

THEMATIC SECTION:
THE LESSONS OF THE PANDEMIC



Ensuring Transference on Remote Learning: teaching in pandemic times

Simone Bicca Charczuk¹

¹Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre/RS – Brazil

ABSTRACT – Ensuring Transference on Remote Learning: teaching in pandemic times. We discuss teaching in remote learning in pandemic times. Despite the differences between remote learning and distance learning (EaD), we point out that criticisms of both focus on the interaction difficulties understood as inherent to them. We argue, however, that considerations on any teaching method must emphasize the theoretical-conceptual models that support them. Inspired by the clinical case construction approach, we present narratives about remote learning and analyze them based on the concept of transference. We believe that the transference between teacher, student and knowledge can be established in remote learning, considering listening and speech as representatives of presence and corporeality in this context.

Keywords: Teaching. Remote Learning. Transference. Psychoanalysis.

RESUMO – Sustentar a Transferência no Ensino Remoto: docência em tempos de pandemia. Problematizamos a docência no ensino remoto em tempos de pandemia. Apesar das diferenças entre ensino remoto e educação a distância (EaD), apontamos que críticas a ambos recaem sobre as dificuldades de interação entendidas como inerentes a eles. Em contraposição, argumentamos que ponderações a todo modo de ensino precisam enfatizar modelos teóricos conceituais que os sustentam. Inspirados na construção do caso em psicanálise, apresentamos narrativas acerca do ensino remoto e as analisamos a partir do conceito de transferência. Acreditamos que o laço transferencial entre professor, aluno e conhecimento pode ser estabelecido no ensino remoto, considerando a escuta e a palavra como representantes da presença e da corporeidade neste contexto.

Palavras-chave: Docência. Ensino Remoto. Transferência. Psicanálise.

At the end of 2019, we entered a health alert due to the discovery of a new virus, first identified in the city of Wuhan, China. This virus, named Covid-19, quickly spread throughout Europe and the emergence of new cases in Brazil occurred, more prevalently, from March 2020, surprising by its high transmission and mortality rate. It is at this time that measures encouraging some hygiene care gained ground in Brazil, such as frequent hand washing and use of alcohol-based hand sanitizer, as well as proposing social distancing to contain the spread of the disease. Places of public gathering were quickly instructed to restrict or cancel their activities, with schools and universities being some of the first spaces to follow this measure, showing concern for their own safety and the safety of others. With the impossibility of inhabiting these traditional educational establishments, we envisioned the challenge of reflecting on other ways of structuring the teaching processes, to promote it effectively, as well as to learn in different spaces, outside the ordinary school and academic environment.

It should be highlighted that, in Brazil, this movement of creating alternative ways to support education took place in a somewhat diverse and controversial way, as since the beginning of the pandemic in the country, there has been no unanimous position regarding the protocols to be followed, either by the municipal, state or federal governments. We must also emphasize that the guidelines (or lack thereof) by current President Jair Bolsonaro, as well as his denialist position before the lethality of the new virus, made the social distancing measures take place in an erratic and uncoordinated way. At the moment, we are reaping the results of this inaction, with more than 150,000 deaths recorded by October 2020; it is worth noting that, unfortunately, there is no forecast of a significant decrease in contagion and the number of daily deaths. On the other hand, with the closure of schools, we contribute so that this number is not even higher, thus preserving the safety and care of the school community and its surroundings.

Regarding, more specifically, the ways of supporting spaces for teaching and learning in this context, a strategy that has spread in the country was the adoption of remote resources, especially the use of the Internet, as to enable teachers of all levels of education to send and share learning materials and activities with students. This strategy raised a series of criticisms and resistance from those involved (i.e., teachers, family members and students), as well as civil society. This movement focused on two major issues: (i) the vast socioeconomic inequality of Brazilians and, consequently, the lack of access to the resources needed to participate in remote classes by a large part of the population; and (ii) the opposition between face-to-face learning and distance learning (EaD), or remote learning, and the alleged quality of the former to the detriment of the later.

Without disregarding the complexity of the topic and the necessary criticism of the socioeconomic inequalities previously mentioned, this article focuses especially on the debate about teaching when done by digital technologies, use of the Internet and preparation of remote

learning. Our main objective is to present and discuss elements that allow us to reflect on the teacher's work and the meeting opportunities between teacher, student and knowledge in a context different from the classroom, established as an emergency solution to the pandemic and on adopting remote learning in place of face-to-face classes.

To this end, we follow a methodological approach inspired by clinical case construction, according to psychoanalytic research. This approach underlines the importance of the trait, understood as a characteristic, sign, vestige or mark of what is not immediately seen, its indications and listening, whether in clinical cases (Freud, 1975) or in works of art (Freud, 2012a), in addition to other social and cultural manifestations. About this method, Dunker and Zanetti (2017), inspired by Lacan, also state that clinical case construction implies reading, identifying and organizing relevant traits, or signs, similar to the transit between forms of meaning and their expression, in addition to proposing writing systems, called transliteration.

As such, we interpret remote learning and teaching in this context as a case to reflect on the teacher's work in this unprecedented way of teaching. Traces and clues of this process, as well as its vicissitudes, were searched for in news stories taken from the Internet and personal reports. In dialogue with Freudian-Lacanian psychoanalysis, in particular the concept of transference, we weave some contributions to reflect on teaching in times of social distancing and, consequently, in possible ways of teaching.

First, we discuss the false dichotomy between classroom learning and EaD, or remote learning, arguing that it is not the teaching method – be it face-to-face or distancing, or remote – that guarantees to the didactic-pedagogical proposal the effect of exchange, relation and construction of learning, but rather the conceptual theoretical models that support such methods. In a second moment, we present narrative excerpts collected in social networks and digital media about how teachers, students and family members are experiencing remote learning. These narratives give us clues or signs to discuss teaching from the dialogue with psychoanalysis, which is later proposed. Finally, in conclusion, we summarize elements to reflect on the teacher's work regarding remote learning, in addition to proposing other relevant questions to be addressed in future works.

