Voices in Confrontation in Structuring Professoriate Groups of Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs: Between the Prescribed and the Institutionalized Practice / *Vozes em confronto no Núcleo Docente Estruturante de cursos de Letras: entre o prescrito e a prática institucionalizada*

Jozanes Assunção Nunes*

ABSTRACT

The present article aims to analyze the reactions-responses of professors who belong to a Structuring Professoriate Group (SPG) from a public university's Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs to discourses in official education documents that discuss the SPGs in higher education institutions. It focuses on the relations of tensions between discourses involved in verbal interactions. Bakhtinian Dialogical Discourse Theory fundamentals guide the study, favoring the debate around refractions and revaluations of legal discourses related to the SPG creation in the scope of undergraduate programs. A dialogical analysis reveals that the utterances of the research subjects interact with the official voices which determine the SPG creation and, somehow, are answers to them, welcoming them, as well as altering them, refusing them and disregarding them, in a context in which the Language programs would be assessed by the Ministry of Education evaluation committee.

KEYWORDS: Structuring Professoriate Group; Official Discourses; Professors' Discourses; Dialogism; Responsiveness

RESUMO

O presente artigo tem como objetivo analisar as reações-respostas de professores do Núcleo Docente Estruturante (NDE) de Cursos de Letras de uma universidade pública aos discursos consignados nos documentos oficiais da educação que dispõem sobre o Núcleo nas instituições de ensino, focalizando as relações de tensão existentes entre os discursos envolvidos na interação verbal. Os fundamentos da Teoria Dialógica do Discurso, de viés bakhtiniano, orientam o estudo, favorecendo o debate em torno das refrações e revalorizações dos discursos legais relacionados à criação do NDE no âmbito dos cursos de graduação. A análise dialógica revela que os enunciados dos sujeitos da pesquisa interagem com as vozes oficiais que determinam a criação do NDE e, de algum modo, são respostas a elas, tanto acolhendo-as, como também alterando-as, recusando-as, desprezando-as, num contexto em que os cursos de Letras seriam avaliados por comissões de avaliadores do Ministério da Educação.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Núcleo Docente Estruturante; Discursos oficiais; Discursos de professores; Dialogismo; Responsividade

---

* Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso – UFMT, Cuiabá, Mato Grosso, Brazil; She holds a PhD in Linguística Aplicada e Estudos da Linguagem [Applied Linguistics and Languages Studies] from Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo – PUC/SP, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil; jozanes@globo.com

Introduction

This article presents part of the results of our doctoral research, which sought to understand the complexity of the restructuration process of an Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Program in the academic sphere (NUNES, 2017), having Bakhtinian studies, entitled by Brait (2008) Dialogic Discourse Analysis, as the epistemic and methodological basis. We aim to analyze the reactions-responses of professors belonging to the Structuring Professoriate Group (hereinafter SPG) from the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs of a public university to the discourses in the official documents that discuss the Group within the scope of undergraduate programs, namely CONAES Report n. 4/2010 and CONAES Resolution n. 1/2010, focusing on the existing relations between the discourses involved in verbal interactions.[1]

The SPG is a collegiate body comprised of a group of professors responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the pedagogical project of an undergraduate program, formally indicated by the institution (BRAZIL, 2010a). In the university researched, the SPG of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs was created[2] in a context in which these programs would be evaluated by expert committees of the National Institute of Educational Studies and Research Anísio Teixeira (hereinafter INEP)[3], due to the unsatisfactory Preliminary Course Score (hereinafter PCS)[4] in the National Student Performance Exam (hereinafter ENADE)[5] in 2011.

---

[1] T.N.: CONAES (Comissão Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior) is a Brazilian agency that coordinates and oversees the National System for the Evaluation of Higher Education (SINAES), instituted by Act 10,861 / 2004. The committee has the responsibility of proposing and evaluating the dynamics, procedures and mechanisms of institutional evaluation of programs and student performance. It establishes guidelines for the organization and designation of evaluation committees, analyzes reports, elaborates assessments and sends recommendations to other academic realms, among others. SINAES, in turn, consists of three main components: the evaluation of institutions, programs, and student performance. SINAES evaluates all aspects that encompass these three axes, especially teaching, research, and extension (BRAZIL, 2004).

[2] Nunes (2016) conducts a dialogical analysis of CONAES Report n. 4/2010 in its relationship with CONAES Resolution n. 1/2010, unveiling the strategies used by the enunciator of the utterance to convince the subjects of the academic bodies to create SPGs in undergraduate programs.

[3] T.N.: INEP (Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira) is a federal institute linked to the Ministry of Education of Brazil. Its mission is to subsidize the formulation of educational policies of the different levels of government in order to contribute to the economic and social development of the country. Available at: [http://portal.inep.gov.br/web/guest/inicio]. Accessed on: February, 08, 2018.

[4] T.N.: CPC (Conceito Preliminar de Curso) in the original.

[5] T.N.: ENADE (Exame Nacional de Desempenho de Estudantes) is a compulsory exam held in Brazil, which evaluates the performance of the students who complete their undergraduate programs in relation

The study is based on the assumption that there is a clash of political-ideological forces that permeate the research subjects' utterances concerning the SPG configuration. This provokes a wide variety of responses to the official discourses, which may be not only of adhesion, but also of refusal, criticism and revalorization, even in a context in which the courses would be evaluated by the Ministry of Education's evaluation committee.

In order to achieve the proposed objective, this article has four sections. The first addresses the theoretical-methodological basis for the research; the second discusses the conditions of the research subjects' utterance production; the third reflects on the SPG of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs from their members' perceptions, focusing both on the SPG configuration in the curricular structuring process and the role of their members. The last concludes our trajectory with final remarks.

1 Theoretical-Methodological Aspects

In the light of Bakhtin and the Circle's studies, this work starts from the understanding that every utterance is made in a given concrete communicative situation, in a particular historical-social context by subjects with different communicative intentions and who act and interact through language. From this point of view, the utterance, as discursive materiality, is not closed in on itself. It constitutes itself as such in the endless dialogues between discourses already spoken or not yet spoken, housing a multiplicity of voices, that is, ideological positions, which establish with each other relations of agreement or disagreement, acceptance or refusal, harmony or conflict.

Faraco (2010, p.69), based on the Bakhtinian thought, highlights that dialogue, in the broad sense of the term, must be understood as a vast space of struggle between social voices (a kind of discourse battle), in which centripetal and centrifugal forces act. Certainly, when discussing the issue of dialogism, Bakhtin (1981)[6] states that centripetal and centrifugal forces, which affect language, are projected towards centralization and dispersion, always being in confrontation. From this perspective, while centripetal forces

to syllabus, skills and competences they acquired in their undergraduate training. Available at: [http://portal.inep.gov.br/enade]. Accessed on: February, 08, 2018.

