

Teaching practice in communication theory: a study based on teaching experiences¹

Luís Mauro Sá Martino

Doctor of Social Sciences from PUC-SP. Professor at Faculdade Cásper Líbero, Faculdade Paulus de Comunicação, Communication Courses, and Fundação Escola de Comércio Álvares Penteado.

E-mail: lmsamartino@gmail.com. ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5099-1741>.

Abstract: How does one become a communication theory teacher? Based on the responses of 37 faculty members to an online questionnaire, it was possible to observe three main aspects regarding the paths, choices, and contingencies in teaching the discipline: (1) most respondents (34) took the discipline by chance or institutional determination; (2) most of the training was carried out by individuals; (3) a dichotomy between teaching and research is observed, with few references to research. These elements are discussed against the literature on Communication teaching.

Keywords: communication theory; teaching; communication; university; training.

Resumo: Como alguém se torna docente de Teoria da Comunicação? Este texto delinea algumas das condições a partir das respostas de 37 docentes a um questionário online. Foi possível observar três aspectos principais: (1) a maior parte dos respondentes assumiu a disciplina por acaso ou determinação institucional, sem necessariamente aderência ou afinidade de pesquisa; (2) a formação ficou, majoritariamente, a cargo de cada docente; (3) há uma dicotomia entre ensino e pesquisa, com poucas referências às investigações realizadas por docentes. Esses elementos são discutidos contra o pano de fundo da bibliografia sobre ensino de Comunicação.

Palavras-chave: teoria da comunicação; ensino; comunicação; universidade; formação.

1 An initial version of this text was presented at the Communication Theories Working Group, XX Meeting of Communication Research Groups, an event within the 48th Brazilian Congress of Communication Sciences. This work is part of a research project carried out with support from CNPq, process no. 305133/2022-5. I would like to express my gratitude to the people responsible for the initial reviews for their contribution to this work.

Submission: 18/08/2025

Accepted: 24/10/2025

1. INTRODUCTION

How does someone begin their teaching career in Communication Theory? This question, posed initially, can itself be the subject of further questioning, as there may not be a single answer, but rather a whole set of personal trajectories marked by social and political influences, as well as life choices and, potentially, all sorts of random choices and chance occurrences that lead a person to the classroom—and, in particular, to a specific discipline. Similarly, biographical resonances would be beyond any answer that seeks any degree of possible generalization.

At the same time, a closer look might reveal the need for this question when, in dialogue with previous studies such as those by Hickson and Stacks (1993), Costa (2003), Russi-Duarte (2010), one perceives the delineation of specificities linked to this type of teaching, especially in its epistemological dimension, in the question of what constitutes a theoretical knowledge of Communication.

Courses related to the field of Communication are bachelor's degrees, not teaching degrees, and therefore do not offer the option of teacher training. In this field, there is no figure of a graduate who will necessarily immediately work in education and would have the option of taking courses related to Education during their training. Since these courses are not geared towards teaching, the choice of an academic career—and therefore, entering the classroom at some point in the future—does not seem to be among the major concerns of students. The academic prestige of the course *Communication Theory*, notes Baptista (2003), tends to be low, seen by students as *curriculum clutter*.

At the same time, the specific importance of this discipline as a microcosm of epistemological and formative issues in the field of Communication makes it necessary to take a closer look at it in order to understand what is brought into the classroom. As Bachelard (1976) recalls, the teaching of a science is one of its fundamental constitutive factors—in other words, in the words of Barthes (1987), science is what is taught.

Furthermore, hooks (2013) recalls the political dimension of theory as a mode of autonomous and dialogical elaboration of a critical understanding of reality, as well as the possibilities of mobilization and action in the face of broader societal issues. The act of teaching, in particular, is widely highlighted by the philosopher as a space not only for the construction of knowledge, but also for affects and actions linked to the intersection of forms and life histories.

It is with these questions in mind that the question arises regarding the conditions under which a person becomes a professor of Communication Theory: it is not a biographical dimension, but a field trajectory—without neglecting, of course, the intersections between them. This research develops from these concerns.

This text outlines some aspects of teaching practice in Communication Theory in university courses in the field, focusing on the conditions at which this activity begins. Based on the responses of 37 professors to an online

questionnaire, made available on some of the main discussion lists in the field, Intercom and Compós, supported by bibliographic research, the paths, choices, and contingencies present in the conduct of teaching the discipline were analyzed, highlighting (1) the specific prior preparation for teaching the discipline, (2) the institutional conditions that led to taking on this subject, and (3) the initial challenges faced, as well as the conditions for its continuity. This text seeks to continue studies previously carried out on the syllabi and programs of the discipline, its political-historical derivations, and epistemological articulations with the Communication Epistemology Working Group of Compós (Martino, 2011; 2012; 2018a; 2018b; Souza; Martino, 2025).

It is worth pointing out, as a starting point for the analysis, three notes regarding the focus and limitations of this text.

