

PRESENTATION

# Internationalization in Education as a field in Linguistic Studies: linguistic rights and social justice in focus



OPEN ACCESS

## HOW TO CITE

Souza, M. M. M. F.; Chagas, L. A.; Wexell-Machado, L. E. (2026). A internacionalização na Educação como campo nos Estudos Linguísticos: os direitos linguísticos e a justiça social em cena. *Revista da Abralín*, v. 24, n. 2, p. 1-12, 2025. *English version*.

Marina Mello de Menezes Felix de Souza

Federal University of Western Bahia (UFOB)

Lucas Araujo Chagas

State University of Mato Grosso do Sul (UEMS)

Luis Eduardo Wexell-Machado

National University of Asunción (UNA)

## Introduction

The proposal of this thematic dossier stems from the understanding that Internationalization in Education constitutes a fruitful field of investigation for Linguistic Studies and its different research areas. The relevance of the theme for language sciences is due to the fact that internationalization movements encompass glottopolitical actions, intercultural mediation practices, and discourses that, at times, naturalize unequal conditions of participation in educational, scientific, and social spaces. In this sense, as researchers in the field, we highlight that it is not about artificially displacing an educational or institutional agenda to the field of Linguistic Studies, but rather recognizing that internationalization movements and processes are constituted by discursive practices, linguistic choices, language, educational, teaching and learning policies, social repertoires, and struggles for recognition.

Thus, by adopting this scope in this dossier, we position ourselves in favor of understanding Internationalization in Education as one of the fields of investigation within language sciences. We therefore recognize its potential for Linguistic Studies and seek to contribute to strengthening a

research agenda that, although gaining ground in recent decades, still demands greater recognition from our peers and the expansion and projection of its multiple objects of study.

This approach becomes especially necessary given that internationalization is still idealized by many as mobility, production of institutional visibility indicators, cooperation among peers, and international projection. Although these elements are relevant, they do not exhaust the complexity of the phenomenon itself. Conceived from the perspective of Linguistic Studies, Internationalization, both Basic and Higher Education, demands attention to the languages circulating in the institutional spaces and their teaching and learning practices, to the recognized or silenced repertoires and knowledge, to the language policies, to the concrete conditions of participation of those involved in educational processes, to the political, cultural, and economic dimensions of people attending educational institutions, and to the subjective and social aspects that challenge the people involved in pre-established processes.

From this angle, linguistic rights and social justice do not appear as accessory themes, but as constitutive dimensions of the debate. We understand that Internationalization in Education can expand possibilities for professional education, cooperation, and scientific exchange, but it can also reproduce asymmetries when it naturalizes privileged avenues of access to knowledge, disregards plural repertoires, or transforms linguistic diversity into an institutional brand without problematizing the concrete effects of these choices on the social and subjective repertoires of the actors challenged by it. Therefore, discussing Internationalization in Education within the field of Linguistic Studies implies questioning who participates, in which languages they participate, under what conditions of recognition they participate, from which institutional, social, and epistemic positions they participate, and how the subjectivities of the participants are challenged by their entry into the promoted actions.

The dossier “*Internationalization in Education as a Field in Linguistic Studies: Linguistic Rights and Social Justice in Focus*” brings together research developed by Brazilian scholars linked to language sciences with the purpose of broadening the dialogue on these issues and intensifying the recognition of the field as an inter/multi/transdisciplinary territory of studies. To this end, this presentation organizes a reading path that problematizes the intersections between Linguistic Studies and Internationalization in Education, discusses the approximation between internationalization, language policies, and linguistic rights, and finally, presents the articles gathered in this volume of the ABRALIN Journal. Together, these contributions allow us to conceive Internationalization in Education as a social practice traversed by subjective and cultural affections and by linguistic, political, economic, social, institutional, and epistemic disputes.

