

# Imaginaries Of Digital Culture In Public Schools

Álvaro Acevedo-Merlano<sup>1</sup>, Hilda Guerreño Cuentas<sup>2</sup>, Yuneidis Morales-Ortega<sup>3</sup>, Olga Martínez Palmera<sup>4</sup>, Carolina Mercado-Porras<sup>5</sup>, Yicera Ferrer Mendoza<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Humanities Department, Universidad de la Costa (Colombia), [aacevedo8@cuc.edu.co](mailto:aacevedo8@cuc.edu.co)

<sup>2</sup>Humanities Department, Universidad de la Costa (Colombia), [hguerrero@cuc.edu.co](mailto:hguerrero@cuc.edu.co)

<sup>3</sup>Department of Business Sciences, Universidad de la Costa (Colombia), [ymorales4@cuc.edu.co](mailto:ymorales4@cuc.edu.co)

<sup>4</sup>Humanities Department, Universidad de la Costa (Colombia), [omartinez@cuc.edu.co](mailto:omartinez@cuc.edu.co)

<sup>5</sup>Humanities Department, Universidad de la Costa (Colombia), [cmmercado6@cuc.edu.co](mailto:cmmercado6@cuc.edu.co)

<sup>6</sup>Humanities Department, Universidad de la Costa (Colombia), [yferrer5@cuc.edu.co](mailto:yferrer5@cuc.edu.co)

## Abstract

In Colombia, technology has gained importance in education, especially in schools that aim to develop innovative knowledge, with teaching models that integrate ICT. This article focuses its objective on the approach on the imaginaries that young students from the department of Magdalena in Colombia have regarding digital culture in their educational contexts. The methodology was based on a qualitative approach, on a hermeneutical epistemological basis and a case study inquiry strategy with an ethnographic perspective. The techniques applied were the documentary review, focus group and survey. The results reflected students from rural and urban institutions relate digital culture to the customs of a society linked to technologies. It is concluded that it is necessary to know the realities of the population when formulating educational policies related to the incorporation of ICT in school environments.

**Keywords:** Public school, digital culture, high school student, information and communication technologies.

## Introduction

Colombia has undergone a substantial transformation in the last two decades regarding its technological reality; It went from being a partially rural country less than thirty years ago, to one with a view to the use, incorporation and commercialization of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). In this sense, the proposal of a country with technological projections is institutionally encouraged by promoting a “digital culture” (Daza, 2011; Fernández, 2014; Geertz, 1987; Kerckhove, 2005; Lago, 2012 and Medina en Lévy, 2007) at the level national from the Subdirectorate of Digital Culture, through the Ministry of Information and Communication Technologies (MinTIC). Thus, in recent years there have been some investigations from the governmental interested in studying digital culture, in which they have participated, from national entities such as the National Consulting Center (2013), to international

organizations such as The Trust for the Americas (2014). However, these investigations have focused only on investigating the implementation of public policies aimed at technological endowment, lagging behind the execution of surveys that do not problematize what the consolidation of a digital culture means in local contexts.

The transformation that the country has undergone has produced some difficulties when promoting a digital culture articulated to the sociocultural dynamics and the realities of the population where it is promoted, since there has not been a sequence or a gradual process of technological transformations, in which the step will be elucidated from one technology to another. This situation is worrying because “accelerated technological change and consequently rapid obsolescence, prevent countries with fewer resources from being able to keep up with the richest” (Zapata, 2006, p. 5). This scenario

translates into the absence of a legitimate digital culture, as most Colombians went from gigantic typewriters to powerful multiprocessor laptops, without even witnessing the various technological devices that existed between typing and typing. multiprocessors.

In this sense, despite the broad interest in integrating ICT into the school, there are still a large number of institutions that continue to develop classes as in the last century (Marqués, 2001). However, this situation has occurred in most cases, not by simple denial, but because the ways in which they try to integrate technologies into educational dynamics have been and continue to be homogeneous, without adapting to the singularities of the contexts. in which the educational institutions are located. Thus, unlike other societies that have adapted step by step to the current conditions of the information society (Covi, 2002), in Colombia and even more so in peripheral regions, the shock with the flow has been sharp and forceful. of the technologies promoted from the institutional, taking into account that the process of technological assimilation in terms of Belloso and Perozo (2009), has not been carried out in the best way due to the lack of knowledge that exists about the dynamics of technological appropriation that populations generate from their contexts and realities.

