UNLV | UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education

Volume 22
Issue 2 *Summer 2023: 22.2*

Article 5

June 2023

Can Subaltern, Multilingual and Multidialectical Bodies Feel? An Aspirational Call for Undoing the Coloniality of Affects in English Learning and Teaching

Jihea Maddamsetti
Old Dominion University, jmaddams@odu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/taboo

Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons, and the Language and Literacy Education Commons

Repository Citation

Maddamsetti, J. (2023). Can Subaltern, Multilingual and Multidialectical Bodies Feel? An Aspirational Call for Undoing the Coloniality of Affects in English Learning and Teaching. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education, 22* (2). Retrieved from https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/taboo/vol22/iss2/5

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Article in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself.

This Article has been accepted for inclusion in Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

Can Subaltern, Multilingual, and Multidialectical Bodies Feel?

An Aspirational Call for Undoing the Coloniality of Affects in English Learning and teaching

Jihea Maddamsetti

Abstract

When Spivak (1988/2010) provocatively raised the question "Can the subaltern speak?" and concluded that they cannot, she did not mean that the subaltern literally or physically cannot speak. She meant that Western/Eurocentric/White ways of knowing and languaging produce colonial, epistemic violence that silences subaltern bodies. In this conceptual paper, I pose a related question: "Can subaltern, multilingual and multidialectical bodies feel?" Little attention has been paid to understanding the affect of multilingual and multidialectical students during English Learning and Teaching (ELT) . As a teacher educator/researcher positioned within ELT in the white settler context of the U.S., I reach a conclusion similar to that reached by Spivak. When dominant ELT research and practice rejects the languaging and affective experiences of multilingual and multidialectical students, those students are treated as subaltern bodies that cannot speak or feel.Here, I ask how subaltern, multilingual and multidialectical bodies can speak and feel in learning English. I argue that the (de)coloniality of affects must be a key conceptual framework for teaching English to multilingual and multidialectical students.

Introduction

When Spivak (1988/2010) provocatively raised the question "Can the subaltern[1] speak?" andconcluded that they cannot, she did not mean that the subaltern

Jihea Maddamsetti is an assistant professor in the Department of Teaching & Learning of the Darden College of Education and Professional Studies at Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia. Email address: jmaddams@odu.edu

© 2023 by Caddo Gap Press.

literally or physically cannot speak. She meant that Western/Eurocentric/White ways of knowing and languaging produce colonial, *epistemic violence* that silences subaltern bodies.

In this conceptual paper, I[2] pose a related question: "Can subaltern, multilingual and multidialectical[3] bodies feel?" Little attention has been paid to understanding the *affect* of multilingual and multidialectical students during English Learning and Teaching (ELT)[4]. As a teacher educator/researcher positioned within ELT in the white settler context of the U.S., I reacha conclusion similar to that reached by Spivak. When dominant ELT research and practice rejects the languaging and affective experiences of multilingual and multidialectical students, those students are treated as subaltern bodies that cannot speak or feel.

Here, I ask how subaltern, multilingual and multidialectical bodies *can* speak *and* feel inlearning English. I argue that the (de)coloniality of affects must be a key conceptual frameworkfor teaching English to multilingual and multidialectical students.

Why (De)coloniality of Affects in ELT?

"Affect" can be broadly understood as embodied, relational, situated, and dynamic intensities,capacities, or encounters that circulate and do things (Seigworth & Gregg, 2010). Massumi (2002) distinguished affect from emotion. That is, while affect is an ontological capacity of bodies to act or be acted on by other bodies, emotion manifests affect through language, rationale, and consciousness (e.g., describing oneself as happy or sad). This view of affect, however, largely disregards how, within a colonialist and white supremacist system, racializedand subjugated bodies are not granted the same capacity to affect and be affected (Thiel & Dernikos, 2020; Zembylas, 2021).

By contrast, Ahmed (2012) conceptualized affect as the economy (e.g., racialized and gendered) through which "affect does not reside in an object or sign, but is an effect of the circulation between objects and signs: the more signs circulate, the affective they become" (p. 45). In this view, affective economies work in and through exclusionary logic by which affect, not just circulate between bodies. Affect thus "sticks" to particular bodies (e.g., fear and suspicion around racialized, gendered, linguicized, queer, im/migrant, low-paid, and dis/abled bodies) and, accordingly, preserve extant, unequal power relations among bodies, objects, and ideas (e.g., border control and de facto school segregation. Ahmed (2004, 2012) argued that affect and emotions are indistinguishable because both are expressed and felt bodily in ways thatlead to action.

In this light, close attention to racialized and colonizing aspects of affects enables us to foreground bodies and affects that have long been backgrounded, silenced, censored, disavowed, and erased in dominant social and institutional practices, such as multilingual and multidialectical bodies in dominant lan-

guage education and research. Indeed, although women ofColor[5] feminists may (e.g., Ahmed, 2004, 2014) or may not (e.g., Wynter, 2003) identify themselves as critical affect scholars, they nonetheless considered colonial, white supremacist, cis-hetero-patriarchal, and capitalist neoliberal ways of knowing, being, doing, and feeling as affective, embodied, and ontological forces. For instance, this literature critique that Western/Eurocentric/White ontological, epistemic, and affective ideal has long upheld a mind/body distinction, privileged disembodied and universalized praxis by autonomous Western/White/Eurocentric knowing-, acting-, and feeling subjects with the "scientific" or "rational" mind, and prioritized Western/Eurocentric/White intellectual *and* emotional equilibrium (Ahmed, 2004, 2014; Wynter, 2003). This literature, thus, challenges us to radicallyreconsider and transform the ontological, epistemic, and affective foundations that have shaped institutional and structural injustices against Indigenous, Black, Brown, and many other intersectionally minoritized peoples.

The decolonial critique of ahistorical, depoliticized, and ethnocentric approaches to affectruns parallels to anti-racist, decolonial, and culturally sustaining educational scholarship that urges us to disrupt the dominant, oppressive educational ethos that discipline and surveil intersectionally minoritized students into Western/Eurocentric/White ways of being, knowing, acting, and feeling that are dissonant from their lived, embodied experiences (Tuck & Yang, 2012; 2014). Of these approaches, educational scholarship on decolonial affects has taken the role of *refusal* seriously as an affective and embodied act of saying enough or no to the hegemonic coloniality of teaching and learning (e.g., Thiel & Dernikos, 2020; Truman et al., 2020; Zembylas, 2021). Refusal can take various shapes in classrooms and beyond because our bodies think, feel, (re)member, and act in relation to other human and more-than-human bodies(e.g., texts, sounds, media, and nature) (ibid.).

Nevertheless, limited attention has been paid to what roles of (de)coloniality of affects may come into play in multilingual and multidialectical classrooms and what decolonial theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical practice need to be cultivated in the field of ELT. This limited attention stands in contrast with a surge of the field's interest in language teacher emotion and language learner emotion from cognitive (Gregersen, Mercer, & MacIntyre, 2021), sociocultural (Wolff & De Costa, 2017), and poststructuralist perspectives (Benesch, 2018). Some notable exceptions have considered affects in teaching and learning English as discursiveand racially constructed. These studies have (a) discussed the link between intersecting global forces (white supremacy, capitalism, and neoliberalism) and 'non-native' and 'non-white' English speakers' feelings of inferiority, frustration, anxiety, and desire towards English; (b) examined the connection among teacher affects, identities, and pedagogical stances and moves; (c) emphasized the agentive power of intersectionally minoritized teachers' affects in naming and challenging unequal power relations in multilingual and multidialectical class-

rooms (e.g., Maddamsetti, 2021; Park, 2022; Song, 2018). Still, while racialized and colonial aspects of affects areaddressed in this literature, they are rarely foregrounded as focal, decolonial praxis in working with and for multilingual and multidialectical students.