[6] BAKHTIN, M. Discourse in the Novel. In: _____. *The Dialogic Imagination*: Four Essays. Edited by Michael Holquist and translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981, pp.259-422.

seek to establish centralization of reality, centrifugal forces seek to destabilize the centralizing order, aiming at rupture. However, it is worth highlighting that, regardless of production and its respective socio-historical context, both forces will be always in a dialogical state of interaction, constituting one in function of the other, in a perspective of conflict that is only possible to evaluate in the concrete reality of language.

By taking into account such concept, we have established, in this article, an analogy between the official voices that deal with SPG's creation and centripetal forces, which seek homogenization of the process of program restructuring, and another one between voices which present an axiological perspective as opposed to the official voices and centrifugal forces. The documents, such as Report n. 4/2010 and Resolution n. 1/2010 of CONAES[7], were elaborated with the aim of overcoming the several discourses which make up the curricular reform process, opposing barriers to it, as it occurs with the single language, dealt with by Bakhtin (1981).[8]

When it is stated, the utterance expects a response. As pointed out by Bakhtin (1986, p.68),[9] "any understanding of live speech, a live utterance, is inherently responsive, although the degree of this activity varies extremely. Any understanding is imbued with response and necessarily elicits it in one form or another: the listener becomes a speaker". Thus, there is no understanding without a *counter word*, according to Vološinov (2000, p.102).[10]

Considering that the nature of utterances is dialogical, the discourse-response relationship of the SPG members, in dialogue with the CONAES documents that deal with the creation of the Group, will be analyzed so that the senses are constituted, since they are generated only within dialogues. Thus, the senses will emerge from the establishment of dialogical relationships.

It is worth noting that the existing dialogical relationships between discourses can be either harmonious or polemical, openly polemical or covertly polemical, acquired from

---

[7] For details, see footnote 1.
[8] For full reference, see footnote 6.
[9] BAKHTIN, M. The Problem of Speech Genres. In: BAKHTIN, M. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. 20th ed. Austin, TX: University of Texas Pressa, 1986, pp.60-102.
[10] VOLOŠINOV, V. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trad. Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

the point of view of the observer, the researcher. For Bakhtin (1984),[11] open polemics occurs when the object of refutation is the discourse of the other. In the hidden polemics, differently, "the other's thought does not personally make its way inside the discourse but is only reflected in it, determining its tone and its meaning" (BAKHTIN, 1984, p.195).[12]

Based on these precepts, we have analyzed the responsiveness of the SPG members from a public university's Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs to the official discourses, in relation to the implementation and development of this Group. The data were obtained by means of a questionnaire[13] and a semi-structured interview carried out collectively with the research subjects.[14]

We formulated our research path based on Vološinov's (2000)[15] orientation, by which, firstly, it is necessary to understand the "discursive interaction" which occurs in a historical, concrete situation, observing the genre to which the discourses belong, to finally carry out the analysis of the language forms in its habitual linguistic conception.

From these coordinates, we move on to the discussion of the SPG members' utterances in their relationship with the CONAES utterances, first addressing their production context. As Brait and Pistori (2012, 378) state, "before a genre, and the texts that constitute it, it is necessary to take into account their (internal/external) dimensions in a way to make explicit the dialogical and evaluative inter-relationships."[16]

---

[11] BAKHTIN, M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Edited and translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

[12] For full reference, see previous footnote.

[13] The questionnaire was created to collect data of the participants' profile and their perceptions about the SPG that they integrate.

[14] We seek, with the interview, to identify the trends and patterns of relevant responses related to the problematics studied, focusing on the interaction of the discursive subjects. Five professors who were members of the SPG participated in the interview, at ages between 40 and 65 years, whose main task was to restructure the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs. For the transcription of the data, we followed some of the codifications presented by Marcuschi (2000). The codes used are: [ ] intercalated speech of teachers; (+) brief pause in speech flows; (++) long pause in speech flows; ((   )) comments of the researcher; UPPERCASE emphasis or strong accentuation. In addition to these codes, we used: E for interviewer; PO1… PO2 for professors.

[15] For full reference, see footnote 10.

[16] In the original: "[...] diante de um gênero, e dos textos que o constituem, é necessário considerar suas dimensões (interna/externa), de maneira a explicitar as inter-relações dialógicas e valorativas."

2 Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs during the SINAES: The Production Context of the SPG Professors

The restructuring of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs in the researched institution (Portuguese and Literature, Portuguese and English, Portuguese and French and Portuguese and Spanish) began in January 2013. One of the factors that triggered such restructuring was the insufficient performance of the courses, in 2011, in the Preliminary Course Score (PCS). The PCS is an indicator of the undergraduate program quality (evaluated on a scale from 1 to 5), which composes the National System of Higher Education Evaluation (SINAES),[17] created by Act n. 10,861/2004. In order to ensure the national evaluation process of Higher Education Institutions, the SINAES relies on three basic components: the evaluation of institutions, programs, and students' performance.

Undergraduate programs with an PCS below three undergo precautionary measures. This is what happened to the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs of the institution researched. As they did not obtain a satisfactory PCS in the 2011 ENADE, they had, along with the institution, to sign commitment protocols with the Ministry of Education in order to remedy the deficiencies identified by the evaluation. In addition, all the programs were visited *in loco* by a committee of evaluators from INEP, who aimed to verify protocol compliance.

In this context, in 2013, following the instructions of CONAES, the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs created the SPG so that, among other attributions, its members could conduct the reformulation of the Program's Pedagogical Project (hereinafter PPP),[18] which would be evaluated during the *in loco* visit by INEP examiners.

In relation to the SPG creation, we have observed that there is some conformity with the CONAES determinations stated in Resolution CNE/CP n. 1/2010, as follows:

> Higher Education Institutions, through their superior collegiate, should define the responsibilities and the criteria for the SPG creation. It should meet at least the following criteria:

---

[17] T.N.: Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior, in the original. For full reference, see footnote 1.

[18] T.N.: PPP (Program's Pedagogical Project) is a normative document of undergraduate programs that presents information on their design, structure, and internal regulatory elements.

