

ARTIGO ORIGINAL

Translingual perspectives in focus: (de)coloniality in English teaching

Perspectiva translíngua em foco: (de)colonialidade no ensino de Inglês

Josenil Araújo dos Santos¹ , Márcio Evaristo Beltrão² , Antônio Henrique Coutelo de Moraes³ 

1 Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso - E-mail: teacherjosenil@gmail.com

2 Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso - e-mail: marcioevaristobeltrao@hotmail.com

3 Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso- e-mail: antonio.moraes@ufr.edu.br

Como citar o artigo.

ARAÚJO DOS SANTOS, J., BELTRÃO, M. E., & MORAES, A. H. C. DE. Perspectiva translíngua em foco: (de)colonialidade no ensino de Inglês. *Revista Horizontes de Linguística Aplicada*, ano 24, n. 1, AG7, 2025.

Abstract:

Linguistic pluralism, from a translingual perspective in English language teaching, can serve as a decolonizing theoretical-methodological alternative to monolingual approaches in which traditional standards of language teaching indicate what would or would not be acceptable. This article emerges from the ongoing research of a doctoral thesis, to be defended in March 2027 at the Center for Emancipatory Studies and Research in Language at the Federal University of Mato Grosso. It aims at understanding to understand the English language teaching process through a bibliographic discussion on issues such as monolingualism, translanguaging and decolonization in English language education. The discussion goes beyond recognizing the teacher's creativity/autonomy, instrumentalized by practices that consider the linguistic-cultural repertoire of the student in the development of a translingual teaching-learning culture. It also poses possible questions on (post)structuralist stances in the teaching of an Additional Language. Drawing on the works of authors such as Garcia and Lee Wei (2014), Pennycook (2017), Canagarajah (2017), Mignolo (2017), as well as Walsh and Candau (2018), linguistic-cultural discussions are put forward in this article. As such, the reflections presented can contribute to a proposal for the promotion of a translingual culture within the perspective of creating an additional language teaching methodology.

Keywords: Translanguaging. Decoloniality. English language teaching.

Resumo:

O pluralismo linguístico, a partir de uma perspectiva translíngua no ensino de língua inglesa, pode vir a ser uma alternativa teórico-metodológica decolonizadora ante a perspectiva monolíngua em que padrões tradicionalistas de ensino de língua indicam o que seria ou não aceitável. Assim, este artigo advém do processo de elaboração de uma tese em andamento a ser defendida em março de 2027 no Núcleo de Estudos e Pesquisas Emancipatórias em Linguagem (NEPEL) da Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso (UFMT); pretende compreender o processo de ensino de língua inglesa, ao discutir, bibliograficamente, assuntos como monolinguismo, translanguagem e decolonização no ensino de língua inglesa, não só no sentido de compreender a criatividade/autonomia do professor, instrumentalizado por práticas que consideram o repertório linguístico-cultural do estudante no

Fonte de financiamento: Nenhuma.

Conflito de interesse: Os autores declaram não haver.

Recebido em: 12 Dez 2024. Revisões requeridas: 23 abril 2025. Aceito em: 25 maio 2025.



Este é um artigo publicado em acesso aberto (Open Access) sob a licença Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivative, que permite uso, distribuição e reprodução em qualquer meio, sem restrições desde que sem fins comerciais, sem alterações e que o trabalho original seja corretamente citado.

desenvolvimento de uma cultura translingue de ensino-aprendizagem, mas também elencar possíveis indagações acerca das posturas (pós) estruturalistas no ensino de Língua Adicional. A partir dos autores Garcia e Lee Wei (2014), Pennycook (2017), Canagarajah (2017), Mignolo (2017) e Walsh e Candau (2018), emergem as discussões linguístico-culturais contidas neste artigo. Dessa maneira, as reflexões aqui apresentadas podem contribuir com uma proposta de formação de uma cultura translingue na perspectiva de criação de uma metodologia de ensino de Língua Adicional.

Palavras-chave: Translinguagem. Decolonialidade. Ensino de língua Inglesa.

1. INTRODUCTION

For some time now, most human beings – especially in colonized communities – have experienced the perverse impacts of voracious subservience that paved a long way towards poverty, segregation and subjugation. In this context, language can contribute significantly to the intensification of these inequalities, especially when the guarantees of learning linguistic skills – to which the students are entitled in the school environment – are withheld. This reinforces, for instance, the rhetoric that “you can’t learn English in public schools”.

