

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18764/2178-2229v33n3e26493>

## Deaf community education: plurilingualism, literacies, and language teaching

**Leonardo Peluso**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3797-6309>

**Ana Claudia Balieiro Lodi**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7106-172X>

**Abstract:** In Uruguay, an educational study was conducted from 2017 to 2019 under the National Administration of Public Education (ANEP)—the governing body for nationwide educational policies in Uruguay—to establish general guidelines on the linguistic-discursive development of hearing and Deaf students in Primary and Secondary Education. The aim of this study is to examine this document, seeking, on one hand, to uncover the underlying conceptions of language, discourse, Deaf community, literate culture, and language technologies; and on the other, to identify its distinctions from the hegemonic bilingual model. By “language technologies,” we mean those that produce deferred textuality—that is, textuality separated from the moment of its utterance—which can be achieved with writing systems as well as with recordings. A methodology for documentary analysis was employed. The analyzed document adopts a plurilingual perspective, both in its conception of linguistic repertoire and in the role assigned to Uruguayan Sign Language (Lengua de Señas Uruguay, LSU) in education. Furthermore, it argues that video-recorded LSU productions are the natural form of literate text creation for the Deaf community and that this should be incorporated into educational approaches. In conclusion, the document’s plurilingual framework and its understanding of literacy present a disruptive perspective compared to Uruguay’s hegemonic bilingual education model for the Deaf community.

**Keywords:** plurilingualism; deferred textuality; literacy; language teaching; deaf community.

### 1 Introduction

Education for the Deaf community in Uruguay has been officially recognized since 1910, as documented in various texts produced by the official educational institution. Since its inception, it has evolved through various paradigms, which are essentially related to language policies and conceptions regarding the Deaf community, its language, its literate culture, and the relationship between members of the Deaf community and discourses on disability and educational inclusion (Peluso, 2022; Peluso; Lodi, 2023).

Political forces of various kinds, including hegemonic and counter-hegemonic ones, have been involved in this process. The latter are linked to the struggles of the Deaf community, both nationally and internationally, and of other social minorities. Likewise, changes have been influenced in scientific paradigms, educational models,



Esta licença permite que outros distribuam, remixem, adaptem e criem a partir do seu trabalho, mesmo para fins comerciais, desde que lhe atribuem o devido crédito pela criação original.

and language teaching models. These changes in scientific paradigms have occurred in dialogue with institutional and organizational movements, as well as through individual contributions from various professionals in the education system. In this complex context, three distinct periods can be identified, each reflected in an official document drafted by the government agency that, at the time, was responsible for developing national education policies and, concurrently, language policies.

The three periods could be referred to as: the oralist period (monolingual in Spanish: spoken and written), the bilingual period (Uruguayan Sign Language – Spanish: direct communication in Uruguayan Sign Language, writing in Spanish), and the plurilingual and pluriliterate period (Uruguayan Sign Language – Spanish – other sign languages – other spoken languages: direct communication in sign languages, literacy through videos in sign languages, writing in spoken languages). The first period would be inaugurated by the document titled: Regulations of the National Institute for the Deaf and Mute (Dirección General de Instrucción Primaria, 1910); the second period by the Proposal for Bilingual Education for the Deaf (Consejo Nacional de Educación/Consejo de Educación Primaria, 1987); and the third, based on the National Curriculum Framework (MCRN, acronym in Spanish). Development of cultural thinking and its mediations. Linguistic-discursive domain. Learning progressions (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública / Consejo Directivo Central, 2019).

Although these three periods follow a chronological order, the consolidation of one did not automatically lead to the disappearance of the previous ones. In contrast, an occasional contentious process has been observed in Uruguay. This process involved an overlap of perspectives and positions, and, in addition to these educational approaches, it incorporated discourse on disability, special education, inclusion, and treatment through cochlear implants.

In this paper, we aim to examine the document National Curriculum Framework (MCRN). Development of cultural thinking and its mediations. Linguistic-discursive domain. Learning progressions (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública / Consejo Directivo Central, 2019). This official document was produced by the National Public Education Administration (ANEP, acronym in Spanish), the government agency currently responsible for setting education policy in Uruguay, from 2018 to 2019 (published in December 2019) during a progressive administration in

Uruguay. It outlines the developmental stages in linguistic and discursive proficiency for hearing students and students in the Deaf community.

As noted in the text: “The development of learning progressions involves delving deeper into the expected learning outcomes in the domains around which the curriculum is organized” (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública / Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 13, our translation). One of these domains mentioned in the document is the linguistic-discursive domain, which is the only one that refers to the education of the Deaf. This domain is briefly characterized in the document as follows:

In this study, we chose to refer to the domain in question as the linguistic-discursive domain to reflect the fact that oral communication, reading, and writing are cross-cutting aspects of all disciplines, insofar as language serves as the foundation and organizing principle for the production and teaching of knowledge in any field (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública / Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 17, our translation).

From the entire text, we will focus on analyzing the sections that address education in the Deaf community. These sections were developed by a team of linguists and educators, including hearing individuals and members of the Deaf community: Adriana De León, Juan Andrés Larrinaga, Leonardo Peluso, and Mariana Silveira.

In analyzing the document, a decolonial and critical perspective will be adopted. Decolonial and critical epistemology challenges the dominant knowledge imposed by modernity and colonialism, arguing that it has silenced other forms of knowledge, particularly those of the Indigenous peoples of the Americas, those of enslaved peoples from Africa, and those of other communities that have been marginalized due to the ideology of normality imposed by coloniality itself. Therefore, it is an epistemology that seeks to dismantle the Eurocentrism of Western thought and reclaim the Indigenous knowledge of colonized peoples (Freire, 2004; Grosfoguel, 2007; Quijano, 2005, 2012; Lander, 2011; Ballestrín, 2013; Walsh, 2013, 2017; Peluso, 2020a). Decolonial and critical perspectives in the field of education are particularly relevant to the analysis we will conduct in this paper (Freire, 2004; Walsh, 2013), in the field of linguistics (Rajagopalan, 2003), and in the field of glottopolitics (Arnoux; Valle, 2010).

