Acta Scientiarum

http://periodicos.uem.br/ojs
ISSN on-line: 2178-5201
https://doi.org/10.4025/actascieduc.v48i1.78638

Between the self and the algorithm: authorship in times of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI)

Mirian Maia do Amaral

Fundação Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil. E-mail: amaral3378@gmail.com

ABSTRACT. This essay proposes a critical reflection on the shifts in the notion of authorship throughout history, problematizing its uses, in general and, in particular, in light of advances in Generative Artificial Intelligence. Grounded in the theoretical contributions of Barthes (2004), Foucault (1992), and Freire (2019a, 2019b, 2021), among others, the author approaches authorship as an ethical and political stance. Within this framework, the essay articulates the concepts of creative curation, collective intelligence (Lévy, 1999), and responsibility (Bakhtin, 2011; Jonas, 2006), aiming to foster pedagogical practices that resist the homogenization of thought and promote a distributed, insurgent, and intentional authorship. Within this framework, the essay proposes the adoption of a Pedagogy of Encounter, in which Generative Artificial Intelligence embraces Education, encouraging active listening, the recognition of the other, and the collective construction of knowledge through the creation of bridges between different realities. Such an approach offers plural pathways for learning and fosters the active participation of students. The author emphasizes that, when used consciously, prudently, and responsibly, Generative Artificial Intelligence can transform education into a more humanized and emancipatory process, in which teachers play an essential role and students are encouraged to think critically, explore their own potential, and prepare themselves for the challenges of an ever-changing future.

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence; education; pedagogy of encounte; critical-reflective thinking.

Entre o eu e o algoritmo: a autoria em tempos de Inteligência Artificial Generativa (IAGen)

RESUMO. Este ensaio propõe uma reflexão crítica sobre os deslocamentos da noção de autoria ao longo da história, problematizando seus usos, em geral e, em particular, diante dos avanços da Inteligência Artificial Generativa. Com base nas contribuições de Barthes (2004), Foucault (1992) e Freire (2019a, 2019b, 2021), entre outros, a autora, a partir da compreensão da autoria como posição ética e política, articula os conceitos de curadoria criativa, inteligência coletiva (Lévy, 1999) e responsabilidade (Bakhtin, 2011; Jonas, 2006), visando à construção de práticas pedagógicas que resistam à pasteurização do pensamento e promovam uma autoria distribuída, insurgente e intencional. Nesse contexto propõe a adoção de uma Pedagogia do Encontro, na qual a Inteligência Artificial Generativa abrace a Educação, favorecendo a escuta ativa, o reconhecimento do outro e a construção coletiva do saber, mediante a criação de pontes entre diferentes realidades, que ofereça caminhos plurais para o aprendizado e fomente a participação ativa dos educandos. A autor enfatiza que, se utilizada de modo consciente, prudente e responsável, a IAGen pode transformar a educação em um processo mais humanizado e libertador, no qual o docente desempenha um papel essencial, e os estudantes são estimulados a pensar criticamente, explorar suas próprias possibilidades e se preparar para os desafios de um futuro em constante mudança.

Palavras-chave: inteligência artificial generativa; pedagogia do encontro; pensamento crítico-reflexivo.

Entre el yo y el algoritmo: la autoría en tiempos de Inteligencia Artificial Generativa (IAG)

RESUMEN. Este ensayo propone una reflexión crítica sobre los desplazamientos de la noción de autoría a lo largo de la historia, problematizando sus usos en general y, en particular, frente a los avances de las Inteligencia ArtificialeGenerativa. Con base en las contribuciones de Barthes (2004), Foucault (1992) y Freire (2019a, 2019b, 2021), entre otros, la autora, desde la comprensión de la autoría como posición ética y política, articula los conceptos de curaduría creativa, inteligencia colectiva (Lévy, 1999) y responsabilidad (Bakhtin, 2011; Jonas, 2006), con el objetivo de construir prácticas pedagógicas que resistan la homogeneización del pensamiento y promuevan una autoría distribuida, insurgente e intencional.

En este contexto, propone la adopción de una Pedagogía del Encuentro, en la cual la Inteligencia Artificial Generativa abrace la Educación, favoreciendo la escucha activa, el reconocimiento del otro y la construcción colectiva del conocimiento mediante la creación de puentes entre diferentes realidades. Este enfoque ofrece caminos plurales para el aprendizaje y fomenta la participación activa de los estudiantes. La autora enfatiza que, si se utiliza de manera consciente, prudente y responsable, la Inteligencia Artificial Generativa puede transformar la educación en un proceso más humanizado y liberador, en el cual el docente desempeña un papel esencial y los estudiantes son estimulados a pensar críticamente, explorar sus propias posibilidades y prepararse para los desafíos de un futuro en constante transformación.

