



Citation for published version:

de Pietri, É, de Araújo Donnini Rodrigues, L & Sanchez, H 2019, 'The construction of the professional identity of Portuguese language teachers during initial teacher education.', *Revista Brasileira de Educação*.

Publication date:
2019

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

University of Bath

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY OF PORTUGUESE LANGUAGE TEACHERS DURING INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION

SUMMARY

This paper presents the results of a research project developed with the objective of understanding, from a teacher identity and cognition perspective, the concepts constructed by pre-service teachers of what it is to be a teacher and what it means to teach and learn Portuguese in working conditions characterized by social and cultural diversity as well as economic adversity. The study reveals how two undergraduate students participating in a national teacher education program resorted to representations of the school and teaching in order to build references that constituted the foundations of both their formative experiences as teachers and the mental projections they construct of their pedagogical work and their professional identity. The data analysis focused on the referencing processes produced by the participants based on the contrast between their previous and current experiences and expectations, captured by the methodological tools that were used in the research.

KEYWORDS: Teacher education; teacher identity; language teaching.

A CONSTRUÇÃO DA IDENTIDADE PROFISSIONAL DE PROFESSORES DE LÍNGUA PORTUGUESA EM FORMAÇÃO INICIAL

RESUMO

Apresentam-se neste trabalho resultados de pesquisa desenvolvida com o objetivo de compreender, em suas bases identitárias e cognitivas, as concepções construídas por professores em formação inicial do que seja ser docente e do que seja ensinar e aprender língua portuguesa em condições de trabalho caracterizadas pela diversidade social e cultural, e pela adversidade econômica. Observa-se como dois licenciandos em Letras, participantes de um programa nacional de formação docente, recorrem a representações de escola e de docência para construir referências que fundamentem suas experiências formativas como professores e as projeções que constroem para seu trabalho pedagógico e sua identidade profissional. Constituem dados de análise os processos de referenciação produzidos pelos participantes com base no contraste entre suas experiências e expectativas prévias com aquelas vivenciadas nas escolas, nos diferentes momentos capturados pelos instrumentos metodológicos utilizados na pesquisa.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Formação de professores; identidade docente; ensino de língua

CONSTRUCCION DE LA IDENTIDAD PROFESIONAL DE PROFESORES DE LENGUA PORTUGUESA EN FORMACION DOCENTE INICIAL

RESUMEN

Este artículo presenta resultados de investigación cuyo fin es entender, desde la perspectiva de la identidad y cognición docentes, las concepciones construidas por los profesores en formación inicial sobre lo que significa ser docente en condiciones caracterizadas por la diversidad social y cultural, y por la adversidad económica. Se observa como dos licenciandos en Letras, participantes de un programa nacional de formación docente, recurren a representaciones de la escuela y de la docencia para construir referencias que fundamenten sus experiencias formativas y las proyecciones que construyen para su trabajo pedagógico y su identidad profesional. Constituyen datos de análisis los procesos de referenciación producidos por los participantes basados en el contraste entre sus experiencias y expectativas previas con aquellas vivenciadas en las escuelas donde realizaron sus prácticas docentes y capturadas por los instrumentos metodológicos utilizados en la investigación.

PALABRAS CLAVES: formación docente; identidad docente; enseñanza de lenguas.

Introduction

This paper presents findings from a research project which investigated the participation of pre-service teachers in school contexts characterized by social, cultural and linguistic diversity and the effects of this participation in terms of professional education and identity formation¹. The research participants were two undergraduate students in Letras/Licenciatura [a teaching degree which entitles degree holders to teach disciplines both in middle and high school] from a public university in the state of São Paulo. Both participants developed their practicum activities² in state schools located in peripheral urban areas, away from the political, economic or cultural hubs of the city. Such schools had unsatisfactory results in the official evaluation indexes of their institutional conditions and pedagogical results. The students in these schools come from the most impoverished strata of population, and they make up the cultural and linguistic diversity predominant in most state schools of the largest urban centers of Brazil. The representations constructed by these two participants during the performance of their activities in the school context were analyzed, observing the contrast between their previous experiences and expectations with those lived in the schools.

In Brazil, the debate on teachers' and students' identity has become essential for the academic output on Portuguese language teaching, especially from the 1980s. Since then, following the expansion of the state school system and the establishment of an 8-year period of compulsory education for all children, members of uneducated and unschooled families have gained access to schooling. (SOARES, 1984; CASTILHO, 1978; 1988a; 1988b; FRANCHI, 1991; GERALDI, 1984; 1991; GERALDI, SILVA & FIAD, 1996; MARINHO, 2001).

Teacher education then became the subject of inquiry by research which looked into the conditions that hindered schools from achieving their goals as a result of the predominance of a normative and prescriptive pedagogical tradition (FREGONEZI, 1999; BAGNO & EGON, 2005). Teaching practice became the object of analyses, debates and propositions which aimed to explore the causes of its difficulties and propose approaches that might enable the creation of groundbreaking or transformative teaching practices (APARÍCIO, 1999; SILVA, PILATI & DIAS, 2010; SIGNORINI, 2007).

The focus of academic and pedagogical propositions for Portuguese language teaching and teacher education then shifted onto questions of teachers' identity in its relation to the social and political role of language education in an economically unequal society, such as the Brazilian one. Such studies have explored the development of teaching practices which are more authoritative or agentive, and function as resources to change the conditions of Portuguese teaching within schools as well as the ways in which Portuguese language teachers are prepared professionally under these conditions (BENEVIDES, 2006; OLIVEIRA, 2006). This highlights the need to take into account the viewpoints of pre-service teachers regarding their own professional education (ANDRADE, 2003). The identity construction of the Portuguese language teacher aiming at social transformation might then be able to provide a contrast to the negative image conjured up by Brazilian society about this teacher (KLEIMAN, 2006; 2009).

¹ The research called 'Conceptualisations of pedagogical contexts and development of appropriate pedagogies: a multiple-case study of pre-service language teachers working in peripheral urban state schools in São Paulo' is the result of a partnership between teachers from the Department of Education at the University of Bath and the Faculty of Education at the University of São Paulo.

² When the data of this research were being produced, the participants had recently joined PIBID CAPES / USP, a national programme in Brazil to promote teacher recruitment and encourage undergraduate students to pursue a career in teaching. PIBID is the abbreviation for 'Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência'. The programme involves funding the student-teacher to remain in one single school for practicum activities during at least one year under the supervision of a single school-teacher, who is also the recipient of monetary compensation for undertaking such a role.

Teachers would thus take up the role of ethnographers (HEATH, 1983) who attempt to interpret their pupils' learning needs and consider their cultural and social background (KLEIMAN, 2007).

