

**THE HERMENEUTIC PHENOMENOLOGY AS METHOD AND  
EDUCOMMUNICATION AS SUBJECT: A SEARCH FOR THE PHENOMENON**

***A HERMENÊUTICA FENOMENOLÓGICA COMO MÉTODO E A  
EDUCOMUNICAÇÃO COMO SUJEITO: UMA BUSCA PELA ESSÊNCIA DO  
FENÔMENO***

***LA HERMENÉUTICA FENOMENOLÓGICA COMO MÉTODO Y  
EDUCOMUNICACIÓN COMO SUJETO: UNA BÚSQUEDA DE LA ESENCIA DEL  
FENÓMENO***



Tiago Silvio DEDONÉ<sup>1</sup>  
e-mail: tiago.dedone@pucpr.edu.br



Patricia Helena de Ribeiro MUNHOZ COSTA<sup>2</sup>  
e-mail: patriciamunhoz0207@gmail.com



Peri MESQUIDA<sup>3</sup>  
e-mail: mesquida.peri@gmail.com

**How to reference this paper:**

DEDONÉ, T. S.; MUNHOZ COSTA, P. H. R.; MESQUIDA, P.  
The hermeneutic phenomenology as method and  
educommunication as subject: A search for the phenomenon.  
**Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara,  
v. 18, n. 00, e023034, 2023. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI:  
<https://doi.org/10.21723/riace.v18i00.18009>



| Submitted: 16/12/2022  
| Revisions required: 05/02/2023  
| Approved: 20/04/2023  
| Published: 17/05/2023

**Editor:** Prof. Dr. José Luís Bizelli  
**Deputy Executive Editor:** Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

<sup>1</sup> Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná (PUC-PR), Curitiba – PR – Brazil. PhD student in the Graduate Program in Education.

<sup>2</sup> Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná (PUC-PR), Curitiba – PR – Brazil. PhD student in the Graduate Program in Education.

<sup>3</sup> Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná (PUC-PR), Curitiba – PR – Brazil. Full Professor and Advisor Professor in the Graduate Program in Education. PhD in Educational Sciences (UNIGENÈVE) – Switzerland.

**ABSTRACT:** The article aims to demonstrate a dialogue between phenomenology and hermeneutics as theoretical research methods that seek to unveil the essence of the phenomenon in the field of Educommunication, as they place the phenomenon as subject-object of research within its context and enable the interpretation with criticality. The question is: how to relate these two complex methods to the field of Educommunication? The theoretical contribution is centered on Husserl (2000; 2006); Foucault (2006); Ricoeur (1989); Heidegger (1967; 1999); Freire (1980; 2011), Freinet (1974) and Soares (2000). The philosophical method is Critical Hermeneutics, with the qualitative approach. The results showed that the methods involve the subjects and their consciousness of the world/phenomenon. In the approach of the field of Educommunication with the Dialogic Phenomenological Hermeneutics, identification occurs of an apparent phenomenon that involves an interpretation of discourses and meanings in the relationship between the fields of communication and education.

**KEYWORDS:** Research method. Phenomenology. Critical Hermeneutics. Educommunication.

**RESUMO:** O artigo objetiva demonstrar um diálogo entre a fenomenologia e a hermenêutica como métodos teóricos de pesquisa que buscam desvelar a essência do fenômeno no campo da Educomunicação, pois colocam o fenômeno como sujeito-objeto de pesquisa dentro do seu contexto e possibilitam a interpretação com criticidade. A pergunta norteadora desta pesquisa é: como relacionar esses dois métodos complexos com o campo da Educomunicação? O aporte teórico está centrado em Husserl (2000; 2006); Foucault (2006); Ricoeur (1989); Heidegger (1967; 1999); Freire (1980; 2011), Freinet (1974) e Soares (2000). O método filosófico é a Hermenêutica Crítica, com a abordagem qualitativa. Os resultados apontaram que os métodos envolvem os sujeitos e suas consciências do mundo/fenômeno. Na aproximação do campo da Educomunicação com a Hermenêutica Fenomenológica Dialógica ocorre a identificação de um fenômeno aparente que passa por uma interpretação dos discursos e dos sentidos na relação entre os campos de comunicação e de educação.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Método de pesquisa. Fenomenologia. Hermenêutica Crítica. Educomunicação.

**RESUMEN:** El artículo tiene como objetivo presentar un diálogo entre la fenomenología y la hermenéutica como métodos teóricos-filosóficos de investigación que buscan develar la esencia del fenómeno en el campo de la Educomunicación, porque sitúan el fenómeno como sujeto-objeto de investigación dentro de su contexto y permiten su interpretación con criticidad. La pregunta orientadora de esta investigación es: ¿Cómo relacionar estos dos métodos complejos con el campo de la Educomunicación? El marco teórico está centrado en: Husserl (2000;2006); Foucault (2006); Ricoeur (1989); Heidegger (1967; 1999); Freire (1980; 2011); Freinet (1984) y Soares (2000). El método filosófico es la Hermenéutica crítica, con un enfoque cualitativo. Los resultados mostraron que los métodos involucran a los sujetos y su conciencia del mundo/fenómeno. Al acercar el campo de la Educomunicación a la Hermenéutica Fenomenológica Dialógica, se produce la identificación de un fenómeno aparente que pasa por una interpretación de los discursos y significados en la relación entre los campos de la comunicación y la educación.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Método de investigación. Fenomenología. Hermenéutica Crítica. Educomunicación.

## Introduction

The research that originated the article arises from a need of researchers to systematize knowledge acquired during the first semester of a Doctorate in Education course of a confessional university, in relation to the research method called Phenomenological Hermeneutics. Following our study process, the article begins by putting in dialogue Phenomenology and Hermeneutics as research methods to reflect on the possible movements in the path taken by the researcher with the phenomenon object of his investigation. By using both methods, the researcher intends to understand the meaning of silences, that is, of what is veiled, the "unsaid".

Due to the training and line of research of the researchers, throughout this study on the method we found a possible approximation with the field of Educommunication. This is a relatively new field in the History of Education, dating from the late 1990s, but which has stood out more and more in the face of rapid and significant changes in the current educational landscape. Several contemporary authors investigate and produce research on educative practices, both in formal and informal education environments. Some names of scholars best known in this area of research stand out, namely: José Marques de Melo, Jesús Martín-Barbero, Mario Kaplún and Ismar de Oliveira Soares. The latter is the central author used in this article, since the term Educommunication was consolidated in 1999 "to designate a new field of social intervention" (SOARES, 2011a, p. 13, our translation) by the professor/researcher Soares and his research group from the University of São Paulo (USP).

Thus, we understand that it is a field that presents itself as an area of knowledge, and can be seen, by the researcher, as a phenomenon continuously observed, analyzed, reflected and understood as praxis of social and educational intervention.

Thus, the objective of the article is to understand the research method that we call Phenomenological Hermeneutics, in Heidegger's view, having as a phenomenon Educommunication, from the thought of Paulo Freire. Therefore, the guiding question of the research is: How to perform a phenomenological hermeneutic of the phenomenon in the search for the essence and its meanings in the field of Educommunication?

