

EDITORIAL

Ana Claudia Mei Alves de Oliveira¹

Marcelo Machado Martins²

When the issue of this dossier was announced in April 2020, we were learning to reshape our public and private behavior, that is, our practices, in the most diverse spheres of daily life, due to the COVID-19 that was spreading ferociously on our continent and whose transmitting virus, the Coronavirus, was still a great unknown

¹ Full Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy, Communication, Letters, and Arts of the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP), working at the Graduate Studies Program (PEPG) of Communication and Semiotics. Co-director of the Center for Socio-semiotic Research – CPS; Coordinator of the Working Group (GT) of the National Association of Graduate Programs in Communication (COMPÓS): Interactional practices, languages, and production of meaning in communication; co-coordinator of GT 3 “body, fashion, communication” of the Fashion Colloquium. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6528-8143>; email: anaclaudiamei@hotmail.com

² Associate Professor at the Design and Communication Center of the Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE – Centro Acadêmico do Agreste); Tenure Professor of the Graduate Program in Consumption, Everyday Life, and Social Development (PPGCDS) at the Federal Rural University of Pernambuco (UFRPE); President of the Congress of Scientific Initiation in Design and Fashion (CIC_DEM); member of the board of directors of the Brazilian Association of Fashion Studies and Research (ABEPEM), and co-coordinator of GT 3 “body, fashion, communication” of the Fashion Colloquium. Orcid: 0000-0002-5846-4559; email: machodomartins@yahoo.com.br

being for hundreds and thousands of scientists and health professionals who delved into it to better comprehend it and, perhaps, eliminate it as an imminently overwhelming danger to humanity.

At that time, the classroom—both public and private—was still undergoing real experiments by the heroic teachers and professors who were working hard to maintain at least some contact with the students, even considering the “loss” of content due to the way teaching was being done: *roughly*, without any preparation and adequate infrastructure for the action of the agents involved. Universities were reluctant to adopt emergency remote teaching, but in the end it was accepted by university boards, following the guidelines of the Brazilian Ministry of Education, although necessary adjustments were made along the way, given the specific demands of the States and Municipalities. Graduation ceremonies were held remotely, and undergraduate health students had to anticipate their training to join the specialized workforce on the foggy and often deadly battlefield.

History will reserve a huge chapter to inform future generations about this setting, including the political nonsense of the country’s administration in open ideological internal warfare with the press, political parties and foreign governments, etc. From the opening of the dossier’s call to date, that is, to the finalization of its originals, the impression we had was that social isolation and/or lockdown was only carried out by a certain portion of the Brazilian population, while others did not follow the rules of conduct dictated by public management and the health professional class. Since then, there have been more than 8,500,000 cases in Brazil (95,000,000 in the world), with more than 210,000 deaths in Brazil (2,000,000 in the world), against 7,500,000 recovered cases in Brazil (52,900,000 in the world), and in the second half of January 2021 vaccinations began timidly, which also became the subject of political clashes. And we, professors and researchers, in this new social configuration that encompasses our work with the sciences, have outdone ourselves in order to at least satisfactorily meet our previously assumed commitments.

This is how we begin this dossier: acknowledging and thanking the Herculean efforts of each author who, when invited, gladly accepted the call and were willing to

discuss with us—in the midst of a pandemic—the world of education, more particularly teaching, and even more particularly the teaching of art, fashion, and design in this special issue in which we designed articles that presented ideas, insights, and experiences of a teaching practice based, regardless of area and subject, on discourse studies and its important connection with teaching and research. This was achieved, according to the texts selected for this issue! In fact, the discussion launched by the articles as a whole goes beyond the barriers of areas and subjects and dialogues with the “novelties”—without any pejorative sense of the term—that took shape in the practices or pedagogical models of 2020, given the context of the pandemic, called “active learning methodologies,” “hybrid teaching,” “experimental learning,” “flipped classroom,” etc. And the point that unites these models to the works presented in the dossier is the need for the teacher’s identity to be built from the paradigmatic basis of a *theoretical construct* that enables dialogue or the establishment of inter-, trans-, pluri-, and even multidisciplinary relationships with different areas—depending on the approach taken and developed by the researcher and that materialized in the teacher’s classroom practice.