First, it is worth mentioning some methodological points—a broader discussion would require a separate text, but it would not be possible to omit this aspect. Initially, a questionnaire was formulated and applied online as part of a broader, ongoing research project on the teaching of Communication Theory in Brazil. Two of the questions from this questionnaire are addressed in this text: *How did you begin teaching this course? Was there any prior preparation in the area of teaching or didactics?*, followed by another, *In what way are your research activities (including, possibly, involvement in networks and groups) reflected in your classroom practice?*

In addition to these questions, respondents were asked, if possible, to submit the course syllabi and teaching programs. It is understood that the definition of topics often involves various institutional decision-making processes that are not always immediately accessible to those who teach—for example, depending on the institution, there is greater or lesser flexibility to alter programs and syllabi. Since the analysis of these programs, as done elsewhere (Martino, 2012), requires a specific methodology, it is understood that, for reasons of focus and scope, it would not be possible to address it in this text.

The questionnaire was sent to the email lists of Intercom and Compós, two of the main research entities in the field of Communication. In addition, it was also personally addressed to professors of the discipline specifically mentioned as such on the websites of all Postgraduate Communication Programs in the country. Thirty-seven responses were obtained, from which this research is organized.

Secondly, as indicated, the teaching practice of a discipline is situated at the intersection of field agencies (Bourdieu, 2017) relating, on the one hand, to the epistemological conditions of a given area and, at the same time, to social and political aspects, in tension with institutional and market issues present in university teaching. The teaching of a discipline is therefore not isolated from other conditions, and the focus here, although restricted to a specific moment and subject, does not lose sight of this horizon. Not all responses are quoted verbatim here: in the case of several responses with similar meanings, only the most complete or representative one was included.

Finally, there is no intention to generalize the results outlined here. The number of participants in the study, 37, is linked to a qualitative analysis without seeking numerical representativeness in terms of the number of Communication Theory professors. Since participation was voluntary through open invitations on discussion lists in the field, the number of respondents is understood here as research data, as it suggests the difficulties and possibilities—of time, interest, or willingness—for engaging with the research, between the desire to discuss one's own practice and the almost infinite demands of time in the job market. In this sense, there was no intention of sample representativeness, as the focus of the question, from the beginning, was on seeking specific information. In order to establish greater proximity to the experiences of the interviewees, while preserving their identities, fictitious names were assigned to the participants.

In what follows, we initially highlight (1) an overview of the issues related to the teaching of Communication Theory, then move on to the analysis of the responses, highlighting (2) the conditions for entry into and adherence to the discipline and (3) the symbolic value of the subject and its institutional place in the demands for teaching Communication Theory.

2. QUESTIONS ABOUT TEACHING AS PART OF THE PRACTICE OF THE DISCIPLINE

When examining studies on the teaching of Communication Theory, one aspect that initially stands out is its temporal distribution. Defining founding dates or origins is always a subject of discussion, as Bourdieu (2017) reminds us that it involves a dispute between classification criteria. Bearing this caveat in mind, in the case of the teaching of Communication Theory, it is possible to indicate the beginning of discussions on the subject in texts by Pignatari (1971) and Lins da Silva (1979), continuing uninterrupted to the present day (Martino, 2018a).

These works present themselves, in a way, as a discontinuous line, exhibiting diverse conceptions, focuses, and points of view related to the problems that demanded reflection at each moment. However, there seems to be a continuous tension, present in these studies, between two lines of force.

On the one hand, studies on the teaching of Communication Theory point to the need for the formulation of a discipline with sufficient dynamism to deal with a constantly transforming media environment, which continually challenges both what would be the canon of the discipline, but also the place of the subject in university courses (Trivinho, 2001; Felinto, 2011). The pedagogical challenge of the Communication Theory discipline would be to establish a critical dialogue between the theoretical propositions in circulation and the contemporary media and communication scenario.

On the other hand, it is a university discipline, linked to the specific movements of the academic field, such as defining what will be taught, the

approaches and readings to be programmed, and, in didactic terms, the concern with working with this knowledge to make it meaningful for classes of students. It would also be possible to add, in this second aspect, everyday elements in teaching matters, such as the teaching regime and working conditions, or the demands of deadlines, schedules, and assessments, among others.

Academic production on the teaching of Communication Theory allows us to recall that, at the intersection between theoretical-disciplinary and didactic issues, lies a teaching subject, marked by a specific trajectory, diverse training, and shaped by the social influences that constitute them along with their historicity. In practice, this involves professors who find themselves daily in Communication courses, facing a classroom, challenged by the gaze of students, the learners, in the expectation of a dialogical construction of knowledge called *Communication Theory*, using various strategies for this purpose (Martins; Silva, 2012; Bauman, 2023).

