

## CREATIVE AND AUTHORIAL WRITING AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: AESTHETIC RELATIONS AND BIVOCALITY

Graziele Aline Zonta <sup>1</sup>; Andrea Vieira Zanella <sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the creation and authorship processes in the academic practices of undergraduate students. Designed in the research-intervention format, the study was developed from reading and writing workshops held with students from two Brazilian federal universities. The speeches and texts produced by the students were analyzed discursively based on Bakhtin and Vygotski's foundations and revealed that the exercise of appropriation of new ways of writing is perceived as a risk by the students, who produce their texts responsively to evaluative practices. They also indicate that they seem to be unaware of the creative dimension of their productions, limiting academic creation to repetition of concepts, format restrictions and citations. On the other hand, writing gains authorship and creation traits when the studied content is articulated to their experiences and social contexts.

**Keywords:** literacy; creative workshop; authorship

### Escrita creativa y autoral entre universitarios/as: relaciones estéticas y bivocalidad

#### RESUMEN

En este estudio se analiza los procesos de creación y autoría en las prácticas académicas de estudiantes universitarios. Delineado en el formato de investigación-intervención, el estudio fue desarrollado a partir de talleres de lectura y escritura realizadas con estudiantes de universidades federales brasileñas. Las hablas y textos producidos por los estudiantes fueron analizados discursivamente a partir de fundamentos de Bakhtin y de Vygotski y revelaron que el ejercicio de apropiación de nuevos modos de escritura es significado como un riesgo por los discentes, los cuales producen sus textos responsivamente a las prácticas evaluativas. Indican también que ellos parecen desconocer la dimensión creativa de sus producciones, limitando la creación académica a la repetición de conceptos, restricciones de formato y citas. Por otro lado, la escritura gana trazos de autoría y creación cuando el contenido estudiado es articulado a sus experiencias y contextos sociales.

**Palabras clave:** instrucción académica; taller creativo; autoría

### Escrita criativa e autoral entre universitários/as: relações estéticas e bivocalidade

#### RESUMO

Este estudo analisa os processos de criação e autoria nas práticas acadêmicas de estudantes de graduação. Delineado no formato de pesquisa-intervenção, o estudo foi desenvolvido a partir de oficinas de leitura e escrita realizadas com estudantes de duas universidades federais brasileiras. As falas e textos produzidos pelos/as estudantes foram analisados discursivamente a partir de fundamentos de Bakhtin e de Vygotski e revelaram que o exercício de apropriação de novos modos de escrita é significado como um risco pelos/as discentes, que produzem seus textos responsivamente às práticas avaliativas. Indicam também que eles/as parecem desconhecer a dimensão criativa de suas produções, limitando a criação acadêmica à repetição de conceitos, restrições de formato e citações. Por outro lado, a escrita ganha traços de autoria e criação quando o conteúdo estudado é articulado às suas experiências e contextos sociais.

**Palavras-chave:** letramento; oficina criativa; autoria

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Federal do Paraná – Curitiba – PR – Brasil; gzonta@hotmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina – Florianópolis – SC – Brasil; avzanella@gmail.com



## INTRODUCTION

Reading and writing scientific articles, manuals and book chapters are activities developed by undergraduate students in different training areas. The present work, inserted in the field of academic literacy studies (Henderson & Hirst, 2007), focuses on how the uses of written language in the university, more than instrumental for the production of academic activities, are fundamental for the formation of readers-writers creative and authoritative.

From this perspective, we understand that written language is objectification of the author in the text produced and, simultaneously, is constitutive of their subjectivity (Munhoz, 2010; Ortiz, 2010; Zanella, 2013). Because they engender the creation of new meanings in a complex process that involves awareness, intentionality, thoughts and affections, reading and writing are creative activities amalgamated with the psychological process of imagination, and through the experiences of the subject in specific cultural contexts, that this process moves (Vigotski, 2009).

Furthermore, reading and writing are mediated by a particular type of relationship that is established between people, between people and objects, between people and the world in which they live: the aesthetic relation. For Zanella (2013), the aesthetic relation is what makes possible the strangeness of what is known, the reinvention of the customary, envisioning possibilities of becoming. Through aesthetic relationships, we overcome what is presented to us as given and exercise new ways of seeing.

