

Original Article

DOI: 10.17143/rbaad.v17i1.49

Distance Education, Convergence Culture and Audiovisuals: Notes for Teacher Training

*Educación a Distancia, Cultura de la Convergencia y Audiovisualidades:
Apuntes para la Formación del Profesorado*

*Educação a Distância, Cultura da Convergência e Audiovisualidades:
Apontamentos para a Formação de Professores*

Leonardo Nolasco-Silva¹, Lia Faria¹, Vittorio Lo Bianco²

Abstract

Our proposal is to think, based on the concept of *audiovisualities*, the possibilities open by the convergence culture, whether in the scenarios of distance education, whether in the landscapes of the face to face education. To this end, we discussed the role of television in order to problematize the educational technologies and their use by teachers and students. We discuss our daily contact with the commercial television - in the traditional device or in the palm of our hand - and remember initiatives that have elected the TV as a means of practicing and giving access to formal education - more specifically talking about the genesis and the logic of the *TELECOURSE 2nd Grade*, thinking about how that type of education still resonates among the current practices of Distance Learning. We asked what we still have to learn with this logic of image production and which spaces of invention we can exploit

¹ Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro. R. São Francisco Xavier, 524 Maracanã, Rio de Janeiro - Brasil

² Fundação Cecierj. Praça Cristiano Ottoni s/n, 6º andar, sala 650 Centro - Rio de Janeiro-RJ - Brasil

from it, expanding the repertoire on the educational technologies in teacher training.

Keywords: *Audiovisualities*. Convergence culture. Distance education.

Resumen

Nuestra propuesta es pensar, basado en el concepto de audiovisuales, las posibilidades abiertas por la cultura de convergencia, ya sea en los escenarios de la educación a distancia, ya sea en los paisajes de la educación presencial. Para ello, analizamos el papel de la televisión con el fin de cuestionar las tecnologías educativas y su uso por parte de profesores y estudiantes. Hablamos de nuestro contacto diario con la televisión comercial tradicional - en el dispositivo o en la palma de la mano - y recordamos iniciativas que han elegido a la TV como un medio de practicar y dar acceso a la educación formal - más específicamente hablando de la génesis y la lógica del *Telecurso 2º grado*, pensando acerca de cómo este tipo de educación, aún resuena entre las prácticas actuales de la educación a distancia. Hemos preguntado lo que aún tenemos que aprender con esta lógica de producción de imagen y que espacios de invención podemos explotar, ampliando el repertorio de las tecnologías educativas en la formación del profesorado.

Palabras clave: Audiovisuailidades. Cultura da convergência. Educação a distância.

Resumo

Nossa proposta é pensar, a partir do conceito de *audiovisualidades*, as possibilidades didáticas abertas pela cultura da convergência, seja nos cenários da Educação a Distância, seja nas paisagens da modalidade presencial. Para tanto, discutimos o papel da televisão, de modo a problematizar as tecnologias educacionais e seus usos por professores e estudantes. Discutimos o nosso contato diário com a televisão comercial – no aparelho tradicional ou na palma da nossa mão – e lembramos iniciativas que elegeram a TV como meio de praticar e dar acesso à educação formal – mais especificamente, falamos da gênese e da lógica

do Telecurso 2º Grau, pensando em como aquela modalidade de ensino ainda ressoa entre as práticas atuais de EaD. Perguntamos o que ainda temos a aprender com essa lógica de produção de imagens e que espaços de invenção podemos explorar a partir dela, ampliando o repertório sobre as tecnologias educacionais na formação de professores.

Palavras-chave: Audiovisualidades. Cultura da convergência. Educação a distância.

Introduction

This is a text about moving images. Or rather, it is a text that tries to understand which movements are produced by images put to the consumption in the television – movements that are acts of learning, are modes of appropriation or means of inculcation of ideas and values. These movements triggers debates that are never just about consumption, because in the act of consuming, we upgrade virtualities, as Certeau (1994) points out, when speaking of the unpredictability of the uses made by *cultural practitioners*.

