

DOSSIER

Literacy and Curriculum: between the establishment of meanings and the experiments that create fissures and make other ways of life possible

Literacy/Literacies in Curricular Literacy Policies: meanings in dispute**Letramento/s em Políticas Curriculares de Alfabetização:
sentidos em disputa**

Andréia Mello Rangel^a
profandreamello@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article aims to mobilize the field of curricular literacy policies in an attempt to highlight discursive articulations that produce meanings about literacies. In this path, I highlight significances especially in the National Literacy Policy. Based on a post-structural and post-foundational perspective, I localize literacies in traces, in a non-essentialist logic, to operate with the dissemination of meanings that tensions the discursive field without the pretension to overcome such tension. I move away from classical conceptions of curriculum as a guide to practice, as guidelines produced by experts and implemented by teachers. I consider an understanding of curricular policies as a policy of significances that operates by translations. I defend, based on Derrida's spectrology, that full access to the other (or to something) is impossible and, by assuming the impossibility of accessing the things themselves, we are provoked to respond considering other literacies - perhaps possible to be meant, contingently, such as reading, writing, images, sounds, orality, gestures, expressions – discursive process-literacies, in which there is no accuracy or guarantees, merely undecidabilities that demand responsibilities as an ethical-political stance of the philosophy of the coming.

Keywords: Curricular Policy. Literacies. Literacy. Spectrology.

RESUMO

Este artigo objetiva mobilizar o campo das políticas curriculares de alfabetização na tentativa de destacar articulações discursivas que produzem sentidos sobre letramento/s. Neste percurso, realço sentidos, especialmente, na Política Nacional de Alfabetização (PNA). Apoiada em uma perspectiva pós-estrutural e pós-fundacional, localizo letramentos na ordem do rastro, em uma lógica não essencialista, a fim de operar com a disseminação de sentidos que tensiona o campo discursivo sem a pretensão de superar essa tensão. Afasto-me de concepções clássicas de currículo como um guia para a prática, como orientações produzidas por especialistas e implementadas por professores. Admito uma compreensão de políticas curriculares como política de significação que opera por traduções. Argumento, com base na espectrologia derridiana, que o acesso pleno ao outro (ou a alguma coisa) é da ordem do impossível e que, ao assumir a impossibilidade de acessar *as coisas mesmas*, somos provocados a responder considerando *letramentos outros* – talvez possíveis de serem significados, contingentemente, como leitura, escrita, imagens, sons, oralidade, gestos, expressões – letramentos-processo discursivo, em que não há precisão e garantias, apenas indecidibilidades que nos demandam responsabilidades como uma postura ético-política da filosofia do por vir.

Palavras-chave: Política Curricular. Letramentos. Alfabetização. Espectrologia.

^a Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil.

Introduction

The concept of literacy has emerged in the 1980s in the context of the teaching how to write and read curriculum policies in Brazil. Although the discussion about literacy/literacies find room in other fields of the human science studies, it is in the one of language and education that its reverberation is bigger. Thus, I bring up discussions related to literacy in these fields to lay the groundwork for my argument in this article: meanings of literacy that seek to highlight its inherent qualities circulate socially and are reinforced by the field and by the curriculum policies. I argue that this leads to an understanding of literacy as a reified concept, one that can be acquired through schooling, with predictable outcomes and assurances.

To begin with, I refer to the ideas of Magda Soares (2020a), widely spread in Brazil. The author argues that knowing how to read or write is the state or condition of the individual who is able to use letters appropriately (what we will from now on refer to as *alphabetization*), whilst literacy is the state or condition of the social group or of the individual that possesses the social skills of reading and writing. In an attempt to ensure the specificity of what constitutes alphabetization and what literacy would be – while simultaneously advocating for a convergence of these concepts – Soares (2020a) argues in favor of the idea of to alphabetize by literating, for, according to the author, dissociating alphabetization from literacy would be a mistake, as the process of learning how to read or write should develop through social practices of reading and writing.

The author asserts that literacy can be taught—I can teach someone literacy—and in discussing the various levels of literacy, she emphasizes the importance of the alphabetization process in determining these levels. In her discussions, the researcher notes that in Brazil, the concepts of alphabetization and literacy merge, overlap and are often confused. For Soares (2004, p. 7), “This embedding of the concept of literacy within the concept of alphabetization can be detected through an analysis of sources such as demographic censuses, media reports, and academic literature”.