However, there are characteristics specific to the teaching of Communication, especially Communication Theory, that demand specific attention—without neglecting, of course, contributions from other areas and disciplines. One of the characteristics of the constitution and delineation of the boundaries of a field of knowledge is the concern with the teaching of the knowledge produced within it. Thinking in terms of the notion of an academic field, according to Bourdieu (2021), one aspect of defining symbolic boundaries is the establishment of legitimate—and, in a way, exclusive—spaces for the circulation of knowledge in a field among its peers, which also means contributing directly and practically to the training of new and future participants in that field.

The existence of similar concerns in other fields, as shown by Dau (2015) and Almeida (2016) in Literature, Barros (2018) and Cavalcanti (2021) in History, Tavolaro (2013), Reis (2015) and Oliveira (2016) in Sociology, or Flor and Cassiani (2016) in Chemistry, suggests that the question of teaching a theoretical discipline, if it enters into dialogue with aspects of Education, also develops within its own institutional and epistemological boundaries.

It seems important to highlight, in this respect, the disciplinary specificity of Communication Theory. In courses linked to Communication, this subject is usually located in the initial semesters, placed among the *theoretical, preparatory, common subjects*, or some similar nomenclature, according to the denomination of each institution. It therefore dialogues with other formative disciplines, but is not always associated with *practical subjects*. The variations regarding the dialogues—or dichotomies—between *theoretical* and *practical subjects* depend, to a large extent, on the ways in which this issue is addressed in each institution, as shown, among others, by studies by Heisler and Discena (2005), Sadoff (2014), Fuss (2014), Y. Maia *et al.* (2017), Myers (2022), Gray (2023), or J. Maia (2023) on the strategies adopted in the teaching of Communication Theory.

Communication theory presents itself as a discipline with relatively undefined contours, as already indicated, among others, by França (1994; 2001), Lima (1983, 2001) or Martino (2012; 2018b): it is the only theoretical discipline

exclusively focused on Communication studies, while at the same time being, in a way, devoid of a consensus regarding what its specific canon would be—insofar as one could speak of the “classics” of Sociology or Anthropology—and, therefore, allows for a series of interdisciplinary dialogues. This poses some additional challenges.

Thus, the person who takes on the teaching of the subject may find themselves facing the challenge of dealing with a subject with relatively unclear contributions and, at the same time, considerably broad in terms of focus. It is in this sense that Communication Theory can be understood as a kind of microcosm of broader epistemological questions within the field, concerning the possibilities of defining a specific object—what is studied in *Communication Theory*?—and the theoretical contributions aimed at its constitution and analysis, objectified in the question: *Why is this theory ‘of Communication’?*

These questions, even if not directly addressed in the classroom, are brought there insofar as they govern not only the programmatic constitution of what will be taught, but also refer to the processes of institutionalizing knowledge associated with certain discursive practices—in other words, the constitution, reconstitution, and continuation of a theoretical discourse on Communication objectified in the classroom space in each class taught.

The establishment of continuity within a field of knowledge, in this sense, is linked to the field’s capacity to train new participants, either by attracting them through its specific prestige within the relative hierarchy of fields, or by showcasing its specificities and dynamics. In the dynamics of the academic field, this is achieved through the establishment of university courses focused on a particular theme, thus guaranteeing the legitimacy, in fact and in law, of that knowledge.

However, none of these backgrounds necessarily prepares students for teaching: formal academic training produces *researchers*, not teachers, just as market experience can train professionals, but does not necessarily contribute to teaching experience, as Vocate (1997) pointed out decades ago. Furthermore, it could be argued that the very requirement of a degree to teach in higher education dates from the early 2000s, reinforcing the possible questions in this regard.

3. ENTRY REQUIREMENTS AND ADHERENCE TO THE COURSE

In the Brazilian university model, teaching is generally the gateway to an academic career. Although based on the three pillars of *teaching*, *research*, and *outreach*, the predominance of the first element is noticeable, as the career of a researcher, independently, is not usually considered within the university. To some extent, the most common practice is that of the professor who researches, not necessarily the researcher who finds in teaching an extension of their

research activities—and the aspect of outreach, due to its complexity, would require specific texts to be addressed.

This scenario appears to be initially linked to an institutional and professional aspect.

The primary path to entering a university career tends to be teaching. A well-established model in this scenario seems to be that of the adjunct lecturer, that is, a contract focused exclusively on teaching activities, with hours allocated for lesson preparation, but without a regime of partial or total dedication to research. In private institutions, which make up the majority of the university system, this regime is the most common, in contrast to public universities where the person approved through a competitive examination has exclusive dedication encompassing teaching and research activities—not to mention, in each case, any management and organizational practices.

In this scenario, the beginning of teaching in Communication Theory would be motivated by participation in competitions or selection processes focused exclusively on this subject. Some of the respondents, in fact, began directly in this discipline:

I began teaching the subject of Communication Theories in my first work experience as a professor, in 2009. My preparation for this activity took place when I was in my doctoral studies, as I was a CAPES scholarship recipient and scholarship recipients must complete a teaching internship (Emma, interviewee 01).

