

The mediation of language in the promotion of reciprocal interactions in the classroom environment

A mediação da linguagem na promoção de interações recíprocas no ambiente da sala de aula

La mediación del lenguaje en la promoción de interacciones recíprocas en el entorno del aula

Edmilson Francisco¹

Abstract

The article aims to highlight the importance of the use of language as an instrument of human development and transmission of knowledge in the classroom environment and its implications for teaching and learning. The conception of language is approached as a "living instance", used by partners (students and teachers) who use it in the game of linguistic communication established in the context of the classroom, through the exchange of utterances, in interaction, and that, together, mutually construct each other, mediated by this language. The discussion is supported by Bakhtin (2003) and Faiclough (2006), in which we seek to align their theoretical concepts, referring to the conception of language as a social phenomenon deeply rooted in interaction and dialogue. We intend to point out how important language is in the classroom environment, if it is used effectively as an instrument of human development and knowledge production.

Keywords: Language; Classroom context; Language-mediated teaching and learning.

Resumo

O artigo tem como objetivo destacar a importância do uso da linguagem como instrumento de desenvolvimento humano e de transmissão do conhecimento no ambiente da sala de aula e de suas implicações para o ensino e a aprendizagem. A concepção de linguagem é abordada como "instância viva", utilizada por parceiros (alunos e professores) que a utilizam no jogo da comunicação linguística estabelecida no contexto da sala de aula, por meio da troca de enunciados, em interação, e que, juntos, se constroem mutuamente, mediados por essa linguagem. A discussão é amparada por Bakhtin (2003) e Faiclough (2006), nos quais buscamos alinhar seus conceitos teóricos, referentes à concepção da linguagem como um fenômeno social profundamente enraizado na interação e no diálogo. Intentamos assinalar o quão importante é a linguagem no ambiente da sala de aula, se for utilizada eficazmente como instrumento de desenvolvimento humano e de produção de conhecimentos.

Palavras-chave: Linguagem; Contexto da sala de aula; Ensino e aprendizagem mediados pela linguagem.

¹ Federal University of Minas Gerais – UFMG. Belo Horizonte/MG, Brazil. Email: ferriceliuei2014@gmail.com - Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5357-3617>

Resumen

El artículo pretende destacar la importancia del uso del lenguaje como instrumento de desarrollo humano y transmisión de conocimientos en el entorno del aula y sus implicaciones para la enseñanza y el aprendizaje. La concepción del lenguaje es abordada como una "instancia viva", utilizada por compañeros (estudiantes y docentes) que la utilizan en el juego de la comunicación lingüística establecida en el contexto del aula, a través del intercambio de enunciados, en interacción, y que, en conjunto, se construyen mutuamente, mediados por este lenguaje. La discusión es apoyada por Bajtín (2003) y Fairclough (2006), en los cuales se busca alinear sus conceptos teóricos, refiriéndonos a la concepción del lenguaje como un fenómeno social profundamente arraigado en la interacción y el diálogo. Pretendemos señalar la importancia que tiene el lenguaje en el ambiente del aula, si se utiliza eficazmente como instrumento de desarrollo humano y de producción de conocimiento.

Palabras clave: Lenguaje; Contexto del aula; Enseñanza y aprendizaje mediados por el lenguaje.

Introduction

Language plays a fundamental role in human development and in the transmission² of knowledge, especially in the classroom environment, used by students and teachers in the context of linguistic communication, as a "living instance", for the exchange of utterances and for constant interaction, allowing both partners to build each other, mediating the educational process. Language is a vehicle for expressing cultural and personal identity, through which traditions, histories, and values are transmitted, strengthening the sense of community and belonging. Being a fundamental tool for social interaction, it not only transmits information, but also emotions, intentions and relationships, being essential for the construction and maintenance of social ties. In addition, it reflects the society in which we live, adapting and evolving to meet our needs for communication and expression and it is this dynamic character that makes it an essential and fascinating part of the human experience.

