

*Original Paper*

*Habitus* and Teacher Education in Higher Education:  
Reflections of a Supervisor and a Master Student during  
Teaching Internship

Barbara Cortat Simoneli<sup>1</sup> & Kyria Rebeca Finardi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Federal University of Espírito Santo (Department of Languages, Culture and Education, Ufes), Vitória, Brazil

<sup>2</sup> Federal University of Espírito Santo (Postgraduate Program in Education, Ufes), Vitória, Brazil

Received: October 22, 2023    Accepted: November 9, 2023    Online Published: November 27, 2023

doi:10.22158/selt.v11n4p57

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/selt.v11n4p57>

**Abstract**

*The paper reflects on the role of the Teaching Internship in the teacher education program based on the perceptions of a professor and a teacher assistant working together in the undergraduate Supervised Internship course during remote emergency teaching (ERT). The professor involved worked in the discipline as principal teacher/master advisor/supervisor of the teaching internship and the other teacher worked as assistant professor/master student/intern in teaching. Using autoethnography techniques with records made by the professor and the teacher involved in the discipline in their reflection diaries, excerpts from their experience were chosen to illustrate the discussion/reflection on the role of the Teaching Internship in teacher education. Bourdieu's concept of habitus is used in the interpretative analysis, concluding that the experiences lived by the two teachers are permeated and built through the habitus that shaped the interpretation and education of the teachers involved.*

**Keywords**

*Teacher training, Teaching Internship, Habitus*

**1. Introduction**

The teaching internship is a mandatory activity for graduate/postgraduate students who participate in the Brazilian Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (henceforth Capes) (Note 1) and aims to improve teaching training for Higher Education. According to MEC/CAPES Ordinance No. 76/2010 (our translation):

Art. 18. Theaching internship is an integral part of the graduate/postgraduate training, aiming to prepare

for teaching, and the qualification of undergraduate education [(Note 2)] is mandatory for all scholarship holders of the Social Demand Program [(Note 3)], complying with the following criteria:

I – for programs with two levels, master's and doctorate, the obligation will be restricted to the doctorate;

II – for programs that only have a master's level, the mandatory teaching internship will be transferred to the master's degree;

III - institutions that do not offer undergraduate courses must associate themselves with other higher education institutions to meet the requirements of the teaching internship;

IV - the teaching internship may be remunerated at the discretion of the institution, but the transfer of resources by CAPES is prohibited;

V - the minimum duration of the teaching internship will be one semester for the master's degree and two semesters for the doctorate and the maximum duration for the master's degree will be two semesters and three semesters for the doctorate;

VI - the CAPES/DS Scholarship Committee is responsible for registering and evaluating the teaching internship for graduate/postgraduate credit purposes, as well as defining the supervision and monitoring of the internship;

VII - higher education professors are exempt from the requirement for teaching internship;

VIII - the activities of the teaching internship must be compatible with the research area of the graduate/postgraduate project carried out by the graduate/postgraduate student.

IX – if there is a specific articulation between the education systems agreed by the competent authorities and the other conditions established in this article, the teaching internship in the public secondary education network will be permitted;

X – the maximum workload of the teaching internship will be 4 hours per week.

The rules of the Postgraduate Program in Education (PPGE) (Note 4) of the university where the internship was carried out and to which we are linked, state that the teaching internship is mandatory for all students who are CAPES/DS scholarship holders, as provided in Ordinance MEC/CAPES n<sup>o</sup> 76/2010, and is optional for other students.

According to the PPGE curriculum proposal where this study was carried out, in force since 2017, the teaching internship is a mandatory activity for all doctoral students, and in general the doctoral student does the teaching internship with their own supervisor or with another professor who works in the area of related knowledge of the student if the advisor does not teach undergraduate courses.

Since the Teaching Internship course aims to improve teaching training for Higher Education, it is configured as a context for continued training, as an opportunity for students/teachers to give new meaning to their pedagogical practices. In this article, we reflect on the role of the Teaching Internship in pedagogical redefinition as well as in the training of Higher Education teachers through the analysis of the narratives of two teachers involved in an undergraduate course, one as a supervisor/professor responsible for the course and the other as a master's student/intern/monitor.

The narratives were collected from auto-ethnographic notes and individual and joint reflections carried out in the Supervised Practicum course (Note 5) offered in the Faculty of English (Note 6) at a federal university in the southeast of Brazil in the years of 2021 and 2022, which included the participation of six teachers working in different roles, namely: 1) a professor responsible for the undergraduate course, also acting as a post-doctoral supervisor for one of the participants in the course and also acting as a supervisor for the other four teaching interns, 2) a professor from a federal university in the south of Brazil as a postdoctoral internship at the university where this study was carried out, 3) three doctoral students and a master's student in a teaching internship, linked to the Postgraduate Program in Education at the institution where the study was carried out, guided by the professor responsible for the undergraduate course. For the purposes of this article, only the reports and experiences of the supervisor/professor responsible for the courses and the master's student/teaching intern will be discussed here.

In order to situate the role of the teaching internship in the training of the two participants, we made a brief review of the literature on Teaching Internship to then analyze the experiences lived by the two teachers involved in the course through theoretical lenses and the Bordieuan concept of *habitus*, discussed later on in the text.

## 2. Method

The Teaching Internship represents a privileged space for action and training, given that in the Postgraduate Program in Education (PPGE) where the experience analyzed here took place, the Teaching Internship generally takes place in the Course Final Assignment (TCC course) (Note 7) course/discipline/subject of graduation. This article describes a Teaching Internship experience in the mandatory Supervised Practicum course of undergraduate program which had the participation of the professor responsible for the undergraduate course (and master's advisor) and the intern in teaching (master's student linked to PPGE).

In order to analyze the Teaching Internship experience of the teachers involved in this course and how the different roles played by each of them during this experience which affected and was affected by others, we used the autoethnographic method (Pardo, 2019; Fadini, 2020) to record and analyze our perceptions. Our perceptions were collected throughout the planning and participation in the undergraduate Supervised Practicum course and the graduate/postgraduate Teaching Internship course as well as in reflection meetings and in the diaries/records of the researchers/professors/teachers/intern involved.

Autoethnography has a qualitative nature and is carried out through observations and self-observations of the researcher about the object of study, followed by their vigorous interpretations and/or reflections on it (Pardo, 2019; Fadini, 2020). This type of research is characterized by the duality of the role of the researcher who is both researcher and object of the research, or rather, researcher and researched. The context and field of research is habitual and familiar, as it is a culture in which we are immersed in and

the which we belong to (Pardo, 2019). Pardo (2019) and Fadini (2020) state that, although the researcher carries out their research through an 'emic' perspective or the perspective of an insider, they must not fail to capture the complexities of the reality experienced by the researcher being researched., and they need to reflect on the subjectivities contained in their analyses.