Palavras clave: inteligencia artificial generativa; pedagogía del encuentro; pensamiento crítico-reflexivo.

Received on August 26, 2025.
Accepted on November 26, 2025.
Published in March 06, 2026.

Introduction

There was a time when writing was, for me, a solitary ritual; writing carried out in silence and introspection – almost a mystical act, insofar as I delved into myself, excavating memories, emotions, and ideas. I preferred to write at night, as if summoning muses at sacred hours, always accompanied by a cup of tea. Each word was chosen with precision; in each pause, an intention. It was like lighting candles in an inner temple – a slow, reflective process, sometimes painful, but also revealing. An intimate, artisanal, and deeply human form of writing.

Today, with the emergence of the networked digital world and the arrival of Generative Artificial Intelligence (IAGen), especially those focused on writing and creation, I – an education specialist who still insists on writing with my own hands, even if they now touch the keys of mobile devices – experience something surprising: different modes of writing. While one is introspective, the other is expansive. But both seek to give shape to the invisible, translate the unsayable, and touch the other with words.

With IAGen, the process transforms into a dance with the unexpected, blending styles, voices, cultural and technical references with a fluidity that pushes me out of my comfort zone, as I must negotiate meaning with it. In this context, writing ceases to be solitary and becomes a dialogue between human and machine, between intention and chance. It is like summoning a digital creative spirit that tosses ideas onto the table and says: "What if it were like this?"

Freire (2019b, p. 96) states that education is not a practice of isolated individuals, and that "[...] men educate each other in communion, mediated by the world. Mediated by knowable objects." From this perspective, and driven by the epistemological curiosity built through the critical exercise of the capacity to learn, I turn on the computer and access ChatGPT. Soon, I am invited to ask questions. I then feed it with my questions, notes, joys, sketches, and pains. In seconds, a text appears on the screen, with clarity, cohesion, consistency, and depth. Captivating words, solid arguments, and an elegant style seem to reflect the essence of a human author. Polished verses, unprecedented metaphors, and a disconcerting fluidity!

We live in an era in which words, guided by algorithms that learn from the world and return it in the form of text, seem to write themselves almost autonomously, giving rise to a troubling, almost uncomfortable question: to whom does authorship belong in times of Generative Artificial Intelligence, given that it does not create from scratch, but merely reorganizes data?

At this point, perhaps both I and you, the reader, desire a precise, prescriptive, comforting answer. But a critical-reflective essay, unlike a recipe, does not alleviate symptoms; it provokes wounds, makes us reflect. I then think: insofar as I formulated the question, guided and elaborated the queries that constituted the prompts, to whom do these writings belong? Who is the author? Me? Or could it be the machine?

We know well that Generative Artificial Intelligence (IAGen) is a branch of Artificial Intelligence - AI, centered on neural network models capable of generating content such as art, music, software code, and writing, based on statistical combinations of information stored in databases, thus inaugurating a new ecology of writing.

Producing texts is no longer an exclusively human process: generative algorithms, fed by large volumes of data, are now capable of generating coherent, creative, and sometimes refined content. If this is so, how should we think about authorship in a context where writing itself is automated? More than a technical or legal concern, this is an epistemological, ethical, and educational question that has stirred the world. IAGen has become a central topic of contemporary debate, particularly in academia, where discussions intensify and divide opinions. In academia especially, debates intensify, dividing opinions.

For a better understanding of this phenomenon, I turn to the literature and find shelter for my musings in the work of Eco (2020), who, in analyzing mass culture and the media, divides intellectuals into two groups: the apocalyptics, who view mass culture as a threat to high culture, and the integrated, who accept it without reservation.

The same happens with these intelligences. On one side, some applaud the initiative, highlighting the speed with which IAGen responds to prompts, its small margin of error, its availability, the cost-benefit of its adoption, as well as its potential to influence processes of human evolution by impacting cognitive competencies and social interaction dynamics.

> Generative Artificial Intelligence for text is reshaping our writing practices. What was once a solitary process is now a dialogue with intelligent machines. This change is so profound that we now perceive ourselves as hybrid authors, with a capacity for creation amplified by AI. Writing without this partnership now seems as unthinkable to us as drafting scientific articles without search engines like Google Scholar (Pimentel et al., 2024, p. 10).