In an attempt to strengthen the defense of the inseparability between alphabetization and literacy and to fixate a meaning for that inseparability, the researcher creates the signifier “*alfalettrar*” (something like to *alphaliterate*), which she relates to an educational action. Based on the experience of a Brazilian municipality, she develops a discussion that focuses on how a child learns and, also, on how to consider alphabetization as a field, not only as a written alphabetical system (Soares, 2020b).

By stating that there are disputed perceptions in the field of literacy/literacies, the approach of the New Literacy Studies emerges as a counterpoint to the ancient studies on literacy, presenting a counterpoint to traditional studies on literacy, offering a different perspective with the aim of enhancing theoretical and methodological approaches to the use of writing and to literacy policies. For Brian Street (1984) – one of the main proponents of the field – there was a perception that the epistemological discussion about writing was rooted in hierarchical foundations and the division between the literate and the illiterate.

In order to overcome that hierarchical view of literacy, the propositions of the New Literacy Studies adopt a sociocultural approach to language and literacy (Heath, 1983; Street, 1984; 2001; 2014; Barton; Hamilton, 1998; Kleiman, 1995; Gee, 2000). Designated in Brazil as *Novos Estudos*

de Letramento (NEL), the proposal presents a discussion in which the practices of writing usage are considered multiple, plural, heterogeneous, and linked to the power relations in societies. The expression “social literacies” (Street, 1984) gains prominence in an endeavor to establish a stable meaning for literacies. The term “practice” becomes especially relevant for this perspective, as it is defined as the possibility of thinking about writing in terms of social interaction rather than merely individual skill (Gee, 2000). Thus, “literacies” (in the plural) tends to gain traction, highlighting the ethnographic perspective emphasized by the New Literacy Studies, in which knowledge is seen as situated and interactional rather than as neutral skills originated from a single, foundational center.

In Brazil, Angela Kleiman (1995) retakes the studies from Heath and Street mentioned previously, highlighting that those investigations had debated the writing usage conditions, emphasizing, mostly, the literacy practices of minority groups. The author states literacy “as a set of social practices that make use of writing as a symbolic system and as a technology in specific contexts for specific purposes” (Kleiman, 1995, p.18-19).

In regard to curriculum policies for the training of alphabetization teachers, the term literacy gains prominence mainly in the Pró-Letramento (Pro-Literacy) Program, launched in 2005, which was a continuing education course for literacy educators, focusing on Portuguese and Mathematics. In Booklet 1 of the Pro-Literacy material, named “Linguistic Capabilities: alphabetization and literacy” (Brasil, 2008), in the specific part dedicated to literacies, that is approached from a perspective that considers it an absolute phenomenon, capable of being described and organized.

A similar movement can be identified in the Booklet 1 of the National Pact for Literacy at the Right Age (PNAIC) – “Curriculum from the Perspective of Inclusion and Diversity: The National Curriculum Guidelines for Basic Education and the Literacy Cycle” (Brasil, 2015). When discussing the Learning Rights in the Literacy Cycle, the curriculum document emphasizes the necessity of expanding and deepening literacy practices.

As can be noticed from this brief overview, meanings of literacies circulate within society and are underscored by the field and curricular policies in an effort to establish a definitive understanding of this *phenomenon*. To develop what I aim to establish in this paper, I emphasize that I draw theoretical inspiration from post-structuralist and post-foundational authors – Jacques Derrida, Ernesto Laclau, and Chantal Mouffe – and that I consider the translations of the Laclau’s discursive approach to the field of education in Brazil developed by Alice Lopes and Elizabeth Macedo.

This text is structured into three main sections, alongside this introduction and concluding remarks. In the forthcoming section, I present the first part of the theoretical-strategic aspects supporting this discourse, focusing on the senses of discourse and curriculum highlighted in this article. I introduce these aspects by employing Derrida’s notion of trace to emphasize the impossibility of pinning down a singular meaning for literacy/literacies. To further the discussion, I analyze the National Literacy Policy, specifically noting the absence of the term literacy/literacies in the policy text. Finally, I conclude (albeit provisionally and partially) by advocating for a nuanced understanding of literacy/literacies that acknowledges contextual and contingent factors, underpinned by a radical theoretical and political commitment to educational relations and the relentless dynamics of *différance*.