A False Dichotomy Between Face-to-Face Learning and EaD, or Remote Learning

As already mentioned, apart the necessary criticism regarding the socioeconomic aspects that prevent most Brazilians from accessing resources to continue working and studying remotely due to the huge income inequality among the population, a point we ourselves denounce but do not explore in this article, a false dichotomy between face-to-face learning and EaD, or remote learning, appears as the target of debates

about the alternatives found to transpose classes from different levels of education to other ways of ensuring teaching. When we refer to a false dichotomy, we are not defending an equivalence between the methods, erasing their differences, but rather we point out the mistake, in our understanding, in considering face-to-face learning as necessarily guaranteeing a teaching and learning quality to the detriment of a poor quality inherent to EaD, or remote learning.

Before continuing this debate, we consider it important to briefly differentiate between EaD and remote learning, even if both involve the use of digital resources, predominantly for its implementation. A classic definition of EaD is that of Moore and Kearsley (2007), who highlight that, in addition to its use of technologies and distinct temporality, a course is considered EaD when teachers and students are present in a (predominantly) virtual space based on didactic-pedagogical assumptions proposed for this purpose, which guide the proposition of activities and their subsequent evaluation.

One of the important Brazilian documents on EaD is Decree No. 9,057 of May 25, 2017 (Brasil, 2017), which characterizes the term *distance learning* as follows:

Art. 1º For the purposes of this Decree, distance learning is considered the educational model in which the didactic-pedagogical mediation in teaching and learning processes occurs by information and communication means and technologies, with qualified personnel, with access policies, with compatible attendance and evaluation, among others, and develop educational activities by students and education professionals who are in different places and times (Brasil, 2017).

When reading these definitions, we highlight that, although they mention the use of digital resources as mediators in the relationship between teacher, student and knowledge, each EaD program is based on theoretical-conceptual assumptions that support the didactic-pedagogical practices and are articulated with the digital resources used and how they are used, in addition to guiding the interactions between the participants of the educational scene – a characteristic explained in the concept addressed by Moore and Kearsley (2007). On the other hand, remote learning cannot be considered an educational model, but rather a pedagogical action, in which face-to-face learning is somewhat transposed to teaching mediated by digital tools, predominantly, or by textbooks and printed materials sent to students.

Additionally, remote learning lacks any planning or specific and previous theoretical-conceptual models for its practice; there is only the transposition of face-to-face learning into a digital or printed space. Digital or material resources given to students are used to enable what was planned pedagogically to be carried out in the classroom, without explicitly proposing a didactic-pedagogical plan articulated with the tools. Such definition is similar to what Bozkurt and Sharma (2020)

present, when they refer to remote emergency learning, characterizing it as a temporary solution to an immediate problem. The authors also mention that, although such a solution can be appropriate in original and creative ways, resources and experiences developed within EaD, they are fundamentally different.

Despite these differences, the criticisms received by this modality and this pedagogical action are somewhat similar since they focus and precisely impute a precariousness inherent to the use of digital tools as mediators in the processes of teaching and learning. Thus, teaching mediated by digital technologies – be it EaD or remote – is considered *a priori*, by common sense, as poor quality, because it prevents the *eye-to-eye*, the spontaneity, focusing on the teacher who only transmits information to students, etc.

We disagree with these positions, for we consider that a discussion centered only on the digital tools is insufficient and oversimplifies the topic. To reflect on teaching, as well as to evaluate its potential in enabling learning processes that recognize teachers and students as subjects and authors, we need to be attentive mainly to the theoretical-conceptual models anchoring these practices. Here, we consider it important to emphasize that, even without denoting a model that supports the practice of remote learning prior to its planning, this pedagogical action is informed by the models that support the teacher's work, even if it is unaware of its existence and operability.

In this sense, we consider relevant a summation of some theoretical-conceptual models to articulate such definitions about the power, or not, of the teaching methods. Classically, we find in the education literature the conceptualization of three ways of conceiving the construction of knowledge and that, consequently, give us clues to think about the teaching methods, namely: (i) the empiricist associationist model; (ii) the innatist model, or apriorist; and (iii) the constructivist model. Regarding mainly an epistemological approach on the subject's relationship with knowledge, we highlight the work of Jean Piaget (1988), who defines the three models mentioned as follows: (i) the former is linked to empiricist associationism and understands knowledge as external acquisition, the result of another presenting sensory stimuli to the subject; (ii) in turn, innate and maturation factors are prioritized by the second model, which understands reason as pre-formed in the subject and knowledge as an internal expression of reason; (iii) finally, the latter model understands knowledge as a process constructed by successive elaborations, highlighting the subject's activity and not exogenous (first model) or endogenous (second model) mechanisms.

Let us now turn to the exercise of articulating such theoretical-conceptual models with the teaching methods. When thinking on these models articulated with face-to-face teaching, we can highlight the Becker's (2001) classical approach, where the author presents three pedagogical models as follows: (a) the first, called directive pedagogy, is based on the empiricist theoretical-conceptual model, whose main

assumption is the notion that knowledge should be transmitted from teacher to student; (b) the second, non-directive pedagogy, is based on the innatist theoretical-conceptual model, or apriorist, who understands knowledge as innate to the student, and the teacher acts only as a facilitator, with little interference in the process; (c) finally, the author refers to relational pedagogy, based on the constructivist theoretical-conceptual model, understanding learning as a construction, from the student's action and its relationship with the teacher.

