that involved children. Since in literacy, although it has children as students, they are covered by Elementary School legislation and not by Early Childhood Education legislation (Brasil, 1996; 2010). For this reason, from the age of six, children “lose” the right to play as a learning right, which is only for Early Childhood Education.

According to the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDB) (Brasil, 1996), it is up to Elementary School — “I - to develop the ability to learn, having as basic means the full mastery of reading, writing and calculus”. Thus, the learning rights that are playing, knowing, participating, exploring, expressing and living together are not prioritized in this space, as they are considered specificities of Early Childhood Education (Brasil, 2018).

Thus, play is currently being taken as part of a trinomial — care-educate-play that, after six years of age, even though they are children, are excluded. The trinomial is very important, since “the modes of conception and construction of the teaching and learning process have as one of their central elements, education and care interconnected as a continuous, diversified and contextual trajectory; and play as expression and subjectivation” (Ferreira; Abreu, 2021, p. 5).

In this course, the activities that seek a more dynamic interaction in the teacher's practice is a characteristic to make the child learn. Thus, I repeat the teacher's statement when highlighting the way she conducts her class: “we invent, bring different games, they think they are playing, it brings a fun, colorful activity, they are doing the activity, they are learning, but they think they are playing”. This characteristic of the teacher's practice — making children learn by playing — demonstrates that, despite using play as a teaching strategy and not as an activity with an end in itself, with an intention to reinvent their pedagogical practice. However, this

needs to be revised, as it is essential that the teacher understands the importance and characteristics of structuring aspects of the curriculum such as playing and teaching reading and writing. Like this:

Teachers dealing with the first year of elementary school occupy an important place and, at the same time, loaded with dilemmas and contradictions because of the confusing state of this period, in particular: an Early Childhood Education class in the structure of elementary school. They deal with a reality of children entering this schooling phase without ever having had contact with the school. In this sense, a deep diagnostic work is fundamental to structure and direct the teaching and learning process that, at this stage, is characterized by the acquisition of reading and writing (Ferreira; Abreu, 2021, p. 6).

Literacy is a process that involves learning how to read and write. Thus, according to the National Education Plan (PNE) (Brasil, 2014) children need to reach the 3rd year literate, the means that the teacher uses for this to happen is what makes the difference in the classroom. Therefore, “the school space of the early years of elementary school needs to be thought and structured to welcome and meet the development and learning needs of these children” (Ferreira; Abreu, 2021, p. 6).

Thus, making children reach the desirable level of learning for their age is important, but we cannot plaster the practices leaving them conservative and decontextualized, such as making use of syllabic games that, despite the playful appeal, reproduce the old booklets. However, the characteristics of the practices are based on specific aspects or practices that focus on the specificities of each class than necessarily on a more collective perspective.

For Ferreiro (2015, p. 25), “[...] the development of literacy undoubtedly occurs in a social environment”, shared, heterogeneous in the service of learning. Why did separating students by levels not allow inclusion to occur? Because it dissociated them from other colleagues for not being at the same learning level. What justifies the teacher's practice is the sensitive look at the individualities of each student and, for this, the teacher used the means she knew and considered necessary to achieve the goal, but it was not noticed that she was classifying the students and, at the same time, socially separating them from learning with their peers.

In this sense, the different approaches taken by the teacher define the constitution of practices focused on the specificities of each student. In this context, the children's understanding manifested itself in a “play for play”, something that Emília intentionally used to move them. This practice is common in Early Childhood

Education, but she takes it as a reference in the 1st year, considering that they are still children.

It is worth noting that these students came from a pandemic period, in which many of them had no contact with the physical classroom, only with the virtual one, and also, “[...] the home environment is not always conducive, full of domestic violence, inadequate food, poor lighting, lack of guidance from educators for activities [...]” (Avelino; Mendes, 2020, p. 60). From these constitutions, the teachers provided these children with opportunities that, due to remote teaching, they could not experience in previous years. Thus, Emília and Antonieta had to rediscover themselves in the teaching and learning process from the perspective of remote teaching. She narrates that:

I think within the platform there was a change. During the pandemic you had to make an effort to work inside that board, and I didn't fit in, I put a board in my room, but I couldn't write on the board, because they could see inside a small board, so I had to make an effort to do different things, and the mother sitting next to me, the mother helped, but this one the mothers were very participative, when it wasn't the mother, a brother, they were there to help. I think this period was very positive, so there was a child who did not have a bad income, most of them, now this year. I didn't think differently, I came back with more in the tank after the pandemic, because I knew I would get a room with more boys in need of help, more encouragement, and then, as we play a lot with children, they don't complain. This year there was not, even repairing the school, not having recess, they did not complain, because you always have to be in the game, teaching like that. I didn't find much difference this year, my class is so good, great, that I still played with these boys, I never left anyone without recess, because there are boys who when they are disturbing, isn't that so? It is a class that asks some kinds of questions (Antoinette).

