

CONFLICTS THAT ARISE IN THE USE OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM ACCENTUATED BY THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC<sup>1</sup>

*CONFLITOS QUE SE APRESENTAM NO USO DA TECNOLOGIA DIGITAL EM SALA DE AULA ACENTUADOS PELA PANDEMIA DA COVID-19*

*CONFLICTOS QUE SURGEN EN EL USO DE LA TECNOLOGÍA DIGITAL EN EL AULA ACENTUADOS POR LA PANDEMIA DE COVID-19*



Aline SILVA<sup>2</sup>  
e-mail: [acedecari@gmail.com](mailto:acedecari@gmail.com)



Adriana FISCHER<sup>3</sup>  
e-mail: [adrfischer@furb.br](mailto:adrfischer@furb.br)



Sandra POTTMEIER<sup>4</sup>  
e-mail: [pottmeyer@gmail.com](mailto:pottmeyer@gmail.com)

**How to reference this article:**

SILVA, A.; FISCHER, A.; POTTMEIER, S. Conflicts that arise in the use of digital technology in the classroom accentuated by the COVID-19 pandemic. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 19, n. 00, e024048, 2024. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v19i00.18703>



| Submitted: 20/11/2023  
| Revisions required: 02/01/2024  
| Approved: 25/02/2024  
| Published: 08/04/2024

**Editor:** Prof. Dr. José Luís Bizelli

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

<sup>1</sup> This article is affiliated with the thematic project “Academic-scientific literacies for the training of globalized teachers and researchers in scientific education: *podcasts*, *TED Talks* and confronting misinformation”, included in the macro-project “University apprentices in contemporary practices of academic-scientific literacy for training of globalized teachers and researchers”, FAPESP Thematic Project no. 2022/05908-0. It is also supported by CNPq, with a CNPQ/PQ2 productivity grant, a project entitled “Academic literacies: impacts and transformations in practices in educational contexts”.

<sup>2</sup> Regional University of Blumenau (FURB), Campus I, Blumenau – SC – Brazil. Master in Education.

<sup>3</sup> Regional University of Blumenau (FURB), Campus I, Blumenau – SC – Brazil. Adjunct Professor at the Center for Education Sciences, Arts and Letters (Department of Letters) and the Postgraduate Program in Education (Masters and Doctorate). PhD in Linguistics (UFSC).

<sup>4</sup> Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC), Trindade University Campus, Florianópolis – SC – Brazil. PhD in Linguistics. Teacher at the Santa Catarina State Public Network (SED/SC).

**ABSTRACT:** This article aims to identify conflicts that arise in the use of digital technologies (DT) in the classroom, accentuated by the COVID-19 pandemic. The methodology of this research is part of a qualitative approach circumscribed in a documentary approach based on the analysis of the discourse of two teachers in a live produced by the Aula Aberta project and the other carried out by the Brazilian Linguistics Association (ABRALIN) during the COVID-19 pandemic, in 2020. This research is affiliated with literacy studies that consider practices with social and plural digital technologies. The results indicate that literacy practices with DT can enhance teaching. However, this perspective, in parallel, shows that several DT used in social practices previously known in the student's daily life, to be inserted in the school sphere, cause conflicts to the detriment of precarious infrastructure and the lack of specific training of many teachers regarding their pedagogical use. in the COVID-19 pandemic.

**KEYWORDS:** Literacies. Digital Technologies. Teachers. Researchers. Lives.

**RESUMO:** Este artigo objetiva identificar conflitos que se apresentam no uso de tecnologias digitais (TD) em sala de aula acentuados pela pandemia da COVID-19. A metodologia desta pesquisa inscreve-se em uma abordagem qualitativa circunscrita em um enfoque documental a partir da análise da discursivização de duas professoras em uma live produzida pelo projeto Aula Aberta e a outra realizada pela Associação Brasileira de Linguística (ABRALIN) durante a pandemia da COVID-19, em 2020. Tal investigação afilia-se aos estudos dos letramentos que considera as práticas com tecnologias digitais sociais e plurais. Os resultados indicam que práticas de letramentos com TD podem potencializar o ensino. Contudo, tal perspectiva, paralelamente, evidencia que diversas TD utilizadas em práticas sociais antes conhecidas no cotidiano do estudante, para se inserirem na esfera escolar, ocasionam conflitos em detrimento da infraestrutura precária e da falta de formação específica de muitos professores quanto ao seu uso pedagógico na pandemia da COVID-19.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Letramentos. Tecnologias Digitais. Professores. Pesquisadores. Lives.