This situation is exacerbated in the department of Magdalena, since a large percentage of its geography continues to be clearly rural with more than 30% of its population residing outside the municipal capitals, where agricultural activities are an important region, having the largest participation in the general production of the department, employing more than a third of the Magdalena workforce, as is well stated by Romero (2006).

In this way, through the different programs executed by the MINICT, it is expected to promote the generation of a digital culture in Magdalena, strengthening the presence and use of ICT in the official educational sector, with the purpose of promoting, from the early levels of education, a

technological appropriation in the educational contexts of the Magdalena youth, and thus, reduce the still prevailing “digital gap” (Del Álamo, 2003). Thus, ICTs are presented in the sphere of official education with the promise of enhancing the characteristics that make up the educational institutionality, manifesting the benefits they offer for the improvement of teaching-learning processes, thus supporting the development of educational institutions. communities: A proposal very similar to that offered by the modernization model built by development theorists in the 1950s (Beltrán, 2006).

However, there are some historical difficulties that programs for the promotion of ICT in the classroom must face when implemented in peripheral regions, such as the need to strengthen cultural policies consistent with the contexts (Sanguinetti, 2012), which in the case of the Magdalena department focus on 3 central problems:

- A. Decontextualized educational projects and educational offers that do not respond adequately to the needs of the environment and the development perspectives of the department.
- B. Study plans in which the reference of standards and basic competencies is not clear enough.
- C. Weaknesses in classroom work due to the lack of training and updating of teachers in disciplinary knowledge and in didactic options to promote effective student learning, as well as the lack of didactic materials (Ten-Year Education Plan, Departmental Secretariat of Magdalena Education, 2010, p. 10).

In this sense, education should be understood as the governing body for the formation of critical citizens in the face of the use and appropriation of technologies (Vargas, 2014); It is not about going from chalk to video beam or from pencil to laptop; While the same practices and routine activities are reproduced with the new devices, the “Fingertip”

as Perkins (1995) calls it, since using ICT as devices that replace one technology for another without changing the conceptions of the teaching-learning process does not the panorama will change, it will not end the divorce that still seems to continue between school and ICT (Pasquali, 2009). It is about understanding a reality in which the teacher is in front of the board teaching a class as has been done for centuries, while many students are using Laptops, iPads or Smartphones, causing the ways of teaching to begin to lag behind, even in rural contexts.

It is at this point where we know the imaginary of the students (Baczko, 1991; Baeza, 2000; Castoriadis, 1975; Escobar, 2000; Gómez, 2001; Molinares, 2005; Pintos, 1995/2005; Taylor, 2006 and Zambrano, 2012) Faced with technologies and their use, it can play an important role in order to find alternatives beyond an instrumentalization, because by understanding what they think, a greater affinity can be achieved in the process of consolidating an organic digital culture, not only from educational policies, but from the perspective the students themselves have in the face of the impact that technologies have on their pedagogical process and in their daily lives.

Thus, while students are forced to receive classes under the traditional canons, at the same time they are assimilating, interacting and facing new logics characterized, among other things, by the management and construction of online knowledge, fragmented and hypertextual reading, access to a large amount of information immediately, the dynamics of collaborative learning (Martín-Moreno, 2004), interrelationships through social networks, virtual learning communities (Ruiz, Galindo and Martínez, 2012) and the new mediated and interactive forms of socialization. To this extent, when trying to train subjects who can competently face the efforts that the current information society brings with it, it is necessary to know what their conceptions are regarding technology and its integration into their lives.

Therefore, the promotion of this digital culture should be aimed at strengthening the learning

processes, the “meaningful use” and the incorporation that young people make (Law 375, 1997) of technology, through the articulation of the ICT in the educational contexts of the department, without going in dissonance with the web of meanings that young students have built around technology. Thus, it is under this context that an approach is made to the imaginaries that young Magdalena students have around digital culture, in the educational contexts of the Magdalena department in Colombia.

### Methodology

The methodological design chosen for this research was built under a qualitative approach, since the interest of this research was to understand and interpret the concrete reality of two educational institutions from their contexts, rather than measure, predict or control their problems. Thus, we worked on a hermeneutic epistemological basis, which considers social facts as “symbols, texts or textual analogues that must be interpreted” (Bunge, 2007, p. 403), implementing an inquiry strategy in a case study, with a ethnographic perspective.