Moreover, the logic of language teaching as an end in itself creates disadvantages, fragments and denies individuals access to critical linguistic education, which is so necessary for the mobility, advancement and emancipation of marginalized classes. In recent decades, geopolitical disputes, conflicts and socioeconomic (dis)arrangements have expropriated the right to choose regionalized linguistic-cultural interests, to the point where we have become part of a global monoculture, with increasingly homogeneous patterns of linguistic practices. That does not seem to be an essentially organic movement of communities.

Thus, as Rocha and Hilsdorf (2019, p. 11, our translation) highlights, it is urgent to “rethink the understanding of the human”¹, in order to foreground post-humanist issues. It is also necessary to discuss the teaching of additional languages, from a decolonial perspective. This approach, in itself, signals a transgressive attitude, in favor of those subordinated, since the unilateral, prescriptive and conditioning maintenance of dominant teaching methods implies the disregard for other learning possibilities beyond linguistic structuralism – possibilities that intersect with the ongoing social structuralism.

Given this context, the hypothesis is raised regarding the importance of Translingualism, or even Translanguaging in the teaching of Additional Languages² (hereinafter LA) – English language, specifically – in basic education, as a starting point for raising critical awareness. To this end, we will try to carry out a decolonial exercise (Mignolo, 2017), in the sense of, deconstructing the colonizing logic intertwined in communicative practices, focusing on the English language, throughout the article.

It is intended, then, based on bibliographical references, to invite English language teachers in basic education to reflect on the possibility of developing a culture of translingual practices as a teaching methodology. As such, through the dialogues held here, we seek to contribute to meaningful teaching for both those who teach and those who learn. This article emerges from an ongoing doctoral thesis, to be defended in March 2027 at the Center for Emancipatory Studies and Research in Language at the Federal University of Mato Grosso.

2. TOWARDS CRITICAL LINGUISTICS

One of the issues that instigates many Brazilian linguists concerns the settled intentionality regarding the implementation of a monolingual linguistic perspective since the early days of the Portuguese empire on Brazilian lands. The inorganic movement of teaching

¹ “falar sobre o pós-humano ou sobre o pós humanismo implica repensar o entendimento do humano” (Rocha; Hilsdorf, 2019, p. 11).

²According to Lapô (2021), an Additional Language is one that an individual adds to their linguistic repertoire, which enables understanding, learning and using the language without the hierarchization of languages. In this way, it is assumed that languages are perceived from a perspective of equality, and not necessarily linked to centers of power.

the Portuguese language – at the expense of the suppression of several languages spoken by the original peoples – resulted, with weights and measures, in imposed, invasive and artificial learning experiences. By the way, the curricular “choice” itself, within a restricted set of possibilities, is based on “objects of knowledge” to be achieved and dictates the experiences that may or may not make up language teaching in Brazilian territory.

In order to provide a better understanding of this situation, Pazinato (2019, p. 154) suggests that we look at this from another perspective, trying to imagine ourselves in the position of the one who had to submit to humiliation, who was raped, enslaved, who had to give up their customs, including their language. Given this historical context, nowadays, can we not ask whether students are still subjected to the silencing of other linguistic-cultural possibilities? Who, today, is subjugated to a monolingual education policy? Who is on the “margins” of this process? These are questions that, at the very least, prompt more contextualized analyses of the linguistic reality of Brazilian students.

Although the rigidity of monolingual linguistic structures has historically sought to homogenize language teaching practices, critical educators are expanding on their skills to embrace a model of critical linguistic education – going beyond static and complacent positions. In this sense, critical educators are not just “spectators” in the face of social ills (Bauman, 2017, p. 153, *apud* Rocha; Hilsdorf, 2019, p.13), since even under the excessive imperativeness of education systems they act in the gaps – those spaces not yet fully homogenized by standardization.

Based on discussions carried out by language teaching scholars such as Garcia e Wei (2014), Pennycook (2017) and Canagarajah (2017), it is understood that research on theoretical teaching is always relevant for improving the quality of classes. These authors highlight the importance of not only indicating how to do and/or reflect on the methodologies used in the classroom but also expanding the teacher's and student's field of vision/action on the topics covered.

Even though there are research trends that highlight the exclusive relationship between language and power, it is clear that public policies that establish guidelines for teaching the English language, in the context of Brazilian basic schools, do little to reflect the subversive research done by “undisciplined linguists” (Moita Lopes, 2006). Such indiscipline can be seen when the teacher goes beyond the superficiality of his/her teaching curricular component, recognizing and legitimizing diverse world views, based on a logic of respect for linguistic and cultural differences that are often left aside because they do not belong to large – but no less important – economic centers, even when they speak the same language. In this respect, the teacher establishes a critical relationship with language, advancing a pedagogy for liberation from a Freirean perspective.

