Macrothink Institute™

Education and Linguistics Research
ISSN 2377-1356
2025, Vol. 11, No. 1

Theoretical-Methodological Assumptions of the Didactics of Plurilinguism: Thinking About Linguistic Education

Sweder Souza

Faculty of Language Studies, Institute of Linguistics, Letters and Arts, Federal University of Southern and Southeastern Pará — Rod. BR-230 (Transamazônica), Cidade Jardim, Av. dos Ipês, s/n.º, Marabá, PA, Brazil

Post-Graduate Program of Letters, Human Sciences Sector, Federal University of Paraná — Rua General Carneiro, 460, 10º andar – sala 1018/1019, Curitiba, Paraná, PR, Brazil

Research Center for Didactics and Technology in Trainer Training, Department of Education and Psychology, University of Aveiro — Campus Universitário de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal

E-mail: swedersouza@gmail.com

Received: March 12, 2025 Accepted: May 10, 2025 Published: June 3, 2025

doi:10.5296/elr.v11i1.22915 URL: https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v11i1.22915

Abstract

This paper discusses the theoretical and methodological foundations of Plurilingualism Didactics (DP) as an alternative and critical proposal to the monolingual approach that still dominates language teaching. Based on the distinction between bilingualism, multilingualism and plurilingualism, we propose a reflection on Language Education (LE) in contexts marked by sociolinguistic and cultural diversity. Considering the Brazilian scenario of erasure of minority languages and the absence of effective public policies to promote plurilingualism, we defend DP as an inclusive and formative pedagogical strategy, capable of valuing the linguistic repertoires of subjects and developing Plurilingual and Pluricultural Competence (CP). The adopted approach presupposes a paradigmatic change in teacher training, school practices and curriculum, highlighting the importance of institutional language policies that recognize linguistic plurality as a vector of democratic citizenship and meaningful learning.

Keywords: Linguistic Education, Didactics of Plurilingualism

1. Introduction

Contemporary times have revealed an educational scenario in constant transformation, marked by migratory flows, cultural contacts and heterogeneous linguistic practices. In this context, it is urgent to rethink the ways of teaching and learning languages, especially in countries like Brazil, whose sociolinguistic reality is deeply marked by diversity. However, the ideology of monolingualism, rooted in discourses of cultural and national homogenization, still structures many of the pedagogical practices and linguistic policies in schools, rendering invisible other languages and ways of speaking that do not fit into the model of the standard norm of Portuguese.

Language education, understood as a formative process that goes beyond the mere instrumental learning of a language, must be attentive to the multiple linguistic and cultural repertoires that individuals mobilize in their daily lives. It is related to citizenship, the recognition of diversity and the right to use one's own languages in educational spaces. In light of this, Plurilingualism Didactics (DP) has emerged as a field of reflection and pedagogical action focused on valuing this diversity, recognizing that individuals learn and use languages in unique trajectories that span different contexts and experiences.

The concept of plurilingualism, although often confused with bilingualism or multilingualism, has fundamental specificities. While bilingualism tends to be understood as the mastery of two languages—often from childhood—and multilingualism as the coexistence of several languages in the same territory, plurilingualism focuses on individuals and their ability to mobilize varied linguistic repertoires, even if partially, in an integrated and functional way. It is, therefore, an approach centered on language practices and the construction of meanings based on the articulation between languages and cultures.

This perspective destabilizes the idealized notion of full competence in all languages, often associated with the figure of the "native speaker". On the contrary, plurilingualism recognizes that linguistic skills are always partial, situated and dynamic, and that the communicative value of a language does not depend on its complete mastery, but on its functionality in real contexts of use. This broadens the possibilities of learning and legitimizes linguistic knowledge that has traditionally been disregarded by schools.

In Brazil, the presence of indigenous communities, quilombolas, international migrants and speakers of heritage languages confirms the existence of a historical linguistic diversity, often neglected. The very constitution of the national territory involved multiple linguistic contacts, which were often silenced by policies of assimilation and repression. The dictatorship of standard Portuguese, reinforced by national unification projects, generated a social imaginary of monolingualism, which still persists in the educational system.

In light of this scenario, the Didactics of Plurilingualism proposes not only the introduction of new languages in schools, but a paradigmatic change in the way language teaching is conceived. This implies shifting the focus from the exclusive teaching of a single foreign language to pedagogical practices that recognize, mobilize and integrate the linguistic repertoires of the subjects. This approach requires rethinking the curriculum, teacher training,

teaching materials and institutional language policies in order to promote equity and the recognition of plurality.

Teacher Training (TP) plays a central role in this context. It is in initial and continuing training that future teachers can be made aware of a critical perspective of language, understanding the complexity of the linguistic and cultural phenomena involved in the educational act. In addition, TP should provide spaces for reflection on the teachers' own linguistic biographies, their attitudes towards diversity and their teaching practices, creating conditions for the construction of multilingual and multicultural competence.

This competence, as formulated by authors such as Coste, Moore and Zarate (2009), refers to the ability to use different languages to varying degrees, articulating intercultural experiences in a flexible, critical and creative way. It is not restricted to technical knowledge of languages, but involves socio-affective, communicative, strategic and identity dimensions. Developing this competence is essential for teachers to be able to work in plural educational contexts, recognizing diversity as a value and as a pedagogical power.

