Full Length Research Paper

English Language Teachers' Representations in the Military Scope

Amanda Maria Bicudo de Souza Almeida

Professor Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of São Paulo - Campus Caraguatatuba, Brazil.
Email: amandamarya@yahoo.com.br

French Discourse Analysis has been developing in France since the 1960s, pioneered by Bachelard and Canguilhem. In this text, Glyn Williams presents an account of the emergence and development of French Discourse Analysis and the contribution which both sociology and linguistics make to the social construction of meaning. Williams seeks to develop a language based method that corresponds to the theoretical force of post-structuralism. He guides the reader through the general history of structuralism and post-structuralism before covering the different stages in the development of French Discourse Analysis between 1965 and the present. The theoretical background of this research is based on French Discourse Analysis. This research aims at identifying imaginary representations of the civil and military English teachers from *Escola de Especialistas de Aeronáutica (EEAR)*, considering their speaking activities choices to the students from the Air Traffic Control course. The analysis were made based on the theories of French Discourse Analysis and the results show that there are no differences among the English language teachers from EEAR or that, if these differences exist, they could not be noticed in their speech being not significant enough, as being a 'teacher' is the position they occupy in society.

Keywords: Imaginary representations, teachers, English language, speaking activities.

INTRODUCTION

This study has as its goal to identify and comprehend, through imaginary representations' concept, the knowledge of a group of English Language teachers from a military school – the *Escola de Especialistas de Aeronáutica (EEAR)* – taking into consideration their didactic choices of oral activities to students from Air Traffic Control course.

Glyn (1999) explained French Discourse Analysis has been developing in France since the 1960s, pioneered by Bachelard and Canguilhem. In this text, Glyn Williams presents an account of the emergence and development of French Discourse Analysis and the contribution which both sociology and linguistics make to the social construction of meaning. Williams seeks to develop a language based method that corresponds to the theoretical force of post-structuralism. He guides the reader through the general history of structuralism and post-structuralism before covering the different stages in

the development of French Discourse Analysis between 1965 and the present. The theoretical background of this research is based on French Discourse Analysis. The methodological analysis is presented having as its base the outlined theoretical framework, considering the teacher's representation and having as its corpus the evaluation instrument used during the investigation process to collect the data: a written questionnaire applied to the teachers from EEAR.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

When we talk about language, we affirm that the language subject acts in the social formation from which he belongs and he is, at the same time, influenced by it. Thus, we can say that language is marked by the discursive and ideological positioning of the enunciator

subject, as well as the enunciator subject is marked by language. Language is, in this sense, product of ideology.

According to Orlandi (1999), in French Discourse Analysis, discourse is seen as language practice, that is, studying the discourse means base this study on the word in movement, in the speech the subject produces, considering language as the mediator in the relationship between men and natural/social reality he is inserted.

Orlandi (1999) postulates that the relationship between language, discourse and ideology is the base of French Discourse Analysis. Considering discourse as ideology materiality and language as discourse materiality, we can conclude that discourse is, indeed, the object of study from this perspective, because from it the relationship between language and ideology can be observed, in order to understand how language produces senses for the subject.

About the concept of ideology, Coracini (2011) explains that French Discourse Analysis does not assume ideology in the sense of manipulation and domination postulated by Marx and Engels (apud Brandão, 1995). Unlike, ideology is considered as having a positive and productive sense, as it points to ways of seeing, being and engaging with the world, as well as with the values that provide the ethics of a social group. Ideology is the world conception of a determined social group in a historical circumstance and it is inherent to discourse. It is a significant practice, effect from the necessary relationship between subject and language.

In the discursive perspective, although language has its own order, it is relatively autonomous, as it is part of history which has its reality affected by the symbolic. This means that language is not a private property. The subject is not the owner of his words. They have sense in history and in language.

Besides analyzing what is said, French Discourse Analysis also gives sense to silence, as this perspective considers that there are senses in everything we say or in everything we do not say, because even silence is not free from interpretation. According to Santos (2012), when we say something we make choices, and in this process a lot of senses are erased, a lot of possibilities of other speeches. Thus, silence is constitutive of senses.

About the subject, Orlandi (1999) presents the language subject as being decentralized, affected by language and history, although he is not aware of their influence in his speech. The French Discourse Analysis subject is "materially divided since its constitution: he is subject to language and history, as to constitute himself, to produce senses, he is affected by them" (ORLANDI, 1999, p. 49). The subject who speaks, although he believes he is the legitimate producer of his speech and sees himself as able of achieving an only and true sense, he does not do this, as this is a necessary illusion to enunciate. Coracini (2011, p.137) points that "the apparent transparence of language is an ideological effect which makes the subject believe or have the illusion that the sense is in the words and the subject is in the origin of his speech".

In summary, French Discourse Analysis purposes us a discursive view which goes beyond the patterns adopted by other theories. In discursive approach, language is seen as practice, as it intervenes in the construction of reality. It is practical because it practices and produces senses. And the sense is history and through history the subject means himself. Orlandi (1999) says that French Discourse Analysis makes possible for us to understand that words are not linked to things/objects. Through ideology the relation between word/thing becomes possible as it establishes the relation among thought, language and world. Ideology joins subject and sense. This is the way the subject constitutes himself and the world constitutes itself.

If discourse and subject are constituted by ideology, we can affirm that it is also responsible for disseminating and constructing the imaginary representations, which guide the way we act in the world.

