# Process Criticism and Education: Possible dialogues

Cecilia Almeida **SALLES**\*

\* Post-doc (2016) in Cinema, Radio and Television from the Universidade de São Paulo. Titular Professor at Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC/SP). Contact: cecilia.salles@gmail.com.

**Abstract:**
The aim of the article is to discuss the possible relationships between process criticism and education. Our starting point is the presentation of this critical approach and some relevant aspects of the concept of creation as a network – Musso, 2004 –, based on semiotics – Charles S. Peirce, 1994 –, to approach some specificities of educational processes, which involve interactions between students, teachers and schools. Some results of the research on the creation process in group or team will be presented, in dialogue with Domenico De Masi (2005, 2007), Steven Johnson (2011) and Edgar Morin (2002, 2010), emphasizing the lack of bibliography in this area. Then the relationship between teachers and students will be discussed, highlighting the relevance of monitoring and awareness of processes and their sensitive effects, amid the possibility of errors and the need for research. And finally, in the context of the relationship between teachers and school, some relevant aspects of the group creation processes will be discussed, such as the context of production, construction of common projects, communication of these projects and subjective effects in the context of the meetings.

**Keywords:**
Process criticism. Educational process. Group creation process.

# Process Criticism and Education: Possible dialogues

Cecilia Almeida Salles

## INTRODUCTION

This article aims to propose a reflection on some developments of the criticism of creation processes for the field of education. As the questions presented here are still in a latent stage, we do not intend to offer answers, but rather to think together with all who are involved in educational processes. To this end, we will establish dialogues with the article "From genetic criticism to process criticism: a research line in expansion" (SALLES, 2017a), offering a history of the development of this theoretical approach, marked by expansions, adjustments and a broadening of objectives.

We, therefore, start with a research on creative processes in a variety of areas, such as visual arts, films, scenic arts, literature, architecture, photography, journalism, publicity and curatorship, from studies of written, visual, oral, audiovisual, analogic and/or digital records, *i.e.*, archives of creation taken as indices of development of thought in process. The interdisciplinary aspect of this approach, therefore, offers the possibility of studies to be also carried out on education.

It is worth highlighting that it was a research brought about by the difficulties experienced in foreign language (English) writing classes. And the study of the process records of Ignácio de Loyola Brandão undertaken during the construction of his novel, *Não Verás País Nenhum*, seemed to provide a productive path for understanding the writing process in greater depth. It equally provided a critical approach to literature, focusing on production processes, that is, on how works are constructed. The author's documents revealed segments of work and multiple interactions, responsible for the construction of a complex network, departing from the romantic concept of creation as inspiration, or magical insight, without explanation.

The diversity of research projects led us to observe recurrences, *i.e.*, aspects common to many processes that, over time, enabled the systematization of a critical process theory that discusses creation as a network under permanent construction, dialoguing with the concept of semiosis (sign process) according to Charles S. Peirce, and of Pierre Musso's network. Further ahead, we will present some of the general characteristics of the processes of creation that seem relevant for these reflections.

Next, we will also discuss collective creative processes, producing the book *Processos de Criação em Grupo* (SALLES, 2017b). We believe that some of the dialogues that occurred between the members of the teams are relevant for this discussion. It is important to point out that there was a severe lack of studies on team processes. In this respect, we interacted with Domenico De Masi (2007) and Steven Johnson (2011), who were extremely important for the development of our research.

De Masi (2005a, p. 94) says that he is surprised by the fact that there hardly exist studies on collective creativity and states that "individual creativity was the most studied, notably under a psychological and psychoanalytical profile." In another work, De Masi (2005b) refers to the lack of more in-depth studies on collective creativity, observing

the creation of socio-political systems and the influence exerted by external factors on the fertility of the creatives. And for many years, and to this day, most aesthetic products – films, publicity, design, urban plans, physical and biological discoveries, pharmaceuticals, economic scenarios – is the result of collective creation, and it seems increasingly evident that ascribing creative works to a sole individual, only meets the requirements of specific familiarity, of juridical practicality, of majestic arrogance (p. 94).

