

Comunicação e educação: as pontes da linguagem

Communication and education: the bridges of language

*Adilson Odair Citelli*¹

Resumo: *Este trabalho procura refletir acerca de alguns procedimentos discursivos que circundam a escola, os docentes e discentes tendo em vista o possível exercício (ou sua negação) dos procedimentos dialógicos. A partir desse vetor, são expandidas e cruzadas indagações acerca do aspecto propriamente comunicacional que estaria presente (ou ausente) nas salas de aula, seja nas relações presenciais, seja naquelas mediadas pelos dispositivos técnicos. Levanta-se a hipótese segundo a qual os andamentos monológicos, tendentes a serem associados aos circuitos tradicionais da linguagem exercitada nas salas de aula, estão se fazendo presentes também quando entram em cena aparatos tecnológicos acionados com a finalidade de cumprir propósitos didático-pedagógicos.*

Palavras-chave: *comunicação; educação; diálogo; mediadores técnicos.*

Abstract: *This work tries to elaborate reflection on some discursive procedures that surround the school, teachers and students, considering the possible exercise (or its negation) of the dialogical procedures. From this vector, questions about the properly communicational aspect that are present (or absent) in classrooms, whether in face-to-face relationships or in those mediated by technical devices, are expanded and cross-referenced. The hypothesis arises that monological movements, tending to be associated with the traditional circuits of the language practiced in classrooms, are also becoming present when technological apparatuses brought in with the purpose of fulfilling teaching-pedagogical purposes.*

Keywords: *communication; education; dialogue; technical mediators.*

1 Universidade de São Paulo (USP). São Paulo, SP, Brazil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0838-9917>. email: citelli@uol.com.br

The challenge of interconnecting the fields of communication and education presents complex nuances. One of them involve the treatment given to the concept of dialogue. Let's see it as a founding instance of language itself (paraphrases, parodies, appropriations, quotations, etc.) Or as procedure (for example, what linguists call dialogic turns: someone speaks to another person that answers, initiating a sequence of utterances), we're facing a manifestation which can be constellated oxymoronic expressions like monophony, unidirectional, polyphony, plural. It is worth saying, the *logos* in two is not always what it seems, because, even when there is a dislocation of place of speech, the utterance control suffers the serious risk of remaining stuck to the place of univocal, being the truth of the Other eliminated or reduced to the point of remaining only the echoes of fleeting laments.

One of the problems brought to light by educationalists in the last few years refers to the fact of the word being centralized in the teacher, leaving the students in a condition of passivity and receiving the murmur of their own utterances. Typical case of a monolog that insinuates the promotion of a dialogue. For many, digital technologies would allow the breach of such cycle, because it would have the vocation of a discursive opening, and the permission of many statements to be crossed. And they could, therefore, provide healthy democratic expansion of different utterances, rupturing the monologic circuits and positivating the multi-vocal possibilities of fairest fights in processes that implicate convincing or persuasion, respecting each case.

In a certain way, we would be facing the challenge of exercising in a wide dimension the noun communication, known as an instance capable of franchising fundamental experiences, or, if we want, events in the life of those interacting. What we seek in the next pages is to check how far the monologic course of language, normally associated to the world of school, have or don't have continuity when the technical devices of communication enter the classroom, whether in shape of apparatuses geared towards the pedagogic-didactic field, for example, TV sets or mobile phones, or for having a presence in the daily life of

teachers and students, users of computers and locative media, therefore, creating a direct line between what goes through inside and outside the school environment. In other terms: it remains to be seen whether the effective exercise of dialogue is a problem concerning certain discursive mediating strategies or certain understanding and deepening of the own concept of communication.

1

The education that happens in a classroom promotes a particular type of communicational circle: the one centrally anchored in the word, in the closeness between speakers and listeners, in interpersonal mechanisms (although not always intersubjective), in the mix between utterance games and power strategies. It is possible to identify, in this context, certain concerns from Paulo Freire made to the communicative-educational bonds. The book that is always mentioned to characterize such interface is *Extension or communication*, published in 1969 by the Instituto de Capacitación e Investigación en Reforma Agraria, in Santiago de Chile, with the title *¿Extensión o comunicación?*. The work grew under particular circumstances, because regarding the way how the activity of agronomists was implemented in the rural region of Pernambuco in the period before the 1964 coup. Paulo Freire's criticism was directed towards the method used by the agricultural technicians to teach certain practices to be adopted by farmers in the work with the land, in the enhancement of productive work, without considering, however, the political, cultural, or even behavioral surroundings involved in the process.

