

THE EDUCATIONAL RADIO IN THE PERCEPTION OF BASIC EDUCATION TEACHERS – THE MORE EDUCATION PROGRAM’S SCHOOL RADIO CASE

Edgard Patrício

Abstract

The public policies of media literacy gain importance in the face of the transformations of the ways of making communication. And the effectiveness of these policies, within the scope of basic education, may run counter to the receptivity of teachers. This article analyzes the perception of teachers of public education in Fortaleza (Brazil) about educational radio and the orientation they adopt in the development of curricular activities. The research was carried out in 2014, in 21 schools integrated to the More Education Program (PME). The PME, implemented in 2007 by the Ministry of Education, intends to develop a policy of integral education for schools. One of the activities offered is school radio, by the macro field “Communication and Use of Media”. A total of 124 interviews were carried out, among More Education coordinators, teachers and students. The interviews were carried out from a questionnaire of 63 questions. For this article, we focused on the analysis of 31 interviews with public school teachers who made the option of school radio as an activity. The results of the analysis point to a low index of teachers participation in the functioning of school radio, a perception of learning still focused only on literacy and difficulties in the approximation between school radio and classroom.

Keywords

Public policy, media literacy, participation, school radio, teachers

INTRODUCTION¹

The increasing complexity of media and communication processes and their widespread insertion in social relations have led countries to work on the implementation of public policies that bring the school closer to the media dimension. In relation to Portugal and Brazil, two documents appear as the basis for the delimitation of these policies. Portugal launches the “Referencial de Educação para os Media para a Educação Pré-escolar, o Ensino Básico e o Ensino Secundário” (Reference of Education for the Media for Pre-school Education, Basic Education and Secondary Education). Brazil, through the More Education Program, announces the “Caderno Pedagógico 9” (Pedagogical Notebook 9), which establishes the premises of the macro field Communication and media use in the school environment.

But the approximation between the areas of Communication and Education is not something recent. And the support used for such an approach alternates from initiative to initiative, no matter what conception of communication or education each of these

¹ This text departs from work previously developed by the author elsewhere (Patrício, 2015).

initiatives brings. It was thus with Freinet (1974), at the beginning of the twentieth century, who worked with the possibility of the school newspaper being a learning tool, in the wake of the ideas brought by the New School movement (Monarcha, 2009), among which were included the Technical and student autonomy. This was also the case with Edgard Roquete-Pinto (1926), who in 1923 founded Rio de Janeiro Society Radio, with its strictly educational bias (Prado, 2012). The same happened to the Argentine Mário Kaplún (1973), who through the cassette-forum was obstinately trying to make dialogical a communication that was doomed to the unidirectional flow of information. The same principle that encouraged Paulo Freire (1987) to defend dialogue as an educational strategy.

Along the walk, some concepts were being constructed to designate this approach between Communication and Education. Two of these concepts seem to add more followers at the moment. In the European environment, the concept of media education emerges. In Latin America, the concept of educommunication stands out. In these two geographical spaces, two countries have tried to articulate some concrete actions that operationalize the approach between Communication and Education in the context of school curricular practices. Portugal and Brazil are experiencing similar concerns about this issue.

In Portugal, the contribution of studies from institutions such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco, 2011) underpins this approach. The researches and productions (Pereira, 2011; Pinto, 2003; Pinto, Pereira, Pereira & Ferreira, 2011) of the Institute and the Center of Social Sciences of the University of Minho (Braga, Portugal) also structure this perspective. In Brazil, examples are the studies and research carried out by the Center of Communication and Education (NCE), University of São Paulo (Baccega, 2002; Soares, 1999, 2001) and by studies and systematization of the performance of nongovernmental organizations working in Area of educommunication (Sampaio, Almeida & Mendes, 2012; Vivarta, 2001).

In addition to studies and research by academic institutions or civil society, the governments of these countries have also invested in deepening the discussion about the rapprochement between communication and education. Often in the context of the launch of public policies that seek to materialize the concepts worked on in these studies in the application of the school curriculum.

Here, we turn specifically to an analysis of the initiative of the Brazilian government through the More Education Program, having as one of the offers of activity the work with the school radio. We analyze the processes of participation and perception of teachers of the public school system in Fortaleza (Ceará-Brazil) over the operationalization of this activity in schools.

THE MORE EDUCATION PROGRAM AND THE SCHOOL RADIO

The More Education Program, an action developed by the Ministry of Education (MEC), aims to develop a public policy of integral education for Brazilian schools. Implemented in 2007, the proposal of integral education of the More Education Program is in

the trajectory of several similar projects present in moments of the history of the country. Created by the most diverse educators, these projects, however punctual and sporadic, tried, in their own way, to deal with the challenges of access, permanence and learning in the context of the country's education.