By mobilizing these assumptions, this text seeks to discuss the theoretical and methodological foundations of Plurilingualism Didactics, articulating concepts, policies, practices and challenges for the establishment of a more democratic and inclusive linguistic education. The proposal is to contribute to the strengthening of a pedagogical perspective that respects the linguistic and cultural diversity of subjects, promotes equity in access to knowledge and expands the possibilities of social, political and communicative participation of all those involved in the educational process.

Therefore, thinking about linguistic education from the perspective of plurilingualism is also a political and ethical act, which is part of the fight for a more just, plural school that is committed to linguistic rights – as in the works of Souza (2022, 2023, 2024). Plurilingualism Didactics, in this sense, is not just a methodology, but an epistemological and pedagogical perspective that challenges traditional ways of teaching languages and invites educators, researchers and managers to (re)construct their practices based on the recognition of the multiple voices that inhabit the classroom.

2. Thinking about Plurilingual Education at School

The notion of plurilingual and intercultural education can serve as a didactic response—among other possible ones—to the needs of schools and their main actors, students and teachers. This notion results from a paradigm shift that has occurred over time in language teaching through a series of transformations that have deeply altered and contributed to the evolution from a traditional monolingual conception, as discussed in the second chapter, toward the plurilingual conception addressed in this work.

Language Didactics (LD) has been enriched over time by new approaches, such as the Pluralistic Approaches (PA) that will be explored later. However, certain shifts must occur for this plural perspective to reach the school context. It is necessary to move away from a closed conception of teaching the school language (SL) toward a broader ecological approach that considers the languages within students' repertoires, the languages present in the surrounding

environment, and those taught in schools.

A monolithic didactics that separates languages into clearly differentiated domains—unrelated to each other and characterized by different teaching methods (foreign languages, regional/minority/schooling/classical/prestigious languages)—must be replaced by a decompartmentalized and holistic conception of languages. This conception, while not denying the normative, cognitive, or didactic differences between languages, should grant them equal prestige in the classroom.

In other words, it is necessary to recognize the languages in students' repertoires (speakers of regional/minority, migrant, or non-standard/non-legitimized languages in school settings—even the schooling language itself) even when these are not the direct object of instruction.

Thus, a functional and utilitarian view of language teaching—primarily focused on linguistic and communicative competence—should be elevated to a broader formative conception of language, as a process for democratic citizenship, social inclusion, and respect for the diversity and plurality of languages and cultures. This leads to the formation of the subject and future citizen (DE MAURO, 2018), global language education, plurilingual and intercultural education (Council of Europe, 2009), and education for the plurality of languages and cultures understood as means and vectors for knowledge construction beyond the linguistic level.

We need to transcend the vision centered on acquiring competencies and skills in all linguistic activities (speaking, writing, reading), and instead develop an awareness of the verbal phenomenon as it occurs across multiple languages, alongside traditional education. Linguistic education in the teaching-learning process should be conceived plurilingually and interculturally, with a clear emphasis on valuing the linguistic and cultural repertoires of learners.

We must also move away from viewing the native speaker as the model and adopt a more realistic view of the plurilingual repertoire as a progressive construction where mistakes do not play a punitive or corrective role. Language is unstable, relative, and dynamic, while competencies must be acquired within various linguistic systems (school/regional/standard/formal) depending on frequency and fields of use.

It is important to overcome a monolingual discourse framework in classroom practices and move away from viewing the school as the guardian of the standard norm. Instead, the school should be seen as a space where the internal variation of any language—including the language of schooling—is a subject of study. Methodologies do not need to maintain a compartmentalized and competitive stance between the different didactic approaches used to teach SL; rather, they should reflect an integration of such approaches and their flexible use to meet diverse teaching and learning needs across different contexts.

LD should not be understood as uniform and standardizing, but rather as attentive to the specificities of each context and the awareness of the need to contextualize both approaches and practices. These and many other changes, when combined, contribute to the paradigm

shift that characterizes what we call Plurilingual Didactics (PD). They are accompanied by other equally fundamental educational orientations, such as: promoting student autonomy, considering educational institutions and environments beyond the school, active and critical use of new technologies in the classroom, and preparing learners for lifelong learning, among others.

As Cavalli (2014) points out, these approaches should not be seen as delegating or negating the school's role. On the contrary, they reinforce a new duty for the school: to prepare all students to continue and deepen their learning throughout life while developing critical thinking. In general, all these changes do not seek to reduce language acquisition but rather to diversify and enrich the ways in which it occurs.

To deal with these changes and to consider the specific configuration they assume in each unique context, it is essential to think about language policy, curriculum, and the (re)structuring of the school—not as a singular concern for language teaching but as a constitutive and transversal dimension of all areas of education and school life.

In this case, all school actors are involved: teachers, students, families, pedagogical staff, and school leadership. This plurilingual curriculum must be attentive to national opportunities and capable of adapting to and responding to the specific needs of the sociocultural and sociolinguistic context in which the school is situated.

The language policy that should be embodied in the school curriculum must not be just another document whose impact ends with its writing: it should be a continuous source of inspiration for all stakeholders. It would help shape the specific identity of each school. Because embracing languages transversally means engaging with all aspects of education: plurality, diversity, and alterity in all their forms—social, ethnic, gender-based, religious.

In contrast, a plurilingual approach emphasizes the development of effective communication skills that draw on our linguistic and cultural experiences interactively. Plurilingualism is a lifelong activity—a process of learning the languages of home, society, school, and other peoples; it acknowledges the partial nature of one's knowledge of any language, whether it be a first language or not.