**RESUMEN:** Este artículo tiene como objetivo identificar los conflictos que surgen en el uso de las tecnologías digitales (TD) en el aula, acentuados por la pandemia de COVID-19. La metodología de esta investigación se inscribe en un enfoque cualitativo circunscrito en un enfoque documental basado en el análisis de la discursivización de dos profesoras en un en vivo (live) producido por el proyecto Aula Aberta y el otro realizado por la Asociación Brasileña de Lingüística (ABRALIN) durante la pandemia de COVID-19, en 2020. Dicha investigación está afiliada a los estudios de Letramientos, que consideran prácticas con tecnologías digitales, sociales y plurales. Los resultados indican que las prácticas de lectoescritura con TD pueden mejorar la enseñanza. Sin embargo, esta perspectiva, al mismo tiempo, muestra que varios TD utilizados en prácticas sociales previamente conocidas en la vida cotidiana del estudiante, para insertarse en el ámbito escolar, provocan conflictos en detrimento de la precaria infraestructura y la falta de formación específica de muchos docentes respecto a su uso pedagógico en la pandemia de COVID-19.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Alfabetizaciones. Tecnologías digitales. Profesores. Investigadores. Live.

## Introduction

The work presented here is part of a broader research (2020-2022) originating from the Postgraduate Program in Education at the Regional University of Blumenau, at master's level, with a theme focused on literacy practices using digital technologies (hereinafter DT), based on what teachers/researchers say. The main objective of this study is to understand literacy practices with digital technologies in Basic Education supported by *lives* undertaken by the Aula Aberta project and the Brazilian Linguistics Association (ABRALIN) bringing teachers/researchers, representatives from the areas of Education and Linguistics, in the pandemic of COVID-19, in the year 2020. This purpose is also coined by a specific objective, which seeks to identify the conflicts that arise in the use of DT in the classroom, accentuated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

From this perspective, we highlight as the focus of this study the deficit of pedagogical practices with DT in the classroom, since the expectation of this implementation encounters barriers, such as the lack of teacher training to use this technology and the infrastructure with incipient technological equipment in when it comes to the school context. In view of this, we can observe marks that are repeated in real conflicts in the classroom, manifested in the statements of two teachers who have carried out their research in the area of Language and Educational Sciences, specifically, in relation to Brazilian Basic Education. Given these initial remarks, we will address in this section the theoretical approaches for understanding the methodological and analytical directions of the present study.

## Literacies using digital technologies: theoretical-methodological approaches

Literacies (Street, 2003) are understood in this study as the set of social and plural practices seen from the relationship of writing as a historically situated practice (Barton; Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1994) and the use of DT (Gourlay; Hamilton; Lea, 2014). These act as fundamental components in current learning panoramas, because in line with the theoretical studies presented in this work, DT are designed with the potential to transversally influence learning, constitute and transform the subjects who use it in the most varied social spheres of human activity (family, work, school, among others) (Gourlay; Hamilton; Lea, 2014).

In this sense, it is worth thinking about the ideological model of literacy presented by Street (2006, p. 466) and which is taken up based on the reflections undertaken by Corrêa (2022, np, our translation) when he recognizes it as

[...] a multiplicity of literacies; that the meaning and uses of literacy practices are related to specific cultural contexts; and that these practices are always associated with power relations and ideology: they are not simply neutral technologies [...].

For these authors (Corrêa, 2022; Street, 2006), literacy practices that employ DT mark the positioning, time and place from which their users (interactants) enunciate in the most diverse contexts of using the language that is constitutive of digital instruments (cell phone, *tablet*, computer). In this sense, based on an ideological model in which these practices are inscribed, we can consider them “[...] as inextricably linked to the cultural and power structures of society [which] recognizes the variety of cultural practices associated with reading and writing in different contexts” (Street, 1993, p. 7, our additions, our translation).

It is in light of this perspective that the school sphere, at certain moments, such as the one presented in this article, puts tension on the uses of DT that students bring to the Basic Education classroom, precisely because it emphasizes another model of literacy, the autonomous model (Street, 1993; 2014). This aims to legitimize and validate school practices, which ends up marginalizing reading and writing practices that are not part of this social and cultural construct, the school, distancing itself from the *constitutive subjectivity* (Geraldi, 2015) of this learner, outside of school. A model aimed at schooling and a single *project of saying* (Geraldi, 2013[1991]), because it is woven by “[...] dominant conceptions of literacy [...]” that are “[...] constructed and reproduced in such a way as to marginalize alternatives and, we would suggest, to control aspects of language and thought [...]” (Street; Street, 2014, p. 121, our translation). These emphasize a “[...] technical and individual dimension” (Mortatti, 2004, p. 102, our translation). Different from ideological literacy which “[...] focuses on a social [and cultural] dimension” (Mortatti, 2004, p. 103, our translation).

Monte Mor (2017, p. 269, our translation) corroborates this thought, as it highlights the “[...] uncertainties regarding the adequacy of the use of digital technology in schools [...]”, stating that “[...] this was perceived when this use was compared to that of the users’ personal daily life”. It also emphasizes that “[...] learning to read and write represents the central reason for people to join school [...]”, this is because we are talking about a technology, since “[...] the school is portrayed as a creation or product of the written culture society [...]” (Monte Mor, 2017, p. 271-272, our translation). In other words, this institution must promote, based on pedagogical proposals, the construction of knowledge embedded in a technological process that produces meanings for and with students.

