



**AUTORES****Anwar Ahmed** sardar15@yorku.ca

Assistant Professor in the Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics at York University in Canada.

**Brian Morgan** bmorgan@glendon.yorku.ca

Senior Scholar, Department of English Studies, Center for Research on Language and Culture Contact, Glendon College, York University. His main research area is in critical theories, literacies, and pedagogies and their implementation across English Language Teaching contexts. Another area of research interest relates to language and identity with a particular emphasis on language teacher identity work.

**Ruberval Franco Maciel** ruberval.maciell@gmail.com

Associate Professor in the MA in Letras and BA in Letras and Medicine at the State University of Mato Grosso do Sul (UEMS). He also supervises dissertations and theses in the Graduate Program in Linguistics at UNEMAT. CNPq scholar - P2. His recent research interests include translanguaging, affect and health literacy. He coordinates the Transculturality, Language and Education group - ANPOLL. Former President of ALAB (2014/2015).

**COMO CITAR**Ahmed, A., Morgan, B. & Maciel, R. F. (2021). Feeling our Way: A Trioethnography on Critical Affective Literacy for Applied Linguistics. *Calidoscópico*, 19(4): 538-552. 10.4013/cld.2021.194.08**FLUXO DA SUBMISSÃO**Submissão: 30/08/2021  
Aprovação: 19/12/2021**DISTRIBUÍDO SOB**

# Feeling our Way: A Trioethnography on Critical Affective Literacy for Applied Linguistics

## *Nossos sentidos: Uma Trioetnografia sobre Letramento Crítico Afetivo*

**ABSTRACT / RESUMO**

This paper argues that attention to affect/emotion be given greater prominence in applied linguistics following a theoretical and pedagogical framework delineated as critical affective literacy (CAL) by Anwaruddin (2016). Following a brief description of key CAL principles, the authors explore the potency of affect and emotionality of texts by way of duo/trioethnography (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, 2017), a research methodology particularly relevant for exploring affective/emotional dimensions of language in educational domains (e.g., English for Academic Purposes, Language Teacher Education, English

**Keywords:**

Affect; emotion; critical affective literacy; duoethnography; democratic pedagogies

for Medical Purposes) and as part of broader socio-political deliberation. The authors detail specific features of duoethnographic research methodology (e.g., participant transparency and juxtaposition, epistemological and ideological risk-taking) that contribute to CAL principles and aspirations. In the final sections of the paper, the authors identify several implications of their trioethnography for the development of CAL in applied linguistics followed by brief descriptions of curricular and pedagogical innovation where affect/emotion has been integral to the pedagogical and literacy strategies described.

Este artigo argumenta que a atenção ao afeto/emoção deve receber mais destaque na linguística aplicada, seguindo uma abordagem teórica e pedagógica delineada por Author A (2016) como letramento crítico afetivo (CAL). Seguindo uma breve descrição dos principais princípios da CAL, os autores exploram a potência do afeto e do aspecto emocional dos textos por meio da duo/trioetnografia (Norris e Sawyer, 2012, 2017), uma metodologia de pesquisa particularmente relevante para explorar as dimensões afetivas/emocionais da linguagem em domínios educacionais (por exemplo, Inglês para Fins Acadêmicos, Formação de Professores de Línguas, Inglês

para Fins Médicos) e como parte de uma deliberação sócio-política mais ampla. Os autores detalham características específicas da metodologia de pesquisa duoetnográfica (por exemplo, transparência e justaposição do participante, risco epistemológico e ideológico) que contribuem para os princípios e aspirações do CAL. Nas seções finais do artigo, os autores identificam várias implicações de suas trioetnografias para o desenvolvimento do CAL em linguística aplicada, seguida por breves descrições de inovação curricular e pedagógica onde afeto/emoção foram essenciais para as estratégias pedagógicas e de alfabetização descritas.

**Palavras-chave:**

Afeto; emoções; letramento crítico afetivo; duoetnografia; pedagogias democráticas

## 1. Introduction

Applied linguistics has adopted both traditional (descriptive) and critical (transformative) approaches to the study of languages and literacies. Critical studies of language-related concerns are urgently needed in times of crisis (Duboc & Ferraz, 2021). Today we face a number of crises: the pandemic of COVID-19, environmental destruction, neo-nationalism, nativist populisms (fueled by white supremacy, Islamophobia, anti-semitism, and racism), mistrust in science, and growing economic inequalities. The list could go on, but what is really problematic here is that these issues are no longer rationally debated whereby truths arise from the evidence presented. Increasingly, affect, emotion and feeling are implicated in the production, circulation, and/or mitigation of the various challenges we collectively face at local and global levels. As researchers and practitioners of applied linguistics, one of our key responsibilities is to find ways of social transformation. As Pennycook (2021) asks, “How do we work toward change in the contexts of our work, where issues of language sit at the heart of forms of inequality” (p. 21). To address this need, we discuss why attention to affect/emotion should be a priority for applied linguistics. We delineate a pedagogical framework for critical affective literacy (CAL) and its potential relevance for social transformation. Utilizing the methodology of duo/trio-ethnography, we focus specifically on our experiences of teaching English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and language teacher education (LTE) in transnational contexts. We conclude the article with three classroom examples of critical affective literacy.

### Critical affective literacy

We can look at the concept of literacy from an absolute or a relative perspective. While the absolute view considers a set of competencies, scores in standardized tests and duration of schooling, the relative view of literacy focuses on the evolving needs of individuals and the societies in which they function. At the current historical moment, most societies are going through unprecedented changes due to technological advancements, inequitable distribution of resources, an alarming rise of misinformation, and a continuing attack on truth itself. In this context, language and literacy classrooms have important roles to play. While some literacy researchers and practitioners want to combat social injustices by “recommitting to traditional information literacy and rhetorical pedagogies,” we agree with Lockhart, Glascott, Warnick, and Parrish (2021) that there is a need for novel pedagogical approaches to respond to the challenges of post-truth rhetoric and “to account for the structures that sustain the creation, distribution, and reception of mis- and disinformation” (p. 2). We believe that such structures of misinformation are often constructed through a strong appeal to emotions. Traditional cognition-focused

and evidence-based models of argumentation seem to be insufficient to dismantle the social media echo-chambers in which most people live today. In fact, research suggests that people experience genuine pleasure when they encounter and process new information that supports their existing beliefs. As Kolbert (2017, n.p.) puts it, “It feels good to ‘stick to our guns’ even if we are wrong.” Therefore, we need a pedagogical approach that aims to shed light on the affective construction of structures that align meanings, feelings, and actions in ways that can be oppressive or emancipatory. For such a pedagogical approach, we draw upon a conceptual framework of critical affective literacy (Anwaruddin, 2016). This framework consists of four principles:

- One: examining why we feel what we feel,
- Two: striving to enter a relation of affective equivalence,
- Three: interrogating the production and circulation of objects of emotion in everyday politics, and
- Four: focusing on the performativity of emotions to achieve social justice.

As we will show below, this framework may be helpful to understand how affectively constructed modes of textual practices align bodies with ideas and thus give shape to collectives. In other words, an affective approach to literacies education may enable teachers and students to counter such oppressive forces as misinformation and myside bias by paying attention to what Ahmed (2004) described as “the emotionality of texts” (p. 27). Thus, we contribute to the relative view of literacy, according to which literacy skills and practices are dynamic and evolving alongside societal needs and changes.

### Duoethnography

Duoethnography is a methodology in which two or more researchers juxtapose their life histories and lived experiences—the *emic* dimension of ethnographic inquiry—to interrogate a topic under investigation. It is a dialogic and iterative methodology that brings about multiple and often unpredictable understandings of the same phenomenon. Such emergent understandings reflect a notion of thick description (Geertz, 1995), which underpins ethnographic study. Having recently completed several duo/trio/multi/ethnographies (Ahmed & Morgan, 2021; Barbosa & Maciel, 2020; Bruz, Moura, Maciel, Martin, & Morgan, 2021; Morgan, Rocha, & Maciel, 2021; Morgan, Martin & Maciel, 2019), we have gained an enhanced appreciation of how this research methodology can support the principles and goals for a critical affective literacy as stated above. In place of objectivity, rationality, and universality as foundations for inquiry, duoethnography foregrounds the production of difference and multivocality around shared experiences and textual phenomena (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, 2017). Central to this production is the strategic deployment of affect/emotion/feeling as resources for transformative social research. Trust,

risk-taking, a willingness to suspend cherished beliefs/biases in dialogic encounters—along with the attendant anxiety such re-positioning and self-exposure generates—are all affective requirements for duoethnographic research. As Norris and Sawyer (2017) note, duoethnography “requires the courage to make oneself vulnerable in the presence of anOther and a future audience” (p. 6). The intent of such vulnerability is not simply emotional self-discovery and healing but, instead, a newfound social awareness from which the production or circulation of objects of emotion can be more effectively interrogated (Anwaruddin, 2016).