Similarly to what was put forward by the aforementioned studies, the process of teacher education analyzed in this article is grounded in the reflexivity of pre-service teachers in regard to their own formative trajectory in a process characterized by authorship and agency, autonomy and criticality.

Theoretical framework

This paper is based on studies undertaken in the field of teacher education, and particularly on those which aim to understand how knowledge is produced by language teachers depending on the characteristics of the social contexts in which their professional education takes place. It starts from the social, cultural and historically situated nature of teacher education, in which knowing, doing and feeling are constructed in interactive processes and in response to the demands presented by a given context and its specificities (BREEN ET AL., 2001; FERYOK, 2012; GOLOMBEK & JOHNSON, 2004; GOLOMBEK & DORAN, 2014; JOHNSON & GOLOMBEK, 2011; TSUI, 2007, 2003). Therefore, our discussion distances itself from views of teacher education based on methodological or applied perspectives in which knowledge and practices are dissociated, and practices are logically and temporally subordinated to knowledge (TARDIF, 2002).

In another sense, it is considered that the formative process unfolds in the midst of the complexity of the contexts of professional practice, with the participation of pre-service teachers in situations of multiple and diverse identity positioning. Therefore, the assumption is that a teacher's formative process does not evolve around principles of causality or linearity. Rather, it is seen as a system of non-hierarchical relations, which are not predictable and cannot be pre-determined (BURNS et al., 2015).

According to this perspective, teacher education is conceived as a sociocultural process rather than an individual one. Concurring with the ideas put forward by Lee & Schallertb (2016), in the present study teacher education is based on the critical positions which are adopted by the student teacher participants towards the contexts where they develop professionally and which are therefore sensitive to the social diversity and the heterogeneity that characterize these contexts. Thus, teaching consists of social, cultural, moral and political practices (CROOKES, 2015), and the critical teacher education which is responsive to democratic values requires school experience, life experience and the development of ethically responsible personal values. Technical and methodological training reduced to instrumental values turns out to be insufficient, as critical awareness can only fully flourish if pre-service teachers participate in school contexts, in community life and in collaborative work (FREIRE, 1973).

Stating that critical teacher education perspectives are guided by the principle that teachers' actions are morally and ethically grounded has an important implication. It embraces the principle that teachers are transformative intellectuals (KUMARAVADIVELU, 2012) who think about their practice in response to the changing needs of their contexts and the individuals who construct these contexts collaboratively, rather than technicians who passively apply methods, or practitioners who are not capable of theorizing and can only act and reflect upon their actions.

Given the social and pedagogical implications of the educational context, Kubanyiova & Crookes (2016, p. 126) emphasize that pre-service teachers should be aware of the moral

bases of their actions as agents must face political, economic and social realities to ensure that their students develop their language possibilities.

The strengthening of the political, moral and ethical principles underlying the education of teachers who are socially committed would seek to respond to five knowledge domains for teaching, as proposed by Goodwin (2010). The personal knowledge domain is rooted in the biography of the individual and defines their teaching philosophy; the contextual knowledge domain involves understanding school, society, and who the children and the youth of the community are; the pedagogical knowledge domain comprises knowledge about the content and the syllabus to be taught as well as teaching theories and methods; the sociological knowledge domain relates to the diversity of education and its cultural relevance, and to the different conceptions of social justice; and, finally, the social knowledge domain underpins the implementation of democratic and collaborative processes in the classroom both to produce knowledge and to settle any conflicts that might emerge (GOODWIN, 2010, p. 22).

The data presented and analyzed in this paper take into account the relevance of these five domains for critical language teacher education. In this sense, the research participants – pre-service Portuguese language teachers – were enrolled on a teacher education program that is based on the principles aforementioned. In this program, the propositions on Portuguese language teaching and teacher education are oriented towards the defense of democratic possibilities, of participation and struggle for social transformation, towards the construction of a more equitable society, less economically unequal and more responsive to cultural diversity and heterogeneity. The research participants developed their educational activities in schools located in the economic periphery of the city of São Paulo and, within this context, while constructing their professional identities, they set in motion memories with which they reconnected to create new conceptions of school, teaching and learning.

The theoretical framework for data analysis in the present study is based on the perspective that knowledge objects are not *a priori* given as static referents; rather, they are constructed within a context of interaction, in referencing processes which derive from our sociocognitive interaction with the physical, social and cultural world. In this sense, “the designated entities are regarded as objects-of-discourse rather than as objects-of-the-world”. (KOCH, 2002, p. 79).

Therefore, this perspective challenges “the hypothesis of a referential power of language that is founded or legitimized by a direct (and true) connection between words and things” (MONDADA, 2002, pp. 118-119). It then posits that “rather than presupposing *a priori* stability of the entities in the world and in language, it is possible to reconsider the issue on the basis of the constitutive instability of the categories which are both cognitive and linguistic, as well as their processes of stabilization” (Ibid.).

In their attempts to understand the processes in which they are involved and the contexts in which they collaborate, not only do the participants retrieve previous references, but they build up new referents (c.f.: MARCUSCHI, 2001). The construction of discourse objects is thus the result of collaborative processes, discursively realized in the interaction between participants in their symbolic practices in context (MONDADA, 2002, p. 121). Moreover, these constructions are not chaotic or disordered, but rather structured by memory, and “operate on a psychological, discursive, linguistic level, arising from social competences, viewpoints, situated activities, and intersubjective practices rather than uncertain properties of the world” (MONDADA, 2001, p. 125-6).

During the process of data collection, we sought to enable the research participants to produce meanings about their experiences in schools as part of their teacher education in a situated way, in response to interactions with the individuals that constitute the school context. Therefore, the reference to the context is not a pre-existing construct, but a situated construction, in which “a multiplicity of situated players discretize language and the world and

make sense of them, individually and socially constituting entities” (MONDADA, 2002, p. 119).

The negotiations of meanings undertaken by the research participants emphasize therefore the process of construction of categories for the understanding of the context in which their formative activities take place. This allows us to regard teacher development as a space of instability where recategorizations occur, a characteristic which contrasts with static or pre-established conceptions of teaching and learning as a set of practices defined by methodological principles. In a different sense, the context of teacher education is observed as resulting from intersubjective relationships in which effects of objectivity are produced (MONDADA, 2002, p. 119).

In that sense, the data here analyzed show how the research participants retrieve memories from their school experiences concerning teaching and learning as the foundation for elaborating their own concepts of teacher education and their own projections of their self-images as future teachers.