Therefore, plurilingualism dismisses the ideal of the native speaker as the ultimate goal and instead promotes the ideal of an effective pluralistic communicator who draws upon a varied linguistic and cultural repertoire in a flexible, creative, and individual manner (Council of Europe, 2007). As such, the concept of plurilingualism represents a significant qualitative leap in our understanding of language and is reflected in a language education based on exposure and use of language.

In this sense, even though the terms bilingualism and multilingualism are well established and widely disseminated in the literature, we choose to use the term plurilingualism. We understand that working with multiple languages requires flexibility from teachers, as many of them may not "master" a second language. For this reason, the more contact teachers have with other languages, the greater the opportunity for new discoveries and collaborative learning with their students.

PD can be understood as an intentional form of Language Education (DE MAURO, 2018), as it does not imply the triangulation of two, three, or four languages within a hegemonic vision of learning one foreign language, separate from the mother tongue, then another, and so forth. Instead, it invites a rethinking of the categories of L1, L2, and FL based on integration and fluidity between different varieties—ranging from dialects to standard languages—including differences between Brazilian and European Portuguese, varieties of other Lusophone countries, regional and social variations within each society, and the registers involved in issues of standard norms and linguistic prejudice.

3. Plurilingual and Pluricultural Competence

In relation to Language Didactics (LD), it is important to understand the notion of Plurilingual and Pluricultural Competence (PPC or PC), which, according to Coste, Moore, and Zarate (2009, p. 11), can be defined as follows:

"(…) Plurilingual and Pluricultural Competence refers to the ability to use languages for the purposes of communication and participation in intercultural interaction, where a person, seen as a social actor, has proficiency, to varying degrees, in several languages and experience in several cultures. This is not seen as the overlapping or juxtaposition of distinct competences, but rather as the existence of a complex or even composite competence upon which the social actor can draw."

According to the notion of PPC, individuals possess resources that can be used to deal with linguistic and cultural diversity, as well as with otherness, when they wish to interact in exolingual contexts and adapt to a multicultural community. This not only allows individuals to communicate and relate to others but also to become more aware of the linguistic and cultural differences between themselves and others. In other words, to promote PPC, it is not enough to diversify the offer of languages beyond English—as the dominant international language—but it is also necessary to provide diverse, dynamic, and real sociocultural experiences.

In oral or written communication processes, individuals move from one language to another in a process of mutual understanding, relying on their knowledge of a number of languages and varieties. This should imply a diversification in the language offerings within an institution or educational system so that students can develop their plurilingual competences.

PPC, as both an approach and a methodology, in line with Dabène (1994) and others, offers an interesting framework for language teaching and intercultural experiences. It can be particularly beneficial for teachers who aim to define learning objectives and language proficiency levels not with the goal of achieving native-like fluency in a second language, but rather in terms of success levels appropriate to the specific needs, characteristics, and objectives of a given group of students.

Promoting plurilingualism through conscious pedagogical interventions creates opportunities for individuals to develop their plurilingual competences. Thus, encouraging an understanding of otherness among languages should lead learners to construct their own language use within a critical and reflective paradigmatic context.

According to Gonçalves and Andrade (2007), Plurilingual Competence is not limited to linguistic knowledge but also includes social, cultural, pragmatic, and strategic skills. As they state: "(…) this competence is relatively autonomous in relation to school content and materials, as it is structured and evolves beyond the school, in other contexts—contexts of life and personal development—asserting itself as a plural, evolving and flexible competence, necessarily imbalanced and open to the enrichment of new competences based on new verbal experiences" (Goncalves & Andrade, 2007, p. 66).

This PC is composed of four dimensions: the socio-affective dimension; the management of linguistic-communicative repertoires; the management of learning repertoires; and the management of interaction. These dimensions can be developed through the construction of a cultural and linguistic identity based on diverse experiences of encountering the other and through the ability to learn via a shared, diversified experience of engaging with multiple languages and cultures (Goncalves & Andrade, 2007; Andrade & Araujo e sa, 2001).

In this case, promoting PC means that the teacher is not only responsible for teaching a specific language, but also for enabling the construction and development of plurilingual competence by respecting, valuing, and including other languages in their teaching practice.

The Socio-Affective Dimension addresses the social and emotional aspects involved in the learning and use of multiple languages. It includes the ability to understand and respect cultural and linguistic diversity, as well as the skill to establish effective interpersonal relationships in different linguistic contexts. Moreover, it involves managing emotions such as anxiety, motivation, and confidence when learning and using foreign languages.

The Linguistic-Communicative Repertoires Dimension focuses on the knowledge and practical skills of the languages a person possesses. It involves not only grammatical and lexical competence but also communicative competence, which includes knowing when and how to use different registers and styles of language. A plurilingual individual is capable of switching between languages and adapting communication according to the context and the interlocutor.

The Learning Repertoires Management Dimension is related to the ability to efficiently manage one's own language learning process. It includes setting learning goals, choosing appropriate learning strategies, self-assessing progress, and adapting learning approaches based on experience. It also encompasses the ability to transfer knowledge and skills from one language to another.

Finally, the Interaction Management Dimension involves the ability to effectively manage interactions in multiple languages. It includes strategies to overcome communication barriers, such as asking for clarification, using simplified language, resorting to other languages, or using nonverbal forms of communication. A plurilingual individual knows how to adapt communication to facilitate mutual understanding and maintain the flow of conversation in multilingual situations.