Present in almost every homes, television is a source of information and entertainment, with non-formal educational space-time³. The possibility of educating, regarding teaching-learning on the screen, is not only in the television transmissions we consume at home, but refers to elaborate systematizations that thought the language of TV as a pedagogical tool for the formation of frames. Both in the past and in the present day, the relationship between television sets and school education is close and fruitful, though viewed by many as dangerous and undesirable. If television is inevitable, since it is our practice of reading the world, we must go deep into what it has to say to us – or what we have to say from it. We are the country of the soap operas, and much of what we elaborate on the life events goes through the fiction discussed in family gatherings, on the street, in the bars and, obviously, in the schools. From television news to sports, everything on television resonates in our daily lives. It is, then,

³ We opted, in our researches with the daily routines, to mark in our spellings the understanding that it would be more appropriate to break with some dichotomies that, in the midst of Modernity, express supposedly antagonistic models. Against this movement, we write *teaching-learning*, *spacetime*, *practical theories*, etc.

necessary to see what exists beyond the screen. On the other hand, in the age of the *convergence culture* (JENKIS, *apud* PRIMO, 2013), we must recognize that television does not work alone, having in the multiplication of screens a complex process that we need to understand.

Therefore, Our proposal is therefore, to debate our daily contact with commercial television – whether in the traditional apparatus or with at hand device – and with those initiatives that have chosen TV as a means of practicing and giving access to formal education – more specifically, we talk about the genesis and logic of *Telecurso 2º Grau*, thinking about how that teaching modality still resonates between the current practices of EAD and, we dare to say, asking what we still have to learn from that logic of imaging that, far from being free or spontaneous, follows a political-aesthetic-cultural agenda of winning the attention of the viewer and the transmission of a message designed to reach a certain audience in a certain historical time.

In this way, we understand that our training is not restricted to *formal periods* of schooling, and knowledge is produced in everyday networks of meanings and subjective (ALVES, 2015). Among the many scenarios in which we perform the *teaching-learning*, we think of television - and its multiple forms of consumption today -, it is worth highlighting the scope of its performance in Brazil, being, probably, the most present technology in Brazilian people's homes. In the exercise of the teaching profession, it is necessary to recognize the constant presence of this technology which, not infrequently, appears as a trigger for themes in the classroom, either because the students reverberate something they attended, or because the teacher reverberated what was seen. And we cannot forget that it was from the TV set that the cinema entered the classroom, coupled with the VCR or, more recently, the DVD player. Such an entry, nowadays, is given by the computer connected to the datashow.

Much more than expected, these teachers, especially in the space/time of urban every day, *know* why they *use* (and not only consume) television and computer, besides refrigerator, telephone, blender, they chose and bought with their little money, because they understand that these objects (even before they are means) are important for their children and for themselves. In

this process, with these companions of curiosity and learning, they “rediscover” the logic they have always used in everyday life, but did not know, and that indicates that *knowledge is “woven” in a network*, without compulsory paths and without hierarchies, with some teaching the others knowledge that change permanently. (ALVES, 2000, pp. 33-34).

In other words, television does not have to enter the school as a technology to be pedagogized, but as an aesthetic experience lived in daily life and that overflows to other spaces, not limited to the house. We bring television programming into our affective memories, and it is possible that we have built much of our world view from it. This does not mean that, in recognizing its formative function, we are saying that we maintain with it a passive relation of uncritical reception. We, the viewers, also who put television programming in motion – whether it is spreading news and forms of entertainment, or by *zapping*⁴ and stimulating broadcasters to create audience loyalty strategies (MARCONDES FILHO, 1994). Although there are many other entertainment possibilities today, television maintains its strength and is a kind of link between our traditional consumer habits and market innovations, such as online social networks and streaming devices.

Television begins to expand from the 1950s onwards and rapidly reaches the public and occupies an important place in the leisure of people until it becomes, by the end of the century [XX], the absolute medium of transmission of images throughout culture. It dominates all other forms of transmission of images, as well as all the other media, produced in large scale, as is the case of newspaper, radio, cinema, literature. (MARCONDES FILHO, 1994, p. 16).⁵

⁴ For Ciro Marcondes Filho (1994), the advent of remote control facilitated the practice of *zapping*, i.e., it produced in the viewer the habit of navigating between channels. As a result, TV audiences have become less stable, requiring media companies to pay more attention to creating content that engages the public, depriving it of the desire to *zap* to competitors.

