

<https://doi.org/10.1590/198053147126>

DIGITAL CULTURE AND LITERATURE TEACHING AT SECONDARY SCHOOLS¹

 Emanuel do Rosário Santos Nonato¹

¹Universidade do Estado da Bahia (Uneb), Salvador (BA), Brasil; enonato@uneb.br

Abstract

The digital culture in high schools puts into question the pedagogical practice and, in the case of literature teaching, the way one interprets and enjoys literature in the classroom. This research measures the perception of the teachers of the public schools in relation to the dialogue between digital culture through its artefacts and the pedagogical process in literature classes in high school education. It is a survey with 802 school teachers from public high schools in Bahia who declared they teach literature in high schools. The data produced demonstrates that digital technologies are being used in the pedagogical process in literature classes with the consequent insertion of the school life in the way of life mediated by digital technologies.

DIGITAL CULTURE • HIGH SCHOOL • LITERATURE • TEACHING

CULTURE NUMÉRIQUE ET ENSEIGNEMENT DE LA LITTÉRATURE DANS LE SECONDAIRE

Résumé

La culture numérique dans le secondaire problématise comment se déroule la pratique pédagogique et dans le cas des cours de littérature comment apprendre l'interprétation et la jouissance des textes littéraires en milieu scolaire. Par le biais d'un survey, cette étude évalue la dimension de la perception d'un groupe d'enseignants concernant le dialogue entre la culture numérique et la pratique pédagogique dans l'enseignement de la littérature. L'enquête a été menée auprès de 802 enseignants ayant déclaré enseigner la littérature dans des écoles secondaires du réseau scolaire public de l'état de Bahia. L'ensemble de données montre que les technologies numériques sont incorporées dans la pratique pédagogique des professeurs de littérature et que, par conséquent, l'école s'insère aussi dans la culturelles numérique.

CULTURE NUMÉRIQUE • ÉCOLE SECONDAIRE • LITTÉRATURE • ENSEIGNEMENT

CULTURA DIGITAL Y ENSEÑANZA DE LITERATURA EN LA ESCUELA SECUNDARIA

Resumen

La cultura digital en la escuela secundaria problematiza el modo como se da la práctica pedagógica y, en el caso de la enseñanza de literatura, la fruición y la interpretación de las obras de arte literaria en el ambiente escolar. Este estudio mide la percepción de los docentes de la red pública sobre el diálogo de la cultura digital, por medio de sus artefactos, con el hacer pedagógico en la docencia de literatura en la enseñanza secundaria por medio de un survey aplicado a 802 docentes de escuelas públicas de Bahía que declararon impartir clases de Literatura en la enseñanza secundaria. El conjunto de los datos recogidos demuestra la inserción de las tecnologías digitales en la práctica pedagógica de profesores de Literatura con la consiguiente inserción de la escuela en el modo de ser y de hacer mediado por las tecnologías digitales.

CULTURA DIGITAL • ESCUELA SECUNDARIA • LITERATURA • ENSEÑANZA

CULTURA DIGITAL E ENSINO DE LITERATURA NA EDUCAÇÃO SECUNDÁRIA

Resumo

A cultura digital no ensino médio problematiza o modo como se dá a prática pedagógica e, no caso do ensino de literatura, a fruição e a interpretação das obras de arte literária no ambiente escolar. Este estudo dimensiona a percepção dos docentes da rede pública estadual da Bahia sobre o diálogo da cultura digital, mediante seus artefatos, com o fazer pedagógico na docência de literatura no ensino médio através de um survey aplicado a 802 docentes da rede estadual de ensino da Bahia que declararam ensinar literatura no ensino médio. O conjunto dos dados demonstra a inserção das tecnologias digitais na prática pedagógica dos professores de Literatura, com a consequente inserção da escola no modo de ser e de fazer mediado pelas tecnologias digitais.

CULTURA DIGITAL • ENSINO MÉDIO • LITERATURA • ENSINO

IN ORDER TO REFLECT ABOUT LITERATURE TEACHING IN SECONDARY SCHOOL, IT IS NECESSARY TO consider how culture is produced and perceived in contemporary world because a) culture marks school life the same way it marks all other expressions of life. In other words, culture is the dialectical fruit of those expressions of life: it shapes them and is shaped; b) literature is art beyond its aspect of a content in a school syllabus, it is the artistic expression of the time and place that produced it and, as such, it is in constant dialogue with the culture and place in which it is consumed and resignified.

The necessity of dialogue with digital culture concerning its impact on literature teaching is also due to the understanding of the way one apprehends the aesthetics experiences (fruition) and understands the aesthetics expressions (interpretation), which are products of one's own culture or belong to other cultures separated by time and space, is intimately connected to the way the culture which one is immersed in is organized and articulated. Education cannot be analyzed in dissonance with the cultural context it is inserted in and to which it prepares the subjects in constant interaction with the sociocultural environment either.

This study aims to understand the perception of public school teachers about the dialogue between the digital culture through its artefacts and the pedagogical practice of literature teaching in high school in order to identify and describe the state of the process of school approximation and assimilation by the digital culture. It is a subproject of the research project "Networks and Digital Culture Educational Observatory" developed by the Research Group "Formation, Technologies, Distance Education and Curriculum" of Bahia State University (ForTEC/Uneb).

This paper focuses on literature teaching approach towards Digital Information and Communication Technology (DICT) through public literature school teachers in Bahia answers to four questions taken from the questionnaire of preliminary information of the first edition of the Course of Educational Technology.²

It is a survey designed to reveal how public school teachers in Bahia State, Brazil, think about using DICT in their pedagogical practice as long as to understand how the digital culture is inserted on their pedagogical practice. This research focused those school teachers who declared themselves to be high school literature teachers, according to the following research question: how does the digital culture, identified through technological devices, present itself on the pedagogical practice of literature school teachers?

DIGITAL CULTURE

The appearance of new behavioral patterns, i. e., the cultural redefinition of the way one deals with the instruments of social interaction as well as the mechanisms of self construction puts pressure on the institutions in order to its reorganization in dialogue with the operative and discursive demands of the subjects in relation to both social and cultural acts. That is to say that "the emergency of digital technologies and the development of new social practices or new ways of mediating social practices already established are determinant to the development of a digital culture"³ (NONATO; SALES, 2019, p. 152, own translation).

² Distance Education Unit, Bahia State University (2014/2015).

³ In the original: "a emergência das tecnologias digitais e, com ela, o desenvolvimento de novas práticas sociais ou de novas formas de mediar práticas sociais já estabelecidas são determinantes para o desenvolvimento de uma cultura digital".

Human Sciences have already understood for a long time that “man’s presence on machines is a perpetual invention. The thing that is in the machine is the human reality, it is the fixed and crystalized human gesture inside functional structures”⁴ (SIMONDON, 1989, p. 12, own translation). They are not merely operative mutations, i. e., changes of the mode of production in Capitalism in a strict sense. This is about a very profound change that is inscribed on the *continuum* of human history that is marked by the inseparability of technics and technology in the self building of humanity.

Digital culture is used here both as the synthesis of the relationship between culture and Information Technology (IT) (HOFFMANN; FAGUNDES, 2008) and how this movement of production of the existence mediated through DICT (NONATO; SALES, 2019) is forged in the context of the social changes of the “Information Society” announced by Castells (2005). It articulates the idea of culture, according to Williams (2000), as a reunion of all dimensions of social life such as

[...] “the artistic and intellectual activities”, although, due to emphasis on a general system of signification, these activities are defined in a much broader sense in order to include not only arts and traditional way of intellectual production, but also every “significant practice” – from language, arts and philosophy to journalism, fashion and publicity – that constitutes this complex and necessarily extensive field now. (WILLIAMS, 2000, p. 13)

So, to deal with digital culture one has to understand the role digital technologies have on human activities in this time in history. This does not mean that culture as a fully and pure human enterprise is now being invaded by technology: on the contrary, each and every culture has got and supposes a technics and a technology that the human being produces as a condition and consequence of its existence in the world.