Furthermore, in research writing, the main research instrument used in autoethnography is the field diary where researchers write their observations, such as memories, experiences and thoughts (Pardo, 2019). Fadini (2020, p. 36, our translation) believes that the main merit of this work methodology is “to cause discomfort that takes us out of our comfort zone to think about new possibilities”. Therefore, in this study, we accept this invitation to leave our comfort zones by looking diachronically at our experiences with and in the teaching internship throughout our academic trajectory and during a course taught in co-participation. Fadini (2020) also highlights that there is no ideal way to carry out an autoethnography, each autoethnography has the perspective (in constant construction) of its researcher regarding the field where they live and research (Fadini, 2020).

Autoethnography is carried out through a genre of writing where the researcher tries to understand the social and cultural through the study of personal experience (Fadini, 2020; Pardo, 2019). In what follows, we briefly describe the context of the course and the participants before sharing excerpts from our diaries chosen to support the analysis of the impact of the Teaching Internship on the training of teacher-researchers.

### 3. Literature Review

As stated in the introduction to this article, the teaching internship is a mandatory activity for graduate/postgraduate students who participate in the Capes program in Brazilian Higher Education; however, and according to Verhine and Dantas (2007), graduate/postgraduate students often perceive this activity as a diversion from their research activities. For this reason, the authors propose the rapprochement between classroom practice and the development of the teaching intern's research, making this activity important not only for their training as a teacher, but also as a researcher. This approach was what we sought to follow during the second semester of 2021 (henceforth 2021-2 semester) in which the teaching internship experience analyzed here was carried out.

According to Vieira and Maciel (2010), the undergraduate teaching internship taken by the graduate/postgraduate students aims to prepare master's and doctoral students to work in Higher Education teaching. Therefore, and based on the analysis of our experience in the teaching internship carried out during the 2021-2 semester, we seek to reflect on the possibilities for effective teacher and researcher training during the teaching internship experience reported here.

Almeida Vieira (2013) presents an excerpt from a broader research mapping the discussions about the teaching internship published by the *Revista Brasileira de Pós-Graduação* (RBPG), a journal linked to Capes. The choice of this journal as an investigative source was due to its connection with the funding agency that, in 1999, established the undergraduate teaching internship in Brazil. The author maintains

that Capes, as the agency responsible for evaluating postgraduate programs and prescribing teaching internships, has an important role in building the legitimacy of this activity.

Lima and Braga (2016) understand teaching in Higher Education as a concrete and historically situated educational phenomenon of dialogical praxis in the training of university teachers. In order to contribute on the debate on teaching in Higher Education the authors resort to Paulo Freire's Pedagogy (Freire, 1996), recognizing the contradictions inherent to the context political and its influence on training for teaching in the space-time of the university. Lima and Braga (2016) acknowledge the teaching internship and research as a formative principle and an act of knowledge that mediates contact and reflection with and about the reality of teaching in Higher Education.

Barra, Oliveira and Figueiredo (2021) describe a didactic experience carried out in classes of Faculty of Letters undergraduate courses - Portuguese and English, French, German, Spanish, Italian and classical languages - belonging to the Federal University of Ceará (UFC) (Note 8) analyzing the participants of those courses. The authors applied a qualitative research method to analyze those disciplines using Participant Observation (PO) as a basis for interaction with the locus of investigation and data collection. Barra, Oliveira and Figueiredo (2021) concluded that it is possible to move away from a more rigid didactic aspect, seeking to build an experiential didactic path that works on lovingness, critical awareness in the face of reality seeking the integral construction of individuals.

Souza et al. (2021) analyzed the perceptions of 15 master's students in teaching internships recorded in their reports on a Master's in Education Course at a University in the state of Santa Catarina in Brazil in the years 2015 and 2016. The analysis of the reports highlight positive aspects such as: the learning of the teaching practice in Higher Education, the appreciation of the internship supervisor, and the role of teaching and the lessons acquired during the teaching internship.

Chamorro, Gamboa and Mendinueta (2022) suggest that the area of initial language teacher training has moved away from a technical vision towards a more sociocultural one that integrates cultural, historical and contextual issues in the formation of teacher identity. Through a systematic literature review between 2014 and 2019 in international indexed journals, the authors explore these views in research on teacher training. The results of their analysis suggest a growing concern with the teacher as a person inserted and interconnected with a broader context. We bring this last study because it relates to the field of our research, namely, the training of language teachers/professors to work in Higher Education.

In general, these studies (Lima & Braga, 2016; Barra, Oliveira, & Figueiredo, 2021; Souza et al., 2021; Chamorro, Gamboa, & Mendinueta, 2022) present the teaching internship and research as primary components in the training of graduate/postgraduate students as teachers in Higher Education. This training puts them in contact with the reality of teaching in Higher Education, for which they are being prepared for, giving them experience and possibilities for expanding critical awareness and reflection in the face of this reality, thus being the basis for structuring the teaching identity.

From this perspective, we see teacher training as related to the concept of *habitus* developed by Pierre

Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Chartier, 2015; Bourdieu, 1980, 1990C) considering that practices, actions, perceptions and values are built into *habitus*. Bourdieu (1980, 1990C, p. 53) defines *habitus* as systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing consciousness aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them.

In other words, *habitus* is a system of dispositions or inclinations that individuals, as social agents, possess and that incorporates structures being shaped by past and present situations that underlie the current and future practices of that individual (Bourdieu, 1980, 1990c; Bourdieu & Chartier, 2015; Maton, 2008).

Medeiros (2009) explains that the concept of *habitus*, along with other related concepts, such as *cultural capital* and Bourdieu's *field*, has been used by researchers working in the field of Education in Brazil to investigate and analyze how pedagogical practices in teacher training, infused by *habitus* and cultural capital, influence the way these teachers teach. Warwick and McCray (2017) investigate how such concepts influence the way individuals learn, especially learning actively, in a given teaching-learning context. Medeiros (2009) claims that education researchers use Bourdieu's conceptualizations as units of analysis in their work, such as field research, ethnographic research and/or research that has autobiographical accounts, dealing with the teacher's professional life. In these studies, pedagogical and school practices and teacher training are studied with a focus on school trajectories, considering and analyzing students, teachers, the school and the university, thus bringing researchers and school fields closer together.