Thus, the dossier consists of four articles. In the first, “Greimas’ semiotics in design and fashion research in Brazil: separation and mixing between disciplines,” by Marc Barreto Bogoand Mariana Braga Clemente, the reader is presented with a careful survey of what the authors call the “conceptual architecture” of the semiotic theory developed by Algirdas Julien Greimas—known as French semiotics, discursive semiotics, among other names. This is the result of a major piece of research very close to historiography, covering dissertations and theses (in design and fashion) in which the theoretical-methodological apparatus of the aforementioned semiotics is found. The authors discuss specific issues of semiotics in order to construct the bias adopted for the argumentative organization of the text and, at the same time, present what has been said so far in academia about the interrelations among semiotics, design, and fashion. Thus, they discuss the “ancillary” character proposed by semiotics (at different times, by Greimas and, later, by Eric Landowski), treating it as “interdisciplinarity” (based on the definitions of the processes of *separating* and *mixing* developed by José Luiz Fiorin, even adding to the studies a semiotic square that deals

with these terms in recurrent pedagogical practices of teachers at various levels and modalities of teaching.

In the second article, “Fashion Design: teaching and interaction regimes,” by *Luciana Chen*, arguments are developed that interrelate studies and research in semiotics with teaching practices/methodologies, with a view to expand the range of possibilities for the educator’s work, encouraging them to learn about the spread of the proposals described and analyzed in the text, especially for those who work with the teaching of visual productions. To this end, the author discusses different “schools of teaching methods,” adding different structures of manipulation and programming to their characterization, but focuses on a liberating pedagogy, as advocated by Paulo Freire—also because she considers, after her exposition, that the regimes of interaction defined, according to Erick Landowski, as adjustment and accident tend to be part of constructivist-oriented teaching. In the development of the text, the author inserts the terms to be conceptualized in a very fluid way, establishing a strong coherence between them and the content expressed—using elements of cohesion that contribute enormously to the intelligibility of the text, which alternates and interrelates contents of education, in general, and semiotics, in particular.

In the third article, “(Re) Designing Fashion Contextual Studies: a generative view of socio-semiotics in creative higher education ,” by *Marília Jardim*, the interrelationship between the fields of Socio-semiotics and Pedagogy is discussed, based on the construction of a path of analysis regarding a teaching program, that is, issues related to the pedagogical approach (program conception) are taken up from Socio-semiotics, used, therefore, in its generative structure for the construction of meaning and the practices “placed” in discourse. Its originality extends to the description of the processes of pedagogical practices in different regimes, whose discursive paths organize narratives that are close to the four regimes of interaction: programming, manipulation, adjustment, and accident. The research also takes place within the scope of “Fashion Contextual Studies,” and brings an important new “methodological” perspective to the field—based on Lévi-Strauss’ concepts of bricolage. Finally, the work proposes a practical application of Landowskian theorizing in the elaboration of a syllabus (and in live and color classroom situations); this not

only gives more visibility to the work of the semiotician but also expands its fields of application in the sciences (social, humanities, applied, etc.). In it, semiotic theory is not approached as an instrument that allows us to develop critiques of certain objects, but rather as an instrument that can be used as a guide for the construction of an educational praxis. In the work, Freire's ideas regarding the construction of a student who is a "co-creator" of knowledge gain strength, due to the necessary and joint relationship between the theorization of practice and the practice of theorization—as the two inseparable sides of the same coin; in addition, this aspect is treated together with the concepts of design thinking, considering its "purest" pedagogical conception.