The unsatisfactory results of the “educational” work of agronomists would come from the asymmetrical relationship they had with farmers, according to which the specialists, creating a condition of a modernizing superiority before the traditional structures of the farming world, would create monologic schemes of language, with disregard to the Other's experiences. According to the author of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, what was discontinued was the cycle of communication itself, being replaced

with unidirectional information. This, in turn, both incorporated the reductive dimension of the Northwestern rural world while it promoted the distance of the discourse of the Other, impeding the manifestation of “responsive consciousness” (BAKHTIN, 2003), the one who clarifies the effective dialogic exercise of language. Or, still, the centralized and exclusive place of the utterer ruptures communication and the purpose that must be theirs in the sense of involving the principle of otherness, of intersubjective mechanisms, of valuing the enunciatee’s experience. Located in front of monovalent signs and put into motion without the due significant force, it stops being strange that, to the expecting farmers, wouldn’t arise the dimension of happening (HEIDEGGER, 2006; ŽIŽEK, 2017), capable of instigating the changes sought by the agrarian technicians. In a certain way, we are facing the same type of difficulties that follows, in a reasonable extent, the relationship between students and teachers in formal education.

It is opportune to notice that the author of *Pedagogy of Autonomy* wasn’t dealing with technical mediators of communication – subject that he would not be very involved –, but with direct bonds, face to face, between interlocutors. It is in this environment that the Freire passage, recurring between researchers of educational-communicative interfaces, must be read:

It only communicates the intelligible to the extent it is communicable. This is the reason why, while the meaning is not understandable for one of the subjects, it isn’t possible to understand the meaning one of them got and that, notwithstanding, wasn’t apprehended by the other in the expression of the first. Education is communication, it is dialogue, as it is not a transference of knowledge, but a meeting of interlocutor subjects that seek the signification of meanings (FREIRE, 1983, p. 46).

It is, thus, about understanding the communicative phenomenon put in a, let’s say, ontological key – precedent to any discussion associated to technical mediators –, whose radical exercise is around the referred orbit of happening, here to be read in the syntagma “interlocutor subjects that seek the signification of meanings”. The procedural anchorage capable

of ensuring the meanings sought ask the dialogical turns – the exchanges and dislocations of utterance poles – without which education, in any of its levels, formal or non-formal, stops being effective. Such assertive, geared towards the recognition of the other, illuminates the levels of heterogeneity (including discursive heterogeneity), of diversity, of ethical-moral values put in social circulation. Finally, when they deny the effectiveness of extensionism, considered a Siamese twin of monologue, of monosemy, of the presence of one only discursive vector, Paulo Freire puts back the debate about communication, understanding it as an integrating phenomenon of subjects and capable of activating, through dialogue, the emancipatory formative process.

Derived from such project, wide as we verify it, the imperative of engendering interdependences between communication and education, as they share territory to be fertilized by terms as: autonomy, cultural affirmation, alterity. Communication is thought, therefore, as vivifying force in human relationships, including and transcending the simple information, requiring for its exercise de-centered voices, the activation of dialogue, the democratic affirmation – conditions, thus, imposed to the own knowledge and production of education.

2

The problem that challenge us resides, however, in the fact that, in the level of discourses put *in praesentia*, according to those accentuated in formal education – which do not distance their numberless intercorrencies exposed in the work of Paulo Freire, namely in the topic that enterprises the criticism of the unidirectional transference of knowledge –, being added new resulting elements, in particular, from a historic circumstance acting from the vast array of technical media that sustain the communicational circuits. It would suffice to remember, still in the course of formal education, the convocation for pedagogical-didactic terms of e-learning. It is worth saying that there is the possibility nowadays of enabling a more direct contact between students and professors (or tutors) through devices, depending on the software and application used, even with the subsidiary

support of spaced presential meetings, varying between weeks and fortnights, for example. Despite the path open and its growth, e-learning, at least under the angle we think about education, presents limitations when considering the affective and intercommunicational levels involved. However, we will not verify here the reach, circumscription and possibilities of e-learning systems, but we are going to emphasize that aimed strategies and forms of producing communication for education whose limits are not necessarily located in formal educational spaces in their exemplary requirements of daily presence and in fixed schedules of students and teachers (CITELLI, 2011).

