



Language teaching-learning: Technologies at the center of the paradigmatic confrontation

  <https://doi.org/10.56238/emerrelcovid19-071>

Sérgio Gomes de Miranda

Doctor of Arts and Linguistics
Professor at the State University of Goiás – UEG

ABSTRACT

This text synthesizes the Research Project: "Language Teaching-Learning: paradigms, ideologies, globalization and technologies", developed in the period 2021-2023. Your Problem: How does the teaching-learning of Language, at the State University of Goiás/Iporá and at the Basic

School of Iporá and surrounding municipalities, take place and transform itself in times of remote teaching, mediated by technology, due to the COVID-19 pandemic? A qualitative, ethnographic study. The participants were twelve students of the Literature Course of UEG-Iporá and ten teachers of basic education in Iporá and surrounding areas. Instruments: questionnaire and observation. Analyzed here as a synthesis.

Keywords: Teaching-Learning, Language, COVID-19 pandemic, Paradigms, Technologies.

1 INTRODUCTION

This text is a synthesis of the Research Project: "Teaching-Learning of Language: paradigms, ideologies, globalization and technologies" and the "Study Group: Language and Ideologies: to think about Interdisciplinarity and Literacies - GELI", developed during the years 2021 to 2023, within the scope of my attributions as an effective teacher in the Course of Letters of the State University of Goiás - UEG, University Unit of Iporá. The study dared to understand the impacts of globalization and technologization on the teaching-learning process of language in times of the COVID-19 Pandemic: a study of the teaching-learning of language, mediated by technology in times of remote teaching, at the university and in elementary school.

This research embraces the defense that we are going through a paradigmatic and ideological clash between Modernity and Postmodernity in the sciences, in general, and in language studies, specifically. Such a confrontation of paradigms directs us to other concepts, methods, instruments, means; other practices, tools and approaches to problems, as well as unites us with a number of other scholars engaged in the construction of an anti-hegemonic agenda to think and do research and teaching-learning of the Portuguese language. As Moita Lopes (2013) argues, new theorizations and new perceptions of linguistic ideologies are important to deal with the various natures that construct language: "[t]he linguistic ideologies are multiple and come from specific political, cultural and economic perspectives" (MOITA LOPES, 2013, p. 21).

This reflection is supported by the many criticisms directed to linguistic studies and the teaching-learning of the Portuguese language based on concepts and practices based on the modern

paradigm. The understanding expressed here is that, both in research practices and in teaching-learning practices, the paradigm of modernity distorts the object "Portuguese Language", through its basic ideological network and its epistemological assumptions. With this, the theoretical currents and their representatives in research and teaching are directed by epistemological bases, consciously or not, to act under the conceptual and practical seals of modernity.

The Problem that drove this research was: how does the teaching-learning of Language, at the State University of Goiás/Iporá and in the Basic School of Iporá and surrounding municipalities, occur and transform itself in times of remote teaching, mediated by technology, due to the COVID-19 pandemic? In this sense, its General Objective sought to understand how the teaching-learning of Language, in the University and in the School, takes place and is transformed in times of remote teaching, mediated by technology, due to the COVID 19 pandemic. In order to be able to reach the answer to the problem and the achievement of this objective, other specific objectives were established: to analyze the language practices and activities posed as means for the teaching of language; to discover which didactic-pedagogical instruments/tools were used by the participants for remote interaction and their effects on teaching-learning; to analyze the paradigmatic adherence to language teaching, through the literacy practices placed in the teaching-learning process; to investigate what are the conceptions of language expressed by the participants; to analyze how participants self-evaluate and how they generally evaluate teaching and learning during the remote learning period due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Twelve students of the Literature Course of the State University of Goiás, University Unit of Iporá, and ten professors who work in the Basic Education Network of Iporá and surrounding municipalities participated in the study. It was a qualitative research, of ethnographic nature, which intended to study the Language and its practices in its real context of occurrence, produced and disseminated by the participants of the study.

2 THE CONCEPT OF PARADIGM AND THE BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE PARADIGMS IN CONFRONTATION

One of the greatest thinkers of this theme, Morin (2000, p. 41) teaches that "paradigms are the principles of principles, some master notions that control the spirits, that command the theories." As this author argues,

One must be aware of the problem of the paradigm. A paradigm reigns over minds because it institutes sovereign concepts and their logical relation (disjunction, conjunction, implication), which govern, covertly, the scientific conceptions and theories, carried out under their empire. (MORIN, 2003, p. 114)

To explain how the paradigmatic confrontation takes place, Morin, Ciurana and Motta (2003, p. 37) explain that all knowledge is born, matures, has its apogee and, finally, suffers its decadence. However, in the course of its journey, such knowledge contemplates the birth of another vein that will take its place. Thus, a paradigm does not suffer its replacement as a rupture, but as a resignificant process, until the hegemonic paradigm loses its space to another paradigm. According to Morin (2000), one of the greatest difficulties in paradigmatic change lies in the fact that change is always a difficult decision. It imposes a crisis on our ideas and forces us to recognize the errors in our own practices, beliefs, ideologies, in values that we defend and with which we live our lives.

Also as a way of explaining how the paradigmatic change occurs, Vasconcellos (2005) deepens this discussion and distinguishes the three epistemological axes, which act as basic assumptions of the paradigms of modernity and postmodernity: modern science has simplicity as presuppositions; stability; objectivity; postmodernity is based on the assumptions of complexity; instability; and intersubjectivity, inversely to the hegemonic paradigm.

According to what Vasconcellos (2005) summarizes, this basic confrontation means that: modern science simplifies the complex and reduces it to fragments of the whole. Therefore, his interest in the creation of disciplines and atomic and watertight knowledge that, intentionally, do not seek to dialogue. Another characteristic of modernity is the creation of immutable and universal laws to explain events and phenomena. In the same vein, an objective view of scientific practice is defended, in which the person does not interfere in the researched knowledge.

On the other hand, according to Vasconcellos (2005), postmodernity recognizes the world in its inherent complexity. His gaze is centered on the context in which the practice is situated and the perspective is always multidirectional and interdisciplinary: knowledge is built in dialogue. As Vasconcellos (2005) points out, "reality would be so rich, so full of complex reliefs, that a single projector could not fully illuminate it. No point of view could encompass the whole object" (VASCONCELLOS, 2005, p. 133).