Thus, the theoretical and methodological contribution of qualitative approach focuses on the four philosophers central to the method approach. The first is the German philosopher Edmund Gustav Albrecht Husserl, who is considered the founder of the school of phenomenology, influencing the intellectual scene of the twentieth and twenty-first century. The second philosopher is Paul Ricoeur, who contributed to the elaboration of phenomenology

and hermeneutics from Aristotelian philosophy, particularly in the work *The Conflict of Interpretations* (1989). Michel Foucault, also a French philosopher, focuses on the method in his work *The Hermeneutics of the Subject*, in which his lectures taught at the *Collège de France* in 1970 are transcribed. Foucault classifies his own thought as the critical history of modernity. And the fourth philosopher is Martin Heidegger, German, who took the question of BEING as the most fundamental, took on the task of questioning about its meaning, and questioned about themes such as existence, historicity, temporality, reality and truth. Heidegger made the approximation between phenomenology and hermeneutics, creating what we might call Heideggerian ontology.

Since phenomenology is a method that seeks the *Eidetics* of the phenomenon, that is, the essence, and hermeneutics a method of interpretation that contextualizes and seeks the meaning of symbols, especially language, we demonstrate throughout this article a possible dialogue in order to place the object of research within its context from an analytical-critical look in the search for meanings and in the apprehension and understanding of reality.

That is, in addition to delving into readings of these four expressive philosophers, we also use writings of central educators for the connection between the method and Educommunication. The first educator, Paulo Freire, Brazilian and worldwide recognized for his practices and teachings, was also the one who based the beginning of educational practices from a group of teachers reading Freire and discussing how they could practice their pedagogical theory in the classroom. In this article, the main work of Paulo Freire used for support is *Education as a practice of freedom* (1980). The second educator on whom we rely is Célestin Freinet, a Frenchman of the last century, who dialogued a lot with Freirean thought. And the third educator is Professor Ismar de Oliveira Soares, already mentioned above, being one of the main contemporary names at the forefront of research in the field of Educommunication in Brazil.

From this interweaving between the phenomenological hermeneutics and the Educommunication, we will modify the nomenclature of the method to as close as possible to what we seek between this connection, leaving it as Dialogical Phenomenological Hermeneutics: boldly, to say that we intend a Freirean research method, in essence.

In a didactic and logical way, we have divided the article into four sections. In the first section, we approach the phenomenological method from Husserl's perspective, within the limits of the research, without a deepening in the fields of philosophy and epistemology, only to meet the objective of the article. Similarly, in the second section, we approach the

hermeneutic method from Ricoeur's perspective and also the concept of truth in the light of Foucault. Soon, in the first sections we reveal our first steps towards the study of the method and, therefore, writing as didactically as possible for the general understanding of what these methods are and how they would present themselves in scientific research in the field of the History of Education.

In the third section, we actually put both methods in dialogue evidencing the possible connections from, in particular, Martin Heidegger, philosopher who made the relationship between Hermeneutics and Phenomenology. Finally, in the fourth section, we elaborate a dialogue between the method of Hermeneutic Phenomenology of dialogical character – in the Freirean concept – and the field of Educommunication as a phenomenon – subject-object – of research.

Thus, throughout this course of study and research, we unveil the essence of dialogical phenomenological hermeneutics from Educommunication as a phenomenon, which carries in its baggage a Freirean and Freinetean look of the world, of subject and citizen of / with the world.

## Phenomenology

What is Phenomenology? Who was the philosopher behind this method? How does scientific research work with this method in practice? Questions that will be addressed throughout this first section of the article to understand Phenomenology in its nature and essence.

At first, we can say that phenomenology aims to move from a naive view of the phenomenon to an analytical-critical view of reality<sup>4</sup>. For an illustrative understanding of the workings of this method, we turn to the well-known Myth of the Cave (or Allegory of the Cave) written by Plato in the *Republic* (1993).

The myth deals with the concepts of darkness/ignorance and light/knowledge, also about the duality between appearance and reality. Briefly, in the myth, Plato describes a group of men imprisoned in a cave, the only view they have of the outside world being represented by images projected on the cave wall by the light of a campfire. In these images, they see shadows of people carrying things (it's a diffusion-image, very far from reality). Thus, these men construct

---

<sup>4</sup> There is an approximation there with the concepts of naive consciousness and critical consciousness of Paulo Freire, which will be explored further throughout the article.

a conception of the world founded on these shadows, believing this to be the real world. Until one of the men manages to free himself and decides to leave the cave and, upon seeing the world, finally realizes the illusion in which he lived in the cave, and the external reality, now in the light of truth.

From this metaphor, we illustrate Phenomenology as a method that seeks the light behind the shadows, that is, wants to unveil the true essence that is hidden by appearance.

The essence of the phenomenon would be its truth. To apprehend the concept of the word truth<sup>5</sup> used by these authors, both in the Phenomenological and Hermeneutic methods, we seek support in Plato, essentially in the passages of Socrates:

Socrates: We declare that there are numerous beautiful things, numerous good things, many things of other species whose existence we affirm and distinguish in language.

Adiamanto – Indeed, we declare.

Socrates – We also declare that there is the beautiful in itself, the good in itself and, equally, in relation to all the things that we now indicate as being multiple, we declare that each of them also corresponds to its idea, which we call the essence of the thing, its "aletheia" (PLATO, 1993, p. 288, emphasis added, our translation).

Relating the above excerpt with the understanding of what the phenomenological method is, we can say that the researcher, when using this method, observes its phenomenon from its various contexts, and then analyzes and interprets each of the aspects involved until getting as close as possible to the truth of the phenomenon.

In this phenomenological exercise, the researcher needs to understand that he probably never really gets to the essence, even if his pursuit is the goal. It is only possible to go to the maximum point of awareness of the phenomenon for that moment.

Before we delve into the concept of the method that we have begun to outline here, we must contextualize it from the one who is considered its creator. That is, it is necessary to know the one who thought and systematized it. The German philosopher and mathematician Edmund Gustav Albrecht Husserl is considered the founder of the school of phenomenology. His thought profoundly influenced the intellectual landscape of the twentieth and twenty-first century.

Husserl (1859-1938) was born into a Jewish family in the German-dominated Czech Republic. In 1884 he graduated in Philosophy in Vienna. In 1887, he converted to Christianity, joined the Lutheran Church and became professor of philosophy at the University of Halle.

---

<sup>5</sup> In dialogue with the methods, the concept of truth will also be approached from the perspective of Foucault (2006).



After 29 years, the philosopher moved to Freiburg and continued teaching until his retirement in 1928.

His main works are: *Logical Investigations* (1901), *Philosophy as a Rigorous Science* (1911), *Ideas for a Pure Philosophy and a Phenomenological Philosophy* (1913) and *Cartesian Meditations* (1931). His work with phenomenology influenced the thinking of many philosophers, such as Martin Heidegger, Jean-Paul Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Michel Henry, and Jacques Derrida.

And certainly, his greatest contribution as a philosopher was to conceive phenomenology as a scientific theory and method. In Husserl's own words (2000, p. 46, emphasis added, our translation), the method

'Phenomenology' – designates a science, a connection of scientific disciplines; but at the same time and above all, 'phenomenology' designates an intellectual method and attitude: the specifically philosophical intellectual attitude, the specifically *philosophical* method.

