Conceptions of language in school: Ideological and paradigmatic clashes

Sérgio Gomes de Miranda[1]

ABSTRACT

This text synthesizes a qualitative research, produced from the Research Project: "The Conception of Language in School: ideological and paradigmatic clashes" and the "Study Group: Language and Ideologies: to think about Interdisciplinarity and Literacies - GELI", developed from 2019 to 2021, within the scope of the State University of Goiás – UEG, whose objective was to investigate the conceptions of language of students of this university and teachers who work in the basic education network of Iporá and surrounding municipalities, participants in the study, with a focus on changing paradigms in language studies. Eighteen students and twelve professors participated in the study. Based on observations of classes and questionnaires answered, the study data were produced, which were transcribed and analyzed, and are presented here, in the form of a synthesis, as research results. This text responds to the five specific objectives of the study and its general objective. In summary, the participants are divided regarding the idea of language as a school object: some still linked to the notion of language teaching as teaching grammar or grammatical nomenclature; others attuned to a perspective of language in its inherent complexity, as an interface of the social life of its users. The research demonstrates that the conceptions of language expressed by the participants reveal respect for the subjectivities and identities of the students of the basic school, understanding them in their interactions and real ways of life. The language practices of the participants act in the space of contradiction, in relation to the impositions of the system.

Keywords: Research, Paradigm Shift, Teaching-learning, Language.

---

[1] Professor., State University of Goiás – UEG
E-mail: sergio.miranda@ueg.br

INTRODUCTION

This text summarizes a research approved and developed within the State University of Goiás – UEG/Iporá, whose main objective was to investigate the teaching-learning of language in the university and in the basic school, regulating the focus for the change of paradigms in language studies, in order to understand its basic ideological assumptions.

As Vasconcellos (2005) teaches us, the paradigm shift that is underway in the sciences places in a position of confrontation three epistemological axes that govern modernity: "simplicity"; "stability"; "objectivity"; and, in opposition, three axes on which postmodern science is based: "complexity"; of "instability"; and "intersubjectivity". Within linguistic studies, as a reflection of these clashes in the sciences in general, Agha (2007) lists three aspects that characterize this modern epistemic project. In summary, the extractionist aspect, characterized by the extraction of a small fraction, called language, from the interior of the totality of language and by an invention of this language that will be chosen for study; the restrictivist aspect, characterized by the creation of exclusive limits for a discipline, instituting a field of knowledge for the study of the extracted object; and the exclusionist aspect, marked by the prior exclusion of those who can or cannot be called linguists. In these three basic aspects for the study of language, the object, the field of action and the researcher for this field and for this object are reified. In contrast, Agha (2007) also presents the three postmodern aspects. Briefly, the expansionist aspect, which understands language as a historical, cultural and discursive formation. Language is recognized in its inherent complexity; the integrationist aspect, characterized by the perception of language in its contextual insertion, manifests itself in different genres of text expressed in the realization of this language: instead of structures, the set of discursive practices; and the collaborative aspect, in which linguistics is integrated and, at the same time, part of a field of action composed of different disciplines, but which dialogue for a common cause: an enterprise that links the study of linguistics to other forms of social scientific studies.

Here, in this text, it is understood that, as Moita Lopes (2013) argues, 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. Moita Lopes (2013) argues that 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). Changing paradigms means transforming ourselves and, consequently, the knowledge we produce. Feyerabend (2011, p. 33. Emphasis added) explains that "science does not know 'naked facts' at all, but that all the 'facts' we become aware of are already seen in a certain way and are therefore essentially ideational." In summary, all scientific practice is inherently ideological.

The research produced and that gives rise to this text was driven by the following Research Problem: "What are the conceptions of Portuguese language/language that are put into discourse and practices by the students of the Letters Course – Iporá and by the teachers of the Basic Education Network of Iporá and neighboring municipalities, participants in this research, in the sense of thinking about the ideological clash modernity versus postmodernity that is established by the paradigmatic change underway in linguistic studies?"

The objectives of the text were: general – "To study the conceptions of Portuguese language/language that are put into discourse and practices by the students of the Language Course – Iporá and by the teachers of the Basic Education Network of Iporá and neighboring municipalities, participants in this research, in order to think about the ideological clash modernity versus post-modernity that is established by the paradigmatic change underway in linguistic studies."; specific – "To analyze the language practices and activities put forward as means for the teaching of the Portuguese language at the secondary level"; "To analyze the paradigmatic adherence of the school to the teaching of the Portuguese language through the literacy practices placed in the teaching and learning process"; "To analyze if and how interdisciplinary relationships are placed, with a focus on language teaching"; "To investigate what are the Conceptions of Language, Literacy and Interdisciplinarity brought by the students of the Letters Course-Iporá, participants in this Research".

METHODOLOGY

The Research Project had as participants, twelve (12) teachers of Portuguese language who work in public schools of basic education located in Iporá and surrounding municipalities, as well as eighteen (18) students in teacher training of the Letters Course of the State University of Goiás - UEG/Iporá, who, after being invited, volunteered to participate in the study. Under my supervision and coordination, the "Study Group: Language and Ideologies: to think about Interdisciplinarity and Literacies" was formed; henceforth, only "GELI", in which the students met with me to study about the change of paradigms in language studies, to deepen their knowledge about how to produce qualitative research, as well as to improve their knowledge about the production of instruments for the production of data in scientific studies. With the advent of the COVID 19 Pandemic and its worsening, the study underwent reformulations, to allow interaction and continuity of the study, in the same way as the classes of the course subjects. In this sense, everything that was face-to-face started to take place remotely, mediated by the internet.