To explain how this confrontation and these assumptions act in linguistic studies, Agha (2007) brings an analysis of the studies of Saussure, Bloomfield and Chomsky, as representatives of language studies in the last century. Based on Agha (2007), modern linguistics is characterized, first, by being extractionist; that is, by the extraction of language from within the totality of language. He invents an ideal language, as a cutout, called by Agha (2007) metonymic reduction. There is no complex approach to language, especially with regard to the variant practices that appear in the discourse. Another characteristic is the restrictivist aspect, which calls the creation of restricted disciplinary limits, while establishing what it is to do linguistics and not to do linguistics. Finally, modernity is exclusionist;

That is, it is previously defined who can and cannot be called a linguist. It is the structuralist perspective of language and the idealistic perspective of language that can bring the scholar this title.

On the other side of this paradigmatic confrontation in linguistic studies, Agha (2007) chooses the work of Franz Boas and presents the three aspects of the Boasian epistemic project. The first aspect is expansionist: language is conceived in its historical, cultural, social and discursive formation. The scientific gaze privileges the practices and variations of language placed in discourses and real contexts of interaction. Another aspect is the integrationist: language is approached in its context, in the different and diverse genres of text. Language practices are of interest beyond structures; Speeches matter more than forms. The other aspect is collaborative: linguistics is integrated and, at the same time, part of a field of action composed of different disciplines, which dialogue in common projects. Social and linguistic studies privilege the complexity of language studies.

The study of paradigm shift must take into account what Feyerabend (2011, p. 33. Emphasis added) explains: "Science does not know "naked facts" at all, but that all the "facts" of which we become aware are already seen in a certain way and are therefore essentially ideational." In short, all scientific practice is inherently ideological. As Moita Lopes (2013) argues, it is intended, here, that linguistic research needs to employ a reasoning that is focused on what is local, without forgetting its relations with what is global, at the same time.

3 LANGUAGE AND IDEOLOGY: MODERNITY; COLONIALISM/NATIONALISM; GLOBALIZATION

For a better understanding of the ideological network that constitutes Modernity, Moita Lopes (2006) clarifies that the philosophical and theoretical positioning of Modernity tends to be very well demarcated by currents and scholars who intend to defend exclusive positions. Therefore, there is little convergence and contribution between the distinct areas. In a position critical of this position, Moita Lopes (2006) questions whether there is a place for the establishment of kingdoms with regard to knowledge. For this scholar, "[t]his inquiry contains in itself a challenge to the traditional forms of organization of knowledge in "churches" in the academy, so to speak, in which one cannot enter without obtaining permission or visa" (MOITA LOPES, 2006, p. 19. Emphasis added). Fabrício (2006) also criticizes that it is common in modernity the idea of replacing one regime of truths by another. In the words of Fabrício (2006):

[t]he scathing critique of the tradition carried out by Marxists, neo-Marxists, Frankfurters and by many linguists affiliated with the critical line of discourse seems to have succumbed to this "temptation" to construct new certainties in the process of clashing ideas. (FABRÍCIO, 2006, p. 49. Emphasis added)

In a critical sense regarding the role that linguistics and applied linguistics have played in his research, Pennycook (2006) emphasizes that "the relationship between the subject and the discourse has been conceived in a static way, in the sense that a subject chooses to assume a position of subject in a pre-given discourse" (PENNYCOOK, 2006, p. 81). Kumaravadivelu (2006) also criticizes LA in the context of Modernity. According to this author,

[t]he type of LA associated with modernism treats language primarily as a system and operates according to a positivist and prescriptive research paradigm. It investigates the use of language in a decontextualized and disembodied way. [...] Even when it explores linguistic planning, it avoids the question of linguistic ideology. Even when it deals with the issue of language and society, it does not focus on issues of social inequality and power. In short, modernist LA strives to preserve the macrostructures of linguistic and cultural domination. (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2006, p. 139)

Pennycook (2001), in turn, lists a series of theoretical positions that need to be overcome for the establishment of a new way of doing applied linguistics: the first position is what he calls "centrist-autonomous", which defends various forms of liberal or conservative policies, but without seeing the connections between politics and applied linguistic knowledge. In this view, the conjunction between liberalism and structuralism is crucial. These domains help in the elaboration of issues such as inequality, language and power; The second position is the "anarcho-autonomous," which combines the most radical leftist politics with the view that does not relate to applied linguistics; another position is termed "emancipatory modernism," which avoids the connections between politics and the study of language. This non-autonomous left-wing position is specifically aimed at relating the study of language to left-wing politics. On the one hand, sharing rationalist and realist beliefs, on the other hand, relates to the study and analysis of the language in use.

Moita Lopes (2013) also criticizes that the theorizations of modernist linguistics function as maintainers of "inequalities of social class, race, gender, etc. in their proper places through the ideal of pure, neutral, autonomous, transparent and representational language" (MOITA LOPES, 2013, p. 105). In order to clarify the modernist position in the treatment of language, Pinto (2013) explains that the "cultured variety presupposes that it corresponds to these two supports of the Western normative metalanguage: writing and grammar" (PINTO, 2013, p. 127). Fabrício (2013) summarizes very well the logic in force in modern thought:

[t]he logic at work in the oppositional pairs language/language, culture/nature, we/others operates in the reductive terms of construction and laziness. Notions of language as a heritage shared by all and in the same way, ensuring its unity, stability and harmony; of uniform culture, islanded and isomorphic; and of clearly delimited cultural identities, they are tributaries of modernist and colonialist visions, builders of linguistic and monocultural utopias (Pratt, 1987), and, as a corollary, of the well-known boundaries between "us" and "others". These are theories, warns Sousa Santos (2007), in which the subjects and social practices are invisible and the possibilities of agency are non-existent. (FABRÍCIO, 2013, p. 151. Emphasis added)

The hegemonic position of the Paradigm of Modernity, criticized here in this work, is maintained because of the network of ideologies that serve as its basis. One of the currents that make up this network constitutes a conceptual hybrid that scholars have called Colonialism/Nationalism. Makoni and Pennycook (2007) state that notions of languages were invented as part of the projects of Christianity/colonialism and nationalism in different parts of the world. They warn that this project of invention of languages needs to be understood beyond the European attempt to build a world in their image, going towards the project of building the history of other peoples for themselves, as a form of basis for European governance and surveillance of these other peoples. This project is also responsible for the development of imaginary nations as a central focus for the creation of the European nation-state. Thus, European colonizers invented themselves and others in a reciprocal process. Errington (2001) points out that colonial rule reproduced, on smaller scales, European modes of territoriality, in the form of strategies for controlling people and their relations, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographical area, assumed to be culturally homogeneous and linguistically limited among national citizens within European sovereign states. For this researcher, colonial missionary work erased pre-colonial social formations and also gave rise to a new language, linked to socioeconomic stratification that facilitated the political and economic agendas of the colonial states sanctioned in this work.