After passing a specific exam for Communication Theories, I started teaching that subject in 2007. I have a degree in German Language and Literature from the 1990s, where I found support in teaching and didactics, and that helped a lot (and still helps) (Mariana, interviewee 11).

Through a public competition. The prior preparation was done independently (Hamilton, interviewee 19).

Only four of the thirty-seven respondents began their teaching activities in Communication Theory. It is noted that, in all three cases, it was a specific opportunity to teach this subject as part of a selection process, with no preparation or training for it in any of the cases. A particularly representative response is that of respondent number 24:

In 1994, I took a competitive exam for the area of Communication Theories. I didn't even have a specialization at that time (Catarina, interviewee 24).

It would be possible to initially question some of the reasons for this lack of specific training. Firstly, the very notion of *specific training* can be called into question, insofar as it is impossible to imagine what this would constitute in practical terms, except in terms of courses or pedagogical workshops. Should we then formulate a discussion of the epistemological foundations of the area? The panoramic aspect generally assumed by the discipline? A didactic training for teaching theoretical subjects? Questions of this nature are formulated insofar as they can directly affect classroom practice regarding the scope and limits of this discipline.

In institutional terms, this is understood to be linked to the expectation of the teacher's adherence to the subject matter being taught—in this way, the research carried out by the individual, as well as their trajectory of thematic choices throughout their graduate studies, *would be* conditions not only for academic legitimacy in the practice of teaching theory, but also for its epistemological possibility of objectification in the classroom.

These elements seem to become particularly relevant when relatively arbitrary aspects—or, its complementary opposite, chance—are linked to the beginning of teaching Communication Theory. Although some public competitions and selection processes in private universities indicate a search for teachers of this discipline, the assignment of subjects may vary throughout the semesters. Thus, a teacher hired to teach Communication Theory may be allocated, in subsequent academic periods, to teach a related subject according not only to the specifics of their training, but also according to current university issues.

Some respondents indicated that their lack of preparation for teaching the subject was related to the fact that this assignment occurred unexpectedly, either due to a direct institutional demand or some situation that led to unexpected arrangements, resulting in their entry into teaching Communication Theory.

I started teaching when a coordinator at the college where I taught asked me to teach. There was no prior preparation from the college, nor any teaching methodology classes. The coordinator shared the literature of theories with me (Mauro Wolf, De Fleur and Mattelart) and I prepared myself by studying the literature (Jane, interviewee 37).

No, I'm a substitute teacher and, so to speak, the subject "fell into my lap" (Max, interviewee 29).

The subjects were assigned to me; I didn't have the opportunity to choose. There was a conversation with the coordinator to talk, in general terms, about the 4 subjects I was assigned to teach. None in particular. But I received help from a colleague who had taught that subject before me (Maria, interviewee 25).

Note, in this last response, the recourse to solidarity networks in order to obtain some preparation for teaching Communication Theory. As an institutionalized discipline and, therefore, endowed with a history—not only as part of communication knowledge, but also within university spaces—Communication Theory inevitably engages with a past, understood here as the symbolic capital accumulated over decades of its presence in the academic environment, with which the newly arrived teacher needs to engage.

It is at this point that the problem of the discipline's specificity seems to re-emerge: what would constitute preparation for the *theoretical part* of communication? In general, the elaboration of monographic research, from undergraduate research to postdoctoral studies, involves a relatively organized set of references from which the *theoretical framework* of the research is developed, and not a panoramic approach like that which characterizes the discipline of *Communication Theory*. In this sense, in the eyes of a hasty critic, the person would be able to teach the *theories* with which they worked throughout their

career, but not necessarily a whole set of concepts, without necessarily considering the various paths of the discipline, pointed out, among others, by LC Martino (2007) or LM Martino (2011; 2012; 2018a).

The responses seem to suggest a certain equivalence between studying a particular theoretical framework and the possibility of teaching Communication Theory—a correlation, it's worth noting, that cannot be ignored when considering the possibilities opened up by training in this area. Some of the questionnaire responses suggest this link between studying a framework and teaching assignments:

I was a graduate student, I studied theory in that environment (Mariane, interviewee 8).

Yes, prior preparation from the point of view of knowledge of Communication Theories took place during the completion of my master's research and, above all, my doctoral research, the latter addressing the issue of the theoretical training of the Social Communicator in the context of the University [Name], a case study on the teaching of Communication at [Name of the institution]. From the point of view of didactics, I have been learning over the years of experience (Fernando, interviewee 10).

The preparation consisted of analogous subjects from the master's degree in communication (Alex, interviewee 14).

However, there are some subtle nuances that might also be observable from the responses.