The study was characterized as a qualitative research, of an ethnographic nature, since it intended to study the concepts of Language that the participants had and disseminated through their practices and in their 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 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: "bringing to light situated realities and practices of language that are little valued in relation to hegemonic discourses." (LUCENA, 2015, p. 79).

Based on the research schedule, first the "GELI" was formed; then, invitations were extended to the teachers of the basic school, as well as the submission of the instruments produced in the study. The duration of the project was 24 months, from the second half of 2019 to the end of 2020. Because of the COVID 19 Pandemic, changes in the university and basic school calendars were necessary, messing with all the previous programming and, therefore, changing the lives of all those involved in the research. Also due to the pandemic and all its impacts, another objective was added to the research: "To analyze how teachers self-evaluate and how they evaluate their general performance, regarding teaching and learning, during the period of remote teaching, due to the COVID 19 Pandemic." In all, there were eleven actions that were completed and that structured the production schedule of the research.

The instruments for the production of the research data were produced jointly, by me, as the study coordinator, and by the student-participants, based on the theoretical framework of the study. Initially, the Questionnaire would be used; Direct Observation; and the Semi-Structured Interview. However, because of the many changes in the university's academic calendar and school calendars due to the COVID 19 Pandemic, the study also had to undergo changes in terms of temporality and methodology.

Amid the complexity of sudden changes, some alterations were necessary; such as: the entrance to the school, for the presentation of the project to the teachers, was changed to the individualized invitation to the teachers; instead of the Observations of the classroom classes, the classes were observed and the activities were analyzed through remote interaction platforms, guided by a thematic script, which directed the look to the practices; the Consent Form and the Questionnaire, which would previously be delivered in print, were sent by email or WhatsApp to the participating teachers by the participating students and sent back, through the same digital means. Mainly due to the increasingly strict recommendations for social isolation, Interviews were avoided. To reduce the damage to the study due to the lack of this instrument, its main questions were incorporated into the Questionnaire, which began to ask about the teaching profile and about theoretical and practical elements that would help to better understand the teaching work in basic school and to respond to the problem of this study.

The descriptions and preliminary analyses of the data produced were the responsibility of the student-participants: to receive the resubmissions of the questionnaires answered by the participating teachers, to preliminarily organize the data from the observations of the classes attended. Three (03)

classes of each of the twelve (12) participating teachers were observed, in different grades/classes of basic education. In all, thirty-six (36) classes taught were observed by the student-participants. It was up to the project coordinator to improve and deepen the descriptions and produce the analyses. After this phase, the selection of the pertinent data for the production of this text was carried out.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This research was inserted in a broader ideological discussion, which has as its core the change of the modern epistemic model of language studies, characterized by the stabilization of language to the code and the idealization of its uses and its users, by a more complex model, centered on the paradigm of post-modernity, which seeks to understand the ideological aspects present in language practices in their real uses, in situated contexts.

It is defended, here, that there is a network of ideological power that directly affects the role that education should play and, for this very reason, resonates in the processes of initial and continuing training of the teacher, in his or her performance and in the results of this action for the training of his or her apprentices. The analysis of the inner functioning of this framework will find an amalgam between ideological currents that come together to exercise their power and dictate events and their respective consequences. Such ideological currents are known as: the paradigm of modernity; the ideologies of colonialism/nationalism; the ideology of globalization, governed under the power of capitalism.

The Paradigm of Modernity has, among several characteristics, the concern with creating laws, establishing rules common to all, producing generalizations, totalizing the context, perceiving a regularity of discourse. Moita Lopes (2006) clarifies that Modernity tends to be very well demarcated by currents and by scholars who intend to defend exclusive positions, disciplinary knowledge. Within this modern ideology, there are the marks of Western violence imposed in colonization processes. Santos (2004) points out that Colonialism was conceived as a civilizing mission in Western history, at a time when Europe dictated the development of the rest of the world. This ideology imposes a new geopolitical organization of knowledge, based on the imposition of ideas from the North and the creation of a periphery formed by ideas from the South, and has at its foundation prejudice, discrimination, cultural imposition, the dictatorship of knowledge. Pinto (2013) argues that Colonialism hierarchizes the users of the language into cultured and uneducated, as well as its uses. As for the ideology of Nationalism, originating from the French Enlightenment and German Romanticism of the eighteenth century, it associates language with a delimited and specific geographical space, forging a local identity, simulating a connection between territory, cultural tradition and language, establishing a uniform identity for the nation. Jacquemet (2005) exposes the criticism that most contemporary linguistic studies are still under the influence of the myth of Babel,