Santos (2012) points that imaginary representations form themselves from images people carry about themselves and about the others, based on the place they occupy in society. Considering this characteristic, it is possible to notice the reason why, from a same reading or discursive event, derives a lot of senses because of the conditions to produce the discourse. In these terms, we can conclude that when the language subject enunciates, a discursive functioning is mobilized, remitting to imaginary representations.

The representations analysis purposed in this research is extremely important because through it we can study the imaginary which guides the subjects (English teachers from a military school) in their speeches, discussing the ways how the senses are produced and better understanding what is said. We are interested in the corpus analysis considering it as something which allows us to have access to the discourse that embodies ideology.

Considerations about the process of acquisition of a foreign language according to French Discourse Analysis.

French Discourse Analysis sees the process of acquisition of a foreign language as being something extremely complex. Guilherme de Castro (2004, p.197)

explains that the complexity of this process mainly happens because of the "inevitable contradiction between the impulse towards the new and the fear of exile of these founding discourses as constitutive of his structuring as subject".

According to the author, the subject learns significantly a second language when he opens himself to the experience of his own strangeness and when he registers himself in discursive formations from the second language.

Thus, Guilherme de Castro (2004, p.197) affirms that there is a meeting between the subject and the second language, being this "one of the most visible mobilizing experiences of identity questions of the subject".

According to the named author, the language acquisition requires the establishment of a relation between subject and symbolic. "This relation is structuring of the subject with himself, with others and with knowledge". (GUILHERME DE CASTRO, 2004, p.199). Thus, the acquisition of a second language will always be permeated by the relation already established between the subject and his mother tongue.

Guilherme de Castro (2004) postulates that learn a second language means, to some extend, become another person, from this point the difficulties presented by students arise, due to the fact that they have to face, through breaks and displacements, a space of difference.

Worried about supporting students with everything they need, the teachers, most of the time, forget the fact that students, while inserted in the learning process of a second language, need some time to face their breaks and displacements in order to be able to become "the other" in the language they are learning. According to Guilherme de Castro (2004), when this time is not available to the student, feelings of threat, failure and incapacity tend to bloom during the learning process.

Revuz (1998, p.221 apud Guilherme de Castro, 2004) says that many students, when they start studying a foreign language, put themselves in a position of lack of knowledge, returning to the stage of a baby who does not speak, making the experience of the importance to be understood. "The feeling of regression associated with this situation is reinforced when the learning primes the beginning, as frequently happens in a work exclusively oral focusing sounds and rhythms".(REVUZ 1998, p.221 apud Guilherme de Castro, 2004, p.199).

The model of an ideal teacher

The theorists of the cognitive perspective, here represented by Harmer (2007) and Brown (2007) affirm that there is a model of an ideal teacher. According to Brown (2007) this teacher is the one who has technical knowledge, pedagogical skills, interpersonal abilities and personal qualities. Additionally, this teacher masters teaching strategies, performs different functions, motivates and reduces students' anxiety. To sum up, he/she is a perfect and complete professional, who seeks to achieve a totalizing knowledge.

However, as we can notice in the teachers' practice and according to French Discourse Analysis, this ideal model of learning and teaching tends to fail, because even if the teacher tries to be coherent with everything that was purposed by cognitive theory, there is a big gap between what he/she wants to do and what he/she, in fact, is able to do. This situation can be named as a mistake that is always and inevitably part of the do-say, as postulated by discursive perspective.

Mrech (2008, p.20 apud Cavallari, 2014 p.3) affirms that "while speakers subjects, passed by language, we are destined to symbolic error", as we are incomplete individuals, who always search for something that lacks to us, although we are not aware of what we really need. Cavallari (2014) explains that the incompleteness and the lack are necessary in the process of construction of knowledge, allowing it to be reinvented during the process of teaching-learning.

According to Cavallari (2014, p.2) "if there is no lack, there is no wish", the lack propels the wish of knowing. Here we find a radical difference in relation to the lack in the teaching-learning process from most of the current teaching methods and approaches which guide teachers. In the cognitive view, the teacher should provide students will all the answers they need, he/she must have a finished and updated knowledge to be transmitted in order to meet students' expectations, avoiding the lack.

In this sense, Cavallari (2014, p.4) questions: how can we raise the wish of knowing of the student if all the knowledge he needs to learn is, imaginarily, in the teacher, in the materials and in the didactic resources that he/she uses? How can the teacher transmit a finished knowledge if he/she does not have a unique knowledge?

As affirms Cavallari (2014), in the first moment, it is necessary that the student have an imaginary representation of the teacher as the holder of the knowledge he needs to acquire. However, during the learning process, it is necessary to have a separation, the teacher should demystify his/her own image of knowledge holder, allowing the student to take part effectively of his own learning process, being able to have a unique knowledge and to transform his knowledge.

Costa (2012, p.29) points that the relationship

between teacher-student puts in scene two wishes: the wish of teaching and the wish of knowing. According to the author, the teacher plays the role assigned by society that he/she has what he/she supposes is lacking in the other. He assumes the position of subject-supposed-knowledge who carries a structure which is understood by the student as trust, confidence, appreciation, the aware presumption of knowledge, being these, aspects from the transference.