We stress, in such De Masi statements, the relevance of studies on creative groups, the acknowledgment of the greater quantity of research on the creative act, which focus on individual processes and their contribution to the expansion of this bibliography, particularly in the case of studies on education processes, which are also developed, in our view, by creative groups.

On several occasions, De Masi (2007) emphasizes that the majority of human creations is not the work of isolated geniuses, but of groups and communities, and that the genuine historical subject of creation is not man, but society.

We do, however, question some of his convictions, as the isolation itself of the genius and the demarcation of the fields of approaches on individual processes. On the one hand, the view of creation amid a great diversity of interactions, mentioned above, draws us away from the myth of the genius who creates from scratch. Initially, moreover, we cannot fail to mention the relevance of this perspective in the context of students' works, which were the pedagogical triggers of our research.

At the same time, process criticism is already developing a great number of research works on movies, scenic arts, design and publicity processes, and we are now starting to consider education. De Masi (2007) studies involve education, as we will see further ahead. One of the members of his team of researchers focused on Bauhaus. However, this school appears to be viewed as an isolated case of interaction between "geniuses" of art and design.

Another relevant question raised by De Masis's work is the fact that, by offering a historical perspective of the new approaches to organization of creative groups, through the prism of the sociology of work, he discusses different pursuits and forms of work, over time (from 1850 to 1950). In his other books, he comes even closer to the end of the twentieth century. He discusses, among other issues, the characteristics of the groups and the subjects involved, and types of interaction and leaderships.

This perspective draws us away from attempts of associating these forms of interaction, or these aspects of the operation of the networks of creative groups, to a given moment in time, especially to contemporary experimentation. This approach does not lead to an undue emphasis on changes to the ways of interaction in the context of social media, which only expands the diversity of supports and reduces the time of the ever existing, but necessary, interactions for the development of group thought.

Something similar occurs in the book *Where Good Ideas Come From,* by Steven Johnson (2011). The author starts from the analysis of a great diversity of creative processes in different fields, with the object of understanding the ways in which new *ideas* are formulated. He seeks "*shared properties and patterns* recurring again and again in unusually fertile environments" (p. 20). His research sources dialogue directly with those with which process criticism deals; for example, there are constant references to Charles Darwin's diaries in his Beagle voyages, as well as footages of laboratory study groups during a research process, which will be discussed further along.

It was of major importance, for the continuity of our research on creative processes, to find De Masi and Steven Johnson seeking, in a very similar manner (albeit along other theoretical paths), generalizations on these processes from specific case studies.

Perhaps the only aspect that draws us away is that De Masi, occasionally, and Steven Johnson (2011), constantly, endeavor to provide a way to promote creativity socially, and evaluate and offer means

for us to become more innovative. As Johnson says, "the more we espouse these patterns – in our working habits and personal hobbies, in our work environments, in the project of new software tools – the more we will be able to explore this extraordinary capacity of innovative thinking" (p. 20).

In our research, we strive to emphatically deny the prescriptive perspective of how it should be done, that is, to provide models to be followed. What we seek is to understand and map the general characteristics of the processes of creation, which help us to get closer to the complex singularities.

What attracts us in Steven Johnson, in this context, besides the methodology already mentioned, is the nature of the "shared patterns" he achieves, which are linked to the formulation of hypotheses (abduction in Peircean terms) that I developed in the book *Networks of Creation*. When we discuss dialogues of cognitive interactions within the framework of thought, there are many points in common with shared patterns and others that I had not observed.

In De Masi's case, however, it is interesting when he endeavors to understand "what are the organizational particularities that characterize group creativity" (2007, p. 18) which takes up the greater part of his research.