expressed in the ideological desire to maintain linguistic borders, allocate people to their respective territories, with the idea of connecting language with the emergence of the feeling of national identity. Another ideological current that enters this network is what is conventionally called Globalization. This ideology is used, above all, by the use of mass media, giving the impression that the world now appears as a huge society that homogenizes itself at all times. However, despite the peaceful impression that the hegemonic discourse tries to fictionalize, there is a macabre power relationship that crushes disadvantaged peoples. To explain globalization, Signorini (2013) points out that its ideological forces are borrowed from liberalism and neoliberalism: a wide range of globalizing processes, manifested under the aegis of the articulation between ideas, beliefs and values. The same author adds that, when it comes specifically to linguistic globalization, the best example is the "commoditization/commodification of English as a good access to the globalized world" (SIGNORINI, 2013, p. 77). In this ideal, every language represents a value in the global market. Moita Lopes (2006) argues that, today, we live in a new world order and a new capitalism. For him, globalization promotes elites and oppresses local lives: the former, "start to live transglobally"; the latter survive "without alternatives or the garbage of those who live transglobally" (MOITA LOPES, 2006, p. 24). It is not difficult to notice that the relationship between these ideological currents forms a network whose knots are tied by the capitalist system. There is a whole machinery that ranges from mega international agencies, from countries that lead global economic markets, through public policies for education and its management in the federal, state and municipal spheres, to local work that takes place in the classroom, in its realization.

The great challenges to be overcome for the change of language education in Brazil are completely based on changing this scenario. Moita Lopes (2013) argues that it is necessary to reflect on the ideology with which we operate: "there is a need to think about other theoretical constructs and analytical tools to account for what we understand by Portuguese and how to conduct linguistic research" (MOITA LOPES, 2013, p. 29). The aforementioned author defends and aligns himself with the creation of an anti-hegemonic agenda for the practice of research and language teaching. This implies the choice of certain theories, specific worldviews, "in order to open spaces for the creation of other alternative, fairer and more ethical social futures" (MOITA LOPES, 2006, p. 52). This change is understood as fundamental, since many dimensions of social life have been forgotten in the modern perspectives of doing research and education. In this regard, Love (2009) criticizes the neutrality of Western linguistics in the face of context, in order to establish itself as a science. In the same sense, Irvine (1996) highlights dissatisfaction with the classical model of linguistics; above all, due to the sentencing isolation for analysis, the invention of an anonymous speaker and listener. To affirm his position, Irvine (1996) stresses that it is essential to consider the context, as one seeks to analyze what includes the discourse, ideologically constituted.

A very important factor to imprint this change is the understanding that any transformation will not be carried out on a global scale, but, on the contrary, it will be exercised in local contexts, in actions situated and characterized by local forms of existence. All challenges to education bring with them their marks of locality. Fabrício (2006) explains that language should be seen in a way that is "inseparable from the social and discursive practices that build, sustain or modify the productive, cognitive and desiring capacities of social actors." (FABRÍCIO, 2006, p. 48).

To develop an enterprise of this magnitude and face the challenges that contemporaneity presents, it will be crucial to find ways to cope and engage. With this in mind, Moita Lopes (2006) understands that issues of ethics and power are implicit in this change, in the sense of thinking about language in an existence that "only comes to life when people and their subjectivities and histories are considered in the multiple and situated social practices of meaning construction" (MOITA LOPES, 2013, p. 104). The aforementioned researcher invites us to "go to meet the world in which we live in the twenty-first century [...] a crucial demand if we want our knowledge to be relevant to the social practices in which we are situated." (MOITA LOPES, 2013, p. 52)

NEW LITERACIES

Despite the local changes that are already taking place, even today, the model of initial and continuing training of teachers in many of our universities mirrors the modern paradigm. The concept that expresses this formative model well is that of autonomous literacy. In it, the language is restricted to the teaching of the standard normative nomenclature; literature is reduced to the fragmentation of literary periods; linguistics is limited to the delimitation of theoretical currents. As Street (2012) teaches, the concept of autonomous literacy explains well an education that is characterized by uniqueness and association with a unique culture. Kleiman (2012), in turn, emphasizes that this is the model that has still been maintained in our society since the last century. From this perspective, language and literature are conceived as entities neutral to social reality. In this vein, Jordão (2013) highlights the consequences of this view: an abstraction of the communicative process, stabilized in the code; the reproduction of this code as an object of teaching, as a substitution of language; The classroom is limited to having as practices the "memorization and reproduction of the "relatively stable" forms socially available for the linguistic construction of texts." (JORDÃO, 2013, p. 355. Emphasis added)

In turn, Rocha (2012) denounces that "[i]f the school often legitimizes a single practice for literacy, it also legitimizes certain sociabilities linked to it" (ROCHA, 2012, p. 01). Kleiman (2008) explains that one of the reasons for this is the reductionism embedded in the guidelines about knowledge regarding teacher training. A deeper reading of what is put here by these scholars reveals that the central problem of this autonomous model adopted for teacher training seems to be

associated with the fact that the current world is multiple, complex, marked by different flows, especially if we think about the discourse and the media environment; And yet, our classrooms, university and basic education, remain obsolete, without being contaminated by these current transformations in the world.