I – to consist of *at least 5* professors belonging to the teaching staff of the program;
II – to have at least 60% of its members with *academic qualifications obtained in stricto sensu graduate programs*;
III – to have all members employed on a part or full-time basis, with at least *20% full time*;
IV – to ensure a partial renewal strategy of the NDE members in order to guarantee the continuity in the follow-up process of the program (BRAZIL, 2010a, emphasis added).[19]

The SPG was organized by appointment and approval of its members by the Program Collegiate, and six PhD professors were selected from the list of programs in which they work(ed) full time in the institution. The creation of this Group took place according to the criteria established by CONAES, regarding hours of work and academic titles, thus, evidencing the active reaction-response of the professors' agreement to what was said in the document (VOLOŠINOV, 2000).[20]

However, regarding the members' length of stay in the Group, we observed a disagreement among the professors about the orientation of CONAES in Report CNE/CP n. 04/2010, advising that, "being a monitoring group, its members should remain for at least 3 years and adopt a strategy of partial renewals in order to maintain continuity in the understanding of the program."[21] Through Recommendation n. 020/Congregation/IL/2013, of June 13, 2013, the Board of the Institute responsible for the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs appointed professors with a term of 2 years as from January 30, 2013.

In this regard, we considered that the Institute leadership could even create "a strategy of partial renewal" and, with the end of the SPG members' term, to extend the time for professors to work for additional one or two years; however, they could not guarantee that the professors would remain in the Group for "at least three years." This is due to the fact that professors are free to decide, according to the determination, whether

---

[19] In the original: "As instituições de Educação Superior, por meio dos seus colegiados superiores, devem definir as atribuições e os critérios de constituição do NDE, atendidos, no mínimo, os seguintes: I – ser *constituído por um mínimo de 5* professores pertencentes ao corpo docente do curso; II – ter pelo menos 60% de seus membros com *titulação acadêmica obtida em programas de pós-graduação stricto sensu*; III – Ter todos os membros em regime de trabalho de tempo parcial ou integral, sendo pelo menos *20% em tempo integral*; IV assegurar estratégia de renovação parcial dos integrantes do NDE de modo a assegurar continuidade no processo de acompanhamento do curso" (BRASIL, 2010a).
[20] For full reference, see footnote 10.
[21] In the original: "[...] sendo um grupo de acompanhamento, seus membros devem permanecer por, no mínimo, 3 anos e adotada estratégia de renovações parciais de modo a haver continuidade no pensar do curso".

or not they remain in the group. This deadlock is evident when we verify that, out of the six professors nominated for the SPG in 2013, three failed to join it that year, for different reasons. Out of these, two were replaced in 2014/1,[22] and five professors remained in the Group.

Thus, despite the fact that the institution and the professors of the Language Teacher Education Undergraduate Programs have responded positively to CONAES, with the creation of the SPG, the Recommendation n. 020/ Congregation/IL/2013, as well as the reasons which led the professors to leave the group, clashed with the centripetal forces that determine the members' length of stay in the Group, aiming at homogenizing the SPG configuration in the scope of undergraduate programs.

The Evaluation Instrument of Undergraduate Programs published by INEP and used by the evaluators establishes, as an indicator of the program quality, the existence of the SPG. During the *in loco* evaluation of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs,[23] the SPG was positively evaluated, considering, in a systemic and global analysis, the aspects related to the reformulation of the PPP.

In the next section, we analyze the data which present the research subjects' perception of the SPG they integrate.

3 Structuring Professoriate Group: The Space of the Discursive Clash

In this section, we present the members' analysis of the SPG's axiological positions regarding both the configuration and development of the Group in the institution studied, based on the data collected from the questionnaire administered to these subjects and the collective interview carried out, without leaving aside our observation, as researchers of the meetings we attended. In analyzing these data, we turned our eyes to the words, since discursive operations find in the present or absent word a great informant, being a stage where different ideologies are debated (VOLOŠINOV, 2000).[24]

---

[22] In February 2014, we began the research in the SPG of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs, ending the activities in May 2015 because of the national strike of the professors of federal universities.

[23] In the evaluation *in loco*, all the courses were positively evaluated, with Course Outcomes (CC)ranging from 3 to 5 (5 being profile of excellence), and, in the ENADE 2014, they obtained CPC 4.

[24] For full reference, see footnote 10.

3.1 Tension among Voices in the Configuration of the Structuring Professoriate Group from the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs

CONAES Resolution n. 1/2010 determines that the SPG must be constituted by a minimum of

> *five professors belonging to the faculty of the program,* [that] exercise *academic leadership within it*, which is observed in their production of knowledge in the area, in teaching development, and in other dimensions understood as important by the institution, and that *act on the development of the program* (BRAZIL 2010a; emphasis added).[25]

In the glossary which integrates the Evaluation Instrument for Undergraduate Programs produced by INEP and used by expert committees for the evaluation of the programs, the SPG is defined as

> A set of professors, made up of at least *five professors of the program*, of high qualification and rank, hired to work full or part-time, who *respond more directly for the design, implementation and consolidation of the Pedagogical Project of the Program* (BRAZIL, 2015, p.47; emphasis added).[26]

In view of such precepts, we can characterize these voices as centripetal forces, which act in the sense of standardizing the collegiate structure responsible for the PPP in Brazilian Institutions. In this scenario, each program, when seeking to comply with the INEP legislation and instrument, must establish its SPG with at least five professors, who should belong to the faculty of the program.

Nevertheless, in the researched institution, the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education programs created a single SPG, made up of professors with specific training in the areas of the courses being offered (Portuguese, Literature, English, French and Spanish), thus, totalizing, five members belonging to distinct faculties. Thus, the SPG was

---

[25] In the original: "[...] *cinco professores pertencentes ao corpo docente do curso,* [que] *exerçam liderança acadêmica no âmbito do mesmo*, percebida na produção de conhecimentos na área, no desenvolvimento do ensino, e em outras dimensões entendidas como importantes pela instituição, e que *atuem sobre o desenvolvimento do curso"* (BRASIL, 2010a).

[26] In the original: "Conjunto de professores, composto por pelo menos *cinco docentes do curso*, de elevada formação e titulação, contratados em tempo integral ou parcial, que *respondem mais diretamente pela concepção, implementação e consolidação do Projeto Pedagógico do Curso"* (BRASIL, 2015, p.47).

made up of professors who "act on development" (BRAZIL, 2010b) not of all programs, but only of their own in particular. Such a configuration demanded that the specific issues of each course be discussed with their coordinators and professors, having the representative of SPG as an articulator of the process.