The development of Plurilingual and Pluricultural Competence (PC) goes beyond the mastery of multiple languages; it is a dynamic process that involves intercultural, emotional, cognitive,

and interactive skills. These dimensions work together to enable individuals to successfully navigate an increasingly globalized and linguistically diverse world. In short, PC from the perspective of Plurilingual Didactics (PD) expands the questioning around the relationship between education, the individual, and society—as an ongoing, never-finished or complete process, but one that is dynamic in its movement of advances and setbacks, producing a dialogical and polyphonic relationship between languages and those who speak them—a true construction of multiple voices (Volochinov, 2016 [1979]).

It is important to pay attention to what actually happens in life, in everyday interactions, as this offers important insights into how to transpose teaching issues into meaningful classroom practices. When we place the aforementioned theoretical perspectives within the field of Language Didactics, the central question becomes how to conceive of teaching that is informed by a more holistic and plural understanding of language, interconnecting different spaces of language use—such as the classroom, the street, or the marketplace.

In the following section, we will explore the Pluralistic Approaches currently proposed (Candelir et al., 2012), in order to intertwine them with the aspects previously discussed regarding PD and to reflect on plural and decentralized methodological proposals that move away from a potentially monolingual practice in the teaching of the Portuguese language.

4. The *Savoirs*

In this thesis, a pluralistic approach is considered as any approach that implements activities involving linguistic and cultural varieties. Thus, a pluralistic approach differs from a singular approach, where the sole focus is on a specific language or culture, considered in isolation.

Continuing from the previous section, Plurilingual Competence is characterized by the fact that it does not consist of "(…) a collection of distinct and separate communication skills according to languages" (Candelier et al., 2012), but rather as a "(…) plurilingual and pluricultural competence that encompasses the entire available linguistic repertoire" (Candelier et al., 2012, p. 129).

Therefore, the Council of Europe has sought to shape the contours of a plurilingual and intercultural approach to language teaching and learning, aiming to minimize distances between peoples of different countries. An example of this is the Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures – CARAP (Candelier et al., 2012).

According to CARAP:

(…) we refer to Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures as didactic approaches that implement teaching and learning activities involving (more than one) linguistic and cultural varieties. We contrast them with approaches that could be called "singular," in which the only object of attention considered in the didactic process is a specific language or culture, considered in isolation. These singular approaches were particularly valued when structural and communicative methods developed, and in any translation, any use of the first language was banned from teaching (Candelier et al., 2012, p. 6, authors' emphasis).

The term "Pluralistic Approaches" (PAs) thus refers to didactic approaches used in teaching

and learning activities that involve varieties of languages and cultures. The same document outlines this concept in the form of four pluralistic approaches: the intercultural approach, integrated didactics of different languages, intercomprehension between related languages, and awakening to languages.

These PAs will then offer students activities related simultaneously to various languages, cultures, and contexts. It is, therefore, about conceiving and perceiving the valorization of the conception of a Plurilingual and Pluricultural Competence (PPC) in a global manner. Candelier et al. (2015) construct a flexible definition of PAs through an attempt to define the emergence of a didactic perspective that currently constitutes the notion of Pluralistic Didactics.

This attempt at definition is beginning to stabilize but presents itself as a fine example of an emerging and innovative didactic concept. Although this perspective is widely implemented in certain European educational contexts, this does not mean it cannot be transposed to other realities in other countries, as culture or the pluricultural apparatus permeates the entire world.

As the concept develops over time, we can, however, take stock of the common skills for all PAs. Understanding that they do not function hierarchically, with all four at the same level, but for organizational purposes, we will start with the Intercultural Approach. This approach is based on didactic principles that support phenomena related to one or more cultural areas to understand different cultures. It also seeks to implement strategies aimed at encouraging reflection on methods of contact between individuals with different cultural backgrounds.

At the end of the 1970s, by inaugurating the approach based on communicative competence, Language Didactics became aware that no interaction is possible outside a cultural context (Moore, 2001; Zarate, 2001). This concept, relatively recent in the human sciences, employs a notion that allows, considering the interaction between speakers from different sociocultural contexts, the possibility of one opening up to the other while maintaining their original identity (Salomão, 2012).

For example, multiculturalism (cultural, religious, ethnic, political, gender identity) is a concept that promotes the recognition of difference between cultures, each individual being considered a member of their group. It implies, first and foremost, the recognition of an individual identity. While “multi-” assumes an aggregation of diverse elements (in this case, individuals and/or cultures), emphasizing difference and delimitation, “inter-” refers to exchange, dynamic interaction, the desire to meet, to know each other reciprocally, and to interact without renouncing one’s own identity (Salomão, 2012).

Byram (2008) operationalizes a model of Intercultural Competence (IC) and Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC), to mark the place of this competence within the communicative approach. In this sense, for a speaker to be interculturally competent, they must develop five savoirs.

Byram’s (2008) work contributes to studies on Interculturality, ICC, and IC. This knowledge, following these five suggestions, gives us the opportunity to think about teaching and

learning in a more intercultural way.

Knowing how to be provides us with the posture or attitude to open up and reflect on two or more cultures; knowing refers to knowledge about social groups, their products, and practices; knowing how to understand and knowing how to learn help us mobilize competencies to understand events of other cultures, to acquire new knowledge about them, and to interact in certain contexts; knowing how to engage requires skills of critical cultural awareness of one or more cultures and the commitment to negotiate commitments for ourselves and with others.