This scenario reverberates gaps in the initial and continuing training of teachers regarding DT and, therefore, digital literacy. However, it is permeated by “ubiquitous learning”, as highlighted by Monte Mor (2017). For the author, it consists of “Learning that has always existed, but which, when reinforced and supplemented by technological resources and academically recognized, has generated questions about the model of education and school and university institutions that have been established so far” (Monte Mor, 2017, p. 278, our translation). What the author points to a rupture when students who have entered schools with and in different contexts and experiences, when using DT, end up being instigated, by teachers who also used these technologies, to experience authentic, real learning processes permeated by “trial and error” (Monte Mor, 2017, p. 278, our translation).

In this sense, we agree with Monte Mor (2017, p. 282, our translation), when he indicates that the school has the function of promoting and valuing “[...] the subject as one who is capable of constructing meanings, having a critical vision, thus developing their subjectivity within the community they are part of – should be valued by school and academic institutions, reflected in their social participation”. Regarding this, studies have pointed to reading and writing practices in Higher Education and Basic Education being given new meanings in the face of the uses of academic literacies involving DT (Mendes, 2017) and Literature graduates (Miranda, 2016); in the initial and continuing training of teachers based on the creation of the Support Program for Interdisciplinary Educator Training Laboratories (LIFE) financed by the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) (Gonçalves, 2018); in promoting literacy and gamification practices in the context of formal and non-formal education with public school students (Vicentini, 2019).

In this sense, the approach of this work is classified as qualitative, because according to Martins (2004, p. 289, our translation) “qualitative research is defined as that which privileges the analysis of microprocesses, through the study of individual and group social actions, carrying out an intensive examination of the data, and characterized by heterodoxy at the time of analysis”. In other words, it essentially involves learning intuition, artisanal work by the researcher who carries out the research, mainly in data analysis and whose purpose is to promote understanding of the results obtained. It is also a study with a documentary focus (Cellard, 2008), given that, in this type of investigation, looking at written or virtual documents in our time are valuable for researchers and are linked in this research to qualitative analysis, because allows them to make temporal inferences leading to the understanding of a given social context.

This approach dialogues with the sociocultural perspective of literacies, because through the documents analyzed here based on excerpts from the *lives*, there is the possibility of observing the evolutionary development of individuals, social groups and concepts from their genesis to the present day (Cellard, 2008). In this sense, the speeches of teachers/researchers around the theme are analyzed based on the following sources: a *live* produced by the Aula Aberta project and one made by the Brazilian Linguistics Association (ABRALIN) during the COVID-19 pandemic, in 2020.

We chose these channels because these scientific communities bring together researchers from Brazil and around the world, the networks of meaning that are provided by this environment, the constancy and recurrence of *lives* around the areas of Education and Linguistics and the themes that involve literacy studies with digital technologies, currently, both representing the area of Language Education in Brazil. Thus, we selected two teachers/researchers, authors of documents that address DT in Basic Education and who have years of experience with a social function and relevant research in the object of knowledge of this study. The first teacher, researcher and author of “Ideas to think about the end of school”, professor Dr. Carla Coscarelli and the second teacher, researcher and author of “Education and digital technologies: cycles of precariousness in the face of the pandemic”, professor Dr. Ana Elisa Ribeiro, as shown in table 1, with basic information about the *lives* covered:

**Table 1** – *Lives* covered in the research.

EVENT	ABRALIN	AULA ABERTA (Open Class)
<b>Live Title</b>	“Education and digital technologies: cycles of precariousness in the face of the pandemic”.	“Ideas for thinking about the end of school”.
<b>Teacher/Researcher</b>	Prof. Dr. Ana Elisa Ribeiro	Prof. Dr. Carla Viana Coscarelli
<b>Date</b>	06/25/2020	07/18/2020
<b>Duration</b>	1h 33min 35s	1h 36min 01s
<b>Access Link</b>	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-lfTZT7oFI">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-lfTZT7oFI</a>	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UcCHga9c8RQ">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UcCHga9c8RQ</a>

Source: Prepared by the authors.

The statements are analyzed **from a** descriptive-interpretivist perspective (Bortoni - Ricardo, 2008) that responds to the enunciative-discursive conception of language (Bakhtin, 2011[1979]), which dialogues with literacy studies.

## Data analysis and discussion

From this perspective, when analyzing data on conflicts that arise when using DT in the classroom, accentuated by the COVID-19 pandemic, we debate how teachers/researchers (Coscarelli, 2020; Ribeiro, 2020) approach and discuss with other teachers about the conflicts identified in the classroom regarding the use of DT and how these challenges were revealed in the COVID-19 pandemic, such as the lack of specific training of many teachers regarding the pedagogical uses of DT and the precarious infrastructure, such as described in table 2.

**Table 2** – Conflicts that arise between expectations and real conditions for producing pedagogical practices with DT.

Document authors	Expectations of pedagogical practices with DT	Actual conditions
Ana Elisa Ribeiro; Carla Coscarelli (2020)	1 – Training teachers in the use of digital equipment.	Teachers who often do not feel prepared to use DT in the classroom.
Ana Elisa Ribeiro; Carla Coscarelli (2020)	2 – Classroom infrastructure with digital equipment.	In most schools, there is no classroom infrastructure with digital equipment.

Source: Prepared by the authors.

