

**Reinventing spaces  
between art and education**  
**Genesis, development  
and main conclusions  
of the research project**

90 91

**Ana Luísa de Oliveira Pires**

School of Education of the Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal

**Elisabete Xavier Gomes**

Maria Ulrich Early Childhood Educators' School

**Teresa N. R. Gonçalves**

Faculty of Education of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro

**Researchers at the Unit for  
Research in Education and  
Development, Universidade  
Nova de Lisboa**

## INTRODUCTION

The research project “Reinventing Spaces between Art and Education” is based on the understanding that education is a multi-referenced field of action and thought, in which dynamics resulting from different perspectives – epistemological, disciplinary and methodological – are accepted and acknowledged (Alves and Azevedo, 2010). Thus, researching into education is a complex activity that has two main requirements: *attention* to the world and the phenomena that constitute education in the present day; and, as far as choosing what we know and understand is concerned, an *openness* in our way of looking at these questions, without anticipating meanings or working with pre-defined models (Alves and Azevedo, 2010).

The decision to study the *10x10* project derived from the research team’s interest in getting to know more about a project whose pedagogical proposals displayed a great potential for change and whose systematisation and dissemination could make an important contribution to education and pedagogy. For this purpose, the team adopted a qualitative research design, one that was open, emerging and flexible in nature, in order to respect the object of their study, having progressively constructed the theoretical framework that would support their way of looking at the *10x10* project.

The authors assumed as their challenge the possibility of establishing research as a strategy for monitoring, theorising and disseminating innovative and transformational experiences that give shape to these contemporary educational practices.

In this chapter, we present the main theoretical stances and premises from which the research was developed, as well as the methodology and a summary of its main conclusions, giving special importance to the pedagogical dimension of the experiences of the *10x10* project, particularly in relation to what these bring us in terms of an interruption of established bureaucratic practices and a renewal of its repertoire and languages.

# 1. THEORETICAL STANCE AND PREMISES

We consider it to be fundamental to present the positions that we adopted in relation to some of the central concepts and questions underlying the *10x10* project and to the analysis of its practices. Our stance was constructed from educational theory, taking into account the discussions taking place in the field of education and the above-mentioned aims of the research project. The clarification of our theoretical stance seems to us to be fundamental for establishing the context for the construction of our research and analysis, as well as for understanding some of the main conclusions emerging from the research project.

The term “pedagogy” has been used with different meanings, which do not always coincide with one another (Gonçalves, Azevedo, Alves, 2013; Biesta, 2010). The ambiguity of the term is linked to the historical development of education as a discipline (German tradition) or as a field of academic research (Anglo-Saxon tradition) and it has been the subject of analysis by different authors. Estrela (2007) states that this ambiguity is still maintained today. According to this author, the term “pedagogy” is used simultaneously to refer to an applied science (deductive), to the science that studies the relationship between educational phenomena (inductive), to a specific form of education – school education – and to the reflections that we make about this, as well as to pedagogical or practical action, and to our reflections upon this or to the coming together of thought and action. In our view, these ambiguities are due to a certain naturalisation of the concept. For this reason, it seems to us to be fundamental to clarify what we understand by “pedagogy” and the meaning that we attribute to it in this research.

In our view, “pedagogy” implies a way of life – what Jorge Larrosa (2015) has designated the “pedagogical life” – which simultaneously constructs itself and is constructed from a certain relationship with the world. A pedagogical life implies a relationship with oneself and with the world that goes beyond the formal and technical aspects that are usually attributed to pedagogy. As a relational field, the pedagogical field is open to sudden and unexpected tensions, requiring ways of thinking and acting that call for attention, care and commitment to the other and to the world. For this reason, certain ways of thinking, deciding and acting are required, resulting in possibilities that go far beyond what is prescribed or predetermined, and which result in their own ways of theorising about the subject and produce their own forms of expression. This approach counters the trend towards a homogenisation of pedagogical practices

## A CERTAIN IDEA OF PEDAGOGY

with unique and different ways of doing things, thus making it possible for discourses, practices and languages to be more plural in nature.

The relationship with the world in the field of pedagogy takes place in an unproductive sphere, happening at a time and in a space that are intended to be genuinely free. The time and space of pedagogy, as the time and space of our meeting with one another, of the construction of ourselves as a unit and of the common shared aspects, only exists in the public space (Masschelein and Simons, 2013), in a space that cannot be privatised or even commercialised. The heart of pedagogy is its interest in the common good, in the construction of spaces and times of freedom, permitting, at each moment, a decision about what is desirable from an educational point of view. Yet, what is desirable at one moment or in one given situation is not necessarily so at another time, and is certainly not desirable in relation to the prevailing logic of production – since it does not obey the requirements of a merely technical or operational nature. For this reason, the so-called “pedagogical life” can only be understood and experienced in its ethical, aesthetic and political dimensions.

According to this line of analysis, some French-speaking authors (Houssaye, Hameline and Fabre, 2004) have proposed recovering the figure of the “pedagogue”, as the person who, through his or her action, combines both theory and practice. In other words, pedagogues are both practitioners and theoreticians of educational action. Pedagogy is understood as something that is “between”, which takes place in the specific interaction between the theory and the practice that exist in education. According to Meirieu (2006), it represents the opportunity to think about (and maintain) the contradictions that are inherent in education and in the educational task, as well as to think about educational principles, aims, facts and actions.

The interest of this proposal for the analysis of the practices of the *10x10* project lies in the fact that it enables us to think about them according to their pedagogical nature and in relation to the principles and aims that sustain the actions that are developed. It has a political, anthropological and philosophical dimension that makes it possible to go beyond merely technical or didactic questions.

The public dimension of pedagogy constitutes a central aspect for understanding educational contexts, processes and actions. In this way, the task of pedagogy is closely related to the common good, with the possibility of preserving and constructing a common world. Its public nature therefore has to do with the building of that world, with the form with which it is made public through education, through the construction of possibilities and experiences of freedom. It frees us from the productivist and privatising tendencies that are currently in fashion, recovering the idea of education as “a liberating process, a process whose aim is the realisation of freedom” (Biesta and Säfström, 2011). By distancing education from a modern vision of progress, the authors propose an understanding of education as a responsibility for the present, whose aim is freedom.

Analysing the practices of the *10x10* project in the light of this public dimension allows us to approach them from the point of view of their relationship with freedom, with the common good, in short with

the very experience of democracy itself. It is interesting to consider the way and the extent to which these practices make the world public. What knowledge, what meanings, what experiences are made public through the practices of the *10x10* project?

This understanding of pedagogy, in a broad sense, but even so not an all-embracing one, combines the theoretical and practical dimensions and makes it possible for us to establish a framework for actions, relations, conversations, contexts and rules with educational principles and aims. In this sense, pedagogy makes it possible to think about the unique and particular nature of the educational event, in its existential and public dimension, understood as relational and collective. For this reason, we move away from the currently prevailing perspectives that link pedagogy to the production of certain pre-defined results, following a productive and productivist logic, so that we may then consider how it can establish spaces of freedom, as a vital exercise in relating to the world and to others.

Observing the pedagogical and artistic experiments developed under the scope of educational programmes at museums and other centres of artistic activity (see, for example, Leite and Vitorino, 2008; Eça, Saldanha and Vidal, 2012; Thomson, Hall, Jones and Green, 2012), as well as studying the ideas being produced in the field of educational theory (Larrosa, 2013; Rancière, 2010 a. b.), enables us to construct a renewed stance about the relationships between art and pedagogy. The experiments that have been conducted and the paths that have been followed are organised around different approaches, which are not always convergent in their practices: art teaching, aesthetic education, education through art (see, in particular, the studies by Herbert Read, Arquimedes Silva Santos, and João Pedro Fróis).