A discursive approach to contemplate curriculum policies

From the post-structuralist and post-foundational perspective, curriculum is understood as a discursive production embedded within the language games that, relationally and contextually, generate meanings. This way of conceptualizing curriculum stems from an understanding of discourse “as a meaningful totality that transcends the distinction between the linguistic and the extralinguistic” (Laclau, 2014, p. 5) – central to the Discourse Theory (DT) developed by Laclau and Mouffe (2015).

Adopting the post-structural perspective of DT and its applications in the field of education in Brazil, Lopes and Macedo (2011) argue against defining curriculum by emphasizing any singular characteristic, as the term’s meanings point to partiality and are always historically situated. Therefore, the theoretical framework of these curriculum scholars allows for the assertion of curriculum as contingent meaning-making. By conceptualizing curriculum as a discourse that constructs meanings, the authors view curriculum as the very process that enables signification, as the creation or enunciation of meanings, and as a form of cultural production (Lopes; Macedo, 2011).

Although not originally conceived specifically for educational policies, the post-structural and post-foundational approach of DT enables the consideration of politics discursively, thus understanding the educational field and curriculum as a political arena. This implies “understanding the power relations at play at a given moment and the traces they leave on the curriculum text” (Caldeira; Frangella, 2023, p. 4).

It also implies the need to understand the rules that allow the production and recreation of meanings – even for literacies in curriculum policies – (meanings which fullness is an unattainable project). Therefore, there is not an order which defines a single way of signifying in a particular context, but the way how contingency presents itself and how the processes of subjectivation and identification of subjects, always relational, they occur at the moment of decision/signification.

In this regard, the notion of translation, developed by Derrida’s philosophy, is important for conceptualizing politics as something that does not end with the application of norms. Therefore, it is not possible to halt the movement of politics. We engage in translation as an operator of language – one that escapes our choice – causing the instituting acts of discourse power to be incapable of containing iteration, negotiation of meanings, and the leakage of meanings from curriculum policies.

Thus, within the contextual relationship, it is possible to think of the curriculum discursively and, therefore, powerful for producing disturbances, since we are producers in relation to others and cannot decide/signify in place of others, as we cannot control the processes of curriculum signification, even though our movement is always to try to fix the difference, to stabilize what we believe is possible to signify as curriculum production. Nevertheless, there is always flux, and it is impossible to completely tie down and control meaning. Therefore, there are always effects of difference. Here, I reference Derrida’s notion of *différance* as a movement of relation with the constitutive alterity of the subject itself, which is ungraspable, hence cannot be precisely determined.

Through this theory, I seek to distance myself from a logic that attempts to fix the curriculum as a prescription to guide a particular identity project. This is because I understand that identities

are not fixed and that we are constantly constructing notions and constituting ourselves within a political game of possibilities of being, which occur in context, in the constant process of deferral and in relation to alterity. This understanding aims to challenge theoretical foundations that consider the curriculum as a line of determination capable of ensuring the formation of a desired subject.

That leads us to consider that curriculum – and education – is not about determining what others should be, but about a discursive practice (a project, when there is one) – with no guarantees or assurances of what there is to come – of intersubject relation and construction, which considers that any educational activity is involved in the relationship to the radical alterity, and therefore in the negotiations of meanings, knowledge and context, with all the possibilities of being (Lopes, 2015).

It is from this perspective that the meanings of literacy/literacies inscribed in society and mobilized by curriculum policies are interpreted here. Engaging in the contestation over the signification of literacy/literacies, I depart from an idea that unsettles a potential signification related to homogeneity, with the defense of a “literate subject” under the pretext of equality, which is constructed through the violence of exclusion, by affirming oneself as one and thus excluding other possibilities. My expectation is that this argumentation enables the signification of literacy/literacies as enabling various subjectivations, as that which allows for the emergence of difference and is not reduced to mere “know-how.”

Trace: a possibility to resist the idea of the sign as a permanent stabilization of meanings

Derrida’s philosophy states that the reference structure is much more complex than a simple relationship between a signifier and a signified. It argues, therefore, that the inseparability between signifier and signified, as Saussurean linguistics maintains (Saussure, 2006), makes it seem as though there are deep regularities capable of organizing social structures and guiding individuals’ actions.