Methodological rationale and the preparation of the *corpus* for analysis

This study was exploratory-interpretive and took the form of a multi-sited, multiple-case design that investigated teacher education processes within an institutional program developed in a state university in São Paulo. Four case studies of individual pre-service Portuguese language teachers were conducted in three different peripheral state schools in the city of São Paulo where the student teachers had their initial teaching experiences as interns.

The study used a multimodal approach for data collection, and included three main methods, all of them based on interviews made with the research participants. The first method, called Tree of Life – TOL (MERRYFIELD, 1993), is autobiographical in nature. Prior to the interview, the participants were asked to draw a tree containing three parts: the roots, where they would name the people, events and ideas that had contributed to their decision to choose teaching as a profession; the trunk, where the participants would indicate their skills, interests, interpersonal relationships and the events which were useful for them to make their career choices; and, finally, the branches, where they would outline their expectations and viewpoints that could somehow anticipate the possible ways in which their teaching careers would develop. This first set of data was collected before the participants started their pre-service activities in the schools.

The second method consisted of a photo-driven interview – PDI, and was based on photographs taken by the participants during their first two weeks of activities in the schools. They were asked to take pictures of people, places or events that drew their attention. Then, using those images as a memory recall tool, they were asked to explain why they had made each photographic record and what they meant to convey about the context through those images. The interpretative nature of these photos enabled the researchers to observe the context through the participants’ eyes, and was very useful for understanding how each participant associated symbolic and material aspects in their processes of context (re)construction.

The third method, called Teaching Experience Recollection – TER, consisted of retrospective interviews which took place between three and four months after the pre-service teachers had begun their activities within the schools. During this period, they went to the schools at least once a week with two objectives: firstly, to become familiarized with the context through observing teachers performing their daily activities; secondly, to implement the teaching plans they had devised – individually or in pairs – during the meetings of their teacher education program at the university. In these teaching plans, all the student teachers of the program, including the research participants, were asked to adopt teaching practices which they

perceived as important and necessary, but missing in the context. For the research interviews, the participants were asked to share their lesson plans and field journal entries, and to explain their rationales and practices, in an attempt to encourage them to theorize their own practices.

Each interview lasted between 30 and 50 minutes. Collectively, these three methods provided the researchers with a substantial amount of data, as illustrated in the table below³:

	TOL	PDI	TER
CARMEN	5967	9837	6527
EDNA	5192	5767	7738
GISELE	4932	4854	6572
RAFAEL	7284	5609	7985

Table 1: Number of transcribed words for each data collection tool and participant

Once transcribed and coded, the data were examined in order to locate themes that were underlying the four student-teacher narratives in each separate case. These themes were then cross-examined and re-grouped, thus forming new categories, namely, access to pedagogical resources, school environment (physical and psychological), use of school facilities, power relations, educational culture and practices, teacher-student relations, learning environment, teaching-learning culture and practices, becoming a teacher and being a teacher. As a final procedure, further examination of the categories led to the identification of two major units of analysis: critiques, defined as perceptions that reveal attempts to problematise educational contexts, discourse and practices; and educational insights, defined as perceptions that indicate enhanced understandings of educational contexts, discourse and practices generated during the participants' activities within the schools.

Taking into account these units of analysis as well the identity characteristics of the research participants, identified in previous stages of the research (RODRIGUES et al., 2018), we looked into the data in relation to two of the participants, Carmen and Rafael. Their data were selected for being contrasting cases: having gone through their pre-service activities in the same school, each of them came up with distinct understandings of their in-school formative processes. This contrast was grounded particularly in their previous schooling experiences, which were characterized as follows.

As a student, Carmen valued school as a place where students were educated and had access to general culture and particularly to the school culture; her father was a teacher and taught at the same school she went to; her memories of school were generally positive, and she chose to pursue a degree in Letras [Language and Literature] and work as a teacher because of the value she attached to schooling and the way she projected herself in relation to her father as a teacher (being respected; enjoying one's profession; helping others; being recognized as a professional).

With regard to the school where she carried out her practicum activities, confronted with the references she previously had, Carmen pointed out the downsides of her experience (mistrust rather than respect; surveillance rather than cooperation; compulsoriness and punishment rather than willingness to teach and learn). Observing the activities conducted in the classroom, she adopted a deficit perspective in comparison to the school model she had in her memory. She then emphasized deficiencies such as the attitude of the students (who failed to pay attention, to respect their teacher or to perform their activities) and of the teachers (who did not feel like doing that job, who took pauses during class in order to talk to a colleague,

³ Conforming to the Code of Ethics of the universities involved in this research project, the participants' names were preserved in anonymity. The pseudonyms used here are: Carmen, Edna, Gisele and Rafael.

who had a negative perception about their students and predicted poor performance in external evaluations).

On the other hand, as a student, Rafael felt ill-adapted to school. He confronted school rules and did not fit into the institutional context. The educational experiences he regarded as positive took place in a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) in which he had access to cultural resources that at times remained closer or farther away from the knowledge he could gain in school.

Rafael acknowledged the downsides of the school where he was doing his pre-service education activities, but tried to place himself in the students' shoes in order to understand them (he seemed to project in these students the same position in which he saw himself when he was in elementary school). So, he identified problems, but was able to relate to them and sometimes justified them because of the material and structural conditions of the school. When he observed his own practices during his practicum, he felt optimistic. In his view, if part of the students did not engage in the proposed tasks, they would do so along the way; if a specific activity did not appeal to students at a given time, it was still possible to redesign it, trying to get them involved in the debates (even if by doing this, curricular content was not directly addressed). So, he had a positive outlook on the setbacks and problems that he faced in the school context.

By contrasting these two cases, we will examine in this paper the extent to which the conceptions of school and teaching that arose from these two pre-service teachers' previous schooling experiences shaped their identity as teachers. In our analysis, we will highlight the process of construction of objects of discourse that might help us to see how the research participants relied on their previous experience and references in order to build their own conceptualizations about Portuguese language teaching. As suggested by Mondada (2002), we will attempt to explain how the references to school, to teaching and learning are anchored socially and culturally, revealing these individuals' views of the world, in a more or less objective way, in a more or less solidified way (MONDADA, 2002, p. 121).

Data analysis and discussion

In order to produce the data for our analysis, we sought to observe the unique involvement of each individual with the school context, as anchored on affective or intellectual aspects. In this sense, data production was performed according to the following methodological principles:

- (1) Observing the linguistic and sociocognitive elements used by the research participants to talk about themselves or other individuals, as well as to material elements of their context;
- (2) Emphasizing the processes of lexical categorization in relation to their semantic fields of reference, with the focus on "the process of adjusting words, which is not done directly regarding the referent inside the world, but within the contextual framework, in order to build the object of discourse through the referencing process itself" (MONDADA, 2002, p. 123);
- (3) By using each methodological tool (TOL, PDI, TER), characterizing the processes whereby the participants "build flexible categories, which are *ad hoc* and useful for practical goals, and rely on the multiplicity of the subjects' viewpoints on the world rather than on restrictions imposed by the materiality of the world" (MONDADA, 2002, p. 120).