Since we have made a commitment to comply with what is established in the curriculum – that is, the set of norms, guidelines and legislation that sustain a monolithic language education policy – when “teaching” the language of the colonizer we are faced with the structures of monolingualism. These structures remind us of the rigid boundaries imposed by ideas of “purity” regarding language, and these ideas are, attributed to teaching-learning processes. As a result, they become the basic source for attributing (non)proficiency. However, it turns out that the rigid framework in language education is not very welcome, being that such curricular delineations – in recent decades – have been changed several times by different educational administrators. The lack of a solid plurilingual language teaching policy seems to negatively interfere with the acquisition of linguistic skills that are so necessary nowadays.

The reconfiguration and convergence of traditional structuralist linguistic models – at some level – are gradually giving way to plurilingual practices. As a result, what was once a consensus, is now making room for experiences and practices of non-linear languages, within liberating perspective among critical educators. This shift proves to be an excellent exercise for the subject who lives in a social, political, and economic world shaped by ideologically discrepant meanings.

3. TRANSLANGUAGING TO GO BEYOND THE LINGUISTIC CODE

A movement is underway to oppose the monoglot view of language. Pennycook (2017) suggests that translanguaging allows us to look at a broader set of semiotic possibilities beyond linguistic codes. In this view, translingual research can “question” not only the boundaries between languages, but also the borders between different semiotic modes.

According to Oliveira (2021), translanguaging offers us concrete possibilities of disruption and destabilization of the discourses of modernity that permeate. Foreign Language classes, especially English. This perspective helps us to overcome the convenient dogmatic dichotomy that assumes the need for linguistic borders to hierarchize languages and, as such, establishing where each student’s linguistic repertoire begins and ends.

Therefore, a critical stance on the part of English language educators is essentially necessary, under the auspices of using language as a logic of subversion – capable of challenging the idea of linguistic neutrality as mere intelligibility. What is being proposed here, concretely, is a perspective grounded on alterity, transformation and rupture of the hegemonic pattern of segregation – that is, the promotion of social justice.

Brazil is a linguistically and culturally diverse nation, and the lack of a plurilingual language teaching policy signals a disregard for its vast linguistic landscape. Current teaching policies, while sometimes open doors to elite spaces, often look to normative standards to define what is acceptable in terms of communicative practices.

Thus, one of the challenges of adopting translanguaging the classroom involves the limited real-life experiences that students have access to. In this sense, the fluidity of languages almost always permeates the digital context, where English is often (un)consciously validated by students. However, this validation is generally legitimized in moments when students use their linguistic repertoire for the purpose of leisure, for instance, the use of English to access online games, social networks or even signing up for the most diverse applications emerging on a daily basis.

In these and other ways, translanguaging in English language learning, - especially within geographically distant contexts, is visibly related to the adoption of more fluid and less rigid communication practices. Lemke (2020) proposes a new “reconceptualization of language teaching”, with the intention of questioning hegemonic discourses regarding languages.

To understand the significance of the term translanguaging, it is necessary to highlight that, in its early days of use, it was seen only as a pedagogical practice involving the alternation of languages, as Lee (2018) points out. However, with further studies, it was possible to highlight the fluidity of plurilingual practices, beyond the binary model of language alternation. Therefore, in the words of Lemke (2020), the term evokes a conception of language that is non-structural and open-ended. It is important to highlight that it also values and recovers the knowledge of speakers in their linguistic practices, in favor of the knowledge construction.

Therefore, the alternative proposed is that teachers reflect on their practice through a translingual lens, bringing together multilingual knowledge in a fluid and horizontal dialogue between teachers and students. Consequently, if teachers are informed to implement language practices that go beyond the norms of governments and external agencies, education could contribute in a more direct and less subjective way, addressing inequalities linked to low literacy rates.

Thus, by curriculum structures aligned with a post-structural curricular awareness, institutional bodies are invited to re-signify their proposals, acknowledging existing linguistic practices. In this way, there is the integration of practices that had previously been made invisible by a supposed condition of literacy that attempted to align geographic and linguistic borders within a narrow frame of references.

For the purpose of the reflections presented here, multilingual interest, is not limited to language norms. Rather, it privileges communication strategies and Canagarajah (2017). Therefore, translinguism, translingualism or translanguaging in language teaching emerges as a pedagogical practice in which students can construct meanings through observation,

understanding and knowledge of a given object from the perspective of more than one culture (language) – through multilingualism and /or bilingualism.

Given the complexity of this framework, it is understandable that public language education policies demonstrate significant differences in the understanding of what would be appropriate to offer, in order for a school to achieve successful additional language instruction. Such instruction would be based on respect for the student's linguistic repertoire. To this end, there is a need to rethink and redesign linguistic priorities regarding the principle of autonomy in the choices of activities carried out in the classroom.