Thus, as affirms Cavallari (2014, p.9), there is not a prescription to students and teachers about the teaching-learning process of a second language, "because the educational act, to become significant, have to allow different ways of subjectivity and subjective rectifying". According to the author, what is missing nowadays is to understand the teaching as a dissymmetrical process, liable of mistakes and gaps and, consequently, of wish of knowledge, becoming possible the transferencial relation and the establishment of links.

METHODOLOGY

First, we are going to approach the theoretical and methodological procedures, aiming to show how the French Discourse Analysis assumptions underlie the interpretation gestures of the researcher-analyst, starting from discursive cuttings which compound the corpus of this research. We will also show the analysis of parts of the collected corpus, in order to show some enunciative regularities materialized in the answers of the English language teachers to the questionnaire applied.

Our goal is to observe, in the post materiality, the functioning and construction of senses, according to French Discourse Analysis, analyzing the ideological positions and the enunciative regularities in the selected corpus. The following analysis reassembles the regularities that point to different imaginary representations of the teacher about the teaching of English language speaking skill practiced at EEAR.

Formation of the research corpus

The selected corpus from this study was collected in a military school of sergeants' formation, the *Escola de Especialistas de Aeronáutica (EEAR)*, located in Guaratinguetá city, in São Paulo state. The data gathering was realized during the year of 2013.

Four teachers were invited to take part of this research. These teachers answered to a written questionnaire, being two military teachers and two civil ones. The questionnaires' collection was made in

situations, spaces and varied contexts, as the questionnaires were handed individually and each one of the participants answered it in the moment and place they wanted. The purposed questionnaire had general and open questions that were elaborated in order to avoid the answers direction to meet the researcher's wishes. The questions were basically about the teaching-learning process of the speaking skill. Through the questionnaires it was possible to understand some representations which form the identity of the teacher, rescuing voices which live inside this subject and are evoked by him and updated in discursive happenings. We believe that the four answered questionnaires were enough to cover these questions.

Theoretical and methodological assumptions

According to French Discourse Analysis, there is not an analysis methodology, as it is constructed as far as it establishes relations among linguistics, history and ideology inside the discourse. But Orlandi (1999, p.77 e 78) proposes some analysis steps. The first step is related to the passage of linguistic surface to the text (discourse). In this step, the analyst, in contact with the text constructs a discursive object, undoing the "illusion that what was said could only be said in that way, denaturing the relation word-thing". (Orlandi, 1999, p. 77 - 78)

The second step is the passage of the object to a discursive formation. This is the step in which the analyst is already able to visualize how the discursive formations that are dominating the discursive practice in focus are configured, becoming "visible the fact that "inside the discourse are formed paraphrased families, relating what was said with what was not said or what could have been said". (ORLANDI, 1999, p.77).

The third step refers to the passage of the process to the ideological formation. In this step, having as base the discursive object, the analyst aims to relate different discursive formations with the ideological formation that governs these relationships. According to Orlandi (1999, p.78), "through the analytical procedure, with the paraphrased mechanism, it is the analyst's role to observe what we call metaphoric effects".

Based on these steps purposed by Orlandi (1999) and having as theoretical support the French Discourse Analysis concepts presented above, we will analyze the given answers to the questionnaires designed to teachers.

The conditions of production in the constitution of senses

Orlandi (1999, p.40) explains that the conditions of production take into consideration "what is material (the language subject to mistakes and historicity), the institutional (social formation, in its order) and the imaginary mechanism, besides understanding, fundamentally, the subjects and the situation".

Silva (2012) points that the conditions of production act directly in the constitution of senses and govern interpretation gestures. Because of this it is necessary for the researcher-analyst to be careful about the conditions of production during the analysis of discursive happenings, observing the images that the subject has of the place from where he talks about himself, the other and the referent; these images direct and provoke senses in his speech. Thus, Silva (2012, p.29) concludes that "the conditions of production are determinant to the positions undertake by the subject and to the senses produced by his speech".

Below, we will bring the description of the condition of production, in which we focused our gathering data.

The Escola de Especialistas de Aeronáutica

The Escola de Especialistas de Aeronáutica (EEAR) is the organization of the Aeronautics Command directly subordinated to the general director of the Teaching Department of Aeronautica which has as its goal to form and improve the Aeronautical sergeants.

Among the formation courses offered by EEAR, we highlighted the Air Traffic Control course, because it is the one which has the biggest workload of English classes.

During the two years of course which students take at EEAR, besides having specific and military subjects, they have a big workload of English classes and they study the language starting from General English until Aviation English. The main purpose of the English classes is to develop speaking and listening skills. Thus, the focus of the activities purposed in the didactic materials used in the English classes are listening and speaking abilities.

Although there is a didactic material to be used, the English language teacher at EEAR is free to add activities which can contribute to students' development.

Students have classes with civil and military teachers, what imply changes in posture by students and, probably, differences between choices and didactic sequences by the teachers.

And here is the validity of the current research which has as its main goal to analyze, through questionnaires application, the didactic choices referring to oral activities proposed to students from Air Traffic Control course, in order to identify which representations the civil and military teachers have and how this representations base their didactic choices about oral activities.

This research also purposes a teacher's reflection about ideologies, positioning and choices that support the conceptions of teaching and learning of English language speaking ability that teachers have, in order to contribute to possible paradigm's break.

Profile of the participants

Below, we bring some relevant information about the teachers who took part of this research, considering the fact that the conditions of production, the context in which the teacher is inserted, influence directly the sense effects produced in a discursive happening.