Anderson (1983) teaches that the very concept of nation comes from the idea of a delimited and sovereign political community, forged by the European enlightenment of the eighteenth century. Jacquemet (2005) points out that throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century the legacy of this way of thinking about the link between territory, cultural tradition and language led to the concept of human populations as delimited entities, as entities that are culturally, linguistically, and territorially uniform.

Spotti (2011) associates the official use of language in school with the construction of identity in sociocultural spaces. In this regard, Signorini (2006) criticizes that

[t]he legitimacy of the speaker and his language is a consequence of the acquisition of patterns, that is, it is the forms and functions instituted by the institutionalized metapragmatics that legitimize and equalize the speakers because they erase/neutralize the differences (including of color, creed, gender, socioeconomic condition, for example). (SIGNORINI, 2006, p. 172)

In a similar sense, Moita Lopes (2013) raises these questions:

[It is] crucial to discuss whether we will continue to view languages as autonomous systems, erasing the social subject, its socio-historical and ideological marks on its body – and the sufferings or advantages they entail. Do we maintain the idea that language corresponds to a nation-state? (MOITA LOPES, 2013, p. 105. Emphasis added)

In the same sense, Pinto (2013) argues that "the hegemonic discourse that materializes the Portuguese takes root in the invention of the Portuguese nation, and for this it hides interactions and connections between speakers" (PINTO, 2013, p. 126). She also states that this homogeneity hides the "identity prefiguration and its linguistic hierarchy", as a way of controlling the groups of speakers and configuring them according to what is relevant to the research cuts (PINTO, 2013, p. 133). In the opinion of this author, "the prefiguration of the identity of a Portuguese speaker in Brazil needs to be discussed in the light of the criteria for delimiting the hierarchy between language, dialect and variety" (PINTO, 2013, p. 139). To close this turn, it is worth bringing up a critical issue raised by Bagno (2013), when criticizing the idea of purity of the established language as a reflection of a nation; namely:

Will a community of human beings live so socially homogeneous, so isolated, so distant from any other group of people, that their language could remain immune to any and all contact and is, today, the pure and exclusive result of their own "internal drift"? (BAGNO, 2013, p. 2013. Emphasis added)

Another current that structures this ideological network is called Globalization. According to what Kumaravadivelu (2006) explains, the term globalization suffers different conceptualizations by different scholars. Steger (2003) associates Globalization with the social multidimensions that exert the creation, multiplication, intensification and expansion of exchanges and interdependencies in world dimensions, as well as, simultaneously, makes people aware of the deepening of the connections between what is global and what is local. Kumaravadivelu (2006) associates Globalization with the modern colonial period, linking it to the models of commercial exploitation led by Portugal and Spain, to English industrialization and to the post-war context franchised by the United States. As a synthesis of this, Kumaravadivelu (2006) exposes that, with the processes of globalization, "the economic and cultural lives of people around the world are more intensely and immediately interconnected, in a way that has never occurred before" (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2006, p. 131). Another important aspect highlighted by this author is the cultural homogenization, whose center is the United States, marked by individualism and consumerism. The same scholar also points out that it is possible to identify a cultural heterogeneization, with the central aspect of strengthening local cultures and diverse religious identities, even bringing a dangerous fundamentalism, as a response and defense to what is proposed as a global culture; Still, according to this author, in the form of synthesis of these two sides, it is noticeable the tension between the forces of homogenesis and those of heterogenesis of cultures, concomitantly, intertwining what is global and what is local. Kumaravadivelu (2006) summarizes, according to *the United Nations Report on Human Development* (1999: 29), that the current Globalization manifests itself in the world in three ways: in the reduction of spaces in people's lives;

in the reduction of time, with the advent of technologies; in the disappearance of borders, by the dissolution of trade, information, cultures, norms, etc.

In the expansion of ideas in this regard, Moita Lopes (2006) points out that, today, we live a new world order and a new capitalism, spread throughout the world through the forces of Globalization. For him, this phenomenon promotes the elites and oppresses local lives: the former "begin to live transglobally"; the latter survive "without alternatives or to the garbage of those who live transglobally" (MOITA LOPES, 2006, p. 24). In order to problematize these contours in the field of applied linguistics, the author raises the following question-problem:

[w]here these aspects of a world that criticizes modernity and that lives under the seal of globalization can be theorized and faced by LA in countries such as Brazil or in regions of the so-called First World, which are far from having achieved the ideals of modernity and live on the periphery of globalization? (MOITA LOPES, 2006, p. 24-25)

In this same attempt to clarify the context in which we are situated, Moita Lopes (2013) argues that recent modernity is characterized by the diaspora of social, economic, political, demographic and cultural processes, to which we group in the title of Globalization. In this context, the aforementioned author characterizes Globalization as a world of spatio-temporal compression, of shocks and sociocultural changes, of digital technology, of hypersemiotization, of hybridizations, of superdiversity, of imbrications between the first and third world, of borders in flows; "A world in which language occupies a privileged space. This is a world in which nothing relevant is done without discourse" (MOITA LOPES, 2013, p. 19). According to this same author, "language scholars have struggled to realize the relevance of theorizations about globalization for the field of language" (MOITA LOPES, 2013, p. 19).

With regard to language policies in the context of Globalization, Signorini (2013) argues that capitalism creates the association of the markets of production and circulation of linguistic and semiotic products in synergy with labor and capital markets. According to her, the State and the most traditional literacy agencies that we know participate in this game, such as the family, the school, the church, etc. The same author exposes that, within these globalizing processes, there is the ideology of globalism, manifested as the articulation between ideas, beliefs and values, whose impréstimo comes from the forces of liberalism. Signorini (2013) adds that, when it comes specifically to Linguistic Globalization, the best example is the "commoditization/commodification of English as a good of access to the globalized world", in the sense of guaranteeing "power in transnational and cosmopolitan social networks through access to information and knowledge" (SIGNORINI, 2013, p. 77). In this way, every language is a representation of the value it has in the global marketplace, in the form of knowledge and power, as a vehicle for competition. Blommaert (2005) teaches that what is globalized is not expressed through an abstract language, but through specific forms of discourse, genres, styles

and practices of literacy. Gimenez and Monteiro (2010) argue in favor of teaching in school to be geared towards the deconstruction of stereotyped views, contrary to this vision of single thought that characterizes exclusionary Globalization. For these authors, Globalization poses increasingly complex challenges for education. However, in his view, the classroom should be "understood as a place of reconstruction of cultural identities [...], as a place of formation of critical consciousness, one of the possible paths for the construction of another globalization." (GIMENEZ; MONTEIRO, 2010, p. 214)

