

Scientific
Journal of
**Applied
Social and
Clinical
Science**

**SOCIOLINGUISTIC
DIVERSITY: IDENTITY
KNOWLEDGE IN
EDUCATIONAL
PRACTICE**

Antônio Hilario Aguilera Urquiza

PhD in Anthropology (University of Salamanca / Spain) Associate Professor at UFMS; Professor of the Graduate Program in Law at UFMS. Professor and coordinator of the Graduate Program in Social Anthropology at UFMS
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3375-8630>

Evanir Gomes dos Santos

Post Doctorate in Education by: Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto (UFOP). Doctorate and Master in Education Science (UTCD). Master in Language Studies (UFMS). Member of the Institute of Human Rights (IDHMS-JN)
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7093-1095>

José Paulo Gutierrez

Philosopher and Lawyer. Professor Doctor in Higher Education at: Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso (UFMS, Campo Grande, Brasil) Campo Grande (MS)
<https://orcid.org/0000.0001-8738-4411>

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: Like all subjects in the national territory, indigenous people have socialization needs, however, due to their quantity, as a minority, and in an unfavorable cultural situation in relation to non-indigenous people, prejudice prevails in the Brazilian social imaginary. By induction, they then try to assume the other's position, hoping to get out of a frame of invisibility due to their differences. As a result, they suffer the imposition of renouncing the greatest cultural asset of a people, which is their language, which results in the extinction of knowledge, with the systematic use of a discursive domain in the imposition of a false uniformity. The challenges presented by an intricate social and linguistic context - and here we look at the border region of Mato Grosso do Sul with Paraguay and the indigenous populations that live there, motivated this study to analyze the linguistic diversity and the need for linguistic studies to prioritization in the school context with a critical intercultural approach in their didactic practice. To do so, we base ourselves on Troquez (2012-2013), Cavalcanti (2013), Souza (2010), Aguilera Urquiza (2013-217), Todorov (2003) and on official documents from the 1988 Constitution in which they determine the legal support for indigenous culture and education. This in defense of reflections on the conflicts arising from "pluri" or "multi" cultural spaces, focusing on the existing contradictions in the relations between different societies and, equally, discriminated against languages.

Keywords: Culture; Differences; Knowledge; Linguistics; Education.

INTRODUCTION

With the loosening of their culture and their identity, the Indian sees himself as a subject adrift, in search of a port for himself. As a result, with the ethnic people's movement in the early 1980s, indigenous peoples became

the protagonists of their demands, claiming the right to a formal and specific indigenous education, distinct from the integrationist and evangelizing practices of a system that despised their cultural background, their mother tongue and the reminiscences of inherited historical knowledge.

Linked to this movement were university centers and researchers who began to defend the institution of training courses for Indian teachers. Some experiences, in the sense of cultural appreciation, were implemented, but only after the enactment of CF/88 that certain executions outside the paper can be pointed out, since many determinations were linked only to the official registration, likewise, the training of teachers for differentiated education for indigenous people.

Gutierrez (2013, p. 284) emphasizes the practice of integrationism, in which it ignores difference and exasperates non-indigenous practices, with the consequent devaluation of beliefs, religiosity, customs, language and cultural knowledge "[...] the [European] States did not recognize the differences that existed between indigenous and non-indigenous societies, as they wanted the indigenous people to stop living the way they do".

Circumstances of things, which affect, notably, the linguistic culture with the difficulties in meeting the (RCNEI) National Curriculum Reference for Indigenous Schools of 1998, updated in 2005, which provides for the teaching practices of teachers of indigenous schools to bilingual and intercultural school education. The following researchers contribute in this sense: Souza (2013, p. 312), "[...] most schools have not followed these guidelines, and when they do, it is in a folkloric way" and Troquez (2013, p. 7), "even if there is a need to teach non-indigenous content as tools for survival in the non-indigenous world, education must be guided by the indigenous way of being,

specific to each ethnic group”.

Above all, Brazil, still faced with a very monolingual state, coexists with the contradiction between the control mechanism of universal linguistic behavior and the reality of linguistic variation, especially with regard to the various indigenous populations, to which the standardized symbol of the official language under a character of totality, even if its effectiveness produces distorted and non-compliant effects with the needs of interaction in social relations.

In such a way, the then decree of Marquês de Pombal, around the 18th century, period of Portuguese colonization, which determined only the use of the Portuguese language in the national territory, after the enactment of CF/88 is only partially broken. The constitutional establishment is still not confirmed in the coexistence between Indian and non-Indian societies, with regard to the response to the aspirations of a recognition of ethnic cultural history, restoring to the Indian his voice in his mother tongue, as a way of preserving his knowledge cultural values and the (re)establishment of the identifying reference of a linguistic “I” and no longer the linguistic identification as the other, with the non-Indian.