Structure of the Article

I began by situating the coloniality of teaching and learning English at the onto-epistemological and affective levels because, in the colonial matrix of power, intellectual and affective economies are intertwined in what follows. I then highlight the issues of "why," "who," "how." and "what" of (de)coloniality of affects in ELT research and practice. I conclude by arguing that educators and teacher educators working with multilingual and multidialectical students need todirectly address the affective and embodied workings of colonial power in teaching and learningEnglish.

Framing the Issue: Coloniality in Ways of Knowing, Be(com)ing-with, and FeelingEnglish

Colonialism refers to diverse modes of domination of a nation and people (e.g., white settlers' political and economic domination and repatriation of land, labor, sovereignty, culture, language,beliefs, identities, and resources in the U.S., Canada, and South Africa) (Mignolo, 2007; Wa Thiong'o, 2009; Sousa Santos & Meneses, 2020). Coloniality is defined as the pervasive effects of colonialism, in concert with intersecting global forces (e.g., neoliberalism, capitalism, and White supremacy), in the contemporary context, even without the overt presence of colonial regime and control (ibid.).

Although the coloniality of English has taken different shapes across various geographicalcontexts, I consider ELT in multilingual and multidialectical classrooms has been long tied to onto-epistemological (entangled ways of being and knowing) and affective (ways of feeling) aspects of coloniality in this section.

Coloniality at the Onto-epistemological Level and its Link to English Learning andTeaching

Coloniality can take many different social and institutional shapes, such as what counts as "legitimate" or "rigorous" schooling, education, and research. Such coloniality, in turn, demandsindigenous and other subaltern and minoritized groups to accept and internalize the subjectivitiesof the "colonial matrix of power" in symbolic and discursive ways (Mignolo, 2007). For example, Paris (2019) noted "education as a space of erasure" (p. 219) in which intersectionally minoritized students are asked to acquire dominant language, cultural norms, and knowledgewhile often being positioned as "at risk," "inner-city residents." or "free and

reduced lunch status"—all of which violently ignore, obfuscate, or negate minoritized students' complex intersectional identities and agency.

Relatedly, at the onto-epistemological level, Western/White/Eurocentric ways of knowing and speaking the English language and their associated subjectivities have long been privileged over others (Flores, 2013; Flores & Rosa, 2015, 2022). Such colonial hegemony of English is rooted in oppressive, colonial logics that construct Western/White/Eurocentric modes of knowing and being as *superior, modern*, and *universal* while positioning "non-dominant", "non-white", or "non-native" ways of knowing and being as *inferior, uncivilized*, and *erasable*. Due to colonial co-construction of race and language, being perceived as linguisticOther is often synonymous with being perceived as racial Other. In this regard, when Spivak (1988/2010) questioned whether the 'subaltern can speak', she highlighted that it is not that the subaltern cannot speak or is not speaking. Rather, it is who is listening to them and how they are being listened to—or silenced, subjugated, and disenfranchised by Western/White/Eurocentric epistemologies (e.g., about language, self, belonging, and success). Following this line of thinking, Flores and Rosa (2015) described "white listening subjects" as racialized language ideologies (also known as raciolinguistic ideologies) that position the English languaging practices of racialized minoritized individuals as "inappropriate" or "non-academic" to those of privileged white individuals, even though their linguistic practices are identical. This raciolinguistic ideology also propagates the globally dominant ideology of "native-speakerism" (Holliday, 2005), which posits the white listening/speaking subjects as authentic citizens, and ideal and authoritative models for teaching and learning English. What must be highlighted here is that these racialized language ideologies ultimately uphold intersecting and ongoing systems of colonialism and white supremacy. Seen this way, the violence of coloniality moves beyond the tangible, material and physical violence (e.g., enslavement, genocide, and dispossession of land). It entails *epistemic violence* (Spivak,1988/2010) and its related ontology of becoming, through which the subaltern Other come to understand what they must know and what they would never fully be(come) in relation to Western/White/Eurocentric ways of knowing and being. In so doing, such epistemic violence in teaching and learning English positions Indigenous, Black, Brown, and other minoritized bodies as sub-human or less-than-human, and disenfranchises, negates, and endangers Other ways of knowing and being (Flores, 2013; Flores & Rosa, 2015, 2022).

One prime example of such onto-epistemic violence is legislative institutionalization of "standard English-only" language policies in white settler colonialist contexts (e.g., the U.S., Canada, Australia, and New Zealand) as necessary for educating and uniting all people (Flores, 2013). Such language policies not only valorize monolingualism in English: they impose Western/White/Eurocentric norms and practices at the local/classroom and structural/institutionallevels in order to (re)produce colonial subjects who relate to a singular nation-state/colo-

nial governmentality. In the context of Global South, scholars have also critiqued how onto-epistemic violence is manifested through uncritical, ahistorical, and apolitical approaches to teaching standardized English verities (e.g., "standard American/British English") and applying Western/Eurocentric/White-washed English-teaching curriculum, instruction, and assessment to the local contexts (Kubota, 2022; Motha & Lin, 2014; Park, 2022). Across academic institutions in the context of Global North and Global South, this onto-epistemic violence becomes embodied through knowledge production systems or "intellectual economies," in which Western/Eurocentric/White rules govern or monopolize what theory, methods, praxis, andcommunicative modes are more 'scholarly' and 'legitimate' than others.

Coloniality at the Affective Level and its Link to English Learning and Teaching

The colonial power matrix does not simply populate "intellectual economies" but also promotes and sustains "affective economies". According to Ahmed (2004, 2012), "affective economies" refers to how affects are circulated and mobilized to produce particular affective responses to certain bodies, relations, things, spaces, and ideas, and their consequentiality (e.g., in material and political terms). For instance, affective economies steeped in the complex colonized and racialized history of the U.S. repeatedly circulate fears of crime and terrorism about racially minoritized bodies, and yield tangible material consequences, including de facto segregation of neighborhoods and schools, and border control policies and practices. Ahmed (2004, 2012) also points out the ways in which colonial and racialized affective economies prioritize, universalize, and humanize white feeling subjects (e.g., white guilt, fragility, and benevolence), in order to naturalize power differentials through affects, and protect its embedded whiteness. Ahmed also points out the flip side: colonial and racialized affective economies frame the structural forces at play in one's affective and embodied realities as individual pathologies—they posit intersectionally minoritized people's affective responses to systemic injustices as 'over- reacting,' 'confrontational,' or 'overly political,' Zembylas (2018) further noted how such affective economies justify state-sanctioned surveillance and violence over minoritized bodies, and enable affective consumptions among well-meaning white liberals, such as solicitation of celebratory and empathetic approaches to diversity and inclusion without effecting changes at the institutional level. To speak English 'proficiently' and 'appropriately' also demands us to think, act, and feelin ways that conform to a hegemonic notion of proficiency and appropriateness. In this vein, colonial, affective economies of ELT do not merely circulate English language as abstract ideals,but regulate what emotions, whose emotions, and what kinds of emotional expressions are considered to be 'proper' and 'professional' in teaching and learning English.

For example, the superiority, authority, and desirability of the racialized "native" English-speakers are underpinned by naturalizing "non-native" English-speakers' feelings of inferiority, insecurity, and alienation towards their indigenous languages and cultures (Motha & Lin, 2014; Park, 2022; Song, 2018). Fanon (1963/2008) reminds us that being colonized is a process in which our bodies literally become physically, onto-epistemologically, *and* affectively controlled by others. For Fanon (1963/2008), feelings of desire, fears, anxieties, paranoia, and insecurities that colonized subjects experience with respect to the perceived proficiency of colonizers' language are both processes and instruments that perpetuate colonial domination and subjugation. Fanon' observation is situated in the context of French Caribbean colonialism; however, it still resonates with subaltern Others who must learn how to speak, behave, *and* feel in accordance with hegemonic norms and expectations in public institutional spaces (Maddamsetti, 2021; Zembylas, 2018, 2021). Motha and Lin (2014) further suggest that in this age of globalization, the coloniality of the English language has worked in concert with intersecting global forces (e.g., neoliberalism, capitalism, and white supremacy), and instrumentalized English as objects of *desire* that colonialsubjects must pursue:

> [At] the center of every English language learning moment lies desire: desire for the language; for the identities represented by particular accents and varieties of English; for capital, power, and images that are associated with English; for what is believed to liebeyond the doors that English unlocks. (p. 146)

Treating English as an affective object—as a desired commodity—assumes that one's proficiency of speaking hegemonic English can help one to attain cultural modernity, social and economic mobility, and equality with one's culturally and socioeconomically 'superior' western/white counterparts. At the same time, the implication of desiring English is that colonial subjects must be *obedient* to colonial episteme (e.g., disembodied rationality) and unequal, affective relations therein, to eliminate all vestiges of boorishness (Mignolo, 2007; see also, Motha & Lin, 2014).

