UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS E LINGUÍSTICA
FACULDADE DE LETRAS

PEDRO AUGUSTO DE LIMA BASTOS

PROBLEMATIZING LANGUAGE CONCEPTIONS IN A DECOLONIAL PERSPECTIVE: AN EXPERIENCE WITH STUDENT TEACHERS IN AN ENGLISH TEACHER EDUCATION COURSE AT A BRAZILIAN UNIVERSITY

GOIÂNIA
2019

TERMO DE CIÊNCIA E DE AUTORIZAÇÃO PARA DISPONIBILIZAR VERSÕES ELETRÔNICAS DE TESES E DISSERTAÇÕES NA BIBLIOTECA DIGITAL DA UFG

Na qualidade de titular dos direitos de autor, autorizo a Universidade Federal de Goiás (UFG) a disponibilizar, gratuitamente, por meio da Biblioteca Digital de Teses e Dissertações (BDTD/UFG), regulamentada pela Resolução CEPEC nº 832/2007, sem ressarcimento dos direitos autorais, de acordo com a Lei nº 9610/98, o documento conforme permissões assinaladas abaixo, para fins de leitura, impressão e/ou *download*, a título de divulgação da produção científica brasileira, a partir desta data.

1. Identificação do material bibliográfico: **[X] Dissertação   [ ] Tese**

2. Identificação da Tese ou Dissertação:

Nome completo do autor: Pedro Augusto de Lima Bastos

Título do trabalho: Problematizing language conceptions in a decolonial perspective: an experience with student teachers in an English teacher education course at a Brazilian university

3. Informações de acesso ao documento:

Concorda com a liberação total do documento [X] SIM   [ ] NÃO[1]

Havendo concordância com a disponibilização eletrônica, torna-se imprescindível o envio do(s) arquivo(s) em formato digital PDF da tese ou dissertação.

_____
Assinatura do(a) autor(a)[2]

Ciente e de acordo:

_____
Assinatura do(a) orientador(a)[2]

Data: 26/09/2019

---

[1] Neste caso o documento será embargado por até um ano a partir da data de defesa. A extensão deste prazo suscita justificativa junto à coordenação do curso. Os dados do documento não serão disponibilizados durante o período de embargo.

Casos de embargo:
- Solicitação de registro de patente
- Submissão de artigo em revista científica
- Publicação como capítulo de livro
- Publicação da dissertação/tese em livro

[2]A assinatura deve ser escaneada.

PEDRO AUGUSTO DE LIMA BASTOS

PROBLEMATIZING LANGUAGE CONCEPTIONS IN A DECOLONIAL PERSPECTIVE: AN EXPERIENCE WITH STUDENT TEACHERS IN AN ENGLISH TEACHER EDUCATION COURSE AT A BRAZILIAN UNIVERSITY

Master's thesis presented to the Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras e Linguística, from Universidade Federal de Goiás, as partial requirement for a MA degree in Letras e Linguística

Field of concentration: Linguistic Studies.

Line of research: Teaching and learning of second languages and foreign languages.

Advisor: Rosane Rocha Pessoa, Ph.D.

GOIÂNIA
2019

ATA Nº 25/2019

ATA DA SESSÃO DE JULGAMENTO DA DISSERTAÇÃO DE MESTRADO DO ALUNO PEDRO AUGUSTO DE LIMA BASTOS

Aos trinta dias do mês de agosto do ano de dois mil e dezenove, a partir das quatorze horas, no Miniauditório Professor Egídio Turchi da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade Federal de Goiás, nesta capital, realizou-se a sessão pública da Defesa de Dissertação intitulada "PROBLEMATIZING LANGUAGE CONCEPTIONS IN A DECOLONIAL PERSPECTIVE: AN EXPERIENCE WITH STUDENT TEACHERS IN AN ENGLISH TEACHER EDUCATION COURSE AT A BRAZILIAN UNIVERSITY". Os trabalhos foram instalados pela Orientadora, Professora Doutora Rosane Rocha Pessoa (Presidente/PPGLL/FL/UFG) com a participação dos demais Membros da Banca Examinadora: Professor Doutor Lynn Mario Trindade Menezes de Souza (Universidade de São Paulo) e a Professora Doutora Viviane Pires Viana Silvestre (Universidade Estadual de Goiás). A Banca Examinadora reuniu-se em sessão secreta a fim de concluir o julgamento da Dissertação, tendo sido o candidato _aprovado_ pelos seus membros. Proclamados os resultados pela Professora Doutora Rosane Rocha Pessoa, Presidente da Banca Examinadora, foram encerrados os trabalhos e, para constar, lavrou-se a presente ata que vai assinada pelos Membros da Banca Examinadora e visada pela Coordenadora do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras e Linguística. Goiânia, aos trinta dias do mês de agosto do ano de dois mil e dezenove.

Profª Drª Rosane Rocha Pessoa – Presidente

Prof. Dr. Lynn Mario Trindade Menezes de Souza

Profª Drª Viviane Pires Viana Silvestre

Visto:
Profª Drª Solange Fiuza Cardoso Yokozawa

AGRADECIMENTOS

Even though this master's thesis is written in English, the acknowledgement section would only make sense to me if it were written in Portuguese. Minha jornada enquanto aluno de pós-graduação não foi fácil, como nunca é. Mas tenho a certeza de que foi uma jornada libertadora, seja em aspectos acadêmicos ou pessoais. Muitas pessoas cruzaram esse caminho, e, agora, é a hora de agradecê-las.

À professora Rosane Rocha Pessoa, orientadora deste trabalho. Conheci a Rosane em 2014, na disciplina de Inglês 5 da graduação e resolvi trabalhar com ela desde então. Sempre vi na Rosane muita garra, determinação e engajamento com o trabalho acadêmico, características com as quais me identifiquei. Arrisco-me a definir sua orientação comigo em duas palavras: desafiadora e encorajadora. Sempre me senti motivado a buscar novos desafios em minha carreira acadêmica, e, em todos, fui encorajado pela professora. Desde a submissão de artigos em periódicos, participação em eventos e grupos de estudos, e até a participação para concorrer a um prêmio internacional em nossa área. Obrigado, Rosane, por nunca ter duvidado do meu potencial, até mesmo quando eu duvidei dele. Obrigado, Rosane, por todo afeto, carinho, paciência, confiança e apoio dados durante este processo, sem os quais o término desta dissertação teria sido mais difícil.

À Ivanete Maria de Lima Bastos, minha mãe. Mainha para mim também é sinônimo de força e determinação para vencer na vida. Educação em nossa casa sempre foi prioridade, mesmo quando passamos por dificuldades financeiras. Muito obrigado, mainha, por todo o apoio dado durante este processo. Obrigado por sempre me escutar e estar preocupada comigo. Amor de mãe é bão demais!

À Mariana Santana Ofugi, uma amiga que virou uma irmã! Nossa amizade se fortalece a cada dia mais, mesmo com a distância que nos separa. Obrigado pela escuta atenta e por toda palavra de apoio!

À Fernanda Caiado da Costa Ferreira, minha querida amiga, companheira de concursos e da vida. Minha vida seria muito sem graça sem essa sagitariana! Sua luz, leveza de pensamento e sinceridade me ensinaram a levar a vida de um jeito mais leve. Muito obrigado pelo seu amor, Fernanda!

Ao Carlos Eduardo Alves Lopes, um querido amigo que o mestrado me deu! Nossa amizade excedeu os muros da academia e eu sou muito feliz por compartilhar minhas angústias, lutas e vitórias com você, meu amigo! Obrigado por tudo! Você é uma inspiração para mim!

Ao Eduardo Faria de Souza, companheiro e amigo. Obrigado pela escuta atenta, pelo interesse em meu tema de pesquisa e pelo apoio constante.

Às/aos minhas/meus amigas/os queridas/os, Ana Leticia, Bruna Mundim, Carla Janaina, Carlos Lopes, Eduardo Souza, Fabiene Azevedo, Fernanda Ferreira, Graziely Borges, Janice Magalhães, Marcos Fernandes, Mariana Ofugi, Mateus Geraldo, Nathalia Bueno, Renata Gabriela, Renata Lima, Ricardo Regis, Rosy Leny, Virgínia Carvalho. Muito obrigado pelos rolês, cafés, baladas, drinks, viagens, passeios, conversas e terapias! Vocês fizeram essa jornada e fazem minha vida serem muito mais melhor de bão!

Neither eagle nor serpent, but both.
And like the ocean, neither animal respects borders.
(ANZALDÚA, 2007, p. 84)

ABSTRACT

Drawing on a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize conceptions of language grounded on a decolonial perspective with university student teachers, this study aims: a) to investigate the language ideologies produced by student teachers throughout a critical language teacher education experience; b) to investigate the pedagogical reflections that emerged from this experience. This experience was held in a Brazilian university course that prepares students to become English language teachers. Empirical material generation happened in a language discipline of the last term of this course in fifteen classes of 100 minutes each. Besides me, twelve female student teachers, three male student teachers and the professor responsible for the group participated in the study. The classes followed premises of critical language teaching and critical language teacher education. In the first ten classes, the student-teachers and I problematized language through a diverse set of authentic materials that focused on: language ideologies; language hierarchization and invention; linguistic repertoires; language as power; globalization; coloniality. In the four following classes, student teachers prepared and taught a microlesson of 25 minutes based on the themes studied. In the last class, we reflected upon the experience. The empirical material sources were an initial questionnaire, first and final narratives, classroom activities produced by student teachers, a field diary, classroom interactions, reflective sessions with the professor, a final reflective session, and a final interview, being the last four audio-recorded. Concerning the language ideologies produced throughout the study, I demonstrate chronologically how student teachers' standpoints towards language are multiple, complex, unstable. They align with or resist to traditional/modern and critical/decolonial language ideologies at different times. This was due to different factors, such as: the way they looked at language use (if only linguistic aspects are taken into consideration and contextual ones being left out); the type of activity developed (if it was a classroom interaction or an assessment activity) and the vocabulary used to problematize modern Linguistics (if it is still the same one we fight against). As for the pedagogical reflections that emerged during this language teacher education experience, four issues are raised by the participants: the detachment between school language and real language; the power of structure on teacher agency; the complexity of dealing with students' expectations of nativized English; the coloniality of assessment. First, we discuss how normative grammar is still present in our classes and how the language present in textbooks is different from the language used in real contexts, having implications on the concept of authenticity. Second, we debate on how English language teaching is ruled by center-based methodologies and language ideologies, making it harder for teachers to implement more a more decolonial approach. Third, we present how students' expectations towards nativized English is a strong barrier for a more decolonial practice. Such expectations may have its origins from parental beliefs about language and the societal pressure to learn the Standard language. Lastly, we discuss about assessment and I present how I tried to have a balance between an idealist and a pragmatist position to deal with the praxiologies I work with and the demands that traditional language teaching practice require. In the conclusion, I answer the research questions, discuss the implications of this master's thesis and present the traces of (de)coloniality present in this study.

Keywords: critical language teacher education; decoloniality; language ideologies; classroom ethnography.

RESUMO

Com base em uma experiência de formação crítica de professores/as de línguas que objetivou problematizar concepções de linguagem em uma perspectiva decolonial com alunos/as-professores/as do curso de Letras: Inglês, este estudo objetiva: a) investigar as ideologias linguísticas produzidas por estudantes universitários/as ao longo de uma experiencia de formação crítica de professores; b) investigar as reflexões pedagógicas que emergiram a partir dessa experiência. O material empírico foi gerado em uma disciplina de língua do último semestre de um curso de Letras: Inglês de uma universidade brasileira que prepara alunos/as para atuarem como professores de inglês em diversos contextos. O curso teve duração de 15 aulas de 100 minutos cada. Além de mim, 12 alunas-professoras e três alunos-professores, e a professora responsável pelo grupo participaram do estudo. As aulas foram planejadas com base no ensino crítico de línguas e na formação crítica de professores. Nas dez primeiras aulas, os/as alunos/as professores/as e eu problematizamos língua por meio de diversos materiais que focalizavam: ideologias linguísticas; invenção e hierarquização linguística; repertórios linguísticos; língua como poder; globalização; colonialidade. Nas outras quatro aulas, os/as alunos/as professores/as prepararam e ministraram uma microaula de 25 minutos baseada nos temas estudados. Na última aula, refletimos sobre a experiência. As fontes de material empírico foram questionário inicial, narrativa inicial e final, atividades produzidas pelos alunos/as professores/as, um diário de campo, interações em sala de aula, sessões reflexivas com a professora, uma sessão reflexiva final, e uma entrevista final, sendo as últimas quatro fontes gravadas em áudio. Em relação às ideologias linguísticas produzidas ao longo do estudo, mostro cronologicamente como os posicionamentos dos/as alunos/as professores/as sobre língua são múltiplos, complexos e instáveis. Eles/as se alinham ou resistem a ideologias tradicionais/modernas e críticas/decoloniais em diferentes momentos. Isso aconteceu devido a diferentes fatores, sendo eles: a forma em que os/as alunos/as-professores/as analisavam um uso linguístico (se apenas aspectos linguísticos eram considerados e aspectos contextuais deixados de lado); o tipo de atividade desenvolvida (se era uma interação em sala de aula ou uma atividade avaliativa); o vocabulário utilizado para problematizar construtos da linguística moderna (se são os mesmos que lutamos contra). Considerando as reflexões pedagógicas que emergiram durante esta, quatro questões são levantadas pelos/as participantes: a distância entre a língua da escola e a língua real; o poder da estrutura sob a agência docente; a complexidade de lidar com as expectativas de ingleses nativizados por parte dos/as alunos/as; a colonialidade da avaliação. Primeiro, discutimos como a gramática normativa ainda se faz presente em nossas salas e como a linguagem apresentada em livros didáticos é diferente da linguagem utilizada em contextos reais, tendo implicações para o conceito de autenticidade. Segundo, debatemos sobre como o ensino de inglês é regido por metodologias e ideologias linguísticas impostas pelo centro, tornando mais difícil a implementação de uma abordagem mais decolonial. Terceiro, apresentamos como as expectativas dos/as alunos/as em relação a ingleses nativizados é uma barreira forte para uma prática mais decolonial. Tais expectativas podem se originar das crenças que os pais desses/as alunos/as possuem sobre língua e de uma pressão da sociedade para que se aprenda a língua padrão. Por último, discorremos sobre avaliação, e eu discuto como tentei encontrar um balanço entre uma posição pragmática e idealista para lidar com as praxiologias que eu trabalho e com as demandas que práticas tradicionais de ensino de língua requerem. Na conclusão, respondo as perguntas de pesquisa, discuto as implicações da dissertação e aponto traços de (de)colonialidade presentes no estudo.

Palavras-chave: formação crítica de professores/as de língua; decolonialidade; ideologia linguística; etnografia da sala de aula.

Table of contents

INTRODUCTION[1]

Language. Since the beginning of my undergraduate course, I have been quite curious and interested to define language. I remember that on the first day of the subject Linguistic Studies I took in the first term, the professor read us out a fable of the elephant and the six blind men. In the fable, each blind man touched the elephant in a different part of its body and said that the new animal was just like the part they had touched. If they touched the tail, they would say it was like a rope. If they touched the belly, they would say the elephant was a big wall. The professor wanted us to reflect that many linguists have been trying to define language, but we have not grasped the whole. We have focused on different aspects of our limited vision. Then, throughout the subject, we studied structuralist, gerativist, functionalist, pragmatic, and discursive conceptions of language.

Based on the readings I have now, I reflect that the fable and our interpretation at the time displayed a positivist tradition in language studies. We have assumed that there is a reality to be known and we have been trying to study and define it through scientific methods (REAGAN, 2004). We have assumed that language is that elephant: a closed entity ready to be studied and defined. We have assumed and studied language (or the elephant) separately from the world. We have also assumed that languages are separate from each other. Lastly, these assumptions have influenced the way we also teach this thing called *language*. Reagan (2004), then, taught me we have objectified language.

Obviously, I did not learn this right after I took the subject. So, in this introductory part, I aim to discuss: a) my trajectory and what I learned throughout the Letras: Inglês[2,3] course based on Critical Applied Linguistics, praxiologies[4] that problematize language, and

---

[1] Grounded on the CEPEC (Conselho de Ensino, Pesquisa, Extensão e Cultura – Culture, Extension, Research, and Teaching Committee) Resolution 1474/2017, graduate students in the Letras e Linguistica graduate program are allowed to write their final product in English, French, Spanish, or Portuguese. However, the resolution also standardizes the use of ABNT (Associação Brasileira de Normas e Técnicas – Brazilian Association for Norms and Techniques) formatting norms, and not Vancouver or APA, even though the work is written in a language other than Portuguese.

[2] This is an English language teacher education course. A better description on how the course is organized will be made in the methodology section.

[3] Traditionally, words or expressions in a language different from the main one used in a text should come in italics to separate languages. Pratt's (2012) text encouraged me not to do that. I only use italics if I want to emphasize a word or an expression.

[4] Because I do not see theory and practice as separate, I use the term praxiologies instead of theory or practice.

on the decolonial thinking; b) and the design of this study. By doing that, I believe I can shed light on the praxiological orientations I follow and how they have shaped this study.

Starting to think about Critical Applied Linguistics reminded me of a critical moment[5] I had during my undergraduate studies. In the fourth term, I took a mandatory discipline called Applied Linguistics. I remember reading a text that affirmed that the role of Applied Linguistics was to study language in social contexts. I have always been inclined towards Linguistics rather than Literature since the start of the course, but I found it amazing that I would study praxiologies about language from a perspective that would have social implications, something that I had not found in the other disciplines. Afterwards, in the fifth term, I was in contact with critical perspectives to language teaching and at that time I connected what I had read in the previous discipline and noticed a gap between both moments. I noticed the notion of social from the first discipline I had taken was quite different from the ones I started to read in the fifth term and had nothing to do with relations of power. Also, examples of social contexts shown in the first discipline were quite simplistic and not politicized. So, I got more engaged with critical language critical language teaching and critical language teacher education and started reading more about them.

Pennycook (2001) is pioneer in defining the domains and concerns of Critical Applied Linguistics. He argues that the critical is not simply an addition of the term to traditional Applied Linguistics, since it adds domains that were not considered by Applied Linguistics, such as sexuality, gender, race, social class, etc. Also, Pennycook (2001) is worried about the definition of the term *critical*, since it can be found in different perspectives. He argues that the critical he is defending is not either from the critical thinking perspective, aimed at looking at reality from a distant and objective perspective, nor from Critical Theory, which is focused on emancipation and rationality, "developing a critique of social and political formations but offering only a version of an alternative truth in its place" (PENNYCOOK, 2001, p. 7), thus reproducing modernist ideals. Even though Critical Theory engages with problematizations of power and difference, it does so from an objective perspective. Pennycook (2001) defends that Critical Applied Linguistics should engage with questions of power, difference, and argues that the praxiologies they develop are not neutral but

---

[5] Pennycook (2012, p. 131) defines critical moments as "a point of significance, an instant when things change".

circumscribed in a specific space and time. The critical he defends is one of a *Problematizing practice*, that is, a constant practice of problematizing naturalized notions.

Critical work would not be critical if it stopped problematizing its own givens. So, Pennycook (2001, p. 3) contends that Critical Applied Linguistics is not supposed to be a disciplinary cannon of texts, but "a way of thinking and doing". Such constant problematization would lead to the notion that our knowledge production is limited to what we know and read, developing what Pennycook (2001) calls as self-reflexivity. Recognizing such limitations can prevent us from creating grand narratives about social experiences and imposing the critical point of view as the good or correct one. Another aspect of Critical Applied Linguistics is an intrinsic connection to change in the sense that it not only problematizes givens, but also provides us with a vision of preferred futures, that is, different possibilities of recreating social experience.

Classroom researchers under a critical perspective should look at classroom practice in a politicized way. Pennycook (2001 based on AUERBACH, 1995) defends that every choice we make about any educational aspect is political. Seating arrangement in a classroom, for example, might raise questions related to the definition of education a teacher has and his/her role as a teacher towards his/her students. Pennycook (2001) also defends that we should not see classrooms as mere sites of social reproduction or a place where free will can be exercised. He contends that his view is "one where the classroom is part of the world, both affected by what happens outside its walls and affecting what happens there. Classrooms, from this perspective, are also sites where identities are produced and changed" (PENNYCOOK, 2001, p. 129).

In Brazil, critical perspectives in Applied Linguistics have become quite popular, mainly after the publication of the book Por uma Linguística Aplicada INdisciplinar (Towards an INdisciplinary Applied Linguistics), organized by Moita Lopes (2006a). Moita Lopes (2006b) defends that the purpose of research should be problematized due to social changes happening in the world. According to him, modernism influenced research in that it looked for a universalized truth and considered science as something that would save the world. He argues that the knowledge produced today cannot be that of modernism, in the sense that it privileged the white and heterosexual men and marginalized identities other than

that. His central claim relies on bringing marginalized people to the center of knowledge production to create new ways of thinking about society.

Likewise, Fabrício (2006) defends an Applied Linguistics as an unlearning space. She argues that plurality is not the exception, but the rule in society, and, thus, simplistic and universalized definitions cannot take into account the complexity of human lives. Ethics should be the guiding principle of this Applied Linguistics, focusing on the outcomes of its praxiologies. Also, an Applied Linguistics as an unlearning space would not consider fluidity as negative but as spaces of learning about contemporary life.

Borelli and Pessoa (2018, p. 19), in the same vein, defend that these changes in the world and in Applied Linguistics have direct implications for "the role of the linguist and the role of society, the conception of research, and the relationship between theory and practice". First, the linguist occupies an ethical position in producing knowledge able to create a more just society. Second, researchers should recognize research situatedness while aiming at improving people's lives. These two aspects lead "to the necessity of redefining the status of theory, the value attributed to practice and the relationship between them" (BORELLI; PESSOA, 2018, p. 23).

Critical language teacher education is one of the concerns Critical Applied Linguistics has and it aims at "investigating and promoting critical activity in language education contexts" (SILVESTRE, 2017, p. 80). When explaining why critical language teacher education is important, Hawkins and Norton (2009, p. 2) contend that "language, culture, and identity are integrally related, [so] language teachers are in a key position to address educational inequality". Hawkins and Norton (2009) affirm that research on critical language teacher education practices is difficult to find. Since the publication of their paper, research on this topic increased, as noted by Silvestre (2017), but I agree with them that it is still sparse, mainly when we consider empirically grounded research.

What I have learned from Critical Applied Linguistics studies is that every choice we make in our classroom is political. Adopting a simply functional view of language and not choosing to address inequality in education is a political choice and not a neutral one. Because Critical Applied Linguistics is based on poststrucutalism, we see language as discourse, and we believe our realities and subjectivities are built through language

(JORDÃO, 2006). Because of that, as language teachers, we should address issues of race, gender, body, sexuality, class and problematize hegemonic thoughts about them.

During my graduation and master's course, I also participated in the study group Transição, coordinated by the professors Rosane Rocha Pessoa and Viviane Pires Viana Silvestre. I remember reading texts about translingual practice (CANAGARAJAH, 2013; 2014) and decolonial thinking (BALLESTRIN, 2013), and we were amazed by the way the authors problematized the modern and positivist tradition in language studies and also how European colonization helped shape the realities we live now, mainly concerning knowledge construction.

The texts about translingual practice shifted my perceptions, as Canagarajah (2013; 2014) acutely destabilized common notions I used to have about languages. For example, I had always thought that languages were separate from each other, belonged to nations and had a self-standing system. These notions were built not only throughout my Letras: Inglês course in disciplines that did not focus on the critical perspectives I mentioned, but also before that, since our formal education in Secondary education is complicit with modern ideals too. Canagarajah's (2014) ideas inspired me to read more about that and I came to other concepts such as: Herderian triad, monolingual orientation, linguistic hierarchization, language ideologies, and language invention. I like to imagine these concepts as parting from the main one, which is *language invention*, as they all aim to destabilize the modern ideal of language we have in Linguistics.

More recently I came to read authors that problematize language as ahistorical (REAGAN, 2004). Harris (2002), for example, affirms language is a myth entrenched in our Western imaginary and such myth is constituted by two fallacies, the determinability and the tellementality fallacy, which will be explained later. Other authors also problematize the positivist and colonial aspects in traditional Linguistics (BLOMMAERT, 2010; NASCIMENTO, 2017; PRATT, 2012). Connecting my readings that problematized conceptions of language with the readings on the decolonial thinking, I noticed how they could be related to each other since, for Makoni and Pennycook (2007), languages are inventions built as part of colonialist and nationalist projects.

Linguistics, thus, is complicit with colonial and positivist ideals. The discussion on coloniality is important, because the end of the colonial administrative structures did not

mean the end of colonial forms of domination, as Castro-Gómez and Grosfóguel (2007) claim. We still reproduce colonial forms of domination in all areas of our lives: profession, research, education, etc. Concerning academic contexts, Castro-Gómez (2007) claims that the knowledge produced at the university reflects colonial forms of domination. He argues that "the arboreal and disciplinary structure of knowledge […] reproduce a modern/colonial epistemic model" (CASTRO-GÓMEZ, 2007, p. 81). It is arboreal, since the university is a hierarchical structure organized in faculties, departments, programs, etc., and it is disciplinary because "the disciplines delimit certain types of knowledge and define certain themes which are singularly pertinent to the discipline" (CASTRO-GÓMEZ, 2007, p. 84). He affirms that the university holds the position of la hybris del punto cero, which guarantees the university the right to describe, research, and legitimize knowledge. However, el gran pecado del Occidente, as Castro-Gómez (2007) affirms, is to create a point of view with supposed neutrality over the others without assuming its ideological nature. For Nascimento (2017), Saussure's (2011) book is responsible for attributing un punto cero in Linguistics.

Blommaert and Backus (2012), Pennycook (2007), Makoni and Meinhof (2006), and Milroy (2001) also problematize the construction of knowledge around the concept of language for Linguistic Studies. We have understood language as an abstract entity to be described and studied through scientific methods. This language has a Standard version and varieties orbiting around it. However, as Pennycook and Makoni (2007) discuss, languages and praxiologies about languages are invented through social and political processes. The authors compare language to time and discuss that time does not exist. We have decided to use the conception of time to describe the rotation of the Earth around its axis and the sun. The rotation is a natural phenomenon, while the idea of time that we use to measure is a convention. The same goes for language.

The idea of language might be an invention, but the effects of this idea are very real (PENNYCOOK; MAKONI, 2007). In language education, authors have also been interested to problematize modern constructs in teacher education and language teaching research (BORELLI, 2018a; CANAGARAJAH, 2007b; 2013; 2014; FLORES; ANEJA, 2017; PESSOA; SILVESTRE; BORELLI, 2019). Canagarajah (2007b, p. 923) critiques Second Language Acquisition for having

> generally worked with the assumption that learners are emulating the idealized competence of NSs [native speakers], that they are handicapped in their capacity to communicate with the undeveloped language they possess, and that learning a language primarily constitutes mastering its grammar in specially designed pedagogical contexts.

When using the socially invented category of the native speaker of English as a Standard to be achieved, as Assis-Peterson and Cox (2013) discuss, a torture is created for students and teachers in the classroom, since students feel they are failing for not learning and teachers for not being able to teach this invented language. For Jordão (2014, p. 230), the binary native versus non-native speakers creates in Brazilian language teachers of English "a feeling of anxiety and inaptness that makes life and work extremely difficult". So, Canagarajah (2007b, p. 924) affirms that the social, political, and linguistic moment we live "created an urgency to understand acquisition outside homogeneous communities". Together with Garcia (2007, p. xii), I would like to ask: "What would language education look like if we no longer posited the existence of separate languages?".

What I have learned from *praxiologies that problematize languages* and from the *decolonial thinking* is that we reproduce colonialities in the way we research, in the way we conceptualized language, and in the way we teach this thing called language. Because of these readings on Critical Applied Linguistics and on decolonial thinking that problematize language, language teaching and language teacher education, I have decided to develop this research.

This research is based on a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize conceptions of language with university student teachers in a Letras: Inglês course. I call it a qualitative study following an ethnographic perspective. It follows ethnographic assumptions, as I want to focus on the processes and relations of this teacher education experience. Empirical material generation took place in a Letras: Inglês discipline called Inglês 8. In this subject, students are supposed to improve their language knowledge through the discussion of teaching issues and Applied Linguistics praxiological texts. In 2017, with the allowance of the professor responsible for the course, I taught fifteen classes of 100 minutes each. In these classes, we problematized conceptions of language under a decolonial perspective. The problematization happened through the discussion of videos and academic texts that versed about the following themes: language invention, monolingual orientation, linguistic repertoires, linguistic hierarchization, globalization and language,

language and identity, coloniality. Because I taught for two months, I was also responsible for the assessment of the first two months of the term.

This research has two specific aims:

a) To investigate the language ideologies produced by student teachers throughout a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective;

b) To investigate the pedagogical reflections that emerged from a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective.

Empirical material was generated by means of eight research sources: initial questionnaire, classroom interaction, field diary, narratives (first and final), activities produced by student teachers, reflective sessions with the professor, final reflective session, and final interview. Due to research focus on the language ideologies produced by the student teachers and on the pedagogical reflections made in the course, not every source will be used in this study, but they will be described because they were part of the research process.

This master's thesis is divided as follows: in this introductory part, I have attempted to narrate my praxiological orientations based on my trajectory as a Letras: Inglês student; in the first chapter, I discuss the methodological choices I have made; in the second chapter, I discuss the language ideologies produced by student teachers; in the third chapter, I focus on the pedagogical reflections that emerged from this experience; finally, in the conclusion, I answer the research questions and reflect upon some issues this study raises.

Since I have made the decision to write my master's thesis in English, I have been questioned whether I was reproducing neoliberal/colonial ideologies or being less critical in doing research in a critical perspective *in English*. There is no finished answer to that, but here are some of the reasons why I made this decision: 1. Even though English is a discursive field of neoliberalism, globalization, and human capital (PENNYCOOK, 2007), I believe that writing my work in English can promote critical work in the field of TESOL and possibly confront the discursive construction of English; 2. My experiences with English contradict, at least to some extent, the conception that languages belong to places, people, and community (CANAGARAJAH, 2013), as I feel much more confident to write academically

in English than in my first language[6], even though I am from a country which has Portuguese as its official language; 3. In the monolingual paradigm, I am a non-native language teacher of English; however, I am using this language to produce knowledge about my experiences as a non-native language teacher. Like Canagarajah (2018)[7], I prefer to think that

> we can find ways to resist compromising our values and interests by being firmly grounded in our communities, histories, and knowledge traditions. It is possible to critically engage with the dominant academic conventions, drawing actively from our own backgrounds.

---

[6] It is hard not to use terminologies about language that reproduce the separation of language ideology. However, I prefer to use *first language* instead of *mother language* and *second language* instead of *foreign language*.

[7] Available at: <https://www.aaal.org/news/aaaletter---april-2018>. Accessed on: July 31st, 2018.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this work is comprised by two characteristics: it is a qualitative study, since I aim to study a real environment making use of qualitative sources; it adopts an ethnographic perspective, as I try to discuss how teacher education and learning processes operate in a classroom. In this section, I will explain my conception of these two research perspectives and then I will describe the context, the participants, the research sources, and how the empirical material discussion will be developed.

2.1. Qualitative approach

Qualitative approach is characterized by how empirical material is generated and discussed. For Croker (2009, p. 5), "qualitative research entails collecting primarily textual empirical material and examining it using interpretive analysis". Also, in qualitative approaches reality is understood as socially constructed, and researchers "seek answers to questions that stress *how* social experience is created and given meaning" (DENZIN; LINCOLN, 2005, p. 10).

Another aspect of qualitative approach is its focus on the real world, and the task researchers need to follow is to make the world visible. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005, p. 3), we do it through the research sources we use, "such as field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self". The reality built in a qualitative work, however, cannot be universally understood, but it is "person-, context- and time-bound" (CROKER, 2009, p. 6). In this perspective, the researcher works as a *bricoleur*, a maker of quilts, since they may use different excerpts, documents, theories to rebuild and retell the reality from which empirical material was generated (DENZIN; LINCOLN, 2005; PARAÍSO; 2012).

Concerning the researcher, I hold an important role on the research I am producing, since I was the main source of empirical material in the sense that everything that was generated for the research was influenced by my actions/ideologies, that is, by my praxis. Qualitative research "connects him or her [the researcher] to specific sites, persons, groups, institutions, and bodies of relevant interpretive material, including documents and archives" (DENZIN; LINCOLN, 2005, p. 25). So, in this research, I speak from an insider point of

view, that is, from an emic perspective, in which the Cartesian dichotomy of observer and observed is deconstructed (REES, 2008). As Rees (2008, p. 258) affirms, "in writing the research texts (annotation field, diaries, reports, papers, thesis), the researcher is inserted in an act of interpretation and creation".

It is impossible to speak of qualitative work as objective. Researcher subjectivity is permeated in every research process. In my case, since I was responsible for teaching the classes during the empirical material generation, I was present with my intellectual baggage and life experiences (CROKER, 2009). I was the researcher and the teacher educator. Also, I interviewed and transcribed the audios. So, my worldview will be inextricably connected to every process and decision I took in my research.

In the qualification exam, I was questioned about ethical matters concerning my research, as my double position could infect empirical material generation and the production of this work. This questioning, to my account, seems to reflect positivist tradition in research, which sees knowledge as separate from the researcher. Also, it emphasizes a colonial distinction between practice and theory, in which the university produces the knowledge applied in the school, since teachers cannot position themselves as researchers (BORELLI, 2018b; BORELLI; PESSOA, 2018). This interrogation goes against the ideas I defend in this work, which sees knowledge as embodied and local. Even though I do not frame this study as Practitioner Research (teachers researching their practice), Anderson (2002) reflects on the devaluation this type of study suffers from more traditional and positivist researchers and I think the interrogation that was made is related to that. So, Anderson (2002) suggests reflexivity as a way of having best practices in this type of research.

Adding to this discussion, Tracy (2010) defines eight criteria that should be followed by a qualitative work. These criteria are not to eliminate the researcher's subjectivity, but to provide researchers with best practices in qualitative research. They are: worthy topic, rich rigor, sincerity, credibility, resonance, significant contribution, and ethical and meaningful coherence. I believe that Tracy's (2010) third criterium, *sincerity*, can respond well to problematizations on researcher's subjectivity and my dual position as a teacher educator and researcher. She affirms that sincerity is comprised by two elements: self-reflexivity and transparency. Self-reflexivity is about acknowledging that our work is limited and reflects our own positions. We should not hide our subjectivity but make it clearer to the reader. One

way of doing that is to explain where the researcher comes from and why s/he thinks that way, something I started doing in the Introduction. *Transparency*, however, refers to research processes. Tracy (2010, p. 842) contends that we should explain "how the researcher got into the context, the level of participation and immersion, fieldnote practices, and level of detail in transcription". I will try to follow her suggestions in this section, but first I will provide some insights on ethnography and classroom ethnography.

2.2. Ethnography and classroom ethnography

Ethnography is an inquiry method that was developed by anthropologists, but researchers from the educational area have been quite interested in investigating classrooms under this perspective (ANDRÉ, 2005; LAU, 2017; WATSON-GEGEO, 1997). Ethnography aims to describe "cultures (practices, habits, beliefs, values, languages, meanings) of a social group" (ANDRÉ, 2005, p. 28). Also, another focus ethnographic research has is on the *processes* and *relationships* that display patterns of behavior of social groups, rather than on their result.

Watson-Gegeo (1997) defines *classroom ethnography* as a methodology in which researchers can apply ethnographic knowledge into researching what happens in school contexts. Teaching and learning processes hold a sociocultural nature and classroom ethnography has been used to examine

> teaching styles, lesson structure and other classroom speech activities (such as 'sharing time'), teacher and student discourse styles/registers, discourse tasks (questions, scaffolding, topic-setting, etc.), differential treatment of student resistance, teacher expectations and idealizations of students, student resistance, teacher and student empowerment, and the teaching of classroom subjects (reading, writing, mathematics, science). (WATSON-GEGEO, 1997, p. 139).

Since my main research objective is to problematize, in a decolonial perspective, language conceptions with student teachers in an English language teacher education course, I believe that following an ethnographic perspective can add a lot to my discussion. Also, my two specific objectives are quite aligned with ethnographic assumptions (emphasis on processes of social phenomena, rather than result), as we can see below:

a) To investigate the language ideologies produced by the student teachers throughout a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective;

b) To investigate the pedagogical reflections that emerged from a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective.

Another aspect highlighted by Lau (2017, p. 81) is that "classroom ethnography allows for the examination of complex human activities and relationships in full and in connections to spaces, institutions, and broader social practices". Since my research follows a critical perspective, connecting the social phenomenon analyzed to macro social relations is an important aspect. I prefer to say that this work follows a critical perspective because saying that it is a critical ethnography may resonate a Marxist-oriented notion of critical (MAY, 1997). Thomas (1993, p. 34), when discussing about critical ethnography, affirms that, "for critical thinkers, the ontological assumption is that there is something else there that will take us beneath the surface world of accepted appearances and reveal the darker, oppressive side of social life". The notion of critical I am taking into consideration is aligned with the three post-critical notions that challenge our ways of being:

> the postcolonial challenge of dealing with the Other, the poststructuralist requirement to understand how discourses operate across multiple sites, constructing our worlds and subjectivities, and the postmodern challenge to deal with the particularities and complexities presented by trying to take differences seriously. (PENNYCOOK, 2001, p. 140).

Rather than conceiving truth as something hidden, I believe that "the discourse we produce with our research is a partial one, which was produced based on what we could see and signify with the descriptive-analytical-theoretical tools we chose to operate" (PARAÍSO, 2012, p. 28). So, my reading of the social phenomena I am investigating will not be aimed at uncovering one single truth, but to problematize the processes and relations developed throughout the course.

2.3. Research questions

Considering it a qualitative study following an ethnographic perspective, we will try to discuss the following research questions:

a) What language ideologies are produced by student teachers throughout a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective?

b) What pedagogical reflections emerged from a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective?

2.4. Context

This study was developed in English language classes from a Letras: Inglês course in a public university in the Midwest of Brazil. It lasts for four years and one of the specific objectives of this course is to "prepare English language teachers to work in elementary school, high school, and vocational education" (UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS, 2011, p. 6). The course is organized in the following way: a) common core subjects, in which future-teachers study general praxiologies on Linguistics and Literature; b) specific core subjects, in which future-teachers will develop their language skills, knowledge on literature produced in English, and their English language teaching practices in regular schools; c) free core subjects, which accounts for the smallest part of the whole curriculum; future teachers can choose any free core subject from any faculty in the university.

More specifically, this study took place in a specific core subject from the last term called Inglês 8 (English 8), in which students study the English language through the discussion of teaching issues discussed by Applied Linguistics. As it is in the Syllabus, Inglês 8 has as its aims the

> [i]mprovement of the communicative competence in upper-intermediate English level. Development of the ability to express opinion, to argue, to interpret and to produce texts in the English language. Reflection on the processes of foreign language teaching and learning. (UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS, 2011, p. 42)

I decided to choose this subject because of my past experiences. Most of the students who take Inglês 8 are either teaching in language schools or are developing their teaching practices in Practicum subjects. Since I intended to develop a critical language teacher education experience problematizing language, I wanted to do this study with a group of students who were already teaching. So, I talked to the professor responsible for the subject and she allowed me to teach fifteen lessons on the topic I decided to work with. Thus, empirical material generation started at the beginning of September and lasted until the beginning of November, 2017. The classes happened in the morning, on Tuesdays, from 10:00am to 11:40am, and on Thursdays, from 08:00am to 09:40am. In the next subsection, I will describe the teacher-researcher, the research participants, and the classes developed in the course.

2.4.1. *Participants*

2.4.1.1. Teacher-researcher

I am from a small town in the state of Goiás, Brazil. I moved to Goiânia in 2012 because I intended to study Letras: Inglês. As many of Letras students I know, I wanted to take this course because I liked the English language. I had already studied English for four years before entering university. I remember I was quite connected to London and one of my dreams was to apply for an interchange program to study English abroad. However, many of my ideas concerning English, language, and teaching changed throughout the four years of the course. I got in touch with structuralist, discursive, sociocultural, critical and, more recently, decolonial perspectives on language. I have always been quite engaged in academic studies since I started studying at the Universidade Federal de Goiás. Now, I have been trying to publish papers in journals and I have been presenting my works in Applied Linguistics events. Currently, I am interested in researching teacher education and language teaching grounded on critical and decolonial perspectives.

Concerning my teaching experiences, I started teaching English in 2012 at Centro de Línguas[8] (the university language center). I taught at Centro de Línguas for three years and

---

[8] Centro de Línguas is an extension project from Faculdade de Letras (Letras Faculty). It aims at teaching languages to academic and general community. Besides, students of Letras can also develop trainee experiences there.

a half. Afterwards, I was a PIBID[9] student for 10 months. In PIBID, we had weekly meetings at the university with the professor responsible for the program and weekly visits at a regular school to observe and teach with the help of a collaborator, who was a regular school teacher. Then, I applied to teach at Idiomas sem Fronteiras (Languages without Borders), an educational program from the Brazilian Ministry of Education aimed at preparing university students to speak a second language and apply for international scholarships or interchange programs abroad. All my experiences accounted for around 5 years of English language teaching at the time of the empirical material generation.

2.4.1.2. University student teachers

I call the participants *student teachers*, because they were at the university as students; however, most of them had already started teaching, be it in Practicum subjects or any other trainee program. In this section, the following chart describes them, taking into account the information they wrote on the Initial questionnaire and on the First narrative. The student teachers signed a consent term (Appendix A) and chose a fictitious name to be used in this text. Participant anonymity is a challenge in qualitative research from an ethnographic perspective, since their identity must be kept safe at the same time specific details about them need to be described since they are important for the discussion. I will try to provide details about the participants without compromising their anonymity. I had previously thought of writing a paragraph about them, but the information I wrote could compromise their anonymity. Thus, I have decided to draw a chart with general information about them with details that might be important for the discussion. One participant chose to withdraw from the research on October 19th, 2018, almost a year after the generation of the empirical material. He affirmed he had not been feeling well at the time of the research and what he had said in the production of activities, in classroom interactions and in the final interview had more to do with external factors than with my research focus. So, the empirical material consists of fourteen student teachers, as shown in Chart 1:

---

[9] PIBID is Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência (Teaching Initiation Scholarship Program).

Chart 1 – Participants

Fictitious name	Gender	Race	Age	English teaching experience	Experience abroad
Lenore	Female	Yellow	Not declared	One year in a public school	No experience
Bianca	Female	White	22	5 years in a language school	Lived in an English-speaking country
Emily	Female	Parda (mixed race)	22	No experience	No experience
Luna	Female	White	22	3 years in a language center	Lived in an English-speaking country
Magali	Female	White	33	No experience	Lived in a non-English-speaking country
Anita	Female	Parda (mixed race)	30	Two years in a language center	No experience
Maria Clara	Female	White	23	No experience	No experience
Rosa	Female	White	22	No experience	
Raul	Male	Black	20	Two years in a language center	No experience
Larissa	Female	White	22	One semester in a language school	No experience
Yoshihara	Female	White	35	7 years in a language school	Lived in an English-speaking country
Rita	Female	White	23	3 years and a half in a language school	No experience
Sérgio	Male	Black	21	2 years in a language school	No experience
Nina	Female	Black	26	No experience	Lived in a non-English-speaking country

Source: Elaborated by the author, 2019.