4 TEACHING-LEARNING OF THE PORTUGUESE LANGUAGE: TECHNOLOGIES AND TEACHING WORK

In recent decades, the world has evolved at a dizzying speed. Babin and Kouloumdjian (1989, p. 11) state that we are witnessing the rise of a new way of being, thinking, and understanding. According to these researchers, a kind of new culture has been growing in recent times, since the technological environment in general "models a new form of intellectual and affective behavior." As Babin and Kouloumdjian (1989) guide us, we should not be mistaken when conceptualizing the technological medium. In this sense, these authors warn that "[t]here we reduce the technological environment to devices and media: we must discover the colossal set of social, political and administrative infrastructures, in a more determinant, although less conscious, role, without which the medium could not function." (BABIN AND KOULOUMDJIAN, 1989, p. 11)

For Babin and Kouloumdjian (1989), the institution of the technological environment gave rise to a new generation, called by them the "audiovisual generation". In this wake of this denomination they make a comparison between what they call the "man of the book generation" and "man of the audiovisual generation": the first, is the bearer of a geometric, verb-linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligence, of linear, conceptual and sequential reasoning; and the second, it bears a tissue intelligence, musical, creative, of global, analytical and symbolic reasoning. The basis for this comparison used by the authors is the change in brain dominance shaped in this "audiovisual generation", as well as the differences in the ways of understanding reality, provoked by this change. As Babin and Kouloumdjian (1989) teach, in the "audiovisual generation" there is a predominance of the activities of the right hemisphere of the brain, given the wide use of creativity, musicality, emotional, global reasoning; whereas in the "book generation" there is a predominance of the activities of the left hemisphere of the brain, making use of logic, mathematics, linearity, sequential reasoning and language.

The university and the school are at the center of these changes in scientific practice, paradigms, reality and, above all, ways of understanding this reality. However, throughout its history, the school and the university have been privileging the forms of learning found in the left cerebral hemisphere,

crystallized in traditional education and that, for all this, does not meet the satisfaction of this new generation, because it does not account for the varied forms of learning that characterize. Education has not kept pace with technological changes and, therefore, has not prepared for such innovations. With this, science and education fall into the sin of excluding from themselves the reality that surrounds them and of which they are integral parts. Without an awakening to new technologies there is no way to privilege them. This is exactly what Gomes (2004) postulates, when he states that "the audiovisual generation has cognitive characteristics for which the school must be prepared, in order to provide these young people with a training appropriate to their needs", adding, still, that the university and the school should have resources "for a more global education, in tune with the channels of perception of today's young people, and to demonstrate, finally, a more holistic conception of teaching and culture." (GOMES, 2004, p. 13)

In all contexts we can see a direction of society towards using technology to facilitate life and insertion in the world. The technologization is already impregnated in the most varied cultures through power relations in which the dominant culture imposes itself on the dominated cultures, in this context in which capitalism and the process of globalization dictate the norms and standards of life.

Santos (1997) states that today the signs of a crisis of the model of scientific rationality are clear and that we are living a period of revolution in the sciences. In this way, new conceptualizations, new forms of thought, new approaches to phenomena hitherto unexplained emerge. In the words of Santos (1997, p. 55): "it is what is called a crisis of paradigms and that usually leads to a paradigm shift." We are facing a constant transformation of everything we know.

Masetto (2000) states that, with regard to school education, there was no adequate appreciation of the use of technologies for the efficiency and effectiveness of the teaching-learning process, due to the conception of education as the transmission of knowledge of specific areas and professional training, in the form of memorization of this "knowledge", as well as its reproduction in tests and evaluations. This scholar raises the importance of four elements linked to reflection on the learning process and technology; namely: "the very concept of learning, the role of the student, the role of the teacher and the use of technology" (MASETTO, 2000, p. 139). This author defends the thesis that with the use of technologies there is a greater dynamism in the teacher-student relationship: an active student in the search for knowledge and a teacher mediator between the student and their learning, as well as an environment of interaction between them. According to Masetto (2000), pedagogical mediation is the "attitude, the behavior of the teacher who places himself as a facilitator, encourager or motivator of learning [...] a 'crane' bridge, which actively collaborates so that the apprentice reaches his goals" (MASETTO, 2000, p. 15). For the new generations, the use of new technologies and pedagogical mediation are enriching elements of learning. The teacher must be prepared to face the new challenges

and, mainly, be an active agent in this technological environment, as a connoisseur of these new technologies, as someone who knows how to use them for their own benefit, especially in favor of the students. In this regard, Delizoicov et. al. (2002), state that

The challenges of the contemporary world, particularly those related to the transformations that school education needs to undergo, directly affect the initial and continuing training courses of teachers, whose knowledge and practices, traditionally established and disseminated, give unequivocal signs of exhaustion. (DELIZOICOV, 2002, p. 38)

There are numerous responsibilities that fall on the teaching role in this new context. But it is also a huge opportunity to provide an education that fulfills its true role, which is that of formation for life. This new reality, the new ways of understanding this reality, the new modes of learning are more reasons for the teacher to prepare himself to the maximum to make the best use of what is presented to us as an element of qualification of the teaching-learning process, in order to use the new technologies as being pertinent in educational contexts, given their desire to provide a democratic education.

There are those who can oppose this new position, arguing that we live in an underdeveloped country, in which most of the population is economically disadvantaged and that, for this very reason, studies in public schools. Evidently, the new technological goods have arrived randomly and unevenly, without the proper preparation and training of their users, especially education professionals, for their best benefit. However, this is already a present reality and we must even be in constant preparation and training for our active insertion in this reality. The advent of the COVID-19 pandemic has laid bare the need for technology and how obsolete the traditional school is for the preparation of new generations. More than suddenly, teachers and students were forced to act by technological mediation, in the remote mode of teaching-learning. However, neither students nor teachers, in general, were prepared for this new form of interaction, in a more fruitful way. In a lighter analysis, the lack of digital literacy for the purpose of teaching-learning interaction is evident.