From a decolonial and critical perspective, documentary analysis cannot claim to be objective; rather, in this work, we adopt an ethical-political stance. This position

recognizes the Uruguayan Deaf community as a linguistic community that uses Uruguayan Sign Language (LSU, acronym in Spanish) and views education for the Deaf community as one that must safeguard the linguistic rights of that community.

This paper will be structured as follows. First, we will explore plurilingualism and pluriliteracies, which are the two central theoretical aspects of this proposal. We will discuss the current plurilingual repertoire of the Uruguayan Deaf community and the importance of incorporating this repertoire into language and education policy; we will also address pluriliteracies and the script-centered ideology, which is another of the document's theoretical pillars. We will highlight the role that video recordings play in deaf literacy culture and the need to consider this in the education of the Deaf community. In the following section, we will present the twelve dimensions proposed in the document to describe the learning experiences of students in the Deaf community. These dimensions result from the intersection of the variable "type of language" (mother tongue/first language/native language, second, foreign language, and/or global language) with the variable "orality—deferred textuality (writing and video recordings)." Next, we will present the expected competencies for deferred textuality in LSU and Spanish at the point of graduation from the education system. In the concluding remarks, to wrap up this discussion, we will present some fundamental principles of language teaching that emerge from the theoretical framework and the description of the competencies mentioned in the previous sections. It should be noted that the document does not directly address language teaching, but rather this aspect is implied through the proposed learning progressions.

## **2 Plurilingualism and pluriliteracies**

One of the key approaches proposed in this document regarding the education of the Deaf community is based on the introduction of a plurilingual perspective. The bilingual approach broke with the oralist model because it was monolingual and did not respect the native language of the Deaf community, whereas the plurilingual approach breaks with the bilingual approach by recognizing that the Deaf community has more than two languages in its linguistic repertoire, a fact consistent with the processes of Western globalization, to which the Deaf community is no stranger.

The document analyzed describes the following linguistic repertoire for the Uruguayan Deaf community:

- Uruguayan Sign Language (LSU) is the first, natural, and native language of members of the Deaf community. The language is conveyed through oral communication, that is, through visual-spatial interaction (with and without technology), and through textual representations recorded in video recordings.
- Spanish is the second language and the language of the majority of the country. It is conveyed through very limited spoken communication restricted to specific contexts of interaction with hearing people, through spoken communication mediated by information and communication technologies (chats, online forums, etc.), and through writing. Spanish has historically been a language of oppression for the Deaf.
- English is the global foreign language. It is used through oral communication mediated by information and communication technologies (chats, online forums, etc.) and through writing.
- International Sign Language (ISL, also known as the International Sign System, ISS), Argentine Sign Language (LSA), Brazilian Sign Language (LIBRAS), or American Sign Language (ASL). Deaf Uruguayans are fluent in one or more of these foreign sign languages (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 45, our translation).

The document presents LSU as the first, natural, and native language of the Deaf community and, based on that, identifies second languages, foreign and global languages, oral and sign languages. This classification of languages is based on two criteria: first, whether they are spoken (vocal) or sign languages; and second, whether they are first/native/mother tongues, second languages, foreign languages, or global languages.

The oral (sound-based) or sign-based criterion is based on the materiality in which the signifier is organized: the signifier in oral languages organizes a sound-based materiality, while the signifier in sign languages organizes a visual materiality.

The criteria of “native,” “second,” “foreign,” and “global” are based on two aspects: on the one hand, the cognitive aspect, that is, linguistic competence; and on the other hand, the identity and social aspects. In terms of language proficiency, the mother tongue/native language and first language is the one involved in language acquisition; it is the language in which one has the greatest proficiency. It is linked to identity and to belonging to the Deaf community, and it is the language in which each speaker feels, and is recognized, as a native speaker. A second language is one in which a person does not have native-speaker proficiency; for members of the Deaf community, it is the language spoken by the majority of the population in the country where they live, that is, the so-called national language. Foreign languages are those that one does not speak natively and that are not recognized as national languages.

Among foreign languages, we considered the role that some play as global languages, that is, those with a supranational function.

Judd, Tan and Walberg (2001, p. 6) propose the use of the term “additional language” to replace the terms “second languages” or “foreign languages”. These authors and the tradition that subsequently developed, in support of this terminological shift in the field of second-language teaching, base their proposal for this substitution on the observation that, since there may be third and fourth languages, the term “additional” would encompass them all while distinguishing them from the first/native language. According to these authors, another advantage of the term “additional” is that it does not imply that some languages are superior or inferior to others, and that it highlights the irreplaceable role of the first/native language, since it distinguishes the first/native language from the others.

The document does not adopt the term “additional language,” as proposed by Judd, Tan, and Walberg (2001, p. 6) and subsequent scholars, because of the need to highlight the political and identity-related roles that different languages play in the Deaf community. We understand that by distinguishing between second languages and foreign and/or global languages, and by cross-referencing that variable with the distinction between spoken/auditory and sign languages, the document explicitly establishes the political and identity-related role that each language, or group of languages, plays for the current Deaf community and, consequently, for its students. Thus, the proposal falls not only within the realm of educational policy but also within that of language policy. Given the unique circumstances of the Deaf community, any educational policy designed for this group is, by necessity, also a language policy.

Furthermore, adopting a plurilingual approach entails a shift in focus in language teaching. Rather than focusing on the target language (as in the bilingual model), the plurilingual perspective centers on the natural and native languages of the learners. This aspect of plurilingualism will be explored in greater depth in the section on language teaching.

With regard to the linguistic repertoire described, the document proposes that education for the Deaf community should adopt a critical stance and recognize languages and their varieties. It is very important to highlight the critical perspective adopted by the document, as this has a significant impact on the proposal for critical

pedagogy and language instruction that will support plurilingual education for the Deaf community.

To this end, an ideological, political, historical, and critical stance must be adopted regarding the functional distribution of languages (LSU, Spanish, English, and foreign sign languages), requiring the development of the following skills:

- a. The recognition of LSU as the language of the Uruguayan Deaf community, with all its historical and political implications.
- b. The understanding that Spanish is significant as a second language, insofar as it is the language of contact with listeners as well as the country's predominant language. It adopts a critical, decolonizing position toward Spanish, historically an oppressive language, particularly in relation to the role that "correctness" plays in the presentation of the standard language, as an imposition.
- c. The understanding that ISL (or ISS) is a global communication system useful for attending international events, that LSA is the sign language used in Argentina, and that Libras is the sign language used in Brazil, both of which are of strategic importance due to their geographical proximity.
- d. The recognition of English as the language of information technology and as a global and international language, useful for accessing information on the Internet (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p.46, our translation).