This SPG characteristic is corroborated by the research subjects when presenting their counter words to what is requested in the questionnaire, which aimed to know what the role of the Group was in the context of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs. Let us see what the professors highlighted:

> E: What is the role of the Structuring Professoriate Group (SPG) of the program?
> P01: To improve the curriculum on the basis of better teaching result quality (teacher training).
> P02: The creation of the SPG in the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Program is quite recent (January 2013) and we are still trying to understand what it means to be 'the soul' of the program, a function designated to the Group by the document which organizes the SPG. However, I can say that the SPG was in charge of rethinking and (re)elaborating the new PPP for 2015-2020 (still in progress, but in its almost final version). This project for me meant to work with the other members of the SPG through collective reflections on the development of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Program, in search for its improvement involving the faculty through consultation with the areas of the four Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs. The SPG is composed of the representatives of all areas. It is up to the SPG, however, to conduct work to promote the improvement of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs.
> P03: To present a proposal for the restructuring of the Portuguese-Literature Teacher Education Program, to review the profile of the program and its alumni, correct distortions, (re)adjust courses, meet MEC demands, update the contents and bibliographic references, aiming to reverse the score of 2,0 that the Program received in the 2011 ENADE.
> P04: At this moment, to study some fundamentals for a wider understanding of the mechanics of the curricular framework of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Program in order to reformulate the PPP. Of course, for this purpose, it counts on the discussions and referrals of the program component areas.
> P05: Due to the poor performance of the students and, by extension, of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs in the ENADE evaluation, the SPG had the responsibility of conducting the PPP reformulation, discussing it with students and professors and, later, implementing, evaluating and monitoring the new PPP.[27]

---

[27] In the original: "E: Qual o papel do Núcleo Docente Estruturante (NDE) do curso? - P01: Aprimorar o currículo em função de maior qualidade do resultado do ensino (formação de professores). - P02: A criação do NDE no curso de Letras é bastante recente (janeiro de 2013) e estamos ainda tentando entender o que significa ser 'a alma' do curso, função designada ao núcleo pelo documento que estrutura o NDE. Contudo, posso dizer que o NDE ficou encarregado de repensar e reelaborar o novo PPC para o período de 2015-2020 (ainda em elaboração, mas em sua versão quase final). Esse trabalho para mim significou trabalhar com os outros membros do NDE por meio de reflexões coletivas acerca do desenvolvimento do curso de Letras, em busca de sua melhoria envolvendo todos os professores, por meio de consulta às áreas dos quatro cursos de Letras. O NDE é composto pelos representantes de todas as áreas. Cabe ao NDE, portanto, conduzir trabalhos que promovam melhoria para os cursos de Letras. - P03: Apresentar uma

P02 highlights that the *NDE is composed of the representatives across all areas*. For this professor, the Group activities meant *working with the other members of the SPG through collective reflections, involving all the professors, through consultation with the areas of the four Language Teacher Education Undergraduate Programs*. P04, in the same direction, emphasizes that the PPP reformulation counted on *discussions and referrals of the program component areas* it represents. By adapting the precepts established by CONAES Resolution n. 01/2010 to the internal reality of the programs, the academic individuals voiced their defense of a kind of collegiate organization formed not by isolated groups, but, rather, by a single group with an open structure of dialogue with the peers. This voice can be understood as the voice of *autonomy*, which assumes new ways of planning and organizing the Group work from the view of local reality.

Thus, the configuration of the SPG projects the Bakhtinian concept of centrifugal force by highlighting the responsive position of an academic community that conforms with the legal precepts of the institutional context and takes into account the reality of its teaching staff, its purposes, thus destabilizing the centripetal force, which requires the Higher Education Institutions to create a Group whose minimum number of professors who belong to it and the group profile are determined by it.

We observe in this field of forces that the professors' actions represent an attempt to survive the centripetal homogenization. On the one hand, the programs were forced to create the SPG, as this group is part of the evaluation process done by INEP/MEC; on the other, they eroded its determinations, establishing it according to the reality of each program, seeking to preserve its singularity, within the diversity of the educational context.

In the fragment under analysis, P5 highlights students' involvement *in conducting the works of PPP reformulation*. In fact, the SPG professors organized two meetings with

---

proposta de reestruturação do Curso de Letras Português-Literatura, para rever o perfil do curso e do seu egresso, corrigir distorções, (re)ajustar disciplinas, para atender às exigências do MEC, atualizar conteúdos e bibliografias, com o objetivo de reverter a média 2,0, que o Curso recebeu no ENADE 2011. - P04: Neste momento, estudar alguns fundamentos para uma compreensão mais ampliada da mecânica da matriz curricular do curso de Letras, a fim de reformular o PPC. Naturalmente, para essa finalidade, conta com as discussões e encaminhamentos das áreas componentes do curso. - P05: Por ocasião do mau desempenho dos alunos e, por extensão, dos cursos de Letras na avaliação do ENADE, o NDE teve por papel a condução dos trabalhos de reformulação do Projeto Pedagógico do Curso, discussão junto a alunos e professores e, posteriormente, a implantação, avaliação e acompanhamento do novo PPC".

them, along with the professors of the programs, to present and discuss the curricular proposal and changes required for each program. Along with Veiga (2012), we understand that students' involvement in issues related to pedagogical projects is essential for a task that is presented with a decentralizing profile, giving the opportunity to visualize the program as a whole, thus enabling a pedagogical dialogue between students and professors.

In addition, according to Bakhtinian premises, the other's position provides the understanding of the object, giving it its finishing. In this light, each SPG member has different value horizons in relation to teacher training. However, when each professor understands the words and positions of the other subjects from different academic realms in the process of conceiving of the Pedagogical Project, he/she exceeds his/her own value horizon, comes into contact with the others' horizon, introduces his/her accentuation and expressions in it, thus giving it a particular form (BAKHTIN, 1981).[28]

Still analyzing the data from the questionnaire, we found that the SPG role, from the professors' point of view, is directed to the reformulation of the PPPs, which involves issues related to curriculum. For P03, this activity translates a legal requirement, since it was carried out with the aim of *meeting MEC demands*. From this same point of view, P5 highlights the reason that led the programs to reformulate their projects, namely the *poor performance of the students, and by extension, of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs in the ENADE evaluation*. P1, P02 and P04 do not relate the activity to the fulfillment of MEC's prescriptive requests, as if they wanted to pinpoint a silent rupture with that fact, not mentioning it (*the score of 2,0 that the Program received in the 2011 ENADE – P03*), which surprised everybody. For P01, the SPG role is to *improve the curriculum on the basis of better teaching result quality*

Certainly, as we have seen, the fact that the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Program of the institution underwent a process of special supervision, as a result of the students' evaluation having been considered insufficient in the 2011 ENADE, was the main reason that led the professors to reformulate the PPPs. From this perspective, the SINAES ended up affecting the PPPs and the curricula resulting from them, because it mobilized the academic individuals who were provoked by the need to meet the demands of public policy.

---

[28] For full reference, see footnote 6.