The classroom, certainly, have been operating some changes in its physical structure, in order to see the units frequented by the segments of groups with bigger economic status (generally allocated in the private sector), with their digital boards, internet connection, PowerPoint, sophisticated labs of foreign languages, etc. There are institutions of elementary school with that profile in some cities in Brazil, registering tuition fees around the value of R\$ 3000 and 4000 (US\$ 925 and US\$ 1230, considering the value of the dollar in R\$ 3,20). Or in cases like the Concept network, with bilingual teaching in English and expanding for Spanish, to the approximate monthly cost of R\$ 6500 (US\$ 2000). And finally, the most elitist example of the Avenues Group, located in New York, with expanded businesses in São Paulo and forecast of opening more businesses in London and Beijing – that has among their purposes to form the so-called global subject, since it is in the business plan of the institution the dislocation of students over the international units –, with the tuition fee of R\$ 8000 (US\$ 2470) a month plus enrollment fee of R\$ 6000 (US\$ 1850). It would be an inanity to seek a comparison to public schools - except those always mentioned exceptions, that only confirm the rule –, set around chalk, blackboard, the effort and capability of their professionals in trying to mend the neglect that we watch involving the education of minorities.

Such landscape does not impede us, however, to think about processes of new meanings in classrooms that articulate to consistent

pedagogic-didactic projects capable of irradiating and to which converge change in the organizational structure of spaces and eventual inclusions of pertinent technologies resources. In anyway, without attending the platitudes that sweetens the responsibility as a territory of honey and manna, everything indicates that the outlines of the school remain in their central aspects caused by the face-to-face relations of students and teachers. In this case, interpersonal communication will keep performing a role of extreme relevance, carrying in it the affective, cognitive, cultural components, the tensions between what was said and what is unsaid, having available the potential allowed by interlocutions.

Considering the problem under that angle, we can observe that the educational practices are strongly supported in language, or better yet, in languages. It is through them or along with them that it becomes possible to perform the multidimensional discursive transits – a decisive mechanism ruling the communicative-educational bonds –, in other words, the dislocation between varied systems of signs and their supports. Put in another form: interpersonal word and nexus, that fill an important place in didactic-pedagogic practices, evidence variables that are not drained nor limited (at least *a priori*) the widest spectrum of communication, due to the capacity it has to act the referred multidimensionality. The classroom experience, however, is rarely aware of these passages, because it tends to restrict the circulation of languages to the verbal modality (whose importance is unequivocal), letting escape the rich suggestions allowed by the iconic, chromatic, sound levels, etc. From that, derives the dominant tone of the lecture, of the textbook, of the intense use of apostille supplied under the regimen of franchises maintained by many elementary schools with the so-called “teaching systems”, strategies that, by weakening the multidimensional character of language and the own intermediations franchised by communication devices, contribute to raise certain fractures among the youth expectations and the canonic imperatives of the school as institution. It is essential to perceive that the vast apparatus of communication, where we evidence two integrated dimensions, one that allows the pedagogical

discourse – centered in words – and another concerning the mechanisms of technical mediation, is already part of the students and teachers lives; however, this affirmation does not register the biggest continuities when the day to day of classrooms is at stake.

3

It is necessary to put forward that we understand the interface communication and education in a conceptual ambiance involved by the idea of emancipation of subjects, of affirmation of values like solidarity, tolerance, democratic participation. Also, in recent years in Brazil, themes such as immigration, for example, started coming back to evidence thanks to the arrival of a bigger amount of Haitians, Bolivians, Peruvians, Nigerians, Venezuelans, Syrians, etc. Responses to that migration movement were almost instant, with xenophobic groups sponsoring scenes of explicit violence and discrimination. The fight of the so-called minorities have also been followed by intolerant reactions and reaching groups that are engaged against discrimination of gender and sexual orientation, in the promotion of inclusive social politics. The scenario is not different when we see political and ideologic conflicts, now, not being limited to the wild arena of social media, but reaching the physical elimination of opposition, as we've seen with the assassination of the politician Marielle Franco and her driver, Anderson Pedro Gomes, on March 14th, 2018, on Rio de Janeiro.