Thus, in order to understand the culture in which we live, it is important to highlight that

[...] the contemporary society is a context strongly subject to the mass media rules: it is therefore mediatic, hence the importance of spectacle and image. Literature, considered as a social act, also seems to suffer from the forces of the journalistic field, without forgetting the effects of economic forces.⁵ (SOARES, 2009, p. 208, own translation)

Thus, the cultural change that Informationalism (CASTELLS, 2005) provides impacts on our life insofar as it creates and recreates the spaces of human interaction and of production of culture. Castells (2002, p. 15) explains that when he states that

[...] new information technologies are transforming the way we produce, consume, manage, live, and die; not by themselves, certainly, but as powerful mediators of the broader set of factors that determines human behavior and social organization.

While avoiding any outburst of technological determinism, this modulation that Castells (2002, 2005) presents correctly marks DICT out – we unfold DICT from the IT approach that Castells (2002) originally indicates, because we consider it to be contained within the plural form the author uses – as a mediator in these process of cultural remodeling due to the emergence of new elements that lead to the reconfiguration of ancestral social and cultural practices as well as the

4 In the original: “la présence de l’homme aux machine est une invention perpétuée. Ce que réside dans les machine, c’est de la réalité humaine, du geste humain fixé et cristallisé en structures qui fonctionnent”.

5 In the original: “la société contemporaine est un contexte social fortement soumis aux règles des mass-media: elle est donc médiatique, d’où l’importance du spectacle et de l’image. La littérature, considérée comme acte social, semble souffrir, elle aussi, les forces du champ journalistique, sans oublier les effets des forces économistes”.

development of new practices consistent with previously inconceivable interactional possibilities. Also, art, that is always sensitive to social and cultural changes, is impacted by Informationalism.

Hereupon, it is also fundamental to highlight that “post modernity – society of spectacle and images – is at least partly defined by the massive transformation of its own category of Beauty into consumer object” (JAMESON, 2004, p. 152). This is essential to the discussion of Literature teaching in digital culture, both due to its condition as art, therefore tributary to the idea of beauty, and due to the emphasis on imagetics as a primordial manifestation of digital culture as an outspread of post modernity, although we do not investigate these categories thoroughly here.

The conflicts imposed by this context to all institutions have necessary implications on schools, because it is an outspread or reflex of the conflicts of the subjects in their dynamics of adaptation to the demands of the new relational and cultural paradigm and of production of demands related to the dynamics of imbrication man/machine and it surpasses a dichotomy of opposition man/machine that could justify any kind of technological determinism.

But DICT strength, rhythm and depth of impact on education is necessarily conditioned by deep asymmetries. Thereby,

[...] we face constant conflicts of power between a young digital culture that is anxious to use and explore the potential of digital technologies and an analogical school culture afraid of the effects and consequences of the spread of these technologies in the school, an educational space that seem to remain disassociated from the Digital Culture in which it is inset.⁶ (NOGUEIRA; PADILHA, 2014, p. 269, own translation)

Digital Culture imposes the rediscussion of the parameters of understanding in relation to culture, reshaping the concepts of real and virtual in order to clarify the comprehension that “all realities are communicated by symbols [thus] [...] each reality is perceived virtually” (CASTELLS, 2005, p. 459). It is always useful to remember Lévy’s admonition (2011, p. 15, own translation) related to virtuality: “in strictly philosophical terms, the virtual is not opposed to the real but to the current: virtuality and actuality are just two ways of being different”.⁷

But, even if we could not reduce the complexity of the cultural dynamics of the technological devices as aprioristic defining objects of the way in which we produce culture in a specific historical moment, we also cannot minimize them to the point of ceasing to recognize its systemic importance in the constitution of how a culture is formed and forms its subjects. So, it is always convenient to remember that “media are means and, as the name suggests, are merely means, i. e., material support, physical channels in which languages as embodied through which they operate”⁸ (SANTAELLA, 2003, p. 25, own translation). Considering Digital Culture, it is important to remember that its dynamics is intimately connected to the logic of DICT feedback, because

[...] the characteristics of the current technological revolution is not the centrality of knowledge and information, but the application of knowledge and information in order to produce knowledge and information processing and communication devices in a cumulative cycle of realimentation between innovation and use. (CASTELLS, 2005, p. 69)

6 In the original: “presenciamos, então, conflitos constantes de poder, onde de um lado está uma cultura jovem digital, ansiosa por utilizar e explorar as potencialidades das tecnologias digitais, e em contrapartida, uma cultura escolar analógica temerosa dos efeitos e consequências da proliferação dessas tecnologias dentro da escola, espaço educativo que parece permanecer dissociado da Cultura Digital na qual essa geração está inserida”.

7 In the original: “em termos rigorosamente filosóficos, o virtual não se opõe ao real mas ao atual: virtualidade e atualidade são apenas duas maneiras de ser diferentes”.

8 In the original: “mídias são meios, e meios, como o próprio nome diz, são simplesmente meios, isto é, suportes materiais, canais físicos, nos quais as linguagens se corporificam e através dos quais transitam”.

On the other hand, it cannot be forgotten that the vertiginous growth of digital culture and its unappealable penetration into school structures and practices does not eliminate the inner contradictions and tensions, according to the dynamics of the modes of production in which they are inserted and from which they are constituted, insofar as “a mode of production is not a ‘total system’ in a threatening sense; it includes a number of counter-forces and new trends within, ‘residual’ forces as well as ‘emerging’ forces, which it has got to try to manage or control [...]” (JAMESON, 2002, p. 402).

In this sense, those people Santaella (2010) calls “euphoric” and “dysphoric” in relation to cyberspace keep trying to turn this attempt of ‘reading’ the reality – interpreting the *Zeitgeist* – into a kind of autophagic dispute. They have forgotten that cyberculture inner contradictions are no denial of its condition of a contemporary phenomenon, but they are natural deployments of the sociocultural fabric transformation dynamics that moves forward and backward among advances and accommodations, rearrangements and retentions, innovation and ressignification which sets the conditions for the subjects in the social fabric that constitutes them.

Thereby, Castells (2005, p. 456) highlighted that “new electronic media do not diverge from traditional cultures: they absorb them”. This is consistent with the fact that, notwithstanding the perception that “when a new communication technology is introduced, it wages a undeclared war against the existing culture, up to now no cultural era disappeared with the emergence of another one”⁹ (SANTAELLA, 2010, p. 78, own translation). The ordinary movement of these processes is integration.

But, the singular aspect of the dynamic process that the informational revolution (CASTELLS, 2002) sets up, and which establishes the informational production mode within capitalism or, just like Castells also names it, Informational Capitalism or Informational Mode of Production, is that time and space converge in the dynamics of culture and reorder themselves in a new flux of time and space management which makes liquid the dimensions of existence that were considered unwavering up to then, according to Bauman (2007). In the last years of the twentieth century, Castells (2002, p. 1) explained this reality quite well: “a technological revolution of historic proportions is transforming the fundamental dimensions of human life: time and space”.

Cyberspace is not a *locus* in which one lives certain specific and pre established sensorial experiences. It happens in time and mostly in a time characterized by

[...] the freneticism of the amplification of the spaces of influence and hegemony of some ways of comprehension of the reality with its unusual dissemination, that is the virtualization of all possibilities. All of this is an attempt to determine the impossibility of the impossibility. The impossibility is the new undesirable thing that has no time or space to exist.¹⁰ (SOUZA, 1998, p. 14-15, own translation)

Step by step, life is carried on both in physical time and space and in cyberspace.¹¹ The realities related to virtual world impact on time and space in which we live. Being-in-the-world expands itself in order to contain the real interactions that dynamically transit from virtual to material space and subvert the notion of time and space in the material world. The material world limitations of time and space are slowly confronted with the new way of operating life in which

9 In the original: “quando uma nova tecnologia de comunicação é introduzida, lança uma guerra não declarada à cultura existente, pelo menos até agora nenhuma era cultural desapareceu com o surgimento de outra”.

10 In the original: “o frenetismo de ampliação dos espaços de influência e hegemonia de certos modelos de compreensão da realidade, sua inusitada disseminação, a *virtualização de todas as possibilidades*, tudo isso tenta decretar a impossibilidade do impossível; e o impossível é o Novo indesejado, sem tempo nem espaço para existir”.