Therefore, a method that seeks to know the essence of phenomena, which the German philosopher will call *Eidetic*.

Every formal essence has, on the other hand, its formal or "mathematical" extension. Every essence possesses, moreover, in general, its extension of individual singularizations, a complete ideal set of all possible "this here" to which it can be referred in eidetic-universal thought. The empirical expression says rather: restriction to a sphere of existence by virtue of the inclusion of a position of existence that suppresses generality (HUSSERL, 2006, p. 14, emphasis added, our translation).

Therefore, this method works with two aspects: the subject and the subjective. Therefore, it is not the phenomenon itself, but the awareness that the subject has of the phenomenon. It needs a work of reflection and meditation that questions and doubts at all times the very idea that one has of the phenomenon. At this point, awareness is key to understanding what the experience and empathetic observation of subjects in Husserl is.

[...] we have original experience of physical things in "external perception," but no longer in recall or anticipatory expectation; We have original experience of ourselves and our states of consciousness in the so-called inner perception or of self, but not of others and their lived in "empathy". "We observe what is experienced by others" based on the perception of their bodily exteriorizations. This observation of empathy is, of course, an intuitive, giving, but no longer originally giving. The other and His soul life are brought

to consciousness as being "themselves there", and together with the body, but, unlike this, not as originally given (HUSSERL, 2006, p. 2, emphasis added, our translation).

Being a philosophical method and working directly with the subject, or rather with the consciousness of the subject, the movement of phenomenology is made in the direction of the construction of a worldview. Thus, in phenomenology, the worldview becomes, for Husserl, the world of life. In this way, the theoretical framework can be transformed into an attitude, thus the very practice of this reference.

Although the practical functioning of the method seems complex, it is possible to explain it in a didactic and objective way, because phenomenology works with qualitative elements and can go through three phases, from the eidetic suspension: the dialogical observation, open interview and problematization.

In the first phase, dialogue observation, there is the attentive gaze of the subject (researcher) who observes the space, the subjects, the movements and the non-movements, at the same time that he dialogues (researcher is active in this phenomenological observation) and interacts with the phenomenon.

The second phase, open interview, consists of a formal data collection with open forms for different answers to the pertinent questions for the understanding of the phenomenon in its totality and contextualized in its historical-geographical-political time.

And the third phase, the problematization, is essentially the method because it consists of the critical reading of all the aspects that involve the phenomenon, even that which is not seen or heard at first.

## **Hermeneutics**

The hermeneutic method is just as, if not more, complex. Approaching hermeneutics in the conception of Paul Ricoeur (1989) and Michel Foucault (2006) is not a simple task, however, it is a necessary path for the formulation of a real understanding of what this method is and how it works in research in the field of Education, to then carry out a dialogue between the two methods in Heidegger's perspective.

Before delving into the method, it is of paramount importance to contextualize who was the philosopher behind it.

Paul Ricoeur (1913–2005) was a French philosopher whose philosophical activity took place, in particular, in the period after World War II. He contributed to the elaboration of



phenomenology and hermeneutics. Ricoeur was born into a Protestant family, lost his parents at an early age, and was raised by his aunt. In 1936, he had already finished the course of Philosophy and then created the magazine *Être* (Being). In 1939, he served as a reserve officer and was arrested by the Nazis and sent to concentration camps. After the war, he went through several universities, for example: University of the Sorbonne, Louvain (Belgium) and Yale (USA).

His main works are: *The Philosophy of the Will* (1950 and 1960), *The Conflict of Interpretations* (1969) and *The Living Metaphor* (1975).

The French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926-1984) made an invaluable contribution to the reflection on the relationship between power and knowledge, and how both move in different social environments, as instruments of social control. The philosopher classifies thought itself as the critical history of modernity.

In this article, we use the work *The Hermeneutics of the Subject*, in which are transcribed the lectures given at the *Collège de France*, in 1982. Early in the work, Foucault addresses the question of truth for the subject, saying that

[...] Truth is only given to the subject at a price that puts at stake the very being of the subject. For, as he is, he is not truly capable. I think this is the simplest but most fundamental formula for defining spirituality. This implies, as a consequence, that from this point of view there can be no truth without a conversion or without a transformation of the subject. This conversion, this transformation – and there would be the second great aspect of spirituality – can be done in different forms (FOUCAULT, 2006, p. 20, our translation).

Foucault's thought is influenced by Ricoeur. And Ricoeur's hermeneutics in *The Conflict of Interpretations* (1989) is grounded in Aristotle. In the light of this work, we highlight the first point about *hermenéia*: "it interprets reality, to the extent that enunciation is an expression of the real through significant expressions and significant discourse" (RICOEUR, 1989, p. 6). That is, reality is constructed by symbols created by the subjects, from the subjectivity of the human being.

In this subjectivity is the whole construction of the subject, its culture, its historical-social and economic context, which form the conception of the world of the subjects. Paulo Freire, throughout his career, talks about the construction of the subject of/with the world:

Existence, because it is human, cannot be mute, silent, nor can it be nourished by false words, but by true words, with which men transform the world. To exist, humanly, is to *pronounce* the world, to modify it. The *pronounced* world, in turn, becomes problematized to the *pronouncing* subjects,

demanding from them a new *pronouncement* (FREIRE, 2019, p. 108, emphasis added, our translation).

Therefore, in the Freirean perspective, the subject is not made in silence, but rather, in the word, in the work and in the praxis (action and reflection) (FREIRE, 2019). We highlight the concept of word in Freire, which is culture. That is, the word is never empty of meaning, because it is a symbol that we use to express ourselves and communicate in the world. It is in it and by it that we constitute ourselves subjects.

The interpretation of symbols is the characteristic point of the hermeneutic method as a way of apprehending reality. Since reality is truth itself, and the apprehension of this by hermeneutics is given by critical interpretation, which never really becomes reality – in other words, it never comes to be the Truth itself. In this way, "there is always the interpretative quality of the symbols that mark our rootedness, our belonging to the world, to a culture and to a tradition" (RICOEUR, 1989, p. 3, our translation).

The interpretive quality goes through the work of the "with you" that Foucault talks about in his classes at the *Collège de France*,

Work from oneself to oneself, elaboration of oneself to oneself, progressive transformation from oneself to oneself in which one is responsible for a long work that is that of asceticism (*âskesis*). Eros and *âskesis* are, I believe, the two great ways in which, in Western spirituality, we conceive of the ways in which the subject must be transformed in order to finally become a subject capable of truth. This is the second character of spirituality (FOUCAULT, 2006, p. 20, our translation).

From the point of view of hermeneutics, we can understand that everything that the human being does in the world is free from neutrality. Therefore, like phenomenology, hermeneutics is the opposite of positivism. We affirm, then, that production is the result of a conception of the world and the apprehension of productions happens from different conceptions of the world.