Thinking about it, we aim to analyze linguistic diversity and the need for linguistic studies to prioritize in the school context with a critical intercultural approach, which we have theoretical support in Troquez (2013), in linguists such as Cavalcanti (2013), Souza (2010), in anthropologists Aguilera Urquiza (2013) and Todorov (2003) and, with legal basis in official documents from the 1988 Constitution in which they ensure the right of indigenous people to their culture and differentiated education, guaranteeing ethnic and border identities.

Therefore, this study intends to contribute to the correction of existing prejudices and

contradictions in the relations between different societies with regard to differentiated didactic practice, specifically, of discriminated languages. Distortions that demand the need to search for civilizing values based on their historicity, on events experienced and produced by a given community, as opposed to exclusions and inequalities.

RELATIONS BETWEEN DIFFERENT SOCIETIES, THEIR CULTURAL MANIFESTATIONS AND, COMMONLY, OF DISCRIMINATED LANGUAGES

Mato Grosso do Sul, according to Aguilera Urquiza (2013, p. 7), it has two realities: on the one hand, it is welcoming in its borders, on the other hand, it is a transit space, being “[...] currently, the second Brazilian State in indigenous population, officially counting with eight ethnic groups”. These indigenous populations resist after clashes and cultural divergences, including among the ethnic groups themselves, such as the Kaiowás, the Guaranis and the Terenas, the latter with a history of greater coexistence with the non-indigenous. However, in cities, everyone carries, due to lack of knowledge linked to hegemonic prejudice, a negative stigma, with the nomenclature of “desaldeados” and “bugres”.

These populations, phenomena of resistance, have numerous movements of cultural manifestations and it is through them that their situation is revealed. It is through the process of understanding and interpreting the events in their coexistence that the redefinition of their symbolic system occurs, arising from the marks of identity subjectivity, formed by their own cultural values, because “[...] belonging of each and of the group, which in anthropological science, we call cultural identity, or simply, identity” Aguilera Urquiza (2013, p. 176).

Once this process is broken, a people becomes extinct or fragments, with the possibility of their exclusion, a daily situation in Brazil among indigenous populations, in which cultural traits such as linguistics are not accepted, with the imposition of the official language, Portuguese. According to IBGE data pointed out by Troquez (2013, p. 5), “[...] there are more than 225 distinct ethnic groups that speak more than 180 different languages and that have different cultures, histories and their own knowledge”. In Mato Grosso do Sul, there are the Guarani, the Kaiowá and the Terena, the latter being the most affected by the suppression of their linguistic identity.

The concept of culture, according to Souza (2010), is still tied to structural conceptions of specific contents and values, as it is also analyzed as isolated cases related to certain groups within the national territory. Another aggravating factor pointed out by Souza concerns the study of educational practice in a superficial and homogeneous way. The author attributes this, among other causes, to the fact that linguistic studies do not prioritize a critical intercultural approach in the school context, which would bring up reflections on the conflicts arising from “pluri” or “multi” cultural spaces, focusing on existing contradictions in relations between different societies, as warned by Aguilera Urquiza (2017, p. 50) when analyzing the complex and tense scenario in Mato Grosso do Sul: “In this context, it is not enough to recognize that we are different, that there is diversity, it is necessary to go further and understand the difference of the other in its otherness. And, by recognizing it, contesting hegemonic knowledge, analyzing the games of power and knowledge that still prevail”.

1 Quijano(2007) presents us with a very interesting distinction between colonialism and coloniality. For the author, they are two related but distinct concepts. Colonialism refers to a pattern of domination and exploitation in which the control of the political authority, the production resources and the work of a population. Coloniality, on the other hand, emerges as something that transcends the particularities of historical colonialism and that does not disappear with independence or decolonization. With coloniality there is continuity of colonial forms of domination.

This would be an implication inherited from a colonial history of violence, whose traumatic remnants prevail in Brazil in relation to monolingualism and indigenous cultures. It is observed that it did not break at all, with the coloniality¹ of knowledge, did not allow the epistemic deconstruction of the impositions of the Eurocentric hegemonic logic. In practice, elucidate Aguilera Urquiza and Santos (2020), we found that, whether in basic or higher education, there are timid initiatives to insert fragments of elements of traditional indigenous knowledge, however, without questioning the autonomy and legitimacy of this knowledge. The perception is that it becomes necessary to ask permission to “include” some contents, reinforcing, as we said, the relationship of epistemic subalternity.