Indeed, previous studies have suggested that a hegemony of English and its embedded, dominant ways of knowing is being perpetuated by imposing (English-only) monolingualism onto language-minoritized students' bodies, by the disciplining and silencing of their bodies, and by dismissing their affective and (dis)embodied realities (Park, 2022; Petrie & Darragh, 2020). For instance, examining the impact of neorealism and coloniality on South Korean students' English learning, Park (2022) illustrated that English language learners in (neo/post-) colonial contexts are positioned as human capital who must ceaselessly invest in self-improvement projects, including speaking academic or 'good' English, to enhance their marketability.

Similarly, Petrie and Darragh (2020) showcased that desiring English in southwestern Nicaragua is valorized for cultural and economic advancement

through tourism policies, educational curriculum, and social media. Extant literature has also documented colonial and (post/neo-) colonial contexts where one hegemonic variety of English (e.g., "American English") dominatesin public and professional life, and in which teachers, who do not look or sound like 'native (Western/Eurocentric/White) speakers', often undergo a range of difficult emotions—such asanxiety, frustration, insecurity, vulnerability, and self-censorship—and face challenges in establishing authority, regardless of their linguistic knowledge and pedagogic competence (e.g.,Song, 2018).

These examples highlight a key point about the colonial affects that permeates teaching and learning English: they are meant to maintain a colonial legacy and mentality by linking human worth and capital with a 'good' command of dominant colonial language, while rejectingthe linguistic legitimacy of racialized colonial subjects. Conversely, it is equally pivotal to remember that racially and linguistically minoritized teachers and students can agentively name, unpack, and disrupt such colonial affects and associated language ideologies. A bulk of literature provides possibilities for using discourses (e.g., written, spoken, and/or signed, critical reflectionand [counter-]storytelling) and engaging in collaborative learning across diverse contexts, professional relationships, and time as a powerful means to foster their agency to act against power structures (Park, 2022; Petrie & Darragh, 2020; Song, 2018; Wolff & De Costa, 2018).

What Is at Stake?

Most literature that has addressed coloniality of ELT at the onto-epistemological and affective levels tends to consider the body as a discursive construction of "multiple forms and locations of discourse, *discursive* performance, politics, values, and the 'everyday'—both past and present—that emanate from the history of colonialism" (Madison, 2005, p. 46, italics added for emphasis). In this view, the body is something that can be controlled, disciplined, and legislated by power- laden discourses, or something that can conceptually and materially represent or enact agency against such power structures. This discursive view of the body privileges discursive aspects of affects and, however unwittingly, may reinscribe colonizing Western/Eurocentric ontology of separation— separations between human bodies, separations between one's body and the world(e.g., land, spirits, and nature), and separations from one's mother tongue (Wynter, 2003).

Yet, for Indigenous, Black, Brown, and many other minoritized, multilingual and multidialectical groups in the context of settler-colonization and post-/neo-colonization, the relational self and the whole body—and its links with emotions/affects, memories, languages, histories, and lands—have been vital, and notions of ontologies, epistemologies, and axiologies have always been intertwined (e.g., Anzaldúa, 2015; Collins, 1990/2009; Crenshaw, 1991; Dillard, 2012; Minh-ha, 1989; Wynter, 2003). In this respect, women of Color feminist scholars have

asserted the necessity of challenging human- and linguistic exceptionalism when accounting for the coloniality of affects. At the same time, they have underlined the significanceof countering the assumptions of the universality of human subject, body, and affect, because such assumptions have invented who and what constitute 'the human' and, thereby, dehumanize,ignore, criminalize, and erase indigenous, Black, Brown, and many other multilingual and multidialectical subaltern subjects, bodies, and affects from the very category of 'the human' (ibid.).

Accordingly, it is imperative to engage in a decolonial reading of affect and explore howcolonization, racialization, and other intersectional forms of oppression have shaped affective norms and practices of teaching and learning English.

A Note on Researcher Positionality

I am a Korean immigrant woman. My own experiences at the intersection of privilege (e.g., a highly educated, cis-, middle-class, abled body) and marginalization (e.g., a body that has beensubject to racism, linguicism, xenophobia, and deportation court proceedings) across different racial, linguistic and cultural contexts push me to think about the coloniality of languages and guide my work as a teacher educator/researcher in multilingual and multidialectical classrooms.

As much as I desire to disrupt the coloniality of affects in the ELT field, I acknowledge that the conceptual, methodological, and pedagogical scope of this paper is inherently limited. While I propose that the decolonial option of affects in ELT research and practice is urgent, I alsostay cautious about desires for "securities with alternative perspectives… [that may] instrumentalize, essentialize, and romanticize these alternatives as the mythical opposite of whatever is perceive to have caused the interruption of previous ontological securities" (Shahjahan et al., 2017, p. 16).

1. RethinkingAffects in ELT Research and Practice Through a Decolonial Lens

I understand that decolonial, affective approaches to ELT research and practices seek *to refuse* (Tuck & Yang, 2012, 2014) or *delink* (Mignolo, 2007) from Western/Eurocentric/White assumptions about universal, neutral, anthropocentric, and logocentric concept of the human capacity (or legitimacy) to affect and be affected by teaching and learning English. Such approaches also entail power-laden, embodied and affective *subjectivities* (self and other) who engage in meaning- and identity-making practices in a *particular context* (e.g., social, cultural, material, political, and historical) *via* various ELT materials and activities. In other words, the "why", the "who", the "how", and the "what" of ELT influence decolonizing affective approaches to ELT research and practices. It is important to note, however, that these elements are intertwined with one another. The separation of these components is problematic, especiallyfrom a decolonial standpoint.

Here, I explore four aspects of decolonial perspectives that can account for the (de)coloniality of affects and can foster alternate connections to affects, bodies, spaces, and things in ELT research and practice. These four aspects include: (a) refusing affectively and linguistically Othered ways (or the "why"); (b) rethinking Self and Other in (dis)embodying affects (or the "who"); (c) rethinking methodologies of (de-/re-)constructing affects (or the "how"); and (d) rethinking material and affective encounters (or the "what").

4-1. Issues of the "Why": Refusing Affectively and Linguistically Othered Ways

Fostering such affective modes of refusal requires rethinking multilingual and multidialecticalstudents' languaging bodies and affects in relation to interlocking power structures (Collins, 1990/2009; Crenshaw, 1991) and issues of (de)humanization (Wynter, 2003). As such, I consideraffective modes of refusal as embodied intersectional and humanizing experiences in what follows.

A decolonial pedagogical framework purposefully seeks to undo or delink from the unequal power relations inherent to the colonial episteme and affect (Mignolo, 2007; Wa Thiong'o, 2009). The concept of refusal, in particular, aims to recenter and reclaim alternative (e.g., Indigenous) sovereignty, practices, and lifeworlds within and against oppressive, colonial logics. According to Tuck and Yang (2014), refusal, as a concept and means, allows for rejecting the onto-epistemologies of the White Gaze and its disembodied emphasis on knowledge production and practice, which collect "[damage-centered] stories of pain and humiliation" as a determining feature of (re)presenting those deemed disposable (p. 812). Thus, one must actively resist "trading in pain and humiliation, and supply a rationale for blocking the settler colonial gaze that wants those stories" (ibid.). Tuck and Yang (2014) noted that decolonial refusal, however, is not just saying no "but a redirection to ideas otherwise unacknowledged or unquestioned. Unlike settler colonial configuration of knowledge that is particularly exasperated and resentful of limits, a methodology of refusal regards limits on knowledge as productive, as indeed a good thing" (p. 239).