Thus, the target culture is no longer presented as an ideal to be achieved, but the goal is to develop a set of knowledge, skills, and savoirs with characteristics specific to each individual, based on each culture, and to seek a balance between two or more standards, that is, "intercultural," allowing the subject to understand and act in both communication spaces.

For this, it is necessary, first, to lead the native speaker to reflect on their own culture, present their interpretation to the interlocutor of the other culture, and then negotiate a possible interpretation for the different parties through an interaction in which each brings their knowledge and questions.

The first of these, Savoir-Être (knowing how to be), refers to attitudes related to curiosity, openness, and readiness to re-evaluate beliefs and misconceptions about other cultures and oneself. Savoirs (knowledge) concerns the understanding of social groups, their products and practices—both from the interlocutor's country and from one's own—and knowledge of the general interactional processes within a society and between individuals. Savoir Comprendre (knowing how to understand) involves interpretative skills—knowing how to interpret a document or any cultural event from the target culture, and how to establish connections between these and one's own cultural documents and events. Savoir Apprendre/Faire (knowing how to learn/knowing how to do) relates to discovery and interaction skills: it refers to the ability to acquire new knowledge about a culture or cultural practices, and the capacity to mobilize knowledge, attitudes (and beliefs), and personal skills to navigate misunderstandings and difficulties in real-time interactions. Finally, Savoir S'engager (knowing how to engage) is about having critical cultural and political awareness, enabling individuals to critically assess the practices and products of other cultures and countries—as well as their own—based on explicit criteria.

Byram's (2008) work contributes significantly to the studies of Interculturality, Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC), and Intercultural Competence (IC). This framework of five savoirs provides valuable insights into how teaching and learning can be approached in a more intercultural way.

Savoir-Être provides the posture or attitude of openness and reflection toward two or more cultures; Savoirs refers to the knowledge about social groups, their products, and practices; Savoir Comprendre and Savoir Apprendre help us mobilize competences to understand events from other cultures, to acquire new knowledge about them, and to interact in specific contexts; Savoir S'engager requires critical cultural awareness regarding one or more cultures,

along with the commitment to engage in mutual understanding and negotiation of meaning.

In this sense, the target culture is no longer perceived as an ideal to be reached. Rather, the goal is to develop a set of knowledge, skills, and competences shaped by each individual's unique characteristics, grounded in their respective cultures, and to seek a balance between two or more communicative norms—in other words, "intercultural" ones—allowing individuals to understand and operate within multiple communicative spaces.

To achieve this, it is first necessary to encourage native speakers to reflect on their own culture, to present their interpretation to interlocutors from other cultures, and then to negotiate a possible shared interpretation through interactions in which each party contributes their knowledge and perspectives.

In doing so, the individual becomes an intercultural speaker (BYRAM, 2008), and based on this interculturality, a system is developed between two or more cultures—a learning journey that does not culminate in reaching a single "target" culture.

Cultural diversity remains an inescapable reality. The school environment lies at the heart of cultural issues, and teachers must prepare learners to engage with contemporary and future society. These learners should reflect the image of a plural society and develop the ability to live together, integrating linguistic, social, cultural, and ethical differences, among others. In this context, reflection on the notion of interculturality and on ICC/IC is crucial to fostering a critical and democratic approach to language education—one in which individuals are able to perceive and engage with others not in exclusion, but in integration.

5. Final Remarks: Plural Approaches as Possibilities for Teaching and Learning from a Linguistic Education Perspective

As pointed out by CARAP, Integrated Didactics (ID) aims to:

"(…) help the student establish connections between a limited number of languages—those intended to be learned within the school curriculum (whether the aim is to develop the same competencies for all languages taught in a 'classical' way or to develop partial competencies for some of them)" (Candelier et al., 2015, p. 6).

The objective, then, is to consider the first language (or the school language) as a means to facilitate access to a first foreign language. Subsequently, these two languages can be used to ease access to a second foreign language—the reverse process may also be applied. At the same time, working with ID may foster interdisciplinary work between languages, allowing for their articulation in the construction of new linguistic knowledge.

ID aims to develop the learner's first language—in this case, Portuguese—in order to facilitate the acquisition of a first foreign language, Spanish. Then, based on both Portuguese and Spanish, it supports the acquisition of a second foreign language, Italian. Conversely, the process may also begin with Italian, building links with Spanish to eventually reach Portuguese. Therefore, it is a recursive process.

Intercomprehension focuses on working with languages of the same family, integrating three

dimensions: the linguistic dimension—which includes verbal components at the formal levels of morphology, phonology, syntax, semantics, and lexicon; the textual dimension—which encompasses knowledge of oral, written, and visual texts; and the situational dimension—which refers to the diverse social practices and interactions, as well as the literate events that surround individuals in their daily lives (Escudé & Calvo del Olmo, 2019).

The situational dimension is particularly interesting as it includes three interconnected subcomponents: the sociocultural component, which pertains to the knowledge of language use rooted in the relationship between society, culture, and discourse; the interactional component, which relates to the structuring rules that govern interactions and the co-construction of discourse in dialogic situations; and the pragmatic component, which addresses what can be included in the action domain of language.