In a critical view of More Education itself, in its presentation, "these programs sought to extend the time of the school day, but many did not question the fragmentation of knowledge and educational processes and how this can interfere in the permanence of children and young people in school" (Ministry of Education, 2012, p. 9). Not only a full-time education, but an integrated proposal and an expansion of educational spaces are the challenges to be overcome by the More Education Program.

In recent decades, Brazil has been making universal access to basic education for children, adolescents and young people. But enrollments at this level of education outnumber the resident population. This data reveals that there are still children and teenagers in the proper age range of secondary school (15 to 17 years) in elementary school. In 2011, for a resident population of 29,264,015 in the age group of 6 to 14 years old, belonging to elementary education, 30,358,640 enrollments were made (Ministry of Education, 2013, p.20). In relation to high school, access was not even guaranteed. In 2011, for a population resident in the age group of 15 to 17 years old (proper to secondary school) of 10,580,060 adolescents, enrollments reached only 8,400,689 of this population (Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 24). Regarding qualitative data, in 2013 (Ministry of Education, 2013b), only 89,3% of those enrolled in elementary education achieved approval. In high school, the data is even more disturbing. Only 80,1% of those enrolled were approved. Results that increase the age-grade distortion at the two levels of education, which implies higher school dropouts. What is the quality of the public school offered to our children, adolescents and young people? Can it respond to the aspirations of these segments of the population? And how to structure "your answer" to this call?

The statistics, explained here, point to a distancing from the role that the school institution represents, in fact, in the lives of its students. A great challenge is precisely to retake the sense that the school has for the life and personal success of each student. Success in fulfilling the existential, cultural, academic, social and professional needs of each one. Becoming necessary and desired by all – and exercising its central emancipatory role – demands of education an integrality of proposal and a capillarity in each student's social and particular reality.

The integral education, in the definition of the More Education Program (Ministry of Education, 2012), proposes the most complete formation possible for the human being, considering the particularities of social issues in Brazil and feeding on partnerships between ministries and other agencies of the Federal Government. It includes, among its concerns, requirements that, in general, are not contemplated in a traditional content view of education and school space, such as the development of specific skills, dialogue between school and community knowledges, protection and basic guarantee of the rights of children, adolescents and young people and concern for public health issues.

Therefore, the More Education Program assumes that curricular and extracurricular activities are part of a single process with a common goal: the full education of the

learner, thus overcoming the limits and addictions of a school schedule and its extracurricular shifts, or in other words, the More Education Program proposes to rethink the serial and compartmentalized structure of the school. The activities proposed in the More Education books, according to their content, should dialogue with the academic disciplines and the youth and community knowledge, so that the sense of “completeness” is actually exercised. It is the discussion of a new curricular order in the school, an old debate in Brazilian society.

From the establishment of these principles, More Education argues that only completeness of time does not guarantee that the school makes sense to those for whom it was created: its students. And there are several factors that induce this statement. The obsolescence of contents, disconnected with the reality of the young person, becomes a hindrance to their permanence in the classroom. To accompany the social demands of each student, the More Education Program also proposes a break with the clausturation created by the school space, that is, “breaking down the walls of the school”, at least in the sphere of knowledge.

That is why the More Education Program focuses on the concept of territoriality. The territorialization of the school - expanding its physical spaces, beyond its walls and its classrooms, and encompassing knowledge, in addition to its books, would make the proposal of education potentially connected with real and daily demands of the public to which the school serves. The school would become part of the community in which it is inserted, in order to be respected and considered by its members no longer as purely bureaucratic organism that, almost by chance, is part of that landscape.

THE OFFER

The offer of activities of the More Education Program is divided into macro fields. One of the macro fields is the Communication and Use of Media. In this macro field, activities related to the school newspaper, school radio, comics, photography and video are offered to public schools. Data provided to the author by the Department of Basic Education of the Ministry of Education reveal that, in 2010, 9,995 schools were attended, reaching three million students. Of these, 3,911 opted for the macro field “Communication and Use of Media”. In this universe, 2,218 schools opted for school radio. Highlight for the state of Ceará. Of its 333 schools integrated to More Education until 2010 and working with the macro field “Communication and Use of Media”, 246 opted for school radio.

Ceará only loses to Rio de Janeiro in the option for school radio. In Rio, 375 schools have made that choice. It should be borne in mind that the number of schools in Rio de Janeiro integrated into the More Educação up to 2010, in the macro field “Communication and Media Use” (658), is practically double the number of schools in Ceará (333).