We can establish aesthetic relations with written language, both as readers and writers. The condition of readers requires that we assume not a passive posture of understanding the elements that the author of the text read recorded in his/her work, but a movement of reconstruction of meanings, a movement that Vigotski (2001) called "secondary creative synthesis" (p. 334).

As writers, writing takes place as a possible secondary synthesis from the readings carried out, but not only from these, as the readings of texts and other experiences are interwoven in the creation process. Thus, reading and writing allow experimenting with different ways of using language, problematizing them and thus realizing how we insert ourselves and circulate through the practices that involve written language in the different contexts in which we participate. This, we argue, is a process that favors the recognition of authorship by the reader/a-writer.

From the Bakhtin's (2003; 2012) perspective, the concepts of authorship and creation are linked to the active, responsible, ethical-aesthetic positioning between subjects and objects in relation. "Understanding an object means understanding my duty in relation to it (the orientation I need to assume in relation to it),

understanding it in relation to me in the singularity of the existing-event" (Bakhtin, 2012, p. 66). As we find ourselves in an exotopic distance, we give to others, people and objects, the aesthetic finish that we cannot give ourselves and, thus, from our unique and irreplaceable place, we know, evaluate, signify and create the/in the world. Therefore, for Bakhtin (2012), the existence of an indisputable truth is not possible, since its validity is recognized not by the content taken abstractly, but by its correlation with the singular place of the one who manifests it as a statement.

In this orientation, based on the concept of bivocality, Bakhtin (2013) indicates that even the repetition of the other's words materializes as a creative process, coated with something new, while relying on something already known, in the words that preceded it. In this process, our voices mingle with the voices of others, building the discursive fields in which we are inserted (Bakhtin, 2013).

In this way, the conception of reading as decoding of final meanings printed in texts becomes unfeasible, since the text cannot be reduced to concrete-semantic relations. In addition to linguistic relations, reading-writing presents itself as a mediating practice of relations between subjects, as a dialogue between the voices of authors who objectify their ideas and values in written texts and readers who access and refract them in the very process of reading, building a polysemic and polyphonic process (Bakhtin & Voloshínov, 2006; Bakhtin, 2013).

In the academic context, we understand that writing activities actively involve the student in the appropriation of readings and in the production of texts in response to academic demands, as they launch them in the creation of counterwords that produce subjective effects. In view of this, in our analysis we will look at the way students experience and signify academic reading and writing practices, seeking to understand what stands in the way for them as obstacles to the creation and recognition of authorship in these practices.

## METHOD

Our study is based on information produced by undergraduate students at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC) and the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR) who participated in reading and writing workshops offered at these institutions in 2016. Structured in the format of research-intervention (Dias, Zanella, & Tittoni, 2017) the workshops were mediated by a psychologist who works in a student assistance service at a public university. Three groups of students were organized (two at UFSC and one at UFPR) with a number of meetings ranging from six to eight, addressing themes that intertwined academic production practices and the relationships established

at the university mediated by such practices. In each workshop, readings and written productions of different types of texts were proposed (academic, literary, social networks) and conversation circles on the conditions for creating these texts, seeking to problematize the dialogue between voices that the texts embody and their interrelations with the academic daily life.

The participants' speeches<sup>1</sup>, which were recorded on tape recorder and later transcribed, and the texts they produced in the meetings, served as the basis for the discursive analysis guided by the constructs of Vigotsky and Bakhtin, which is presented here. Through this method, we seek to analyze the meanings produced by the participants, their axiological position (Bakhtin, 2003; 2013) on academic reading and writing practices, in order to engender a discussion about the possibilities of creation and authorship in these practices.

### To create is to take risks

During the workshops, the proposals for written activities to be carried out by the participants addressed the themes worked on in each meeting. There was no evaluation of the texts, or any kind of punishment or reward for the results. Our focus was on talking about how each participant related to the texts, what were the difficulties and facilities that emerged from the read-write process. There was also no obligation to read the texts produced to the colleagues, if they didn't want to. With these strategies, we tried to create an environment free from the evaluative sieve common to the classroom context and provide a space where writers could dare to produce different texts, signify them, recognizing themselves as authors.