The other theoretical position taken by the document is that literate culture can be realized through both writing and recordings of texts (Lodi, 2014; Peluso, 2020b). This implies that written texts and recorded texts constitute what has been termed "deferred textuality," given that they are permanent and separate from the moment of speech. This characteristic enables them to develop a culture of literacy, which is based on the consumption (production and retrieval) of texts in the absence of the person who produced them and, therefore, separate from their original context.

In the document, the concept of deferred textuality is defined as follows:

What is meant by deferred textuality? In the case of the Progressions in LSU, the category of deferred textuality is incorporated. Deaf people do not have a writing system for their language (LSU). Given this situation, our proposal regarding their learning includes the use of video recordings in their language, since this is the technology they have adopted to carry out their literacy practices in that language. For theoretical reasons, we refer to LSU texts created through video recordings that are characterized by being literate as deferred textuality. (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 24, our translation).

In turn, the concept of deferred textuality relates to that of literate culture in the document as follows:

Nowadays, deferred textuality and literate culture are not produced exclusively through writing and books; rather, there are other technologies (recording, digital, and communication) that enable new ways of being literate subjects. In this sense, it is understood that video recordings serve functions similar to those of writing in terms of generating deferred textuality, and that the systems for archiving and collecting texts that exist on the internet serve functions similar to those of libraries in producing literate culture. (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 45, our translation).

These concepts of deferred textuality and literate culture lead us to understand that we are dealing with a pluriliterate culture, insofar as it is a culture that develops through various technologies for representing and recording language and texts. However, in many educational, academic, and non-academic settings, there is a strong conviction that writing is the only means of creating and preserving a literate culture. This view has been termed a writing-centric ideology (Peluso, 2020b). This ideology is based on the premise that writing is the only tool capable of separating the text from its context, to the point that, on numerous occasions, the term “text” is used as a synonym for “written text.” This fails to acknowledge the role that recordings currently play in the development of contemporary literate culture.

A writing-centric ideology lies at the heart of the approaches underlying the educational programs of various schools, given that schools have, to a large extent, served as a mechanism for imposing written technology with the aim of shaping literate citizenship in its current form. Life in contemporary literate society and the full exercise of citizens’ rights inevitably require the acquisition of literacy skills. Hence the fundamental importance of writing and of the institutions dedicated to its teaching and dissemination (Olson, 1998).

Research conducted in Uruguay on deferred textuality and pluriliterate culture, initially with the Deaf community and later with the academic community (Deaf and hearing individuals) (Peluso; Vallarino, 2014; Larrinaga, 2014; Larrinaga; Peluso, 2017; Peluso, 2018, 2019, 2020b; Peluso; Lodi, 2023; Peluso; Holly; Silveira, 2024) highlight the need to move toward a break with writing-centricity. This research is in dialogue with studies being conducted in Brazil, which also seek to move away from a writing-centered approach and to develop models for tracking learning progress in video production among students (Martins, 2024; Martins *et al.*, 2024; Peluso *et al.*, 2025). This perspective of deferred textuality and a pluriliterate culture, as well as the shift away from a writing-centered ideology, has an impact on the conception of the

literacy process, understood as the process through which people become literate, that is, members of a literate culture (Soares, 2020; Peluso; Holly; Silveira, 2024; Peluso *et al*, 2025).

### 3 Two variables and twelve dimensions

The document analyzed combines two variables to establish the different dimensions to be described in relation to learning progressions for students in the Deaf community at the linguistic-discursive level. The two variables combined in the document are:

- the language or type of language (native/first sign language, second spoken language, foreign and/or global spoken language, foreign and/or global sign language);
- oral communication and deferred textuality (oral communication in sign language and spoken language; video production in sign language and writing; comprehension of videos in sign language and reading).

The twelve dimensions derived from the intersection of these variables are shown in the following table:

Figure 1 – General Architecture of Learning Progressions

|                 |                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| L1 LSU          | Orality          | Interaction and socialization without technological mediation.<br>Interaction and socialization with technological mediation.<br>Interaction, learning, and communication of what was learned. |
|                 | Production DT    | Knowledge and use of technologies for reproducing and archiving video recordings. Knowledge and use of LSU writing systems. Processes for producing deferred textuality.                       |
|                 | Comprehension DT | Knowledge and use of grammatization tools. Contact with deferred texts. Comprehension processes involved.                                                                                      |
| L2 Spanish      | Orality          | Interaction and socialization without technological mediation.<br>Interaction and socialization with technological mediation.                                                                  |
|                 | Writing          | Knowledge and use of writing, archiving, and grammatization tools. Writing texts in Spanish.                                                                                                   |
|                 | Reading          | Knowledge and use of grammatization tools. Contact with writing texts. Comprehension processes involved.                                                                                       |
| LE Oral English | Orality          | Interaction and socialization with technological mediation.                                                                                                                                    |
|                 | Writing          | Writing texts in English.                                                                                                                                                                      |
|                 | Reading          | Knowledge and use of grammatization tools. Contact with writing texts. Comprehension processes involved.                                                                                       |

|                                               |                  |                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| LE Sign Language:<br>LSA, LIBRAS, ASL,<br>ISS | Orality          | Interaction and socialization without technological mediation.<br>Interaction and socialization with technological mediation. |
|                                               | Production DT    | Deferred textuality production. Deferred textuality production process.                                                       |
|                                               | Comprehension DT | Knowledge and use of grammatization tools. Contact with deferred texts. Comprehension processes involved.                     |

Source: Administración Nacional de Educación Pública / Consejo Directivo Central (2019, p. 20)

As we have already noted, the four languages, or language groups, distinguished based on the criteria mentioned above (sign or spoken languages and native, second, foreign, or global languages) are described by distinguishing three skills: oral communication, writing/production of deferred textuality (DT), and reading/comprehension of deferred textuality. In this regard, the document presents a clear ambiguity, since, on a theoretical level, it defines deferred textuality as any text separated from its moment of enunciation (whether written or recorded), but in the presentation of the progressions (as shown in the table), the term “deferred textuality” is used as a synonym for recordings, failing to recognize that written texts also constitute deferred textuality, just like recordings.