In Ceará, the 246 schools that opted for school radio until 2010 congregated 34,480 students. There are 71 state and 175 municipal schools. Data including enrollment by schools in 2011 pointed to Fortaleza, the state capital, with 108 schools opting for school

radios, 61 of the municipal public network and 47 of the state public network, with the participation of more than 15 thousand students. Data updated in 2012, provided to the author by the Municipal Department of Education of Fortaleza, count 48 schools of the municipal public network with option for school radio and 28,957 students reached. The most recent data on the school radio option in schools shows that 210,045 students opted for school radio throughout Brazil in 2012 (Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 23).

The “Caderno Pedagógico 9” (Ministry of Education, 2012), which deals with the macro field “Communication and Use of Media” by the More Education Program, is based on Umberto Eco (1991) to justify the importance of the discussion about the field within the proposal of integral education of the MEC. And it highlights the concept of “media age”, of the referenced author, as an attestation of the importance that communication has in today’s world. They also make explicit their inspiration in Paulo Freire when talking about the approximation between the two areas, Communication and Education (Freire, 1979). “Now, if the school has at its core the construction of the autonomy of the learners, how could this task be accomplished without considering communication and its role in society today?” (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.9). And it ends up assuming the term Educommunication as the new academic area that combines the two previously specific areas, Education and Communication. In this case, they approach the thought of Martin-Barbero (2008), from a culturalist view of reality.

And how would be carried out this approach between Communication and Education? Or more specifically, the approximation between the school and Communication? The Notebook (Ministry of Education, 2012) points to this approach by the bias of the school recipients, when it indicates that the media “are the origin of a new culture, oriented to the future, in which adolescents and young people have as their main reference their peers; this mutation is being deepened by the internet” (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.15). And where would the adult be in this story? It would seem “at first glance, that the adult has lost influence in the formation of young people, but it is not so. Mass communication generated the new culture and at the same time gave meaning to it, normalizing it within the needs of the capitalist market in the present moment” (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.15).

Thusly, the school would be among the adult institutions that would have lost strength as their educational action. And the Notebook points out how this formerly occupied place can be restored by another adult institution, in this case the media, but from a critical view of the new institution.

Consequently, for the school to regain its role, it should, first of all, fight for its own legitimacy towards children and young people. We put it here as a thesis that it can not recover this legitimacy if it does not unveil, through criticism, the mystification proposed by the world of communication-market. This critique generates the possibility of creating a complicity with the younger ones, valuing and promoting the search for autonomy as an existential adventure of intimacy, of thought and of knowledge, and not as

a proposal conditioned, subliminally, by the mercantile logic. (Ministry of Education, 2012, p. 15)

Still according to the *Caderno Pedagógico 9* (Ministry of Education, 2012), the recovery of the role of the school would then be related to its capacity to become a privileged space to guarantee the new generations the knowledge and the indispensable skills to communicate with autonomy and authenticity. It would be from a “problematizing pedagogy” that the media reading will be more efficient if young people are guaranteed the ability to analyze their own forms of communication and the ways of communicating adopted and privileged by the school.

The Brazilian researcher Ismar Soares (2001) is the author recognized by the Notebook when dealing with Communication and Use of Media in school, using the term Educommunication. The new field would absorb its foundations from the traditional fields of education, communication and other fields of the social sciences, subsequently overcoming the “epistemological barriers imposed by the Enlightenment and Functionalist vision of social relations that keep the traditional fields of knowledge isolated and incommunicable” (Ministry of Education, 2012, p. 16). The new field would work based on

joint actions in different areas, gaining the dimension of a movement that is tuned around a basic idea: to enable the knowledge about the media society, through the exercise of the use of its resources, always in a participative and integrating perspective of the interests of life in community. (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.16)

The various media, for the *Caderno Pedagógico 9* (Ministry of Education, 2012, p. 18), would have the potential to become part of a communication system among students, teachers, principals and the school community. Thus, they would have the potential to instigate dialogues for the construction of a rich political-pedagogical project aligned with the characteristics of a school that has importance in the lives of its students and of the community. But in the way to reach this reality, we would be facing some challenges.

The understanding of the Notebook about the use of the media in the school passes through an interdisciplinary vision of this process. It points out that, although “it does not aim to solve all the issues of Brazilian education, More Education, through ‘Communication and Use of Media’, is an important instrument to flexibilize the curriculum and to disseminate an interdisciplinary proposal” (Ministry of Education, 2012, p. 19). One of the first perceptions in the production of communication is that a newspaper, video, radio, photography and comics are, by nature, interdisciplinary products, that is, they require the application of multiple academic knowledge in their elaboration. The production in communication is understood as “a student / scholar practice, which respects student autonomy and must involve the most diverse disciplines” (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.19).