Among the authors who have sought to systematise these relationships, we draw special attention to the contribution by Helguera (2011), which is concerned with the presentation of the pedagogical project of the 8<sup>th</sup> Mercosul Biennial. Based on the concept of “reterritorialisation”, developed by Deleuze and Guattari, Helguera proposes that we “imagine pedagogy as a territory that has different regions. One of these, which is the best known, is situated in the field of interpretation or education as an instrument for understanding art; the second is the fusion of art and education [...], and the third is art as an instrument of education, [...] art as knowledge of the world” (Helguera, 2011, p. 6).

The first region is worked on through the dialogue that is established between the mediator and the audience, from the point of view of sharing reflections and the expansion of individual knowledge, mobilising, for example, the ideas of critical pedagogy, developed by Paulo Freire, and of group dynamics, developed by Augusto Boal. The second region, the fusion between art and education, may be found through the exploration of specific works of art, through which the audience are invited to enter into a “playful world”, freeing themselves from temporal reality, through games and pedagogical dynamics in which the “experience is not only a scattered affair”, but rather “a constructive and generative experience that satisfies all members of the group” – even if they are not immediately

aware of this. The third area, “art as knowledge of the world”, explores the work of the artist “as an object of study that is to be valued as such, but also as a window to be able to acquire an understanding of themes that are of relevance [for other] fields” (Helguera, 2011, p. 7); or, in other words, the work of art is linked to and explored from the perspective of certain disciplinary fields, such as Geography, History or Literature.

Gaztambide-Fernández (2013) also reflects on various discourses and debates taking place on the subject of the arts in education, identifying tensions between different currents and trends. He identifies the expressionist current, which defends the idea that, through the arts, children express themselves better; the reconstructionist current, which attributes the arts with the power to transform the person and society; as well as scientific rationalism, which emphasises the heuristic relationship between art and knowledge. Above all, attention is drawn to his severe criticism of the prevailing instrumentalisation of the arts in education:

*This ability to demonstrate what the arts do – whether it is to improve achievement or to make us better human beings – has become the holy grail of arts advocacy. [...] The rhetoric of effects is always caught in a positivist logic [...]. Moreover, a focus on effects has tended to obscure the actual experiences – whether positive, negative, or otherwise – that evolve within contexts defined by practices and processes of symbolic creativity typically associated with the concept of the arts [...].* (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013, p. 213)

We adopt a similar stance in attempting to understand whether, in the *10x10* project, the central idea lies in the opening up of work processes or in the search for and confirmation of pre-defined effects and impacts. The concept of “bricolage”, used by Paley (1995) to think about the relationship between art and education, directs our attention to the possibilities of transformation through the incorporation of artistic practices into the pedagogical field. According to the same author, “bricolage” implies discontinuity and juxtaposition, decentring, and an association between disconnected parts. It represents an alternative to the compartmentalisation of knowledge, permitting the inclusion of the “difference”, resisting the objectification and reduction of the heterogeneity of the experiences and creating the possibility of an intertext.

The historical analysis developed by Bordes (2007) also assumes another perspective, insofar as it proposes and highlights an intrinsic relationship between the emergence of New Pedagogies in Europe from the eighteenth century onwards, based specifically on Rousseau, and the possibility of developing artistic vanguards at the beginning of the twentieth century. Bordes analyses Europe during the childhood period of some of the artists of the vanguard movements, highlighting the presence of the pedagogical proposals, for example, of Froebel and Pestalozzi, centred around drawing, educational games and a large group of new exercises developed for the education of children. Bordes defends the idea that the New Pedagogies marked the beginning of the democratisation of the art forms (which tended to be elitist) of observing, expressing and moving the body, permitting the separation between artistic practices, the work of art and the author.

Taking into account the various theoretical approaches that combine pedagogy and art, we acknowledge in this text the possibility of a heterodox dialogue between pedagogical work and practices and artistic work and practices. In choosing the term “dialogue”, we wish to state that, in this model, neither is pedagogy placed at the service of art, nor is art instrumentalised through pedagogy. In fact, in line with Larrosa, we “think of art and the classroom as places that have to do with a certain responsibility and a certain love for childhood and for the world” (2013, p. 40).

Larrosa (2013) and Rancière (2010b.) regard art and a certain understanding of artistic work as the opening up of another space and time that consists in the sharing of what is sensitive, in sharing the sensitive cloak of the world: “Artistic practices are not an exception when compared with other practices. They represent and reconfigure the sharing of these activities” (Rancière, 2010b, p. 53). In his elegy of the sharing of activities, Silva states that “art is one of the names of the group of techniques through which man gives form to the world and, simultaneously, forms himself” (2011, p. 29). This approach makes it possible to strengthen the link between artistic practices and pedagogical practices through the relationship that they both have with the construction of what is commonly shared and with the formation of the human being.

It is from this perspective that we are interested in observing the *10x10* project: through the way it opens up space and time for this dialogue, which fertilises artistic work and pedagogical work and positions them as elements in the construction of a shared and common world.

Considering that one of the main structural features of the *10x10* project is to be found at the level of the development of pedagogical situations that are then intended to serve as significant formative experiences, as much for the teachers themselves as for the artists and students, implicitly bringing into play the concepts of experience and learning, we considered it fundamental to contextualise these concepts from a theoretical and conceptual point of view.

There are several educational currents that attribute a central role to experience, recognising that it is one of the bases and also the necessary condition for learning and development. John Dewey, one of the main authors to stress the role of experience in education, defended the concept of education as the “continuous reconstruction of experience” (Dewey, 1916, p. 80, quoted by Pires 2005, p. 145). In recognising the importance of individual experiences, interpersonal dynamics and the autonomy of the subject in the learning process, Dewey significantly influenced the concept of experiential learning and attributed a central role to reflective thinking – establishing the difference between “activity” and “experience” and highlighting the fact that only through reflection is it possible to attribute meaning to experience, making it a formative element.

As we know, the concept of experience is a complex one. Among its fundamental properties, Honoré (1992) highlights relationality, temporality and reflexivity. Serving as a continuation of this perspective, we identify the proposal of Larrosa (2002), for whom experience is a globalising phenomenon and appeals to all the senses, having as its basic

● This is what the author says about this question: “Inventing one’s world is deciphering the signs that unexpectedly force their way into the human experience of the subject. It is due to the encounter with the signs that the subject has an experience of problematisation, when the differential nature of the sign affects them, creating a problem for their thinking. It is from there that the subject begins to search for a meaning to the problem, seeking to solve it in order to circumscribe a truth for it.” (Uberti, 2013, p. 1232)

condition the existence of a spatial and temporal context. Furthermore, experience requires passivity (in the sense of patience and attention), receptivity (regarded as fundamental availability) and openness. In fact, openness and receptivity are essential not only for ensuring that the subject may be available for the experience – hearing, listening, feeling – but also for attributing meaning to that experience. Experience is, therefore, simultaneously existential and contextual, as Larrosa underlines, highlighting “its relationship with existence, with the singular and concrete life of a singular and concrete experient” (2002, p. 27). Thus, it is through experience and the knowledge that it produces that people construct themselves and take ownership of this construction process: “Experience and the knowledge that derives from it are what enable us to take ownership of our own lives” (Larrosa, 2002, p. 27).