The methodological procedures for data production uncover the ways in which memory and affect are related in the subjective processes through which participants conceptualize the reality of their lived experiences.

Rafael and his processes of school referencing

In the interview with Rafael, through the use of the Tree of Life methodological tool, we noticed the predominance of references to *school*: 36 references, as compared to *teacher*, which had 32 references. In this interview, Rafael drew on the references to *teacher* which he had built as an elementary school student to categorize the teaching and learning conditions in the present institutional context as positive or negative. By contrasting positive and negative references, Rafael was able to categorize his experiences as a former student and pre-service teacher: his studies for the entrance exam in a preparatory course, institution in which he had “a fantastic literature teacher”, led him to question why he had not read literary works before (“why have I not had this contact with literature before, why have I not raised the questions that these literary works are raising before?”). Rafael developed referral processes based on the categorization, as more or less significant, of the institutional contexts in which he had participated as a school student.

The most challenging institutional contexts Rafael had lived in while he was a student led him to reevaluate his conceptions about studying and learning in a school environment. He repeatedly said that he “had never had the culture of a student”, “he was never serious about studying”, since the school context he lived in was not very challenging; he did his classwork and homework relying on other people’s sources, without “a discerning revision”, which prevented him from developing his skills as a writer or as a reader. What somehow changed this perception of himself as “a disinterested student” was his participation in a school project that enabled a few students to work as assistants in institutional projects (“I guess that this made me start to reflect about my own attitude (...) that, besides being a student, there was something else in that for me, and my teachers were demanding that”).

Having participated in cultural activities organized by an NGO also enabled Rafael to assign new meaning to his connection with school and his schooling process (“that was an environment where there was more dedication (...) even more than in school, maybe. Maybe because I think it was more meaningful”). Having been in this distinct institutional context enabled him to reflect about the teaching and learning processes with which individuals might engage (“It’s somehow a challenge (...) for my work as a teacher (...) how to make the school space as meaningful as all external spaces”). Since he devoted himself more to the activities offered by the NGO than to the school itself, Rafael wondered about the reasons why his bonds to the institutions had been established in this way, and concluded that the degree of significance which students attached to a context either facilitated or hindered their engagement with it

Thus, participation in significant contexts was the milestone pointed out by Rafael to indicate the moments in which his conceptions about education and schooling had been constructed in the referral processes that he developed and which had guided him to pursue a teaching degree at university. His memory recollections included his Sociology teacher, who encouraged his students to think critically (“He managed to address topics and issues that made us reflect a lot about society, about the structure of the school itself, you see... subjects that I later had in my POEB [Politics and Organization of Brazilian Education] program, a course called “Introduction to Studies from a Sociological Approach”). They also included the cultural activities conducted by the NGO he took part in (“I guess I was influenced by this environment I had contact with when I was a teenager”), the preparatory course for the university exams (“It was when I found out about Literature that I made up my mind (...) I think that this

intermediation is something I want to investigate, a challenge I want to face”), and, when entering university, the Language and Literature course (“I think that my trajectory has the university as a point of departure. That’s the place where I’m reflecting more and also being trained, this is essential for me to go back to school. So I’m always trying to take in the most I can from university”). The referencing process developed by Rafael to conceptualize or categorize what he understood by school, teaching and education seemed to be rooted in previous memories initially considered negative. By doing so, he observed events or relationships that may lead to changes in the present, or be projected towards the future.

In this process, elementary school and his school memories as a student became the objects that guided the referential processes that underlay Rafael’s discourse about his teacher education. It was all about the difficulties he had had as a student (“I believe I wasn’t an outstanding or dedicated student, but there are also exceptions, right?”). Therefore, by the time he completed his undergraduate course, he hoped to be able to perform “a relevant job”, one “which has a social impact, and gives him a financial reward”. The investment in his qualifications would allow him to combine his personal interests and his contributions to society (“My goal is to mature academically so that I may keep opening these doors”). Once again, by assigning a different meaning to his conceptualizations of school, he evaluated the academic experience as positive, since engagement in academic research would be the basis for his actions as a teacher who turned his experience in school environments into something meaningful. The soundness of his education and training would also enable him to become a teacher in schools that offered better working conditions (“If I happen to work in a non-conventional school, then I could also shift towards research as part of my teaching practice”).

The use of the photo-driven interview tool facilitated the process of looking at Rafael’s references to the school. An outstanding aspect was his being more interested in the school as a formal institution (33 references), than in the teachers who worked in it (16 references), in comparison to the data produced by Carmen, in which the reference to teachers (91 references) was predominant, rather than to school (23 references). In Rafael’s processes of building objects of discourse, it was observed that he was driven by his search of meaning, by the creation of school contexts and by teaching practice which may turn out to be meaningful for the individuals who participated in it – in contrast with his memories of the school as a place that did not challenge students to learn, and whose teachers lacked authorship and therefore did not arouse students’ interest.

A school with broken doors, dilapidated toilets and security bars similar to those in a prison: this is the image that Rafael evoked of the school he had gone to as a student and saw in the school where he was doing his pre-service teaching activities. In his words, “an oft-replicated model”. During his pre-service training, he pointed out the poor conditions of the school, yet he focused on its potentials (“I’m saying the school conditions are poor, it is unstable and misused, but it has great potential”). He also mentioned the school’s infrastructure problems (“So there are rooms with no doors and lots of students hanging around during the period of classes, in the halls”). In his view, the existence of doors established order, a principle of organization for the educational context (“So when you have a door, you can establish a temporal division; you use time to organize the contact you have with people behind that door; you somehow manage to organize the place to perform your activities. I believe it’s important because of that”).

Instead of simply referring to this aspect as something negative, an illustration of the precariousness of the school system, Rafael emphasized the structural importance of a satisfactory school infrastructure. Although he faced limitations imposed by the materiality of the world (MONDADA, 2002), Rafael built (flexible) categories which enabled him to conceptualize his context and to project productive pedagogical action into the future. In this sense, as it was pointed out in a previous study (RODRIGUES et al., 2018), experiences that

once were regarded as negative may have a positive effect in the development of teachers in pre-service education. Taking on an ethnographic point of view, the teacher in pre-service education retrieves their memories not only in order to understand the situation they are currently in, but to reinterpret and assign new values to their own memories.