Medeiros (2009) and Warwick and McCray (2017) reaffirm the relevance of theorizations about *habitus* in research on teacher training and/or learning, encouraging researchers to understand and reflect on how the contexts and histories of individuals become habituated before becoming teachers. That is, whether adapt and/or modify their mental schemes, and how they can persist until the end of their lives. In Bourdieu's view, *habitus* is as much a product of history as it produces history, to the extent that the individual's past experiences together with the social contexts in which they were elaborated are active in the present through the practices of these individuals, practices that are made in accordance with the schemes generated in individuals from their histories and contexts (Bourdieu, [1980] 1990c; Bourdieu; Chartier, 2015).

Those schemas determine what individuals do or do not do. Bourdieu ([1980] 1990c) understands these schemas as being more reliable than formal norms and rules, as they guarantee that practices are constant and convenient or not. Furthermore, the existential conditions that structure *habitus* and that generate these schemes of dispositions concern the lives of these individuals, such as: economic and social needs, domestic economy, relationships within and outside the family, work, studies, among others (Bourdieu, 1980, 1990c; Maton, 2008; Bourdieu & Chartier, 2015). In this way, the theorization relates to teacher and researcher training considering that this training is historically situated and that

the individuals in this process are inserted in different existential contexts or circumstances, as the studies by Lima and Braga (2016) and Chamorro, Gamboa and Mendinueta (2022) support.

The *habitus* structured before, during and after the teaching internship of teachers-researchers, underpins the perceptions of individuals, in this case teacher-researchers in training and/or trainers and other educational agents. Similarly, Souza et al (2021) report the teaching appreciation and the lessons acquired in the Teaching Internship as positive aspects of such a course. Correspondingly, Barra, Oliveira and Figueiredo (2021) and Chamorro, Gamboa and Mendinueta (2022) describe overcoming the more rigid and technical didactic aspect for the critical awareness of reality in a didactic experience, previously discussed, and consider teacher-researcher training as a phenomenon that occurs in certain cultural, social and historical contexts.

Having presented this panorama, we believe that both theorizations about teacher training and *habitus* will help us understand how the Teaching Internship experience supports the foundation of world views, appreciations and critical reflections that raise, guide and/or modify the practices and perceptions of the teachers/participants/authors of this work (the teacher-researchers in training and trainers) in the certain circumstances in which they are inserted. Furthermore, they will contribute to our reflection and better understanding of teacher-researcher training through the lens of self-reflection using the notion of *habitus*.

#### **4. Context of the Study: Supervised Practicum Course of the Faculty of English and Teaching Internship Courses of the Postgraduate Program – ERT**

The Supervised Practicum course of the Faculty of English in which the Teaching Internship of graduate /postgraduate students (from masters' and doctoral) was carried out, was offered during the Emergency Remote Teaching (henceforth ERT) (Note 9) format in the 2021-2 semester due to the social distancing measures imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. The academic semester occurred from November 2021 to March 2022 and, due to the period in which the course was offered, it was not possible to articulate the practice (of monitoring co-regency/teaching activities in public schools in the municipal Primary Education network - Elementary School) that semester.

In order to give students of the Supervised Practicum course (pre-service English teachers) an opportunity to have contact with teachers, practices and the reality of teaching English at this level, the professor responsible for this course adopted two main strategies: 1) participation of a pedagogical team made up of 5 English teachers working at different levels and under her supervision: one of them was a Higher Education professor carrying out her post-doctorate internship in the institution where the study was carried out, three doctoral students were carrying out their teaching internship there, and one of them was a master's students carrying out her teaching internship; all guided and supervised by the professor responsible for the English Language Teaching Practicum course who was also acting as the supervisor and advisor of the pedagogical team involved 2) the implementation of a virtual exchange project with a Teaching Course at the same level in a foreign university in order to enable contact with

different in-service and pre-service teachers, practices and realities of teaching English in Primary Education based on studies previously carried out in the research group on the effects of the pandemic and the possibilities of incorporating hybrid approaches, digital technologies and virtual exchanges in the training of English teachers (e.g. Amorim, Co & Finardi, 2021; Co Amorim, & Finardi, 2020; Finardi, Prebianca, & Schmitt, 2015; Finardi & Guimar es, 2020; Finardi, Hildeblando Junior, & Guimar es, 2020; Orsini-Jones, Cervero-Carrascosa, & Finardi, 2021; Sevilla-Pavon & Finardi, 2021; Hildeblando Junior, Finardi, & El Kadri, 2022).

As previously stated, the reflections made here are mainly based on the evaluation of the perceptions of two of the six members of the pedagogical team involved in the undergraduate (Supervised Practicum) and graduate/postgraduate (Teaching Internship) course. It is important to note that the strategies were analyzed in relation to the context in which these courses were offered, that is, in relation to the special semester and conditions imposed by the pandemic and given the challenge of teaching practical classes in the ERT format to train teachers for Primary Education (in the case of students from course in undergraduate course) and for Higher Education (in the case of teaching interns of the graduate course) as well as researchers in the Freirean view that teachers are researchers of their own practices (Freire, 1996).

The English Practicum course is a mandatory discipline in the curriculum of the Faculty of English and has a total semester workload of 200 hours, divided into 80 hours (theoretical part) and 120 hours (practical part). The theoretical part is generally done at the university, while the practical part is carried out in the internship field (primary schools). It is important to remember that in the semester analyzed here, the practical part was hampered by the fact that students were not able to go to the field due to the ERT protocol in Brazil.

According to the syllabus of the Supervised Practicum course, the objectives of this course during ERT were: to experience the co-participation of the regency/teaching in the remote teaching of the English language in Primary Education; to identify teaching methodologies and the theoretical/practical relationship in the different teaching realities caused by social isolation; to monitor pedagogical actions aimed at teaching the English language, and their developments resulting from the period of isolation; to identify the strategies used for remote teaching of the English language during the pandemic; to act in the selection, organization of content and production of teaching materials for teaching English; to analyze critically the educational and didactic-pedagogical processes that occur during social isolation.

According to the syllabus, the methodology used in this course during ERT was synchronous meetings using a platform provided by the university (google meet); flipped classroom with reflection before, during and after the activities carried out (e.g., Finardi, Prebianca, & Schmitt, 2016; Orsini-Jones, Cervero-Carrascosa, & Finardi, 2021); dialogue with mandatory reading of texts through a digital platform defined by the professor responsible for the course; individual meetings held virtually; virtual meetings with teachers and teaching internship teachers; activities developed remotely and in co-participation with teachers in teaching internship involving the planning, preparation of teaching



material and teaching; presentation of the final internship report critically detailing the experiences developed.