Like all subjects in the national territory, indigenous people have socialization needs. However, due to their numbers, as a minority, and in an unfavorable linguistic and cultural situation in relation to non-Indians, prejudice against them prevails in the Brazilian social imaginary. By induction, they then try to assume the other’s position, hoping to get out of a frame of invisibility. For this, they suffer the imposition of renouncing the greatest cultural asset of a people, which is its language.

For communication and insertion in non-indigenous society, indigenous people become users of a foreign language, an L2 that, in most cases, is imposed on them as an L1, to meet the demands of social interaction. According to Coracini (2009, p. 478), there is an illusion of monolingualism in Brazil:

Another basic assumption concerns the much-desired and sought-after monolingualism: despite the fact that we are faced with so many situations of plurilingualism, with so many situations in

which the first language is not Portuguese, but German, Italian, indigenous, Polish, etc. ., we continue to refer to Brazil as a Portuguese-speaking country, in the illusory belief in linguistic and cultural unity.

In these multicultural and multilingual spaces, subjects are not assured the right to assert themselves linguistically and culturally, which creates a contradiction in terms of the displacement of knowledge. It even comes to the suppression of knowledge, with the systematic use of a discursive domain in the imposition of a false uniformity. This comes from Columbus, when linguistic heterogeneity was not accepted. As Todorov (2003, p. 42) points out, “[...] there are two possible and complementary behaviors: recognizing that it is a language, and refusing to accept that it is different, or recognizing the difference and refusing to admit that it is a language”. In the case of Brazilian indigenous populations, the second option is still chosen, in which the recognition of linguistic difference is linked to social power; unlike the indigenous language, it only puts it in a condition of assimilation in the face of the predominant majority language, which establishes the hierarchy between the subjects.

In contrast to the above, the aim is to overcome the principle of “integration”, a traditional form of relationship that still prevails even with the enactment of the (CF) of 1988. Document that guarantees in its article Art. 210, § 2, in its Chapter III, Section I (On Education), specifies that “[...] regular elementary education will be taught in Portuguese, ensuring that indigenous communities also use their mother tongues and their own processes of learning”. For the first time, it annuls a paradigm consummated around the 18th century, the period of Portuguese colonization in which the Marquis of Pombal decreed the prohibition of the use of the indigenous language in Brazil, with the officialization of Portuguese as the only

language for general use, establishing the landmark of a predominantly monolingual nation.

Above all, the Pombaline framework, only partially broken with CF/88, the constitutional establishment is still not confirmed in the coexistence between Indian and non-Indian societies with regard to the response to the aspirations of a recognition of history, cultural and ethnic, restoring to the Indian his voice in his mother tongue, as a way of preserving his cultural knowledge and of (re)establishing the identifying reference of a linguistic “I” and no longer of the linguistic identification as another, with the non-Indian. This achievement also ensures the right to possess school knowledge with specific didactics and with its own processes, thus guaranteeing the right to difference.

A path that required several opinions and decrees published for the purpose, of which it is worth mentioning the measure of support to Art. 210, Decree n° 26/91, which makes the Ministry of Education (MEC) responsible for organizing indigenous education, creating the National Education Coordination; the National Guidelines and Bases Law (LDB) n. 9.394/96, which, specifically in its Art. 78 and 79, guarantees indigenous societies an educational system supported financially and mutually within the three spheres of power (federal, state and municipal) and, especially, the Ministry of Education and Culture published, in 1998, the National Curriculum Reference for Indigenous Schools (RCNEI). As of this publication, there are two documents, the LDB and the RCNEI, which consolidate and cover from the political, historical, legal and anthropological foundations to the didactic-pedagogical organization of an indigenous education.

The RCNEI, updated in 2005, provides that the “[...] inclusion of an indigenous language in the school curriculum has the function of

attributing it the status of a full language and of putting it, at least in the school scenario, on its feet of equality with the Portuguese language” (p. 118). The provision presented refers to the interethnic, multiple and traditional plural contexts in which the indigenous language must be treated as the Portuguese language, in order to avoid what the document itself calls “sociolinguistic displacement”, or even “linguistic invasions”, that occur when the dominant language occupies the space of the dominated language.

There are situations, such as family situations and dealing with neighbors and close people, in which the indigenous language is used. However, in other environments, such as school and work, and in other interpersonal relationships, the indigenous use Portuguese, the majority. Due to pressures, especially of a socioeconomic nature, members who speak indigenous languages sometimes fail to use them in their personal relationship contexts; consequently, their children, instead of learning these languages, learn and use the standard language. This triggers a process of weakening of indigenous languages and it is from there that the dominant language takes over the space of the traditional culture of the Indian, which leads to the suppression of the ethnic mother tongue. This process takes place over a period of just three generations, as clarified by the RCNEI (2005, p. 118): “[...] a community, previously monolingual in an indigenous language, becomes bilingual (Portuguese/indigenous language) and then returns to to be monolingual again: only this time, monolingual in Portuguese”.