Nevertheless, in both cases, we feel a lack of theoretical instruments that can show what leads the subjects on creation toward specific paths and not to others. We are speaking of the principles that guide choices during the process, to which we will return further ahead.

We will now set forth some aspects of the concept of creation that substantiates process criticism, which will assist us in the establishment of the proposed relationship.

## CREATION AS A NETWORK

The first aspect to be highlighted is the fact that it is a sensitive and intellectual[1] construction route (action/conflict/confrontation/encounters), experiencing interventions of the subconscious and unconscious. Thus, it moves away from the intellectual or sensitive dichotomy that still governs the discussions of many thinkers of creation, who see, for example, the science process as objective and intellectual, and that of art as subjective and sensitive. What we propose here is that all processes coexist with these three aspects. The differences are of a distinct order, as the nature of the search or tendency, as we will see.

The network of creation is formed along a continuous process of interactions with tendencies. It is a path without beginning or end, fallible, sustained by the logic of uncertainty, encompassing the intervention of chance and opening the way for the introduction of new ideas.

Tendencies, under a semiotic viewpoint, are vague routes that guide the process of construction of the objects in an environment of uncertainty and imprecision. They generate work in search of something as yet unknown. The development of the process leads to decision-making that entails a lessening of vagueness, providing clearer shapes to the work under construction. These routes can be observed through two perspectives: constitution of artistic or education projects, for example, and communicative practices.

The project of artists and educators, therefore, comes within this context of vague tendencies, which are ethical and aesthetical guiding principles present in creative actions related to the production of a specific work, and which bind that creator's work as a whole. They are theories implicit in the work, relative to the artist's singularity. They are value plans, forms of representing the world, tastes and beliefs

---

[1] I refer to Charles S. Peirce's three categories of phenomenology.

that govern the mode of action. This project is incorporated in the space and time of creation that, inevitably, affect the artist or educator. It involves concepts of education, ways of work, etc.

On the other hand, reflections on process tendencies, under the viewpoint of communicative practices, dialogue with the observation of Mário de Andrade (1989, p. 61), that "art is social because every work of art is a phenomenon of the relationship between human beings." The creative process is also revealed as a tendency toward others, insofar as it is incorporated in the complex cultural networks. We are referring to the interactions that nurture the processes.

With this semiotic concept of creative process tendencies in mind, we return to the criticism we made before of the concepts of creation implicit in De Masi's and Johnson's studies, which do not discuss nor provide clues regarding criteria of choices or guiding principles.

The fallible aspect of the process, in turn, is closely related to its continuity, inseparable from indetermination and uncertainty. Where there is continuous variation, precision is unattainable, and the possibility of error is inevitable. Transience engenders the impossibility of having absolute knowledge and the possibility of having erroneous knowledge.

As to the acquisition of new ideas, we refer to Peirce's discussion on the inferential nature of cognition. The philosopher states that "all cognition is based on another" (CP 5.213, 1994)[2]. This statement leads us to the reasoning that produces hypotheses, the only logical operation that introduces a new idea. In Peircean terms, we refer to abduction, one of the forms of development of thought that reveals the inductive nature of creation. At this moment of materialization of the work, hypotheses of various natures are raised and tested. We found experimentation in drafts, versions of discipline programs, records of professors' classes, as well as artists' sketches, for example. It should be stressed, however, that there is experimentation or testing of hypotheses in all processes. What differs them is the nature of the tendencies or searches. Consequently, we can speak of education hypotheses within the context of these reflections.

So far we have highlighted the circumstances of uncertainty, the sensitive aspect, interactions, error and the acquisition of new ideas, amid experimentations.

Advancing in the presentation of some general aspects of the creative process that seem of interest to consider the interactions of process criticism with education, we bring back the discussion of the two dimensions of the tendencies observed in the networks of creation: construction of the project and communicative practices.