11 Cyberspace is considered a time and space *continuum*. Virtuality does not configure space disarticulated from time. Cyberspace singularity is exactly the suspension of space-time boundaries in a variety of degrees, in order to operate concurrently in both dimensions of reality in the contemporaneity.

such limitations do not exist or can be faced otherwise. Thus, cyberculture is the exercise of life in such fluid space between virtual and material forms in which the cyberspace is intricated with classic time and space perspectives in a further indissociable way, as long as digital culture is related to the ways of dealing with existence with the mediation of digital technology without necessarily diving into the fluidity of cyberspace in order to transact cultural operations on an immaterial support, i. e., it deals with cultural phenomena mediated by digital technologies in this dual relationship between material and virtual worlds. Somehow, one could say that today's existence happens in this continuum movement of oscillation between virtual and material worlds through the mediation of digital technologies. This reality is present in all departments of life.

Contemporaneity – considering the condition of subjects immersed in the phenomenon due to the complexity of cultural movements and social forces that dispute the hegemony of the reinterpretation made about the project of modernity,¹² or due to the impossibility of producing a panoramic and comprehensive view of the contemporary *modus vivendi* – is not consistent in its effort to produce a totalizing understanding of cyberculture, besides considering that “the world explodes into an infinity of fragments, an infinite multiplicity of senses, in a time tired of promises of eternity” (SOUZA, 1998, p. 13). Cyberspace is the *locus* in which such tensions of contemporaneity operate and are confronted in all areas of life. Thus, digital culture offers a wider interpretative key that is better suited to explain the way one is producing the existence in the contemporaneity.

Schools are not disconnected from this logic. On the contrary, a school is a specially tense spot in this process of reconfiguration of the way of operating in the contemporaneity concerning to time and space in the digital culture. The school is the time-space of construction of the strategies of action of the subjects in society, both on a cognitive and intellectual approach and on an emotional and relational one. It sets conditions to the society for which it works and is conditioned by the sociocultural environment in which it is placed.

LITERATURE TEACHING

Due to this cultural melting pot that hits language so deeply, the teaching of arts¹³ has to be carefully considered, especially in relation to “the ways Literature and Arts alike are constituted, dialogue and feedback” (BRASIL, 2018, p. 525). So, due to its singular characteristics of word free artistic expression and canonical *corpus* with clear standard language regulatory functions, Literature teaching has to dialogue with the cultural forms and the technological tools which shape the cultural environment in which Literature Teaching is inserted and in relation to which the cultural production is directed. Time and space of literary texts and its context have to be reminded in the process of literary text interpretation. If time/space of the production of literary text and its context has to be poignantly reminded during the process of literary text interpretation, time/space in the process of reading reception, by a secondary level student in this case, also needs to be reminded: literary text reception implies a dialogue among unlike contexts.

¹² The idea of modernity and post modernity, with its limits and structures as well as how these concepts are totally or partially applicable to contemporaneity, is the object of a strong conceptual dispute. Although this is not the purpose of this paper, we consider that contemporaneity is situated in the late modernity in which all characteristics of the modern project are fully implemented, but key elements such as science and capital, according to Habermas (1992) and Weber (1983), continue to preside over the way one constitutes the existence in the contemporaneity.

¹³ Regardless of being an artistic manifestation, Brazilian National Curriculum (Base Nacional Comum Curricular - BNCC) (BRASIL, 2018) considers Literature as part of Portuguese Language Syllabus in the Area of Languages and its Technologies, notwithstanding its consideration of Literature as part of the “artistic and literary field” (BRASIL, 2018, p. 525-526). Thus, the BNCC considers Literature to be an artistic expression. Here, we would like to evoke the border like condition of Literature as Language and Art, renouncing to the merely utilitarian approach of Literature Teaching to which it may be reduced in favour of other contents, regardless of how relevant they might be.

Literature is understood as an “artistically organized language”¹⁴ (BRASIL, 2017, p. 491).¹⁵ Literature is a border entity between written language and art. Thus, Literature teaching cannot be separated from the dynamics of culture in relation to the time/space of production and the time/space of reception. Literature teaching has to imply

[...] the increase in the understanding of digital culture practices and youth cultures through the deepening of the analysis of their practices and circulating cultural productions, [...] repertoire expansion in attention to cultural diversity, in order to embrace various productions and forms of expression – youth literature, peripheral literature, marginal literature, high culture, classical culture, mass culture, media culture, youth culture and so on [...] [beyond] Brazilian literary tradition masterpiece inclusion and the western references – mainly Portuguese Literature.¹⁶ (BRASIL, 2017, p. 492, own translation)

That is why it is necessary to think about literature teaching considering the dialogue with the digital culture that comprises the contemporary world and its condition of a temporal, spatial and cultural interconnection, taking into account that

Digital environments are procedural, participatory, spatial and encyclopedic. The first two properties make up most of what when mean by the vaguely used word interactive; the remaining two properties help make digital creations seem as explorable and extensive as the actual world, making up much of what we mean when we say that cyberspace is immersive. (MURRAY, 1997 apud BRUNNER; TALLY, 1999, p. 126)

Thereby, the interfaces which are “border areas of negotiation”¹⁷ (SANTAELLA, 2010, p. 92, own translation) present a strain between human and machinic aspects of such interfaces. This strain has a deep impact on Education because it is a culturally conditioned process and, at the same time, a conditioning element of cultural developments. However, in relation to the school as a whole and Literature teaching in particular, the insertion of the cultural dynamics is not supposed to be a mere addition of digital technological devices to the pedagogical practice. DICT “gets into the formative spaces and puts pressure ‘on the *establishment*, proposing a more critical, dynamic and dialectical curricular ‘movement’”¹⁸ (SALES; NONATO, 2019, p. 625, own translation). On the contrary,

[...] ICT use as a pedagogical mediation tool implies a re-reading of the previously defined strategies about teacher/student relations in face to face classrooms. It is not enough to add [ICT] to traditional practices, one has to use them in order to reorganize the pedagogical approaches, to recreate the teaching practice. Traditional and still effective practices must not be ‘disguised’ by the addition of a “new appearance”. However, ICT may and

14 In the original: “linguagem artisticamente organizada”.

15 The 2017 and 2018 texts are discordant in relation to the idea of Literature. That is why we use both texts in this essay.

16 In the original: “o incremento da consideração das práticas da cultura digital e das culturas juvenis, por meio do aprofundamento da análise de suas práticas e produções culturais em circulação, [...] ampliação de repertório, considerando a diversidade cultural, de maneira a abranger produções e formas de expressão diversas – literatura juvenil, literatura periférico--marginal, o culto, o clássico, o popular, cultura de massa, cultura das mídias, culturas juvenis etc. [...] [Além da] a inclusão de obras da tradição literária brasileira e de suas referências ocidentais – em especial da literatura portuguesa”.

17 In the original: “zonas fronteiriças de negociação”.

18 In the original: “adentram os espaços formativos e pressionam o *establishment*, propondo um ‘movimento’ curricular mais crítico, dinâmico e dialético”.

should be instrumental to new approaches, new ways of mediating learning, new ways of teaching.¹⁹ (NONATO, 2007, p. 8, own translation)

One should also take into account the tools which teachers and students use and the appropriated digital literacy demanded. First, “new digital media can no longer be regarded simply as a matter of ‘information’ or of ‘technology’” (BUCKINGHAM, 2010, p. 59). The turning point is to understand that it is not about using digital technology in education as an alien element to be integrated to the educational process. Yet, digital technologies are integral part of the daily life dynamics:

The internet, computer games, digital video, mobile phones and other contemporary technologies provide new ways of mediating and representing the world, and of communicating. Outside school, children are engaging with these media, not as technologies but as cultural forms: they are not seeing them primarily as technical tools, but on the contrary as part of their popular culture, and of their everyday lived experience. (BUCKINGHAM, 2010, p. 59)

The idea of digital literacy exceeds the idea of computational literacy, the mere acquisition of operational abilities. It is the development of modes of knowledge production in digital media. In this context, schools must take a humble and learning attitude: rather than telling the students how to use digital technology that is already deeply rooted in their daily life, schools must learn from the student who are subjects of digital culture how those technologies take part of their daily lives producing culture and find out the best way to incorporate such strategies (and develop new ones) into the process of academic knowledge construction.