An example of current relevance in Canada would be the recent circulation of historical photographs of residential schools for Indigenous children against the backdrop of the recent discoveries of unmarked children’s graves at these sites. For longstanding white settler citizens and politicians, these images may invoke sentiments of benevolence born of good intentions (albeit “misapplied”). For Indigenous communities, however, the same images would invoke (post) memories of profound cultural and linguistic loss and the collective trauma that past and present government practices have inflicted on Canada’s First Nations. A duo/multi/ethnography would draw attention to the distributed addressivity of the image involved—its co-existing yet conflicting meanings/emotions for different groups (see Ahmed & Morgan, 2021)—inviting closer analysis of the purposes of its specific design features and the socio-political interests that the circulation of this image/text would support, following the four principles for CAL outlined by Anwaruddin (2016). Indeed, the public foregrounding of these conflicting meanings and affective experiences would compel some/many to reassess their face-value historical assumptions regarding the imagined nation and their responsibilities to right past wrongs<sup>[1]</sup> (i.e., the performativity of emotions to achieve social justice, Anwaruddin, 2016).

As mentioned above, participant voices in a duo/trioethnography are made transparent and juxtaposed, sometimes without agreement or resolution. Two relevant points arise from this strategy. First, most scholarly publications with multiple authors appear as one voice speaking in triumphal consensus and unfolding in predictable patterns that enhance the validity of the ultimate truths claimed. Yet, it is interesting to reflect on the hidden deliberations and silences that may arise when multiple authors are involved, and when power differentials between senior/junior contributors or gendered and racialized collaborators shape the final work. The duoethnographic structure of transparent, dialogic voices thus mitigates the pressure to impose unanimity, contributing to a “relation of affective equivalence” (Anwaruddin, 2016) amongst participants. A second, related point is the stance towards a reader that dialogic tensions and a lack of unanimity confer: “Duoethnographies, unlike

prescriptive studies, do not give conclusions or recommendations. The ethical stance toward the reader is one of unknown future partner in inquiry, not a recipient of newfound wisdom. ... [G]eneralizability rests with the reader, not the researcher” (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 22). Based on our own varied transnational experiences of research and teaching, we fully appreciate the ethical wisdom and local relevance of readerly partnership promoted here.

Clearly, there is a *potency of affect* (cf. Morgan, Rocha, & Maciel, 2021) that duoethnography promotes as both research method and pedagogy in support of critical literacies and pedagogies. As an unpredictable, dialogic method requiring trust and vulnerability, interconnections between the social and personal—between the ideological and affective—can be prioritized when examining why we feel what we feel. As a pedagogy, the affective rewards gained from such risk-taking can inspire creative and innovative ways of teaching that might not otherwise be explored. This would also extend to the many shared conversations and reconsiderations that unfolded in the recursive process of co-writing this article. We hope readers are inspired by our efforts.

## 2. Duoethnography and the Potência of Affect in Language Teaching

*Anwar Ahmed:* The study of affect/emotion is interesting and challenging for the fields of language teaching and language teacher education. It is interesting because it brings to the fore a historically neglected area of linguistic analysis, i.e., the emotional indexicality of sign use. It is, however, challenging because affect’s effect is hard to describe by using language. Yet, in language studies fields, we are well positioned to think about, and feel, what affect does to pedagogy. For me, pedagogy is a site of productive inquiry into affect and language because it is inherently dialogical, relational, and emergent. I wonder what duo/trio-ethnography can offer us as we endeavour to understand the *potência* of affect in language teaching and language teacher education.

*Brian Morgan:* Anwar, I like the reciprocity suggested in your opening to this section: what can duoethnography offer us as applied linguists and additional language educators interested in the *potência* of affect; what can we offer in exchange? Considering the latter, I haven’t seen mention of the emotional indexicality of signs in the duoethnography publications I’ve read so far. While Norris and Sawyer (2012, 2017) place courage, vulnerability, and trust at the forefront, the specific lexico-grammatical resources that potentially realize these affective positionings are areas of linguistic expertise we bring to the duoethnographic table. Even as I write this response, I am extra sensitive to

[1] An example of such affective performativity recently occurred in the Province of Manitoba, following controversial statements and a subsequent apology by the province’s Indigenous Relations Minister, regarding residential schools. See e.g. <https://winnipeg.ctvnews.ca/sincerest-apologies-manitoba-s-indigenous-relations-minister-says-his-residential-school-comments-were-wrong-1.5512913>



the language choices I'm making. It's like negotiating a Hallidayan (Halliday & Hasan, 1985) tightrope interwoven with ideational (situated content), interpersonal (construal of relationships), and textual (mode/tools of expression) metafunctions, as I waver in the emergent breeze: Am I conveying the right amount of emotional candor as required by this research genre? Will I still be taken seriously as a scholar, which I have always desired? Instead, will the indexicality of my sign choices end up sounding pretentious and insincere to my dialogue partners and readers? When writing for an academic audience, will I have the courage to push against the weight of conformity and predictability I feel, mindful of the role assigned us: "duoethnographers are the sites of studies about beauty, power, privilege, immigration, professional boundaries, cross-cultural identity, patriotism, the act of having dangerous conversations" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p.13)? It's a daunting study list certain to provoke a wide set of emotions, especially when such conversations take place in classrooms.

Reflecting on my response above, I can also see a point of tension—i.e., the proverbial double-edged sword—when considering what duoethnography potentially brings to CAL. I'm thinking here of Benesch's (2020) important work on teachers' "emotion labour", correlated to the appropriately named concept of "feeling rules" (cf. Hochschild, in Gkonou & Miller, 2021; Zembylas, 2007). Both concepts, for me, suggest a kind of affective biopolitics, following Foucault, in which the subjectivities/identities of teachers are brought into discourses that condition or domesticate their emotional investments and performances in ways that advance institutional agendas and power relations. It's not much of a stretch to suggest that an academic research methodology such as duoethnography also has "feeling rules" whose effects (e.g., a confessional obligation, Morgan & Clarke, 2011) may not always advance social justice interests, warranting instead a healthy degree of caution from participants. This is a small qualification, I believe, but a necessary one when considering the full *potência* of affect. Research "innovations" seem to move in fast flowing waves, with everyone in a rush to ride the crest before it passes them by. To what extent does duoethnography follow this fleeting pattern? Or, are its insights for CAL substantively long term?

**Anwar:** Brian, I am glad that you mentioned the concept of "feeling rules." I find Hochschild's works very interesting, especially when she explains how our activities and feelings are measured against expectations set by others. The social actor's struggle is to keep motivation to mediate between feeling rules and emotional labour. In other words, Hochschild (2008) showed that there are inherent tensions between "what I want to feel" (motivation), "what I should feel" (feeling rule), and "what I try to feel" (emotion work).

“Increasingly, affect, emotion and feeling are implicated in the production, circulation, and/or mitigation of the various challenges we collectively face at local and global levels”

This work is very interesting, but Hochschild placed much emphasis on the actors' construction of emotions and their affective experiences in social interactions and imaginaries. While this has been a dominant approach in the contemporary sociology of emotions, I see duoethnography as a promising field for experimenting with a new kind of affective practice. Here, I am thinking specifically about Sara Ahmed's (2015) concept of the "sociality of emotions." Ahmed begins with the observation that "the everyday language of emotion is based on the presumption of interiority" (p. 8). This presumption of interiority asks people to look inwards and ask themselves: *how do I feel?* She takes issue with this psychological conception of emotions (the inside-out model, i.e., emotions are our internal property, and we bring them out through language, gestures, and actions). She also discusses how the traditional sociological approach (the outside-in model, i.e., emotions come from outside and move inward) is also problematic. Ahmed's notion of the sociality of emotions suggests that "emotions

are not simply something 'I' or 'we' have. Rather, it is through emotions, or how we respond to objects and others, that surfaces or boundaries are made: the 'I' and the 'we' are shaped by, and even take the shape of, contact with others" (p. 10). Thus, emotions are neither individual nor social, in the strict sense of these terms. What I find most intriguing here is the idea of "contact with others." For me, both memory and imagination of such contact is crucial for pedagogical and social transformation. Memory is important for the history of our contact with others, and imagination is important for future

possibilities of ethical relationships with others. Now, the question that is worth asking is: Does duoethnography nurture a sociality of emotions? If it does, then how?