It should further be underlined that experience is unique, heterogeneous and plural, directing us towards the field of “non-order”, of the unknown, the uncertain, the unpredictable and the unrepeatable (Larrosa, 2002). It is pure “transformation”, insofar as it forms and transforms the subject: “Thus, the result of the experience is the formation or transformation of the subject of the experience. And hence the subject of the experience is not the subject of knowing, or the subject of being able, or the subject of wishing, but the subject of the formation and transformation” (Larrosa, 2002, p. 7). Or, in other words, underlying this proposal are also the principles of uncertainty and freedom – “Experience is a ‘perhaps’” (Larrosa, 2011, p. 19).

As far as learning is concerned, we understand that learning is not a way for the subject to adapt to the world, to recognise it or to establish a framework for its contextualisation, but instead it is a way for the subject to invent his or her own world, in accordance with the proposal made by Deleuze (1987, quoted by Uberti, 2013) ●. If we consider that learning is a creative process of searching for meanings and solving problems, which produces knowledge of a multiple and diverse nature, we also have to take into consideration that this knowledge is situated on two sides: on the one hand, it is constructed from the subject or subjects’ frame of reference, which is constantly being (re)invented; on the other hand, it is influenced by the elements and conditions in which the situation/experience itself occurs.

## 2. GENERAL METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

Theory and method are interlinked, as Graue and Walsh (2003) maintain. Both theory and method are tools that support (and sometimes restrict) research. Aware of this dual possibility, we tried at all times to assume a perspective based on openness and flexibility, in accordance with the nature and aims of the study. Consequently, we share the premise that “how one looks affects what one looks at, and what one looks at affects how one looks. [...] Research, like life itself, is a connected endeavor” (Graue and Walsh, 2003, p. 48).

The study undertaken here is based on the premises of qualitative research (Bogdan and Biklen, 1994; Alves and Azevedo, 2010) and interpretive research (Erickson, 1986; Graue and Walsh, 2003), and, as has already been mentioned, the theoretical frame of reference was built progressively, in an inductive way, based on the analysis of the situations, practices, characteristics and dynamics that emerged during the course of the *10 x 10* project.

An attempt was made to develop a methodology that ensured a dynamic relationship between theoretical research and empirical research, in order to maintain the necessary openness that is required by the inductive construction of knowledge. Instead of translating theory into practice, our intention with this proposal was to theorise practice and maintain the experimental nature of the theoretical exercise that accompanies, observes and questions the empirical project. In this sense, the research project developed along three central and interconnected lines of questioning, mutually intercepting and feeding off one another, namely:

- A) *How have experiences about the relationship between education and art been theorised? How can innovative educational experiences be theorised?*
- B) *What are the characteristics, impacts and educational possibilities opened up by the *10 x 10* project?*
- C) *What strategies are best suited to the dissemination of a project of this nature?*

The research work that embodied the first of this series of questions, based on critical analysis and writing, consisted in defining a theoretical and conceptual framework that would enable us not only to make a comprehensive reading of educational experiences, but also to study the potential enlargement of its effects/characteristics/impacts, as well as to interrogate and pluralise the relationship between theory, practice and research, with a view to inductively constructing a theory of education.

The second line of questioning was geared towards identifying the aims and empirical premises for the activities of the *10 x 10* project, understanding

## 2.1. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

its continuities and discontinuities, as well as legitimising the use of the 10×10 micropedagogies. To this end, we undertook an analysis of the documents produced under the scope of the project, constructing questionnaires to be addressed to the teachers who took part in the first three editions of the project, applying them and then analysing their results, taking part as observers in the meetings held between the working team of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation/artists/teachers, and also sitting in on the public lessons.

The third line of questioning had as its aim to disseminate the experiences and results of the research in progress, to organise the discussion of these at national and international conferences, promoting dissemination as a theorising strategy, and also to establish and/or strengthen networks of cooperation with other national and international institutions. This line of research was developed through a theoretical and scientific approach, consisting in the presentation of papers at national and international seminars and conferences, and their submission for inclusion in different types of scientific and academic publications: conference proceedings, journals, chapters in books. We also organised the international seminar “Spaces between Art and Education”, held at UIED-FCT/UNL, in December 2015.

Just like Graue and Walsh (2003, p. 148), we consider that “an instrument is a research tool constructed to assist in the generation of a certain kind of data in a systematic way”. As such, we constructed our tools throughout the course of the research, adapting it to the contexts, in order to gather relevant and pertinent information, taking into account our initial research questions, which were also (re)formulated during the course of the study.

We also tried to guarantee data triangulation – mainly through the use of different sources of information, spaces and people (Denzin, 1978, quoted by Graue and Walsh, 2003). It should be noted that the fact that the team was composed of three researchers with PhDs in Education Sciences, but with different backgrounds in terms of their basic training and with a wide range of different experiences, also contributed to the adoption of a multi-referenced approach, which always underlay the carrying out of this study.

Thus, based on these principles, we resorted to the following procedures:

— *Non-participant observation of the public lessons presented by the project’s participants in Auditorium 2 of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (FCG), at the beginning of each calendar year (January 2013, January 2014, January 2015);*

— *Participant observation of the monitoring meetings of the 10×10 project, held between members of the FCG team, the teachers and the artists, throughout the duration of the research project (three years). For one of the meetings, a script was drawn up with questions that focused on the conception and use of the micropedagogies, which was used as the document to promote a collective group discussion (focus-group).*

— *Questionnaires addressed to the teachers (applied in the first three editions)●, with the aim of characterising, understanding and assessing the impact of the training project at the level of its concepts and practices. The questionnaire was organised into five thematic groups: personal characterisation, professional development, perceptions of the 10×10 project, micropedagogies and final assessment of the project. It included open-ended questions, closed questions and (4-point) Likert scales. The aims were as follows: to characterise the perspectives of the teachers in relation to the project’s effects at various levels and dimensions (on the students, and on the teachers’ educational practices and concepts); to make an overall assessment of the project, identifying the strong points and the less successful aspects; to gather suggestions for changes and improvements.*

— *Documentary analysis of the materials produced by the teachers and the artists: lesson plans, reports and other records and documents about the strategies produced; documents from the 10×10 project prepared by the FCG team, as well as the Notebooks of the Public Lessons and the Micropedagogies Document, among others.*

In the documentary analysis and the analysis of the records of the observations, special privilege was given to an interpretive consideration of the documents, so that, on the one hand, the wealth of the material collected would be respected and, on the other hand, it would be afforded greater visibility.

As Bogdan and Biklen (1994, p. 50) state, “qualitative researchers tend to analyze their data inductively”, mobilising concepts from abstractions that arise from the collection and grouping together of data. The theory is constructed in a “bottom-up” fashion; in other words, a framework is constructed as its forms are being delineated and as its parts are being put together, in a heuristic dynamics of knowledge production.

● The questionnaire was pre-tested with a reduced group of teachers and their contributions/suggestions/difficulties were incorporated into the final questionnaire. This was filled in by the teachers of the first three editions, roughly a year after the end of the respective edition. The time interval was justified by the need to create a physical and temporal distance from the assessment of its impacts. As far as the conditions under which it was administered are concerned, we highlight the fact that the teachers were summoned to attend beforehand, and in good time, and that the questionnaire was administered by the researchers in a room at the FCG.

### 3. THE QUESTIONS THAT GUIDED THE RESEARCH AND SHAPED THE MAIN CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

Based on the questions that were originally drawn up in the questionnaire, we reformulated and reconstructed the lines of our research throughout the study, always from a dialectic perspective and with a spirit of openness to new questions that might arise, through comparisons that we made between the analysis conducted empirically and the theoretical concepts that emerged and were constructed inductively.