According to table 2, we can highlight marks that are repeated in real conflicts in the classroom, which are manifested in excerpts analyzed in part of this research. In principle, we discussed the training of teachers regarding the use of digital equipment, professionals who often do not feel prepared to use DT in their daily teaching. In this sense, we can infer from excerpts 1, 2 and 3, a difficulty in acceptance by some teachers and school managers who did not want to use DT at school:

Excerpt 1: *“There was a time when there was a teacher who didn’t want to, there was a director who didn’t allow technology to be used in the classroom.”* (Live produced by Carla Coscarelli, Aula Aberta, July/2020, our translation).

Excerpt 2: *“Having regular subjects as part of the curriculum of this training, but that is not there in the curriculum, not of this training to use equipment, it seems that when you use digital you will throw everything else away, you will be left alone in the digital, the rest falls away.”* (Live produced by Carla Coscarelli, Aula Aberta, July/2020, our translation).

Excerpt 3: *“There was not much training for technologies, there was a lack of training for some teachers who felt incapacitated for this use. Not because the teachers don’t have competence, but because the conditions are difficult, sometimes people end up getting tired of wanting and not being able to want and not being able to, it ends up frustrating a little”* (Live produced by Carla Coscarelli, Aula Aberta, July/2020, our translation).

What Coscarelli (2020) states encourages us to understand about and with the historical processes that involve the social reality of students in the classroom, in which we cannot leave aside the appreciation of the social and political context in which these subjects are inserted and which are directly linked to guaranteeing the right to school education and the development of their *projects* (Geraldi, 2013[1991]). This is because in this time and space involving DT in teaching and learning processes, there must be discussion about social and political issues, as well as the need for professional training (Cury, 2002) aimed at the use of these technologies (Fistarol; Pottmeier; De Caetano, 2021; Pottmeier; Caetano; Fischer, 2022; Vicentini, 2019).

On the one hand, it can be seen that the insertion of DT in the classroom requires methodological preparation and improvement of teachers to use these technologies and monitor students in this process. On the other hand, it is necessary to “listen” to teachers, as highlighted by Coscarelli (2020), since sometimes they can use DT in the classroom, sometimes they cannot. In other words, the curriculum also needs to be flexible for digital literacy practices, just as there needs to be a deconstruction in and of the *operating modes* of the educational system that still resists technological and innovation processes, whether due to the deficient structure found in different Brazilian school contexts, either due to the lack of initial and continued training that effectively encompasses DT in Basic Education (Pottmeier *et al.*, in press).

Therefore, there is a need to reorganize school pedagogical practices towards methodological approaches that are appropriate to the social reality of students (Barton; Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1994), as shown in excerpts 4 and 5:

Excerpt 4: “DTs are present in all environments for teachers, but it is the trainer's responsibility to train teachers, it is the school's responsibility to offer qualifications. The school can even pay for training, a specialization in DT for example, I'm not saying that the school should finance it, there are some that finance it, but others don't, they don't pay, but it needs to, for example, invest in you, freeing you up, freeing up hours for you and this is the participation of a school that is responsible for this teacher.” (Live produced by Ana Elisa Ribeiro, Abralín, June/2020, our translation).

Excerpt 5: “After this, many people will feel a little more comfortable with DT too, because the person was forced to go and suddenly becomes attached to some way of doing digital, I think there will be a change in perspective on this.” (Live by Ana Elisa Ribeiro, Abralín, June/2020, our translation).

Given the positions presented by Ribeiro (2020), we understand that teachers often use DT they do not know in their classes and, due to unforeseen events caused by the use of technologies not yet experienced, they have a negative impact and end up no longer using them,



then following paths that they consider easier (Gonçalves, 2018). To introduce the use of DT in the classroom, teachers may encounter possible challenges in this introduction (Gourlay; Hamilton; Lea, 2014).

However, this inclusion is very important, since students who arrive at schools already use DT to interact with others (family, friends) in other social spheres (family, religious, media, among others). And, the use of digital media, which is already part of students' daily lives, can be explored and expanded in order to develop their *projects* and *strategies of saying* (Geraldi, 2013[1991]) in the teaching and learning processes, as it enables teacher's performance in a situated, local way (Barton; Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1994).

Based on what Ribeiro (2020) says, we understand that there are conflicts present in the use of DT by teachers, among them, there is a portion that does not engage, nor seeks to deepen the use of DT in the classroom (Gourlay; Hamilton; Lea, 2014), as they consider that this use is something that is outside the “normal” model of classes. They act like this because the routine and pedagogical demands are often exhausting. When there is the possibility of professional development, it is only possible to do so with authorization from the institution. We understand in this scenario that there are challenges that need to be overcome in this regard, despite the advancement of policies that provide for a third of activity hours, in accordance with Law 11,738/2008 (Brazil, 2008), some states and municipalities still do not comply. School managers know little about the aforementioned law and fail to mobilize training in the workplace, often due to power relations between the education departments and the current political position, limiting the school to what it can and cannot do, what should and what should not do.