⁵ It is quite possible that the centrality of television today is something to contend with in the face of the advance of digital technologies connected in network.

Television as a lazy machine⁶

Umberto Eco (1994), when speaking of literature, attributed to the reader the task of making the “lazy machine” of writing work. For the author, all text rests on unread pages and the reader needs to put it in motion, creating meaning for what the author wrote. In this direction, as much as writing, we try to draw maps for the reader to walk according to our intentions, it is up to them alone - the reader - to trace their own path, triggering the whole network of knowledge and experiences of their personal plots - that luggage that helps us to read the world.

The literary work would thus be an “open work” and would invite the reader to enter its pages as one enters a forest - a landscape that suddenly forks, requiring the walker to choose one path or the other. Then, a book would not produce an irremediable destiny. Although the written stories lead our eyes to a final point, to an arrival place, each of us, when reading a book, walk with our own luggage, make “inferential rides”, for reading, return a time later, unite what was lived with what was read, make syntheses, associate ideas, recognize someone in the pages, identify themselves, create judgments and then, if they return to the book, they are already another reader, with their own marks, never apprehensible by the original author or by any another reader who has embarked on the challenge of entering the same book. Is it possible to use the same reasoning to think about the relationship we have with television? We believe so.

TV programming produces nothing that cannot be redone by the viewer’s updating work. It is enough to observe an informal conversation about some scene from the *soap opera*, transmitted the previous night, so that we verify the multiplicity of understandings before the history narrated. The same thing happens in the discussions about news stories or the attractions of auditorium programs. More than diversity of opinions, these behaviors reveal a variety of appropriations that, in theory, result from diverse backgrounds. However controversial, television, in inculcating some ideas, standardizing certain contents, opens space for discordance, criticism, and other uses (CERTEAU, 1994) of

⁶ Reference to the concept of Umberto Eco (1994). For the author, the literary text is a lazy machine that needs to be updated by the reader. We assume that television also has this demand.

what it intends to shape. Therefore, while some prefer to denounce the harmful nature of television, we argue that it is imperative to think of TV as a trigger for debates in the classroom, identifying it as an educational resource that, regardless of our will or intervention, will participate in the training of our students.

What we cannot disregard in choosing television programming as a trigger for formal *periods* (teaching-learning) situations is the fact that we do not always think of TV as something to react to. In other words, our domestic relationship with television is more of a distraction than a debate. It is up to us to ask: to what extent are we called to reflect on a television program? What are the problematic spaces of this programming where, pedagogically, we could rethink the ways in which we see the world? The speed of daily chores does not always allow us to mobilize everything we consume on TV and perhaps this is a gap to be filled by the school - and teacher training courses.

What we have said so far, although important, is not great news. The relevance of television as a proposer of an agenda of themes debated in society has already been the subject of studies by Marcondes Filho (1994) and Bourdieu (1987), for example. The relevance of considering TV consumption in teacher training has also been the focus of research by Nilda Alves (2000). What we want to add to the debate is the emergence of other TV consumption practices - consumption that is also of production, remix, bricolage of images and transmigration practices. In parallel, in showing such changes, which are significant in recent times, we will try to construct the argument that there is something left of the old way of producing content for television in our didactic conduction in EAD. We speak basically of a discursive construction that bets on a linearity in the interaction between sender and receiver, ignoring the communicative polysemy of online social networks and other cybercultural authorships.

Web TV

As we have said, we have witnessed, in recent years, new ways of consuming television productions. The possibility of enlarging the screens removed the protagonist of the transmission of images from the TV, giving

access to other means - computers, tablets, smartphones, etc. Mobile devices allow the ritual of watching television to diversify, no longer needed to be at home, in front of the TV, at the time of your favorite show.

Thinking about it, the television stations themselves, recognizing the emergence of a new public, more networked and willing to do, themselves, their programming, have created on demand services to offer their products. It has thus become customary to immerse in marathons from TV series, in which viewers watch, in one go, all available episodes of one or more seasons. Inspired by the Netflix⁷ model, where a menu of audiovisual products is offered to the consumer, large-scale broadcasters such as Rede Globo and Rede Record now offer their programming on the web, not only by re-viewing what was on TV, but also by creating products for the Internet - or even anticipating chapters and series that will only enter into conventional programming in the future. Globo Play - an application with audiovisual content from Rede Globo - currently offers all the episodes of the first season of *Brasil a Bordo* and *Carcereiro*, series that will only debut on TV in 2018.