The methodological strategies used during ERT were the debate and guidance on aspects related to topics linked to the course and guidance for carrying out activities, through virtual meetings, held between 11/08/21 and 03/21/22. The teaching resources used were academic articles and contents freely accessed on the internet and on the blog of the professor responsible for the undergraduate course, a platform for synchronous meetings and monitoring of asynchronous activities; digital devices and tools. The evaluation process was continuous and mediated by digital platforms and resources, involving the following criteria/requirements: preparation and participation in classroom discussions (synchronous); activities in the (remote) internship field with planning, execution and critical-reflective self-evaluation; organization of a digital portfolio with a critical record of the experience resulting from the internship; socialization of students' production resulting from the intern's reflections on theoretical classes (held on the google meet platform), in virtual exchange meetings (held on the Microsoft Teams platform) and during individual dialogues and in asynchronous groups held mostly in groups of Whatsapp. In what follows, we will briefly describe the participants before looking at their reflections for analysis.

#### *4.1 Participants*

In total, there were 27 participants in the course in Brazil, 21 students (pre-service teachers) of the English Letters course, 1 professor/supervisor/advisor, 1 post-doc teacher/intern, 3 doctoral students in teaching internship and 1 master's student in teaching internship. The pedagogical team was made up of 3 doctoral students and the master's student who acted as monitors in the course and in the virtual exchange project. The class from the Spanish university that participated in the virtual exchange had 15 participants, 10 students (pre-service teachers) of the Pedagogy in English course which corresponds to the Supervised practicum course in Brazil, 1 professor/supervisor/advisor and 4 monitors (master's students in Pedagogy in English). During the virtual exchange project, pre-service teachers were divided into 8 groups made up of Brazilian and Spanish participants and monitors for virtual and intercultural exchanges.

The virtual exchange project had a total of 4 synchronous meetings of 1 hour each that took place between November 22nd and December 13th, 2021. The Microsoft Teams platform was used for synchronous meetings and asynchronous interaction between professors, monitors and pre-service teachers. Each synchronous session occurred as follows: 1) presentation of the topic for 15 minutes; 2) directing students to breakout rooms for discussion/reflection with monitors for 10 minutes; 3) posting the key points of the group's reflection on the padlet - around 5 minutes; 4) collective discussion of the topic for 20 minutes; 5) gamification through tools such as kahoot and quiz maker for 5 minutes; and 6) closing/conclusion and forwards for 5 minutes.

The topics covered in each session were respectively: 1) Task-Based Language Teaching; 2) Pluriliteracies and CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning in English); 3) Online teaching

and learning; and 4) English as a lingua franca (ILF) and English as a foreign language (IFL) in Brazil and Spain, with the presentations of these topics being divided between the two professors responsible for the classes in Brazil and Spain. In what follows we will briefly describe the professors/teachers involved in the reflection and analysis of this work and whose autobiographical accounts we will analyze.

#### 4.1.1 P1 - Teacher Trainer Responsible for the Undergraduate Course Supervised Practicum, Master's Advisor and Teaching Internship Supervisor

The professor responsible for the undergraduate course Supervised Practicum, hereinafter referred to as P1 (Participant 1), has a master's degree (2004) and a doctorate (2009) in English and is an associate professor at the university where she has worked since 2009. She is a permanent member of PPGE where she currently supervises 7 doctoral projects and one master's project. Since she joined this university, the professor responsible for the course where the Teaching Internship took place, the Supervised Practicum, she has been responsible for the Supervised Practicum course at the undergraduate level and several courses in the postgraduate course in programs of Education and Linguistics (PPGEL) (Note 10).

Having supervised a total of 79 research projects (17 master's degree, 3 doctorate, 2 post-doctorate, 5 specialization, 14 scientific initiation, 38 the Course Final Monographs) and currently supervising a total of 11 research projects (2 master's degree, 7 doctorate, 2 postdoctoral), we can say that P1 has extensive experience in guiding research and Teaching Internship projects, almost always carried out in her undergraduate English teacher classes in the Supervised Practicum course. However, despite this guidance experience, her experience with Supervised practice and the Teaching Internship courses in the remote/ERT format was only three semesters, with only the last one being held in a period that did not allow undergraduate students to go to schools due to the fact that the course was offered during the academic recess months for regular schools in Brazil (December to February).

Thus, we can say that the format in which Supervised Practice course was offered significantly affected decisions and reflections on the training of teachers (pre-service teachers at undergraduate level) and the training of researchers (teachers/researchers linked to this discipline during Teaching Internship that semester). Another issue that affected the planning and way in which the Supervised Practice was carried out that semester refers to the *habitus*/history of the professor responsible for the class (P1) during her training as a teacher/researcher at a federal university in southern Brazil where she graduated as a teacher and researcher having completed her undergraduate degree (2008), master's degree (2004) and doctorate (2009) there. P1's training experience during her training was lonely and somewhat frightening without co-participation which motivated her to want to make things differently if she ever became an advisor.

#### 4.1.2 P2- Master's Degree Student in the Teaching Internship Course

The master's student, P2 (Participant 2) graduated in the English Letters course (2020) from the same university where P1 works and teaches, having thus had her experience and training in the Supervised

Practicum course with the same professor (P1), who is currently her advisor in the master's degree in Education. Furthermore, P2 had teaching experience as a volunteer intern on the Institutional Program of Teaching Initiation Scholarships (PIBID) (Note 11) for the English Letters course (2019) during one semester, thus having some experience in teaching English in public schools. P2's research uses an autoethnographic methodology to analyze the training of English language teachers in and today at a public university in the southeastern of Brazil, that is, taking into account the impacts of globalization and the pandemic on teacher training in this context. It is worth mentioning that P2 had little experience in teaching English, and had no experience in Supervised Practicum (in undergraduate courses) and virtual exchanges, making her feel somewhat unprepared and afraid about the experiences that she was about to face during her training.

## 5. Analysis

P1's training experiences during her master's and doctorate were challenging and led her to seek another training model with more co-participation. Considering *habitus* as a product of history, where first experiences help the individual to create predictions of how they should act in similar situations, Bourdieu explains that personal factors play an important role in social situations (Bourdieu, 1980, 1990c; Maton, 2008; Bourdieu & Chartier, 2015).

In her training experience, P1 was responsible for planning and conducting the course on her own and this experience made her look for a way to involve teaching interns more in co-participation and planning of the disciplines taught during graduation, opening more spaces for reflection and discussion than for the management of teaching interns during their Teaching Internship. The co-regency of teaching interns carried out in classes of Supervised Practicum under P1's supervision was generally limited to the intern's participation in the course together with P1 and during the ERT semester analyzed here. The participation of teaching interns in the Supervised Practicum course was limited to monitoring/assistance carried out outside the time/space of the class (online synchronous meetings) where interns had asynchronous (online) contact with pre-service teachers to answer questions, send reminders and advise on planning content for teaching English.