Another dimension of the interdisciplinary would be related to the different knowledge that would enter in the composition of this new learning. For the “*Caderno Pedagógico 9*” (Ministry of Education, 2012), the

community and student knowledge also have space in this construction. The networks that constitute these knowledge (...) are fundamental, also, as a way for the learner to recognize himself in the process. The agenda of the child and the young person should be the main line of the newspaper, magazine, radio or video produced; the potential of the community becomes visible and active in the content proposed and discussed. (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.19)

Furthermore,

The integration of academic, community and student knowledge facilitates the school becoming the articulator of a learning community, that is, “an organized human community that builds its own educational and cultural project to educate itself, its children, its young people and adults. (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.19)

The social role of reading and writing is the starting point for the “Caderno Pedagógico 9” to highlight the importance of the re-signification of social spaces where people exercise their citizenship. The guarantee of “access to communication vehicles, mastery of different languages and the production of communication as a form of democratic participation are fundamental elements of the MEC program and also central activities of educational practices” (Ministry of Education, 2012, pp. 19 and 20). The exercise of critical reading of the mass media would be “one of the presuppositions, so that the newspaper, magazine, comics, video or radio produced by children, adolescents and young people have in fact an authentic and innovative character in the programs of ‘Communication and Use of Media’” (Ministry of Education, 2012, pp. 19-20). It would be necessary before any effort to produce communication, “to know and analyze the mass media system that today is still dominant. This means deeply understanding the commercial relations of vehicles and the important role they play in building personal and social values” (Ministry of Education, 2012, pp. 19-20).

But the dimension of the MEC proposal for the use of the media by the school, embodied in the “Caderno Pedagógico 9”, would not be restricted to the critical reception of the communication. The “Caderno Pedagógico 9” points to a next stage of communication production.

After reading and analyzing the different media, the emphasis of Educommunication is the production, and especially the placement, of the material made by the students. It is an authentic communication of learners. In newspapers, fanzines, radios, videos or comics, the student is instigated to produce a communication that makes sense to him and his community; themes that generate discussion and lead debates on solutions and problems in the community or related to youth issues per se, such as sexuality and other existential matters. (Ministry of Education, 2012, p. 20)

It would be a first approximation of the Notebook to the thought of Celestine Freinet (1974) and the New School, a movement that proposes to the students diverse activities - intellectual, artistic, physical, manual works - foreshadowing what today we call integral education. Among these activities, the use of typographic printing devices, starting the production of school print. For the “Caderno Pedagógico 9”, the

(...) Freinet's importance in the history of school media is not to have been a precursor - he was not, as we have seen - but in the fact that he made the newspaper a point of “concentration” and the synthesis of an inspired pedagogical proposal Principles of the New School. In Freinet there is not the slightest trace of an instrumental or functionalist perspective of the school newspaper (school media), which focuses on some partial aspect, such as school performance or the mastery of technologies, for example. Its vision starts from an integral conception of the child and concludes in the formulation of a thought that can be considered as precursor of an integral vision of the education. The following text draws largely on Freinet. (Ministry of Education, 2012, pp. 24-25)

Finally, it is worth mentioning the “Caderno Pedagógico 9”'s vision of the social function of reading and writing in the processes of approximation between Education and Communication in the school environment. The use of language and expression in the process would be “fundamental so that the message is understood by the recipient (target audience of the media in question) and the product of communication is indeed efficient. It is a constant exercise of language research and social use of writing” (Ministry of Education, 2012, p. 20). The concern ‘of being understood’ would make communication a “practice of daily use of the language and the newspaper produced, being an important tool of citizenship” (Ministry of Education, 2012, p. 20). The learners would be led to realize that it is “from the local change and reading of world, that the readings and the global changes are constructed, and that a new, transformative and authentic type of communication is possible” (Ministry of Education, 2012, p. 20).

In short, based on the proposal of the More Education Program, in relation to the macro field Communication and Use of Media, there are the ideas that we live in a “media age”, hence the importance of macro field, that the projects that the schools can implement in the area should privilege the reality of the students. More so, they must be constructed taking into account the autonomy of the students, which must be inserted from a critical proposal of the communication that is practiced today. The proposals implemented within the framework of the macro field should enable the dialogues for the development of a rich pedagogical project. And these proposals come from a vision that involves the various disciplines, in the perspective of approximation between school and community knowledge, and that they demonstrate the social function of reading and writing.