From these new lines of questioning, we highlight the following questions:

- I. *What are the distinctive characteristics of the pedagogical strategies that were tried out throughout the course of the project?*
- II. *What are the main aspects of the 10×10 project as a formative experience?*
- III. *To what extent can the 10×10 project be recognised as a unique project constructed in discontinuity with other formative proposals?*
- IV. *What intentions lay behind the experiences of the 10×10 project?*
- V. *What is the nature of the relationship established between artistic practices and pedagogical practices?*

Just as we stated in the introduction to this chapter, it is our intention to give greater visibility to the pedagogical dimension of the 10×10 experiences, which leads us to the gradual revelation of the characteristics that make it possible to interrupt established bureaucratic practices and renew repertoires and languages brought to us by the *micropedagogies* that are the central focus of this book. It is for this reason that the answer to the first question merited a greater in-depth study and extension, as we explain below.

The analysis of the experiences resulting from the interaction between artists and teachers, and between the artistic and pedagogical work processes made possible by the 10×10 project, enabled us to glimpse ways of doing things that concentrate more on exercises than on products, more on teaching/learning processes than on the “effective” learning outcomes achieved, measured in the form of tests and final marks.

We were interested in understanding the mechanisms, devices and principles established and recovered through interdiscursivity, realised in the form of a generative dialogue between vocabularies and artistic and pedagogical ways of doing things provided by the project under analysis. We consider that the strategies developed and tried out under the scope of the 10×10 project may be organised according to two dimensions:

#### A) 10×10 EXPERIENCES THAT MADE IT POSSIBLE TO RENEW SCHOLASTIC TECHNOLOGIES

*Scholastic technologies [...] are by no means tools that, when used correctly, produce well-formed young people, like finished products off a production line. [...] Scholastic technologies are techniques that engage young people on the one hand and present the world on the other.*  
(Masschelein and Simons, 2013, p. 65)

Known as elements of scholastic technology or as devices (Chartier, 2002), there are components that define life at school and that, once they have been established and incorporated, function automatically and produce specific ways of being and doing things. The risk of automatisms in the use of scholastic technologies is especially high because of the mass spread of working instruments (see the case of the industrialisation of file cards, didactic games and other “ready to use” devices, which almost completely dispense with the need for the teacher’s own professional exercise) or the political and administrative institutionalisation (remember, in Portugal, the case of the Project Area and the consequent trivialisation that it caused in the methodology of project work).

In fact, the effectiveness of scholastic technology lies in the very smallest of details (Masschelein and Simons, 2013) – or, in other words, it is the details of the pedagogical exercise that make it possible for scholastic technology to catch the attention of the students, making them interested in something that lies outside them, in the common world (a skill, a language, an equation, an author, an exercise), to the extent of their committing themselves to passing from the state of “I don’t know/I can’t do this” to the state of “I can do this/I’m capable of doing this”.

One of the key elements of the relevance that we attribute to the 10×10 project lies precisely in the attention that is paid to the details, to the work that is realised in the *micropedagogies*. By being obliged to rethink the working mechanisms that are already incorporated into the teaching practices of each and every one of us, and which are sometimes used in a routine fashion, we concluded that the 10×10 project provided a certain interruption in the (not always) pedagogical automatisms, brought about by the interdiscursive relationship constructed between clearly pedagogical procedures and languages and clearly artistic procedures and

languages. The work of *bricolage* developed by teachers and artists made it possible to introduce renewed forms of discovering and establishing a relationship with the world through this generative dialogue between art and pedagogy. We consider that this generative dialogue of languages and actions was possible because the *10x10* project placed teachers and artists in a situation where they felt that they were beginning something anew, that they were radically involved in what they were doing.

In order to make this conclusion visible, we will use the pair of notebooks and routines/rituals – objects and practices that inhabit the territories of art and pedagogy – as key elements of the scholastic devices that have no author and which, because of their artistic influx, were thought about, reconfigured and infused with meaning throughout the various editions of the *10x10* project.

## NOTEBOOKS

Chartier and Renard (2000), Chartier (2002) and Mignot (2010) identify notebooks as one of the scholastic devices that, despite their tendency to be used without thinking, make it possible to think about and to get to know the inside of the classroom, by making what the students are doing and what the teachers make them do visible. This historiographical research into the school notebooks makes it possible, first of all, to note their duration (they have been used since the time of the precursors of schools in the Middle Ages), the universal spread of their use (at different levels of teaching, in different subjects), as well as to note their pragmatic functions (they make the students do things and act), their pedagogical functions (they mark out the boundaries and limit the possibilities of the exercises that the teachers make them do) and their cognitive functions (the notebooks are instruments of thought and of the organisation, construction and consolidation of knowledge).

In the context of the plastic and visual arts, the notebooks of the artists, because they have an author, because they are public and are published, and because they represent “laboratories of the imagination” (Paul Claudel, quoted by Vale, 2015, p. 125), based on the 1960s and 1970s, have established their own autonomy as an artistic object, gaining the name of “artist’s books”.

Since the first edition of the *10x10* project, notebooks have been worked upon by the various pairs of teachers and artists: “Polyphonic graphic diaries”, the “Fieldwork notebook”, “Diary of unusual events”, “My notebook” and “Anthology”. These experiences appear as examples that mark the miscegenation between pedagogy and art, the above-mentioned interdiscursivity. In fact, just as occurred with the use of the school notebook device, the teacher-artist pairs *made* the students *do* the notebooks, defining rules for recording items, the languages to be used, and dignifying this instrument, as an integral part of the school work that was being experimented with. Perverting the most basic rules for the standardised use of the school notebook, the students were asked to use the notebook outside the classroom, outside the school, to record aspects of everyday life that are not considered by the educational institution to be part of the canon and which were not previously known about by the teacher-artist pair (see “Diaries”, p. 179).

In the *10x10* project, the use was proposed of diaries, notebooks and anthologies that expanded the limits of the subjects which characterise secondary education (it was proposed that the same notebook should be used to record situations and the exercises from the various school subjects) and made it possible to use different languages and different ways of keeping records (writing, drawings, collages, among others).

It was noted that the pedagogical experiences of the *10x10* project made use of devices that were familiar features of the day-to-day life of schools, so familiar that they were close to being forgotten, so forgotten that they were close to being automatisms. The reinvention of the notebooks, infused with a certain artistic quality, did not result in artist’s books, but they produced a school atmosphere, insofar as they captured the attention of each student, inviting them to indulge in an element of surprise, through their close and attentive relationship with the world that they inhabit.

## ROUTINES AND RITUALS

The invention of simultaneous teaching in the eighteenth century, and the gradual replacement of the traditional methods of education, came to require the introduction of routines and rituals for the organisation of time, the space, the group and general conduct. However, today, the relationship that teachers and students have with the routines and rituals of school life is not a peaceful one, given their repetitive nature and their disciplinary function, setting up the group and community life, which fosters a certain normalisation of what it is to be human at each stage in one’s life. These dilemmas and ambiguities provoke some unease about routines and lead to some difficulties in the way that they are used and thought about.

By way of contrast, under the scope of the *10x10* project, a particularly fertile group of experiences was identified which acknowledged the need to give visibility, body and originality to the rituals and routines that form part of everyday school life (see the micropedagogies of stretching, the security rituals, among other examples). In the *10x10* project, the rituals contain an openly acknowledged artistic and playful dimension, which shifts and disconfigures the pedagogical action, causing it to be an element that disturbs the established environment, which makes it possible to ensure the student’s full enjoyment of each situation, avoiding the automatic repetition that has led to the stiffening of methods and techniques that so often are only ephemerally innovative (see “Making the invisible visible”, p. 142).