In the folklore of classrooms and university corridors—unsystematic spaces, but no less representative of academic decision-making—it is not uncommon to hear that the person assigned to teach Communication Theories based the course primarily on this or that theory (often their theoretical research framework) to the detriment of others. Obviously, this type of account cannot be taken as predominant, but rather as a symptom of the field from which more elaborate questions can be addressed. The choice to work with the discipline, in this sense, also seems to take into account personal perspectives and the specific place of the subject within the university space. This leads to the next point.

4. THE SYMBOLIC VALUE AND PLACE OF DISCIPLINE IN EDUCATION

At the same time, it is worth noting that entry into teaching this subject is also linked to the possibilities of adapting to other curricular components, as well as to the pedagogical culture of each educational institution responsible for characterizing what Hyland (2012) characterizes as *disciplinary identity*, constructed at the intersections of the teaching and research subject with the university research space where it is situated. One of the answers seems to more closely contemplate this aspect, suggesting a high degree of epistemological

indefiniteness rooted in the institutional perspective that presided, at a given moment, over the place where the person taught:

My first teaching experience in the subject of Communication Theory was at a private university, in a course whose pedagogical project did not correspond to the reality of the students. At the time, the beginning of the 21st century, the trend was to create fanciful names for subjects, in the belief that this was enough to guarantee interdisciplinarity. (Currently I see that this is a hasty and dazzled reading of Edgar Morin). Instead of “Communication Theory,” the name “Scientific Foundations of Communication” was used. Encouraged by a discourse that confused freedom with negligence, the syllabus was not followed. Instead of discussing theoretical schools, the classes explored questionable notions of body language and promoted debates about media based on common sense. There was no prior didactic preparation. The assessments were arbitrary, as there was no clear objective regarding the necessary skills and abilities. In practice, no scientific training was carried out. Neither the students nor the teachers knew exactly how that content could be useful (Elizabeth, interviewee 08).

My colleague’s response, due to its content, requires a pause for reflection in order to process it.

Initially, the institutional conditions of teaching stand out, an aspect not always present when observing Communication Theory issues from an epistemological point of view, but equally relevant when one remembers that discourses, including theoretical ones, do not escape their social conditions of production. Therefore, teaching the subject requires, first and foremost, an understanding of the discipline’s attributions in relation to the body of knowledge of a course—the interdisciplinary aspect mentioned by my colleague is representative of this need to situate the discipline.

Upon beginning to teach the subject, under a different name, the colleague observed a considerable thematic dispersion which, paradoxically, does not present itself as a way of establishing interdisciplinary dialogues, but rather as a limitation to the discussions to be held in class and to the pedagogical issues addressed as a whole. It is certainly symptomatic that the result of this disciplinary ambiguity is a misunderstanding of the objectives of the discipline, as indicated by the respondent.

Again, invoking a hasty critical perspective, one could ask what leads a discipline to face an identity crisis lasting more than fifty years, given that similar points were raised at other times by Noetti (1972) or Epstein (1982). At the same time, it is equally possible to ask to what extent the confrontation of problems related to this matter should not be all the more incisive, considering that this is not an isolated phenomenon in Communication Theory, but is reflected, from time to time, in questions raised within the field itself (Bonin, 2005; Santos, 2005; Temer, 2007).

These points seem to take on particular importance when considering that the institutional movement towards teaching Communication Theory, as found in some of the responses obtained in the questionnaire, suggests the existence of components related to aspects of chance, sometimes bordering on

randomness, present in the distribution of course assignments at the beginning of the semester. There is a whole set of academic dynamics, including collaborative networks, but also field effects, that may be related to how courses are distributed among professors. Although one may be aware of these aspects, the focus here—the beginning of teaching Communication Theory—seems to point to specific aspects of these university practices.

One of them would be the symbolic value attributed to Communication Theory within the context of courses in the field. Based on the responses, it is possible to work on some aspects. Communication Theory seems to occupy an ambiguous space, a kind of territory under construction, between two concepts, with a value that varies according to the conditions of its evaluation.

On the one hand, the discipline would be endowed with a high symbolic value stemming from being a *theoretical subject* par excellence and, therefore, restricted to people with the highest academic credentials, possessing a high level of academic capital that would make them capable of dealing in the field of theory.

I work at a private university and, when I started working there, being one of the few professors in the area with a doctorate, I was assigned to theoretical subjects. I have already taken courses and training in teaching for higher education. In general, only professors with doctorates are assigned these subjects here at the university (Carlos, interviewee 09).

I started teaching the subject when I took office in 2015. The preparation I received was not in the specific subject, but in the teaching internship I did during my master's and doctoral studies for other subjects (Gabriel, interviewee 22).

Throughout my academic training, I felt the need to delve deeper into theoretical discussions about communication from an early age. However, it was only during my doctoral studies that I had the opportunity to propose research that fundamentally valued the theoretical discussion of the field. I began teaching Theory (and Methodology) in my final year of doctoral studies, as an adjunct lecturer at the University of [Name] (George, interviewee 17).