² When we use "transmission of knowledge" in the text, we do so from the perspectives of Mikhail Bakhtin (2003) and Norman Fairclough (2006), each with distinct but complementary approaches. For Bakhtin, knowledge is not transmitted unilaterally, but constructed through interaction and dialogue between interlocutors. For Fairclough, the transmission of knowledge is permeated by power relations that shape discourse, and language, when transmitting knowledge, also reproduces and transforms social and ideological structures. Thus, the role of language in the transmission of knowledge, from the perspective of both, involves both the active and dialogical social construction of meanings (Bakhtin) and the reproduction and potential transformation of social and ideological structures (Fairclough).

Based on the theories of Bakhtin (2003) and Fairclough (2006), our discussion is aligned with the conception of language as a social phenomenon deeply rooted in interaction and dialogue. Thus, we intend to show, in this work, how language can be a powerful instrument of human development and production of knowledge in the educational context.

Language as an instrument of human development

Ilari (2001) states that there is a dialectical relationship between language and reality, given that "language organizes thought, produces ideas and composes the frame of reference for man's action in the world, [...] but what is fundamentally constitutive is the capacity it has to constantly recreate this reality, since it is historical" (ILARI, 2001, p. 12).

From this perspective, language is understood as social and historical work that takes place between subjects, for subjects and with subjects "the historicity of language, at the same time, creates a cultural nationality and, therefore, mobile, and gives it a dynamism, which makes it 'open to the works of understanding' and 'to the provocations of the imagination' (FRANCHI apud ILARI, 2011, p. 12).

When we think about working with language, we need to consider it linked to the real world, given that language is dynamic, alive and not static, and accompanies historical events, that is, it is recontextualized (FAIRCLOUGH, 2006). The expression "recontextualizations of language" was used by Norman Fairclough and refers to the process of transporting elements from one discursive context to another, so that they acquire new meanings or functions. As already mentioned, as language is dynamic, it constantly evolves, reflecting cultural, social, and technological changes in society. As a living phenomenon, language is constantly evolving and changing, with new words and expressions emerging, while others fall into disuse. A language's vocabulary is constantly growing and adapting, often influenced by technological innovations, cultural fashions, and historical events.

The "recontextualizations of language" cited by Fairclough (2006) are compatible with the theories developed by Bakhtin (2003) regarding a conception of language based on a sociocultural perspective. The authors point to it not as a formal system of norms, but as a living phenomenon, which in its eventicity manifests itself in the created statements, eliciting a response, an "axiological position" (FREITAS, 2010, p. 14).

Freitas (2010), when discussing the conception of language, is based on the sociocultural perspective, moving away from the traditional idea that language is a formal system of rigid norms. He highlights the "eventicity" of language, that is, the dynamic and situational character of the utterances that are created. These statements are not static, but are always in the process of generating a response, reflecting the idea that communication is a continuous and interactive action. When mentioning "taking an axiological position", the author refers to the fact that each statement carries a load of values and judgments. In other words, by using language, people not only convey information but also express their attitudes, opinions, and ethical and moral positions. Therefore, language is seen as a living and active phenomenon, deeply rooted in the social and cultural context in which it is used. And because it is a living and active phenomenon, which we use to interact and exchange statements, the use of language constitutes us as human beings, making it fundamental for the formation of our reality and our identity.

For Ferraro (2021, p. 1),

From this point on, language is conceived as a constituent element of reality, contrary to what occurred within the metaphysical tradition, in which it was believed that words were only labels for "real" elements that, in turn, would exist, truly and originally, only on a metaphysical plane. Thus, starting from this new/other way of relating to the world – now through language – it is understood that the totality of what is thought by us is structured from a system of signs; of symbols that structure language and set it in motion as language. Therefore, what would be "outside" language – without name, designation or form of representation – becomes inconceivable in a dimension of the real, which is in line with Ferdinand de Saussure's statement that sustains the impossibility of any concept that cannot be named and, therefore, (re)signified. (FERRARO, 2021, p. 1).

In this sense, it is through the use of language that we shape our understanding of the world and ourselves, highlighting the idea that the limits of my language mean the limits of my world. In other words, language shapes our perception of the world - if I don't conceptualize or don't have words, it's as if something doesn't exist for me. In this way, the limits of my language define what I can know and understand in the world. However, to make use of language is not only to take possession of a set of words or phrases, but of a whole system of utterances that acquire a meaning in the context of communication. In other words, language only makes sense if addressed to someone, creating a communication cycle where a response is expected and, from this cycle, the utterances result, which are co-constructed by

the interlocutors, influenced by the context and the voices involved, and represent a process of reciprocal influence – a dynamic that is essential for the understanding and continuity of communication.