In this sense, a translingual perspective aims to identify communicative practices that are more fluid, expansive and coherent with the transcultural nature of human experience – one not demarcated by agencies or governments. These practices emerge from cultural, political and educational interests common to individuals, something that goes far beyond just considering the linguistic aspects. Thus, engaging with other areas of scientific knowledge may provide the opportunity for a more critical reading of the phenomenological issues embedded in transculturality.

It is worth highlighting that having the autonomy to implement translingual practices does not necessarily mean the abandonment or rupture of current public policies. Rather, it involves granting teachers institutional autonomy to make the choices that are convenient for them, in order to achieve the best results in the inclusion of marginalized communities. Among the positive results of this movement are the democratization of education and the potential for social emancipation of students who have been historically neglected.

4. DECOLONIALITY AS A FORM OF TRANSGRESSION

There are significant divergences in the literature regarding the most appropriate and democratic model of social organization. It seems that the historically constructed model has done little to resolving discrepant social anomalies. Expanding the idea of border fragmentation, in order to empower communities with their identities and communicative practices, may favor a more organic movement toward reducing inequalities. The ways in which identities are constituted are associated with the formation of socio-historical subjects.

In this regard, Mignolo (2017, p. 19, our translation) highlights – more as a forced acknowledgement than a justification, that:

The existence of a territorial and imperial epistemology that invented and established such categories and classifications. In such a way, once you realize that your inferiority is a fiction created to dominate you, and if you do not want to be assimilated nor accept with resignation “the bad luck” of being born where you were born, then let go³.

Furthering this resignification, Mignolo (2017, p. 15, our translation) argues that:

Decolonial opens up a new way of thinking that is disconnected from the chronologies constructed by new epistemes or paradigms (modern, postmodern, alter modern, Newtonian science, quantum theory, relativity theory etc.). It is not that epistemes and paradigms are alien to decolonial thinking. They couldn't be; but they are no longer the reference for epistemic legitimacy⁴.

³ “Existe uma epistemologia territorial e imperial que inventou e estabeleceu tais categorias e classificações. De tal forma, uma vez que percebe que sua inferioridade é uma ficção criada para dominá-lo, e se não quer ser assimilado nem aceitar com a resignação “a má sorte” de ter nascido onde nasceu, então desprenda-se” (Mignolo (2017, p.19).

⁴ “Apresentando-se como uma opção, o decolonial abre um novo modo de pensar que se desvincula das cronologias construídas pelas novas epistemes ou paradigmas (moderno, pós-moderno, altermoderno, ciência newtoniana, teoria quântica, teoria da relatividade etc.). Não é que as epistemes e os paradigmas estejam alheios ao pensamento decolonial. Não poderiam sê-lo; mas deixaram de ser a referência da legitimidade epistêmica” (Mignolo, 2017, p. 15).

As highlighted in the lines above, the insistence on ways to review the fragile context and unfavorable negotiation for marginalized groups is rooted in, an intention aimed towards conceiving the world based on the hierarchization of individuals into superior or inferior beings. . In this regard, the globalizing process – driven by imperial, republican and more recently democratic impositions – has served the neoliberal project by suppressing attempts to overcome this historical and hereditary denial of rights and opportunities.

Decolonizing is not about confronting or supporting capitalism or communism. As outlined by Mignolo (2017) on his reading of Fanon's theoretical intervention presented at the Bandung conference, decoloniality is not merely a “third option”. Rather it is a way of stopping the voracious logic of inorganic indexing in the sense of undoing the traumatic and chronic devastating ways of life. As such language in this context, becomes a site resistance to the enormous difficulties impeding social emancipation.

From this view, with the aim of overcoming inequalities, injustice and complacent hierarchies that maintain systems of privilege, transgressive approaches are required. Such approaches call on reinvigorating principles of a real democracy. That is necessary because there is a gap in “redistribution (linguistic, economic and cultural capitals between the different, more equitable social groups) and political representation (empowerment of less favored groups)⁵” (Rocha; Hilsdorf, 2019, p. 15, our translation).

Students deprived of the social assets of society, left, only with the crumbs of this exclusionary process, they suffer the negative effects of this system. Accordingly, Castells (2000, p. 98) highlights that large processes of capital circulation (part of them unregulated) exacerbate social disparities between individuals and intensify the deprivation of citizen's rights and guarantees.

Thus, based on Walsh (2013), a critical and decolonial pedagogy is essential, one capable of instigating teachers to embrace a professional practice anchored in the principle of critical linguistic education. Such an education considers the process of teaching and learning additional languages an instrument of subversion of colonial logic, historically crystallized in the teaching practices of Brazilian education.