To reflect on the implications of the theoretical-conceptual models in EaD, we cite Preti's (2009) work, which states that an empiricist practice in EaD, or remote teaching, comprises those courses offered massively as educational packages whose objectives consist of instructing and training students by providing massive and content-focused information. The emphasis is, therefore, on the distribution of content on the web or in textbooks, in the compliance with a previously established agenda of activities and cumulative evaluations. The innatist approach emphasizes the students' independence – they learn by themselves, at their own time, by searching available materials, with a predominance of self-evaluation; courses based on a constructivist approach, in turn, prioritize the interaction between teacher, student and knowledge and emphasize digital resources, which enable exchange and shared learning (such as discussion forums, wikis for writing collective texts, etc.), being important to stress that resources are understood as authorship tools and no longer as ends in themselves. Based on the approaches by Piaget (1988), Becker (2001) and Preti (2009), if we shift the analysis focus from the digital technologies itself to the theoretical-conceptual models anchoring the various teaching methods – face-to-face, distance or remote –, we see that everyone is subject to transmissive (when approaching the empiricist model), self-taught and individualistic (when based on the innatist-apriorist model) practices, or to the prevalence of the relationship between teacher, student and knowledge (supported by constructivist assumptions).

Even if Piaget (1988), Becker (2001) and Preti (2009) do not use Freudian-Lacanian psychoanalytic theory to characterize these theoretical-conceptual models, we defend here its approximation with constructivist models by its criticism, or distancing, to the concept of reality proposed by behaviorism (psychological approach based on empiricism) and by idealism (close to the innatist theories). Instead of conceiving the relationship with reality as a copy, Lacan (2008a, p. 62) explains that “[...] reality is only perceived by man, in his natural, spontaneous state at least, as radically selected, and ‘man deals with selected bits of reality’”. On idealism, the author says that “[...] consists in affirming that we are the ones who give shape to reality, and that there is no point in looking any further. It is a comfortable position. Freud's position, or that of any sensible man for that matter, is something very different” (Lacan, 2008a, p. 42). Moreover, the importance that this approach gives to the relationship with the other as a speaking subject that produces intermediation in the processes of thought and consti-

tution of subjectivity and, consequently, of learning processes (Lacan, 2008a) also allow us to bring it closer to constructivist approaches. Specifically, on the concept of learning for psychoanalysis, D'Agord (2010, p. 148) states that

A learning process based on the psychoanalytic method involves, first, the assumption of a subject of unconscious knowledge. That is, the teacher, as the one who directs learning, assumes that those in a learning situation (the students) have some knowledge. In the learning situation, an unconscious knowledge is what determines our conscious choices on topics of knowledge.

We believe this approach to Freudian-Lacanian psychoanalysis productive, for it is the concepts of this theory that best support the proposition of a teaching that recognizes both teacher and student as subjects of the teaching and learning process. Similarly, based on this approach, we propose our analysis of teaching in times of isolation. Next, we discuss the contributions of psychoanalysis to reflect on teaching in the context of remote learning, being presented and articulated with reflections about scenes of remote learning gathered from social networks and digital media. For now, we share some learning scenes and some of its articulations with the theoretical debate developed so far.

Scenes from Remote Learning in the Pandemic

There are many reports, testimonies and narratives that can be followed, mainly by digital media, which deal with impasses, challenges, suffering and innovations from families, children and teachers in these months of social isolation and school closures. In a web consultation (secondary data) and testimonials sent by family members (primary data), we gathered some reports that inspire us to discuss teaching in times of remote learning, from which we chose some narratives, organized below in seven scenes.

In Scene 1, Ceila Sodré de Carvalho, who has two teenage daughters in the state school system in the city of Vila Rica, Mato Grosso, says the following:

Although I think it is good, I find the system limiting. At school, I know the methodology is a little stricter. I value both means because of the current circumstances, of the pandemic, but I know that my daughters' coexistence with others and with teachers in the classroom, for example, is very important, and now they lack it. (Sampaio, 2020).

In Scene 2, Barbara Lehmkul, mother of Arthur, 4 years old, residents of Ituporanga, Santa Catarina, points out that the activities at home are “[...] a way for parents to participate in the day-to-day lives of children, to help educate them. With Arthur closer to us, I found out that he already knows how to separate the words with syllables. It's been very good” (Szenczuk, 2020).

In Scene 3, Ana, mother of Lucas, 4 years old, and², Ricardo, 9 years old, residents of Curitiba, Paraná, shared the following report, by WhatsApp, in informal conversation:

They sent a video of Lucas' teacher dancing to festa junina music, as if she were rehearsing the children... The orientation for the parents was to dress the children in typical clothes and record them dancing to the choreography proposed by the teacher. Result in practice: Lucas crying because he did not want to dance at home but at school 'using a mask to not catch the virus'. At other times, I tried to teach the classes following the themes... He does only what he wants to, says 'you are not my teacher!'.

Ricardo wears the school t-shirt to watch classes... it was a way we created (me and the other mothers in the class) to maintain these 'school rules'. He has developed autonomy, organizes himself around the established routine, does the lessons, gets involved... misbehaves (sometimes he keeps drawing in the notebook or using the cellphone under the 'school desk') gets a scolding... He complains, I think it is too much time for an online class, but it works... the lack of human interaction weighs, I feel him tense and sometimes he gets emotionally disorganized...

Scene 4 consists of a WhatsApp audio transcript, sent by João Victor dos Santos, 6 years old, resident of Lagoa Vermelha, Rio Grande do Sul, to his teacher, Benice Ávila Matos, as follows:

[...] without you, teacher, I cannot learn well. Mom is not like you. You have the teacher's knowhow. My mom does not have it. She works in a restaurant; she only knows how to cook. I am sorry to bother you right now, only I wanted to tell you that (Padilha, 2020).