In the document, orality (defined broadly as face-to-face communication) was presented in general terms and analyzed according to three criteria:

#### Interaction and Socialization Without Technological Mediation

This category refers to intragroup and intergroup oral communication and socialization practices that do not involve communication technology or social media.

#### Interaction and Socialization With Technological Mediation

This category refers to intragroup and intergroup oral communication and socialization practices mediated by communication technology and social media.

#### Interaction, learning, and sharing what was learned

This category refers to oral practices that take place in formal learning contexts (interchanges between peers, preparation and oral presentation of curricular content) (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 49, our translation).

Particular importance is placed on interaction and socialization facilitated by technology: on chats and all types of communication via social media. Interaction and socialization without technological mediation are not anticipated for English language use, and it is suggested that the development of this skill for Spanish take place outside the school setting and be highly responsive to each student’s individual characteristics.

Thus, when we define the skills developed in the area of non-technology-based oral Spanish, we must be very cautious. We understand that this development should take place outside the classroom (and even outside the school setting) and that these linguistic skills are clearly dependent on each student's identity-related circumstances, their residual hearing, or the presence of a cochlear implant (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 49, our translation).

From this perspective, a decolonial approach to Spanish, particularly in its unwritten form, entails understanding that education for the Deaf community cannot adopt a uniform view on the teaching of spoken Spanish for all students, but must instead address each individual case and adapt accordingly, given that each student has different needs and interests regarding this language. On the other hand, interaction, learning, and the sharing of what has been learned are only anticipated for the LSU.

In this document, the handling of deferred textuality has its own particularities, given that there is the comprehension and production of video recordings in sign languages (LSU and foreign sign languages) and the reading and writing of spoken languages (Spanish and English). As we noted, this represents a contradiction with respect to the theoretical framework, given that deferred textuality is used as a synonym for "video recordings," without considering that, according to the document's own theoretical framework, deferred textuality is a general concept that includes both written and recorded texts.

With regard to the production of deferred textuality, the LSU establishes three categories to consider in learning progressions. The first two address, on the one hand, knowledge of the technology that enables the creation of deferred textuality and, on the other hand, the linguistic skills (syntactic, lexical, and discursive) required for the production of deferred textuality in the context of the current pluriliterate culture of the Deaf community:

Knowledge and use of technologies for reproducing and archiving video recordings.

This category refers to the use of video cameras, lighting and background techniques, and knowledge of the technical aspects involved in producing a video recording. It also involves knowing how to organize and archive videos on a personal computer and on online platforms so that they are accessible to the community.

Processes for producing deferred textuality

This category refers to the production of video recordings (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 49, our translation).

The third category *Knowledge and use of LSU writing systems*, relates to knowledge of a representational writing system:

This category refers to knowledge of signwriting (a representational writing system that was invented for sign languages but was not adopted by the Uruguayan Deaf community) (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 49, our translation).

Furthermore, for foreign and/or global sign languages, the document considers only the process of producing deferred textuality, that is, the linguistic realization of the text, since the knowledge and use of technologies for producing and archiving video recordings, as already provided for in the LSU, are applicable to the recording of any text in any language. It is noticeable that the document does not provide for learning signwriting in LIBRAS or ISS, given that this writing system is available for both, unlike LSU and LSA. We believe this is why the use of signwriting remains in the sphere of deferred textuality rather than that of comprehension (since, as there are no texts written in LSU, there would be no texts to read).

Regarding the understanding of deferred textuality in LSU video recordings, the document proposes four categories. The first of these is “*knowledge and use of technologies for reproducing and archiving video recordings*,” which refers to students’ exposure to the technology that supports deferred textuality. The remaining three categories are:

Knowledge and use of grammatization tools

This category refers to knowledge of descriptive and prescriptive lexicons (dictionaries and sign lists) and descriptive and prescriptive grammars.

Contact with deferred texts (in signwriting)

This category refers to access to and interaction with sign language videos in their various formats and file types.

Comprehension processes of deferred texts

This category refers to the viewing and understanding of video recordings (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 49, our translation).

Particular importance is placed on the use of grammatization tools (dictionaries and grammar books) as part of the development of a metalanguage—which David Olson (1991) refers to as “oral metalanguage”—and the expansion of metalinguistic skills that enable a deeper understanding of comprehension skills (this category could also apply to production). Furthermore, the need for access to texts in LSU recorded on video and for developing an understanding of this particular form of textuality, in which the text must be interpreted in the absence of the speaker and outside the

context of the utterance (similar to reading comprehension), is raised. Similar categories are proposed for understanding deferred textuality in foreign and/or global sign languages.

With regard to writing and reading, the document focuses exclusively on Spanish and English, given that signwriting had already been addressed in the context of deferred textuality for sign languages. This theoretical inconsistency may be due to signwriting not having actually been developed in LSU.

For writing in Spanish and English, students are expected to have knowledge of and proficiency in writing, archiving, and grammar technologies, as well as the ability to write texts in Spanish and English (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 49). For Spanish and English reading, the document states:

Knowledge and use of writing, archiving, and grammatization tools  
Contact with written texts (deferred texts in spoken language)  
This category refers to access to and engagement with various types of texts written in the spoken language across different media  
Comprehension processes involved (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central 2019, p. 49, our translation).

The document highlights the importance, in the literacy process, of various interconnected levels that contribute to the development of reading proficiency: the technologies that support writing and its archiving, and the tools of grammaticalization that enable metalinguistic reflection on language, texts, and the psycholinguistic skills involved in reading.

#### **4 Expected skills for deferred textuality in LSU and Spanish**

Once the twelve dimensions were established, the expected competencies for students in those dimensions were described in relation to four stages within the formal education system: third grade of elementary school (approximately 8 or 9 years old), sixth grade of elementary school (approximately 11 or 12 years old), third grade of middle school (approximately 14 or 15 years old), and sixth grade of middle school (approximately 17 or 18 years old).