If it's true that not everything is solved through education, it has a lot to contribute when it is geared towards the principles of tolerance and citizen affirmation – just to name a few –, in last instance to be persecuted by the contemporary school. Those who work on the interface communication and education have, in the aforementioned examples, a vast material to be used in the classroom, either on the treatment given to them by the media, or about the content, or even the impacts of the problem in the field of associated life. Hence, formal education not being a synonym of adjustment to perspectives that escalate individualism and impersonal

training, whose horizon seems geared towards complying certain market determinative in schemes close to on-demand services.

What is cared for, therefore, is understanding the role of school and teachers as activators of speeches and enablers of social dialogue, communicative dimension in its broader sense, according to Freire's observations mentioned in the first segment of this text. We distance ourselves, thus, from the pedagogic experience that trusts its full performance only to a perfect class, to the monophonic course, whose exposition conducted by the autothelic rhetoric serves to clarify the opacity of the disciple. In an excerpt of *Being and Time*, Martin Heidegger reflects about the chatter, that modulation that hold the opening of the discourse and that, as a result of the closing, results in the "abstention of returning to the ground of what is said" (HEIDEGGER, 1988, p. 229). Speaking, when it migrates to chatter, compromises the first communication, since the exaggeration of lights about what is said leads to the weakness of the speculative plan, opening space, even, for expressive inauthenticity. Something to be approximated to quarrel, fuss, verbiage, wordy excess in which the discursive Other is only part of a language scenario that is dispensed from communication. The fuss express sounds that dim the interlocutional potential of the sign:

Communication does not "share" the basic ontologic reference with the referential entity, but the life moving inside a common utterance and an occupation with what is said. Its interest is speech. What is said, the said and the diction is engaged now by authenticity and objectivity of discourse and its understanding. On the other hand, since the discourse lost or never reached the ontological reference with the referential entity, it never communicates in the way of an original appropriation of this entity, contenting in repeating and putting the utterance forward. What is said in the fuss drags with it circles increasingly wider, assuming an authoritarian character. Things are how they are because this is how they are talked about. Repeating and moving the speech forward, the lack of solidity is potentialized. That is how the fuss is constituted (HEIDEGGER, 2006, p. 228).

It is, therefore, a discursive variable in search of reiterative adjustments, of instruction accorded with the “order”, an elaboration made from the slogan and the words of command the reason of something being pronounced in one only way because there is only one way to say it, to remind the known formulation of Michel Foucault (1996). Through this optics, the process of communication is rupture, remaining a technical operation restricted to transmission of messages, to the eventual – because not even that is guaranteed – efficiency and efficacy of emission of signs. The price for following the route of fuss is letting in suspense the own communicative accomplishment. If we had an exercise of approximation by the borders, we would be facing the “bank education” uttered by Paulo Freire. On one hand, the set of facts more or less agreed by tradition in the propaedeutic teaching whose expansion is guaranteed in manuals – and its perspective surrounding history and its events – and, on the other, the institutional vigilance of the school institution in its hierarchical distribution and its strategies of control.

If we align this process to Heidegger’s reflection about fuss, we would say that a good part of formal education, especially in the elementary level, not always bring satisfactory quotas of communication. And that is because a discursive cut of strong informative remains valid, expressing especially centralized institutional concerns, of little or no dialogue with teachers and students – or even between them. Everything indicates that resides in this point a vector which the present studies performed in the interface between communication and education can collaborate with the improvement of formal educational procedures, fertilizing a communicational perspective that helps create new meanings of the place of subjects within the dialogic mechanisms of language.

4

It’s important to remember that an important part of the verbal anchorage feeding the discourses exercises on classrooms gains effectivity in the outlines of a communicative ecosystem fed by devices such as TV, internet, mobile phones. The issue stops being, therefore, recognizing a fact,

ARTIGO

but remembering that the valid pragmatism affirms (inside and outside the classroom) an instrumental perspective of the media. It equates to saying: subjects are introduced to a circumstance that restricts the reality of techniques and abducts, for example, the diachronic character of technologies. Learning how a device works implies, in a last instance, in case the problem is put under the perspective of “operational procedures”, freezing the story surrounding equipment, machines, intermediating resources evoked to the field of production of material and symbolic goods. As the story of techniques and technologies contemplates the permanent overcoming, the constant revolution remembered by Marx and Engels in the Manifesto of the Communist Party, it remains extremely limited to circumscribe the knowledge of the device to the learning of certain functional stratagems. Objects get old and not recognizing their place in the order of mechanisms that promote the inevitable obsolescence is to perpetuate the state of semi-formation (ADORNHO, 2003). Users, when subject, risk giving up their destination to the order of things. Hence the “operational procedures” only reaching importance when they integrate the level of tasks and knowledges, manner through which the users recognize the historicity, the possibilities and limits of devices. To illustrate this issue, it is enough to remember the use, at times, naïve, that people do of the internet, giving sequence to fake news, to nudes shared ending up compromising facts, events, bodies and reputations.