In Scene 5, Pedro Daniel, 18, a student from the public system of Paraná, argues the following:

Honestly, I am finding it pretty bad, because the communication and interaction with the teachers are very difficult, and it is hard to follow what they teach through the TV or the computer. This teaching method seems more complicated to understand, and it is bad because we cannot ask questions the moment they arise. If you do not understand something, it is not like in the classroom, where teachers repeat until you understand (Sampaio, 2020).

Scene 6 shows the speech of Deborah Meneghetti, teacher, resident in Recife, Pernambuco:

The student's gaze in the classroom says a lot. He can shake his head claiming he understood, but the eye says no. With the remote class, the class cameras stay off while I explain the topic. I have to be more thorough, repeat myself, teach more slowly to make sure they understood. It's good because before the pandemic some students said I was too hasty. I was forced to slow down and I am liking it (Azevedo, 2020).

Finally, Scene 7 shows the impression of Elisa, a teacher in the public school system of the State of Paraná:

They have tried to convince us that we are leading actors in this process [...]. We are leading actors, but they say that you can change the contents being sent by the main office, but they say you should not change too much, it is not advisable. They say you can remove activities, but then the advisable later is not to remove it. So, it is a very complicated thing. I've never wanted to work with EAD in my life, and now I'm in this mess (Sampaio, 2020).

In searching for these scenes, we proposed no specific and rigid system or criteria of consultation. We prioritized only websites with news stories from the Brazilian scenario or reports received by WhatsApp³. We were interested, in some of the scenes gathered, their value as a trait, of what is not immediately seen, that needs to be, in a way, interpreted.

Freud (2012a), in his 1914 text *Moses of Michelangelo*, presents the construction of the analysis of the artist's sculpture, a movement that allows us to affirm that the construction in psychoanalysis does not refer to the unveiling of a purely hidden meaning, but as something unprecedented, created from the analyst's work in the encounter with the analyzed material (patient's speech, work of art, etc.). In his text *Constructions in Analysis*, Freud (1975) relates the work of psychoanalysis with archaeological research. This comparison is based on the fact that the analyst "[...] draws his inferences from the fragments of memories, from the associations and from the behavior of the subject of the analysis" (Freud, 1975, p. 293), or from the material to be analyzed, we add.

We can see some recurring traits in the scenes described, such as lack or difficulty of interaction (Scenes 1, 3, 5 and 6), difference between teacher and mother (Scenes 3 and 4) and shifting of the practice (Scenes 3, 6 and 7). Regarding the lack or difficulty of interaction, in Scene 1 the interviewed mother emphasizes the issue of her teenage daughters' lack of coexistence with colleagues and teachers when she says: *now they lack it* (Sampaio, 2020), which also appears in scene 3 since the mother says that *the lack of human interaction weighs*. The student of scene 5 stresses that "[...] the communication and interaction with teachers are very difficult, and it's hard to follow what they teach [...]" and the teacher in scene 6 states that "[...] the student's gaze in the classroom says a lot. He can shake his head claiming he understood, but the eye says no. With the remote class, the class cameras stay off while I explain the topic" (Azevedo, 2020; Sampaio, 2020).

When we look at these narratives, we can suppose that the interaction mentioned refers to being together with other colleagues and teachers, sharing the same physical space in person, and it should be noted that other forms of interaction, mediated by digital technologies, do not seem to gain space or recognition. In this sense, we do not want to equate face-to-face interaction, which implies the physical body's

presence, and virtual interaction, as they consist of different ways of being with the other; but we cannot disregard that spaces mediated by digital devices can also produce encounters. When we disregard this possibility, we risk opposing face-to-face interaction and virtual interaction, similar to what is done with face-to-face learning and EaD, or remote learning, as discussed earlier.

The student of Scene 5, when talking about interaction, highlights another aspect: the difficulty of interaction is not necessarily in the absence of physical presence, but “[...] to follow what they [teachers] teach [...].” Here, the student seems to denounce much more an empiricist theoretical-conceptual model than the fact that classes take place remotely. The criticism that, at first, may be directed at remote learning conceals a fundamental issue: as we addressed in the previous section, both classroom learning (Becker, 2001) and EaD, or remote learning (Preti, 2009) can be directive. In the same direction, when the teacher of Scene 6 says that “[...] the student’s gaze in the classroom says a lot [...]”. With the remote class, the class cameras stay off while I explain the topic”, we ask ourselves: and if the cameras were on, would it not be possible to follow the student’s gaze? Both scenes allow us to identify that the issue of interaction says much more about how it can be established, or not, as well as about its theoretical-conceptual foundations than about the space (face-to-face, distance, or remote) that supports it.

Another interesting feature that can be derived from the narratives lies in the difference between mothers and teachers that young children mention during early childhood education. In Scene 3, 4-year-old Lucas says to his mother “[...] you are not my teacher!”; 6-year-old João Vitor, in Scene 4, speaks to the teacher “[...] without you, teacher, I can’t learn well. Mom’s not like you. You have like a way with teaching. Mom doesn’t”. In this sense, it is of utmost importance to address the school as a third place, bordering the private space of the family and the public space of society. On that matter, Kupfer and Bernardino (2009, p. 12) highlight that “[...] it is imperative that children make good encounters – not only with their parents, founders of their primordial markings, but also all those who will represent a broader symbolic field for them at the social level”. With their speeches, these children seem to distinguish the role of the teacher from the role of the mother, acknowledging the one who sustains them in the place of student, a third place that is placed among the mother (or family) – son dichotomy. Regarding this aspect, we observe that remote learning tends to blur these places, requiring mothers to predominantly exert the role of supporting the school proposal and, especially, the role of the teacher, which is rejected by the boy in Scene 3; the difference between one and the other is also denounced by the boy in Scene 4, “You have like a way with teaching, mom doesn’t”. In the next section we will cover other aspects involving the place of student of early childhood education in the context of remote learning.