Derrida problematizes Ferdinand de Saussure’s thoughts by pointing out their contradictions. Saussurean linguistics maintains that the principle of arbitrariness imposes a coercion of collective sign usage, yet Saussure’s principle of referentiality emphasizes the sign’s mediating function – it represents the thing while it is absent (Saussure, 2006). Thus, in Saussure’s structural linguistics, signs like education, curriculum, literacy/literacies would be determined in relation to other signs, but their referential function would not be contested, as this reference is understood as a supposed presence/essence of what lies outside the system of representation. Therefore, from the originality and limits of Saussure’s thoughts, Derrida defends what he calls *différance* (Derrida, 1973).

There is nothing causing or producing *différance* – there is *différance* – but since language is indebted to metaphysics (and one cannot escape this fact), we speak of the effect of *différance*. At this juncture, it is crucial to invoke another Derridean notion: undecidability. Derrida, in his attempt to dismantle the binary oppositions of metaphysics and to refute the notion of an original presence, argues that meaning is merely a signifier positioned in relation to other signifiers. Consequently, there is no signifier that leads to a fixed signified. Undecidability becomes relevant here as it shapes the understanding that there is also no fixed signifier.

[The signifier] is merely a trace that refers to other signifiers (also traces) and bears their mark, thus forming a network. A 'signifier' (trace) can only be understood, in this way, by the difference it establishes in relation to others within this network. This trace also has a spectral character, as it is not purely sensible and because, being neither a presence nor an absence, it exists in this undecidability. The process of signification is thus a referentiality of spectral traces, which Derrida calls writing or *différance*. (Coelho, 2007, p. 04 – author's emphasis and brackets).

The notion of undecidability emphasizes the precarious nature of choices and decisions – though necessary – and the spectral character of traces within the network of references (Derrida, 1973; 1994; 2016). Thus, literacies-curriculum does not fit into a closed system of differences, in diversity, but rather in an open structure, which occurs at the edges, at its limit, and it is at this limit that we respond, translate, signify. Therefore, the idea of reference (an objectivity that connects one thing to another) is reconsidered and becomes referentiality. Similarly, meaning is understood as a metaphysical illusion, as an effect in the chain of "signifiers", because "just as there is no presence, there is also no absence. To think that if it is not presence, then it is absence, would be to fall back into a metaphysics, that is, into one of its binary oppositions. Things, in fact, are spectral" (Coelho, 2007, p. 05).

Things are traces of traces. From the understanding that traces differ – not in an oppositional difference that considers things apparently present and different from each other – but from the understanding that "every trace is already and always constituted as a differential trace: neither present nor absent" (Duque-Estrada, 2020, p. 25), Derrida radically rethinks the structure of signification, understanding that it inhabits a play of differences that operates within a "referential or referral structure ('traces of traces') intrinsic to anything, or any fact" (Duque-Estrada, 2020, p. 29).

The differentiability that inhabits the structure of the trace – "It is necessary to think of the trace before the entity" (Derrida, 1973, p. 57) – allows us to consider presence as an effect of differentiation (Duque-Estrada, 2002) and to understand that there are references, there is understanding, there is legibility, however, there is no way to direct the reference so that it reaches a final point. Something fictional, literary, always contaminates the reference, the referred (Derrida; Ferraris, 2006).

Thus, we are challenged to think about difference in curriculum theory not as a possible adjective for subject, education, curriculum, literacy/literacies, for example, but as a disposition to reflect on these terms, always considering the challenge of producing political readings while acknowledging the fissure within every structure and that every process of identification occurs in an undecidable terrain, that is, it is the product of a possible language game among other possible ones.

The notion of the trace as that which announces and differs contributes to the recognition of this aporetic logic because "the trace posits the impossibility of a pure origin and of a 'closure of becoming.' Every trace is a trace of a trace (trace de trace)" (Amitrano, 2015, p. 621). This affirmation of difference, of radical alterity, places us in front of the necessity to acknowledge the endogenous lack of all relationality, which allows us to affirm that any idea about "all", "us", even if it makes sense, has already set aside other relationalities.

It's crucial to emphasize that Derridean philosophy inscribes us into a mode of thinking that does not abandon the universal but invites us to conceive of it differently: not as a fixed structure, essence, or substance, but as a constantly evolving imperative. Derrida does not seek to dismiss the notion of “us” but rather to consider this experience beyond the paradigm of “the whole”.