One of the photographs Rafael took of the school had the blackboard as the focal point, which was, to him, “a special historical tool belonging to the physical space of the school, the support in which the words come alive”. In his process of constructing discourse objects related to schooling, and in an attempt to devise a school that was appealing to those who participated in it, Rafael reflected upon an artifact that had the potential to produce contextual meaning, an artifact through which “words come alive”. The blackboard was the material support for the “the words, and they are the basis for us to establish a dialogue with students”; this meaningful artifact was, “historically, a support, a meaningful support for teachers”. But for that to happen, the blackboard must be assigned a new meaning: “many students and teachers use the blackboard in a way that I don’t approve of, I’ve seen it a lot in my experience as a student, which is the teacher writes a medium-length or a lengthy text on the blackboard, then the student copies it, and this ends up being the only pedagogical activity. It becomes an end in itself. So, eventually, the purpose of writing is unaccomplished”. The value of writing was that it enabled teachers to become authors.

Rafael made similar observations with regard to the textbooks and their undeveloped potential to help create meaningful learning spaces and opportunities. He photographed textbooks that remained stored in one of the rooms of the school and were not available for student use because they had not been distributed to students yet. He wondered what he would do if he were in the teacher’s – or manager’s – place in order to ensure that these resources were well-used. In his view, “what is at stake is probably not the investment made, but the teachers being adequately trained for using this material. If people were educated to give a more meaningful value to materials, these would consequently have a wider circulation, wouldn’t they?” Once again, by assigning value to professional education and development, Rafael recategorized the objects of discourse, in order to envision more meaningful contexts.

Aiming at enhancing his understanding of the school context, Rafael personified the school and questioned the school model he had had as a student (“So I ask the school, when will you start to change and update yourself, when are you going to start building new things, and give new meanings to the areas inside and around you?”). It is interesting to note in Rafael’s remarks that the value he assigned to the school as an institution was made explicit in the very way he addressed the institution (“So I ask the school”). In this process, people seem to be part of the institution, and it is the institution the one that holds the possibility to ensure that formative interactions are established; therefore, the actions taken by the individuals who participate in the institution must be oriented towards transforming the school itself. In this sense, it seems that, for Rafael, improved teaching derived from establishing meaningful contexts, which, in turn, resulted from the work done by teachers in changing the institutional conditions of their workplace.

The data collected from the tool Teaching Experience Recollection seem to point out to Rafael’s changes of perspective with regard to school, since in this case he made a much larger number of references to the word *teacher* (20) than to the word *school* (9).

However, following the tendency shown in previous analyses, it seems that his references to teachers were made to discursively construct them as the change agents within the school institutional context, making their role more meaningful. This conception of teaching derives from the counterpoint provided by Rafael in the way he referred to the relationship between his supervisor’s work and her profession: “That was something I used to reflect about my teacher education, the way she [his supervisor and teacher] used the textbook in the classroom: it looks as if the textbook was her own teaching method; she somehow outsourced

her teaching method to the textbooks”. Referring to the submission of this teacher’s practice to textbooks, Rafael emphasized authorship as the distinguishing feature in making teaching more meaningful, a similar opinion he gave when talking about technological resources in the classroom.

The relationship between teachers and teaching would be one of the bases for the establishment of interactive constructive processes in the classroom. In an excerpt of the interview, Rafael criticized the attitude of the teacher who, having managed to draw the students’ attention, interrupted her class to deal with someone’s request outside the classroom; when she was back, she had trouble in resuming her activities, since the students’ involvement was gone (“She asked students for their attention twice or three times, when she finally got it and started teaching, someone knocked on the door. It was one of the secretaries, a school inspector who came to talk to her, so she attended to it”). For Rafael, her attitude resulted from her breach of commitment with students, and he tried to understand what had motivated that: “This is something I reflected about, for my own education, this commitment to students in the classroom. There’s so little time, time flies, especially when we... usually... have a lesson plan, right?”

Teacher-students interaction is portrayed as an ethical relationship which must be cared for and continuously rebuilt: “There are many people, many lives at that moment you are teaching, for you to fulfill your goal there you need - it has to be a whole sequence of stages of planning, right, preparation and also mediation. In addition, you also need to plan the way you will conduct the lesson, it also has a level of complexity, you need to, I believe, build that foundation”.

The way Rafael recategorized his experiences as a pre-service teacher seems to derive, according to the data analyzed, from the counterpoint between that and the practices that he regarded as unsatisfactory. He characterized such practices based on his student memories, or on what he observed within the context of the school where he was performing his practicum activities. To contrast his somewhat ethnographical observations of meaninglessness, he projected other ways of acting that may constitute the institutional contexts of teaching on a significant basis.

Carmen and the teacher at the core of her referencing processes

From the data collected with the tool Tree of Life, the 76 references Carmen made to *teacher*, as opposed to the 30 references to *school*, were initially based on the categorization of those she referred to as “important teachers” throughout her training and education period. In this initial categorization, the combination between the personal qualities of these teachers and their pedagogical knowledge was emphasized through the use of expressions such as: “teaching very affectionately”, “transmitting tenderness”, “my students’ eyes glowed [when she talked about a specific subject]”, teaching in a way “that the contents studied do not get tedious” and the class “becomes more fun”, and giving the students “more freedom for us to talk and read whatever we want”. Carmen’s point of departure, therefore, was that the teaching of the contents, including topics which were less appealing or interesting, may be improved by the affection teachers dedicated to professional practice.

This reference to affection as an action modulator suggests that affection is an innate quality, that is, one may either have it or not. However, Carmen’s view changed when she resorted to the idea of a long stay in a given school context and thus added a temporal characteristic to this referral process. Talking about one of these “important teachers”, Carmen said that “she was one of those teachers who have a super background, she’s been in that school

for many years, she's one of the longest-standing teachers in that school and she keeps working there".

In her process of assigning new meanings in defining what these "important teachers" were like, Carmen took up the figure of her father, who was also a teacher, and by referring to him she reiterated and broadened the relationship between affection and the unfolding of professional practice over time. Carmen stated that she had always found it "very beautiful" to see her father-teacher's emotion at the impact he had on the lives of his students. To characterize this, she recounted memories of witnessing casual encounters between her father and alumni at the mall ("Some student coming, oh teacher! I studied with you in 86 and now I'm a lawyer, I graduated ") or at school parties ("then the people came, 'oh, teacher, I managed to finish high school', 'teacher, I went to college', then he was all thrilled, then 'ah, no teacher, don't cry', no I know what. My father is very emotional when he meets a former student."). In the data, when Carmen referred to the memory of her father-teacher, she used strong affectionate expressions, such as "I always liked to see", "I always found it very beautiful", "I always found it very cool", "I always said, 'Wow, that's very cool!'" and "I thought it was very beautiful."