We are interested in showing what the document considers to be the expected level of deferred textuality in LSU and in Spanish for students graduating from the

formal education system, since, based on that, we will attempt to infer methodological aspects involved in language and literacy learning.

For the production of deferred textuality in LSU, the document describes the following skills:

- a) knowledge and use of technologies for producing and archiving video recording

Proficiency in using technologies related to the production and archiving of deferred textuality in LSU (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 53, our translation).

- b) knowledge and use of LSU writing systems

Independent and productive use of mind maps, image creation, and annotations for organizing deferred textuality. Knowledge of signwriting (the only phonographic system used in sign languages, which is not used in Uruguay) (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 53, our translation).

- c) process of producing deferred textuality

Management of cohesion and coherence, as well as formal and informal discourse, which must be present in the final version of the text to be shared. Expansion of the metalinguistic function for text processing. Production of high-quality deferred texts, both in terms of the formal aspects of recording and subsequent editing. Ability to include images and written text. Ability to share texts online and make them available to the Deaf community. The above entails participation, as a literate individual, in the emerging culture of literacy in LSU, both in the use of linguistic structures and functions, which are reflected in the video recordings that appear at the institutional level, on social media, on personal websites, in academia, and elsewhere (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 53, our translation).

With regard to understanding deferred textuality in LSU, the skills described in the document are:

- a) knowledge and use of technologies for the reproduction and archiving of video recordings

Use of play and recording technology independently, as well as for searching for videos of personal interest and for academic purposes. Knowledge of the internet technology that currently hosts the largest number of videos. Ability to adjust and refine search criteria according to subject areas or disciplines: for example, biology, literature, etc. Ability to search for, categorize, and save recorded videos of interest for later viewing. Ability to create personal video collections, organizing videos according to own criteria (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 55, our translation).

- b) knowledge and use of grammatical technologies, with reference to the use of LSU grammars and dictionaries

Proficiency in the grammatical content of LSU and phonological descriptors; familiarity with the different varieties of LSU based on the diatopic, diaphasic, and diastratic axes; and the ability to use different registers depending on the speaking situation. Ability to compare LSU with other languages of the region. In terms of technology, proficiency in the use of phonological descriptors, sign language, bilingual and monolingual dictionaries in various formats, the ELAN program or similar software, glossaries, and mind maps. (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 55, our translation).

- c) contact with deferred texts; comprehension processes involved

Full understanding of the differences between written and spoken language (...). Fluency and independence when working with written texts. Ability to analyze, organize, rephrase, and evaluate the content of texts (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 55).

- d) comprehension processes involved

Ability to independently comprehend texts of interest. Ability to identify explicit and implicit information in texts and to analyze both microstructure and macrostructure. High fluency in all text genres. Ability to independently access international platforms and understand videos in other sign languages, in addition to using their own language. Ability to compare texts and rework information based on them. Ability to delve deeply into the processes of interlinguistic transfer and enunciative iconicity (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 55, our translation).

With regard to writing in Spanish, the document proposes the following skills:

- a) knowledge and use of writing, archiving, and grammar technologies

Ability to independently use word processing software and internet technology that supports social media. Ability to use captioning technology (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 59, our translation).

- b) writing various types of texts in Spanish at different levels of formality

Ability to independently construct narratives and arguments in Spanish for the Deaf. Ability to perform simple translations from written Spanish to LSU video recordings and vice versa (for example, adding subtitles to their own work in LSU video recordings). Ability to independently produce simple academic reports. Ability to adapt their own style of Spanish to more closely resemble standard Spanish, depending on the interlocutor and the register (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 59, our translation).

Finally, the skills outlined in the document for reading in Spanish by students who are members of the Deaf community are:

a) knowledge and use of writing, archiving, and grammaticalization technologies

Ability to recognize the structure and vocabulary of texts in each subject and to conduct online research on various topics. Ability to use dictionaries (both monolingual and translation dictionaries) in different formats. Ability to work with subtitles (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 61, our translation).

b) contact with written texts

Ability to read all types of texts independently. Skill in using written Spanish for academic, recreational, and informational purposes. Ability to read subtitles in audiovisual productions. Skill in searching for texts of interest using independent criteria. (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 61, our translation).

c) comprehension processes involved

Autonomy in understanding texts related to academic disciplines and other fields. Acquisition of a substantial vocabulary and its recognition within the text as a whole. Demonstration of metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness, enabling self-regulation of reading; that is, the ability to choose between global and linear reading strategies in different sections, depending on interest and ability. Ability to seek outside help to achieve reading goals, such as searching for information online, using dictionaries, asking others for help, etc. Comprehension of subtitles in audiovisual productions of interest (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 61, our translation).

In short, the learning progression document places the development of literacy in LSU video recordings and written Spanish on an equal footing in policy terms, emphasizing that LSU is the native language and that Spanish is the second language for students in the Deaf community. Therefore, it establishes different proficiency goals for both languages. Furthermore, the document notes that literacy in LSU relies on a representational technology, whereas literacy in Spanish is based on a representational technology, resulting in different psycholinguistic processes.

The document under analysis calls for the development of pluriliteracies based on knowledge of skills and technologies described in many contexts and which are similar for literacy in LSU (video recordings) and in Spanish (writing). On the one hand, the document refers to the technological dimension, which involves understanding the language technologies implicated in the development of deferred textuality and literate culture, that is, the technologies of writing (including signwriting, even though it is not used), video recording, text archiving (repositories, libraries, the Internet), and

grammaticalization (descriptive lexicons and grammars of LSU and Spanish). The document also proposes that students learn about technologies for creating intermediate texts that reveal the macrostructure of the text, which are useful for both production and comprehension (outlines, glosses, mind maps, drawings, highlighting text and video using programs such as ELAN, etc.).

In terms of textual skills, the document expects students to be fluent in aspects of cohesion and coherence. It also promotes the development of all types of metalinguistic skills (through descriptive lexicons and grammars) for working with texts, both in comprehension and production.