Regarding the trait *dislocations of practice*, we are invited to reflect on what is preserved and what promotes torsion in this *passage*

from face-to-face education to remote learning. In Scene 3, the mother reports that her 9-year-old son *wears* the school t-shirt during class hours, a symbolic act supported by her (and the other mothers of the classmates) as a representation of a place, a mark of home school. The place-school is preserved in the space-house. According to the mother's speech, this has helped in the organization and autonomy of the child, even if moments of anguish are present. The teacher in Scene 6 states that "Before the pandemic some students commented that I was too hasty" and that now she has modified her way of sharing content, "I was forced to slow down and I'm finding this good", which denotes possibilities to learn and build other ways of being a teacher, promoting a twist in teaching that, perhaps, can inspire changes in the return to face-to-face learning. On the other hand, the teacher of Scene 7 denounces that, despite giving prominence to teachers, the teaching network, while indicating the possibility of modification of content and activities in remote learning, denies this movement towards the teacher. Thus, although there is a sign of an opportunity for the invention of the teacher, they see themselves in a transposition of face-to-face learning to remote learning without the possibility of authorship.

In short, these scenes seem to give us subsidies that allow a shift from the criticism and problems of remote learning as well as from the technological aspects towards the ties established through technology. If the way of teaching, by itself, does not acknowledge an authorship practice considering teacher and student as subjects of the teaching and learning process, one can only wonder, during this exceptional time we experience, how can one sustain a space for transmission that is not necessarily the physical space of the school, and how to set up and maintain a relationship between the teacher, the student, and knowledge in a context of social distancing. In the next section, we propose some other traits inspired by the described scenes that allow us to think about the teacher's work and the meeting with the student in remote learning.

Teaching and Remote Learning: sustaining the transference

The emerging demand of the transition from a form of face-to-face work to the offer of remote learning has lead teachers to an urgency to adapt their ways of meeting with students and sharing didactic contents. Thus, we can conjecture that teachers, at first were (pre)occupied with thinking technical resources (audio, video, handouts) to support teaching, making the definition of a different possible bond with knowledge and with students fragile or subjugated to the background. The impossibility of sharing the school as a traditional physical space requires that the support of the bond take place in other ways and having to rely on the intermediary of digital technologies. More than focusing on the debate about technological resources, we propose that the questioning about the ways of sustaining interaction in remote learning is a great challenge.

As we argued earlier, we bet that the link between teacher, student and knowledge is precisely effects the acknowledgment of subjects and authorship in teaching and learning processes, similarly to constructivist theoretical models and the psychoanalytic approach. The scenes presented above indicated that the interaction, or lack thereof, is an important sign read in the process of analyzing the narratives and serves as a great concern of family members, students and teachers. When we think about interaction from psychoanalysis, we are referring to the concept of transference and how it operates in the educational context.

Such a concept is closely associated with the method of treatment proposed by psychoanalysis. As Maurano (2006) points out, the term refers to the affective bond established between the doctor and the patient, and this bond allows to express and update unconscious conflicts during analysis. Lacan (2010) dedicated one of his seminars to this field with the concept of transference, rescuing Freudian notes on the matter and including the dimension of speech as central to the transference process. According to Lacan (2010, p. 221), “[...] it seems impossible to eliminate from the phenomenon of transference the fact that it manifests itself in the relationship with someone to whom one speaks”.

The transference can be present in other contexts of encounter where a subject refers their speech to another person, as is the case of education, and is presented as one of the main phenomena when dealing with the relationship between teacher, student and knowledge from a psychoanalytic perspective. Here, we can refer to the speech of the boy João Vitor, in Scene 4, because, when he comments on his learning process in remote learning, he puts the emphasis on the teacher and not necessarily in the school space, stating what follows: “Without you, teacher, I cannot learn well”. In his classic text *Some Reflections on Schoolboy Psychology*, published in 1913, Freud (2012b) comments that the personality of teachers mobilizes and builds bond with students as much as, or more than, the contents, because the teacher understands that access to knowledge is performed through the person the teacher is. We can consider that the transference allows students to take advantage of the teacher and extract from this relationship proper knowledge that becomes the basis for the construction of new knowledge (Kupfer, 1995).

With this reflection, the authors invite us to think about the effect that such a bond causes both in students and teachers. For Speller (2004), it is of paramount importance that the teacher approaches this concept when teaching, because, when working with people, the profession requires dealing with the relationships established with these people and not only knowing the content to be taught, the teacher choosing a methodological proposal to transmit knowledge. In this sense, it can be questioned how to establish a presence and create a transferential bond, even if these are mediated by technologies, spaces other than school.

Instead of just passing on materials (texts, audios or videos) to students with the help of digital or printed media, we consider that a

fundamental element for establishing and supporting the transferential bond between teacher, student and knowledge in the context of remote learning lies in the possibility of teachers presenting themselves as the subject-author of these materials, capable of leaving impressions on these materials with the way they deal with knowledge. Thus, the word of the teacher, whether by video, audio or written, becomes a mark of presence; it becomes corporeity in the absence of a body occupying the materiality of a physical space. As Lajonquière (2011) mentions, education cannot be distanced from the teacher's word, because, if it is so put, it cannot be considered a formative process, only transfer of information.

Specifically with regard to the possibility of the word and presence of the teacher in the context of distance learning, we highlight the paper by Silva (2010), in which the author states that "[...] being close or distant to someone, be they present or absent, in the current context of technological development that we have, is no longer a geographical issue, it is more like a stance of the subject in language" (p. 118). We bet that the reflections brought by the author are also valid for remote learning.