Some other attributes of the "important teachers" in Carmen's school background, such as "a cool person", "someone you can trust", were related to the reverence for her affectionate image of her father-teacher, leading to the notion of a teacher as a friend ("this interaction between teacher and students (...) I think it's more helpful when the teacher is a friend than when he is picky, boring. I guess this helps to win over the students'). Moreover, according to Carmen, for a teacher to be able to "win over", to establish bonds, they needed an attribute which was less temporal and rather innate: they needed "to have a knack for it". In order to establish this reference, she pointed out to another member of her family, her younger sister: "I think she will become a teacher too, she also has a knack for helping people".

After this initial stage, in which she related to affectionate memories of "important teachers", Carmen started talking about the present. It was as a result of her affection-motivated choice that she was now able to see herself as a teacher. Here, the objects of discourse were built in a different way. Carmen left affectivity in the background and anchored herself on a sort of rationality, which made herself experience feelings of absence, lack or deficiency. This became clear through her use of self-referential expressions, such as "I need to study more", "I need to go deeper into this", "I'm interested in studying more", "reading and researching", "I wish I could go deeper into this", "I'd never thought about it", and "there are many things to learn". This momentary fixation on the perception of not knowing was soon reconfigured when Carmen talked about her performance during three years as an assistant teacher in a school that provided tutoring classes for students. Describing her performance, she said she had been in a place where she could "experience": "It's as if it were another... we do the things that parents can't do [helping their kids in their studies]" and "I once had a student who was deaf, another one with, I can't remember, I guess it was autism. They assigned me to tutor a student and I had to find ways to help them to understand". In such a heterogeneous context, Carmen was willing to promote authentic learning, and relied on knowledge – rather than on personal attributes or qualities – as a way out of the locus of not-knowing ("I wanted to go deeper into it, because it interests me, and I felt some... some sort of burden, because I wasn't able to make him understand something that wasn't... it wasn't that difficult; he would have been able to understand if he hadn't that condition. But he wouldn't make progress, he'd get stuck").

Therefore, one's know-how started altering the image of the teacher which Carmen created for herself, and she saw herself halfway between two alternatives: on the one hand, creating her own methodology, "not only those we see in doctoral theses and schoolbooks, but I want to develop something of my own"; on the other hand, experimenting techniques and methodologies developed by other teachers ("I enjoy starting from a specific content I had [in

college] and trying to apply it with my students; by doing so, I “steal” ideas from my teachers, and apply them to my teaching”).

Her concern with pedagogical know-how was once again changed when Carmen established a connection between the teacher’s performance and her affectionate memories, when she stated that “some teachers just don’t manage to captivate their students; they arrive, give their classes and leave. And the ability to captivate is one of the most precious attributes of a teacher”. And this near-absolute realization placed Carmen in a moral dilemma: “I’m afraid of failing, I’m afraid of not being able to transmit knowledge, that they [the students] leave school just like they started it, that they learn nothing. That they learn only to be able to pass the exams”.

Through this account, we see Carmen combining affectivity and the references she brought in her memory in order to create her own teacher identity. Starting from a categorization marked by affective memories that helped her define who her important teachers had been and what they had been like, she transitioned towards an elaboration in which the relationship with professional knowledge stood out in the understanding of what teachers did and how they acted, and consequently, how she intended to be and act as a teacher.

In the data collected through the photo-driven interview, Carmen’s 23 references to *school* depicted in the photographs was articulated through her 91 references to different *teachers*: the teacher with whom Carmen interacted when she first arrived at the school, other teachers in this school and her own teachers at the university. The school depicted by Carmen in photographs of security bars, warehouses for the storage of books, barely furnished classrooms, empty halls and bare walls was defined as a “non-place”. In her words, “to me, it looked just like an abandoned school, a ghost hall, no one was around. I find it really sad looking at the walls with no posters, without something that might indicate the presence of students around”, “no one takes care of it, not even the students enjoy being in the school”, “they throw things on the floor, pieces of paper, snacks, that kind of thing”. And this “non-place” showed signs of “non-action”: “This is just one more warehouse, but in this case it’s even sadder, because these books have been distributed to them [the students], they are supposed to be given these books, but this doesn’t happen”.

This sadness that came from being confronted with the void, with the absence of evidence of knowledge production in that space, was explained by Carmen by the invocation of the school image she had built when recollecting her own school process: “In the school I attended, I was used to seeing lots of things posted on the walls. So it’s really odd not to have a bulletin board in the classroom, with notices about field trips or exam dates, or even some work produced by the students”. This contrast between two very distinct images of schools made her evaluate the school as “not a cool place to be around”.

In this “non-place”, which was in conflict with her affective memory of her school, Carmen noticed that the teacher-student relationship was also hollow and mechanical: “So when the teacher tells students that they’ll have to produce a piece of work for which they will get a grade, they stop and pay attention”; “and the teacher simply said, ‘Ah, the topic [you’ll be working on] is metonymy’, that was the only instruction they were given, ‘ah, just like [the language of] the traffic signs’, and that was it. And then everyone in class did their work on traffic signs”. This relationship thus turned students into mere traders of assessment grades (“‘Teacher, give me ‘a plus’ in my grade!’, They keep begging to be given a ‘plus’”).

Whereas in Carmen’s first categorization she placed the responsibility for the lack of purpose of school onto the school itself as a public apparatus and onto students, she soon changed the way she discursively constructed the object by describing an event in which “the teacher had managed to take control of her students and have them perform the task, and it looked like the class was finally about to start. We were very excited”. However, they were soon let down: “Then someone arrived and started to talk to the teacher, by the classroom door,

and they kept talking for 15 minutes (...). The students were about to start paying attention when the class was over. But it had barely begun”.

The fact that Carmen blamed the teacher for the failure in the pedagogical relationship became even more emphatic when she described what she defined as the teacher’s only strategy used in classes: copying. In her words, “for Portuguese lessons, it’s always like that, copying this and that exercise, it’s always this business of copying, sometimes they copy, maybe, a text, an article from a newspaper, something like that. This is their task. Copying a poem, copying a little joke”.

This teacher, so unlike the image of teacher Carmen brought from her experience as a student and her projection of what kind of teacher she wanted to be, was then condemned: “I guess the problem is not, no, it’s not them [the students]. Sometimes, the problem is the teacher herself”. But the condemnation did not last long; it got diluted as Carmen, as an ethnographic observer, started considering the material working conditions in the school: “The only wall socket we have is that one on the top, and we just can’t climb a ladder to plug our appliances in (...) the radio, the computer, the overhead projector, for example... because that’s the only wall socket”. This process of blaming the teacher also got diluted when Carmen also placed this responsibility on the students: “on that day, the rowdy boys were not around, but the girls simply didn’t care [about the class]. The teacher went on with her class, and the girls were painting their fingernails. They just didn’t care; it was as if nothing was happening”.