We believe that considering the interrelation of these dimensions of the tendencies of creative processes may be a fruitful way to set in motion the complexity of the processes through groups or teams. Routes immersed in the context described above, of uncertainty, of possibility of addressing errors, conflicts and, at the same time, having the potential of new possibilities, of construction of a common project in the interaction between subjects who have their personal projects. Hence the importance of observing the construction of common projects amid communicative practices, that is, in the interaction between the members of the groups.

In this respect it is also important to discuss the communication process of the projects under construction. In view of the difficulties of communication between the members of the group, we bring an extremely eloquent quote from choreographer and dancer Alwin Nikolais: "choreographing to someone else is like delivering a *handful of sand*. Much is lost. But we learn to be content with a reasonable percentage" (*apud* LOUIS, 1992, p. 133).

---

[2] From Collected Papers of Charles S. Peirce: vol. 5 paragraph 213.

Based on a general viewpoint of process criticism, we will now address some particularities of the processes of creation in education.

## SOME REFLECTIONS ON EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES

Analyzing the educational processes involving students, teachers and schools within the team processes, we see that it is a field of action that occurs, necessarily, in interactions that support the networks of creation.

To discuss these interactions, we have to dialogue with Morin (2002), Steven Johnson (2011) and Colapietro (2014). Group processes are developed with the concept of the subject as a community (COLAPIETRO, 2014). The author states that the subject is not a private and isolated sphere, but a communicative agent. It is distinguishable but not separable from others, as its identity is formed through relationships with others; it is not only a possible member of a community, but the person, as subject, has its own form of community.

It is interesting to relate this subject, described by Colapietro, to Steven Johnson's (2011, p. 20) concept of "liquid network:" one of the characteristics shared by different and exceptionally fertile environments. The author reports discoveries from research conducted by Kevin Dunbar (psychologist at McGill University/USA), in a molecular biology laboratory. Audiovisual records showed that most important ideas emerged during regular lab meetings, where a dozen or so researchers would gather and informally present and discuss their latest work.

If one looked at the map of ideas that Dunbar created, the ground zero of innovation was not the microscope, but the conference table. The social flow of the group conversations turned this solid private state into a liquid network.

Intermingling in an environment of interactions enables the elucidation of problems. One person's reasoning may become an input for another person's reasoning and may lead to important discoveries. The liquid network prevents ideas from getting stalled by prejudice. It also stresses interaction involving interdisciplinarity, leaving the boundaries of specialized fields and outlooks, broadening the modes of perception. To the author, the interactions between the members of the group can also help to address uncertainties. Questions asked by colleagues force a rethinking of what is being done, opening the way for doubt.

According to Johnson, Dunbar's research suggests one vaguely reassuring thought: even with all the advanced technology of a leading molecular biology lab, the most productive tool for generating good ideas remains a circle of humans at a table, talking shop.

And today, amid the pandemic, we can consider remote meetings with some similarities facing, however, challenges in the field of materialization of interactions, with the overlapping of voices or hands, digitally raised.

Continuing these reflections on interaction, we now resort to Morin (2002, p. 72), when the author discusses the nature of interactions in culture, such as reciprocal actions that alter behaviors or the nature of the elements involved therein. They suppose conditions of encounters, agitation, turbulence, and become, under certain conditions, interrelations, associations, linkages, communications, etc.; that is to say, they give birth to phenomena of organization. There is something in the characteristics associated with interactivity that is worth highlighting in order to understand the linkages of the network of creation: conditions of encounters, mutual influence, something acting over something else and something being affected by other elements.

It is interesting to see the result of this action of one element over another, under the form of a ramification of new possibilities in the network of creation. By thinking creation under this perspective, even individual processes occur in community. In other words, creation happens amid a great diversity of interaction: conversation with friends, a film seen, etc., generate new possibilities that may or may not be pursued. The network gains complexity as new linkages are established.

In team processes, the actions of each member become committed to the construction of a common project. It is the search for guiding principles, within the context of the community. At the same time, groups are formed by subjects included in their complex networks and guided by the individual projects that attract them.