Associating the simple manipulation of instruments to the integrality of their meanings usually results in a type of esoteric ritual (the imperative of acquiring a modern phone that will only work for exchanging messages; the purchase of a potent computer that will only be used for writing the pages of a diary or reading the newspaper on the internet). The almost mythical mistake only clears the general phenomenon of the presence of merchandise, according to what Karl Marx wrote in his first volume of *The Capital* (2013) when talking about the concept of value.

Oddly – and accepting the register contained in the following *boutades* – the strength reached by the objects in the daily life of people has

been cyphered according to model expressions: “How can anyone live without a phone?”, “Not having internet is hell!”, “I do everything through my smartphone”. In the last case, there is not one attribute left associated almost directly to humans: smart. What remains for us to do facing smart devices and anthromorphed media? Recognizing compassionately that the margin of maneuver is restricted to “playing an Argentinian tango”, just as the poem “Pneumotórax” by Manuel Bandeira? Either way, machines, in order to be explored in their “embarked” potentiality, in a succession of clicks, slides, require a type of functional dominion, expertises, so-called operational competences. And the landscape of succession on the streets, bar tables, meetings with friends, boyfriends, family parties, becomes cut through supports in fashion of locative resources, frantically acted, configuring the feeling that those mediators are “macluhaniany”, extensions of the subjects; ones and others requiring one another like life requires oxygen. Everything would invite, finally, to imagine a naturalized bias of techniques as expression of instruments conveniently circumscribed to the limits of certain tasks.

Such variable has its problems, one of them being the almost deification of networks and flows produced and reproduced in scenarios apparently open, deregulated, that promise themselves the fulfilment of the democratic adventure, the free access to information, the own libertarian development. It would occur, in this case, the “de-intermediation” of signs, able to flow without obstacles through digital systems whose access would be dependent, fundamentally, only on the power of equipment and the skills and competencies of users to receive or put in march the messages. Such dream had a hard crash with the revelation that Facebook, with over 2.1 billion users, had its data leaked for the English political consultancy Cambridge Analytica, whose sponsors, with a conservative inflection, align (or used to align, since the company is being closed, according to the news on *The Wall Street Journal* in May 2nd, 2018) the billionaire Robert Mercer, one of the alt-right sponsors – the American alternative right –, and Steve Bannon, the former chief strategist of Donald Trump. In a laconic confession, Mark Zuckerberg,

Facebook's CEO, said that the professor of Analytical Psychology in Cambridge, Aleksandr Kogan, leaked a personality test anchored on Facebook for 270 thousand users in the network, allowing them to be accessed by their friends, in which opened over 80 million profiles around the world – certainly estimated number, since it is a difficult number to count. Then, everything was sold to Cambridge Analytica. And Facebook would've been a naïve victim of fraud, taken by the good faith that they trusted the data for professor Kogan's research.² The violation of privacy and the principle of trustworthiness of data – the most skeptical would complement: "It's the market, you idiot" – allowed, for instance, the manipulation of elections throughout the world, including the referendum on Brexit and Donald Trump's election. Models such as Big Five or Ocean,³ created by Michal Kosinski and his collaborator David Stilwell, from Cambridge University, and basically used by Kogan (developer of an app whose name has no subtlety: This is your digital life), which retrieves different profiles out of the life of internet users researched – everything properly put in pragmatic direction by the Cambridge Analytica with the goal of persuading and convincing huge contingencies of voters – clarify some of the mistifying procedures that surrounds the informative "de-intermediation" which would guarantee the libertarian success through social media. The question left to answer facing our times of post-privacy involves mechanisms that we dispose to face the dissemination of fake news, the manipulation of data of internet users, now a key that not only affects commercial aspects, but the own democratic course.

Due to the complexity of this board, the "operational culture" shouldn't go through schools, after all it is also their challenge to incorporate the historic, social, political, ideological dimensions that follow the techniques and technologies. In this movement, lies the difference

2 To follow this case, read, in Motherboard's website, the article "The data that turned the world upside down". Available at: https://motherboard.vice.com/en_us/article/mg9vvn/how-our-likes-helped-trump-win.