P1's system of dispositions structured in her *habitus* was reactivated in the current situation where she sought to go in the opposite direction of her formative experience during her Teaching Internship course and experience where she was left alone to teach the class without supervision and/or co-participation. In addition to the previous experience during her training, P1's insecurity was aggravated by the fact that the course was taught that semester in the ERT format, which affected the class' interaction strategies and pre-service teachers' participation due to not being able to go to the field.

We see here that the individual's system of dispositions manifests itself virtually, that is, according to the situations and circumstances with which this system comes into contact (Bourdieu & Chartier, 2015). In the case of P1 and P2, as we will see further, the circumstances were the COVID 19

pandemic, ERT, the use of the google meet and Microsoft Teams platforms where the classes took place, in contact with different subjects in a virtual classroom context where P1 was the leading professor and simultaneously advisor to 6 graduate/postgraduate students. Such circumstances determine what Bourdieu calls the *field*: the individuals and environments, geographic or not, around us (Bourdieu & Chartier, 2015; Bourdieu, 1980, 1990c; Warwick & Mccray, 2017). The circumstances, the *field*, are important because, as the *habitus* is a system of virtualities, it is in its contact with the *field* that the *habitus* produces something, such as practices (Bourdieu & Chartier, 2015); and thus, we can understand the practices and educational actions of the participants in this study.

As for P2, she believes that Teaching Internship course has a social role in the training of the individual teacher-researcher, a role that is carried out through the possibility of practice and reflection of those beings who are inserted in this process of teacher-researcher training. Therefore, the master's student/P2 thinks that Teaching Internship is not only carried out through the fulfillment of its teaching plan, the curriculum, but it is also carried out in the ways in which individuals face the problems that arise in this training process. And it is carried out equally in the relationships between the subjects present in it, such as the professor responsible for the subject/advisor of graduate/postgraduate students/interns/monitors, fellow postgraduate students and undergraduate students/pre-service teachers. For P2, the Teaching Internship has the role of developing the autonomy and authority of teacher-researchers in training, a development carried out mainly through co-participation, as Freirean education proposes (Freire, 1996).

From her perspective, P2 expresses that the *habitus* of pre-service teachers is present and unfolds during their training and is not only expressed, but also transformed through critical reflection and practice. In this way, since *habitus* is both a structured and structuring scheme, the structured schemes during the training of the individual teacher and teacher-researcher will provide the capacity for reflexivity and critical practices through the available circumstances and the experience of learning together. Thus, the new structures created during training will allow the individual to develop autonomy and authority. P2's conception of the formative process brings with it both the idea that *habitus* links the individual and the social, since for P2 learning is also formed in social relationships, in co-participation, and the idea of the relationship between the objective probabilities and subjective aspirations of agents, of individuals (Bourdieu, 1980, 1990C). In other words, dispositions are influenced by possibilities and impossibilities, opportunities and lack of them, freedoms and needs; probabilities that are objectively connected to a group, in this case the group of teachers and teacher-researchers and those in training, who see the need and possibility of developing critical practices and reflexivity, autonomy and authority in exercising their academic roles -professionals, and therefore generate dispositions to meet this purpose (Bourdieu, 1980, 1990c; Maton, 2008). In this way, P2 unconsciously understands that *habitus* in fact generates perceptions, appreciations and practices.

The P2 teacher-researcher training experience did not happen without tribulations and uncertainties. Starting with her repetitive questions about the role of each individual involved in this process, finding

that being a teacher, teacher-researcher and a teaching in training, and being an undergraduate and graduate student means being in a constant movement of learning, voluntarily or involuntarily. Another question relevant to the experience in Teaching Internship of the master's/P2 refers to the difference between the Supervised Practice at undergraduate level and the Teaching Internship at graduate level. P2 experienced similar feelings of confusion because in all of them (Supervised Practicum as an English Letters' student and Teaching Internship as a master's degree student) she was not only a student, but she was also not a teacher yet. Furthermore, being in the process of training, such courses required tireless critical reflection, whether she was a researcher or not.

Just as P1 did, P2 searched in her *habitus* for schemes of similar dispositions from the past, her training during undergraduation in the same course in which she was now a monitor to those she was experiencing at that moment, her training as a teacher-researcher and her role as a monitor for the undergraduates. However, unlike P1, P2 did not have as much experience in the area. According to Bourdieu and Chartier (2015), long-lived (more experienced) people have a more firmly structured *habitus* than younger ones, such is the case of P1, who, in addition to her rich and problematic experiences, also built a career in the area. In any case, P2's first experiences were as essential for her as those of P1, who clung to her scheme of dispositions (perceptions, actions, practices) as a graduate student and intern to support her actions and practices, highlighting the role of reflection as a primary assessment in both cases, which we will see later.

As explained previously, the Supervised practicum and the Teaching Internship courses began with the virtual exchange, also known as COIL (Collaborative Online International Learning), carried out between the university in Brazil and Spain, where P1 was one of the responsible professors and P2 was a monitor for some of the undergraduate students from both universities. This was a completely new experience for P2, making unfamiliarity the biggest challenge she had to overcome in this first part of her Teaching Internship. As a way to prepare for monitoring within COIL, P2 sought help through prior reading on the subject, and then, idealized how she would like the meetings in the breakout rooms to happen, where she was a monitor, and how she intended to act in the role of monitor. P2 tried to make an assumption of her role and practices in the COIL and in her Teaching Internship without having anything to base it on in her *habitus*, despite this, in practice the experience did not occur as she expected. During all meetings, she had difficulties with the Teams platform, as did some monitored pre-service teachers, and she was unable to directly access the questions to be discussed, having to ask students to read them out loud. In her last meeting with the monitored pre-service teachers, her microphone did not work and she had to move from Teams to a video call on WhatsApp. Furthermore, sometimes the discussions in the small groups did not go in the direction she expected, some of the discussing questions were not covered due to the short time in the breakout rooms' meetings of Teams. At the end, for P2, the biggest setback for COIL and the Teaching Internship participants was technological problems (with audio and video, internet and others) that somewhat reduced the potential of interactions and resulted in one of the participants not being able to participate as actively as the

others. In this regard, P2 felt frustrated and powerless, having to seek knowledge about technology, an area that she does not master, to remedy the flaws in the best possible way.