How do school teachers interpret the possibilities? And how do they construct this other communication in practice?

CONTEXTUALIZING THE RESEARCH

THE ROUTINE OF THE MORE EDUCATION PROGRAM IN SCHOOLS

Each year, schools make the choice for the activities they want to develop around the Program. On average, the school “may” choose between five and six activities, of the set of activities that compose all macro fields of More Education. There are 10 macro fields available to schools: i. Pedagogical Accompaniment, ii. Environmental Education, iii. Sport and Recreation, iv. Human Rights in Education, v. Culture and Arts, vi. Digital Culture, vii. Health Promotion, viii. Communication and Use of Media, ix. Research in the Field of the Sciences of the Nature, x. Economic Education. These macro fields offer 62 different activities to students (Ministry of Education, 2011). The MEC also guides the selection of these activities, hence the “may” be quoted. Of these five or six activities, one must necessarily be that of pedagogical reinforcement, of the microfield Pedagogical Accompaniment, which is compulsory for the participating schools. And in 2013, the MEC did not provide the macro campo “Communication and Use of Media” for rural schools. Only urban schools could make the choice for some of their activities.

Once the activities are chosen, the schools receive the necessary support from the MEC to develop them. In relation to the macro field “Communication and Use of Media”, in the school radio option, the support alternates between sending a kit of equipment for school use or the remittance of financial resources, so that the school itself acquires the equipment. In the term in which the MEC is responsible for sending the equipment itself, the schools even wait a year for the actual shipment. As the option of the activities is annual, in some schools the equipment arrives when the school has not the option of school radio anymore between its activities of More Education, which generates discontinuity of activities. The delay in the arrival of the equipment also discourages the participation of students and teachers, whose expectations are not attended during that year.

The MEC, in the school radio case, also supports the school by passing on resources so that it can hire a supervisor to accompany the forming classes. There is an indication, but not an obligation, for this supervisor to have specific radio training. The remuneration of this monitor is R\$ 80.00 (US\$ 23,56, approximately) per class formed. In view of the low remuneration, there is an intense turnover of these employees. That is, if the school is able to attract any professional to carry out this work.

With the equipment and supervisor available, the process of developing the activities begins. One of the problems verified at this stage is the lack of autonomy of students in joining the proposed activities. The same student who makes the choice, for example, for school radio, must, necessarily, participate in all other activities selected by the school for that year. The pedagogical reinforcement activity is daily. Each activity takes, on average, 90 minutes of the three hours a day dedicated to More Education in the school, in the extracurricular shift on school. Based on five selected activities plus the pedagogical reinforcement, of obligatory character, every day the student participates in the pedagogical reinforcement plus an activity. As a result, if the school makes the option for school radio, the work with this activity will be limited to 90 minutes per week, six hours a month, which is detrimental to any formative process of more systematic basis.

SELECTING THE SEARCH DATASET

For the research, 21 schools belonging to the public networks of Fortaleza (state and municipal) were selected. The selection criterion of schools was based on the connection with the More Education Program, the option for the School Radio activity and, moreover, that at some point the school radio had effectively worked - in many schools the equipment was received and not even installed. Specific questionnaires were prepared for principals, More Education Program activities coordinators, classroom teachers and students. The number of respondents varied from school to school and between the segments, according to the availability demonstrated by the school community to participate in the research. In relation to teachers and students, we made a division between those who participated in the school's radio activity and those who did not participate. As our intention was to have a perception of the understanding of the relation between radio and learning, from the "Communication and Use of Media" proposal, this separation seemed appropriate, considering who is only a listener of the school radio and who is active participant in the process of production of the communication transmitted by the school radio.

Specifically for this article, we selected 31 questionnaires from teachers interviewed, among those who took part at some point in the activities of the school radio and those who did not participate. It should be noted that participation in the activities of the school radio may have occurred in moments prior to the conduction of the research, a fact that between the option for the activity and its effective development may take a time interval that can reach 18 months, depending on the equipment availability, including its installation at school. The number of teachers interviewed varied from school to school, based on their availability.