Considering the voices of CONAES, the SPG role is to establish a plan for educational work, determine guidelines, foster curricular practices that consolidate the PPP and contribute to the full development of the curriculum. This role is expressed in CONAES Resolution n. 1/2010 as follows:

> The responsibilities of the Structuring Professoriate Group are, among others:
> I – to contribute to the professional profile consolidation of the alumni;
> II – to ensure interdisciplinary curricular integration among the different teaching activities in the curriculum;
> III – to indicate ways to encourage the development of research lines and extension, stemming from undergraduate needs and labor market requirements, and in line with the public policies related to the knowledge area of the program;
> IV – to ensure compliance with the National Curricular Guidelines for Undergraduate Programs (BRAZIL, 2010a).[29]

The professors' utterances-responses, extracted from the questionnaire, establish a relationship of assimilation to such precepts of CONAES, more specifically regarding the SPG attributions, related to the reformulation of the PPP. However, we verified in these utterances-responses, as well as in the *in loco* observations, that there is a silence regarding the responsibility set forth in subsection III of the Resolution.

In the PO2 discursive expressions, we can find a possible reason for these professors' silence, when this professor states that the *SPG creation in the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Program is quite recent (January 2013)* and that the members of the Group *are still trying to understand what it means to be 'the soul' of the program.* In fact, the SPG is a new program structure, still in the process of institutional acceptance, of understanding the role to be played by their members. Thus, similar to all imposed educational policies, there is also a certain resistance on the part of the academic community that views such an imposition with suspicion.

Nonetheless, the professors' silence produces other meanings. If these professors did not address the SPG attribution described in subsection III of CONAES Resolution n.

---

[29] In the original: "São atribuições do Núcleo Docente Estruturante, entre outras: I - contribuir para a consolidação do perfil profissional do egresso do curso; II - zelar pela integração curricular interdisciplinar entre as diferentes atividades de ensino constantes no currículo; III - indicar formas de incentivo ao desenvolvimento de linhas de pesquisa e extensão, oriundas de necessidades da graduação, de exigências do mercado de trabalho e afinadas com as políticas públicas relativas à área de conhecimento do curso; IV - zelar pelo cumprimento das Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para os Cursos de Graduação" (BRASIL, 2010a).

1/2010, we can consider that this attribution did not enter their appreciative horizons significantly enough to be pointed out when questioned about the role of the SPG they integrate. As Vološinov (2000)[30] states, the theme and meanings only enter the social group when the group starts to value these themes and meanings. In view of this, the SPG members appropriate some discourses while others do not enter their appreciative horizons. Thus, out of the attributions established by CONAES, the one about which the professors expressed their opinions was the reformulation of pedagogical projects, which encompasses the issue of the National Curricular Guidelines and the consolidation of the professional profile of the alumni.

It is worth remembering that the SPG broadened their scope in the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs when the Pedagogical Projects of these programs had to be reformulated as an action-response to the SINAES determinations. It is expected that after this initial phase of the participative process, the next step will be – in addition to other actions that contribute to the development of the program - the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of these instruments, with the participation and involvement of all the academic community. This expectation is justified because the reformulated Pedagogical Projects are more than established formality: they represent a reflection on research, extension, and teacher training.

In this light, we share with Veiga (2012) the perspective that, regardless of the collegiate structure (SPG or the collegiate of an undergraduate program), in order to guide the process of project development, it is necessary that their members guarantee the projects' implementation and evaluation so that these documents do not become only decorative pieces, reducing themselves to the fulfillment of a task.

P02 points out that the SPG members are *still trying to understand what it means to be "the soul" of the program*. He dialogues with CONAES Report n. 04/2010, when he says that "every program that has quality has (albeit informally) a group of professors who, one might say, are the soul of the program" (BRAZIL, 2010b).[31]

Concurring with Vološinov's (2000)[32] considerations, we can affirm that there can only be understanding of a text in the dialogue when it is possible to oppose the author to

---

[30] For full reference, see footnote 10.
[31] In the original: "[...] todo curso que tem qualidade possui (ainda que informalmente) um grupo de professores que, poder-se-ia dizer, é a alma do curso".
[32] For full reference, see footnote 10.

his *counter word*. If the SPG members do not assimilate the words of CONAES Report n. 4/2010, for this group such words are only words of others, which he does not appropriate. On the other hand, as this group's members value, assimilate and transform such words into their own words, they achieve an active understanding of this discourse by re(signifying) it in the actions of the Group.

It is noted, therefore, that the SPG's attribute as "soul of the program," in the sense attributed by CONAES, was not assimilated, reframed by the SPG members of the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs studied. P02's response, thus, shows that the institution of the SPG in the academic setting does not guarantee that the constant requirements of the official documents are adopted the way they were proposed by their mentors.

Finally, from what we discussed so far, we can affirm that CONAES Report and Resolution, as centripetal, centralizing forces, ended up provoking a dual movement in the academic community: on the one hand, the community changed by establishing the SPG in the scope of the programs, and, on the other, it resisted, due to other forces, as *centrifuge forces*, which prevented the full development of the legal provisions.

3.2 The SPG Dynamics: A Controversial Issue

The interview conducted collectively with the research subjects, responsible for the reformulation of the Pedagogical Projects of the four *Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs* of the institution, evidences different views on how the SPG should work. According to the Bakhtinian perspective, it is worth considering that respondents' answerability is constitutive of the genre in question, in which the participants of the discursive interaction, when they perceive the linguistic meaning of the other's discourse, agree with him, disagree with him, complete him, etc., thus manifesting, ideologically, their adherence to certain discourses.

The excerpt from the interview below (fragment 1) presents the professors' counter words about the dynamics of the Group, which, in fragment 2, is polemicized. Let us first look at fragment 1.

FRAGMENT 1

> E - Did the discussions occur only in the Group or in other spaces as well?
> P02 - No. It was all done in the areas of the group members.
> P03 - The meetings were held basically in the areas of the group members. There was one occasion when we met with the coordinators, but that was towards the end. The whole process actually occurred in the areas.
> P02 - In the areas, we searched, we talked (++) then we would discuss with the Group what each one had talked about, right? And, this way, we were coordinating. /.../
> PO5 - / ... / it was a constant work of coming and going to discuss various topics ...[33]

The counter words of the professors *(it was all done in the areas* of the group members; *the whole process actually occurred in the areas; in the areas, we searched, we talked then we would discuss with the Group what each one had talked about; it was a constant work of coming and going to discuss various topics)* reveal that the SPG role in the PPP reformulation process was to democratize power relations, seeking to allow, in turn, the participation of the faculty. Thus, such decisions were planned without hierarchy prevalence. Until then, the programs had the pedagogical projects elaborated by the coordination or by a collegiate team. In this process, however, this reality seems to have been altered, designing another aspect to the management of the programs insofar as the elaboration of the instrument becomes the responsibility of every one.