The multiplication of the screens via the Internet, besides diversifying the access to the contents, also allowed a new experience of sharing and creating bonds from the television programming. Tools such as hashtags (#), for example, make it possible to find Twitter connected users who are watching (and replaying) the same TV show and, united by this strategy of searching and cataloging subjects, these people - who do not know each other, necessarily - will be able to interact, exchange opinions about what they are seeing and, mainly, will be able to generate new products from the original program. The *inferential* rides that we mention from Umberto Eco (1994) can now be made in the company of other users, and *the lazy machine* - to resume the same author - is updated more frequently and with variations of uses (CERTEAU, 1994).

⁷ Reference in on demand offer.

The production of *memes*⁸, which is a way of updating the lazy machine of TV and/or the internet, has eternalized some soap opera scenes, not only amplifying the audience of the plot, but also producing new messages, new products and other senses that escape of any and all attempts to control the broadcasters or their playwrights. Synchronous interactions - which take place in real time - can generate asynchronous interactions in two days or two years. The traces of the effects caused by the television stay in the network and, from time to time, return with full force. Soap operas like *Senhora do Destino* and *Avenida Brasil*, which have been broadcast for years on television, are recurring subjects nowadays, turned into successful memes.



Figure 1: *Meme* inspired by the character Nazaré, by *Senhora do Destino*, a soap opera shown by Rede Globo between 2004 and 2005. The *meme* has been used in various current situations to illustrate misunderstanding about something. (Internet image)

The transformation of a soap opera character into a *meme* reveals the willingness of *practicing thinkers*⁹ (OLIVEIRA, 2012) to update

⁸ *Memes* are speeches (images, videos, music and other forms of expression) that *viralize* on the internet and awaken the desire to update. Unlike *viral*, which relies primarily on sharing, the *meme* demands to be modified to be inserted into each new act of sharing. A *meme* is, therefore, a discourse that adapts to the most varied contexts, demanding from those who share it a work of updating and resignification. Originally, in Greek, *meme* means *imitation*. If we agree with BHABHA (1998), what imitation is always the creation of the new, we can say that to produce a *meme* is to imitate one discourse to make it another.

⁹ The option for the word aims to demonstrate that when we speak of practitioners, we do not see in action a merely mechanical gesture, but the result of a know-how that produces knowledge and which has been produced in the midst of so many other wisdom and ignorance. The practicing thinker is the attempt to reconnect manual labor and thought, two elements usually dissociated in Modernity.

meanings and produce bricolages from what is consumed and considered, by many, as material of lesser value. It is not only a process of textual appropriation, but also of co-creation and exploration of dramaturgical abilities. *Memes* tell a story and are, by definition, open to communicative continuities. It is proper for memes to have an origin, but never an end. The *meme* ends when it is forgotten, but there are countless examples of memes that return later and seem never to have gone out of style. Although very popular on the internet, the *meme* is seen as part of an underground culture, just as television has long been perceived.

Martín-Barbero (2000), however, considers that our insertion in Modernity - with emphasis on Latin America - has been much more via audiovisual production/consumption than through traditional modes of reading, such as books, for example. In this observation, there is not necessarily a criticism of this type of practice, but the perception that we constitute ourselves especially from the images. According to Martín-Barbero (2000, pp. 83-84),

no matter how scandalous it sounds to us, it is a fact that the majorities in Latin America are incorporating modernity not under the domain of the book, but from the discourses and narratives, the knowledge and the languages of industry and the audiovisual experience. [...] the complicity and interpenetration between cultural orality and audiovisual languages do not refer – as many of our intellectuals and our anachronistic educational systems want – to ignorance, or to the exoticism of illiteracy, but to the cultural decentralization that, in our societies, are producing the new regimes of feeling and knowing, which pass through the image catalyzed by television and computer.