A multiple case study was led (Yin in Díaz, Mendoza and Porras, 2011), where the comparison between an urban educational institution: “El Instituto Educativo Distrital Técnico INEM Simón Bolívar de Santa Marta Magdalena, and a rural educational institution: “El Instituto Educativo Rural Carlos García Mayorca de Ciénaga Magdalena”, contributed to the identification of the imaginary that young students have around digital culture. Likewise, the study has a hermeneutical emphasis on the search for understanding and comprehension of the problem of interest from an inductive process. Therefore, according to the epistemological position of this research, there is neither an interest nor an intention to find formulas or establish generalities from analytic-deductive processes. Thus, a study was carried out with a duration of 1 year between 2016 and 2017, divided into three phases or stages.

### Techniques and Instruments

In the first phase, a review of the policies related to the promotion of digital culture in the department of

Magdalena was carried out; For this, the files and databases of the (MinICT), as the entity responsible for the promotion of ICT in the department, were investigated with the aim of knowing the initiatives developed for Magdalena in school contexts. In phase two, the field work consisted of several activities, the first of them was the reconnaissance of the field and establishment of contacts. This first activity was directed to the approach with the directors and teachers of the addressed institutions; They were reported about the work that was planned to be carried out and at the same time they were consulted about their availability to participate in the activities that were organized.

As an initial instrument, a diagnostic survey was implemented (García cited in García, 2016) in order to have a general perspective on what young people understand by digital culture. This survey made it possible to select the students who participated in the focus groups and open questionnaires. To that effect, the survey was applied to every 10th and 11th grade students in the selected schools, then taking into account the results of the survey, a number of 15 students was selected from each of the classrooms; the selection criteria were established in accordance with the knowledge handled by the students. Thus, as far as possible, 5 students with little management in relation to digital culture were selected, 5 with intermediate knowledge and another 5 with a broad management of the subject, with the purpose of having the greatest diversity of opinions regarding the topic of concern.

Four focus groups were held with young people from grades 10 and 11 from the Educational Institutions addressed. Thus, the principals, teachers, parents and students were contacted, with the purpose of informing them about the work that was planned to be carried out, and at the same time, their collaboration was requested through informed consents to organize the focus groups. The focus groups were made up of a maximum of fifteen people and a minimum of six. All the sessions were recorded and represented the starting data in the selection and elaboration of a sample for the successive questionnaires.

Subsequently, based on the experience and the data

found in the focus groups, the questionnaire was applied (Feixas, 2006). In this way, the versions that the young people presented orally and in groups were taken into account in contrast to the written and individual questionnaire. Thus, a crossing was made between the versions and ways of argumentation of young people regarding what they understand by digital culture. The purpose of this instrument was to recognize which students have to say about digital culture in their school context, as well as to identify the participants' perceptions about the specific concept, taking into account the previous elaboration of the guiding questions.

#### Data collection and analysis method

In phase three, a comparative analysis by categories was carry out through a double entry matrix, in which the objectives were related and linked together with the categories of analysis and the questions of the instruments that helped to meet the objectives, answering thus to the overall objective. In this matrix, a first interpretation of the data found in the survey and questionnaire was achieved, based on the information provided by the focus groups. All this was done for each of the categories that were then compared between the rural and urban institutions to strengthen the analysis.

### Results

#### Digital culture (concept) / Imaginaries

In the rural context, young people relate the concept of digital culture with technology, social development, the internet, communication and information about places and people. Within their imaginary about this concept, the government presence is seen, linked to the provision of devices. This is due to the representation of the state through promotional programs, such as “Vive Digital”, specifically related to the presence of a “Digital Kiosk” (Builes, 2016) near the instances of the educational institution.

Young students tend to decompose the concept of digital culture, relating culture with tradition and digital with technology and information technology; perform a conjunction, arguing digital culture can be interpreted as the tradition of technology. This is an approach to the concept that



could be understood, rather than as a tradition referring to the historical, it can be understood as specific “ways of doing”, linked to the technological. They consider digital culture is related to the daily life of contemporary life assembled to technology (De Certeau, 1979), transcending the academic sphere and totally permeating society, where the presence of social networks is essential. In the same way, they establish a relationship between digital culture and the benefits that technology can bring to human activities.

For the case of the urban context, the students, as happened in rural areas, also related digital culture with the customs that a society assembled to technologies possesses, understanding it as “the ways of doing” and the knowledge that is possessed on the technological. In that respect, they made the same articulation between the concept of culture, understood as traditional, and digital, understood as technological. Thus, both in the rural and urban contexts, the students' definitions of digital culture are shown as the customs and / or traditions generated around and in relation to technology.

In both cases, emphasis is placed on the social relationships that occur through technological mediation (Martin-Barbero, 2009). However, unlike the rural context, in the urban case, digital culture manifests itself as forms of expression of people who are influenced by technology. Furthermore, the presence of government does not appear in this school context.