Souza (2007) conceptualizes digital literacy in two types: a restricted definition, which considers only the instrumental aspect of the concept and its practice, of how to "use digital technology, communication tools and/or networks to access, manage, integrate, evaluate and create information to function in a knowledge society" (SOUZA, 2007, p. 57); a broad definition, which considers the sociocultural, historical and political contexts that involve the process of digital literacy as "a complex series of values, practices and skills situated socially and culturally involved in operating linguistically within a context of electronic environments, which include reading, writing and communication" (SOUZA, 2007, p. 59). In the extension of this concept, Souza (2007) delimits four basic competencies for the acquisition of digital literacy. For him, the most essential of these is the competence of the "critical evaluation of the contents", followed by the reading in "hypertextuality", the association of

the "diverse sources" and, finally, the competence in dealing with the "virtual library". (SOUZA, 2007, p. 60)

This is a very complex and broad concept. In the conception produced by Buzato (2001), the

Digital literacies (LDs) are sets of literacies (social practices) that support, intertwine, and mutually and continuously appropriate each other through digital devices for specific purposes, both in geographically and temporally limited sociocultural contexts, and in those constructed by electronically mediated interaction. (BUZATO, 2001, p. 16).

In fact, there is no denying the prevalence of technology in today's social vision. As integrated and members of this technological society, the university and the school must resignify themselves to be able to fulfill their role of preparing children, young people and adults for life. To oppose this is a reflection of the imprisonment caused by a traditional education, based on self-indulgence and "sameness". As Paulo Freire (1996) defends, teaching requires, among other things, risk, acceptance of the new, awareness of incompleteness, joy, hope, the conviction that change is possible and, mainly, the understanding that education is a form of intervention in the world.

After this theoretical-conceptual exposition, the next section describes and analyzes the research data.

5 THE DATA, THE DESCRIPTION AND THE ANALYSIS

The Research Project had as participants twelve students in teacher training of the Course of Letters of the State University of Goiás - UEG / Iporá and ten teachers of Portuguese language who work in public schools of basic education located in Iporá and in surrounding municipalities, who after being invited, volunteered to participate in the study. Under my supervision and coordination was formed with the students the *Study Group: Language and Ideologies*: to think about Interdisciplinarity and Literacies – *GELI*. The students met with me to study about the paradigm shift in language studies and to deepen their knowledge about how to produce qualitative research: to improve their knowledge about theories and practices of the production of instruments for the production of data in scientific studies and the production of analyses. The COVID-19 pandemic and all the restrictions imposed by it forced interactions and study to be conducted remotely, through mediation through internet technology.

According to the institutional approval, the Research Project was approved for twenty-four months, starting on 08/2021 and ending on 06/2023. The study was characterized as a qualitative ethnographic research. It was intended to study the teaching-learning of the Portuguese language in its context of occurrence, focusing on its qualitative dimension. As Lucena (2015) explains, a study is called ethnographic research mainly because of its time limits, in a comparison with the long time that studies called ethnographic research demand. Thus, the central aspects of ethnography are preserved

in both types, in particular, the democratization of the forms of knowledge production: "to bring to light realities and situated practices of language little valued in relation to hegemonic discourses." (LUCENA, 2015, p. 79).

The study was produced together, by me and the participating students. The means for the co-production of the research data were the Questionnaire and Direct Observation, elaborated in the context of the group of studies mentioned above and applied, based on the theoretical framework of the study, according to the schedule pre-established by the institutional research project. Each teacher answered a questionnaire and had three classes observed, after having volunteered to participate in the research and signed the consent form. The collection of the answered instruments was the responsibility of the student-participants, in the direct relationship with the professors-participants, and it was up to the project coordinator to improve and deepen the descriptions and produce the analyses, for the purposes of institutional report and for the production of this article.

To bring, in the form of synthesis, such descriptions and analyses, it is worth recovering what were the specific objectives of the study, in a form of gradation, until it is possible to reach the scope of the General Objective and the answer to the Research Problem.

The first Specific Objective proposed was: *to analyze the practices and activities of language posed as means for the teaching of language*. It is opportune to clarify that, here, the teaching practices performed in the Teaching-Learning process, in the processes of Literacy and Literacy, are inextricably understood as practices of language and language. Thus, the teaching propositions of activities, the exhibitions/explanations of themes and proposed contents, the mediations of the activities produced by the students and their oral productions are practices and activities of language and language. The data of this theme lead us to the analysis that remote teaching, as an absolutely spectacular event, hindered student-student interaction and teacher-student interaction. The classes were, hegemonically, marked by the total silence of the students during the classes, with muted microphones and, in the same wake, without being called to the protagonism of the speeches during the classes. The difficulties of both sides of the interaction in acting together in the dialogue were evident, leaving then the monologue exhibition of the teacher as a discursive mark and the student silence during the classes. All participating teachers exposed this difficulty in interactions, including as a mark of difference between remote and face-to-face teaching, as well as identifying themselves powerless before the novelty of technological mediation.

As for the activities proposed in the Teaching-Learning process, among the ten (10) teacher-participants, eight (08) were based on textbook activities, focused on text analysis, comprehension and textual interpretation, as well as norms and nomenclatures of the grammatical structure present in the text. Two others (02) worked with texts in digital format, also directed to comprehension and textual

interpretation. Regarding the methodology of teacher-student interaction, the ten (10) read the text and asked the students to answer the questions. These data present lead us to think that the lack of digital literacy, as a continuing teacher education, forces the participants to interact in a more expository way. The fact of being under observation also affected the interactions, leading teachers to act in a way in which they felt safer in their practice. Regarding this, Barreto (2002) produces the criticism that, many times, in school, technology takes on an instrumental character, which leads to mechanized pedagogical practices, little innovative and with low significance for students. According to this scholar, this is precisely due to the fact that "new possibilities imply new challenges for the teaching work. And the confrontation of this challenge requires, as a nucleus, the reflection on pedagogical practices" (BARRETO, 2002, p. 110). Delizoicov et. al (2002) also dedicate themselves to this discussion and affirm that "the challenges of the contemporary world, particularly those related to the transformations that school education needs to go through, directly affect the initial and continuing training courses of teachers." (DELIZOICOV, et. al, 2002, p. 38)

The second Specific Objective of the investigation was: *to discover which didactic-pedagogical instruments/tools were used by the participants for remote interaction and their effects on teaching-learning*. The participating teachers, for the interaction with the students, used in the Teaching-Learning process, in general, the computer and the internet, to access the google classroom. In the same sense, the cell phone and the WhatsApp application for errands, faster problem solving, clarification of doubts, etc.; The cell phone was also used to film the work of exposing the content, during some classes, simulating the usual interaction that was established in the face-to-face interaction. As a basis and source for the contents, the themes studied and for the activities, the participating teachers used the textbook and scanned PDF files. According to the teachers' reports, they also used the practice of research on the Internet as methodologies. These data direct the analysis to the complexity brought by the abrupt change of the face-to-face process, to the new modality of remote teaching. The use of technologies as didactic-pedagogical instruments requires a conceptual and practical resignification that is not always possible, in times of such abrupt measures as was the period marked by the COVID-19 Pandemic. The work of critical reflection requires time and a procedural gradation of the acquisition of knowledge due to the best use of the different possibilities offered by technologies. The uses of technology by the participants are explained by Souza's (2007) definition of what he calls a restricted view of digital literacy. According to this scholar, the restricted view considers only the instrumental aspect of the concept and its practice: "to use digital technology, communication tools and/or networks to access, manage, integrate, evaluate and create information to function in a knowledge society" (SOUZA, 2007, p. 57).