# 1. Intersections between Linguistic Studies and Internationalization in Education

Considering Internationalization in Education from the perspective of Linguistic Studies implies shifting it from an understanding restricted to institutional strategies, academic mobility, cooperation agreements, or insertion into prestigious international circuits (Albuquerque-Costa; Souza, 2024). Although such dimensions are relevant, they do not exhaust the complexity of the phenomenon and the cultural and political movements it potentiates. As Knight (2004) observes, internationalization is a term mobilized in different ways by individuals and institutions, which favors its expansion but also its imprecision. This imprecision demands critical attention, as a contemporary agenda of rights and social justice cannot limit itself to asking which actions are named international. It needs to go beyond and interrogate which conceptions of language, knowledge, university, school, and subject are produced, legitimized, or reinforced by these actions.

It is precisely for this reason that Internationalization in Education cannot be reduced to institutional management processes, products, and mechanisms (Knight, 2004; Hudzik, 2015; De Wit, 2019). Although important, this reading does not encompass its complexity and often limits its understanding and transversality in educational contexts. By placing language issues at the center of the debate, it becomes possible to understand it as a broad cultural and political movement challenged by social practices that mobilize linguistic choices, educational policies, institutional discourses, intercultural mediations, power relations, and subjective affections. In this way, studies that articulate language and internationalization contribute to shifting the debate from a predominantly managerial logic to a perspective more attentive to the human, social, and symbolic relations that traverse educational processes and the communities that benefit from them. Thus, Internationalization in Education can be understood as a social praxis and as a multidimensional cultural and political movement, permeated by impasses, conflicts, tensions, mediations, uncertainties, congregations, and dispersions.

By characterizing it as social praxis, Rocha and Maciel (2018, p. 137) highlight that these movements involve “a continuous process of living and reconstructing oneself amidst aporic spaces,”<sup>1</sup> in which doubt, uncertainty, and instability lead to shifts in ideas, sayings, and doings. Therefore, speaking of Internationalization in Education is not perceiving it as a form of regime or as a fixed essence, but as a set of interrelations that organizes modes of coexistence, production of meanings, and social participation.

Approaching it as a movement implies considering the forms of coexistence among individuals, languages, cultures, and institutions. From this perspective, language does not appear as an accessory dimension, but as a constitutive element of the relations that sustain Internationalization in Education (Chagas, 2021). In it, policies, institutional documents, teaching practices, intercultural

---

<sup>1</sup> Traduced by the authors. In the original: [...]um contínuo processo de viver e se reconstruir em meio a espaços aporéticos [...]. (Rocha; Maciel, 2018, p. 137).

mediations, human resources, curricula, and choices about languages not only guide and organize actions but also produce meanings, legitimize repertoires, define conditions of participation and recognition, delineate scientific practices, and consolidate beliefs about which languages, individuals, and knowledge should be more valued (Silva, 2020; Amorim, 2020; Guimarães, 2021; Pereira, 2024; Silva, 2024; Gimenez et al, 2024; Rosa; Da Silva; Kurtz, 2025; França; Ortega; Prado, 2025).

From a convergent perspective, within the scope of Linguistic Studies, Internationalization in Education should be seen as a cultural and political movement capable of fostering articulations between different Brazilian educational contexts and capable of contributing to the promotion of democracy and social emancipation through education (Santos et al., 2024). Gomes and Santos (2023, p. 17) add that Internationalization in Education should be conceived as an

articulated movement by academic and non-academic communities that seeks to promote the sharing of ideas, cultures, innovative practices, and social responsibilities, which manifest transversally in the different sectors of teaching, research, extension, and management of educational institutions. This movement involves solidarity and collaboration between national and international partners in order to allow a decolonial and critical positioning, repositioning local demands in the face of the need for insertion in an international context<sup>2</sup>.

This understanding directly interests the purposes of this dossier, as it shifts Internationalization in Education from a logic restricted to institutional insertion in international circuits and places it in the field of social responsibilities, collaboration, and articulation between local demands and international relations. By emphasizing the sharing of ideas, cultures, practices, and responsibilities, Santos et al. (2024) and Gomes and Santos (2023) contribute to a reading of internationalization as a socially situated movement, traversed by individuals, institutions, languages, territories, and power relations.