#### Relationship between digital culture and ICT

Most of the students in the rural context did not establish a relationship between digital culture and ICT. However, some argued, in the first place, that both concepts are related to computer systems, conceiving digital culture as a dependent and contained element within ICT. Both concepts are perceived as government projects and state initiatives, although for a few they are understood as synonyms, because they are related to the digital world. Along the same lines, ICT is also related to information through technology, while digital culture is concerned with promoting the techno digital. However, both are perceived in relation to communication, technology management, information search and the Internet.

Technology becomes another axis that links both categories, however, ICT is related a little more to use, while digital culture is perceived as the management that is made of that technology in local contexts, whether they are towns or communities, since they are perceived as the technological tradition that is built over time.

In contrast to what happened in rural areas, in the urban case a higher percentage of students argued that there is a connection between both concepts through technology. The relationship with the government was not evidenced, a situation that does occur in rural areas. Thus, for both the rural and urban cases, the concepts of ICT and digital culture are understood as synonyms, since the definition of the students does not demonstrate an explicit or clear differentiation between both concepts.

In this sense, ICTs are interpreted as the devices that enable communication, while digital culture is interpreted as the way in which communication is carried out. Here, a notion related to the “ways of doing” with technology reappears. Therefore, at this point for both contexts the notions are very similar.

In urban areas they relate both concepts to the help that devices provide to daily life; establish a relationship between being able to get more information and knowledge, with reaching a deeper culture of digital technologies. They emphasize that both concepts help and have to do with communication and being informed as well as being updated; they are also conceived as projects that promote technology in daily life. They define digital culture as the relationship established between people and ICT.

For both contexts, the two concepts are related to the integration of technologies in society, on the one hand, in the rural as a technological tradition and in the urban case as the improvement of the quality of life through the use that is made of the technology.

#### Digital culture (education relationship) / Imaginaries

In the rural case, a significant percentage of students expressed their ignorance of the relationship that may exist between digital culture and their school context. However, the majority affirm that such a relationship exists, basing their

response on the handling of computer devices in their school, conceiving of digital culture within the framework of projects implemented to facilitate school activities for students. In that respect, students directly relate computer science class to digital culture, highlighting the use made there of the internet. However, another group of students expresses great disapproval with the precariousness in the school's infrastructure, as this hinders connectivity and the possibility of accessing the computer devices that the educational institution has. This situation has led to the creation of critical positions that deny the existence of a harmonious relationship between digital culture and the school context.

The students' responses show how their use of computers is one of the main dynamics that could bring them closer in order to having a direct relationship with what they conceive of digital culture. Thus, students established a relationship between technology as a tangible element of digital culture that helps the school process, while many relate ICT more to the Internet. In that respect, they conceive of digital culture as a concept that encompasses the relationship established with technology in a general educational context.

For the urban case, unlike the rural area, all the students establish a relationship between digital culture and their educational context, arguing that through digital culture, classes can be much more didactic, since it is easier to learn using the technology and surfing the net in order to solve the tasks that teachers propose in class. Students consider that such a relationship does exist because the school has a large number of devices such as computers and tablets that it makes available to students; however, no reference is made to the infrastructural and connectivity difficulties exposed by the students of the rural school. In the same way, the subject of computer science appears as the moment in which the subject of digital culture is most touched upon. However, for the urban case, they affirm there is not a consolidated digital culture due to the short amount of hours of computing that are given per week, since they are not enough to acquire all the necessary knowledge

related to digital culture.

In contrast to what is seen in the rural context, urban students relate digital culture to obtaining knowledge in their school context. In addition, they mention most teachers are concerned about keeping them informed about new technologies, such as new applications for cell phones that can help the development of classes, although there are teachers who still continue to develop tasks in a traditional way, by hand. , in order to avoid, according to them, vices or excesses in the use of technology.

Use and appropriation of ICT.

In rural areas, students conceive ICTs as information and communication programs, relating them to the use made of technology, the Internet, digital, apps, programs, video games, the use of WhatsApp, tablets, video editing programs, social networks and web pages dedicated to the student environment; They also relate them to initiatives of technological endowment, learning, the exploration of information on the Internet and access to news. Thus, for students this acronym is closely linked to technological devices and institutional teaching programs.

When talking about ICT, students refer to the good management that must be done with technology, since they understand them as programs that help learning and searching for information. In this sense, they are conceived as procedural devices or tools when technology is used in communicative teaching processes.