According to Bakhtin (2003), language is formed by utterances, and enunciation is:

the product of the interaction of two socially organized individuals and, even if there is no real interlocutor, this can be replaced by the average representative of the social group to which the speaker belongs. The word is addressed to an interlocutor: it is a function of the person of that interlocutor: it will vary depending on whether he is a person from the same social group or not, if he is inferior or superior in the social hierarchy, if he is linked to the speaker by more or less close social ties (father, mother, husband, etc.) There can be no abstract interlocutor; we would not have a common language with such an interlocutor, neither in the proper sense nor in the figurative sense" (BAKHTIN, 2003, p. 114).

Bakhtin (2003) places the participants of the speech and the very precise social situation as determinants for the style and form of enunciation. In this same perspective of language, Freitas (1994) describes that:

It was from a dialogical conception of language that Bakhtin affirmed its true substance, constituted by the social phenomenon of verbal interaction. To ignore the social and dialogical nature of the utterance would be to erase the deep connection between language and life. Statements do not exist in isolation: each statement presupposes its antecedents and others that will succeed it; an utterance is only a link in a chain, and can only be understood within this chain (FREITAS, 1994, p. 138).

Freitas (1994) understood well the essence of what Bakhtin says about the dialogical conception of language when he says in other words that, its core, its main characteristic is to be dialogical, that is, it does not exist in isolation, but always in a context of social interaction and communication between individuals.

The dialogical nature of language carries aspects that show its non-existence in isolation: social interaction, meanings constructed together, influence of the context in the construction of meanings, the multiple voices and discourses that make up the language, and reciprocal influence between the interlocutors. Bakhtin's view highlights the importance of enunciation partners in determining the content and form of discourse, complementing the general idea that language is essentially dialogical, contextual, and influenced by social interaction. The author states that, with regard to the enunciated theme (text) and the enunciation partners, these constitute the most important element for the enunciative will or

the will-to-say of the speaker or speaker and that they determine the choice of the genre and the concrete realization of the utterance.

The enunciative will of the speaker is realized first of all in the choice of a genre of discourse. This choice is determined by the specificity of a given field of discursive communication, by semantic-object (thematic) considerations, by the concrete situation of discursive communication, by the personal composition of its participants, etc. (BAKHTIN, 2003, p. 282, emphasis original text).

It is understood, from Bakhtin, that, when we choose a genre to produce an utterance, it will make a difference in the way we address the interlocutors, because the enunciation is defined by the possibilities left by the sphere/field of communication in which it takes place (ROJO; BARBOSA, 2015). In the relationship to be built between the subjects (sender and receiver), in the social context, "two limit poles" are distinguished (Bakhtin, 2003, p. 117) and, both sides, have their own ideological elaborations and awareness. This means that when the sender, due to his mental activity, provokes a reaction in the receiver by means of information, the receiver, consequently, responds to the elaboration made by the sender. The receiver becomes aware of what was elaborated by the sender and structures a response through his own ideological elaboration, based on his experiences and socially constructed conceptions.

To explain the existence of two poles between the subjects (sender and receiver) who try to build a relationship, Bakhtin (2003) uses the metaphor of hunger to explain that the way each individual sees, reacts and thinks about hunger depends on the context and the group of which this subject is a part. In this regard, the author also states that "the social situation determines which model, which metaphor, which form of enunciation will serve to express hunger from the inflectional directions of experience" (BAKHTIN, 2003, p. 119) and that hunger, as an "other subject", provokes different reactions in subjects belonging to different social groups and contexts. For him, "the mental activity of this isolated, classless individual will have a specific coloring and will tend towards determined ideological forms, whose range can be quite extensive: resignation, shame, the feeling of dependence and many other shades will color his mental activity" (BAKHTIN, 2003, p. 118). By using this metaphor, Bakhtin explains that, depending on the social group and the context of which we are a part, enunciating and expressing it, the reactions, the responses to the elaborations and enunciations made "by others", belonging to our group or not, will be different, given that each group and

social context have ideologically different elaborations. In the same way, the receiver's response may cause the sender to change his posture or remake his enunciation, under the condition that, if he does not redo it, he will not be understood, incurring in a "straight construction, created without considering the concrete data of social expression (BAKHTIN, 2003, p. 120). For the author, discourse, enunciation and expressions are only real when they come into contact with the real social context and real participants in which they effect their objectification.