The third Specific Objective of the study consisted of: *to analyze the paradigmatic adherence to language teaching, through the literacy practices placed in the teaching-learning process*. It was analyzed that the participants have a clear conception of how much their work and the work of the school and education as a whole mean for the transformation of the lives of their students, especially the most socioeconomically vulnerable. This awareness helps them in a fundamental aspect for the work of Literacy; That is: teacher engagement, as an ethical and critical stance, before the challenges that social life imposes on education. This exposed position is in tune with what Pessoa (2014) expresses, arguing that we can choose to contribute to the reproduction of social relations; however, our role is to build alternatives for the world in which we live. We must act with commitment against the practices of exclusion, injustices and inequalities, in favor of the lives of those who suffer most from the impositions of this world increasingly governed by the interests of capitalism. In this sense, specifically on paradigmatic adherence, the participants are in a hybrid process: as expressed here, they sometimes position themselves in a postmodern, poststructuralist, engaged and critical position; a perspective of working with language in its complexity, which integrates active reading and writing. In another way, because of the constraints, especially those imposed by the COVID-19 Pandemic, the participants are forced to act disciplinarily, to practice expository and less interactive methodologies, based on the paradigm of modernity. There was no form of aggression or disrespect to the teachers, nor to the students. On the other hand, the criticism that orality is not well worked in school is already quite widespread, which has been further aggravated by remote teaching. For Bakhtin (2010), in the social relationship "every ideological sign, and therefore also the linguistic sign, is marked by the *social horizon* of a given time and social group" (BAKHTIN, 2010, p. 45. Emphasis added).

In its fourth Specific Objective, the study aimed to: *investigate what are the conceptions of language expressed by the participants*. Mainly because of the social and educational transformations imposed by the Covid 19 Pandemic, the conceptions of language whose practices are more aligned with modernity prevailed. Travaglia (2003) and Koch (2007) advise that there are three distinct conceptions of language: "The first conception sees language as an expression of thought". The practice of language is only a "translation" of what exists in the mind. It is worth the position of the sender, regardless of the context and the interlocutor in the process of "enunciation". One of the results of this conception is normative grammar. Similarly, "the second conception sees language as an instrument of communication, as an objective means for communication." The language would be a set of signs, which form a code for the transfer of messages from a sender to a receiver. In communication, "it is necessary that the code be used in a similar, pre-established, agreed manner." As Travaglia (2003) explains, the studies of Saussure and Chomsky contribute to these conceptions. These are the most evident conceptions of language in the discourses and practices of the participants,

based on the paradigm of modernity. The student silence in the uses of technologies and the activities produced with a character more centered on the teacher exhibition prevent the identification of the third conception: language as a form or process of interaction." It is a "communicative interaction by the production of effects of meaning between interlocutors", situated in an ideology, in a social and historical context. "Dialogue in the broad sense is what characterizes language." (TRAVAGLIA, 2003, p. 21 - 23)

In its fifth and last Specific Objective, to establish the dialectic between the analyses of the research and the own vision of the participating teachers about the theme under study, the research sought: to *analyze how the participants evaluate themselves and how they evaluate, in general, teaching and learning, during the period of remote teaching, because of the COVID-19 pandemic.*

In their self-analyses, the participants express feelings of exhaustion, fatigue, frustration, demotivation, difficulties, uncertainties, dissatisfaction, challenges, resignification, learning, motivation, innovation. They were unanimous in complaining about the overload of work: the preparation, the difficulties with the choices and preparation of materials, the disposition of technological/technical resources for so much load of data, content, information, etc. They were also unanimous regarding the concern with student learning, reporting: low student performance, resistance, absence from classes, aversion to the modality and methodologies, little production of activities, absence of dialogue.

The participating teachers were also unanimous in denouncing social inequalities, social vulnerability and the difficulties that these inequalities and social vulnerability reveal in this moment of remote teaching. They made it evident that remote teaching has not achieved efficacy, due to the difficulty in teaching methodologies, the absence of teacher-student interaction, the lack of a more proximal teacher mediation, and the difficulty in promoting student autonomy. For the participants, learning has been shown to be low due to technological and technical difficulties, lack of access to the internet, etc. All denounced that the mixture of these factors of social and economic needs, associated with the pedagogical and psychological aspects of teachers-students, acted to harm the quality of teaching work and student learning. All were unanimous in stating that the learning losses of this period will affect many years ahead, in the curriculum of the grades, by the serious learning deficits. This self-analysis of the participating teachers is in tune with what Moita Lopes (2006) conceptualizes, when denouncing that today we live a new world order and a new capitalism, spread throughout the world through the forces of Globalization. A phenomenon that promotes elites and oppresses local lives: elites "go on to live transglobally"; the localities survive "without alternatives or to the garbage of those who live transglobally" (MOITA LOPES, 2006, p. 24).

Among the ten (10) participating teachers, seven (07) stated that they had no previous knowledge about Remote Teaching, Distance Learning, teaching mediated by remote technology, as in the current situation in which we live. Three (03) stated that they had little prior knowledge for this remote operation. Of the ten (10), five (05) emphasized not having received any technical/technological support or little support for their daily work. The other half reported having received support either at the institution where they work, by a colleague, or through online/internet courses.