To this end, a decolonial pedagogical framework calls for a purposeful shift away from a deracialized, ahistorical, apolitical, and universalized view of languages, discourses, and practices toward an intersectional, historic, politicized, and holistic view that re-centers the affective and embodied realities of minoritized peoples, including multilingual and multidialectical students. In this sense, refusals call out subaltern subjectification—the processesof how colonial subjects are formed in colonizing discourse, relations, time, and space and how they are onto-epistemologically and affectively (re)presented. In doing so, refusal of colonial subjectification enables us to turn back the racist, colonialist, and imperialist White Gaze and itsembedded "colonial modalities of knowing persons as [disposable] bodies" (Tuck & Yang, 2014,p. 817).

More recent studies (Park, 2022; Truman et al., 2020; Zembylas, 2021) have called for more affective and embodied perspectives on decolonial refusal. Zembylas (2021) outlined three affective modes of decolonial refusal. These modes include (a) refusal as social and affiliative in enabling alternative forms of relationality and community; (b) refusal as distinguished from resistance which may oversimplify power relations in anthropocentric and binary terms (superior Self versus inferior Other); and (c) refusal as hopeful and willful for contesting Western/Eurocentric/White humanist futurity of colonization. Park (2022) and Truman et al. (2020) further underline the importance of affective modes of refusal (e.g., silences and pushbacks). These can reframe and deepen our understanding of multilingual and multidialectical bodies who refuse to speak "correctly", write "correctly", and behave "correctly", as defined by dominant languaging and literacy practices. In this regard, Park (2022) notes that affective modes of decolonial refusal in multilingual and multidialectical classroomscan provide "alternative instances of feeling, thinking, and experiencing" beyond westernized, eurocentric, and white-washed, colonial subjectivities (p. 5).

4-2. Issues of the "Who": Rethinking Self and Other in (Dis)embodying Affects

Decolonial framings of affects require us to consider our relational, collective, and coalitionalways of being and becoming in the world, as "I am because we are" in contrast to "I think, therefore I am" (Dillard & Neal, 2020).). Concurrently, we must ask: who are "we" in contestingcolonial affects in teaching and learning English with and for multilingual and multi-dialectical students? Whose worldviews and subjectivities do we choose to align in that process?

Western/Eurocentric/White colonialism has normalized a worldview in which the worldis ontologically separated from a series of forces that are always already divided and in opposition with each other, such as self | other, mind | body, subject | object, native | non-native,civilized | primitive, theory | practice—thereby, reifying a Cartesian dualism (Wynter, 2003).

Within this colonial logic, being viewed as 'articulate' in using English is a supposed complimentfor demonstrating particular ways of thinking, being, feeling, and acting 'appropriately' in and through the whitestream world. In this colonial structure, learning English for multilingual and multi-dialectical students is about accepting and internalizing particular felt and embodied subjectivities of 'appropriateness' and 'correctness' (Flores, 2013; Flores & Rosa, 2022). These include that accepting that those who cannot and do not speak and write 'correctly' will invite anddeserve poor treatment in the classroom and beyond; that feelings of indignation, humiliation, anxiety, and rejection from the whitestream world are an inevitable part of becoming 'appropriate' English users; and that multilingual and multi-dialectical peoples are individually responsible for using

'correct' and 'appropriate' English in public and institutional, whitestreamspaces. Yet, embodying the attributes of 'appropriateness' and 'correctness' lies at the root of thecolonial project, which has long justified physical, embodied, affective, and material violence towards those who are seen as the subaltern Other.

While the work of Black, Brown, Indigenous, and Asian women of Color feminist scholars may (e.g., Ahmed and King) or may not (e.g., Anzaldúa, Minh-ha, and Wynter) view themselves as affect theorists, their work nevertheless addresses racialization and intersecting forces (e.g., gendered, linguicized, and classed) as ontological, embodied, and affective issues with possibilities to challenge white supremacist colonial legacies (King et al., 2020, p. 13; see also Thiel & Dernikos, 2020). In what follows, I turn to women of color feminist perspectives onenfleshments of intersectionality, (de)humanization, and agency to think through ways to challenge (dis)embodied white gaze on subjectivities and affects in working with multilingual and multi-dialectical students.

Considering Intersectional, Colonial Subjects as Affectively Racialized and (Dis)embodied

Being disenfranchised, endangered, and, ultimately, colonized is about our bodies being physically, discursively, and affectively governed by others. That is to say, those who govern thebody consider the subjugated body as ridden with savagery, irrationality, and disorder. In so doing, when the body is seen, heard, read, and felt as the Other, that body evokes (or is imposed upon) certain affective responses, such as suspicion, disgust, anxiety, and fear (Fanon, 1963/2008). In this colonial logic, those who identify with the subaltern body are made to acceptthat their embodied, affective, and spiritual relations to other human bodies and nature must be disciplined to indicate the civilized, cultured, and palatable body. In this light, women of Color feminists have conceptualized the body as not just physical/material and sensory flesh. Rather, the body is a site of struggle where systemic positionings of power, privilege, dominance, and subjugation (e.g., raced, gendered, linguistic, classed, and dis/abled) are inscribed on that flesh (e.g., Anzaldúa, 2015; Minh-ha, 1989). The body is also a site of resistance, resilience, and social action where one explores their lived, embodied experiences and affective realities to re-envisionwhat counts as knowledge and what it means to be with other bodies (both human and otherwise)(ibid.). In this regard, women of Color feminists proposed the notion of intersectionality—i.e., how the interconnected social identities (e.g., race, gender, language, and class) intersect in the (re)production of and resistance against oppression and subjugation (Combahee River Collective, 1977/1982; Collins, 1990/2009; Crenshaw, 1991). In this view, intersectionality is not merely discursively constructed and, thereby, abstracted from the body. Instead, intersectionality is evoked through the flesh-and-blood body and negotiated within everyday power-laden interactions, actions, and affectivities.

Critical language studies have increasingly emphasized the embodied and enfleshed nature of English languaging practices. In particular, the intersectionality of race and language— also known as "native-speakerism" (Holliday, 2005) and "raciolinguistic ideologies" (Flores & Rosa, 2015)—plays a vital role because it involves disciplining and policing a "speaking" body into a specific kind of discourse (e.g., "American English") while leaving non-whitestream ways of speaking and being are left to feel incorrect, unprofessional, and undesirable. In this view, due to the racist and colonialist construction of 'native speaker', racialized, multilingual and multi- dialectical bodies' languaging practices are likely to be perceived as linguistically, culturally, and cognitively deficient, regardless of their objective English proficiency. Indeed, studies taking an intersectional approach to race and language have considered how the subaltern-speaking body is daily met with the white gaze through the ears, the mouth, the eyes, and the hands (e.g., Maddamsetti, 2021, Kaveh, 2023). In so doing, echoing Flores and Rosa (2015), this literature hasproblematized that it is "white listening subjects" who have silenced and pathologized silences of subaltern speaking subjects—even when the subaltern *can* and *do* speak and feel and act against distress, anxiety, and (self-)doubt.