Antoinette's narrative demonstrates the lack of knowledge about remote teaching and how this new educational paradigm would proceed, however, many teachers went through the same difficulties until they adapted to the new one, “[...] the use of the internet for distance learning was characterized as a very pertinent strategy [...], nevertheless, it incurs serious limitations regarding its application to children due to the difficulties of applying online curricula [...]” (Ladies, 2020, p. 133). Thus, the teacher believed that in this teaching format, there would be the possibility of teaching in the same way she did in the classroom. Antonieta realized that there would be no way for this to happen, and started to rebuild her practice or she would not succeed in the teaching and learning process. In this context, remote teaching forced Antonieta to reinvent herself, to adapt to the moment. Although she said that the pandemic was a

bad time for her practices, after allowing herself to seek other knowledges, expertises and practices, it became positive.

From this perspective, regarding aspects of the child's socialization, development and interaction that did not fully exist because of remote teaching, I refer to Antoinette's statement when she says: “[...] I came back with more in the tank after the pandemic, because I knew I would get a room with more boys in need of help, more encouragement, and then, as we play a lot with children, they don't complain”. Coming back with more in the tank is potential for literacy, it is being aware that remote teaching would bring a considerable number of challenges on learning and that, because of this, it would require new/different strategies for literacy from teachers, with diversified activities for the construction of knowledge. This required Antonieta “[...] to have knowledge about what they think and how they think to propose didactic situations that can help them advance from what they already know about reading and writing and the challenges they need to face to continue learning” (Nascimento; Zen, 2024, p. 267).

Back in the post-pandemic classroom, she showed other behaviors, both from the teacher and the students. For Antonieta, the return revealed the possibility of changes in literacy pedagogical practices, reinventing them to meet the needs of her students. For students, the return brought other needs in addition to those already existing.

Therefore, the post-pandemic period of literacy teachers revealed knowledge that emerged from the movement of pedagogical practices related to what is done and not done, about what is done intentionally and not perceived. Both refer to an effective teacher training policy, a training policy that identifies the between-place, that is, the specificities, and acts from them, because the characteristics here are not seen as a product, but as a process.

Seeking justifications for such actions, we dialogue with Perrenoud (2001) when he says that teaching is to act in urgency and decide in uncertainty, in line with the pandemic and post-pandemic period, demonstrating that the context of the classroom and teaching is complex, this will require teachers to make quick decisions, often not consistent with their way of teaching, but respecting the need that the moment requires for them to have skillful answers, directing what they want to achieve. In fact, this is what the teachers did in remote teaching, they had to redo their planning after the diagnosis made with the students. They needed to act urgently and decide in

uncertainty so that the literacy process could be achieved and it was possible to achieve the proposed objective — literacy.

“No one ignores everything. No one knows everything. We all know something. We all ignore something” (Freire, 2002, p. 55). The teachers showed what they knew how to do, that they knew how to teach. What worries us about the teachers' narratives is that it was evident how lonely teaching work is sometimes, individual, not intentionally, but because the context requires/oblige it. The teachers' decisions will not always be consistent with what was described in the curriculum that comes to them, but rather, necessary, in front of what is possible to do to achieve literacy, because they know their role in the school space, as well as in society.

5 Final Considerations

The paths taken to complete a research are long and involve several academic, social, professional and personal situations to achieve the proposed objective. Thus, this research made it possible to reflect on the importance of the teaching and learning process, literacy and teacher training. We know that continuing education is not a guarantee that teachers will weave knowledge and expertise of the practice, but without it, one can fall into the abyss of alienation and guesswork. Although many formations do not address the reality of school daily life and do not bring references of what is experienced in this space, these are still important or should be to improve and update professionals on what is currently happening in education and society.

In the analysis of the teachers' narratives about the practices carried out by them, we noticed their efforts to do the best possible work in an adverse context such as the ERE. The characteristics and specificities of these practices were identified by observing the dialogue between what was done and what was not. It was at this moment that we understood the existence of an “in-between-place”, where the characteristics and specificities of the practice were manifested.