**Brian:** Of course, I'm going to answer 'yes' (imagine if I said 'no', which would require a winking emoji in another setting!). As you note, Ahmed's sociality of emotions is a specific understanding of affect that is neither 'inside-out' nor 'outside-in', regarding causal trajectories. It is instead "an interweaving of the personal with the social, the affective with the mediated" (Ahmed, 2004, p. 28). I'm reminded of Ott's (2017) comprehensive survey of affect that Ruberval first shared with me. Ott describes Ahmed's conceptualization as part of a middle ground between *affect as elemental state* and *affect as intensive force*. So, what does duoethnography provide in terms of supporting this kind of interwoven, middle ground approach? How we are shaped through/by our contact with others is an interesting example. Ahmed (2004) notes that emotions attach us to places and others. At the same time, it is through the proximity and intensity of this attachment that we are moved, which I assume is directed towards both social and psychological pathways of understanding and agency. This sense of mobility/change

made possible by close contact is foundational to the transparent, juxtaposition of voices in duoethnography, whose purpose is also movement: i.e., the disruption of individually constructed metanarratives of self and the world (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). Towards this goal, Norris and Sawyer (pp. 16-17) talk about the value of “counterpunctual reading” in terms of disrupting both form and content. The related noun for this type of reading, counterpoint, is a musical metaphor worth considering. In counterpoint, separate voices/instruments are interwoven, coming into contact and producing resonant frequencies that they do not possess in isolation. The closer their tonal proximity, the greater the intensity and productive dissonance that is produced as a result. Through its unresolved juxtaposition of researcher voices, duoethnography utilizes this resonant proximity and emotion-mediated “contact with others” (cf. Ahmed) as a means of mobilizing social transformation.

*Ruberval Maciel:* Another aspect I think worth mentioning, Brian and Anwar, is duoethnography’s contribution to CAL from a decolonial perspective, which might also be viewed as a kind of productive dissonance based on enforced proximity (i.e. conquest), following the musical metaphor above. That gives me the opportunity to revisit a recent discussion Brian and I had with my graduate students in relation to duoethnography’s role to decolonize academic genres. Modern scientific thought and traditional academic genres are based on the logic of rationality, and they have been strongly marked by objectivity, impartiality, homogenization, and clarity. In this aspect, the distance between the subject and the object is taken into account. Discussions are centered on reason, linearity and third-person writing in order to seek to ensure distance. From this perspective, there is little space for authors to consider other less rational possibilities, such as the voices of bodies and affections. I think it is worth mentioning Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s book - *Decolonizing Methodologies* and its relationship with duoethnography. She draws attention to the fact that:

Decolonizing methodologies is not a method for revolution in the political sense, but it provides revolutionary thoughts of thinking about the role that knowledge, knowledge production, knowledge hierarchies and knowledge institutions play a role in decolonization and social transformation. (Smith, 1999, p. x).

In this excerpt, she refers to the ethical aspects of who narrates and who is narrated. More specifically, based on her locus of enunciation, Smith points out how her perceptions — as a non-indigenous researcher — have expanded from her work in indigenous contexts. From this perspective, it is possible to understand the notion of decolonization as a transgressive aspect of destabilization and disobedience to the Eurocentric views that dominate scientific knowledge and silence local experiences.

Duoethnography is similarly local and transgressive in that it encourages researchers to “engage in multiple inter-

pretations as they use self as a site of analysis of sociocultural meanings and influences” (Sawyer & Tigget, 2012, p. 629). In this sense, I have experienced writing duoethnographic texts (Barbosa & Maciel, 2019) with medical students, which gives us opportunities - to unlearn more rigid genre-oriented models, to negotiate concepts from two different academic backgrounds and to find spaces to introduce affective literacies in academic genres that traditionally have valorized scientific evidence in health sciences. As Sawyer and Tigget (2012) remind us, this approach rejects the notion of a single, fixed and absolute reality. I can see a direct connection between CAL and duoethnography and both would require in bell hooks’s words - a radical openness. She warns us that it became clear to her, “after years in academic spaces, that it is too easy to cling to one’s point of view and protect it, discarding other perspectives [...] it requires a lot of courage and imagination [...]” to consider other possibilities (hooks, 2020, p. 35). So, when we use duoethnography to bring together researchers from different fields, we create possibilities for new knowledges to emerge from these different disciplinary worldviews. This has been my experience of writing with medical students. It has generated heteroglossic and polyvocal texts, and perspectives on embodiment that would not be possible through mainstream medical discourses and methods. Again, it requires courage and imagination to transgress disciplinary knowledge and to decolonize traditional academic genres such as applied linguistics and health studies.

*Anwar:* Ruberval, the “courage and imagination” that you mentioned, following bell hooks, is what we need to reconceptualize both our academic practice and our political action. To create awareness for such reconceptualization, I turn to affect because affective experiences tell us stories – simple, complex, unpredictable, and perplexing – about how people construct social realities and carry out their days within such realities. To capture such stories, I find the concept of “social imaginary” very helpful. Here, I am thinking with Charles Taylor (2004), who chooses the concept of social imaginary over social theory. Taylor is interested in “the ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations” (p. 23). What I gather from Taylor and other interpretivist thinkers is that critical social awareness and its associated imaginaries are inherently dialogical. However, I should note that, despite much currency in social sciences and educational studies, the concept of dialogue remains to be highly problematic. Two challenges to dialogue that I often identify are that (1) many people conflate dialogue and debate, and they start a dialogue with the intent to win “the debate,” and (2) participants of a dialogue do not always fully open up to their interlocutors, i.e., not all aspects of self are shared with others. To address the first challenge, we – as educators – can teach students that the primary goal of dialogues should be *to understand* the Other, not

to argue for a position already made. To address the second challenge, we may benefit from paying attention to what Bakhtin described as “microdialogue.” A major problem in dialogue is the interruption of one voice by other voices. Consequently, participants often hold dialogized inner monologues, and Bakhtin called these microdialogues, which re-create the voices of the participants. Microdialogues are important for a special “mode of communication with the autonomous consciousnesses of others” and for “an active dialogic penetration into the unfinalizable depths of man” (quoted in Emerson, 1997, p. 139). These microdialogues can inform social dialogues in ways that bring us additional vantage points to see what was previously unseen.

Dialogues and microdialogues are foundational to democratic social imaginaries. In particular, the success of deliberative approaches to democracy depends, to a large extent, on people’s ability to engage in dialogue with others. In popular discourses, deliberative dialogues are understood as individuals coming together and considering relevant facts and values from multiple points of view, listening and responding to one another in order to arrive at a nuanced public judgment (e.g., Carcasson, 2013). However, in such deliberation, reason has been historically prioritized over emotion. Some political thinkers have recently pointed to the importance of paying more attention to emotional interactions in democratic deliberation. For example, Curato, Dryzek, Ercan, Hendriks and Niemeyer (2017) wrote that “deliberation is more complex than originally theorized, involving both dispositional and procedural components. The purely procedural rationalist model of deliberation is normatively problematic because it is empirically questionable” (p. 30). In successful deliberative dialogues aimed at public decision and action, the dispositional and procedural aspects need to complement each other. Reason and emotion do not have to oppose each other. As Habermas (1990) wrote, “Feelings seem to have a similar function for the moral justification of action as sense perceptions have for the theoretical justification of facts” (p. 50). Echoing Habermas, some contemporary authors have highlighted the roles of emotion in deliberative theory (see, e.g., Neblo, 2020). This is where critical affective literacy (CAL) can make a contribution. With a relational approach to understanding emotions, CAL aims to shed light on how certain ideas stick together on an affective ground and how they form collectives in particular ways that encourage or discourage members to carry out actions for the common good.

*Brian:* Anwar, Ruberval, I find a duoethnographic method potentially well suited for the kinds of relational and embodied understandings and social possibilities that you mention. Reason and emotion stick together in ways not easily recognized. On one level we may be extolling the virtues of feeling/emotion for democratic practice, while unaware of the degree to which our advocacy is communicated through deliberative practices and language forms saturated with reason and the types of logocentric language games that surround us in our academic lives. Without the

means to interrupt this pattern of habituated and internalized reinforcement, students/citizens are restricted in their ability to understand and respond effectively to the potency of affect in public life. This dialogic interruption must first occur on an *interpersonal* level, Anwar is saying, before it is productively mobilized at an *intrapersonal* level along the lines of Bakhtin’s work on microdialogues.