However, even though all these possibilities were presented and discussed, an unease was manifested whenever the time came to move from the conversation circle to writing. At the invitation of the mediator - "Shall we write?" - the participants responded by sighing, straightening up in their chair, adjusting their materials and asking in an anxious tone, sometimes all at the same time:

*"We got to the worst part: writing!"*

*"Is it to deliver?"*

*"Could it be in the first person, I'm speaking?"*

*"Will I be able to clean it up later?"*

What do these statements/senses tell us about writing for the participants? Studies that deal with literacy practices in formal schooling contexts show us that the confusion generated by the moment of writing is not exclusive to

higher education. On the contrary, it follows the movement of basic levels of education that, from an early age, associate the time of writing to tense situations:

As a rule, the most frequent place for students' written practices at school is the test, exam, or graded work. In general, an anxiogenic moment for subjects of any age, as it implies evaluation, that is, judgment, by someone who holds the socially legitimate insignia to issue a concept. (Machado, 2007, p. 183).

Although the school is not the only one responsible for the formation of authorship, since it is not only in it that the subject is produced through written language, this is the privileged institution for its promotion or restriction. In this way, "even outside the school, the subject-readers end up internalizing the coercive rituals of reading and writing experienced in it, marked by the experiences built in their discursive wanderings along the school paths" (Silva, 2008, p. 363). About this point, Olave-Arias, Rojas-García and Cisneros-Estupiñan (2013) state that assessment based on written texts constitutes a harmful reduction in reading and writing at the university, as the function of measuring learning ends up guiding their practices to please a teacher in order to obtain the qualification that will be translated into a number and which, in turn, can contribute to his (dis)approval.

We can assume that the evaluative practices that involve written language in formal education, from the early grades to higher education, intertwine and take place in the anxious responses of the participants when they are invited to write freely, as happened in the workshops. Ester, a student of the Occupational Therapy course at UFPR, after hearing the proposal for a written activity at a meeting of the workshops, which invited her to write about a topic worked on in her undergraduate course, but making use of any non-academic textual genre, in the talks about how she experienced this process:

*I think it's difficult, I think precisely because we keep criticizing ourselves too much. I already thought: "Oh, I can't do it, it's going to be all wrong. Oh my God!" I think we are under a lot of pressure in college to do everything in one way, in ONE way, that you cannot opine, you have to write that way. You can't even think, be free to write. (Ester, UFPR).*

The way through higher education is presented, in the Brazilian educational context, as the moment when academic literacy occurs, as it is at this level of education that students learn the modes of communication that build the specific field of science discourse, as well as

<sup>1</sup> The participants were offered the possibility of being referenced by their own names, by the initials of the names or by pseudonyms created by them, and the option of each one was respected in this article.

knowledge relevant to the faculties attended. In this sense, academic literacy practices need to involve teaching-learning the language of this context, its values and ways of speaking, including writing here, as well as teaching content and following the course syllabus (Boughey, 2000). Such appropriation needs to be elaborated along the academic trajectory, creating conditions for the construction of an authorial and responsive writing to the scientific field.

However, what Ester seems to illustrate in her speech is the meaning that her writing must respond to restrictions of form and content that are placed on her production. It is necessary to “write that way”, in the predefined formats for the works, without freedom in conducting their writing.

When we present the aforementioned activity, which sought to break with this logic by demanding a freer writing, offering the possibility of tensioning the notions of right or wrong content and guidance by pre-defined text formats, the student manifests intense feelings of helplessness. Creative writing gives way to the concern with maintaining a predefined format and the fear of doing “everything wrong”. The imposition of a certain form and a specific way of presenting a content, for her, restricts the very possibility of writing.