The description of this space of interaction is very familiar, within the scope of the meetings of professors and coordinators, classroom relations, etc., and interactions, whether or not as a field of possibilities.

Let us now look more closely at the processes of students, professors and schools, with all the difficulty of segmentations, seeing that they are interactions between subjects, as we have just discussed.

## STUDENTS' AND PROFESSORS' PROCESSES

There is no doubt that we can discuss the actions of students and professor in the classroom along the semesters and/or years as a process of creation with their specific tendencies.

Within this context, we must point out that, in order to consider the reverberations of process criticism in education, we do not have to question whether what is being produced is or is not art. Based on an approach on processes of creation of a general nature, we are always faced with a search for vague routes, making mistakes, formulating and testing hypotheses, making choices, and producing knowledge in the sphere of the specificities of the educational context.

At this stage we will observe creation processes with educational searches based on the record potential of the paths and the sensitive aspects inherent to them. As to process documents, we highlight the possibility of studying the professors' records under the form of lessons preparation, meetings notes, research, to mention only a few examples. The theoretical and critical view of this documentation may enable a critical reflection on its own practice, also nurturing more extensive discussions on educational processes.

Having followed research from other professionals, as the case of journalists who proposed to reflect on their own work, we emphasize the impact of certainties and errors, causing the need for the development of new hypotheses under intense experimentations, opening the way for new ideas and a wide field of possibilities.

As to the sensitive aspect of creation, in the book *Unfinished Gesture* we call it psychological marks of the paths of all and every creative agent. They are tensional relations that maintain the vitality of the work construction process that also appear in the emotions or feelings of artists, professors, students, etc.

At that stage of the research, it was clear that in view of the difficulties, the need to resist and become aware of the problem, artists also experience moments of great pleasure, delights, ability for associations and recreation. Projects are constructed in this emotionally tense environment, amid pleasures and displeasures, flexibility and resistance. Sensitiveness crosses all and any process; hence we can observe students and professors also amidst fears, pleasures, recreation, motivation, tackling problems, uncertainties etc. What is important is being able to think of the consequences of this discovery in the environment of the school or university, as we will see further along.

Proceeding with our proposal for a possible convergence between process criticism and education, we will now discuss professor-student relationships.

## PROFESSOR-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP

Thinking of how the study on the creative process can shed light on choices of action in the classroom, we emphasize the possible relevance of considering the follow-up of processes, errors, process e research awareness, and sensitive effects.

The follow-up of paths involves considering teaching/learning as a process and not as a series of products, *i.e.*, a non-segmented approach to isolated productions. Consequently, considering production throughout the year as records of the students' path.

As early as the 1980s, we proposed in the English writing classes, still in a basic form, as we had not undergone the experience of a study of Loyola's archives of creation, that students did not make isolated essays, but rather a project for the semester, dialoguing with literature professors.

Recently we were invited to a live lecture at *Instituto Iungo*[3] focused on tuition, research and support to teachers of Basic Education, which inspired the reflections proposed herein. Ultimately, Professor Renata Alencar, coordinator, together with Professor Tailze Melo, in residence for educators of public and private schools, stimulating the creation and implantation of innovative pedagogical practices in the schools, made a very instigation question: How can studies of the process contribute toward the "methodologies of active learning that bring to the debates on education the pedagogical strategies that place students at the center of the process of knowledge construction?"

There is no doubt that there is a leap in time between our experience described and the methodologies of active learning. We believe, however, that learning, based on projects, dialogues very closely with the view of process monitoring described here.

At the same time, we cannot ignore the difficulties of addressing errors in this context. We have seen that the process is fallible, or, in other words, error is part of the process. Is there a need to review the concept of pre-established error and accept it as part of the process, which can be corrected on different occasions? We have no answer, but offer a space for reflection.