Efforts to define Intercomprehension (IC) have been ongoing for more than three decades. By the end of the 1990s, this approach emerged in the field of Language Didactics—and later, in cultural studies (Dabène & Degache, 1996). Recent studies represent attempts to systematize language and cultural contact in education, whereas schools have often tried to normalize, standardize, and predetermine such contacts—after denying and rejecting them (Bagno, 2019).

Schools were constructed upon the principle of monolingualism—anchored in a single language of instruction—and our current language education owes much to this essentially nationalist monolingualism. But how can we define IC? Rather than being based on the idea that individuals or communities are strictly monolingual, IC starts from the understanding that any space has been, is, or will be traversed by multiple languages and varieties. Jules Ronjat was the first to use the term “intercomprehension” in 1913, as noted by Escudé and Del Olmo (2019, p. 10): “(…) the word ‘intercomprehension’ was coined in 1913 by the French linguist Jules Ronjat, but it is still not widely known in academic settings.” Yet the meaning of the term is quite simple: two interlocutors meet, each speaking—or writing—in their own language while making an effort to understand the other's language. In fact, intercomprehension refers to a form of communication that all of us have experienced at some point in our lives: when traveling to a Spanish-speaking country or reading a short text in Italian, for example, we manage to approach the language—even if it is theoretically unknown—grasp the main ideas (even with difficulty), and even interact using our mother tongue.

In addition to being an immediate resource, this form of communication is an ancestral practice and presents several important advantages in terms of efficiency, since each interlocutor uses a language they know well, and in terms of equality, as no one imposes their language on the other or feels pressured to speak a language with insecurity. As a communicative practice, it can be successful as long as interlocutors adopt certain strategies and develop specific competences, as will be explained further (Escudé & Del Olmo, 2019, p. 10).

According to Escudé and Del Olmo (2019, p. 19), phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and lexical differences are not so significant as to prevent someone proficient in one dialect from

conversing with a speaker of another dialect: "(…) in markets and village bars, I've always seen people from different regions maintaining casual conversations and negotiating deals without difficulty."

There is a clear sense of a shared language, spoken a little differently; context helps make sense of sounds, forms, word order, and vocabulary—which, if isolated, might hinder communication. At most, one might need to repeat or explain a word, or rephrase a sentence for better understanding.

IC is thus considered an open and broad space, offering a variety of possibilities that are constantly evolving and shaped by specific constituent variants. It involves a "necessary standardization" (Escudé, 2015), but one that is flexible and adaptable to various sociolinguistic contexts.

In addition to

(…) being an immediate resource, this form of communication is an ancestral practice and has some important advantages both in terms of efficiency, since each interlocutor uses a language that they know well, and in terms of equality, since no one imposes their language on the other or feels constrained to speak a language with insecurity. As a communicative practice, it can be successful as long as the interlocutors adopt some strategies and develop certain skills, as we will explain later (Escude & Del Olmo, 2019, p. 10).

Also according to Escudé and Del Olmo (2019, p. 19), the phonetic, morphological, syntactic and vocabulary differences are not so great as to prevent a person proficient in one of our dialects from conversing in that dialect with another person who speaks a different dialect "(…) at the fairs and in the village bars, I have always seen people from different regions having family conversations and business discussions without difficulty".

There is a very clear sense of a common language, pronounced in a slightly different way; the context makes it possible to understand sounds, shapes, placements and words, which, in isolation, would hinder communication; at most, it is sometimes necessary to repeat or explain a word, or change the structure of a sentence in order for it to be better understood.

CI is therefore considered an open and broad space, offering a variety of possibilities in continuous construction and mutation through specific constitutive variants and a "necessary standardization" (Escude, 2015), but malleable and adaptable to various sociolinguistic contexts.

So, how does the CI approach work? It is essential to consider CI as a sociolinguistic practice of the reality of language practices that result in facts in which we can intervene every day: communicating and interacting with speakers who do not have the same LM.

CI, then, deals with this continuum, and it is remarkable in itself that it only works fully when considering the linguistic contributions of other languages, that is,

(…) intercomprehension takes language families as the starting point for its reflection on learning and bases its didactics on the continuum that they constitute. Starting from their own

language, the learner moves towards understanding the languages that are related to them. For this, lexical and syntactic transparencies are used, as well as a series of features common to the family, since the diversity of each one is nothing more than the singular declination of common features (Escude & Janin, 2010, pp. 18–19). As we have five to emphasize, linguistic and cultural diversity constitutes the main characteristic of our societies, which cannot be excluded from schools. Furthermore, mutual understanding involves a set of attitudes and resources that necessarily include respect and curiosity for other languages and cultures. In this sense, it is important to confront the subject with reality and deconstruct structured representations, sometimes anchored as a reference model of monolingualism, which rejects linguistic varieties, establishes hierarchy between languages, the dominance of one language over another, "right" and "wrong" in the context of use. The last of the APs, Awakening to Languages (DPL), acts as a way of introducing subjects, especially at school age, to their own diversity and other surrounding linguistic diversities. Thus, "(…) according to the definition given of an awakening to languages within the framework of European projects that allowed for greater development, there is an awakening to languages when part of the activities are related to languages that the school does not intend to teach" (Candelier et al., 2012, p. 7).

This does not mean that the approach refers only to these languages. It also includes the language of the school and any other that is being learned, but is not limited to these "learned" languages. In other words, it integrates all types of other linguistic varieties, from the family, the environment and the world, without excluding any.