For its part, for the urban environment, the definitions that students use of the acronym ICT are very close to the official concept. This does not mean that the responses of the students in the rural context were wrong or far from what ICTs make up, it only shows a handling of the concept that has been worked directly throughout their school process in EI urban. Now, as in the rural case, students are very clear that acronyms are directly related to the technologies that serve and are used to facilitate communication between people; However, unlike the rural case, the students do not associate the acronym with the institutional, nor with

technological endowment initiatives, since they relate it much more directly to technological devices and tools.

Regarding to appropriation, in rural areas, most of the students stated that they did not know what "appropriation of ICT" means; Appropriation is associated with the use made of technology, establishing the concepts of use and appropriation almost as synonymous, while some affirmed that such appropriation is what is made of the internet and technology.

The same happened for the urban context, since there is a large percentage of students who do not know or did not know how to answer this question. In this sense, those who responded related the appropriation of ICTs with their use, turning to the concept of use as a reference for appropriation. In some cases, the responses were aimed at relating appropriation with dependency, and a few related appropriations with the exercise of making the technology used their own. Thus, for both cases the concept of use was quite significant when it came to appropriation.

Regarding the devices used by the students of the rural school, the majority use them to investigate the tasks and sometimes to watch videos; the most used devices are smartphones, PCs and tablets, although there is a smaller percentage of the population that does not have this type of device. Smartphone's are generally used in classrooms to resolve concerns that are generated in the dynamic of the classes. In addition, they argue that using these devices is the easiest way to find the information that teachers require in the tasks they propose to develop, referring to "Los kioscos vive digital" located on the school boundaries that is used to develop the tasks. It can be seen that there is a significant percentage of the student population that has access to these devices in their daily school life.

In the urban case, the vast majority of the students affirmed that they use some computer device when carrying out their tasks; the device that is mentioned the most is the Smartphone, followed by the Tablet. As in the rural context, the reasons why students say they use these devices are aimed to speed up,

optimize and make the process of searching for tasks and solving problems proposed in class much faster. There are those who claim that it is much faster than killing their heads reading paper books, when they can find the tasks with a click.

## Discussion and Conclusions

One of the elements to take into account when discussing the concept of digital culture is the evident transformation that the Internet has generated in the daily lives of young people and specifically in their school contexts; Issues such as fragmented reading (Levratto, 2017) have been replacing the dynamics of linear reading, since young people currently do not completely read a whole text, nowadays if they need to perform a task, they enter the network and search page by page, fragments and snippets from various sources that require them to read in a fragmented way in order to put together a collage of ideas, which in a very short time they can turn into meaningful texts to fulfill their academic activities.

It could be deduced, this has led to a transformation in the ways of thinking of young students when they access information, since they have gone from linear thinking to divergent one that affects the network of signifiers that they build and in which they are immersed, because very few are those who prefer to read an entire book to do their homework, when they can solve them immediately with just one click.

Now, if reading and writing are understood as cultural processes of informational encoding and representation of reality, the ways in which these processes are carried out can directly influence the construction of the entire web of meanings that make up a given culture. In this sense, for centuries the school, through the book, the codex, and its linear reading, built ways of approaching, constructing and understanding the knowledge that made the culture of the book, the written culture, the literate culture possible. However, currently these traditional and even canonical forms are threatened by that fragmented reading practiced on the Internet, when subjects are faced with amounts of information never before imagined through the possibilities offered by hypertextuality.

These new practices show different ways of encoding and processing information, through collaborative learning or the creation of virtual learning communities that do not

depend on a physical location for the effective communication of their members, while their dynamics are imbricated by the ITc and supported on the existence of the Internet as a relocated and interconnected information network at a global level, without schedule rigidity and with unlimited temporal flexibility.

This is not to say that one way of reading is better or worse than the other, it is about raising the differences that occurred in these new ways of approaching information. However, linear reading does not fundamentally guarantee a greater or better deepening or understanding of the subject studied, since when reading a book from beginning to end as is traditionally customary, it does not mean that people remember all of the information the book contains, since they retain the main ideas or the sections that interest them most, always with a tendency to identify the relevant ideas over and above the redundancies that can commonly exist in long documents.

Since ICTs are articulated to the subjectivities of young students (Gil-Juárez, Vall- Ilovera & Feliu, 2010), they make them build symbolic networks and agreements related to their immediate contexts (Acevedo, Chaux & Rodríguez, 2016). In that respect, if the concept of culture is interpreted as the web of meanings assigned and exchanged by the subjects of a specific community, digital culture can be understood as that new form created from the relationship that exists between communities and communities. ICTs in terms of constructing meanings and new ways of conceiving being and knowing, compared to other different forms.