For a transformative spirit, teacher training must always be in the process of self-contestation in the face of the challenges of the teaching role. Therefore, teachers must understand the premise of always being interdisciplinary scholars, attuned to the world, beyond traditional training and the predetermined curriculum. In this attempt to discuss the more comprehensive training of teachers, Street (2012) highlights the concept of "literacy practices", in the way of associating literacy with cultural and social spheres, as well as with a broader conception of the cultural contexts in which people apprehend the meanings and senses of the world to which they are integrated. Based on this notion, this scholar proposes a change from the autonomous literacy model to the ideological literacies model. At the center of this conception, "literacy is considered a field to investigate the processes of hegemony, power relations, practices and competing discourses, instead of exploring the great division and relative rationality of modern and traditional societies." (STREET, 2012, p. 83)

By adopting the concept of ideological literacies, by extension, a new way of looking at the role of education and teacher training is configured. As Rocha (2012) teaches, literacies "are ways of acting in the world that consider the social contexts in which the action takes place" (ROCHA, 2012, p. 04).

Also concerned with this aspect of teacher training, Monte Mór (2013) warns of the importance of including the topic of language teaching policies in the curriculum of initial and continuing teacher training, as well as during their work as teachers. From this perspective, the teacher's performance makes more sense, as it reflects the most proximal traits of his or her life and the lives of his or her learners. This position is in line with the opinion expressed by Pessoa (2014), when he states that we can no longer see education as a neutral or autonomous activity. For the author, we have to believe in alternatives for the world we live in, increasingly governed by the interests of capitalism.

Academic production only makes sense if it positively influences the practical life of people and their ways of knowing, especially those people who live on the margins of social life based on the power of capital. Interested in new ways of producing knowledge, Arnold et al (2012) advocate a continuum between school and university, with the aim of refining teacher training and building professional development. The aforementioned authors thus bring the concept of "critical praxis" to educators, in the sense of going beyond the formal constraints of curriculum and knowledge, to encourage the local community, students and teachers to act together in the understanding of practices of general interest.

In order for what is stated above to be possible, a course correction will be necessary. This correction involves the inversion of the poles, with the public school as the starting point and the point of arrival, while the university will act as the mediator to meet the demands posed. To this end, it requires a new training profile and academic curricular dimension. In people's real lives, knowledge is not departmentalized. Language mediates all human relationships and gives them meanings and senses. A critical literacy of teachers is a primordial condition for the conquest of new directions for the linguistic education that occurs in school. This discussion posted above in this text is an attempt to reflect on some of the guidelines that lead to this transformation.

RESULTS

This section will be dedicated to the difficult task of synthesizing the production of the data and analysis of the research. For this reason, the objectives set to the study will be privileged, in order to try to demonstrate how they were tried to be achieved during the research process. This time, at the end of the project, several results can be highlighted that deserve to be highlighted for the development of the research. Below are these attempts to summarize the objectives achieved:

The first specific objective of the study was *"To analyze the language practices and activities put forward as means for the teaching of the Portuguese language at the high school level*." School practices are also language practices, literacy practices are at the same time language practices that teachers produce to mediate the expression or creation of the meaning of some knowledge, whatever their field of knowledge. The qualifiers of the analyzed teaching work are good: the interdisciplinary interaction, the teacher-student relationship, the selected contents, the literacies put into practice, among others. The analysis of this research theme leads us to the understanding that language/language as an object to be taught in school is in a process of construction of its meaning. Among the participants, four (04), when conceiving the language as an object of teaching at school, associated it with the teaching of grammar and/or the cultured norm, with a focus on the written record. An idea of regulation of student discourses is perceived, when they identify in their productions that they distance themselves from the set of norms of prescriptive-normative grammar and in the demands of students for this knowledge when producing their activities. For them, teaching the language is teaching grammar or teaching textual genres in their relatively stable forms. This dichotomy in language teaching practices appears in Cerutti-Rizzatti (2013), when he warns that, due to the strength that the hegemonic paradigm still holds in our schools, we are only replacing one type of categorical study with another, since textual genres end up being transformed into objects in themselves, instead of social practices of language use.

From different perspectives, the other participants see language as an object for teaching at school from the perspective of communication and reading beyond decoding; in defense of the

"reading of the world", of the identification of language with the identity and history of people and communication; linguistic variations and diversity; the importance of literacy and literacy. Analyzed from the pedagogical point of view, these positions point to a very important way of understanding language as the content of classes, since language multiplies and changes as many times as the contexts and situations of reading, of productions of activities are modified. Also, there is the understanding of a meaningful school for its learners, which can open to them the world of meanings that is around them, in a critical way before this world, so that they can also walk their own steps, with the due autonomy for this. In the way it is analyzed here, this position of the participants is very important, as it thinks about language from the social and cultural perspective, as its defense has a political, critical and ethical nature for the role of the school and the teacher, in the face of the theme of linguistic prejudice, of the social differences that extend from society to the school and from there to society. Here we see a place more open to the plurality of discourses, especially for the discourses of students, which have been neglected for so long. Moita Lopes (2006b) embraces this view by arguing that contemporary applied linguistics should have the understanding of reality as part of an ethical research project, in the sense that the construction of knowledge is associated with change in social life. In the author's own words, it is "fundamental to problematize social life, in order to understand the social practices in which language plays a crucial role" (MOITA LOPES, 2006b, p. 102).