Another conflict that marks the insertion of DT is the infrastructure of classrooms, which have insufficient or low-quality digital equipment available to students and teachers. This context was worsened by the implementation of remote public education programs in Brazil to combat the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and the significant delays in the adoption of these programs. When schools closed in March 2020, almost all Brazilian states decided that classes would be transmitted over the internet, using digital platforms such as *Google Classroom* (Barberia; Cantarelli; Schmalz, 2021; Fistarol; Pottmeier; De Caetano, 2021).

According to Barberia, Cantarelli and Schmalz (2021, p. 10, our translation), “[...] only around 15% of states distributed devices, and less than 10% subsidized internet access [...]”, in an amount, therefore, insufficient for the number of students without access. Thus, educational programs did not consider problems of unequal access to education during the pandemic, with

the consequent worsening and reinforcement of inequalities that already existed even before COVID-19, since access was not guaranteed in the family environment, as pointed out in excerpts 6, 7 and 8:

Excerpt 6: “*In education we detected a big problem which is the lack of access to the internet, both for teachers and students, it is not just the lack of preparation sometimes on the part of teachers to deal with technology. The problem is not thinking interesting things, the problem is that many students don't have access, people need access to a means of communication.*” (Live produced by Carla Coscarelli, Aula Aberta, July/2020, our translation).

Excerpt 7: “*Changing this access to information, this access to information is a right, a computer with internet is a basic right, as many do not have access, they are no longer able to do many things and even have access to communication, and to We know that those who are rich and those who are poor cannot continue like this and there is no point in teaching literacy without providing access.*” (Live produced by Carla Coscarelli, Aula Aberta, July/2020, our translation).

Excerpt 8: “*The education department is often giving autonomy to schools, but has not offered any structure. Really, this lack of access is such an urgent demand.*” (Live produced by Carla Coscarelli, Aula Aberta, July/2020, our translation).

In view of what Coscarelli (2020) explains, we must consider the large number of people without access to DT, which has increased economic gaps, as it is not always positive for individuals and society who have less purchasing power (Nóvoa, 2020). Therefore, access to information is a necessity and the lack of it is a real conflict that hinders the implementation of DT in the classroom. In this sense, we observed that a portion of students are unable to have this infrastructure without the conflicts that arise, which are intensified by power relations, expectations and identities that are related to the sociocultural context in which these practices take place (Lea; Street, 2006).

As stated by Coscarelli (2020), social inequality as an emphasis in this work makes a difference to access to information. This is because it became even clearer and more accentuated due to part of society having this access and another part not having this right. According to the Continuous National Household Sample Survey – Information and Communication Technology (PNAD TIC), published by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), it was found that 21.7% of the population over the age of 10 no longer had access to the internet before the pandemic, in 2019 (Ibge, 2019). Among the reasons is the lack of connection, because “4.3 million did not access the internet, almost all of them on the public network (95.9%, or 4.1 million). [...]” (Exame, 2021, online, our translation).

It was also observed that “Owning a cell phone was even less common, 9.7 million students did not have the device, with 8.8 million of them (91.7%) attending the public education network” (Exame, 2021, online, our translation). Such data reinforce digital social exclusion and from them we understand the recognition of power and authority imbued in literacy practices (Lea; Street, 2006). This is because the use of DT by a portion of society with low purchasing power becomes a challenge, as there is no access to communication and information for the entire Brazilian population, not even before the COVID-19 pandemic.

According to excerpts presented so far, inequality in infrastructure, especially regarding access to the internet, highlights what Lea and Street (2006) understand from a perspective that emphasizes the power relations of those who can and cannot have access when it comes to literacy practices using DT before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Buckingham (2010) corroborates this discussion when reflecting on and with the principle that social inequalities can reduce access to DT and influence its use in a school environment in a negative way, since students could acquire scientific knowledge at a use DT in your teaching and learning processes.

These data indicate, in turn, that the political transformations and modernizations that Brazil has undergone, with measures being applied from the dominant classes to the less favored ones (Cury, 2002), reproduce, through social relations, this dependence of the dominated classes towards what is adopted by the ruling class. The reality of the popular classes is not the same as that of the dominant classes, which is directly related to the social inequalities present in Brazil, such as the increase in poverty (Bianchetti; Valle, 2014). It is necessary to reduce inequalities so that the poorest and most marginalized strata can have access to school education.

Furthermore, the excerpts have demonstrated that it is possible to observe the lack of representation of marginalized social groups in the context of politics (Bianchetti; Valle, 2014), a necessary element so that the voice of these populations could be heard in discussions involving access to education. We understand that union and discussion between the dominant classes and others is necessary and urgent for the inclusion of different social groups in Basic Education with a guarantee not only of access, as already guaranteed by law (Brazil, 1988; 1996), but that conditions for these students to remain, as highlighted in excerpts 9 and 10:

*Excerpt 9: “It means that it will be very difficult for us to go to a classroom, for 40, 50 people without a window, without ventilation and for health reasons we will not be able to do so, teachers over 60 years old will not be able to return. Over time, we noticed that this situation of remote teaching, which has become established, is a situation that can last and then become an alternating*