The enduring and expansive nature of the colonial legacy extends across the globe. As such, decolonization through the lens of intersectionality also requires considering racialization of 'non-native' and/or 'non-white' bodies in conjunction with global forces (e.g., capitalism, neoliberalism, and white supremacy). At the same time, we must remember that intersectionalitywas conceptualized based on the U.S. racial and its intersecting power dynamics. For instance, Global Southern and transnational feminists have critiqued terms like 'women of Color' and 'peoples of Color' signal U.S.-specific racial (dis)embodiment and intersectional subjectivities because they may not apply to different contexts around the globe (e.g., Dillard, 2012; Minh-ha,1989). Seen this way, framing (de)colonial subjectivities of English through U.S. racial tensions and asserting universalized (de)colonial subjecthood and affects is deeply problematic.

I turn to the work of Wynter (2003, 2015) who fiercely endeavored to retheorize 'the human' and 'humanness' toward a more expansive anti-racist, feminist, and decolonial vision inthe following section.

Reconsidering 'Humanness' and Affects With(in) Human and More-than-human Relations

As much as it is significant to recenter and humanize embodied and affective realities of multilingual and multi-dialectical students in colonial settings, it is also necessary to locate and unpack the colonial logic of humanism. I turn to decolonial feminist scholar Wynter (2003, 2015), who viewed that the ontology of humanity is deeply rooted in Western/Eurocentric/White onto-epistemological assumptions, which are often universalizing, reductive, essentialist, binary, and

non-relational. This colonial logic imposes western/white/eurocentric, masculine-centered, cis-hetero-patriarchal, Christian, able-bodied, male subjects as the template for what it means to be the most Human/Man. In this onto-epistemological logic, those who do not fit that template are viewed and treated as less than human. Wynter (2003, 2015) asserted that this way of being and knowing worldwide has been—and still is—guiding principles of commodification, dispossession, categorization, and violence in the historical and contemporary context of colonialism. Specifically, Wynter (2003, 2015) traced the 'genres' of Man, or the liberal humanist and colonialist project, in two ways—i.e., Man 1 and Man 2. For Wynter, while Man 1 refers to the rational and autonomous human making decisions without theoretical binds in the eighteenth century, Man 2 refers to the 'scientifically literate' man based on the Darwinian view of natural selection and a capitalist upsurge in the nineteenth century. Wynter (2003) described that this "Man's overrepresentation as the human"—or the overrepresentation of whiteness as humanness—has been guiding principles for justifying Western/Eurocentric/White colonialism, the trans-Atlantic slave trade, cis-hetero-patriarchal relations, the promotion of secular or modernscience, and fascist movements. Wynter (2015), thus, calls for the "radical reconstruction and decolonization of what it means to be human" (p. 4).

Educational institutions and, by extension, teaching and learning the English language in and through these spaces have been shaped by this overrepresentation of Man as *the* human. For this reason, following Wynter's (2003, 2015) view, language and literacy scholars have critiquedthe normative, colonial, and white linguistic underpinning of who counts as a 'literate' subject and what counts as an 'appropriate' languaging and literacy practice. For example, according to Truman et al. (2020), while languaging and literacy practices that are "white and rational, schooled and sensible" are recognized as legitimate and competent, those that are "found onwalks, scratched on bedsteads, stuffed under furniture, or enacted in gesture, sound, and drawing" (p. 226) are not. Further developing Wynter's (2003, 2015) framework from a decolonial and anti-racist affective perspective, Truman et al. (2020) argued that processes of humanization and dehumanization in teaching and learning English in multilingual and multidialectical classrooms are affective—entrenched in colonial condition and conditioning of how one senses oneself and relates with others. In Truman et al.'s (2020) account, the capacity for some to feel humane towards their languages and languaging rests upon colonial conditions and conditioning that others are left to feel their alienation and inhumanity towards their ways ofbeing, knowing, and languaging (see also, Snaza, 2019). Domínguez (2021) also called this condition(ing) "colonial, *affective geographies*—landscapes of socio-emotional intensity and constraint" in which multilingual and multidialectical students must work to discipline or discardnon-Man ways of being, knowing, and languaging (p. 552, italics original). In this sense, seeing multilingual and multidialectical bodies and subjectivities as ratio-

nal and disembodied, as opposed to affective and embodied, is a way of anchoring and maintaining these languaging bodies within the Western/Eurocentric/White modes of humanization and normalizing its unavoidable, dehumanizing effects on them.

Alternatively, decolonizing methodologies can enable us to refuse the abjection of multilingual and multidialectical bodies from the very category of the human, while simultaneously recentering and reclaiming alternate ontologies. To this end, I discuss how researchers and teacher educators can deploy decolonizing approaches in working with multilingual and multidialectical students in the following section.

Issues of the "How": Rethinking Methodologies of (De-/Re-)Constructing Affects

In this section, I consider two prominent researchers' roles in analyzing (de)colonial affects in ELT research and practice through a decolonial lens: (a) speaking and acting from the locus of enunciation and (b) counter-storytelling through decolonizing memory work.

Speaking and Acting from the Locus of Enunciation

Decolonial projects call us to recognize and de-center power relations inherent between researchers and participants in research processes in ways that question whether and how researchers utilize uneven power hierarchies to define, categorize, and disenfranchise marginalized populations in the name of research. Indeed, King (2017) aptly contended that we "need to consider whose back or through whose blood a theory developed and then circulated while hiding its own violence" (p. 170). In this light, it is crucial to unpack our own "locus of enunciation"—i.e., the point from where (the geopolitical dimension of knowledge production) and by whom and for whom (the body-political aspect of knowledge production) the subject speaks, and knowledge is being articulated (Mignolo, 2007).

Attending critically and affectively to reflexivity is crucial to examining one's locus of enunciation and considering (de)colonial purposefulness, interpretation, and consequentiality of research (Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Sousa Santos & Meneses, 2020). Reflexivity requires researchers to explicitly attend to how power structures situate how researchers themselves and participants think, say, feel, and do in the research process. From a decolonial standpoint, reflexivity further demands researchers to address what is left said, said differently, or unsaid, and thus who and what is being silenced, marginalized, and colonized—or contesting against coloniality in the research process.

Discourses (spoken, written, and/or signed language) are often used to reflexively explain or justify how we exist within and apart from colonial power relations. However, the embodied and relational aspects of affects provide con-

siderable insight into how researchers and participants affectively reflect in the research process (e.g., deliberate silences and refusals to perform) (e.g., Park, 2022; Truman et al., 2020). In this respect, reflexivity in decolonial projectsmust be critical and affective; it allows for critically interrogating researchers' colonial language,epistemological assumptions, and positioning in the research (Zembylas, 2018, 2021). It also allows for affectively questioning Western/Eurocentric/White and cis-hetero-patriarchal approaches, which undervalue knowledge that is embodied, relational, local, affective, or spiritual.

Partaking in critical and affective reflexivity in decolonial projects, however, moves past"confessions of privilege" (Lockard, 2016, p. 2), as if mentioning once that researchers identify with dominant bodies (e.g., white, middle-class, standardized English-speaking, cis-hetero- normative, or abled) would resolve colonial past and ongoing practices in and through research.Our bodies are both affective and ideological sites, so frictions, fissures, cracks, and ruptures exist, especially those who refuse hegemonic, colonial logic (Anzaldúa, 2015; Minh-ha, 1989; Combahee River Collective, 1977/1982; Collins, 1990/2009; Crenshaw, 1991). As such, criticaland affective reflexivity is also about sitting with the vulnerability, humility, and discomfort thatcomes with these tensions—e.g., of having to work with and across borders and spaces within which our knowing and not-knowing, be(com)ing, doing, and feeling concerning decolonial projects are always incomplete, partial, contradictory and subject to change in each fleeting moment of research.

While turning the critical affective and reflexive gaze on us as decolonial researchers, Patel (2015) highlights three aspects that we must be "response-able" to (or able to respond to and act for): learning, knowledge, and context. Response-ability to learning refers to collapsing the colonized "known" into the decolonized "unknown" and exploring multiple venues to understand, embody, and expand decolonized unknowns. In so doing, response-ability to learning demands moving beyond the colonial framing of knowledge 'acquisition' and 'ownership' as the end goal of learning. Response-ability to knowledge refers to enabling reciprocal, respectful, and embodied relationship within the knowledge production process. Response-ability to context extends beyond addressing colonialism's historical and contemporary legacy to consider the relationship between different bodies (human and otherwise) in (trans)forming the basis of being, knowing, and doing.