On the other hand, precisely because it is a *theoretical subject*, it would be among the least prestigious among students, who seek a university education that is progressively interested in *practice* as a starting point for a pragmatic professional market and, to some extent, averse to *theory*—as Martino (2020) pointed out elsewhere, university advertisements emphasizing *practice from the first semester* or *here you learn by doing* would be representative of this discourse. One professor's response to the questionnaire reflects this theme, also indicative of the expectations a person might have when starting to teach the subject:

There is still a stigma that theoretical classes are the opposite of practical components, and students come to university very much stuck in the theory vs. practice dichotomy, not to mention that these stigmas are also reinforced by professors from fields whose components are more experimental (Lídia, interviewee 11).

Despite this aspect, three of the respondents indicated that they sought to teach Communication Theory voluntarily, due to research interest in this area.

In these cases, the entry was driven by the desire to teach this subject based on previous experiences in higher education combined with the opportunity to take on this discipline.

At this point, there is one aspect still to be addressed: the people who, in their questionnaire responses, indicated having had some kind of preparation for teaching Communication Theory. It should be noted that the concept of *preparation*, in this case, seems to vary between specific training in the discipline itself and the idea of training in pedagogy and didactics. The demand, however, is still highlighted by the research participants themselves, even when it comes to a voluntary pursuit of teaching this subject.

I started teaching communication courses in a technical subject, but since my undergraduate studies, I had an interest in Communication Theories. After years of teaching, a position opened up for Communication Theories, but I didn't receive any preparation in the area of teaching or didactics. Now, looking back, I realize how much a subject focused on didactics is lacking. In areas that are not teaching degrees, didactic knowledge is ignored. However, in postgraduate programs, which are training programs for teaching in higher education, teaching how to teach could be the norm (Sérgio, interviewee 30).

It is possible to revisit here the discussion from the first item regarding the conditions for delimiting the symbolic boundaries of a field of study and question to what extent the indication of the issue as a pedagogical problem—although, it should be emphasized again, this dimension exists—cannot ignore some of the demands for addressing epistemological problems in Communication that manifest themselves in the teaching of Communication Theory.

5. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The analysis of the 37 responses given to the questionnaire suggests the possibility of formulating some lines of argument, without any conclusive or generalizing intentions, regarding the beginning of teaching in Communication Theory.

From the beginning of the analysis, it is noted that most respondents (34) indicate that they took the course either by chance or by institutional determination, with only three indicating a manifestation of will in this regard, which leads to a question—for future discussions—about this absence. The course, as defined by one of the people already mentioned, “fell into their lap,” without any kind of prior preparation or direction in terms of adherence or research affinity.

Similarly, it is observed that the idea of *preparation* for teaching this subject is associated, when applicable, with Master's or Doctoral research, but not necessarily within the scope of Communication Theory, indicating that the idea of training is based on mastery of a specific theoretical field.

Issues related to Communication education seem to occupy a space that has been diachronically consolidated in the literature on the subject, suggesting

a constant—and justified—concern with the conditions of academic training for future professionals and researchers, while simultaneously working towards consolidating the symbolic boundaries of the field. Far from concluding any discussion, it is understood that these results may propose new research questions related to teaching conditions—a point to be connected with the professional and academic scenarios with which Communication Theory, as a discipline and area of knowledge, interacts.

REFERENCES

ALMEIDA, Sherry Mary Joan. Problematizações sobre pesquisa e ensino de teoria literária no Brasil. **Revista Gelne**, Natal, RN, v. 18, n. 2, p. 168-183, 2016. DOI: 10.21680/1517-7874.2016v18n2ID11210. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufrn.br/gelne/article/view/11210>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.

BACHELARD, Gaston. **O racionalismo aplicado**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1976.

BAPTISTA, Maria Luiza Cardinale. Disciplinas teóricas: de entulho de currículo a campo de desejo e autopoiese. 26º INTERCOM. **Anais [...]** Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2 a 6 set. 2003.

BARREIRA, Irllys Alencar Firmo. O ofício de ensinar para iniciantes. **Revista de Ciências Sociais**, Fortaleza, v. 45, n. 1, p. 63-85, 2014. Available at: <https://repositorio.ufc.br/handle/riufc/17951>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.

BARROS, José Costa D'Assunção. **A construção da teoria nas ciências humanas**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2018.

BARTHES, Roland. **O rumor da língua**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1987.

BAUMAN, Isabelle. Bagging a theory: A random sorting activity for teaching theorizing. **Communication Teacher**, v. 37, n. 3, p. 194–197, 2023. Available at: <https://encurtador.com.br/4oK3L>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.

BONIN, Jiani Adriana. Elementos para pensar a formação e o ensino em teorias da comunicação. **Conexão**, v. 4, n. 8, p. 61–68, 2005.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. **Por uma sociologia da ciência**. Lisboa: Ed. 70, 2017.