Therefore, Derrida urges us to resist the telos presumed by the universal—which can be signified in the idea of education, curriculum, literacy/literacies, multiliteracies, alphabetization – since, considering the spectral order proposed by Derrida’s studies, one is the condition/unconditionality of the other, one participates in the other, in a logic that is non-binary or hierarchical, but of co-belonging, combining absence and presence, differing and differentiating, without essentializing. In this context, I advocate for a perspective that considers literacy/literacies within the framework of the trace, within *différance*, without presuppositions, as this prevents the formation of an “us” that comprehends the ongoing negotiation with radical alterity as identities always in motion as a means to resist the violence of the universal “all”.

National Literacy Program (PNA) and the Term “Literacy” in Place of “Literacy/Literacies (Letramento/s)”¹

Although it is possible to identify shifts in meaning in policies such as Pró-Letramento and PNAIC regarding the standardization of a sense of literacy/literacies that disciplines appropriate ways to achieve its implementation — emphasizing a prescriptive and predictive understanding of curriculum — I interpret that it is in the text of the PNA where this understanding of curriculum is most strongly emphasized, highlighting a descriptive character of the policy. The PNA can be considered conservative in Brazil. This assertion is primarily based on the debate developed by Lopes (2019) about conservative educational demands in Brazil.

Considering a discursive approach, the author delves into the discussion of conservative and ultra-liberal educational demands that rearticulated in the political landscape following the 2018 presidential elections in Brazil. The researcher posits that these demands extend beyond the educational realm and are shaped by antagonism toward “Cultural Marxism”, which is equated with the Sciences, particularly the Humanities and Social Sciences, and public universities. The author argues that this critique of intellectualism also constitutes an anti-political movement, “which continues to attempt to hegemonize another framework for education in the country through the articulation of differential demands that antagonize what has been termed ‘Cultural Marxism’” (Lopes, 2019, p. 2).

This movement, associated with conservative and anti-intellectual thought, mobilizes other signifiers in the articulatory chain to block meanings that these conservative, often reactionary

¹ Translation notes: Although the term “Letramento/s” can be translated by literacy/literacies, as it has happened previously in this paper, in this context there is a different connotation from how the term Literacy (from the Portuguese *Literacia*) was used at this point for the text. Though we have used Alphabetization, referring to *Alfabetização*, and Literacy, as a means to refer to *Letramento* before, we will now on use the term Literacy as an equivalent for the Portuguese *Literacia*, and the term literacy/literacies (letramento/s) to refer to *letramento/s*. All of the meanings implied by each of the terms have been sufficiently stated in the text.

demands oppose. In this context, I argue that the PNA constitutes a political text that not only emphasizes a sense of curricular policy as something that prescribes and institutes what should happen in schools but, more importantly, seeks to erase debates developed in the field that discusses literacy/literacies (*letramento/s*). This is part of an anti-political movement driven by a ghostly discourse that relies on fundamentalism and views the other — enemy/adversary — not as someone to be confronted but as the cause of social horror, thereby needing to be erased. This effort aims to eliminate “any possibility of discourse outside the conservative-liberal spectrum, promoting a reactionary and anti-democratic government agenda” (Lopes, 2019, p. 13).

The omission of the signifier literacy/literacies (*letramento/s*) in the policy text in favor of “literacy” supports this interpretation. Instead, the curricular document employs the signifier “literacy” under the justification of “aligning with internationally consolidated scientific terminology” (Brasil, 2019, p. 21). This choice projects an identity for “literacy” that dismisses the possibility of this signifier being contested in the countries referenced by the document, as if the meaning the political text aims to establish for this term is singular and well-defined.

By invoking the demand for “alignment with internationally consolidated scientific terminology”, the idea of literacy advocated by the PNA text seeks to attain an unquestionable status, thereby opposing demands for other possible interpretations of this signifier. A restricted sense of literacy is advocated, defined as the “set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to reading and writing, as well as their productive practice” (Brasil, 2019, p. 21). This is specified at “various levels” through the deployment of other signifiers that aim to classify and categorize these “different levels of literacy” in a very defined manner, namely: “basic literacy (from preschool to the 1st year of elementary school)”, “intermediate literacy (from the 2nd to the 5th year)”, and “disciplinary literacy (from the 6th year to high school)” (Brasil, 2019). The PNA also mentions “emergent literacy” and “family literacy” (Brasil, 2019)

The political text thus emphasizes a notion of literacy reduced to skills related to reading and writing, as well as to the “acquisition, transmission, and production of knowledge” related to them (Brasil, 2019). This perspective is driven by an instrumental view of knowledge, where “the relevant knowledge to be taught in school should be knowledge capable of being translated into competencies, skills, concepts, and performances that can be transferred and applied in social and economic contexts outside of the school” (Lopes; Macedo, 2011, p. 74).