Another important factor for P2 in her Teaching Internship was her role as a monitor at COIL. Because COIL was as new to her as it was to the pre-service teachers being monitored by her, she felt like she was their colleague, not their monitor. In this sense, initially, she felt unprepared and shy, and aggravated by technological problems and time constraints, she felt limited contact with students, as if she did not know them well. However, little by little, she managed to develop content discussions within the group of pre-service teachers monitored by her, and realized that everyone there (with the exception of the pre-service teacher who was unable to participate directly) had strong autonomy and could be monitors as much as she could and was, making P2 understand that she would rarely need to control interactions and felt and accepted herself more as a fellow participant than as a monitor trapped in a certain regulatory mold.

Despite the problems (mostly technological), everyone was participative and provided fluid conversations and rich exchanges of experiences. In this way, P2 needed to adapt her expectations, especially regarding her role, and believes that she managed to overcome the challenges in the sense that she was able to exchange experiences with the other subjects and managed to develop autonomy as a group monitor and intern at COIL within her Teaching Internship.

In the second part of the Supervised Practicum and the Teaching Internship, expository classes were held by the responsible professor and by one of her advisors only with pre-service teachers from the university in Brazil, and lesson plans that would serve as part of their assessments were created by the students. To prepare the lesson plans, the undergraduate students were divided into groups and each group was guided by a monitor again. P2 was a monitor for a group of four students and, like the other monitors, due to ERT, she had to guide the students through online tools, such as google meet, WhatsApp, email, google docs and an academic blog. Throughout the course, P2 felt distance from the class in general because of the ERT model, at the beginning students sporadically turned on their cameras, rarely participated in classes spontaneously, and the same few students always participated more frequently, while the others preferred to answer questions of more objectively or to remain silent. On the other hand, P2's monitoring meetings with the group in which she monitored were well used in terms of time, discussion and proximity to those being monitored. However, during the Internships P2 felt somewhat incompetent as a monitor considering that some of her guidelines differed from those made by the professor responsible for the class and her advisor, P1. Influenced by her readings on critical teaching of the English language and multiliteracies, P2 initially chose to give students more freedom to produce lesson plans for the four skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking), and supported them in choosing a song to use in their lesson plans understanding that there would be no adversities with the guidance and feedback from teacher P1. While P1, in reality, preferred that undergraduate students (the pre-service teachers) follow a standard and simpler model for fear that, when these pre-service teachers take the public exam and/or put the plan into practice in a hypothetical

scenario (since there was no possibility of going in fact to schools to carry out the internship), their plans were too complex for elementary school students in regular schools and/or they were not approved in the competitions.

Being in the position of teacher-researcher in training and the fact that there were five monitors in addition to the responsible professor/P1 in the construction of classes and advising students, for a while P2's role was confusing for both her and the undergraduates students (pre-service teachers) she monitored. P2 felt that the students placed a false role of authority on her and on the other monitors. False because the real authority in that course was P1. This situation created in P2 a feeling of illusion of what she could or could not accomplish as an intern/monitor. Whereas, in reality, she would have to receive the approval of professor P1 who, despite giving some freedom to the monitors, had her own organization and regulations in the course and assessments.

Thus, the disagreements that occurred for about two weeks doubled the work for the group that P2 monitored, as the group had to redo all four lesson plans and P2 had to correct them twice as well. This situation initially resulted in a feeling of subordination in P2 and more frustration and fatigue in undergraduate students (pre-service teachers), generating tension among everyone involved, including P1. The pre-service teachers monitored by P2 expressed great dissatisfaction and frustration with the way the course was being conducted and with the feedback from the monitors and P1 on their work, as the other students in the class demonstrated at the end of the course, negatively affecting the monitors and the leading professor/P1.

Besides that, everyone was experiencing a moment of stress generated by the Covid 19 pandemic, in addition to personal problems that most were experiencing at that time in their lives (some very delicate) which ended up leaving everyone somewhat unmotivated due to the lack of personal interaction and affection in the online environment at a time in their training where this was necessary but not possible due to the pandemic.

From the analysis of P2's exposition on the *field* in which her *habitus* was manifested (and modified), and P1's as well, we can understand that her search for structures similar to the current ones in her past experience as an undergraduate student in Supervised Practicum was not so categorical as expected. Since her past experience took place in a context considerably different from the current one: based on the date of completion of her Supervised Practicum course (2020), we understand that her course as an undergraduate student took place in a pre-pandemic moment, it occurred entirely in in-person, so she had the opportunity to go to regular schools to carry out the practical part of her internship. Along with this, the other difficult circumstances/situations that P2 encountered in the *field*, and her realization that she was inexperienced, made her look for another way of acting, as the need and possibility of training that developed autonomy and authority of individuals still existed for her.

According to Bourdieu (1980, 1990C) the system of dispositions follows both the principle of continuity, where we use the past/experiences in our present, and regulation and transformations, where the individual modifies it (appreciations, practices, actions) and makes it habitual according to the

circumstances/*field* that it finds. Considering this, we believe that P2 felt pressured to perform her role as monitor more efficiently at the same time as she felt afraid of further harming the pre-service teachers' experiences with the course as they were already frustrated. And finally, she ended up coming to terms with the prescriptions from the leading professor/P1 and would justify her contradictory perspectives at the final moment of the discipline, the moment of feedback, where everyone could or tried to enter into a reflective dialogue.

Through critical reflection on her own role, something P2 had learned and carried from her graduation into her *habitus*, she recognized that despite not having authority, she was there so that in the academic-professional future she would become one. Therefore, in her vision, in the same way that the undergraduate students (pre-service teachers) were there to develop autonomy and stimulate the beginning of the development of authority and creating their *habitus* through the mediation of the leading professor, she was also there and depended in a certain way on this mediation from the professor P1 as much as they did. In other words, both were interns and apprentices (teachers in training) of the same professor (trainer), but at different degrees (undergraduate and graduate/postgraduate). And because they were at different degrees, P2 (graduate student) had a greater responsibility in assisting P1 in her role as a leading professor, with the undergraduate intern students (focusing on primary education) while developing her autonomy and authority as a graduate intern (focusing on Higher Education and research). P2 was finally able to understand her role and develop her autonomy a *habitus* a little more, which was initially fragile, and envision the role of authority while respecting P1's authority and autonomy.