An account of the impasses placed on creative writing was also offered by Vick Block, a student who at the time was completing a private business school and starting a Psychology course at UFSC. For him, the difficulties in breaking with predefined formats throughout his educational trajectory seem to stem from the appropriation of writing guided by assessment processes that could determine his academic (failure) success:

*My whole life was a dissertation in the entrance exam. So for me, doing anything else, it's like I'm risking failing in the entrance exam. (...) We get so... We don't allow ourselves. (Vick Block, UFSC)*

We hear echo in Vick Block's speech meanings constructed in previous years of formal education and that are now reinvented in higher education. His school writing was built on the basis of dissertation and argumentative texts that would give him access to university, a situation common to elementary and high school students who graduate as proficient authors/writers in the vestibular writing genre.

Vick Block's resistance to creation in other genres is understandable. Evidently, we do not expect students to take advantage of the entrance exam to launch themselves in productions for which they are unprepared. On the other hand, we can use their speeches to question the writing orientation of our students: What are the possibilities of creative writing oriented by the fear of not passing the entrance exam?

When talking about Higher Education, Vick Block expresses a desire to appropriate other writing possibilities, but as he continues to be submitted to the evaluation of the professors, to the test scores, to the panel that will evaluate the course conclusion work, his production continues to be conducted. by the success-failure binary:

*I wish I could do this, I think I can, right? But it's that thing like that, you have to deliver it to an examining board. You don't want to risk someone giving you a low grade. You don't want to take too many risks. I really tell you, I'm going to graduate, I've been graduating for a year and a half. It's a risk I don't want to take. I myself say: “no, I wouldn't do that at this point in my life”, because I want to finish my course anyway. So to do this is to take a risk. (Vick Block, UFSC).*

For the student who dominates academic writing, as is the case with Vick Block, even if he feels like exercising other ways of writing in the academy, doing this would be taking too much risk “at this moment in his life”. Risk, a word often repeated in the student's speech, is not conceived as a project. Taking risks does not assume the sense of launching into the new, of venturing into an aesthetic relation with the world, letting oneself be affected “by the simple possibility of encounter and what this, in an unpredictable way, can make possible” (Zanella, 2013, p. 44).

Risk is a threat to good performance, good grades, passing the course. In the uncertainty of success, it is safer to continue with what is already known. But we ask: Is it possible to be and feel creative and author in the academic practices that one already knows? Is it possible that educational institutions, the main trainers of writers, offer possibilities for recognition of authorship and creation in reading-writing activities? If this process does not happen during the university period, when will this “moment of life” arrive?

Here, we assume that the conception of reading and writing as social practices that interrelate subjects and meanings is a way to recognize authorship in these activities. However, as pointed out by Munhoz and Zanella (2008), the emphasis given to the technical dimension in the processes of appropriation of written language tends to disregard the possibilities of producing meanings that these activities engender. On the other hand, writing appropriation practices that guide the construction of aesthetic relation between subjects and their production processes, could offer conditions for them to see the text beyond the sentences that compose it, conceiving it as “an inserted production in a given historical-cultural context, which mobilizes memories, produces sensations, affections that allow him a differentiated contact with the text” (p. 293).

Furthermore, because these writings carry the marks of these aesthetic relations of their authors, they may also cause this type of relation in possible readers.

In this sense, it is the identification of reading-writing as an appropriation and (re)creation of meanings that enables the recognition of the reader-writer as a product and producer, author and work of their culture, as an expression and foundation the social and historical context in which it participates. It's what moves him to create and recreate with writing.

### ***"Repeating is a gift of style"***

Thought and imagination are psychological processes that catalyze, combined with affections, the production of meanings, creation (Vigotski, 2009). However, how can these processes be carried out in the academic text, which is responsive to the demands of science know-how? We will leave for this discussion dialoguing with the meanings that the participants build about their possibilities of thinking, imagining and creating in the university context.