Again, I see duoethnographic priorities and validity criteria (e.g., juxtaposition over resolution; disruption of the metanarrative of the self) particularly useful. For me, a good example would be a recent duoethnography on postmemory and multilingual identity Anwar and I co-authored (Ahmed & Morgan, 2021). It was through sharing and responding to each other’s personal stories and teaching examples that I started to reflect more closely on why and how particular public images and scripts attained a sort of polyvocality in diverse, ethnolinguistic settings. For some, the same text might convey a simple denotational message, while for others it might evoke strong feelings and difficult memories tied to history and identity, reflecting what Anwar referred to earlier as an emotional indexicality in sign use. Before responding in writing, a series of inner, counterpunctual conversations with my “imagined Anwar” would take place, each one considered in light of duoethnographic and CAL principles. I remember a similar process of “dialogic penetration” (cf. Emerson) in my trioethnography with Ruberval and Claudia (Morgan, Rocha, & Maciel, 2021). Perhaps from now on, I should call these inner conversations microdialogues, following Bakhtin.

Something else about the relationship between microdialogue and social dialogue has caught my attention, particularly in relation to what duoethnography both enables and constrains for CAL. Given the inner depth and penetration Emerson attributes to microdialogues, to what extent is language choice for bi/multilingual speakers affectively implicated in what might be achieved in a trioethnography? For both of you, English is an additional language, one whose global reach and power compels its acquisition, especially for academic careers. What kinds of translingual, microdialogues take place for you? I pose this question reminded of Rajagopalan’s (2004) insightful article on emotion and language politics, in which he explores the affective inventories and burdens—what can and cannot be said—across bilingual speakers’ repertoires. It was fascinating that his article began with the example of a fluently bilingual Guarani-Portuguese teacher in Ruberval’s home state of Mato Grosso do Sul. As retold by Rajagopalan, when speaking Portuguese, the teacher’s commitment and responsibility for promises made was greatly reduced, in part, reflecting a legacy of colonial experience for Indigenous Brazilians. Of course, I am not suggesting any subtle deceit or decolonial retribution from either of you (imagine another winking emoji here), but I am curious about your translingual experiences in relation to CAL and the microdialogic process that is an inherent element of a duoethnography. For example, are there “feeling rules” that you perceive, negotiate or trans-



gress in an English-Medium trioethnography?

*Anwar:* This is an interesting point! It might be true that most bi/multilingual speakers have a mechanism of ordering their languages in terms of affective closeness and distance. Unlike the teacher reported in Rajagopalan (2004), I do not recall a situation where my use of English as a second language made me less committed to the promises I made or to my moral obligations for others. However, I do remember instances where I purposely used English when I had to talk about a topic that was considered taboo in the society where I grew up in Bangladesh. In other words, using English words was a way of avoiding a feeling of embarrassment. My interlocutors knew the English words I used and there was no problem for effective communication. Yet, I did not feel as embarrassed as I would if I used Bengali words to talk about those taboo topics. So, anecdotally, I would agree with Dewaele and Pavlenko's claim that "the two languages of an individual may differ in their emotional impact" (as quoted in Rajagopalan, 2004, p. 106).

In the context of an English-medium duo/trioethnography, I am less concerned with the different emotional impact of my second language than my search for the "right" words in this language. My constant worry about not finding the right words and the possibility of sending a wrong message works as a metaphor and as a reminder. It is a metaphor for the inadequacy of language to fully express what I mean. And, it is a reminder of the kind of intellectual, emotional, and physical labour that I need to expend when I am communicating with my co-ethnographers. Not being entirely sure and constantly trying to find a more accurate word also reminds me of the importance of mindful listening and a genuine effort to understand the other. This relates to my concern for teaching language for democratic citizenship and the processual and dispositional components of dialogue necessary for such citizenship. Participation in an English-medium duo/trioethnography gives me an opportunity to get better at both microdialogues with self and dialogues with social others. I hope that my constant search for more accurate words in a second language will translate into my willingness, patience and sincerity to understand the perspectives of others in pedagogical, social and political contexts.

*Ruberval:* I think that Rajagopalan's (2014) paper is very inspiring and gives us the opportunity to talk about bi/multilingual speakers and the relationship with affect. Similar to Anwar, I do not remember an experience where the use of English made me more or less committed to a specific feeling rule. As Rajagopalan's example was from one of his Brazilian PhD researchers working with indigenous communities, I also have an MA student who raised similar aspects when researching the border of Brasil-Paraguai. One of the Paraguayan trilingual immigrants, who has lived in Brazil for more than 50 years, reported that some aspects of meaning making in Guarani could not be expressed in Portuguese. During the Covid-19 pandemic period, she was asked what situations and expressions are not translatable

across the three languages she speaks. To illustrate this, the following sentence - *Oñemboé, Jesú oñenöty jaguepe, ha chupekuera Jesu oyeichaucá tenonderá, oikogueyevy* - was chosen by the speaker because its meaning and emotional intensity in Portuguese or Spanish was not the same as in Guarani (Santos & Maciel, 2021). This same speaker also reports that the word *camby* (milk) does not have the same affective representation in Portuguese. When pronouncing the word *camby*, she says it even has a different taste. So, in order to understand it, as Rajagopalan (2004) points out, it is important to question the underlying rationality of emotional distrust in Western thought and look at alternative epistemologies that counter this logic. Rajagopalan (2004, p. 106) claims that "ordinary people attach a great amount of emotional value to their language. Indeed, languages are powerful flags of allegiance. Bi-multilingual speakers typically have different degrees of emotional attachment to their languages that make up their repertoires".

I think it is worth revisiting how we compare and contrast feelings and meanings here. Feeling involves a more sensorial or embodied relationship to the world, whereas meaning is more closely associated with signification, the moment when something starts to have a representation for the subject (Maciel & Pereira, 2020). For Lemke (2015), both meaning and feeling can be characterized as situated, distributed, active and specific to each culture. So, for the trilingual immigrant in our study, her preference for the Guarani language does not reflect a lack of Portuguese in her specific linguistic repertoire. Instead, it reflects the unique meanings and feelings she experiences when she prays or drinks milk in Guarani.

### 3. Implications for Critical Affective Literacies and Democratic Pedagogies

*Anwar:* The kind of learning needed for democratic pedagogy is often ignored or forgotten in conventional approaches to EAP. While democratic pedagogy may be understood from several perspectives, I am particularly interested in two of such perspectives: deliberative and affective. Deliberative democracy is based on a political theory that maintains that political decisions should be made through reasonable discussions and debate by citizens. It is assumed that citizens would prioritize the collective good over self-interest. Here, the process of deliberation is as important as the outcome of deliberation. In theory, a deliberative approach to democracy is our best hope to save the world from such catastrophes as climate change, widening gap between the rich and the poor, increasing xenophobia, and intolerance for different ideas. However, a heavy emphasis on reason/rationality in democratic deliberation remains to be a challenge. As Sant (2019) wrote, participants in deliberative processes usually "commit themselves to the values of rationality and impartiality, seeking the best collective reasons" (p. 667). However, as

we have seen in recent events such as the presidential election campaigns in the United States and anti-vaccine campaigns in many countries such as Brazil, citizens attach their arguments more to their emotions than to scientific reason and empirical evidence. This tendency is a significant barrier to developing scientifically literate citizenry. Therefore, I concur with those political thinkers who are arguing for more attention to affect and emotions in theorizing and practicing democracy – in the classroom and the wider society (see e.g., Groenendyk, 2011; Marcus, 2002; Neblo, 2020). Such an attention to emotion in democratic politics has important implications for democratic pedagogy in educational contexts (e.g., Zembylas, 2020, 2021).