From the fifteen student teachers who took part in the study, one withdrew his participation from the research. Thus, the empirical material from this student will not be taken into consideration. From the fourteen students who make part of this study, twelve are female and two are male. Eight self-declared as white, while six self-declared as non-white. 11 students were in their twenties, with ages ranging from 20 to 26. Three students had ages

ranging from 30 to 35. Eight students had previous teaching experiences in language schools, one in public school, and five did not have any teaching experience. Even though the Pedagogical Project of the course affirms that it prepares students to work in elementary, secondary and vocational education contexts (UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS, 2011), most of the student teachers affirmed to have experience in language schools. This is due to the extension project that there is in our Faculty of Letras, in which student teachers can develop paid, non-mandatory internship. Their experience had implications on how the discussions in class were held, which will be discussed later. Lastly, three had lived in English-speaking countries, two had lived in non-English-speaking countries, and nine had never had any experience abroad.

2.4.1.3. Professor

Graça

She was female, white, and 53 years old at the time of the research. She had been teaching at the Universidade Federal de Goiás since 1991. My relationship with Graça started in 2013 in a jornada pedagógica (a short teaching training course) at Centro de Línguas. I remember my friends were supervised by her in Centro de Línguas and I saw how they really liked her. During my undergraduate years, I had classes with her in 2014 (English Teaching Practicum 1 and 2), and in 2015, she was my professor in English 7 and 8. I remember my friends and I felt very comfortable to talk about our problems, insecurities, and fears about life or English teaching. It was our safe place. In 2017, when I looked for her to develop my research in her group, she received me with open arms. Lastly, she signed a consent term (Appendix B) and chose a fictitious name to be used in the text.

2.4.2. Aims of the course

I started teaching on September 12th, 2017, after receiving the letter of acceptance from the Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa (Ethics Committee in Research) (Annex A). Empirical material generation took place in fifteen classes of 100 minutes each. Since the number of classes corresponded to the first half of the term, I was also responsible for assessing the students. With the allowance of the professor responsible for the subject, I taught all the fifteen classes. She observed fourteen of the lessons and assisted me with lesson planning

during our reflective sessions. The themes discussed in class aimed at problematizing conceptions of language, English, and English language teaching. The praxiologies used to guide the classes come from discussions in Applied Linguistics and Critical Applied Linguists that conceive language as an invention (BLOMMAERT; BACKUS, 2012; CANAGARAJAH, 2013; MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007; MAKONI; MEINHOF, 2006); and propose a decolonial option in English teaching (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2012; 2016; RAJAGOPALAN, 2015).

Because my work is grounded on the premises of a decolonial option in English teaching (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2016), the course aimed at problematizing colonial and power relations in center-based knowledge production, too. Not only did I want us to problematize these relations, but I also wanted teachers to envision possibilities of attempting to do decolonial work. So, during the first 10 classes, we discussed themes such as language invention, globalization, linguistic repertoire, identity, colonization/coloniality. In the four following classes, students were asked to prepare a microlesson based on the themes discussed. Then, in the final class, a reflective session was held with the whole group to discuss the outcomes of the course. In this section, I explain all the activities we developed during the course.

In the **first class**, I prepared some activities to get to know the students as I did not know all of them. Also, I presented the research, the course syllabus for the first term, and I read the consent term with them. All the 15 students decided to take part in the research, but I will only take into account the empirical material produced by 14 students, since one decided to withdraw from the research.

In the **second class**, I introduced the discussion on language and English, but I did not want to make it too theoretical. I wanted to focus on their experiences with languages. First, we brainstormed some words related to language and explained why these words were mentioned. Then, we watched three videos of classes that corresponded to the three most known language teaching methods (grammar-translation, audiolingual, and communicative language teaching). I wanted them to see that behind any teaching practice, there is a conception of language. Afterwards, we brainstormed some ideas specifically about English and discussed the influence of English on their lives. Later, we read two language-related events. One from Rajagopalan's (2015) text, in which an Anglo-Saxon looking foreigner

suffers harassment from a Nicaraguan taxi driver, highlighting a resistance Nicaraguans have towards the anglophone world due to political matters, and another one from Kumaravadivelu's (2016) text, in which he discusses his experience as a scholar trying to publish on methods and language teaching. These two language-related events characterize how language is political. We read the excerpts and discussed similar language-related events in our lives. After that, I assigned a first narrative in which they had to discuss their conception of language and talk about how language was present in their lives by means of language-related events.

In the **third class**, we discussed two concepts: monolingual orientation and Herderian triad. First, we read parts of Canagarajah's (2013) book, in which he discusses the construction of languages and the monolingual orientation in language studies, and, then, we went through the Herderian triad, which shows how languages had to be invented and territorialized, contributing to the creation of nation-states. Afterwards, we read excerpts from Webster's (1789) dissertation on the English language. Webster is considered one of the Founding Fathers of the United States. He wrote a dissertation arguing that the English from the United States had to be different (and better) from the English of England. In his dissertation, he defends that linguistic purity could be guarded by the Standardization of books and schools, thus guaranteeing political harmony in their nation. Also, he argues that the norm used should come from the upper classes. His dissertation is representative of how languages were invented during the creation of nation-states. What we highlighted in our class discussion is that such process is never apolitical or neutral, and it has serious implications for people's lives.

In the **fourth class**, we continued the discussion on language as invention through two videos: parts of a documentary called *American Tongues* (1988) and a TED talk named *What makes a word real?*. *American Tongues* (1988) is a sociolinguistics documentary in which different accents spoken in the USA are shown. It also shows people's perception of these accents. With this video, we worked on the concept of linguistic hierarchization, that is, how people are discursively hierarchized based on the way they speak. We also discussed how such hierarchization operates with other social markers of difference, such as race. *What makes a word "real"?* is a video produced by the linguist Anne Curzan (2014), in which she confronts the idea that dictionaries are neutral and unauthored. She aims to show how

dictionaries are socially produced, or better saying, handmade. Lastly, I assigned the text *After disinvention: possibilities for communication, community and competence* by Canagarajah (2007a) for homework, and students had to write two paragraphs about it. In the first one, they would answer these two questions: 1. What could you understand by language invention?; 2. What are the effects of language invention?. In the second one, they would summarize the text they had read.

In the **fifth class**, we continued with the concept of language as invention and read some excerpts from Pennycook and Makoni's (2007) text on language invention. Also, we discussed Canagarajah's (2007a) text, in which he talks about how we should see language, competence, and communication after disinventing it, that is, after acknowledging that languages are inventions.

In the **sixth class**, we discussed globalization through the video *The Myth of Globalization*, by Peter Alfandary (2015), who defends that globalization should not be conceived as something that connects the world by erasing differences since we encounter with difference every single day. Also, we discussed the impact globalization has on language use and how such impacts could be addressed in our English language classes. At the end of the class, I asked them to read Assis-Petterson and Cox's (2013) *Standard English & World English: entre o siso e o riso* (Standard English & World English: between Karl and Groucho) and choose three excerpts to write what they thought about each one.

In the **seventh class**, we continued discussing globalization, but also focused on two other concepts: linguistic repertoire and World Englishes. We discussed Assis-Peterson and Cox's (2013) text, in which they problematize the English we teach in schools and its effects. They argue that English should not be seen as a unitary language belonging to a specific country, whether it is the United States or England. Such notion, in their view, harms students' creativity. Teachers should see English as a resource that students can acquire and use for their purposes. Lastly, we directed our discussion to our classes and problematized how and if the World Englishes perspective would work in our contexts. Still in this class, I showed a video of a Brazilian woman speaking English in London. In this video, she talks about her experience in London. She does not rely on Standard English to speak and mixes different linguistic resources. So, I wanted them to relate the video with the text we had read.

Afterwards, in the **eighth class**, we discussed Anzaldúa's (2007) text *How to tame a wild tongue*. Anzaldúa narrates parts of her life and its connection with language as powerful and sexist. Prior to this class, I advised students to write five questions about the text. I collected them one day before the class and prepared a PowerPoint presentation using them. During the class, we discussed the text using some of the students' questions. Next, we tried to relate it to our personal lives and to our trajectories at school.

In the **ninth class**, we held a similar discussion. I brought a transcription[10] from a real class in which the teacher was discussing with his students about a movie they had watched. Even though he was discussing about the movie during the whole class, in one part, the teacher focused on form; in the other, he focused on meaning. After reading it, we discussed whether we should focus on form or meaning and how this discussion was related to Standardized language and power. After this activity, I explained what they were supposed to do in their microlesson. Lastly, I asked them to prepare a 25-minute lesson with pre-, while-, and post-reading activities based on part of Anzaldúa's (2007) text. We discussed some of their ideas in the whole group as preparation for the microlessons they would have to produce for the following classes.

In the **tenth class**, we revised all the concepts we discussed during the course and discussed how Linguistics was constructed in the 20th century and how structuralist notions of language have erased discussions on power. We compared two speech situations, Saussure's and Guama Poma's, which can be seen below. From that, we discussed the conception of language in both images.

Image 1 - Saussure's *le circuit de la parole*

Source: Saussure (1915) cited in Pratt (2012).

---

[10] Taken from a semiotic event in Lima Neto's (2017) master's thesis Ensino crítico de línguas: reprodução social e resistência em uma sala de aula de língua inglesa (Critical language teaching: social reproduction and resistance in an English language classroom). Available at: <https://repositorio.bc.ufg.br/tede/bitstream/tede/7796/5/Disserta%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20-%20Luiz%20Martins%20de%20Lima%20Neto%20-%202017.pdf>. Accessed on July 7th, 2018.

Image 2 - Guama Poma's mala confición

Source: Poma de Ayala (1613) cited in Pratt (2012).

After discussing the two speech situations, I projected excerpts of Kumaravadivelu's (2016) text *The decolonial option in English teaching: can the subaltern act?*, and we discussed how textbooks and teaching materials can be used as an instrument of colonization, because they carry a structuralist notion of language. Finally, I brought a lesson from the famous textbook *English File*. In this lesson, students learn general adjectives and adjectives of appearance. However, the context in which vocabulary is taught could be considered colonial for highlighting only positive aspects about the USA and bringing celebrities known in the global north. I asked the students to problematize the colonialities reproduced in the lesson and, in pairs, they prepared different activities in which the colonialities discussed would not be reproduced.

From the eleventh to the fourteenth class, we had a more practical focus. Guided by Kumaravadivelu's (2016, p. 16) idea that we need teachers who can develop "the knowledge, skill, and disposition necessary to become producers, not just consumers, of pedagogic

knowledge and pedagogic materials", students were asked to prepare, in pairs, a 25-minute microlesson based on the topics we had been discussing using any authentic material (video, text, music, etc). Since I had 15 participants, we had two pairs teaching each day, but one student teacher – Rosa – did it by herself. After students conducted their classes, we opened the discussion and their classmates gave them feedback. Because I wanted the evaluation process to be more democratic, that is, I did not want to have only my evaluation, I proposed the following: two students who were watching the class would evaluate the ones who were teaching. One student disagreed and said it would not be fair. She suggested that all the students evaluated the ones presenting. Thus, I created an evaluation report based on their suggestions, so they could evaluate one another. After the classes they taught, I collected all the evaluation reports, so I could grade their presentation. Besides, at the end of the following class after their presentation, I had a face-to-face conversation with the pair who had presented in the previous class.

In the **eleventh class**, Magali and Nina taught for 35 minutes on the topics *culture and languages*. They brought a video and a text by Claire Kramsch (2013), in which she discusses whether we teach language using culture or culture using language. Also, they brought comics that were related to the topic and discussed how cultural differences impact communication. Their feedback moment lasted for around 6 minutes. Afterwards, Raul and the student who withdrew from the research taught for 25 minutes on the topics *Herderian triad and Esperanto*. They brought a video by De Ugarte (2012), which compared Esperanto to Linux. Since Linux is a free operational system, the presenter argued that it helps him to think freely. As Esperanto is a language that does not belong to any country and does not have a correct accent, it would do the same. Their feedback moment lasted for 8 minutes.

In the **twelfth class**, Luna and Anita taught for 30 minutes. They guided discussions on the English language in a decolonial perspective. Their aim, as they stated in their lesson plan, was to "make students aware of the myth of the native speaker and help them to be more comfortable with their own accents". After that, we had a conversation which lasted for 5 minutes and 30 seconds. Then, Lenore presented her class on the topics *language and identity*. She brought a video by Flama (2014), a YouTube channel, on how to speak Spanglish. She related the video to the text we had read by Anzaldúa (2007). Then, she brought quotes by famous thinkers who related language to power and identity. Emily was

supposed to teach this class with Lenore, but Lenore told me afterwards that Emily was quite insecure to teach the group and be evaluated by them. Then, we had a conversation about Lenore's class for 6 minutes. After students had left, I gave an individual feedback to Raul and the student who withdrew from the research about their microlessons taught in the previous class.

In the **thirteenth class**, it was Rosa's time to teach. Her class lasted for 21 minutes. She used the video *Three ways to speak English*, by Lyiscott (2014), who makes a connection between language and identity to celebrate and defend the right to speak with all the linguistic resources she has. She is a tri-lingual orator, because she has different resources to speak at home, school, and work. In her talk, she also relates language to race. The conversation about Rosa's class lasted for 5 minutes. Then, we had Rita's and Sergio's class, which lasted for 30 minutes. They used the video *Go ahead, make up new words* by McKean (2014), in which she encourages her audience to make up new words through 6 different ways. One of them is 'verbing', which is transforming a noun into a verb. Rita and Sergio problematized the use of dictionaries and encouraged students to create new words. The conversation about their class lasted for 1 minute and a half. After students left, I had a face-to-face conversation with Lenore and Emily, to give Lenore a feedback and ask Emily why she had not taught her class. Then, I talked to Nina and Magali about their class. The first conversation lasted for 14 minutes, while the second lasted for 26 minutes.

In the **fourteenth class**, Bianca and Maria Clara used the video *Like totally whatever*, by Lozada-Oliva (2015), to discuss about *language and sexism*. Students watched the video and discussed how sexist language can be. Their class lasted for 28 minutes, and the feedback, 4 minutes. Then, Yoshihara and Larissa talked about *language invention* through the video *Go ahead, make up new words*, the same used by Rita and Sergio. In their class, which lasted for 28 minutes, students watched the video and related it to Canagarajah's concept of language invention. The conversation about their class took 5 minutes and a half. Lastly, I talked to Luna and Anita for 5 minutes and to Rosa for 2 minutes and a half.

Finally, in our **last class**, I brainstormed all the activities done and texts we read during the course, so we could have a feedback session. I divided this class into two moments: in the first one, they would evaluate the course and the teacher; then, they would evaluate their participation. I had created a set of criteria to evaluate every aspect on the course, but

first I elicited some criteria from them and added the ones they said and were different from mine. At the end, I thanked them for their active participation in the research.

2.5. Research sources

In this section, I show every research source used to generate empirical material. However, this does not mean that every source will be used for analysis. They are here because they are part of the research process.

2.5.1. Initial questionnaire

The initial questionnaire was used to gather general information from my participants, such as race, age, social class, conceptions of language and learning. I took this questionnaire from Ferreira's (2018) study, since I found it would be relevant to mine. All the 15 student teachers and the professor answered the questionnaire. In order to have an initial view on the participants' conception of language, this questionnaire contained some other questions, such as: a) What motivated you to study Letras: Inglês? b) Do discussions in class influence you? How? c) What is language? d) How is language used in class? If you are a teacher, how do you teach language? e) Which activities do you consider as being more relevant for your English learning? The questions were all in Portuguese and students could answer them in Portuguese, too. In Annex B, I attach a sample of the initial questionnaire answered by Magali.

2.5.2. Classroom interactions

From the fifteen classes we had, the first was an introductory one, while the last was a reflective session. The first class was not recorded, because students had not signed the consent term yet. As explained before, I taught from Class 1 to Class 10. Afterwards, students peer-taught from Class 11 to Class 14. Because of the amount of empirical material, I decided to transcribe only the most important moments in the interactions from Class 2 to Class 10, and Class 15. Considering the classes students peer-taught, I did not transcribe their classes, but listened to all of them and took notes on moments I found important. There were two conversation moments from Class 11 to Class 14. In the first, there was a whole class

conversation on the class taught. In the second, there was a face-to-face conversation between the pair and me about the class they had taught. In this second moment, I also handed in their marks and gave them a feedback on their classmates' comments about their classes. In the text, these moments are referred to as: Class 1 (C1), whole class conversation (WCC), face-to-face conversation (FFC). As I did not transcribe all WCC and FFC, some were summarized with a brief description on what was discussed from each class. When I thought it was important to have the complete dialogue, I transcribed it. Also, I did not have FFC with every pair when I thought it was not important. In Appendix C, there is a sample class transcribed by me. Because of the research focus, the classes students peer-taught will not be used for this master's thesis. Chart 2 shows a summary of the topics addressed followed by the duration of each class.

Chart 2 – Description of the classes

Class	Topic	Class duration
C1	Get to know each other.	--
C2	Personal stories with language. Language-related events.	1:41:45
C3	Language invention.	1:31:14
C4	Language invention. Linguistic hierarchization.	1:41:51
C5	Language invention.	1:40:18
C6	Globalization and language.	1:27:11
C7	World English and repertoire.	1:32:52
C8	Language and identity.	1:34:58
C9	Standard language and teaching. Microteaching instructions.	1:37:48
C10	Language and coloniality. Textbooks. Material adaptation.	1:42:14
C11	Microteaching: *Raul and the student who withdrew his participation*: Esperanto, language invention, free software. *Magali and Nina*: language and culture.	1:28:17
C12	Microteaching: *Lenore*: language, identity, and politics. *Luna and Anita*: Englishes and decoloniality. Face to face conversation with --- and Raul.	1:16:31
C13	Microteaching *Rosa*: language, identity, and race.	1:53:41

	Rita and Sérgio: language invention. Face to face conversation with Lenore and Emily, and Magali and Nina.	
C14	Microteaching: *Maria Clara and Bianca:* language and sexism. *Larissa and Yoshihara:* language invention. Face to face conversation with Rosa, Luna and Anita.	1:26:46
C15	Reflective session.	1:33:23

Source: Elaborated by the author, 2019.

2.5.3. Field diary

I kept a diary to write my impressions of the classes I had taught. In this diary, I first took descriptive notes, and then I wrote about my impressions on them. I have fourteen entries in the field diary because I did not write about the last class, since it was a reflective session. During the text, each entry will be referred to as DE1, DE2, etc. I believe the diary is important for my research since it captures my perception of what happened in each class. A sample of an entry in the field diary can be found in Appendix D.

2.5.4. Narratives

I adopted Narratives as a source of empirical material for this study, because I believed that students could freely reflect on their life experiences in the First narrative and on the course experiences in the Final narrative. The first narrative, which had five questions to guide their writing, focused on student teachers' personal experiences related to language. The questions were: 1) *What is language for you?* 2) *What is your story with language(s)?* 3) *What inspired you to study Letras?* 4) *How do you feel about the English language?* 5) *How is language present in your life? Write about a specific language-related event you have been through (you can write about more than one).* One example can be found in Annex C. All the fifteen students did the First narrative.

In the Final narrative, students had to write about their impressions of our trajectory throughout the course. The following questions were used to guide it: 1) *How do you conceptualize language?* 2) *What do you think of the classes? Analyze them in relation to*

your career as an English teacher. 3) *What about the content of our classes? What do you think of them?* 4) *How did you prepare your micolesson? Why did you do it that way?* 5) *Do you think we could have done anything different? What? Why?* Thirteen students wrote and handed in the Final narrative (Annex D shows an example).

2.5.5. *Activities produced by the student teachers*

As I was the teacher responsible for the first part of the term, I assessed the student teachers. The assessment was made by means of four activities: first narrative (1.0), activities from the three texts we read (3.0 – 1.0 each), microlesson (2.0), and final narrative (3.0), totalizing 10.0. I consider Narratives as a different source of empirical material because the type of activity developed was different from the ones in the text activities. However, they were also assessed.

Concerning the activities from the texts, ten students did the Text activity 1, twelve students did the Text activity 2, while thirteen students did the Text activity 3. An example of each Text activity can be found in Annex E. In the microlesson, as explained before, students had to peer-teach a 25-minute class. They also had to hand in a lesson plan. Their assignments are displayed here with their linguistic repertoires, that is, I did not correct their language use based on what is considered *Standard English*.

2.5.6. *Reflective sessions with the professor*

The reflective sessions with the professor (RSP) were done immediately after the classes. We walked downstairs to her office and talked about the class. I intended to develop one reflective session every other class, but, whenever I felt I needed to talk to her, I recorded. Because of that, there is an amount of ten reflective sessions. All reflective sessions were fully transcribed. One example can be found in Appendix E. Chart 3 presents the duration of each RSP.

Chart 3 – Reflective sessions with the professor

Reflective session with the professor	RSP duration
RSP 1	6:35

RSP 2	10:28
RSP 3	6:06
RSP 4	14:53
RSP 5	29:28
RSP 6	9:11
RSP 7	10:45
RSP 8	20:44
RSP 9	25:12
RSP 10	9:49

Source: Elaborated by the author, 2019.

2.5.7. *Final reflective session*

In the fifteenth class, a final reflective session, which lasted the whole class, was held. We evaluated many aspects of the course, such as: their participation, group interaction, activities, teacher's attitudes, and content. The reflective session was held with the objective of generating a group discussion about the classes. First, I projected the course syllabus, so we could remember what we had studied together. Then, I brainstormed some criteria to evaluate two aspects: the teacher and the course, and the students. For 'the teacher and the course', students talked about activities, topics discussed, evaluation, and teacher's attitudes, while for 'the student', we talked about participation in class, group interaction, commitment, and students' attitudes. Also, the final reflective session was partially transcribed. The transcribed excerpts can be found in Appendix F.

2.5.8. *Final interview*

The final interview was individually made after the course ended. Since I had not planned the questions before the research started, I was able to think about the questions after the course. Issues of power and participation arose and that is why some questions focus on that. Also, I saw that some student teachers were not happy with the idea of teaching and I wanted to understand how they saw themselves in professional terms. I believe that this aspect might have affected their participation in the course. The questions were: 1) *Remember chronologically what we did during the course.* 2) *What were your general impressions on the content?* 3) *What were your general impressions on the activities?* 4) *What were your general impressions on the evaluation?* 5) *How did you feel during the classes?* 6) *How was*

your participation during the course? 7) *How was your interaction with the teacher?* 8) *How was your interaction with the other students?* 8) *How did relations of power take place in the class?* 9) *In your opinion, how did research participants (student teachers and teacher) reproduced or resisted colonial discourses and practices?* 10) *How do you see yourself as a teacher?* These questions were used to guide the interview. If any other information happened to be necessary at the time, I asked. From all the questions, I did not transcribe the first one since it is more descriptive than reflective. Finally, the interviews were held in Portuguese and I was able to talk to every student teacher. An example of the final interview can be found in Appendix G. Chart 4 shows the information about the duration of each interview.

Chart 4 – Final interview

Student	Interview duration
Lenore	30:37
Bianca	26:01
Emily	18:00
Luna	27:45
Magali	26:46
Anita	28:19
Maria Clara	22:09
Rosa	13:22
Raul	20:06
Larissa	13:08
Yoshihara	27:44
Rita	12:42
Sérgio	13:52
Nina	13:43

Source: Elaborated by the author, 2019.

2.6. Transcription

Most of the empirical material I have is interaction-based and recorded. So, I had to transcribe it. Bucholtz (2000, p. 1643) affirms that transcription processes are not neutral since they involve choice and "the inscription of a context". Depending on how I transcribe something, the meaning can be altered. Bucholtz (2000) differs transcription into two types: *naturalized* and *denaturalized*. The first happens when we privilege written over oral

communication features, that is, a *literacization* process happens whilst the last comprises the inclusion of discourse markers, repetitions, repairs, etc. Denaturalized transcription should not be seen as better than naturalized transcription, or the other way around, since any "transcription is inevitably a creative, authorial act that has political effects, and many of these effects cannot be anticipated" (BUCHOLTZ, 2000, p. 1461). Because of time constraints, I have opted to produce a naturalized transcription, in which repetitions, repairs, interjections and other features of oral communication are removed.

Understanding that transcription is a political activity, Buchotlz (2000) does not say we should go for neutrality, but for responsibility. She contends that "a reflexive transcription practice, then, is one in which the researcher is conscious of her or his effect on the unfolding transcript, and the effect of the transcript on the representation of speakers whose discourse is transcribed" (BUCHOLTZ, 2000, p. 1462). Because of that, I tried to carefully transcribe the material I recorded. Lastly, the transcription symbols used are shown in Chart 5:

Chart 5 – Transcription symbols

Symbols	Description
.	End of intonation unit, falling intonation.
,	End of intonation unit; fall-rise intonation.
?	End of intonation unit; rising intonation.
-	Self-interruption; break in the intonational unit.
---	Erased speech[11].
( )	Transcriber comments.
(?)	Incomprehensible.
[ ]	Overlap beginning and end.
" "	Quoting direct discourse.

Source: Elaborated based on Bucholtz (2000, p. 1447), 2019.

2.7. Trustworthiness and empirical material discussion processes

Denzin and Lincoln (2005) argue that researchers today go through a triple crisis. The first one is a representational crisis. It asks whether qualitative researchers can capture lived experience and argues that social phenomena "is created in the social text written by the researcher" (DENZIN; LINCOLN, 2005, p. 19). Another crisis is the legitimation one. If

---

[11] One student teacher chose to withdraw from the research after data was generated. His speeches were erased from the dialogues.

realities and truths, based on poststructural and postmodern readings of the world, are always partial, we should rethink "such terms as *validity*, *generalizability*, and *reliability*" (DENZIN; LINCOLN, 2005, p. 19-20). The last crisis is concerned with whether research can change the world. These crises raise, in my opinion, three questions that will be addressed in this section: How can validity be achieved (if there is such a thing) in qualitative study? What is the purpose of qualitative research? What were the methodological paths taken to develop the empirical material discussion?

Croker (2009) affirms that one way of handling with researcher subjectivity is following triangulation processes when analyzing empirical material. However, I agree with Richardson (2000, p. 13) when he affirms that triangulation should be deconstructed, since it carries "the assumption that there is a fixed point or object that can be triangulated". Also, it assumes a single reality to be known (TRACY, 2010), since the triangle is "a rigid, fixed, two-dimensional object" (RICHARDSON, 2000, p. 13). He argues that we should focus on the crystal, rather than the triangle, as it "combines symmetry and substance with an infinite variety of shapes, substances, transmutations, multidimensionalities, and angles of approach" (RICHARDSON, 2000, p. 13). The image of the crystal seems to be more aligned with my praxiological assumptions, since I go against the positivist idea that there is a single reality to be discovered. Following Urzêda-Freitas (2018, p. 83), "the crystallization perspective allows the researcher to use the information from all research sources but does not make it mandatory the use of every source to dialogue with all perceptions, as triangulation does".

Problematizing truth, validity, and power from a poststructuralist and postmodernist perspective makes us question the purpose of research. If there is no objectivity in research, since it is always value-laden, what is its purpose? I think we can answer such question with Lincoln and Cannella's (2007) discussion on ethics. They argue that we need to recognize that "the practice of research involves relationships, knowledge creation and exclusion, and usually the construction of privilege" (LINCOLN; CANNELLA, 2007, p. 68). Questioning research in this way problematizes the position the researcher occupies as a person who holds the truth about a group of people s/he is studying. Lincoln and Canella (2007) and Denzin and Lincoln (2005), thus, affirm that more participatory and action-oriented research is welcomed in this perspective. Finally, I agree with Lincoln and Canella (2007, p. 75) when they state that "the purpose of research would [and should] no longer be to represent or

'know' others, but rather to examine and change the systems and discourses within which we function".

These discussions are in line with the methodological paths taken to produce the empirical material discussion. In the first discussion chapter, dedicated to the first research aim, I focus on the language ideologies produced by the student teachers throughout this critical language teacher education experience. I organize three empirical material sources in a way that allows us to see: the movements in the language ideologies produced by the student teachers, their multiple and complex positionings, the reinforcement and reshaping of the language ideologies they had in the beginning of the course and in the end. In order to do that, I bring First narratives, Text activity 1 and 2, four classroom interactions that highlight traditional/modern and critical/decolonial language ideologies, and Final narratives.

In the second discussion chapter, I focus on the pedagogical discussions that emerged from this experience. I make use of Classroom interactions, Reflective sessions with the professor, Text activity 2, and the Final interview to investigate the pedagogical issues that emerged from the discussions on language from a decolonial perspective involving the concepts I worked with the students (language invention, language hierarchization, monolingual orientation, linguistic repertoires, globalization and language, language and identity, coloniality). Differently from the first discussion chapter, in this one I also focus on my perspective, something I do not take into account in the first one. Lastly, the discussion is not chronologically developed like in the first one, but it is divided by themes.

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES IN THE COURSE

In this chapter, I discuss about the language ideologies produced by the student teachers in a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective. The *First* and the *Final narratives*, *Classroom interactions* and *Activities produced by the student teachers* will account for the empirical material discussed. Since this master's thesis does not have a theoretical chapter, as it is traditionally expected, the so-called theories will be discussed throughout the analysis crafted with the empirical material[12]. First, I will provide a definition for language ideology, a key concept in my study. Then, I discuss about the language ideologies produced by the student teachers throughout the course.

3.1. Language ideologies throughout a critical language teacher education experience

Kroskrity (2004) affirms that language ideologies are beliefs, feelings or thoughts we have about languages. For example, saying that one language is easy or not is a language ideology. The idea that the spread of English is neutral, natural and beneficial is also another language ideology (PENNYCOOK, 2007). These ideologies are socially and historically constructed. Also, "such rationalizations are typically multiple, context-bound, and necessarily constructed from the sociocultural experience of the speaker" (KROSKRITY, 2004, p. 496). That said, we can affirm that the speaker's social experiences influence how he/she conceives ideas about language.

Woolard and Schiefellin (1994) affirm that language ideologies can tell about social institutions, gender, education, race, and colonization. In Portuguese, the letters *a* and *o* are used to mark gender. Using the letter *x* or the symbol @ in words with male/female versions is a demonstration of gender equality going against the generic male form. This highlights how language ideologies shape the use of language. Even though I focus on the language ideologies produced by student teachers in this research, these ideologies should not be seen as individual, that is, originated by these students. They should be seen as part of a macro-

---

[12] More recently, our research group Language Teacher Education (CNPq – National Council For Scientific and Technological Development) has been doing that to break with the dichotomy between theory and practice. Urzêda-Freitas's (2018), Ferreira's (2018), and Silvestre's (2017) final work exemplify that.

structure that can be manifested in individuals, but not originating from them simply. For example, Garcés (2007) discusses the concept of la colonialidad lingüística, which can be related to language ideologies. According to him, knowledge and languages are geopolitically distributed. Also, he creates a relation between language and economy in the sense that they work "through a value system, which asymmetrically classifies the production, consumption, distribution and circulation of *goods*" (GARCÉS, 2007, p. 225).

The value system described by Garcés (2007) has classified language and knowledge into scientific and cultural. As he affirms, "whoever wants to do science, philosophy, knowledge, has to appropriate such languages [English, German, French] to move in this space of power. Languages such as Chinese or Bengali, Quichua, Quechua, Aymara or Shuar, at most serve to express culture and literature" (GARCÉS, 2007, p. 226). Garcés's (2007) discussion on la colonialidad lingüística highlights the link between social structures and language, as prestigious languages are for scientific communication while others are byproducts of culture. Woolard and Schieffelin (1994, p. 56) affirm that such notions are useful not only for a linguistic analysis, but for a social one, as they can connect language "to group and personal identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology". Lastly, language ideologies can also be used to hierarchize people, institutions, and social groups (KROSKRITY, 2004).

In this text, I consider every comment about language a language ideology. That is why I do not use the term conceptions of language, but language ideologies, as I believe it is much broader. It can encompass anything a student says about language, from when they are conceptualizing language (e.g. language is an abstract system) to when they are talking about their impressions of a specific socially constructed language (e.g. English is an international language). I call **traditional/modern language ideologies** those that align with positivist, colonial, and Eurocentric thought. These ideologies comprehend languages as having a Standard, monolithic version, belonging to a specific community. Also, these ideologies do not link language to power and claim that the purpose of language is simply communication. **Critical/decolonial language ideologies**, however, are ideologies that question the modern tradition in language studies. Critical/decolonial language ideologies are in line with the concepts that were part of the syllabus in this teacher education experience: language hierarchization and invention (CANAGARAJAH, 2007a; PENNYCOOK; MAKONI, 2007);

world Englishes (ASSIS-PETERSON; COX, 2013; RAJAGOPALAN, 2015); linguistic repertoires (BLOMMAERT; BACKUS, 2012); language as power (ANZALDÚA; 1986); Herderian triad (CANAGARAJAH, 2013). Critical/decolonial ideologies also highlight how language can be used to express power and hierarchize people. Together with Martínez (2013) and Metz (2018), I hope not to dichotomize language ideologies as traditional/modern or critical/decolonial simply, since language ideologies are contradictory and multiple (GAL, 1998). So, in the empirical material discussion, I hope to develop a more nuanced debate on how student teachers produce language ideologies.

3.1.1. First narrative

The First narrative was assigned in the second class. In the first class, I only introduced the research and got to know the participants. In the second, we discussed about common language teaching methods (grammar-translation, audiolingualism, communicative approach) and the language conceptions behind them. The questions that guided the first narrative encouraged students to talk about language. From the thirteen First narratives, I could identify traditional/modern language ideologies in twelve (Lenore, Bianca, Emily, Nina, Luna, Maria Clara, Giovana, Rosa, Larissa, Yoshihara, Rita, Sérgio) and critical/decolonial language ideologies in four (Lenore, Bianca, Raul, Rita) of them. This means that sometimes there were critical and traditional language ideologies in the same narrative. Chart 6 displays the excerpts that could be identified with traditional/modern language ideologies, while Chart 7 presents the excerpts with critical/decolonial language ideologies.

Chart 6 - Traditional language ideologies

First narrative
Language as a system
To talk about language and its importance we have to take into account, according to **Ferdinand Saussure**, that it is a **system of elements** which are both social and individual constructs. (Lenore, First narrative)
Language as separate
As I have learned **more than one language** throughout my life I have come to terms with the fact that memory plays a huge role when you are in touch with **a new language**. […]. In addition, how you first became in contact with your **mother tongue** will influence how you deal with language later on. (Maria Clara, First narrative)
It was only here in Brazil that I began to actually study **the English language**, not just use it. Since **this country is not bilingual**, language teachers are needed. (Bianca, First narrative)

My first experience with **the English language** in school happened in 2004 during the fourth year of the elementary school. When the school director told us, students, that we would have English classes I got very excited to know that we would learn **a second language**. (Nina, First narrative)
I know that I am not a hundred percent proficient neither in **Portuguese** nor in **English** and I feel that I should study **both** more, but I feel more confident with the English language. (Luna, First narrative)
Language as communication
For me language is an important **tool for communication**, expression and social interaction, in other words, without it we could not express our beliefs, ideas and feelings, neither socialize with each other. (Emily, First narrative)
For me language is a **way to communicate**. (Giovana, First narrative)
For me, language is what makes us human; what **connects** us people to each other. Sometimes, language is a barrier for us, that can be used in a bad way, but we are human beings: we cannot **communicate** without it, even if it is for a bad purpose. (Rosa, First narrative)
To study and to define language is a complicated task. […] For me, language has a main feature: to establish **communication** in some way. If I talk to someone or write/read something, **communication** has been establised somehow, and this is what language is for. (Larissa, First narrative)
Hence, language for me is a way, **a tool of communication**. On one hand, this communication might be to **transmit** knowledge in its many ways, such as, history, mathematics, or a guideline, just to name a few. On the other hand, language is also intertwined to culture, values, morals, body and lexicon expression. Hereafter, language is complex, and for me, that is the beauty of language. Language is a whole new world knitted to many areas, but we, people, mostly connect language to words. (Yoshihara, First narrative)
Language, in my opinion, is **a tool for communication**. (Rita, First narrative)
Finally, my beliefs concerning language were built up throughout the *Letras* course. In my view, language is an **expression of ideas by means of words**, sounds or even signs. Language is also related to **communication** that is, sharing ideas, information and **meaning**. (Sérgio, First narrative)

Source: Elaborated by the author, 2019.

In the First narrative, I could identify three main traditional language ideologies: *language as a system*, *language as separate*, *language as communication*. These three ideologies are interrelated and can be explained by Harris problematization of *the language myth,* which intended to challenge the grounds of modern scientific Linguistics (CICOUREL; 1983; HARRIS, 2002; PINTO; 2013)[13]. Harris (2002) argues that there is a language myth entrenched in Western culture dating 2000 years back. First, he defines myth as "a cultural fossil, a sedimented form of thinking that has gone unchallenged for so long that it has hardened into a kind of intellectual concrete" (HARRIS, 2002, p. 1). Harris (2002) then affirms that the language myth is constructed around two main ideas: a) that we can transmit information, thoughts, by means of words and b) that we must use fixed codes or symbols to do that. These two ideas are named as the tellementality fallacy and the determinability (or fixed-code) fallacy (HARRIS, 1980 cited in PINTO, 2013).

---

[13] The Language Myth (1980), by Roy Harris, is the first book he published developing his ideas. Unfortunately, I could not find the book either on the internet or at any library. So, the discussion will be developed based on these three texts: (CICOUREL; 1983; HARRIS, 2002; PINTO; 2013)

These two fallacies ground the way Linguistics has thought about language and communication. Harris (1980 cited in HARRIS, 2002) exemplifies that, based on these fallacies, when we want to express our thoughts, we need to search for sentences/words that can translate that thought and are shared between the interlocutors. As he (1980, p. 10 cited in HARRIS, 2002, p. 3) demonstrates,

> Suppose *A* has a thought that he wishes to communicate to B, for example, that gold is valuable. His task is to search among the sentences of a language known both to himself and to *B* and select that sentence which has a meaning appropriate to the thought to be conveyed; for example, in English, the sentence *Gold is valuable*. He then encodes this sentence in its appropriate oral or written form from which *B* is able to decode it, and in virtue of knowing what it means, grasp the thought which A intended to convey to him, namely that gold is valuable.

Harris's (1980) description may resonate in the reader's mind Saussure's le circuit de la parole, which was created by Saussure to explain how communication functions. In Lenore's excerpt, which aligns with language as a system ideology, Saussure is mentioned. Saussure is well known for institutionalizing Linguistics as a discipline. He defined parole (speaking) and langue (language) as two different things and selected langue as the linguist's object of study because of its systematicity, while parole was too unpredictable to be scientific. This idea helped reproduce the language myth as it assumes two speakers belonging to the same linguistic community sharing similar codes (CICOUREL; 1983). In the positivist tradition, the body was removed from language studies and language was regarded as an abstract system, beyond humans, which had its own rules to be studied (NASCIMENTO, 2017; PESSOA; URZÊDA-FREITAS, 2016; PRATT; 2012). This ideology is present in Lenore's First narrative as she affirms language is a 'system of elements'.

The language myth also depends on the idea that languages are separate. In order to communicate, speakers must use similar codes. If one speaker selects codes from a language different of his/her interlocutor's, communication will not happen. In Maria Clara's, Bianca's, Nina's, and Luna's First narratives, the languages as separate ideology is present. We can identify it by the expressions they use (*more than one language, mother tongue, the English language, second language, bilingual, Portuguese, both*). These words highlight an enumerative strategy (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007) that separates languages and counts them. The term mother tongue, for example, infers that there is another language that is not

the 'mother'. The term second language infers that there is a first one, while both and bilingual means two. This ideology will be better developed when I discuss about the invention of languages later on.

The third language ideology identified is the epitome of the language myth: seven students claimed that the main purpose of language is communication. This is where the ideology that the tellementality and the determinability fallacies are chiefly highlighted. These students probably did not read Harris's discussion on the language myth, but it is interesting to observe how something that was problematized forty years ago is still very much present in Linguistics and in the minds of those who study it. All seven students use the word communication, followed by *transmit*, *tool*, *connect*, *expressions of ideas by means of words*. These words are in accordance to Harris's (2002) communication myth, in which "individuals are able to exchange their thoughts by means of words because – and insofar as – they have come to understand and to adhere to a fixed public plan for doing so" (HARRIS, 1980, p. 10 cited in HARRIS, 2002, p. 2). Harris (1980) goes on to explain that this communication happens through sentences that are invariant in form and meaning. They are part of the community's language and need to be invariant, so they are "proof against the vagaries of changing speakers, hearers and circumstances" (HARRIS, 1980, p. 10 cited in HARRIS, 2002, p. 2). For modern Linguistics, communication takes place when a similar code is being used by those who speak and those who listen. In brief, in the First narrative, these three traditional/modern language ideologies could be identified: *language as a system*, *language as separate*, *language as communication*.

As previously discussed, language ideologies are contradictory and multiple (GAL, 1998). This means that students can present conflicting language ideologies and my aim is not to categorize student teachers into critical or traditional. So, in Chart 7, I present students who showed some sign of critical language ideologies.

Chart 7 – Critical language ideologies

First narrative
Language equality
Before I started studying modern English **I was a prejudicial person concerning another accents**, for example, and I am really not proud of it. **I used to feel uncomfortable with northeastern and Goiânia people's accent**, and nowadays I really do not think the same about different accents, because I have a **more mature** point of view about language. (Lenore, First narrative)
Language meshing

Since I was **raised amongst two languages**, I used to **mash up the words together**, almost making a new language. For example, I remember one day while taking a trip to the beach with my family in Florida; we passed by something that smelled very fishy. I was always the type to blurt out things that are obvious, shouted "**Eu tô smellando peixe**". Instantly my parents started laughing and repeating what I had said. Little 4 year-old me did not realize it was wrong, but I knew they had understood it. (Bianca, First narrative)
Language as power
My conceptions on language have greatly changed throughout my academic journey. I used to see it as just a tool of communication with which people express themselves. Theoretical background and discussions on the **power** of language let me to believe that **language could also be political and oppressive**. Now, I suppose that language is a little bit of everything I have believed. (Raul, First narrative)
Before getting at the English course, I had never stopped to think about **the power that languages have upon people**. Nowadays, I know that English is a very **powerful** language and its **history** is not that good concerning the **colonization**. (Rita, First narrative)

Source: Elaborated by the author, 2019.

Lenore's excerpt is classified as having a critical language ideology for recognizing diversity in language and not acknowledging it as something negative. The impressions we have about the way people speak or sound are language ideologies, and these can be hierarchized into good/bad, positive/negative, beautiful/ugly (KROSKRITY, 2004). In her narrative, Lenore declares she is not from Goiânia and she does not like the way people speak here or in the Northeastern part of Brazil. Enjoying or not the way someone speaks is related to socially constructed beliefs we hold about language. Lenore recognizes she had a prejudicial view on these two different accents and affirms she has changed it. Thus, I classify her as having a *language equality ideology*.

The *language meshing ideology* can be found in Bianca's First narrative as she recalls a moment she had in her childhood when mixing different repertoires. Language ideologies can be perceived not only by how people say their opinions about language, but also by their language use (KROSKRITY, 2004; MARTINEZ, 2018). First, if we look at what she talks about languages, we notice how she is aligned with traditional language ideologies, such as the *language as separate ideology*. The expressions 'two languages', 'making a new language' and her use of the adjective 'wrong' to characterize her language practice makes it possible to affirm that. However, if we take her language use into consideration, we can also notice a *critical/decolonial language ideology*, as neither her nor her parents seem to repress her language use. Bianca's actual mixing of repertoires highlights a positive attitude towards creative use of language (GARCIA; WEI, 2014; LUCENA; NASCIMENTO, 2016). Such use emphasizes her identity as belonging to different cultures and having access to different repertoires. So, here we have a mismatch between what she conceives as language (traditional language ideology) and how she uses it (critical language ideology). That is why

I prefer to say that students in the critical language ideology category had signs of criticality in their ideologies.