From a sociopolitical and sociolinguistic perspective, the document assumes that students in the Deaf community are plurilingual and plurivarietal, knowing several languages and several registers of LSU and Spanish, but always positioning themselves from the perspective of LSU as their mother tongue/native language/first language. Thus, the document analyzed states:

Considering these two aspects—the linguistic characteristics of the Uruguayan Deaf community and the role of new technologies in fostering deferred textuality and a literate culture—the following methodological considerations were taken into account when designing the learning progression:

- Significant emphasis is placed on developing plurilingual learners with pluritechnological literacy. This involves learning the skills needed to create video recordings, on the understanding that this is the path to literacy in sign language and to learning Spanish writing skills. Second, there is a focus on developing deferred textuality in foreign languages (spoken and sign languages).
- The process of second-language teaching is understood from a plurilingual perspective, that is, by rejecting the native speaker and the standard language as ideological tools of imposition. In this regard, an approach to inclusive, plurilingual, and intercultural education must address the Spanish used by the Deaf community, considering the functional language distribution system currently in place within the Uruguayan Deaf community.

Thus, when we define the skills developed in the area of non-technology-based oral Spanish, we must be very cautious. We understand that this development should take place outside the classroom (and even outside the school setting) and that these linguistic skills are clearly dependent on each student's identity-related circumstances, their residual hearing, or the presence of a cochlear implant.

- Through their studies at LSU, students will determine how far they can go in their second-language and foreign-language learning. In this regard, we understand that, methodologically speaking, the teaching of second languages and foreign languages must be based on the LSU (Administración Nacional de Educación Pública/Consejo Directivo Central, 2019, p. 45-46, our translation).

The document aims to enable students to perform interlinguistic transfers and translations and to fluently handle expressive iconicity, which is a very important part of the structure of sign languages. It introduces the concept of deaf Spanish and does not refer to standard Spanish as a hegemonic model that students must necessarily achieve. Furthermore, the document includes the linguistic register framework characteristic of deferred textuality, which encompasses levels of abstraction, generalization, independence, and formality, as well as knowledge of various textual genres. It is assumed that, upon graduation from the formal education system, students will have developed a critical perspective toward texts, languages, and language varieties.

## **5 Final Thoughts:** language teaching

The document under analysis does not address language instruction, but rather the linguistic and discursive skills that students in the Deaf community are expected to possess at four different stages of formal education. Based on the skills described, particularly those relevant to the final stage of the educational system, and on the theoretical framework outlined in this document, we will offer some reflections on the language and literacy teaching methodologies involved.

From a theoretical perspective, the document is based on the concepts of plurilingualism and pluriliteracy, as noted in previous sections. Within this framework, it proposes that second-language instruction follow a plurilingual model, without imposing the standard form of Spanish and while respecting the functional distribution of languages within the Uruguayan Deaf community. It is emphasized that Spanish instruction should take place primarily outside the school setting, in accordance with each student's identity and abilities. Furthermore, from the plurilingual perspective adopted, LSU is positioned as the foundation for learning second languages and foreign and/or global languages. Likewise, it is noted that the literacy process should be carried out in both LSU (video recordings) and Spanish (writing), as well as in the other proposed languages.

In terms of describing the various skills, the document on learning progressions equates, at the policy level, the development of literacy in LSU video recordings with that in written Spanish, establishing different proficiency goals because LSU is the native language of the Deaf community and Spanish is their second language. Both

types of literacy are considered to employ different technologies and psycholinguistic processes, encompassing technological competencies (writing, video recording, archiving, grammaticalization), textual competencies (cohesion, coherence, metalinguistic skills), and sociolinguistic competencies (plurilingualism, translation, enunciative iconicity). Furthermore, the document emphasizes the development of a critical perspective toward texts and languages, without imposing standard Spanish as a hegemonic model.

We find it interesting to note that the document takes a critical perspective on language and literacy instruction, one that is implicit, given that the document does not address teaching methodologies but rather learning progressions. We understand that it takes a critical perspective because it focuses on the proficiency in the mother tongue/first language/native language of students in the Deaf community. It also seeks to foster sociopolitical awareness among these students regarding the relationship between their community's language and other languages—whether second languages, foreign languages, and/or global languages—as well as language varieties. It is important that, in language and literacy instruction, the LSU remain the guiding language throughout the entire process. Obviously, this approach has a clear impact on the language teaching methodology that will be followed.

Another aspect worth highlighting is the role of grammaticalization technologies in language teaching. The document clearly takes the view that language teaching and literacy must be accompanied by deep metalinguistic reflection. In part, because it is understood that deferred textuality, since it is always conveyed through technology that makes it permanent, necessarily implies the development of the metalinguistic function. The document states that this development depends on the use of descriptive grammars and lexicons. Thus, this document would be aligned with those trends in language teaching that emphasize the importance of grammatical reflection in the language teaching process (Defagó, 2022; Defagó *et al.*, 2022). This reflection, as we noted earlier, must be approached from a critical perspective; that is, it is a metalinguistic reflection grounded in grammatical and interlinguistic studies that must hold identity-based and political significance for students in the Deaf community.

In summary, the document on learning progressions in the linguistic-discursive domain for students in the Deaf community proposes several changes. These changes challenge the previous bilingual model in education for the Deaf community (Peluso

2019, 2022; Peluso; Lodi, 2023) insofar as they introduce a plurilingual and pluriliterate perspective.

The document establishes a plurilingual linguistic framework, recognizing that the student body belongs to a plurilingual Deaf community. Based on this, the document establishes a new relationship among different languages in the educational context. This represents a shift from a bilingual LSU-Spanish approach to a plurilingual approach in which LSU is treated as the mother tongue/native language/first language and the centerpiece of the educational project; Spanish as a second language, as it is the majority language in Uruguay; the International Sign System (ISS), Brazilian Sign Language (LIBRAS), or Argentine Sign Language (LSA) as regional and/or global foreign sign languages; and English as a foreign and/or global spoken language.

Likewise, moving from bilingualism to plurilingualism means moving away from Spanish as the ultimate goal of education (a goal that has been maintained in bilingual education for the Deaf community due to the central role that written Spanish continues to play), and instead placing LSU at the center of educational goals (in both oral communication and deferred textuality), as the language that forms the core of students' linguistic competence and identity. This approach breaks with the writing-centered perspective that holds that writing is the only way to develop a literate culture, a perspective that dominates the bilingual approach, and proposes that video recordings in LSU be the preferred technology for developing a literate culture in students' natural and first language. From this, the process of literacy and language development shifts away from a focus on learning to write, and the relationship between video recordings and writing is redefined. Therefore, it is understood that schools must provide literacy instruction in video-recorded LSU (as well as in other video-recorded sign languages), and literacy instruction in written Spanish, as well as in English.