Lieutenant Maria (called P1), who is 26 years old, is graduated in Letras, has postgraduate course in English Language and Masters in Applied Linguistics. She has been teaching at EEAR for two years and she is part of the group of military teachers, teaching English language to students from Air Traffic Control course.

Lieutenant Ana (called P2) is 24 years old. She is graduated in Letras and is taking part of a postgraduate course in Clinic Psychology. She has been teaching at EEAR for two years and she is part of the group of military teachers, teaching English language to students from Air Traffic Control course.

Teacher Joana (called P3) who is 36 years old, is graduated in Letras and masters in Applied Linguistics. She has been teaching at EEAR for eight years. She is part of the group of civil teachers, teaching English language to students from Air Traffic Control course. She is the coordinator of Aviation English course at EEAR.

Teacher José (called P4) is 40 years old. He is graduated in Letras and has postgraduate course in English language. He has been teaching at EEAR for six years and he is part of the group of civil teachers, teaching English language to students from Air Traffic Control course. He lived in London – England for 15 years.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In order to analyze the teachers' answers to the questionnaires we observed, in the first moment of analysis, some discursive regularities. The analysis axes were purposed considering the point of view of this analyst-researcher, without losing sight of the research's

goals. The analysis axes are: the teacher and his teaching action; the teacher and the context of production in which he is inserted; the teacher and his view about the teaching of speaking skill.

The first axe: "The teacher and his teaching action" presents two representations liable to analysis: the subject position while being an English teacher and the representations this subject has about the role of the English teacher considered as the ideal one.

In the axe: "The teacher and the context of production in which he is inserted" we showed how the context of production of the teachers interferes in the English language teaching-learning process and how the teachers see the teaching in public and military schools.

In "The teacher and his view about the teaching of speaking skill" the subjects show the representations they have about the teaching of speaking skill, as their wishes and searches.

The teacher and his teaching

The utterances below were presented in sequence because they are inserted in the same discursive formation. The question of the written questionnaire which fostered the answers below was: In your opinion what are the characteristics of a competent teacher?

P1: *The competent teacher should be worried with the development of his students. For this it is necessary to know them and prepare activities which encompass their needs.*

P2: *First, the English language knowledge. Then, the pleasure in teaching. It is necessary to diagnose the group and identify students who have difficulties and help them, besides always searching new knowledge, methods and actualizing himself in the language teaching.*

P3: *A competent teacher is the one who diagnoses his group, identifies the learner's difficulties, search teaching strategies to help them and, finally, reflects about his teaching action.*

P4: *A competent English teacher is the one who is suitable to teach an issue in a determined situation. As issues vary and people are different and fallible, I think it is just to affirm that a teacher cannot be competent in everything all the time.*

We observed that the answers of P1, P2 and P3 are supported by the cognitive perspective which guides, in general, the languages teaching-learning process nowadays. They refer to what Brown (2007) calls pedagogic ability. According to this cognitivist theorist, the teacher who has pedagogic ability is the one who plans his classes and put in practice the purposes of his planning, basing his choices on the needs, individual and collective abilities of his students. For this purpose, he uses varied techniques and approaches, adding extra activities to those purposed in the didactic material. He is a teacher who provides his students with feedback, stimulates interaction, cooperation and group work during classes. He uses proper principles in his classes, being clear in his goals and efficient in his purposes.

According to French Discourse Analysis P1, P2 and P3 are inserted in the same discursive formation and evoke the same discourse about the teaching considered as ideal which is based on the same representations of the English teacher as a learning facilitator, as the one responsible for meeting the students' needs and wishes, being able to identify what they need without asking them to say, trying to solve their problems and difficulties through varied activities, avoiding lacks in the teaching-learning process.

We noticed that the answers of the teachers presented above are empty of senses, because they are not unique, what the teachers said is only the materialization of the representations socio-historically shared, in other words, they reproduce current discourses from contemporaneity which guide the teaching practices.

About P4 answers we observed that his answer differs from the others and his statement that "a teacher cannot be competent in everything all the time" is based on the notion of incomplete subject postulated by French Discourse Analysis. We can say that P4's discourse is unique and not a merely reproduction of other discourses. However, it is important to note that P4 was the last to hand the questionnaire to this researcher. He said he had difficulties in answering the questions and he seemed to be worried about giving the right answers. He asked me a lot of times if those were the answers I wanted and he told he did not like his own answers because they should be improved. So, although P4 seemed to affiliate to a different discursive formation from the other participant teachers, we can observe his concern in being accepted and recognized by the others.

The teacher and the context of production in which he is inserted

The second question of the questionnaire formulated to the participant teachers was: Are there any differences between the teaching of English language in public and in military schools? What are these differences? How they interfere or help in the learning process?