*thing, we are talking about hybridization.” (Live produced by Carla Coscarelli, Aula Aberta, July/2020, our translation).*

Excerpt 10: *“The lack of infrastructure of equipment, network, software, and the lack of qualifications, so we are only working in precarious conditions, we are working because we don't have the things, because we don't have the equipment, because we don't have the broadband, because the country's broadband is bad, because it's expensive.” (Live produced by Carla Coscarelli, Aula Aberta, July/2020, our translation).*

Coscarelli (2020) takes a look at exclusionary and late-character contexts in relation to the implementation of democratic education in Brazil (Cury, 2008). In this sense, there is tension within the supposed advancement of education as a universal right, which, in practice, ends up being a privilege for the few (Bianchetti; Valle, 2014). In this way, the need to highlight the issues involving social inequality in this context becomes clear, which, with the pandemic and the need to use DT to continue remote teaching, became even more evident. There is no way to act with global resources, to think as if we were another country, which has many more resources than ours (Nóvoa, 2020), without visualizing a situated practice (Barton; Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1994).

So, in this situation marked by conflicts, on the one hand, we have a strong contingency of resources, given that there has been a reduction in funding for education (Komesu; Assis; Fluckrigger, 2020), at the same time that there is interest on the part of teachers for more qualified training in the use of DT, which were fundamental for maintaining school activities, and should remain so. Therefore, this is a solution both for communicating results and for maintenance and continuity in this scenario.

In this way, the gap left is discovered by the fact that the novelty of technology is almost always associated with progress, with development with the promise of ever-ascending social mobility, interaction with others, without geographical barriers and without conflicts, but it does not bring the qualification of their insertion in a social and historical order (Komesu; Assis; Fluckrigger, 2020). Thus, the impermanent dynamic of transformation by a portion of society is admittedly unhappy by the new.

Therefore, we see that the practices of teachers, when observed in relation to the use of DT, constitute conflicts, both in the context of teacher training, in decisions regarding work with digital technologies, and in various interactions with students in the classroom (physical and *online*), which must be discussed. Given this, we understand that social contexts are often disregarded in the school context.

## Final remarks

This study, by proposing to identify conflicts that are marked in the relationship between expectations and real conditions for the production of pedagogical practices with DT, highlights that it is necessary to promote changes in schools, so that they better connect with the social reality of today's society. Such changes need to happen in the pedagogical practice of teachers, in the actions of students, in the transformation of schools as an environment that provides meaningful knowledge, in the new curricular organization in a way that values the reality of students and that there is clarity in the use of DT in this space.

Thus, the relationship between DT and the way people use it needs to be problematized, as it is not DT that shapes these practices, but its use that will bring about changes (Barton; Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1994; Monte Mor, 2017) based on individuals who participate in these processes in a meaningful way. However, they will not necessarily bring improvements and results to these practices (Barton; Hamilton, 1998), therefore, it depends on the directions of their use, based on the planning, interaction and conceptual mediation of the teacher who uses this resource. However, it is clear that the use of DT in the classroom does not guarantee significant learning, as it requires its use in a situated way and related to the student's reality.

Furthermore, the democratization of access for all equally is urgent (Bianchetti; Valle, 2014). In this sense, the teacher needs to be prepared to use technologies in the school context in a meaningful way, which enables democracy in the classroom so that students feel included in this space. Thus, the results indicate that literacy practices with digital technologies in the classroom can enhance teaching, however, these approaches, in parallel, indicate that several DT, despite being used by students in their daily lives, in social practices previously known, to If they are inserted into the school environment, they cause conflicts to the detriment of the precarious infrastructure and the lack of specific training of many teachers regarding the pedagogical uses of these DT accentuated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

From this perspective, we consider that the use of technologies helps in the learning process, but it is not the use itself that will significantly change learning in the school environment. It is necessary to be clear about how the practice carried out with the use of technology will bring relevance to the student's reality, as simply introducing DT without effective planning, without relating them to the learner's context, will not bring effective results.

Therefore, it becomes essential to rethink the training and role of the teacher to use these digital resources and instruments for pedagogical purposes to act in the training of students, so that they can enhance learning (Gourlay; Hamilton; Lea, 2014). In this way, the use of DT

provides the opportunity to rethink pedagogical practices with such resources and can bring students' enchantment back to the classroom, considering planning and interactions conveyed by teachers' theoretical-methodological knowledge.

## REFERENCES

BAKHTIN, M. M. **Estética da criação verbal**. Translated by: Paulo Bezerra. 6. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2011[1979].

BARBERIA, L. G.; CANTARELLI, L. G. R.; SCHMALZ, P. H. S. **Uma avaliação dos programas de educação pública remota dos estados e capitais brasileiros durante a pandemia do Covid-19**. [S. l.]: FGV, 2021. Available at: <http://fgvclear.org/site/wp-content/uploads/remote-learning-in-the-covid-19-pandemic-v-1-0-portuguese-diagramado-1.pdf>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

BARTON, D.; HAMILTON, M. Literacy Practices. In: BARTON, D.; HAMILTON, M. **Local literacies: reading and writing in one community**. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. p. 7-15.