In this sense, the orientation of the official document is the inclusion of the mother tongue in the didactic practice, at first as the “language of oral instruction” of the curriculum, that is, it is necessary to use the language to introduce, explain and explain the new concepts addressed. Through this

method, in addition to students learning the indigenous language more, they will exercise their orality, which will give vigor to speakers in their natural space. In the case of a context in which there is more than one indigenous language, one of them is chosen, which will be the language of instruction. The “language of written instruction” will be used in a second moment, to address traditional ethnic and scientific knowledge, maintaining the language of written instruction when this knowledge is mediated by the school curriculum.

The RCNEI presents, with clarifications on the use of the indigenous language in schools in bilingual communities, situations in which it is called the first language (L1). According to this document, the Portuguese language must be treated as the second language in use (L2). In this didactic practice, the indigenous language will be included in the curriculum as a subject, being used, in addition to the language of oral and written instruction, as a form of reflection and an instrument for the search for knowledge, providing even greater appropriation of the linguistic culture for the development of the skills of its use to the student.

In addition to being the language of instruction, the indigenous language must also enter the curriculum, in the case of bilingual communities, as one of its subjects: indigenous language as a first language. In these cases, it will be the object of reflection and study, both oral and written [...]. (RCNEI, 2005, p. 120)

Likewise, when the indigenous language is established as a second language (L2), it can be part of the curriculum as a subject, encouraging the linguistic revitalization of communities in which the dominant majority language has advanced the traditional space of the dominated minority, in cases in which only older people have possession of this cultural asset. With this practice, there will be greater interest in the appropriation of

the indigenous language beyond the walls of the school, extending to the community, with the rescue of its self-image.

In this regard, it is worth mentioning Resolution No. 3/99, which guides the operation of indigenous schools in ratifying the curricular guidelines for teaching indigenous schools, with “[...] its own legal norms and order, and establishing the curricular guidelines for intercultural and cultural teaching. bilingual, aiming at the full appreciation of the cultures of indigenous peoples and the affirmation and maintenance of their ethnic diversity”. These are curricular guidelines contemplated in the LDB/1996 and, consequently, in the National Curricular Parameters, PCN/1998, and in the National Education Plan, which deal with cultural plurality, how to proceed with the school education of the Indian, its guidelines, its objectives and its targets for a given period. This document is supported by Law nº 10.172/2001, updated in 2014.

Although all this legislation contains essential recommendations on Brazilian cultural diversity, with the inclusion of indigenous knowledge and knowledge, as well as the teaching of the mother tongue, discussions have expanded towards extinction, prejudice and discrimination. In this direction, Law nº 11.645, of 2008, sought to correct some official documents, including the history and culture of indigenous populations in the formation of Brazil, causing alteration in the previous law, 10.639/2003, starting to be valid in a broad sense for the entire educational sphere, the new wording given in Art. 26-A of LDB 9.394/96:

Art. 26-A In public and private primary and secondary education establishments, the study of Afro-Brazilian and indigenous history and culture is mandatory.

§ 1 The syllabus referred to in this article will include various aspects of history and

culture that characterize the formation of the Brazilian population, from these two ethnic groups, such as the study of the history of Africa and Africans, the struggle of blacks and indigenous peoples in Brazil, black and indigenous Brazilian culture and blacks and Indians in the formation of national society, recovering their contributions in the social, economic and political areas, pertinent to the history of Brazil.

§ 2 The content referring to the history and culture of Afro-Brazilians and Brazilian indigenous peoples will be taught within the scope of the entire school curriculum, especially in the areas of artistic education and Brazilian literature and history.

Faced with this persistent panorama, there is in Brazil, on the one hand, the effort to transmit humanistic knowledge, via schooling, based on a curriculum, the reference that governs knowledge and values of Western culture that goes through a process of assimilation, with the aim of of an identity/national unification; on the other hand, there are cultural manifestations of indigenous peoples who resist by the strength of a tradition, seeking a school education capable of constituting their own and necessary knowledge for social relations, especially with regard to the goods of literate culture, which, in hypothesis, would propitiate the corrections of the inequalities.

LINGUISTIC MANIFESTATIONS, CULTURE OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN THE INTERFACE OF TEACHING PRACTICE IN A BORDER REGION

Among the challenges presented by an intricate social and linguistic context – and here we are looking at the border region of Mato Grosso do Sul with Paraguay and the indigenous populations that live there –, the indigenous teacher is given the task of teaching and use of more than one language

in their exercise. These professionals work in villages where they come from, most of the time being bilingual, with knowledge of their mother tongue and ethnic Portuguese. His use of these languages is generally only orally and the knowledge he has of them almost always does not confer a normative, standardized structure, especially ethnic Portuguese, this, because its appropriation proceeds through coexistence with various peoples, of different dialects and accents, sonorities, derivations and variations used in urban and rural areas, in a dry frontier region where the traffic of people is constant.