Due to the large number of languages in which students are required to work—several dozen, most of the time—the awakening to languages can appear as an "extreme" plural approach,

(…) conceived, mainly, as a welcome to students in the diversity of languages (and their languages!), from the beginning of schooling, as a vector for a better recognition in the school context of the languages "brought" by allophone students, as a type of propaedeutics developed in primary education, it can also be promoted as support for language learning throughout schooling (Candelier et al., 2012, p. 7).

There is an integration between all these APs, because, when working with one of them, it is customary to integrate it with others. To this end, it is necessary to understand which concept of language can account for these APs, so that they can, in fact, have plurilingual effects on language teaching and learning.

DPL was born in the 1980s based on studies by Hawkins (1984), who created an educational movement in Great Britain called Awareness of Language. DPL initially sought to develop metalinguistic skills that would encourage students to start writing, moving from their mother tongue to foreign language(s), and with the aim of recognizing the languages of students belonging to linguistic minorities.

Therefore, having good knowledge of a first language has a positive impact on learning other languages and this is also related to teaching practice, how the teacher brings students closer to the language (we are not talking about grammatical aspects), how this teacher treats the

language and how he or she teaches at school. In Brazil, there is a certain prescriptive orientation for teaching LP, but this orientation does not actually bring the student closer to the language.

In this sense, DPL, as well as Interculturality, IC and DI are integrated. Considering the justification for using AP in this work, this transversality regarding AP occurs intrinsically, since language teaching, in general, encompasses these and other issues. Promoting contact with languages in relation to teaching the TL itself is a way of thinking about AP in a practical way and not just in the teaching of a FL.

Working with AP can help teaching didactics in the context of the TL, as it can promote multidisciplinary work on the language, that is, it is a way of treating the TL as a multicultural language as well and not just as something internal and monolingual—especially if we think about and consider the history/constitution of the language being taught or of any other language.

In short, APs have a significant role in the teaching of the TL and in the school curriculum. They promote an EL that values plurilingualism and cultural diversity. These approaches view language learning not as the isolated acquisition of a language, but as the development of skills that allow the learner to establish connections between different languages and cultures, thus enriching the linguistic repertoire and promoting an attitude of openness and linguistic curiosity.

In addition, these approaches seek to integrate knowledge of several languages, contributing to a more comprehensive communicative competence, and encourage the maintenance of linguistic and cultural diversity. The concept of plurilingualism underlying these approaches promotes the ability to use more than one language in social contexts, regardless of the level of proficiency.

DI promotes the integration of different languages in the teaching-learning process, helping students to better understand the Portuguese language through comparisons and connections with other languages. This not only enriches the learning of Portuguese, but also develops broader linguistic skills, fostering plurilingualism. IC, on the other hand, focuses on the ability to understand related languages without necessarily being fluent in them. In the context of Portuguese language teaching, this might involve recognizing similarities and differences between Portuguese and other Romance languages, such as Spanish, French or Italian. This encourages students to see languages not as isolated systems, but as part of a wider language family.

DPL aims to increase students' linguistic and cultural awareness by introducing them to a variety of languages and cultures. In Portuguese language teaching, this might mean exploring the varieties of Portuguese around the world, their differences and similarities, and how these relate to the culture and identity of the speakers. Finally, Interculturality emphasizes understanding and respect for cultural and linguistic differences. In the context of Portuguese language teaching, this might mean exploring the diverse cultures of Portuguese-speaking countries, helping students develop a deeper understanding and

appreciation for the language and its cultural varieties.

Together, these approaches contribute to a school curriculum that values linguistic and cultural diversity, preparing students for an increasingly globalized and interconnected world. By emphasizing multilingualism and interculturality, EL becomes more inclusive and democratic, allowing students to recognize and value not only Portuguese, but also the richness of languages and cultures around the world.

In this context, the following chapter presents the methodological approaches that underpinned this work and how we were able to articulate the theory and reflections proposed to think about the training proposal and the assistance that these bases gave us in processing the data generated.

References

Alarcão, I., Araújo e Sá, M. H., & Pinto, S. (2023). *Isabel Alarcão: itinerários a partir dos "ditos" e* [PowerPoint slides]. Aveiro: UA Editora.

Almeida, M., & Pimenta, S. (2014). *Estágios supervisionados na formação docente*. São Paulo: Cortez.

Andrade, A. I., Araújo e Sá, M. H., Moreira, G., & Sá, C. (2007). *Intercompreensão e formação de professores: Percursos de desenvolvimento do projecto ILTE*. Retrieved from http://www.dialintercom.eu/Post/Painel1/2.pdf

Andrade, A. I., Araújo e Sá, M. H., & Neto, A. (2003). Análise e construção da competência plurilingue - alguns percursos didácticos. In A. Neto et al. (Orgs.), *Didáctica e metodologias de educação, percursos e desafios* (pp. 489–506). Évora: Universidade de Évora.

ANFOPE. (2022). *Manifesto contra a desqualificação da formação dos professores da educação básica*. Retrieved from https://anped.org.br/news/manifesto-contra-desqualificacao-da-formacao-dos-professores-da-educacao-basica

Antunes, I. (2003). *Aula de português: Encontro e interação*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

Antunes, I. (2007). *Muito além da gramática: Por um ensino de línguas sem pedras no caminho*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

Antunes, I. (2009). *Língua, texto e ensino: Outra escola possível* (2nd ed.). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

Antunes, I. (2014). *Gramática contextualizada: Limpando "o pó das ideias simples"*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

Araújo e Sá, M. H. (2013). A intercompreensão em didática de línguas: Modulações em torno de uma abordagem interacional. *Lingvarvm Arena*, *4*, 79–106.