*Brian:* I agree. Attention to emotion seems more crucial than ever for democratic life. As your recent examples from the USA and Brazil show, strong feelings can quickly overwhelm effective public decision making (e.g., COVID-19 immunization), especially when communal differences of opinion are provoked and intensified by unprincipled politicians. I always thought that Mouffe's (2013, p. 13) theory of "agonistic pluralism" was an important effort to bridge affect and reason in liberal democratic societies marked by strong divisions and conflicting interests. Her proposal to treat political opponents as adversaries to debate (an agonistic orientation) rather than enemies to be destroyed (an antagonistic orientation) would appear essential for deliberative purposes, yet recent developments in Brazil and the USA suggest that even these basic principles are too idealistic to address the potency of affect in public life. A transdisciplinary dialogue with political thinkers on ways to best merge emotion and reason in theory and practice seems promising and would build on earlier work on critical ELT citizenship practices in local and global contexts (Andreotti & Pashby, 2013; Fleming & Morgan, 2011; Monte Mór & Morgan, 2014). One major challenge I see relates to the earlier quote from Curato et al. (2017) on the complexity of deliberation related to its combination of both dispositional and procedural elements. Whereas procedural elements fit neatly into linear models of formal curricula (i.e., the timed accumulation of discrete units of knowledge), the timescales involved in fostering democratic dispositions, including an enhanced affective awareness, do not. Indeed, this type of dispositional learning may take place recursively, experientially, and long after the actual classroom lessons and assignments have been completed. In this regard, it's interesting to note that one of Bondy and Johnson's (2020) recommendations for CAL in pre-service programs includes service-learning opportunities to "cultivate a deeper understanding of the communities in which their students live, as well as empower them to confront injustices and cultivate socially just practices" (p. 362). The timescales and interactivity required to support this type of understanding may be even more difficult in EAP settings, where existing beliefs regarding the scope and function of EAP would pose significant obstacles.

*Ruberval:* I completely agree, Brian and Anwar. I believe

that these democratic constraints in education are due to mainstream views in the different contexts already mentioned above. As bell hooks (2020, p. 56) warns us, "without a decolonizing mentality, students coming from deprived contexts often find it difficult to succeed in educational institutions of the culture of the dominant." Alternatively, she advocates that "we must seek every opportunity to decolonize our minds and the minds of our students [...] since minds in search of freedom teach to transgress and transform" (p. 59). In Brazil, it is a challenge to think and feel otherwise as the new national policy (Brasil, 2018) relies on teaching by a predictable/pre-established list of abilities and competencies. These policies promote mechanisms that can reproduce language hierarchies, marginalize and exclude minority groups, and create one-size-fits-all national standards. They certainly restrict the kinds of democratic beliefs and deliberative abilities students need to develop.

*Anwar:* Brian, Ruberval, I am glad that you both pointed to the need for an awareness of both procedural and dispositional elements of deliberation. Ruberval's example from Brazil reminds us of how policies and curricula (i.e., formalized procedures and structures) can be coopted and normalized in ways that reproduce existing inequalities and restrict the deliberative skills needed to counter them. This reminds me of Luke's (Garcia, Luke, & Seglem, 2018) reflection on the New London Group's (1996) work and his emphasis on "acquiring a disposition" for critical literacy. I agree that curricula and pedagogies of formal education have focused more on the procedural than on the dispositional. And, this is where a critical affective approach to literacy can make a contribution.

*Brian:* Yes, Luke's call for a shift from pedagogical design (cf. New London Group) to dispositional development is clearly within the scope of CAL as well as language teacher identity work. When I think of conceptualizing dispositions, I am also reminded of Bourdieu's work on *habitus*, a mediating construct between structure and agency, not unlike Ahmed's sociality of emotions raised earlier. As described by Bourdieu's collaborator, Loïc Wacquant (2016), a person's *habitus* reflects a sociosymbolic internalization "in the form of lasting *dispositions*, or trained capacities and patterned propensities to think, feel and act in determinate ways, which in turn guide them in their creative responses to the constraints and solicitations of their extant milieu" (p. 65, emphasis included). This perspective on creativity within/through constraint is indicative of the regulatory milieu of a university and the curricular challenges we face in developing CAL for democratic deliberation beyond the classroom.

*Anwar:* In the context of my EAP teaching at the post-secondary level, there are several challenges to teaching for democratic deliberation from an affective perspective, e.g., teaching discrete set of skills within short calendrical time frames. Another example, related more to the curricular than the administrative aspect, is the field's obsession with teaching argumentative writing. For me, the problem is not the genre of argumentative writing, but the way it is usually



taught. Many colleagues passionately teach argumentative writing because, they believe, students who are unable to present arguments in persuasive ways may be excluded from democratic decision making and deliberative processes. In other words, these students may not be taken seriously by others. Hence, a general consensus is that second language “writers need to learn how to write quality arguments” (Hirvela, 2017, p. 70). However, the question that remains to be answered is: What does “quality argument” mean? One of the hallmarks of quality argument in our field is the effective use of a model developed by the British philosopher Stephen Toulmin (1958). The fundamental elements of Toulmin’s model are claim, qualifiers, reasons/evidence, warrants, and backing. Lunsford, Ruszkiewicz, and Walters (2019) articulated the relationship among these elements in this way: “My claim is true, to a qualified degree, because of the following reasons which make sense if you consider the warrant, backed by these additional reasons” (p. 143). My worry about this tradition of teaching argumentative writing is that it promotes myside bias<sup>[2]</sup>. James Southworth (2020) has recently raised a similar concern about teaching argumentative writing. He believes that argumentative writing “stifles open-mindedness” and it does not “challenge students to confront key cognitive biases when engaging in moral, political and social topics” (p. 44). While I do not wish to generalize Southworth’s observation to all contexts of teaching argumentative writing, my overall assessment of teaching this genre of academic writing is in line with his observation and concern.

*Brian:* I share your worry about myside bias in argumentative writing. Maybe expository writing as well. It seems like we are preparing lawyers-in-waiting, amoral wordsmiths who, not coincidentally, are over-represented in our hyper-partisan “democratic” politics.

#### 4. CAL Exemplars

*Brian:* From this vantage point in the article, I have to say that our trioethnography has ventured along theoretical pathways I would not have predicted in the beginning. As in the past, this has directed me towards new readings to fill in gaps and rethink ideas before responding. Is it extra work? Yes! But it is also a pleasure and at times a revelation, or A-ha moment (see Bruz et al. 2021), which has its own affective rewards. Though critical affective literacies and duoethnographic research have been prominent dialogue topics, other key issues around affect, democracy and de-

liberation have arisen and garnered rigorous discussion, particularly as related to schooling. On that latter note, let us now choose aspects of our discussions above and show how they have informed and inspired specific innovative practices (i.e., curricula, lesson plans, assignments), mindful of what Cummins (2021) describes as “consequential validity”, the key role of teacher knowledge, experience and agency in assessing the paradigmatic relevance of theory and research, which would include affect/emotion in applied linguistics and language teaching. We have three pedagogical domains

to consider: English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English for Medical Purposes (EMP), Language Teacher Education (LTE). Who would like to start?

*Anwar:* I will go first. I will give you an example of how I used duoethnography to respond to the problem of argumentative essay writing that I mentioned earlier. I was concerned about myside bias in the ways the genre of an argumentative essay is usually taught. I thought that the extraordinary information overload and antagonistic polarization in social and political fields had only worsened myside bias and posed a threat to nurturing democratic disposition and practices. Against

this backdrop, I believed that duoethnography as a method of inquiry would be a potentially transformative way of teaching writing in my EAP context. My premise was that thinking alone and thinking with others are two different ways of knowing the world and making decisions about matters that have consequences for individual and collective lives. Thinking with others is a necessary condition for democratic disposition. As Mercier and Landemore (2012) wrote, “When people reason on their own, there is a real danger that the ever-present confirmation bias will not be balanced through the presence of other individuals defending different opinions” (p. 251). Therefore, I turned to duoethnography for its polyvocal and dialogic character. I wanted to explore how duoethnography could be pedagogically useful to address the problem of traditional argumentative writing, i.e., teaching students how to support their prior beliefs and refute anticipatory counter-arguments, instead of understanding the complexities of a given topic and challenging others’ as well as their own ideas and beliefs (Southworth, 2020). Challenging self-beliefs is necessary for democratic deliberation in a world divided by ideological lines. I hoped that duoethnography would be helpful in the context of my teaching as it aims to develop and promote “higher forms of consciousness” (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 13).

I developed a major inquiry assignment (worth 20% of the final grade) for a course entitled: *ESL1200: Society*

“Thinking alone and thinking with others are two different ways of knowing the world and making decisions about matters that have consequences for individual and collective lives”

[2] “Myside bias occurs when people evaluate evidence, generate evidence, and test hypotheses in a manner biased toward their own prior opinions and attitudes” (Stanovich, West., & Toplak, 2013, p. 259).

*and Culture*. The key goal of this course is to provide an introduction to the major topics in the social sciences for undergraduate students from an ESL background. In addition to teaching content in psychology, anthropology and sociology, I endeavoured to develop students' English language communication skills essential for academic success at the university level. In this course, I took an interdisciplinary approach to curriculum design and teaching and aimed to foster students' critical thinking about contemporary social issues and enhance their understanding of rhetorical patterns and styles. This course was approved as a social science general education course in the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies at York University.