In such circumstances, the indigenous teacher, who has a natural language such as L1, includes it in his/her teaching routine, in compliance with the RCNEI, as the language of instruction. He also attends the RCNEI, through another language, L2, for the transmission of school knowledge. However, this L2 has an ethnic and popular reach, not meeting the cultural standardization established by the non-Indian society as correct and accepted in the majority society. There are therefore “many indigenous schools whose populations speak ethnic Portuguese and, on the other hand, speak a L1 that is not Portuguese” Pereira (2008, p. 5).

Another challenge involving language teaching and learning is the didactic practice of bilingualism. This stems, according to Pereira (2008), from the fact that the indigenous schools do not have in their Pedagogical Political Project (the PPP) the proper denominations punctuated for this purpose. Take as an example the research carried out by Pereira herself (2008) in the region of Dourados/MS; she analyzed the only two indigenous schools that, at the time, had initiatives on bilingualism in their PPP. Despite pointing out in the document the teaching of the mother tongue (L1) according to the instructions of the RCNEI, the notes indicate,

on the one hand, a certain inconsistency in demonstrating the deletion of one of the languages among the ethnic groups present in the school. On the other hand, the mother tongue was offered only in the initial grades, incorporating a deficient didactic practice of maintaining the L1, with the strengthening of the majority language (L2). In view of these findings, the researcher makes her comments:

If, on the one hand, a school brings a bilingual proposal, it is perceived that it ‘still’ points to poor maintenance. And one cannot forget the great and strong appeal for the incorporation of the majority language – Portuguese, given that these are practically urban villages where Portuguese is the official language for all purposes. (PEREIRA, 2008, p. 9)

The author clarifies that the region of Dourados has a dense and complex sociolinguistic concentration, referring to the fact that Brazil is “a plurilingual and, without a doubt, multicultural country”. In turn, the villages in the region understand approximately 30 languages in the oral modality. Families that today belong to the context close to Dourados, the second largest city in Mato Grosso do Sul and distant around 150 km from Ponta Porã, located on the dividing line with a neighboring country – Paraguay –, speak, in domestic and affective situations, Spanish, one of the official Paraguayan languages along with Guarani.

Space of linguistic cultural manifestations in which the language must allow the subject to transit through linguistic varieties, not excluding him through the standardization of a so-called cultured form. In this sense, in Brazil, relevant research has been carried out with regard to multilingualism and sociolinguistics, supported by the interfaces of cultural and anthropological studies, as shown by the findings of the analysis carried out by Santos (2018) through the Pedagogical Political Project-PPP of the Intercultural

Guateka Indigenous State School - Marçal de Souza, which is located on the banks of Highway MS - 156 (Pedro Palhano) between two villages, Jaquapiru and Bororó, with a population composed of three ethnic groups: Terena, Guarani/Kaiowá, Guarani/Nandeva (Guarani) and a growing number of non-indigenous people, comprising approximately 15,000 inhabitants, according to this institution's document, which informs that the school offers, during the day and night, elementary and high school and the EJA modality - Education of Youth and Adults. In this educational reality, the difficulty that students demonstrate in relation to learning the mother tongue and in the discipline QIB - Brazilian Indigenous Issues is configured. For the school, this fact stems from the lack of didactic material to meet such needs; in this sense, the school seeks to motivate teachers, of all disciplines, to contemplate the differences in their lesson plans and, in addition, to adopt the position of mediators, arousing interest and mentioning the relevance of learning the mother tongue. The document confirms that the students of this school unit face the challenge of learning five different languages:

However, the indigenous student is faced with a linguistic complexity in Basic Education, having in the curriculum the teaching of five different languages: Portuguese Language, English Language, Spanish Language, Terena Language and Guarani Language, this variety also makes the work of teachers difficult, which they seek to serve all students, respecting their particularities and difficulties (MATO GROSSO DO SUL, 2017, p. 17).