Araújo e Sá, M. H., & Melo-Pfeifer, S. (2020). Online plurilingual interaction: Identity construction and development of plurilingual competence in students and teachers: A focus

on intercomprehension. In E. Piccardo, A. Germain-Rutherford, & G. Lawrence (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of plurilingual language education* (pp. 279–296). Londres: Routledge.

Brasil. (1988). *Constituição brasileira*. Brasília.

Brasil. (1996). *Lei de diretrizes e bases*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica.

Brasil. (1997). *Parâmetros curriculares nacionais: Terceiro e quarto ciclos do ensino fundamental (Língua Portuguesa)*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica.

Brasil. (1998). *Parâmetros curriculares nacionais: Quinto e sexto ciclos do ensino fundamental (Língua Portuguesa)*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica.

Brasil. (2000). *Parâmetros curriculares nacionais*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica.

Brasil. (2002). *Complemento aos parâmetros curriculares nacionais*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica.

Brasil. (2006). *Orientações curriculares para o ensino médio: Linguagens, códigos e suas tecnologias*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica.

Brasil. (2013). *Diretrizes curriculares nacionais da educação básica*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica.

Brasil. (2014). *Plano nacional de educação – Lei n.º 13.005/2014*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica.

Brasil. (2017/18). *Base Nacional Comum Curricular*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica.

Brasil. (2018). *Resolução no 3, de 21 de novembro de 2018*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica. Retrieved from http://novoensinomedio.mec.gov.br/resources/downloads/pdf/dcnem.pdf

Brasil. (2020). *Resolução CNE/CP n.º 1 de 27 de outubro de 2020*. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica. Retrieved from https://in.gov.br/web/dou/-/resolucao-cne/cp-n-1-de-27-de-outubro-de-2020-285609724.

Freire, P. (1959). *Educação e atualidade brasileira* (Tese de concurso para a Cadeira de História e Educação - Escola de Belas Artes de Pernambuco, Recife).

Freire, P. (1967). *Educação como prática da liberdade*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freire, P. (1974). *Pedagogia do oprimido*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários à prática docente*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

Freire, P. (2019). *Pedagogia do oprimido* (Manuscritos). São Paulo: Instituto Paulo Freire. (Obra original publicada em 1968)

Geraldi, J. W. (1984). Concepções de linguagem e ensino de português. In *O texto na sala de aula*. Cascavel: Assoeste.

Geraldi, J. W. (Org.). (2002). *O texto na sala de aula*. São Paulo: Ática.

Geraldi, J. W. (2015). O ensino da Língua Portuguesa e a BNCC. *Revista Retratos da Escola*, *9*(17), 381–396.

Geraldi, J. W. (2018). *Tranças e danças: Linguagem, ciência, poder e ensino*. São Carlos: Pedro & João Editores.

Geraldi, J. W. (2020). Entrevista com João Wanderlei Geraldi. In S. Souza & A. Rutikewiski (Orgs.), *Ensino de Língua Portuguesa e Base Nacional Comum Curricular: Propostas e desafios (BNCC - Ensino Fundamental II)* (Vol. 1, pp. 205–206). Campinas: Mercado de Letras.

Gomes, A., & Souza, S. (2015). Os módulos da sequência didática e a prática de análise linguística: Relações facilitadoras. *Con(Textos) Linguísticos*, *9*(14), 8–22.

Gomes, A., & Souza, S. (2017). O ensino de gramática e as articulações teórico-metodológicas da prática de análise linguística. *Work. Pap. Linguíst.*, 18(2), 50–68. https://doi.org/10.5007/1984-8420.2017v18n2p50

Gomes, A., & Souza, S. (2020). Base Nacional Comum Curricular: Retornos, estagnações ou progressos? Entrevista com Egon de Oliveira Rangel e João Wanderlei Geraldi. In S. Souza & A. Rutikewiski (Orgs.), *Ensino de Língua Portuguesa e Base Nacional Comum Curricular: Propostas e desafios (BNCC - Ensino Fundamental II)* (Vol. 1, pp. 205–206). Campinas: Mercado de Letras.

Gomes, A., & Souza, S. (2022). Análise linguística/semiótica para o ensino médio: A proposta da BNCC. *Línguas & Letras (Online)*, *23*, 76–95. https://doi.org/10.5935/1981-4755.20220030

Militão, A. (2012, outubro 22–25). *Contribuições de Paulo Freire para o debate sobre a formação continuada de professores*. Encontro de Ensino, Pesquisa e Extensão, Presidente Prudente, Brasil.

Souza, S. (2020). A Língua Portuguesa nos documentos de ensino brasileiro: Um olhar sobre a Base Nacional Comum Curricular. *Humanidades & Inovação*, *7*, 282–298.

Souza, S. (2024). The Common National Base – Training: Reflections on Teacher Training in Brazi. *Education and Linguistic Research*, *10*, 60–75. https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v10i2.22417

Souza, S., & Araújo e Sá, M. H. (2022). Reflexões acerca da promoção de uma didática do plurilinguismo no ensino-aprendizagem de línguas. *Revista Letras*, *1*, 45–65. https://doi.org/10.5380/rel.v105i1.85749