This assignment was a collaborative research and writing project. Two students worked together and chose a topic (e.g., conformity, collective behaviour, and gender identity) from the assigned course readings. Together, they developed a research question and completed the project in three steps:

*Step 1 (5%): Literature review and outline:* Students conducted a review of contemporary literature to find answer(s) to their research question. Then they prepared and submitted an outline of their findings and opinions, following the Toulmin model of argument. This step was completed individually. Each student submitted their outline separately.

The reason for asking them to complete this step separately was to see if their ideas and arguments would change after they engaged in duoethnographic writing and presentation in the next steps.

*Step 2 (10%): Research paper:* Two students worked together and wrote a research paper following the method of duoethnography. They were instructed to utilize the principles of duoethnographic dialogue in their research and writing. I also explained how collaborative writing is usually done and its benefits in academic and professional contexts (e.g., Storch, 2019). I encouraged students to write their collaborative paper using Google Drive or Microsoft OneDrive.

*Step 3 (5%): Oral presentation:* In this final step, both students gave an oral presentation, reflecting on their duoethnographic research project. I asked them to focus on two specific components: content transformation and linguistic awareness. After introducing their research topic, they discussed how their ideas and arguments have changed, evolved, or transformed during and after completing the duoethnographic project. They compared their ideas and arguments in the research paper with those in their Toulmin outline (completed in Step 1). They also discussed their awareness of linguistic structures and rhetorical patterns and how they have used academic writing conventions such as expressing ideas, reporting content, and attributing sources of information.

While listening to students' presentations, I was particularly interested in how the perspectives of their collaborator brought a new lens to their own reflective thinking. In other words, I wanted to know how the voice of the other had been helpful, or other-

wise, to interrogate their myside biases.

A key insight from my observation is that the duoethnographic project provided the students many opportunities to engage in dialogues with their collaborator who often held different opinions about the topic of their research. While it was not true for all students in my class, some of them found duoethnography as a productive site for effective engagement with ideas that have important implications for social imaginaries of our time. For example, two students chose the topic of false memory and how language, misinformation, and negative feelings are used in manipulative ways to generate false memories. These students used eyewitness testimony in the courtroom as a major point of discussion, but they also drew from their personal experience of remembering and how they use memory to understand controversial issues such as the judicial system's overreliance on memory. In their research paper and oral presentation, I noticed a kind of thinking where the students took steps forward and backward. The kind of recursivity that I noticed does not mean that these students were not engaging in progressive thinking. Quite the contrary. Their thinking was "slow" because they were self-critical and conscious of their own thinking, which was constantly being shaped by the thinking of their collaborator. Thus, the duoethnographic dialogues worked as a kind of "checks and balance" in the students' critical reflection and affective assessment of their lived experiences of remembering and how memory needs to be re-thought in the context of determining "facts" from the past so that the future can be imagined in more just and equitable ways. Another feature of duoethnography that contributed to the CAL principles of my pedagogy was the students' courage to be vulnerable, as they revealed life-histories, interrogated deep seated beliefs and, at the same time, trusted each other in the "risky" act of unsettling positionalities. Based on my observations, I would like to say that duoethnography has the potential to be an enabler of critical reflective pedagogy in post-secondary EAP contexts. Such an approach to pedagogy may allow for meaning-making beyond acquisition of mis/information and facilitate both the procedural and dispositional components of democratic deliberation.

*Brian:* That's a really innovative pedagogical use of duoethnography. The affective dimension is also really interesting. Students are not often encouraged to see their vulnerabilities as sources of new learning, especially in argumentative writing where truth claims are linguistically asserted or carefully hedged. I could see this assignment being adapted to other applied linguistics courses dealing with language and the law or education courses that look at pedagogies of commemoration.

My CAL exemplar is the Issues Analysis Project (IAP), which is a final assignment in both pre-service LTE and graduate Applied Linguistics courses I have taught. As I have described elsewhere (Morgan, 2016), the IAP asks students to develop a "blueprint for action" (e.g., a new policy, advocacy initiative, curriculum innovation, spe-

cialized materials, workshop for teachers and/or program administrators) based on a sociopolitical or identity-based gap/bias in the ELT field. These blueprints—or deliberative genres, following our dialogue above—can be seen as field-internal resources for the performance or mobilization of affect/emotion in support of social justice initiatives (e.g., Morgan, 2016; Benesch, 2020). By field-internal I refer to the kinds of oral and written texts (this article being an example) that enable us to be taken seriously by professional colleagues, whose support and collaboration are essential for any kind of workplace or community change to occur. These genres/blueprints are never easy to master, so a lot of class time has been devoted to their effective organization and delivery. The fact that I still feel nervous at conference presentations reminds me of the emotion labour involved in our desire to be professionally accepted and the anxiety that accompanies such efforts.

I'd like to briefly describe an IAP created by a doctoral student, Stephanie Kinzie, in my Language and Social Identity graduate course. Stephanie, an experienced adult ESL instructor in Toronto, decided to create a workshop for ESL instructors on how to read a popular ESL coursebook, *Discover Canada*, from the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis as well as the Final Report and Calls for Action from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) on the legacy of the residential school system for Indigenous children.<sup>[3]</sup> Excerpts of the TRC report were required readings in the course. Stephanie's workshop included background discussion of Indigenous peoples in Canada, the TRC report, representation of Indigenous perspectives in *Discover Canada*, and a set of discourse analytic activities that could be adapted to adult ESL settings. Stephanie presented her workshop at a regional TESL conference and has recently revised it as a journal article manuscript (Kinzie, in press), which she asked me to review. After my review I asked Stephanie to reflect on the affective/emotional dimensions of her IAP and shared a few related articles cited in this paper (e.g., Ahmed & Morgan, 2021; Anwaruddin, 2016; Morgan, Rocha, & Maciel, 2021). Below are a few of her responses.

Adult ESL texts such as *Discover Canada* are not just about L2 acquisition. They are also resources for moulding new citizens within the nation-state's dominant ideological frames and historical narratives. The mobilization of affect in such texts is key for the kinds of questions Stephanie's IPA encourages: i.e., What should newcomers know and *feel* about Canada's Indigenous peoples? What future citizenship responsibilities are implicated as a result? As Stephanie notes, the stories represented in *Discover Canada* serve as "objects of emotions ... [that] move and circulate in public domains and move readers toward or away" (Anwaruddin, 2016, p. 389) from particular affiliations and emotional investments:

Is feeling negative emotion (hate, fear, uncertainty) towards a person or object better or worse than feeling no emotion? Discover Canada wants its audience to feel positively towards Canada, negatively towards barbaric outsiders, and neutral/nothing towards Indigenous peoples. Perhaps readers will feel these things as they read, but are they aware of these emotions or why they arise? I wasn't, especially regarding the "nothing" focus on Indigenous peoples, until I started analyzing the text. Bringing attention to the deliberate techniques used to move readers toward or away from objects of emotion can help language teachers and learners actively decide how to feel about such objects rather than being passively swept up in the author's intentions. (Stephanie Kinzie, personal communication).

The silences of a text are as important as its stated propositions. As Stephanie suggests, the affective invisibility of Indigenous issues and perspectives in *Discover Canada* mirrors the continued indifference and inaction on longstanding Indigenous grievances on land claims, language rights, and appropriate reparation for the victims of residential schools in the country. Bringing attention to these issues—and deliberate language choices involved—should be a required component of adult ESL instruction. Stephanie's IAP provides a concrete approach to this "gap" in the field. It is a strong example of the kinds of critical citizenship work we have been exploring in our trioethnography on CAL.

The design affordances of this assignment, I believe, support the kinds of field-internal, mobilizations of affect that students might develop. At the same time, the IAP can constrain what might be created, perhaps conveying its own "feeling rules" and "emotion labour" for students, as indicated in Stephanie's recent reflections on her IAP experience. As she noted, the assignment's targeting of ideological gaps/biases in the field, as well as assigned course readings that illuminate the same, encouraged an exclusive focus on negative affect in her discourse analysis of *Discover Canada*. "DC became this kind of villain, and I tended to lose sight of the fact that it is meeting a need (as a citizenship study guide) for a diverse population, and there are limits to what and how information is presented" (ibid.). As course instructor, I take some responsibility for the villainy provoked and see it as a learning opportunity for revising and improving the IAP.