Through images and, above all, moving images, either from TV, movies or videos hosted on Youtube, we are experimenting with other forms of literacy. We are constructing arguments, developing scripts, elaborating textualities that intend to account for life, between selfies, posts, likes and shares. But we do all this without breaking up definitively with what we did in the past - and stressing this is imperative when

we think of possible analogies between audiovisual production, distribution and consumption, and teacher training.

Education and the culture of convergence

The incorporation of a vast number of electronic and digital technologies into our lives does not imply, as we have already said, the automatic substitution of previous knowledge, nor does it mean a rupture with a certain mode of existence. The new devices - which change every day, following the booklet of programmed obsolescence - enter schools and universities and there it interacts with technologies traditionally thought and/or used as educational. That is why we are not talking here of substitution, but of technological increments that alter our routine, creating other ways of inhabiting the world. The school, contrary to what some might think, is part of this world and not immune to change; it is contaminated by technological practices, and what goes on inside it speaks to the flow of experiences lived *inside and outside* the educational institutions.

To the process of transmissive circulation of content, from one screen to another, breaking the boundaries of time space by ubiquity and uses (CERTEAU, 1994) by *practicing thinkers* (OLIVEIRA, 2012), Henry Jenkins (*apud* PRIMO, 2013) calls it *convergence culture*. The content transits in varied media and is customized according to the user – the soap opera is seen in parts in the cell phone or once in the tablet; the auditorium program is reduced to a single frame that catches the viewer's attention; the story of the newscast is replicated on Facebook from an unauthorized upload and will be accessed by *Smart TV* via *wi-fi*. All this process will occur through the performance of the viewer, because they choose the equipment and resignify its functions. The technical feasibility, of course, is provided in the instruction manual of each machine, but the connections and the uses will be the competence of the *practicing thinkers*.

Such autonomy and lack of ceremony given to the digital network does not always correspond to the behaviors adopted in the classroom, in front of the resources and educational materials presented by the teachers. Educational technologies are often treated as obsolete and unleash in the public a certain apathy that makes the classroom stay somewhat formal

and dull. Nevertheless, although boredom may seem like the proper landscape of school buildings, it should be borne in mind that one of the pillars of distance education practiced in the country is the insistence on transposing didactic gestures that no longer make sense in presential teaching.

Using a classical classroom framework in EAD is a mistake. To see an AVA¹⁰ as a PDF repository, to translate the old chalkboard into slides in motion, to believe in the forum as an increment for spontaneous conversations when in fact it makes it a space of reactive interactions where the student responds to the online teacher because it participates in the evaluative process is a pedagogical inconsequence. The logic of the EAD hardly escapes the scholastic model and, when it tries to be more attentive, it ends up talking with the audiovisual production more inflexible, based on the communication supposedly controlled and reduced to two poles of emission, linear and predictable. We have, therefore, plausible elements to point out similarities between distance education and part of the didactic irrelevances of the presential modality. And this is not always the order of circumstantial, of coincidence, but rests in a transmissional and content culture, which horizon of efficiency would be to produce an autonomous student, controller of their study time, since they have practically everything they need to perform their training: organized content, open channels of communication, a friendly online environment and all the hypertext structure of the internet at their disposal. But, between the supply of the new and the cultivated and non-deconstructed habit of those who propagate the novelty, there is an abyss in which we all fall, without a safety net or rescue teams ready to assist us.

What we want to point out is that the EAD is an adventure that has not yet been mapped out and that, once it is explored, it will be up to its actors to draw their own paths to reach goals and contemplate other landscapes. Adopting EAD with presential education clothing or thinking that just inserting the machine to lead it to the new habits of the digital world is a risk we cannot afford. And, as a didactic precaution, it is always a good idea to not forget that distance education is not limited to computers – this is just your online version.

¹⁰ Virtual Learning Environment

EAD in Brazil, for example, has for a long time had its productive focus in *tele-education*. In the 1970s, betting on the evolutionary path of the educational offer, several initiatives chose television as adequate machinery to bring school education to those who could not go to school. The highlight of this offer was the Fundação Roberto Marinho, which, in partnership with the Fundação Padre Anchieta, created the *Telecurso 2º Grau* in 1978. The enterprise, which linked TV and printed material, can be cited as an incipient gesture of convergence. If, through television, the student revealed the possibilities of the audiovisual as a language to learning-teaching, they had in printed material - more familiar in the field of educational technology - the “security” of a training that innovated without giving up the culturally established. The summaries of the concepts, present on the TV screen, were also in the books and, negotiating the new and the old, *Telecurso* was winning supporters and digging its place in the history of Brazilian education.