In an attempt to move away from the pendulum in which she sometimes blamed the teacher, sometimes the school, sometimes the students, Carmen pondered two aspects: “When they [the students] are having a lesson with *a teacher* who likes them, and likes the job, they pay attention”, and “*the school* somehow may be improved if *they* [school staff] took care of it, and did some renovation, something like hanging some posters and *students’* productions on the walls, the place would start looking like a school, rather than a prison”. It is worth noticing how Carmen used general categories (as indicated by the words highlighted in italics) in her descriptions in order to point out the transformative potential of that school, initially characterized as a “non-place”.

It is also worth noting that the conflict between what Carmen experienced in her current school and her school experience as a student seemed to give the meaning-making process some referential stability through negative lenses, characterizing what she currently lived as incomprehensible, or hard to fit into one single category: “I get sort of... I find it odd because when I was a student, it wasn’t like that. Our relationship was very different. I find it strange, like, wow!”.

Carmen's attempts, as a socially and culturally involved individual, to put into words how her references to school, teachers and students were produced, reveal the multiplicity, transience and uncertainty in the construction of the image of a self-realized teacher who performs her activities within the specificities of a given school context. This process demanded her to resort to her memories in order to understand her present context, according to an ethnographical principle. It also made her reassess her own memories and values, which enabled her to understand the working conditions under which her own professional education was taking place.

This complex frame of referencing, which was categorical when Carmen first voiced it, and right afterwards became partial, insufficient and subject to changes, was summed up in the data collected with the Teaching Experience Recollection tool. By describing her first steps in planning and conducting her pedagogical work in the same school and classrooms which she got to know as a critical and active observer, Carmen seemed to seek some balance in the references to *teacher* and *school*, with 36 references to the former, and 23 to the latter. From this conflicting experience, anchored in different references to realities experienced in a chronological and synchronic way, her purpose was materialized in her discourse in two distinct

ways: one in which Carmen talked about herself as a teacher today, identifying and rooting her state of change in what she had done as an assistant teacher in a school that provided tutoring classes for students (“I’ve already started letting them [the students] talk (...) develop their thinking, trying not to force them”); the other in which she anchored her image as a school teacher as “something-to-be”, in an attempt to distinguish herself from what she characterized as a teacher based on her experience in the school where her professional education was taking place (“So I guess that when I have my own class to teach, I’ll do my best not to act like that, not to say things like, ‘No, you said it wrong, this is not the way we speak’, to avoid correcting students in front of the class, or keep saying ‘come one, let’s copy this’, to avoid assigning copying tasks to them, so that it can be an interactive class, in which they can participate”).

Conclusions

Having an inner dialogue and interacting with their own memories, Carmen and Rafael built their subjective conceptualizations of the world and externalized them as objects of discourse. Their accounts reveal the way they referred to the school and the teachers, in an attempt to combine contradictions, thus creating a state of temporary instability for their professional practice. In spite of the singularities in the processes of each of the research participants, they both stated, restated, expanded and explained meaningful school experiences.

For Carmen, since the school she had attended and her former teachers were diametrically opposed to those she observed in her present experience, the process of referencing that shaped her conceptualizations about the world kept oscillating between blaming someone (generally, the teacher) for the meaninglessness of what she saw, and putting herself in this person’s place in order to reevaluate her interpretation and judgment. In this sense, Carmen’s process of referencing was characterized by doubts, in that the idealization of her own experience as a student, which was strongly influenced by affection, became predominant. For her, the life and meaning of the school rested in interpersonal relationships, which made her put the figure of the teacher and the appreciation of the personal, human aspect of teaching, at the center of her meaning-making process of what a school was.

For Rafael, the sensation of revisiting something well-known (the school he observed today was similar to the one he had attended as a student; the teachers with whom he was working now were similar to most of his teachers in elementary and middle school) made him construct images of schools and teachers in a positive way; he regarded whatever gaps he identified at the present time or in his past memories as meaningful. In other words, underlying his complex process of referencing was his certainty that schools may and must be different. Therefore, Rafael used the educational theories that were the basis for his education as a source for retrieving the tools that enabled his process of transformation. For him, the school needed to be a place that provided a meaningful relationship with knowledge, hence the centrality of references to the school as an institution built by people, particularly teachers. The presence of the other, named and referenced either centrally or peripherally, sometimes as a teacher, sometimes as a school, in Carmen and Rafael's intrasubjective process reveals instability and change not as problems but as intrinsic dimensions of discursive production and situated cognition (MONDADA, 2002, p. 124). Such instability in identifying discrete objects can also be observed at a non-linguistic level (or at least at a cognitive level where verbalization is neither necessary nor explicit) in everyday practices. In other words, individual cognitive activity is also a continuous activity of categorization, rather than the simple identification and recognition of pre-existing objects. Categorization depends on a non-exhaustive and selective treatment of the world, itself susceptible to change and transformation of either its finalities or adaptive modalities.

Considering that referencing processes are based on people's previous knowledge and on the images associated to the memories of their experiences, any pre-service teacher's construction of objects of discourse and categorization processes are always unique, as a response to the constitutive singularity of the individual. This observation highlights the impossibility of teacher education processes that are intended as instrumental, standardizing, or normative, since the resources which different pre-service teachers bring to their professional education are characterized by heterogeneity and instability.

By understanding instability as constitutive of individuals, we are compelled to rethink the definition of quality of education for both teachers and students. Since it is a situated phenomenon, the existence of which cannot precede the people who construct it, the quality of the school experience cannot be reduced to the efficiency of learning, nor can the success of teaching be linked to the effectiveness of teaching techniques. In this sense, teacher education is characterized as an ethnographic process which allows pre-service teachers to know and interpret the context in which they act, re-signifying it. It also enables teachers-to-be to redefine what teaching and schooling represent based on the very memory-based representations (intellectual, affective) which they bring to the process.

The analyses of the processes experienced by the research participants illustrate the complex weaving construction of teacher identities. Their singularities reveal that identities can be at the same time permanently unstable and constantly committed to democratic values and the reduction of social inequalities.