In this paper, we sought to demonstrate how this theoretical framework and the proposed learning progressions outlined in the document under analysis must influence the language and literacy instruction models that, based on these approaches, will be designed for teaching the Deaf population in formal settings. It is not easy to transition from a bilingual to a plurilingual model, and we understand that this is the major challenge currently facing education for the Deaf community.

## REFERENCES

- ADMINISTRACIÓN NACIONAL DE EDUCACIÓN PÚBLICA/CONSEJO DIRECTIVO CENTRAL. **Marco Curricular de Referencia Nacional - MCRN. Desarrollo del pensamiento cultural y sus mediaciones. Dominio Lingüístico-discursivo.** Progresiones de Aprendizaje. Administración Nacional de Educación Pública. Documento oficial, 2019. Available at: <https://www.anep.edu.uy/aaa019037051>. Accessed on: Apr. 23, 2025.
- ARNOUX, Elvira Narvaja de; VALLE, José del. Las representaciones ideológicas del lenguaje. Discurso glotopolítico y panhispanismo. **Spanish in Context**, Nova York, v. 7, n. 1, p. 1-24, 2010. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.7.1.01nar>. Accessed on: Apr. 23, 2025.
- BALLESTRIN, Luciana. América Latina e o giro decolonial. **Revista Brasileira de Ciência Política**, Brasília, n. 11, p. 89-117, maio/ago. 2013. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbcpol/a/DxkN3kQ3XdYYPbwwXH55jyv/?format=pdf>. Accessed on: Apr. 23, 2025.
- CONSEJO NACIONAL DE EDUCACIÓN/CONSEJO DE EDUCACIÓN PRIMARIA. **Propuesta para la implementación de la educación bilingüe en el sordo.** Documento oficial. Montevideo: Instituto Interamericano del Niño, 1987.
- DEFAGÓ, Cecilia. **Nombrar y Predicar:** del conocimiento gramatical a una gramática pedagógica. Editado Universidad Nacional de Villa María, 2022. Available at: [http://biblio.unvm.edu.ar/opac\\_css/visionneuse.php?lvl=afficheur&explnum=3316#page/1/mode/2up](http://biblio.unvm.edu.ar/opac_css/visionneuse.php?lvl=afficheur&explnum=3316#page/1/mode/2up). Accessed on: Apr. 23, 2025.
- DEFAGÓ, Cecilia; ANGLADA, Liliana; MANOILOFF, Laura; OLIVA, M. Belén; SUPISICHE, Patricia M. **Procesamiento del lenguaje y enseñanza de la lengua:** diálogos entre investigación y práctica docente. Editado Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, 2022. Available at: <https://rdu.unc.edu.ar/handle/11086/29721>. Accessed on: 23 Apr. 2025.
- DIRECCIÓN GENERAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PRIMARIA. **Reglamento del Instituto Nacional de Sordo-Mudos.** Montevideo: Imp. Artística, 1910. Available at: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1LUrYkqg3eRIQ4Jnqy3RsAfDOuoD0qC0o?usp=sharing>. Accessed on: 23 Apr. 2025.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogía de la autonomía.** São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2004.
- GROSFOGUEL, Ramón. **El giro decolonial, reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global.** Bogotá: Encuentros, 2007.
- JUDD, Elliot; TAN, Lihua; WALBERG, Herbert. **Teaching Additional Languages.** Bruselas: International Academy of Education, 2001.
- LANDER, Edgardo (org.) **La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales.** Perspectivas latinoamericanas. Ediciones CICCUS, 2011.
- LARRINAGA, Juan Andrés. Linguistic, educational and political aspects regarding two groups in Uruguay: Deaf students and University students. **Psicología, Conocimiento y Sociedad**, Montevideo, v. 4, n. 2, p. 62-88, 2014. Available at: <http://revista.psico.edu.uy>. Accessed on: Apr. 23, 2025.

LARRINAGA, Juan Andrés; PELUSO, Leonardo. Bilingual education or multiple linguistic and technological channels shaping a plurilingual education: the Uruguayan experience. In: GARCIA, Bárbara G. de.; KARNOPP, Lodenir B. (org.). **Change and Promise: Bilingual Deaf Education, Sign Language and Deaf Culture in Latin America**. Washington: Gallaudet University Press, 2017. p. 171-192.

LODI, Ana Claudia Balieiro. Texto e discurso em Libras: possibilidades de apropriação de práticas de leitura e produção de textos/discursos por alunos surdos. In: ERNST, Aracy; LEFFA, Vilson J.; SOBRAL, Adail (Org.). **Ensino e Linguagem. Novos desafios**. Pelotas: EDUCAT, 2014, p. 97-126.

MARTINS, Vanessa R. de Oliveira. **Desenvolvimento linguístico-educacional de crianças surdas: estratégias de avaliação em Libras**. Relatório parcial de pesquisa enviado à Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP), processo nº 2023/12886-5. São Paulo: FAPESP, 2024.

MARTINS, Vanessa R. de Oliveira; LOPES, Maura Corcini; PELUSO, Leonardo; SOLER, Priscila Silveira. Textualidade diferida em Libras e os desafios para a apropriação da escrita por alunos surdos dos anos iniciais do ensino fundamental. **Caletroscópio**, Pelotas, v. 12, p. 92-107, 2024. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufop.br/caletroscopio/issue/view/459/189>. Accessed on: Apr. 23, 2025.

OLSON, David. La cultura escrita como actividad metalingüística. In: OLSON, David; TORRANCE, Nancy. **Cultura escrita y oralidad**. Barcelona: Gedisa, 1991. p. 333-358.

OLSON, David. **El mundo sobre papel**. Barcelona: Gedisa, 1998.