Raul's and Rita's First narrative enact the *language as power* ideology. This ideology is more systematically explained in Pennycook's (2001) *Critical Applied Linguistics: a critical introduction*. The author affirms that we should connect power and inequality to the way we develop research in Applied Linguistics. However, Pennycook (2001, p. 6) defends not only a simple link between language and society, but also a focus on raising "more critical questions to do with access, power, disparity, desire, difference, and resistance". Besides, he focuses on how power is operated in society through language and how "social relations came to be the way they are" (PENNYCOOK, 2001, p. 6). Raul's use of words *political* and *oppressive*, while Rita's expressions *the power that languages have upon people*, *English is a very powerful language* highlight an alignment with critical language ideologies, which are present in Applied Linguistics studies.

In this first part of the empirical material discussion, I aimed to show which language ideologies emerged mostly from students in the beginning of the course. From the fourteen First narratives, twelve were identified as having traditional/modern language ideologies: *language as a system* (Lenore), *languages as separate* (Bianca, Maria Clara Nina, Luna), *language as communication* (Emily, Giovana, Rosa, Lara, Yoshihara, Rita, Sérgio), while four were identified as having critical/decolonial language ideologies *language equality* (Lenore), *language meshing* (Bianca), *language as power* (Raul and Rita). As previously said, ideologies are overlapping, and students may present conflicting ideologies, as three student teachers were placed in both categories. The discussion now will follow to the classroom interactions and the activities produced by the student teachers.

3.1.2. Class 4

The first three concepts I discussed with students were *Herderian triad*, *monolingual orientation* and *Standard language* (BLOMMAERT; VERSCHUEREN, 2002; BLOMMAERT, 2010; CANAGARAJAH, 2007a; 2013; MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007; MILROY, 2001). I decided to have this discussion first because I consider that these concepts show how languages were invented as part of a nationalist project and how we as Linguists contribute to this invention. So, in Class 3, we discussed parts of Canagarajah's (2013) text

on monolingual orientation and read parts of Webster's dissertation (1789) to problematize a real example of the idea that languages belong to specific territories. Due to time constraints, the discussion followed up to Class 4 and excerpt [1] is part of this discussion:

[1]
1.   Pedro: But going back to the discussion on Standard language, what is Standard language?
2.   Sérgio: The language according to the grammar rules.
3.   Pedro: The language according to the grammar rules. Where do these rules come from?
4.   Rosa: Old white people.
5.   (Sts laugh)
6.   Pedro: You remember reading Webster's dissertation last class?
7.   Students: Yes.
8.   Pedro: What does he say about the yeomanry?
9.   Rosa: It's like the future of language?
10.   Pedro: The future of language? No.
11.   (indistinct conversation)
12.   Pedro: How do they speak?
13.   Rosa: They used to speak like the people from England.
14.   Pedro: No.
15.   Rosa: Find another way, I think.
16.   Anita: I remember that they read the Bible and the newspapers?
17.   Pedro: Yeah, they read good English.
18.   Students: Yes.
19.   Pedro: Good English, not bad English, right? What else? What does he say about how the English of the new nation should be?
20.   Anita: They had to be equal concerning pronunciation, the Standard grammar.
21.   Pedro: Yes, and where does it have to come from?
22.   (Indistinct conversation)
23.   Rosa: Not England, because-
24.   ---
25.   Pedro: England was a mess and they want purity (referring to the language).
26.   (T projects Webster's dissertation excerpts and discusses about them)
27.   Pedro: Luna, can you read it, please?
28.   Luna: "Let Englishmen take notice that when I speak of the American yeomanry, the latter are not to be compared to the illiterate peasantry of their own country." (reading)
29.   Pedro: Okay, so who are they?
30.   Rosa: The yeomanry?
31.   Anita: American, American people.
32.   Rosa: American farmers.
33.   Pedro: Which class do they come from? Social class.
34.   Luna: I think it's high.
35.   Rosa: Low.
36.   Luna: It's high, because after it says that these men had considerable education.
37.   Anita: It's "a group of men who held and cultivated small landed estates", so…
38.   Pedro: Do you think that all men could have land in the past?
39.   Students: No.
40.   Pedro: What type of people had land in the past?
41.   Students: Rich people.

42.   Pedro: So, who are they? (Referring to the yeomanry)
43.   Students: Rich Americans.
44.   Pedro: What about the English?
45.   Luna: "The yeomanry of this country consists of substantial independent freeholders, masters of their own persons and lords of their own soil." (reading)
46.   Pedro: Yeah, so they had people working for them for free.
47.   Luna: For freedom?
48.   Students: Free. Slaves.
49.   Pedro: Slaves.
50.   Luna: Okay. "These men have considerable education. They not only learn to read, write and keep accounts; but a vast proportion of them read newspapers every week, and besides the Bible, which is found in all families, they read the best English sermons and treatises upon religion, ethics, geography and history;" (reading)
51.   Pedro: So, where does Standard language come from?
52.   Anita: Rich people.
53.   Student: Rich, white, old people.
54.   (Students laugh)
55.   Rosa: Usually men.
56.   Pedro: Yes, men.
57.   Rosa: Because women couldn't have land.
(Class 4)

In the discussion about Webster's (1789) dissertation on the English language from the United States, students seem to align with the concepts *monolingual orientation* and *Herderian triad*, which problematize Standard languages, as they make relations to comprehend how the construction of the English language in the USA was part of a nationalist project that aimed at erasing linguistic diversity and created a Standard version of the English language. After the USA independence, Webster (1789) wrote his dissertation to prove how the English from the USA was better than the English from England. As he affirms, people from England could hardly understand one another, while English in the USA was much more uniform. In his own words, Webster (1789, p. 20) claims: "as an independent nation, our honor requires us to have a system of our own, in language as well as government''. Webster's (1789) dissertation highlights how languages were invented as part of nationalist projects (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007). In the case of the USA, Trimbur (2015) discusses that Webster (1789) projected the English language to erase the linguistic memories of other local languages and implanted monolingualism (English only) in the American linguistic culture. This means that linguistic diversity is the rule, and not monolingualism, as nationalist projects try to implement.

What Webster (1789) was promising in his dissertation were values following a monolingual orientation, which were "efficiency, control, and transparency, features valued

by the Enlightenment" (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 20). As the name says, *mono* equals *one* and *monolingual orientation* means one language, one identity, one place; a notion which considers languages as pure and separate from each other. Canagarajah (2013) links the monolingual orientation with the concept of the *Herderian triad,* which comes from the Romantic movement and represents a link between language, community, and place (BLOMMAERT; VERSCHUEREN, 2002; BLOMMAERT, 2010; CANAGARAJAH, 2013). For Canagarajah (2013, p. 20), the Romantic era influenced how we conceive language today, as some "thinkers of this period defined the essence of a community through its language". Now, the problem that comes with language territorialization is that those who belong to a specific territory are the legitimate speakers of that language, while those who live in another place are not. This ideology can illustrate well what happened in the USA with the publication of Webster's (1789) dissertation, as he believed in the homogeneity of the language in the territory.

As for the Standard language, Milroy (2001) considers that Standards are constructed based on the suppression of heterogeneity in language, that is, heterogeneity exists and is part of our reality and the Standard version of a language is no more than an invention. Milroy (2001) goes on to discuss that the way Standard languages are constructed is more related to ideology than internal structures itself, that is, Standard languages are created through the category of prestige rather than the level of uniformity a constructed variety carries. So, the three concepts discussed (Herderian triad, monolingual orientation, Standard language) are quite related, as they are used to produce this thing called *language*.

In excerpt [1], students analyze, from a real example, how languages are invented. Webster's (1789) discussion makes it possible to see what is behind the Standard language ideology and how it is constructed over time. When I ask, in line 3, where the grammar rules come from and Rosa affirms "old white people", in line 4, she comprehends that people's hands are behind language invention. Afterwards, I focus the discussion on the dissertation and what Webster (1789) talks about yeomanry, who were men who cultivated their own land. Students do not seem to understand at first, but in line 16 Anita remembers that "they read the Bible and the newspapers". In line 17, I affirm they read good English, which is a word that indexicalizes a relationship of good versus bad, Standard versus non-Standard. Following the discussion, from line 19 to 25, we analyze Webster's perspective around the

English from England and students (Anita and Rosa) seem to align with the discussion. From this discussion, we can also notice how language is a criterion for the independence of the colony as Webster wanted to detach US English from British English by arguing that the New World had a purer accent.

The discussion is more focused on the yeomanry from line 28 to 49 as I ask Luna to read an excerpt. When I ask who the yeomanry was, students respond they were American farmers coming from high class. These men also had considerable education, were rich and had slaves working for them. It is in line 50, when Luna reads the other part of the excerpt, that the Standard language ideology is mostly highlighted. When I ask where the Standard language comes from, in line 51, students align with the critical language ideology, which, as Milroy (2001) affirms, varieties with prestige are those that come from people with prestige. This means that language is a characteristic that cannot be detached from social life (prestige), as traditional linguists have always tried to do. Thus, at the end, the students who participated in the discussion (Sérgio, Rosa, Anita, Luna) seem to produce critical language ideologies, as they align with the language invention ideology by comprehending that a Standard language comes from a variety with prestige, that is, a variety of rich, white, old people. More than that, they could also see how languages are invented as part of nationalistic projects.

3.1.3. Text activity 1 and Class 5

In the fifth class, students were supposed to discuss Canagarajah's (2007a) *After disinvention: possibilities for communication, community and competence*. The assessment of the text was done by means of an activity in which they had to write two paragraphs, one summarizing the text and the other answering the following questions on a personal perspective: *1. What could you understand by language invention?; 2. What are the effects of language invention?* Nine students completed the activity. Eight (Emily, Luna, Anita, Maria Clara, Raul, Larissa, Yoshihara, Rita) out of nine students produced critical language ideologies by aligning with the perspective defended on the text, while one did not (Rosa). The following excerpts are from the second question in which students were supposed to answer stating their opinion. Two of the excerpts are from the students who alighted with the text while the other one is not.

[2]
On a more personal perspective, I could understand language invention as the way **dominant groups suppress multilingual communities knowledge**, by creating common centralized codes as an attempt of **homogenize** and **Standardize language**. In my opinion, the effects of language invention are the **devaluation** of local dialects and languages and, consequently, the vanishing of peculiar traces of this languages. Moreover, in this perspective, over the long term, language invention can make some local dialects and languages desapear. (Anita, Text activity 1)

[3]
The text "After disinvention: Possibilities for Communication, Community and Competence", by Canagarajah, discusses the problems of languages separation, that is to say, language invention. What I could understand of this issue is that the separation of languages are **rather geographical than linguistic**. The **invention of languages causes people to worry more about grammatical rules and language itself than communication**. This mentality also creates **hierarchy** between people who dominate the formal and Standard language, what is seen as superior, from the ones who speak a "variety." (Raul, Text activity 1)

[4]
Language invention happens every day. It is something inherently to us, as we are speaking and communicating with other people all the time. Some invent a new slang that goes **viral**, some create a new word by **adding a suffix**. It does not matter. New types of communication are emerging in this new technological era and we have to adapt ourselves to it. Language invention has always been like this. **A word from another dialect can be adapted to our language and so on.** The effects are not always seen right away, but it will develop throughout the years to come. (Rosa, Text activity 1)

Makoni and Pennycook (2007, p. 1, emphases in the original) brilliantly assert that "*languages*, *conceptions of languageness* and the *metalanguages* used to describe them are inventions" and "languages were, in the most literal sense, invented, particularly as part of the Christian/colonial and nationalistic projects in different parts of the globe". Makoni and Pennycook (2007) argue that languages were constructed, and they do not exist as real entities that can be analyzed. Time, for example, is a convention, a way of measuring the rotation of the earth, which is a natural phenomenon. The same goes for language, as they are "inventions of social, cultural and political movements" (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007, p. 2). The idea of language is an invention, but the effects of this invention are very real, since they influence how "languages have been understood, how language policies have been constructed, how education has been pursued, how language tests have been developed and administered, and how people have come to identify with particular labels and at times even to die for them" (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007, p. 3).

The invention of languages is an ideological and hierarchizing process, since when we hierarchize invented languages, we hierarchize its speakers (KROSKRITY, 2004). This invention is also perceived in subalternization processes of languages/epistemes, as European languages (English, German, French) become languages of science, whilst non-European languages (Chino, Bengalí, Quechua) become languages of cultures and literature (GARCÉS, 2007).

It is possible to identify critical language ideologies in Anita's activity as she aligns with Canagarajah's (2007a) discussion when she recognizes how power is embedded in language invention. Canagarajah (2007a, p. 238) asserts that European modernity suppressed language practices in precolonial times "in order to develop systems of commonality based on categorization, classification and codification". So, he recognizes that language invention is a political and social process. Also, these homogenizing attempts have real effects over the way less powerful communities communicate, as these ways have been erased in order to develop such centralized code. At the same time Anita aligns with more critical language ideologies that problematize language invention, she still reproduces traditional ideologies such as the enumerative strategy, which "on the one hand reduce significant sociolinguistic concerns to the level of arithmetic, and on the other overlook both the problematic history of the construction of such languages and the contemporary interests behind their enumeration" (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007, p. 11). This highlights how difficult it is to adopt a different paradigm, while not reproducing the traditional one, as we are immerged in the colonial/modern world. Finally, Anita shows signs of having critical language ideologies as she recognizes that language invention is a political and social process with real consequences in real life.

Raul's paragraph is similar to Anita's as he recognizes that languages are invented. Also, he affirms that the demarcation of languages is not purely linguistic, as defended by Linguistic studies, but it also involves extra-linguistic aspects, such as geography (REAGAN, 2004). Following Canagarajah's (2007a) text, he observes the effects of language invention. The two effects he discusses are in line with critical language ideologies, as he debates that language invention causes hierarchization of its speakers and people being worried more about grammar than communication itself.

Rosa's excerpt differs from Canagarajah's (2007a) text in the sense that she does not recognize the historical and political aspects of language invention. The language ideology present in her activity is more traditional/modern, as she understands language invention as a linguistic process only. She does not use the word neologism to talk about language invention, but her discussion leads to the interpretation that she sees language invention from a traditional perspective, in which words are created through combination of suffixes, prefixes, etc. In this way, she distances from critical language ideologies for not mentioning extra-linguistic aspects of language invention.

In Text activity 1, most students (eight out of nine) aligned with the praxiological background discussed in the text. They also reproduced hegemonic language ideologies when trying to argument the opposite. However, this is understandable when we think that, even though we problematize the positivist tradition in language studies, we are still emerged in it, as no epistemic break has happened to date. Finally, one student did not produce critical language ideologies (Rosa), as she did not recognize the political and social aspects of language invention.

Students handed in the activities by e-mail prior to the lesson in which the text was discussed. In Class 5, we discussed some excerpts by Makoni and Pennycook (2007) and also by Canagarajah (2007a). The dialogue in excerpt [5] is from a classroom event in which we were discussing the text:

[5]
1.   Pedro: Okay, you can google it later. Now, what about the last question? (T reads sentence "Language and concepts of language are inventions"). What do you think about it?. Language is invention.
2.   Larissa: But invention in a bad way?
3.   Pedro: No, not in a bad way.
4.   Larissa: Invention, invented.
5.   Pedro: Yes, invent things. Like, you can invent a fan, I don't know.
6.   Larissa: I think all theories are inventions, because people invented them, but they must be based on something-
7.   Rita: Something concrete.
8.   Larissa: Yeah, something that you know that it's real, because when people study language, it's not like that "Oh, I think it's like this and this and that". They have to- […]
9.   Pedro: […] You were talking about inventions, concrete.
10.   Larissa: For example, we study language in a scientific way. I don't know if that's what it means, but we know that it's scientific somehow, it's not just- we invent something and put there as theory. You must prove it somehow. Did you get it?
11.   Pedro: Yes.

12.   Luna: Not prove, but argument.

13.   Pedro: Sorry?

14.   Luna: It's because to prove something is a very strong word, I think you have to argument that that is that.

15.   Larissa: But language can (?), languages are inventions, like, we invent languages. We do, right?

16.   Luna: Yes.

17.   Anita: I don't think so, I think languages just happen, something natural, you know? Because we need it, and then when I think about invention, do we need a fan, for example? Do we really need it?

18.   ---

19.   Anita: So, we invented it, because "Oh, okay, maybe it's useful", but language is more than this. Language is essential. And I think that the concepts of language, yeah, okay. Maybe we invented them, but language I don't think so, it just happens.

20.   Pedro: What's a language? We say that English is a language, yeah? Portuguese is a language. It's in this sense I mean. Do you think we invent Portuguese, we invent English? That's-

21.   Rita: I think so, because one person came here and said "Oh, this is going to be called Portuguese, this is going to be called English".

22.   Larissa: I don't think one person did that "Oh, let's- 'vamo fundar o português aqui'". [Let's found Portuguese]

23.   Raul: Yeah, but it actually happened, because all the Latin languages come from Latin. So, they were geographically separated. It was like "This accent or this dialect is gonna be the official language, like Portuguese".

24.   Anita: Yeah, but-

25.   Raul: It wasn't natural.

26.   (Many students talking at the same time. Indistinct conversation)

27.   ---

28.   Pedro: So, it already existed, and we just labeled it?

29.   ---

30.   Anita: We invented something like Esperanto.

31.   Larissa: Flopadíssimo [Lame]. English is the new Esperanto.

32.   Raul: I mean, it's because usually they choose an accent or variety to be the official one. So, it's kind of invented.

33.   ---

34.   Raul: Yeah.

35.   ---

36.   Raul: What (?) people? The most important people. The ones that had power. I mean, you have this with Italian. It wasn't a natural language. There were many dialects in Italy, so they choose one dialect that was-

37.   Yoshihara: Roman?

38.   Raul: No, it was from a part of Italy. I don't remember now. Yeah, so, they chose this dialect to be the official one.

39.   (Sts laugh)

40.   Raul: Yes, so, they based Italian in (?). People actually had to learn Italian. Italians had to learn [Standard] Italian.

(Class 5)

In excerpt [5], teacher and student teachers are having a discussion about the *language as invention ideology*. The term *invention* is first perceived by Larissa as something negative. I, then, affirm it is not and compares the invention of language to the invention of an object.

Larissa, then, affirms that theories about language are inventions, but they have to be based on something concrete, as Rita affirms. Based on the discussion between Larissa, Rita and Luna (lines 6 to 14), I would assume that the concrete element they are talking about is language itself. So, in this discussion, there is a reproduction of the positivist influence in language studies, in which there is a reality to be known, and this reality can be described through scientific methods (REAGAN, 2004).

As Reagan (2004) discusses, we have assumed that language is an abstract entity that can be knowable, and we have assumed that languages are separate from each other. These two thoughts contribute to the objectification of language, which, in turn, makes us think that there is something out there that can be codified and controlled. Reagan (2004) also affirms that the term *language* is ahistorical and atheoretical. First, it is "ahistorical in that it presupposes that language is in some sense fixed and static – that is, that it is a singular reality, in positivistic terms" (REAGAN, 2004, p. 43). For example, when we consider that English has developed in three phases: Old English, Middle English and Modern English, we are fixing the language in history. Reagan (2004) problematizes that we do not know when one English started and when the other ended, but they are completely different from each other. This division is rather arbitrary, as there is no clear reason for this division. Furthermore, the term is atheoretical as there is no unity in language. It varies from time to time, place to place, individual to individual, and the idea of language requires stability (REAGAN, 2004). Larissa, Rita and Luna, first, resist the idea of language invention by aligning with the positivist tradition of thought that there is a reality out there to be known and described. However, these same students aligned with the critical language ideologies in the Text activity 1, but now they go against it.

In line 15, Larissa goes back to the question of language invention and ends up affirming that we invent languages, followed by Luna's alignment in line 16. In this short event, we can see how multiple and how contradictory our standpoints can be in classroom interactions. Anita, then, resists the word *invention* by saying that languages are natural and necessary for human communication. In this case, even though she disagrees with the word invention, I do not think she resists the language invention ideology, because her argumentation is centered in the idea that languages are a natural phenomenon. So, there is a misunderstanding between the teacher and the student teacher, since languages were actually

invented through social and political processes, but this aspect is not highlighted in this part of the discussion. Also, it is interesting to notice that in the written activity, Anita agreed with the language invention ideology, as previously discussed.

In line 20, I try to problematize the invention of languages by naming languages and asking if they are invented. Rita and Raul seem to align with my perspective, while Larissa and Anita do not. Rita's and Raul's speeches (line 21 and 23) are in line with critical language ideologies, as they recognize the historicity of the invention of languages. Raul also introduces another important aspect: geography. His argumentation is in line with Reagan's (2004), since the separation of languages is rather extra-linguistic, that is, it involves social and political processes and not just linguistic aspects.

In line 30, Anita resists the idea that other languages could have been invented by saying that Esperanto was the only invented language. Esperanto is known to be an artificial language, which means it was not evolved as part of a nation, traditionally speaking. For her, the other languages were not invented. This shows that she repeatedly resists the language invention ideology and how the term *language* is ahistorical (REAGAN, 2004). Because we do not understand how languages were historically invented, we tend to naturalize language, in the sense that they have always existed as real entities.

Raul, in lines 32, 36, 38, and 40, problematizes the idea of Standard and legitimacy of a language. Milroy (2001, p. 531) affirms that any process of Standardization is an "imposition of uniformity upon a class of objects". There is, however, a social category used to help us define *Standard*, which is the category of prestige, as previously discussed. The Standard variety is mostly defined by the social prestige it carries rather than the level of uniformity of the variety (MILROY, 2001). So, the Standard language is defined not based on linguistic categories or uniformity per se, but it is indexical, as it is involved in the social life of its speakers. Raul's speech, in line 32, emphasizes the processual aspect of inventing a language, while in line 36, he highlights how social and extra-linguistic aspects are important in choosing the *correct* variety of the invented language. Raul's discussion in class is in accordance to his standpoints in the written exercise, as he aligned with the historical and political perspective on language invention Canagarajah (2007a) defends. Finally, in this interaction, we could see how student teachers' positioning are multiple as we had students who confronted the language invention ideology and produced traditional language

ideologies (Anita), students who confronted and at times agreed with it (Larissa and Luna), and two students who aligned with it and produced critical language ideologies (Rita and Raul).

3.1.4. Text activity 2 and Class 7

In Class 6, we discussed about globalization and I assigned Assis-Peterson and Cox's (2013) *Standard English & World English: entre o siso e o riso* (Standard English & World English: between Karl and Groucho[14]) to be discussed in Class 7. The text discusses about a speech event by Joel Santana, the Brazilian coach for South American football team, in 2009, in which he is interviewed in English. He mixes Portuguese and English, because of his low English proficiency, if we take Standard English as the norm, and was a target of criticism after the interview was publicized. In the text, the authors discuss whether Standard English should be taken as the model to teach our students English, as it can suffocate students' language performance. They discuss that English does not belong to its home countries anymore and its Standard version should not be considered the norm. Also, their praxiological background includes recent discussion on language and globalization through the concepts of metrolingualism (PENNYCOOK, 2010) and linguistic repertoire (BLOMMAERT; BACKUS, 2012). My intention was to discuss these concepts with the student teachers, as they indicate that language does not exist as an abstract entity before communication, but it is a practice that is constructed and emerges in interaction. In Text activity 2, students had to choose three excerpts from the text and write a paragraph about each excerpt saying if they agreed or not with them. Then, we discussed the text in class and watched a video of a Brazilian woman speaking English in London. In the video, her ability to communicate is similar to Joel's since she mixes different repertoires and does not mind about Standard English. Twelve out of fifteen students handed in Text activity 2. From the twelve students, eleven (Lenore, Emily, Luna, Anita, Maria Clara, Larissa, Raul, Nina, Yoshihara, Rita, Sérgio) aligned with the critical language ideologies defended on the text by saying that they agreed with the excerpts they chose, while one (Magali) said she agreed with some parts, but not completely. The two first excerpts exemplify students who aligned

---

[14] This is how the authors translated the title of their article.

with the critical language ideologies, while the last one is from Magali, who aligned with traditional language ideologies:

[6]
Therefore the first excerpt I liked was when Assis-Peterson and Cox (2013, p.157) refer to Pennycook (2010) and talks about "metrolinguismo" [metrolingualism]. Pennycook says what this word means in this excerpt: "descreve os modos pelos quais pessoas de backgrounds diferentes e misturados usam, brincam com e negociam identidades por meio da língua, sem, contudo, reafirmar o vínculo entre língua, cultura, etnicidade, nacionalidade e geografia, mas procurando explorar as contingências dessas categorias. " [metrolingualism describes the ways in which people from different and mixed background use, play with and negotiate identities through language, without reaffirming the connection between language, culture, ethnicity, nationality and geography, but aiming to explore the contingencies of these categories]. It is interesting because it opens the reader's eyes, to recognize that **each person uses the language in a different way**, considering their own particularities and culture. It also shows that **there is no "incorrect" or only one way of using a language**. (Luna, Text activity 2)

[7]
2nd excerpt – page 161 – "De acordo com o senso comum, nas situações da fala pública, falar "errado" seria uma ameaça à fachada, ou seja, à face positiva do enunciador, que, infringir essa norma, é frequentemente castigado pela crítica e/ou pelo riso escarnecedor". [According to common sense, in public speech, making "mistakes" is a threat to the positive image of the speaker, who, violating this rule, is frequently punished with criticism and/or mocking laughter].
Unfortunately, this is true. Before attending to the classes at UFG I had prejudice concerning language, I used to correct people. However, nowadays I see that I do not have this right, **each person has to talk in the way he/she wants to**. Brazilian people usually complains when someone says something "wrong" or different from what we are used to. (Rita, Text activity 2)

[8]
So, the first paragraph that called my attention was "[…] é mais fecunda a idéia de que o inglês é uma língua mundial (Ortiz, 2006), ou seja, uma língua do mundo (Rajagopalan, 2008), enfim, "um idioma que atravessa os distintos lugares do planeta" [The idea that English is a world language (Ortiz, 2006) is more fruitful in this context, that is, a language of the world (Rajagopalan, 2008), a language that crosses barriers in the different places of the planet] (COX & ASSIS-PETERSON, 2013, p.154). **I can not agree with all these ideas**. Yes, I agree that "English Language" has crossed the World. But I can not agree that "o inglês da modernidade-mundo é um espectro 'glocal', no sentido de que é, a um só tempo, global e local" (idem, p.154). **I do not believe that we can take the English Language and do whatever we want with it**. There are a lot of **rules** in English (in the same away that there are in other languages) that must to be **respected** if we want to be able to **communicate** with people in **different places**. (Magali, Text activity 2)

Luna's discussion focuses on the concept of metrolingualism (PENNYCOOK; OTSUJI, 2010). Pennycook and Otsuji (2010) describe it as an attempt to distance from terms such as *multilingualism*, which presupposes separation of languages because of the prefix

multi-. Also, metrolingualism focuses on the result of urban and modern interactions, highlighting how identities and repertoires are negotiated. Moreover, when saying that each person speaks in a certain way, she locates language production in the individual, and not in the community. This discussion is in line with the concept of repertoires developed by Blommaert and Backus (2012), since they argue for a reorientation of the concept of repertoire. Because of the intensification of globalization, it is hard to define repertoires as belonging to a specific community, as the flux of people has increased. Thus, the authors defend that we should understand linguistic repertoires as subjective and biographical, that is, they are individual and not from one community. So, when she says that each person speaks their own way, she aligns with the critical language ideology defended on the text.

Milroy (2001) discusses that one of the greatest beliefs that help sustain the myth of Standard language is the popular belief of correctness. This belief assumes that if two varieties exist, only one can be right. Because this belief is a common sense, it is quite hard to be contested since it is something that "everybody should know". Rita affirms that, after university, she stopped correcting people. Before university, she believed in the traditional language ideology of correctness, in which there was a certain variety to be followed. After her undergraduate course, her vision changed. Similar to Luna, when she affirms that each individual speaks his/her own way, she aligns with the critical language ideology of the text, according to which our "repertoires are biographic, that is, they are not connected to the community, but to the life trajectory of subjects" (ASSIS-PETERSON; COX, 2013, p. 162).

Magali aligns with traditional language ideologies, as she stated she does not believe we "can take the English language and do whatever we want with it". First, she aligns with the objectifying idea that languages are abstract entities with a structure (REAGAN, 2004; MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007). Then, she says that rules have to be respected so communication can take place. In this case, she reproduces the traditional ideology of mutual intelligibility (REAGAN, 2004), in which speakers need to share a common code in order to communicate. This shows how she resisted the ideas developed in the text. If we compare her discussion with Rosa's Text activity 1, since she was the only one who did not align with the first text, there is a difference. Magali actively disagrees with the text, while, in my view, Rosa did not comprehend the text.

In the discussion in class about the text, students were not so engaged. I believe the text was quite long and students were a little tired, as it was the end of the semester. So, the following excerpt chosen is from a discussion we had about a video of a Brazilian woman in London, which happened in the same class. In the video, she talks about her impressions of the city and the people. Like Joel, the coach in Assis-Peterson and Cox's (2013) text, she mixes different linguistic resources and she does not mind about Standard English. In excerpt [9], student teachers question whether people would understand her or not:

[9]
1.   Pedro: So, how does she feel about her English language ability?
2.   Anita: She says "I can speak English very well".
3.   Luna: She's excited about it.
4.   Raul: But she can communicate.
5.   Luna: Yes.
6.   Student: Can she?
7.   Raul: She says "sometimes they understand, sometimes they don't, but it's okay".
8.   Pedro: "But it's oka::y, just say yes, yes".
9.   Luna: "I'm travelling."
10.   Anita: I think we understand because we speak Portuguese.
11.   Pedro: You think?
12.   Anita: Yeah.
13.   Rosa: Acho que o mais difícil é o sotaque dela. O carioca, não o que ela tá falando- [Her accent is the most difficult part. The carioca accent, not what she's saying-] oh, not that she's speaking wrong, but the carioquês 'shhh'.
14.   Anita: But she uses some Portuguese words.
15.   Luna: Interessa:nte. [Interesting]
16.   Anita: Esquentar a food. [To heat the food]
17.   Luna: No microo:ndas. [In the microwave]
18.   Pedro: Yes. Why do you think she uses Portuguese?
19.   Rosa: Because she doesn't have the vocabulary in English.
20.   Anita: And she's talking to Brazilian people. At the first part of the video, she says "Hi, Brazil".
21.   Pedro: "Hi, Londres". But she says "hi, Londres" too.
22.   Luna: But I think it's because of cognates, because the words that she uses in Portuguese are the words that are written or almost the same sound, like interesting, interessante.
23.   Anita: Esquentar a food? [To heat the food?]
24.   Luna: Mas ela falou micro-ondas. [But she said microwave]
25.   Student: But it's not a-
26.   Luna: I don't know.
27.   Sérgio: She said excelente.
28.   Luna: Excelente. [Excellent]
29.   [...]
30.   Ana: Ah, another example. "Em relação a prosódia, destacamos a pronúncia de 'control', do inglês 'control', seguindo um padrão de tonicidade do Português, língua em que as palavras terminadas em L são normalmente oxítonas. For example- [In relation to prosody, we highlight the pronunciation of 'control', from

the English 'control', following a tonicity pattern of Portuguese, a language in which the words ending in L are usually oxytones]

31. Luna: Eu acho que quando a gente não tá acostumado com o som, a gente vai pro som mais perto que a gente conhece, né? […] [I think when we are not used to the sound, we choose the closest to the ones we know, right?]

32. Pedro: But why do you think only Brazilians would understand her?

33. Yoshihara: The rhythm she speaks.

34. Luna: Because we know it. We know the difficulty when we started. We're teachers also. It's because we are teachers. I think we are already trained to understand what she's saying.

35. Anita: It's because we are-

36. Luna: We are Letras students. Our repertoire helps us understand what she says.

37. Pedro: Yeah, I think it's more on that way.

38. Anita: And we are mutually supportive.

39. Pedro: You think?

40. Anita: As teachers.

41. Luna: We're trained.

42. Anita: Maybe another person "What are you talking? I can't understand". But we try, because we do it every day. We are listening to our students.

43. Pedro: Okay. So, you think it's more, like, if you are willing to understand, you'll understand.

44. Luna: Yes.

45. Yoshihara: You make an effort.

46. Pedro: What about 'esquentar' [to heat]? She uses the word in Portuguese, yes? Do you think that people would understand 'esquentar' [to heat]? People who don't speak English.

47. Students: No.

48. Pedro: Why not?

49. Anita: But they would understand the context, the context.

50. Luna: Cause they don't know Portuguese.

51. Anita: Yeah, but she was saying that you can buy food, it's not necessary to spend a lot of money, because you can buy your own food at the supermarket and esquentar [heat] the food in the micro-ondas [microwave]. So, by the context, you can understand even though you don't know the word esquentar [to heat].

52. Pedro: Yeah. So, quais são as pistas que ajudam a entender que esquentar é esquentar? [What are the clues that help us understand the word esquentar?]

53. Anita: Food e micro-ondas. Não ter muito dinheiro, comprar, e- [Food and microwave. Not having money, buy, and-

54. Yoshihara: Ela falou também da questão de acomodação. Ela fala de hostel. Cê junta dinheiro, todo mundo dorme junto, [cê fica num hostel. Se você tem uma ideia de hostel-] [She also mentioned about hostels. You save money, everybody sleeps together, you stay in a hostel. If you have an idea about hostel-]

(Class 7)

From lines 1 to 9, students discuss their first impressions on the video. Students notice she is not afraid of speaking English, since not speaking the Standard form does not make her feel inferior or incapable of speaking English. From lines 9 to 54, student teachers and I debate around the matter of understanding/misunderstanding. Pennycook (2018, p. 16) affirms that "the Western tradition of thought about language and communication has often assumed that humans routinely understand each other". The longstanding tradition of

language studies also suggests "brains in cognitive isolation encoding and decoding ideas in and out of language and passing messages back and forth between themselves" (PENNYCOOK, 2018, p. 16). As the student teachers are immerged in a context in which language is studied "scientifically", the discussion on whether people would understand the woman's nonstandard English would surely be present.

Pratt (2013) problematizes the concept of *speech communities*, by stating that the idea of the modern nation as an imagined community reflects the imaginary object of modern linguistics. Traditional linguistics is anchored in an idea of community as unified and homogeneous. Thus, people from the same community speak with similar codes (PRATT, 2013). Whether it is from Generative Theory or from Discourse Analysis, the traditional ideology of homogenizing communities is still very present. Thus, Pratt's (2013, p. 441) discussion is developed around the idea that Linguistics has created linguistic utopias when defining the conception of *speech communities*, because they are far from the "fractured reality of linguistic experience in modern stratified societies". The idea of speech community is also based on commonalities and on understanding, as people from the same community would share the same code and would understand each other.

Nascimento (2017) and Pratt (2012) also problematize the positivist tradition in language studies, dating back to Saussure's (2011) *Cours de linguistique Générale*. Nascimento (2017, p. 59) affirms that "the epistemological basis of naturalized language conceptions and practices by hegemonic geopolitics of knowledge align with modern rational thought". Nascimento (2017) uses Pratt's (2012) discussion to problematize how Linguistics institutionalized itself as la hybris del punto cero, a point of objectivity and supposed neutrality which guarantees the university a single position to describe, research, and legitimize knowledge (CASTRO-GÓMEZ, 2007). Saussure is, as discussed, known for institutionalizing Linguistics from a scientific perspective. Through structuralism, Saussure isolated language "from other domains such as society, culture, individuals, and politics" transforming language into an analyzable, abstract, detached product (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 23). Pratt (2012, p. 17) presents Saussure's (1915) le circuit de la parole and discusses how "the two figures are an interesting combination of markings and absence of markings" (see Image 1, p. 34).

For Pratt (2012, p. 17), both subjects in the figure are in an equal position, since

> [t]hey are identical in appearance, Caucasian, generically male, and young. Their expressions are serious but calm. Their eyes are open and they are looking straight at each other, suggesting equality of rank. They are unclothed, even hairless, bearing no marks of class, religion, place, or livelihood. No surroundings define where they are. Their bodies are outside the frame. Language operates identically and symmetrically between them. Only one language is in play in the situation, and it is identically shared by both.

Saussure's (1915) le circuit de la parole reflects "an assumption of commonality coupled with a model of communication that starts with the idea of minds communicating with each other through words" (PENNYCOOK, 2018, p. 92). In this way, language is considered an abstract system that can work independently from our will. Also, Pratt (2012) problematizes Saussure's scheme when she questions why other categories such age, gender, race, emotions, power relations, and place are left out. Pennycook's (2018, p. 93) discussion is in line with her problematization as he affirms that, in Saussure's circuit, what is missing "is the context of communication, the messiness of communication, the conflict, ambiguity and uncertainty of communication, the role of bodies, places, artefacts, clothes, feelings, smells, social relations, gender, race and so much more".

Pratt (2012, p. 19-20) sensibly opposes Saussure's circuit to Poma de Ayala's (1613) Mala conficion (see Image 2, p. 35). These two drawings oppose themselves mainly in one aspect: one portrays the body outside of research in a neutralizing attempt, while perpetuating traditional/modern language ideologies, and the other depicts communication as an embodied experience. Pratt (2012, p. 19) affirms that "Guaman Poma's drawing depicts everything Saussure's seeks to dispel". All the elements neglected by traditional Linguistics are present in mala conficiono: hierarchy, inequality, gender, race, education, emotional state, setting, and multilingualism. As Pratt (2012, p. 19-20) describes, there are three languages at play:

> […] the priest is a native speaker of Spanish and is literate in it as well as in Latin. He may have sufficient mastery of Quechua to preach and receive confession, as the Spanish church encouraged. The woman is a native speaker of Quechua who may know some Spanish or none, and she is not literate. Her access to the doctrines that bind her body and soul runs through the priest, who does not administer them in her interest. But she also inhabits an Andean history, cosmology, and social world to which he has little access.

Nascimento (2017, p. 64) contends that "the hegemonic language conceptions and practices were forged as part of the colonial project, keeping in mind the geopolitics position and the colonizer's interests as a privileged perspective". In this way, we can see how modern Linguistics as it is known today reproduces traditional/modern language ideologies, as many linguists and applied linguists have been trying to problematize (BLOMMAERT; BACKUS, 2012; CANAGARAJAH, 2013; MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007; PINTO, 2017; MAKONI; MEINHOF, 2006). It is also in this context that we can problematize the student teachers's and my discussion on understanding/misunderstanding (lines 9 to 54).

In line 9, Anita affirms that we understand the woman from the video because we also speak Portuguese. There is an alignment with the traditional language ideology of speech community, as we supposedly understand each other based on the commonalities we have. Because we come from the same community (Brazil), we share the same linguistic characteristics, and, thus, we are able to understand each other. The argument of mutual understanding is simply based on linguistic aspects, as it is believed that "we need a thing called a common language in order to communicate successfully" (PENNYCOOK, 2018, p. 91). In line 13, Rosa affirms it is difficult to understand because of her "carioquês", the accent by people from Rio de Janeiro in Brazil. Anita, then, mentions that the woman mixes Portuguese with English. In line 18, I ask student teachers why she uses Portuguese and they say it is because of her lack of English knowledge and because she is talking to Brazilian people, reproducing the deficit language ideology (MARTÍNEZ, 2013). Then, in line 21, I mention she is also talking to people from London, as she greets them. This highlights how her linguistic repertoire is constituted biographically (BLOMMAERT; BACKUS, 2012): her speech indexes a regionalized Brazilian accent, she is Brazilian and speaks Portuguese, but she also speaks English. We could not have access to her story, but her repertoire is an indexical biography of her life.

From line 22 to 33, student teachers' discussion is still guided by the traditional language ideology of speech community. In line 22, Luna is not explicit, but she suggests that people from London would understand the woman because of the cognate words she uses. It is again the same commonality argument, which is based on the fact that we understand each other because the codes we use to speak are similar (CANAGARAJAH, 2007a; PENNYCOOK, 2018). Anita doubts it (line 23), as the woman uses the word

esquentar, which is not a cognate, but Luna mentions other two cognates she uses: excelente and micro-ondas. In line 32 and 33, there is the commonality argument again as I ask why Brazilian people would understand her and Yoshihara affirms it is because of the rhythm she speaks.

The commonality argument is comprised by the following assumptions:

> […] by communicating in the same language people can arrive at a state of mutual comprehension; this is done by sharing a code and the ideas that are then passed to and fro in that language; and the fact that we understand each other or not is a demonstration of the distinctive existence of different and separate language (PENNYCOOK, 2018, p. 90)

This first part of the discussion is marked by the assumptions Pennycook (2018) problematizes. As students point out, English speakers would not understand the woman because they do not hold the same code; only Brazilian English-speakers would understand her because of the common linguistic characteristics the interlocutors have.

Differently from the previous discussion, in line 34, Luna mentions an argument that is not based on linguistic commonalities. From line 34 to line 45, there is a discussion on being mutually supportive. Canagarajah (2007a, p. 236) mentions that we need to distance from the idea of common centralized codes, because "what speakers need are ways of negotiating difference rather than codes that are shared with others". Canagarajah (2007a) exemplifies *being mutually supportive* as a pragmatic strategy that can help us negotiate difference. In this sense, I believe students distanced from the traditional language ideology of speech communities, since the conversation now is not based on commonalities, but on negotiating differences through complex pragmatic strategies (CANAGARAJAH, 2007a; 2007c).

In line 46, I go back to the discussion on language and ask if people who do not share a similar code would understand the word esquentar. I believe I also reproduce traditional language ideologies while fighting against them since I start from from the monolingual paradigm to discuss about the matter of understanding when I use words such as Portuguese or English. In this discussion, some students affirm people would not understand, but Anita develops a different argumentation. In line 49 and 51, she defends that, because of the contextual clues (going to the supermarket, microwave, not having a lot of money), people would understand what the woman had meant. Yoshihara, in line 54, also agrees with Anita's

argumentation and provides other contextual clues: the fact that she is in a hostel and must cook her food.

Pennycook (2018) discusses that misunderstanding should not be seen with negative lenses, as it is part of communication. Also, he argues that instead of assuming that we have the same cognitive system able to understand a similar language, we should see the use of language from an alignment perspective. For second language acquisition, Atkinson et al. (2007, p. 171) defines alignment as "the means by which human actors dynamically adapt to – that is, flexibly depend on, integrate with, and construct – the ever-changing body-size-world environments". So, negotiation and adjustments are necessary for communication. As Canagarajah (2007c, p. 94) discusses, alignment is more important than uniformity to understand communication as "each brings his or her own language resources to find a strategic fit with the participants and purpose of a context". What Anita and Yoshihara do in the final part of the interaction is to imagine how people (from a different background) can align with the communication at play. In this way, I believe student teachers distanced from traditional language ideologies as they did not consider necessary to have a common code to communicate. Also, this second part of the discussion is more in line with the praxiologies discussed in this thesis, as student teachers take into consideration social aspects in communication, and not only the linguistic ones.