Finally, despite the obstacles, P2 had other experiences and developed practices that helped her develop autonomy: with the monitored groups she held two long meetings in which she felt heard and in which she managed to stimulate the students' creativity; she recorded videos for the pre-service teachers asynchronously to help them with their activities; she created activities as examples that for the pre-service teachers could base themselves on; she mediated group conversations with the professor P1; she exchanged ideas with fellow monitors when she was in doubt; and she provided emotional support when the group found itself in an extremely delicate personal and emotional situation. Furthermore, P2 had contact throughout the course with online and technological resources of which she had no experience, as mentioned previously, and which proved to be teaching-learning instruments for future use: kahoot, quiz maker, padlet, among others. In this way, P2 began to build experience in her career as a teacher-researcher and to modify her *habitus* in this *field*.

In this sense, Bourdieu explains that *habitus* goes beyond the structure-agency dichotomy, as individuals do not enter the *field* completely prepared, with extensive knowledge of the area, knowing exactly how to act, knowing their positions or roles and knowing how to deal with social relations of power camouflaged there and its risks. On the contrary, individuals, based on their positions, with their points of view and beliefs, enter into processes where they will learn how things progress within that *field*, when and how to act, the implied rules, and this occurs through the accumulation of experiences



(Bourdieu, 1980, 1990C; Warwick & McCray, 2017). That is why P2 entered the monitoring process feeling unprepared, shy and at the same time with the illusion that she should act as an authority right away, but then, when she began to understand her role and what she could do with it, she adapted and began to act in accordance with the *field*, but in constant learning and slow accumulation of experiences. Moving within the *field* requires effort, work and time, as occurred with P1 throughout her master's and doctorate and began to occur with P2 with the help of P1.

Considering the above, it is important to highlight the importance of the Teaching Internship in improving teacher training as a possibility for students (pre-service teachers) and/or teacher-researchers in training and trainers to give new meaning to their pedagogical practices, just as participants P1 and P2 have done through dialogue and of critical self-reflections. An example of this redefinition was P1's attempt to change the way of conducting the discipline, keeping in mind the impossibility of undergraduate students going to schools to carry out internship practice, and by inserting COIL into the Supervised Practicum and the Teaching Internship courses, expanding the context of teacher and researcher training. Another example, which is related to what was mentioned by Verhine and Dantas (2007) previously, is that P1 tried to include P2's research object in the reflections and actions encouraged by the Teaching Internship course so that P2 would not understand the teaching internship as a deviation from her search. This inclusion was still challenging since the roles that P2 played in the Teaching Internship course were, at times, unclear to everyone involved as she was acting at the same time as a teaching intern, researcher/master's student and teacher in training working in the training of other teachers. Finally, still as an example of the resignification carried out by P1 and P2, we return to the suggestion by Barra, Oliveira and Figueiredo (2021) that the Teaching Internship should include trying to work on emotions as P1 and P2 tried, within their possibilities of action and interpretation, working on the emotions and sensitivity of those involved in that semester, taking into account the challenging context that the class was experiencing and in particular, the situation of the students' delicate emotional situation during the pandemics.

Keeping in mind the *habitus* of teacher-researchers in training and trainers, the Teaching Internship has the role of preparing graduate/postgraduate students to teach and act in Higher Education (Almeida Vieira, 2013), just as P1 did in her past experience, providing opportunities for new forms of Teaching Internship experiences for P2 and other colleagues on the pedagogical team. Furthermore, the Teaching Internship course also allows for the detachment of hardened models from didactic aspects for the critical awareness of teachers, students and researchers. Therefore, despite part of the assessment of Supervised Practicum course of undergraduate students (the production of English lesson plans for elementary school) following a rigid mold, P1 developed a didactic path where, at times, it was possible to break out of the mold using gamification with online resources and interacting with other teachers through COIL. Circumstances that, together with the restricted lesson plans, made it possible for teachers and teacher-researchers and trainees to become critically aware of the context and practices (and activities) that experienced in the Supervised Practice and the Teaching Internship courses.

## 6. Conclusion

This paper aimed to reflect and discuss the role of the Teaching Internship in the training of Higher Education teachers through the theoretical lenses and notion of Bourdieu's *habitus* used to analyze the perceptions of two teachers working in the Supervised Internship course of the Faculty of English Letters in a university in southeast Brazil during remote emergency teaching (ERT). In general, the interpretative analysis concludes that the experiences lived by the two teachers are (P1 and P2) permeated and constructed through the *habitus* that shaped their interpretation and training and action and of the other teachers involved.

Both Supervised Practice and Teaching Internship provided teachers and researchers in training and trainers, as well as P1 and P2, with the *field* where their *habitus* is modified and where they can put their past experiences to the test along with their structured system (their respective worldviews, actions, practices and knowledge), putting them in contact with new ones, in order to reflect on and give new meaning to their practice. In this way, Teaching Internship is the *space/field* where teacher-researchers in training find the authenticity of Higher Education teaching in a given cultural, social and historical context, a space-time where the educational phenomenon occurs (Lima; Braga, 2016), just as ERT provided a teaching-learning path, practices and reflections for the participants of this study. This is the space-time where the preparation/education of these teacher-researchers in training takes place; where the *habitus* of individuals, structured by their schemes/knowledge, is put into practice, is legitimized and expanded. This occurs as Bourdieu and Chartier (2015) exemplified in the case of the child who, despite knowing their language, goes to school to learn grammar in order to be able to transition from practice to meta-practice (Bourdieu & Chartier, 2015).

Furthermore, the Teaching Internship course is not only important for teacher training, but also for researchers, because, as we saw in our study and throughout the theorizations brought here (e.g., Viera & Maciel, 2010; Verhine & Dantas, 2007), this course encourages us to reflect on the possibilities and impossibilities of effective training, possibilities that also exist in the *field*. And it is through reflection, through active questioning of the relationship between (the educational) *field* and *habitus* (of teacher and researcher), that the teacher-researcher understands what leads teachers to act as they do, to have the beliefs they have, to develop the practices they carry out in the classroom. That is, the Teaching Internship provides the reflection that enables teachers to understand the teacher as an individual embedded in a given context and also in a broader context, as was our intention in this study as teacher-researchers investigating the role of Teaching Internship in teacher and researcher training (for higher education) intertwining these reflections with our experience in the undergraduate teacher training discipline.

## Acknowledgement

Author 1 thanks Capes for mater's scholarship and author 2 thanks Fapes and Cnpq for financial support for research in the form of productivity scholarship.