We found that literacy pedagogical practices were influenced by the context of remote teaching, which inherited limitations related to the construction of knowledge by students, hampered by the modes of schooling possible in the period of the COVID-19 health crisis. It is important to highlight that the way literacy teachers developed their pedagogical practices, immersed in the tension between the realized and the

unrealized, revealed that they triggered pedagogical practices that, apparently, could be overcome. This led them to make choices, such as separating students into groups, among others.

However, we realize that the learnings of teaching, which are within the scope of training, practice, experience, among others, are marking a place in the daily life of the classroom, taken as a space for the production of culture, diversity, transformations. However, the teachers showed that they knew how to do literacy, according to the needs of their field of activity.

In order to become literate, it is not only necessary to know methodological aspects, because in literacy there are other more specific things, such as the issue of linguistic knowledge that falls on knowledge; this knowledge is built on a daily basis, it is procedural and unfinished what prevailed in the teachers' practices was to carry out interventions in the face of the challenges and contexts of crisis that affected their teaching and their formative process. Still, the constitutions of the practices are marked, mainly by the post-pandemic context that required and, at the same time, gave a sensitive look at the classroom and students, the development of a process of awareness about their role, the responsibilities and the transformations of the "world readings".

Thus, we draw attention to the need for greater investments in literacy and literacy pedagogical practices, increasing their possibilities to promote actions to transform education. The characteristics of pedagogical practices need to be made visible, highlighted and supported.

In view of the teachers' narratives about their practices, it was possible to identify the constitutive aspects of the attribution of meanings and the contradictions explicit and not perceived in them, revealing themselves in everyday knowledge and knowledges. Also, from the experience, the training, the moment that required changes in attitudes in the face of remote teaching and the uncertainty of the end of the health crisis and its consequences, in addition to not knowing what the face-to-face return would be like. All these apparatuses significantly shook the entire society and, especially, the teachers who were dealing directly and indirectly with the situation of the educational process, without the necessary support for its implementation.

Therefore, we cannot blame them or point them out for the way the teaching and learning process was conducted in remote teaching. It was what they had to offer

at that moment. The most important thing that needs to be recognized is that they tried and did not give up, fought with the weapons they had and managed to make education happen.

REFERENCES

- AVELINO, Wagner Feitosa; MENDES, Jessica Guimarães. The reality of Brazilian education based on COVID-19. **Bulletin of Conjuncture (BOCA)**, Boa Vista, v. 2, n. 5, p. 56-62, 2020. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: April 15, 2021.
- BARDIN, Laurence. **Análise de conteúdo**. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2010.
- BOLZAN, Doris Pires Vargas; MILLANI, Silvana Martins de Freitas. Learning literacy teaching: challenges to training. **Contrapontos Magazine**, v. 13, n. 3, 2013. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: may, 17
- BRASIL. **Law n. 9.394**, of December 20, 1996, Establishes Guidelines and Bases for National Education. Diário Oficial da República Federativa do Brasil. Brasília, DF. 1996 Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: sep 8. 2022.
- BRASIL. Ministry of Education, Department of Elementary Education. **Literacy Teacher Training Program – PROF**. Brasília, 2001. Available at: https://portal.mec.gov.br/seb/arquivos/pdf/Profa/guia_for_1.pdf. Accessed on: ago 12. 2021.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **General Guide to Pro-Literacy**. Brasília, 2007. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Access on: Jan. 11, 2021.
- BRAZIL. Ministério da Educação. **National pact for literacy at the right age: literacy teacher training**: presentation notebook. Brasília: MEC, SEB, 2014. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: oct 13. 2021.
- BRASIL. **Law No. 13,005**, of June 25, 2014. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação - PNE e dá outras providências. Presidência da República. Casa Civil. Brasília, junho de 2014. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: fev 15. 2021.
- BRAZIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Básica. **National curriculum guidelines for early childhood education** – Brasília: MEC; SEB, 2010. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: Dec. 20. 2023.
- BRASIL. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC)**: educação é a base. Brasília (DF), 2018. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Access on: March 23. 2020.
- BRASIL. Ministry of Education. Secretariat of Literacy. **Política Nacional de Alfabetização**. Secretariat of Literacy. Brasília: MEC, SEALF, 2019. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: jan 20. 2021.
- BRAZIL. Ministry of Education. **Time to learn**. Brasília: MEC, 2020. Available at: <https://alfabetizacao.mec.gov.br/tempo-de-aprender>. Accessed on: June 16, 2021. 2020.
- DEMO, Pedro. **The future**: challenges of 21st century languages. Curitiba: Ibpex, 2007.
- CAGLIARI, Luiz Carlos. **Literacy without BÁ-BÉ-BI-BÓ-BÚ**. São Paulo: Scipione, 1998.
- CARDOSO, Luciana Cristina; REALI, Aline Maria de Medeiros Rodrigues. Teaching learning and professional development in Early Childhood Education – approaches in the school context. **Revista Educação**, Porto Alegre, v. 39, n. 2, p. 220–230, May/Aug., 2016. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: Jan 25. 2021.