This reading dialogues with Chagas (2025), for whom Internationalization in Education involves “racial, social, ecological, economic, decolonial, gender, power, identity dimensions and many others<sup>3</sup>” that are present in Brazil's relations with different nations, peoples, and political regimes. According to the author, the assumptions mobilized to internationalize education “directly affect the life, culture, and conceptions of engaging with the world of individuals who coexist<sup>4</sup>” in schools, universities, capacitation courses, and society (Chagas, 2025, p. 3). Such relations directly interest Linguistic Studies, as they are materialized in and through language. This means that they can be observed in the interactions that occur through languages that are predominant or silenced, in discourses that legitimize certain knowledge, in policies that organize academic participation and

---

<sup>2</sup> Traduced by the authors. In the original: [...] movimento articulado pelas comunidades acadêmicas e não-acadêmicas que busca promover o compartilhamento de ideias, de culturas, de práticas inovadoras e de responsabilidades sociais, que se manifestam de forma transversal nos diferentes setores de ensino, pesquisa, extensão e gestão das instituições de educação. Este movimento envolve a solidariedade e a colaboração entre os parceiros nacionais e internacionais de forma a permitir um posicionamento decolonial e crítico, reposicionando as demandas locais diante da necessidade de inserção em um contexto internacional (Gomes; Santos, 2023, p. 17).

<sup>3</sup> Traduced by the authors. In the original: [...] dimensões raciais, sociais, ecológicas, econômicas, decoloniais, de gênero, de poder, de identidade e tantas outras mais (Chagas, 2025, p. 3).

<sup>4</sup> Traduced by the authors. In the original: [...] afetam diretamente a vida, a cultura e as concepções de se relacionar com o mundo dos indivíduos que convivem [...] (Chagas, 2025, p. 3).

student life, and in intercultural mediation practices that make possible, or limit, the encounter between individuals, cultures, and knowledge.

In this scenario, as a study object that can be approached in the different domains of language sciences, especially regarding to the understanding of linguistic, symbolic, institutional, educational, and social development elements, producing research based on Internationalization in Education practices expands the space that linguists have within these discussions. Lagares' (2018) proposition becomes pertinent in this debate by highlighting the social and political implications of the linguist's work. When discussing it, the author reminds that their work,

as that of any other human sciences specialist, also has social effects, often unforeseen by them [...]. The political effects of their research exist even in spite of their absence, insofar as they contribute to consolidate certain linguistic culture and can endorse positions of power and authority in relation to languages<sup>5</sup> (Lagares, 2018, p. 16-18).

This observation allows us to understand that investigating Internationalization in Education from the perspective of Linguistic Studies also implies recognizing the responsibility of linguistic research in legitimizing, contesting, or transforming the ways of valuing languages, subjects, knowledge, praxis, and forms of researching, learning, teaching, interacting, and coexisting from and with languages and their symbolic repertoires. In this way, studies on language not only describe internationalized educational practices but also contribute to highlight inequalities, quest hierarchies, and expand the conditions of recognition in educational spaces.

## 2. From Internationalization in Education to Linguistic Rights: Language Policies and Social Justice

As discussed in the previous section, the movements of Internationalization in Education carry, even if implicitly, ways of selecting, valuing, inducing, and managing languages, individuals, and knowledge. This understanding dialogues with Spolsky (2016), for whom language policies are constituted by three interconnected, though relatively independent, components: linguistic practices, beliefs or ideologies about language, and language management. For the author, practices correspond to the observable choices and behaviors of individuals; beliefs concern to the values attributed to languages, varieties, and linguistic uses; and language management refers to the explicit efforts to intervene in practices and beliefs (Spolsky, 2016).