In fact, the banner of televised education was demanded, according to Garrocini (2010), by the National Congress of the civil-military dictatorship. The National Congress Diary in 1977 stated that “the school system (primary, secondary, vocational and higher education) will be difficult to meet all the educational needs of the people” (BRAZIL, 1977, p.7383). The solution to increase the educational offer would be to invest in the use of technology as a way of accessing training outside the traditional school benches. Bringing a certain type of educational message to places where the school did not arrive was of paramount importance to the political regime that ruled the country. Previously recorded educational practices that could be modified by the censorship of the time, propagating ideas that did not threaten the interests of national politics. *Telecurso 2º grau* was the ideal model that needed to be exalted.

Produced by the country’s largest broadcasting station, broadcast three times a day and repeated on weekends, *Telecurso* counted on the station actors to attract the attention of the public. Editora Globo produced the fascicles - which were the equivalent of books - and sold them on newsstands. *Telecurso* was not the same as school, but it did

not have to be so different. Another initiative that resulted from this approach between television education and classroom teaching was the creation of Organized Reception Centers (CROs), which functioned as meeting places for Telecurso students who had doubts or wanted to interact with others (GARROCINI, 2011). Given the differences, the CROs would be equivalent to the current EAD poles which, by legal imposition, act as a locus for the performing tests and, in some cases, also fulfill pedagogical guidance functions.

Garrocini (2011), when associating *Telecurso 2º Grau* with the ideological aspirations of the civil-military regime, believes that

It became clear that the military regime used a distance education course through a mass vehicle, television, in order to direct and form public opinion, and also for the purpose of building a democracy that is protected, acceptable, training them to a democracy imposed by the authoritarian regime, aiming at reaching the greatest number of people, especially in the lowest strata of the population. Thus, it was possible to centralize, organize and integrate civil society in the mold of the military project, characterizing its actions and proposals in a strategy of hegemony after years of predominance of the violence and coercion tools. (GARROCINI, 2011, p. 116).

However, we know that power exists in dispute and must always be seen as a relation of forces that now hangs from one side to another (FOUCAULT, 2010). Thus, despite the intrinsic link between the educational offer of *Telecurso 2º Grau* and the objectives of the *civil-military* dictatorship, it is important to observe the possibilities open to access a literate culture that, even crossed by political-ideological interests, could be the gateway to future educational investments.

From TV to audiovisualities

This brief historical incursion, rather than narrate facts and curiosities, served to show us the diversity of appropriations we can make of

the educational offer, whether it is inscribed in the conventional model of classrooms constituted by bodies that go to school or thought out in the distance modality. The importance of knowing these stories, of thinking the paths of each trajectory, is in making us understand that all educational offerings dialogue with intentions not necessarily pedagogical; and it is from this point of view that we speak in everyday educational networks, highlighting television as a powerful interlocutor of our formation, not only today, at the peak of the convergence culture, but for a long time and in a very thoughtful way by those who decide on television programming - not only journalistic editorials, but also the whole entertainment grid.

It is not our goal to give commercial television the role of a villain in the *hall* of everything that educates us. On the contrary, we call attention to very peculiar forms of content production that, through distraction, emotionality, recurrence to significant memories, lead us to a sense of acceptance, making us receptive to the multiple messages produced and broadcast on TV. In this sense, what we indicate is that we have something to learn from the television audiovisual production, which longevity and audience inform the competence in public approaching and loyalty.

At this point, we will no longer be fooled about the possibility of uncritical television performance on minds and bodies. We have seen that, to the viewer, the gesture of the update, of the *inferential* tours, of the decisions in front of all the content conveyed will be available. We are *practicing thinkers* and, as such, use television programming (CERTEAU, 1994), and from it we produce meanings and subjectivities. Every appropriation talks with our previous baggage and with our trajectories.