Regarding the omission of literacy/literacies (*letramento/s*) in the PNA, Bunzen (2019b, p. 46-47 – author’s emphasis in bold) highlights that “such **silencing** is not neutral and certainly is part of a larger discursive strategy **to erase** yet another field of knowledge and discussions about literacy in Brazil.” Summarizing this interpretation, Caldeira and Frangella (2023, p. 10) state that the PNA “constitutes a curriculum policy that, in addition to seeking the closure/fixation of meanings, also creates a devaluation of studies on alphabetization and literacy/literacies (*letramento/s*) in Brazil.”

I understand that the choice of the term “literacy” is not random, and I interpret that it brings together discourses about “skills”, “productive practice”, “efficiency”, and “capabilities” into a field of signification. This configures a mechanism to control the meaning of this term “in the most restrictive sense”, “in its narrow version”, and “disregards all Brazilian and international discussions about social practices of writing usage” (Bunzen, 2019a, p. 3-4).

However, relying on the heuristic potential of Derrida's notion of trace – which recognizes the radically prior character of a system of differences in relation to every signifier and every signified (Dardeau, 2011) – I understand that there is only dissemination and that any process of attributing meaning and attempting to grasp a signifier is a cultural and possible process within a system of differences. Therefore, while I understand that there are terms sedimented according to a metaphysical paradigm of presence, I argue that the issue here does not lie precisely in the adoption of “literacy/literacies (*letramento/s*)” or “literacy”, but in how academic texts and curriculum policies operate with these meanings within the intricate web of references, of traces and traces.

Taking this into account, I argue that the reduced sense of literacy advocated by the PNA seeks to stifle the possibility of conceiving curriculum *within* difference, within the movement of deferral, as a postponement of meanings. By advocating for an entirely technical and reductionist character of literacy, the PNA engenders a sense of curriculum as a pedagogical organization guided by Tylerian rationality, emphasizing and endorsing an efficiency-oriented approach.

Concluding Remarks

Through the convergence of Discourse Theory and Derridean philosophy, it is possible to affirm the presence of *différance* – the deferral of meaning – as the fixation of a meaning around a policy name is always partial and provisional. There are traces of traces – a constant process of deferral marked by a flow of ambivalences and translations that challenge finality in politics. Shedding light on this issue allows us to consider the impossibility of meanings being transported, as there is always a relation to new referential meanings.

It also allows us to think about how documents like the PNA – referring to other regulatory mechanisms – constitute attempts to curtail the difference or the perception of differing. Therefore, the demands for a single/common/minimal curriculum tend strongly to discredit the experiences produced in municipalities, in school units, in a movement that seeks to argue that the work developed in schools does not favor “good” quality education.

This can make hospitality difficult for other literacies, meaning contingently. Investing in local curriculum production contexts does not imply strengthening the idea of fixed local identities, but rather emphasizing how policies are constituted differently, as processes of identification/meaning/negotiation. Consequently, it allows us to advance the defense that it is possible to have national curricular policies strengthening local policies and schools, in a movement of un/conditional hospitality (Derrida, 2012), which enables *the democracy yet to come*, always a promise, always insufficient, but marked by this un/conditional hospitality that welcomes *the other* in an act of underscored generosity, paradoxically, by rights and duties of both the newcomer and the host.

I propose literacy/literacies (*letramento/s*) as a post-structural trace/signifier potent for contemplating proposals not only related to the appropriation of the alphabetic writing system but also considering the political dispute over the meaning of literacies as always contingent. I argue that these proposals mobilize actions in such a way that belongings/identifications/subjectivities are not taken as pre-existing and put at risk of being banished.