This linguistic complexity and exacerbation is due to the fact that the school, even if indigenous, follows Deliberation CEE/MS nº 10.647/2015, which deals with the regulation of indigenous schools, and Resolution/SED 3.196/2017 of the State Education Network, which, in turn, complies with the LDB/1996,

which regulates the curricular organization of all schools in the national territory. On the other hand, it is important to recall that this Resolution, in its articles 12 and 13, refer to the terms of the constitutional wording in its articles 210, 215, 231, of LDB/1996, article 26-A and of RCNEI/1998, which establish norms for Brazilian national education, with its formulations of educational organizations, providing for the contents of Indigenous and Afro-Brazilian History and Culture throughout the education system, with emphasis on the curricular components of History and Art. However, the researcher warns:

[...] the discourse of official curricular differentiation is fragile to meet the proposed objectives in the field of indigenous school education, especially with regard to the construction of autonomy, as it verified a proposal to weaken the boundaries between academic contents and local/everyday contents which points to limits or obstacles to the acquisition of specialized knowledge [...] the curriculum prescribed for indigenous school education, although it advocates for itself the status of differentiated, does not manage to break completely with the national curriculum engineering with regard to the principle of organization by disciplines traditionally instituted/instituted and dealing with broader social issues through transversality (TROQUEZ, 2012, p. 14).

In this educational framework, teacher training - indigenous or not - needs to adopt a vision of language education under an inter and transdisciplinary intercultural approach, "socially engaged, anthropologically reflective, plural in its focus, to include literacy studies, studies on multilingualism with questions of intercomprehension and translanguaging practices", as Cavalcanti assures (2013, p. 226). The teacher must be involved in a transcultural practice that allows him to understand the concept of "intercomprehension", providing

him with access to the complexity of the communicative dynamics between languages, in which communication does not take place horizontally, unilaterally, but with several communicative interlocutors. Cavalcanti (2013, p. 216) recommends “leaving the comfort zone of monolingualism”, referring to leaving the standardization of the cultured language towards socially unrecognized linguistic varieties, located in the rural area or in peripheral regions, as is the case of indigenous languages. They, in addition to not being recognized, are taken as generic.

Souza (2011) emphasizes the importance of pedagogical objectives in preparing students for today’s globalized world, amid the diverse cultural differences produced by different peoples. In this sense, valuing conflicts, discussing them critically, will allow the revision of postures and actions of an exclusion society, through the practice of literacy with considerations focused on the “temporal and historical aspect and its political and ethical role in education” Souza (2011, p. 128). It is necessary to seek a didactic practice based on civilizing values based on their historicity, on the events experienced and produced by a given community.

This way, it is necessary to develop a language teaching practice that defines a reader capable of reading/valuing his experiences as an active subject in the world, endowed with knowledge that leads him to not only understand the world, but also to represent his convictions and beliefs. your culture. There will then be a participatory subject, determined to get to know himself and his surroundings better, in constant improvement of a critical and reflective dialogue.

A condition different from simply being in the world is proposed, which will give the subject the perception of the meanings of complex interpersonal relationships. This subject will start to question why there

are situations in which he is a non-me, a marginalized other. He will see himself as a collective being, constituted in a specific space and time, endowed with an identity and aware of being in the world.

Souza (2011) warns that one only learns to listen when one understands that the meaning of oral and written productions is linked to genealogical meanings, being part of the historicity of communities. From them, there is a greater collectivity, in a global sense, whose meanings emerge in the production of language in power relations. Thus, a given language is constituted by the production of meanings imputed by the common interests of groups located in the daily relationship of a given time and space. They are processes of productions and meanings that lead to the recognition of the other or to their suppression by silencing their culture.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Language education and teaching as means of law has the legal support from the 1988 Constitution, the (LDB) 9.394\96 and the official document RCNEI\1998, among other official documents, legal references to the correction of iniquities in opposition of the dominant assertion of the extremely monolingual in the face of the non-recognition of linguistic variety, which leads to discrimination, constraints, tensions and the exclusion of ethnic people, which affects suppressions of their customs and historical values due to lack of expedients to differences in immersion in the intercultural sense in which it considers the specificities of the different social contexts, the different forms of acquisition, the rhythms and learning of students and the very different conditions of these populations.

The socio-epistemological and cultural ethnic rescue, in the educational system, means, on the one hand, the consolidation of

the pedagogical base in all areas of knowledge instigated in the re-signification of the school didactic organization with critical reflection of the universalized Eurocentric concepts, which over the decades implied cultural reductionism, including linguistic reductionism in Brazil. On the other hand, teacher training – indigenous or not – implies diversities in which this professional is inserted in multiple relationships, socio-educational and ethnological values in a vision of intercultural education to socio-multicultural practice.

This in the educational segment refers to the role of literate culture in addition to respect in valuing differences in the dimensions of knowledge and in sharing customs and practices experienced arising from a cultural symbolic system, that is, through an educational structure and context of inclusion through plural dialogue with the interrelationship of cultural identities with interaction between people and knowledge, in which conflicts and understanding become part of the didactic practice in a critically reflective way with exchanges and communication of experiences, knowledge, appreciation and introspection of the different cultures.