The ideas of Freitas (1994) and Bakhtin (2003) are complementary to the extent that both underline the importance of language in the construction and understanding of the world. The first statement focuses on the role of language in delimiting our inner and outer world, while the second focuses on how this language is used in interaction with others, forming a bridge between individuals. The idea that language provokes a response in the other reinforces the view that communication is a two-way street. This resonates with the notion that an individual's understanding of the world is broadened through interaction with others. Through the exchange of statements, we expand our own "limits" by incorporating new perspectives and knowledge. Thus, both statements highlight crucial aspects of language: its fundamental role in shaping our perception of the world and its essentially communicative and social nature. The assertion that language is crucial both in the formation of our perception of the world and in its communicative and social nature is closely aligned with Bakhtin's categories of the context of production, a subject that we will address in the next section, explaining how this alignment happens.

The alignment of Bakhtinian categories with language

Mikhail Bakhtin addressed the categories of the context of production in his work "Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics" ("Problemy Poetiki Dostoevskogo"), first published in 1929. These categories can be summarized as: (1) partners in the interaction (speaker and recipient), (2) objectives of the interaction, meaning of the speaker, (3) the sphere where the interaction will occur, which delimits the context of the situation, with its ideological, social and cultural marks, (4) theme and (5) the chosen genre (and its realizable forms).

Bakhtin's categories of production context are aligned with the aspects of language with regard to the partners of interaction by Bakhtin stating that language is inherently

dialogical, always existing in a context of interaction between at least two people: the speaker and the recipient. This aligns perfectly with the essentially communicative nature of language, as language gains meaning in the exchange between interlocutors, reinforcing the idea that communication is not a unilateral path.

As for the purpose of the interaction and the speaker's wanting, language is used to achieve certain ends and convey intentions, which is directly related to the role of language in shaping the perception of the world, as what a speaker wants to communicate shapes the way he sees and interprets reality. In addition, by conveying these intentions, language builds a shared understanding among the participants in the communication. The sphere where the interaction occurs encompasses the situational context with its ideological, social and cultural marks, an aspect that highlights language as not neutral, but loaded with contextual meanings that reflect and shape the perception of the world of individuals, reinforcing the social nature of language, since cultural and ideological contexts are collectively constructed and influence the way we communicate. The theme of interaction defines the content of what is being discussed and is always inserted in a specific context, aligned with the perception that language shapes our understanding of the world. What we choose to talk about and how we choose to approach certain topics reflect and influence our worldview. As for the genre chosen for the interaction, with its realizable forms, it defines the conventions and expectations of how something should be said in a given context. Discursive genres are socially and historically situated, reinforcing both the communicative and social nature of language and guide the form and structure of our communication, thereby shaping our perception of and interaction with the world. These Bakhtinian categories influenced the proposal of Sociodiscursive Interactionism (SDI), in which Bronckart is its greatest representative.

According to Francisco, Goulart and Ferreira (2021), the ISD is

a term created by Bronckart (1999; 2004) to name a field of theorization about the conditions of human development, based on the studies and conceptions of Spinoza, Marx, Vygotsky and Bakhtin. ISD is a more specific strand of social interactionism, which refers to an epistemological position in which various currents of philosophy and the human sciences are inserted, as described by Bronckart (1999). According to the author, this position considers the historicity of the human being, with regard to the conditions in which particular ways of organizing themselves in society and forms of interaction of a semiotic nature are developed in the species, in view of the

process of formation of the human organism in person. In the epistemological framework of the ISD, the conditions of production are born from epistemological bases founded on different currents, and it was with this epistemological position called social interactionism and with the works of Vygotsky and Bakhtin, that language began to be seen from another perspective. (FRANCISCO; GOULART, FERREIRA, 2021, p. 131).

From the perspective of Bronckart's (1999) sociodiscursive interactionism, the central thesis is that the development of the human properly is the result of a historical process of socialization, made possible by the development of semiotic instruments, in which language is undoubtedly the greatest of them.