CERTEAU, Michel de. **The Practice of Everyday Life**. Art of making. 16. ed. Translation by Ephraim Ferreira Alves. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2009.

COLELLO, Sílvia Mattos Gasparian. Literacy in times of pandemic. **Convenit Internacional**, n. 35. São Paulo: CEMOrOc- FEUSP, Jan./Apr., 2021. Available at: <http://www.hottopos.com/convenit35/Silvia.pdf>. Accessed on: jun 15. 2022.

FERRAZ, Rita de Cássia Souza Nascimento; FERREIRA, Lucimar Gracia; FERREIRA, Lúcia Gracia. Resignification of pedagogical practice: contributions of autoscopia to teacher education. **Revista Brasileira de Educação de Jovens e Adultos**, v. 7, p. 222-237, 2019. Available at: <https://revistas.uneb.br/index.php/educajovenseadultos/article/view/9846>. Accessed on: abr 11. 2021.

FERREIRA, Lúcia Gracia. Online mentoring program: a proposal for teacher induction. **Revista de Estudos em Educação e Diversidade**, Itapetinga, v. 2, n. 6, p. 1-22, Oct./Dec., 2021. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: jun 20. 2022.

FERREIRA, Lúcia Gracia; ABREU, Roberta Melo de Andrade. Characteristics and challenges of/in the early years of elementary school: voices of trainees. **Revista de Estudos em Educação e Diversidade [Journal of Studies in Education and Diversity] - REED**, v. 2, n. 5, p. 1-31, Jul./Sept., 2021. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Access on: April 10, 2022.

FERREIRA, Lúcia Gracia; BARRETO, Denise Aparecida Brito; SOUZA, Ester Maria de Figueiredo. Inclusive Education and Curriculum: reflections on the new training requirements. *In*: COSTA, Graça dos Santos; PUIGGRÓS, Núria Rajadell; NUNES, Cláudio Pinto (orgs.). **Education and inclusion: formative and curricular challenges**. Vitória da Conquista: Edições UESB, 2020. p. 87-100.

FERREIRA, Lucimar Gracia; FERREIRA, Lúcia Gracia; ZEN, Giovana Cristina. Literacy in times of pandemic: perspectives for teaching the mother tongue. **Folio – Revista de Letras**, Vitória da Conquista, v. 12, n. 2 Jul./Dec. 2020. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: March 15, 2024.

BLACKSMITH, Emilia. **The children of illiteracy**: proposals for school literacy in Latin America. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1990.

BLACKSMITH, Emilia. **Reflections on literacy**. 26. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011a.

BLACKSMITH, Emilia. **With all Lyrics** 17. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011b.

BLACKSMITH, Emilia. **Past and present of verbs: reading and writing**. 4. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

BLACKSMITH, Emilia. **Entrance into writing and writing cultures**: selection of research texts. São Paulo: Cortez, 2013.

BLACKSMITH, Emilia. **Literacy in process**. 21. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2015.

FERREIRO, Emília; TEBEROSKY, Ana. **The psychogenesis of written language**. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 1999.

FRANCO, Maria Amélia do Rosário Santoro. **Pedagogy and teaching practice**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

FRANCO, Maria Amélia Santoro. Pedagogical practice and teaching: a look from the epistemology of the concept. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos**, Brasília, v. 97, n. 247, p. 534-551, Sept./Dec. 2016. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: jan 20. 2020.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Professora sim, tia não**: cartas a quem ousa ensinar. 12. ed. São Paulo: Editora Olho D'Água, 2002.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Ação cultural para a liberdade e outros escritos**. 16. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2013.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da autonomia**: saberes necessários à prática educativa. 66. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

KUBO, Olga Mitsue; BOTOMÉ, Silvio Paulo. Teaching-learning: an interaction between two behavioral processes. **Journal Interaction in Psychology**, v. 5, 2001. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: April 2nd. 2023.