Still in this sense, we affirm the importance of the word and the encounter between corporeities, as the teacher points out in Scene 6. Even in the absence of a gaze due to the disconnection of the cameras, the teacher modulates the voice, it *slows down*, because, based on the student's listening that was already established since before the pandemic, it moves from an *accelerated* teaching position to occupy a different one in the face of this new scenario. Listening becomes a presence and the teacher's word is also registered, producing the effect that gives body to the encounter; thus, technologies, be they digital, analog or printed, gain ground as a new space to be occupied in an unprecedented way, both by the teacher and by students, as a place of bond between teacher, student and knowledge.

In addition, we consider that the materials and proposals of activities proposed by the teacher must also constitute a place for the registration of each student as a subject of their learning process. Therefore, we believe on proposals that serve to mobilize questions and research, because these are more powerful for both teaching and learning compared to activities aimed at ready answers or mere knowledge measurement.

When the student is invited to build knowledge with their questions, it becomes possible to inscribe in such questions a bit of themselves, of their concerns and anxieties in this construction process. Freud (2016), in 1905, emphasizes that the child weaves his child sexual theories based on questions made to adults, serving as precursors of the desire to know and mobilizing the sublimatory processes that support future learning. In the text *Little Hans*, from 1909, Freud (2015) presents the investigation trajectory of a boy regarding sexuality, stating that "[...] desire to know and sexual curiosity are inseparable" (p. 129). We

consider that this theoretical contribution helps us think about the effect of the question as a mobilizer of knowledge, and it can also make us think about proposing activities to students, even in a remote context. As such, we bet on propositions of activities such as learning projects, in which students are invited to work on research based on the questions they can formulate about certain contents, sharing their findings and constructions with the teacher and colleagues (Longo, 2012; Fagundes; Sato; Maçada, 1999).

Some brief considerations remain to be made when we take into account the process of subjective constitution of the student and its relationship with remote learning. Young children, especially those undergoing early childhood education, experience a constitutive time that makes them strongly alienated in the body of the other (Lacan, 2008b), and those who find themselves with some impasse in their process of constitution as a subject tend to need the physical and material presence of the body of another adult in the course of remote learning. Thus, the adult who shares the physical space with the child needs to support the teacher's word, which can cause impasses in this process.

On the one hand, as we see in Scene 2, although the bond between the child and the family is strengthened, there may also be a risk that the difference between mother and teacher, as well as between home and school will not be established, or appears difficult. Thus, a third public space is engulfed by the private-domestic space, which makes it difficult for the child to meet with other possible social approaches, besides the family one. It should be noted that the school is configured for children as a place of their own and meeting with other children, unlike the house, a place shared with the family. As we have already pointed out in this paper, the school as a third space between the child and the family is of paramount importance in the constitution of the small being as a subject and their insertion in culture (Kupfer; Bernardino, 2009), which also constitutes a protective space for situations of domestic violence of all kinds – cases that tend to become even more invisible in the current context, especially when they involve very young children.

On the other hand, as we have seen in Scene 3, when the child states that there is a difference between home and school, denoting a movement promoting their subjective constitution, what can become difficult in the process is the fact the adult family asserts the word of the teacher, in the physical absence of their body, as shown in the speech by the boy Lucas: "[...] you are not my teacher!". In these situations, perhaps the possible resource to sustain some schooling for these children and their families is the proposition of activities that can be done together by adults and children, finding in the teacher and school a space that can receive the reports, photos and videos of these experiences lived at home. Enabling a space to listen to the learning that is done during this period, in the company of the family, seems to be of paramount importance in this moment of social isolation and can constitute a privileged place where the school is a third place participant in the subjectivation process of the child.

When we gather narratives about the trajectory of children in the early years of school (especially after literacy training) and adolescents from high school in a context of remote learning, we can see that they have already gone through the process of separation (Lacan, 2008b), demonstrating a subjective constitution shift that allows them to invest in objects alien to the body and the family home; the status of the word already has a certain level of independence from the object, acquiring symbolic substance, wherein children are able to assert themselves as subjects with desires. Although it is not enough to guarantee a path in remote education without difficulties and anguish, this process can take place more calmly and independently of the family. This aspect can be seen in the account of Ricardo's mother, in Scene 3, when she says that:

[...] he has gotten autonomy, he organizes himself around a established routine, does the lessons, gets involved... messes around (sometimes he's drawing in his notebook or checking his cellphone under the 'wallet') he gets scolded... he complains: I think that's a lot of time for an online class, but it works...

In short, the context of remote learning poses an emergency and challenge for all participants in the educational scene in this context of pandemic. In this section, we present some of the analyses and reflections to discuss this unprecedented process in teaching and learning, mainly focusing on the concept of transference in the relationship between teacher, student and knowledge, which can also be set up in remote learning, even if this new environment introduces new forms of malaise that needs to be listened to, and for which we still need to devise a means of monitoring and intervention. *A posteriori* time will be necessary to elaborate this discouraging current scenario, creating tension in the classic ways of thinking teaching and learning, and mobilizing us to create other possible methods.

Final Considerations

It is not our task to 'understand' a clinical case, this may happen later, when we have received enough impressions from it. We temporarily leave our judgment suspended and welcome with equal attention all that is offered to observation (Freud, 2015).

The worldwide incidence of the pandemic caused by Covid-19 has revealed human fragility with exposure to a virus, against which we still study ways of fighting. On the other hand, we are faced with the importance of being with others and supporting other possible forms of bonding, predominantly using digital means for meetings, parties and goodbyes in order to reduce the physical distance caused by the need for social distancing. With educational contexts it was no different. Teachers from all educational levels around the world faced the chal-

lenge of conducting education without relying on the physical space of the school. In this sense, although controversial and subject to criticism, remote learning, in the various forms that are being carried out, has been supporting teaching and learning in many countries.

Using the statement of Freud (2015) that introduces this last session as an epigraph, when we consider teaching in remote learning as a case, we can think that we have not yet extracted more consistent information about this form of teaching. As the Viennese master puts it (Freud, 2015), we need to temporarily leave our readings unfinished, that is, engage in *suspended judgment*, so that we can extract from this experience new elements that allow us to think about it, and live it. For now, the course carried out throughout this article allows to make some provisional considerations about remote learning and the exercise of teaching in this unprecedented way of teaching and learning.