In other words, the Group dynamics closely follows the democratic model of organization and management, representing a pedagogical leadership within the group, since the members take a decentralized practice, aiming at the sharing of actions (ANTUNES; PADILHA, 2010). However, this axiological position is challenged by one of the professors who presents a discourse that is opposed by the other members of the group, as we can observe in fragment 2. This is the moment of the interview when they discussed what they intended to do to implement SPG's actions.

> FRAGMENT 2
> P01 - / ... / we started several activities to implement what the Group decides, right? But we are faced with a concept of democracy that does not work well in Education, which is to consult first and then bring it here to the group; when it should be the contrary: it should be what we discuss and agree on, as I suggested and criticized that we were

---

[33] In the original: "E **-** As discussões ocorriam apenas no núcleo ou ocorriam em outros espaços também? - P02 – Não. Ia tudo pras áreas. - P03 – As reuniões foram basicamente nas áreas. Houve um momento, em que nós nos reunimos com as coordenadoras, mas aí já foi mais pro final. O processo todo se deu mesmo nas áreas. - P02 – Nas áreas, buscamos, conversamos (++) depois nós trazíamos pro núcleo e discutíamos o que cada um tinha conversado, né? E assim nós íamos coordenando. /.../ - PO5 – /…/ foi um trabalho, assim, constante de idas e vindas pra discussão de vários tópicos…"

clinging too much to bureaucracy and less to theoretical initiatives and so on /.../ EDUCATION does not work like this. When it is the Group that will propose curricular changes supported by theories, supported by practices, supported by official documents, because otherwise the mechanisms that existed before the creation of the Group would have prevailed and still, it would perhaps be the collegiate that would do this, as it has always been done.

/ ... /

P04 - This is what I understand: we learn to walk by walking. We go to the area because we want to know how it is done as well. It's no use. We have no idea to come and say: LET'S PROPOSE this. Sorry. That's how I see myself in the process, right? There are many things I do not know yet. I need to discuss with the area to clarify things, so I can bring something here, right? So, I think it's a movement, still in progress. I think we're new, still. / ... / But I see the role of this Group as very important. I also see and I have respect, like that, because WE ALL have many activities. To think about this one that is not a joke and also with many retirement prospects here in my area, for example. /.../

P02 - So ((mentions P01)) because it was a very new thing, it all came like that. When we listen to the area, the Group comes with an idea. /.../ It's something that comes from them, but at the same time, it's something that we're building.

P04 - Something I missed a lot, here I thought we put the cart before the horse, you see? It was like this: "what is the bibliography, which framework will guide this document?" This is what we are going to study ... "We have redone many times, we were told that we had to redo. We were given a deadline." [P02 – I'm not happy about this either.] I would redo it again. So, this is what I think: there was lack of maturity. So, let's decide on the bibliography, we'll study this, right, and then we'll do it. This did not happen.

E – But didn't you do that in 2013? Wasn't there a discussion meeting?

PO3 – Half way through the process, we were given a lot of information, right?

P05 – Ultimatums.

P03 – Yes.

P05 – Ultimatums, mainly, that ended up disturbing. Because, there was, indeed, planning, in this sense. The vision was to do studies first, then go on to make changes. Well, with those ultimatums where we had deadlines to meet and that we needed to approve, well, that ended up (++) weakening the work. And then in relation to what professor ((mentions P01)) says about the SPG, I think it is important, yes, for us to work, go to the bases, because we are not sovereign. We are here just as (++) representatives also (++) of our colleagues (++) they have relevant knowledge, because ultimately all of them are experts in their fields.

P01 – I didn't understand.

P05 – No, when you say that we are the ones who should determine, think, propose and not do the opposite. Well, I think it is a job that it has to be what? (++) two-ways.

P04- As already stated by Guimaraes: "I only know that I know nothing, but I doubt a lot of things." ((all laugh))[34]

---

[34] In the original: "P01 – **/…/** iniciamos várias atividades para implementarmos o que sai do núcleo, né? Só que estamos atravessados por um conceito de democracia que não funciona bem na Educação, que é consultar primeiro e depois trazer isso aqui pro núcleo; quando deve ser o contrário, deve ser o que nós discutirmos e combinarmos, como eu sugeri e critiquei de que estávamos nos agarrando muito à burocracia e menos na iniciativa teórica e coisa assim. /…/ A EDUCAÇÃO não funciona assim. Quando é o núcleo que vai propor mudanças curriculares amparadas em teorias, amparadas em práticas, amparadas em documentos oficiais, porque senão os mecanismos que existiam antes do aparecimento do núcleo, teriam prevalecido e ainda, seria, talvez, o colegiado que faria isso, como sempre se fez. /…/ - P04 – O que estou entendendo é assim: a gente aprende a caminhar caminhando. A gente vai pra área porque a gente tá querendo saber como é que faz também. Não adianta. A gente não tem noção pra chegar e falar: VAMOS propor isto. Desculpem. É assim que estou me vendo no processo, né? Há muitas coisas que eu não sei ainda. Eu preciso discutir com a área até pra clarear, pra poder trazer alguma coisa aqui,

PO1's speech, in fragment 2, presents a divergent view from that of other professors regarding the way in which the SPG members should develop their work. Such divergence is marked by an adverb of negation: *we are faced with a concept of democracy that does not work well in Education, which is to consult first and then bring it here to the group...* In this statement, which actively responds to the words of P02, P03 and P05, presented in fragment 1, PO1's negative accentuation in relation to the concept of democracy that surrounds the work of professors who belong to the SPG is clear. The controversy in this case clearly shows the discordant tone and opposition to this thought. For the professor, the dynamics should be the opposite, that is, the professors of the Group who should discuss, agree on and then forward their proposals *to their peers*. At the linguistic level, the open debate is reinforced by the use of the connective "when," with comparative / contrast value *(...when it should be the contrary: it should be what we discuss and agree on ... When it is the Group that will propose curricular changes supported by theories, supported by practices, supported by official documents ...).*

As a result of the positioning manifested by P01, in the following statements, we find a polemical clash with the professor's discourse, beginning with P04's discourse, with a clarification statement: *This is what I understand: we learn to walk* by walking. In