In this way, digital culture goes far beyond the instrumental use that is given to devices, even beyond consensual use or appropriation, since it encompasses a whole range of conceptions regarding time, space, social relations, to the ways of acquiring information, of building knowledge and of ways of conceiving as individuals part of an interconnected network that transcends the borders of the nation-state, but that at the same time can be linked to cultural singularities without necessarily attacking traditions or local dynamics (García-Canclini, 2004).

Thus, to understand that digital culture in the case of young people in their school contexts, is to understand that there is a fragmented reading driven by the need for immediacy, by the possibilities of ubiquity, where geospatial barriers are no longer an obstacle to configure themselves as

subjects. social issues around connectivity in an interconnected world. Thus, it is not once again about the use that is given to the devices, it is the way in which reality is conceived. It is a way of understanding how young people place themselves, assuming themselves as cultural subjects influenced by the interaction they have with ICT.

So, all the new practices triggered by the integration of technologies in the student environments of young people, exacerbate the virtual environments they visit, extrapolating themselves to the analogous context of their classroom (Acevedo and Soto, 2016), since the latter has also been and is modified by these technological manifestations, which when adopted condition the totality of the sociocultural practices and therefore the school dynamics, transforming habits, generating customs built in ruptures, in synchronic, timeless and fragmentary processes. Thus, the constant in the creation of habits, rather than the repetition or prolonged permanence of actions or activities, turns out to be the irruption of practices, transformation and adaptation to change (Paz, 1987). Therefore, digital culture could be understood as irruption and discontinuity in opposition to traditional culture understood as linearity and constancy.

Now, although there is a long distance regarding access to the latest generation technology between students in urban and rural areas, many notions are shared regarding technology in the school context, since youngest people have the same codes, the same ways in which they understand technology and the ways of relating to it. Likewise, it can be established they share the same conception of time regarding the construction of knowledge within their academic practices based on their use of the Internet.

To that extent, by sharing so many references, it could be said that they are immersed in the same digital culture, under principles that allow them to communicate with each other through interpretable and interpreted codes without the difference in contexts being an obstacle. So, there is no radical incompatibility between what a young student from a rural context understands by digital culture versus what a student from an urban context conceives. Similarly, there is not much difference regarding the relationship they establish with technology in their school environments, despite the fact that access in both contexts turns out to be considerably asymmetric.



However, this does not prevent young people from the rural context from accessing certain technologies that share the same codes and that enable communication between both contexts, since a student from the rural context can have a conversation about social networks with a young person from the context urban without any kind of difficulty, contradiction or incoherence in the codes managed within what is interpretable for them; which shows the existence of a digital culture that transcends the two realities.

With this, it is not intended to legitimize or obviate the great gaps that exist between both contexts, since it is clear how in the search to build the knowledge society, imposing proposals elaborated under eurocentric perspectives of progress and development, have unexpectedly revealed huge constitute fissures on the structuring of capitalism in the current social system, since most of the difficulties that make the consolidation of said knowledge society impossible, turn out to be traces of historically naturalized asymmetries, located in the foundations of the societal archetype, result from the modern / colonial project, that apparently resolved, still determine the way in which the great narrative of techno-science is understood as a result of the European episteme, although with airs and particularities ready to become a supposed universal ideology.

In this sense, the institutional presence for access to technology is much more existing in rural areas than in urban ones, since young people take much more into account the government presence manifested in the provision of equipment and connectivity, as in the case of the "Los kioscos vive digital" scattered throughout many rural areas of the department, a situation that does not occur in urban areas.

Another of the situations that occurred in both contexts is the point view that students have of the teacher as an obstacle to the articulation of technologies in the classroom. However, students are very clear about how to access technologies, and although they do not handle the official concepts of ICT or technological appropriation, they are largely immersed in the dynamics that characterize digital culture, due to their ways of approaching and relate to technology, thereby permeating the ways in which they elaborate their tasks and create friendships while generating new non-formal learning experiences through technological appropriation (Peña,

Rodríguez & Sáez, 2016). Thus, it is necessary to exhort the teacher so that, aware of these changes, develop pedagogical strategies that allow students to take advantage of these new ways of coding and decoding information in the process of building knowledge.