We argue that the criticisms directed at remote learning and distance learning tend to focus on the use of technologies considered harmful to the bond, making it impossible or rendering issues. However, we consider that, although we recognize differences between face-to-face and remote bond, the criticisms should be directed much more towards the theoretical-conceptual grounds supporting this mode of teaching than to the mode itself. As mentioned, although remote learning lacks conceptual bases prior to its planning and proposition thus making it different from distance learning, it is anchored in concepts that support, consciously or unconsciously, the teacher's actions. We believe this aspect needs to be considered in the criticisms and evaluations concerning this way of teaching. In this sense, the opposition between face-to-face education and distance learning or remote learning, is superficial and insufficient, since both forms can assume a directive, non-directive or relational approach (Becker, 2001; Preti, 2009).

Another element of paramount importance for our analysis, closely related to the previous discussion, was the debate around the matter of interaction. We went through some narratives of family members, students and teachers who have talked about their experiences with remote learning. In them, directly or indirectly, the interaction between teacher, student and shared knowledge served as an important element in the perceptions and evaluations made so far about this mode of teaching. In order to theoretically question its potential, we analyze this new mode of teaching by utilizing the concept of transference as proposed by Freud-Lacanian psychoanalysis, and it should be considered that the transferential bond between teacher, student and knowledge can be established in remote learning by listening to students and the teacher's word referring to the students themselves, together with the materials and activities shared in the various virtual environments or sent through print. In this sense, the student's listening and the teacher's word, and vice versa, would be indispensable elements for the development of a bond and the support of a corporeity when the physical encounter of bodies is impossible. Thus, technologies start supporting a possible space of meeting, of word and not only of replacement and dissemination of didactic-pedagogical materials.

We also point out some singularities when we think about the differences in the remote learning process involving small students, early childhood education, early and final years, in addition to high school. We stress that younger students, especially those of early childhood education and early years, require the participation of an adult to support the teacher's word in remote learning. This presence can lead to various vicissitudes, such as difficulty in affirming the difference between mother and teacher, in addition to the distinction between home and school, or even the challenge of parents in sustaining the teacher's word when the educator is absent. Despite the difficulties and anxieties generated by this mode of teaching, older students seem to demonstrate engagement potential and bond with the proposal of teachers, depending on the way they are proposed. It is worth noting that we consider the process of teachers and students who have socioeconomic and technical resources that allow access to remote learning. Much remains to be discussed about the exclusion of teachers and students from this process especially in political and socioeconomic terms, precisely because of social inequalities that are not exclusive to this pandemic period, but that in this context are emphasized.

We acknowledge the complexity of the current moment in which we live, be it subjective, political, economic or social. In the context of remote learning, we need to reestablish the social, ethical and political challenge and commitment to equitable access for all to a genuinely inclusive education. For now, we bet that discussion made around teaching in times of social distancing is necessary and contributes to acknowledge the role of the teacher and reaffirm the role of education as an essential bond between subjects. In this sense, we affirm the power of the psychoanalytic approach in supporting and analyzing a teaching practice that recognizes teachers and students as subject-authors of the processes of teaching and learning, maintaining an ethics of relationship through transference, recognizing and helping to name inventions and anxieties in this singular emergency moment that characterizes the educational encounter in remote learning.

Received on October 1, 2020
Accepted on November 12, 2020

Notes

- 1 It is important to emphasize that the notion of choice for psychoanalysis does not refer to a rationally deliberate process, but follows determinations of unconscious functioning. For a detailed discussion on the notion of choice in psychoanalysis, see article by Costa and Gomes (2017).
- 2 The names displayed in Scene 3 are fictitious.
- 3 The use of these reports in this study was duly authorized.

References

- AZEVEDO, Margarida. Professores aprendem, na marra, a usar tecnologia para dar aula remota. **JC**, São Paulo, 31 maio 2020. Disponível em: <<https://jc.ne10.uol.com.br/colunas/enem-e-educacao/2020/05/5610966-professores-aprendem-na-marra-a-usar-tecnologia-para-dar-aula-remota.html>>. Acesso em: 31 maio 2020.
- BECKER, Fernando. Modelos Pedagógicos e Modelos Epistemológicos. In: BECKER, Fernando. **Educação e Construção do Conhecimento**. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2001. P. 15-32.
- BOZKURT, Aras; SHARMA, Ramesh Chander. Emergency Remote Teaching in a Time of Global Crisis Due to Coronavirus Pandemic. **Asian Journal of Distance Education**, Nova Deli, v. 15, n. 1, p. 1-6, 2020. Disponível em: <<http://asianjde.org/ojs/index.php/AsianJDE/article/download/447/297>>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2020.
- BRASIL. Decreto nº 9.057, de 25 de maio de 2017. Regulamenta o art. 80 da Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 26 maio 2017. Disponível em: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2017/decreto/d9057.htm. Acesso em: 25 mar. 2008.
- COSTA, Germano Quintanilha; GOMES, Gilberto. Considerações Sobre a Causalidade Psíquica e a Escolha na Psicanálise. **Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa**, Brasília, v. 33, e33418, p. 1-9, 30 nov. 2017. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0102-37722017000100416&lng=en&nrm=iso>. Acesso em: 12 set. 2020.
- D'AGORD, Marta Regina de Leão. Aprendizagem e Método Psicanalítico. **Educação em Revista**, Curitiba, n. 36, p. 147-161, 2010. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0104-40602010000100011&lng=en&nrm=iso>. Acesso em: 12 set. 2020.
- DUNKER, Christian Ingo Lenz; ZANETTI, Clovis Eduardo. Construção e Formalização de Casos Clínicos. In: DUNKER, Christian; RAMIREZ, Heloisa; ASSADI, Tatiana (Org.). **A Construção de Casos Clínicos em Psicanálise: método clínico e formalização discursiva**. São Paulo: Annablume, 2017. P. 23-45.
- FAGUNDES, Léa da Cruz; SATO, Luciane Sayuri; MAÇADA, Débora Laurino. **Aprendizes do Futuro: as inovações começaram!** Brasília: Ministério da Educação, 1999. (Coleção Informática para a Mudança na Educação). Disponível em: <<http://www.dominiopublico.gov.br/download/texto/me003153.pdf>>. Acesso em: 5 dez. 2009.
- FREUD, Sigmund. Construções em Análise. In: FREUD, Sigmund. **Moisés e o Monoteísmo, Esboço de Psicanálise e Outros Trabalhos**. Tradução sob a direção de Jayme Salomão. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1975. P. 289-304.
- FREUD, Sigmund. O Moisés de Michelangelo. In: FREUD, Sigmund. **Obras Completas, Volume 11**. Tradução Paulo César de Souza. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2012a. P. 373-412.
- FREUD, Sigmund. Sobre a Psicologia do Colegial. In: FREUD, Sigmund. **Obras Completas, Volume 11**. Tradução Paulo César de Souza. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2012b. P. 418-423.
- FREUD, Sigmund. Análise da Fobia de um Garoto de Cinco Anos ("O pequeno Hans", 1909). In: FREUD, Sigmund. **Obras Completas, Volume 8**. Tradução Paulo César de Souza. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2015. P. 123-284.