CAVALCANTI, Erinaldo Vicente. Onde está o ensino nas disciplinas de teoria da história ensinadas no Brasil? **História da Historiografia**, Ouro Preto, v. 14, n. 36, p. 133-166, 2021. DOI: 10.15848/hh.v14i36.1659. Available at: <https://www.historiadahistoriografia.com.br/revista/article/view/1659>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.

COSTA, Rosa Maria Costa Della. O ensino de Teoria da Comunicação nos cursos de graduação em Comunicação Social. 26º INTERCOM. **Anais [...]** Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2 a 6 de setembro de 2003.

DAU, Mayara Regina Pereira. Ensino de literatura e teoria literária: amores difíceis. **Trama**, v. 11, n. 23, p. 88-110, 2015. DOI: 10.48075/rt.v11i23.9941. Available at: <https://e-revista.unioeste.br/index.php/trama/article/view/9941>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.

EPSTEIN, Isaac. Um impasse curricular: teoria da Comunicação. *In*: MELO, José Marques de. **Ensino de Comunicação no Brasil**. São Paulo: Eca/Usf, 1987. p. 94-113.

FELINTO, Erick. Da teoria da comunicação às teorias da mídia: ou, temperando a epistemologia com uma dose de cibercultura. **Revista Eco-Pós**, v. 14, n. 1, p. 233-249, 2012. DOI: 10.29146/eco-pos.v14i1.920.

FLÔR, Cristhiane Cunha.; CASSIANI, Suzani. Qual química ensinar? Reflexões a respeito da educação química. **Revista Reflexão e Ação**, Santa Cruz do Sul, v. 24, n. 1, p. 366–381, 2016. DOI: 10.17058/rea.v24i1.3873. Available at: <https://online.unisc.br/seer/index.php/reflex/article/view/3873>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.

FRANÇA, Vera Regina Veiga. Teoria(s) da comunicação: busca de identidade e caminhos. **Revista da Escola de Biblioteconomia UFMG**, Belo Horizonte, v. 23, n. 2, p. 138-152, 1994. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufmg.br/index.php/reb/article/view/38276>. Accessed in: 26 Nov. 2025.

FRANÇA, Vera Regina Veiga. Paradigmas da Comunicação: conhecer o quê? *In*: MOTTA, Luiz Gonzaga; FRANÇA, Vera Regina; WEBER, Maria Helena. (org.). **Estratégias e culturas da comunicação**. Brasília: UnB, 2001. p. 6-19.

FUSS, Diana. Accounting for theory in the undergraduate classroom. *In*: SADOFF, Dianne; CAIN, William E. **Teaching contemporary theory to undergraduates**. The Modern Language Association of America: Nova Iorque, 2014. p. 15–30.

GRAY, Jennifer B. Flee boring explanations of theory. **Communication Teacher**, v. 37, n. 4, p. 266–271, 2023. DOI: 10.1080/17404622.2023.2242916. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17404622.2023.2242916>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.

HEISLER, Jennifer; DISCENA, Thomas. Teaching meta theoretical beliefs in Communication Theory. **Communication Teacher**, v. 19, n. 2, p. 44–47, 2005.

HICKSON, Mark; STAKS, Don. teaching the introductory communication theory course to undergraduates. **Communication Quarterly**, v. 41, n. 3, p. 261–26. DOI: 10.1080/01463379309369887.

HOOKS, bell. **Ensinando a transgredir**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2013.

HYLAND, Ken. **Disciplinary identities: individuality and community in academic discourse**. Cambridge: CUP, 2012.