BIANCHETTI, L.; VALLE, I. R. V. Produtivismo acadêmico e decorrências às condições de vida/trabalho de pesquisadores brasileiros e europeus. **Ensaio: avaliação e políticas públicas em Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 22, n. 82, p. 89-110, jan./mar. 2014. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/ensaio/a/McWkP54pFcYWp9t9Y48YftJ/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

BORTONI-RICARDO, S. M. **O professor pesquisador: introdução à pesquisa qualitativa**. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2008.

BRASIL. **Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988**. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 1988. Available at: <http://www.stf.jus.br/arquivo/cms/legislacaoconstituicao/anexo/cf.pdf>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

BRASIL. **Lei N. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996**. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Brasília, DF: MEC, 1996. Available at: [http://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/lei9394\\_ldbn1.pdf](http://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/lei9394_ldbn1.pdf). Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

BRASIL. **Lei N. 11.738, de 16 de julho de 2008**. Regulamenta a alínea “e” do inciso III do **caput** do art. 60 do Ato das Disposições Constitucionais Transitórias, para instituir o piso salarial profissional nacional para os profissionais do magistério público da educação básica. Brasília: Presidência da República, 2008. Available at: [https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/\\_ato2007-2010/2008/lei/11738.htm](https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2008/lei/11738.htm). Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

BUCKINGHAM, D. Cultura digital, educação midiática e o lugar da escolarização. **Educ. Real.**, Porto Alegre, v. 35, n. 03, p. 37-58, dez. 2010. Available at: [http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S0100-31432010000300004&lng=pt&nrm=iso](http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0100-31432010000300004&lng=pt&nrm=iso). Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

CELLARD, A. A análise documental. *In: POUPART, J. et al. A pesquisa qualitativa: enfoques epistemológicos e metodológicos*. Translated by: Ana Cristina Nasser. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2008.

COSCARELLI, C. V. Ideias para se pensar o fim da escola. *In: PROJETO DE EXTENSÃO AULA ABERTA* do CEFET-MG, Belo Horizonte, 2020. 1 vídeo (96 min.). Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UcCHga9c8RQ>. Access: 20 May 2021.

CURY, C. R. J. A Educação Básica no Brasil. *Educ. e Soc.*, Campinas, SP, v. 23, n. 80. p. 168-200, set. 2002. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/Hj6wG6H4g8q4LLXBcnxRcxD/?format=pdf>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

CURY, C. R. J. A Educação Básica como direito. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 38, n. 134, p. 293-303, maio/ago. 2008. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/cp/a/QBBB9RrmKBx7MngxzBfWgcF/?format=pdf>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

CORRÊA, M. L. G. Letramentos em perspectiva histórica: do império da escrita aos sonhos do pós-pandemia. *Muiraquitã: Revista de Letras e Humanidades*, v. 1, n. 1, maio/2022. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufac.br/index.php/mui/article/view/5829/3625>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

EXAME. **IBGE**: um quinto dos brasileiros entrou na pandemia sem acesso à internet. 2021. Available at: <https://exame.com/tecnologia/no-pre-covid-brasil-tinha-12-mi-de-familias-sem-acesso-a-internet-em-casa/>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

FISTAROL, C. F.; POTTMEIER, S.; DE CAETANO, M. H. O uso do aplicativo Google Classroom durante a pandemia Covid-19: o que enunciam docentes de língua inglesa da rede pública municipal de ensino de Blumenau/SC? *Revista Científica do UBM*, v. 23, n. 45, p. 14-25, 5 jul. 2021. Available at: <https://revista.ubm.br/index.php/revistacientifica/article/view/1024/261>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

GEE, J. P. Orality and literacy: from the savage mind to ways with words. *In: MAYBIN, J. (ed.). Language and literacy in social practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1994. p. 168-192.

GERALDI, J. W. *Portos de Passagem*. 5. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2013[1991].

GERALDI, J. W. *Ancoragens – Estudos bakhtinianos*. 2. ed. São Carlos, SP: Pedro & João Editores, 2015.

GONÇALVES, K. *Práticas de letramentos acadêmicos com tecnologias digitais: tensões, sentidos e expectativas de professores formadores em um LIFE*. 2018. 193 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Centro de Ciências da Educação, Universidade Regional de Blumenau, Blumenau, SC, 2018. Available at: [http://www.bc.furb.br/docs/DS/2018/365782\\_1\\_1.pdf](http://www.bc.furb.br/docs/DS/2018/365782_1_1.pdf). Access: 4 Nov. 2023.

GOURLAY, L.; HAMILTON, M.; LEA, M. R. Textual practices in the new media digital landscape: messing with digital literacies. **Research in Learning Technology**, v. 21, 2014. Available at: <https://journal.alt.ac.uk/index.php/rlt/article/view/1442>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

IBGE. **Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios Contínua**, 2019. Available at: <https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/populacao/9173-pesquisa-nacional-por-amostra-de-domicilios-continua-trimestral.html?=&t=destaques>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

KOMESU, F.; ASSIS, J. A.; FLUCKRIGER, C. Em torno dos efeitos da Covid em práticas letradas acadêmicas. *In*: KOMESU, F.; ASSIS, J. A.; FLUCKRIGER, C. **Práticas Discursivas em Letramento Acadêmico: questões em Estudo**. Belo Horizonte: PUC- Minas, 2020. p. 15-100.