Bronckart (1999), based on Vygotsky's reflection in *Thought and Language* (1934), conceives language as a founding and organizing instrument of higher psychological processes (such as perception, cognition, emotions and feelings). With this, Bronckart (1999) clarifies that the approach of Sociodiscursive Interactionism (SDI) has language, active behaviors and conscious thought as units of analysis. Of the three aspects mentioned, language stands out as the central element in the approach to ISD and, therefore, for a science of the human. In fact, the ISD argues that the signs of language are part of the genesis of the constitution of consciousness. In the words of Machado (2009), the ISD seeks to demonstrate that situated language practices are the greatest instruments of human development, not only in terms of knowledge and knowledge, but also in relation to people's capacities to act and identity. She also points out that the construction of cognitive capacities is the result of a process initially marked by sociocultural and language.

As for the social aspect and activity, Bronckart (2009) understands it as the way in which the behavioral functions of living beings in relation to the environment and the elements of internal representation (or knowledge) about this same environment are organized (BRONCKART, 2009, p.31). In this sense, language is seen as a social organization that, through a permanent historical construction, is structured from signs, which are put to use in the representation of three worlds: *objective or physical world, social world, subjective world*³

³ According to Abreu-Tardelli (2006, p. 23), for Bronckart (1999), the *objective world* is constituted by collective knowledge acquired in relation to the physical environment. Thus, to be efficient in a given activity, one must have pertinent representations in relation to this environment. The *social world*, in turn, concerns the way of organizing common tasks, that is, the conventional modalities of cooperation between group members and the collective knowledge accumulated to carry out a task. The *subjective world* is made up of the

- terms taken from Habermas (1989). Together, these worlds represent the context of social activity.

According to Bronckart (2009, p. 91), the agent-producer, engaging in a language action, mobilizes representations about the worlds and, in the framework of the ISD, the language action is a unit of a psychological nature and "designates the properties of the formal worlds (physical, social and subjective) that can exert influence on the textual production". What Bronckart meant is that textual production does not occur in a vacuum, but rather within formal worlds that influence and shape this production. These formal worlds are categorized into three main types: physical, social, and subjective. The physical world refers to the material and natural environment in which individuals find themselves and includes elements such as space, time, and the objects that surround the individual. These elements can influence the way texts are produced and interpreted. For example, the description of a landscape in a literary text is influenced by the physical world perceived by the author. The social world encompasses the social relations, norms, values, and institutions that make up society. Language and textual production are profoundly influenced by the social context, including culture, social interactions, and communicative conventions. A legal text, for example, is shaped by the norms and rules of a society's legal system. The subjective world, on the other hand, is related to the individual's internal experiences, emotions, thoughts, and perceptions. Each person brings their own experiences and subjectivities to the textual production. The writing of a diary, for example, is directly influenced by the subjective world of the author.

Reciprocal interactions via language in the classroom context

From the theoretical concepts of Bakhtin (2003) regarding the game of linguistic communication, we understand that the social context and the exchanges established between the participants of the social group will determine whether the dialogue will be situated and the communication will be effective. Thus, we advocate that learning environments, in this case the classroom, need to be structured so that all the interactive and communicational

characteristics of each individual engaged in the task and the collective knowledge accumulated regarding these characteristics.

potential emerges, enabling the contents, utterances and language(s) to be used to favor the teaching and learning process, since the participants involved in the teaching and learning situation are part of a real social context and group. The "organizing center of all enunciation, of all expression, is not interior, but exterior: it is situated in the social environment that surrounds the individual" (BAKHTIN, 2003, p. 124). Bakhtin's statement shows that language and enunciation are not purely internal phenomena, but are deeply rooted in the social and interactive context in which they occur. Applied to the classroom, Bakhtin's statement makes us understand that social interaction is the basis of communication.

In the context of the classroom, the communication established between teacher and student is primarily a social process, in which the meanings of words and utterances gain full meaning within this interactive context, where the exchange of ideas and information happens continuously. The social environment where students are - classroom, school and place where they live - significantly influences the way they interpret and respond to the teacher's enunciations, given that factors such as culture, socioeconomic context, previous experiences and social dynamics of the class shape students' understanding and participation.