This issue must be addressed taking into account the singularities of the populations, since the processes of cognitive appropriation must respond to the native sociocultural dynamics, in order to achieve an optimal use of the techno-scientific advances. Therefore, it is important to create inclusive methods that incite critical reflections, without violating cultural scaffolds, without curtailing the freedom that communities preserve around their idiosyncrasies, helping to solve the controversies and problems that may arise in the interaction between different positions, knowledge or customs, seeking equitable agreements.

Here is how important the interactions between government entities and official schools abandon vertical hierarchies when educational projects are formulated and executed, so that they do not continue to be a notification disguised as a consultation, in which only educational periphresal institutions are informed on the sentences approved in the political-administrative sectors, under a complete ignorance of the contexts they aspire to govern.

In this way, it is considered essential to take into account all these realities that occur in each population when formulating and implementing public policies related to the intervention of ICT in school environments, beyond the simple provision of devices in a homogeneous way for all the contexts.

## References

1. Acevedo, A. Chaux, J. and Rodríguez, U. (2016). Couple relationships in role-playing video games
2. Massively Multiplayer Online (MMORPG). Athenea Digital. Thought Magazine and Social Research, 16 (3), pp. 131-165.
3. Acevedo, A. and Soto, N. (2016). Dissemination of realities: virtual communities present in the online role-playing video games. (Aguabrial-Dofus Case - Period 2012-2013). Education in the

- Knowledge Society, 17 (2), pp. 133-148.
4. Bacsko, B. (1991). The social imaginaries, memories and collective hopes. Buenos Aires: New Vision.
  5. Baeza, M. (2000). The invisible paths of social reality. Deep sociology essay on social imaginaries. Santiago de Chile: RIL Editores.
  6. Belloso, N and Migdalia P. (2009). Assimilation of information and communication technology in mayors of Venezuela. Journal of Social Sciences, 15 (1), pp. 139-147.
  7. Beltrán, L. (2006). Communication for development in Latin America: a recount of half a century. Anagrams Rumbos y Senses de la Comunicación, 4 (8), pp. 53-76.
  8. Bunge, M. (2007). Look for philosophy in the social sciences. Mexico: XXI century.
  9. Builes, C. (2016). Kioscos Vive Digital: a digital and connectivity strategy to promote the social inclusion in rural communities in Colombia. International Journal of Psychological Research, 9 (1), pp. 126-130.
  10. Castoriadis, C. (1975). The imaginary institution of society. Buenos Aires: Tusquets Editores.
  11. Covi, D. (2002). Information and knowledge society. Between optimism and hopelessness. Mexican Journal of Political and Social Sciences, 45 (185), pp. 13-33.
  12. Daza, G. (2011). Towards a concept of digital culture. Interaction, 52 (1), pp. 1-05.
  13. De Certeau, M. (1996). The invention of the everyday, Vol1 Arts of doing. Mexico: University Ibero-American.
  14. Del Álamo, O. (2003). "The challenge of the Digital Divide". Human and institutional development in Latin America. DHIAL [online]. [Date consulted: May 20, 2016]. Available in: <https://es.scribd.com/doc/19022462/El-desafio-de-la-brecha-digital>.
  15. Díaz, S., Mendoza, V. and Porras, C. (2011). A guide for the elaboration of case studies. Reason and Word, 16 (75), pp. 1-26.
  16. Escobar, J. (2000). The imaginary. Between the social sciences and history. Medellín: Editorial Fund EAFIT University.
  17. Fernández, S. (2014). Digital culture for a full life [online]. [Date consulted: August 24, 2016]. Available in: <http://www.latinconference.org/index.php/ascolbi/13/paper/viewFile/3/16>.
  18. Feixas, M. (2006). Questionnaire for the analysis of the teaching orientation of the university professor. Journal of Educational Research, 24 (1), pp. 97-118.
  19. García-Canclini, N. (2004). Different, uneven and disconnected. Interculturality maps. Barcelona: Gedisa.
  20. García, M and Ramón L. (2016). The survey. In: García, M., Alvira, F. Alonso, L. and Escobar, R. (eds.). The analysis of social reality. Methods and techniques of investigation. Madrid: Alliance, pp. 331-362.
  21. Geertz, C. (1987). The interpretation of cultures. México: Gedisa.
  22. Gil-Juárez, A., Vall- llovera , M. and Feliu, J. (2010). ICT Consumption and Emerging Subjectivities: New problems? Psychosocial Intervention, 19 (1), pp. 19-26.
  23. Gómez, P. (2001). Social Imaginaries and Semiotic Analysis. An approach to construction narrative of reality. Notebooks of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, 17 (1), pp. 195-209.
  24. Kerckhove , D. (2005). The biases of electricity, inaugural lesson of the academic year 2005-2006 of the UOC [online]. [Date consulted: April 2, 2016]. Available in: <http://www.uoc.edu/inaugural05/esp/kerckhove.pdf>.
  25. Lago, S. (2012). Cyberspace and resistance. Exploration in digital culture. Buenos Aires: Hekht Books.
  26. Levratto , V. (2017). Encounter between reading on paper and digital reading: towards a reading grammar in virtual environments. Education Forum, 15 (23), pp. 85-99.
  27. Lévy, P. (2007). Cyberculture , the culture of the digital society. Spain: Anthropos.
  28. Government of Colombia. (1997). Law 375 of July 4, 1997, through which the law of