To consider possibilities of signifying literacies that do not simply reduce to a direct relationship with writing does not mean diminishing the significance of writing. Rather, it proposes a movement that, while emphasizing its importance as a way of acting in the world, announces the possibility of not diminishing other ways of thinking/feeling/living through the thought of deconstruction, thereby inviting diverse epistemological perspectives.

In mobilizing meanings for what could be understood as literacies, I argue that this should be done from an understanding of curriculum as cultural enunciation, as the production of meanings; based on the assertion that curricula are constituted in the struggle for signification. (Lopes; Macedo, 2011). I state this as powerful for paying attention to the violence of re-cognition (Macedo, 2017) and the attempts to constrain meanings in the political negotiation with difference. I understand that curriculum, signified in the ceaseless movement of deferral, prompts us to signify literacy-curriculum as a disposition toward alterity, toward the unknown that calls upon us and to which we cannot refrain from responding.

References

AMITRANO, Georgia. "Com-por", "rastros" e "espectros" de Derrida. *Revista Educação e Filosofia*, v. 29, n.58, p. 615-630, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.14393/REVEDFIL.issn.0102-6801.v29n58a2015-p615a630>

BARTON, David; HAMILTON, Mary. *Local Literacies: reading and writing in one community*. London: Routledge, 1998.

BRASIL. *Pró-Letramento: Programa de Formação Continuada de Professores dos Anos/Séries Iniciais do Ensino Fundamental: alfabetização e linguagem*. Ed. rev. e ampl. Incluindo SAEB/Prova Brasil matriz de referência/Secretaria de Educação Básica. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica, 2008. 364 p.

BRASIL. *Pacto Nacional pela Alfabetização na Idade Certa. Currículo na perspectiva da inclusão e da diversidade: as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais da Educação Básica e o ciclo de alfabetização*. Caderno 01 / Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica, Diretoria de Apoio à Gestão Educacional. Brasília: MEC, SEB, 2015. 104 p.

BRASIL. *PNA - Política Nacional de Alfabetização/Secretaria de Alfabetização (Caderno)*. Brasília: MEC, 2019.

BUNZEN, Clecio. *Letramento ou literacia?* Entrevista com Clecio Bunzen (UFPE) sobre diferenças conceituais e práticas dos termos relacionados a políticas, estudos, ensino e aprendizagem da língua escrita, 2019a. <https://www.cenpec.org.br/tematicas/letramento-e-ou-literacia-distincoes-e-aproximacoes>.

BUNZEN, Clecio. Um breve decálogo sobre o conceito de 'literacia' na Política Nacional de Alfabetização (PNA, 2019). *Revista Brasileira de Alfabetização - ABAlf*, v. 1, n. 10 (edição especial), p. 44-51, 2019b. <https://revistaabalf.com.br/index.html/index.php/rabalf/article/view/352>.

CALDEIRA, Maria Carolina da Silva; FRANGELLA, Rita. Letramento em políticas curriculares de alfabetização: relações de poder-saber em torno do conceito cunhado por Magda Soares. *Revista Brasileira de Alfabetização*, n. 20 (edição especial), p. 1-14, 2023. <https://revistaabalf.com.br/index.html/index.php/rabalf/article/view/748>