Counter-storytelling Through Decolonizing Memory Work

Decolonizing methodology highlights the importance of naming and countering the onto- epistemological and affective oppression reinforced by colonial legacies of institutional racism and knowledge systems (Tuck & Yang, 2012, 2014). One approach is using counter-storytelling as decolonial praxis—where alternate ways of knowing, feeling, and be(com)ing come through re-membering, re-envi-

sioning, and doing (Delgado-Bernal et al., 2017; Solórzano & Delgado- Bernal, 2001). Here, counter-storytelling is akin to *testimonio* rooted in Latin American narrativetraditions and critical race theory (CRT)—they are told by people whose experiences with oppressive systems are distorted, censored, or erased by dominant storylines as well as by dominant modes of storytelling (ibid.). Counter-storytelling concerns not just naming and resisting majoritarian/master stories of modernity and civilization. It is also about fully centering subaltern perspectives and acts of resistance, resiliency, and survivance when confronted with thegenocidal, colonialist, and imperialist forms of violence. In other words, counter-storytelling re- centers the embodied (or enfleshed), intuitive, spiritual, axiological, and cosmological knowing of subaltern communities in unmasking oppressive, interlocking systems of power. In doing so, counter-storytelling allows for casting a different light on silences, "reclaiming authority to narrate," and building solidarity across shared struggles across minoritized communities (Delgado-Bernal et al., 2017, p. 365). In this vein, counter-storytelling can serve as an alternative pedagogic means to legitimize other(ed) bodies and their embodied knowledge in ways that cultivate healing, hope, love, resistance, and resilience, especially among marginalized students in the classroom.

The colonial past seems to be a closed case; remembering, however, reopens it. In this light, an act of (re)membering—i.e., both remembering and re-membering—is integral to engaging in counter-storytelling as decolonial praxis (e.g., Dillard, 2012; Wa Thiong'o, 2009; Zavala, 2016). According to Wa Thiong'o (2009), whereas remembering is a process of recallingor recollecting past events, people, and relations, re-membering is an intentional decolonizing actto put the bodies (of knowledge), memories, and things back together that have been dismembered by a colonial matrix of power, domination, and subjugation. According to Dillard (2012), the act of re-membering allows for our "radical response to our individual and collective fragmentation at the cultural, spiritual, *and* material levels, a response to the false division created between mind, body, and spirit" (p. 17, emphasis original). In this way, (re)membering isnot just about recalling forgotten or erased ancestral memories. It also calls on stories of ancestral wisdom, resistance, and resilience—what got them through tough times? What stories will help them heal and flourish?. In so doing, (re)membering enables us to respond to the demands of the present context, reclaim what it means to be a human in relation to people, histories, and land, and reimagine what a "desirable" future means.

At the same time, what must be highlighted in that process is how colonial legacies and violence, which have obliterated subjugated body (of knowledge), time, and place, *haunt* us across body, time, and place (e.g., Dixon-Román, 2019). (Re)membering can, thus, serves to surface one's enduring sense of trauma, loss, and shame. According to Yoon (2019), such haunted trauma narratives show three characteristics: distortion of the future as it has always andalready been colonized by Western/Eurocentric/White and anthropocentric imaginary; repetitively revis-

iting of past experiences in the present; and the "senses that are presences and forces at play that are not empirically evidence" (p. 424). To put it differently, while (re)membering can unburden the mind, body, and soul from such haunting pain, we must not forget that such modes of (re)membering against dominant stories of division are affectively charged, embodied processes. In this respect, Yoon (2019) and other scholars have cautioned against romanticizing or intellectualizing (re)membering as a counter-storytelling process for 'empowering' or 'empowered' individuals. Instead, they have argued for shifting away from the Western/Eurocentric/White ethical and political positions that focus on individual integrity and autonomy towards those of collective accountability, with an emphasis on reciprocal relationships and local priorities (Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Sousa Santos & Meneses, 2020).

Overall, refusal in methodological spaces requires researchers to 'resist the urge to study people (and their "social problems") and to study instead *their relationships with* institutions andpower' (Tuck & Yang, 2014, p. 813, italics added for emphasis). In other words, refusal concernssharing the benefit of institutional practices (e.g., scholarly research) with indigenous and many other subjugated communities rather than over- or under-recruiting and objectifying these communities through Western/Eurocentric/White methodological approaches. Refusal in methodological terms is also related to challenging dominant, Western/Eurocentric/White notions of methodologies, such as linear and categorical construction or representation of the data and abstraction via rational, anthropocentric, and logocentric discourses. Concurrently, as Dixon-Román (2019) suggested, "empiricism is always-already haunted by power and empire"(p. 276). Therefore, when engaging in (de)colonial affects in ELT research and practice, we (researchers and teacher educators) must ask "how our actions, our research agendas, the knowledge we contribute, can undo coloniality and create spaces for ways of being in relation that are not about individualism, ranking, and status" (p. 73).

4-4. Issues of the "What": Rethinking Material and Affective Encounters

In contrast to the Western/Eurocentric/White assumption about human-only agency and humanness as universal, individual autonomy, many Indigenous, Black, Brown, and many globalSouth feminist traditions stress our ways of being, knowing, doing, and feeling have never been separated (Anzaldúa, 2015; Minh-ha, 1989; Combahee River Collective, 1977/1982; Collins, 1990/2009; Crenshaw, 1991; Wynter, 2002, 2015). These ontological traditions consider more- than-human bodies (e.g., land, borders, language, histories, and spirit/soul) as agentic and always-already entangled with our human bodies. To put it differently, we exist as a whole of ourmind (knowing), body (doing), and soul (being). We are also embodied or enfleshed through the material, affective, and reciprocal relations be-

tween humans (e.g., peers, families, teachers, and local and global communities) and more-than-humans (e.g., land, borders, language, knowledge, histories, and spirit/soul) (ibid.). Likewise, in this ontology, languaging and literacy practices are not seen as pregiven, static, and numerable entity that can be defined and categorized, but insteadas an "always-becoming process that is worked and reworked in interaction with race, gender, class, the media, professional role, in the continuous creation of new subjectivities" (Flores, 2013, p. 284).

This relational and holistic ontology allows for recentering alternative and ancestral knowledge systems that consider our entangled relationship with one another, the material world,and nature and for reclaiming a fuller, rather than partialized, trajectory of humanity. This ontological orientation contrasts with humanist, colonial, white/settler ontology that posits human exceptionalism and regards peoples, knowledge, and land as capital, property, or asset toinvest and claim ownership. In this vein, Sundberg (2014) asserted that decolonization means "[exposing] the ontological violence authorized by eurocentric epistemologies both in scholarship and everyday life" (p. 34).

Accordingly, in decolonizing affective approaches to ELT research and practice, there is a need to explore how multilingual and multidialectical bodies and actions are produced alongside an inquiry into how more-than-human bodies are produced and foster anti-racist and decolonial aims. In response, language and literacy studies have increasingly turned towards creative materials and experimental practices that encourage us to (re)think both human and more-than- human bodies and affectively saturated moments as co-participants in fostering otherwise ways of languaging, feeling, and becoming human—beyond the humanist, colonialist, and white supremacist premise of Man/Human (Wynter, 2003, 2012). Such materials and methodology include community mapping (Corntassel & Hardbarger, 2019; Varga, Agosto, & Maguregui, 2021), theater performance projects and workshops (Caldas, 2017; Domínguez, 2021), photovoice-based counter-narrative (Cahill et al., 2019), poetry and creating writing practices (Dutta, 2022; Ohito, 2022), and affects and effects of the evolving technologies on ELT curricula and multilingual and multidialectical students' language learning (Zhang, 2022).