Bakhtin's statement also suggests that the social environment collaborates for the collective construction of knowledge, revealing to us that the teacher is not the one who holds the knowledge and transmits it to the students, but that he must be a mediator who guides and organizes everyone's knowledge, allowing both him and the students to build understanding through the interactions established between them. This is justified by the fact that all those involved in communicative practice carry within themselves different voices and perspectives and take them to the classroom. In the development of activities, the teacher needs to consider this diversity of voices, creating an inclusive environment where different points of view are valued and debated. By doing so, the teacher will be exercising listening, highlighting the importance of empathetic listening, which involves not only the understanding of words, but also the ability to put oneself in the other's shoes, understanding their emotions and perspectives (BAJOUR, 2012).

Freitas (2010, p. 22) states that language is of paramount importance, since it becomes a "mediating instrument that allows teachers and students to intertwine in the process of knowledge production as a constitutive element of teaching and learning". As a

mediating instrument, Freitas sees language as an essential tool that enables communication and the exchange of ideas between teachers and students. Language is not only a means of transmitting information, but a mechanism through which the co-construction of knowledge takes place. This mediation allows students not to be mere passive receivers, but active participants in the educational process.

When referring to the intertwining in the process of knowledge production, the term "intertwining" indicates a dynamic and continuous interconnection between teachers and students. Both groups are seen as co-authors in the educational process, where interaction and dialogue are fundamental. Knowledge is built collectively, through the exchange of perspectives and the confrontation of ideas, and this interaction promotes a collaborative and participatory learning environment. As for the constitutive elements of teaching and learning, Freitas (2010) emphasizes that both teachers and students are essential elements in the formation of the teaching and learning environment and that language acts as a link that unites these elements, allowing teaching to become a bidirectional and interactive process. This approach transforms the classroom into a space where knowledge is continuously negotiated and reconfigured through verbal interaction. As far as the practical implications are concerned, all this means that the role of the teacher is not only that of a transmitter of knowledge, but also of a facilitator and mediator, who helps students to develop their own understandings and skills. Through pedagogical practices that value dialogue, critical reflection, and collaboration, language becomes a powerful means of engagement and cognitive development. In this sense, Freitas' statement underlines the importance of language as a vital means for educational interaction, where teachers and students actively collaborate in the construction of knowledge, making the teaching and learning process more meaningful and effective.

Because it is dialogical language, because it provokes responsive action in the other, for Freitas (2010, p. 22), "pedagogical practice presupposes these interpersonal relationships in which reciprocal interactions occur via the language of an active subject with other active subjects". Freitas' statement emphasizes the importance of interpersonal interactions and the active role of all those involved in the educational process.

Final considerations

Pedagogical practice is not limited to the unilateral transmission of knowledge from the teacher to the student. Instead, it involves rich and dynamic interpersonal relationships in which teachers and students interact and influence each other. These interactions are fundamental to the teaching and learning process, as they allow the exchange of experiences, ideas, and knowledge. Language is the primary means by which these interactions occur. Through dialogue, questions, answers, discussions, and debates, teachers and students engage in a continuous process of communication. These reciprocal interactions are crucial, as they allow all participants to express their perspectives, clarify doubts, construct meanings, and develop a deeper understanding of the contents covered. Both teachers and students are seen as active subjects in this process and this means that each individual has an important role in the construction of knowledge. Students are not passive receivers of information, but engaged participants who actively contribute their ideas, experiences, and reflections. In the same way, teachers are not mere transmitters of knowledge, but facilitators who guide, motivate and stimulate students' critical thinking and autonomy.

When we look at our pedagogical practice in view of the importance of interpersonal interactions and the active role of all those involved in the educational process, there will be several implications for the educational process. Among the various implications, we highlight that the teaching method will become participatory, since it will promote the active participation of students, whether in group work, classroom discussions, collaborative projects and problem-based teaching methods, which are fundamental. In addition, it will lead to the creation of an open and respectful learning environment, where everyone feels comfortable expressing their ideas and opinions, an essential aspect to facilitate reciprocal interactions. In addition to these implications, we also highlight that the involvement, the active participation of students and teachers in the teaching and learning process and the openness to the establishment of interpersonal interactions in the context of the classroom will allow the development of students' social and communicative skills, such as the ability to argue, negotiate and collaborate, which is crucial to foster productive interpersonal relationships, in addition to promoting critical reflection on the contents studied and on the learning process itself, which helps to consolidate students' autonomy and independent thinking. We believe that an effective pedagogical practice is one that values and promotes

reciprocal interpersonal interactions, mediated by language, between active subjects. This approach not only enriches the teaching and learning process, but also contributes to the integral development of students as critical thinkers and participatory citizens.