Alba, a second-year law student at UFPR, compares her creativity in childhood and at university. Here, we observe that the characteristics of the contexts in which the student participated and participates are the meanings constituent she produces about her practices and about herself:

I have always been a very fanciful child; my imagination is very fertile. It comes from the place where I lived, where we had a lot of freedom. We didn't have dolls, I used to create my dolls with a papaya straw, put their little hair there... And it's always been like that. This exercised my creativity a lot. Now in college, I see she's more limited. Because the content is that fixed content that I have to learn. I can't, I don't exercise my imagination or creativity much because I have to learn the technique, the correct way of speaking, the terms, the concepts. In my course there is not much scope for creation. And this thing about delivering work, proofs, you end up not having time for that. (Alba, UFPR).

We reiterate that the creative dimension is not a one-way street, which goes only from the subjectivity of the creator to objectification in the created work. Creation is also done, and mutually, in the opposite sense: creation (re)creates, (trans)forms the creator (Prestes, Tunes, Pederiva, & Terzi 2018; Wedekin & Zanella, 2018). Speaking of her, Alba does not seem to recognize where creativity is inserted in her course's practices, limiting herself to appropriating "techniques, the correct way of speaking, terms, concepts". She understands that tests and assignments are necessary for her to learn to materialize productions in the form-

content responsive to the discursive field of her course, or to the demands of the subjects attended. However, she does not understand that such practices are, at the same time, subjectively producing it, mobilizing her thoughts and affections, and this is the fundamental process for the (de)construction of the content-meanings taught in the course, for an active, responsive positioning, regarding the learning process. Therefore, academic writing seems detached from the world of life, plastered by supposedly immutable contents-meanings, devoid of historicity and the conditions of authorship.

When we do not pay attention to the creative dimension of academic practices, we disregard the condition that all knowledge is transformed into the complex affective-cognitive relationships of the subjects who dialogue with it, the social places and the conditions of knowledge/power that guide these relationships. We charge knowledge with the value of commodities, as Boughy (2000) calls them, to be acquired and reproduced, or as "deposits" to be made by teachers to students, according to Paulo Freire's (1987) criticism of the banking education model. Here, we can illustrate the meaning effects of this process with short but incisive speeches by Dhara, a first-year Pedagogy student, and Júlia, a fourth-year Nursing student, both at UFSC, when they cite comments they heard from their professors during the graduation:

*You're a first stage, you don't have to talk. So sit back and listen.* (Dhara, UFSC).

*We don't have your own thoughts in undergraduate courses. That's what they say to us. You don't have your own thoughts at graduation. You always have to name someone.* (Júlia, UFSC).

Dhara and Júlia's speeches echo meanings that indicate that "quoting someone", in this case the authors of academic texts, means not having "own thought", which would be, according to their speeches, understood by teachers as a condition of every undergraduate student, especially the freshman who, apparently devoid of any knowledge, is not authorized to take a stand, and must sit and listen to the authority to know. The practice of citing works, which effects the dialogue between voices, and which in turn builds arguments in the production of knowledge, is understood by the students as reproduction, devoid of creation. Therefore, they would be knowledge affirmed by others who think for them. According to the research participants, the condition of thinking subject seems to have been denied to undergraduate students.

There are issues to be considered in this debate: on the one hand, the students express through their speeches what they perceive as a process of disqualification of their experiences, a way of teaching that is based on the hierarchy of knowledge and the

subjugation of those who have not yet mastered particular language and its codes. On the other hand, they understand that the fact that they have to write referring to concepts and, therefore, to authors who coined and developed them, is understood by them as a restriction on creative writing. In this way, it is possible to understand that the notion of responsiveness, as an active position towards the contents, knowledge and experiences that participate in written creation, and which involves the relationships that mediate academic literacy practices, remains obscure to student-writers.

For Alba, Dhara and Júlia, it is not clear that the authorial and creative position is inherent to academic activities. Their writing does not seem to be understood as the result of creative processes, as a dialogue between concepts, such as (re)creation of the meanings objectified in the texts, which would make it possible to reinvent them, transform them into new (con)texts, as secondary creative syntheses (Vigotsky, 2001).

Let us remember that our utterances, even when they only seem to repeat the words of the other, take on our evaluation of the world, becoming bivocal. Other voices dialogue with ours and we can even confuse ourselves with some of them, but we will always do it from our unique place in the world (Bakhtin, 2013). Thus, we asked if it would be possible to silence the counterwords inherent in the statements of the student-readers-writers, even if they are in the early stages of the course. Would it be possible to deprive them of their unique and irreplaceable ethical-aesthetic position?