However, this process has an impact on the curriculum, as long as DICT has an impact on the pedagogical design which has deep interconnection with curriculum (and condition one another) (NONATO; SALES, 2014) in a symbiotic relationship which constitutes the backbone of the knowledge construction process in schools, as Burniske (2002, p. 4, own translation) states: “literacy changes inevitably alter school syllabus”,²⁰ what already is a great deal *per se*. But one must understand that the implications of digital culture on curriculum are greater and instituting.

Therefore, DICT adoption in pedagogical practice happens as a result of the unfolding of the curriculum premises or come from social practices that go into the school as a by-product of the digital culture that thrives in the social context, as a result of pedagogical practices that, while redefining the methodological design by the insertion of socially referenced mediation possibilities, they internalize social mediation practices and knowledge construction that are already fully disseminated in society in order to guarantee a “contextualized, situated and incorporated teaching and learning approach”²¹ (SALES, 2013, p. 94, own translation). In any case, DICT penetrate schools with the strength of a preponderant factor in the immanent cultural rationality.

All these things condition the way Education is made, i.e., the methodological design that shapes the curriculum that is actually performed and it directly impacts academic knowledge and curriculum structures, as long as

¹⁹ In the original: “o uso das TIC como ferramenta de mediação pedagógica supõe uma releitura das estratégias previamente pensadas para a relação professor/aluno em sala de aula presencial. Não basta adicioná-las às práticas tradicionais, é preciso utilizá-las para reestruturar abordagens pedagógicas, reinventar a prática docente. Práticas tradicionais que ainda são efetivas não precisam ser ‘maquiadas’ pelo acréscimo de um ‘novo formato’. Todavia, as TIC podem e devem ser instrumento para novas abordagens, novas formas de mediar a aprendizagem, novas formas de ensinar”.

²⁰ In the original: “mudanças na literacia inevitavelmente alteram os currículos escolares”.

²¹ In the original: “relação ensino-aprendizagem contextualizada, situada, incorporada”.

[...] the relationships between curriculum and methodological design happen inside each ones' epistemological premises as well as in the open field of the outcomes related to the conceptual references that they establish and imply. If the curriculum architectonics [(SALES, 2013)] depends on the proposed methodological design, the design is only shaped as such as far as the curriculum is able to pragmatically translate the methodological perspectives set by the methodological design, i. e., to become curricular practices.²² (NONATO; SALES, 2014, p. 1937, own translation)

This is not a peaceful process. Tensions between curriculum and pedagogical design emerge, as well as between instituted academic knowledge and emerging social practices that put pressure on the instituted curriculum fissures, between the expected behaviour related to the procedural standard of instituted roles in school and the creative autonomy potentiated by DICT and authorized by a new valuation parameter of social roles of the subjects of curriculum. All these facts establish conditions to the redesign of the curriculum that is actually performed with formal reverberations on the established curriculum.

Literature teaching is especially related to this dynamics. Teaching Literature in schools is already a problematic activity related to the fact that “scientific and technical formation has surpassed the humanistic one”²³ (COSSON, 2010, p. 56, own translation). Thus,

Literature teaching was frozen in the literary text supposedly didactical use to teach a grammar approach of the language and whatever would be interesting to the school syllabus. Literary text reading, when it was done, was destined to support the innocuous discussion of themes vaguely inspired by the text and in order to allow the students to fill in standard reading sheets. Literary knowledge was reduced to meaningless lists of authors' names, dates and characteristics, as well as works and style. The possible relations among the texts were lost in the random and excessive use of fragments or selections which were previously organized by textbooks.²⁴ (COSSON, 2010, p. 57, own translation)

Literature teaching has 'classical' problems not directly related to digital culture, such as: definition of canonical texts; the place of contemporary and classical Literature in the syllabus; Literature teaching purpose and its connection to reading formation and language teaching. Beside such candent questions, Literature teaching faces, among other things, the challenge of articulating DICT use with digital screen reading, digital hypertextuality and discursive dispersity as stated by Marcuschi (2005). This new and old problem melting pot is the context of Literature teaching in digital culture, and it implies “fluency in relation to the strategy and tactics that we can use alongside network technology for educational purposes”²⁵ (BURNISKE, 2002, p. 165, own translation).

22 In the original: “as relações entre currículo e desenho metodológico se dão no campo interno das premissas epistemológicas de cada um e no campo externo dos desdobramentos que suas balizas conceituais estabelecem e implicam. Se, por um lado, a arquitetônica do currículo [(SALES, 2013)] depende do desenho metodológico proposto para o curso, o desenho metodológico do curso só se configura como tal na medida em que o currículo for capaz de traduzir pragmaticamente as perspectivas metodológicas traçadas pelo desenho metodológico do curso, isto é, se configurar em práticas curriculares”.

23 In the original: “a formação técnica e científica sobrepôs-se à formação humanística”.

24 In the original: “O ensino da literatura cristalizou-se no uso supostamente didático do texto literário para ensinar uma gramática esterilizada da língua e o que mais interessasse ao currículo escolar. A leitura da obra, quando realizada, servia apenas para discussões inócuas de temas vagamente inspirados pelo texto e o preenchimento de fichas de leitura padronizadas. O conhecimento literário foi reduzido a listas sem muito sentido de nomes, datas e características de autores, obras e estilos de época. As relações possíveis entre os textos foram perdidas pelo uso aleatório e excessivo de fragmentos ou nas seleções já organizadas pelos livros didáticos”.

25 In the original: “uma fluência com a estratégia e as táticas que podemos empregar junto com a tecnologia de rede para fins educativos”.

Just like all and any other pedagogical practice, Literature teaching cannot set itself apart from the cultural context that shapes the curriculum, the social and interactional structures and the goals of the educational process. Thus, digital literacy imposes itself as a condition necessary for the competent articulation of digital culture tools. But it does not exclude the irrevocability of pedagogical literacy as a teaching assumption, considered as “fluency in relation to methods able to be used to teach and learn, as well as critical judgment needed to determine which activities and means are more adequate to a specific group, time and goal”²⁶ (BURNISKE, 2002, p. 165, own translation).

Using digital technologies in Literature teaching brings several things up. But we would like to highlight only one now: intertextuality and DICT hypertext approach naturally brought up by digital devices. In relation to this, it is important to remember that

[...] external intertextuality happens only in the reader's memory; but internal intertextuality needs a text reference identified as such. In both cases the one who sets intertextuality in motion is always the reader who recognizes the “kinship” between the texts and establishes connections [...].²⁷ (COSSON, 2010, p. 64, own translation)

When intertextuality happens in digital context it has singular outlines, because it potentializes the immanent hypertextuality of the text. Beyond intertextuality that was always a concern in text production,

[...] what is different in digital support is that, besides integrating texts, styles and languages from all kinds of media (oral, written, audiovisual) in a digital basis, it has greatly facilitated text circulation and handling. We can say that digital communication is guided by a triple integration or convergence.²⁸ (OLIVEIRA, 2015, p. 213, own translation)

Hypertextuality and intertextuality operate in parallel spheres and sometimes touch and cross one another. If this is not a problem from practical standpoint, it is a challenge to textual linguistics. Lévy (2011) highlights it when he says that

[...] the text culture, in relation to what it implies in the expression as critical distance in interpretation and closed remissions within the semantic universe of intertextuality is, on the contrary, largely developed in the new communicational space of digital networks.²⁹ (LÉVY, 2011, p. 50, own translation)

The concepts of hypertext and intertext will not be deepened, as well as the conceptual tensions between them, because they are not the mains focus of this essay. Nevertheless, it seems appropriate to indicate that each subject-hyperreader's singular hypertextual ‘route’³⁰ materialization

26 In the original: “uma fluência com os métodos que podem ser empregados para ensinar e aprender, assim como o julgamento crítico necessário para determinar que atividades e meios são mais adequados a um grupo, época e finalidade específicos”.

27 In the original: “a intertextualidade externa é feita apenas pela memória do leitor; já a intertextualidade interna precisa de uma referência no texto para ser identificada como tal. Nos dois casos, quem ativa a intertextualidade é sempre o leitor que reconhece o ‘parentesco’ entre os textos e estabelece as conexões [...]”.