- youth and other provisions are issued.
29. Marqués, P. (2001). ICTs and their contributions to society [online]. [Date of consultation: 2 of September 2016]. Available at: <http://peremarques.pangea.org/si.htm>.
  30. Martín-Barbero, J. (2009). When technology ceases to be a teaching aid to become into cultural mediation. *Theory of Education. Education and Culture in the Society of information*, 10 (1), pp. 19-31.
  31. Martín-Moreno, Q. (2004). Collaborative learning and knowledge networks. In: Lorenzo, M., Ortega, J., Sola, T. and Chacón, A. (eds.). *The Organization and Management of Educational Networks*. Granada: Grupo Editorial Universitario, (pp. 55-70).
  32. Government of Colombia-MINTIC. (2013). Coming to World Internet Day, MinTIC reveals digital culture study in Colombia [online]. [Date consulted: July 4, 2016]. Available at: <http://www.mintic.gov.co/portal/604/w3-article-6096.html>.
  33. Government of Colombia-Departmental Education Secretariat. (2010). Ten-year education plan from the department of Magdalena 2010–2019. Santa Marta: SED.
  34. Molinares, V. (2005). Social imaginaries about social conflict and the way in which it is settle the residents of the La Paz neighborhood in Barranquilla (Colombia). *Magazine Law*, 24 (1), pp. 106-139.
  35. Pasquali, A. (2009). How to educate in the electronic age? *Revista de Pedagogía*, 30 (87), pp. 387- 394.
  36. Paz, O. (1987). *The children of the slime*. Barcelona: Seix Barral.
  37. Pintos, J. (1995). *Social Imaginaries: The New Construction of Social Reality*. Barcelona: Editorial Sal Térrea.
  38. Pintos, J. (2005). Communication, construction of reality and social imaginaries. *Utopia and Praxis Latin American*, 10 (29), pp. 37-65.
  39. Peña, P., Rodríguez, R. and Sáez, C. (2016). Student movement in Chile, situated learning and digital activism. *Commitment, social change and adolescent technological uses*. OBETS. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 11 (1), pp. 287-310.
  40. Perkins, D. (1995). *The smart school*. Madrid: Gedisa.
  41. Romero, J. (2006). Social mobility, education and employment: the challenges of the economic policy of the Magdalena department. Cartagena: Bank of the Republic.
  42. Ruiz, E., Galindo, R. and Martínez, N. (2012). Collaborative learning in virtual environments and their socio-constructivist bases as a way of meaningful learning. *Apertura*, 4 (2), pp. 1.
  43. Sanguinetti, I. (2012). Art, culture and equitable development in Latin America [online]. [Date accessed: November 20, 2016]. Available in: [http://www.campuseuroamericano.org/pdf/es/ES\\_ARTE\\_CULTURA\\_DESARROLLO\\_EQUITATIVO\\_Ines\\_Sanguinetti.pdf](http://www.campuseuroamericano.org/pdf/es/ES_ARTE_CULTURA_DESARROLLO_EQUITATIVO_Ines_Sanguinetti.pdf).
  44. Taylor, C. (2006). *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Barcelona: Paidós.
  45. Vargas, M. (2014). The appropriation of ICT in education: a path for development social reunion. *Analysis of University Problems*, 69 (1), pp. 55-65.
  46. Zambrano, I. (2012). Scientific-abnormal glances at street children: José Gutiérrez or modern social imaginaries. *Colombian Journal of Education*, 63 (1), pp. 273-288.
  47. Zapata, C. (2006). The public library faced with the dilemma of reducing the digital divide: are we facing a impossible? [online]. [Date consulted: October 10, 2016]. Available in: [http://www.patrimoniocultural.gob.cl/dinamicas/DocAdjunto\\_648.pdf](http://www.patrimoniocultural.gob.cl/dinamicas/DocAdjunto_648.pdf).