The second objective was: "*To analyze the paradigmatic adherence of teachers to the teaching of the Portuguese language through the literacy practices placed in the teaching and learning process*." There was opposition among the research participants: of the twelve participating teachers, half claim to work with a focus on the concept of literacies and/or their practices. The other half say they have not studied literacy practices. It is evident that there is an inviolable relationship between the conceptions of language and the practices of literacies. The more language is stabilized, as a grammatical structure, affecting its original role and potentialities, the more the notion of literacy and its practices will be limited.

It was possible to analyze that, because they did not study literacy in their initial and continuing education, some understand literacies as a kind of course that is taken with people who did not have the opportunity to attend school and who are learning to read and write in adulthood. Likewise, they refer to learners who have difficulties with reading texts and with formal written production. It is clear that continuing education for teachers is very much needed. For the analyses made regarding the participants, the literacies are still in their process of constructing their meanings as practices that the school must produce daily within it. In their own performances, it was also possible to analyze the literacy practices that are identified here as ideological literacy practices: excellent texts and teaching mediations for the critical reflection of social issues by students.

Another relevant aspect was the regularity regarding the use of didactic material for their classes: when the students had some type of didactic material to support the study in the classroom, for the activities to be produced and for the monitoring of the presentation made by the teacher, better participation and interest in producing was perceived. Whether it is a photocopy taken by the teacher to class, or the textbook of the course, or a printout made from a web page, etc., the didactic material for the use of the students was a fundamental element for the quality of the classes: the use of class time; the ease/quality of teacher-student interaction; the deepening of the discussion and the possibility of a more effective literacy work. In general, this genuine contact with the written text, whether it is in any medium, constituted a very significant element for the students, especially for the purpose of learning to read and write. As Rampton (2006b) understands and defends, the analysis of language must be done with an eye to situated experiences, so as not to make the mistake of reifying language as a contextually sterile and stable object in terms of the interlocutors and their performances in these contexts.

The use of other resources and other technologies by teachers during the observations is highlighted, such as a sound system; Datashow etc.; With this, the teacher maintains a more direct and interactive interaction with the students, since the class is less dispersed, with greater conditions of concentration on the theme of the class. In analysis, these various factors linked to the use of these materials revealed a fundamental aspect of the participants' teaching literacies, as well as their condition to offer learners more significant literacy practices for their learning. Moita Lopes (2013b) argues that in school the practices should be genuinely real practices for the students' lives, so that they can identify with them and so that they can perceive and produce the meanings of the interactions they produce within these practices; that is, so that they are not limited to only practices that serve the school. In this sense, the participants aimed to lead students to think and act critically in the face of the topics studied. Regarding this teaching attitude, Hall and Walsh (2002) point out that our linguistic, social and cognitive knowledge is closely linked to our participation and active learning in events and activities that are socioculturally significant. The principles of the post-modernity paradigm are the critical position and the engaged posture of the teacher in the face of their global/local realities and those of their learners. By adopting this attitude, the participants made their classrooms a place for reflection, discussion and confrontation with the challenges that are presented to us. This work done by the participants and analyzed here is in line with what Cerutti-Rizzatti (2013, p. 250) proposes as a school action that has as its identifying mark the commitment, "the will to give the pedagogical process a direction that reveals less artificiality and favors meaningful learning".

The third objective sought in the research: "*To analyze if and how interdisciplinary relations are placed in the school, with a focus on language teaching.*" All participants answered that they

know interdisciplinarity, as well as that they recognize its importance and benefits for teaching and learning. In the same sense, all of them stated that they had studied about this concept, both in their undergraduate and specialization programs. This is a crucial aspect for teacher training and its practices, since the defense of interdisciplinarity is inserted in the process of paradigmatic change underway in the university and in basic schools. However, all of them also answered that they had more theoretical knowledge than practical experiences with interdisciplinarity. This analysis is in line with Severino's (2001) critique that interdisciplinarity needs to be resized theoretically and, in its practice, it needs to be constructed. This revelation of the participants makes perfect sense, given the fact that in many higher education courses, in various areas, more specifically in the teaching degree courses, the interdisciplinary matrices, based on genuinely interdisciplinary projects, have not yet been implemented. At the State University of Goiás – UEG itself, as will be seen later in these analyses, the Curricular Matrices of the Letters Course of the State University of Goiás – UEG, from 2009 and 2015, which will be highlighted in this text, completely ignore this important concept.

The participants denounce that the teaching days in several shifts, the legal structures of workloads, the relationships of the semester disciplines in the organization of the matrices, etc., leave little room for continuing education, as well as great physical and mental exhaustion for this cause. Another factor is the defense that teachers make of their performances, in the sense of protecting themselves in their specific knowledge. Each knowledge has its space occupied and represented in those who are its specialists, while disallowing others to deal with knowledge from areas other than their own. Domingues (2012, p. 01) criticizes that our teaching is still "ultra-disciplinary, the departments function as true registry offices." This makes cooperation very difficult, with little or no possibility for experiences that go beyond the "walls" of disciplinarity. The participants in this study extend their criticism from their own personal formation, regarding the concept and interdisciplinary practices, to broader views of the entire education system to which interdisciplinarity seeks to become an integrator, but which, due to various conditions, it is not yet effective. The greatest adversary of interdisciplinarity, in this view, is the modern paradigm that persists in our educational system, from its political management, through the structuring of the curriculum, affecting classroom practices, both in training courses and in their results in the basic schools where graduated teachers go.