Finally, the fourth and last article of the dossier section, "The construction of identity through the Fashion Portfolio: an international experience of field research," by Paolo Franzo, discusses the fashion portfolio as a "design instrument" and as a space for constructing the identity of its producer, its designer; the results that make up the development of the article's explanation come from field research (workshops) developed by the author at the Politecnico di Milano, the Luav University of Venice, and the École d'Art i Superior de Disseny d'Alcoi. The lack of information in the specialized literature that theorizes the production of a portfolio, since the little material that exists is limited to a few more specific tips on a given aspect, encouraged the author to think of this generic production (of textual genre) as a whole of meaning by which a simulacrum of its producer/creator is apprehended—as in any type of text/discourse. In this case, the expertise of the approach comes from the fact that the portfolio is not considered in its final aspect; on the contrary, it is from it that the potential for new and daring experiences can be apprehended—all apprehended as a function of the identity of its producer that is projected in the *production itself*. Understanding the portfolio in the ways considered by the author from the activities carried out in the workshops is a possible way to expand the possibilities of working with the basic theory that sustains the arguments of this article, semiotics, as well as contributing to the training of professionals who need, as part of their job, to produce and keep the portfolio up to date—whose first orientation for producing meaning is to apprehend it from the perspective of narrativity and as a communication "tool" and means of constructing the author's own identity.

The *cross-sectional openings* section of the dossier features ten productions by different collaborators, authors who sign the articles individually or as a group. Given the space for this brief presentation, only the titles and authorship of the articles that make up this set will be cited.

Ana Beatriz Alonso de Oliveira, Luciene Contiero Felipe, and Marcus Vinícius Pereira present and discuss a form of dialogue between design and art, in “A look at forms and composition in interior design from the perspective of art;” “Art and fashion: an experience at the Recife arts school” is the title of *Ediel Barbalho de A. Moura*’s work, a theme that also reverberates in the article by *Thiago Camacho Teixeira*, “Subversion in performance in public schools and dialogues with cultural policies;” closing this first set is the text “Art Teaching: semiotic contributions,” whose author, *Anamélia Bueno Buoro*, traces her path as a “semiotacist author” of books and collections related to art teaching, both didactic and paradidactic.

A second block is formed from the article by *Vanilson Luis de Melo Coimbra* and *José Ronaldo Alonso Mathias*, “The fashion editorial based on relational art,” and the theme of fashion expands in its relationship with consumption in “Fashion and peripheral consumption: the construction of social identity from the actions promoted by the ‘Periferia Inventando Moda’ project in the city of São Paulo,” by *Anderson Gurgel Campos* and *Danilo Souza Moura*; but still as memory and ethnic identity, the manifestation of fashion is taken up in “Fashion as a memory device in the museum space,” by *Diêgo Jorge Lobato Ferreira* and *Priscila Almeida Cunha Arantes*, and in “Turban and black identity: an analysis by discursive semiotics applied to a Facebook post,” by *Isaac Matheus Santos Batista*. Concluding this second set are the works by *José Roberto Pereira Peres*, who presents a detailed investigation into a facet of *Mário de Andrade* perhaps little known by the general public, in “The teaching experience of *Mário de Andrade* at the Institute of Arts of the University of the Federal District - RJ (1938–1939);” and the article by *Gisely Andressa Pires, Livia Marsari Pereira* and *Raquel Rabelo Andrade*, “Teacher and student interaction in times of pandemic: educational practices of creative fashion illustration techniques using Instagram,” which in a circular way takes us back to the beginning of this presentation, that is, we return to the theme of the pandemic times that so strongly marked the year 2020.

We would like to reiterate our thanks to the authors, inviting everyone to discuss with us, on another occasion, the *limits* and *non-limits* of social practices, whatever they may be, from the perspective of studies of discourses, texts, semiotics, or socio-semiotics, with a view to enhancing our knowledge in the area of discipline teaching, which is part of our vast field of research that are intertwined in its different and at the same time so close productions and dialogues: the arts, fashion, and design.

Enjoy your reading!