FREUD, Sigmund. Três Ensaio sobre a Teoria da Sexualidade. In: FREUD, Sigmund. **Obras Completas, Volume 6**. Tradução Paulo César de Souza. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2016. P. 13-172. [1905]

KUPFER, Maria Cristina Machado. **Freud e a Educação**. São Paulo: Scipione, 1995.

KUPFER, Maria Cristina Machado; BERNARDINO, Leda Mariza Fischer. Apresentação. In: MARIOTTO, Rosa Maria. **Cuidar, Educar e Prevenir**: as funções da creche na subjetivação de bebês. São Paulo: Escuta, 2009. P. 11-14.

LACAN, Jacques. **Seminário 7**: a ética da psicanálise. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2008a.

LACAN, Jacques. **Seminário 11**: os quatro conceitos fundamentais da psicanálise. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2008b.

LACAN, Jacques. **O Seminário, Livro 8**: a transferência. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2010.

LAJONQUIÈRE, Leandro de. Mestria da Palavra e Formação de Professores. **Educação e Realidade**, Porto Alegre, v. 36, n. 3, p. 849-865, set./dez. 2011. Disponível em: <<https://seer.ufrgs.br/educacaoerealidade/article/view/13316/14337>>. Acesso em: 23 maio 2020.

LONGO, José Luis. **A Aprendizagem por Projeto e a Pesquisa Psicanalítica**. 2012. 84 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Psicologia Social e Institucional) – Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2012. Disponível em: <<https://www.lume.ufrgs.br/handle/10183/53160>>. Acesso em: 23 maio 2020.

MAURANO, Denise. **A Transferência**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2006.

MOORE, Michael Grahame; KEARSLEY, Greg. **Educação a Distância**: uma visão integrada. São Paulo: Thomson Learning, 2007.

PADILHA, Débora. Com Aulas Suspensas, Menino de Lagoa Vermelha Manda Áudio à Professora: ‘sem você eu não consigo aprender’. **G1 – RBS TV**, Porto Alegre, 20 maio 2020. Disponível em: <<https://g1.globo.com/rs/rio-grande-do-sul/noticia/2020/05/20/com-aulas-suspensas-menino-de-lagoa-vermelha-manda-audio-a-professora-sem-voce-eu-nao-consigo-aprender.ghtml>>. Acesso em: 23 maio 2020.

PIAGET, Jean. **Où Va l'Éducation?** Paris: Gallimard, 1988. (Coleção Folio Essais).

PRETI, Oreste. **Bases Epistemológicas e Teorias em Construção na Educação a Distância**. Cuiabá: Universidade Federal do Mato Grosso, 2009.

SAMPAIO, Cristiane. Professores, Pais e Alunos Apontam Dificuldades e Limitações do Ensino a Distância. **Brasil de Fato**, Brasília, 4 maio 2020. Disponível em: <<https://www.brasildefato.com.br/2020/05/04/professores-pais-e-alunos-apontam-dificuldades-e-limitacoes-no-ensino-a-distancia>>. Acesso em: 23 maio 2020.

SILVA, Iranice Carvalho da. **Da Presença Virtual**: um estudo sobre a transferência em contexto de educação a distância. 2010. 133 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2010. Disponível em: <<https://www.lume.ufrgs.br/handle/10183/37381>>. Acesso em: 23 maio 2020.

SPELLER, Maria Augusta Rondas. **Psicanálise e Educação**: caminhos cruzáveis. Brasília, DF: Plano, 2004.

SZENCZUK, Gabriela. Aulas Online Dividem Opinião de Pais na Região. **Diário do Alto Vale**, Rio do Sul, 16 abr. 2020. Disponível em: <<https://diarioav.com.br/aulas-online-dividem-opiniao-de-pais-na-regiao/>>. Acesso em: 16 abr. 2020.

Simone Bicca Charczuk is a psychologist (UNISINOS), Master in Public Health (UNISINOS) and PhD in Education (UFRGS). Professor at the Faculty of Education (UFRGS). Researcher at the Research Group on Psychoanalysis, Education and Culture - NUPPEC
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1947-1366>
Email: sibicca@gmail.com

Editor-in-charge: Carla Vasques

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International. Available at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>.