It was noted that the use of rituals promoted the necessary feeling of security and a certain decentring of each subject, which allows for a freer entry into a universe of enjoyment and experimentation. The reinvented rituals of the *10x10* project, where the performers (the student and the teacher and the artist) show themselves to a restricted community (the community of the classroom, of each class), makes it possible to suspend the rules that previously existed. Their relevance is accentuated by the fact that they have been identified by some teachers as examples of micropedagogies that continued to be used autonomously, already after the students’ participation in the

10x10 project, as well as the fact that they enabled the pedagogical imagination to be fed, causing it to be understood that teaching admits all possibilities, moving teachers away from the routine practices that are manifested

[...] in the most common ways of thinking about lessons, pedagogical practices, teaching and assessment methodologies: methods that are hidebound by prescriptive manuals, methods that are resistant to any form of boldness, to innovations and to any unaccustomed way of thinking that breaks away from what is already expected. (Loponte, 2013, p. 6)

#### B) 10x10 EXPERIENCES THAT PROVOKED A DISRUPTIVE FORCE AND LED TO THE EXPLORATION OF OTHER PATHS AND OTHER PEDAGOGICAL POSSIBILITIES

These are experiences that, although they form part of the pedagogical set of ideas announced by the New School or by Active Pedagogy, have had difficulty in taking root, but which, under the scope of the 10x10 project became possible. The creative potential of the 10x10 project allows for experimentation and openness to new practices and languages, rehabilitates and gives visibility to the artisanal dimension of pedagogy, lost in detriment to a certain vision of technicity, enclosed within criteria of objectivity and predictability and restricted by the trivialised recourse to stereotyped materials.

Based on the research that was developed, it was possible for us to find some lines of force that emerged in a consistent fashion, being organised around a set of characteristics, which, since they are not self-enclosed, are combined and linked to one another, giving rise to a multiplicity of situations and educational experiences.

Here, we should like to highlight three predominant aspects: a first aspect that is linked to the dimension of corporality, movement and space, which is developed by breaking away from the traditional pedagogical conceptions that prevail in the classroom; a second aspect that is linked to the new technologies, which legitimises the use of “prohibited”/“disruptive” instruments in the class, such as mobile phones and hyperlinks; and a third aspect, which is autobiographical in nature and highlights experiences of self-production and sharing, supported by different instruments, such as writing or practices inspired by cartography.

#### BODY, MOVEMENT AND SPACE

The body assumes a very powerful central role in various practices developed by the teachers-artist pairs. The possibility of liberating and enjoying the movements of the body is highlighted in a broad spectrum of strategies that, under the scope of the 10x10 project, are known as “corporisations” (p. 173). They have as their pedagogical intentionality to approach specific problems and concepts relating to school subjects, based on concrete experience and valuing the body as a pedagogical possibility. This type

of pedagogical work may be developed independently of the subjects or the curriculum in question, and the way in which the teachers use the body (their own and that of the students) during the lessons paves the way for new practices full of potential, in keeping with the arguments of Rossana della Costa (2009). The strategies are mobilised to attain certain objectives, both at the level of promoting self-knowledge, communication, interpersonal relationships and group cohesion and at the level of acquiring concepts and contents from specific subjects. Within the context of the 10x10 project, there are various pedagogical strategies that attribute a great central role to the space in which the students work and the different ways of exploring it. The use of space in the participating schools is dynamic and was extended beyond the physical space of the classrooms – with frequent use being made of gymnasiums, corridors, outside spaces, courtyards, stairs, etc. On the other hand, the use of the space and the materials inside the classroom and the different and non-traditional forms of arranging the space (see “Choreography for a U-shaped classroom”, p. 136) are also one of its predominant characteristics. Underlying this form of pedagogical work is the explicit intention of promoting significant experiences for the students, establishing different relationships with the space, exploring different pedagogical possibilities related with the body and with its movement in this space, being able to “untidy” and “empty” (of the tables and desks) the traditional places of school work, breaking with the formatting of the pre-established model.

In this project, we must also emphasise the fact that the use of the space expands beyond the physical limits of the internal walls of the classroom and the external walls of the school. Study visits and field trips are held to various places – courtyards, gardens, museums, fairs... – materialising this “decloistering”, bringing with it other possibilities for the pedagogical exploration of the space and the surrounding contexts of the schools. As we know, the organisation of the educational space is intentional and flexible, so that it must be adapted to the nature and aim of the educational activities.

Considering that one of the aspects defended by the “pedagogy-in-participation” is the greater value that is given to the pedagogical space as a terrain where experiences occur and learning processes are developed (Oliveira-Formosinho, 2007, 2011), it is possible to state that this concern is an underlying feature of various “micropedagogies” (p. 118) constructed under the scope of the 10x10 project.

#### THE TRANSGRESSIVE – “PROHIBITED” AND “DISRUPTIVE” – INSTRUMENTS

The relevance of “cultivating positive transgressions” (one of the recommendations of the 10x10 project), together with the idea that the school should be a place where one goes to find meaning and not information, are materialised in the form of strategies that make an appeal to the information technologies, to the various instruments of the visual world or to mobile phones, among many other things, which are instruments and tools that today form an integral part of the everyday life of the students and which mediate their relationship with the world.

It has become increasingly evident that the learning processes of young people – considered “digital natives” – mainly occur through the sharing of knowledge, in a collective and not in an individual way (Carrega, 2011). Young people create new languages, using words, images and movement. However, the incorporation of the mobile phone as a pedagogical tool demands new attitudes and skills on the part of teachers, who, as Ganito highlights (2009, p. 77), “have to adapt to this culture of permanent contact where learning has become, above all, a shared experience”, or, in other words, an experience based on the collaborative construction of knowledge. It is in keeping with this line of thinking that the *10x10* project assumed the use of “disruptive”/“prohibited”/“penalised” instruments as a strategy of positive transgression, openly exploring the potentialities deriving from the use of mobile phones and other digital equipment within the classroom context (see “Forum”, p. 168). These pedagogical proposals of the *10x10* project resort to the use of hyperlinks, to the sending of text messages, videos and recordings made by mobile phones, among other devices. They mobilise as resources the computer, programmes used for editing video and sound, the Internet, photographic cameras, film cameras, mobile phones, sound recorders and systems. Observing the expansion of the school space and the need to think about new possibilities for new times, Melchiorretto and Kraemer (2015, p. 7) consider the emergence of “a perspective that can transcend the school walls, break the control mechanisms by transforming the use of mobile tools into a strategy for the decentralisation of teaching.”

#### PRACTICES OF SELF-TRAINING AND HETERO-TRAINING IN THE SCHOOL CONTEXT

In the pedagogical strategies developed under the scope of the *10x10* project, we find the use of *autobiographies* and *cartographies*, with the aim of promoting self-knowledge in students, the construction of the self and an awareness of others.

The strategies of an autobiographical nature mobilised under the scope of the *10x10* project use a variety of resources – handwritten letters, family histories, photographs, images, writing material, mirrors... – seeking to increase the potential for self-knowledge and the discovery of the self, valuing one’s own world and the life path that one has developed (see “Autobiographies”, p. 162). Individual experiences are shared through the construction of intersubjectivity, reinforcing interpersonal relationships. Besides promoting questioning of a philosophical nature (“who am I?”), they seek to develop skills through the production of texts of a biographical nature, besides the skills needed for the interpretation of poems, photographs and images. In this way, poetry, music, images, the theatrical staging of events, among others, constitute the terrain for the revelation, (re)construction and sharing of identities.