Taken as a key to understanding Internationalization in Education, these three components allow us to observe that internationalization processes are not organized solely by administrative

---

<sup>5</sup> Traduced by the authors. In the original: [...] como o de qualquer outro especialista de ciências humanas, também tem efeitos sociais, muitas vezes não previstos por ele [...]. Os efeitos políticos de suas pesquisas existem mesmo à sua revelia, na medida em que elas contribuem para consolidar determinada cultura linguística e pode cancelar posições de poder e autoridade em relação às línguas" (Lagares, 2018, p. 16-18).

decisions or institutional agreements. Linguistic practices appear in curricula, the choice of languages to be mobilized in classes, calls for proposals, documents, mobility programs, reception actions, publications, and academic interactions. Beliefs and ideologies manifest in the values attributed to certain languages, varieties, and repertoires, especially when some become associated with academic prestige, scientific excellence, or international insertion. Language management, in turn, can be perceived in the ways institutions define educational policies, proficiency requirements, course offerings, choices of publication languages, translation, intercultural mediation, and linguistic support. Thus, Internationalization in Education involves language policies even when these are not explicitly formulated as such.

From this framework, academic mobility actions, institutional partnerships, the debate on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and the use of additional languages and the demarcation of languages of instruction in educational spaces are not, in themselves, problematic. On the contrary, they can expand repertoires, foster cooperation, and create conditions for the circulation of individuals and knowledge among different nations and educational institutions. The critical point emerges, however, when these linguistic choices begin to function as self-sufficient indicators of Internationalization in Education, without questioning the practices, beliefs, and forms of language management that sustain them. When an institution promotes certain languages and linguistic and intercultural practices to the detriment of others, privileges certain partnerships, defines which productions will have greater circulation, or establishes which repertoires are considered most appropriate for international academic and student participation, it organizes institutional flows, but also hierarchizes languages, subjects, knowledge, educational practices, and forms of recognition.

This problematization, therefore, brings Internationalization in Education closer to the field of linguistic rights. The contribution of Linguistic Studies to understanding the movement allows us to highlight that academic and student participation and interaction resulting from internationalization depend on concrete linguistic conditions such as access to education, support for language learning, recognition of plural and plurilingual repertoires in universities and schools, intercultural mediation, the circulation of productions in different languages, the valorization of historically minoritized individuals, and the awareness that school and university communities interact with the multiple social groups that occupy the territories in which they are located, configuring plurilingual knowledge as part of the resources for exercising citizenship. Thus, if the access to education, networked academic and school cooperation, mobility, intercultural practices, scientific production, and local and international circulation of knowledge depend on such conditions, their absence produces simultaneously institutional, educational, political, social, and linguistic inequalities.

Hamel (1995), when addressing the field of linguistic rights, emphasizes that it is situated at the articulation between two domains: language and human rights. From this perspective, analyzing Internationalization in Education from a language perspective does not mean adding a lateral theme to the educational debate, but recognizing that access to knowledge, education, cooperation, and participation in school and academic spaces is always mediated by languages and discourses capable of legitimizing or delegitimizing individuals, practices, and knowledge. Internationalization in

Education, therefore, can also produce exclusions when it naturalizes certain languages as the only legitimate avenues of academic circulation or when it transforms linguistic diversity into a decorative brand, without concrete effects on the conditions of participation.

Discussing the contemporary frameworks of linguistic rights in Brazil, Abreu (2025, p. 9) states that this field has as one of its constitutive bases the search for a “linguistic social justice that guarantees dignity and redistributive equity, recognition, and representation<sup>6</sup>.” This formulation allows us to bring linguistic rights and Internationalization in Education closer without reducing the discussion to a generic defense of diversity. It is, rather, about asking who has the conditions to participate in internationalization processes and movements, in which languages this participation occurs, which repertoires are recognized as legitimate, and which subjects remain marginalized from academic prestige circuits. It is also about recognizing languages as an inherent element of the cultural and political practices and movements of Internationalization in Education, because without them it is not possible to interact and experience the interculturality and intercomprehension that educational and networked collaboration practices demand.

From this perspective, Internationalization in Education, when considered from the viewpoint of Linguistic Studies, needs to be analyzed not only by academic mobility or the international circulation of knowledge, but also by the conditions of access, permanence, recognition, representation, and participation of linguistically minoritized groups. It is worth noting that access without permanence can produce only apparent inclusion; permanence without recognition can keep individuals and repertoires in subalternized positions; and recognition without participation can convert diversity into institutional rhetoric without concrete effects (Souza, Silva, and Silva, 2025). These issues highlight the centrality of language in Internationalization in Education movements and reinforce the need to consider linguistic rights as a constitutive part of this debate. It is about understanding that participation in internationalized educational processes depends not only on the existence of institutional opportunities, but also on the linguistic, political, and epistemic conditions that allow subjects to access, remain, be recognized, and effectively participate in these spaces.