REFERENCES

- ANDRADE, L. T. A escrita dos professores: textos em formação, professores em formação, formação em formação. *Educação & Sociedade*, vol. 24, n. 85, dez., 2003, p. 1297-1315.
- APARÍCIO, A. S. M. A renovação do ensino de gramática no primeiro grau no Estado de São Paulo. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística Aplicada). Universidade Estadual de Campinas. Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem. Campinas, 1999.
- BAGNO, M.; RANGEL, E. O. Tarefas da educação linguística no Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, Belo Horizonte, v. 5, n. 1, p. 63-81, 2005.
- BENEVIDES, A. S. A formação de professores do curso de Letras: aspectos para uma prática 16rofessio. *Revista Letra Magna*, n. 5, p. 1-19, 2006.
- BREEN, M. P., HIRD, B., MILTON, M., OLIVER, R., & THWAITE, A. Making sense of language teaching: Teachers' principles and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 470–501, 2001.
- BURNS, A.; FREEMAN, D.; EDWARDS, E. Theorizing and Studying the Language-Teaching Mind: Mapping Research on Language Teacher Cognition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99, 3, 585-601, 2015.
- CASTILHO, A. T. de. Variação 16rofessio e ensino institucionalizado da língua portuguesa. In: *Cadernos de Estudos Linguísticos*. Nº 1, 1978, p. 13-20.
- CASTILHO, A. T. Os sons. In: SÃO PAULO. Secretaria da Educação. Subsídios à Proposta Curricular de Língua Portuguesa para o 1º e 2º graus – coletânea de textos. São Paulo: CENP, vol. 1, 1988a.
- CASTILHO, A. T. Variação linguística, norma culta e ensino da língua 16rofessi. In: SÃO PAULO. Secretaria da Educação. Subsídios à Proposta Curricular de Língua Portuguesa para o 1º e 2º graus – coletânea de textos. São Paulo: CENP, vol. 1, 1988b.
- CROOKES, G. V. Redrawing the Boundaries on Theory, Research, and Practice Concerning Language Teachers' Philosophies and Language Teacher Cognition: Toward a Critical Perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99, 3, 485-499, 2015.

- FERYOK, A. Activity theory and language teacher agency. *Modern Language Journal*, 96, 95–107, 2012.
- FRANCHI, E. P. *Pedagogia da alfabetização: da oralidade à escrita*. 3ª ed. São Paulo: Cortes, 1991.
- FREGONEZI, D. E. Aconteceu a virada no ensino de língua portuguesa? *Revista do GELNE*. Ano 1, nº 2, pp. 82-85. 1999.
- FREIRE, P. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1973.
- GERALDI, J. W., SILVA, L. L. M. & FIAD, R. S. Linguística, Ensino de Língua Materna e Formação de Professores. In: D.E.L.T.A., São Paulo, vol.12, nº 2, p. 307-326, 1996.
- GERALDI, J. W. (Org.) *O texto na sala de aula: Leitura e produção*. Cascavel: Assoeste, 1984.
- GERALDI, J. W. *Portos de Passagem*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1991.
- GOLOMBEK, P. R., & DORAN, M. Unifying cognition, emotion, and activity in language teacher professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 39, 102–111, 2014.
- GOLOMBEK, P. R., & JOHNSON, K. E. Narrative inquiry as a mediational space: Exploring emotional and cognitive dissonance in second language teachers' development. *Teachers and Teaching*, 10, 307–328, 2004.
- GOODWIN, A. L. Globalization and the preparation of quality teachers: Rethinking 17rofessio domains for teaching. *Teaching Education*, 21(1), 19–32, 2010.
- HEATH, S. B. *Ways With Words*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- JOHNSON, K. E., & GOLOMBEK, P. R. (Eds.). *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- KLEIMAN, A. C. B. Professores e agentes de letramento: identidade e posicionamento social. *Revista Filologia e Linguística Portuguesa*, n. 08, 2006, p. 409-424.
- KLEIMAN, A. C. B. Letramento e suas implicações para o ensino de língua 17rofessi. *Signo*, Santa Cruz do Sul, v. 32, n. 53, p. 1-25, dez. 2007.
- KLEIMAN, A. C. B. Projetos dentro de projetos: ensino-aprendizagem da escrita na formação de professores de nível universitário e de outros agentes de letramento. *Revista Scripta*. Belo Horizonte: PUC/MG, v. 13, n. 24, p. 17-30, 2009.
- KOCH, I. G. V. A referenciação. In: *Desvendando os Segredos do Texto*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002.
- KUBANYOVA, M. & CROOKES, G. Re-Envisioning the Roles, Tasks, and Contributions of Language Teachers in the Multilingual Era of Language Education Research and Practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100 (Supplement 2016), 117-132, 2016.
- KUMARAVADIVELU, B. *Language Teacher Education for a Global Society – a modular model for knowing, 17rofessio, recognizing, doing, and seeing*. New York: Routledge-Taylor & Francis, 2012.
- LEE, S. & SCHALLERT, D. Becoming a teacher: Coordinating past, present, and future selves with perspectival understandings about teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 56, 72-83, 2016.
- MARCUSCHI, L. A. Anáfora indireta: o barco textual e suas âncoras. *Revista Letras*, v. 56, dez., 2001.
- MARINHO, M. *A oficialização de novas concepções para o ensino de Português*. TESE (Doutorado) Universidade Estadual de Campinas. Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem. Campinas, 2001.
- MERRYFIELD, M. M. Reflective Practice in Global Education: Strategies for Teacher Educators. *Theory into Practice*, 32/1, 27-32, 1993.
- MONDADA, L. Construction des objets de discours et categorization: une approche des processus de référenciation. Tradução: Mônica Magalhães Cavalcante. *Revista de Letras*, nº 24, vol.1/2, p.119-128, 2002.

OLIVEIRA, M. B. F. Revisitando a formação de professores de língua 18rofessi: teoria, prática e construção de identidades. *Linguagem em (Dis)curso*, Tubarão, v.6, n.1, jan/abr., 2006.

RODRIGUES, L. A. D.; PIETRI, E.; SANCHEZ, H. S.; KUCHAH, K. The role of experienced teachers in the development of pre-service language teachers? professional identity: Revisiting school memories and constructing future teacher selves. *International Journal of Educational Research*, v. 88, p. 146-155, 2018.

SIGNORINI, I. Significados da inovação no ensino de língua portuguesa e na formação de professores. 1. Ed. Campinas (SP): Mercado de Letras, 2007.

SILVA, K.; PILATI, E.; e DIAS, J. O ensino de gramática na contemporaneidade: delimitando e atravessando as fronteiras na formação inicial de professores de língua portuguesa. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*. V. 10, n. 4, p. 981, 2010.

SOARES, M. *Linguagem e escola: uma perspectiva social*. São Paulo: Ática, 1984.

TARDIF, M. *Saberes 18rofess e formação 18rofessional*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2002.

TSUI, A. B. M. *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of second language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

TSUI, A. B. M. Complexities of identity formation: a narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 657–680, 2007.