28 In the original: “o diferencial do formato digital é que, além de integrar textos, estilos e linguagens provenientes de todo o tipo de mídia (oral, escrita, audiovisual) para a base digital, ele facilitou imensamente a circulação e o manuseio dos textos. Podemos estipular que a comunicação digital pauta-se em uma tripla integração ou convergência”.

29 In the original: “a cultura do texto, com o que ela implica de diferido na expressão, de distância crítica na interpretação e de remissões cerradas no interior de um universo semântico de intertextualidade é, ao contrário, levada a um imenso desenvolvimento no novo espaço de comunicação das redes digitais”.

30 A concrete hypertextual ‘route’ is the actual realization of a singular hyperreader who, among the almost infinite hypertextual options, constitutes a specific and singular textuality through his reading which makes the text he constituted almost unrepeatable.

is a very objective criterion to outline the singularity of the hypertext in this context (NONATO, 2013). Hereupon, the aristotelian concept of potency fits well as basis, insofar as hypertext accomplishes in a concrete hypertextual 'route' that potency that is latent in hypertextuality: that is how one constitutes a concrete hypertext (NONATO, 2013). Thereby, in every and any text, but mostly in digital texts,

[...] subjects operate mental remission indiscriminately and *stricto sensu* digital hypertextual routes according to their volition and intellectual training. Such movements are comparable among themselves as cognitive knowledge construction processes of the text.³¹ (NONATO, 2013, p. 197, own translation)

So, when one addresses the problem of the use of digital technologies to support Literature teaching, the issue of hypertextuality becomes tangent, among other things, and therefore the way people interact with the literary text.

As from the reign of book and photocopy to the reign of electronic documents, an educator is the one who is willing to cross cultures, from his culture to the student's, leaving his territory in order to meet the other one, in the face of the desacralization of the book and reading, the devaluation of the power of legitimation that literary culture had for such a long time [...].³² (OUTEIRINHO, 2009, p. 171, own translation)

Thus, Literature teaching, when it is articulated according to the digital culture that permeates contemporary subjects' thinking and doing, implies much more than digital resource use in the pedagogical process, according to the perspective of a paradigmatic change in pedagogical practice beyond the mere digital inclusion conceived as mere digital device availability and insertion in school life (MORAIS; FAGUNDES, 2011); it implicates the internalization of the way with which the subjects deal with this cultural dynamics in the pedagogical practices in order to make Education into part of the cultural practices in contemporaneity.

Literature teaching and digital culture articulation is part of the dynamics of the embodiment of educational processes in the virtual world (LÉVY, 2007) in which much of teachers' and students' actual existence takes place, no matter how immaterially. In this sense, it would be artificial to cut educational experiences off such dynamics that integrates physical and virtual worlds in digital culture in which people produce their existence nowadays in order to build an educational reality preserved from the dynamics cyberculture, because "far from being a subculture of network fanatics, cyberculture expresses a fundamental change in the very essence of culture"³³ (LÉVY, 2007, p. 247, own translation).

However, what is at stake in this process is the capacity of the school to open itself to the dynamics of the society in which it exists and to engage in the construction of that society with the very tools that society itself provides. The school cannot lend itself to trap reality. Rather, it must imbue from it to reduce "the incongruity between what contemporary children and young people are and what educational institutions expect of them to be"³⁴ (SIBILIA, 2016, p. 78, own translation).

³¹ In the original: "os sujeitos operam indiscriminadamente remissões mentais e percursos hipertextuais digitais *stricto sensu* na medida de sua volição e formação intelectual. Esses movimentos são equiparáveis entre si na condição de processos cognitivos de construção de sentidos do texto".

³² In the original: "Do reinado do livro e da fotocópia para o reinado do documento electrónico, o educador é então aquele que se dispõe a cruzar culturas, da sua para a do estudante, saindo do seu território para ir ao encontro do outro e face à dessacralização do livro e da leitura, perante a desvalorização do poder de legitimação que uma cultura literária durante tanto tempo exerceu [...]".

³³ In the original: "longe de ser uma subcultura dos fanáticos pela rede, a cibercultura expressa uma mutação fundamental da própria essência da cultura".

³⁴ In the original: "a incongruência entre o que as crianças e os jovens contemporâneos são e o que as instituições educativas esperam deles".

Literature teaching, although it is at the very heart of “literate culture” project (SIBILIA, 2016) that permeates all school life, has to turn itself into the students’ gateway to Literature World in a broad sense, that means to Literary text fruition *per se* as a self referenced artistic manifestation, a cultural product that is part of and complements the students’ way of being in the world, in time and space, through arts and those things that only the arts are able to communicate. In this sense, BNCC states that,

[...] so that each experience with Literature – and arts in general – may reach its transforming and humanizing potential, one must promote reading training that not only leads to understand the meaning of the texts, but also makes the students able to enjoy them. A subject who develops preference and choice criteria (about authors, styles, genres) and shares impressions and critics with other readers-enjoyers.³⁵ (BRASIL, 2018, p. 156, own translation)

In this sense, Literature teaching is located between language and feeling, art and technics, instrumentalization and fruition. Paradoxically, such pressures on the world of culture – here represented by Literature – occur alongside misunderstandings which are still existent in relation to the place of technology in contemporary society. While stressing the need of awareness of the place of technics and technology in contemporary society, Simondon (1989, p. 12, own translation) questions how “man can realize in himself the awareness of the technical reality, and introduce it into the culture”.³⁶ With the imbrication of technology and culture in the twentieth century, this paradox exacerbates the problem of how to teach Literature to young students today.

The truth is that if human beings suppose the way they connect themselves to the surrounding world and operate with it through technics and technology that shape themselves together with the other human dimensions, the contemporary human being strengthens this imbrication through the ways of digital culture that permeates all human beings.

So, nothing that is taught in schools makes sense if it discredits the cultural environment in which it is taught and learnt. The challenge in Literature teaching is to articulate itself with digital culture, as it happens to be the challenge of teaching in all areas of knowledge,³⁷ notwithstanding the specificities of each area of knowledge and how each one of them deals with digital culture through the bridges which seem to be most adequate and best suited to potencialize the convergence points of these autonomous cultural dynamical entities.

METHODOLOGY

There is no consolidated tradition of quantitative research in Education in Brazil. On the contrary, there is some prejudice and they are considered technicist and reductionist. The strong French tradition in Education research in Brazil let it to be too inclined to qualitative research, nevertheless “quantitative and qualitative researches are not opposite and antagonic; they are complementary and offer different perspectives”³⁸ (PEREIRA; ORTIGÃO, 2016, p. 71, own translation).

35 In the original: “para que a experiência da literatura – e da arte em geral – possa alcançar seu potencial transformador e humanizador, é preciso promover a formação de um leitor que não apenas compreenda os sentidos dos textos, mas também que seja capaz de fruí-los. Um sujeito que desenvolve critérios de escolha e preferências (por autores, estilos, gêneros) e que compartilha impressões e críticas com outros leitores-fruidores”.

36 In the original: “homme peut réaliser en lui la prise de conscience de la réalité technique, et l’introduire dans la culture”.

37 Thus, Gilbert Simondon’s statement that “a real awareness of technical realities grasped in their meaning corresponds to an open plurality of techniques” [une véritable prise de conscience des réalités techniques saisies dans leur signification correspond à une pluralité ouverte de techniques] (1989, p. 12) is very enlightening.

38 In the original: “Pesquisas quantitativas e qualitativas não são polos opostos e antagônicos; são complementares e oferecem diferentes perspectivas”.

Except in relation to educational performance, there are few quantitative researches in Education in Brazil. Gatti (2004, p. 13, own translation) identifies two typical results related to this behaviour: “or one believes in any data (many times it depends on who cites it – authority argument), or one rejects any data due to ideological reified reasons, *a priori*”³⁹. This produces a hypertrophy in qualitative research in Education and a difficulty to the statistical consubstantiation of the analysis of educational phenomena.