The fourth specific objective of the research consisted of: *investigating what are the Conceptions of Language, Literacy and Interdisciplinarity brought by the students of the Letters Course-Iporá, participants in this Research.* When analyzing the Matrices of the Letters Course of the State University of Goiás – UEG, from 2009 and 2015, it is easy to see that the Matrices and Syllabuses are built in a form of sequence and gradation of concepts and contents, within the disciplines. In this way, the disciplines gain a gradation and a deepening in terms of 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, students do not come to establish the existing relationships between these disciplines, their syllabus, their concepts and contents; that is: there is no *Interdisciplinarity.* In this study, it is important to emphasize that, when analyzing the *2009 Curricular Matrix of the Letters Course*, in its Syllabuses and Bibliographies, only once is the concept of *Interdisciplinarity mentioned;* 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 2015 Curricular Matrix, *Interdisciplinarity* appears as one of the themes to be addressed in a knowledge framework of an *"Optional" discipline* of *"Free Core"*: *"Interdisciplinary Projects in the Classroom."* This finding makes it clear that there was no concern in the construction of the *2009 Curricular Matrix*, nor in the *Construction of the 2015 Curricular Matrix*, in addressing the Concept or putting *Interdisciplinarity into practice.* Such a concept and its practice would only appear in the students' education, in a more consistent way, through the individual initiative of some teacher in approaching it and/or 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.

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 2009 Curricular Matrix*, 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 2015 Curriculum Matrix,* the word does not even appear. Again, there is no concern about the concepts and/or practice of Literacies in the construction of the matrices of the Letters Course. That is; there is no institutional project for the discussion of the concept and practices of Literacies. This is worrisome, since teachers are being trained who will have to 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 teachers of the Letters Course – Iporá, in 2016, a Specialization in Literacies was offered, which has just received its authorization for a re-edition. This is an important training opportunity for the institution's students and teachers from 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 it has been more strongly defended since the beginning of the twenty-first century. It is clear that it is necessary to overcome the encapsulation of scientific knowledge.

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 post-modernity. The Modern model of conceiving *Language*; that is: disciplined, atomized, esoteric, as an object of specific currents, represented by its specialists, is the hegemonic one in the Curricular Matrices of the Course. The focus on *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.

During the course of the study, due to the changes brought about by the COVID 19 Pandemic, it was necessary to add another fifth objective; that is: "*To analyze how the teacher self-evaluates and how he or she evaluates the general performance, regarding teaching and learning, during the period of remote teaching, due to the COVID 19 Pandemic.*" Among the twelve (12) teaching participants of the research, with regard to this objective, five (05) stated that they had no previous knowledge about Remote Teaching, Distance Learning, teaching mediated by remote technology, as in the current situation we are experiencing. Three (03) out of these twelve (12) stated that they had little prior knowledge for this remote work. Four (04) stated that they already had prior knowledge in this regard. Of the twelve (12) teaching participants, five (05) emphasized that they had not received any technical/technological support or little support. Another seven (07) highlighted having received support: either at the institution where they work, or through the Department of Education/Superintendence, or through online/internet courses.

When they analyzed their own actions during this period, the responses included positions of frustration, challenge, exhaustion, tiredness, demotivation, difficulties, uncertainties, dissatisfaction, learning, motivation, and innovation. All of them criticized the work overload, within school hours and after: the preparation time, the difficulties with choosing/preparing materials, availability of technological/technical resources for so much load of data, content, information, etc. With regard to their students, they evaluated learning with great concern; they claimed low student performance; a lot of resistance, low adherence and even aversion to the teaching modality and methodologies; difficulty in dialogue, in the interaction between teacher and student; a lot of student shyness in interactions; little student autonomy.

On the other hand, four (04) highlighted the engagement of some students; protagonism and autonomy; the support of the school community to the students. All twelve (12) teaching participants showed concern about social inequalities, social vulnerability and the difficulties that these inequalities and social vulnerability reveal, especially at this time of remote teaching. In this sense, even recognizing the opportunity for innovation, for learning new teaching methodologies, everyone was clear in showing that remote teaching has not been effective, with regard to teaching methodologies, teacher-student interaction, teacher mediation, promotion of student autonomy, pedagogical monitoring of learning and, therefore, understand that learning has been shown to be low, mainly because technical and technological difficulties, lack of access to the internet, social and economic factors are associated with pedagogical and psychological aspects to impair the teaching work and, consequently, student learning.