In this classroom interaction, it was interesting to observe how student teachers' affirmations and mine are contradictory. Being contradictory should not have a negative connotation, as I believe it is part of our condition as human beings. In Text activity 2, every student who participated in the discussion from excerpt [9] aligned with the perspective defended in the text. In the first part of the classroom interaction (lines 11 to 33), Anita, Luna, Rosa and Yoshihara employed traditional language ideologies to explain how the woman communicates in London. When considering linguistic aspects only, they analyze that she would not be able to communicate with people who do not share the same linguistic code as her. So, they use the commonality argument, which is a traditional language ideology, as it reproduces traditional and positivist perspective in language studies.

In the second part of the classroom interaction (lines 34 to 54), the discussion changes as students defend people who have a different code would understand her. In this part, they do not consider simply linguistic arguments, but also contextual and social ones. When the

linguistic commonality argument is not used, student teachers seem to align with more critical language ideologies that understand communication beyond linguistic codes. In this way, I believe they distanced from traditional language ideologies.

3.1.5. Class 8

Students were assigned to read Anzaldúa's (2007) *How to tame a wild tongue* and the text was discussed in Class 8. In this text, Anzaldúa discusses about her experience as a person who lived on and spoke from the border. She considers herself a Chicana, a person born in the US with Latin American ascendance. Her narratives are complicated by the fact that she mixes different linguistic resources and text genres. Also, she does not fix herself in one identity/country/language but speaks from the border. In her text, she affirms a Chicano/a speaks eight languages: Standard English; working class and slang English; Standard Spanish; Standard Mexican Spanish; North Mexican Spanish dialect; Chicano Spanish (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California have regional variations); Tex-Mex; Pachuco (called caló). Even though she uses words such as regional variations, Standard, and dialect to characterize the items, she affirms they are all languages. Thus, she reproduces a traditional language ideology at the same time she fights against it, decentralizing language from a nationalist perspective. Excerpt [10] is from a discussion we had about this issue:

[10]
1. Pedro: Okay, but what did you think about this idea of speaking eight languages?
2. Souza: I think it must be very complicated, but I think it's beautiful.
3. (Students laugh)
4. Rita: I wouldn't be able to talk eight languages, although these languages are similar. One is a variety of the other. It's very complicated. [And I think-]
5. Raul: [She's articulated].
6. Pedro: She's articulate.
7. Rita: I think eight languages are part of her identity, because she seems to be proud of speaking these languages.
8. Pedro: How many languages do you think you speak?
9. Luna: When I read this, I-
10. Maria Clara: You think or you actually speak? There's a difference between that.
11. Luna: It's very complicated.
12. Raul: I speak four. That's it.
13. Luna: When I read this, I thought how I speak to my students, how I speak if I'm applying for a job, how I speak with my parents, how I speak with my puppy.
14. Student: Que bonitinho!
15. (Students laugh)
16. Rita: Isn't it a variety?

17.   Luna: It's a variety, because I speak in a way in a context and, in another context, I speak differently. I thought about that, because eight languages, you say what?

18.   Pedro: What is her definition of language?

19.   Student: I don't know.

20.   Luna: The text made me think like this, I'm not sure if it's like this.

21.   Pedro: Yes. If you had read the text and you didn't know this information, and I asked you, how many languages does she speak?

22.   Luna: We would answer two.

23.   Rita: Two.

24.   Anita: English and Spanish.

25.   Pedro: Why does she say she speaks eight and not two?

26.   Nina: She adapts her language according to the people she is going to direct her speech. For example, if she talks in an interview or with an American person, she uses Standard English, she uses the words for this language and the slangs. She adapts the language according to the context.

27.   Pedro: Is her conception of language related to nation?

28.   Students: No.

29.   Pedro: Because she said that she speaks eight languages, right? And they are not from specific places. At least the six ones, right? Like, Chicano belongs to Chicanoland, I don't know. Did you get it? Now, I want you to get together in groups again. Just one last thing. Do you think these are varieties or languages?

30.   Anita: Varieties.

31.   Student: I don't think it is a language.

32.   Pedro: But don't you think that categories such as language and varieties are ways of hierarchizing them?

33.   Anita: [I don't think so.]

34.   Raul: [Categorizing different languages] are also a way of hierarchizing them.

35.   Anita: I think it's just pragmatics. As I said, when I talk to Graça it's not the same way as I talk to my sister, or to a friend, when I have a conversation with a friend. It's different.

36.   Maria Clara: But it's the same language.

37.   Anita: That's the same language. I think it's pragmatics.

38.   Nina: (?) she said she spoke different, but in the text, she talks a lot of things that- is it Spanish or English, this language Pachuco? It's really different.

39.   Pedro: Yes, but like Chicano? Do you think it's a language or a variation?

40.   Students: Variation.

41.   Pedro: Why?

42.   Nina: (?).

43.   Raul: Chicano?

44.   Pedro: Why do you think it's not a language?

45.   Anita: It's a variety of a language.

46.   Raul: Well, variety- I think it's just part of the language, because if you say variety, you mean that there is a perfect one.

47.   Pedro: So, you think that Portuguese is a variety of Latin and not a language?

48.   Raul: That is totally different.

49.   Rita: It's not the same.

50.   Nina: I think it's the same as you said Goiano, for example. We use Goiano. Chicanos, they use- okay, Chicanos the idea is bigger than Goianos, but-

51.   Rita: I think language is a system. It's a system, right? For example, Anita said that she talks differently with a friend of with a teacher. I think she uses the same codes, the same structures, but the rhythm, the words are different, but they all belong to the same language, which is Portuguese. You see? That's what I think.

52.   Anita: That's language in its use, interaction. My interaction with my sister is different.
53.   Rita: Otherwise, I would speak fifteen languages, because with my boyfriend I speak different, with my mother-
54.   Pedro: Yes, but what we've been trying to problematize is the separation of languages. Why do we separate languages like this?
55.   Anita: Because it exists.
56.   Rita: Because it's a relation of power, you know? We are inside of a system, we cannot be the rebel ones and "Let's stop it. This is not Portuguese anymore, this is-"
(Class 8)

In line 1, I question students about their impressions on the language issue in Anzaldua's (2007) text. From line 2 to 7, Rita and Raul participate. Rita seems to have a positive attitude towards Anzaldúa's language use and affirms that it is a complicated situation, but a positive one. However, she affirms, in line 4, that the claimed languages in Anzaldúa's text are varieties of other languages, and, in line 7, contradictorily to this affirmation, she refers to them as languages. Raul, in line 5, also has a positive attitude as he affirms Anzaldúa is articulate. In line 8, I direct this language issue to students' language use and question how many languages they speak and the discussion on language versus variety heats up. Raul says he speaks four, while Luna describes her language use attached to different situations. In lines 16 and 17, Luna's comment is followed by Rita's questioning whether she speaks varieties, not languages, and Luna agrees.

Milroy (2001) asserts that the idea of Standard versus nonstandard varieties depends on two things: first, on the existence of a Standard variety; second, on the centrality of this variety. It is such centrality that characterizes the others as nonstandard and it is the same centrality that attributes the idea that only the Standard is considered a language, while the others are credited as varieties (MILROY, 2001; PINTO, 2013). So, when students try to categorize ways of speaking as varieties or Standards, they reproduce the traditional/modern language ideology of the Standard in which "dialects become, as it were, satellites that have orbits at various distances around a central body – the Standard" (MILROY, 2001, p. 534).

In line 18, I try to problematize their discussion by asking Anzaldúa's (2007) definition of language, which tries to distance from traditional language ideologies, and students seem to resist it. In line 25, I try to confront Anzaldúa's (2007) affirmation of speaking eight languages with students' impression of her language use, and Nina aligns with critical language ideologies in line 26 when she recognizes Anzaldúa's (2007) ability to communicate fluidly. The words *adapt* and *context* seem to align with the concepts we have

been discussing, that is, the view of communication from an alignment perspective, taking context into consideration (ATKINSON et al., 2007; CANAGARAJAH, 2007a; PENNYCOOK, 2018).

In lines 27 and 29, I try to problematize the dichotomy language versus variety again, but at the end of line 29, I believe my question reproduces the same ideology I am fighting against. My questioning whether Anzaldúa's (2007) repertoires are varieties or languages directs student teachers' argumentation to discuss about these two possibilities. Possibily, this is one of the reasons why Anita and one student align again with the Standard language ideology to defend that Anzaldúa speaks varieties. Perhaps, if I had asked another question, using another vocabulary, their answers could have been different. When describing a sociolinguistics for globalized times, Blommaert (2010, p. 1-2) affirms that "a new vocabulary [is needed] to describe events, phenomena and processes, new metaphors for representing them, new arguments to explain them – those elements of scientific imagination we call theory". We need a new vocabulary, such as linguistic repertoire (BLOMMAERT; BACKUS, 2012), because in using the ones from traditional Linguistics (language and variety) we are still reproducing ideologies we are trying to fight against.

In line 32, I introduce the idea that the dichotomy between variety and language is hierarchizing, and Anita and Maria Clara align with traditional language ideologies as they agree with the dichotomy. Nina, on the other hand, seems to align with the perspective defended in the text when she argues that Pachuco could be considered a language. In line 39, I still reproduce the vocabulary from traditional Linguistics and students still seem to resist to my problematization. In line 46, Raul aligns with critical language ideologies by saying that she speaks part of the language and not a variety, but reproduces traditional language ideologies as if there were a whole language. Finally, in line 47, I compare Portuguese as a variety of Latin, and Raul and Rita (lines 48 and 49) do not agree. Portuguese has the status of language and students would not easily see it as a variety. From lines 51 to 53, Rita and Anita align with traditional language ideologies by using traditional Linguistics vocabulary, such as *system*, *pragmatics*, *codes* and *structures*. Finally, in line 54, I try again to problematize the ideology of language separation, while Anita, Rita and Maria Clara still align with traditional language ideologies, when they agree that language separation exists, and there is an abstract system above us that cannot be rebelled. As discussed by Ferreira

(2018), it is hard not to reproduce colonialities since an epistemic break has not happened and we are still inserted in a world characterized by colonial reasoning. Also, I believe that my use of traditional linguistics vocabulary to discuss the language issue might have influenced students' perception and directed their answers. Thus, we see how difficult it is to detach from old models of seeing communication.

In excerpt [10] from Class 8, we could observe how students produced traditional language ideologies by aligning with the dichotomy of language versus variety. Raul and Nina seemed to align with critical language ideologies while still reproducing traditional ones, whilst Rita, Maria Clara, and Anita aligned with traditional language ideologies by completely agreeing with the distinction of language versus variety

From Class 4 to Class 8, including the two Text activities, we could observe how student teachers' language ideologies are conflicting and contradictory. They positioned themselves differently in each interaction or activity. In Class 9 and 10, we discussed coloniality and textbook adaptation besides giving instructions for the microlessons, while from Class 11 to Class 13, students presented their microlessons. These classes do not appear in the discussion as I consider they did not fit the criterium I used for selecting the interactions. Also, I am not going to analyze their microlessons, but the discussions we had in class. Thus, the discussion will now follow to the language ideologies present in the Final narrative of the course.

3.1.6. Final narrative

Chart [8] describes the traditional/modern language ideologies found in the Final narrative, which were *language as a system* and *language as a tool/communication*:

Chart 8 – Traditional language ideologies

Final narrative
Language as a system
I would like to start this narrative conceptualizing language as a **system of communication**. Through this system we express our feelings, thoughts and ideas, and we do that using writing, speaking and other process. (Lenore, Final narrative)
For me, language is a **system** that has a specific **grammar, formal structure, rules** and this **system** is common to a **group** of people. […] In other words, when we consider a **country**, there are **many cities**, and within these spaces there are many **villages** too, similar to this; is a language. There are many 'villages', which are the **codes** within the **system language**. (Yoshihara, Final narrative)
As I have mentioned in my first narrative, I see language from different perspectives. In a certain way, I see it as a **kind of system**, but more than this, by taking into consideration that language is a way of

communication, I also see it as a primordial way of social practice which provides interaction. (Anita, Final narrative)
I see language as both a **structure** and as a fluid concept. (Maria Clara, Final narrative)
Language as a tool/communication
From my point of view, language is a symbolic tool of **communication**, **expression** and **social interaction**. Through language, we can communicate with each other, express our ideas and socialize. (Emily, Final narrative)
Language for me is a way to **communicate** my thoughts, and to **know what other people are thinking**. (Giovana, Final narrative)
[…] language has always had a very strong characteristic: to **establish communication between people**. Nowadays, my way of seeing language can be summed up in Erin McKean's speech: "Every language is just a **group of people** who agree to understand each other." (Larissa, Final narrative)
For me, language is a way of **communicating** and **discussing ideas**, providing knowledge and **connecting** to each other. It is strictly linked to culture, I believe: both of them walk together as one. (Rosa, Final narrative)
I conceptualize language as a tool for **communication** and consequently, a **bridge** to new cultures. It allows people to get to know each other, to **get to know** different habits, rituals, behaviors, among others. Language involves people's feelings, beliefs and it can change lives. (Rita, Final narrative)
In my view, language is a vehicle which people can count on to **express their identities**. Since culture is intrinsically connected to language, it is impossible for human beings to speak a language without expressing conscious or unwittingly their identities. Besides that, people can also share ideas with each other by means of language and that is when **communication** takes place. (Sérgio, Final narrative)

Source: Elaborated by the author, 2019.

In the First narratives, from the fourteen students who handed it in, twelve aligned with traditional language ideologies: *language as a system* (Lenore); *languages as separate* (Maria Clara, Bianca, Nina, and Luna); *language as communication* (Emily, Giovana, Rosa, Larissa, Yoshihara, Rita, and Sérgio). From the twelve students who handed in the Final narrative, ten produced traditional language ideologies: *language as a system* (Lenore, Yoshihara, Maria Clara) and *language as communication* (Emily, Giovana, Anita, Larissa, Rosa, Leticia Souza, Sérgio).

Lenore, Yoshihara and Maria Clara believe language is a system. Yoshihara goes further in defending that different groups hold different codes, as we are organized by countries, cities, villages. In this way, she also reproduces the idea that languages are fixed to places (BLOMMAERT, 2010; CANAGARAJAH, 2013). Maria Clara, on the other hand, affirms that language can be a 'fluid concept', but, contradictorily, still agrees that they have a structure.

In the second category, *language as communication ideology*, students defend the idea that language is a tool, a vehicle, for communication and expression. *Language as communication* ideology and *language as a system* ideology are complementary as I

previously discussed. Both reproduce the language myth (CICOUREL, 1983; HARRIS, 2002; PINTO, 2013) in that they are followed by the two fallacies Harris (2002) talks about: the tellementality and the determinability fallacy. The tellementality fallacy is constructed around the idea that we can transmit/receive information by means of words, while the determinability fallacy relates to using the same codes to promote understanding.

Even though the idea that language is for communication is problematized, some authors (BLOMMAERT, 2010; CANAGARAJAH, 2007a; 2013; PENNYCOOK, 2018) study the communicative aspect of language, but from a different perspective. If for traditional/modern linguistics, the commonality ideology is necessary so communication happens; for these authors, it is not. That is why we prefer to use the concept *linguistic repertoire*, focused on the biographies of individuals, rather than languages, which is based on commonalities of groups. These student teachers, when affirming that language is for communication, were placed in the traditional language ideologies for not problematizing the assumption that we need to have a similar code to understand each other (CANAGARAJAH, 2007a). Also, these traditional/modern ideologies are widely embedded in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics research and student teachers may have had contact with them since the beginning of their Letras: Inglês course.

In the First narrative, I could identify three critical/decolonial language ideologies in four narratives: *language equality* (Lenore); *language meshing* (Bianca); *language as power* (Raul and Rita). The number of students who produced critical/decolonial language ideologies in the Final narrative increased, as it is shown in Chart [9]: from the twelve narratives, five students aligned with the *language as power* ideology (Emily, Luna, Giovana, Raul and Rosa), while nine aligned with the *language invention* ideology (Lenore, Emily, Luna, Sérgio, Anita, Leticia Souza, Raul, Yoshihara and Maria Clara).

Chart [9] – Critical language ideologies

Final narratives
Language as power
[…] many times the language is used by its users as a means to **oppress** and **degrade** others. (Emily, Final narrative)
It **express identities, culture** and it **mark the place where someone is or can be in the World**. Language also is power and, being power, it can begin some **unpleasure conversation**. At my classroom I could see that during the time that Pedro was there as a teacher. I won't be extend myself here discussing this I will just say that it was a good experience to have Pedro these class. (Giovana, Final narrative)

Throughout the classes during the first two months of the subject English 8, I could get in touch with a broader view of language and language teaching. After the discussions about language in economic, geographic, and cultural aspects, my conceptions of language have somehow changed. In being a **tool** of **power**, languages can **oppress a certain group of people** according to the **hierarchy** that is given to it. (Raul, Final narrative)

I do not have confidence that it is possible to learn a language without having to learn the culture that is behind it. Language is, of course, also a way of **hierarchization**, but also can be a way of **resistance**. (Rosa, Final narrative)

Language invention ideology

[…] this experience […] enriches my thoughts about concepts of language, use of grammar and linguistic prejudice. Our classes also changes some **beliefs** I used to have, as that **without grammar we can not understand the other.** (Lenore, Final narrative)

[…] language is not only a structured concept, with grammatical rules and a pattern taught in a classroom, but it goes beyond that, transcending the concept of **nations and culture**, transcending the barriers of **Standardized English** and English teaching. I see language as both a structure and as a **fluid** concept, in a sense that you can teach and learn languages in a critical way, not only relying on grammar but also **most importantly** learning the language from its cultural roots and evolving in your learning as the language shows its own natural progress when it is used in everyday situations. (Maria Clara, Final narrative)

In addition to that, I understood and reflected about the power behind language and how **politics and social movements** interfere in language. **I never saw language as pure structure** and [t]he classes and the texts we read also reflected this idea. (Luna, Final narrative)

Due to the lessons I attended, I have already experienced some changes on my teaching techniques. As an example, I have been trying not to reproduce some present ideas on language such as the **Herderian Triad** by taking to class some materials which make reference to English spoken in countries **other than USA and UK**. (Sérgio, Final narrative)

In the contexts where I teach, students normally have traditional thoughts regarding the English language, since they **overvalue native speakers and some English speaking countrie**s like **England** and the **USA**. The discussions we had in our English VIII classes are helping my to deal with situations in which my students reveal these kinds of ideas, what I consider very important to my career as an English teacher. (Anita, Final narrative)

We discussed **coloniality, monolingual orientation, herderian triad, world englishes, invention of languages and linguistic hierarchization**. These are topics that I did not have much contact before. Moreover, I think they are **extremely important** to my colleagues and me because we are graduating in the Letras - Inglês course, so we have to know the topics related to language, and more than that, we have to know how to problematize our own practice as speakers of these languages. (Leticia Souza, Final narrative)

Most of the concepts discussed in the classes were already discussed before, like the *Herderian triad*, *hierarchy of language* and *monolingual orientation*. However, categorizing those concepts in different topics helped me to organize my arguments better. The way the authors expose their thoughts and exemplify them was well seized in the discussions in the classes. In addition, I feel like the contents were all connected in a logical way. (Raul, Final narrative)

Second, the content of our classes were good because I could revise few things that I had studied during the graduation, such as **world Englishes, linguistic hierarchization**. I also learned new conceptions and ways of teaching; for example, bring topics to class such as **coloniality**. (Yoshihara, Final narrative)

I liked them, since I could read and reflect about the dangerous **connection between language, community and plac**e, in addition to the **Standard English**, English **native speaker**, languages as inventions of **political**, **social** and **cultural movements** etc. […] (Emily, Final narrative)

Source: Elaborated by the author, 2019.

In the First narrative, two students aligned with the *language as power* ideology (Raul and Rita), while in the Final narrative, four did (Emily, Giovana, Raul and Rosa). I can affirm that because of the expressions student teachers used: *oppress* and *degrade* (Emily), *express identities*, *mark the place where someone is or can be in the World* (Giovana), *power*, *oppress*, *certain group of people*, *hierarchy* (Raul) *hierarchization*, *resistance* (Rosa). Emily's affirmation reflects the idea that language can cause suffering, as it can be used to degrade others (BUTLER, 1997 cited in PESSOA; URZÊDA-FREITAS, 2016). Giovana's excerpt highlight a language conception related to power by recognizing how language can mark someone's identity and it can limit or enable ways of living. As Norton and Toohey (2004, p. 1) asserts, language is "a practice that constructs, and is constructed by, the ways language learners understand themselves, their social surroundings, their histories, and their possibilities for the future". Hawking and Norton (2009, p. 2) also reflect that language "can itself serve to both empower and marginalize", that is, marginalized groups can get empowered and resist against hegemonic forces.

The *language as power* ideology was not the main focus of the course, but it was embedded in the discussions, as we problematized one effect of the language invention ideology: how it can hierarchize its speakers. Besides, they certainly had discussed this topic previously in other subjects in the course. These are possible reasons why students also produced this language ideology in the Final narrative. As we could observe, comparing First and Final narratives, more students ended the course aligning with this critical/decolonial language ideology.

The concepts we discussed in the course, which were *Herderian triad, linguistic hierarchization, language ideologies, coloniality, repertoires, world Englishes, Standard language*, are all attached to the *language invention* ideology. For languages to be invented, they had to be connected to places and people (BLOMMAERT, 2010; CANAGARAJAH, 2013). This connection did not happen naturally, as it was influenced by colonial and nationalistic projects (PENNYCOOK; MAKONI, 2007). Also, languages were hierarchized through language ideologies into scientific (languages from the colonizers) and cultural (languages from the colonized). Research in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics sustain this invention as they reproduce the commonality argument (CANAGARAJAH, 2007a;

PENNYCOOK, 2018; PRATT, 2012) and the language myth (HARRIS, 2002; PINTO, 2013).

In the First narrative, student teachers did not produce the *language as invention* ideology, as explained in Chart [8]. As I discussed in the introduction, my aim was to problematize the invention of languages with student teachers since I had not had contact with this praxiology in my undergraduate course; and it seems most of student teachers did not either. So, that is why the language as invention ideology appears only in the Final narrative, in which it was possible to identify nine out of twelve narratives having this language ideology. Lenore aligns with critical language ideologies for considering that we do not need a similar code to communicate, an idea that is not present in modern Linguistics. So, she goes against the commonality argument and the determinability fallacy, discussed by Harris (2002). Maria Clara, on the other hand, seems to inhabit a space of in-betweenness since she produces critical and traditional language ideologies when she affirms that language can be both structural and fluid. As she affirms, languages transcend the concept of nations, cultures, and Standard English. Her ideas are quite in line with the ones we studied during the course. However, she still produces both ideologies. Unlike Maria Clara, Luna seems to show some previous knowledge on the topic, as she affirms she had never seen language as pure structure. Her use of words *political*, *social movements*, *power*, also makes me think she aligned with critical language ideologies, since languages were invented by means of and can be affected by political movements (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007; KROSKRITY, 2004).

Sérgio and Anita discuss similar ideas when they confront the Herderian triad and the monolingual orientation: Sérgio's teaching techniques have changed as he claims he is trying to show to his students how English is spoken in other countries, while Anita affirms that the discussions in the course have been helping her to confront some effects of the invention of languages, such as the myth of the native speaker and how students overvalue the USA and England. When Sérgio affirms that he would like to bring the English spoken in other countries, I am reminded by Pennycook (2007), who affirms that World English praxiologies still reproduce the nationalistic idea they try to fight against. Again, this shows how language ideologies are multiple and complex, as student teachers hold different language ideologies and reproduce traditional ideologies while trying to produce critical ones. However, unlike

Pennycook (2007), I still consider Sérgio's claim as an attempt to fight within the system, because sometimes we can be limited by it.

The last four students (Emily, Leticia Souza, Raul, Yoshihara) displayed critical language ideologies by means of mentioning the concepts discussed in the course and asserting they liked the concepts. They affirm the concepts studied were relevant for their professional lives: Raul mentions he knew a lot about the discussion, but the concepts discussed helped him develop argumentation, while Rita affirmed she did not know anything about the topics. Finally, Emily and Yoshihara explicitly state that they enjoyed the concepts we discussed. In this sense, student teachers were explicitly articulating the language ideologies they were getting aligned to (KROSKRITY, 1004; MARTÍNEZ, 2013).

In this section, the production of language ideologies by student teachers throughout this critical language teacher education has been addressed. I have used First and Final narratives, Text activities, Classroom interactions to show how their language ideologies are fluid, complex, and contradictory. Not only have I discussed how complex their production of language ideologies was, but I also have identified which moments they tended to align to a certain ideology. Three aspects influenced their language ideologies production: the type of activity developed (if it was a classroom interaction or an assessment activity); the way they looked at language use (if only linguistic aspects are taken into consideration); and the vocabulary used to problematize modern Linguistics (if it is still the same one we fight against). In the next section, I focus on the pedagogical reflections that have emerged from this teacher education experience.

PEDAGOGICAL REFLECTIONS

In this chapter, I discuss the pedagogical reflections that emerged in this critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective with university student teachers. I make use of *Classroom interaction*, *Final interview*, *Reflective session with the professor*, and *Text activity* to examine the challenges addressed by the participants in this study when considering the pedagogical implications of looking at classroom aspects concerning the praxiologies on language under a decolonial perspective. In the first discussion chapter, I focused on the language ideologies produced by the university student teachers, that is, I focused on how they produced knowledge about language throughout the course. Now, my interest is on how they envision pedagogical practice under the perspective defended in this text. The participants raised reflections on four aspects: the detachment between school language and real language; the power of structure on teacher agency; the complexity of dealing with students' expectations of nativized English; the coloniality of assessment.

4.1. Pedagogical reflections about language under a decolonial perspective

The subject we teach, English, has been described by various authors (CANAGARAJAH, 2013; KACHRU, 1986; PHILLIPSON, 1992; PENNYCOOK, 2007; 2017). Some (PHILLIPSON, 1992; PENNYCOOK, 2007; 2017) have denounced the imperialistic/colonial aspects of English and English teaching due to political reasons. Pennycook (2007) discusses that this language has collusionary, delusionary, and exclusionary effects. As he affirms (2007, p. 102), English

> colludes with many of the pernicious processes of globalization, deludes many learners through the false promises it holds out for social and material gain, and excludes people by operating as an exclusionary class dialect, favouring particular people, countries, cultures and forms of knowledge.

Pennycook (2007) also adverts that we should have a more balanced view of English, instead of an overdeterministic or a romantic one. We should not consider English as a language that simply excludes people or a language that harmonically makes communication between nations possible. Instead, "we need to understand how English is involved in global

flows of culture and knowledge, how English is used and appropriated by users of English round the world" (PENNYCOOK, 2007, p. 102). In this sense, other scholars have tried to redefine English and describe how marginalized populations have reinvented it. Terminologies such as World Englishes, English as an International Language, English as a Lingua Franca, Translingual English have been trying to explain how people have used English for their own purposes (CANAGARAJAH, 2013). Though they are different in their epistemes, I agree with Szundy (2017, p. 173) who affirms that "several scholars who use other metaphors to define English seem to inscribe themselves in language ideologies that depict both an awareness of its abuses, but also redesigned possibilities of its uses". In this sense, these terminologies belong to different epistemological fields, but have a similar goal: to explain how people round the world appropriate and make use of English for their own purposes. Based on Canagarajah (2013), I will explain how these terminologies differ and how related they are from the perspective defended in this text.

The World English (WE) model comes from Kachru's (1986) three circles model in which he divided the countries in Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle. The Inner Circle is recognized as norm providing since they are formed by nations who have English as a first language. The Outer Circle is formed by countries which have been colonized by Inner Circle countries and use English as second language, while the Expanding Circle is comprised by countries that are considered "norm dependent", since they adopt norms from the Inner Circle and use English for contact purposes (CANGARAJAH, 2013). Canagarajah (2013) recognizes Kachru's (1986) for legitimizing other varieties of English besides the ones in the Inner Circle but also problematizes it for reproducing the nation-state logic present in modern language studies. Also, it reproduces the "enumerative strategy" (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007) and the Herderian triad by linking varieties to nations. Lastly, it fails to recognize emerging varieties of English in globalized times since it "has left the complexities of transnational contact unaddressed" (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 61).

English as an International Language (EIL) is another model for describing English in globalized times (CANAGARAJAH, 2013). This model complicates the use of the English language arguing that the number of speakers in the Inner Circle is smaller than the number of speakers from the other circles. Thus, the prestige held by the Inner Circle is questioned since relations of power in language are influenced by aspects such as economy, production,

and military intervention. Moreover, Outer Circle and Expanding Circle countries have got politically and economically stronger over the years. This way, the EIL model places all varieties in the same hierarchical level and is not nation-dependent. However, like the WE model, it fails for reproducing the enumerative strategy and for being norms-based "as it treats grammatical norms as the criterion for identifying self-contained varieties, often in an impressionistic manner" (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 62).

Another model described by Canagarajah (2013) in this category is the English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) model. It differs from EIL for being engaged in defining a lingua franca core with special features on how ELF is used between multilinguals. However, this model still reproduces the idea of a stable variety and has been questioned due to a supposed neutrality in language use for treating ELF as a monolithic variety. Canagarajah (2013, p. 64) debates that scholars on ELF have started to problematize these aspects and given emphasis on pragmatic strategies, but they "still retain an important place for grammatical norms, treating negotiation strategies as an add-on, perhaps of the same status as form". Canagarajah (2013) argues that this model lacks philosophical clarity for having controversial connections between repertoires and practices and the notion of community. However, he also recognizes that it has advanced somehow for comprehending English as a contact language and establishing that the norms from the Expanding Circle are not dependent from the Inner Circle. Lastly, this model does not work within the deficit language ideology, legitimizing multilinguals' language use.

The last orientation introduced by Canagarajah (2013) is English as Translingual (ET). This orientation is present in his whole book and starts from practice to explain communication. It considers norms as emergent from the communicative event, and not predetermined to it. Also, it does not rely on sharedness of codes to describe communicative success, but it relies on "strategies that enable such negotiation of power and difference for meaning and communication" (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 68). The translingual model is different from the other ones because it focuses on practice rather than form to explain communicative success. For scholars who defend ET, languages were invented as part of colonial and nationalistic projects (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007) and they argue that meaning does not depend on such inventions, but in alignment with other ecological resources such as "the topic of the conversation, the geographical context" and the situation

itself (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 74). Lastly, this orientation is more related to the praxiological background I defend because, unlike the others, it is not rooted on the Structuralist notion of language as a self-standing system (CANAGARAJAH, 2013).

As I affirmed previously, these terminologies differ as they come from diverse ideological arenas (SZUNDY, 2017), but they have a similar goal: to legitimize how *Othered*[15] speakers appropriate and make use of English. Even though my praxiological orientations are closer to English as Translingual, I do believe the others are relevant. Also, since the translingual orientation is quite recent in language studies, it is easier to find texts that imagine pedagogical practices in WE, EIL or EFL perspectives to ground my discussion. In this sense, considering that they have some similarities, they can also shed light on some pedagogical problematizations I make in the text.

4.1.1. The detachment between school language and real language

In this teacher education experience, I followed a critical approach in which the problematization of social issues is crucial. Also, in terms of communication, I tried to adopt a translingual view, focusing on content negotiation and not on grammar instruction. This was possible because there is no established syllabus in the course I was teaching. In other contexts, this may not be possible, if teachers are submitted to a strict syllabus. As Pessoa and Bastos (2017, p. 173) contend, "normative grammar is still the star of language classrooms in Brazil" even when teachers adopt critical approaches. When I asked students to relate some concepts from our class to their pedagogical practice, a similar discussion was raised by Anita and Yoshihara:

> [11]
> 1. Pedro: And what did you discuss about the Herderian triad?
> 2. (Sts laugh)
> 3. Pedro: Anita!
> 4. Anita: So, I said that we reproduce this monolingual orientation when we teach our students grammar according to our textbooks and ignore the deviations of the Standard language. For example, I'm teaching something and I say to my students "Grammar says that", but maybe you are watching a movie and you are going to see it differently, and you are going to say "Oh, but teacher said that I have to say 'she does' and the movie says 'she don't'". So, when we ignore, and we don't say that it can happen, I think we reinforce this monolingual orientation. We also discussed, for example, that our textbooks, we have units about London or units

---

[15] I use *othered* to highlight how the marginalization of speakers in the countries from the Outer or Expanding Circle is a process that benefits speakers from the Inner Circle.

about New York, so we are reinforcing it because we use this idea of language as place, as well. So, I think that we are reinforcing it again.
5. Pedro: What do you think about her comment regarding monolingual orientation?
6. ---
7. Pedro: What about her comment on grammar?
8. Yoshihara: I think she said something that is very true. The idea is that in the classroom we teach what should be 100% correct, everything is perfect, etc, but, for real, it doesn't work this way. The same goes for Portuguese. We learn Portuguese, but we leave the room, it's another language. (?). If you say 'gimme', [students would say:] "gimme? I didn't understand that. What does it mean?", or gonna. So, there are things that it's like what she said. Well, like, this is what we teach, but on a daily basis that's what everyone is going to listen to, she does a bridge, let's say.
(Class 4)

Pennycook and Makoni (2007) affirms that languages are inventions, but their effects are very real, influencing from policy making to educational aspects. The effects of language invention are felt by Anita, Yoshihara, and their students when they talk about *the disconnection between school language and real language*. Their agony lies within one of the effects of language invention: when we objectify and see languages as single entities, "the grammar of a language becomes what is contained in a textbook or reference grammar; the lexicon becomes synonymous with what is in the dictionary" (REAGAN, 2004, p. 46). Because textbooks are produced by center-based industries, they still reproduce colonial aspects of language teaching (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2016), being the conception of language one of them. Their discussion is in line with Pessoa and Bastos (2017) who argue that normative grammar is still present in our classrooms.

Anita compares the differences between the repertoires students are in contact with in the real world and in the classroom. From her discussion, we can deduce that the repertoires students are in contact with outside the classroom are different from the ones present in textbooks. Also, since books bring units from London and New York, they still reproduce the Herderian triad (CANAGARAJAH, 2013) and the idea that the Inner Circle is *norm providing* and the Expanding Circle is *norm dependent* (KACHRU, 1986). Yoshihara reflects on similar aspects and adds that students learn school language and do not understand the linguistic resources used outside the classroom. Their discussion on *real language* leads to the issue of authentic material. What does it mean to be authentic?

Gilmore (2007, p. 98) reflects upon the concept of authenticity and affirms that there are many meanings related to it: "authenticity can be situated in either the text itself, in the

participants, in the social or cultural situation and purposes of the communicative act, or some combination of these". For example, one may define authenticity as language produced by native speakers or language produced by a real speaker to a real audience. The author also contends that textbook language is a poor representation of what communication can be. From the WE perspective, she discusses that it is hard to determine what is authentic since non-native speakers of English have outnumbered native speakers. Which variety should we value, then, when teaching English? Truth is that the so called American and British English are still present in language schools since textbooks come mostly from these countries (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2016) and cause the discomfort problematized by Anita, Yoshihara and their students in the Brazilian context.

The translingual orientation complicates even more the case of authenticity, since language is not attached to a place and we cannot name where a variety starts or ends. I believe the concept of authenticity is questioned when we try to see it under a translingual orientation, because there is no real language to be taught since we consider languages are inventions (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007). What we have is people constructing meaning with the resources available to them. In this case, I agree with Gilmore (2007), who believes the answer to our problem is more likely to be found locally than globally. Instead of adopting global, center-based textbooks to guide our syllabus, we should resort to the goals of language learners and the ability of language teachers to use materials at their disposal. In this sense, student teachers' discomfort would have been reduced, if they had had the chance to plan their own material based on their learners' needs (CANAGARAJAH, 2012; 2014).

4.1.2. The power of structure on teacher agency

Lenore and Raul reflected upon *the power of structure on teacher agency*. In their views, critical/decolonial language ideologies are quite difficult to be implemented, since there is a powerful structure that is above teacher agency and can control our actions:

> [12]
> 1. Pedro: What were your general impressions on the content we studied?
> 2. Lenore: My general impressions? Let me think.
> 3. Pedro: You can say anything that comes to your mind.
> 4. Lenore: Quite expressive, in the sense that- the question of linguistic prejudice, which was the one I understood the most, at least, is quite complex because it is not applicable, you know? It's a theory, a beautiful theory- there is a professor who

talks about this, I'm not going to mention her, but if you say "english" to her, the correct pronunciation is "inglish" [imitating the professor]. If you say "apple" with her, "épou", "épou". She corrects you on spot and does not accept it. She talks about it [linguistic prejudice], so it's something that is not applicable. It's nice to talk about it, but if I get to [mentions two nationally, highly prestigious language schools], I won't be able to apply what I learned here. I'll have to adapt to what they demand, right? So, I can't say to my students: "you can speak English with a Brazilian accent if you are from the Northeast Brazilian region, it's not a problem, what matters is communication". I can't. The school won't allow me to do that. I'll have to teach the correct pronunciation.
(Lenore, Final interview)

[13]
1. Pedro: In your opinion, how do research participants, student teachers and teacher educator, reproduced or resisted to colonial discourses and practices?
2. Raul: As I said before, I think that, in theory we know how it works, how capitalism, how the American symbolic colonization is everywhere through fast food restaurants, music, but I think that in practice, it's not- at least I don't know about my friends- with this decolonization project, of trying to bring things different from the USA, basically, since the UK is present, but the USA dominates. For example, during their classes, there was Halloween and every teacher-
3. Pedro: Huh?
4. Raul: I don't remember when it was-
5. Pedro: I didn't get what happened.
6. Raul: Halloween. Every teacher decorated their classrooms and got into costumes. We know it's a practice from American culture, but everyone worshipped Halloween. Even my French students said: "teacher, we want cake and party from Halloween". In theory, we know how it works, but in practice it doesn't change much.
7. Pedro: Why do you think there is such a big difference, then?
8. Raul: As I said, I think it's about the line of least resistance. Researching about cultures that are not so popular- I'm sure there are other types of celebrations and cultural stuff we don't know. We could bring this to class, but it would demand research on the topic, search for materials, which is not easy to find. If you research Halloween, there will be thousands of ready-made activities, articles, videos, but not from other less popular cultures. That's what I think.
(Raul, Final interview)

Joseph (2006) defends that it is important to research on the possibilities and constraints of actions in certain contexts. The concept of agency became popular in the 1970s since structuralism was not able to theorize about the power of human actions (AHEARN, 2000). Ahearn (2000) affirms that agency is an often-researched term these days, but many authors define it in different ways. Moreover, she (2000; 2001; 2013) argues that this concept should not be seen either as *free will*, since it would lack influences of the social nature of the concept, nor simply as *resistance*, as "oppositional agency is only one of many forms of agency" (AHEARN, 2001, p. 115). So, she defines agency as "the sociocultural mediated capacity to act" (AHEARN, 2001, p. 112), as it depends on the social and cultural possibilities or constraints of contexts.

As for teacher education, *teacher agency* is a concept that describes a type of agency that "is theorized specifically in respect of the activities in school" (BIESTA; PRIESTELEY; ROBINSON, 2015, p. 625). According to Silvestre (2017), this concept has been of interest to applied linguists in Brazil, but research on it is still emergent (for examples, see JORDÃO, 2011; JORDÃO; BUHRER, 2013; DUBOC, 2012; SILVESTRE, 2017; LEMOS; BORGES, 2015). In a critical language teacher education study, Silvestre (2017) envisions the concept of teacher agency under a decolonial perspective and affirms that it consists of investigating how agency is constructed or exercised in different educational settings.

Silvestre's (2017) study maps the factors that either contributed or suppressed teacher agency in her critical language teacher education experience. Based on her study, in which she was the teacher educator, the collaborative production of didactic materials and the engagement of the student teachers promoted teacher agency, while feelings of fear towards using the English language and her excessive supervision over their activities hindered it. Most importantly, Silvestre (2017) understands agency as a dynamic process marked by oscillations and tensions.

Lenore and Raul see constraints when adopting a decolonial perspective to their practice: either by changing the conception of language (Lenore) or the materials they bring to class (Raul). They feel disempowered to act due to colonial traces in our profession that privilege teaching materials, language variations, textbooks and methods from center-based countries (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2016). Kumaravadivelu (2016) centralizes the issue of coloniality in English language teaching in methods. He affirms that the concept of method is central to understand how the hegemonic forces in language teaching is reproduced in "curricular plans, materials design, teaching methods, standardized tests, and teacher preparation" (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2016, p. 72-73).

Lenore adverts that language schools reproduce modern/traditional ideologies for adopting language norms coming from Inner Circle countries. In this sense, different linguistic practices would not be allowed, and students would have to cleanse their accents in order to achieve native-like pronunciation. Another interesting aspect she mentions is related to a professor who believed in these same praxiologies and still dealt with language correction under a colonial perspective. As discussed in Ferreira's (2018) study, it is hard not to reproduce modern/traditional language ideologies in our practice, since we are inside a

matrix of power that operates this way. Also, as highlighted by me in a later discussion, this correction might have its origins in a concern on the part of the professor in order to have her students get any job opportunities they may want, as these language schools would demand "native-like language production" from prospective teachers.

In Raul's speech, he declares his difficulty in following a more decolonial approach to teaching. This difficulty is due to a symbolic colonization that has its origin in American imperialism. This imperialism is reflected in two aspects: the difficulty of finding materials that deal with aspects from different minoritized cultures and students' desire to celebrate festivals from North American culture. Such imperialism makes language teachers reproduce colonial practices in the classroom that centralize North American culture in the teaching of English, since, as Kumaravadivelu (2016) defends, the hegemonic forces in English education are alive and kicking. Even though our applied linguist community have described the pernicious ways that the native speaker ideology operates in our field, we still fall into its colonial traps (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2016). Thus, Kumaravadivelu (2016) argues for a systematic call for action with counter-hegemonic strategies in material production and teacher education. In this sense, student teachers consider that these colonial aspects entrenched in our profession through the language conception and the availability of course materials hinder the adoption of more critical/decolonial approaches.

4.1.3. The complexity of dealing with students' expectations of nativized English

Another topic of discussion is how students' expectations towards nativized forms of English might affect their attempt to work under a decolonial perspective. Luna and Raul discuss on this matter:

[14]
1. Luna: I'm kind of generalizing, but our students, I think they don't know about varieties. They think that there is only British and American English. And there is this story of "Is he a native speaker? Does he speak like a native?"
2. Raul: But I guess we reinforce it. At least, when I was studying here, teachers talked a lot about American and British English, and I think we internalize this.
3. Luna: It's because we are also students and I don't know you, guys, I knew the variety in the United States, but as a student, we don't have much contact with different accents. I got to know that Australian and Indian people had a different accent in English when I came to Letras. I never thought about it. So, as a student, we don't have contact in regular school.
(Class 4)

Luna reflects upon English language students' lack of knowledge on different repertoires in English and their desire towards American English. Raul posits students' lack of knowledge as a consequence of teachers' work, that is, because of the school dominant language ideology (METZ, 2019), language teachers reinforce the native speaker ideology and students do not have contact with any other repertoires. In a mixed-method study, Metz (2018) investigated the perception of 169 high-school students towards language variation. These students were from 7 racially and linguistically diverse classrooms in the San Francisco Bay Area, the USA. Also, he interviewed 5-6 students from each classroom to debate specifically about issues that came up in the initial survey.

Metz (2018) identified the opposite of what Luna and Raul discussed. Students may not have the right meta-language to talk about different linguistic repertoires, but not only are they aware that they exist, but they are also sensible of how language is racialized and hierarchized. 86% of the interviewed students connected language to race in ways that could be divided into three categories: "(a) explanations of racial stereotypes related to language, (b) descriptions of personal experiences of racial bias related to language, (c) contestation of racialized stereotypes related to language" (METZ, 2018, p. 14). Obviously, we cannot say that Metz's (2018) study is representative of our Brazilian reality, since Raul and Luna were talking about Brazilian students, but we can at least question whether students are not really aware of the existence of other linguistic repertoires. Possibly they are, but what could be investigated is how these repertoires are ideologically seen by our students.