---

né? Então eu acho que é um movimento, ainda, de construção. Acho que nós somos novos, ainda. /…/ Mas eu vejo como muito importante o papel desse núcleo. Vejo também e tenho respeito, assim, porque TODOS NÓS temos muitas atividades. Pensar em mais essa que não é brincadeira e ainda com muitas perspectivas de aposentadorias aqui na minha área, por exemplo. /.../ - P02 – Por isso ((menciona P01)) como era uma coisa muito nova, veio tudo assim. Quando a gente vai ouvir a área, o núcleo vai com uma ideia. /.../ É uma coisa que vem por eles, mas, ao mesmo tempo, é uma coisa que nós estamos construindo. - P04 – Uma coisa que senti uma falta tremenda, aí eu achei que a gente colocou os carros na frente dos bois, né? Foi assim: "qual a bibliografia, qual o referencial que vai pautar esse documento?", Nós vamos estudar isso aqui..." Nós refizemos muitas vezes, a gente tinha notícias que tinha que refazer. A gente refazia que era pra tal época. [P02 – Eu também não estou satisfeita com isso daí não] Refazia de novo. Então, acho que isso: faltou um amadurecimento. Assim, vamos estabelecer a bibliografia, a gente estuda isso aí, né, e depois a gente faz. Isso não aconteceu.- E- Mas vocês não fizeram isso em 2013? Não havia uma reunião de discussão? - PO3 – É que no meio do percurso, a gente recebia várias informações, né? - P05 – Ultimatos. - P03 – É. -P05 - Ultimatos, principalmente, que acabaram atrapalhando. Porque houve, sim, um planejamento, nesse sentido. A visão era essa de fazer estudos, primeiro, pra depois passar a fazer alguma alteração. Então, com esses ultimatos que nós tínhamos prazos pra entregar e que precisávamos aprovar, então, isso acabou (++) minando o trabalho. E aí com relação ao que o professor ((menciona P01)) coloca do NDE, eu penso que é importante, sim, nós trabalharmos, irmos às bases, porque não somos soberanos. Nós estamos aqui apenas como (++) representantes também (++) dos nossos colegas (++) que eles têm um conhecimento, porque afinal de contas todos são especialistas em suas áreas. P01 – Não entendi. - P05 – Não, quando você coloca que nós é que teríamos que determinar, que pensar, propor e não fazer o oposto. Então, eu penso que é um trabalho que ele tem que ser o quê? (++) De mão dupla. **-** P04- Guimarães já disse: "Só sei que nada sei, mas desconfio de muita coisa". ((todos *riem))*

this construction the thought of the renowned education theorist, Paulo Freire, is underlined. He states that: "No one walks without learning to walk, without learning to walk by walking the path, remaking and retouching the dream by which he started walking" (FREIRE, 2000, p.155).[35] The theorist's voice is inserted in the professor's discourse, who dialogues with the social voices when saying that "we learn by living." In such a statement, the discourse of the other is re-elaborated, without the discursive clash, having an effect of a fusion of voices.

By using the path metaphor, P04 hints that the SPG has goals to attain, horizons to reach, but it is necessary to move from an initial situation at the beginning of the path to a final one, after the group's gradual process of involvement and development, as they walk along this path. The SPG is in the early stage *(I think it's a movement, still in progress. I think we're new, still).* And because it is at this stage, the professor, in an incisive way, declares: *We have no idea to come and say: LET'S PROPOSE this. Sorry.*. The emphatic statement, with the insertion of the "pseudo-courtesy" "sorry," strongly marks the attack on P01's discourse, when he states that *When it is the Group that will propose curricular changes.* To clarify his discordant positioning, P04 adopts the same verb used by the professor: "propose." Thus, taking P01's discourse as an object of refutation characterizes an open controversy in which his discourse is seen predominantly refracted in P04's discourse.

P04 also highlights the SPG importance (*But I see the role of this Group as very important*) and stresses that he respects the Group's work (*because WE ALL have many activities*). With emphasis on the expression "we all" in his discourse, the professor calls the attention to the intensification of the work of the professors, which is not only restricted to the classroom, but also contemplates relationships with the management, the pedagogical project, the participation in academic bodies, their relations with society, to name a few. That is why to be in the Group and perform another activity deserves respect.

However, the professor also presents his critical analysis of the work developed by the Group, mobilizing the popular saying "put the cart before the horse" (*I thought we put the cart before the horse*) in order to say that he was missing the establishment of

---

[35] In the original: "Ninguém caminha sem aprender a caminhar, sem aprender a fazer o caminho caminhando, refazendo e retocando o sonho pelo qual se pôs a caminhar" (FREIRE, 2000, p.155).

theoretical educational references to guide the discussion before starting to develop Pedagogical Projects.

It is interesting to observe the dialogical relationship established between the discourse of P03 and P05 when they justify why the Group has placed the cart before the horse. P03 states that the reason for the order change was that the Group received information in the middle of the process. However, P05 selects an even more emphatic term, i.e., *ultimatums,* which P03 calls *a variety of information*, and in his discourse the meaning of the selected word is built in the unity as a whole. The professor declares that such "ultimatums" *that ended up disturbing. Because, there was, indeed, planning, in this sense. The vision was to do studies first, then go on to make changes.* But because they had deadlines to meet for the PPPs, such *ultimatums* ended up *weakening the work.*

Following his discourse, PO5 mentions PO1 in order to challenge his discourse: *then in relation to what professor ((mentions P01)) says about the SPG, I think it is important, yes, for us to work, go to the bases, because we are not sovereign.* Although P05 does not resume P01's discourse, his own is constructed based on the professor's position. In this situation, the expressions "I think it is important," "We are not sovereign" mark P05's intention to rise above his axiological position in relation to the contested discourse. P05 complements his thinking by stating that the SPG members are like representatives of their peers, who have knowledge, because after all everyone is an expert in their field. However, since P05 only mentioned P01, but did not explicitly resume his words, the professor expressed that he did not understand his speech. P05 then retakes the professor's discourse by means of indirect discourse: *No, when you say that we are the ones who should determine, think, propose and not do the opposite.* This way P05 makes the open debate around the issue more evident.

In the same direction as P05 and P04, P02 also contests the speech of P01, stating that when *we listen to the area, the Group comes with an idea. /.../ It's something that comes from them, but at the same time, it's something that we're building.* PO2's counter word reinforces the position that participation in the PPP's redesign involves the sharing of power in the program definition.

Another point highlighted is the idea defended by the professors that the SPG members need to go the bases because they want to *know how it is done* as they need to clarify some questions because the teachers at the bases *are experts in their fields.* Their

discourses are in line with the views expressed in CONAES Report n. 4/2010, which defines the profile of the SPG members as *people who are references both to students and to the academic community* and who must be recognized *institutionally to qualify the conception*, *consolidation and constant updating of PPPs in general* (BRAZIL, 2010b, emphasis added). From this perspective of the official document, as Veiga (2012) elucidates, the PPP is the result of accumulated experience and reflection on it and is designed by a small group.

The professors' discourses make it evident that the (re)design process of the PPPs is much more complex and demands the document to be produced and developed along the path of a participatory movement. This contrast between what is defined in the official document and the way the PPCs (re)design process occurred in the professors' discourse and in the answers given to the questionnaire reinforces our understanding that the official discourse is re-signified in the academic context.