On the other hand, the systematic refusal of performing quantitative research undermines the education research scientificity, not because qualitative research is less scientific, but because the empirical nature of science (KERLINGER, 1979) is obnubilated by an almost ideological choice of research approach: the empirical data loose primacy in relation to the researcher’s discretionary choice.

Whether qualitative or quantitative, a research is to address a research problem with the methodological approach which is more suitable to the proposed problem, not to the researcher’s personal preferences. The act of choosing discretionarily between qualitative or quantitative research, between this or that research method, compromises objectivity as a cornerstone of scientific research. Thereby,

[...] quantitative researches are indicated in order to answer research questions which are set to unveil the degree or the extent of some aspects of a population, and it is also a way to address social problems. There is a kind of generalizing character in such researches; however, the concern to relate the research to the context enriches the study.⁴⁰ (PEREIRA; ORTIGÃO, 2016, p. 69, own translation)

In order to verify how school teachers understand ICT use in pedagogical practice, this research proposed a survey, in this case an incidental or instant poll (LAVILLE; DIONNE, 1999; SILVA, 2017), defined as a quantitative exploratory research. Survey é “a systematic method for gathering information from entities for the purpose of constructing quantitative descriptors of the attributes of a larger population of which the entities are members” (GROVES *et al.*, 2009, p. 2). The choice of a survey considered “the strengths and limitations of survey research compared with other research strategies. Surveys are good because they allow collection of data from a larger number of people than is generally possible” (MERTENS, 2015, p. 181).

On the other hand, a Survey⁴¹ contributes to open science, “because collecting and measuring data are a permanent source of inquiry and information”⁴² (SILVA, 2017, p. 138, own translation). Thus, although it does not imply strict replicability, a Survey guarantees the data reassessment under theoretical and methodological premises. Moreover,

[...] survey, as a research method, is relevant to Education due to its sample character. The rigor of research indicates the possibility of generalization from a sample. This is very useful when it is not possible to access the full population. It is important to stress that generalization is not homogenization, or considering that the results represent reality in an absolute and reliable way.

39 In the original: “ou se acredita piamente em qualquer dado citado (muitas vezes dependendo de quem cita – argumento de autoridade), ou se rejeita qualquer dado traduzido em número por razões ideológicas reificadas, *a priori*”.

40 In the original: “pesquisas quantitativas são indicadas para responder a questionamentos que passam por conhecer o grau e a abrangência de determinados traços em uma população, esta também é uma forma de estar sensível aos problemas sociais. Há, nesse tipo de pesquisa, um caráter mais ou menos generalizador; contudo a preocupação em relacionar a pesquisa aos contextos enriquece o trabalho”.

41 Even with such a large number of participants, it is not a census, because it does not reach all the population concerned.

42 In the original: “já que a coleta e a quantificação dos dados se tornam fonte permanente de consulta e informação”.

No research, no matter its nature, is able to do it.⁴³ (PEREIRA; ORTIGÃO, 2016, p. 79, own translation)

According to Babbie (1999), *surveys* may be classified as description, explanation and exploitation. This research is an exploitation study.

Accordingly, a 42 question closed digital questionnaire was applied in the registration period to the 31.165 public school teachers who were candidates to the Educational Technology Course of Bahia State University. This course was requirement to professional promotion at the State Public System.

In order to answer the research question, we selected those teachers who said they taught Literature. All teachers had three or more years of experience on Public Schools, because this was a basic requirement to take part in the course.

Depending on how one understands the subjects of this research, it is possible to consider the 802 teachers the full population – if we consider only Literature teachers in public schools in Bahia State – or a population stratum – if you take into consideration the population of Bahia State public school teachers, and literature teachers as a stratum. In any case, 802 public school teachers who said they teach Literature answered the questionnaire. A questionnaire is the most adequate way to measure subjective perspectives with a standardized inquiry (GROVES *et al.*, 2009).

Four questions were selected to this study (from the 42 question questionnaire). The selected questions were related to DICT use in Literature teaching: a) do you think is it important to use technological tools in your pedagogical practice?; b) After knowing the technological devices Bahia's Secretary of Education and Brazil's Ministry of Education provide, how such devices are inserted in your practice?; c) Do you consider yourself to be able to include technological resources on your pedagogical practice?; and d) If you have answered 'yes' to the previous question, name which resource(s) would you use on your pedagogical practice.

These questions make it possible to deduce the stage of the process of proximity and enculturation of public schools, namely literature secondary teachers, in digital culture which is already fully settled in contemporary society.

RESULTS

The data presented are a representation of the way Bahia State public school Literature teachers comprehend the place of digital culture in the pedagogical practice. Thereby, these data reveal the 'mind' of the teacher. This movement that was identified in relation to Literature teachers is a sign of a movement of digital culture introduction in a especially significant group of teachers, because they are the mediators of the process of appropriation of the literary patrimony by the new generations. So, they are the privilegiate agents of the movement of cultural transference, especially the literary one. They may do it with the mediation of digital technologies or they may deepen the gap between the way of being and making culture nowadays and the cultural patrimony built over the centuries.

Thus, the data collected in this research are relevant because: a) this research reached Bahia public school Literature teachers with three or more years of teaching experience at the time of the research; b) the teachers expressed their of the use of DICT in relation to real teaching situations; c) the selection of those who said they teach Literature permits to analyse the situation of that specific group, unveiling their conditioning and the implications of their choices.

⁴³ In the original: "*survey* enquanto método de pesquisa mostra-se relevante no âmbito educacional devido ao seu caráter amostral. O rigor da pesquisa indica possibilidade de generalização a partir de uma amostragem, o que é útil quando o acesso a população total é inviável. É preciso salientar que generalizar não significa homogeneizar, ou considerar que o resultado representa a realidade de maneira absoluta e fidedigna. Nenhuma pesquisa, independe de sua natureza, seria capaz disso".

The question A (do you think is it important to use technological tools in your pedagogical practice?) supports the understanding that teacher consider it necessary to to articulate digital culture with the pedagogical practice, in the case in relation to Literature teaching. Among 802 teachers investigated, all answered “yes” and 732 said they used technological tools frequently to teach literature, while 70 said they use them only sometimes.

The fact that no one answered “no” indicates that no use of digital technological tools in pedagogical practices is no longer an option for teachers. On the contrary, it is already clear that the digital culture that mediates contemporary social relations has penetrated/must penetrate the pedagogical practice.

On the other hand, all teachers recognized a more or less frequent use of technological tools in their pedagogical practices, among which 91.2% indicated that they use technological devices “frequently” in their pedagogical practices. This is a sign of naturalization of digital technology use in pedagogical practices, at least at the discursive level, but this is a sign of a consolidated symbolic reality, even though the data cannot establish how this is done, i. e., the concrete way in which the insertion of technological devices in Literature classes happen. But one can understand that this is a sign of digital enculturation.

In the next question, (question b), it was asked “how such devices [in reference to digital devices] are inserted in your practice?”. The alternatives were: I) as content; II) as a knowledge production device; III) as support tool for teachers; IV) as a way to facilitate the content teaching and learning process V) No answer. The next table presents a summary of the answers:

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY OF DIGITAL DEVICE USE ON PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

	ANSWER I	ANSWER II	ANSWER III	ANSWER IV	ANSWER V	TOTAL
Frequent use	04 (0,55%)	62 (8,47%)	225 (30,74%)	439 (59,98%)	02 (0,28%)	732
Occasional use	01 (1,43%)	05 (7,14%)	23 (32,86%)	39 (55,71%)	02 (2,86%)	70
Total	05 (0,63%)	67 (8,3%)	248 (30,98%)	478 (60%)	04 (0,5%)	802

Source: Authors' elaboration.

The extremely small percentage of answers related to alternative I means that the teachers are already beyond the understanding of IT as a mere content in the syllabus. They understand that digital devices are tools, not content, just like in the other areas of social interaction.

Among the researched teachers, only 0.63% do not consider that technological devices may have pedagogical mediating capabilities. But 98.87% (793 teachers among the total 802) consider technological devices a mediating factor in the pedagogical practice, in the context of digital culture.

The comprehension of technological devices as mediation tools is a strong sign of digital culture enculturation in classrooms, i.e., DICT as digital culture devices are understood as cultural tools used in the pedagogical practice as meditation tools, not as content in the syllabus the students should learn about. This is a symptom that they understand education articulated with social life and inserted in the dynamics of culture, using the existing tools naturally as an expression of the needs, conditions and potentials of this time in history.