In the search for the interpretation of the symbols to reach the understanding of the possible reality, the subject puts himself in a position of deep reflection and criticism when looking at the phenomenon. Going further,

[...] If a text can have several meanings, for example, a historical sense and a spiritual sense, it is necessary to resort to a notion of signification much more complex than that of the so-called univocal signs that a logic of argumentation requires. Finally, the very work of interpretation reveals a profound design, that of overcoming a distance, a cultural distance, of making the reader equal to a text made strange, and thus of incorporating its meaning into the present

understanding that a man can have of himself (RICOEUR, 1989, p. 6, our translation).

Therefore, the necessary movement in this method is one of comprehension, interpretation, apprehension, and communication. The first moment – comprehension – consists of the context of the word; The second – interpretation – is the decontamination of the word from the interpretation of the context; the third – apprehension – is the fullest possible and, mainly, critical understanding of the word in its context. Finally, the last moment – communication – is the concretion of all the hermeneutical movements to say what was the intention behind the discourse said: essentially, it is the unveiling.

Strictly speaking, this division is only a didactic way of explaining the method, because the four constituent elements of the method are related, completed and realized throughout the elaboration of the text, according to what Hans-Georg Gadamer (1998) calls the hermeneutic circle. That is, the praxis of the method does not necessarily happen in that order.

### **A possible dialogue: the search for the essence of the phenomenon**

In understanding the objectives and paths of each method, we can already glimpse that this is a possible dialogue. In both phenomenology and hermeneutics, the goal is to go beyond what is placed, what appears at first sight and what is said literally.

With both methods, the researcher seeks something more when looking at the phenomenon, wants to go as deep as possible to arrive at something that is not seen, that is not heard and that is not understood at first.

We also perceive a common thread making it possible to relate both methods with Paulo Freire's concept of *naïve consciousness* and *critical consciousness*. Beisiegel (1989, p. 43-44, our translation) explains didactically that

[...] Compared to naïve consciousness, critical consciousness would be a radically different way of apprehending facts, which would result not only in awakened and vigilant human conduct, but also in an attitude of self-mastery and of the outside.

That is, how phenomenology and hermeneutics guide the researcher in this process of the passage from a naive view of the phenomenon to an analytical-critical view that contextualizes and interprets critically by the search for truth/essence.

We understand the word interpretation from Ricoeur (1989). The philosopher says that:

All interpretation aims to overcome a gap, a distance, between the past cultural epoch to which the text belongs and the interpreter himself. By overcoming this distance, by becoming a contemporary of the text, the exegete can appropriate the meaning: from the strange he wants to make it his own, that is, to make it his own; and, therefore, the aggrandizement of the very understanding of himself that he pursues through the understanding of the other. All hermeneutics is thus, explicitly or implicitly, understanding of oneself through the deviation of the understanding of the other (RICOEUR, 1989, p. 18, our translation).

Relating to Husserl's phenomenology, we highlight the moment of criticism, that is, of judgment to knowledge: "[...] rather, it wants to elucidate, clarify, illustrate the essence of knowledge and the claim to validity that belongs to its essence; What else does this mean but to bring it to give itself directly?" (HUSSERL, 2000, p. 57, our translation).

Another necessary aspect to be elucidated is the possible approximation of the phenomenological method with positivism. Throughout our studies, we have come to understand that yes, phenomenology can have a tenuous approximation, not always very clear, with positivism, even begrudgingly of Husserl.

This approach is at the moment in which the method places the need for the researcher to leave in parentheses the very conception of the world when having the first contact with the phenomenon. This would be the only point of disagreement we have with phenomenology, because we are researchers more aligned with the strand of hermeneutics, which places the subject as central in the process of unveiling the phenomenon to arrive at the possible essence/truth. Strand in which a critical, questioning, interpretive and curious reading of the phenomenon situated in the world (context/reality) is carried out as a yearning for a reading that connects symbolic language to the understanding of oneself (RICOEUR, 1989).

Since the process of reflection is an effort to exist and the desire to be, it is more than the simple criticism of moral judgment (RICOEUR, 1989). This is the way – method – to interpret, through exegesis, the meaning of the language of the phenomenon. Returning to the point of criticism of the knowledge proper to phenomenology, "All knowledge [...] each knowledge chosen as a starting point is called into question" (HUSSERL, 2000, p. 24, our translation).

While phenomenology places the phenomenon in its various contexts, in parentheses, hermeneutics seeks the meanings of signifiers, phenomenology places the active subject when observing the phenomenon. Hermeneutics understands and apprehends the phenomenon in its entirety; and, finally, phenomenology seeks *eidetic* (essence), while hermeneutics communicates veiled intention.

Both methods are in search of the truth:

Truth is what enlightens the subject; truth is what gives you beatitude; Truth is what gives you tranquility of soul. In short, in truth and in access to truth, there is something that completes the subject itself, that completes the very being of the subject and that transfigures it. In short, I think we can say the following: for spirituality, an act of knowledge, in and of itself, would never be able to give access to the truth if it were not prepared, accompanied, duplicated, consummated by a certain transformation of the subject, not of the individual, but of the subject himself in his being of subject (FOUCAULT, 2006, p. 21, our translation).

The dialogue between the two methods, therefore, is made by the possibility of complementarity between the movements of each method, as we can observe in Heideggerian thought. Heidegger, a German philosopher, in reflecting on the meaning of being, works with three central concepts: humanism, truth and essence. Therefore, these are recurrent words in Heideggerian readings. About the essence of BEING, the philosopher says:

I refer to the Being even if, willingly, it has power over the thought and thus over the Essence of man, which means, over the re-reference of man to the Being. Power something means: to pre-serve it in its Essence, with-to serve it in its element (HEIDEGGER, 1967, p. 30, our translation).

Therefore, in the Heideggerian perspective, the essence of Being is in its humanization by its connection with the world, with the reality that surrounds it and the subjects. What dialogues with Freire's thinking that the human being is a historical and social being, thus needs dialogical relations and interaction with nature connecting to himself:

We understand that, for man, the world is an objective reality, independent of it, possible to be known. It is fundamental, however, that man, being of relations and not only of contacts, is not only in the world, but *with* the world. Being *with* the world results from its openness to reality, which makes it the entity of relations that it is (FREIRE, 1980, p. 39, our translation).

This entity present in Freire's writings is part of the studies of phenomenology and hermeneutics. In Heidegger, we understand the being in being-*there* (*dasein*). The philosopher affirms that: "being-being becomes, in multiple ways, a phenomenon" (HEIDEGGER, 1967, p. 40). Therefore, we affirm that the phenomenon is not an object, but is the subject itself.

The purpose of Phenomenological Hermeneutics is the unveiling of the phenomenon/subject, that is, it seeks to unveil to the subject its essence. The essence of the phenomenon. The word unveiling appears in his writings as

*Alétheia*, unveiling thought of as a clearing of presence, is not yet the truth. Is *Alétheia* then less than true? Or is it more, since it alone enables truth as *adaequatio* and *certitudo*, since there can be no presence and presentification outside the scope of the clearing? (HEIDEGGER, 1999, p. 106, our translation).

In this way, the essence is connected to the idea of truth in Heidegger. That is, ultimately what is desired with this method is the demystification of the phenomenon/subject.