Finally, we arrive at the Problem and the General Objective of the study, amalgamated in the following question: *What are the conceptions of Portuguese language/language that are put into discourse and practices by the students of the Letters Course – Iporá and by the teachers of the Basic Education Network of Iporá and neighboring municipalities, participants in this research, in order to think about the ideological clash modernity versus post-modernity that is established by the paradigmatic change underway in the linguistic studies.*

One of the factors of great interference in the teachers' attempts to contribute to the learning of their learners, during the observations, was the silence of the students, in an almost absolute way, during most of the classes. In many of the cases analyzed, the predominance of student silence during classes was due to the concern of some participating teachers for being observed in their classroom practices. Thus, they ended up creating a change in the interaction with the students, as well as in the student-student relationship. This practice is related to the idea of controlling the behavior of the class. This caution created a kind of regularity regarding the disciplined behavior of students during classes. This teacher-student and student-student interaction is opposed to the already widespread view that the public school classroom is an unfavorable environment for teaching work, due to the undisciplined behavior of students. As a way of trying to hear the voice of their interlocutor, some teachers instigated the students to give their opinions, to talk about the theme, to bring examples, achieving relative success in this proposal. During the research there was no aggression or disrespect to the professors, not even among students. From another perspective, the criticism that orality is not well worked in school is already widespread. Thus, the teacher's protagonism remains as a methodological option in the classes and the students' role of listening to the teacher. Bakhtin has interaction as one of his main theses for the understanding of language. As he teaches us, 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). When dealing with language as an object of study, he emphasizes that "[t]he true object is the interrelation and interaction of the 'spirits'" (BAKHTIN, 2003, p. 373. Emphasis added). In other words, giving freedom to students means, in this sense, horizontalizing the relationships in the classroom, privileging interaction, as well as recognizing the diversity inherent to any school class.

In the interactions between teachers and students, it was possible to find a regularity: the participants adopted, in most classes, as a discursive-pedagogical model for the exposition of the contents, the uses of formal/technical terminology, both in the practices of reading the texts and for writing during the examples; as well as, for the explanation/discussion of these contents, they made use of the paraphrase of this technical terminology of the text studied. The students did not show concern with the formalisms of the language. They were free to express themselves in their most everyday way, naturally, even with the observations of the classes. There was no teacher concern with the legitimacy or non-legitimacy of the students' linguistic uses. Seen from the analytical perspective adopted here, the posture of the participating teachers in the face of these forms of expression of the students in the observed interactions can be characterized as an anti-hegemonic form, since, from the modern perspective of interaction in the classroom, the privilege of the so-called cultured norm and the discredit of the other variations can be seen. Thus, the participating teachers are taking into account the diversity that marks all social interaction, respecting the history of the subjectivities of those who share the rich space of the classroom with them. In this way, the participating teachers are awake to what Pinto (2013, p. 143) defends: "it is time to give up the fallacy of identity prefiguration rooted in the supports of writing and grammar".

The mediation for the learning made by the participating teachers adopted the practice of reading aloud, carried out by the teachers and, in a few opportunities, carried out by the students. This initiative seems to me to be a good opportunity for literacy, given the fact that reading was not limited to the purpose of answering a questionnaire, or a school task. Reading aloud is an important form of interaction in the classroom. This initiative under analysis here proved to be a significant aspect of classroom relationships. It was clear how important the teaching mediations are and how revealing it can be in this process of knowing.

In summary, it was seen that the participants are aware of the importance of their roles for the meaningful learning of their learners. The participants are divided regarding the idea of language as a school object: some still linked to the notion of language teaching as teaching grammar or grammatical nomenclature; others attuned to a perspective of language in its inherent complexity, which integrates active reading before the text, writing endowed with meaning and language as an interface of the social life of its users. In this sense, the participants expressed a lot of potential for the production of their work, indicating that, despite the many constraints imposed by the system on

their roles, their discourses and practices demonstrated that they are aware of their context and their teaching condition, in the face of the challenges that arise in the school.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The practice of research almost always brings unexpected elements, compared to what is initially projected before the study. Proof of this are all these changes in the schedule and methodologies expressed above that the study went through. For this reason, it is worth saying, a path of predetermined certainties was not proposed for the study, but a journey of attempts, constant self-reflection and self-criticism. In this ethical sense, an inquisition was not established for the discourses and practices of the participants, nor was it intended to construct a prescription for the conduct of the participants, as regimes of truth.

Contemporaneity is marked by great social and scientific transformations. A new society is rapidly emerging, as well as new ways of living and understanding the world. The school is a prominent place as a *locus* of social disalienation. However, the participants denounced a huge framework of impositions of the system on the school and on its teaching performances.

In this research, the conceptions of language expressed by the participants reveal the recognition of the community by which the school is involved. Respect for the subjectivities and identities of the students was perceived, understanding them in their interactions and real ways of life. Here, this respect and understanding are integral to the paradigm of postmodernity. The language practices of the participants act in the space of contradiction, in relation to the impositions of the system. They resignify their conception based on modernity and express the adoption of language in the real practices of people's lives.

Due to the characteristics of this research, its analyses and results cannot be generalized to the professors who work throughout Brazil. However, some of the aspects highlighted here are easily found in the network in education in our country, in particular, the arena of forces between the system that governs education and the teachers who work in public schools.

The road to be covered for the education we dream of is still quite long. However, the challenges must be faced. Many have already taken the first steps on this journey of transforming our study models and teaching practices. Whoever decides to walk this distance will never be alone: there will be interaction and support. The transformation will not be carried out on a global scale, but will be exercised in local contexts, in situated actions. All challenges to education bring with them their marks of locality, the main reason for the school to be thought of with a view to those who live the daily school life.

REFERENCES

1. Agha, A. (2007). The Object Called "Language" and the Subject of Linguistics. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 35(3), 217-235.

2. Arnold, J., et al. (2012). Conceptualizing teacher education and research as critical praxis. *Critical Studies in Education*, 53(3), 281-295.