In dialogue [15], some students, Raul, and Anita discuss about our practices in the classroom:

[15]
1. Pedro: Okay. Do you think that our practices reflect the World Englishes perspective?
2. Students: No.
3. Pedro: Our practices in the classroom.
4. Students: No.
5. Pedro: Why not?
6. Student: Unfortunately.
7. Raul: We use a book that is from Britain and all the audios, it's in British English, some kind of British English. It's not World English. I remember when I used to teach English a long time ago, I don't remember bringing a video that wasn't with native speakers. Video, audio, songs. That's why it's not world-

8. Pedro: Okay, and what is the implication of adopting the World English perspective to language teaching? Do you think it would change much or just bring a video and that's it?
9. Anita: I discussed it with- I chose one excerpt and then I discussed this perspective, because I think that students are not prepared or opened to this kind of World English perspective.
10. Pedro: Ah, okay.
11. Anita: Because they ask us "Teacher, seu inglês é americano ou britânico? Em quanto tempo é possível a gente falar igual a um nativo?" So, they expect this American English and this British English, and if you try, of course, I talk to them about this World English, but (?). They are like "Oh, it's bullshit. It doesn't exist. I want to speak like a native speaker." So, this myth is really strong.
(Class 7)

Students discuss that our practices are far from counter-hegemonic ones (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2016). Raul reifies that by affirming that his practice is still marked by a cultural imposition from the norm providing countries, that is, England. The issue of students' expectations is highlighted again by Anita, who affirms that students are not opened to a work with different repertoires, since they expect nativized English from two specific countries: England and the USA. In this sense, one of the effects of language invention, that is, placing a language, a community together, is making the idea of absolute competence possible (FIGUEREDO, 2011). According to Anita, this idea comes from the native speaker myth in which any native speaker is the only one able to control and shape his/her language (DAVIES, 2003). The literature reveals that even though applied linguistics has problematized the native speaker myth, it is still a very strong idea, glorified by students and present in our practices (FIGUEREDO, 2011; KUMARAVADIVELU, 2016), as noticed by Anita and Raul.

In dialogue [16], student teachers still persisted on the idea that students would reject a decolonial approach when I asked about the barriers we would face if we adopted it:

[16]
1. Pedro: Okay. So, if we adopt this perspective, what are some barriers that we are going to face in language teaching? You talked about evaluation. What else? What are the others?
2. Sérgio: I said (?) and students' perspective on this English concept.
3. Student: Enganado [cheated].
4. Pedro: What? Enganado [cheated]?
5. Anita: (?) "I'm not here to learn English like this".
6. Luna: "I want a teacher to say if I'm right or wrong".
7. Anita: Yeah.
8. Maria Clara: Most students want that.
9. Luna: I think all students.
10. Pedro: All students want that?

11. Luna: I think so.
12. Pedro: Yeah?
13. Luna: Yeah.
(Class 7)

In this discussion, the student teachers justify a focus on Standard English as the norm in their classroom as a result of students' desire. Students would feel cheated, in Anita's words, if they did not have access to Standard English. Luna and Maria Clara align with the native speaker ideology as a product of students' desire. It seems that the desire for a nativized Standard English comes from societal pressures (DEWEY, 2011; METZ, 2018; 2019). In Dewey's (2011) study, he states that teachers tend to teach Standard English over English as a lingua franca due to its possibility of gatekeeping. In this sense, students who would not master a Standard variety would have their freedom constrained, since English is widely used in academic contexts, for example.

Metz's (2018; 2019) studies follow a similar line of thought. In Metz's (2019) investigation of high school English teachers, he applied a survey with 310 teachers in Missouri, USA, to identify teachers' language ideologies about Standard English. In general, teachers in Missouri hold more counter-hegemonic perspectives on language since they do not link language to morality and kindness. However, when it comes to societal perception, the results are different, as teachers believe that society hold more hegemonic perceptions. Their language ideologies are conflicting when it comes to teaching practice since they believe that they should teach multiple repertoires, but they defend that a dominant norm should be used in schools. Also, they tend to believe that Standard English should be the variety used by students.

By understanding Metz's (2019) discussion on teachers' language ideology, we can shed some light on dialogue [16]. First, student teachers believe language learners want Standard English and see it as the only variety to be used. This discussion is in line with Metz's (2019) research, which highlights that teachers take Standard English as the norm when they are confronted with two situations: school context and societal perception. These situations shape teachers' perception of what students desire. Another study developed by Metz (2018) focuses on students' perception of different linguistic repertoires, as I discussed previously. In this study, he also finds out that there is no correlation among students' gender, race, and language ideology. However, what influences them the most to have more

hegemonic ideas about language is parents' beliefs about language, at least in the US context. Also, students in his study affirmed that, in school, Standard language should be taught. This reflects the student teachers' discussion that learners usually prefer a Standard variety. In summary, parental pressure and social perception impacts our choices as language teachers.

When we were discussing globalization, the issue of dealing with students' expectations was raised again, as shown in dialogue [17]:

> [17]
> 1. Pedro: Do you think it's enough to bring only Brazilian people?
> 2. Students: No.
> 3. Lara: It's necessary to bring different perspectives.
> 4. Bianca: Of the whole world.
> 5. Lara: Yeah.
> 6. Bianca: This is globalization. Show Brazil so you can- so they can interact more and after they feel comfortable, you get out of the comfort zone.
> 7. ---
> 8. Rita: Yeah, because they are used to the bank approach, Paulo Freire's-
> 9. Lara: They want to follow the book. They want to feel like they are in a sequence.
> 10. Rita: And they like to see grammar rules on the board.
> 11. ---
> 12. Pedro: Yes, I think it's a change of culture that we need to make, in the sense that we need to change habits, right? Their expectations.
> 13. Bianca: Yes. Whenever somebody asks me why we aren't doing this, why we are seeing this, I'm like "I do what I need to do to us". Just start asking them questions "Why do you wanna see this? Why do you think it's important? What is the difference between this content and this content that I'm showing you? How do you feel about it? Why do you wanna learn about (?)?". And they are like "No, let's just follow the plan teacher, I don't wanna talk about it." (laugh).
> 14. Pedro: Yes, and if they ask "Why do we need to see this?", you can just ask "Why not?"
> 15. Bianca: Why not? What do you wanna see? You wanna see what we've been repeating and ever since what you see on TV every day.
> 16. Pedro: Yeah.
> (Class 10)

This example is quite different from the others since student teachers are not afraid of confronting the discourses that students come to classroom with. First, they discussed about the globalization issue and affirmed that the classroom is a place where students should think outside the box, not only write grammar rules or use the textbook. Moreover, differently from the other student teachers, in this case, Bianca does not show hesitation and she confronts standpoints in a problem-posing way. In this case, besides showing that she is aware of current language praxiologies to describe communication, like in Dewey's (2011) and Metz's (2018; 2019) studies, Bianca shows she is not afraid of going against her students,

as in these studies people were cautious about that since they only stayed on the level of recognizing that students come with different desires and expectations that reflect more traditional ideologies.

Szundy (2017) conducted a course on writing practice in the university she works at and she developed activities with her students about English as a lingua franca. In these activities, students were able to describe praxiological aspects of ELF and their impressions about it. In her paper, she states that students at times confront native speaker ideologies, but also reproduce it. What the experience also shows is how the teacher in the group was resistant to naïve, romantic and simplified problematizations on the matter. Also, it showed how she confronted students' opinions in their written assignments. Bianca seems to be more in line with Szundy's (2017) attitude as she stated her ideological position when it came to confronting students' expectations.

4.1.4. The coloniality of assessment

Lastly, student teachers and I reflected on *the coloniality of assessment*. Authors (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007; REAGAN, 2004) have discussed that the objectification and invention of languages have serious implications for language teaching, learning, and assessment. Shohamy (1998; 2005) has reflected on the power assessment has in influencing teachers' and students' behaviors and practices in the classroom. Language tests can "define linguistic knowledge, determine membership, classify people, and stipulate criteria for success and failure of individuals and groups" (SHOHAMY, 1998, p. 331). Shohamy (1998; 2005) incites us to understand that tests are not neutral but represent views of society that can either privilege or marginalize groups. When selecting knowledge of those who are in power, they serve as gatekeepers for groups with marginalized knowledge (SHOHAMY, 2005).

In order to understand how tests are part of political, contextual, social issues that shape the lives of those involved in it (teachers and students), Shohamy (1998) proposes us to see tests under a critical perspective. *Critical language testing* questions (SHOHAMY, 1998): the role of test takers in test production; the type (psychometric or interpretive) and origin of knowledge (hegemonic or marginalized) present in tests; the preferred visions of society present in tests; the role of tests in shaping educational and social systems.

In our context, a widely, worldwide administered test is the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) which is described by Makoni and Pennycook (2007, p. 35) as "desperately monolingual". The authors also talk of a 'washback' effect on curriculum and classroom evaluation this test provokes. This may explain why normative grammar from Inner Circle countries is present in textbooks and guides curriculum in English classes (PESSOA; BASTOS, 2017; PESSOA; BORELLI; SILVESTRE, 2018), since the TOEFL is the most popular English proficiency test in the world and is required by many university graduate programs[16].

In Text activity 2, Larissa talks about the contradiction between having critical/decolonial language ideologies and having to submit to modern/traditional ones:

[18]
[…] as an English teacher, I always thing about the contradictions I face regarding English teaching. As a student at university, I learn many linguistic theories about language learning/teaching, and how we should value more the meaning instead of form. But when I'm teaching, I have to face the reality: tests, grammar, accuracy, fluency and many other things I must evaluate. Sometimes I feel confused, and I don't know how I can do something real to make students understand that language is not a set of rules and structures they must learn. And also, how can I say something like this, if I am the person who corrects them all the time? Very contradictory, but that's life, isn't it?! (Larissa, Text activity 2)

Larissa talks about the distance between the knowledge she acquired at the university and her position as a teacher when she has to assess grammar, fluency, and accuracy from a normative perspective. This is an example of how tests may shape "teacher behavior and lead teachers to focus on teaching test language and emphasize the material that is to be included on the test" (SHOHAMY, 2005, p. 104). When teaching, the conceptions she meets in textbooks, evaluation sheets, tests, and teacher education courses might be those of traditional/modern language ideologies, leading to feelings of agony and inbetweeness for not being able to adopt more critical/decolonial language ideologies in her teaching practice.

In Class 7, student teachers and I reflected on the matter of assessment and we tried to envision a solution:

[19]
1. Anita: Yeah. And, of course, how can I accept? Yes, I can, but it's not the program. For example, I have an oral test and if the student says "to the right,

---

to the left" (imitating a nonnative-like pronunciation), you know? It influences his/her marks.

2. Pedro: So, you think that the World English perspective would also influence evaluation.
3. Anita: Yeah.
4. Pedro: So, we need other- So, for example, if we try to teach in this perspective, what should we do in the evaluation?
5. Luna: Ten for everyone.
6. Maria Clara: We should have Standards, rules-
7. Pedro: Like what?
8. Maria Clara: I don't know, you gotta have some sort of rules, a set of rules to follow. Otherwise- I don't know.
9. Luna: I would say I have to understand it.
10. Anita: The message.
11. Luna: Yes.
12. Anita: If you-
13. Luna: I have to understand what you are saying.
14. Anita: If you convey meaning, that's 10.
15. Pedro: I don't know.
16. Maria Clara: Yes, but it's very subjective.
17. Raul: Because Portuguese influences their English. We know Portuguese, so…
18. Pedro: How should we treat mistakes and errors?
19. Yoshihara: I guess we cannot have (?) just for one situation, right? I guess it would be depending on the context. For example, you have a class that's working (?) right now. In my opinion, it's not the situation that we are going to be criticizing how accurate, how fluent, how- So, it's like, your ideas are clear (?)? yes. Is it understandable in English or you have to say in Portuguese so people understand you? No, I have it in English. So, I'm not going to correct you. But, if it's something that we have to write, I don't know. You ask us to send you in a month's time, for example. The idea is that you have time to read, write, etc. And then "Oh, I'm going to correct everything, but at the same time how structure, etc…". That's what I mean. It depends really on the situation. For example, someone is sharing an experience of a life, something that was very (?), etc. I'm not going to cut the person and "Oh, this is wrong". Just listen. But you cannot be in a box all the time, the same, the same, the same. For example, considering evaluation, if you think of Cambridge exams. It used to have a question that you had the text in CAE exam. You had a text and you had to rewrite the text according to the British Standard Punctuation. It has been removed about five years ago, because it's very difficult to have people learning how to have the commas, etc. And it was removed because many people were failing, because many people that are not English (?). And also because they did a research in Cambridge that English, they don't know how to do this. So, they have removed it. So, I guess, it's something that you could consider. (Class 7)

In line 1, Anita also reflects upon the conflict between traditional/modern and critical/decolonial language ideologies. Her affirmation is an example of how we adopt norms from Inner Circle countries to assess the language production of people from Outer Circle and Expanding Circle countries. This adoption reflects a marginalization, produced by tests, of different linguistic forms (SHOHAMY, 1998). From lines 2 to 17, we discuss the possibility of assessing language production differently. The discussion starts with Luna's

affirmation "ten for everyone", in line 5. Her claim could be read either as showing modern/colonial or critical/decolonial language ideologies. First, she may have understood a decolonial approach to language as an *anything goes* one, that is, everything is valid, without criteria, which is not true. When problematizing different linguistic practices, our intention is to show how nonstandard linguistic practices are read by the deficit language ideology (MARTINEZ, 2013), and we pursue ways of reading them differently. Second, her affirmation may show sings of critical/decolonial language ideologies for she believes that if we do not see language as stabilized and having a standard, there is no reason to grade students on that. In line 6, Maria Clara introduces the idea of having Standards to assess students. Luna argues differently now and resorts to meaning when evaluating students. Anita, in line 10, positions in favor of this point of view when she affirms that she would have to understand the message. In their discussion, there is a change of thought when they give a special focus to meaning over form to assess students. In this sense, they were attempting to follow one of Shohamy's (1998) principle for critical language testing, which is a focus on interpretive skills over psychometric ones.

Maria Clara, in lines 6, 8, 16, and Raul in line 17, seem to resist the ideas discussed. First, Maria Clara contends that we should have Standards and affirms that a form of assessment focused on meaning is subjective, which could be regarded as a negative comment because of the use of *but*. Raul, on the other hand, seems to affirm that we would understand our students because we know Portuguese. This means that when students meet people who do not know Portuguese, they would not be understood, thus reflecting the traditional/modern ideology of separation of languages. So, in the beginning of dialogue [19], we notice how student teachers hold different language ideologies towards language assessment.

In line 18, I attempt to problematize how mistakes and errors should be treated under a decolonial perspective, and Yoshihara argues that assessment criteria should be locally created and offers us an example of how language tests have somehow changed their examination practices. At the same time she argues for a localized way of assessing students, she still reproduces the monolingual orientation by saying that it is only okay if the student conveys meaning in English only. In her example about testing, she affirms that the Cambridge Advanced English (CAE) exam changed a punctuation question that was difficult

even for English people. I do not know if this example is true, but even though she regards this change as something positive, we can see how the native language ideology is still present. The change was only made because native English speakers were not able to answer the punctuation question in the test. This example shows how the ideology that languages are closed entities belonging to a specific nation fails, since even the so-called native speaker could not answer an exercise from their own language.

Hu (2012) establishes that tests have started to adopt some EIL principles in their formulation. The author categorizes these changes as coming from weak or strong approaches. The weak approach relies on small accommodations of EIL principles, but still considering the Inner Circle as norm providing of the English language. The strong approach, on the other hand, incorporates changes that sees Outer and Expanding Circles as independent from Inner Circle norms. In the case mentioned by Yoshihara, the change made in the text is a weak one, for it is still centered around the native speaker.

In class 7, we could see how conflicting language ideologies are when we discuss the matter of assessment. Luna and Anita envisioned some advances in assessment considering a decolonial perspective to language by focusing on meaning rather than form, while Raul and Maria Clara showed some resistance to this ideology: Maria Clara, for considering that a focus on meaning is subjective; Raul, for believing that we understand our students because we come from the same nation. Yoshihara introduced, in a positive way, an example from a famous Standardized test that changed a question because it was difficult for native speakers of English, but it still reproduced the ideology that the Inner Circle countries are norm providers. This discussion emphasizes how complex things can get when we try to envision assessment under a decolonial perspective, since language tests strongly reproduce traditional language ideologies and produce a washback effect on teaching and curriculum.

The same feeling Larissa had towards correction was felt by me when I had to grade the student teachers' assignments, as indicated in dialogue [20]:

[20]
1. Pedro: […] when I grade the student teachers' assignments, I get into a conflict of what I should and should not do.
2. Graça: Why?
3. Pedro: I feel guilty for correcting them.
4. Graça: Do you?
5. Pedro: Yes.

6. Graça: Is it because of the theoretical constructs?
7. Pedro: Yeah.
8. Graça: It doesn't match with correction, right?
9. Pedro: No, it doesn't.
(Reflective section 5)

I felt guilty for correcting their language mistakes, taking Standard language as the norm. Because of the readings I have on language invention and the concepts I discussed in the study, I did not think it was right to correct the student teachers' language production on the basis of language norms. So, one solution I found was to grade student teachers based on content:

[21]
1. Graça: Are they making many mistakes?
2. Pedro: Not much. Just some slips.
3. Graça: How are you grading them?
4. Pedro: I take content into consideration, but I do correct some things. They are teachers, right? If they were students, we could be less strict with norms, you know? They are teachers and they will leave university. When they get to a school, this will be demanded from them. I won't teach all Standard grammar in two months, you know? But I'm trying to discuss the difficulties [I'm facing] with the theoretical background.
5. Graça: I think you should stick to theory, which is what you are teaching. You should focus more on content, at least what you are demanding from them in classroom is content, from what I see- every class you try to remember what you taught. You're not correcting language.
6. Pedro: No. Maybe I should focus more on content, right?
(Reflective section 5)

When reflecting about assessment from a translingual perspective, Lee (2016) provides philosophical reflections on this issue. He affirms that we should not think of a way of assessing translingual language use, but on how to apply translingual tenets to assessment. In his own words, "translanguaging assessment, therefore, refers not to the assessment of translanguaging, but rather to the ways in which assessment philosophies can be continually reconstituted in accordance with the principles of translanguaging" (LEE, 2016, p. 182). If the translingual orientation prioritizes meaning-making aspects of language over Standardized forms of language (CANAGARAJAH, 2013), assessment under this perspective should consider how students make effort to produce meaning, instead of how close to Standard English their language production is.

This perspective is quite aligned with Duboc's (2016) insights on assessing learners within the critical literacy framework. She affirms that a critical assessment should be different in terms of purpose, characteristic, content, and assessment instruments. In terms of

content, Duboc (2016) argues that an assessment perspective under critical literacy framework focuses on the attitudes, values, and ideas learners are able to expand from the ones they have, instead of producing stabilized linguistic forms. My way of assessing students was quite in line with Duboc's (2016) insights since I focused more on content than on linguistic forms.

Lee (2016) goes on to defend that a translanguaging perspective on assessment should be committed to linguistic social justice, that is, it should confront ways in which certain linguistic forms are perceived as superior over others. In this sense, based on Canagarajah (2013), he discusses two positions teachers hold when assessing students: an idealist and a pragmatist one. The idealist position lies on the will to legitimize marginalized linguistic production, while the pragmatist position is about "providing access to this language of power to minority students" (CANAGARAJAH, 2013, p. 110). Both positions are well-intended and have different consequences. While the idealist promotes linguistic diversity, it lacks in teaching a form of language that works as a gatekeeper for those who do not have access to it; the pragmatist position may provide learners with valued varieties, but it also fails to reproduce the idea that a Standard variety exists and we should follow it. I believe my position is a mixture between both, as I corrected the student teachers' assignments considering Standard English as the norm, but I graded them only on the basis of content.

As I affirmed in excerpt [21], I opted to correct their language production taking Standard English as the norm because they are language teachers and they may work in franchised schools that operate within the colonial logics we argue against in this thesis. However, when following this approach, we try to dislocate the idea of the native speaker, but it is still present in the form of Standard language, as this Standard comes from Inner Circle countries. So, the question we are left with is: is it right to deprive student teachers from privileged varieties, considering that they will be required from them when they apply for a job? Assessment is a complex issue since it can shape teacher and student behaviors and futures. In this experience, when confronting traditional assessment practices with the praxiological background on language under a decolonial perspective, the best way I found to assess student teachers was to grade them on the basis of content, but still correct their assignments considering Standard English. However contradictory, this measure seems to be

the most suitable as these language teachers will certainly seek job opportunities in the future and they could have Standard English required from them.

In this section, I have debated around the pedagogical discussions that emerged from a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective. We have discussed upon four issues: the detachment between school language and real language; the power of structure on teacher agency; the complexity of dealing with students' expectations of nativized English; the coloniality of assessment. In the following section, I answer the research questions and discuss the implications of this study.

FINAL WORDS

This study aimed to problematize language conceptions under a decolonial perspective with university student teachers in a Brazilian teacher education course. It is oriented by praxiologies that I got in contact throughout my undergraduate course (Critical Applied Linguistics) and during my participation in the study group Transição (translingual practices and decolonial thinking). Because these praxiologies do not consider languages as having boundaries, being connected to places and people, or having a standard, it provokes changes in the way we conceive and teach what we call *language*. So, following Kumaravadivelu's (2016) call for action, we designed a teacher education study that would problematize language conceptions under a decolonial perspective with student teachers and would encourage pedagogical discussion considering these praxiologies we have been arguing for. So, in this concluding section, I answer my two research questions, reflect upon the implications of this study, and problematize the traces of (de)coloniality present in this study.

5.1. Research questions

The two questions that guided this study were:

a) What language ideologies are produced by student teachers throughout a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective?

b) What pedagogical reflections emerged from a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective?

As for the first research question, I intended to discuss the language ideologies produced by the student teachers throughout a critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective. I used *First* and *Final narratives*, *Classroom interactions* and *Activities produced by the student teachers* to demonstrate chronologically how their standpoints towards language are multiple, fluid, and contradictory. In the First narrative, from the thirteen narratives handed in, three traditional/modern language ideologies were identified in twelve narratives: *language as a*

system (Lenore), *languages as separate* (Bianca, Maria Clara, Nina and Luna), *language as communication* (Emily, Giovana, Rosa, Lara, Yoshihara, Leticia Souza and Sérgio). Moreover, three critical/decolonial language ideologies were found in four narratives: *language equality* (Lenore), *language meshing* (Bianca), *language as power* (Raul and Rita).

Throughout the empirical material discussion, I bring four dialogues, each one from a different class, which highlighted traditional/modern and critical/decolonial language ideologies. Also, I bring two Text activities from students. In the discussion, it is possible to notice how student teachers' language ideologies are multiple and unstable. Sometimes, they align with traditional/modern language ideologies and sometimes they resist it. In Class 4, when discussing Webster's dissertation, Herderian triad, Standard language and monolingual orientation, all the students who participated in the discussion (Sérgio, Rosa, Anita and Luna) align with the ideology at hand, that is, they agree with the discussion. In Class 5, in which we were discussing the concept language invention more explicitly, student teachers present multiple standpoints: Larissa, Rita and Luna at times align with and distance from the discussion; Anita resists the idea that languages are invention and Raul aligns with critical language ideologies. This discussion becomes more interesting when we compare Class 5 with Text activity 1, since the discussion in class was about the text they had to read to complete the evaluation activity. All the students who resisted the language invention ideology in class had aligned with it in Text activity 1. Was it an attempt to please the teacher during assessment? This question remains to be answered.

In Class 7, we discussed Assis-Peterson's and Cox's (2013) text on Standard English and World English. Prior to the discussion, student teachers had read the text and had produced Text activity 2. In Text activity 2, eleven (Lenore, Emily, Luna, Anita, Maria Clara, Larissa, Raul, Yoshihara, Rita, Sergio, Nina) out of twelve students align with critical ideologies, while one (Magali) did not. In the interaction I brought, students are discussing whether people would understand or not a woman speaking English in London. Her repertoire is similar to Joel's, the coach analyzed in Assis-Peterson's and Cox's text, as she mixes different resources and does not mind about Standard English. This interaction could be divided into two parts: in the first one, when students discuss understanding based on linguistic aspects only, four student teachers (Anita, Rosa, Luna, Yoshihara) affirm people would not understand her; in the second part, when they focus on pragmatic strategies for

communication and not on language per se, the same students change opinions and say that people would understand the woman's language use. This is due to the fact that the discussion in the first part is centered on linguistic commonalities (PENNYCOOK, 2018), while the second centers on understanding the will to align with the interlocutor (ATINKSON et al, 2004; CANAGARAJAH; 2007a).

In Class 8, we discussed Anzaldúa's (2007) description of her language issue. She affirms she speaks eight languages (some that are not connected to nation) and I try to problematize what her definition of language is. Students, in general, seemed to resist my problematization. I believe this was due to my use of traditional vocabulary to analyze the situation. As Blommaert (2010) claims, a new vocabulary is needed to discuss language use in globalized times. If we continue using old vocabulary, we may not be able to avoid reproducing traditional/modern language ideologies. When problematizing the dichotomy *language versus variety* using traditional vocabulary, we are still reproducing the notion that there is one centered variety that is right and other varieties that orbit around the main one (MILROY, 2001). This may be the reason why Anita, Rita and Luna produced traditional/modern language ideologies in Class 8.

Finally, twelve students handed in the Final narrative and I could identify two traditional/modern language ideologies in ten narratives: *language as a system* (Lenore, Yoshihara and Maria Clara) and *language as communication* (Emily, Giovana, Anita, Lara, Rosa, Rita, Sérgio). Also, it was possible to identify two critical/decolonial language ideologies in nine narratives: *language as power* (Emily, Luna, Giovana, Raul and Rosa) and *language as invention* (Lenore, Emily, Luna, Sérgio, Anita, Rita, Raul, Yoshihara and Maria Clara). Comparing First narratives with Final narratives, we can observe the strong presence of traditional/modern language ideologies. These ideologies are too solidified and hard to be problematized, considering that they are hegemonic discourses present in society since our first years of formal education. However, we can also observe a movement towards critical language ideologies, as the number grew from four to nine students having critical language ideologies.

Concerning the second research question, I intended to focus on the pedagogical reflections that emerged in this critical language teacher education experience that aimed to problematize language under a decolonial perspective with university student teachers. Using

Classroom interaction, *Final interview*, *Reflective session with the professor*, and *Text activity*, I examined how participants envisioned pedagogical practice under the perspective we have defended in this text. From the empirical material, four issues were raised by the participants: *the detachment between school language and real language*; *the power of structure on teacher agency*; *the complexity of dealing with students' expectations of nativized English*; *the coloniality of assessment*.

As for the first issue, we discussed how normative grammar is still the center of language teaching practices and how it is not representative of real language use, as declared by Anita, Yoshihara and their students. Normative grammar is present through center-based textbooks, and student teachers felt they were in a contradictory role by having to teach what is not real for them. Also, the concept of authenticity falls apart when taking a translingual approach into consideration because there is no language use per se to be considered authentic. Instead, we have people trying to negotiate meaning through repertoires. In this sense, we also discussed that textbooks are representative of unauthentic material, focused on a language conception that comes from Inner Circle countries.

The second issue raised was about teacher agency and structure. Taking Silvestre's (2017) discussion on teacher agency under a decolonial perspective, I analyzed students' complaints about the limitations when adopting a decolonial approach to teaching. First, franchised language schools still operate within colonial logics, maybe not having the native speaker as the target, but having Standard English as the result of language production, as Lenore argued. Also, based on Raul's reflection, the availability of materials about colonizing cultures and the desire from students to learn about them hinder teacher agency to develop this approach. These two factors leave teachers more prone to work with center-based materials that bring colonized views of the world and positivist language conceptions.

The third matter raised by student teachers was the complexity of dealing with students' expectations towards American and British Englishes. Student teachers affirmed that students' lack of knowledge on varieties is due to our teaching practices that do not focus on other linguistic repertoires beyond American and British Englishes. However, as the literature discusses, students do not lack knowledge on the recognition of varieties, they simply may not have the right metalanguage to describe them. Also, students' expectations have its origins in their parents' beliefs about language and a societal pressure to learn

Standard language. So, in order to deal with students' expectations, a change of culture is necessary. This involves constantly questioning our preferences and students' preferences of nativized English, as Bianca affirmed.

Lastly, our discussion focused on assessment. Student teachers and I reflected upon the discomfort we feel for having critical language ideologies and at the same time having to submit to traditional ideologies because of the washback effects of tests. This shows how tests shape and change teachers' behavior. Lastly, I discussed two positionings on language teaching, the pragmatist and the idealist one, and argued that mine was a mixture of both. It can be seen in my attitude of assessing their knowledge based on content, and, at the same time, highlighting their language mistakes according to Standard English. This strategy was twofold: I intended to follow a more idealist approach, but I also wanted to follow an approach that, to my knowledge, would not prevent student teachers from passing a mainstream English test and getting a job as a teacher.

5.2. Implications of the study

The relevance of the first discussion of this study lies in the attempt to identify not only that student teachers produced language ideologies throughout the course in a complex way, but also which moments this happened. From this research, three aspects influenced their language ideologies production: the type of activity developed (whether it was a classroom interaction or an assessment activity); the way they looked at language use (if only linguistic aspects are taken into consideration); and the vocabulary used to problematize modern Linguistics (if it is still the same one we fight against). These three aspects have implications on:

a) *Research practices*: since student teachers produced language ideologies differently in classroom interactions, assessment practices, and final narratives, we should use research sources that explore in more fluid ways how research participants build their ideologies throughout any critical language teacher education experience. We cannot consider from one source or two that there was a movement towards critical language ideologies, for example. Also, not only the quantity but also the quality of the source is important, as their ideologies showed

less consistency in a more dialogic source (classroom interactions) and in a less strict genre (narrative). This requires research reflexivity when designing a study;

b) *Assessment practices*: student teachers seemed to align much more with the perspective defended by me during the assessment activities. This reflects a hierarchical relationship between the student teachers and me when it came to assessment. Were they trying to please me so I could assess them less harshly? Duboc (2016) states content as one of the criteria for assessment under a critical literacy perspective. In her own words, students should develop their expanding of "perspectives, to wear other lenses, valuing the other, in a relationship grounded on ethics and responsibility" (DUBOC, 2016, p. 68). Adding to her discussion, I believe that we should problematize the role of tests with our students. Tests, then, should be seen as spaces in which students' own ideologies could be critically explored. This does not guarantee, but, I believe, it may prevent them from simply aligning with the teacher's perspective. Thus, how would students feel about tests if they saw them as spaces in which their own ideologies could be critically explored?

c) *Classroom practices*: as critical language teachers, we should be aware that we may reproduce ideologies while we fight against them. During our interactions, I reproduced the dichotomy language versus variety by asking the question "Do you think it's [Chicano] a language or a variation?" in Class 8. The way the question was posed directed student teachers' standpoints and they aligned with traditional language ideologies. Language teachers must be aware that their questions also may guide learners' answers and the discussion in the classroom. Thus, a previous preparation and reflection of what questions should be asked during classroom interactions is also important.

The second discussion is quite relevant for debating about the complexities of adopting a more decolonial language ideology in language teaching. All issues raised by the participants during the research are issues that hinder critical work. Adopting a decolonial language conception may be jeopardized by center-based materials, students' expectations towards American or British English, and assessment practices focused on standard language production. Considering that a decolonial perspective to language conceptions destabilize not

only common assumptions we hold about language, but English textbooks, material preparation, assessment, methods, it is natural that we find resistance at first.

These issues posit three challenges for Critical Applied Linguistics praxiological activity. First, how can we fight against the native-speaker or the standard language ideology that franchised schools promote, as alleged by student teachers? Second, how can we make teachers believe that a decolonial work is possible? Third, how can we devise assessment practices that distance from the native-speaker and standard language ideologies? I will try to answer these questions.

a) *Franchised schools*: student teachers affirmed that working under a decolonial perspective in this type of schools may not be possible because of the ideologies these schools adopt and because of students' expectations concerning language production. We should start debating locally the discourse of language invention. BRAZ-TESOL is an event that takes place around Brazil and the participants of this event are mostly people involved in franchised schools. We could promote sessions on how native-speaker and standard language ideologies are pernicious and harmful to our students and do not match the changes we are facing globally. This does not guarantee that we will have a more decolonial work in language schools, but we will at least have these ideas being debated by teachers and coordinators from these schools.

b) *On the possibility of decolonial work*: this study aimed to be an action-oriented research and I believe it served its purpose. However, when designing the study, I reproduced the dichotomy of theory and practice. First, we discussed the "theories" about language under a decolonial perspective. Then, they prepared microlessons about them. I believe this movement from the so-called theory to practice made students think that the praxiologies we were discussing were far from their classroom work. Instead, in critical language teacher education work, we should start talking about our teaching contexts and imagine possibilities of decolonial work in each of them. Each context has its particularities, and some are more open than others to this perspective, so we should be also aware that not everything we want can be implemented, as an *epistemic break* (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2012) with traditional theories has not happened. However, when starting from our contexts and from good

decolonial practices, we may have different answers from those we had in this discussion.

c) *Assessment*: this may be one of the hardest ones to answer, because, as student teachers discussed, we assess based on the standard language ideology and we are trained to look for mistakes. I consider the answer to this question is in Lee's (2011) discussion on assessing under a translingual perspective. Instead of creating a criterion for assessing translingual language use, we could incorporate the tenets of a translingual conception of language to assessment. It is much more an attempt to distance from a monolingual, positivist orientation, than creating a different criterion that could sound imposing too. Instead, we should focus on how students use their linguistic repertoires to build meaning, and not on how many mistakes they have made in their communication practices.

5.3. Traces of (de)coloniality

Recognizing that I am the researcher and I hold power on most of the decisions made during research processes, I reproduced traces of (de)coloniality from my life in this study. I believe that the three most salient traces of (de)coloniality are related to: 1) The research methodology; 2) The English language; 3) The invisibility of regular schools. First, this study follows a critical and decolonial perspective, but most of the decisions were made by me, from teaching procedures to research issues. This means that the participants were not involved in the empirical material analysis process, not even after the study was concluded. This highlights an abyssal line between the participants and me. I decided and gave the final word on what to write about them. At the same time I reproduced such coloniality, I was also quite careful with what to write about. I decided to name this study as ethnographic due to its focus on processes and relations, attempting to break with modern rationalities of cause and effect. Also, I did not want to create a single view of the group, as I attempted to focus on the contradictions and multiplicity of meanings students produced about language.

Another aspect that highlights (de)coloniality in this study is my choice of writing it in English. Even though I write about decoloniality in a Brazilian university, I decided to use English as the main language of this work. First, I recognize that English is a colonial

language embedded in globalization process. It is a value-laden language as it carries Western values. In academia, this is not different since English is connected to neoliberal policies of publishing and knowledge production. At the same time the English language works as a barrier for some, it could be seen as a bridge to others. Also, at the same time this language is a symbol of coloniality, I bring decolonial experiences to the fore. This way I believe I am challenging the coloniality that English has and I am expanding knowledge from the South in a language that circulates in the North.

The invisibility of regular schools is also a trace of (de)coloniality present in this study. As mentioned in the methodology, most participants in this study had experience in language schools, while only one student had experience in secondary education. There seems to be an invisibility of regular public education in my study, since it does not discuss implications for this context, contradicting one of the objectives of the undergraduate course, which is to prepare student teachers to work in elementary, secondary, and vocational education. I do not have empirical material and it was not the focus of the study to shed light on that, but such invisibility of regular schools is not simply a product of this study. It is part of a bigger picture of English language teaching in Brazil, where public schools are not normally seen as a desirable context of teaching for reasons such as low pay, bad working conditions and a place where foreign language learning is not successful. My trajectory as a student of language schools and as a person who has worked for a long time is language schools is also part of this bigger picture, since this type of school is recognized as a place where foreign language learning actually takes place.

Adding to that, the discussions I guided during this teacher education experience were more focused on language schools contexts in mainly two moments: I brought a lesson from a famous center-based textbook to be problematized and the microlesson they had to teach was also focused on developing the steps as in a language school lesson, with pre-, while- and post-steps. However, at the same time we reproduced such colonial belief that it is only possible to teach English in language schools, it is highly important that student teachers get to teach in this context with a more decolonial/critical language ideology, so they are aware of the pernicious effects attached to English teaching methodologies and center-based materials.

Summing up, the first discussion has implications on research, classroom, and assessment practices, as demonstrated, while the second raises questions on the work developed in franchised schools, the possibility of decolonial work, and assessment. When fighting against coloniality in language teaching or language teacher education, we should not aim to detach completely from colonial patterns, as no epistemic break (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2012) has happened yet. Also, the idea that we will one day wake up and have coloniality erased from our world is also a reflection of the modernist idea of change (PENNYCOOK, 2001). Instead, we should speak of attempts, small ruptures that are locally possible. Fighting against coloniality should be grounded on self-reflexitivity of the effects of our practices and conceptions. If languages are invented, but the effects of this invention are real (MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2001), our self-reflexitivity to fight against coloniality in language conceptions and in language teaching should be guided by a constant reflection of the effects of our conceptions. Therefore, we can pave the way to a more decolonial work.

REFERENCES

AHEARN, Laura M. Agency. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, v. 9, n. 1-2, p. 12-15, 2000.

AHEARN, Laura M. Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, v. 30, n. 1, p. 109-137, 2001.

AHEARN, Laura M. Privileging and affecting agency. In: MAXWELL, Claire; AGGLETON, Peter. (Ed.). *Privilege, agency and affect*: understanding the production and effects of action. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. p. 240-247.

ALFANDARY, Peter. *The myth of globalization*. Talk presented at TEDxAix, May 2015. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xUYNB4a8d2U>. Accessed on June 5th, 2018.

AMERICAN Tongues. Directed and produced by Louis Alvarez and Andy Kolker. New York: The Center for New American Media, 1988. 1 tape (56 min.). Available at: <https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x4jrdic>. Accessed on June 5th, 2018.

ANDERSON, Gary L. Reflecting on research for doctoral students in education. *Educational researcher*, v. 31, n. 7, p. 22-25, 2002.

ANDRÉ, Marli Eliza Dalmazo Afonso de. *Etnografia da prática escolar*. Papirus Editora, 2005.

ANZALDÚA, Gloria. How to tame a wild tongue. In: ANZALDÚA, Gloria. *Borderlands/La frontera*: the new mestiza. São Francisco: Aunt Luke Books, 2007. p. 75-86.

ASSIS-PETERSON, Ana Antônia; COX, Maria Inês Pagliarini. Standard English & World English: entre o siso e o riso. *Calidoscópio*, v. 11, n. 2, p. 153-166, maio/ago. 2013.

ATKINSON, Dwight et al. Alignment and interaction in a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, v. 91, n. 2, p. 169-188, 2007.

AUERBACH, Elsa R. The politics of the ESL classroom: issues of power in pedagogical choices. In: TOFFELSON, James W. (Ed.). *Power and inequality in language education*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995. p. 9-33 cited in PENNYCOOK, Alastair. *Critical applied linguistics*: a critical introduction. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.

BALLESTRIN, Luciana. América Latina e o giro decolonial. *Revista Brasileira de Ciência Política*, n. 11, p. 89-117. mai./ago. 2013. Available at: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbcpol/n11/04.pdf>. Accessed on Jan. 20th, 2019.

BIESTA, Gert; PRIESTLEY, Mark; ROBINSON, Sarah. The role of beliefs in teacher agency. *Teachers and Teaching*, v. 21, n. 6, p. 624-640, 2015.

BLOMMAERT, Jan. *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

BLOMMAERT, Jan; BACKUS, Ad. Superdiverse repertoires and the individual. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, n. 24, p. 1-32, 2012.

BLOMMAERT, Jan; VERSCHUEREN, Jef. *Debating diversity: analysing the discourse of tolerance*. London: Routledge, 2002.

BORELLI, Julma Dalva Vilarinho Pereira. *O estágio e o desafio decolonial: (des)construindo sentidos sobre a formação de professores/as de inglês.* 2018. 222 f. Tese (Doutorado em Letras e Linguística) – Faculdade de Letras, Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, 2018a.

BORELLI, Julma Dalva Vilarinho Pereira. Caminhos e vivências de uma atuação crítica decolonial. In: PESSOA, Rosane Rosane; SILVESTRE, Viviane Pires Viana; MONTE MÓR, Walkyria. (Org.). *Perspectivas críticas de educação linguística no Brasil:* trajetórias e práticas de professoras/es universitárias/os de inglês. São Paulo: Pá de Palavra, 2018b. p. 137-146.

BORELLI, Julma Dalva Vilarinho Pereira; PESSOA, Rosane Rocha. Linguística aplicada e formação de professores: convergências da atuação crítica. In: BORELLI, Julma Dalva Vilarinho Pereira; PESSOA, Rosane Rocha. (Org.). *Reflexão e crítica na formação de professores de língua estrangeira*. Goiânia: Editora UFG, 2018. p. 17-35.

BUCHOLTZ, Mary. The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 32, n. 10, p. 1439-1465, 2000.

CANAGARAJAH, Suresh. After disinvention: possibilities for communication, community and competence. In: MAKONI, Sinfree; PENNYCOOK, Alastair (Ed.). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2007a. p. 233-239.

CANAGARAJAH, Suresh. Lingua Franca English, Multilingual Communities, and Language Acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, v. 91, n. 1, p. 923-939, 2007b.

CANAGARAJAH, Suresh. *Translingual practice*: global English and cosmopolitan relations. New York: Routledge, 2013.

CANAGARAJAH, Suresh. In search of a new paradigm for teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Journal*, v. 5, n. 4, p. 767-785, 2014.

CASTRO-GÓMEZ, Santiago. Decolonizar la universidad: la hybris del punto cero y el diálogo de saberes. In: CASTRO-GÓMEZ, Santiago; GROFÓGUEL, Ramón. (Org.). *El giro*

decolonial: reflexiones para uma diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores, 2007. p. 79-91.

CASTRO-GÓMEZ, Santiago; GROSFÓGUEL, Ramón. Prólogo. Giro decolonial, teoria crítica y pensamiento heterárquico. In: CASTRO-GÓMEZ, Santiago; GROFÓGUEL, Ramón. (Org.). *El giro decolonial*: reflexiones para uma diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores, 2007. p. 9-24.

CICOUREL, Aaron. Book review: The language myth, by Roy Harris. *Language in Society*, v. 12, n. 3, p. 356-358, 1983.

CROKER, Robert A. An introduction to qualitative research. In: HEIGHAM, Juanita; CROKER, Robert A. (Eds.). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics*: a practical introduction. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. p. 3-24.

CURZAN, Anne. *What makes a word real?* Talk presented at TEDxUofM, Mar. 2014. Available at: <https://www.ted.com/talks/anne_curzan_what_makes_a_word_real>. Accessed on June 5th, 2018.

DAVIES, Alan. *The native speaker*: myth and reality. Multilingual Matters, 2003.

DENZIN, Norman K.; LINCOLN, Yvonna S. Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research. In: DENZIN, Norman K.; LINCOLN, Yvonna. S. (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005. p. 1-31.