### **Educommunication and the method of Dialogical Phenomenological Hermeneutics**

By reflecting on the intersections that orbit around the fields of communication and education – two areas of knowledge that suffer collisions with antagonistic aspects, but that end up finding fertile ground for complementarities – we are invited to walk through an epistemological trajectory followed by a set of thinkers who seek to legitimize an essence of meanings that emerges manifesting dialogical protagonism and emancipations. The twentieth century – since its inception – brings these examples.

Célestin Freinet, in the 1930s, when he weaves a pedagogical construct uniting communication and education through the use of the newspaper in the classroom as a resource for critical construction and recognition of the subject as an active social actor within the scenario where he is inserted, reconfigures the meaning of educational-informational productions, instigating a pedagogical action of comparative communication and education for the means (read, here, media). Its construct permeated not only to read and train language structures, but also acted in a sphere of media literacy, in the comparative analysis between contents and press vehicles, to decode, in the same published agenda, the processes of information construction and its ideological specificities. The students reconstructed news, produced a school newspaper, but in a way that they acted in the reading of the world and in the development of criticality, generating important autonomy and emancipation.

Mário Kaplún (1923-1998) – an Argentine teacher, naturalized Uruguayan – in the 1950s proposed a public policy action called "Cassete Forum" – which consisted of recording classes and distributing tapes to distant places in Uruguay that did not yet have schools –, used technological mediation for the democratization of knowledge. It is considered one of the great references of the Latin American school of communication, because it promoted a set of debates on this convergence of communication with education, legitimizing theoretical foundations that until today are observed by researchers in the field and that also support the construction of Educommunication. He praises that the educational process is an involvement of processes of



multiple communicative flows. Kaplún says that true communication is not given by a sender who speaks and a receptor who listens, but by two human beings who communicate in dialogue (KAPLÚN, 1984, p. 14)<sup>6</sup>.

The author argues that to educate oneself is to engage in a process of multiple communicative flows, because the system will be all the more educational, the richer the web of communicational interactions that it knows how to open and make available to students.

Paulo Freire (1921-1997), a Brazilian, who engendered a whole understanding of the real meaning of this interface of the fields through a pedagogy of dialogicity and liberating political intervention in the system of relations, is the central basis of the educative communicative construct: "Education is communication, it is dialogue, insofar as it is not a transfer of knowledge, but a meeting of interlocutor subjects who seek the meaning of meaning" (FREIRE, 2011, p. 46, our translation). In *Pedagogy of Autonomy* (1996), Freire drew attention to the system of an imposing education, when he defined banking education, a concept to explain a process of imposition of contents, without democratic spaces for the dialogical construction of knowledge: "In banking education, the student is the bank where the master deposits his knowledge that will yield large interest, in favor of the social order that the teacher represents. This education is one of the aspects, and fundamental, of society" (FREIRE, 2005, p. 16, our translation).

In this reflective perspective, Freire warns of educational processes that do not contribute to a verticalized, democratizing, dialogical, emancipatory education. This type of imposing education, which still operates a lot, needs to be extirpated because it does not provide subjective enrichments.

Jesús Martín-Barbero (1937-2021), Colombian, in a perception of environmental complexity/social ecology, where the clashes of subjectivities are constant in the construction of the intersections of knowledge, proposes the reflection of open, democratic communication ecosystems, aiming at the full fruition of dialogical/informational coefficients in the spaces of knowledge construction. Reference in the construction of Educommunication, advocates on the strategic role of the dialogical process for the definition of new social poles.

The dialogical texture is found both in the texture of the symbol and in the constitution of subjectivity: the self only becomes real in the reciprocity of the Interlocution. To dialogue is to risk a word to meet not a resonance, an echo

---

<sup>6</sup> "La verdadera comunicación no está dada por un emisor que habla y un preceptor-recipiente que escucha, sino por dos seres o comunidades humanas que dialogan (aunque sea a distancia y a través de medios artificiales)" (KAPLÚN, 1984, p. 14).

of itself, but another word, the response of another (MARTÍN-BARBERO, 2014, p. 33, our translation).

It is in this context that the dialogical, subjective connections, the semantic structures contributed in the senses and in the constant constructions of the meanings, help in this epistemic nexus proposed that seeks to identify the correlations, the tensions, the solutions for the interface of communication and education. There is a diverse set of areas of knowledge that help these two fields to relate, according to the subjectivities of the subjects, their historical, cultural, political, social contributions, in the structures of languages (responsible for the construction and dissemination of meanings).

Ismar de Oliveira Soares, Brazilian researcher, who bases his theoretical basis on the authors – mentioned above – and on other references to signify/modernize, from the end of the 1990s, the field of this intersection, promoting an epistemological construction called Educommunication, divided into several guiding aspects, which will be highlighted later. It is under the construct of this area and its relations with *dialogical phenomenological hermeneutics* that this section will weave. Rather, it is necessary to specify, even briefly, what Educommunication is: its areas, foundations and methodologies. Soares (2003, p. 115, our translation) defines the concept in question as:

The set of actions inherent to the planning, implementation and evaluation of processes and products aimed at creating and strengthening communicative ecosystems in educational spaces, improving the communicative coefficient of educational actions, developing the critical spirit of users of mass media, properly using information resources in educational practices and expanding people's capacity for expression.

In general, it can be said that these initiatives, actions and activities of interfaces usually provoke in their agents/participants, a sense of autonomy, citizenship, critical awareness, affectivity, expansion of dialogue, democracy, emancipation, engagement and protagonism, in addition to the promotion of other aspects of perception of social meanings that are operationalized in social relations during the educommunicative application.

Since its emergence in the late 1990s, until today, the field presents itself as an area of knowledge that is recognized as a phenomenon – to be continuously observed – that alters structures traditionally orchestrated in the spaces of socialization agencies, fostering protagonism and forms of production and transmission of information and knowledge, legitimizing itself in areas of intervention.

They are: Communication Management, Technological Mediation in educational spaces, Education for communication (with a bias of a reflection on the role of media literacy and critical reading), Communicative Expression through Art, Pedagogy of Communication, Media Production and Epistemological Reflection. This, manifested in *spaces of application of the field*, among which: Social and Religious, Cultural and Political Organizations, in Formal/Informal and Non-Formal Education, in the Management of Procedures and People, in the area of Health, Social Assistance, Socio-environmental, among others; in addition to the multiple *modalities of application*, among which: (Inter) Institutional Practices – because it is an area that circulates in the midst of the socialization agency –, Experimental Projects and Public Policies, various Associations, Religious Institutions, Non-Governmental Organizations, among others. In the field of public policies, for example, it has engendered an architecture of propositions, planning in spaces of public power, with the circulation of communication and education strategies in order to highlight the role of these fields in human relations and in the public instruments of struggles and guarantees of rights, involving / affecting the population in a social and communicative ecology.

Educommunication is presented, therefore, as a phenomenon based on an articulating mechanism of practices and processes, which contests hegemonic systems of subjective construction – which are sometimes loaded with mechanistic, instrumental orders and forms –, highlighting, therefore, that we are all subjects of praxis and, in this sense, we have the possibility – and the right – to intervene, pave the social constructs and reflect on this social state, based on a democracy based on communication coefficients.