3. Bakhtin, M. (2003). *Estética da criação verbal*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

4. Bakhtin, M. (2010). *Marxismo e Filosofia da Linguagem* (14ª ed.). São Paulo: Hucitec.

5. Cerutti-Rizzatti, M. E. (2012). Ensino de língua portuguesa e inquietações teórico-metodológicas: os gêneros discursivos na aula de português e a aula (de português) como gênero discursivo. *Alfa*, 56(1), 249-269. Disponível em: http://seer.fclar.unesp.br/alfa/article/view/4968/0. Acesso em: 05 jun. 2013.

6. Domingues, I. (2012). Disciplinaridade, Multi, Inter e Transdisciplinaridade – onde estamos? In *Instituto de Estudos Avançados Transdisciplinares*. Belo Horizonte: IEAT Publicações.

7. Feyerabend, P. K. (2011). *Contra o Método* (2ª ed.). São Paulo: Editora Unesp.

8. Fabrício, B. F. (2006). Linguística Aplicada como espaço de "desaprendizagem": redescrições em curso. In L. P. Moita Lopes (Org.), *Por uma linguística aplicada INdisciplinar* (pp. 45-65). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

9. Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 186-203.

10. Irvine, J. T. (1996). Shadow conversations: the indeterminancy of participant roles. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban (Eds.), *Natural Histories of Discourse* (pp. 131-159). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

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

12. Jordão, C. M. (2013). Letramento crítico: complexidade e relativismo em discurso. In L. C. S. Calvo et al. (Orgs.), *Reflexões sobre o ensino de línguas e formação de professores no Brasil* (pp. 349-369). Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores.

13. Kleiman, A. B. (2012). Modelos de Letramento e as prática de alfabetização na escola. In A. B. Kleiman (Org.), *Os significados do letramento: novas perspectivas sobre a prática social da escrita* (pp. 15-61). Campinas: Mercado de Letras.

14. Kleiman, A. B. (2008). Os estudos de letramento e a formação do professor de língua materna. *Linguagem em (Dis)curso LemD*, 8(3), 487-517.

15. Love, N. (2009). Science, language and linguistic culture. *Language & Communication*, 29.

16. Lucena, M. I. P. (2015). Práticas de Linguagem na Realidade da Sala de Aula: contribuições da pesquisa de cunho etnográfico em Linguística Aplicada. *DELTA*, 31(Especial), 67-95. Disponível em: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102-445056402228334085. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2014.

17. Moita Lopes, L. P. (2006a). Uma linguística aplicada mestiça e ideológica: interrogando o campo como linguista aplicado. In L. P. Moita Lopes (Org.), *Por uma linguística aplicada INdisciplinar* (pp. 13-44). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

18. Moita Lopes, L. P. (2006b). Linguística aplicada e vida contemporânea: problematização dos construtos que têm orientando a pesquisa. In L. P. Moita Lopes (Org.), *Por uma linguística aplicada INdisciplinar* (pp. 85-107). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

19. Moita Lopes, L. P. (2013a). Ideologia linguística: como construir discursivamente o português no século XXI. In L. P. Moita Lopes (Org.), *Português no século XXI: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico* (pp. 18-52). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

20. Moita Lopes, L. P. (2013b). Como e por que teorizar o português: recurso comunicativo em sociedades porosas e em tempos híbridos de globalização cultural. In L. P. Moita Lopes (Org.), *Português no século XXI: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico* (pp. 101-119). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

21. Monte Mór, W. (2013). As políticas de ensino de línguas e o projeto de letramentos. In C. Nicolaidis et al. (Orgs.), *Política e políticas linguísticas* (pp. 219-236). Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores.

22. Pessoa, R. R. (2014). 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.

23. Pinto, J. P. (2013). Prefiguração identitária e hierarquias linguísticas na invenção do português. In L. P. Moita Lopes (Org.), *Português no século XXI: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico* (pp. 120-143). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

24. Rampton, B. (2006b). *Language in late modernity: interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

25. Rocha, L. L. (2012). Letramentos queer na escola pública: performativizando uma pesquisa-ação. In *Anais do III Simpósio Nacional Discurso, Identidade e Sociedade*, UNICAMP (pp. 1-14).

26. Santos, B. S. (2004). *Do Pós-moderno ao Pós-colonial: e para além de um e de outro*. Coimbra.

27. Severino, A. J. (2001). O conhecimento pedagógico e a interdisciplinaridade: o saber como intencionalização da prática. In I. C. A. Fazenda (Org.), *Didática e interdisciplinaridade* (pp. 79-94). Campinas: Papirus.

28. Signorini, I. (2013). Política, língua portuguesa e globalização. In L. P. Moita Lopes (Org.), *Português no século XXI: cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico* (pp. 74-100). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.

29. Street, B. (2012). Eventos de Letramento e Práticas de Letramento: teoria e prática nos novos estudos do letramento. In I. Magalhães (Org.), *Discursos e Práticas de Letramento: pesquisa etnográfica e formação de professores* (pp. 69-92). Campinas: Mercado de Letras.

30. Vasconcellos, M. J. E. de. (2005). *O pensamento sistêmico. O novo paradigma da ciência*. Campinas: Papirus.