In the same way, cartographies enable the construction of the self and the *creation of worlds* (Panella et al, 2015), through the construction of maps and the mapping of one’s affections and emotions. The groups “construct their own worlds”, take ownership of their surroundings poetically and aesthetically, expressing their perceptions about their “local”

place, linked to a whole, creating new relationships with reality. Under the scope of the *10x10* project, various pedagogical strategies are mobilised with this aim (see “Cartographies”, p. 129). Cartography is a way of inhabiting territories, constructing an experiential and unique space that implies an idea of experience understood as a space of unpredictability from which one emerges transformed. In this sense, it operates a shift, a disturbance that touches modes of existence, processes of self-invention and of inventing the world, producing ways of looking and forming knowledge that are implied (Rolnik, 1987) – and not merely applied – for it operates through the exposure of oneself and one’s affections (Kastup, 2008).

In overall terms, and in close keeping with the intentionality of the *10x10* project, we note that the pedagogical strategies developed by the teacher-artist pairs are inspired by artistic practices, making use of different languages and forms of expression, such as music, dance, calligraphy, drama or film, creatively mobilising the body, the voice, the movement, the space, among others, and rehabilitating different types of pedagogical instruments and tools, some of which are almost “forgotten” and others which are also “forbidden”.

Throughout the study that was undertaken, we took care to identify the main dimensions of the *10x10* project as a formative experience, understanding experience in its complex and globalising sense (Larrosa 2002, 2011).

In a more summarised form, we highlight some of its most relevant dimensions (see Pires, Gonçalves and Gomes, 2015), which, because of their transversal nature, have significant implications at the level of the training process, from the perspective of both the teachers and the students.

These main dimensions were:

- *The space-time dimension, linked to the contexts/spaces/times of learning and the construction of knowledge. As far as the teachers are concerned, this has to do with their own work situation, mobilising the principles of training “in a context”, based on real situations, problem solving and the construction of shared strategies; the school is simultaneously a working and training context, in which formative experiences arise that can contribute to personal, professional and organisational development (although the last of these did not have a greatly significant expression in the 10x10 project).*
- *The pedagogical dimension, through the conception and design of active and collective pedagogical strategies that are participatory in nature and contribute to the students’ development in various dimensions (cognitive, socio-affective and relational, etc.) and to the construction of significant learning processes that have and produce meaning for those who are learning. The nature of the pedagogical experience opens up the possibility of introducing an epistemological and aesthetic order into the classroom, which enables the interruption of objectifying or standardising logics.*
- *The relational dimension, through the construction and development of new professional relations based on horizontality and equality and not on the expertise of the trainer (Gonçalves and Gomes, 2014): the creative partnerships with the artist, the openness to new forms of relationship with and between the students and*

with the educational community. It should be noted that the formative experience provided by the 10 × 10 project is profoundly democratic, because of the way in which it values the individuality and singularity of its participants (teachers, artists, students, and the FCG team).

— The identity dimension, linked to the change in the teachers' educational concepts, with their becoming aware of the contributions made by the project, the feeling that they are developing skills and professional practices that can strengthen their self-esteem and self-image and contribute to the changes taking place in terms of their identity.

— The epistemological dimension, which emerges from the interdisciplinary comparison that is being made between subjects, through the construction of a transdisciplinary "knowledge for action", which can be used to mediate between different rationalities, both theoretical and practical. Knowledge is constructed collectively, through experimentation and reflection, in a shared and cooperative fashion – between teachers, artists and students.

### III TO WHAT EXTENT CAN THE 10 × 10 PROJECT BE RECOGNISED AS A UNIQUE PROJECT CON- STRUCTED IN DISCONTINUITY WITH OTHER FORMATIVE PROPOSALS?

The analysis of the 10 × 10 project enabled us to question the models currently being used for continuous teacher training and the professional development of teachers in regard to their contribution to improving student learning, strengthening the professionalism of teachers or enhancing the informal dynamics in training experiences (Gonçalves and Gomes, 2014). Basing ourselves on the typology proposed by Sachs (2009) for the models to be used for the professional development of teachers, our criticism of the traditional models focuses on the way in which some of these training proposals tend to promote individualism, neglecting the collaborative dimension of the teacher's work, as they tend to standardise and technify teachers' practices, taking their autonomy away from them and neglecting the pedagogical and political dimension of their work.

These models produce forms of mastery and control that are geared towards pre-established ends configuring pre-determined forms of professionalism, based on a relationship of externality with knowledge – resulting in an objective and hierarchical knowledge that is external to the subject that possesses it.

In contrast, some of the central characteristics of the 10 × 10 project open up other possibilities for thinking about teacher training, namely with regard to the promotion of collaborative work between teachers and artists and the consequent opening up of unforeseen and unforeseeable spaces for dialogue and reflection, promoting the implementation of pedagogical strategies ("micropedagogies") that single out and materialise the creative dimension of the teacher's work, making it possible to denaturalise established practices and go beyond individualistic understandings of teaching practices. The analysis of the perspectives expressed by the participating teachers with regard to the training offered by the 10 × 10 project reinforced our initial reading of the situation, since most of those who responded to the questionnaire said that they did not find any similarities between the 10 × 10 project and previous training experiences, valuing the project's interdisciplinary and collaborative nature and the fact that it was based upon languages and processes of artistic creation. The opening up of the training experience to unpredictability and the

full involvement of all the participants in the process are aspects that were mentioned by the teachers taking part and which clearly reinforce the uniqueness of the 10 × 10 project when compared with other training proposals.

We consider it important to identify and give visibility to the intention(s) underlying the pedagogical action, making it possible to understand the concepts, principles and values that guided this project. As Uberti (2013) points out, we are currently confronted with the limits and weaknesses inherent in the existence of a *non-relationship* between the educational intentions and teaching processes of the school as an institution – the way in which the school is organised and works in order to achieve established pedagogical objectives – which are hidebound by the discourse of rationality and predictability on which educational intentions are founded.

First of all, we base our thinking on the idea that pedagogical intentionality can be understood as the implicit aim in a certain conscious action that is structured and developed for a particular purpose, in a certain pedagogical context – in a certain space-time, with a pre-determined group of people (and not one that is specifically chosen) and with a set of pre-defined subject-matters – constituted by the relationship established between those who are teaching, those who are learning and the knowledge that circulates between them. However, as Morin (2000, p. 90) highlights, we are aware that "no action is assured of working in the direction of its intention", so that we accept the challenges inherent in the very uncertainty of the action itself, which implies our also being aware of unpredictability and the need to mobilise strategies in detriment to programmes ●.

In view of the reflections that have been pointed out above, based on the empirical research that was undertaken, we sought to find the answer to the question of what the pedagogical intentions of the 10 × 10 project are. One of the main intentions has to do with the creation of environments and atmospheres that facilitate the students' learning processes, by increasing their motivation, attention and other attitudes that promote learning, their potential being increased by the construction of groups that foster the interpersonal relationship and the acquisition of knowledge and specific curricular contents. This pedagogical intentionality is clearly visible in the different documents produced by the 10 × 10 project – for example, in the record sheets of the micropedagogies conceived by the teacher-artist pairs; in the Notebooks of the Public Lessons. We also noted that this intentionality was to be found in the way that the spaces were organised, the times were managed, the teaching/learning strategies were conceived and the relationships were established between the teacher/educator, and the student/pupil and the knowledge acquired, given the flexible way in which these roles were defined and assumed throughout the course of the 10 × 10 project.

As was defended by Paulo Freire (1996), the teaching/learning process cannot be understood in the light of a "banker's" vision of education, based on a transfer of knowledge between a holder of that knowledge (teacher) and a receiver of that same knowledge (student).