After all these descriptions and analyses it is possible to recover the General Objective of the research, expressed in the Research Problem that drove this investigation; namely: *how the teaching-learning of Language, in the State University of Goiás/Iporá and in the Basic School of Iporá and surrounding municipalities, occurs and is transformed in times of remote teaching, mediated by technology, because of the COVID-19 pandemic?*

When analyzing the Matrices of the Course of Letters of the State University of Goiás – UEG, of 2009 and 2015, it is easy to perceive that the Matrices and the Menus are built in a form of sequence and gradation of the concepts and contents, within the disciplines. In this way, the disciplines are gaining a gradation and a deepening as to the knowledge related to language, language, linguistics, literature, etc. However, in this organization of these same concepts and contents the connections between the disciplines are strongly impaired, since, by separating the linguistic currents, the literary currents, the Portuguese language disciplines, the English language disciplines, etc., within watertight semesters, barriers are created between them, in each year or semester of the course. Thus, the students do not see the existing relations between these disciplines, their menus, their concepts and contents being established; that is: there is no interdisciplinarity. In this study, it is important to emphasize that, when analyzing the 2009 Curricular Matrix of the Literature Course, in its Syllabuses and Bibliographies, there is only once a mention of the concept of Interdisciplinarity; namely: in the 3rd Year of the Course, in the discipline "Guidelines for the Supervised Internship of Portuguese Language and Literatures I". In the same direction, in the Curricular Matrix of 2015, Interdisciplinarity appears as one of the themes to be addressed in a framework of knowledge of an "Optional" discipline of "Free Nucleus": "Interdisciplinary Projects in the Classroom." This finding makes it clear that there was not, in the construction of the Curricular Matrix of 2009, nor in the Construction of the Curricular Matrix of 2015, any concern in addressing the Concept or putting into practice the Interdisciplinarity. This concept and its practice would only appear in the formation of students, in a more consistent way, by the individual initiative of some teacher in approaching it and/or in putting it in their practice through projects with other disciplines. In other words, there is no institutional interdisciplinary project that integrates the disciplines and their knowledge and/or contents within the curricular matrices of the

course analyzed. This difficulty was even more accentuated with the remote teaching modality, given the fact that not even the physical presence of the professors in the institution was possible.

In the same analytical direction, regarding Literacies, the aforementioned Curricular Matrices of 2009 and 2015 present the same characteristics highlighted in relation to Interdisciplinarity. In the Curricular Matrix of 2009, the word Literacy appears only once, in the subtitle of a book, which appears in the references of the discipline "Guidelines for the Supervised Internship of Portuguese Language and Literatures II", offered in the 4th Year of the Course. However, it is not one of the themes of the Syllabus of the aforementioned discipline. In the Curricular Matrix of 2015 the word does not even appear. Again, there is no concern about the concepts and/or the practice of Literacies in the construction of the matrices of the Literature Course. That is; there is no institutional project for the discussion of the concept and practices of Literacy. This is worrisome, since teachers are being trained who should work daily with literacy practices for the training of their students in basic school. It is worth mentioning that, in an attempt to minimize this formative loss, at the initiative of the professors of the Course of Letters – Iporá, in 2016, a Specialization in Literacies was offered, which was even reoffered in 2021. This is an important training opportunity for the students of the institution and the teachers of the basic education network of Iporá and surrounding municipalities. This is one of the themes introduced in academic research since the second half of the twentieth century, and is more strongly defended since the beginning of the twenty-first century. It is seen that it is necessary to overcome the encapsulation of scientific knowledge. One of the problems identified was the need for classes to be taught remotely, also in the aforementioned specialization course.

With regard to the conception of Language, it is constructed in the gradation of the disciplines of Portuguese Language and Linguistics, year after year, semester after semester, within the Curricular Matrices, without the existence of one or more disciplines that synthesize it, for a more precise notion, as to the basic assumptions for its study, from the point of view of the paradigm or the paradigmatic clash between modernity and postmodernity. The Modern Model of Conceiving Language; that is: disciplined, atomized, esoteric, as an object of specific currents, represented by its specialists, is the hegemonic in the Curricular Matrices of the Course. The focus of Language built on the assumptions of Postmodernity is present in only three disciplines: "Discourse Studies", but with a very fixed emphasis on the Theories of Discourse Analysis and its concepts; "Fundamentals of Sociolinguistics and Ethnolinguistics", but concerned with explaining the two currents, their differences and similarities; and "Applied Linguistics", with an emphasis on research and criticism of the various research methodologies in language studies.

As for the participating teachers and according to everything that has already been analyzed above, the remote teaching model caused a very negative impact on teaching practices and,

consequently, on student learning. At first, the teachers tried to mirror the practices in the remote teaching modality with the traditional practices of face-to-face teaching and, little by little, they were trying to adjust to the novelties imposed. Clearly, it was necessary to face the change of conception. For example: the student cell phone that was previously forbidden during classes, with the remote mode, became the main ally for interaction, since few had a laptop or a desktop computer, with camera, for remote interaction. Every abrupt change causes a lot of stress and so it was with faculty and students during the research. The classes were very limited to the pedagogical discourse of the teacher and to the listening of the students. The contents and themes were limited to the exercise of textual and grammatical analysis. This generation of teachers did not receive, neither in their initial training nor in continuing education, classes on the use of technological tools for the mediation of teaching-learning. It is defended, here, that the local secretariats of the education networks invest heavily in this theme, to cooperate with this very important work that is developed by teachers in schools. Freitas (2010) understands that a single discipline, or a single teacher is not able to appropriate this conceptual depth and, therefore, defends the work of initial and continuing education increasingly interdisciplinary. In the words of this researcher,

I come to think that this approach to digital literacy should not necessarily be made from a certain discipline, but through a continuous work, within all the disciplines in which the teacher, in his initial training, can experience digital literacy in the pedagogical process itself. (FREITAS, 2010, p. 345)

6 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In addition to the tragedy of having brought to the end more than 700,000 lives in Brazil, the COVID-19 pandemic has also altered our way of human social life, which has as its hallmark the sociocultural interaction, since we left the caves for the savannas and began to live in social groups. The social relationship is our greatest historical-cultural force and has been heavily devastated by the necessary social isolation. In the context of education, this change made it necessary to carry out investigations about the methodologies to be developed in the remote modality: to rethink the educational practice and to analyze which methods and resources would be possible to be used for the best use of the technologies. New technologies were introduced in public schools: WhatsApp, Google Meet, various study platforms, YouTube, auxiliary tools such as the camera for the production of videos, or immediate filming in the exhibition, the production of 'slides' and video editing programs, all for a new modality of study and teaching. This is how virtual classrooms were established, in a constant flow between new technologies and familiar tools. Teachers had to advance in the use of mediation tools beyond books, scientific journals, newspapers; they also had to overcome the slate supports, the Datashow, etc. The computer, the cell phone and the internet became indispensable allies to the teaching work.

In this synthesis of research in which this text is made, it was not possible to contemplate all the data of the study. However, this work also did not intend to dissect all this analyzed reality. In short, this study was not interested in constituting a path of certainties, but a path in which the path is more important than the final arrival of the route. This is not a question of the production of a new regime of truths, but of a study in which its own author constantly places himself in the condition of an apprentice.