References

- ABREU-TARDELLI, Lília Santos. **trabalhodoprofessor@chateducacional.com.br- Aportes para compreender o trabalho do professor iniciante em EAD**, 2006. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística Aplicada e Estudos da Linguagem) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo. Disponível em: <<http://livros01.livrosgratis.com.br/cp008278.pdf>>. Acesso em 15 julho 2024.
- BAJOUR, Cecília. **Ouvir nas entrelinhas: O valor da escuta nas práticas de leitura**/Cecília Bajour: Tradução de Alexandre Morales. São Paulo: Editora Pulo do Gato, 2012.
- BAKHTIN, Mikhail. **Os gêneros do discurso**. In: BAKHTIN, M. **Estética da Criação Verbal**. São Paulo: Martins fontes, 2003.
- BRONCKART, Jean Paul. **Atividade de linguagem, textos e discursos: por um interacionismo sóciodiscursivo**. São Paulo: EDUC, 1999.
- BRONCKART, Jean Paul. **Gêneros textuais, tipos de discursos e operações psicolinguísticas**. Revista Estudos da Linguagem, Belo Horizonte, v. 11, n.1, p. 49.69, 2009. Disponível em: <<http://www.periodicos.letras.ufmg.br/index.php/relin/article/view/2344/2293>>. Acesso em: 24 julho 2024.
- FAIRCLOUGH, Norman. **Language and globalization**. London; New York, Routhedge: 2006.
- FERRARO, José Luís. **Wittgenstein e os jogos de linguagem**. Revista Educação Pública, v. 21, nº 30, 10 de agosto de 2021. Disponível em:<<https://educacaopublica.cecierj.edu.br/artigos/21/30/wittgenstein-e-os-jogos-de-linguagem>>. Acesso em: 20 julho 2024.
- HABERMAS, Jurgen. **Consciência Moral e Agir Comunicativo/ Jurgen Habermas**. Tradução de Guido A. de Almeida. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Universitário, 1989.
- SINDER, Marilene. **Resenha de Vigotski e Bakhtin – Psicologia e educação: um intertexto/ Maria Tereza de Assunção Freitas**. Educ. Soc. 18 (60). Dez 2017. Disponível em: <<https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73301997000300012>>. Acesso em: 19 julho 2024.
- FRANCISCO, Edmilson; GOULART, Ilsa do Carmo Vieira; FERREIRA, Helena Maria. **Situações de uso da linguagem no ensino remoto de língua portuguesa em contexto pandêmico**. *Devir Educação*, 450–474, 2021. Disponível em: <<https://devireducacao.ded.ufla.br/index.php/DEVIR/article/view/479>>. Acesso em: 19 julho 2024.

FREITAS, Maria Tereza de Assunção. **Letramento digital e formação de professores**. Educação em Revista. Belo horizonte, v. 6, n. 03, p. 335-352, dez. 2010. Disponível em: <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/edur/v26n3/v26n3a17/>>. Acesso em: 20 julho 2024.

ILARI, Rodolfo. **A linguística e o ensino da língua portuguesa**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2001.

STELLA, Paulo Rogério. **Problemas da obra de Dostoiévski** (Versão de 1929) [Problems of Dostoevsky's Creative Arts1 (1929 Edition)]. Bakhtiniana, São Paulo, 18 (1): 161-170, jan. /mar. 2023. Indexado no: Bakhtiniana/Revista de Estudos do discurso, Ano XV, jan. /mar. 2023.

ROJO, Roxane; BARBOSA, Jaqueline Peixoto. **Hipermodernidade, multiletramentos e gêneros discursivos**. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2015.

Recebido: julho/2024.

Publicado: novembro/2024.