We will write down some answers from the research participants and then we will write our considerations:

P1: *In the public school students generally present more deficiencies, possibly because of the precarious conditions of the government or due to the context in which they live. In a military school students are generally older and they seem to have better socioeconomics conditions than those from public school and also government usually invests more in material resources. As a teacher who had already taught in a public school before teaching in a military school, I observe that for the teachers this transition of target audience is very difficult as both groups of students differ from each other in many aspects.*

P2: *For sure. In a military school there are some factors that favor the classroom environment which are discipline and respect. Besides studying to become a professional, students already enter the school with a level of English knowledge which is higher than the one achieved during high school. Also, in public schools students are not engaged in classes because they think they will not need the language knowledge after their graduation. There is also the sociocultural factor which directly influences in classes.*

P3: *Yes, the teaching of English Language in a military school is focused on students' needs according to the speciality they choose (air traffic controller, aeronautical mechanic, aeronautical firefighter etc). Another difference is the military discipline. These differences help in the learning process, as students' discipline favor the creation of a pleasant atmosphere, which is appropriated for learning.*

P4: *Personally I have a brief experience in public schools, but I know that they are different from military schools in many aspects. I think the biggest difference is in the rigid discipline that the military students have to respect. Inside school, military students must have a good behavior and should be careful about showing dissatisfaction to their superiors. This facilitates the teachers' work as he does not need to waste part of his energy to discipline students and he has a passive audience. Also, this "conquered" and little questioner audience cannot present new and big challenges for the teacher. In consequence, this teacher can become complaisant with the quality of what he offers to his students, becoming less motivated to research, recycle himself and become a better professional. This would probably reflect in his teaching performance.*

In his answer, P1 emphasizes two points that she thinks can be the differences between one school and the other. One of these points refers to the socioeconomics differences among students from both schools and the other refers to the students' age. P1 also mentions the difficulties faced by teachers who taught in public schools when they start teaching in military schools, but she does not explain what differences are these.

P2 also talks about students' sociocultural problems and adds one more difference: discipline and respect that military students have in contrast to public school students. P2 also cites the difference in proficiency levels among students from both schools and the lack of interest of students from public school.

P3 approaches the question which involves the peculiarity of students from military schools: they belong to a specific group of students. Just like P2 she says that students of a military school are preparing themselves for a career. P3 also talks about the discipline cited by P2, considering this aspect as positive to the teaching-learning process in English language.

P4 also points that the biggest difference between a public and a military school is the discipline aspect and he sees this fact as a facilitator of learning. However, he presents another point that was not presented by the other teachers, that is how the military doctrine can interfere in the teachers' performance. He points that although this is a positive aspect, students' discipline can let the teacher accommodated as he does not meet challenges in his teaching action.

We observed that the points approached by P1 and P2 which refer to socioeconomics conditions of students, are sustained in the imaginary representation affected by capitalist discourse that students with better socio-economic conditions are better able to learn. First, EEAR has many students with poor economic conditions, which was not considered by P1. Also, there are many students who have favorable economic conditions, but they cannot learn. We found, then, in P1 discourse the reproduction of current contemporary discourse, in relation to the ideal student profile.

About the difficulties highlighted by P1 in relation to teachers and to the target audience (military students), probably they refer to the proficiency level cited by P2. The unsaid by P1 certainly refers to the arising of public school teachers unprepared to teach students more proficient than those with whom they had contact. These difficulties should refer to the oral teaching ability that is often taboo for many teachers, especially in regular schools which still focus on reading comprehension. Note that this difficulty pointed out by P1 and indirectly by P2 was not pointed out by P3 and P4. P4 even poses as negative the passivity of military students, saying that the characteristics of such target audience may discourage the teacher for not being challenging. P4 has a brief teaching experience in public schools and he is

fluent in English language.

The disciplinary aspect, quoted by P2, P3 and P4, was directly or indirectly considered as a positive feature by the participant teachers. Such sayings show that although teachers try to shape their profile, seeking to incorporate representations of an ideal teacher, the representations that come from a more traditional teaching are those that still maintain the teachers' actions, because of this discipline and respect are so valued. Of course these features are also important in the current school, but according to cognitive theory that the teacher aims to put into practice, the ideal student is one who is active in his/her learning process. But how can the student actively participate in a space that follows the same traditional teaching format? We observed, then, a contradiction in the words of teachers in relation to what is considered ideal and what emerges from their imagination and that affects, directly, their praxis, that is, there is a big gap among what teachers want to do, what they can do and what they actually do.

The teacher and his view about the teaching of speaking skill

In this research, we focused on the teaching of oral skill because it is the ability of greater representativeness in the course of Air Traffic Control at EEAR. We suggested four questions related to the teaching of this ability, trying to analyze the imaginary representations that the teachers have about the teaching-learning process of oral ability in English Language.

The first question suggested by this researcher-analyst was: What do you consider to be the main purpose of a conversation class?

To this question P1 answered: *I believe that a good conversation class proposal would be one in which the teacher was able to explore the spontaneous communication without making students feel uncomfortable. In this class students should also be able to interact and learn from each other with the guidance of the teacher. This proposal should include group activities, with dialogues and role-plays.*

Note that P1 takes up the principles of cognitive theory in which the teacher must guide students, promote interaction and be able to explore their oral skill. Her speech is strongly based or even alienated on the communicative approach to foreign language teaching. P1 highlights what would be the proposal of an ideal class based on the profile she imagines as being the one of an ideal teacher, but at the same time says that the teacher should explore the spontaneous communication,

suggests activities like role-plays that, in fact, do not promote spontaneous communication, as students represent roles that not always motivate them to speak. We realized, then, the contradiction among what is imagined as ideal, what teachers want to do and what they actually do.