3 "Ocean" is an acronym for openness, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, neuroticism. .

between teaching the “handling” and opening a qualified debate over the place of objects in a society’s life: computer, mobile and tablet are not only machine, but material expressions of human labor.

We insist in this point, since practically every member of the teaching staff and the students that participated on our recently finished research, whose results orient, fundamentally, this article, have phones, varying only the “embarked technology” in addition to computers almost always connected to the internet.⁴ It seems necessary to take back the idea that the tension increases between the slow rhythms of school (mostly justified for the didactic and pedagogic course) and the quick pace of digital systems. Equate such dystonia is no simple task, considering the dominant educational models in classrooms.

Stems from there the perspective uttered paragraphs before geared towards the inclusion of the “operational culture” in pedagogic themes, something implied in the dislocation of instrumental operative-pragmatic visions that surround certain debates regarding the presence of digital technologies on the school environment. It is necessary to add that the teachers themselves – 48% of the people interviewed on our research were in the age group between 24 and 40 years old, formed practically within the new technologic patterns and not so distanced from the realities of their students – identify the singularity of the pedagogic board, verbalizing it according to the following excerpts: “We cannot compete with cellphones”; “The students have no patience to listen the teacher’s explanations”; “The class became hyperactive and they only have concentration to type and swipe their fingers in a screen”. The few expressions exemplifying work to punctuate the embarrassment interposed to the teachers activities, which faces a type of unfair competition of communicational devices.

Such phenomenon would be explained, at least partially, by the fact that the youth in elementary school belongs to the generation of “digital natives”, subjects born amongst network technology, with easiness

4 The study, performed for CNPq between 2015 and 2017, comprise the universe of 32 schools throughout São Paulo and adjacent municipalities. The sample was composed by 197 teachers and 699 students. The author has this report.

of getting an online connection, living with it, handling it avidly, being challenged by it. Schools, in turn, would be acting communicative strategies of questionable efficiency. Although current and having some charm, the expressions “digital natives” and “digital migrants” are not very convincing. Mark Prensky, creator, or at least, its most effective promoter, reformulated his own utterances – and reflection around them –, since recognizing that it would be putting a rule through generation, attributing the youngest a natural capability of exercising technologies, while the oldest would almost be impeded or have a great difficulty in doing that. Hence, creating a new term, digital wisdom, expressed, among other texts, in *From digital to digital wisdom* (2012). This digital wisdom can, strictly speaking, be explored by subjects in different age groups; in terms of Prensky, the expression would have a double opening, comprising skills and competencies disposed throughout time that the binary scheme natives versus immigrants would not contemplate.

In contrast, it is interesting to observe that many teachers that we interviewed informed that they make use of digital technologies – although not necessarily in the classroom. They consider themselves, however, open and flexible to the experience, indicating such perspective in utterances like: “We shouldn’t fear cellphones and tablets”; “it is necessary to direct the use of such equipments and bring them to the purposes of education”; “It is not enough to only prohibit the use of cellphones and tablets, because students may be looking at the board or listening to the teacher, but thinking about the game they couldn’t finish or the e-mail they need to check”; “The positive side in all of this is that I am being challenged by the students and I have to update my studies, get in a little deeper in these new cultural circumstances”.

Such favorable environment to rethink educational methodologies, procedures and actions brings in itself the already referred challenge to the constitution of an “operational culture”. In other terms, we are facing teachers receptive to bring other rhythms to class – and it is not about, only, the fascination with the novelty allowed by tools and supports, but recognizing in them pedagogic potential and improvement in

the didactic exercise. The issue normally raised refers to the bigger dominion over certain systems whose possibilities can be better explored, to the example of creating blogs, using resources such as PowerPoint, learning from apps and softwares of picture editing, tables and spreadsheets are only a few of the most popular indicators we've encountered in the research.

In a broad synthesis, we can affirm that it doesn't exist, preliminarily, a generational antagonism between teachers and students in schools where we perform interviews and observations about verifying how the themes of communication and their technical media are located. The teacher's speeches disposed in the previous paragraphs indicate directions that go, on one hand, from perplexity to despair and on the other, from positive affirmations to the interesting self-inclusion in technologic processes. There is, therefore, levels, and, in a certain degree, a search for competence not always present in the students themselves, the "digital natives". These, considered "digital literates", stay, mostly, restricted to the relatively simple exercise allowed by computers and smartphones – access to Facebook, WhatsApp, apps to listen to music (Deezer, Spotify, Google Play Music, etc.) researches on Wikipedia, e-mail, just to name a few.