Of course, our capacity for appropriation depends, to a large extent, on our wisdom and ignorance in the multiple languages practiced today. The manipulation of contents, the hybridization of forms and concepts, the editing of sounds and images, i.e., the practice of audiovisuals has to do with our location among natives or among digital immigrants (PRENSKY, 2001). There is a generational difference that cannot be ignored.

From active and creative contact with the convergence culture, people – especially young people – develop technological skills and curiosities, build a varied technical repertoire that will add to much other *know-how* already produced. Such knowledge and notions enter the schools - and we cannot ignore their formative potential.

We need, in our teaching practice, to consider the students' audiovisual consumption habits, integrating into the syllabus of the *know-how* we teach from the consumer-creator. Whether it is in the field of debate, repercussion of a scene transmitted by TV, or appropriation of the techniques learned in the course of the uses we make with the audiovisual, we need to weave possibilities, stimulating the *doing with the equipment and deconstructing the speeches conveyed*, in order to conceive the television production and its derivations as raw material of daily learning and as technologies of access to a language of high social value - language that we must master, gain fluency, inserting our accent, our marks in it.

As we go through the webs of these transmissive conversations, we need to produce speeches, images, possible readings with the means at our disposal. Through our cameras, we recorded testimonials, photographed graffiti on the bathroom walls, added some soundtrack and made a kind of home movie that tells a story or proposes a certain dialogue with images produced by others - including professionals - and published in cyberspace, this audiovisual hybrid without borders and which reaching is impossible to predict. We call this production with images-sounds-movements-ideas-*prints-etc. audiovisualities*.

According to Killp (2012), audiovisualities are the way the productions generated at the threshold of the audiovisual are called, blurring the frontiers constructed by researchers and filmmakers between imagery codes, genres and production-consumption. We operate with this concept in the formation of teachers, stimulating the production of educational resources and materials that consider the new ways of sharing and registering images and ideas as spaces of authorship, of inventing the classroom itself, of expressing a particular way of living and teaching.

What we are betting on, ultimately, is the emergence of a professional who is not only a teacher, but a teacher-designer-of-experiences,

something that, in Distance Education, is mistakenly coined as *instructional designer*. The term instruction does not seem to be the most appropriate, since it indicates the practice of training, when it should stimulate technological curiosity, openness to experimentation, a mixture of languages for the acquisition of a plural speech, uncompromised with definitive affiliations, the teacher-designer-of-experiences is a mediator between the student and the world to be known/explored, not an instructor of know-how stopped in time.

If television, to a large extent, shapes us, why do we not make television? Do to *produce authorships* from it, mix its sounds and images, bricolage their content with so many other information new or old, ours or others. To make its content resonate, mixing it with the concepts of each subject, criticizing what re-affirms inequalities and prejudices, reading in another way its dialogues and its images.

We know that, in the culture of convergence, television is an important aspect of audiovisual consumption, but it is not the only one. Earlier, children are introduced to digital technologies and learn from *parents* to mix content. The fluency in the technological language does not demand, at present, specific courses of initiation. It is dispersed in the practices, in the connected city, on the bicycles rented by the mobile application, in the ATMs, in the biometrics of time marking at work, in the cinema self-service, etc. Faced with so many interconnected systems that seem to throw us into a futuristic film setting, the apathy perceived in some students in our classrooms is not surprising. Are these rooms, *online* or presential, adapted to the touch screen world that surrounds us and produces us?

The changes we experience daily do not always leave us time for adequacy processes. When we see it, we already had a projector control in our hands and, instead of the chalkboard, now there is a descending screen, commanded by a button on the wall. The content of the class jumps from the book page to presentation software that is made up by slides. The *slides* are projected on the screen in front of the chalkboard - which, for some time now, is a whiteboard - and the teacher passes these slides with an electronic pointer, connected to the computer by a USB port.

In describing briefly a common practice among teachers today - the mobilization of technological resources for an expository lesson - we wish to underline the importance of thinking about educational technologies as processes of appropriation and everyday invention of didactic workarounds. We emphasize the urgency of looking at the consumption of technocultural artifacts - among them, television multiplied by screens -, taking from this consumption possibilities of interaction with students, recognizing the formative character of their video cybercultural practices. However, we ask: does the teacher need to teach students to watch TV or should we learn from them ways of seeing and producing multiple screens, negotiating meanings and practicing authorship?