In order to discuss the awareness of the process and research, we bring two examples. The first one, also from our "old" writing classroom, was when we brought to students a facsimile edition, celebrating the forty years of literary activity of Érico Veríssimo (1972, p. 1), of the book *Fantoches*, thus introduced by the publishers:

> *Fantoches* (Puppets) appeared in 1932 and was not a best-seller. From the first edition of 1,500 copies, less than five hundred were sold [...]. The 1932 booklet reappears whole, page by page, and brilliantly bolstered – we think the honored author also had to work in the preparation of his own award and the result is here: magnificent. We are sure that the new book will please everyone. First of all, because of its historical value, by reproducing the initial step of a man who became a self-made celebrity in the literature of his language; *then, for being enriched by impressions, so often ironic, that generate in the sixty-year-old of today, the tales of the youthful first-timer* (p. 1, my italics).

---

[3] Available in: https://bit.ly/3dpj87P.

Our objective in showing this book to the students was to make them conscious of an author's review, or self-correcting, process. The variety of the comments he makes is clear: he refers to an inadequate choice of style, words that did not fit the characters, suspect regencies, good themes that deserved better treatment, etc.

In that same live, an art professor said that, in the context of the pandemic, she took different materials to be explored by the students. We call attention to the awareness of the research as an integral part of all processes and, in this case, to the research that leads to the experimentation of the materials, and that brings out layers of the works of the processes, as opposed to the view of creation as magical insights, without history.

Lastly, we readdress the issue of sensitiveness in the professor-student relationship, in order to consider, quite critically, the power of professors as to whether or not they are able to motivate students, which often is strictly related to errors or way of addressing possible errors.

We revert to the classroom and to an unforgettable return of the corrected and graded essays. I delivered[4] one to a student, commenting that I thoroughly enjoyed the text. The grade was not very good, and I had made the comment to the wrong student. Soon after, I asked for a work to be done in pairs in a classroom with an odd number of students. Full of confidence from my comments (and not the grade), she said that she could do the exercise by herself.

We must have a clear view of the sensitive work that we can produce on students (for better or for worse). In the many reports from artists and hundreds of students there is a recurrence of experiences of a writing and researching blockage, from commentaries filled with certainty (in a field of uncertainties) that do not take into account the moment of the process. I cannot affirm that this has not happened with me, over time, but I am always alert to the difficulties these certainties of ours may cause. Naturally it also depends on the student, who might feel challenged.

## PROFESSOR-SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP

As we are speaking of a team process, involving professors, students and principals, we start from some conclusions of the research on groups, with the subtitle *Dialogues, i.e.*, space of interactions. The discussion will begin with some aspects involved in these processes, which can trigger this reflection in the field of education: context of production, construction of common projects, communication of these projects, and subjective effects within the context of the meetings.

### Context of Production

After observing the processes of many groups, based on the follow-up of a few and the publications of others, a relation was also established with a research by Domenico De Masi (2007), a sociologist of work, providing a record of European creative groups from the mid-19th century to the mid-20th century, discussing, among other groups, some schools such as Bauhaus, as mentioned before.

Without going into the specific features of the researched groups, we observed the importance of bearing in mind the context of each team, how to consider issues relating to space and time, in order to understand the work method, such as historical moment, city, neighborhood, etc.

---

[4] I am speaking in the first person here as this involves a very personal experience.

Understanding the context also involves observing the ways and criteria of team formation, forms of financing or not and, especially, whether they are teams open to interactions and reflections on the process, as we are proposing here.

We would like to point out that the De Masi's study showed the recurrence of the interdisciplinary nature in the formation of these groups.

## Construction of Common Projects

We know there are guiding principles of a general nature involving, for example, what is thought of education, learning methodologies, etc.; however, the school project materializes amid relations with the team (principals, professors and staff). At the same time, each one of them has their educational projects that, at that school, is at the service of a broader project, with hierarchy, leaderships and options for specific methods of work, etc. In other contexts researched, we saw many groups working in a collaborative environment, in which the entire team was assertive.