It is worth highlighting that the research on decoloniality carried out in the South American context is related to movements in the most varied areas of knowledge that question European perspectives. These dominant perspectives often fail to engage with knowledge production from the Global South. As such, they continue to dehumanize marginalized communities through the perpetuation of social injustice and the denial of basic rights – housing, healthcare, food – that are expected to be guaranteed “with the good news of capitalism”.

This critique is based on the concepts that form the perspective of the myth of Modernity and Coloniality (Walsh; Candau, 2018). Given this, the perspective to be understood in our article for teaching contexts is that of a decolonial character. Walsh and Candau (2018, p. 5) highlight that the constitution of the pedagogical and the decolonial are built from the school, universities, social movements, as well as Black and indigenous communities. Thus, we understand that the teaching of English must necessarily include the premise of overcoming inequality as a foundational condition for any educational proposal.

While the technical dimension of language acquisition is important, any potential for learning – especially among the working class – must be grounded in the recognition of students as agents, whose linguistic repertoire justify individualized pedagogical proposals. . This must be done so that students are able to analyze, create and develop their ability to communicate, in, association with their experiences and expectations. Their experiences and expectations from the start, -, provide the opportunity to go beyond large-scale teaching processes that contribute to the negligence of the inclusion of marginalized subjects.

⁵“Nessa linha, a promoção de justiça social requer a complexa união de diferentes ações, quais sejam, reconhecimento (da igualdade de direitos e validação das mais diversas formas de expressão linguística e cultural, por exemplo); redistribuição (dos capitais linguístico, econômico e cultural entre os diversos grupos sociais mais equânime); e representação política (empoderamento de grupos menos favorecidos)” (Rocha; Hilsdorf, 2019, p. 15).

Such meaning-making practices can permeate very specific tendencies of certain communities, with the purpose of fostering the dismantling of rigid, sedimented practices, through the questioning of supposed effective results that derive from modernity. A decolonial pedagogy, then, focuses specifically on the deconstruction of the pillars that support the logic of coloniality. As Walsh and Candau (2018, p. 6, our translation) mention, these teaching practices:

[They] make reference to popular education, indigenous education, education in Amazonian communities, oral traditions, memories and Afro-Brazilian heritage. Some texts formulate and analyze pedagogies beyond hegemonic educational systems and dialogue with critical and political experiences rooted in the struggles and praxis of those colonized by modernity⁶.

In addition to this view, it is interesting how the authors' contributions provide a multidisciplinary vision for the potential of emancipation through a decolonial perspective. Their critiques cross disciplinary boundaries, proposing new frameworks of knowledge, reconfiguring their own fields into decolonial projects. Although the proposal for decolonial pedagogy arises with the intention of questioning structures that have been secularly considered unalterable and has a greater incidence of practices in the context of education, it does not seem impossible that every professional, whether in education or not, is capable of carrying out decolonial behaviors. Economic relations, and geopolitical stances are based on an unequal logic of exchange and control.

Far from undermining the scientific study of language acquisition process, in its morphological, structural or even stylistic aspects, proposing a careful reflection on language teaching presupposes the contextualization of the social practices of individuals in a given society, with their socio-political, socio-historical and geo-economic issues. In this regard, the possibilities for decolonial thinking and action are vast, which can range from a relativization of the teaching of exact sciences in the context of social justice, to the critiquing of pricing strategies that large wholesale networks establish for their products, that disproportionately affect low-income populations.

The many researches that already address the themes of modernity and coloniality broaden narrow perspectives, going beyond the spaces of academia, seeking and finding significant potential for decolonizing processes, structures and mindsets, which have historically made the experiences of the Global South invisible.

5. ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LINGUISTIC BORDERS

In the context of the effects of globalization on communities - and consequently on education systems - the classroom becomes a space for resignification. Didactic certainties and methods historically considered effective in teaching languages, such as structuralism, contributed to a form of nationalist "purity" in language use. As a result, English language teaching, specifically in Brazilian basic education, presents characteristics of a monolingual process, which consolidates a vision of teaching in an arbitrary manner between form (signifier) and meaning (signified).

There appears to be a consensus among teachers, even those most fond of traditional teaching practices, that language teaching is structurally undergoing the most significant transformations in the profession since the first reforms of the 20th century. Furthermore, there is much discussion regarding the role of the school, as its place in broader societal projects is not recognized, at least not in practice.

⁶"Fazem referência a educação popular, a educação indígena, a educação em comunidades amazônicas, sobre tradições orais, memórias e patrimônios afro-brasileiros, alguns textos formulam e analisam pedagogias além dos sistemas educativos hegemônicos e dialoga com experiências críticas e políticas enraizadas nas lutas e práxis dos colonizados pela modernidade" (Walsh; Candau, 2018, p. 6).