DE URGARTE, David. *Esperanto, lengua para pensar mejor*. Talk presented at TEDxMadrid, Oct. 2012. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WtxNtG0FNTs>. Accessed on: June 8th, 2018.

DEWEY, Martin. Towards a post-normative approach: learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 141-170, 2012.

DUBOC, Ana Paula Martinez. *Atitude curricular*: letramentos críticos nas brechas da formação de professores de inglês. 2012. 258 f. Tese (Doutorado em Estudos Linguísticos e Literários em Inglês) – Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2012.

DUBOC, Ana Paula Martinez. A avaliação da aprendizagem de línguas e o letramento crítico: uma proposta. In: JESUS, Dánie Marcelo; CARBONIERI, Divanize (Org.). *Práticas de multiletramentos e letramento crítico*: outros sentidos para a sala de aula de línguas. Campinas: Pontes, 2016. p. 57-80.

FABRÍCIO, Branca Falabella. Linguística aplicada como espaço de desaprendizagem: redescrições em curso. In: MOITA LOPES, Luiz Paulo da. *Por uma linguística aplicada indisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2006. p. 45-65.

FERREIRA, Fernanda Caiado da Costa Ferreira. *Problematizando sentidos de língua em uma sala de aula de língua inglesa.* 2018. 159 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Letras e Linguística) - Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, 2018.

FIGUEREDO, Carla Janaina. O falante nativo de inglês versus o falante não-nativo: representações e percepções em uma sala de aula de inglês. *Revista Linguagem & Ensino*, v. 14, n. 1, p. 67-92, 2011.

FLAMA. How to speak Spanglish, 2014. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RVnJ4odvlHc>. Accessed on: June 8th, 2018.

FLORES, Nelson; ANEJA, Geeta. "Why Needs Hiding?" Translingual (re)orientations in TESOL teacher education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, v. 51, n. 4, p. 441, 2017.

GAL, Susan. Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies: A commentary. *Pragmatics*, v. 2, n. 3, p. 445-559, 1998.

GARCÉS, Fernando. Las políticas del conocimiento y la colonialidad linguística y epistêmica. In: CASTRO-GÓMEZ, Santiago; GROFÓGUEL, Ramón. (Org.). *El giro decolonial*: reflexiones para uma diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores, 2007. p. 217-242.

GARCIA, Ofelia. Foreword: Intervening discourses, representations and conceptualizations of language. In: MAKONI, Sinfree; PENNYCOOK, Alastair. (Ed.). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2007. p. xi-xv.

GARCÍA, Ofelia; WEI, Li. *Translanguaging*: language, bilingualism and education. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

GILMORE, Alex. Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language teaching*, v. 40, n. 2, p. 97-118, 2007.

HARRIS, Roy. The role of the language myth in the western cultural tradition. In: HARRIS, Roy. (Ed.). *The language myth in western culture*. Surrey: Richmond, 2002. p. 1-25.

HAWKINS, Margaret; NORTON, Bonny. Critical language teacher education. In: BURNS, Anne; RICHARDS, Jack. *Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009. p. 30-39.

HU, Guangwei. Assessing English as an international language. In: ALSAGOFF, Lubna; RENANDYA, Willy; HU, Guangwei; MCKAY, Sandra Lee. (Ed.). *Principles and practices for teaching english as an international language*. New York: Routledge, 2012. p. 123-144.

JORDÃO, Clarissa Menezes. O Ensino de Línguas Estrangeiras: de código a discurso. In: VAZ BONI, Valéria. (Org.). *Tendências Contemporâneas no Ensino de Línguas*. União da Vitória: Kaygangue, 2006. Available at:

<https://docs.ufpr.br/~marizalmeida/celem_06/o_ensino_de_lem.pdf>. Accessed on July 9th, 2019.

JORDÃO, Clarissa Menezes. A posição de professor de inglês no Brasil: hibridismo, identidade e agência. *Letras & Letras*, v. 26, n. 2, p. 427-442, 2011.

JORDÃO, Clarissa Menezes. BraSilian teacher education: decolonizing the "local South". In*:* STELLA; Paulo Rogério; CAVALCANTI, Ildney; TAVARES, Roseanne; IFA, Sérgio (Org.). *Transculturalidade e de(s)colonialidade nos estudos em inglês no BraZil.* Maceió: EDUFAL, 2014. p. 227-256.

JORDÃO, Clarissa Menezes; BUHRER, Edna Aparecida Cabral. Condição de aluno-professor de língua inglesa em discussão: estágio, identidade e agência. *Educação e Realidade*, v. 38, p. 669-682, 2013.

JOSEPH, John E. Applied linguistics and the choices people make (or do they?). *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, v. 16, n. 2, p. 237-241, 2006.

KACHRU, Braj. *The alchemy of English*: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes. Oxford: Pergamon, 1986.

KUBOTA, Ryuko. "We must look at both sides" – but a denial of genocide too?: Difficult moments on controversial issues in the classroom. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, v. 11, n. 4, p. 225-251, 2014.

KUMARAVADIVELU, Bala. Individual identity, cultural globalization and teaching english as an international language: the case for an epistemic break. In: ALSAGOFF, Lubna; RENANDYA, Willy; HU, Guangwei; MCKAY, Sandra Lee. (Ed.). *Principles and practices for teaching english as an international language*. New York: Routledge, 2012. p. 9-28.

KUMARAVADIVELU, Bala. The decolonial option in English teaching: can the subaltern act? *TESOL Quarterly*, v. 50, n. 1, mar. 2016.

KRAMSCH, Claire. Culture in foreign language teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 57-78, 2013.

KROSKRITY, Paul V. Language Ideologies. In: DURANTI, Alessandro. (Ed.). *A companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Blackwell Publishing: 2004. p. 496-517.

LAU, Sunny Man Chu. Classroom ethnography on critical language and literacy teaching and learning. In: MIRHOSSEINI, Seyyed-Abdolhamid. (Ed.). *Reflections on qualitative research in language and literacy education*. Cham: Springer, 2017. p. 77-90.

LEE, Jerry Won. Beyond translingual writing. *College English*, v. 79, n. 2, p. 174, 2016.

LEMOS, Laís; BORGES, Jadson. Pesquisa-ação e agência em sala de aula. In: INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF CRITICAL APPLIED LINGUISTICS, 1., 2015,

Brasília. Anais do I Congresso Internacional da Linguística Aplicada Crítica. Brasília, 2015. p. 74-91.

LINCOLN, Yvonna S.; CANNELLA, Gaile S. Ethics and the broader rethinking/reconceptualization of research as construct. In: DENZIN, Norman K.; GIARDINA, Michael D. (Eds.). *Ethical futures in qualitative research*: decolonizing the politics of knowledge. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2007. p. 67-84.

LOZADA-OLIVA, Melissa. "*Like totally whatever*". Poem performed at Button Poetry, Ago. 2015. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=me4_QwmaNoQ>. Accessed on June 9th, 2018.

LYISCOTT, Jamila. *3 ways to speak English*. Talk presented at TED conference, Feb. 2014. Available at: <https://www.ted.com/talks/jamila_lyiscott_3_ways_to_speak_english>. Acessed on June 9th, 2018.

LUCENA, Maria Inêz Probst; NASCIMENTO, André Marques do. Práticas (trans) comunicativas contemporâneas: uma discussão sobre dois conceitos fundamentais. *Revista da ANPOLL*, v. 1, n. 40, p. 46-57, 2016.

MAKONI, Sinfree; MEINHOF, Ulrike. Linguística Aplicada na África: desconstruindo a noção de "língua". In: MOITA LOPES, Luiz Paulo da. *Por uma linguística aplicada indisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola, 2006. p. 191-213.

MAKONI, Sinfree; PENNYCOOK, Alastair. Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In: MAKONI, Sinfree; PENNYCOOK, Alastair. (Ed.). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2007. p. 1-41.

MALDONADO-TORRES, Nelson. Sobre la colonialidad del ser: contribuciones al desarrollo de un concepto. In: CASTRO-GÓMEZ, Santiago; GROFÓGUEL, Ramón. (Org.). *El giro decolonial*: reflexiones para uma diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores, 2007. p. 127-167.

MATEUS, Elaine. *Atividade de aprendizagem colaborativa e inovadora de professores*: ressignificando as fronteiras dos mundos universidade-escola. 2005. 327 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística Aplicada e Ensino de Línguas) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2005 citado em SILVESTRE, Viviane Pires Viana. *Práticas problematizadoras e de(s) coloniais na formação de professores/as de línguas:* teorizações construídas em uma experiência com o Pibid. 230 f. Tese (Doutorado em Letras e Linguística) – Faculdade de Letras, Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, 2016.

MARTÍNEZ, Ramón Antonio. Reading the world in Spanglish: hybrid language practices and ideological contestation in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, v. 24, n. 3, p. 276-288, 2013.

MAY, Stephen A. Critical ethnography. In: HORNBERGER, Nancy; CORSON, David. (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of language and education*. Dordrecht: Springer, 1997. p. 197-206.

MCKEAN, Erin. *Go ahead, make up new words*. Talk presented at TEDYouth, Dec. 2014. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pMUv6UWkuWw>. Accessed on June 9th, 2018.

METZ, Mike. Exploring the complexity of high school students' beliefs about language variation. *Linguistics and Education*, v. 45, p. 10-19, 2018.

METZ, Mike. Accommodating linguistic prejudice: examining English teachers' language ideologies. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*, v. 18, n. 1, p. 19-35, 2019.

MIGNOLO, Walter D. Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural studies*, v. 21, n. 2-3, p. 449-514, 2007.

MIGNOLO, Walter D. Colonial/Imperial differences: classifying and inventing global orders of lands, seas, and living organisms. In: WALSH, Catherine E.; MIGNOLO, Walter D. *On decoloniality:* concepts, analytics, praxis. Durham: Duke University Press, 2018a. p. 177-193.

MIGNOLO, Walter D. What does it mean to decolonize?. In: WALSH, Catherine E.; MIGNOLO, Walter D. *On decoloniality*: concepts, analytics, praxis. Durham: Duke University Press, 2018b. p. 105-134.

MILROY, James. Language ideologies and the consequences of standartization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, v. 5, n. 4, p. 530-555, 2001

MOITA LOPES, Luiz P. *Por uma uma lingüística aplicada indisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola, 2006a.

MOITA LOPES, Luiz P. Linguística aplicada e vida contemporânea: problematização dos construtos que têm orientado a pesquisa. In: _____. (Org.). *Por uma lingüística aplicada indisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola, 2006b. p. 85-105.

NASCIMENTO, André Marques do. A queda do céu: elementos para a descentralização epistemológica dos estudos da linguagem desde visões indígenas. In: ZOLIN-VESZ, Fernando (Org.). *Linguagens e descolonialidades*: práticas linguageiras e produção de (des)colonialidades no mundo contemporâneo. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2017. p. 55-78.

NELSON, Cynthia. Sexual identities in ESL: Queer theory and classroom inquiry. *TESOL Quarterly*, v. 33, n. 3, p. 371-391, 1999.

NORTON, Bonny; TOOHEY, Kelleen. Introduction. In: NORTON, Bonny; TOOHEY, Kelleen. (Ed.). *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 1-17.

OTSUJI, Emi; PENNYCOOK, Alastair. Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, v. 7, n. 3, p. 240-254, 2010.

PARAÍSO, Marlucy Alves. Metodologias de pequisas pós-críticas em educação e currícul*o:* trajetórias, pressupostos, procedimentos e estratégias analíticas. In: EYER, Dagmar Estermann; PARAÍSO, Marlucy Alves. (Org.). *Metodologias de pesquisa pós-críticas em educação*. Belo Horizonte: Mazza Edições, 2012. p. 23-45.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair. *Critical applied linguistics*: a critical introduction. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair. The myth of English as an international language. In: MAKONI, Sinfree; PENNYCOOK, Alastair (Ed.). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2007. p. 90-115.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair. *Language as a local practice*. London/New York: Routledge Taylor/Francis Group, 2010. 167 p.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair. Thirteen ways of looking at a Blackboard. In: PENNYCOOK, Alastair. *Language and mobility*: unexpected places. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2012. p. 127-149.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair. *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Routledge, 2017.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair. Introducing posthumanist applied linguistics. In: PENNYCOOK, Alastair. *Posthumanist Applied Linguistics*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2018.

PESSOA, Rosane Rocha. Conversa com Rosane Rocha Pessoa. In: SILVA, Kleber Aparecido da; ARAGÃO, Rodrigo Camargo. (Org.). *Conversas com formadores de professores de línguas*: avanços e desafios. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2013. p. 299-306.

PESSOA, Rosane Rocha. A Critical approach to the teaching of English: pedagogical and identity engagement. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, v. 14, n. 2, p. 353-372, 2014.

PESSOA, Rosane Rocha; BASTOS, Pedro Augusto de Lima. Sentidos de língua/linguagem em aulas de inglês de um curso de letras. In: MATEUS, Eliane; TONELLI, Juliana Reichert Assunção. (Org.). *Diálogos (im)pertinentes entre formação de professores e aprendizagem de línguas*. São Paulo: Blucher, 2017. p. 141-162.

PESSOA, Rosane Rocha; BORELLI, Julma D.; SILVESTRE, Viviane Pires Viana. "Speaking properly": language conceptions problematized in English lessons of an undergraduate teacher education course in Brazil. *Ilha do Desterro*, v. 71, n. 3, p. 81-98, 2018.

PESSOA, Rosane Rocha; SILVESTRE, Viviane Pires Viana; BORELLI, Julma Dalva Vilarinho Pereira. Challenges of a decolonial undertaking in teacher education. *Calidoscópio*, v. 17, n. 2, p. 342-361, 2019.

PESSOA, Rosane Rocha; URZÊDA FREITAS, Marco Túlio de. Challenges in critical language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, v. 46, n. 4, p. 753-776, 2012.

PESSOA, Rosane Rocha; URZÊDA-FREITAS, Marco Túlio de. Língua como espaço de poder: uma pesquisa de sala de aula na perspectiva crítica. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, v. 16, n. 1, p. 133-156, 2016.

PINTO, Joana Plaza. Prefiguração identitária e hierarquias linguísticas na invenção do português. In: MOITA LOPES, Luiz Paulo da. (Org.). *O português no século XXI*: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico**.** São Paulo: Parábola, 2013. p. 120-143.

PINTO, Joana Plaza. On languages, bodies and epistemic violence. In: SILVA, Daniel Nascimento. (Org.). *Language and Violence*: Pragmatic perspectives. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017. p. 171-188.

PRATT, Mary Louise. "If English was good enough for Jesus…" Monolinguismo y mala fe. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 12-30, 2012.

PRATT, Mary Louise. Utopias linguísticas. *Trabalhos em Linguística Aplicada*, v. 52, n. 2, p. 437-459, 2013.

REAGAN, Timothy. Objectification, positivism and language studies: a reconsideration. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*: an international journal, v. 1, n. 1, p. 41-60, 2004.

QUIJANO, Aníbal. Colonialidade do poder, eurocentrismo e América Latina. In: LANDER, Edgardo. (Org.). *A colonialidade do saber:* eurocentrismo e ciências sociais. Buenos Aires: Conselho Latino-americano de Ciências Sociais - Clacso, 2005. p. 107-130. Disponível em: <http://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/clacso/sursur/20100624103322/12_Quijano.pdf>. Accessed on Dec 26th, 2017.

RAJAGOPALAN, Kanavillil. On the challenge of teaching English in Latin America with special emphasis on Brazil. In: RIVERS, Damian. (Ed.). *Resistance to the known*: Counter-conduct in language education. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. p. 121-143.

REES, Dilys Karen. Considerações sobre a pesquisa qualitativa. *Signótica*, v. 20, n. 2, p. 251-272, 2008. Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.ufg.br/sig/article/view/6095/0>. Accessed on May 31st, 2018.

REZENDE, Tânia Ferreira. Ensino intercultural de português para indígenas. In: ENCONTRO NACIONAL DO GRUPO DE ESTUDOS DE LINGUAGEM DO CENTRO-OESTE (GELCO), 7., 2014, Cidade de Goiás. Anais do VII Encontro nacional do grupo de estudos de linguagem do centro-oeste (GELCO). Cidade de Goiás, 2014. p. 427-443

RICHARDSON, Laurel. New writing practices in qualitative research. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, v. 17, n. 1, p. 5-20, 2000.

SAUSSURE, Ferdinand de. *Course in general linguistics*. Columbia University Press, 2011.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. Para além do pensamento abissal: das linhas globais a uma ecologia de saberes. In: _____; MENESES, Maria Paula. (Org.). *Epistemologias do sul*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010, p. 31-83.

SILVESTRE, Viviane Pires Viana. *Práticas problematizadoras e de(s) coloniais na formação de professores/as de línguas:* teorizações construídas em uma experiência com o Pibid. 230 f. Tese (Doutorado em Letras e Linguística) – Faculdade de Letras, Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, 2016.

SILVESTRE, Viviane Pires Viana. *Colaboração e crítica na formação de professores de línguas*: teorizações construídas em uma experiência com o Pibid. Campinas: Pontes, 2017.

SHEPARD, Lorrie. The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational researcher*, v. 29, n. 7, p. 4-14, 2000.

SHOHAMY, Elana. Critical language testing and beyond. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, v. 24, n. 4, p. 331-345, 1998.

SHOHAMY, Elana. The power of tests over teachers: the power of teachers over tests. In: TEDICK, Diane. (Ed.). *Second language teacher education*: international perspectives. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005. p. 101-112.

SZUNDY, Paula Tatianne Carréra. Language ideologies on English as a Lingua Franca in Brazil: conflicting positions expressed by undergraduate students. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, v. 6, n. 1, p. 167-192, 2017.

THOMAS, Jim. *Doing critical ethnography*. Newbury Part: Sage, 1993.

TRACY, Sarah J. Qualitative quality: eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, v. 16, n. 10, p. 837-851, 2010. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1077800410383121>. Accessed on May 31st, 2018.

TRIMBUR, John. Linguistic memory and the uneasy settlement of US English. In: HORNER, Bruce; LU, Min-Zhan; MATSUDA, Paul Kei. (Ed.). *Cross-language relations in composition*. Carbondale: SIU Press, 2010. p. 21-41.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS. Projeto Pedagógico do Curso de **Letras: Inglês** (licenciatura). Goiânia, GO: UFG, 2011. Available at: <https://www.letras.ufg.br/p/296-projeto-pedagogico>. Accessed on May 31st, 2018.

URZÊDA-FREITAS, Marco Túlio. *Letramentos queer na formação de professorxs de línguas*: complicando e subvertendo identidades no fazer docente. 2018. 283 f. Tese (Doutorado em Letras e Linguística) – Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, 2018.

WATSON-GEGEO, Karen Ann. Classroom ethnography. In: HORNBERGER, Nancy; CORSON, D. (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of language and education*. Dordrecht: Springer, 1997. p. 135-144.

WEBSTER, Noah. *Dissertation on the English language*. Boston: Isaiah Thomas, 1789.

WILBRINK, Ben. Assessment in historical perspective. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, v. 23, n. 1, p. 31-48, 1997.

WOOLARD, Kathryn A.; SCHIEFFELIN, Bambi B. Language ideology. *Annual Reviews of Anthropology*, v. 23, p. 55-82, 1994.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Student teachers' consent term

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS/UFG
PRÓ-REITORIA DE PESQUISA E INOVAÇÃO/PRPI
COMITÊ DE ÉTICA EM PESQUISA/CEP

UFG

TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO LIVRE E ESCLARECIDO - TCLE

Você está sendo convidado/a a participar, como voluntário/a, da pesquisa intitulada *Perspectivas decoloniais no ensino de inglês: problematizando o conceito de língua e o lugar do ensino de inglês no Brasil*, ligada ao projeto *Linguística Aplicada Crítica: Estudos sobre Ensino e Formação de Professoras/es de Língua Estrangeira*, coordenado pela Profa. Dra. Rosane Rocha Pessoa da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade Federal de Goiás. Meu nome é Pedro Augusto de Lima Bastos, sou o pesquisador responsável e minha área de atuação é Linguística Aplicada – Ensino e Aprendizagem de Línguas Estrangeiras. Após receber os esclarecimentos e as informações a seguir, se você aceitar fazer parte do estudo, assine ao final deste documento, que está impresso em duas vias, sendo que uma delas é sua e a outra pertence ao pesquisador responsável. Esclareço que em caso de recusa na participação, você não será penalizado/a de forma alguma. Mas, se aceitar participar, as dúvidas *sobre a pesquisa* poderão ser esclarecidas pelo pesquisador responsável, via e-mail (pedro_itapaci@hotmail.com) e, inclusive, sob forma de ligação a cobrar, através do seguinte contato telefônico: (62) 98116-5239. Ao persistirem as dúvidas *sobre os seus direitos* como participante desta pesquisa, você também poderá fazer contato com o **Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa** da Universidade Federal de Goiás, no telefone (62) 3521-1215.

1.1 Informações Importantes sobre a Pesquisa:

Esta pesquisa, intitulada *Perspectivas decoloniais no ensino de inglês: problematizando o conceito de língua e o lugar do ensino de inglês no Brasil*, tem por objetivo problematizar, em uma perspectiva decolonial, conceitos de língua/linguagem e o ensino de inglês com professores em formação universitária.

A pesquisa será realizada na disciplina Inglês 8 em 32 horas-aula, perfazendo um total de 16 encontros. Nas aulas serão discutidas concepções de língua tradicionais e recentes, que têm sido problematizadas por pesquisadores da Linguística Aplicada. Além disso, discutiremos o lugar do ensino de inglês no Brasil, em uma perspectiva decolonial.

Caso aceite participar da pesquisa, você responderá a um questionário inicial com perguntas pessoais (nome, idade, sexo, cor/raça, renda familiar média, grau de escolaridade, universidade onde estuda/estudou, tempo de atuação docente, relação com a língua inglesa). Os momentos das discussões em sala de aula serão gravados em áudio, com a utilização de gravadores fornecidos pelo pesquisador. As atividades desenvolvidas durante as aulas, como narrativas, atividades avaliativas contínuas e finais, também serão utilizadas no estudo. Ao final do bimestre, será realizada uma sessão reflexiva, no horário da aula, que será gravada em áudio, com todos/as os/as alunos/as da turma, acerca das discussões ocorridas em sala de aula. Além disso, no final da pesquisa, você será entrevistado/a para que possamos compreender suas experiências com as aulas, em horário agendado de acordo com sua disponibilidade. Tais momentos somente serão gravados com o seu consentimento.

A pesquisa não oferecerá risco físico ou moral a você. Sua participação é voluntária e há a possibilidade de desistência em qualquer momento, sem qualquer prejuízo. Para os/as alunos/as mais tímidos, durante as discussões, pode haver momentos de constrangimento ou desconforto, uma vez que precisarão expor suas opiniões ou compartilhar tópicos pessoais sobre os assuntos propostos. Além disso, na entrevista, precisarão expressar seus pontos de vista a respeito das perguntas que lhes forem feitas. Outro possível constrangimento é o de terem suas falas analisadas na dissertação. No entanto, tal risco será minimizado, pois, comprometo-me em enviar o texto final online para apreciação e utilizar o pseudônimo escolhido por você.

Como esta é uma pesquisa sem fins lucrativos, não haverá qualquer tipo de remuneração para aqueles/as que decidirem participar. Não haverá, também, qualquer tipo de ônus caso decidam por tomar parte dela. Os possíveis benefícios aos/às participantes serão a oportunidade de discutir e

Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa/CEP
Pró-Reitoria de Pesquisa e Inovação/PRPI-UFG, Caixa Postal: 131, Prédio da Reitoria, Sala do Piso 1, Campus Samambaia (Campus II) - CEP: 74001-970, Goiânia – Goiás, Fone: (55-62) 3521-1215.
E-mail: cep.prpi.ufg@gmail.com

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS/UFG
PRÓ-REITORIA DE PESQUISA E INOVAÇÃO/PRPI
COMITÊ DE ÉTICA EM PESQUISA/CEP

problematizar suas concepções sobre língua e suas práticas pedagógicas, a partir das teorizações na área de Linguística Aplicada e de estudos na perspectiva decolonial, aperfeiçoando-se profissionalmente e desenvolvendo maior sensibilidade para necessidades locais de ensino.

A participação na pesquisa não é obrigatória e o consentimento pode ser retirado a qualquer momento da pesquisa, sem qualquer tipo de penalização ou prejuízo, caso decida fazê-lo.

No início da pesquisa, você deverá escolher um pseudônimo, para assegurar que sua identidade seja resguardada.

Os dados ficarão sob minha guarda em meu computador pessoal por um período mínimo de cinco anos, podendo ser utilizados para escrita de artigos. No entanto, caso uma nova pesquisa sobre os mesmos dados seja realizada, comprometo-me em submeter um novo projeto ao CEP.

Esta pesquisa só pode ser realizada com a aprovação do Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa (CEP).

1.2 Consentimento da Participação da Pessoa como Sujeito da Pesquisa:

Eu, ..., inscrito/a sob o RG/ CPF/ n.º de matrícula ...., abaixo assinado, concordo em participar do estudo intitulado *Perspectivas decoloniais no ensino de inglês: problematizando o conceito de língua e o lugar do ensino de inglês no Brasil*. Informo ter mais de 18 anos de idade, e destaco que minha participação nesta pesquisa é de caráter voluntário. Fui, ainda, devidamente informado/a e esclarecido/a, pelo pesquisador responsável Pedro Augusto de Lima Bastos, sobre a pesquisa, os procedimentos e métodos nela envolvidos, assim como os possíveis riscos e benefícios decorrentes de minha participação no estudo. Foi-me garantido que posso retirar meu consentimento a qualquer momento, sem que isto leve a qualquer penalidade. Declaro, portanto, que concordo com a minha participação no projeto de pesquisa acima descrito.

Goiânia, ... de .... de ....

_____
Assinatura por extenso do/a participante

_____
Assinatura por extenso do pesquisador responsável

Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa/CEP
Pró-Reitoria de Pesquisa e Inovação/PRPI-UFG, Caixa Postal: 131, Prédio da Reitoria, Sala do Piso 1, Campus Samambaia (Campus II) - CEP: 74001-970, Goiânia – Goiás, Fone: (55-62) 3521-1215.
E-mail: cep.prpi.ufg@gmail.com

APPENDIX B – Professor's consent term

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS/UFG
PRÓ-REITORIA DE PESQUISA E INOVAÇÃO/PRPI
COMITÊ DE ÉTICA EM PESQUISA/CEP

UFG

TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO LIVRE E ESCLARECIDO - TCLE

Você está sendo convidado/a a participar, como voluntário/a, da pesquisa intitulada *Perspectivas decoloniais no ensino de inglês: problematizando o conceito de língua e o lugar do ensino de inglês no Brasil*, ligada ao projeto *Linguística Aplicada Crítica: Estudos sobre Ensino e Formação de Professoras/es de Língua Estrangeira*, coordenado pela Profa. Dra. Rosane Rocha Pessoa da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade Federal de Goiás. Meu nome é Pedro Augusto de Lima Bastos, sou o pesquisador responsável e minha área de atuação é Linguística Aplicada – Ensino e Aprendizagem de Línguas Estrangeiras. Após receber os esclarecimentos e as informações a seguir, se você aceitar fazer parte do estudo, assine ao final deste documento, que está impresso em duas vias, sendo que uma delas é sua e a outra pertence ao pesquisador responsável. Esclareço que em caso de recusa na participação, você não será penalizado/a de forma alguma. Mas, se aceitar participar, as dúvidas *sobre a pesquisa* poderão ser esclarecidas pelo pesquisador responsável, via e-mail (pedro_itapaci@hotmail.com) e, inclusive, sob forma de ligação a cobrar, através do seguinte contato telefônico: (62) 98116-5239. Ao persistirem as dúvidas *sobre os seus direitos* como participante desta pesquisa, você também poderá fazer contato com o **Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa** da Universidade Federal de Goiás, no telefone (62) 3521-1215.

1.1 Informações Importantes sobre a Pesquisa:

Esta pesquisa, intitulada *Perspectivas decoloniais no ensino de inglês: problematizando o conceito de língua e o lugar do ensino de inglês no Brasil*, tem por objetivo problematizar, em uma perspectiva decolonial, conceitos de língua/linguagem e o ensino de inglês com professores em formação universitária.

Caso você aceite participar da pesquisa, você me permitirá assumir, como docente e pesquisador, as 32 horas-aula de sua turma Inglês 8, totalizando 16 encontros. O professor-pesquisador ficará responsável por planejar todas as aulas e realizar a avaliação dos/as alunos/as durante esse período. Sua participação na pesquisa, caso aceite, consistirá em responder um questionário inicial com suas informações pessoais (nome, idade, sexo, cor/raça, renda familiar média, grau de escolaridade, universidade onde estuda/estudou, tempo de atuação docente, relação com a língua inglesa), assistir às aulas e realizar sessões reflexivas com o professor-pesquisador durante a pesquisa. As sessões reflexivas poderão acontecer semanalmente às quintas-feiras ou em horário agendado de acordo com sua disponibilidade.

Durante as aulas serão discutidas concepções de língua tradicionais e recentes problematizadas por pesquisadores da Linguística Aplicada. Além disso, discutiremos o lugar do ensino de inglês no Brasil em uma perspectiva decolonial. Os momentos das discussões em sala de aula serão gravados em áudio, com a utilização de gravadores fornecidos pelo pesquisador. Ao final do semestre, será realizada uma sessão reflexiva, no horário da aula, que será gravada em áudio, com todos/as os/as alunos/as da turma acerca das discussões ocorridas em sala de aula. Tais momentos somente serão gravados com o seu consentimento.

A pesquisa não oferecerá risco físico ou moral aos/às participantes. A participação é voluntária e há a possibilidade de desistência em qualquer momento, sem prejuízo ao/à participante. Um possível constrangimento ao participar da pesquisa é o de ter suas falas analisadas na dissertação. No entanto, tal risco será minimizado, pois comprometo-me a utilizar um pseudônimo de sua escolha na escrita do texto e enviar o texto final online para sua apreciação.

Como esta é uma pesquisa sem fins lucrativos, não haverá qualquer tipo de remuneração ao participar dela. Não haverá, também, qualquer tipo de ônus caso decida por tomar parte dela. Os possíveis benefícios aos/às participantes serão a oportunidade de expor suas concepções sobre língua e cotejá-las com as teorizações nas áreas da Linguística Aplicada Crítica e do Pensamento Decolonial.

Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa/CEP
Pró-Reitoria de Pesquisa e Inovação/PRPI-UFG, Caixa Postal: 131, Prédio da Reitoria, Sala do Piso 1, Campus Samambaia (Campus II) - CEP: 74001-970, Goiânia – Goiás, Fone: (55-62) 3521-1215.
E-mail: cep.prpi.ufg@gmail.com

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS/UFG
PRÓ-REITORIA DE PESQUISA E INOVAÇÃO/PRPI
COMITÊ DE ÉTICA EM PESQUISA/CEP

A participação na pesquisa não é obrigatória e o consentimento pode ser retirado a qualquer momento da pesquisa sem qualquer tipo de penalização ou prejuízo caso decidam fazê-lo.

No início da pesquisa, você deverá escolher um pseudônimo, para assegurar que sua identidade seja resguardada.

Os dados ficarão sob minha guarda em meu computador pessoal por um período mínimo de cinco anos, podendo ser utilizados para escrita de artigos. No entanto, caso uma nova pesquisa sobre os mesmos dados seja realizada, comprometo-me em submeter um novo projeto ao CEP.

Esta pesquisa só pode ser realizada com a aprovação do Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa (CEP).

1.2 Consentimento da Participação da Pessoa como Sujeito da Pesquisa:

Eu, ..., inscrito/a sob o RG/ CPF/ n.º de matrícula ...., abaixo assinado, concordo em participar do estudo intitulado *Perspectivas decoloniais no ensino de inglês: problematizando o conceito de língua e o lugar do ensino de inglês no Brasil*. Informo ter mais de 18 anos de idade, e destaco que minha participação nesta pesquisa é de caráter voluntário. Fui, ainda, devidamente informado/a e esclarecido/a, pelo pesquisador responsável Pedro Augusto de Lima Bastos, sobre a pesquisa, os procedimentos e métodos nela envolvidos, assim como os possíveis riscos e benefícios decorrentes de minha participação no estudo. Foi-me garantido que posso retirar meu consentimento a qualquer momento, sem que isto leve a qualquer penalidade. Declaro, portanto, que concordo com a minha participação no projeto de pesquisa acima descrito.

Goiânia, ... de .... de ....

_____
Assinatura por extenso do/a participante

_____
Assinatura por extenso do pesquisador responsável

Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa/CEP
Pró-Reitoria de Pesquisa e Inovação/PRPI-UFG, Caixa Postal: 131, Prédio da Reitoria, Sala do Piso 1, Campus Samambaia (Campus II) - CEP: 74001-970, Goiânia – Goiás, Fone: (55-62) 3521-1215.
E-mail: cep.prpi.ufg@gmail.com

APPENDIX C – Classroom interaction 4

Pedro: Do you remember last class?
Students: Yeah.
Pedro: So, what did we study last class?
Luna: First, we tried to remember the vocabulary from the previous class.
Pedro: Yes.
Luna: And after we saw a text about who owns language.
Rosa: Canagarajah.
Luna: Then after we saw some abstracts.
Pedro: No, not abstracts.
Sérgio: Excerpts.
Pedro: Yes.
Luna: Excerpts. Thank you.
Rosa: About the- one of the founding fathers of the US.
Pedro: Yes. What did he write about?
Rosa: Composition of English, mainly in the United States, because they were trying to be a nation and they needed to have that sort of unity-
Pedro: Okay.
Rosa: In the language.
Pedro: Unity. What else? What other adjectives can you give? Unity, purity? What else? (7s)
Pedro: Nothing?
Anita: Language as community and place?
Pedro: Yeah. Okay, let's remember some concepts. We studied Herderian triad (T writes on the board). What is it? It's the link between?
Luna: Community-
Pedro: Three things, right?
Rosa: Place, community, language.
Pedro: Okay. For example, place. Give me one example.
Luna: Japan.
Pedro: Japan. Community?
Raul: Japanese people.
Pedro: Yes. Language?
Students: Japanese.
Pedro: Yes, this is the Herderian triad, okay? And that is how we construct languages, we link them to nations. What else? We studied the monolingual orientation, right? What is it?
Anita: There are some ideas that they associate, like language and identity.
Rosa: It has to be a pure language.
Pedro: Yeah.
Anita: Language as a self-standing system.
Pedro: Yes, okay, good. Separated languages, like, this is Portuguese, this is English.
Students: Yes.
Pedro: Okay, nice. So now, in pairs, I want you to discuss just one question: How are these concepts related to our language class? Or maybe, how do we reproduce these concepts in the language class? How can you relate them to our language class?
(**Students** discuss in pairs.)

Pedro: So, what did you talk about?

Sérgio: Well, we said that we reproduce this concept when we only use a material from a specific country. For example, by teaching English using only British English. I don't show students the different Englishes around the world.

Pedro: Hum.

Yoshihara: We were talking about monolingual orientation. It's very difficult-

Pedro: I'm sorry?

Yoshihara: The first-

Luna: Monolingual orientation.

Pedro: Okay.

Yoshihara: That in the first level, it's very difficult, for example, English 1, English 2, to have a whole class in English, because they have no background, [no previous knowledge]-

Luna: [Previous knowledge.]

Yoshihara: in English. So, at first, it's very difficult, and then it would be more difficult to place that than have the place, language, community, but it could either be both. Then, after some time, it goes easier, but even in English 8, it's not like a 100%. It's kinda difficult. And the, how to work with the three together would be when we, I believe, sorry, we believe, when you bring something, for example, if you are going to talk about a city, and then you could relate the history of the city to the culture of the place (?). Food, too, you could relate some dishes. Short stories, too.

Student: Music.

Yoshihara: Music. But then Rosa said something interesting. Cinema is something that is for too many people, so you cannot narrow to one specific. Usually, it's for very- many, many people watching, so it's too international, let's say.

Pedro: Yeah. Don't you think it depends on where the movie comes from?

Yoshihara: Yes, but I mean, in general, it's (?).

Pedro: What's general?

Yoshihara: Hollywood.

(Sts laugh)

Student: Hollywood.

Yoshihara: If we say Hollywood, it's general, but then- The same as for Brazilian films. We have many movies that we could be working about exploring it from different points of view, but at the same point we have something that is very specific, and at the same time we could have something that could be (?) for Brazil and other countries. Anyway, I changed the subject.

Pedro: No, it's okay.

Yoshihara laughs.

Pedro: It's just cause I've been thinking here. Don't you think we try, when we say it's general, we take something that is local, a local culture, and try to make it as global?

Student: Repeat.

Pedro: We globalize the local culture.

Rosa: I guess so, because in mostly, movies from the US, we have places in a city, but it's like, it uses the American culture, but we take it as our own because it's relatable. Did you understand?

Raul: I feel like they don't have culture anymore because they are so globalized.

Pedro: They don't have culture?

Rosa: Their culture is ours.

Raul: It's everywhere. I mean-

Rosa: Yes, like, if the character in the movie goes to McDonald's, I relate to that because we have McDonald's here.

Pedro: And what did you discuss about the Herderian triad?

(Sts laugh)

Pedro: Anita!

Anita: So, I said that we reproduce this monolingual orientation when we teach our students grammar according to our textbooks and ignore the deviations of the Standard language. For example, I'm teaching something and I say to my students "Grammar says that", but maybe you are watching a movie and you are going to see it differently, and you are going to say "Oh, but teacher said that I have to say 'she does' and the movie says 'she don't'". So, when we ignore, and we don't say that it can happen, I think we reinforce this monolingual orientation. We also discussed, for example, that our textbooks, we have units about London or units about New York, so we are reinforcing it because we use this idea of language as place, as well. So, I think that we are reinforcing it again.

Pedro: What do you think about her comment regarding monolingual orientation?

Pedro: Okay, but what about her comment on grammar?

Yoshihara: I think she said something that is very true. The idea is that in the classroom we teach what should be 100% correct, everything is perfect, etc, but, for real, it doesn't work this way. The same goes for Portuguese. We learn Portuguese, but we leave the room, it's another language. (?). If you say 'gimme', "gimmme? I didn't understand that. What does it mean?", or gonna. So, there are things that it's like what she said. Well, like, this is what we teach, but on a daily basis that's what everyone is going to listen to, she does a bridge, let's say.

Pedro: So you are saying that in class we teach this Standard language, is it?

Students: Yeah.

Pedro: What is this Standard language?

Raul: Yeah, also with ---, we have this idea of British and American English, like "Oh, this is American English, in British you say that", but it's not like there are two kinds of English, one American English and one British English. Does Standard really exist? I don't think so.

Luna: When I think about the Herderian triad, we said like "Japan, Japanese, Japanese people". When you said classroom, I imagined like a place, a classroom; community, the students; and the language that we use, like, when we simplify our language in order to say things that the level will understand.

Pedro: Hum.

Luna: Because, well, it should- I'm not sure about this, if it should or shouldn't be, but sometimes we speak formal in a higher level and in a lower level we try to simplify language inside the classroom. So, place: classroom; community: students; language: the teacher's language in order for students to understand.

Pedro: I see your point and I think it's a very nice perspective, but this triad is more related to the creation of the nation-states, specifically. But going back to the discussion on Standard language, what is Standard language?

Sérgio: The language according to the grammar rules.

Pedro: The language according to the grammar rules. Where do these rules come from?

Rosa: Old white people.

(Sts laugh)

Pedro: You remember reading Webster's dissertation last class?
Students: Yes.
Pedro: What does he say about the yeomanry?
Rosa: It's like the future of language?
Pedro: The future of language? No.
(indistinct conversation)
Pedro: How do they speak?
Rosa: They use to speak like the people from England.
Pedro: No.
Rosa: Find another way, I think.
Anita: I remember that they read the bible and the newspapers?
Pedro: Yeah, they read good English.
Students: Yes.
Pedro: Good English, not bad English, right? What else? What does he say about how the English of the new nation should be?
Anita: They had to be equal concerning pronunciation, the Standard grammar.
Pedro: Yes, and where does it have to come from?
(Indistinct conversation)
Rosa: Not England, because-

Pedro: England was a mess and they want purity (referring to the language).
(T projects Webster's dissertation excerpts and discusses about them)
Pedro: **Luna**, can you read it, please?
Luna: "Let Englishmen take notice that when I speak of the American yeomanry, the latter are not to be compared to the illiterate peasantry of their own country". (reading)
Pedro: Okay, so who are they?
Rosa: The yeomanry?
Anita: American, American people.
Rosa: American farmers.
Pedro: Which class do they come from? Social class.
Luna: I think it's high.
Rosa: low.
Luna: It's high, because after it says that these men had considerable education.
Anita: It's "a group of men who held and cultivated small landed estates", so…
Pedro: Do you think that all men could have land in the past?
Students: No.
Pedro: What type of people had land in the past?
Students: Rich people.
Pedro: So, who are they? (Referring to the yeomanry)
Students: Rich Americans.
Pedro: What about the English?
Luna: "The yeomanry of this country consist of substantial independent freeholders, masters of their own persons and lords of their own soil". (reading)
Pedro: Yeah, so they had people working for them for free.
Luna: For freedom?
Students: Free. Slaves.
Pedro: Slaves.

Luna: Okay. "These men have considerable education. They not only learn to read, write and keep accounts; but a vast proportion of them read newspapers every week, and besides the Bible, which is found in all families, they read the best English sermons and treatises upon religion, ethics, geography and history;" (reading)

Pedro: So, where does Standard language come from?

Anita: Rich people.

Student: Rich, white, old people.

(**Students** laugh)

Rosa: Usually men.

Pedro: Yes, men.

Rosa: Because women couldn't have land.

Pedro: Yes. Okay. So, what is the main focus of the monolingual orientation? What is the main characteristic? That we speak?

Student: Standard.

Pedro: Standard and the same. We have the same variety, isn't it?

Students: Yes.

Pedro: I'll show you a little piece of a song and I want you to sing it. Not to sing it, but just to say the words.

(T shows the lyrics and reads them. After, **students** do it too, individually.)

(Mary had a little lamb/It's fleece was white as snow/Everywhere the child went/The lamb, the lamb was sure to go)

T: So, what can you see from this exercise?

Students: [(Indistinct conversation)]

Magali: [The pronunciation looks like the same.]

(Sts laugh)

Pedro: What? What did you say?

Anita: That **Yoshihara** has a different accent.

(Sts laugh)

Student: É bullying.

Pedro: Okay, how did you say it? How did you say it, Graça? This word here. (pointing to 'lamb')

(T asks **students** to pronounce 'lamb' and most of them pronounce it differently)

Pedro: Do we have the same accent?

Students: No.

Pedro: Where do we come from?

Students: Brazil.

Pedro: The same nation.

Raul: Most of us.

(Sts laugh)

Pedro: Now, we are going to work with parts of a documentary. I want you to watch the first part and tell me the purpose of the video.

(T plays the first part of the documentary "American Tongues")

Pedro: So, what is the purpose of the first part of the video?

Student: Discuss the many accents.

(Sts repeat 'lamb' in a funny way and laugh)

Pedro: Okay. Now you are going to watch the second part.

(T explains the activity and hand in the handout. They are supposed to watch the video and put the places in the correct order as they are being mentioned in the video. After, the video is played.)

(T checks activity)

(Now, **students** watch it again and have to write what the characters talk about how the people from those places talk.)

(T asks **students** to check it in pairs, before checking with the whole group.)

Pedro: So, the first one, New York.

Rosa: They talk too fast.