Based on this horizon, we proposed this dossier as part of a collective effort to understand Internationalization in Education beyond the idea of openness to the world and to the locality. Together, the texts gathered here allow us to conceive it as a field of disputes for more just, plural, and democratic ways of producing, teaching, learning, and sharing knowledge.

### 3. The Construction of the Dossier

The texts gathered in this dossier, together, allow us to understand Internationalization in Education as a field traversed by linguistic, political, epistemic, and institutional disputes. Thus, more than

---

<sup>6</sup> Traduced by the authors. In the original: [...] justiça social linguística que garanta dignidade e equidade redistributiva, de reconhecimento e de representação (Abreu, 2025, p. 9).

considering it as synonymous with mobility, institutional process, management mechanism, formal cooperation, or adherence to global education metrics, the articles presented here examine it as a situated social practice, marked by tensions between the expansion of possibilities and the production of asymmetries, collaboration and hierarchization, recognition and silencing. In this sense, the dossier is organized around three complementary parts. The first problematizes Internationalization in Education from critical foundations and an ethical-political horizon; the second covers the analysis of devices, strategies, and forms of governance that materialize Internationalization in Education in institutions; and the third refers to the observation of Internationalization in Education policies and practices in diverse educational contexts, where languages, individuals, and territories acquire centrality.

The first part brings together contributions that question the foundations of Internationalization in Education and place language at the center of a contemporary agenda of rights and social justice. In it, the article by Leonardo Alves and Cristine Görski Severo, titled “*Internacionalização do Ensino Superior brasileiro e a construção linguística do comum educativo*,” opens the dossier by proposing a glottopolitical reading of Internationalization in Higher Education in Brazil. By discussing rankings, academic mobility, the hegemony of English, and asymmetries between North and South, the text shifts Internationalization in Education from a celebratory perspective to an analysis of its linguistic and epistemic effects. The notion of the educational common functions, in this framework, as a critical horizon for thinking about ways of knowledge circulation that are not sustained by the erasure of local languages, subjects, and epistemologies.

In dialogue with this critique, Barbara Cortat Simoneli and Kyria Rebeca Finardi, in “*Educação para a cidadania global e internacionalização: uma revisão narrativa focando em discursos, ideologias e disputas hegemônicas*,” examine Education for Global Citizenship as a space of discursive dispute. The article shows that global citizenship can both reinforce logics of competitiveness, ranking, and employability and sustain practices guided by social justice, equity, and decolonial perspectives. This ambivalence is decisive for the dossier, as it prevents any naive reading of Internationalization in Education, evidencing that its discourses are not neutral and its effects depend on the ideologies that traverse them and the practices that concretize them.

Still in this first part, the article by Thiago Ribeiro Rafagnin, Luciana Rita Bellincanta Salvi, and Maritânia Salete Salvi Rafagnin, titled “*A linguagem como prática de liberdade: contribuições de Paulo Freire para a internacionalização da educação na perspectiva dialógica e decolonial*,” expands the debate by recovering the centrality of the word, listening, and dialogue in the construction of a humanizing Internationalization in Education. By mobilizing Freirean thought, the text rejects the idea of internationalizing as a simple transfer of models or adaptation to external standards. Instead, it proposes a cultural and political movement understood as an ethical encounter between subjects and knowledge, founded on co-authorship, solidarity, and epistemic plurality.

In the second part of the dossier, the focus is on the devices, strategies, and institutional challenges that give concrete form to Internationalization in Education, especially in Higher Education. In it, the article by José Celso Freire Junior, Valeska Virgínia Soares Souza, and Cláudia Almeida Rodrigues Murta, “*A percepção da inovação em internacionalização em casa em universidades públicas brasileiras*,”

shifts the focus from physical mobility to internationalization at home practices. By mapping experiences in Brazilian public universities, the text avoids the simplifying notion of “best practices” and values “possible practices,” that is, those that are more pertinent to specific institutional conditions. This shift is important because it brings Internationalization in Education, innovation, and institutional responsibility closer, without losing sight of the concrete conditions of Brazilian universities.