The research participants' productions allow us to state that no, even though the discourses/practices contrary to this statement prevail in the university context. Although the writing of these students is oriented to pre-defined readers/teachers, seeking to establish the meanings they imagine to respond to their expectations and necessary to achieve a good grade, other meanings cross the written production and leave their traces. In this process, (re)creation is inevitable, it transcends the linguistic-structural aspects of the texts and reaches the discursive conditions that make up the "meaning" of its author (Gerald, 2010).

Understanding that creation is present in everything around us, including what appears to be mere imitation, is an important learning experience. Vigotski (1984) clarifies the importance of the imitation process in play for child development, because when imitating an adult, the child seeks to understand these actions and the way in which they are inserted in the social context in which they live. We can extend this discussion to the academic sphere to defend that the imitation of a writing style, for example, is part of a process of constitution of the possibility of authorship itself.

Here, it is important to clarify, there is no equivalence between imitation and plagiarism. Academic plagiarism,

understood as "misappropriation of a text or part of it, without reference to the author, therefore presented as being by the person who takes possession of it" (Silva, 2008, p. 360), is a punishable practice, there is specific legislation about the subject. The imitation we refer to, related to academic writing, concerns the author's own constitution process, which is done through readings, writings, rewritings, more readings, other writings, in a complex, incessant process. For this process to happen at the university,

(...) it is urgent to create a space among places in the academy - where clashes and ambivalences usually occur - that engender the constitution of authorship, because there is the tripod that will sustain writing in the academic space, in which they can and the necessary relationships for the construction of texts by the learner should be established, as the subject of desire that, by seeing themselves as an author, institutes, in the same act, the reader (Silva, 2008, p. 364).

We understand that helping students understand the processes of knowledge creation is also the university's duty in its academic practices. When this issue is neglected, students continue to reinforce the logic of memorizing and copying texts, without understanding how creation enters into this process.

"Repeat repeat – until it becomes different. Repeating is a gift of style". This is the poetic provocation that Manoel de Barros (2016, p. 16) presents to us in the book that gained the expressive title of *O Livro das Ignorâncias*. Let us launch ourselves in the challenge of transcending the field of poetry, expanding its meanings to the field of science, discussing the movements towards an authorial writing.

*Style is at least two people or, more precisely, one person plus their social group in the form of their authorized representative, the listener – the constant participant in a person's inner and outer speech* (Bakhtin & Voloshinov, 1976, p. 15).

Without sticking to a discussion about theories that deal with style, a study that would fall outside the scope of our analysis, we will start from Bakhtin and Voloshinov's statement to approach writing as the transformation of the author's internal speech who, located in a given social context, talks about a topic with the other participants in that context, whether they are real participants in the world of life, or imagined, appropriated from this world by the author.

To help us at this point, we will rely on the testimony of Larisse, a second-year Tourism student at UFPR. In a round of conversation, the student reported a moment when she felt authorized in her academic writing:

*This week a girl from PUC, from Journalism,*

called me to help with a job where she needed black women and feminists. Then I chose to talk about colorism<sup>2</sup>. She gave me four questions and I wrote about ten pages of answers and that was very good for me... I even have some knowledge about colorism, but I thought I would need more background, so I would start reading other texts to see if what I was writing would be right. Then I started writing and I said: "man, I'm not going to base myself on anyone". I had never done it, I wanted to write what I know (...) And this exercise of writing something you know and organizing your thoughts in writing is very good because I saw that I have domain, I know of many things that even I didn't know I had, that I knew. And I thought I was going to need someone's help and I didn't need that because I already know. But as sometimes we don't talk about it so much, we just read it, reading it, absorbing it, you don't expose it... And when you write, you have something more concrete. (...) It was something I really liked, I was surprised. (Larisse, UFPR).