PELUSO, Leonardo. Apuntes para repensar la inclusión educativa. **Tópos**, v. 10, p. 49-55, 2018. Available at: [http://ojs.cfe.edu.uy/index.php/rev\\_topos/issue/view/34](http://ojs.cfe.edu.uy/index.php/rev_topos/issue/view/34). Accessed on: Jun. 22, 2026

PELUSO, Leonardo. Apuntes para repensar la inclusión educativa. **Tópos**, v. 10, p. 49-55, 2018. Available at: [http://ojs.cfe.edu.uy/index.php/rev\\_topos/issue/view/34](http://ojs.cfe.edu.uy/index.php/rev_topos/issue/view/34). Accessed on: Jun. 22, 2026

PELUSO, Leonardo. Considerações teóricas sobre a educação de surdos: especial, bilíngue, inclusiva. **Revista Educação Especial**, v. 32, p. 1-22, 2019. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/educacaoespecial/article/view/38329>. Accessed on: Jun. 22, 2026.

PELUSO, Leonardo. Diversidad, discapacidad, minoridad y disidencia: entre la ideología de la normalidad y las luchas por el reconocimiento. In: JANOARIO, Ricardo; PELUSO, Leonardo (org.). **Apuntes para deconstruir la ideología de la normalidad**. Montevideo: Área de Estudios Sordos/FHCE/UdelaR, 2020a. p. 59-90. Available at: <http://www.tuilsu.edu.uy/biblioteca/espanol/janoarioypeluso2020.pdf>. Accessed on: Jun. 22, 2026.

PELUSO, Leonardo. **La escritura y los sordos: entre representar, registrar/grabar, describir y computar**. Montevideo: Área de Estudios Sordos/TUILSU, 2020b. Available at: <http://www.tuilsu.edu.uy/biblioteca/espanol/peluso2020.pdf>. Accessed on: Jun. 22, 2026.

PELUSO, Leonardo. Consideraciones sobre la educación de la comunidad sorda en Uruguay: del bilingüismo al plurilingüismo. **Educação Temática Digital**, Campinas, v. 24, n. 4, p. 848-865, 2022. Available at:

<https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/etd/article/view/8669209>. Accessed on: Jun. 8, 2026.

PELUSO, Leonardo; VALLARINO, Stella. Panorámica general de la educación pública de los sordos en Uruguay a nivel de primaria. **Psicología, Conocimiento y Sociedad**, v. 4, n. 2, p. 211-236, 2014. Available at:

<https://revista.psico.edu.uy/index.php/revpsicologia/article/view/241/224>. Accessed on: Jun. 8, 2026.

PELUSO, Leonardo; HOLLY, Lucía; SILVEIRA, Mariana. Cultura (pluri)letrada e institución educativa. In: **Libro de Actas del 3er Congreso Internacional Educación Crítica e Inclusiva: Hacia una práctica inclusiva y comprometida socialmente**. Madrid: Grupo de Investigación Estudios sobre Comunicación y Lenguajes para la Inclusión y la Equidad Educativa (ECOLE), Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 2023. p. 331-335. Available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14352/109135>. Accessed on: Jun. 8, 2026.

PELUSO, Leonardo; LODI, Ana Claudia B. Educación de los sordos: desde la normalización al plurilingüismo. **Linguagem & Ensino**, Pelotas, v. 26, n. 1, p. 36-51, jan./abr. 2023. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.15210/rle.v26i1.6802>. Accessed on: Jun. 8, 2026.

PELUSO, Leonardo; KARNOPP, Lodenir.; MENTASTI, María Larua; MUÑOZ, Sol; SINIGAGLIA, María Alicia. Cultura letrada en la educación de las comunidades sordas. **Lingüística**, v. 41, 2025. Available at:

<http://www.scielo.edu.uy/pdf/ling/v41/2079-312X-ling-v41-e201.pdf>. Accessed on: Mar. 14, 2026.

QUIJANO, Anibal. Dom Quixote e os moinhos de vento na América Latina. **Dossiê América Latina**, v. 19, n. 55, p. 9-31, 2005. Available at:

<https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-40142005000300002>. Accessed on: Mar. 14, 2026.

QUIJANO, Anibal. Bien vivir, entre el desarrollo y la decolonialidad del saber.

**Revista VIENTO SUR**, n. 122, p. 46-57, 2012. Available at: [https://vientosur.info/wp-content/uploads/spip/pdf/VS122\\_A\\_QUIJANO\\_Bienvivir---.pdf](https://vientosur.info/wp-content/uploads/spip/pdf/VS122_A_QUIJANO_Bienvivir---.pdf). Accessed on: 23 Apr. 2025.

RAJAGOPALAN, Kanavillil. **Por uma lingüística crítica: linguagem, identidade e questão ética**. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2003.

SOARES, Magda. **Alfabetização e letramento**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2020.

WALSH, Catherine. **Pedagogías decoloniales, prácticas insurgentes para resistir, reexistir y revivir**. Tomo 1. Quito: Abya-Yala, 2013. Available at:

<https://archive.org/details/walsh-c.-pedagogias-decoloniales.-praticas-insurgentes-de-resistir-reexistir-y-revivir.-tomo-i>. Accessed on: Apr. 23, 2025.

WALSH, Catherine. **Pedagogías decoloniales, prácticas insurgentes para resistir, reexistir y revivir**. Tomo 2. Quito: Abya-Yala, 2017.

## **MINI BIOGRAPHY**

### **Leonardo Peluso Crespi**

Ph.D. in Linguistics from the Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina. Associate Professor of the Career of Interpreter and Translator LSU-Spanish and of the Bachelor's Degree in Psychology, Salto Campus, CENUR Litoral Norte, Universidad de la República. Coordinator of the research group "Textualidad Diferida."

E-mail: [leonardo@psico.edu.uy](mailto:leonardo@psico.edu.uy)

### **Ana Claudia Balieiro Lodi**

Lecturer in Education at the Universidade de São Paulo. Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics and Language Studies from the Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo. Associate Professor II in the Department of Education, Information, and Communication and in the Postgraduate Program in Education at the Ribeirão Preto School of Philosophy, Sciences, and Humanities at the Universidade de São Paulo.

E-mail: [analodi@ffclrp.usp.br](mailto:analodi@ffclrp.usp.br)

Translated by **Carlos Eduardo Chiba**