Subsequently, the article by Hiago Higor de Lima and Denise Barros Weiss, “*Desafios da internacionalização da educação: o que os agentes das instituições de ensino superior dizem?*” contributes to the debate by giving voice to agents from international relations offices of Brazilian public institutions. The text shows that Internationalization in Education is not achieved solely by the existence of policies or administrative sectors, as it also depends on the understanding of its objectives by the academic community. The incomprehension of the process, institutional resistance, linguistic insecurity, and the absence of clear guidelines appear as challenges that strain the construction of a more democratic and integrated culture of internationalization. This is a relevant contribution for showing that linguistic and institutional policies only gain effectiveness when they are understood, negotiated, and appropriated by the individuals who experience them.

In the same vein, Luciana Cabrini Simões Calvo and Kyria Finardi, in “Virtual exchange in the internationalization scenario of Brazilian Higher Education: a review of studies,” analyze virtual exchange as a possibility to expand access to internationalization. The review of studies published between 2013 and 2024 shows the growth and diversity of these initiatives in Brazilian Higher Education, but also draws attention to their challenges. Virtual exchange, therefore, does not appear as an automatic or technically neutral solution, but as a practice that requires planning, institutional support, critical reflection on languages, and attention to the conditions of participation of individuals.

The third part of this dossier gathers articles that examine policies and practices in specific educational contexts, evidencing that Internationalization in Education materializes in distinct ways according to territories, educational levels, involved individuals, and circulating languages. In it, the article by Fabiana de Freitas Batista and Nildicéia Aparecida Rocha, “*Ensino de Português para estrangeiros nos Institutos Federais: análise comparativa de cursos do Programa de Português como Língua Adicional em Rede*,” inserts the teaching of Portuguese as an Additional Language into the internationalization debate. By analyzing courses offered in a virtual environment by federal institutions, the text articulates linguistic planning, educational technology, and the education of foreigners in Brazil. Its contribution lies in showing that internationalization also involves the policy of teaching the Portuguese language, technological mediation, and the construction of linguistic access conditions for individuals in mobility.

Meanwhile, the article by Caique Fernando da Silva Fistarol, Andreza Cipriani, and Marcia Regina Selpa Heinzle, “*Educação bilíngue na rede pública municipal de Pomerode/SC: análise de influências e de discursos da política curricular*,” shifts the debate to internationalization in basic education and the formulation of bilingual curricular policies. By analyzing the experience of Pomerode city, in Brazil, the study highlights the presence of local, national, and international influences in the construction of a language education policy. The valorization of cultural and linguistic heritage, the preparation for the

world of work, and the search for educational quality appear as contested meanings, showing that curricular policy is not simply applied, but reinterpreted in daily school life, taking into account the social developments that internationalization practices construct in the local reality.

Also in the field of basic education, Hemily da Silva Oliveira, Jaqueline Nascimento da Silva Reis, and Kelly Cristina Nascimento Day, in “*Ações de Internacionalização na Educação pública do Estado do Amapá (2018-2025): uma análise dos acordos e Parâmetros Nacionais*” analyze Internationalization in Education actions in a context marked by the border dimension and cooperation with French institutions. The article shows that the movement can be thought of from regional specificities, mainly when it involves language policies, French language teaching, teacher education, bilateral agreements, and alignment with the National Parameters for Internationalization in Basic Education. The Amapá experience shows that internationalization does not occur in an abstract way, but in concrete territories, with their own histories, borders, languages, and demands.