*Ruberval:* My CAL exemplar goes into another disciplinary direction. I chose my CAL experience with medical students. In the last 5 years, I have taught English for Medical Purposes (EMP) (Skelton, 2013), and I have also supervised research which focuses on language and health, more specifically. We have been interested in how language plays an important role in humanizing medicine. So, instead of focusing on special time clock skills, we are interested in those affect-

[3] Stephanie's IAP is specifically based on Call to Action 93: "We call upon the federal government, in collaboration with the national Aboriginal organizations, to revise the information kit for newcomers to Canada and its citizenship test to reflect a more inclusive history of the diverse Aboriginal peoples of Canada, including information about the Treaties and the history of residential schools" (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015, pp. 10-11).



tive aspects that emerge from the experience. Revisiting Menezes de Souza (2021), the incompleteness and transformation of people depend on the material conditions of the people we interact with. I believe it is timely to restate that the modern world is quite marked by rationality and, with that, affect is left behind. It is important to say that the ability to affect and to be affected is what makes us human. Therefore, I consider it extremely important that medical students understand the dimensions of affections.

Since Spinoza, affect has been linked to the verb to affect - what affects me and what moves me (either positively or negatively). In this direction, and also based on Safatle's (2016) circuit of affects, I have asked medical students to consider the following issues: How are we affected by the visible, the sensitive, and the perceptible? (i.e. what do we feel, live, perceive or not perceive?) How do I react to these experiences? How do I relate these issues to the choice of being a doctor? My experience with medical students has shown that the ability to affect and be affected sometimes is not perceived initially because their dominant training and worldview can limit them from experiencing other possibilities. As an example of CAL, one of my medical students tried to analyse two medical spaces in a maternity ward, the surgery and the delivery rooms, as two multisemiotic and affective translingual experiences. Instead of adopting the conventional dichotomies of verbal/non verbal communication, I introduced the student to several post-structural concepts related to spatial repertoires, semiotic assemblages, body without organs, and affective repertoires, among others (Maciel & Rocha, 2020). This introduction or intervention is not causally direct nor linear but instead reflects a process of becoming. My main focus was on unpredictable forms of medical learning/experiencing that could emerge - how the students and I could affect and be affected from this experience. It is important to highlight, as we have above, that the goal was not just emotional self-discovery but also emotional, social awareness of patient vulnerability in these often hostile medical spaces, where feelings of fear, anxiety, pain are more evident and not just symptoms of biological bodies. Below are excerpts from a student's final report that illustrate his emergent, critical understanding of the presence of affect in pre-service medical education:

#### General Perceptions:

Dalmo: I started paying attention to aspects not seen before in space and including myself as part of it. The same patient in different contexts can have different perceptions and the medical professional inserted in this space must be aware that the possibilities of constructed perceptions are satisfactory for the patient. I was able to broaden my view in the health environment, allowing me to consider human dimensions of meanings situated in a context of multiple aspects [...] and improve my care in a more welcoming and human way; I no longer restrict communication to only verbal and non-verbal categories, as I had previously conceived, before the beginning of this research.

In the operating room:

Dalmo: Depending on the team in the operating room, and also on the patient's previous relationship with the doctor, for example, information [for patients] about procedural steps, such as "we're almost finished; is everything ok" and questions like "are you sleepy?" are provided more often in order to achieve soothing effects for the patient at the time.

In the delivery room:

Dalmo: [...] emotionally supporting the patient with words of encouragement: "you've come far, it's just a while more"; "you're very strong". These words were used in multimodal ways combined with eye contact and soothing touch to ease the patient's experience of childbirth. At the end of her labor, the patient thanked me, stressing that she would not have been able to do it without such support. It is commonly believed that patients are successful in their labor based solely on the availability of adequate medical resources; however, adding other modalities of care [i.e. empathy and touch] seems to bring unique meanings of strength and pain tolerance to the patient at that time.

From those excerpts, I have tried to illustrate that CAL could be expanded to another disciplinary field such as medicine. It is a very complex accomplishment that is not achieved as a set of goals or skills as represented in a more traditional curriculum. In a sense, this complexity is a common feature across all of our examples, which involve dispositions and forms of learning that are initiated in classroom settings but often realized or accomplished long after the formal lesson has been completed.

## 5. Conclusion

Our trioethnography has taken us through familiar places as well as several undiscovered gems along the way. Our focus on affect/emotion in applied linguistics seems to have encompassed both familiarity and discovery, in part, as a result of the risk-taking that duoethnographic guidelines encourage. Another part, though, may be the larger context of global and local crises beyond our classroom and a collective desire to make our language teaching and research relevant to their mitigation. As Pennycook (2021) reminds us, "issues of language sit at the heart of forms of inequality" (p. 21), compelling us to seek out changes in how we conceptualize and organize our language practices. We recognize that there are multiple avenues to address these disparities. We believe that a critical affective literacy (Anwaruddin, 2016) holds much promise, alerting us to the emotional bridges and barriers that make dialogue possible or prevent its occurrence in the deliberative settings of public life. This is especially pertinent to citizenship and the cultivation of dispositional and procedural qualities that underpin democratic life.

In duoethnography, conclusions ultimately reside with readers and what they find relevant for their own practice. Towards that end, we have offered three classroom examples for consideration (i.e., emulation, debate, or critique): an EAP class in which duoethnography fostered dialogic engagement in an L2 writing assignment; an Issues Analysis project in which affect and emotion shaped critical reading skills for pre-service/in-service language

teachers; an English for Medical Purposes program in which critical affective literacy provided medical students with a more holistic and empathetic understanding of patients' needs and experiences. Our experiences here have shown us that duo/trioethnography offers a surplus of seeing and feeling. We hope that our efforts enhance and enrich our field's current interest in how affect and emotion intersect with language pedagogies.

## REFERÊNCIAS

- AHMED, A.; MORGAN, B. 2021. Postmemory and multilingual identities in English Language Teaching: a duoethnography. *Language Learning Journal*, **49**(4):483-498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2021.1906301>
- AHMED, S. 2004. Collective feelings: or, the impressions left by others. *Theory, Culture & Society*, **21**(2):25-4. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276404042133>
- AHMED, S. 2015. *The cultural politics of emotion*. 2 ed., New York, Routledge, 276 p.
- ANDREOTTI, V.; PASHBY, B. 2013. Digital democracy and global citizenship education: Mutually compatible or mutually complicit? *The Educational Forum*, **77**:422-437. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2013.822043>
- ANWARUDDIN, S. 2016. Why critical literacy should turn to 'the affective turn': making a case for critical affective literacy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, **37**(3):381-396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2015.1042429>
- BARBOSA, D. A.; MACIEL, R. F. 2019. Clampeando o cordão: A maternidade como um espaço multissemiótico de (des)construção de sentidos. *Letras & Letras*, [S. l.], **35**(n. especial):28-52. <https://doi.org/10.14393/LL63-v35nEsp2019-2>
- BELL HOOKS, 2020. *Ensinando pensamento crítico: sabedoria prática*. Trad. Bhuvi Libiano. São Paulo: Elefante, 288 p.
- BENESCH, S. 2020. Emotions and activism: English language teachers' emotion labor as responses to institutional power. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, **17**(1):26-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2020.1716194>
- BONDY, J. M.; JOHNSON, B. E. 2020. Critical affect literacy: a call to action in a Trump administration. *Action in Teacher Education*, **42**(4):354-367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2019.1675200>
- BRUZ, I.; MOURA, G.; MACIEL, R. F.; MARTIN, I.; MORGAN, B. 2021. Transglocality in English language teacher education: A transnational polyethnography of the Glendon D-TEIL experience in Cuba. In: O. Z. BARNAWI; A. AHMED (eds.), *TESOL teacher education in a transnational world*. New York, Routledge, p. 191-208. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003008668-12>
- CARCASSON, M. 2013. Rethinking civic engagement on campus: the overarching potential of deliberative practice. Available at: <https://cpd.colostate.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/07/carcasson-rethinking-civic-engagement-on-campus-hex-version.pdf>. Accessed on: 05/08/21.
- CUMMINS, J. 2021. *Rethinking the Education of Multilingual Learners: A Critical Analysis of Theoretical Concepts*. Bristol, Multilingual Matters, 464 p. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800413597>
- CURATO, N.; DRYZEK, J. S.; ERCAN, S. A.; HENDRIKS, C. M.; NIEMEYER, S. 2017. Twelve key findings in deliberative democracy research. *Daedalus*, **146**(3):28-38. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED\\_a\\_00444](https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_00444)
- DUBOC, A. P.; FERRAZ, D. M. 2021. Language, literacy, and education in times of crises: 'introductory' notes. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, **21**(2):295-30. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-6398202118256>
- EMERSON, C. 1997. *The First Hundred Years of Mikhail Bakhtin*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 293 p. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691187037>
- FLEMING, D.; MORGAN, B. 2011. Discordant anthems: ESL and critical citizenship education. *Citizenship Education Research*, **1**:28-40.
- GARCIA, A.; LUKE, A.; SEGLEM, R. 2018. Looking at the next 20 years of multiliteracies: a discussion with Allan Luke. *Theory Into Practice*, **57**(1):72-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1390330>