The teachers answered a questionnaire of 63 questions, with open questions or multiple choices, divided into two parts: i. Scenario of the More Education Program, including inquiries about the implementation process of the Program in the school; and ii. Scenario of "Communication and Use of Media" and school radio option, related to the process of choice of school radio activity and its implementation in school. Due to the space available in this article, we concentrate our analysis on the data of the questions set that seems to us to be key in this discussion, and which evidences the quality of the relationship between teachers and school radio activities: the participation of teachers in school radio activities; responsibility for the definition of school radio programming, including the insertion or withdrawal of programs from the air; the teachers' perception of the extent of learning linked to school radio activities; and teachers' understanding of the concept of educational radio. It should be noted that some scores of some questions exceed the number of 31 interviews conducted. This is due to the fact that in some questions it was possible to select more than one alternative (multiple choices). As an example, the question asked who was responsible for defining school radio programming.

THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHERS OF MORE EDUCATION ON EDUCATIONAL RADIO

THE PARTICIPATION OF TEACHERS IN SCHOOL RADIO

The More Education Program, in its pedagogical proposal of orientation to the execution of the macro field Communication and Use of Media, emphasizes that the implemented proposals should allow the dialogues for the development of a rich pedagogical project, and that these proposals come from a vision that involves the various disciplines. Above all, these projects should develop dialogues within the school community, which would attest the importance of communication and education. There would not be, at first, success in the initiative without the effective participation of the teacher in the activities. But this is not being experienced in the set of schools reached by the research.

The absence of teachers in the school radio activities is attested by the data. Of the 31 teachers interviewed, only five (16,1%) participated at some point in the activities of the school radio and 26 (83,9%) did not participate. This result is reinforced in the systematization of other research data. It was asked who defined the planning of the school radio broadcasting and contents, and who was responsible for cancelling other shows. Regarding the definition of the broadcasted content, the teachers affirmed a more autonomous participation of the students, which is in line with the orientation of the macro field. Of the collected responses on this aspect, the total of 14 (33,3%) indicated that it was the students who decided the content of the school radio. Next would be the supervisors, with nine affirmations (21,4%). In third place, it was the Education coordinators themselves who decided what to broadcast on school radios, with eight affirmative answers (19%). The teachers were recognized as participants in the definition of school radio schedule planning by only three (7,14%) of their peers.

If the participation of teachers was skewed in the definition of school radio programming, this behavior almost doubles when related to the management of another activity of More Education. We talked about the decision-making process regarding cancelling a program from schedule of school radio. Of the 52 indications about who would be responsible for this, 19 (37,2%) suggested to be the school principal or manager of the school. Another 15 (27,4%) affirmations indicated the coordinator of More Education. Only then comes the teacher, with seven (13,7%) of the indications, a percentage increase that is considerable compared to the previous item, but still not very expressive in the data set. The students appear with four indications (7,8%). More than the low participation of the teachers in the processes of management of the school radio, a centralism is perceived in this scope, which points to the inability of the macro field Communication and Use of Media to establish an effective dialogue between the different disciplines of the curriculum and within the own School community.

The mentioned teacher participation in the decision making (who defines the program, who cancels a program) can still be masked by the fact that the More Education coordinator can also be a teacher, but who coordinates ALL the activities of More Education in the school, which results in the incapability of his participating in the school radio more feasibly. It is seen that the perspective of the reciprocal collaboration between teacher and student, recommended by the pedagogical proposal of “Communication and Use of Media”, is also far from being realized.

THE PERCEPTION OF LEARNING

Two inquiries in the research instruments were made about the perception of educational radio. The first, “Do you believe that radio school helps students learn?”, and the second, “What is educational radio for you?”. Both were open-ended questions. Here, specifically, the answers were systematized by distinguishing the participating teachers from the non-participants in the school radio activities, considering that the own involvement and possible formative processes carried out by the participating teacher could somehow have reoriented this perception.

Among the five professors who claimed to have participated in some of the activities of the school radio, only two said that this environment can greatly favor learning. Two others indicated they did not know how to assess this perspective. One of them stated the meaning that the school radio contributed little to student learning. One of the justifications for the high possibility of learning would be the fact that “When you have an extra activity, such as radio, theater, reading, help in the process of learning, socializing. They draw a lot of students attention”. This statement may indicate a distance perception between the learning process in school radio activity and any subjects of the classroom – although a greater number of respondents would set up a safer interpretation of the data.

But what stands out negatively is the statement of one of the teachers who participated in the school radio activities and who considers student learning something very effective. Why? Simply because “They are bound to write and speak”. It is an example that the pedagogical orientation of the macro field “Communication and Use of Media”, regarding the indication of dialogue as a strategy for the activities development, may not be very effective among teachers.

Among those teachers who watch school radio from afar, who have never participated in their activities, the expectation regarding the improvement of student learning is considerable. Of the 26 interviewees, 12 (46,1%) believe that this improvement can be very effective. On the other hand, four (15,3%) indicated that there is no link between school radio and the learning process, and seven (26,9%) indicated that they did not know how to comment on the question.