In addition to formal education, the way in which individuals are inserted in learning contexts calls for reflection on the nature of language in the 21st century. The distinction between what is 'inside' and what is "outside" national languages is increasingly insignificant, as new interactions are perceived as fluid social practices, which come into conflict with traditional thinking. From this perspective, Kerckhove (2009, p. 224, our translation) highlights that:

When the Western world was only governed by books, there was an "outside" to our psychological experience. The outer realm was public, collective, stable, secure, and objective. It was institutionalized by law, education and science. The inner realm of our minds would remain private, personal and subjective⁷.

In dialogue with other postmodernist culturalists such as Hall (2014), as well as Deleuze and Guattari (1995), we see how transcultural dialogues foster understandings of human interactions, which can be intertwined by non-transparent meanings. That can condition an autonomous, critical and unique stance of the individual in the search for recognition and visibility of their activities as students or professionals. Above all, the indexation of a multicultural stance - in advising on issues hitherto - is seen purely from a linguistic point of view.

Therefore, Deleuze and Guattari (1995, p. 4) understand that languages can be seen in a logic of equality, detached from "political multiplicities". This does not dismiss the results of linguistic instruction. What emerges are the extralinguistic factors that have a positive or negative impact on overcoming inequalities.

In previous decades, English as an additional language was necessary for the individual to operate the processes arising from the ongoing industrialization. That was so because as the acquisition of linguistic resources guaranteed the subject full access to the most varied consumer goods. In addition, and the emphasis on classes permeated the need to deliver a "language package" equivalent to what was spoken in country X or country Z, that is, the patterns of language use were georeferenced, remaining almost rigidly unchangeable. However, nowadays, with communicative fluidity among different points of the globe - without requiring the nativeness of the language - speakers of different backgrounds interact, alter and are altered by the language that reconfigures itself, depending on who speaks, where they speak, as well as which intentions structure the message.

Furthermore, the expanding logic of consumerism reinforces the illusion that mass literacy alone could solve chronic social problems that have not yet been fully addressed. Teaching English monolingually on a wide scale, for individuals to interact in a world where there is a myth of fair and transparent coexistence, as if life opportunities automatically benefitted everyone, seems to be a form of reductionism. Language is not automatically transformative; its potential lies in its social use and critical framing.

In favor of plurilingualism in the school curriculum, we concatenate what Leffa and Irala (2014, p. 29, our translation) suggests:

Going beyond appearances, questioning reality with restless intensity, asking, for example, not only what interests the teaching of other languages in Brazil can serve, but also what interests their exclusion from the curriculum can serve. Denying students access to other languages is also a way of excluding them⁸.

⁷"Quando o mundo ocidental era apenas governado pelos livros, havia um "exterior" da nossa experiência psicológica. O reino exterior era público, coletivo, estável, seguro e objetivo. Era institucionalizado pela lei, educação e ciência. O reino interior das nossas mentes permaneceria privado, pessoal e subjetivo" (Kerckhove, 2009, p. 224).

⁸"Busca-se ir além das aparências, questionando a realidade com intensidade inquieta, indagando, por exemplo, não só a que interesses pode servir o ensino de outras línguas no Brasil, como também a que interesses pode servir sua exclusão do currículo. Negar ao aluno o acesso a outras línguas é também uma maneira de excluí-lo" (Leffa; Irala, 2014, p. 29).

There is a conflicting, exclusionary and politically shaped social world where linguistic skills alone do not guarantee inclusion, do not provide job opportunities. This is because, when it comes to inclusion, in the words of Street (2014), to get a job, the level of literacy is less important than aspects of social class, gender and ethnicity: having low literacy is a symptom of poverty and deprivation. Literacy often reflects symptoms of deprivation rather than their causes. Holding language teachers solely accountable for students' success overlooks systemic injustices. Disposition and competence are not enough to ensure the emancipation of students as global citizens. Structural ideologies must also be questioned – including the binary of instructionism versus constructivism.

Constructivism, centered on the student, replaces instructionism, centered on the teacher. Theoretically, it is affiliated with the great current of post-modernism, which also had its origins in France, in the 1960s and 1970s, and was mainly characterized as a reaction to the ideals of Modernism, denying the rationality, objectivity and reductionism of the sciences so-called exact⁹ (Leffa; Irala, 2014, p. 26, our translation).