LEA, M.; STREET, B. The “Academic Literacies” Model: Theory and Applications. **Theory Into Practice**, v. 45, n. 4, p. 368-77, 2006. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40071622>. Access: 12 May 2023.

MARTINS, H. H. T. S. Metodologia qualitativa de pesquisa. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 30, n. 2, p. 289-300, maio/ago. 2004. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/ep/a/4jbGxKMDjKq79VqwQ6t6Ppp/?format=pdf>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

MENDES, M. A. **Letramentos acadêmicos na educação profissional e tecnológica: práticas de docentes com tecnologias digitais**. 2017. 177 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Centro de Ciências da Educação, Universidade Regional de Blumenau, Blumenau, SC, 2017. Available at: [http://www.bc.furb.br/docs/DS/2017/364492\\_1\\_1.pdf](http://www.bc.furb.br/docs/DS/2017/364492_1_1.pdf). Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

MIRANDA, F. D. S. S. **Letramentos (en)formados por relações dialógicas na universidade: ressignificações e refrações com tecnologias digitais**. 2016. 414 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística Aplicada) – Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, Campinas, SP, 2016. Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12733/1629247>. Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

MONTE MOR, W. Sociedade da escrita e sociedade digital: línguas e linguagens em revisão. *In*: TAKAKI, N. H.; MONTE MOR, W. (org.). **Construções de sentido e letramento digital crítico na área de línguas/linguagens**. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2017. p. 267-286.

MORTATTI, M. R. L. **Educação e letramento**. São Paulo: UNESP, 2004.

NÓVOA, A. Formação Continuada - Aula Magna António Nóvoa. *In*: **Instituto Anísio Teixeira – IAT, Canal Educação Bahia, Salvador**, 14 abr. 2020. 1 vídeo (79 min). Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wx-deAxdegE>. Access: 14 Apr. 2020.

POTTMEIER, S.; CAETANO, M. H. C.; FERRI, C.; FISCHER, A. Currículo e Letramentos Digitais no Novo Ensino Médio. **e-Curriculum**, no prelo.



POTTMEIER, S.; CAETANO, M. H. C.; FISCHER, A. “Novo! Ensino Médio: diálogos possíveis sobre/com e a partir dos letramentos. SANTANA, W. K. F.; SILVEIRA, É. L. (org.). **Educação, Múltiplas Linguagens e Estudos Contemporâneos**. 1. ed. São Carlos, SP: Pedro & João Editores, 2022, v. 1, p. 203-215. Available at:

<https://pedrojoaoeditores.com.br/produto/educacao-multiplas-linguagens-e-estudos-contemporaneos-vol-1/>. Access: 26 Aug. 2022.

RIBEIRO, A. E. Educação e tecnologias digitais: ciclos da precariedade diante da pandemia. *In: ABRALIN - Associação Brasileira de Linguística*, Campinas, SP, 2020. 1 vídeo (93 min.). Available at: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_lftZT7oFI](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_lftZT7oFI). Access: 20 May 2021.

STREET, B. **Cross-cultural Approaches to Literacy**. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

STREET, B. **Abordagens alternativas ao letramento e desenvolvimento**. Teleconferência Unesco Brasil sobre letramento e diversidade, out. 2003.

STREET, B. Perspectivas Interculturais sobre o letramento. *In: STREET, B.; BAGNO, M. Perspectivas interculturais sobre o letramento. **Filologia E Linguística Portuguesa**, v. 8, p. 465-488, 2006. Available at: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/flp/article/view/59767/62876>. Access: 02 Sep. 2022.*

STREET, B.; STREET, J. A escolarização do letramento. *In: STREET, B. **Letramentos sociais**: abordagens críticas do letramento no desenvolvimento, na etnografia e na educação*. Translated by: Marcos Bagno. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2014. cap. 5. p. 121-144.

VICENTINI, M. A. **Práticas de letramentos com tecnologias digitais**: gamificação em um clube de inglês no ensino médio. 2019. 174 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Centro de Ciências da Educação, Artes e Letras, Universidade Regional de Blumenau, Blumenau, 2019. Available at: [http://www.bc.furb.br/docs/DS/2019/366893\\_1\\_1.pdf](http://www.bc.furb.br/docs/DS/2019/366893_1_1.pdf). Access: 04 Nov. 2023.

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

---

**Acknowledgments:** We thank the Regional University of Blumenau for offering the Interinstitutional Master's Degree (Minter) in the Postgraduate Program in Education in partnership with Faculdade Santo Agostinho (Itabuna/BA).

**Financing:** No institutional support.

**Conflicts of interest:** There are no conflicts of interest.

**Ethical approval:** The work did not go through an ethics committee, as the data obtained is available on public domain access platforms.

**Availability of data and material:** The data and materials used in the article are available for access in the body and references of the text.

**Author contributions:** Describe the contribution of each author to this work.

---

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