On the justifications for believing in the connection between school radio and learning, a set of answers points to one of the concerns of More Education in regard to reading and writing learning as an important bias of the student's social perception. Teachers statements point to this connection, when asked about learning: “The reading and writing part is developed”, “Improves writing, speech, communication ability”, “Motivates students to produce, seek knowledge, become interested in studying and being more aware of their role as a student in the school environment”, “They feel more inserted in society, improve self-esteem” were some of the answers systematized.

The increase of the interests of the students, another perspective pointed out by the pedagogical orientation of More Education, is pointed by the professors to justify a possible improvement of the student learning when engaged in the school radio activities. Among the answers: “It's something they like, new to them”, “When they heard

messages on the radio, they were interested in writing them and they took it to the classroom, because, as the message would be read on air, they wanted to write correctly and ask for the teacher's help", "They listened to music they liked and sent their messages". However, one of the professors drew attention to the tenuous frontier between student interests and restricted use of the potential of school radio. Critical regarding possible learning that would be occurring at his school, he qualifies the use of school radio as little. "It only has the entertainment function", he said.

It is also important to highlight another perspective that may have influenced the non-participation of teachers in the school radio activities and also has an impact on the analysis of the learning effectiveness represented by the activity in the school. Initially, we point out the recognition of the teacher's own absence, and consequently the distance between the school radio and the classroom, as a teacher refers to the "lack of interaction between teachers and radio school so that it is used as a medium to encourage student learning". We perceived also a lack of teacher training to take on such activity, according to the report of another teacher, who affirms "Since it was very little time, it is not possible to evaluate if there was learning, because there was no preparation or elaboration of the use of the radio together with the teachers". The interviewed even indicate management deficiencies, as stated by another teacher, "It could there be (learning effectiveness). There is not due to lack of planning and interaction with other parts of the school".

PERCEPTION OF EDUCATIONAL RADIO

The teachers' perception of educational radio teachers reinforces the idea of the distant link between school radio and the classroom. No less important, but still restricted, what stands out in the answers among the participating and nonparticipating teachers of school radio is the broader dimension of the educational reference. We could establish three levels in these perceptions based on the teachers' responses to the research.

The first level is represented by the teachers who still see some approximation between the educational and the schooling aspects of teaching. This perception is reinforced by their statements: "A moment in which the student can read a text produced in a room, show his musical tastes. All this is learning. You can make school announcements. The music itself is also an important thing for the human being"; "It is a means of communication that helps to disseminate information of interest to students, more in the area of education (courses and other information related to learning)"; "It transmits contextualized knowledge in the classroom and on a day-to-day basis through the radio".

Another set of responses representing the second level of the relationship between the educational and the schooling broadens the perception of learning. In the understanding of attentive teachers who incorporate this expanded perception of learning, educational radio "speaks of education in general: research, the result of a problem that the school has, issues related to education as a whole, attending to some students' anxieties"; "A movement that will help the development of young people, teach them to

share their knowledge and enrich themselves in this sharing”; “It’s one more resource you can use to improve student learning. It’s a resource they like, a way for students to be responsible for their learning”.

Finally, on a third level of the relationship between the educational and the schooling, the educational radio is perceived within a very broad understanding of learning, with little connection with teaching and the classroom. In the opinion of teachers who incorporate this perception, educational radio would be “A possibility of integration of the student and society, with communication. An opportunity to realize that we are not so individual, so constructed, but we have the need to live the other, inform the other, empower and do something for the other”; “It is when you make the student perceive not only their world, but also see the world around them. All financial and social conditions, and that they know how to find subjects that they may interact with, read about, get informed, communicate, I think this is educational radio”; “It must deal with subjects related to citizenship, ethics, environment, in the sense of educating the citizen”.

A FEW MORE CONSIDERATIONS

For the construction of the proposal of educational radio that reaches the principles set by the MEC, it is fundamental, above all, a critical perception of the model and content of communication most used in our reality. It would even be arguable to state that, contrary to what the MEC affirms, it would not be necessary to postulate a vision in stages that considers the stream of perceiving critically the communication at first, and then producing an autonomous or educational communication. But this critical perception of communication is absent in the teachers speech, even considering their good intentions. And these contradictory aspects, if we view conflict as positive, can yield good dialogues in order to recognize the distances between thinking and doing. One of these distances are the deficient, or even absent, process of training the teachers who participate in the specific activities of the macro field Communication and Use of Media.