This theoretical interweaving may seem distant from the praxis used in the classroom context. However, when discussing the hierarchies between curricular components, one can still see the perspective of teaching English to satisfy needs restricted to the field of communication that are aimed solely to meet social practices geared towards economic immediacy. Given this, decolonizing would mean teaching the language beyond the communication aspects, that is, it would mean going beyond the supposed idea of the rigid existence of linguistic borders. To this end, translanguaging invites us to overcome the monolingual inadequacy that still perceptibly accompanies the teaching of an additional language.

6. FINAL REMARKS

Any potential for the subversion of monolingual colonialism is based on the understanding that subversive theories - such as translanguaging – do not focus only on the linguistic repertoire in question, but also on the incorporation and validation of social practices that students bring with them to the context of the classroom. In this regard, language is conceived as an integral part of a set of intentionally political situations based on the positions of individuals and institutions that possess hierarchical and socially recognized power.

Given the above, the decolonial perspective emerges as an instrument capable of opposing the structure, which is sedimented mainly in the minds of individuals. It serves as a critical and reflective theoretical framework, sensitive and attentive to the ongoing exclusionary processes of colonialism. Moreover, it establishes the possibility of overcoming social injustices, through the transgression of the harmful logic of ultraliberal competition, intrinsically associated with meritocratic ideals – ideals that falsely assume that all individuals start from the same starting point of opportunity. In this regard, the role of the decolonial teacher takes on an epistemologically central position in lives historically left to chance.

So, for decolonial teachers, the perspective of a decolonial pedagogy (Walsh; Candau, 2018), by nature, contradicts hegemonic thinking regarding monolingual teaching. However, it is worth highlighting structuralist methods, grounded in the notion of linguistic purity, have delivered satisfactory results for some. Yet, the interest in translingual approaches is justified precisely because structuralism has failed to serve all learners – particularly those students who remain excluded.

⁹ “O construtivismo, centrado no aluno, substitui o instrucionismo, centrado no professor. Teoricamente filia-se à grande corrente do Pós-Modernismo, que teve sua origem também na França, nas décadas de 1960 e 1970, e se caracterizou principalmente como uma reação aos ideais do Modernismo, negando a racionalidade, a objetividade e o reducionismo das ciências ditas exatas” (Leffa; Irala, 2014, p. 26).

As language teachers, we do not intend to claim the expertise or vanguard of an effective teaching proposal, especially with a context as adverse, unequal and selectively distributive as ours. Instead, our intention is to contribute to and support teachers who are uncomfortable reproducing colonial logics – logics in which they themselves do not believe, and which do not meet the real demands of their students.

In this light, we recognize that a proposal for the formation of a translingual culture from the perspective of cohesive, emancipated and liberating teaching autonomy in teaching an additional language is necessary. Such a proposal repositions the teacher as a professional explicitly aligned with – and deeply disturbed by – the historical gaps in learning that remain unaddressed.

In this regard, we understand that, like other post-structuralist teaching approaches, for translanguaging to permeate teaching practices, there is an urgent need to re-signify learning spaces, especially in the domain of teaching itself. This involves the process of deconstructing beliefs, myths and values that are historically considered universal, and which need to be widely discussed. It also involves the promotion of linguistic, political and socioeconomic social justice.