This way, the effectiveness of the specific and intercultural educational right, once again, implies a process of (de)construction of the indigenous, which permeates again in its meanings not only in the absorption of new scientific concepts accumulated by humanity, but also through the systematization of their traditional knowledge, which, according to researchers Aguilera Urquiza (2013) and Nascimento (2007), is knowledge that defines the identity of the Indian and, it is in this sense that the education professional in all areas of knowledge needs to blur the didactic practice aimed at a pedagogical work with intercultural edification, differentiated and transforming,

which converges with critical reflection in which dialogue is prioritized considering concepts arising from the accumulation of multicultural and multilingual contextual conditions.

REFERENCES

AGUILERA URQUIZA, Antônio; SANTOS, Evanir G. Educação Indígena e Direitos Humanos: racismo e sub-representação na Educação em MS. **Veredas Revista Interdisciplinar de Humanidades**, v. 3, n. 6, p. 17-43, dez./jun. 2020-2021. Disponível em: <https://revistas.unisa.br/index.php/veredas/article/view/116>.

AGUILERA URQUIZA, Antonio. A Interculturalidade como ferramenta para descolonizar a Educação: reflexões a partir da Ação 'Saberes Indígenas na Escola'. **Revista Articulando e Construindo Saberes**, v. 2, n. 1, 2017. Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.ufg.br/racs/article/view/48996>.

AGUILERA URQUIZA, Antonio. (Org.). **Culturas e história dos povos indígenas em Mato Grosso do Sul**. Campo Grande: Ed. UFMS, 2013.

BRASIL. **Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988**. Disponível em: http://www2.camara.leg.br/responsabilidade-social/ acessibilidade/legislacao-pdf/constituicao_brasil_41ed.pdf.

BRASIL. **Decreto Presidencial nº 26, de abril de 1991**. Brasília, DF: Diário Oficial da União, 1991.

BRASIL. **Decreto nº 5.051**. Convenção nº 169 da OIT sobre Povos Indígenas e Tribais. MEC/SEF, 2004. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/sesu/arquivos/pdf/decreto5051.pdf>. Acesso em: 28 ago. 2015.

BRASIL. **Lei 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996**. Estabelece as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação. Disponível em: Acesso em: 3 ago. 2015.

BRASIL. **Lei 11.645/08** e a sua abordagem nos livros didáticos do ensino fundamental. Disponível em: http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&id=12990&Itemid=866.

BRASIL. **Legislação Escolar Indígena**. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/seb/arquivos/pdf/vol4b.pdf>. Acesso em: 15 ago. 2015.

BRASIL. **Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional**. Brasília, DF: Congresso Nacional, 1996.

BRASIL. **Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais: temas transversais**. Brasília, DF: MEC-SEF, 1998a.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 10.172**, de 9 de janeiro de 2001. Plano Nacional de Educação. *Diário Oficial da União*. Brasília, DF, ano CXXIX, n. 7. Disponível em: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/leis_2001/l10172.htm.

BRASIL. **Parecer 10/2002**. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/cp102002.pdf>.

BRASIL. **Parecer CNE/CEB nº 14/1999**, aprovado em 14 de setembro de 1999. Dispõe sobre as Diretrizes Nacionais para o funcionamento das escolas indígenas. Disponível em: http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&id=12992&Itemid=866.

BRASIL. **Referencial curricular nacional para as escolas indígenas**. Ministério da Educação e do Desporto, Secretaria de Educação Fundamental. Brasília, DF, MEC/SEF, 2005. Disponível em: <http://pib.socioambiental.org/pt/c/politicas-indigenistas/educacao-escolar-indigena/referencial-curricular-nacional-para-escola-indigenas>.

BRASIL. **Resolução CEB nº 3, de 10 de novembro de 1999**. Fixa diretrizes nacionais para o funcionamento das escolas indígenas e dá outras providências. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/CEB0399.pdf>.

CAVALCANTI, Marilda C. Educação linguística na formação de professores de línguas: intercompreensão e práticas translínguas. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. (Org.) **Linguística aplicada na modernidade recente**. São Paulo: Parábola, 2013. p. 211-226.

CORACINI, Maria José R. F. **Língua e efeitos de estranhamento: modos de (vi)ver o outro**. RBLA475, Belo Horizonte, v.9, n.2, p. 475-498, 2009. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbla/v9n2/06.pdf>.

CORACINI, A **celebração do outro**: arquivo, memória e identidade. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2007.

GUTIERREZ, José Paulo. Culturas e história dos povos indígenas em Mato Grosso do Sul. In: URQUIZA, Antonio Hilário Aguilera (Org.) **Culturas e história dos povos indígenas em Mato Grosso do Sul**. Campo Grande: Ed. UFMS, 2013. p. 281-304.