It is in this aspect that *phenomenology*, as a possible method for correlation, is legitimized. Etymologically, it is a concept brought by the junction of the Greek terms "phainomenon" – meaning that which is manifested – and "logos" – reason, discourse. It can be understood as the study that unifies the different modes of presentation of what is seen, but never revealed in its entirety. The phenomenon lets itself show. It seeks to understand, therefore, these phenomena that present themselves as they present themselves, understanding that the consciousness of each one is intentional (the intention of the way the subject interprets a phenomenon).

The method is widely used to understand human existence and its relations with the other, with the ecosystem and with the senses that present themselves, the world of life, by Edmundo Husserl. That is, to understand the concrete world from the manifestations. And these are not finished; but, constant. While the method does not end, it does not have an end, it is in

a state of permanent transformation of human experience(s) and, fundamentally, of observation of these poles of intersections that redirect, in a constancy, the social pavements.

A network of possibilities for phenomenological action is created, starting from the following questions: how will I be willing to look at this educative communicative experience? How does it affect me or redirect my reading optics of the world? How is it possible to orchestrate active methodologies that bring together the communicational ecosystems aiming at a full manifestation of the critical emancipation of the subject? It is an area, therefore, that takes up the human gaze – from human experience – and not to the technique employed in the process. To do phenomenology is not to stick to the objective – and its operations – but, for the subjective – and the unique characteristics of each subject before the object –, seeking the explanation of what is presented of reality in one's own / experience - and, consequently, changing its state of "to be" and "being" - in the world.

The hermeneutic method, on the other hand, is linked to the decoding of the discourses of the phenomenon, of the structure of the language of the action employed. It is not linked specifically to the transmission of how this phenomenon is presented, but to the interpretation of this mechanism – very involved in the sense of the object. Therefore, it can be considered a philosophical/methodological procedure that almost opposes the phenomenological – but with points of convergence.

It is also a work of imaginative interpretation, which invites the subject to put himself in the place of the one who is producing, speaking, describing. An example: when observing a historical object discovered – a ceramic vase from the past –, in order to weave the hermeneutic reading, it is necessary to seek to place oneself in the past, in the experience of the producer, in the aesthetic sense of time, in the possible perception.

In this sense, we observe how Educommunication manifests itself in this construct by providing spaces for subjects to appropriate the instrumental mechanisms of communication (radio, audiovisual production, newspaper, *blog*, *podcast*, among others), produce their own media products while paving a path for the interpretation of the social process in which they are inserted. At this moment, a counter-hegemonic phenomenon emerges from the relations of these same subjects with the media instrumental that, historically, formulates cultural procedures.

That is: the subject begins to understand how it is done, what objectives are possible to achieve and how to orchestrate a political-critical-cultural context about how it was previously operationalized by the hegemonic system. The result of this action is the change of perspective

on how the subjects involved observe, interpret and, finally, intervene in the world (their school, their neighborhood, their social or cultural institution), through the production of communication and, also, the interpretation – now enriched – directed to the established mass media.

Celéstin Freinet (1974), a French professor, already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, in his pedagogical action consisted of bringing newspapers to the classroom not only to understand the grammar or the cultured norm of the language, but also so that students could weave critical readings of the media – and of the surrounding political reality. His students reproduced and rewrote the same guidelines that had to do with their own cultural/community scenario, of experiences, and published in a newspaper produced in the classroom. This action of comparative communication and production of the newspaper instigates protagonism, emancipation, critical social observation.

The school newspaper is a production, a work within the reach of our classes and that touches deeply on the essence of our educational function. It puts us on the path of a new formula of school, that school of work, whose need we begin to feel, which no longer works according to intellectualized norms, but on the basis of a social activity (FREINET, 1974, p. 50, our translation).

Freinet is one of the greatest references of Educommunication, because for many years he experienced the process of appropriation and construction of media and related it to the field of education, witnessing, in the classroom, the influence of critical thinking and reading. The newspaper, in this sense, became, at the time, a powerful mechanism for the reflection of the role of the school and the press, in the formulation of opinion: "a school newspaper is not, cannot be, should not be at the service of a scholastic pedagogy that would diminish its reach. It must be, rather, to the measure of an education that, through life, prepares for life" (FREINET, 1974, p. 44, our translation).

Thus, from the work *O jornal escolar*, Freinet (1974) presents techniques of production, comparison, reflection of educational psychology and relations with the form of symbolic/ideological expression of the press in society. Based on this aspect, it is possible to relate these concerns of critical reading of Freinet (1974) to those of Abramo (2016, p. 40-49), in the work *Patterns of Manipulation in the Great Press*, under the contribution of the political meaning of the ideology of the news, presenting the patterns of manipulation in a certain part of the press aiming, precisely, at the redirection of the perspective of the target audience, about social constructs.

Among these patterns of the ideology of news, observed by Abramo, are: *Induction*, *Inversion*, *Occultation*, the sources (official and non-official cited), *Fragmentation*, the ways in which it was arranged on the page (prominently or not), among other observations they made. When rewriting, they worked on the profound interpretation of the phenomenon contributed in meaning and the renewal of the historical fact, in a hermeneutic-critical action.

Educommunication works, as a discursive context, the affirmation of communication ecosystems by understanding that, when producing a newspaper in the classroom, or school radio project (or any other media activity), for example, it instigates the actors to list social themes that interest them and that impact them, inspire research and interpretation of the object, in addition to constructing their critical readings, based on a strong dialogical content, mobilizing protagonisms.

These expanded communication coefficients, Jesús Martín-Barbero (1997) defined as an ecological process, a communicative ecosystem, as a web of configurations of meanings – and tensions, too – constituted by the set of languages, representations and narratives that manifest themselves in the daily lives of social actors. This reflection is in line with the notes of Ismar de Oliveira Soares (2011b), in his article entitled "Educommunication: a field of mediations", published in the work *Educommunication – building a new area of knowledge*. He attests that the theoretical field is "inaugurating a new transverse discursive paradigm, constituted by transdisciplinary concepts" (p. 25, our translation), which operates affirmative precisely because of its capacity for connections of discourses and interpretations of the world.

Interdiscourse, that is, the dialogue with other discourses, is the guarantee of the survival of the new field and of each of the areas of intervention, while allowing the construction of its specificity. This interdiscourse is multivocal and its structuring element is polyphony. Otherness is the constitutive dimension of this stage of voices that polemicize among themselves, dialogue or complement each other (SOARES, 2011b, p. 25, our translation).

Soares (2000, p. 64, our translation) says that the educative practices seek to achieve a great objective and, therefore, supposes a series of actions that interconnect the meanings of the subjects to the social state to which he is inserted and questions (the phenomenon), as shown in the following excerpt:

Educative communicative practices seek convergence of actions, synchronized around a major objective: to increase the communicative coefficient of human actions. To this end, it supposes a theory of communicative action that privileges the concept of dialogical communication; an ethic of social responsibility for cultural producers; an



active and critical reception by audiences; a policy of use of information resources according to the interests of the poles involved in the communication process (producers, mediating institutions and consumers of information), which culminates in the expansion of spaces for expression.