Luna: They are funny and rude.

Pedro: Their accent is funny, right? And Wisconsin people?

Sérgio: They sound really bad.

Luna: They sound Norwegian.

Rosa: Like they are talking another language.

Student: She said /əʊt/ and /əˈbəʊt/.

Rosa: It's like an idiom.

Raul: Actually, it's /aʊ/, isn't it?

Rosa: Yeah, /aʊ/ /əˈbaʊt/. They say /əʊt/ and /əˈbəʊt/.

Pedro: Actually, it's /aʊ/?

(St laugh)

Student: No, I mean, the words (?)

Pedro: I was trying to problematize it (laugh).

(Sts laugh)

Pedro: Okay, people from Virginia.

Rosa: They have their own dialect.

Anita: Dialect, yeah.

Rosa: They say twice what they are saying.

Pedro: Yes. Okay. People from Chicago.

Sérgio: They are hard to understand.

Pedro: Yes.

Anita: And different (?).

Pedro: Yes. New England?

Rita: They [don't say much at all].

Sérgio: [don't say much at all].

Pedro: Yeah. You remember what the lady that talked about Chicago and New York? What did she say? You remember this? [I didn't ask you to pay attention, but-]

Anita: [She said all of them] are different and are hard to understand, right?

Rosa: Oh, and then she says that New Yorkers and people from Chicago say that she talks different from (?), like, she talks too fast.

Rosa: [Yes].

Luna: She said they are rude. People, right?

Pedro: Did she? I think it wasn't her. It was the narrator.

Rosa: The narrator.

Luna: Ah. Okay, sorry.

Pedro: Cause she says "They may think they are the ones- they may think I'm hard to understand, but they are the ones that are hard to understand".
Luna: Oh, yes.
Rosa: She has the southern accent.
Pedro: Okay, very nice. Now I want you to watch the third part, okay? And these are the questions that you have to answer. "a) What does the black man say about meeting a person for the first time?" "b) What does the white man talk about the way black people talk?"
Student: Hum.
Pedro: Hum, that's kind of obvious, but- "c) How does the woman in the end feel about being called Dutchified?" You understand what Duchified means?
Luna: No.
Pedro: No?
Rosa: Turned into Dutch?
Pedro: Yeah.
Yoshihara: (?) sound like Dutch.
Pedro: Sounding Dutch.
Yoshihara: Yeah.
Pedro: But I did some research and it's specifically for people from Pennsylvania, when they sound Pennsylvania Dutch-
Rosa: Yes. There is a joke about that on Friends.
Pedro: Really?
Rosa: Yeah. Monica finds a new friend and she says she speaks Dutch, her family speak Dutch. And then the woman starts speaking Dutch with her. And she says: "No, Pennsylvania Dutch".
Pedro: Ah.
Student: Ah, in Friends.
Rosa: Yes, it's in the first season. I can't remember the episode, the one with the fake Monica.
Pedro: My goodness.
(Indistinct conversation)
Pedro: Okay, so let's see.
(T plays video)
Pedro: Okay, did you get all the answers?
Students: No.
Pedro: Would you like to watch this part again?
Students: Yes.
Pedro: Okay.
(T plays it again)
Pedro: Okay. What does the black man say about meeting a person from the first time?
Raul: He said that by the way the person talks, he can already not like him.
Pedro: Yes.
Rita: It has to do with what you talk and how you talk.
Pedro: Yes.
Luna: The vibration.
Pedro: Yes. And what do you think about that? Do you agree with him?
Student: I think it's true.
Student: Yes.

Rosa: If someone sounds cocky when they are talking when they are talking to you for the first time, "Oh, stop, I don't like you already".
(Sts laugh)
Rita: It's not right, but I feel like the man.
Students: Yes. (laugh)
Rosa: Maybe a person says so- has this way of talking to people because she is unsure of herself, but still it's not right. You should be yourself. (?).
Raul: What about if the person talks like that is being themselves?
Rosa: Oh, then I'm not gonna be her friend. (laugh)
(**Raul** laughs)
Raul: I don't know, maybe it's the family that talks like that.
Rosa: What?
Raul: Maybe it's the family that talks really formal.
Rosa: No, it's not like formal things, it's just- there's people who like (students laugh – incomprehensible talk). Tem gente que fala desse jeito, but that's-
Rita: Show offers.
Rosa: Yes, that's wrong.
Rita: "Hello, what's your name? Oh, thank you, thank you". (sounding funny, as if imitating somebody – students laugh). No, you're Brazilian, stop doing that.
(Students laugh)
Pedro: Okay. I see your point, but do you think he was talking about people who speak, like, in this cocky way?

Rita: Yes.

Yoshihara: And it's like what Rita said. They don't care about what the person is talking, but how. So, you are going to pay attention to the rhythm, the tone of voice. It's like the voice itself. "Ah, I don't like this, so I don't like you". But it's what he said, we judge, we like what someone does by the first impression that we have of someone speaking.
Pedro: Why do you think we are so much focused on this language and how people speak, how people pronounce words and say sentences?

Pedro: It's because I've been to some events from our area and I've seen lots of people from other countries talk. And then I've also heard friends that were watching, and they said- they were counting the mistakes, instead of paying attention to the content of the presentation.
Luna: I felt-
(indistinct conversation and laughter)
Luna: I felt like that in the Olympic Games when I watched, because some people won, like, Italian people won something and then they were speaking in English, and I was like "I can't understand". Also, I think our Brazilian accent is better than Italian speaking English.
(**Anita** and **Luna** laugh)
Luna: I really thought-
Rosa: Their accent is already really strong.
Luna: Yeah, it sounds strange, I'm sorry. (laugh).
Pedro: Yeah, but do you think it's universally strong, like, everybody thinks it's strong?
Rosa: They don't think.
Student: Yes.

Pedro: They may think you're the one who has a strong accent.
Students: Yes. Probably.
Luna: I think we are so used to our accent, an American accent, that when we see an Italian or a French person speaking English (?), but it's normal.
Pedro: Have you ever judged somebody because of the way he or she speaks?
Students: Oh, yes.
Pedro: Yeah? How? Which situation? Can you share it?

Pedro: You don't have to mention names, okay?

Raul: We could understand him, but we all laughed at him.
Pedro: And the contend of his talk is very nice, isn't it?
Students: Yes.
Pedro: It's "An incredible conversation with Paulo Freire", isn't it?
Raul: I guess so.

Raul: about his accent (laugh).
(**students** laugh)
Pedro: You were watching Paulo Freire, judging the way he speaks and not paying attention to the content of the video?
Students: Yes. (laugh)
Luna: Wow, I don't know this video.
Raul: It was in the second season, we were very immature.
Rita: Yes. After that- I don't remember the name of the teacher, aquela com o brinco de pena, what's her name?
(**Students** laugh)
Pedro: Huh? Ah, okay.
Rita: The teacher, Maria Sueli. She told us about a book, Preconceito Linguístico do Marcos Bagno. It's very interesting, I really recommend it.
Pedro: Well, can you tell us another situation? Or have you ever been judged?
(**Students** respond affirmatively)
Yoshihara: All the time.
Luna: I had a (?) that the first time I started speaking English said "Oh, my God, you sound like Boston people".
Yoshihara: I had a student that he didn't stay in the classroom 15 minutes. (He said) "I don't like your voice" and he left. He was sitting and said "I don't like your voice" and left. And I said "okay, bye". It was really weird because of the way he did. He simply out of the blue said that and left. He didn't even (?) like "I would like to talk to you". It was here and it was last class.
Rita: Oh.
Yoshihara: First meeting, first (?)
Pedro: My goodness!
Luna: She substituted me once and then when I came to the other class, they said "Oh, my God, it was so fun, because she is so different from you". Did you understand? "No, I didn't, but it was very fun". (sts laugh). Just like to have contact with (?) accent and (?) English (?).
Pedro: What are we judging the way somebody talks?
Luna: But they really liked it.

Sérgio: We are judging his/her identity.
Rosa: Their story.

Pedro: Yeah? When you don't get what you expect? What do you expect?

Rita: Yes, and people similar to us.
Raul: To us. Yeah. We expect everybody to speak the same way.
Pedro: Mainly English teachers, yes?
Student: Yes.
Pedro: We expect other English teachers to speak the way we do.
Raul: And also the students as well. Like, "no, that's not the pronunciation, it's like that".
Pedro: Yeah? Do you think that we hierarchize people through language?
Students: Hi what?
Students: Hierarchize. (laugh)
Student: Ah, okay.
Pedro: How?
Yoshihara: It is based on values, for example, from what Raul said, it is, there is usually this idea (of) American English and British English. I don't know much about the United States, but England, for example, "Oh, people have to speak as British English". If you talk to someone from Liverpool, from the countryside, you are not going to understand a word of what they say, because it's very, very difficult. Similar to someone from Alabama or Mississippi. Something that is difficult to understand it. If you take someone from Glasgow, close to Ireland, you're like "Sorry?". So, we have this, I mean, it is a commonsense that there is this specific way of to speak, this specific fluency and rhythm, etc, and then, it's like everyone has to be the same way. So, I guess that's why we value some ways to speak and we diminish some others.
Luna: I'm kind of generalizing, but our students, I think they don't know about varieties. They think that there is only British and American English. And there is this story of "Is he a native speaker? Does he speak like a native?"
Raul: But I guess we reinforce it. At least, when I was studying here, teachers talked a lot about American and British English and I think we internalize this.
Luna: It's because we are also students and I don't know you, guys, I knew the variety in the United States, but as a student, we don't have much contact with different accents. I got to know that Australian and Indian people had a different accent in English when I came to Letras. I never thought about it. So, as a student, we don't have contact in regular school.
Pedro: Okay, but how do you think we hierarchize people based on language? How do we do that? Can you give more practical examples?
Yoshihara: If we take, for example, materials, didactic materials, they somehow do that. For example, differently from Duda, in England, the last time I was there, it was people from everywhere, the same as in the cruise. You have people from Thailand, people from India, and depending on where the person comes from India you understand. Some others, it is really, really difficult. So, I guess from didactic materials, for example, in English, the materials that we use, they have British English, but still they (?), they only have one way of speaking, they don't show different Englishes in England. And then you have American English File, I didn't listen to all the units, but it's the same, they don't have different American ways, it's just basically one way. If it comes to movies, there is a way that, for example, if we take black people in movies, many times they don't have the main role, many

times they are criminals, etc, etc. And the way they speak, it is somehow reproduced through media. In songs, for example, you have rap songs, depending "Ah, it's rap, so I don't like the way they speak". So, maybe through media, through both.

Pedro: What does it mean to hierarchize people?

Pedro: How do we do this in language?

Luna: I feel that when a student calls Cultura Inglesa or any place, English courses, and says "Oh, do you have a native speaker? Because the native speaker is the best". That's how you hierarchize. Is that the word?

Pedro: Yes.

Luna: Is that what you want? What do you want? (laugh)

Pedro: I don't know. (Sts laugh)

Rosa: If someone from São Paulo listens to someone from here, like, we say por::ta (emphasizing the R).

Luna: Porta, porteira, portão.

Rosa: Porteira. Fala dejeito, assim, sabe?

Pedro: Uai.

Rosa: Uai. People from São Paulo, they usually tend to think that we all speak like that. If we say we are from Goiânia, they expect us to do that, to talk with a plaid shirt, a botina, o fivelão no coisa. Stereotypes. And they expect that in language as well.

Anita: It's like when they say "meu" and "imagina" (pronouncing it as a paulistano)

Rosa: Yeah, that's the thing. So, they think they are superiors. We, from the countryside, they think we are not as good as them.

Pedro: Or as developed.

Rosa: Yes.

Luna: In the classroom also, we have "Ah, you're an English teacher, have you been abroad?" If you haven't been abroad, you are not good enough. I feel that.

Rosa: I feel more because I haven't been abroad.

(**Students** laugh)

Pedro: Same here.

Rita: I think language is, as everybody knows, related to power. For example, Dilma. People used to judge her because of the way she speaks. She was the president and people kept judging her. It doesn't matter "She's just the Brazilian president, but she doesn't know how to speak" (?)

Pedro: They even said that she had her own language.

Rita: And now Temer is a good speaker and-

(**Students** laugh)

Pedro: There was a book, I think it was released in 2015, which was called Dilmês.

Rita: Really?

Pedro: I saw it at Saraiva.

Rosa: But as it degradating?

Pedro: Yes, of course. Now, let's change the focus a little bit. How about internet language? Do you use internet language?

Students: Yes.

Pedro: Can you give me some examples?

Rita: Abbreviations.

Yoshihara: Acronyms.

Pedro: Like?

Raul: A.k.a.

Yoshihara: LOL, when people write in English they continue with "kkkk", that's Brazilian.

(Sts laugh)

Yoshihara: And it doesn't make sense, sometimes. You have lots of, for example, ASAP, TYTL. There are lots of it.

(Sts say some acronyms)

Pedro: Have you ever seen TLDR?

Pedro: Yeah, that's the best one.

(Sts laugh)

(T writes on the board 2nite, l8tr and students read them)

Pedro: Do you think internet is reshaping language?

Students: Yeah.

Pedro: Changing the way we write or speak?

Raul: Yes, some people speak like they are on the internet. Also, in Brazil, the memes have changed the way people talk. Some people talk in memes. If you don't get the reference, you can't understand them.

Rita: Some people like <u>you</u>.

(**Students** laugh)

Pedro: What do you think about these changes? For example, writing tonight with 2-n-i-t-e, later with l-8-t-r. How do you feel about it?

Rosa: I think it only complicates the things. I'm more formal, so I don't like to use that kind of (?)

Raul: Uh, somebody sounds cocky.

(**Students** laugh)

Rosa: In Portuguese, I use some, but in English, I think it gets hard.

Pedro: The revenge.

(**Students** laugh)

Pedro: Are you more opened or more conservative to language change?

Pedro: You don't have to answer now.

Yoshihara: I guess also it has to do according to the context. For example, if you are just talking to your friend and you talk like that, okay, as long as both sides understand. I feel, for me, that there are many times people are talking and I was "Okay, what does it mean?", because I don't get, you know? So, I guess depending on the situation, you don't need to be formal or write correctly, but the point is, sometimes I don't understand.

Pedro: What can you do when you don't understand?

Yoshihara: I always ask "What do you want to say?".

Luna: Once I had a problem with that. I had a group with English I students and then a **student** sent a message that was for another group with P and C, and then the woman was like "What is that?" and everybody was like "Hum, what is that?" and then he said "pão na chapa".

(**Students** laugh)

Rosa: That was the smartest way to get (?).

Luna: Yes.

Pedro: But do you see these words in dictionaries?

Yoshihara: Today we have those dictionaries.
Raul: Yeah, but-
Rosa: (?)

Pedro: Okay.
Raul: Ficar, in Portuguese. We have the meaning of hook up in the dictionary.
Pedro: Now, you are going to watch a video and the title of the video is "What makes a word real?". You're gonna watch the first part and you have to answer these questions: 1) What are the two types of people she meets at parties? Have you ever been through this kind of situation? 2) What is the example she talks about?
(T asks students to read the questions and plays the video)
Pedro: What are the two types of people she meets at parties? The first type?
Students: Surprising.
Pedro: Second one?

Pedro: Debate positively or negatively?
Students: Negatively.
Pedro: And the example she gives?

Rita: [From Facebook], the word defriend.
Pedro: Have you ever met people like this, that when you told "I'm a Letras student" or "I'm an English teacher?
Students: Yes.
Sérgio: "Tell me something in English".
Rosa: "Say something in English".
(**Students** laugh)
Raul: "Oh, you're crazy. You study grammar?"
Rosa: "Oh, but do you do anything else or just study?"
Students: "Cê só dá aula?"
Raul: They think we memorize all the verb tenses in Portuguese.
Rosa: Yeah.
Pedro: Do you have any example, Magali?
Magali: I have an example, but it's about French. All the time I (?) in French, "Ah, can you say something with a 'biquinho'?". And they ask if it's necessary to make this with your mouth to get the right sound.
Raul: I always say we also do it in Portuguese, like (?) in Portuguese.
Magali: And I have an example. I was studying with a teacher here and she asked me so many times to say the word woman in French. She said 'femme' and I remember that I thought "Eu não vou fazer esse bico". For me it was very- How can I say? Unbelievable. 'Femme'. No, it's horrible! I don't think it's necessary all this. So, I think there's some kind of people, especially I think, I don't wanna sound- How can I say preconceituosa?
Students: Prejudiced.
Magali: Yes, but all the people, they don't wanna change some things, and for me it was like- How can I say? Do it again, do it again. Too-
Rita: Annoying.
Pedro: Imposed?

Magali: Imposed. It was very unnecessary, but for her it was the way to say perfectly the 'femme'.

Luna: Six<u>th</u>, seven<u>th</u>. "Teacher?"

Pedro: Six<u>th</u>, fif<u>th</u>.

(**Students** laugh)

Magali: And another example. I was giving a child a French lesson and he was talking about his English teacher. He would say "Oh, my teacher was saying 'banheiro'. Can you say 'banheiro' in English?" He was just a child and he was trying to see the pronunciation. "Oh, she is a French teacher, but she say that she knows English, does she?" So, I talk the way he was expecting and he "Oh, you know". And I knew that he was expecting the /th/, so I went to his game, just for- how can I say? "Shut up, little child"., but just in my mind "Shut up, little child".

(**Students** laugh)

Pedro: What makes a word real, in your opinion?

Anita: The use of it. When people start using it, so it exists.

Rosa: One person starts saying, and then the other person sees that person talking and starts saying as well because it's easier.

Sérgio: And it goes viral.

Pedro: Okay, but who has the authority to make decisions about words being right or wrong?

Rosa: Usually linguistics.

Pedro: You think?

Rosa: Well, they have the right.

Rosa: Yeah, she is on (?) and becomes like a linguistics superhero.

Pedro: Now watch the second part and answer these questions: What is her occupation? What are the two slang words she talks about? What is her opinion about them? What is behind dictionaries? According to her, how do we treat dictionaries?

(T plays the video)

Pedro: So, what is her occupation?

Yoshihara: Historian of the English language.

Pedro: And what are the two slang words she talks about?

Students: Hangry.

Pedro: Adorkable. Did she like them?

Students: Yes.

Pedro: Did you like them?

Students: Yes.

Magali: No.

Pedro: What do you think about them, Magali?

Magali: I don't like the way we change so many things. I think we have to have a line to the things, but I remember that you asked about the authority to take the language, I think right now this power has been less concentrated. For example, if you start to use this here, in a few time everybody here that is getting in your class will be able to use this kind of words. So, I think the power has changed some hands in different contexts. But, for example, I studied sign language too and there is a lot of- I don't know the word in English- vazio lexical. In the field- Ah, we need a word to mean this, just the deaf people can give the sign, so here we are fighting for this kind of power, we want to share the power, for example (?) in the deaf

community no, just the deaf has this power. So, I don't know, I have a lot of things to speak about this, but, for me, I don't like so many changes. For example, I remember that Rosane told that she talked differently when she is talking to her daughter, because she wants to hear an example for language. I think it's nice, because when we listen to the mother tongue, I have a child, so I know that what I'm telling to my child, it's for the way she will acquire the language. So, I try to not to do a lot of things like this, because I remembered that I want to pass some language to someone who don't have a reference to understand. And I remember a charge, it was really funny, a grandma received a letter from grandchild and the picture shows the grandma putting on red the mistakes and I "Wow, I think I will do the same with my child" in some kind of point "Oh, no, this is not like this", because I think it's so important to know how to write well in the world that I want her in. For example, we know that if we don't have a lot of study, we can't get enough money, to get a nice job. Sometimes you don't have the way to get simple things.

Pedro: But do you think it's possible to control how a child speaks?

Magali: I think this. It's at least in some contexts. For example, with me I don't want to accept things like this, because I want her to know the Standard language. For example, she needs to write a text from pass on Enem. I help a lot of friends with compositions in Portuguese, and I see that some of them reproduce in the paper the way they speak. So, I want to be able to control how my child talks with me, for example, because I need to know that she will know how to use the language in different contexts, because it will important to her. I don't think I will be able to control everything, because sometimes I see that I use language that I didn't want to and I "oh, I don't know that I knew how to pronunciate things like this", but I think I know the context, but maybe because my father is a military, so he is very- his education is very strong somethings. I remember that I was leaving abroad and I didn't left the house after 8 o'clock, because my father always said "No, you can't". I was so, so, so far away from him and some things I didn't change. So, I think it's possible to control the environment to speak some language.

Pedro: What do you think about it, guys?

Raul: Well, my brother is ten and he curses all the time (?) (We say) "Stop cursing, stop saying those things"-

Magali: Even your parents say?

Raul: My mom complains all the time about his cursing, but it doesn't stop.

Rosa: I have a cousin, he is fifteen, and his mother is also a military. She's very strict with both of her kids, but my cousin curses all the time. Like, he says a "hello" and there is a f- in the middle. She doesn't control him, he is very spoiled, even though she is very strict with everything she does around the kids, but he's still like that. I think it's a trait of personality.

Pedro: I don't know, because I didn't curse much when I was a kid in front of my parents.
(**Students** laugh)

Pedro: Yeah, but something I said frequently was véi. "Vé:i, véi, véi". And they hated it, but just because I knew they hated it I said all the time.
(**Students** laugh)

Rita: After some time I realized that 'véi' is ridiculous.
(**Students** laugh)

Pedro: Yes.

Rita: And then when I realized that, I stopped saying 'véi'.

Raul: I said it once and it was so weird. (laugh)

Luna: I don't know, because I have family that lives in the countryside and my aunt and my uncle speak like normal people, and my cousin-

Pedro: What is it to speak like normal people?

(**Students** laugh)

Luna: I don't know, but I think you are going to get the idea. My cousin is thirteen and he is very formal, like "Mamãe, você poderia, por favor, pegar um copo de água para mim?". And then I'm like, but it's so, so- it's so weird, because the feeling isn't like that, but he is very formal in situations that I think he- not shouldn't be, but it's not normal to be so formal at home.

Pedro: I have a nephew, he is thirteen now, but he was around ten when this happened. He started correcting my parents. For example, my mother says "eu fisso um bolo", and she finished high school twenty years ago, thirty, forty years ago. My father, for example, he didn't even get to finish high school, he only finished elementary school, the first phase of elementary school, which is until the 'quarta série', right? And he says "Pra mim fazer", this kind of things and my nephew started correcting my father.

Rita: Pesado.

Magali: I don't know, I think maybe it's a problem with their father or father. For example, my mother used to say "pra mim fazer". I won't correct my mother, "No, it's pra eu fazer". But, for example, my husband started to say 'pra mim fazer' and I "No". "No, but I can talk like this". "No, you can't because you will be with me with a lot of teachers and they will pay attention in you, so you have to use the Standard language". But, for example, I won't tell this for my mother. He's like my mother, he used to say 'pra mim fazer', but I think the people needs to know where they can to correct people and I didn't say to him in front of a lot of people. So, it's like this, because once I remember I was telling 'pra mim fazer' and a friend told "No, you can't, because-". She explained it to me, so maybe it's a problem with the parents to explain this "Oh, they are different, they are old, they are learning in a different time".

Luna: I think we associate a lot language to politeness. I think my cousin is so polite, he wouldn't correct anyone, but it's the way that he expresses himself, but it's so- (laugh) different. (laugh).

Raul: My mom corrects me all the time, and she says "Oh, you are doing Letras, you have to speak correctly", and I'm like "No, I teach French, I don't teach Portuguese".

Pedro: So, you have to speak French correctly?

Raul: Yeah.

Luna: Hummm.

Raul: I mean, what is correct?

(**Students** laugh)

(Indistinct conversation)

Raul: I feel very upset, because the French area, I'm very connected to the French area, and they say all the time "You have to pronounce it perfectly, because the French people won't accept if you don't speak perfect, if you don't differentiate minimal pairs". I was talking to Emilia "Do they really-", because it seems that the French area here at Faculdade de Letras care more about it than the French people. I've never been to France, but are they really like that?

Pedro: I don't know, but, in the case of Portuguese, why do we think that 'pra mim fazer' is incorrect and 'pra eu fazer' is correct?

Luna: Preconceito linguístico.

Pedro: I don't know, but why?

Magali: É a questão do sujeito, do mim ser um pronome e não ser um sujeito. Foram me corrigir e faLarissam "Mim é pronome e pronome não faz nada, quem faz é sujeito, então, 'pra eu fazer'". Mas eu acho que é mais- sometimes it's more like the sound, it's not very nice 'pra mim fazer' 'pra eu fazer', sometimes it's just like this.

Pedro: What about 'nóis'? 'Nóis faz'.

Magali: Excuse me.

Raul: I say it. I-

Pedro: So, there is this Standard abstract language above us, right here in our, not in our-

Luna: Eu amo ela.

Raul: Sometimes they speak on purpose, because- I come from a countryside, and all my family speak like that, I don't wanna be different just because I'm in college. I wanna sound like the place where I come from.

Pedro: And how do these words get to be formal or correct? It's a question.

Student: Can you repeat, please?

Pedro: How do these grammar patterns get to be considered correct?

Raul: It's funny because many rules come from Portugal Portuguese and we kind of speak different in real Brazilian Portuguese.

Pedro: Do you remember what she said what's behind dictionaries?

Students: Yes.

Pedro: What is it?

Students: People.

Luna: People's hands. Human hands.

Magali: I think it's ideology. We have this (?) to us, as she said, "We don't know what it means, look up in the dictionary, it's there". So, I think someone at some point established the rules for understand them. For example, here, we are doing academy, we need to know how to talk to each other. I think when you write a paper you give someone to read, because you don't want to send to a review and "Oh, no, we can't publish this". Do you send to another friend to review your mistakes?

Pedro: No.

Magali: You send directly?

Pedro: Actually, I don't write much. (laugh)

Magali: For example, I remember that Rosane said that when she writes something, she gives to a friend to-

Pedro: Yeah, I do correct it, I'm not saying that I don't. I correct it.

Magali: But only you?

Pedro: Yes, sometimes I send to a friend. Sometimes the paper is coauthored, so it's not another extra friend. It's the other author. Sometimes the paper has two authors, yes?

Magali: Yes.

Pedro: And sometimes I correct it and the coauthor corrects it, but we correct it. I'm not saying we don't.

Magali: It's because we know that we have to follow the rules to get some results that we want. For example, your project to master, it was- (?) you need to pass, so if someone "No, it's not a good Portuguese here, he doesn't know how to write this", you'll be out.

Pedro: How do we say 'banca' in English? Examining board, that's it. What if you were in the examining board of, for example, masters or doctorate, what would you look for?

Rosa: A good idea?

Raul: Development.
Pedro: Do you think you would not accept a person because of language?
Magali: Yes.
Raul: Some people would.
Pedro: Some people would, some people wouldn't.
Magali: But here-
Pedro: We cannot really control it.
Magali: You cannot control, but if a person has a lot of problems to write correctly all the way that academic do. They won't be able to fix this in the short time. For example, it's two years master?
Pedro: Uhum.
Magali: So, I think they look for this kind of problems, because the examining board, there will be another two, for the qualification and the defense, so they can't pass away some people that has serious problems, because it will be a problem for the program (?), because the teachers here say "No, he doesn't know how to write, I can't pass this". It need to be understanding in the write.
Pedro: I have to stop the lesson now, because time is up, but I want you to go home thinking about these questions: What's behind dictionaries and grammar books? How do we treat them? Why do we treat them as if they were all above us, as if they were unauthored, as if they were neutral or not ideological? And you remember that you have to read a text for next class?

APPENDIX D – Eighth entry in the field diary

Eighth Diary – Class 9 – 26/09 (Tuesday)

Today's class was awesome! I loved it! Students were much more engaged, and I think it was because of the type of activities developed. First, I talked to students about their weekend. Then, I played hangman with the words: ESL and movies. We discussed how they were related and I elicited what they knew from Precious, the movie, since the text they were going to read after was related to the movie. After, they read two excerpts from a discussion about the movie. In the first excerpt, the teacher was more focused on correcting students, while in the second excerpt the focus was more on the meaning construction students developed. After, I planned some questions for discussion. These questions were kind of biased because I was already giving my interpretation to them (that when teachers focus on form, students become less competent in meaning production, since Standard language silences students). After, we reflected on the format I used to work with the reading exercise. We talked about pre-, while- and post-reading strategies and purposes. Then, I put them in pairs to plan a short lesson based on the excerpt of a text we read last class. In the end, we scheduled the groups for the short classes. We didn't have time to do the last activity I had planned: create some criteria for evaluation of the short classes.

Students were engaged to reflect the colonial aspect of linguistic correction and how it can silence students who are from minority groups and do not speak the Standard language. I think the class was also good because we tried to part from a real text, not a theoretical text, and students could see more how the discussions we've been having could influence our practices in class. This was a very nice exercise.

APPENDIX E – Reflective session with the professor 5

Graça: O que você achou da aula hoje?
Pedro: Uai, teve partes que eu gostei, teve partes que eu não gostei.
Graça: O que você não gostou?
Pedro: Tinha uma hora que eles estavam muito calados, sabe? Mas assim, no geral foi boa, acho que foi melhor que a aula passada, por exemplo.
Graça: É?
Pedro: É. Eu não quis fazer Hot Potato como eu falei que ia fazer, porque eu acho que fica- talvez é um tema muito sério pra discutir de forma muito-
Graça: Na brincadeira.
Pedro: Na brincadeira, é. Ainda tentei fazer um pouco mais dinâmico, mas sem ser muito- muita palhaçada, sabe?
Graça: Por que você decidiu não seguir todos os números? Porque eu queria muito ver a Emily falando.
Pedro: Hum, entendi. Eu não tinha muitas perguntas também. Eu tinha acho que oito perguntas e dez números, aí já tava meio corrido o tempo
Graça: O tempo.
Pedro: Aí eu preferi mudar de atividade também.
Graça: Tá.
Pedro: É. Na verdade, eu acho que até que eu deveria ter colocado um gravador no grupo da Emily.
Graça: Eu achei que você não deu muita moral pro grupo da Emily.
Pedro: Foi.
Graça: Até pelo fato dos gravadores estar nos dois grupos.
Pedro: É.
Graça: E pelo fato de você não ir pessoalmente no grupo. Você ficou indo nos dois grupos que estavam os gravadores.
Pedro: É eu fui menos no grupo da Emily mesmo. Isso é ruim, né?
Graça: E a Nina hoje participou, né?
Pedro: Participou. Ela estava bem engajada. Por isso que eu deveria ter colocado lá, porque ela estava falando bastante.
Graça: É.
Pedro: Mas-
Graça: Qual que é seu objetivo, o que você vai fazer com essas gravações?
Pedro: Vou transcrever e analisar. Por quê?
Graça: Não, você pode me falar o objetivo?
Pedro: Como assim?
Graça: Qual é o objetivo? Você vai analisar por quê? Pra quê? O que você quer olhar?
Pedro: Ah, você fala da pesquisa.
Graça: É.
Pedro: Ah, tá. Então, eu quero ver como eles problematizam a língua, o que eles falam sobre língua, o que eles acham que é, quais são as opiniões que eles têm. Ou as opiniões que são construídas através da problematização.
Graça: Essas são as suas perguntas de pesquisa?

Pedro: Sim. Mas assim, hoje eu fiquei meio chocado porque a gente tentou discutir o semestre inteiro, eu não sei se ficou muito claro isso, sabe? Ou se- também eles não precisam concordar com o que eu falo nem com o que os textos falam, né? Mas, a gente tem tentado discutir, problematizar língua, o que que é língua, língua como pertencente a uma nação, língua como um sistema separado e definido de códigos e tudo mais. Assim, indo contra essas ideias, né? Aí hoje eles faLarissam bastante essas ideias que a gente estava indo contra nas aulas anteriores, sabe?

Graça: Eu estava pensando, Pedro, se a gente não podia seguir um pouco o PPP, porque hoje você sugou muito deles.

Pedro: Foi.

Graça: Você jogava a ideia e você imediatamente falava "why?" imediatamente você perguntava "por quê?". Então eles tinham que falar o que eles pensavam e tinham que dar um motivo porque eles pensavam aquilo. Eu estava pensando assim, se você não faz uma presentation rapidinha com a teoria, e depois vinha com a production. Perguntar "por quê?", sabe? Alguma coisa assim. Não sei se é seu objetivo. Por isso que eu tô perguntando o porquê, qual o objetivo, entendeu? Porque eu no final da aula estava cansada.

Pedro: Eu também.

Graça: Eu vi que você estava. Imagina eles.

Pedro: Ah, demais. Eles também estavam bem cansados, eu achei. Ficou muito, a gente fez muito trabalho no grupo todo e ficou só pergunta, pergunta, pergunta, quase que uma entrevista.

Graça: Entendeu? Uma apresentaçãozinha rápida do texto. Anzaldúa diz isso, isso e isso, vocês lembram assim? Faz um eliciting rápido, vai apresentando e aí passa pras outras atividades. E, eu acho que funciona melhor em grupo, o que você achou? Eles falam mais em grupo.

Pedro: Eles falam mais em grupo, é. Pra sala toda eles não falam não.

Graça: Agora, você vê pra você se é melhor pra você transcrever em grupo, porque dá mais trabalho.

Pedro: Mas se bem que agora já tá acabando, é só mais essa aula, tem mais duas aulas, né?

Graça: É? Só isso?

Pedro: Só. Assim, que eu vou dar aula. Aí depois são as short classes e a feedback session. Então, eu não vou transcrever tanta interação em grupo assim. Porque as aulas anteriores já foram e eu não gravei.

Graça: Já? Nossa, passou rápido, hein?

Pedro: Foram sete aulas, né? Sete ou oito, eu acho. Teve muitas falhas assim no meio, muita aula desmarcada.

Graça: Muita.

Pedro: Meu Deus, umas três ou quatro, eu acho.

Graça: Passou muito rápido, né?

Pedro: Passou. Foi, mas-

Graça: Então você vai dar mais duas aulas teóricas e o resto é teaching.

Pedro: Isso. Eles que vão dar.

Graça: São quantas aulas de teaching?

Pedro: Quatro aulas eu acho.

Graça: Tá.

Pedro: Quatro aulas, é verdade.

Graça: Eles vão ter que escolher um vídeo qualquer? Eles que escolhem?

Pedro: Isso, eles que escolhem o material. Na aula que vem eu vou falar sobre o que é pra eles fazerem nas short classes. Eu vou dar as instruções, vou falar que eles têm que escolher qualquer material que problematize língua, qualquer material. Pode ser um texto, um vídeo, fotos, uma música, sei lá, qualquer coisa. E aí eu vou dar a instrução de pre, while, post.

Graça: Quer dizer que hoje no final da aula você tava cansado?

Pedro: Tava. Bem cansado.

Graça: O que você achou? Por que você achou que tava cansado?

Pedro: Além da gripe que me deixou abalado, acho que foi a discussão mesmo, já tava maçante assim, sabe?

Graça: Muita informação, né?

Pedro: Muita informação. Mas assim, no último momento da aula eles começaram a falar muita coisa que a gente já tinha discutido e já tinha- não ido contra, mas já tinha problematizado essas ideias, sabe, mais pro fim da aula. E eu achei isso interessante.

Graça: Segurar a peteca é difícil, né?

Pedro: É difícil. Bem difícil.

Graça: Que é o problematizar e manter o tempo inteiro- o pico o tempo inteiro.

Pedro: Mas sabe o que que eu fico pensando? Durante o semestre eu não interferi muito nas-

Graça: Não, você ficou na sua.

Pedro: Eu fiquei muito na minha, né? Será que eles teriam falado aquelas coisas hoje (?).

Graça: Hoje você interferiu um pouquinho.

Pedro: Um pouquinho mais.

Graça: Você percebeu?

Pedro: Aham, foi.

Graça: Cê deu sua opinião um pouquinho.

Pedro: Foi.

Graça: Que horas que foi mesmo?

Pedro: Foi na hora que ela tava falando lá de variedade, não sei mais o que lá, eu falei se português era variedade do latim.

Graça: É.

Pedro: E não uma língua diferente. Foi esse momento. Mas igual, o que eu tava falando, não sei se eles faLarissam essas coisas hoje porque eu não problematizei, não confrontei direto durante o semestre, entendeu? Eu só fui trazendo material e texto, material e texto e perguntava "o que você acha?", entendeu? Não sei talvez as pessoas só mudam de opinião quando a gente confronta elas assim diretamente.

Graça: Não sei. Eu fico esperando participação sua. Eu fico na expectativa, o Pedro vai falar alguma coisa. Ah, agora o Pedro vai falar alguma, e o Pedro não fala. Mas o seu treinamento é esse, né?

Pedro: Não, assim, é o jeito que dou aula mesmo, sabe? Não sei se é só por causa da pesquisa mesmo.

Graça: Ah tá, eu achei que a Rosane tinha te treinado assim.

Pedro: Não, não foi não. Ela interfere demais, entendeu, enquanto professora. Eu não sou tanto assim.

Graça: Achei que ela tinha te orientado pra fazer desse jeito.

Pedro: Não, não foi não.

Graça: Ah, então o Pedro é assim?

Pedro: É.

Graça: Não, Pedro, interfere.

Pedro: Você quer que interfere mais?

Graça: Eu quero. Tô pedindo pra você já dar aula pra explicar as coisas, uma miniaula, sei lá, alguma coisa. Você já não tava cansado hoje no fim da aula?

Pedro: Tava, mas porque você quer voltar nesse assunto que eu tava cansado?

Graça: Porque eu tava. A turma acho que tava também.

Pedro: Acho que foi uma questão de dinâmica de atividades, sabe? No início eles estavam até engajadinhos.

Graça: Não, até no final eles ficaram. Eles são bem comprometidos.

Pedro: Não, eu imagino se fosse eu nessa posição, porque eu já tava dando a louca. Porque eu sou mais espevitado também.

Graça: É, eu lembro de você no inglês 7. Lembro da sua turma.

Pedro: Terrível, né, Graça?

Graça: Só pra você pensar, a gente tá no final da reta já, né?

Pedro: Sim, mas cê tem alguma coisa pra falar em relação a isso assim?

Graça: Não, só isso. Que eu me senti cansada, aí cê confirmou. Falei, então é mesma, percepção é boa.

Pedro: Não, mas eu acho que foi porque eu delonguei demais a discussão deles em grupos, dos trechos também.

Graça: Mas foi bom porque você gravou?

Pedro: Foi.

Graça: E eles faLarissam bastante.

Pedro: Sim.

Graça: Tá bom.

Pedro: Eu não sei se eu tenho mais alguma coisa pra falar. Deixa eu pensar. Não, acho que não, acho que é isso mesmo. Um pouco mais sobre a teoria, assim ao mesmo que eu acredito, ao mesmo tempo eu duvido.

Graça: Eu sei, a gente é assim. Eu também. Aquela hora que você tava falando lá sobre variedades, na Sociolinguística tem a ideia de socioleto, idioleto. Então, aí eu fico pensando assim, bom que que ele tá falando de repertoire, e na realidade ela tá falando de idioleto não fala assim cinco línguas, o que ela fala é idioleto ou socioleto. Então, assim, o que um teoria tá falando, o que a outra teoria tá falando. Em Socioliguística eles diriam que ela tá falando idioletos.

Pedro: E não línguas especificamente. Já ela fala que tá falando língua.

Graça: Aí o que é conceito de língua pra um e que é conceito de língua pra outro?

Pedro: Parece que entra em confronto, né? Mas eu acho que, assim, a gente estuda desde o inicio da faculdade com essas noções mais tradicionais, né? Então quando a gente topa com outras é um pouco mais complicado mudar o pensamento.

Graça: Você desconstruir-

Pedro: E se descontrói muita coisa, não é que muita coisa cai por terra e fica inutilizado, mas assim, muita crença que a gente tem quanto a ensino de línguas- porque igual se eu falo que língua não é separada, que a gente não pode separar uma língua da outra, uai, o que que a gente tá fazendo aqui ensinando inglês então? O que a gente tem que ensinar então? Linguistic Awareness? Entendeu? Mas assim, a gente construiu, pensando enquanto ciência, metodologia, materiais, um milhão de coisas, tudo com essa noção de língua como separado, né? Então parece que quando a gente muda a noção, e aí como não tem nada pra embasar e nada tipo assim, sei lá, eu não consigo ver como isso iria acontecer na prática, sabe?

Graça: Eu também não, Pedro. Hoje hora que cê falou eu meu Deus, como que eu vejo isso: separado, não separado? Como é que eu vou pra sala de aula e vejo assim? Parece que a gente precisa ver não separado pra ser didático.

Pedro: A gente precisa ver separado.

Graça: É.

Pedro: É que cê falou a gente precisa não ver separado.

Graça: É.

Pedro: Não, qual que cê falou?

Graça: Não, a gente precisa não- ver- não separado pra ser didático. Não separado, não, separado, separado pra ser didático. Cada um na sua caixinha.

Pedro: Sim, então eu também tô falando que eu tô em confronto com isso, entendeu? Nossa, eu acho que eu escolhi um tema de pesquisa que eu entro em confronto demais e isso tá me abalando muito. Ai, tem dias que eu tô com um ódio tão grande desse trem.

Graça: Mas esse é o problema pra gente discutir, Pedro. Pra problematiza esse- é isso aí.

Pedro: Claro, eu também tenho que tentar ser positivo porque eu também sou bem negativo enquanto pessoa. Mas assim-

Graça: Mas cê tá me fazendo pensar bastante. Pode registrar aí.

Pedro: Então cê tem que escrever uma narrativa também, Graça.

Graça: (risada)

Pedro: Tá, mas e aí? Aí a gente vai pra onde depois disso, entendeu?

Graça: Pois é. Pois é.

Pedro: Qual é o próximo passo, sabe? E eu acho que é ainda mais difícil de aceitar essas ideias porque já tá tudo tão construído, né? Por isso que às vezes eles não, não é que eles não concordam, mas talvez eles não acreditam nisso, sabe?

Graça: Hoje quando você foi discutir o dentista e o professor, por isso que eles não tavam dando conta muito disso, de separar, que um era metáfora e o outro tava sendo literal.

Pedro: Que que cê quer dizer com isso?

Graça: Eles não tavam conseguindo separar língua de tongue, porque o professor, o dentista tava falando de língua e a professora tava falando de tongue. E eles não conseguiam ver isso. A Maria Clara não tava vendo a diferença disso. Não, é a-

Pedro: Anita?

Graça: É, a Anita que não tava vendo, ela não via que uma era metáfora e o outro não.

Pedro: E o outro não era, né? Sim. Ela achou que os dois eram reais. Separados. Mas aí vai da interpretação também, né? Cada um tem uma interpretação diferente do texto.

Graça: É. Mas foi massa a discussão de hoje, foi cansativa, mas foi muito boa.

Pedro: Rendeu material pra analisar.

Graça: (risada)

Pedro: Não sei se eles estão gostando das aulas, eu acho que sim.

Graça: Tão, se não eles não discutiriam assim não, discutiam rapidinho e pronto, eles vão a fundo.

Pedro: Verdade.

Graça: E eles tão lendo o texto e faLarissam que gostaram do texto.

Pedro: Tão lendo, tão fazendo atividade.

Graça: O texto é massa.

Pedro: Ele é bom, eu gosto desse texto. Ele é melhor que os outros teóricos, assim pelo menos eu achei, né?

Graça: Pra próxima aula tem texto também?

Pedro: Não, acabou. Não tem texto mais.

Graça: Então que que cê vai fazer agora?

Pedro: Então, na próxima aula a gente vai discutir como vão ser as microaulas e o que eles têm que trazer pras microaulas, e na outra aula a gente vai discutir sobre colonialidade e livro didático.