MATO GROSSO DO SUL. **Projeto Político Pedagógico. Escola Estadual Indígena Intercultural Guateka-Marçal de Souza**, 2017a. Disponível em: <http://www.sistemas.sed.ms.gov.br/ProjetoPoliticoPedagogico/Visualizar.aspx?PPPID=585mXim/wW4>= Acesso em 2 maio 2018.

NASCIMENTO, A. C.; VINHA, M. **Educação Escolar Indígena e o Sistema Nacional de Educação**. XXIII Simpósio Brasileiro de Política e Administração da Educação; V Congresso Luso-Brasileiro de Política e Administração da Educação; I Colóquio Ibero-Americano de Política e Administração da Educação. Cadernos ANPAE. Porto Alegre: ANPAE, 2007. Disponível em: http://www.anpae.org.br/congressos_antigos/simposio2007/01.pdf.

PEREIRA, Maria Ceres. **O Português e as Línguas nas Fronteiras – Desafios para a Escola**. p. 1-8, 2013. Disponível em: http://www.siple.org.br/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=172:3-o-portugues-e-as-linguas-nas-fronteiras--desafios-para-a-escola&catid=57:educacao-2&Itemid=92.

PEREIRA, **Escolhas linguísticas para o ensino em escola da aldeia indígena em Dourados/MS** – Brasil. Trabalho apresentado no XV ALFAL – XV Congresso Internacional de la Asociación de Lingüística y Filología de América Latina. Montevideú, 18 a 21 ago. 2008. (ICD-Rom).

PEREIRA, **Projeto Investigações em Linguística Aplicada. Entre Política Linguística e a Educação Bilingue – O Caso dos Tekohá Kuera no MS**. Brasília, DF: CAPES/DEB/INEP, 2009-2011.

SANTOS, Evanir G. **Organização escolar indígena e não indígena - perspectivas e incongruências desses dois universos**. XV CIDH – Congresso Internacional de Direitos Humanos – Direitos Humanos, Diversidade de Gênero e Trabalho, Campo Grande, 2018, p.1-16. (Anais eletrônicos). Disponível em: https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/5b0a74_b85f2f0b87754d41b7c34983efd7fd77.pdf.

SOUZA, C. C.; FERREIRA, F. M. N. S. **Educação Escolar Indígena: língua materna X língua portuguesa**. II Seminário Internacional: fronteiras étnico-culturais e fronteiras da exclusão - práticas educativas num contexto intercultural. ANAIS DO II Seminário Internacional: fronteiras étnico-culturais; fronteiras da exclusão: práticas educativas num contexto intercultural. Campo Grande: UCDB, 2006.

SOUZA, Ilda de. In: URQUIZA, Antonio Hilário Aguilera (Org.). **Culturas e história dos povos indígenas em Mato Grosso do Sul**. Campo Grande: Ed. UFMS, 2013. p. 305-331.

SOUZA, L. T. de Menezes. Cultura, Língua e Emergência Dialógica. **LETRAS & LETRAS**, Revista do Instituto de Letras e Linguística, Uberlândia, UFU, v. 26, n. 2, p. 289-300, jul./dez. 2010.

SOUZA, L. T. de Menezes. Por uma redefinição de letramento crítico. In: MACIEL, R. F.; ARAÚJO, V. de Assis (Orgs). **Formação de professores de línguas. Ampliando perspectivas**. Jundiaí: Paco Eitorial, 2011.

TODOROV, Tzvetan. **A conquista da América**: a questão do outro. Trad. Beatriz Perrone-Moisés. 3. ed. São Paulo : Martins Fontes, 2003.

TROQUEZ, M. C. C. **DOCUMENTOS CURRICULARES PARA A EDUCAÇÃO ESCOLAR INDÍGENA NO BRASIL: DA PRESCRIÇÃO ÀS POSSIBILIDADES DA DIFERENCIAÇÃO**. In: 35ª Reunião Anual da Anped, 2012, Porto De Galinhas - Pe. Educação, Cultura, Pesquisa e Projetos de Desenvolvimento: O Brasil do Século XXI, 2012. v. Único. p. 01-17. Disponível em https://www.anped.org.br/sites/default/files/gt06-2161_int.pdf.

TROQUEZ, Marta Coelho Castro. **Enfoques de Educação Escolar Indígena**. p. 1-15. Disponível em: <http://www.rededesaberes.org/3seminario/anais/textos/ARTIGOS%20PDF/Artigo%20GT%20B-08%20-%20Marta%20Coelho%20Castro%20A.pdf>. Acesso em: 7 abr. 2013.