### IV WHAT INTENTIONS LAY BEHIND THE EXPERI- ENCES OF THE 10 × 10 PROJECT?

● Unlike the programme, strategy "elaborates a scenario of action based on an appraisal of the certainties and uncertainties, the probabilities and improbabilities of the situation. The scenario may and must be modified according to information gathered along the way and hazards, mishaps or good fortune encountered." (Morin, 2000, p. 90).

V  
WHAT IS THE  
NATURE OF THE  
RELATIONSHIP  
ESTABLISHED  
BETWEEN  
ARTISTIC  
PRACTICES AND  
PEDAGOGICAL  
PRACTICES?

● Educational materialities need to be worked upon. Not only educational ideas, but also educational materialities. The architecture of schools, for example, or pedagogical objects (the things that are used for teaching), the gestures of education, the times and spaces of education, bodies in education, the mechanisms of education (taking the word “mechanism” to mean a way of organising, arranging or composing spaces, times, materialities, knowledge, bodies, languages, etc.) This involves turning thought into a question not only of intelligibility, but also sensitivity. (pp. 5-6) (Translation by John Elliott)

Quoting the pedagogue in this respect: “There is no teaching without learning, they explain each other, and the subjects, despite their differences, are not reduced to the condition of being objects of one another. Whoever teaches learns in the act of teaching and whoever learns teaches in the act of learning.” (Freire, 1996, p. 12)

The intentionality of this proposal is not based on the transfer of knowledge, but instead on the creation “of the possibilities for its production or construction” (Freire, 1996, p. 12). At the same time, the relationship of cooperation and partnership that it was intended should be promoted between teachers, artists and students was based on democratic principles, on the respect for each other’s knowledge, on the expression of uniqueness, diversity and multiplicity, in detriment to the hierarchical structuring of roles and functions.

This question guided a central part of our research work. One of the key ideas that emerges from our analysis of the way in which the *10x10* project was developed is that there is a strong isomorphism between the design of the training programme and the pedagogical experiences set in motion by the various pairs of teachers and artists. This isomorphism lies in the opening of a space-time for *collaborative work*, which is characterised by the experiences of *bricolage* (defined above on the basis of Paley’s works) and *interdiscursivity*.

For various authors, collaborative work amounts to more than a practice, a philosophy and an ethic: it is a more democratic way of working, insofar as, by being more supportive and less competitive, it assumes a greater willingness to help the other, promoting a greater openness and a better interpersonal relationship (Fullan and Hargreaves, 2000; Roldão, 2007; Damiani, 2008; Freire, 1997; Nóvoa, 2008). The commitment to the construction of collaborative relationships was a feature that cut across the whole of the *10x10* project and we found various examples of this in the relationships of the teacher-artist pairs, in the relationships between this pair and the students, as well as in the relationships between the various actors involved in the *10x10* project, as can be noted in Gomes, Pires and Gonçalves (2016).

The concept of interdiscursivity is based on the conjugation of distinct languages and discourses for a better understanding of the educational phenomenon and of human capacities (Gonçalves, 2008). With its origin in post-structuralism, interdiscursivity deals with the way that discourses intersect with one another, are juxtaposed and intertwined. Underlying the idea of interdiscursivity is the view that all discourses function according to a logic that is based on their relationship with or opposition to other discourses (Davis and Sumara, 2005). As we previously argued, interdiscursivity is a central characteristic in the relationship between the artistic practices and the pedagogical practices experienced in the course of the *10x10* project (Gomes, Pires and Gonçalves, 2016).

In fact, the working processes that were set in motion were not intended to publicise artistic movements, works of art or specific authors, nor even to use art as a tool for expanding the means of expression of children and young people. They were, instead, designed to make the educational event possible through the *interruption* (in the sense constructed

by Biesta, 2006) of bureaucratic and standardised dynamics, through the construction of a certain *bricolage*. What therefore happened was an opening of cracks in the pedagogical work, provided by the artistic action, and leading to exercises of liberation: pedagogy freed itself from the shackles of pre-defined outcomes and became available to provide formative training experiences, in the sense that is attributed to them by Larrosa (2013); the teachers freed themselves from the automatic didactic methods used for the teaching of their subject; the artists freed themselves from the association between their practices and their art work; and the artistic practices were themselves freed and placed at the disposal of the students.

In his historical analysis of the infancy of the vanguards, Bordes (2007, pp. 20-21) defends the evidence that the teaching vocation is habitually accompanied by the creative vocation. Among other considerations, the author situates and defines the figure of the *teacher-lecturer* (the one whose work is not made public and is restricted to the classroom) and the figure of the *teacher-lecturer-author* (who writes about and publishes his or her pedagogical experiences).

In contrast to the industrialisation of the didactic objects of immediate consumption that tend to invade the schools and the classrooms, the pedagogical experiences of the *10x10* project made it possible to highlight the artisanal dimension of pedagogy (the act of doing, the inventing of ways of teaching, revaluing routines and materials, objects and spaces), together with the relational dimension (the sharing with other professionals, team work, self-knowledge, the knowledge of the students, the construction of a community). They also made it possible to achieve ways of fulfilling one of the rules of the pedagogical life as defined by Larrosa (2015):

*Il est nécessaire de travailler sur des matérialités éducatives. Pas seulement sur des idées éducatives mais aussi sur des matérialités éducatives. Sur l’architecture des écoles, par exemple, ou sur les objets pédagogiques, les choses qui sont utilisées pour enseigner, sur les gestes de l’éducation, sur les temps et les espaces de l’éducation, sur les corps à l’éducation, sur les dispositifs de l’éducation, si l’on prend le mot dispositif dans le sens de façon de poser, ou de disposer, ou de composer les espaces, les temps, les matérialités, les savoirs, les corps, les langues, etc. Il s’agit de faire de la pensée non seulement une question d’intelligibilité, mais également de sensibilité. (pp. 5-6) ●*

The collaborative work and the interdiscursive nature of the experiences developed in the course of the *10x10* project address the technical rationality within which the teacher’s *profession* has developed, as well as the artistic and authorial rationality that has been the hallmark of the artist’s *profession*. The writing of this book and the various working mechanisms used under the scope of the *10x10* project, namely the public lessons, made it possible to fix the pedagogical work beyond the time and space of the class(room), combining art and pedagogy in the construction of ways of acting, experiencing and disseminating pedagogy. It made it possible to extend the idea of the author, from the artist to the teacher,

from the individual to the partnership and collaborative work, leaving this question open and unanswered: “What is an author of pedagogy?”

Following a logic of “creative partnerships”, as embodied by the teacher-artist pairs, who conceived and implemented learning strategies in the classroom with the students, the project was organised around a community of people who constructed something together, in a collaborative fashion, promoting multiple learning processes, constructing different forms of knowledge and (trans)forming identities.

The pedagogical proposals developed under the scope of the *10x10* project were based on an educational concept that awards experience a fundamental place, insofar as they seek to provide experiences of globalising and integrating spaces-times for (trans)formation, through the interactions and transactions that are established within the groups themselves. These experiences occur in a multiplicity of registers: sensorial (appealing to the senses) and logical and rational (mobilising frames of reference, appealing to reflection), contributing to the development of frameworks for thinking and acting, as well as multiple skills and competences.