Final Considerations

In this study, we analyzed the research subjects' reactions-responses to official education discourses that discuss the Structuring Professoriate Group in educational institutions, focusing on the existing relations of tension between the discourses involved in verbal interactions. The research was based on Bakhtin Circle's theoretical-epistemological and methodological presuppositions, which made us understand the research subjects' utterances in their discursive dimensions, favoring the debate around refractions and revaluations of the principles and guidelines of legal discourses related to the SPG creation and development in the scope of undergraduate programs.

For the data analysis, we established dialogical relationships between the research subjects' discourses (through the utterances analysis extracted from the research questionnaire and collective interview) and the discourses of CONAES Report n. 4/2010 and CONAES Resolution n. 01/2010, which determine the SPG's creation. The dialogic analysis revealed that the subjects' position in relation to the content of the documents was of partial agreement, both in relation to the configuration/dynamics of the Group and the subjects' role that integrate it, even if it was instituted in a context in which the programs would be evaluated by MEC's Evaluation Committees.

In relation to the first aspect, we verified that the SPG professors, along with their peers, sought a distinct way to implement the Group and develop the work, differing from the proposition of the CONAES documents, which present a more closed group model. The way the Group was created (a single SPG for all programs, with only one representative from each specific area), led it to present a structure of an open nature, guided by fundamental principles from democratic management – decentralization and participation – providing a space for reflection on the institution's internal reality of the programs.

The SPG format shows that the professors positively resisted to centripetal forces. To resist, either by means of reevaluation, hybridization or polemization, among several dialogical processes, is one of the characteristics of centrifugal forces. Therefore, in the educational context, it is necessary to always question what is proposed in the official documents, since these utterances convey not just possibilities, but also limitations and contradictions.

In relation to the teachers' role in the Group, it was observed that the research subjects' utterances/discourses responded positively to the provisions of the CONAES Resolution, regarding the attribution of the SPG members as responsible for the process of designing the PPPs. However, the utterances are silent on the attribution of indicating "ways to encourage the development of research lines and extension, stemming from undergraduate needs" (BRAZIL, 2010a),[36] established in CONAES Resolution 1/2010 as one of the members' duties in the Group. Such a silence reveals that this role did not penetrate the subjects' evaluative horizon. At that moment, they were concerned about the redesign of the Pedagogical Projects that would be evaluated by the INEP/MEC expert committee. Besides this aspect, it was also observed that the members' length of stay in the group was not followed as established in Report n. 4/2010.

The analysis also highlighted that the dialogic process to restructure the Undergraduate Language Teacher Education Programs was not characterized by harmony of thoughts and opinions and that the participation in the redesign of the Pedagogical Projects and in the SPG creation involved clashes and negotiations, which were solved after the deliberations of the majority.

---

[36] In the original: "indicar formas de incentivo ao desenvolvimento de linhas de pesquisa e extensão, oriundas de necessidades da graduação" (BRASIL, 2010a).

Consequently, it can be said that the SPG professors' utterances interact with the official voices and, somewhat, are responses to them, welcoming them, as well as altering them, refusing them, disregarding them. This corroborates our understanding that the practices are never entirely a reflection of impositions. Instead, they resist, respond, say, disobey, disrespect (CERTEAU, 1984).[37]

REFERENCES

ANTUNES, A.; PADILHA, P. *Educação cidadã, educação integral*: fundamentos e práticas. São Paulo: Instituto Paulo Freire, 2010.

BAKHTIN, M. Os gêneros do discurso. In:_____. *Estética da criação verbal*. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. 6. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2011, pp.261-306 [1952-1953].

_____. *Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski*. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2013 [1963].

_____. O discurso no romance. In:_____. *Questões de literatura e de estética:* a teoria do romance. 3. ed. Trad. Aurora Fornoni Bernardini et al. São Paulo: Unesp, 2014 [1934-1935].

BRAIT, B. Análise e teoria do discurso. In: _____. *Bakhtin*: outros conceitos-chave. São Paulo: Contexto, 2008.

_____; PISTORI, M. H. C. A produtividade do conceito de gênero em Bakhtin e o Círculo. *Alfa,* Revista de linguística. [online]. 2012, v.56, n.2, pp.371-401. Disponível em: [http://seer.fclar.unesp.br/alfa/article/view/553]. Acesso em: 05 out. 2017.

BRASIL. *Lei Nº 10.861* de 14 de abril de 2004, institui o Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior – SINAES. Disponível em: [http://www.presidencia. gov.br/legislaçao]. Acesso em: 02 out. 2014.

_____. *Resolução Nº 01, de 17 de junho de 2010* – Comissão Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior – CONAES. Brasília, 2010a. Disponível em: [http://portal.mec. gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=15712&Itemid=1093].Acesso em: 04 out. 2013.

_____. *Parecer N. 4 de 17 de junho de 2010* - Comissão Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior – CONAES. Brasília, 2010b. Disponível em: [http://portal.mec. gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=15712&Itemid=1093].Acesso em: 04 out. 2013.

_____. *Instrumento de Avaliação de Cursos de Graduação presencial e a distância -* Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira (INEP*). Brasília: Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Anísio Teixeira, 2015. Disponível em: [http://portal.inep.gov.br/instrumentos]. Acesso em: 17 mar. 2016.

---

[37] CERTEAU, M. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984.

CERTEAU, M. *A invenção do cotidiano*: artes de fazer. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1994.

FARACO, C. *Linguagem e diálogo:* as ideias linguísticas do círculo de Bakhtin. Curitiba: Criar, 2010.

FREIRE, P. *Pedagogia da esperança*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2000.

MARCUSCHI, L. A. *Análise da conversação*. 5. ed. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 2000.

NUNES, J. A. A influência da reação presumida do outro sobre a produção de um enunciado de gênero oficial. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada.* [online]. 2016, vol.16, n.3, pp.387-411. Disponível em: [http://www.scielo. br/pdf/rbla/v16n3/1984-6398-rbla-16-03-00387.pdf]. Acesso em: 17 out. 2017.

_____. Cursos de Letras no centro da arena discursiva da reforma curricular de uma universidade pública mato-grossense. Tese (Doutorado) – Programa de Estudos Pós-Graduados em Linguística Aplicada e Estudos da Linguagem. Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2017.

VEIGA, I. P. A. *Educação básica e educação superior:* Projeto Político-Pedagógico. São Paulo: Papirus Editora, 2012.

VOLÓCHINOV, V. *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem:* problemas fundamentais do método sociológico na ciência da linguagem. Trad. Sheila Grillo e Ekaterina Vólkova Américo. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2017 [1929].

Translated by Heloísa Whyatt – hellowhyatt@yahoo.co.uk and

Odila Maria de Azevedo Watzel - odilawatzel@yahoo.com.br