In a qualitative study with Cherokee youth and community members in Oklahoma in the U.S., Corntassel and Hardbarger (2019), for example, demonstrated that community-engaged artsprojects through photovoice and community mapping could allow for (re)membering their (dis)embodied affects and effects of colonialization on their lands, language, mind/body/spirit, waters and cultivate healing and resistance that is attentive to ancestral knowledge, place, and history. Varga, Agosto, and Maguregui (2021) further added that using community mapping as material, esthetic, and placed-based articulation of racism and white supremacy—or what Varga,Agosto, and Maguregui call "counter-cartographies"—could allow for (re)membering (dis)embodied, material, and affective sources of violence and

injustice, as well as cultivating space of healing and resilience among educators, teacher educators, and multilingual and multidialectical students. Moreover, Caldas (2017) and Domínguez (2021) showed how Boaliaantheater—i.e., interactional role-plays where participants dramatize and reenact (real or imagined) conflicts and envisage possible responses to them—could serve as an affective and embodied means for preservice teachers to explore epistemically disobedient and affectively ambitious practices with multilingual and multidialectical students within and across school-community boundaries. Ohito (2022) showed how diverse forms of matter (e.g., comic strips, violently marked human fleshy body, texts, public space, histories, literacy pedagogies) could work together to produce an alternate understanding of languaging and literacy practices, as opposed to those efficient, rational, and still, within her work literacy preservice teachers. In so doing, Ohito highlighted the importance of thinking through issues of (dis)embodiment and feeling in working with multilingual/multidialectical students.

Implications and Conclusion

While an emerging body of ELT scholars have asserted decolonial refusal as, foremost, an intellectual framework and an ethico-political methodology and pedagogy, I have argued that affective possibilities of refusal remain largely backgrounded. To this end, I have proposed an onto-epistemological *and* affective re-orientation of subjectivities, methodologies, and materials in decolonizing affects in ELT research and practice. I further sketch out key concepts and questions that can prompt reflection and guide conceptual, methodological, and pedagogical shifts in unsettling the coloniality of affects in ELT research and practice (See Table 1).

Colonialism and the enduring coloniality have been successful by reducing the full humanity of Others—such as multilingual and multidialectical students from Black, Brown, Indigenous, and many other subjugated communities in different contexts. The historical, material, affective, and (dis)embodied relations of coloniality have further served as foundationsfor those subaltern bodies' subjectivities and feelings to get obliterated.

In a nutshell, it is not enough to say that including diverse voices and bodies matter. Wemust actively engage in the decolonial project of affects by ensuring that ELT research and practice enable multilingual and multidialectical bodies to *be, act,* and *feel* in humanizing ways against colonial obedience and violence. This work requires our attention and commitment to exploring what theories-methodologies-praxis of refusal might look like, sound like and feel likeif they were (re) imagined and (re)structured to recenter and sustain the languaging practices and affective and embodied realities of multilingual and multidialectical students. In this regard, my call for undoing the coloniality of affects in ELT research and practice must not be read as a viable prescription but as a cri de coeur to rethink the justification we provide for teaching and writing about multilingual and mul-

Table 1
Key Concepts and Questions to Guide Affective Approaches to ELT Research and PracticeThrough a Decolonial Lens

Concepts	*Questions that can strengthen conceptual, methodological, and pedagogicalstances in ELT research and practice*
Issues of the "Why": Refusing Affectively and Linguistically Othered Ways	**Refuse ahistorical, depoliticized, and deracialized framings of affects andemotions in ELT research and practice.** Why should ELT research and practice engage in the affective project ofdecolonization? Why is it significant and necessary to reject linguistic and affectiveOthering to support multilingual and multidialectical students' languaging practices as "always becoming process"?
Issues of the "Who": Rethinking Self and Other in (Dis)embodying Affects	**Engage in intersectional analyses to disrupt (onto-)epistemic and affectiveviolence against multilingual and multidialectical bodies.** In what ways does intersectionality play a role in shaping the listeningand speaking subjectivities? In what ways have the listening and speaking subjectivities been historically and affectively positioned within the intersectional, colonialsystems of power in this ELT context? What affective conditions are communicated or embodied through suchsubjectivities? How do we reinforce or challenge (onto-)epistemic and affective assumptions that standardized English is more 'correct' than other languages and dialects? How can we learn more about the role of our students' intersectionalityin shaping their affective (dis)investment in particular languages and dialects? **By decentering dominant Western/Eurocentric/White onto-epistemologies inELT, embrace Other(ed) and localized ways of knowing, meaning-and identity-making, and feeling.** Who is making the language curriculum and policies, and whose worldviews and interests are they serving? How can we see multilingual and multidialectical students' languagingpractices more dynamically and fluidly? How might we encourage affective, embodied, and even spiritual, ratherthan prescriptive, aspects of languaging practices? How can we disrupt Western/Eurocentric/White onto-epistemological assumptions about 'appropriate' English speaking, reading, and writingin multilingual and multidialectical classrooms?

(continued on next page)

Concepts	*Questions that can strengthen conceptual, methodological, and pedagogicalstances in ELT research and practice*
Issues of the "How": Rethinking Methodologies of (De- /Re-)Constructing Affects	**Support counter-storytelling and (re)membering in ELT research andpractice.** What counter-storytelling and (re)membering opportunities can we provide for multilingual and multidialectical students to draw on their affective and embodied experiences with multiple languages and dialectsin English speaking, reading, and writing? How can we resist disciplinary and neoliberal pressures to ignore the affective and embodied experiences of multilingual and multidialecticalstudents and recognize the complex work these students engage in becoming bi-/multi-literate? **Engender resistance/resilience, hope, and healing when ELT stakeholdersshare counter-stories.** How can we (researchers) see ELT stakeholders from multilingual and multidialectical backgrounds as more than 'data'? What would the resistant/resilient, hopeful, and healing relationship between researchersand participants look like, sound like, and feel like during and after the research process? What resistant/resilient, hopeful, and healing opportunities can we provide for multilingual and multidialectical students to *be, act,* and *feel* onto-epistemologically and affectively disobedient against the colonial logic of languaging?
Issues of the "What": RethinkingMaterial and Affective Encounters	**Engage multilingual and multidialectical students in languaging practicesthrough our material and affective interactions and actions.** How can we arrange material, affective, and embodied components inELT curriculum and pedagogy to honor, sustain, and localize multilingualism and multidialectism? What pushbacks or tensions, if any, do we anticipate from various stakeholders (e.g., school leaders, parents, colleagues, and/or students) in doing so? How might we address them?

tidialectical bodies. This rethinking can provide opportunitiesto reform our deformed selves and affects within and against a colonial matrix of power.

Notes

[1] Here, the term subaltern refers to "all groups that are excluded from the hegemonic power structure"(Kumaravadivelu, 2016, p. 76).

[2] In this article, I use "I" to assert my commitment to the knowledge and arguments being made here and make clear its associated strengths and limitations to the reader. At the same time, I use "we" to refer to myself and multiple stakeholders in order to question

whether and how all of us are implicated, unwittingly or wittingly, in replicating anaffective logic of coloniality in working with multilingual and multidialectical bodies.

[3] I use the term multilingual and multidialectical students, rather than English language learners (ELLs), to align with the languaging and translanguaging perspectives (e.g., Garcia, 2009; Garcia & Wei, 2014) that understand their language use as a fluid, situated, and dynamic process and position their identity positionings from Black, Brown, Indigenous, and many other subjugated communities as strengths for becoming bi-/multiliterate. .

[4] The field of ELT is also known as Teaching English to Speakers of Others (TESOL) and applied linguistics.

[5] I use the term *intersectionally minoritized students or communities* instead of a *minority* or *non-White* because issues of race and racism intersect with other social constructs such as gender, sexuality, class, languages, and im/migration status (e.g., Maddamsetti et al., 2018; Maddamsetti, 2020, 2021). In a similar vein, I capitalize on the term *Color* tocenter socio-historical, cultural, and political marginalization and racialization (Kohli, 2014).