- GEERTZ, C. 1985. *Local knowledge: further essays in interpretive anthropology*. New York, Basic Books, 256 p.
- GKONOU, C.; MILLER, E. R. 2021. An exploration of language teacher reflection, emotion labor, and emotional capital. *TESOL Quarterly*, **55**(1):134-155. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.580>
- GROENENDYK, E. 2011. Current emotion research in political science: How emotions help democracy overcome its collective action problem. *Emotion Review*, **3**(4):455-463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073911410746>
- HIRVELA, A. 2017. Argumentation & second language writing: Are we missing the boat? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, **36**:69-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.002>
- HOCHSCHILD, A. R. 2008. Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. In: M. GRECO; P. STENNER (eds.), *Emotions: A Social Science Reader*. New York, Routledge, p. 121-126.
- KOLBERT, E. 2017. Why facts don't change our minds: new discoveries about the human mind show the limitations of reason. *The New Yorker*. Available at: <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/02/27/why-facts-dont-change-our-minds>. Accessed on: 25/08/21.
- HABERMAS, J. 1990. Discourse ethics: notes on a program of philosophical justification. In: C. LENHARDT; S.W. NICHOLSEN. *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, trans. Cambridge, MIT Press, p. 43-115.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K.; HASAN, R. 1985. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 126 p.
- KINZIE, S. in press. Acknowledge the past, face the present, change the future: implementing Call to Action 93 in TESL classrooms. *Critical Education*.
- LEMKE, J. 2015. Feeling and meaning: a unitary bio-semiotic account. In: P. P. TRIFONIS (Ed.), *International Handbook of Semiotics*, p. 589-616. Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9404-6\\_27](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9404-6_27)
- LOCKHART, T.; GLASCOTT, B.; WARNICK, C.; PARRISH, J. 2021. Introduction. In: T. LOCKHART; B. GLASCOTT; C. WARNICK; J. PARRISH; J. LEWIS (eds.), *Literacy and Pedagogy in an Age of Misinformation and Disinformation*. Anderson, Parlor Press, p. 1-16.
- LUNSFORD, A; RUSZKIEWICZ, J; WALTERS, K. 2019. *Everything's an argument*. 8 ed. Boston, Bedford/St. Martin's, 814 p.
- MACIEL, R. F.; PEREIRA, F. G. 2020. As dinâmicas das linguagens para além das fronteiras linguísticas e semióticas: diálogos entre multimodalidade e translanguagem em contextos médicos. In: N. GOMES; R. F. MACIEL; V. L. BARBOSA (orgs.). *Olhares Sobre os Textos: Verbal e Não Verbal*. Rio de Janeiro: UERJ, p. 31-58.
- MACIEL, R. F.; ROCHA, C.H. 2020. Dialogues on translingual research and practice: weaving threads with Suresh Canagarajah's views. *Revista X*, **15**:7-31. <https://doi.org/10.5380/rvx.v15i1>
- MARCUS, G. E. 2002. *The Sentimental Citizen: Emotion in Democratic Politics*. University Park, Penn State University Press, 184 p.
- MERCIER, H; LANDEMORE, H. 2012. Reasoning is for arguing: understanding the successes and failures of deliberation. *Political Psychology*, **33**(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00873.x>
- MORGAN, B. 2016. Language teacher identity and the domestication of dissent: an exploratory account. *TESOL Quarterly*, **50**(3):708-734. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.316>
- MORGAN, B.; MARTIN, I.; MACIEL, R. F. 2019. The Walkyria effect: inspiring transnational language teacher education. *Pensares em revista*, **15**:8-21.
- MORGAN, B.; CLARKE, M. 2011. Identity in second language teaching and learning. In: E. HINKEL (ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2). New York, Routledge, p. 817-836.
- MORGAN, B.; ROCHA, C. H.; MACIEL, R. F. 2021. Literacies in times of crisis: a trioethnography on affective and transgressive practices. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, **21**(2):333-369. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-6398202118068>
- MONTE MÓR, W.; MORGAN, B. 2014. Between conformity and critique. Teaching volunteerism, 'activism' and active citizenship: dangerous pedagogies? *Interfaces Brasil-Canadá*, **14**(2):16-35.
- MOUFFE, C. 2013. *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically*. London, Verso, 177 p.
- NEBLO, M. A. 2020. Impassioned democracy: the roles of emotion in deliberative theory. *American Political Science Review*, **114**(3):923-927. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055420000210>



- NEW LONDON GROUP. 1996. A pedagogy of multiliteracies: designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, **66**(1):60-92. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.66.1.17370n-67v22j160u>
- NORRIS, J.; SAWYER, R. D. 2012. Toward a dialogic methodology. In: J. NORRIS; R. D. SAWYER; D. LUND. (eds.). *Duoethnography: Dialogic Methods for Social, Health, and Educational Research*. Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press, p. 9-39.
- NORRIS, J.; SAWYER, R. D. 2017. Introduction: The efficacy of duoethnography in teaching and learning: a return to its roots. In: J. NORRIS; R. D. SAWYER (eds.), *Theorizing Curriculum Studies, Teacher Education, through Duoethnographic Pedagogy*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan, p. 1-14. [https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51745-6\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51745-6_1)
- OTT, B. L. 2017. Affect in critical studies. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.56>
- PENNYCOOK, A. 2021. *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Re-Introduction*. 2 ed. New York, Routledge, 220 p. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003090571>
- RAJAGOPALAN, K. 2004. Emotion and Language Politics: the Brazilian case. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, **25**(2&3):105-122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630408666524>
- SAFATLE, V. 2016. *O circuito dos afetos: corpos políticos, desamparo e o fim do indivíduo*. 2 ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 360 p.
- SANT. 2019. Democratic education: a theoretical review (2006–2017). *Review of Educational Research*, **89**(5):655–696. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319862493>
- SANTOS, F.J.; MACIEL, R. F. 2021. “É`á” soy paraguaya y vivo en Brasil: repertorios lingüísticos y prácticas translingües de inmigrantes paraguayos en Jardim- MS. *NEMITÿRÄ - Revista Multilingüe de Lengua, Sociedad y Educación*. **2**(2):80-92. <https://doi.org/10.47133/NEMITYRA>
- SKELTON, J. 2013. English for medical purposes. In: C. A. CHAPPELLE (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0379>
- SMITH, L. T. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London and New York, Zed Books, 208 p.
- SOUTHWORTH, J. 2020. The problem with argumentative writing. *University Affairs*, **61**(4):44.
- STANOVICH, K.E.; WEST, R.F.; TOPLAK, M.E. 2013. Myside bias, rational thinking, and intelligence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, **22**(4):259–264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721413480174>
- TAYLOR, C. 2004. *Modern social imaginaries*. Durham, Duke University Press, 232 p. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822385806>
- SAWYER, R. D.; LIGGETT, T. 2012. Shifting positionalities: a critical discussion of a duoethnographic inquiry of a personal curriculum of post/colonialism. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. **11**(5):628-651. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691201100507>
- TOULMIN, 1958. *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press,
- TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION OF CANADA. 2015. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to action* [PDF file]. Available at: <https://nctr.ca/about/history-of-the-trc/trc-website/>. Accessed on: 25/08/21.
- WACQUANT, L. 2016. A concise genealogy and anatomy of habitus. *The Sociological Review*, **64**(1):64–72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.12356>
- ZEMBYLAS, M. 2007. Theory and methodology in researching emotions in education. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, **30**(1):57-72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437270701207785>
- ZEMBYLAS, M. 2020. The affective atmospheres of democratic education: pedagogical and political implications for challenging right-wing populism. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2020.1858401>
- ZEMBYLAS, M. 2021. Adorno on democratic pedagogy and the education of emotions: Pedagogical insights for resisting right-wing extremism. *Policy Futures in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210320985378>