P2 answered: *Motivate students to speak even making mistakes helping them to feel free to speak, as from their mistakes they will learn to speak properly. In addition, through mistakes, the teacher could diagnose his class and plan activities to assist students in their major difficulties.*

As well as P1, P2 talks about the importance of disinhibit students. P1 explains that the teacher should not embarrass students in conversation classes, while P2 indicates that the teacher's role is to help them to feel free to speak. P2 also takes aspects of the communicative approach, permeated by the cognitive theory and the sociointeractionist perspective, that focus on language teaching based on needs. The teacher should notice students' needs to prepare their activities. He is responsible for providing what students need, helping them to talk, even if they are ashamed, teaching what is right and what is wrong. By P2 discourse we realized that she reproduces a ready discourse, broadcasted in modernity, accepted by educators, but that is empty of meaning, since P2 does not really know how it would be a good conversation class proposal, what can be explained by her unsaid about examples of activities, types of difficulties or what is considered right and wrong in a conversation class.

About P3 this was the answer given by her: *The main purpose of a conversation class is to make all students produce orally during class. For this to happen, it is necessary to prepare a pleasant environment and issues to be addressed should generate interest for students.*

P3 also bolsters the assumptions of communicative approach to give her answer. According to Harmer (2007), theorist of cognitive perspective, the teacher should be an inciter, helping students and promoting the progress of the proposed activity when he realizes that such intervention is necessary, giving discreet advice, ie, the teacher can intervene without interrupting discussion and without requiring from students tasks that they still lack maturity and knowledge to do. This strategy increases students' motivation and prevents them from feeling frustrated when they cannot establish a conversation for lack of prior knowledge and / or vocabulary. The teacher should promote a pleasant atmosphere for learning to take place. Note the prescriptive nature of such approach focused on language teaching.

We note, in P3 response, a concern to please students, arise their interest; this is the reason why the teacher should address issues of interest to them. In her speech, P3 shows a need to be accepted and feels responsible to please every student in her class. Her imaginary, consisting of concepts arising from the cognitive perspective, makes her to see the process of teaching oral ability as something of almost exclusive responsibility of the teacher, who should do everything for students to learn, should cater to all possible wishes and expectations that students may have about the acquisition of oral language process.

P4 answer to the question was*: In my opinion, conversation classes are opportunities for students to practice English they know, exchange views and learn new things - both with colleagues and with the teacher.*

We observed that P4 concentrates conversation class on the student, unlike P3, taking into account what students already know and valuing interaction. The teacher is seen as a member of the teaching-learning process. P4 shares between teacher and student the responsibility for learning process and shows no concern to bring ready proposals to meet students' needs. One thing that is clear in his speech is the view about English language as something of extreme importance in students' lives, as classes are seen as opportunities. An opportunity is something you cannot miss. A conversation class is an opportunity to be part of a globalized world, to be inserted in the labor market and in society.

The second question suggested was: Which aspects of the conversation you use more class time?

To this question P1 said: *The dialogues from the books, small plays, work with pronunciation and video lessons.*

In her response, P1 shows herself quite attached to the teaching materials that she uses in which, with the exception of pronunciation, are not considered aspects of conversation. In fact, the aspects cited by P1 are examples of types of activities and materials. The dialogues are taken from the book, but what are those small plays? P1 does not specify whether the proposals are from the didactic material or not and what she intends to address with them. P1 response does not address what is being questioned.

P2: *Questions and answers, besides asking students to give their opinion in order to formulate dialogues in a short time. Sometimes I ask them to present some activity in English in front of the classroom.*

P2 does not address any aspect of the conversation in her response and cites examples of activities that she proposes in her classes to help students to develop oral ability. Note that P2 works with questions and answers and students can give opinions, but they have a right and short time for it. Activities involving forward presentation to the group probably have as goals to help students to disinhibit, as answered by P2 in the previous question. Although communicative approach preaches the use of dialogue and authentic texts that provide communication, the examples cited by the teacher go against the proposal that she wants to consider as ideal, but it does not seem to make much sense for her, as it does not affect, indeed, their teaching action.

P3: *I don't know, I try to work on oral production ability of students before a listening activity, for example. After the listening activity I also try to ask each student to cut out a piece of what was heard. I propose debates, discussions in groups / pairs, role-plays. Of course I do not use all strategies in just one class. I try to give students feedback, especially regarding to the correct use of grammar and pronunciation after the activities.*

P3 answers the question citing examples of activities and didactic sequences she proposes in her classes. Note that unlike P1 and P2, P3 proposes debates and discussions, broader proposals for oral activities. Finally, P3 cites two aspects that are important in a conversation class: grammar and pronunciation. Grammar, however, seems to contradict what the communicative approach suggests to develop oral production activities.

P4: *My English classes for Aviation are not only conversation classes, but may contain some periods in which students will need to talk to each other - usually role-playing (e.g: a student needs to act as an air traffic controller, another student, as a pilot in need of help). There are also opportunities for some discussions on matters related to aviation. Sometimes, at the beginning of class, I propose a conversation as a warm up acitivity.*

P4 talks specifically about the context of aviation English classes. In this context, he does not mention aspects of conversation with greater focus; he only cites examples of activities proposed in his classes. We notice that he focus his classes on the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach, restricting the covered topics to the context of production in which the student is inserted and which he/she will act after graduation. Although in the previous questions P4 has not addressed the needs analysis approach, in practice, his teaching action is guided by this approach, ie his previous answers traced the teacher's profile that he considers ideal; this response shows what he actually does in the classroom and, in a way, how the concepts

of cognitive theory underpinning the communicative approach are rooted in the imagination of the contemporary teacher.

The third question suggested was: What do you see as the greatest difficulties in the teaching of a conversation class?