Reports recurrently reveal the difficulty of coping with uncertainty in the community. As we have discussed previously, the projects that guide the actions of the groups are immersed in the universe of vagueness and imprecision, generating, in the group, an urgent need for definitions of routes and clarity of criteria.

To better understand this issue, we will now consider some possible consequences of the construction of common projects amid communicative practices.

## Communication of Projects in the Sphere of the Interactions Among the Members of the Team

We now return to the quote from the choreographer Alwin Nikolais and the handful of sand, knowing that something is lost in this communicative process, and bringing an example from the theater to help in the reflection on this aspect of group processes.

In *Caderno de Atuação* (BOTELHO; MÁRMORA; ROMANO, 2013), a publication of the edited diaries of the actors produced during the process of creation of the performance *Pais e Filhos* [Parents and Children], the imprecision and uncertainty of this process was reflected in the need for verbal notations or diagrams, in an attempt to translate and understand what the director wanted of the future performance.

And one of the actors made a notation, which is a line of question marks "???????????????????" explaining: "I notted down lots of question marks. I understood but cannot grasp what the director wanted" (BOTELHO; MÁRMORA; ROMANO, 2013).

How to impart to others what is desired?

To answer this question, we resort to *Projeto Aesthesis: a criação em fluxo,* which we followed. Dancer and choreographer Édi Oliveira, director and performer Francis Wilker, director and ballerina Kênia Dias, choreographer Giselle Rodrigues, actor and director Jonathan Andrade and researcher Glauber Coradesqui, members of different groups, came together for a joint work at the *Rumos Itaú Cultural* (2015), about the moment, the freedom, the listening and horizontality in creative processes. They lived in different cities and met periodically. During the process, audiovisual and photographic records were made of the proposed experiments, with an intense exchange of messages, through the WhatsApp service, to maintain contact, propose ideas, discuss readings, etc.

These were the records of the process, generated out of the need of the group for the construction of a common project. And so, they passed on to each other, in a collaborative environment, what they desired of that project, or what they sought.

The same need led filmmaker Evaldo Mocarzel to write letters/e-mails to the editors of his documentaries. This was the means found to pass the sensitive and conceptual baton of his film project to another member of the team. The letters, in this context, are records of interaction. It is a way of providing ambience and involvement in the project under construction, carried out in an atmosphere of contamination and motivation of the film editors to participate in the project, which leads us to the last aspect that we wish to discuss on the relations between the members of the teams.

## Subjective Effects in the Context of the Meetings

Team processes are groups of subjects on creation, immersed in a maelstrom of sensations, which do not occur if they are not part of the teamwork, such as the case of the school.

While following different processes there were reports of emotions, such as affinity, union, contagion, conflicts and clashes. It is interesting to compare that the feelings described in *Unfinished Gesture,* already mentioned, are focused on the subject, *i.e.*, they would be intransitive. Conversely, in the case of group processes, we speak of being in affinity, in cooperation, in contaminating someone, in the involvement of someone, *i.e.*, terms of a direct or indirect transitive nature, participating with the others, since groups are formed by individuals. It should be observed that the tensive opposition is maintained: affinity/contagion and conflicts.

Another relevant aspect is the recurrence of the report of conflicts between group members. Caristi (2007, p. 246), for example, discusses the clashes that led to the end of *Bauhaus*, translated in the diversity of the education of professionals, causing the break of homogeneity and communion of intentions, "that were the strong point of the group efficiency in Gropius' time."