TABLE 2
PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS ABLE TO DICT PEDAGOGICAL USE

	YES	NO	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
Public A	715 (97,67%)	14 (1,91%)	02 (0,28%)	732
Public B	68 (97,15%)	02 (0,29%)	-	70
Total	783 (97,64%)	16 (2%)	03 (0,37%)	802

Source: Authors' elaboration.

Thereby, Table 2 presents the teachers who said “they feel themselves to be able to include technological resources on their pedagogical practice” divided into those who frequently use DICT (Public A) and those who use it occasionally (Public B). Table 3 shows how the subjects answered to which digital devices they used on the pedagogical practice. The strong convergence of the data (97.67% and 97.15% respectively) indicates that teachers feel themselves able to use DICT. This is consistent with the teacher training policies. But it does not indicate a more diverse and dynamic DICT use.

TABLE 3
PERCENTAGE OF DIGITAL DEVICE USE

	DESKTOP	TABLET	DIGITAL BOARD	PROJETOR INTERATIVO	SMARTPHONE	OTHERS	NO USE	TOTAL
Public A	396 (55,4%)	92 (12,87%)	44 (6,16%)	123 (17,21%)	33 (4,62%)	27 (3,78%)	-	715
Public B	45 (66,2%)	03 (4,42%)	05 (5,89%)	09 (13,24%)	04 (5,89%)	02 (2,95%)	-	68
Total	441 (56,34%)	95 (12,13%)	49 (6,26%)	132 (16,86%)	37 (4,72%)	29 (3,7%)	-	783

Source: Authors' elaboration.

Both publics present the desktop as the main device teachers use as digital technology support on their pedagogical practice. It shows that mobility – a key feature of digital culture represented by the prevalent use of mobile technologies – is still not fully acclimatized in school life as even those teachers who said they are able to pedagogical DICT use focus their use on desktop devices. On the other hand, the poor rates that smartphones got – the symbol of digital culture on the twenty-first century due to its versatility, common daily life use and large public acceptance on a variety of different age groups and socioeconomic strata of society – may be presented as a sign of how slowly digital culture is assimilated into school life whilst it shows a teachers' trend of keeping themselves on cognitive safe zone even in relation to digital culture aspects.

But, the fact that smartphones appear in the list of devices teachers used for pedagogical purposes cannot be under evaluated on its capacity of a sign that the asymmetries of Capitalism are not strong enough to stop the process of technology assimilation at public schools. It is also important to think about a consistent pedagogical use of such technologies. It supposes not only digital device availability policies, but also training for pedagogical use of digital technologies available in the society.

An aspect to be considered in this analysis is the history of teacher training on education technology focused on the desktop computer, as well as computer labs public purchase policies. Another important point is that digital reading devices do not appear in this research among spontaneous devices listed on Table 3 even though the subjects are Literature teachers. One may infer that printed books continue to be the main technological device used. On the other hand, mobile technology availability, especially smartphones, and its common daily use must be considered in this analysis. But all of this cannot fully explain the data. This strong contradiction

points out to the need of further research about how such mobile technologies are being used the pedagogical process and which are the implications of such use for learning and teaching, as well as the pedagogical viability of using smartphones as reading devices. Up to now, this remains unclear.

The following table shows how static technologies *vis-à-vis* mobile technologies are largely prevalent on classrooms among the subjects of this study:

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF TECHNOLOGICAL MODELS ADOPTED BY THE RESEARCHED SUBJECTS

	STATIC TECHNOLOGIES	MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES	OTHERS	NO USE	TOTAL
A1	563 (78,74%)	125 (17,49%)	27 (3,78%)	-	715
A2	59 (86,77%)	07 (10,3%)	02 (2,95%)	-	68
Total	662 (84,55%)	132 (16,86%)	29 (3,7%)	-	783

Source: Authors' elaboration.

The mismatch identified concerning smartphone use in comparison to the way it has become central in common daily life is even more evident when we compare static technologies versus mobile ones. This highlights the necessity of further investigation. Thereby, one may infer that mobile technologies are still not fully accommodated to classrooms and smartphones do not constitute a full classroom pedagogical device yet, mostly regarding literary texts. This is very different from the scenario related to social networks and information access according to way teachers design their pedagogical practice and the digital technology use in this context.

Thus, the data collected demonstrate how the movement of digital enculturation in schools, i. e., the inclusion of digital technologies in school life with the consequent insertion of the school in the digital technology mediated way of being and doing, with its own procedural logic and rationality, that we call digital culture.

When indicating the insertion of DICT in the pedagogical practice of school teachers, the data points out to a school in which the pedagogical practices are more like the life lived which makes it easier to transfer the ways of doing from school life to daily life and vice versa. Nevertheless the data demonstrate the contradictions among which the centrality of static digital technologies is the most relevant, namely desktop computers, as we face the emergence of mobile technologies: it is contrary to the tendency of digital technology use in society. Such contradictions have social, economic and cultural explanations. Yet, they indicate that there is an ongoing process and they set positive signs to the gradual insertion of digital technologies in schools and the insertion of school on digital culture. Otherwise, they point out to the singular characteristics of this process that demand a specific approach in relation to schools and the way that digital culture mixes itself with school culture.

CONCLUSION

Literature is an artistic expression and is in intimate and constant dialogue with the culture in which it was produced and with the culture in which it is consumed. Thus, literature is a bridge and contact point, it is a cultural knot that turns dialogue possible among the cultural expressions that conform the text in its production and reception. In Education, the cultural dimension and its implication on literature teaching is even more important insofar as a school needs to dialogue consistently with the culture in and for which it operates. A school which is incapable of articulating the cultural forces of the subjects by which it is composed has lost all conditions to be a space of mediation of the learning and knowledge construction processes.

Thus, this research about the uses of digital devices in the pedagogical practice of Bahia's public school literature teachers reveals how this community understands this cultural situation. But, when it is approached as a sign of the insertion of digital culture on school life, it indicates that digital culture cannot be preliminarily dissociated from school life and it imposes the reflection about the implications of digital culture on the pedagogical process and, more strictly, the comprehension of the literary text.

The data collected do not allow to address how the digital culture impacts on the literature teaching *stricto sensu*: it was not the research question of this study. But the data clearly indicate that literature teachers do not conceive their pedagogical practice only with the support of printed books of classics of literature: the support of digital technologies is part of their pedagogical practice. The data reveal the place that the DICT occupy on the pedagogical process while the subjects reveal the process of enculturation of the DICT: the digital culture penetrates the school life when the subjects of the pedagogical process assume the DICT rationality, manifestation and devices in their practices.

The cultural process that we call digital culture becomes natural in school life as the pedagogical practice incorporates DICT into the school's daily life, reducing the distance between the life lived in the dynamical connected network society and the microcosm of the classroom.

This research reveals the state of digital enculturation of the pedagogical practice of Literature teachers of Bahia State, but it does not make a qualitative investigation of this practice. It does not address the problems related to the intentions of the pedagogical practices. The option was to measure the insertion of digital culture in schools through the use of digital devices, although it offers a clear parameter and to the respondents and to the scientific community, it is still problematic as long as it does not advance towards the investigation of the rationality inherent to digital culture in pedagogical praxis because the digital device does not guarantee the full dynamism of digital culture.

As we recognize the limits of this research, we would also like to state its strength as a strong indicator that the school is clearly moving towards the diminution or elimination of the distance between school life and daily life that is strongly influenced by digital culture. This is even more important considering that Literature is a subject extremely connected to printed book and bookish culture. That is why the fact that Literature teachers present consistent indicators of digital enculturation indicates a turning trajectory to the school in the twenty-first century, although the asymmetries of Capitalism are also present in the digital culture and gravely impact on the Brazilian public school system.