One of the basic conditions of this work is its bold and constant rebellion against practices that crystallise and capture life and the world in the actions, procedures and everyday relationships of the school, imprisoning the individuals and forcing them to adopt naturalised ways of thinking and acting. The space of creation opened up by the *10x10* project may correspond to a process of producing multiplicities that makes it possible for the thinking and ways of doing things at the school to become inventive and sensitive processes that enable people to experience new ways of living in a community and conceiving and planning their actions in a way that is more open to others. This path is constructed in the collaborative work performed between teachers and students, researchers and artists, thinking and planning together so that we can invent possible new worlds that we can share with one another.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alves, M. G. & Azevedo, N. R. (2010). Introdução: (Re)pensando a investigação em educação. In M. G. Alves, & N. R. Azevedo (eds.), *Investigar em educação: Desafios da construção do conhecimento e da formação dos investigadores num campo multi-referenciado* (pp. 1-29). Caparica: UIED – Coleção Educação e Desenvolvimento.
- Biesta, G. J. (2006). *Beyond Learning. Democratic Education for a Human Future*. Boulder, London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Biesta, G. J. (2011). Disciplines and theory in the academic study of education: A comparative analysis of the Anglo-American and Continental construction of the field. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 19(2), 175-192.
- Biesta, G. J. & Säfström, C. A. (2011). A manifesto for education. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(5), 540-547.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (1994). *Investigação qualitativa em educação: Uma introdução à teoria e aos métodos*. Porto: Porto Editora.
- Bordes, J. (2007). *La infancia de las vanguardias: Sus profesores desde Rousseau a la Bauhaus*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Davis & Sumara (2008). Challenging images of knowing: Complexity science and educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18(3), 305-321.
- Eça, T., Saldanha, A. & Vidigal, L. (Eds.). (2012). *Atravessar pontes: Entre escolas e museus / Crossing bridges: Between schools and museums. Actas do Seminário Internacional*. Porto.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. Chicago: MacMillan.
- Estrela, M. T. (2007). Notas sobre as possibilidades de construção de uma teoria da educação. In J. Boavida & A. G. del Dujo (Eds.), *Teoria da educação: Contributos ibéricos* (pp. 71-108). Coimbra: Coimbra University Press.
- Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários à prática educativa*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2013). Why the arts don't do anything: Toward a new vision for cultural production in Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(1), 211-237.
- Gomes, E. X. & Gonçalves, T. N. (2015). Trabalho da educação: Acção humana, não-produtividade e comunidade. *Interações*, 37, 24-46.
- Gomes, E. X. Pires, A. L. & Gonçalves, T. N. (2016, in press). Composições Interdiscursivas com as linguagens pedagógica e artística. *Atas do XIII Congresso da Sociedade Portuguesa de Ciências da Educação*.
- Gonçalves, T. (2008). *Educação e cognição: Construção de um modelo de análise de programas de desenvolvimento cognitivo* [Unpublished PhD thesis]. University of Seville.
- Gonçalves, T. N. (2010). Investigar em educação: Fundamentos e dimensões da investigação qualitativa. In M. G. Alves & N. Azevedo (eds.). *Investigar em educação: Desafios da construção do conhecimento e da formação de investigadores num campo multi-referenciado* (pp. 39-62). Caparica: UIED-FCT/UNL.
- Gonçalves, T. N. R., Azevedo, N. R. & Alves, M. G. (2013). Theorizing education: Introducing a conversation. In M. G. Alves, N. R. Azevedo & T. N. R. Gonçalves (eds.), *Educational theory informing educational research: Scenarios and lines of flight* (pp. 5-19). Monte da Caparica: UIED-FCT/UNL
- Gonçalves, T. N. & Gomes, E. X. (2014). Re-imaginar o desenvolvimento profissional contínuo dos professores: o projeto 10x10 da Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian. *Medi@ções*, 2(2), 63-80.
- Graue, M. & Walsh, D. (2003). *Investigação etnográfica com crianças: Teorias, métodos e ética*. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Helguera, P. (2011). Transpedagogia. In P. Helguera & M. Hoff (eds.), *Pedagogia no campo expandido* (pp. 11-12). Fundação Bial do Mercosul.
- Honoré, B. (1992). *Vers l'oeuvre de formation: L'ouverture à l'existence*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Houssaye, J., Setard, M., Hameline, D. & Fabre, M. (2004). *Manifesto a favor dos pedagogos*. Porto Alegre: Artmed Editora.
- Larrosa, J. (2002). Notas sobre a experiência e o saber de experiência. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 19, 20-28.
- Larrosa, J. (2011). Experiência e alteridade em educação. *Revista Reflexão e Ação*, 19(2), 4-27.
- Larrosa, J. (2013). Por amor à infância e por amor ao mundo. Notas sobre a arte na sala de aula. *Imaginar*, 56, 39-46.
- Larrosa, J. (2015). Règles pour dire,

- penser et habiter l'éducation. *Interacções*, 37, 5-23.
- Leite, E. & Vitorino, S. (2008). *Serralves: Projectos com escolas 2002-2007*. Porto: Fundação Serralves.
- Masschelein, J. & Simons, M. (2013). *Em defesa da escola: Uma questão pública*. Belo Horizonte, São Paulo: Autêntica Editora.
- Meirieu, P. (2006). Sciences de l'éducation et pédagogie. Recovered from <http://meirieu.com/COURS/pedaetscienceseduc.pdf>.
- Morin, E. (2000). *Os sete saberes necessários à educação do futuro*. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Paley, N. (1995). *Finding art's place: Experiments in contemporary education and culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Pires, A. L. (2005). *Educação e formação ao longo da vida: Análise crítica dos sistemas e dispositivos de reconhecimento e validação de aprendizagens e de competências*. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Pires, A. L. Gonçalves, T. N. & Gomes, E. X. (2015). Formação contínua de professores e construção de saberes pedagógicos em contexto: O projeto 10x10 da Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian. In A. Pereira, A. A. Vasconcelos, C. Delgado, C. G. Silva, F. Botelho, J. Pinto, ... M. P. Alves (eds.), *Entre a teoria, os dados e o conhecimento (III): Investigar práticas em contexto* (pp. 61-78). Setúbal: Escola Superior de Educação do Instituto Politécnico de Setúbal. Recovered from [https://www.si.ips.pt/ese\\_si/web\\_gessi\\_docs.download\\_file?p\\_name=F-1578426110/3\\_ebook\\_versao\\_final\\_web.pdf](https://www.si.ips.pt/ese_si/web_gessi_docs.download_file?p_name=F-1578426110/3_ebook_versao_final_web.pdf)
- Pires, A. L., Gomes, E. X. & Gonçalves, T. N. (2016, no prelo). *Práticas pedagógicas e práticas artísticas na construção da escola como espaço e tempo da democracia. Medi@ções*.
- Rancière, J. (2010a). *Estética e política: A partilha do sensível*. Porto: Dafne Editora.
- Rancière, J. (2010b). *O espectador emancipado*. Lisbon: Orfeu Negro.
- Rancière, J. (2010c). *O mestre ignorante: Cinco lições sobre a emancipação intelectual*. Mangualde: Pedago.
- Sachs, J. (2009). Aprender para melhorar ou melhorar a aprendizagem. In M. A. Flores & A. M. Simão (eds.), *Aprendizagem e desenvolvimento profissional de professores* (pp. 99-118). Mangualde: Edições Pedago.
- Silva, R. (2011). Apresentação (elegia do comum). In G. Didi-Huberman, J. Rancière, M.-J. Mondzain, B. Stiegler, R. Silva & L. Nazaré (eds.), *A república por vir: Arte, política e pensamento para o século XXI* (pp. 11-37). Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Thomson, P., Hall, C., Jones, K. & Green, J. (2012). *The signature pedagogies project: Final report. Creativity, culture and education*. London: University of Nottingham, Goldsmiths College. Recovered from <http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org>.
- Uberti, L. (2013). Intencionalidade educativa. *Educação & Realidade*, 28(4), 1223-1242.