- LIMA, Venício. **Mídia**: teoria e política. São Paulo: Perseu Abramo, 2001.
- LIMA, Venício. Repensando as Teorias da Comunicação. *In*: MELO, José Marques de. (org.) **Teoria e Pesquisa em Comunicação**. São Paulo: Intercom/Cortez, 1983. p. 85-99.
- LINS DA SILVA, Carlos Eduardo. Teoria da comunicação. *In*: MELO, José Marques de; FADUL, Anamaria; LINS DA SILVA, Carlos Eduardo. (org.). **Ideologia e poder no ensino de comunicação**. São Paulo: Cortez e Moraes/Intercom, 1979. p. 191-210.
- MAIA, João M. E. Ensinando a partir do sul. **Revista Brasileira de Sociologia**, v. 11, n. 27, p. 5-22, 2023. DOI: 10.20336/rbs.916. Available at: <https://rbs.sbsociologia.com.br/index.php/rbs/article/view/916>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.
- MAIA, Yasminne Alcântara da Silva; SANTOS, Liliane Bentes dos; SOUSA, Letícia Melo de; HIDALGOS, Eduardo Moraes; OLIVEIRA, Lucas da Silva; BADARÓ, Hugo Bueno; SOUZA, Amarinildo Osório de. Inovações para o ensino de teorias da comunicação. INTERCOM NORTE, 16, Manaus: **Anais [...]**, Universidade Federal do Amazonas, 24 a 26 maio 2017.
- MARTINS, Fernanda C. A.; SILVA, Marcela G. Caderno didático digital: uma estratégia para o ensino de Teorias da Comunicação. SEMINÁRIO DE PESQUISA, ENSINO E EXTENSÃO, 17. Unisc: **Anais [...]** Santa Cruz do Sul, 2012.
- MARTINO, Luís Mauro Sá. A disciplina interdisciplinar: ambivalências epistemológicas no ensino de Teoria(s) da Comunicação. **Logos**, v. 19, n. 1, p. 17-28, 2012. Available at: <https://www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/logos/article/view/4519>. Accessed in: 20 Jun. 2025.
- MARTINO, Luís Mauro Sá. Esboço de um panorama das teorias da comunicação no Brasil: uma aula inaugural. **Libero**, v. 21, n. 42, p. 95-110, 2018a. Available at: <https://seer.casperlibero.edu.br/index.php/libero/article/viewFile/998/923>. Accessed in: 20 Jun. 2025.
- MARTINO, Luís Mauro Sá. Genealogia dos Conceitos na Teoria da Comunicação: esboço de um panorama. **Revista Alaic**, v. 15, n. 1, p. 24-35, 2018b. Available at: <https://revista.pubalaic.org/index.php/alaic/article/view/468>. Accessed in: 20 Jun. 2025.
- MARTINO, Luís Mauro Sá. O que foi teoria da comunicação? Um estudo da bibliografia entre 1967-1986. **Revista Comunicação Midiática**, v. 6, n. 1, p. 28-39, 2011. Available at: <https://www2.faac.unesp.br/comunicacaomidiatica/index.php/CM/article/view/344>. Accessed in: 20 Jun. 2025.
- MARTINO, Luiz Claudio. (org.) **Teorias da Comunicação**: muitas ou poucas? Cotia: Ateliê, 2007.

MYERS, Scott. Learning by doing: student development and evaluation of communication theory. **Communication Teacher**, v. 36, n. 2, p. 153-159, 2022. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2021.1937667>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.

NOETTI, Cláudio. Escolas de Comunicação e Profissionalização. **Revista de Cultura Vozes**, v. 66, n. 8, p. 23-28, 1972.

OLIVEIRA, Márcio. O ensino da teoria sociológica em alguns cursos de Ciências Sociais de universidades públicas brasileiras. **Política & Sociedade**, Florianópolis, v. 14, n. 31, p. 87-113, 2015. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7984.2015v14n31p87>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.

PIGNATARI, Décio. **Contracomunicação**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1971.

REIS, Manuela. Entre textos e contextos: o ensino de teorias sociológicas. **Sociologia**: Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, Porto, v. 44, n. 1, p. 11-27, 2015. Available at: <https://ojs.letras.up.pt/index.php/Sociologia/article/view/13015>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.

RUSSI-DUARTE, Pedro. Por que ensinar teorias (da comunicação)? XXXIII INTERCOM. Caxias do Sul: **Anais [...]** Universidade de Caxias do Sul, 6 a 9 set. 2010.

SADOFF, Dianne F. Frameworks, materials, and the teaching of theory. *In*: SADOFF, Dianne; CAIN, William E. **Teaching contemporary theory to undergraduates**. The Modern Language Association of America: Nova Iorque, 2014. p. 103-113.

SANTOS, Tarcyanie Cajueiro. Teorias da Comunicação: caminhos, buscas e intersecções. **Famecos**, v. 12, n. 28, p. 21-44, 2005. DOI: 10.15448/1980-3729.2005.28.3348.

SOUZA, Pedro Mel Bardini; MARTINO, Luís Mauro Sá. O que se pensa sobre o ensino de Teoria da Comunicação? **Revista Cambiassú**, v. 20, n. 35, p. 114-135, 2025. Disponível em <https://periodicoseletronicos.ufma.br/index.php/cambiassu/article/view/25950>. Accessed in: 28 Nov. 2025.

TAVOLARO, Sergio Barreira de Faria. Teoria sociológica e metodologia. **Ideias**, Campinas, Edição Especial, p. 13-37, 2013. Available at: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/ideias/article/view/8649411>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025

TEMER, Ana Carolina Rocha Pessôa. Teorizar é pensar a prática: uma reflexão sobre o ensino das Teorias da Comunicação nos cursos de Jornalismo. **Revista Brasileira De Ensino De Jornalismo**, v. 1, n. 2. Available at: <https://www.rebej.abedor.org.br/index.php/rebej/article/view/96>. Accessed in: 25 Nov. 2025.

TRIVINHO, Eugenio. **O mal-estar na teoria**. São Paulo: Quartet, 2001.

VOCATE, Donna. Teaching communication theory in the professional school. **Journalism and Mass Communication Educator**, v. 52, n. 2, p. 4-16, 1997. DOI: 10.1177/107769589705200201. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/107769589705200201>. Accessed in: 11 Jan. 2025.