Finally, at the closing of this rich reading journey, the article by Valéria Campos Muniz, Danielle Cristina Mendes Pereira Ramos, and Adriana Lúcia de Escobar Chaves de Barros, “*Agenda 2030: inclusão e educação bilíngue de/com surdos*,” expands the scope of the dossier by articulating internationalization, sustainability, linguistic citizenship, and bilingual education for the deaf. By problematizing the myth of monolingualism and the historical effects of language colonization, the text places Libras (Brazilian Sign Language) and deaf individuals at the center of a linguistic justice agenda. The discussion shows that the formal recognition of rights is not enough, as it is necessary to confront the material, pedagogical, and epistemic conditions that still limit the effectiveness of critical, inclusive, and emancipatory bilingual education.

Read together, the ten articles that make up this dossier construct a path that goes from the critique of hegemonic models of Internationalization in Education to the analysis of its concrete ways of realization in institutions, curricula, technologies, language policies, and educational practices. In common, the texts reject an instrumental and merely procedural conception of the movement and emphasize the need to understand it as a field of dispute, in which it is defined which languages gain legitimacy, which subjects participate, which knowledge is recognized, and which educational projects become possible in the face of contemporary demands. By bringing together Linguistic Studies, Internationalization in Education, linguistic rights, and social justice, the dossier thus proposes a research and intervention agenda committed to epistemic plurality, the democratization of knowledge, and the construction of more just educational practices.

By approaching Internationalization in Education in different contexts, language perceptions, and theoretical perspectives, this publication seeks to broaden the scope of the reflections presented here and reaffirm the centrality of linguistic diversity in contemporary academic debate. Thus, we thank the ABRALIN Journal for accepting the proposal, the authors who accepted the invitation to the academic dialogue proposed here, the reviewers for their promptness in evaluating the manuscripts, and the editorial team for their careful monitoring throughout the organization and publication process.

We hope that the gathered articles will foster new debates and research on the relations between Linguistic Studies, Internationalization in Education, linguistic rights, and social justice. More than concluding a discussion, this dossier seeks to open paths to think about internationalization as a field in Linguistic Studies and as a cultural and political movement and social practice traversed by language, by epistemic disputes, and by the possibility of ethical-political commitments to more plural and democratic forms of teaching and generating and sharing knowledge.

### REFERÊNCIAS

ABREU, Ricardo Nascimento. Prefácio. In: SOUZA, Marina Mello de M. F. de; SILVA, Bruno Pinto; SILVA, Kleber Aparecido da (org.). *Direitos das minorias linguísticas: propostas, avanços e desafios*. 1. ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, p. 7-10, 2025.

ALBUQUERQUE-COSTA, Heloísa; SOUZA, Marina Mello de Menezes Felix de. A complexidade das ações institucionais desenvolvidas por docentes/pesquisadores para a concretização de uma política de internacionalização. In: ALBUQUERQUE-COSTA, Heloísa; SOUZA, Marina Mello de Menezes Felix de (org.). *Internacionalização no Ensino Superior e formação em línguas estrangeiras: conceitos, abordagens metodológicas e programas de ensino*. 1. ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, p. 85-100, 2024.

AMORIM, Gabriel Brito. A internacionalização do Ensino Superior no Brasil: uma proposta de matriz multidimensional de (auto)avaliação. 2020. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória, 2020.

CHAGAS, Lucas Araujo. Perspectivas de internacionalização e cenários políticos de professores de idiomas no contexto de uma universidade federal brasileira. 2021. Tese (Doutorado em Estudos Linguísticos) – Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Uberlândia, 2021.

CHAGAS, Lucas Araujo. A Internacionalização da Educação Superior no contexto brasileiro: os desafios da construção de uma agenda nacional autônoma, decolonial e socialmente implicada. *Revista Vértices*, [S. L.], v. 27, n. 1, p. e27123535, 2025.

DE WIT, H. Internationalization in Higher Education, a critical review. *Simon Fraser University Educational Review*, v. 12, n. 3, p. 9-17, 2019.

FRANÇA, Poliana Quintiliano Silvestro; ORTEGA, Déborah Marinho Carvalho; PRADO, Thaissa Moreira. Políticas de Internacionalização na Educação Básica: inserções na formação continuada de professores. *Revista Vértices*, [S. L.], v. 27, n. 1, p. e27123505, 2025.