Another possible consideration relates to teachers broader perception of educational radio. Is this perception tied to a negative interpretation of the classroom or even the school? Could the noticed absence of the teachers on the processes involving the school radio be strengthening this negative understanding? With the effective participation of teachers in the activities of school radio, could one expect a reorientation of this perception? Or a deepening? How to work the perception of educational radio and learning in the perspective of articulation between the micro and macro scopes of these processes? Challenges for further analysis. //

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Baccega, M. A. (Ed.) (2002). *Gestão de processos comunicacionais*. São Paulo: Atlas.

Eco, U. (1991). *O superhomem de massa*. S. Paulo: Perspectiva.

- Freinet, C. (1974). *O jornal escolar*. Lisboa: Editorial Estampa.
- Freire, P. (1979). *Educação como prática da liberdade*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Freire, P. (1987). *Pedagogia do oprimido*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Kaplún, M. (1999). *Producción de programas de rádio. El guión - la realización*. Quito: Ciespal Ediciones.
- Martin-Barbero, J. (2008). *Dos meios às mediações*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ.
- Monarcha, C. (2009). *Brasil arcaico, escola nova*. São Paulo: Unesp.
- Pereira, L. (2011). *Concepções de literacia digital nas políticas públicas – estudo a partir do Plano Tecnológico da Educação*. PhD Dissertation, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal. Retrieved from <https://repositorium.sdum.uminho.pt/bitstream/1822/19825/1/Lu%C3%ADs%20Miguel%20Gon%C7alves%20Pereira.pdf>
- Pinto, M. (2003). Correntes da educação para os media em Portugal: retrospectiva e horizontes em tempos de mudança. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 32.
- Pinto, M., Pereira, S., Pereira, L. & Ferreira, T. (2011). *Educação para os Media em Portugal: experiências, actores e contextos*. Lisboa: Entidade Reguladora para a Comunicação Social.
- Prado, M. (2012). *História do rádio no Brasil*. Livros de Safra.
- Roquette-Pinto, E. (1926). Rádio e educação do Brasil. *Revista Electron – Revista da Rádio Sociedade do Rio de Janeiro*, 1(06).
- Sampaio, A. L., Patrício, E. & Campos, T. (Eds.) (2012). *Sintonia Infância: uma trajetória de comunicação para a garantia dos direitos infantojuvenis*. Fortaleza: Gráfica LCR.
- Soares, I. (1999). Comunicação/Educação: a emergência de um novo campo e o perfil dos profissionais. *Contato: Revista Brasileira de Comunicação, Arte e Educação*, 1(2), 5-75.
- Soares, I. (2001). *Caminhos da educomunicação*. São Paulo: Editora Salesiana.
- Unesco (2011). *Media and information literacy: curriculum for teachers*, Paris: Unesco.
- Vivarta, V. (Ed.) (2000). *Os jovens na mídia*, Pesquisa ANDI/IAS/Unesco. Brasília, ANDI Agência de Notícias dos Direitos da Infância: Instituto Airton Senna/Unesco. Série Mobilização Social.

OTHER REFERENCES

- Ministério da Educação (2011). Secretaria de Educação Básica. *Passo a Passo do Programa Mais Educação*. Brasília.
- Ministério da Educação (2012). *Caderno Pedagógico 9 – Comunicação e Uso de Mídias*. Série Cadernos Pedagógicos do Programa Mais Educação. Brasília.
- Ministério da Educação (2013a). *Censo da educação básica: 2012 – resumo técnico*. – Brasília: Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira.
- Ministério da Educação (2013b). Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira – *Taxa de Rendimento, Brasil*.

Patrício, E. (2015, setembro). O rádio educativo na percepção de professores de educação básica - O caso rádio escolar do Programa Mais Educação. Comunicação apresentada no XXXVIII Congresso Brasileiro de Ciências da Comunicação, Rio de Janeiro.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Edgard Patrício is a Journalism and Communication professor at both graduate and undergraduate programmes at Federal University of Ceará, Brazil. He holds a PhD in Education from Federal University of Ceará and an undergraduate degree in technology and data processing. Currently heading university extension programmes in Communication and Public Policies he is also a volunteer at the non-governmental organization, Catavento - Communication and Education. Member of the managing board of ANDI Brasil network - Children and Adolescent Rights Communication.

Email: edgard@ufc.br

Universidade Federal do Ceará, Av. da Universidade, 2853 - Benfica
Fortaleza - CE, 60020-181, Brasil

* **Submitted: 14-03-2016**

* **Accepted: 14-04-2016**