The fact we're facing generations (always respecting the social-economic limits involved) whose first infancy are already surrounded by tablets, TV sets, cellphones – therefore, endowed with skills and senses adjusted to a determined technological circumstance – not always will translate in concentration for studies, speculative attitude before their own equipment, awareness around reading and writing, capacity to distinguish or pick informations, procedence in the use of blogs and social media. It is about pondering that teachers and students consign limits and possibilities in the use of devices, being important not to change liminally the signs in order to attribute only to age factors the most general problems surrounding school. Being aware for the working conditions of the teachers, with low income, loss of professional prestige, raise in the load of activities, would help to better complete the previously referred board. In one term, and to take back the point that has been guiding us: the "operational

culture” is not only about the bigger or smaller activating skill of technical or technologic systems, but especially, to the capability of mobilizing the conscience elaborated and widened through a system of meanings and symbolic expressions in which it is incorporated and expressed. In this case, the act of turning on the TV, accessing a computer, getting on the internet, for example, need to be seen and understood as an opening of a given social order that is being “[...] Communicated, reproduced, lived and studied” (WILLIAMS, 2000, p.13), something not always followed by desirable questionings.

Final considerations

When we locate communication as a key social instance to think about contemporary education – due to its ontological and multidimensional amplitude, crossing countless discursive strategies, productive schemes of messages, cunning of landscaping the political and power games –, we verify that it is presente, either in the interpersonal level, or in the mediation of technical and technological devices, cultural marks and historic and social fights. The clarifying forms and mechanisms of such process consign, however, actions that include since the silencing of voices and the sonagation of discourses until the search for clarifying and revelation of what is intended to be hidden.

The school, as an educational, social-political, cultural unit, has been adjusting, majoritarily, its primary communicative fabric – that involving the verbal signs that enter the interpersonal relationships of teachers and students – to the monological register, systemati that had, as we’ve saw, a harsh criticism from Paulo Freire. In this didactic-pedagogic context, the introduction of technical devices also presents its traps. At the same time that there is a wide order to “modernize” the school, rhetoric formula almost always understood as the allocation of new equipment in a classroom, is not careful for the properly communicational character to guide the possible agreement in tone between demands over an emancipating education and the use, for example, of locative media in teaching-learning dynamics. In other words, we find, in crooked paths,

a type of substitute of monologic practices, only that now with different features, since the technical mediators have their own characteristics, with reaches and drawings different from those that follow school exercises based on face-to-face relationships between teachers and students.

The challenge of the screen keeps residing, therefore, in the action of the concept of communication, giving it not only as an informative exchange or a simple control and monologic dominion of the abducted discourse of the other but as affirmation of dialogue, of recognition of alterity, of ampliation of democratic circuits – to be verified both in the interpersonal dynamic of the classroom and the mobilization for educational effects of the technical intermediators.

References

- ADORNO, T. W. *Educação e emancipação*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2003.
- CITELLI, Adilson. Ensino à distância na perspectiva dos diálogos com a comunicação. *Comunicação, mídia e consumo*. São Paulo: ESPM, ano 8, v. 8, jul. 2011.
- BAKHTIN, M. *Estética da criação verbal*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003.
- FOUCAULT, M. *A ordem do discurso*. São Paulo: Loyola, 1966.
- HEIDEGGER, M. *Identidade e diferença*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2006.
- _____. *Ser e tempo*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998.
- MARX, K. *O capital*. l. 1. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.
- PRENSKY, M. *From digital to digital wisdom: hopeful essays for 21 st century learning*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, 2012.
- WILLIAMS, R. *Cultura*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2000.
- ŽIŽEK, S. *Acontecimento*. Uma viagem filosófica através de um conceito. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2017.

About the author

Adilson Odair Citelli – Graduated in Languages at Universidade de São Paulo (USP, 1973). Master's (1982) and PhD (1990) in the same institution, both in the field of Brazilian Literature. Professor at the Department of Communications and Arts at The School of Communications and Arts (ECA)/USP. IB researcher at CNPq.

Date of submission: 09/05/2018

Date of acceptance: 26/03/2019