Dialoguing with Morin (2010), in his book *Science with Conscience*, we move away from the utopia of the need to avoid or eliminate clashes. The author discusses the fields of conflicts in an academic context. When proposing a sociology of science, he states that much of what occurs in universities is more general than one wishes to believe:

> As we know, the major problem of every living organization – and, above all, of human society – is that it operates with much disorder, much randomness and many conflicts. And, as Montesquieu says, referring to Rome, the conflicts, the disorders and the fights that marked its history were not only the cause of its decadence, but also of its grandeur and its existence. I mean to say that the conflict, the disorder and the game [...] are not residues to be reabsorbed, but key constituents of all social existence (MORIN, 2010, p.111).

The author emphasizes this view, stating that the essence of the relations between scientists is both of a friendly and hostile nature of collaboration and competition, ruled by the verification game, specific of their areas.

## Summary

We come to the end of these reflections on the relations between process criticism and education without conclusive answers, models and theories to be applied in the classroom, but as a stimulating space for future insights. We speak, therefore, of hypotheses responsible for the acquisition of new ideas, amid

experimentations, multiple interactions, error, team development and pedagogical searches, all in a context of uncertainty and of processes permeated with sensitiveness. Finally, we offer the possibility of thinking of process follow-up and of critical reflections on the practice in the classroom.

## REFERENCES

ANDRADE, M. de. *O banquete.* São Paulo: Livraria Duas Cidades, 1989.

BOTELHO, S.; MÁRMORA, L.; ROMANO, L. R. V. (org.). *Caderno de atuação:* diário da montagem de Pais e Filhos, nas manhãs, tardes e noites de 18 de maio de 2011 a 29 de setembro de 2012. São Paulo: Mundana Companhia, 2013.

CARISTI, F. Uma ponte entre artesanato, arte, indústria e academia: a criatividade racional da Bauhaus. *In:* DE MASI, D. (org.). *A emoção e a regra:* os grupos criativos na Europa de 1850 a 1950. 9. ed. Translation by Elia Ferreira Edel. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 2007. p. 229-257.

COLAPIETRO, V. *Peirce e a abordagem do self:* uma perspective semiótica sobre a subjetividade humana. São Paulo: Intermeios, 2014.

DE MASI, D. *Criatividade e grupos criativos:* descoberta e invenção. v. 1. Rio de Janeiro: Sextante, 2005a.

DE MASI, D. *Criatividade e grupos criativos:* fantasia e concretude. v. 2. Rio de janeiro: Sextante, 2005b.

DE MASI, D. (org.). *A emoção e a regra:* os grupos criativos na Europa de 1850 a 1950. 9. ed. Translation by Elia Ferreira Edel. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 2007.

JOHNSON, S. *De onde vêm as boas ideias.* Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2011.

LOUIS, M. *Dentro da dança.* Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1992.

MORIN, E. *O Método 1:* a natureza da natureza. Trnaslation by Ilana Heineberg. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2002.

MORIN, E. *Ciência com consciência.* 13. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2010.

MUSSO, P. A filosofia da rede. *In*: PARENTE, A. (org). *Tramas da rede.* Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2004. p. 17-38.

PEIRCE, C. S. *The collected papers of Charles S. Peirce.* Electronic edition reproducing Vols. I-VI [Hartshorne, C.; Weiss, P. (eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University, 1931-1935], Vols. VII-VIII [Burks, A. W. (ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University, 1958]. Charlottesville: Intelex Corporation, 1994.

SALLES, C. A. *Redes da criação.* Vinhedo: Horizonte, 2006.

SALLES, C. A. *Gesto inacabado:* processo de criação artística. 5. ed. rev. e ampl. São Paulo: Intermeios, 2011.

SALLES, C. A. Da crítica genética à crítica de processo: uma linha de pesquisa em expansão. *Signum:* Estudos da Linguagem, Londrina, v. 20, n. 2, p. 41-52, ago. 2017a. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5433/2237-4876.2017v20n2p41.

SALLES, C. A. *Processos de criação em grupo*: diálogos. São Paulo: Estação das Letras e Cores, 2017b.

VERÍSSIMO, É. *Fantoches*. Porto Alegre: Globo, 1972.