MARQUES, Maria Ornélia da Silveira. School Knowledge: beyond school. *In*: OSOWSKI, Cecília (org.). **Classroom provocations**. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 1999. p. 41-60.

MIZUKAMI, Maria da Graça Nicoletti. Teaching learning: some contributions from L. S. Shulman. **Revista Educação**, v. 29, n. 2, Jul./Dec. 2004. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: fev 20. 2020.

MOYSÉS, Maria Aparecida Affonso; GERALDI, João Wanderley; COLLARES, Cecília Azevedo Lima. The adventures of knowing: from transmission to dialogue. **Educação e Sociedade**, ano XXIII, n. 78, p. 91-116, Apr., 2002. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: apr 23. 2023.

NASCIMENTO, Aline Carvalho; ZEN, Giovana Cristina. The order of letters in written production: what children in the literacy process say. **Bulletin of Conjuncture (BOCA)**, Boa Vista, v. 17, n. 49, p. 266–286, 2024. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: sep 20. 2024.

NÓVOA, António. **Professores**: imagens do futuro presente. Lisboa, Educa, 2009. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: apr 20. 2021.

NÓVOA, António. NÓVOA, A. Firmar a posição como professor, afirmar a profissão docente. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, v. 47, n. 166, p. 1106-1133, Oct./Dec., 2017. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: jul 15. 2023.

NÓVOA, António; ALVIM, Yara. Teachers after the pandemic. **Educação e Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 42, n. xx, p. xx-xx, 2021. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: jul 15. 2023.

NÓVOA, António; ALVIM, Yara. Nothing is new, but everything has changed: A viewpoint on the future school. **Prospects**, v. 49, n. 1 and 2, p. 35-41, 2020. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32836427/>. Accessed on: Aug. 15, 2022.

PERRENOUD, Philippe. **Differentiated pedagogy**: from intentions to action. Porto Alegre: Artmed Editora, 2001.

PERRENOUD, Philippe. **Teach: act in urgency, decide in uncertainty**. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed Editora, 2001.

PIRES, Maria das Graças Porto; FERREIRA, Lúcia Gracia; LIMA, Daniel Fernandes. Literacy, literacy teacher and pedagogical practice. **Letra Magna Magazine**, v. 7, n. 13, p. 3-27, 2010. Available at: <https://ojs.ifsp.edu.br/index.php/magna/issue/view/150/202>. Accessed on: Jan 10. 2021.

POERSCH, José Marcelino. Can one become literate without knowledge of linguistics? *In*: TASCA, Maria; POERSCH, José Marcelino (eds.). **Linguistic supports for literacy**. 2. ed. Porto Alegre: Sagra, 1990. p. 9-41.

RADVANSKEI, Sônia de Fátima; HAGEMEYER, Regina Celly de Campos. Continuing education for teaching learning: a responsive act. **Revista Linha Mestra**, v. 16, n. 46, 2022. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: May 18, 2023.

SANTOS, Francisca das Chagas Cardoso. do Nascimento; BRITO, Antônia Edna. Pedagogical Practices of Literacy Teachers: on the production of knowledge and teaching-knowledge. *In*: National Meeting of Didactics and Teaching Practice (ENDIPE), 16, 2012, Campinas-SP. **Anais [...]**. v. 16. Campinas: Unicamp.

LADIES, Elói Martins. Coronavirus and education: analysis of asymmetric impacts. **Bulletin of Conjuncture (BOCA)**, Boa Vista, v. 2, n. 5, p. 128–136, 2020. Available at: <https://shre.ink/ke6G>. Accessed on: April 15, 2021.

VEIGA, Ilma Passos Alencastro. **The pedagogical practice of the didactics teacher**. 10. ed. Campinas: Papirus.

Received in august 2025 | Approved in december 2025

MINI BIOGRAPHY

Lucimar Gracia Ferreira

PhD in Education from the Federal University of Bahia – UFBA. Bahia Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology

Email: lucimargracia@hotmail.com

Giovana Cristina Zen

PhD in Education from the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA). Adjunct Professor at the Faculty of Education of the Federal University of Bahia (FACED/UFBA).

Email: giovanacristinazen@gmail.com

Translated by **Jádson de Carvalho Borges**