Graça: Não, mas na próxima aula você não vai dar nada? Só vai explicar o que eles vão fazer?

Pedro: Então. Eu vou pedir pra eles fazerem uma atividade na hora pra preparar, tipo assim como é que eles deveriam fazer e tudo mais. Eu ainda não preparei a próxima aula, eu tô pensando no que fazer ainda. Talvez no início eu volte na discussão de hoje ou talvez não também. Depende do material que eu tiver lá, mas eu vou preparar alguma coisa pra eles saberem certinho o que tem que fazer nas micro aulas e tudo mais. Porque tem que dar tempo pra essas coisas, entendeu? Não adianta ficar fazendo corrido na hora do intervalo porque tem a [outra professora] que cobra o horário certinho, aí eu tenho também que terminar no horário. Aí assim, a gente vai discutir o que que é pra fazer nas micro aulas, eu vou trabalhar um pouco sobre- eles devem saber bastante sobre pre, while e post, mas talvez só relembrar alguma coisa de teoria, alguma coisa assim, pedir pra eles criarem uma atividade na hora e depois apresentar só pra praticar a criação desse ciclo, né? E discutir sobre o critério de avaliação das micro aulas, o que que eles acham que a gente deve analisar pra avaliá-los e discutir quem vai ficar com tal dia. Já vou fazer o cronograma e deixar tudo certinho.

Graça: Tá bom. Tá bom então. Esse pre, while e post é bom porque já adianta meu serviço, porque eu já ia fazer isso.

Pedro: Ah é? Sim. Aí eu vou trabalhar, eu acho que eles já devem saber, já deve ter pegado alguma coisa no centro de línguas.

Graça: Então de teoria já acabou, né, Pedro?

Pedro: Na aula que vem a gente vai discutir colonialidades só, mas de teoria dessa parte sim. Por quê? Você queria mais alguma coisa?

Graça: Uai, eu tô gostando, né? Tô achando massa.

Pedro: Talvez na última aula. Não sei. Tenho que pensar um pouquinho ainda. Eu gasto muito tempo pensando, sabe?

Graça: Eu sei. Tadinho.

APPENDIX F – Final reflective session

Pedro: We can start with activities.
Rita: No, let's start with evaluation.
Pedro: Okay, let's start with evaluation.
Rita: I really liked when you asked us to do the first narrative and the final narrative, because I think you can get many information for your project (laugh), but I think also us as students, we can reflect how was I before having these classes and how I am now. I really liked it. Did you understand this?
Students: Yes.
Pedro: Yes. Any comment on evaluation?
Larissa: I said to them that I like the way you divided the grades, because we did many things. So, it is better for you, as you said, but for us too. I felt we did many things, three texts, first narrative, final narrative and short classes.
Rita: But I also discussed with Sérgio about this part. I think this class should be given in fifth semester, because we are exhausted as much as we reflect and problematize. And we are in a complicated situation, you want to die (laugh). "I'm going to the English class. I'll be so depressed there because we going to discuss so many things". And I think it could be better in previous- my feelings.
Pedro: Okay. Good feedback.
Rita: Do you agree?
Larissa: I said this in the final narrative that sometimes the topic- we got so bored about it, you know? What is language? I was like "Oh."..
(Students laugh)
Pedro: No, but this is different. Getting bored is different from getting depressed.
Raul: Yes.
Rita: I think my feeling is to be, like, almost at the end of the rock bottom.
Luna: But I think it's because our first subject, our first thing in Letras was "Gente, o que é língua?"
Student: Yes.
Larissa: I said this in the narrative as well. Since I got to study in Letras, this question has been asked several times.
Luna: It was the first question.
(indistinct conversation)
Pedro: And then comes Pedro at the last semester and asks "What is language?"
Rita: But I don't think it was boring. I think-
Larissa: No, I didn't say it was boring all the time, I said sometimes.
(Students laugh)
[…]
Pedro: Anything else about evaluation?

Pedro: Okay.
Student: That's true.

Raul: That's true.

Pedro: Yeah. You have to focus, you have to think about the steps.

Luna: We are so teachers.

Pedro: Yeah. [Anything else?]

Rosa: [I love judging] people.

(Students laugh)

Pedro: Yeah, but this was not the purpose of the activity, right? It was to (?).

Rosa: I was fair with all of you.

Larissa: Me too.

Sérgio: Me too.

Luna: Me three.

Pedro: That's what I expected. Maturity.

Rita: I wasn't. I confess I wasn't.

Raul: Why?

Rita: Fair.

Raul: Why?

Rita: Because I feel pitty for some people. Then I was "Ahh!" (makes a gesture. Students laugh).

(Indistinct conversation)

Pedro: So, you say that you felt pitty and?

Rita: No, it's like "Oh, my God. Poor of this person. He or she didn't have Centro de Línguas course to be a teacher, to develop, to know how to plan a lesson". These people didn't have this. So, why am I supposed to judge this person or to give a grade if this person didn't have the same input to classroom, to plan that I had-

Luna: When Rita says that I think about our English 7 that we had some students from Contábeis and Relações Internacionais. It's very different when you have a Letras student delivering a lesson and other students.

Rosa: Yeah, they suffered a lot.

Rita: Estágio is good, in theory, but when you have the practice, you improve a lot. So, I think in Estágio you don't have time to put all the theory in practice.

Larissa: It's like, you just deliver a lesson in the last period of (?). It looks like a joke. If I didn't have PIBID, if I didn't have monitoria in CEPAE, I wouldn't be the teacher I am today. If I depended only on Estágio, it would be really tragic.

[…]

Pedro: About attitudes? É agora que é a hora!

Larissa: No. This is the best part.

Rita: Yes.

Pedro: You think?

Larissa: Yes.

[…]

Rita: I think you were great. You were patient with us. You are polite.

Raul: Most of the time.

Pedro: Yeah, most of the time.

Larissa: But it's impossible to be patient all the time, specially with lazy students like us. […]

Pedro: So, let's talk about it.

Rita: Yes, I think you were great.

Larissa: I felt comfortable to speak everything I wanted to say, because I knew you were not judging me. I felt my participation was important.

Pedro: Yeah? How did you feel when you had to speak? Everybody says yes or no!

Raul: Yes or no?

(Students laugh)

Pedro: No! Did you feel comfortable when you had to speak?

Students: Yes.

Pedro: Starting with ---.

Pedro: Why?

Pedro: Okay. Next.

Raul: Well, I felt comfortable. I felt my participation was important, like Larissa said.

Anita: I felt comfortable to say my opinion, to talk, but sometimes it was like "Oh, my god! It's being recorded".

Raul: I was okay with that.

Sérgio: I sometimes forgot (?).

(Indistinct conversation)

[…]

Pedro: Luna.

Luna: Sometimes I had a feeling that I had to reflect about what I was about to say. It was like "Is this really my opinion? So, okay, now I'm going to say it". Sometimes everybody talked about something, giving their opinion, and I was like "I was about to say this, but (?) so let's change something before saying it, because it's being recorded". So, I was really careful about- and I really say what I think it is. Sometimes, I was more comfortable than uncomfortable, but I caught myself reflecting on what I was about to say.

Pedro: Okay.

Rosa: Yes. I don't know. I didn't have this filtro when talking and remembering that I'm being recorded. I talked what I (?), so I felt very comfortable.

Pedro: Yoshihara.

Yoshihara: Yeah, it was okay. Taking what Luna was saying, there was one day that Luna and Anita and I were discussing questions and we were changing papers. That day we were like "Let's pay attention to what we are saying because we are being recorded". Then, it changed to another group. But this day I had to pay attention to what I was saying, to not say (?), because I say a lot. Apart of that, it was okay, I didn't remember I was being recorded. […]

Pedro: Sérgio.

Sérgio: I felt comfortable. Most of the times, I forgot that I was being recorded. But everything I said (?), specially in the open group. In the small groups, I don't know. When I was in a small group, I had to say things like commonsense and I don't know if I was being sincere, because I remembered of the recorded and I had to say things that I didn't think. I don't know if I expressed myself clearly.

Rita: Yes, friend.

Pedro: But did you say something you disagree with?

Sérgio: I just didn't reflect much, and I said things that were cliché.

Pedro: Okay. Rita.

Rita: Yes, I felt very comfortable. Sometimes I was like "Oh, my God! I have to stop so I can let my colleagues talk as well". This is the problem.

Pedro: Thank you.

Larissa: Me again?

Pedro: You already answered it.

Larissa: No, I just want to say something. I speak a lot and I know I speak a lot and sometimes I felt like you said "Oh, I have to stop". I always want to participate and say something, but sometimes you have to stop and let your colleagues speak.

[…]

Pedro: Emily.

Emily: I didn't feel comfortable, but it's more related to my personality.

Pedro: Like how?

Emily: Because I'm shy and I have difficulties in expressing my opinion. I don't like disagreeing and arguing with people all the time. I don't like when we have to problematize too much. I like problematizing, but not too much. And I didn't feel comfortable, because you asked many questions all the time. It's more related to my personality, I think.

Pedro: Do you think we could've done something different to help you be more comfortable? In which context do you think you would be more comfortable to speak?

Emily: I feel more comfortable when we have few classmates. I felt comfortable when we had Carla Janaina's classes, because it was only Sérgio, Rita and Lenore.

Students: Six students.

Emily: Yeah. When we have many classmates, I don't feel comfortable.

Pedro: Okay. Anything else about my attitudes? No? Topics discussed!

Student: Good.

Luna: Great.

Rita: I really liked it.

Pedro: But?

Rita: But I'm trying to remember what I was about to say. (laugh).

Yoshihara: I liked the topics, but like some have said, "What is language?", I was like "Again?". (Students laugh). The point is I have this, but I don't know how it could have happened. (Students seem to agree). Like, to have a lead-in, a warmer, instead of "What is language?". I don't know how it could have been done differently. I was talking to Rosa, (?) seems like I didn't know, or at least I don't remember, like herderian triad or some of the texts that you showed or discussed parts of it, they were quite interesting. So, there were

things that were (?) revision, things that we had studied before, and others were quite new. There were things that I was "Hum, this is nice" and others were like "Ohh". I don't know what to suggest, so it's more like a comment.

Rita: It's like too repetitive.

Sérgio: I agree with what Yoshihara said, because I mentioned it in my narrative that I found some things a little bit repetitive, but at the same time we also learned many other topics, like herderian triad, and the theoretical texts helped a lot. So, many new concepts, although we were still discussing language.

Larissa: I said this in my final narrative, that the material was well chosen, and we learned a lot from them. It was really relevant and interesting, the texts, I liked all of them. Your lessons were well planned. We could see that you had a-

Pedro: Put an effort?

Larissa: Yeah, put an effort.

Pedro: Yeah, this is a thing. I wanted to discuss language with you, this is part of my master's project, right? But I knew Rosane had already discussed language with you.

Larissa: Somehow, yeah. It's yes, but not the same thing.

Pedro: But it's language, right? So, I was afraid it would get too repetitive and I agree with you.

Luna: But I think we had a different approach, you had a different approach to language than the ways that I saw. I didn't have classes with Rosane, but I had with Carla Janaina, and she didn't really (?) approach in this way. She focused more on Culture and Pragmatics.

Rita: Carla and Rosane also had to teach language stuff, like grammar, structure.

Sérgio: (?) were different. We didn't read bell hooks again.

Luna: Yes.

Anita: And we had to deliver a short class. We had to put this knowledge into practice. So, I think it's completely different. Although the topics are related to things that we studied before, I think it was completely different.

Luna: That's how we see like it was well planned, because you prepared us to do something. To me, it feels like pre, while, and post. It had a feeling, because you prepared, we delivered a class and now we are reflecting about what we did. So, it is, if you stop to think about it. […]

Pedro: So, now, we are going to talk about you. You are going to talk about yourselves. So, students. Which criteria do you think we should use?

Student: Participation.

Larissa: Respect.

Student: Classroom work, homework.

Anita: Responsibility.

Pedro: Okay, I have some criteria here. If you want to add, you can. Participation, attitudes, group interaction, and commitment. Would you like to add something else?

Student: I think it's enough. (Students laugh).

Pedro: I'll give you two minutes, just a brainstorm. Then, we discuss in the big group. (Sts discuss)

Pedro: So, participation in class.

Yoshihara: Good.
Rita: Great.
Student: Perfect.
(Students laugh)
Larissa: We discussed here is the opposite. I participated a lot, I want to speak. She doesn't really like to speak a lot.
(Indistinct conversation)
Luna: I felt like when everybody is quiet, I'm going to talk, but if there's a person talking too much, I'm like "Okay, let the person talk".
Pedro: Yeah?
Luna: Uhum.
[…]
Sérgio: I don't know if I talk a lot during class. Today I'm talking a lot, because I'm very sleepy. During the classes, I didn't talk much. I talk more in the small groups.
Larissa: Sérgio you are that student that fala pouco mas fala bonito. (students laugh).
Rita: Yes.
Raul: Say few, but say beautiful. (students laugh).
Pedro: Do you have anything else to talk about participation in class?
Luna: I think it was very nice, because everybody participated. Only the people that didn't really wanted to participate that didn't, but I think everybody had their moment to speak, we were very respectful. We knew how to speak and listen. That's very important.
Anita: I also think that your questions helped it, because sometimes we were supposed to speak and we had to speak. "That's your turn, that's your question. So, now, answer it". I think it's nice.
Luna: In the beginning we had, not a problem, but some unusual situations in which only one person talked. After, I saw that you started saying "Raul, Anita, Luna". Sometimes that made some people uncomfortable, but I think it was a good way to-
Pedro: Yes, it was necessary.
Larissa: One thing you did that I liked was (?) divide us in groups and ask us to give feedback or answer something, because the group has to answer the question, so everyone speaks. It's nice.
Luna: I think it has to do with group interaction now.
Anita: And we have to consider that participation is not just talking, it's listening and paying attention (?).
Rita: Doing the activities.
Anita: And we have to consider that we have different kinds of people here. People who are talkative and people who are-
Pedro: But do you think that everybody was respectful and patient?
Larissa: Not all the time and not with everybody. We had some problems with respect in the short classes.
Pedro: Hum?
Larissa: We talked to you, remember?
Pedro: We talked?

Larissa: Me and Yoshihara on that day.
Yoshihara: (?) respect, I was just going to say-
Larissa: Unpolite attitude.
Yoshihara: But I cannot say about the other classes, because I missed some short classes too.
Larissa: Huh?
Yoshihara: I missed some short classes as you, so I cannot say about that as a whole.
Larissa: Yeah, I can say about <u>that</u> episode.
Luna: But I think that's normal. When you have people together, you have problems.
[…]
Pedro: Attitudes?
Yoshihara: I think it was okay. I mean, in a nutshell, we didn't have something like a (?).
Pedro: Like a what?
Yoshihara: We didn't have any (?).
[…]
Pedro: Anything else?
Anita: I think that sometimes I arrived very tired and I came to class like "Oh, my God, class", but it's not related to the topic or to the classes.
Rita: Let's not get into that.
Anita: And I think that (?). I'm so sorry about it.
Pedro: It's okay. I felt the same too.
Rita: It's not related to you.
Anita: And sometimes it was exciting, because we arrived here like "Oh, my God", and then we had (?) "oh, okay, now I'm engaged in this discussion".
Raul: I told --- once that your class actually saved the semester.
Students: Yeah.
Rita: I agree with you.
Larissa: I agree too.
Anita: Although we had lots of things to do, it was (?).
Raul: The most interesting classes (?).
(Indistinct conversation)
Rita: I think it was because of the interaction. We interacted a lot.
Sérgio: Yeah.
Larissa: The interaction pattern in the other subjects is different.
Rita: Yes, it's just a speech. You just listen and-
Anita: Lecture.
[…]
Graça: This was a safe environment. Right, Pedro?
(T hands in marks and thanks students for their participation)

APPENDIX G – Final interview

Pedro: Quais foram as impressões gerais sobre o conteúdo?
Larissa: Eu gostei bastante, achei interessante os temas, que a gente já vem discutindo a algum tempo. Todo mundo até apontou isso na feedback session. Falei isso na minha final narrative também. Os temas são interessantes, mas alguns a gente fica meio cansado, porque a UFG tem uma formação filosófica muito interessante, de matérias que não são tão práticas, são mais para desenvolvimento intelectual. A gente já vinha falando disso há um tempo, mas a gente nunca tinha visto em aula de línguas. Inclusive salvou a N1, fica aí registrado.
Pedro: Mais alguma impressão sobre o conteúdo em si?
Larissa: Impressão fora gostei e não gostei, né? Vamos pensar em algo diferente. Ai, eu não consegui pensar em nada diferente quando eu gosto, é tipo "gostei".
Pedro: Alguma impressão sobre as atividades? Quais foram as tuas impressões gerais sobre elas?
Larissa: Eu gostei da forma como você dividiu as notas. A gente trabalhou com muita coisa e teve vários tipos de avaliação diferente. Foram os trabalhos escritos, foram as narrativas e os trabalhos que tinha que te mandar por email ou entregar, e as lessons e microteaching. Eu acho muito interessante, deveria ter mais em todos os Inglês [referindo-se às disciplinas de língua inglesa]. Acho que do 5 pra frente podia começar a rolar microteaching, porque o estágio não prepara a gente o suficiente, então ter essa experiência dentro de sala de aula é interessante para ter mais contato, também para sentar com os colegas, tá todo mundo no mesmo barco, não vai ficar tão- pode ser que fique, mas eu me sinto mais à vontade para receber o feedback dos colegas e professor. A gente tá todo mundo na área de Inglês, faz a aula e tals.
Pedro: Quais foram as tuas impressões gerais sobre a avaliação?
Larissa: Achei- Não gosto muito da avaliação do colega, o colega me avaliar porque eu não sei- eu acho interessante a ideia de todo mundo se avaliar, mas eu não sei se o colega tá fazendo uma avaliação justa ou pode estar levando para o lado pessoal, entendeu? Isso pode gerar medo, mas tô de boa.
Pedro: Como você se sentia nas aulas?
Larissa: Me senti bem, gostei bastante. Você interage de uma forma bem positiva. Como eu já falei, os temas são interessantes, me senti a vontade de falar o tempo todo, tive até de dar uma segurada. É isso.
Pedro: Como foi sua participação no curso?
Larissa: Acho que foi boa, diria. Bom, participação eu acho que o seguinte, primeiro estar presente, e saber ouvir, saber a hora de falar, saber ouvir o colega também. Por isso às vezes eu fico querendo falar menos porque eu falo muito já na vida. Então quando eu to na sala, porque eu dou aula também, quando eu to propondo uma discussão, eu quero que os alunos me deem retorno. Então, não fico apática em sala de aula, por motivos de também ser professora, e também porque eu gosto de falar e de participar. A participação não é só no falar, é entender que faz parte de um grupo, e ali não é só a sua opinião que conta, mas a de todos. Então, você saber ouvir seu colega, entender que tem coisas que você vai falar que não são relevantes. A aula é um contexto no qual você tem que se encaixar da melhor forma.
Pedro: Como foi a sua interação com o professor
Larissa: Top, very Top. Então, a minha interação com o professor, acho que foi positiva, gostei, você- interação dos professores, sua postura? Comigo? Ah, interessante, foi bom, eu gostei, como eu te falei, você delivery, como que fala? Você entendeu. O jeito que você dá

aula é bastante interativo, você mantém contato visual com todos, convida as pessoas a participarem, você é respeitoso na sua postura, você sabe ouvir. Os meninos reclamaram, sentiram falta, de você dar sua opinião, mas eu sentia que você não queria dar sua opinião, "gente, só falem o que tem de falar que vou dar minha opinião". Mas foi bom.

Pedro: E como foi sua interação com todos os alunos, com todos, e não só com o amiguinho?

Larissa: É que nem eu falei, eu sinto que às vezes, por eu falar demais, eu acabo não dando oportunidade para outros colegas falarem, porque eu sempre quero falar, dar opinião ou participar. Às vezes eu sinto que isso pode ser opressivo de alguma forma, o colega não querer falar porque o outro fala demais, não sei mais o que, e as vezes eu sinto que eu coloco minha opinião de forma agressiva. Não ser agressiva na hora de expor opinião, às vezes acontece, mas no geral foi boa, perfeito só Deus e eu.

Pedro: Com um cabelo desses?

Larissa: Você acha que não tenho meu nome tá no SERASA?

Pedro: Como se davam as relações de poder dentro da sala de aula? Em relação a todos os alunos, assim? Como que acontecia, como que as relações de poder aluno-aluno, professor-aluno.

Larissa: Rolou muito, porque a turma chegou a um ponto, estamos no oitavo período. Então, existe parte dos alunos são professores no centro de línguas, e uma parte dos alunos que não são. Isso influenciou muito a aula. Na hora de formar as duplas a gente forma com quem tem mais afinidade, não foi meu caso, mas você forma com a pessoa que tá ali mais próxima de alguma forma. Aí você vai dar sua aula, aí vem a dupla de 2 professores do centro de línguas, depois a de outros dois alunos que não são professores do centro de línguas. Fica claro, evidente, a forma como a aula é executada, a teaching posture, tudo. Isso fica evidente para todos, todo mundo vê. Eu senti que rolou, assim, não vou dizer atrito, porque não foi nada direto, mas de os colegas que não são do centro de línguas se sentirem inferiores por toda essa questão e não se sentirem tão à vontade e tal. Às vezes a gente, que é professor, também tem essa coisa de, sei lá, ter uma postura de ensinar diferente, então acho que isso foi uma coisa, assim, envolvida.

Pedro: Entendi. Ok. Na sua opinião, de que forma os participantes, tanto os alunos e professores, reproduziram discursos e práticas coloniais, de que forma que a gente reproduziu esses discursos e práticas e de que forma a gente resistiu a esses discursos e essas práticas?

Larissa: Eu acho que a gente resistiu na- você, nós todos, na escolha dos textos, foi uma forma de resistir, tanto pelos temas quanto pelos autores. Agora, reproduzir não sei. Ah, sim, sei. A gente fala muito, aqui na faculdade, "Standard English. We should value communication instead of form, language is for communication", aí o coleguinha chega lá na frente e fala "there is two bottles on the table", e todo mundo "ahahaha there is two bottles". Acho que isso é uma forma de reproduzir isso.

Pedro: Mas você acha que isso aconteceu

Larissa: Não diretamente, mas dentro da cabeça tá todo mundo rindo. E também não é só uma questão de, por exemplo, às vezes você não fala, mas expressa facialmente, na sua postura corporal, numa revirada de olho. Então, essas coisas ficam evidentes também em determinados contextos, eu acho.

Pedro: Mais algum comentário sobre isso? Como você se vê enquanto professora?

Larissa: Ai, eu sou humilde não. Eu me acho uma boa professora, porque eu gosto do que eu faço. Então, pra mim, quando eu to planejando ou dando uma aula, ainda não saí do campo do lazer. É a minha profissão, é o que eu faço pra viver, mas não é uma coisa que me causa sofrimento, "ai, tem que trabalhar". Às vezes dá, sair de casa e tal, mas eu gosto do que eu

faço, eu me considero uma boa professora não só por gostar, mas porque me dedico muito, me importo com o que os alunos pensam, faço feedback sessions, na N1, e N2 não dá tempo, mas eu faço feedback na N1 com os alunos, para eles falarem as impressões deles também. Eu me importo com o que eles pensam porque a aula não é pra me satisfazer, como professor. A gente que é professor, a gente é muito egocentrado. É a minha aula, o meu plano, eu tenho que executar o que eu quero fazer, mas a aula tem um propósito, o aprendizado. Se não tá saindo legal, tem um motivo e vamos entender, então eu sempre converso com os alunos. Eu me vejo como professora muito dedicada e muito boa.

Pedro: Okay! É isso.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A – Letter of acceptance from Ethics in Research Committee (Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa)

PARECER CONSUBSTANCIADO DO CEP

DADOS DO PROJETO DE PESQUISA

Título da Pesquisa: Perspectivas decoloniais no ensino de inglês: problematizando o conceito de língua e o lugar do ensino de inglês no Brasil

Pesquisador: PEDRO AUGUSTO DE LIMA BASTOS

Área Temática:

Versão: 2

CAAE: 69985517.2.0000.5083

Instituição Proponente: Faculdade de Letras

Patrocinador Principal: Financiamento Próprio

DADOS DO PARECER

Número do Parecer: 2.261.397

Apresentação do Projeto:

Este é um estudo de caso qualitativo (MERRIAM, 2002) que tem por objetivo principal problematizar, em uma perspectiva decolonial, conceitos de língua/linguagem e o ensino de inglês com professores/as em formação universitária. Meu interesse em investigar a problematização sobre concepções de língua e ensino de inglês com professores em formação se deve ao fato de que teorizações recentes têm advogado por um paradigma translíngue para o ensino de línguas estrangeiras (CANAGARAJAH, 2013), considerando língua como um recurso móvel, não pertencente a uma nação e emergente da interação (BLOMMAERT; BACKUS,2012; MAKONI; PENNYCOOK, 2007). Além disso, Kumaravadivelu (2012; 2016) argumenta pela necessidade deuma quebra epistêmica com modelos tradicionais de educação linguística ao visar uma opção decolonial no ensino de inglês, desestabilizando o lugar do falante nativo como objetivo a ser atingido.

Objetivo da Pesquisa:

Objetivo Primário:

Esta pesquisa busca problematizar, em uma perspectiva decolonial, conceitos de língua/linguagem e o ensino de inglês com professores/as em formação universitária.

Objetivos Secundários:

Endereço: Prédio da Reitoria Térreo Cx. Postal 131
Bairro: Campus Samambaia   **CEP:** 74.001-970
UF: GO   **Município:** GOIANIA
Telefone: (62)3521-1215   **Fax:** (62)3521-1163   **E-mail:** cep.prpi.ufg@gmail.com

Página 01 de 04

UFG - UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS

PlataForma Brasil

Continuação do Parecer: 2.261.397

a) Discutir como professores/as em formação universitária problematizam concepções sobre língua/linguagem e o ensino de inglês;

b) Discutir como as subjetividades dos/as participantes são construídas por meio de suas experiências relacionadas à língua;

c) Vislumbrar como a problematização, em uma perspectiva decolonial, sobre concepções de língua/linguagem e o ensino de inglês se materializa nas microaulas produzidas pelos/as participantes no final do bimestre.

Avaliação dos Riscos e Benefícios:

O pesquisador aponta o risco de os participantes se sentirem constrangidos ao narrarem sua história. Para isso, assegura que seus nomes não serão divulgados na dissertação que será elaborada como resultado final da pesquisa. Os benefícios estão relacionados como um novo modo de percepção do que vem a ser uma língua estrangeira, com um ensino que não se prenda apenas com a versão da linguagem de um lugar apenas, ainda que seja a origem. Certamente essa compreensão de língua/linguagem trará avanços no ensino de outras culturas, cada vez mais distanciando-se de modelos coloniais.

Comentários e Considerações sobre a Pesquisa:

A pesquisa tem um propósito de contribuir com a atualização do ensino de língua estrangeira, numa superação do modelo tradicional de reprodução de uma vertente da língua desconhecida. Ela vai na linha de considerar todas as manifestações linguísticas importantes para compreensão e aprendizagem de outras culturas. O questionário semi-estruturado será aplicado a 18 professores em formação em 1 professor regente.

Considerações sobre os Termos de apresentação obrigatória:

O pesquisador apresentou toda a documentação necessária ao protocolo de pesquisa: Folha de Rosto,Informações Gerais, Termo de Compromisso assinado pelo pesquisador e orientador responsável, Termo de Anuência assinado pelo diretor da Faculdade de Letras da UFG, onde os dados serão coletados, TCLE para o professor regente e para os professores em formação.

Conclusões ou Pendências e Lista de Inadequações:

Após o atendimento às solicitações que foram feitas, tendo sido assegurado por parte dos participantes a autorização ou não dos seus relatos, bem como a readequação do cronograma, com a coleta de dados prevista para ter início em 19 de setembro próximo, concluo pela aprovação do projeto.

UFG - UNIVERSIDADE
FEDERAL DE GOIÁS

Continuação do Parecer: 2.261.397

Considerações Finais a critério do CEP:

Informamos que o Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa/CEP-UFG considera o presente protocolo APROVADO, o mesmo foi considerado em acordo com os princípios éticos vigentes. Reiteramos a importância deste Parecer Consubstanciado, e lembramos que o(a) pesquisador(a) responsável deverá encaminhar ao CEP-UFG o Relatório Final baseado na conclusão do estudo e na incidência de publicações decorrentes deste, de acordo com o disposto na Resolução CNS n. 466/12. O prazo para entrega do Relatório é de até 30 dias após o encerramento da pesquisa, prevista para fevereiro de 2019.

Este parecer foi elaborado baseado nos documentos abaixo relacionados:

Tipo Documento	Arquivo	Postagem	Autor	Situação
Informações Básicas do Projeto	PB_INFORMAÇÕES_BÁSICAS_DO_P ROJETO_946113.pdf	18/08/2017 13:40:16		Aceito
Cronograma	Cronograma.docx	18/08/2017 13:39:37	PEDRO AUGUSTO DE LIMA BASTOS	Aceito
Outros	Carta_de_Encaminhamento.docx	18/08/2017 13:39:07	PEDRO AUGUSTO DE LIMA BASTOS	Aceito
TCLE / Termos de Assentimento / Justificativa de Ausência	TCLE_Professora_regente.doc	18/08/2017 13:35:49	PEDRO AUGUSTO DE LIMA BASTOS	Aceito
TCLE / Termos de Assentimento / Justificativa de Ausência	TCLE_Professores_em_formacao.doc	18/08/2017 13:35:31	PEDRO AUGUSTO DE LIMA BASTOS	Aceito
Projeto Detalhado / Brochura Investigador	Projeto_detalhado.docx	19/06/2017 18:22:04	PEDRO AUGUSTO DE LIMA BASTOS	Aceito
Folha de Rosto	Folha_de_rosto.pdf	19/06/2017 18:08:26	PEDRO AUGUSTO DE LIMA BASTOS	Aceito

Situação do Parecer:
Aprovado

Necessita Apreciação da CONEP:
Não

UFG - UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE GOIÁS

Plataforma Brasil

Continuação do Parecer: 2.261.397

GOIANIA, 06 de Setembro de 2017

_____

Assinado por:
João Batista de Souza
(Coordenador)

ANNEX B – Initial questionnaire

Universidade Federal de Goiás – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras e Linguística
Pedro Augusto de Lima Bastos

QUESTIONÁRIO INICIAL

1. Nome: ██████████
2. Idade: 33
3. Pseudônimo: Magali
4. Raça/Etnia: Branca
5. Setor em que você mora: Jardim Guanabara

6. Grau de instrução:
Do pai:
- ○ Até 3ª série do fundamental
- ○ Até 4ª série do fundamental
- ● Fundamental completo
- ○ Médio incompleto
- ○ Médio completo
- ○ Superior completo. Qual curso? _____
- ○ Pós-graduação. Qual área? _____

Da mãe:
- ○ Até 3ª série do fundamental
- ○ Até 4ª série do fundamental
- ○ Fundamental completo
- ○ Médio incompleto
- ● Médio completo
- ○ Superior completo. Qual curso? _____
- ○ Pós-graduação. Qual área? _____

7. Profissão do pai: Músico do Exército
8. Profissão da mãe: Secretária em Creche
9. Renda da família:
- ○ Até 2 salários mínimos   Até R$ 1.874,00
- ○ De 2 a 4 salários mínimos   De R$ 1.874,00 até 3.748,00
- ○ De 4 a 10 salários mínimos   De R$ 3.478,00 até 9.370,00
- ● De 10 a 20 salários mínimos   De R$ 9.370,00 até 18.740,00
- ○ Mais de 20 salários mínimos   R$ 18.740,00 ou mais

10. Posse de itens

Posse de itens	0	1	2	3	4 ou +
	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Televisão em cores	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rádio	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Banheiro	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Automóvel	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Empregada mensalista	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Máquina de lavar	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Videocassete e/ou DVD	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Geladeira					
Freezer (aparelho independente ou parte da geladeira duplex)					

11. Qual meio de transporte você mais usa para estudar?
- ○ A pé/carona/bicicleta

○ Transporte escolar
○ Ônibus
● Carro/moto

12. O que você costuma fazer no tempo livre?
● Ler/estudar
○ Ver TV
○ Ajudar os pais nas coisas de casa
○ Praticar esportes
○ Outras: _cuidar da minha filha_

13. Você usa muito a internet?
● Sim
○ Não

14. Para que você a internet mais frequentemente?
● Pesquisas da escola
○ Jogos
● Ler notícias/blogs
● Facebook/redes sociais
○ Não tenho acesso à internet
○ Não gosto de internet

15. O que motivou sua escolha de curso superior?

Gosto por leitura de literatura

16. As discussões em sala de aula no curso de Letras te influenciam? Como?

Sim. Me ajudam a pensar a língua em um sentido mais amplo.

17. O que é língua?

Um veículo de comunicação e uma forma de aquisição de aprendizagem. Ela também pode ser a representação de uma cultura.

18. Como a língua é utilizada em sala de aula no curso de Letras? Caso seja professor, e em sua sala de aula?

Como principal veículo para a comunicação. Os professores procuram demonstrar que há variações da língua inglesa. Não estou professora no momento mas, quando dei aulas de francês a língua francesa era meu principal veículo de comunicação.

19. Quais atividades você considera mais relevantes para o seu aprendizado de Inglês?

Atividades estruturalistas, quando apren estou aprendendo um idioma muito diferente dos que já sei. Nas aulas que tive de nerlandês esse tipo de atividade me ajudou muito.
Mas para as aulas de inglês atividades de comunicação sobre temas amplos e escrita de ensaios sobre temas já discutidos. Fora da sala ter visto filmes e seriados me ajudaram muito. No começo eu via com legendas em inglês e depois sem legendas

ANNEX C – First narrative

Bianca

I am a Brazilian born 22-year-old who was raised in the USA between the ages of 4 and 14, and I have spent my teen years up to now in Brazil. My journey with languages, not just English, was very frustrating in the beginning. However, as I grew older and interacted with my surroundings, the adventure got ever so more interesting.

My earliest memory with English would be a test the American government had us take. If I had to guess today, it was a test to evaluate my brother's and mine English level. I was 4 years old and had just arrived in Florida. I remember a sweet blonde older woman sitting across from me holding various flashcards all with images of common nouns; dogs, chair, sofa, television, etc. I had to say the names of each item she showed me. My brother and me were taking the same test in the same room, only separate by a thin division. Sometimes, if I paid close attention, I could hear him saying his answers. I remember coming across the image of a washing machine. I could not, for the life in me, remember the name of it in either languages. I knew what it was, I knew the function it served, but I just could not remember the name. While I sat there in silence, rummaging through my bag of vocabulary words, I diverted my attention to my brother's voice. A second later, my brother said the words "washing machine". I remember smiling, looking straight at the sweet woman's eyes and saying "washing machine". She smiled back and asked, "Did you say that because you heard it over there?" I, being only 4 years old and aware I was in a test, simply said "no". She passed me anyways, after all, I was able to relate name to picture.

Since I was raised amongst two languages, I used to mash up the words together, almost making a new language. For example, I remember one day while taking a trip to the beach with my family in Florida; we passed by something that smelled very fishy. I was always the type to blurt out things that are obvious, shouted "Eu tô smellando peixe". Instantly my parents started laughing and repeating what I had said. Little 4 year-old me did not realize it was wrong, but I knew they had understood it. So, I guess my brain has always functioned in between both languages; at home Portuguese, everywhere else English. For that matter, I had no clue how to read in Portuguese, I was actually very afraid of the written language. As time went on and I continued school in the USA, my Portuguese vocabulary bag became very scarce. I understood my parents and anyone who spoke Portuguese completely. When a word came up that I did not know, I would ask its meaning, but that was about it.

When I came back to Brazil, my relationship with English became extremely shaky. Submerged in a completely different language, I felt like I had lost my personality. Different expression, different outlooks on life, different environment. Since my Portuguese was so poor, I had to rely on language comparison. As soon as this started happening, I realized how languages function, and in specific the major differences and similarities between English and Portuguese.

It was only here in Brazil that I began to actually study the English language, not just use it. Since this country is not bilingual, language teachers are needed. I started teaching at a young age and right off the bat found my calling. Despite all the trauma and challenges, being exposed to two languages has helped me grow as a person.

ANNEX D – Final narrative

Sérgio

<div align="center">Final narrative</div>

In my view, language is a vehicle which people can count on to express their identities. Since culture is intrinsically connected to language, it is impossible for human beings to speak a language without expressing conscious or unwittingly their identities. Besides that, people can also share ideas with each other by means of language and that is when communication takes place.

Regarding the classes I attended in the first part of this semester, I believe they were very productive. I could reflect more on complex issues such as language, identity and I could give thought to my practice as a teacher. Due to the lessons I attended, I have already experienced some changes on my teaching techniques. As an example, I have been trying not to reproduce some present ideas on language such as the Herderian Triad by taking to class some materials which make reference to English spoken in countries other than USA and UK.

When it comes to the content of these classes, I must confess I enjoyed it. It helped me open my mind a little bit more. However, some topics worked throughout this semester had already been discussed before and sometimes it sound a little repetitive. As for the last year of college, I expected to discuss different topics instead of reviewing some. Nevertheless, the discussions were still enriching and enlightening.

Concerning the class that I delivered, it was a great opportunity to relate the topics I have read and discussed to my practice as a teacher. My partner and I first looked for some materials to use in our class which were related to any topic we discussed during the semester. Afterwards, we tried to be coherent to the proposed activity, which required following the pre-viewing, while viewing and post-viewing stages. I believe that using these stages as a guide facilitated the process of planning the lesson. In my view, it is also the best way to discuss a topic in class for it makes students speak more than the teacher within a lesson.

Finally, I do not have any suggestion or any idea that would have improved this experience. The only drawback I could detect was the amount of assignments. In my view, there were many activities to do, and taking into account that everyone is at the end of the course and there are so many things to do, it was quite demanding. Maybe I am wrong and I had this feeling because I have been too tired.

ANNEX E – Text activities

<div align="center">

TA1

</div>

Emily

From my point of view, languages inventions are like cars, computers, knifes –among other technologies built by man – inventions. As well as these, languages are humans' creations, they do not exist without them, thus they are handled, codified, classified, categorized by them. It seems to me that the effects of language invention are: lack of fluidity and diversity in language identity; little tolerance and patience with people who speak another language or a different variety of language; and loss of opportunities to learn interesting aspects with other communities.

The paper addresses how multilingual communities communicate with each other efficiently and why we must develop metalinguistic awareness. According to Canagarajah, speakers of different varieties of English may form communities and interact with each other like the multilingual communities in precolonial South Asia. After that, the author enumerates the following strategies: code-switching, crossing; speech acomodation; interpersonal strategies; and attitudinal resources. He also states that teachers must focus on strategies of communication, rather than focusing on rules and conventions. Finally, Canagarajah affirms that developing the sensitivity to an intuitive understanding of the way linguistic communication works would help students better with the fluidity in codes that they see around them.

<div align="center">

TA2

</div>

Anita

Excerpts and comments about the text Standard English & World English: entre o siso e o riso, by Ana Antônia de Assis-Peterson and Maria Inês Pagliarini Cox.

Excerpt I
"Nessa conjuntura, é mais fecunda a idéia de que o inglês é uma língua mundial (Ortiz, 2006), ou seja, uma língua do mundo (Rajagopalan, 2008), enfim, "um idioma que atravessa os distintos lugares do planeta" (Ortiz, p. 26), desterritorializado de sua origem anglo-saxônica. Ao se desenraizar, reterritorializa-se no espaço da modernidade-mundo, instituindo-se como bem simbólico a ser apropriado, manipulado, deformado pelos falantes dos quatro cantos do planeta. O inglês da modernidade-mundo é um espectro "glocal", no sentido de que é, a um só tempo, global e local" (p. 154).

In my opinion, this excerpt is one of the most important parts of the text because it summarises one of its main ideas: the glocal nature of the English language. As it is emphasized by the authors, the English language is present all over the world and as it is spoken by people from different places, it suffers influences of different languages. In my point of view, by taking into consideration the ideas presented in the text, these influences

are exactly what makes English a glocal language, since although it is spoken all over the world (globally), it suffers local influences according to the places where it is spoken.

Excerpt II

"Pennycook (2010), em analogia ao termo metroetnicidade de Maher, ensaia o termo metrolinguismo como produto da interação urbana moderna. Assim, metrolinguismo descreve os modos pelos quais pessoas de backgrounds diferentes e misturados usam, brincam com e negociam identidades por meio da língua, sem, contudo, reafirmar o vínculo entre língua, cultura, etnicidade, nacionalidade e geografia, mas procurando explorar as contingências dessas categorias. Seu foco não é mais nos sistemas da língua, mas nas línguas emergentes dos contextos de interação. Na medida em que aprendizes de línguas andam pelo mundo em busca de inglês ou de outras línguas desejáveis, ou estando em casa, conectados por meio de telas, celulares e fones de ouvido, sejam mobilizados por novas opções identitárias. Nesses fluxos transculturais, a mistura é a norma. Línguas, culturas e identidades se misturam". (p. 157)

I think this excerpt is really interesting because it touches on language as a kind of alive entity, which is always being constructed by its users. I agree with this point of view since more than facing language just as a kind of structure, it takes interaction into consideration. Besides, this quote emphasizes how the modern ways of communication have been impacting language and influenced identities. It is also important to take into consideration that the ideas brought by this excerpt give an account of the relation between language, culture and identities, by emphasizing how these elements are mixed by human interaction.

Excerpt III

"O que professores de inglês podem pensar a partir do acontecimento discursivo midiático protagonizado por Joel Santana no mundo superdiverso da contemporaneidade? Em primeiro lugar, podem se desvencilhar da sisudez, da rigidez, da austeridade e do peso que timbram o ensino-aprendizagem formal do Standard English, obstinado em desenvolver nos alunos as quatro habilidades com o mesmo grau de proficiência de americanos ou britânicos, a despeito de todos os obstáculos já fartamente observados e comentados pelas pesquisas na área". (p. 164).

I think this excerpt is important because it touches on the implications of the ideas brought throughout the text on teacher's thinking. Although I do agree that making native speaker as a model does not make sense, since English is a glocal language which suffers influences of local tongues and its speakers, I do not know how to deal rightly with this issue in the classroom. Although I am aware that I am a teacher who speaks Brazilian Portuguese as a mother language and teaches English to other Brazilian Portuguese speakers, in my practice, I have seen how the idea of the native speaker is present on my students' thoughts. Since I have been teaching many groups of beginners, I have been listening to questions like: "Do you speak American or British English?", "How long does it take to a person speaks like a native speaker of English?" and so on. Although I always explain that I do not speak neither American English nor British English, students insist to label my Brazilian

English as one or other. In my point of view, it shows us how ideas like the Standard English and the myth of the native speaker are present in the colonized minds. I do believe that as teachers we have to make our students aware of such kinds of ideas and of their implications, but this is not an easy task.

TA 3

Raul

How to Tame a Wild Tongue – Questions

1) How do you understand the Mexican saying "quien tiene boca se equivoca"? How can it be related to the text?
2) Why do you think Pachuco is a language of rebellion? Is there something similar in Brazil?
3) Why do you think the author said that "to be close another Chicana is like looking into the mirror?
4) What do you think about the sentence "I am my language"? To which contexts can you relate it to?
5) How do you understand the statement "Mexican has nothing to do with which country one lives in"?