Therefore, the essential point of this process is the expansion of the dialogical coefficient, manifested in a transformation of sensitive human relations precisely because of the meanings of subjective clashes. Xavier (2020, p. 95, emphasis added, our translation), in his work *Educommunication in dialogical-discursive perspective*, says that

[...] This condition, discursively, of constructing meanings, of negotiating meanings through procedural mediation, makes educommunication a space of interaction in which communication comes to be seen in direct relation with an adjectival audience of *participative*, configuring a dialogical mode of educative practice.

To justify this reflection under the contribution of the dialogical, he makes use of two reasoned ways: the first, the quote of Freire (2011, p. 86, our translation): "to experience dialogue in the encounter of men who, mediated by the world, pronounce themselves, transforming and humanizing themselves"; the second, by Bakhtin (2010), when it refers to the conception that interaction in language occurs through the dialogical exercise of understanding and responding to concrete statements, confronting them ideologically.

Educommunication presents itself as a guiding instrument in this hermeneutic phenomenological dialogical method – or process –, consolidating itself as a powerful area of fusions, transformations and emancipations, through this philosophical triad. This interface of fields requires a new thinking that restructures the pedagogical formats and proposes new strategies of intervention in society, seeking to respond to contemporary media and educational processes, perpetuating an informational and dialogical flow enriched in the bases of language and the production of meanings.

This reflection is manifested to the extent that both technological development and the various economic and social changes of contemporaneity, as producers of new cultural patterns, have put on the agenda for the school – and other institutions – the need for a repositioning in the face of what is required of it: intentional referrals that prepare people for critical insertion, political and interventionist in society.

In this perspective, it is also important to think about another aspect: experience. It is also a guide of senses, provokes phenomena and liberations and is present in all the educative awakening. Highlighting this notion of experience, Dewey (2010), in his work *Art as experience*, translates this notion as something that "has to have meaning". These are his words:

Experience, insofar as it is experience, consists in the accentuation of vitality. Instead of meaning a closure in private feelings and sensations, it means an active and alert exchange with the world; at its peak, it signifies a complete interpenetration between the self and the world of objects and events (DEWEY, 2010, p. 83, our translation).

When Dewey (2010) speaks of the "complete interpenetration between the self and the world of objects and events", in this "active and alert exchange with the world", he is paying attention to the fact that experience is the instrument of transformations, the awakening to new conceptions, creation, the subjective clash that generates new subjectivity. When a teacher, for example, presents a proposal for the production of a video-documentary on a certain theme in the classroom, the challenge of overcoming and building, organizing collectively and manifesting their talents and even their difficulties aiming at overcoming, emphasizes a content of liberation, protagonism and criticality, a new reading of the world. Denise Jodelet (2017, p. 434, our translation) tells us about the experience and the lived, emphasizing that the experience "refers to the awareness that the subject has of the world in which he lives".

In this reflective space, Jodelet (2017) points us to two important dimensions to understand the experience: the *lived* and the *cognitive*. The first, according to her, implies the experience and/or the experienced, that is: "the way people experience, in their intimate forum, a situation and the way they elaborate, through a psychic and cognitive work, the positive or negative repercussions of this situation and the relationships and actions that they develop in that situation" (JODELET, 2017, p. 435-436, our translation). We have, here, a strategy for reading/understanding the world through a collective subjectivity – under construction – from the phenomena and experiences that the subject encounters and shares. The author also highlights that experience involves the cognitive dimension, when it "favors the experimentation of the world and about the world, and contributes to the construction of reality according to categories or forms that are socially given" (JODELET, 2017, p. 438, our translation).

When a student produces at school, for example, a *podcast* on the topic of urban violence that he and his peers are experiencing in practice in their communities, what he tells us part of an individual consciousness that is revealed by its subjectivity and interpretations, but that breathes, Jodelet (2017, p. 437, our translation) would say, a "social effervescence". His experience manifested by the communicational protagonism – the production of the *podcast* – is also collective, since it affects everyone – in one way or another. This is the "magic" of

Educommunication, which instigates the social subject to the manifestation of his narratives, led by experiences and multiplied by the communication, now critical, that he has appropriated.

Therefore, Educommunication is also related to the strategic role of valuing the experiential proposition, as a methodology or paradigm, which is presented under the cloak of a progressive approach. And, in this sense, when thinking about this field under the contribution of phenomenology, linked to the reflection of dialogical hermeneutics, we cannot separate ourselves from provoking, here, a reflection on the role of the teacher.

After all, Educommunication, as practices and processes that seek the legitimation of a field of interventions, is mediated by this subject moved to hope, but also moved to questions and hypotheses about contemporaneity. Some of these questions, therefore, are present in this reflection. They are: How to pave a road that provides adequate training in times of advances in education technologies and challenges such as Fake News? How to educate teachers in the 21st century? How to help build new curricular architectures and methodologies, contributed in technological mediations? How can the teacher, the subject of so many experiences, help the school to keep an eye on inclusion and the essence of the act of educating, instigating the student to recognize himself, to perceive himself, also, as a subject of memories, subjectivities, cultures and identities, aspects that ground emancipations? How to establish, concretely, the fine line between the advances of tools, mechanisms and technological instruments in education, with the mission of provoking meanings in this new school that is present and that is even more challenging?

The questions presented are provocations, for which we are in search of answers and guidelines for facing the challenges of the time. We can then remember Freire (1995, p. 17, our translation), when he advises: "No one begins to be an educator on a certain Tuesday at four o'clock in the afternoon. No one is born an educator or marked to be an educator. We become educators, in practice and in reflection on practice" (FREIRE, 1991, p. 58, our translation). Communication is the human world, it is organic and transformative; in it, a co-participatory thinking is operated between the subjects who participate in this act, which makes it, in the act, dialectic/dialogical. Educommunication, therefore, the focus of study of this article, carries much of this concept of expansion of democratic ecosystems that aim at the expressiveness of the senses and experiences of the subjects involved.

## Final remarks

We seek, in this research, to make dialogue with the theoretical methods of scientific investigation. We show that hermeneutics and phenomenology dialogue both as methods and as conceptions of the world. That is, both go beyond the step by step necessary for scientific research, because they involve the subjects and their consciousnesses of the world/phenomenon.

They are essentially philosophical methods that, when working with the phenomenon, build a subject that, when looking at the world, seeks to see the whole and its connections. The researcher cannot have a restricted view when analyzing his phenomenon, he needs to broaden and question to go further and further to the encounter of, by and with the understanding of the real.

The goal, then, is the truth of the world. However, phenomenology itself already says that one will not arrive at this truth, only as close as possible for each moment. Hermeneutics is essentially interpretation, that is, it accepts the possibility of transformation, because the reflexive action of interpreting carries in itself a conception of the world and then another, which naturally changes the paths and the look at the phenomenon.

The use of hermeneutics in the interpretation of discourses requires a careful look at the different meanings present in the narrative, especially those veiled that, when perceived, give a new direction to reading. In the perspective of Ricoeur (1989), the movement of interpretation of symbols and their meanings is a way of making oneself *exist by understanding*.