## References

- Amorim, G. B., C E. P., & Finardi, K. R. (2021). Percepes de alunos sobre os impactos da pandemia na Educao: Foco no aprendizado de ingls. *Revista Prksis*, 3, 4-31. <https://doi.org/10.25112/rpr.v3.2563>
- Barra, T. B. A., De Oliveira, R. L., & De Albuquerque Figueiredo, J. B. (2021). A didtica no Ensino Superior: uma experincia dialgica de estgio em docncia. *Ensino em Perspectivas*, 2(4), 1-11.
- Bourdieu, P., & Chartier, R. (2015). *The sociologist & the historian*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990c). *The Logic of Practice*. Redwood City: Stanford University Press. (Original Work Published 1980).
- Chamorro, M. G., Gamboa, M. R., & Mendinueta, N. R. (2022). Initial Language Teacher Education: Components Identified in Research. *Journal of Language and Education*, 8(2), 231-245. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2022.12466>
- C E. P., Amorim, G. B., & Finardi, K. R. (2020). Ensino de lnguas em tempos de pandemia: experincias com tecnologias em ambientes virtuais. *Revista docncia e cibercultura*, 4(3), 112-140. <https://doi.org/10.12957/redoc.2020.53173>
- De Almeida Vieira, R. (2013). Formao ps-graduada e docncia no ensino superior: mapeamento das discusses sobre o estgio de docncia na RBPG/CAPES. *Revista Contrapontos*, 13(2), 94-101. <https://doi.org/10.14210/contrapontos.v13n2.p94-101>
- De Almeida Vieira, R., & Maciel, L. S. B. (2010). Estgio de docncia prescrito pela capes: Tenses E desafios. *Quaestio-Revista de Estudos em Educao*, 12(2).
- De Souza, J. G., Junqueira, M. L., & Heinzle, M. R. S. (2021). Percepes Atribudas ao Estgio De Docncia no Ensino Superior. *EDUCAO*, 10(3), 106-118. <https://doi.org/10.17564/2316-3828.2021v10n3p106-118>
- Fadini, K. A. (2020). *Autoetnografia e processos de subjetificao em educao lingustica: (trans)formao de uma professora de ingls*. Thesis. Universidade Federal do Esprito Santo, Vitria.
- Finardi, K. R., Prebianca, G. V. V., & Schmitt, J. (2015). English distance learning: possibilities and limitations of MEO for the Flipped Classroom. *Revista Brasileira de Lingutica Aplicada*, 16, 181-208. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-639820158527>
- Finardi, K. R., & Guimares, F. F. (2020). Internationalization and the Covid-19 pandemic: challenges and opportunities for the global south. *Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Studies*, 2(4), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.22158/jetss.v2n4p1>
- Finardi, K. R., Hildeblando Jnior, C. A., & Guimares, F. F. (2020). Affordances da formao de professores de lnguas na era digital. *Revista Eletrnica de Educao*, 14, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.14244/198271993723>
- Freire, Paulo. (1996). *Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessrios  prtica educativa*. So Paulo: Paz e Terra.

- Hildeblando Júnior, C. A., Finardi, K. R., & El Kadri, M. (2022). Affordances da COIL para a internacionalização do ensino superior: um estudo de caso. *Revista da Anpoll*, 53(1), 253-272. <https://doi.org/10.18309/ranpoll.v53i1.1615>
- Lima, M. S. L., & Braga, M. M. S. C. (2016). Relação ensino-aprendizagem da docência: traços da Pedagogia de Paulo Freire no Ensino Superior. *Educar em Revista*, 71-88. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-4060.47203>
- Orsini-Jones, M., Cerveró-Carrascosa, A., & Finardi, K. R. (2021). *Digital critical literacy development and intercultural awareness raising 'in' action, 'on' action and 'for' action in ELT*. Published in the Proceedings of the Teaching Culturally and Linguistically Diverse International Students in Open or Online Learning Environments: Research Symposium, Ontario, Canada.
- Maton, K. (2008). *Habitus*. In M. Grenfell, & Pierre Bourdieu (Eds.), *Key Concepts*. Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1017/UPO9781844654031.006>
- Medeiros, C. C. C. (2009). A formação de professores e a teoria sociológica de Pierre Bourdieu: interface possível para pesquisas em Educação. *CONTRAPONTO*, 9(2), 3-16.
- Pardo, F. S. (2019). A autoetnografia em pesquisas em Linguística Aplicada: Reflexões do sujeito pesquisador/pesquisado. *Horizontes de Linguística Aplicada*, 18(2), 15-40. <https://doi.org/10.26512/rhla.v18i2.25104>
- Sevilla-Pavón, A., & Finardi, K. R. (2021). Pandemic Language Teaching: Insights from Brazilian and International Teachers on the Pivot to Emergency Remote Instruction. *Journal of Language and Education*, 7(4), 127-138. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.11676>
- Verhine, R. E., & Dantas, L. M. V. (2007). Estágio de docência: conciliando o desenvolvimento da tese com a prática em sala de aula. *Revista Brasileira de Pós-Graduação*, 4(8).
- Warwick, R. J., & McCray, J. (2017). Bourdieu's habitus and field: implications on the practice and theory of critical action learning. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, Abingdon, 14(2), 104-119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767333.2017.1296409>

## Notes

Note 1. This is an English official translation for: *Programa de Demanda Social da Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (Capes)*.

Note 2. According to CAPES, the Teaching Internship in the graduate/postgraduate level has to be carried out in the undergraduate level. That is, graduate/postgraduate teachers interns teach undergraduate students during their Teaching Internship as a requirement of CAPES.

Note 3. In Portuguese: *Programa de Demanda Social (DS)*. It is a Social Demand Program from CAPES (CAPES/DS).

Note 4. In Portuguese: *Programa de Pós-graduação em Educação (PPGE)*.

Note 5. We are using the names Teaching Internship and Supervised Practicum to refer to (English) teacher training courses. However, we use the first term to refer to the course at the undergraduate level

and the latter to refer to the course at the graduate/postgraduate level. In Portuguese, Teaching Internship is called *Estágio Docência* and Supervised Practicum is called *Estágio Supervisionado*.

Note 6. The Faculty is responsible for the undergraduate course in which English teachers are trained to work in regular schools (Primary and High Schools).

Note 7. In Portuguese it is named *Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso* (TCC). It is both a final course paper/monography and a course/discipline/subject designed to produce and write this final paper/monography in Brazilian Higher Education courses.

Note 8. In Portuguese: *Universidade Federal do Ceará* (UFC).

Note 9. In Brazil it was called *Ensino-Aprendizagem Remoto Temporário e Emergencial* (EARTE) and/or *Ensino Remoto Emergencial* (ERE). The first means Emergency Remote Teaching-Learning, the latter means Emergency Remote Teaching.

Note 10. In Portuguese: *Programa de Pós-graduação em Estudos Linguísticos* (PPGEL).

Note 11. In Portuguese: *Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência* (PIBID).