GOMES, Rodrigo Belfort; SANTOS, Elaine Maria. Da política ao planejamento linguístico: por uma construção coletiva em prol da internacionalização. In: CHAGAS, Lucas Araujo; COELHO, João Paulo Pereira (Org.). *Estudos Linguísticos e Internacionalização na Educação Superior: transdisciplinaridades, inovações e práxis*. Cassilândia, MS: Fundação Universidade Estadual de Mato Grosso do Sul, p. 17-31, 2023.

GIMENEZ, Telma; COGO, Alessia; CALVO, Luciana Cabrini Simões; EL KADRI, Michele Salles. English Language Hegemonies in the Internationalization of Two State Universities in Brazil: Unintended Consequences of English Medium Instruction. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*. v. 24, n. 1, e40232 2024.

GUIMARÃES, Felipe Furtado. Internacionalização e Multilinguismo: uma proposta de política linguística para universidades federais. 2020. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística). Programa de Pós-graduação em Linguística, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória, 2020.

HAMEL, Rainer Enrique. Droits linguistiques universels et diversité socioculturelle: critères sociolinguistiques. In: MARTEL, Pierre; MAURIS, Jacques (ed.). *Langues et sociétés en contact: mélanges offerts à Jean-Claude Corbeil*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, p. 435-453, 1994.

HUDZIK, John. *Comprehensive internationalization: from concept to action*. Washington: Routledge, 2015.

KNIGHT, Jane. Internationalization remodeled: definitions, rationales, and approaches. *Journal for Studies in International Education*, v. 8, n. 1, p. 5-31, 2004.

LAGARES, Xoán Carlos. *Qual política linguística? Desafios glotopolíticos contemporâneos*. São Paulo: Parábola, p. 15-30, 2018.

SILVA, Jefferson Evaristo do Nascimento. Políticas linguísticas de promoção e internacionalização da língua portuguesa: os planos de ação e as revistas Qualis A. 2020. Tese (Doutorado em Letras). Instituto de Letras, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2020.

SILVA, Nayara Stefanie Mandarino. O curso de especialização da Rede IsF para professores(as) de inglês e a Internacionalização do Ensino Superior no Brasil. *Dissertação* (Mestrado em Letras). Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras da Universidade Federal do Paraná. Curitiba, 2024.

PEREIRA, Lauro Sérgio Machado. Formação continuada de professores de inglês e internacionalização da educação: uma pesquisa-ação colaborativo-crítica. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística). Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2024.

ROCHA, Cláudia. Hisdorf; MACIEL, Ruberval Franco. Prática local e Internacionalização do Ensino Superior. In: MACIEL, Ruberval Franco et al. (Orgs.). *Linguística Aplicada para além das fronteiras*. Campinas-SP: Pontes Editores, p. 128-140, 2018.

ROSA, Tamara Angélica Brudna; SILVA, Kléber Aparecido da; KURTZ, Fabiana Diniz. Políticas linguísticas e de internacionalização à luz do legado de Paulo Freire: os inéditos-viáveis no/do/para o Sul Global. *Contexto & Educação*, v. 40, p. e17389-5, 2025.

SANTOS, Elaine Maria; CHAGAS, Lucas Araujo; ALBUQUERQUE-COSTA, Heloísa Brito de; MORAES-FILHO, Waldenor Barros. Da convivência à elaboração teórica: propostas conceituais de língua(s), política(s) linguística(s) e política(s) de internacionalização na visão do grupo de pesquisa sobre Políticas Linguísticas e de Internacionalização da Educação Superior (GPLIES). *Revista Leitura, [S. l.]*, v. 1, n. 83, p. 107-127, 2024.

SOUZA, Marina Mello de M. F. de; SILVA, Bruno Pinto; SILVA, Kleber Aparecido da (org.). *Direitos das minorias linguísticas: propostas, avanços e desafios*. 1. ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, p. 41-72, 2025.

SPOLSKY, Bernard. Para uma Teoria de Políticas Linguísticas. *ReVEL*, vol. 14, n. 26, 2016.