In this way, the researcher who works with hermeneutic phenomenology puts himself in a position of estrangement, a position that cannot be passive, because, when assuming the sense of strangeness, one does not accept simple explanations, first impressions and not even the world as immutable. So, nothing is, but everything is in a way. And there is the possibility of seeing new lenses, new thoughts and observing the transformation of consciousness and action in the world.

With hermeneutics, the word is decontaminated by the interpretation of the context by exegesis, that is, by understanding the discourse from its initial intention. And with phenomenology one seeks to know what does not appear from an awareness of oneself in movement with the phenomenon.

In hermeneutic phenomenology, in Heidegger's thought, one yearns for the understanding of being in its essence, seeking the truth of the phenomenon. That is, "the *unveiling of the being is what first enables the degree of revelation of the being*. This unveiling

as truth about being is called *ontological truth*" (HEIDEGGER, 1999, p. 118, our translation). This search is for the meaning of one's own existence *in* and *with* the world. It is to reconstruct the phenomenon in its entirety for the understanding of the interpretations of reality/truth.

In this aspect, we link the understanding from the field of Educommunication – a theoretical area built since the end of the 1990s, at the School of Communication and Arts of the University of São Paulo (ECA – USP), and which was popularized by several other nuclei of studies in universities and institutional spaces that began to seek to understand what were the possible intersections between the fields of communication and education – and to experience them. By focusing on classic and contemporary authors such as Paulo Freire, Mário Kaplún, Célestin Freinet, Ismar de Oliveira Soares, Jesus Martín-Barbero, among others, to identify the issues and reflections that hover over this convergence, we are faced with a field in full transformation, legitimized in areas such as: Education for the means, technological mediations, pedagogy of projects, epistemological reflection, communicative expressions through art, communication management; and applied in diverse areas of society, such as: formal education, social/cultural institutions, public policies, press.

Educommunication is presented, therefore, as a rich field for propositions of intercommunicative actions that culminate in protagonism, appropriation of media concepts and techniques, expansion of democratic communication ecosystems, emancipation of subjects and social spaces. By producing media – and understanding how the process of information construction works – not only legitimizes a dynamization of practice, but also expands the reading and conception of the world and the condition for decoding the information consumed in hegemonic media that are affected by ideologies, economic or political condition. Reflecting on the critical reading of the media is one of the guiding aspects of educommunication, as it instigates a citizen consciousness and media literacy.

The approach that we conceived of the field of Educommunication with the dialogical phenomenological hermeneutics hovers, first, by the identification of an apparent phenomenon: the need to appropriate knowledge about media resources, in various spaces – among which, the school –, and to transform the optics of the world, from this action experienced collectively. From there, interpret, under the bias of the expanded dialogical coefficient, the discourses and meanings that operate in the relationship between the fields of communication and education. Educommunication is a possible praxis for the establishment of this understanding of the world. In this sense, it operates through the manifestations of the experiences, memories, cultures, identities, of the subjects, congregating in articulations of autonomy and liberation.

## REFERENCES

- ABRAMO, P. **Padrões de manipulação na grande imprensa**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Fundação Perseu Abramo, 2016.
- BACCEGA, M. A. (org.). **Gestão de Processos Comunicacionais**. São Paulo: Atlas, 2002.
- BAKHTIN, M. M. **Estética da criação verbal**. Tradução: Paulo Bezerra. 5. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2010.
- BEISIEGEL, C. R. **Política e Educação Popular: A teoria e a prática de Paulo Freire no Brasil**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Ática, 1989.
- DEWEY, J. **Arte como Experiência**. Tradução: Vera Ribeiro. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2010.
- FOUCAULT, M. **A Hermenêutica do Sujeito**. Tradução: M. A. Fonseca; S. T. Muchail. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2006.
- FREINET, C. **O jornal escolar**. Portugal: Estampa, 1974.
- FREIRE, P. **Educação como prática da liberdade**. 11. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1980.
- FREIRE, P. **A Educação na Cidade**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1991.
- FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários à prática educativa**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.
- FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do oprimido**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2005.
- FREIRE, P. **Extensão ou Comunicação?** 15. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2011.
- FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do oprimido**. 84. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2019.
- GADAMER, H. G. **Verdade e método I: traços fundamentais de uma hermenêutica filosófica**. 9. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2008. 631 p. (Pensamento humano).
- HEIDEGGER, M. **Sôbre o humanismo**. Tradução: Emmanuel Carneiro Leão. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1967.
- HEIDEGGER, M. **Conferências e Escritos Filosóficos**. Tradução e notas: Ernildo Stein. São Paulo: Nova Cultura, 1999.
- HUSSERL, E. G. A. **A ideia da fenomenologia**. Tradução: Artur Morão. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2000.
- HUSSERL, E. G. A. **Idéias para uma fenomenologia pura e para uma filosofia fenomenológica**. São Paulo: Idéias & Letras, 2006.



JODELET, D. **Representações Sociais e mundos de vida**. São Paulo: FCC/Curitiba: PUCPR, 2017.

KÁPLUN, M. **Comunicación entre grupos**: El método del casete-foro. Ottawa: IDRC, 1984.

MARTÍN-BARBERO, J. **A comunicação na educação**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2014.

PLATÃO. **A República**. Tradução: Maria Helena da Rocha Pereira. 2. ed. Lisboa: Calouste Gulbenkian, 1993.

RICOEUR, P. **O conflito das interpretações**: Ensaio de hermenêutica. Tradução: M. F. Sá Correia. Porto: Rés-Editora, 1989.

SOARES, I. O. Educomunicação: as perspectivas do reconhecimento de um novo campo de intervenção social. O caso dos Estados Unidos. **ECCOS**, São Paulo, v. 2, n. 2, p. 61-80, dez. 2000.

SOARES, I. O. **Metodologias da Educação para Comunicação e Gestão Comunicativa no Brasil e na América Latina**. São Paulo: Atlas, 2002.

SOARES, I. O. **Alfabetização e Educomunicação**: o papel dos meios de comunicação e informação na educação de jovens e adultos ao longo da vida. 2003.

SOARES, I. O. **Educomunicação**: O conceito, o profissional, a aplicação (contribuições para a reforma do Ensino Médio). 2. ed. São Paulo: Paulinas, 2011a.

SOARES, I. O. Educomunicação: um campo de mediações. *In*: CITELLI, A. O.; COSTA, M. C. C. (org.). **Educomunicação**: construindo uma nova área do conhecimento. 1. ed. São Paulo: Paulinas, 2011b. cap. 1, p. 13-29.

XAVIER, M. M. **Educomunicação em perspectiva dialógico-discursiva**. São Paulo: Mentis Abertas; Campina Grande: EDUFCEG, 2020.

### ***CRediT Author Statement***

---

**Acknowledgements:** Our special thanks to the Graduate Program in Education (PPGE), of the Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná (PUC-PR).

**Financing:** Not applicable.

**Conflicts of interest:** Not applicable.

**Ethical approval:** The research/narrative did not require an opinion from the Ethics Committee.

**Availability of data and material:** Not applicable.

**Authors' contributions:** All authors dedicated themselves to the deepening of the bibliographic readings, presenting contributions, intersections and critical readings that gave the necessary contribution to the collective construct of the scientific narrative.

---

**Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.**  
Proofreading, formatting, standardization and translation.