References

Anzaldúa G. (2015). *Light in the dark/Luz en lo oscuro: Rewriting identity, spirituality, reality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2004). Affective economies. *Social Text*, *22*(2), 117–139.

Ahmed, S. (2012). *The cultural politics of emotion*. London, UK: Routledge.

Benesch, S. (2018). Emotions as agency: Feeling rules, emotion labor, and English language teachers' decision-making. *System, 79*(1), 60–69.

Cahill, C., Alberto Quijada Cerecer, D., Reyna Rivarola, A. R., Hernández Zamudio, J., & Alvarez Gutiérrez, L. (2019). 'Caution, we have power': Resisting the 'school-to-sweatshop pipeline'through participatory artistic praxes and critical care. *Gender and Education*, *31*(5), 576-589.

Caldas, B. (2017). Shifting discourses in teacher education: Performing the advocate bilingual teacher. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *118*(4), 190-201.

Collins, P. H. (1990/2009). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Combahee River Collective (1982). A black feminist statement. In C. Moraga, & G. Anzaldúa (Eds.), *This bridge called my back. Writings by radical women of color* (pp. 210–218). Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press (Original work published 1977).

Corntassel, J., & Hardbarger, T. (2019). Educate to perpetuate: Land-based pedagogies and community resurgence. *International Review of Education*, *65*, 87-116

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241–1299.

Flores, N. (2013). Silencing the subaltern: Nation-state/colonial governmentality and bilingual education in the United States. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *10*(4), 263-287.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*(2), 149-171.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2022). Undoing competence: Coloniality, homogeneity, and the overrepresentation of whiteness in applied linguistics. *Language Learning*.

Motha, S., & Lin, A. (2014). "Non coercive rearrangements": Theorizing desire in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *48*(2), 331-359.

Delgado-Bernal, D., Burciaga, R., & Carmona, J. F. (Eds.). (2017). *Chicana/Latina testimonios as pedagogical, methodological, and activist approaches to social justice.*

Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
Dixon-Román, E. (2019). Empiricism, affect, and haunting. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *53*(3), 275-277.
Dillard, C. B. (2012). *Learning to (re)member the things we've learned to forget: Endarkened feminisms, spirituality, and the sacred nature of research and teaching*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
Dillard, C. B., & Neal, A. (2020). I am because we are:(Re) membering Ubuntu in the pedagogy of Black women teachers from Africa to America and back again. *Theory Into Practice*, *59*(4), 370-378.
Domínguez, M. (2021). Cultivating epistemic disobedience: Exploring the possibilities of a decolonial practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *72*(5), 551- 563.
Dutta, U. (2022). Reimagining the politics of belonging through counterstorytelling: A decolonial praxis of refusal and desire. *Qualitative Inquiry*.
Fanon, F. (1963/2008). *Black skin, white masks.* New York, NY: Grove Press.
Gregersen, T., Mercer, S., & MacIntyre, P. (2021). Language teacher perspectives on stress and coping. *Foreign Language Annals*, 1–19.
Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT journal*, *60*(4), 385-387.
Kaveh, Y. M. (2023). Re-orienting to language users: humanizing orientations in language planning as praxis. *Language Policy*, *22*(1), 1-23.
King, T., Navarro, J., & Smith, A. (2020). *Otherwise worlds: Against settler colonialism and anti-Blackness*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
King, T. L. (2017). Humans involved: Lurking in the lines of posthumanist flight. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, *3*(1), 162-185.
Kohli, R. (2014). Unpacking internalized racism: Teachers of color striving for racially just classrooms. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *17*(3), 367-387.
Kubota, R. (2022). Decolonizing second language writing: Possibilities and challenges. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 58*.
Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act? *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(1), 66-85.
Lockard, C. A. (2016). Unhappy confessions: The temptation of admitting to white privilege. *Feminist Philosophy Quarterly*, *2*(2).
Maddamsetti, J. (2020). Cultivating culturally relevant and sustaining pedagogy through field experiences: Discourses of elementary preservice teachers of color. *The New Educator, 16*(4), 352-375.
Maddamsetti, J. (2021). Exploring an elementary ESL teacher's emotions and adocacy identity. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 15*(3), 235-252.
Maddamsetti, J., Flennaugh, T. K., & Rosaen, C. L. (2018). Who should teach? A Chinese teacher candidate's understandings of a good teacher and racialized experiences. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(2), 148-168.
Madison, D. S. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Methods, ethics, and performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensa-tion*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Mignolo, W. D. (2007). Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural studies*, *21*(2-3), 449-514.
Motha, S. (2020). Is an antiracist and decolonizing applied linguistics possible?. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *40*, 128-133.
Ohito, E. O. (2022). "I'm yery hurt":(Un) justly reading the Black female body as text in

a racial literacy learning assemblage. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *57*(2), 609-627.

Park, J. S. Y. (2022). On saying "enough": Decolonizing subjectivities in English language learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *115*, 102009.

Patel, L. (2015). *Decolonizing educational research: From ownership to answerability*. New York: Routledge.

Petrie, G. M., & Darragh, J. J. (2018). Desiring English in Southwestern Nicaragua. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *48*(4), 454-474.

Spivak, G. (1988/2010). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Basingstoke, England: Macmillan Education.

Shahjahan, R. A., Blanco Ramirez, G., & Andreotti, V. D. O. (2017). Attempting to imagine the unimaginable: A decolonial reading of global university rankings. *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(S1), S51-S73.

Seigworth, G. J., & Gregg, M. (2010). An inventory of shimmers. In M. Gregg & G. J. Seigworth (Eds.), *The affect theory reader* (pp. 2–25). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Solorzano, D. G., & Bernal, D. D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education*, *36*(3), 308-342.

Song, J. (2018). Critical approaches to emotions of non-native English speaking teachers. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 41*(4), 453–467.

de Sousa Santos, B., & Meneses, M. P. (2020). Epistemologies of the South—Giving voice to the diversity of the South. *Knowledges Born in the Struggle: Constructing the Epistemologies of the Global South*.

Snaza, N. (2019). Curriculum against the state: Sylvia Wynter, the human, and futures of curriculum studies. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *49*(1), 129-148.

Sundberg, J. (2014). Decolonizing posthumanist geographies. *Cultural geographies*, *21*(1), 33- 47.

Thiel, J. J., & Dernikos, B. P. (2020). Refusals, re-turns, and retheorizations of affective literacies: A thrice-told data tale. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *52*(4), 482-506.

Truman, S. E., Hackett, A., Pahl, K., McLean Davies, L., & Escott, H. (2021). The capaciousness of no: Affective refusals as literacy practices. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *56*(2), 223- 236.

Tuck E., Yang K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1).

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). Unbecoming claims: Pedagogies of refusal in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *20*(6), 811-818.

Varga, B. A., Agosto, V., & Maguregui, J. (2021). Material counter-c art ographies:(Un) mapping (in) justice, spatial wounding, and abstract reticulations. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *34*(9), 830-842.

Wa Thiong'o, N. (2009). *Something torn and new: An African renaissance*. New York, NY: Basic Civitas Books.

Wolff, D., & De Costa, P. I. (2017). Expanding the language teacher identity landscape: An investigation of the emotions and strategies of a NNEST. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(S1), 76-90.

Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation—An argument. CR: *The New Centennial Review, 3*(3), 257–337. https://doi.org/10.1353/ncr.2004.0015

Yoon, I. H. (2019). Haunted trauma narratives of inclusion, race, and disability in a school community. *Educational Studies*, *55*(4), 420-435.
Zavala, M. (2016). Decolonial methodologies in education. *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory*, 1-6.
Zembylas, M. (2022). Sylvia Wynter, racialized affects, and minor feelings: unsettling the coloniality of the affects in curriculum and pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *54*(3), 336-350.