- COELHO, Maria Priscilla. A questão da alteridade no pensamento de Derrida. *In: SEMINÁRIO DE INICIAÇÃO CIENTÍFICA DA PUC-RIO*, 15., 2007, Rio de Janeiro. *Anais...* 2007. https://www.puc-rio.br/ensinopesq/ccpg/pibic/relatorio_resumo2007/relatorios/fil/fil_maria_priscilla_coelho.pdf
- DARDEAU, Denise. Jacques Derrida: da linguagem à escritura, da escritura como transbordamento. *Ensaio Filosóficos*, v. III, 2011. https://www.ensaiosfilosoficos.com.br/Artigos/Artigo3/Denise_Dardeau.pdf
- DERRIDA, Jacques. *Gramatologia*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1973.
- DERRIDA, Jacques. *Espectros de Marx*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, 1994.
- DERRIDA, Jacques. Uma certa possibilidade impossível de dizer o acontecimento. *Cerrados*, Brasília, v. 21, n. 33, p. 229-251, 2012. <https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/cerrados/article/view/26148>.
- DERRIDA, Jacques. Observações sobre desconstrução e pragmatismo. *In: MOUFFE, Chantal. (Org.). Desconstrução e Pragmatismo*. Tradução: Victor Dias Maia Soares. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad X, 2016.
- DERRIDA, Jacques; FERRARIS, Maurizio. *O gosto do segredo*. Lisboa: Fim de Século, 2006.
- DUQUE-ESTRADA, Paulo Cesar. Derrida e a escritura. *In: DUQUE-ESTRADA, Paulo Cesar (Org.). Às margens: a propósito de Derrida*. Rio de Janeiro: Loyola/PUC-Rio, 2002. p. 9-28.
- DUQUE-ESTRADA, Paulo Cesar. *Estudos ético-políticos sobre Derrida*. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad X/PUC-Rio, 2020.
- GEE, James Paul. The New Literacy Studies and the “Social Turn”. *In: BARTON, David; HAMILTON, Mary; IVANIC, Roz. Situated Literacies: reading and writing in context*. Londres: Routledge, 2000. p. 180-196.
- HEATH, Shirley Brice. *Ways with words. Language, life and work in the community and classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- KLEIMAN, Ângela (Org.). *Os significados do letramento: uma nova perspectiva sobre a prática social da escrita*. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 1995.
- LACLAU, Ernesto. *Topos & Tropos*, Córdoba, n. 1, p. 1-7, 2014.
- LACLAU, Ernesto; MOUFFE, Chantal. *Hegemonia e Estratégia Socialista: por uma política democrática radical*. São Paulo, Intermeios, 2015.
- LOPES, Alice Casimiro. Normatividade e intervenção política: em defesa de um investimento radical. *In: LOPES, Alice Casimiro; MENDONÇA, Daniel de. (Orgs.). A Teoria do Discurso de Ernesto Laclau: ensaios críticos e entrevistas*. São Paulo: Annablume, 2015. p. 117-148.
- LOPES, Alice Casimiro. Articulações de Demandas Educativas (Im)Possibilitadas pelo Antagonismo ao “Marxismo Cultural”. *Revista AAPE*, v. 27, n. 109, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.4881>
- LOPES, Alice Casimiro; MACEDO, Elizabeth. *Teorias de Currículo*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.
- MACEDO, Elizabeth. Mas a escola não tem que ensinar? Conhecimento, reconhecimento e alteridade na teoria do currículo. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, v. 17, n. 3, p. 539-554, 2017. <https://www.curriculosemfronteiras.org/vol17iss3articles/macedo.pdf>
- SAUSSURE, Ferdinand de. *Curso de linguística geral*. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2006.

SOARES, Magda. Letramento e alfabetização: as muitas facetas. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, n. 25, p. 5-17, 2004. <https://www.scielo.br/jj/rbedu/a/89tX3SGw5G4dNWdHRkRrZk/?format=pdf&lang=pt>

SOARES, Magda. *Letramento: um tema em três gêneros*. 3. ed., 6. reimp. Belo Horizonte: 143 Autêntica, 2020a.

SOARES, Magda. *Alfalettrar: Toda criança pode aprender a ler e a escrever*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2020b.

STREET, Brian Vincent. *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

STREET, Brian Vincent. *Literacy and development*. Ethnographic perspectives. Londres: Routledge, 2001.

STREET, Brian Vincent. Os novos estudos sobre o letramento: histórico e perspectivas. In: MARINHO, Marildes; CARVALHO, Gilcinei Teodoro. (Orgs.). *Cultura escrita e letramento*. Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais: Editora UFMG, 2010. p. 33-53.

STREET, Brian. Vincent. *Letramentos sociais: Abordagens críticas do letramento no desenvolvimento, na etnografia e na educação*. Tradução de Marcos Bagno. Rio de Janeiro: Parábola, 2014.

ANDRÉIA MELLO RANGEL

Ph.D in Education, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ) Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Teacher, Secretaria Municipal de Educação, Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

SUPPORT/FUNDING

Not applicable

AVAILABILITY OF RESEARCH DATA:

Not applicable

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

RANGEL, Andréia Mello. Literacy/Literacies in Curricular Literacy Policies: meanings in dispute. *Educar em Revista*, Curitiba, v. 40, e93106, 2024. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1984-0411.93106>

This article was translated by Aline Javarini, E-mail: ajavarini@gmail.com. After being typeset, it was submitted for validation by the author before publication.

Received: 10/22/2023

Approved: 07/05/2024