REFERENCES

- AGHA, A. The Object Called “Language” and the Subject of Linguistics. In: *Journal of AGHA, A. The Object Called “Language” and the Subject of Linguistics. In: Journal of English Linguistics*, Cambridge, v. 35, n. 3, p. 217-235, Sept. 2007.
- ANDERSON, B. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- BABIN, P.; KOULOUMDJIAN, M. F. Os novos modos de compreender: a geração do audiovisual e do computador. São Paulo: Paulinas, 1989.
- BAGNO, M. Do galego ao brasileiro, passando pelo português: crioulização e ideologias linguísticas. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Português no século XXI: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2013. p. 319-338.
- BAKHTIN, M. *Marxismo e Filosofia da Linguagem*. 14. ed. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2010.
- BARRETO, R. G. Formação de Professores Tecnologias e Linguagem: mapeando velhos e novos (des)encontros. São Paulo, Loyola, 2002.
- BLOMMAERT, J. Situating language rights: English and Swahili in Tanzania revisited. In: *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, v. 9, n. 3, p. 390-417, 2005.
- BUZATO, M. K. Sobre a necessidade de letramento eletrônico na formação de professores: o caso Teresa. In: Cabral, L.G; Souza, P.; Lopes, R.E.V.; Pagotto, E.G. (Org.). *Linguística e ensino: novas tecnologias*. Blumenau: Nova Letra, 2001. p. 229- 267.
- DELIZOICOV, D.; ANGOTTI, J. A.; PERNAMBUCO, M. M. Ensino de ciências: fundamentos e métodos. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002.
- ERRINGTON, J. Colonial Linguistics. In: *Annual Review of Anthropology*, v. 30, n. 1, p. 19-39, 2001.
- FABRÍCIO, B. F. Linguística Aplicada como espaço de “desaprendizagem”: redescrições em curso. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Por uma linguística aplicada INdisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2006. p. 45-65.
- A “outridade lusófona” em tempos de globalização: identidade cultural como potencial semiótico. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Português no século XXI: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2013. p. 144-168.
- FEYERABEND, P. K. *Contra o Método*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2011.
- FREIRE, P. *Pedagogia da autonomia – saberes necessários à prática educativa*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.
- FREITAS, M. T. Letramento Digital e Formação de Professores. *Educação em Revista: Belo Horizonte*, v.26, n. 03, 2010, p. 335-352.

GIMENEZ, T.; MONTEIRO, M. C. de G. Formação de Professores de Línguas na América Latina e Transformação Social. Coleção: *Novas Perspectivas em Linguística Aplicada*. vol. 4. Pontes: São Paulo, 2010.

GOMES, A de O. O ensino explícito da estratégia de aprendizagem “Agrupamento” a alunos de inglês como língua estrangeira. 2004. Dissertação (Mestrado em Letras) – Faculdade de Letras, Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia.

JACQUEMET, M. Transidiomatic Practices: language and power in the age of globalization. *Language and Communication*, 25 (3), 2005.

KOCH, I. V. A inter-ação pela linguagem. São Paulo: Ática, 2007.

KUMARAVADIVELU, B. Linguística Aplicada na era da globalização. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Por uma linguística aplicada INdisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2006. p. 129-148.

LUCENA, M. I. P. Práticas de Linguagem na Realidade da Sala de Aula: contribuições da pesquisa de cunho etnográfico em Linguística Aplicada. In: *DELTA*, São Paulo, n. 31-especial, p. 67-95, 2015. Disponível em: < <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102-445056402228334085>>. Acesso em 07 ago. 2014.

MAKONI, S.; PENNYCOOK, A. Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages. In: MAKONI, S.; PENNYCOOK, A. (Eds.) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon, 2007. p. 01-41.

MASETTO, M. T. Mediação pedagógica e o uso da tecnologia. In: MORAN, J. M.; MASETTO, M. T.; BEHRENS, M. A. *Novas tecnologias e mediação pedagógica*. Campinas: Papirus, 2000. p. 133-173.

MOITA LOPES, L. P. Uma linguística aplicada mestiça e ideológica: interrogando o campo como linguista aplicado. MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Por uma linguística aplicada INdisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2006. p. 13 – 44.

Linguística aplicada e vida contemporânea: problematização dos construtos que têm orientando a pesquisa. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Por uma linguística aplicada INdisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2006. p. 85 – 107.

Ideologia linguística: como construir discursivamente o português no século XXI. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Português no século XXI: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2013. p. 18 – 52.

Como e por que teorizar o português: recurso comunicativo em sociedades porosas e em tempos híbridos de globalização cultural. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Português no século XXI: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2013. p. 101 – 119.

MORIN, E. *Os sete saberes necessários à educação do futuro*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, Brasília, DF: UNESCO, 2000.

A cabeça bem-feita: repensar a reforma, reformar o pensamento. Tradução: Eloá Jacobina. 8. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2003.

MORIN, E.; CIURANA, E. R.; MOTTA, R. D. *Educar na era planetária: o pensamento complexo como Método de aprendizagem no erro e na incerteza humana*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2003.

PENNYCOOK, A. *Critical Applied Linguistic: a critical introduction*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.

Uma linguística aplicada transgressiva. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Por uma linguística aplicada INdisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2006. p. 67–84.

PESSOA, R. R. A critical approach to the teaching of English: pedagogical and identity engagement. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbla/2014nahead/aop3514.pdf>. Acesso em: 02 fev. 2014.

PINTO, J. P. Prefiguração identitária e hierarquias linguísticas na invenção do português. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Português no século XXI: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2013. p. 120-143.

SANTOS, B. de S. *Um discurso sobre as ciências*. 9. ed. Porto: Edições Afrontamento, 1997.

SIGNORINI, I. A questão da língua legítima na sociedade democrática: um desafio para a linguística aplicada contemporânea. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Por uma linguística aplicada INdisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2006. p. 169 – 190.

Política, língua portuguesa e globalização. In: MOITA LOPES, L. P. [Org.] *Português no século XXI: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2013. p. 74 – 100.

SOUZA, V. V. Letramento Digital e Formação de Professores. *Revista Língua Escrita*, n. 2, p. 55-69, dez., 2007.

SPOTTI, M. Ideologies of Success for Superdiverse Citizens: the Dutch Testing Regime for Integration and the Online Private Sector. In: BLOMMAERT, J.; RAMPTON, B.; SPOTTI, M. *Language and Superdiversities*. Vol. 13. N. 2. 2011.

STEGER, M. B. *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: OUP, 2003.

TRAVAGLIA, L. C. *Gramática e interação: uma proposta para o ensino de gramática*. 9. ed. rev. São Paulo: Cortez, 2003.

VASCONCELLOS, M. J. E. de. *O pensamento sistêmico: o novo paradigma da ciência*. Campinas: Papirus, 2005.