P1: *In my current context (military school) I believe it is the shyness of students who feel inhibited because there are students who know more than they do. I note that the main problem of the students is not the lack of knowledge, but the lack of confidence in themselves.*

P2: *I think it is to hold the theme of the lesson without losing its focus and help students to memorize what they learn in an organized manner.*

P3: *First, make those students who have some difficulties feel comfortable to talk. Another difficulty is the choice of topics that generate interest to students. Another difficulty is to propose oral production activities for numerous classes (with more than 20 students).*

P4: *In my reality, as I am teaching English for Aviation in a military training center, it is not possible to escape much of the field program. In addition, more than half of the students do not have enough knowledge of English to be able to talk freely. Finally, air traffic follows clear rules; therefore, we cannot propose activities like "what would you do if something like this happened to you?".*

P1 suggests, in her response, that the greatest difficulty of the class is on the student and not on the teacher. This difficulty is shyness instead of a cognitive difficulty. We can see that P1 puts herself as the subject-holder-of-knowledge, the one who is able to identify the difficulty of the other and does not face difficulties in her teaching action.

In P2 speech, we observed that the focus turns to the teacher. P2 is concerned about working the curriculum content, maintaining the focus of classes at the desired subject. We noted that P2 feels responsible also for making students memorize the content they are learning and see this task as difficult to perform. P2 imaginary about language teaching shows itself crossed and made up of traditional theories, which point the teacher as having the knowledge and as being responsible for making the student to learn and memorize what he/she learns in the classroom. P2 speech is not singular, but reports to other speeches, brings up other voices than those of P2. And that may be related to how P2 sees the teaching process based on theories that are commonly disseminated among teachers or based on those that guided his own learning process, or related to the context of production in which P2 is inserted: a military

school, rigid, which charges the teacher to fulfill the curriculum content.

P3 already has her imaginary affected by Needs Analysis, a highly recommended practice by teachers who follow the communicative approach to language teaching. For her, the responsibility and the difficulties are mainly in the teacher who has the arduous task of offering her students what they need, helps them in their emotional difficulties, motivates them with interesting topics. P3 speech, as well as P1 and P2, is not singular, because P3 evokes concepts arising from cognitive theory that guides the contemporary teaching, though not aware of it, since her statements are affected by Pêcheux forgetfulness, discussed earlier. P3 is concerned to meet the ideal teacher-standard - this is her desire - in order to be accepted in the context in which she operates and comply correctly her role of a teacher.

P4 resumes the difficulty pointed out by P2 in relation to the strict compliance of the program content. However, the difficulties highlighted by P4 are related to the context of production in which the students are inserted and not his personal difficulties as a teacher of English language. P4 gives the military education system responsibility for having to comply with the curriculum and assigns students with difficulties the reason why he cannot purpose open conversation activities. At the end he explains that the course in which students take part: air traffic control, becomes difficult the work with more open questions, as students should follow rules and protocols to perform their function. We note that P4 is also inserted in a discursive formation of teacher-holder of the knowledge, as he points to difficulties that do not relate to his power-knowledge: if the system was another and there were students better prepared he could expand the content and oral production classes, ie he is able to do this, but do not do it because he is not allowed. He has the illusion of being the ideal teacher, but just cannot act like that because of external factors that prevent him.

The last question suggested was: How do you see the proposals of various teaching materials in relation to the oral teaching ability?

P1: *The books we use do not come with specific oral ability activities sometimes we create activities because most of the book focuses on listening comprehension, what is a strange fact, since the air traffic controller as well as listening to understand well, needs to know how to speak properly in order to avoid accidents.*

P2: *In general are very weak because they focus on writing and reading, and rarely on listening. But speech is more a teacher account who needs to create a dynamic, since most of students requests*

to speak to a friend and in general, it does not work.

P3: *The two instructional materials that I work today: English for Controllers and Pilots (Ed Oxford) and Aviation English (Ed Macmillan) have purposes of oral activities that are generally unproductive and generate little interest to students. Several modifications are proposed by the teachers so that students can produce better orally during class.*

P4: *I don't know how to answer this question. I need more information on what are these teaching materials.*

Aside from P4 who could not answer the question because he said he needed more information to do so, the other teachers are part of the same discursive formations. Although P2 has spoken about English Language textbooks in general and P1 and P3 have spoken about specific materials they work with, all emphasized that teaching materials do not assist in working with oral production in class. It can be seen through the discursive analysis of P1 answer that she does not agree with the listening focus of the book she uses, because she believes that students who will be future air traffic controllers need to master oral skills of English Language and didactic materials proposed do not meet the needs of these students.

P2 makes a broader criticism to the textbooks in general that, according her, focus on reading and writing skills, failing to consider activities for working with listening and speaking skills. She explains that working with oral production ends up being the sole responsibility of the teacher and she ends her statement with a confusing explanation, which we suppose that refers to the difficulty of working with oral dialogues in groups, pairs and freer conversation proposals, since students do not have the maturity to perform such proposals.

P3, just like P1, evaluates the didactic materials she uses in her classes and considers that the few proposals for oral activities brought by the books are not productive and the teacher must make adaptations so that they can make sense to students.

Based on the analyzed excerpts from this question we can see that, in fact, teachers do not realize the impossibility of mastering the language, whatever it may be, since we are bound to symbolic wandering while speaking subjects. Imaginatively they believe such a domain is possible and that the incompleteness or failure is in the material, the student and the teacher and not in the incompleteness of the language when put into operation.