REFERENCES

- BABBIE, Earl. *Métodos de pesquisas de survey*. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 1999.
- BAUMAN, Zygmunt. *Tempos líquidos*. Trad. Carlos Alberto Medeiros. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2007.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular*. Brasília: MEC, 2018. Available at: http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/BNCC_19dez2018_site.pdf. Access on: Jan. 10, 2019.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular – Ensino Médio*. Brasília: MEC, 2017. Available at: http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/wpcontent/uploads/2018/04/BNCC_EnsinoMedio_embaixa_site.pdf. Access on: Nov. 5, 2018.
- BRUNNER, Cornelia; TALLY, William. *The new media literacy handbook: an educator's guide to bringing new media into classroom*. New York: Anchor Books, 1999.
- BUCKINGHAM, David. Defining digital literacy. In: BACHMAIR, Ben. *Medienbildung in neuen Kulturräumen*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2010. p. 59-61.
- BURNISKE, Richard W. *Literacia no ciberespaço*. Rio de Janeiro: Minion, 2002.
- CASTELLS, Manuel. *The informational city*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

- CASTELLS, Manuel. *Sociedade em rede*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2005.
- COSSON, Rildo. O espaço da literatura na sala de aula. In: PAIVA, Aparecida; MACIEL, Francisca; COSSON, Rildo (org.). *Literatura: ensino fundamental*. Brasília: MEC, 2010. p. 55-68. (Coleção Explorando o Ensino, v. 20).
- GATTI, Bernardete A. Estudos quantitativos em educação. *Educação e Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v. 30, n. 1, p. 11-30, jan./abr. 2004.
- GROVES, Robert M.; FOWLER Jr, Floyd J.; COUPER, Mick P.; LEPKOWSKI, James M.; SINGER, Eleanor; TOURANGEAU, Roger. *Survey methodology*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Wiley, 2009.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen. A modernidade: um projeto inacabado. In: ARANTES, Otília Beatriz Fiori; ARANTES, Paulo Eduardo. *Um ponto cego no projeto moderno de Jürgen Habermas: arquitetura e dimensão estética depois das vanguardas*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1992. p. 91-123.
- HOFFMANN, Daniela S.; FAGUNDES, Léa da C. Cultura digital na escola ou escola na cultura digital? *Novas Tecnologias na Educação*, v. 6, n. 1, jul. 2008. Available at: <https://seer.ufrgs.br/renote/article/view/14599>. Access on: May 25, 2020.
- JAMESON, Fredric. *Pós-modernismo: a lógica cultural do capitalismo tardio*. São Paulo: Ática, 2002.
- JAMESON, Fredric. *Espaço e imagem: teorias do pós-moderno e outros ensaios*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ, 2004.
- KERLINGER, F. *Behavioral research*. Nova York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
- LAVILLE, Christian; DIONNE, Jean. *A construção do saber*. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 1999.
- LÉVY, Pierre. *Cibercultura*. São Paulo: 34, 2007.
- LÉVY, Pierre. *O que é o virtual?* São Paulo: 34, 2011.
- MARCUSCHI, Luiz Antônio. A coerência no hipertexto. In: COSCARELLI, Carla Viana; RIBEIRO, Ana Elisa (org.). *Letramento digital*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2005, p. 185-208.
- MERTENS, Donna M. *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative and, mixed methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2015.
- MORAIS, Anuar Daian; FAGUNDES, Léa da C. A inclusão digital da escola ou a inclusão da escola na cultura digital? *Diálogo*, Canoas, RS, n. 19, p. 97-113, jul./dez. 2011. Available at: <https://revistas.unilasalle.edu.br/index.php/Diálogo/article/view/188/202>. Access on: Apr. 5, 2019.
- NOGUEIRA, Márcia Gonçalves; PADILHA, Maria Auxiliadora Soares. Cultura digital jovem: as TIMS invadem as periferias, e agora? *ETD – Educação Temática Digital*, Campinas, v. 16, n. 2, p. 268-286, maio/ago. 2014. Available at: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/etd/article/view/1319/1334>. Access on: apr. 7, 2019.
- NONATO, Emanuel do R. S. EaD, TIC e Internet: ainda estranhas à escola. In: CONGRESSO INTERNACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO A DISTÂNCIA, 13., maio 2007, Curitiba. *Anais [...]*. Curitiba: Associação Brasileira de Educação a Distância, 2007. Available at: <http://www.abed.org.br/congresso2007/tc/542007115747PM.pdf>. Access on: apr. 5, 2019.
- NONATO, Emanuel do R. S. *Hipertexto e hiperleitura: contribuições para uma teoria do hipertexto*. 2013. 324 f. Tese (Doutorado em Difusão do Conhecimento) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, 2013.
- NONATO, Emanuel do R. S.; SALES, Mary V. S. Currículo e hipertexto em EAD. In: CONGRESSO BRASILEIRO DE ENSINO SUPERIOR A DISTÂNCIA, 11., ago. 2014, Florianópolis. *Anais [...]*. Florianópolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, 2014. Available at: <http://esud2014.nute.ufsc.br/anais-esud2014/files/pdf/126862.pdf>. Access on: June 5, 2017.
- NONATO, Emanuel do R. S.; SALES, Mary V. S. Educação e os caminhos da escrita na cultura digital. In: FERRAZ, Obdália (org.). *Educação, (multi)letramentos e tecnologias*. Salvador: Edufba, 2019. p. 141-172.
- OLIVEIRA, Fátima Regis de. Textos, texturas e intertextos: apontamentos sobre aprendizado e competência na comunicação digital. *Intexto*, Porto Alegre, n. 33, p. 209-224, maio/ago. 2015.
- OUTEIRINHO, Maria de Fátima. Culturas literárias e cultura digital: percursos, cruzamentos, desafios. *Carnet*, n. spécial, p. 163-172, 2009. Available at: <http://revistas.ua.pt/index.php/Carnets/article/viewFile/435/396>. Access on: June 9, 2019.
- PEREIRA, Guilherme; ORTIGÃO, Maria Isabel Ramalho. Pesquisa quantitativa em educação: algumas considerações. *Revista Periferia*, v. 8, n. 1, p. 66-79, jan./jun. 2016.

SALES, Mary V. S. *Tessituras entre mediação e autora nas práticas de currículo na formação a distância: a construção do conhecimento no contexto universitário*. 2013. 291 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, 2013.

SALES, Mary V. S.; NONATO, Emanuel R. S. Educação a distância e currículo: hipertexto como perspectiva de flexibilidade e design pedagógico. *Revista e-Curriculum*, São Paulo, v. 17, n. 2, p. 616-645, abr./jun. 2019.

SANTAELLA, Lúcia. *Da cultura das mídias à cibercultura: o advento do pós-humano*. *Revista FAMECOS*, Porto Alegre, n. 22, p. 23-32, dez. 2003.

SANTAELLA, Lúcia. *Cultura e artes do pós-humano*. São Paulo: Paulus, 2010.

SIBILIA, Paula. *Redes ou paredes*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto, 2016.

SILVA, João A. da. Anotações sobre a pesquisa survey. In: BOAVENTURA, Edivaldo Machado (org.). *Exercícios de metodologia da pesquisa*. Salvador: Quarteto, 2017. p. 135-146.

SIMONDON, Gilbert. *Du mode d'existence des objets techniques*. Paris: Aubier, 1989.

SOARES, Corina da Rocha. Michel Houellebecq, Amélie Nothomb et Jacques Chessex: performances sous contexte médiatisé. *Carnets*, n. spécial, p. 206-220, 2009. Available at: <http://ler.letras.up.pt/uploads/ficheiros/11810.pdf>. Access on: June 9, 2017.

SOUZA, Ricardo Timm de. *O tempo e a máquina do tempo*. Porto Alegre: Edipucrs, 1998.

WEBER, Max. *A ética protestante e o espírito do capitalismo*. São Paulo: Pioneira, 1983.

WILLIAMS, Raymond. *Cultura*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2000.

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

NONATO, Emanuel do Rosário Santos. Digital culture and literature teaching at secondary schools. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v. 50, n. 176, p.534-554, abr./jun. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1590/198053147126>

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

NONATO, Emanuel do Rosário Santos. Digital culture and literature teaching at secondary schools. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v. 50, n. 176, p.534-554, abr./jun. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1590/198053147126>

Received in: FEBRUARY 7, 2020 | **Approved for publication on:** MAY 5, 2020



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License.