The engine that sets in motion the action of writing ten pages without knowing she would have so much to say, we recognize as the affective-volitional basis (Vigotski, 2009) that propelled Larisse to an authorial writing. The steps for this realization make up a process, in our view, complex and with social origins.

Bakhtin and Voloshinov (1976) state: "*any locution actually said aloud or written for an intelligible communication [...] is the expression and product of the social interaction of three participants: the speaker (author), the interlocutor (reader) and the topic (what or who) of speech (the hero)*" (pp. 8-9, emphasis added). It is in this relationship that we find the ground in which Larisse's meaning is realized as word-roots of an authorized writing.

"I'm not going to rely on anyone," Larisse said. However, for us, it is clear that the foundation is there assumed when she realizes that she already "had control" of "many things she didn't even know". The formal content to support her writing had already been appropriated, but it is when she starts writing that Larisse discovers that she already knows the hero of her text well: colorism, a theme that affects her, that mobilizes her because it speaks of her social existence<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> According to Nascimento (2015), colorism is an "intra-racial segregation system based on skin tone", a process that establishes the "pigmentocracy", that is, "the privilege of light skin over dark skin" in terms of opportunities for social mobility" (p. 155).

<sup>3</sup> Throughout the workshops, Larisse actively positioned herself as a black woman, pointing out the barriers that the university institution imposes on her education.

Thus, she finds in the writing of the text the possibility of actively positioning herself in relation to this appropriate content and directing her thoughts-affectations on the topic to an audience that will listen – ally, witness, adversary – of her position.

In the exercise of "just reading, reading, absorbing", or repeating, repeating, as proposed by Manoel de Barros' poem, Larisse made the voices of the authors who deal with colorism her own and produced her own text, different. When invited to write about the topic, she is free to speak "without needing someone", because that "someone" is no longer needed in the concrete and immediate relationship to help her. The others who previously supported her writing have now become dialogue partners and have gained a place in the objectified voices in the text she created about colorism. In this process, she is surprised by her ability to shape the hero-content in the text, casting a new look on it, which is no longer simple repetition, but an aesthetic look that made it possible to amalgamate its unique senses with the studied contents, involving herself in a writing that gained traces of a creative, authorial production.

Still about this process, we can assess that Larisse realized that when she directs her reading-writing to subjects that mobilize her affectively, she appropriates the knowledge of the texts with interest and positions herself more easily in relation to the meaning-contents. About topics that affect you, there is a want to say.

The experience reported by Larisse indicates that authorship was recognized when the studied content was intertwined with the conditions of existence and her social experiences, finding conditions to be appropriated as part of herself and objectified in written production.

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The issue of authorial and creative writing placed in the arena of debates in academic production requires recognizing creation and authorship as places of difficult access and for which there are no precise paths to follow.

In the movement of production of meanings about reading and writing, the lack of authorship of students about their own productions is articulated with the ways of doing and telling them placed in academic literacy practices and the conditions for success and failure associated with them. This process culminates in the disavowal of their voices in the texts and the fear of taking risks in other writing possibilities.

To help students in their constitution processes as authors, writers, it seems essential to invest in practices that favor reflection about different uses of written language and the recognition of their familiar, or unfamiliar content dialoguing them in order to make the voices that compose the studied texts their

own. It is essential to consider that in this complex relationship, affections, thoughts and senses are tensioned, announced and replicated in a process that necessarily involves the active and creative participation of teachers and students.

#### REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M. (2003). *Estética da criação verbal* (4ª ed., P. Bezerra, Trad.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes. Trabalho original publicado em 1979.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (2012). *Para uma filosofia do ato responsável* (2ª ed., V. Miotello, Trad.). São Carlos: Pedro & João Editores. Trabalho original publicado em 1920.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (2013). *Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski* (5ª ed., P. Bezerra, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária. Trabalho original: *Problémi poétiki Dostoiévskovo*.
- Barros, M. de. (2016). *O livro das ignoranças*. Rio de Janeiro: Alfaguara.
- Boughey, C. (2000). Multiple metaphors in an understanding of academic literacy. *Teachers and Teaching*, 6(3). DOI:10.1080/713698740
- Dias, L. R. R.; Zanella, A. V.; Tittoni, J. (2017). Oficinas de fotografia na pesquisa-intervenção: construção de coletivos de trabalho. *Revista Nupem*, 9(16), 158-174.
- Freire, P. (1987). *A importância do ato de ler: em três artigos que se completam*. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Geraldi, J. W. (2010). *A aula como acontecimento*. São Carlos: Pedro & João Editores.
- Henderson, R.; Hirst, E. (2007). Reframing academic literacy: re-examining a short-course for “disadvantaged” tertiary students. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6(2), 25-38.
- Machado, A. M. N. (2007). Do modelo ao estilo: possibilidades de autoria em contextos acadêmico-científicos. In: E. Calil (Ed.), *Trilhas da escrita: Autoria, leitura e ensino* (pp. 171-206). São Paulo: Cortez.
- Munhoz, S. C. D. (2010). Ler e escrever: palavras que se enredam na técnica e na imaginação. In: A. V. Zanella; K. Maheirie (Eds.), *Diálogos em psicologia social e arte* (pp. 275-287). Curitiba: Editora CRV.
- Munhoz, C. D. M.; Zanella, A. V. (2008). Linguagem escrita e relações estéticas: algumas considerações. *Psicologia em Estudo*, 13(2). 287-295.
- Nascimento, G. X. da C. (2015). Os perigos dos negros brancos: cultura mulata, classe e beleza eugênica no pós-emancipação (EUA, 1900-1920). *Revista Brasileira de História*, 35(69), 155-176. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-93472015v35n69008>
- Olave-Arias, G.; Rojas-García, I.; Cisneros-Estupiñán, M. (2013). Deserción universitaria y alfabetización académica. *Educación y Educadores*, 16(3), 455-471.
- Ortiz, I. M. (2010). A leitura literária e jornalística no processo de constituição do leitor. In: A.V. Zanella; K. Maheirie (Eds.), *Diálogos em psicologia social e arte* (pp. 143-155). Curitiba: Editora CRV.
- Prestes, Z. R.; Tunes, E.; Pederiva, P. L. M.; Terceiro, C. (2018). A emergência da reação estética da criança na atividade musical. *Fractal: Revista de Psicologia*, 30(1), 46-57. <https://doi.org/10.22409/1984-0292/v30i1/1496>
- Silva, O. S. F. (2008). Entre o plágio e a autoria: qual o papel da universidade?. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 13(38), p.357 - 414.
- Vigotsky, L. S. (1984). O papel do brinquedo no desenvolvimento. In: *A formação social da mente* (pp. 121-137.) (J. C. Pipolla Neto; L. S. M. Barreto; S. C. Afeche, Trad.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes. Trabalho original publicado em 1984.
- Vigotsky, L. S. (2001). *Psicologia pedagógica* (P. Bezerra, Trad.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes. Trabalho original: *Pedagoguitcheskaja psirrologuia*.
- Vigotski, L. S. (2009). *Imaginação e criação na infância: ensaio psicológico: livro para professores*. (Z. Prestes, Trad.). São Paulo: Ática. Trabalho original publicado em 1930.
- Voloshinov, V. N.; Bakhtin, M. M. (s.d.). *Discurso na vida e na arte: sobre a poética sociológica*. Tradução para uso didático. (C. A. Faraco; C. Tezza, Trad.). Trabalho original: *Discourse in life and Discourse in art – concerning sociological poetics*.
- Wedekin, L. M.; Zanella, A. V. (2018). Problematizando o ensino de artes na educação regular: contribuições de Lev Vigotski. In: P. L. M. Pederiva; D. Barros; S. Pequeno (Eds.), *Educar na perspectiva histórico-cultural: diálogos vigotskianos* (pp.79- 102). Campinas: Mercado de Letras.
- Zanella, A. V. (2013). *Perguntar, registrar, escrever: inquietações metodológicas*. Porto Alegre: Sulina. Editora da UFRGS.

Received: July 26, 2019

Approved: April 25, 2020

This paper was translated from Portuguese by Ana Maria Pereira Dionísio.