CONCLUSION

Considering thus the arguments listed in this survey

and reflected in the final considerations, we turn to our research objectives. We aimed to analyze the social representations of civil and military English teachers from EEAR, trying to verify how they influence the choices and application of oral activities for students of technical education of Air Traffic Controllers.

We can say that this goal was contemplated, since we stressed, in the analytical part of this study, that the imaginary representations of teachers influence in their educational choices. This can be glimpsed in excerpts taken from interviews, in which we identify some misconceptions. On the one hand, we have a teacher concerned to follow the teaching materials, who is inserted in a condition of production that does not allow them to fail to comply with what is provided. This is a traditional teacher, holder of knowledge, imaginary author and controller of his speech, task doer. At the same time, we have a teacher concerned about meeting the needs of students, seeking to be the ideal teacher as postulates the cognitive theory. He is a dedicated teacher who tries to motivate students and bring varied activities for the classroom. We see here the same subject crossed and made up of different voices: on the one hand we have what he really is and does, and on the other, what he would like to be and do, but he is not and he does not it. And what he is as what he craves does not originate in himself, as all states that he produces only makes sense if they are linked to other discourses (already-said) and how he represents imaginary situations is based on a historical-social situation that legitimizes these representations.

Also we set out throughout this study, investigate whether there were differences in representations between civil and military teachers and how - if they existed - they interfered in the choice and application of oral activities for students of Air Traffic Control course.

Our hypothesis was that there were differences in representations between these two groups of teachers. However, during the course of the research and the analysis of the corpus, we found that there are no such differences or which, if any, are so small that they were not perceived in the collected utterances, because they have not significantly affected the action of these teachers. This is probably due to the fact that, rather than using a uniform and being a military, both professionals are teachers, in their essence. This is the position that they occupy in society and therefore their representations coincide in many respects. Thus, we can conclude that although they have different functions at EEAR, since the military teacher, in addition to teaching, also plays various administrative functions, what does not happen, for example, with the civil teachers, when referring to the teaching process of English Language, representations of civil and military teachers meet each other and converge to the same point: the teaching of

language as a final product to be achieved and offered to the student.

The statements and enrolled considerations are relevant for understanding the ideology's role in the materialization of speech and in the production of effects of meaning and truth. More than an exchange of information, the speech is a set of directions between the participants in a discursive event and cannot be conceived outside the subject and nor the subject out of ideology. The ideology that permeates the condition of production in which the researched subjects are inserted falls directly under the representations they have about language teaching. And not only the space in which they live exerts this influence, but the society to which they belong also exerts great influence on the way teachers see themselves as professionals and the way they visualize the teaching-learning process. The prestigious place occupied by the English language in our society represents a large condition of production of the discourse that is about the importance of learning English and seems to be directly related to the capitalist discourse and socio-economic disputes of our globalized world. Indeed, the conditions of production are decisive for the positions taken by the subject of language and the meanings produced by their say.

REFERENCES

Brandão, Helena H. Nagamine. *Introdução à análise do discurso*. Campinas: UNICAMP, 1995.

Brown, H. Douglas. *Teaching by principles:* an interactive approach to language pedagogy. United States of America: Longman, 2007.

Cavallari, Juliana Santana. *O discurso avaliador do sujeito-professor na constituição da identidade do sujeito-aluno*. Tese de Doutorado, Universidade de Campinas – UNICAMP, Campinas, 2005.

Cavallari, Juliana Santana. Leitura como acontecimento: sentidos que emanam de materiais didáticos de Língua Inglesa. In: *Leitura: Teoria & Prática.* Revista Semestral da Associação de Leitura do Brasil, v.31, n. 60, jun. 2013, p. 119-135.

Cavallari, Juliana Santana. Falta, desejo e (trans)formação do saber. In: *Guavira Letras*, n. 16, Jan/Jul 2013, p. 169 – 183.

Coracini, Maria José (Org). *Interpretação, Autoria e Legitimação do Livro Didático*. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2011.

Costa, Clarice Nunes Ferreira. P*rofessores de Língua Estrangeira em Formação: a angústia de ensinar uma língua que (não) se sabe*. Dissertação de Mestrado, Universidade São Francisco, Itatiba, 2012.

Guilherme De Casto, M. F. F. O discurso midiático institucional para o ensino de segundas línguas. In: Fernandes, C. A. e Santos, J. B. C. (Org). *Análise do Discurso*: unidade e dispersão. EntreMeios: Uberlândia, 2004, p.197 -209.

Glyn Williams:French Discourse Analysis: The Method of Post-structuralism.Psychology Press, 1999 - Foreign Language Study. Available online at:https://books.google.com.ng/books/about/French_Discourse_Analysis.html?id=unzU2oId2rcC&redir_esc=ya

Harmer, Jeremy. *The practice of English Language Teaching*. United States of America: Pearson Longman, 2007.

Orlandi, Eni P. *Análise de Discurso*: princípios e procedimentos. Campinas: Pontes, 1999.

Santos, Aparecida de Fátima Amaral dos. *Leitura, família e subjetivação*. Dissertação de Mestrado, Universidade de Taubaté – UNITAU, Taubaté, 2012.

Silva, Laerte. *(Des)encantos do professor de Língua Inglesa na Rede Pública de Ensino*. Dissertação de Mestrado, Universidade de Taubaté – UNITAU, Taubaté, 2012.