Audiovisuals, both at the level of consumption and at the level of production, present to the teacher the possibilities of DIY and/or of handling without reservation, indicating that know-how is produced in conversations between bodies and machines. Bodies that are like antennae picking up signals; machines that are human productions open to customization. Unlike the staging model of *Telecurso 2º Grau*, in which fiction served the education, the invention proposed by the concept of audiovisualities passes through the collective authorship and the imaginary bricolage. The image here is thought as a way of access to a world that will be meaningful for each of us - and not as a process of internalization of previously formulated instructions.

Because of its hybrid nature, audiovisualities tell us about the possibilities of *manufacturing* with, of mixing knowledge and producing *another* from *a few people*. Because of their openness to sharing, audiovisualities inspire exchange and produce links in distinct social networks. By blurring the boundaries between established codes, authorizing lines of improvisation, audiovisualities indicate that hierarchies can be dispensed with, giving way to freer dialogues.

Here is the challenge presented to teachers and students: to find, in contemporary practices of production and consumption of images, a way to systematize the learning processes. It is not a question of pedagogizing equipment and formats, but of appropriating them, giving them new uses beyond those already practiced. It is more dialogue than conversion; it is meeting, not disputing.

References

ALVES, Nilda. A formação da professora e o uso de multimeios como direito. In: FILÉ, Valter. *Batuques, fragmentos e fluxos: zapeando pela linguagem audiovisual no cotidiano escolar*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2000, pp. 25-40.

_____. *Nilda Alves: praticante pensante de cotidianos*. Organização e introdução: GARCIA, Alexandra; OLIVEIRA, Inês Barbosa de. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2015.

BHABHA, Homik. *O local da Cultura*. Belo Horizonte: Ed. UFMG, 1998.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. *Sobre a televisão – seguido de A influência do jornalismo e Os jogos Olímpicos*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 1987.

BRASIL. *Legislative Decree No. 110*. Diário do Congresso Nacional da República Federativa do Brasil. Poder Legislativo, Brasília DF, Dec 1, 1977. Seção II, p. 7883-7585.

CERTEAU, Michel de. *A invenção do cotidiano: 1: artes de fazer*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1994.

ECO, Umberto. *Seis passeios pelos bosques da ficção*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1994.

_____. *Obra Aberta*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2005.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Em defesa da Sociedade: curso no Collège de France (1975-1976)*. São Paulo: Editora WMF Martins Fontes, 2010.

GARROCINI, Elisandra. *Educação a Distância na Ditadura Militar no Brasil: O caso do Telecurso 2º Grau*. Curitiba: Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, 2010.

KILPP, Suzana. Dispersão-convergência: apontamentos para a pesquisa de audiovisuais. In: MONTAÑO, Sonia; FISCHER, Gustavo; KILPP, Suzana. *Impacto das novas mídias no estatuto da imagem*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2012. P. 223 – 238.

OLIVEIRA, Inês Barbosa de. Currículos e pesquisas com os cotidianos: o caráter emancipatório dos currículos ‘pensadospraticados’ pelos

‘praticantes pensantes’ dos cotidianos das escolas. In: Carlos Eduardo Ferraço e Janete Magalhães Carvalho (orgs.). *Currículos, pesquisas, conhecimentos e produção de subjetividades*. 1st ed. Petrópolis: DP etAlli, 2012, p. 47-70.

MARCONDES FILHO, Ciro. *Televisão*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Scipione, 1994.

PRENSKY, Marc. Nativos digitais, imigrantes digitais. In: *On the Horizon*. NCB University Press, Vol. 9 No. October 5, 2001.

PRIMO, Alex (Org.). *Interações em Rede*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2013.

How to quote this article

NOLASCO-SILVA, Leonardo; LO BIANCO, Vittorio; FARIA, Lia. Distance Education, Convergence Culture and Audiovisuals: Notes for Teacher Training. *Revista Brasileira de Aprendizagem Aberta e a Distância*, [S.l.], v. 17, n. 1, 2018. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17143/rbaad.v17i1.49>

Corresponding Author

Vittorio Lo Bianco
E-mail: vlobianco@cecierj.edu.br

Received: 23/07/2017

Accepted: 12/01/2018

Published: 31/07/2018