7. REFERENCES

- CANAGARAJAH, S. *Translingual practices and neoliberal policies: attitudes and strategies of African skilled migrants in Anglophone workplaces*. New York: Springer, 2017.
- CASTELLS, M. *A era da informação: economia, sociedade e cultura*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2000. v. 3.
- DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. *Introdução: rizoma*. Texto extraído de *Mil Platôs* (Capitalismo e Esquizofrenia) Translation of Aurélio Guerra Neto e Célia Pinto Costa. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1995. v. 1.
- GARCIA, O.; WEI, L. *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- HALL, S. *A identidade cultural da pós-modernidade: a identidade em questão*. Translation of Tomaz Tadeu da Silva Guacira Lopes Louro. 12. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, 2014.
- KERCKHOVE, D. de (1995). *A pele da cultura: investigando a nova realidade eletrônica*. São Paulo: Annablume, 2009.
- LÔPO, R. A.; OLIVEIRA, N. A. C. O aprendiz de PLAc em situação de refúgio: o que a “viz” da docência revela. *Revista Entre Línguas, Araraquara-SP*, v. 7, n. 00, p. e021036, 2021.
- LEE, WEI, L. *Translanguaging and Code-Switching: What’s the difference?* OUPblog, 2018. Available at: <https://blog.oup.com/2018/05/translanguaging-code-switching-difference/>. Accessed on: 20 Apr. 2024.
- LEFFA, V. J.; IRALA, V. B. O ensino de outra(s) língua(s) na contemporaneidade: questões conceituais e metodológicas. In: _____. (Org.). *Uma espiadinha na sala de aula: ensinando línguas adicionais no Brasil*. Pelotas, RS: Educat, 2014. p. 21-48.
- LEMKE, C. K. Translinguagem: uma abordagem dos estudos em contexto estrangeiro e brasileiro. *Trab. Ling. Aplic.*, Campinas-SP, v. 59, n. 3, p. 2071-2101, Sept. /Dec. 2020.
- LÔPO, R. A.; OLIVEIRA, N. A. C. O aprendiz de PLAc em situação de refúgio: o que a “voz” da docência revela. *Revista EntreLínguas, Araraquara-SP*, v. 7, n. 00, p. e021036, 2021.
- MACIEL, R. F.; ROCHA, C. H. Dialogues on translingual research and practice: weaving threads with Suresh Canagarajah’s views. *Revista X, [S.l.]*, v. 15, n. 1, p. 7-31, 2020. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5380/rvx.v15i1.71807>. Accessed on: 15 May 2024.
- MIGNOLO, W. Desafios decoloniais hoje. *Epistemologias do Sul, Foz do Iguaçu-PR*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 12-32, 2017.
- MOITA LOPES, L. P. da (Org.). *Por uma Linguística Aplicada indisciplinar*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2006.
- OLIVEIRA, P. N. R. A translanguagem como brecha: práticas de letramento crítico e decolonial no ensino de inglês. In: *SEMINÁRIO FORMAÇÃO DE PROFESSORES E ENSINO DE LÍNGUA INGLESA, 6.*, 2021, São Cristóvão. *Anais eletrônicos [...]*. São Cristóvão, RJ: UFS, 2021.

- PASINATTO, R. Políticas linguísticas no Brasil: da dominação dos nativos ao silenciamento dos imigrantes. *Domínios de Linguagem*, Uberlândia-MG, v. 13, n. 1, p. 149–174, 2019. DOI: 10.14393/DL37-v13n1a2019-7. Available at: <https://seer.ufu.br/index.php/dominiosdelinguagem/article/view/42006>. Accessed on: 20 May 2024.
- PENNYCOOK, A. *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- ROCHA, R.; HILSDORF, C. *Educação linguística na liquidez da sociedade do cansaço: o potencial decolonial da perspectiva translíngue*. Campinas, SP: Delta, 2019.
- STREET, B. V. *Letramentos sociais: abordagens críticas do letramento no desenvolvimento, na etnografia e na educação*. Translation of Marcos Bagno. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2014.
- WALSH, A. Translanguaging and Semiotic Assemblages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, [S.l.], v. 14, n. 3, p. 269–282, 2017.
- WALSH, C. (Org.). *Pedagogías decoloniales: prácticas insurgientes de resistir, (re)existir y (re)vivir*. Quito, Ecuador: Ediciones Abya-Yala, 2013.
- WALSH, C. O.; CANDAU, V. M. Colonialidade e pedagogia decolonial: para pensar uma educação outra. *Arquivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas*, [S.l.], v. 26, n. 83, 2018. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3874>. Accessed on: 10 Apr. 2024.
- WALSH, C., OLIVEIRA, L. F. de; CANDAU, V. M. Coloniality and decolonial pedagogy: To think of other education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, [S. l.], v. 26, p. 83, 2018. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3874>. Accessed on: 19 Jan. 2025.
- WEI, L. Translanguaging and Code-Switching: What's the difference? *OUPblog*, [S.l.], May 2018. Available at: <https://blog.oup.com/2018/05/translanguaging-code-switching-difference/>. Accessed on: 20 Apr. 2024.

Contribuição dos autores

O presente artigo é resultado da colaboração acadêmica entre os três autores, cujas contribuições foram complementares e essenciais para a construção do trabalho. Josenil Araújo dos Santos foi responsável pela condução da revisão bibliográfica centrada na translanguagem como perspectiva teórica vinculada à decolonialidade, especialmente no contexto da educação brasileira. Além disso, elaborou a redação inicial do texto e estruturou os principais eixos argumentativos do artigo. O professor Márcio Evaristo Beltrão, na condição de orientador de doutorado do primeiro autor, desempenhou papel fundamental ao acompanhar todas as etapas da escrita, oferecendo orientação teórico-metodológica e contribuindo com a seleção criteriosa das referências bibliográficas utilizadas. Já o professor Antonio Henrique Coutelo colaborou com a análise crítica e a revisão dos argumentos apresentados, ampliando a densidade reflexiva do artigo. Também foi o responsável pela tradução integral do manuscrito para a língua inglesa, garantindo fidelidade conceitual e adequação linguística à versão final.