In the opposite direction, there is widespread prohibition of its use, for fear that the practice of 'copying and pasting' will increase at an unprecedented speed, erasing all the effort invested in the formation of 'cyber-author-citizens'[1]– contemporary, critical, and reflective subjects who act, produce, and position themselves in digital spaces, being not only consumers of information but authors of meanings, knowledge, and social practices in the network (Ribeiro, 2015; Ribeiro & Santos, 2018).

In tune with Eco's (2020) thought, which states that instead of rejecting mass culture, intellectuals should seek ways to use it to transmit cultural values, I focus on IAGen and recognize the vast potential of this technological revolution, insofar as it creates opportunities for educational innovation, efficiency, and access to knowledge. However, I admit that if this use is not accompanied by substantive governance, adequate training, and guarantees of equity and transparency, it may aggravate inequalities, weaken the quality of learning, threaten autonomy, and deepen ethical, epistemological, economic, educational, and social conflicts, among others, which must be widely discussed in a critical and reflective manner.

From an ethical standpoint, IAGen can reproduce biases of gender, race, class, ethnicity, among others, due to biased algorithms present in the data stored during its training, leading to discriminatory decisions. The opacity in the production mechanisms of its texts and images, seen as a 'black box' – a concept that, in scientific practice, refers to knowledge or devices that become closed to questioning: we know what goes in and what comes out, but we do not examine what happens inside (Latour, 2012) – hinders their explanation, accountability, and transparency, weakening the quality of learning; and the lack of clarity regarding the sources of data extracted from the Internet, or whether these are protected by copyright, may encounter ethical and legal problems.

Epistemologically, IAGen generates often convincing yet inaccurate texts, threatening user trust in the knowledge produced. By reproducing dominant narratives, this intelligence standardizes knowledge, limiting epistemological plurality (Ardoino, 1998; Macedo, 2020), besides making it difficult to trace sources and recognize human authorship.

In economic terms, IAGen brings implications for the labor market, as automation may lead to the replacement of repetitive tasks, increasing sectoral unemployment, which requires requalification. Furthermore, it can impact productivity, as companies with more resources may benefit, widening inequalities between and within countries. Finally, this technology fosters new business models, with the emergence of startups, customized services, and disruptive technologies.

In the field of education, questions arise concerning the privacy and protection of users' sensitive data, generally collected and used without transparency, potentially violating their rights and trust. Teachers' lack of preparedness also limits the pedagogical and inclusive use of IAGen, and its excessive use may reduce users' autonomy and creativity, making the development of critical thinking and collaboration urgent.

When we consider the social dimension, digital exclusion becomes transparent, due to unequal access to technological infrastructure and connectivity, thus deepening social margins. The massive data collection, alignment, and monetization by large corporations – often not in compliance with current legislation – harms privacy and hinders oversight, besides its use demanding high energy and contributing to environmental degradation due to high computational energy consumption. Thus, the great challenge before us is to build policies, practices, and structures that allow maximizing benefits while mitigating risks across all these dimensions.

[1] The spelling of the term *'cyberauthorcitizens'*, coined by Ribeiro (2015), as well as other terms that appear in this text written in the same way, was adopted in this study based on the theoretical framework of Alves (2019) on research with everyday life. Accordingly, "[...] we prefer to write together, in italics and within single quotation marks, the words that we have learned as dichotomized by homogeneous ways of thinking and writing. In doing so, we reveal the limits of an inherited mode of thinking and indicate that we can create other modes of 'practicestheories'" (Alves, 2019, p. 15–16).

These questions lead me to further inquiries: Could IAGen be recognized as a co-author when it significantly contributes to the co-creation of a work? Who legitimizes the quality of this contribution – the user? The reader? Based on what? In principle, I understand that no matter how 'surprising' it may seem, IAGen does not create in the human sense of the term. It does not intend, take responsibility, interpret, or attribute meaning to what it produces. What it does is an algorithmic mediation that interferes in the creative process, but it does not share the status of a subject with the human.

Foucault (1996) reminds us that authorship is not an intrinsic quality of the text or its writer, but an effect of discourse, a marker of social function. The 'author' is a historical construct, whose legitimacy lies not in the intention of the writer, but in the recognition of the discursive community (readers, peers, institutions). In this sense, authorship is attributed not only to the content developed, but to the position that this subject occupies in the production of knowledge. But what does it mean to be an author? Are we authors only when we write alone? And when a text is born from a conversation, an inherited memory, a collective dream?

Is authorship, or does it also become, permeated by contexts, voices, technologies, as Ardoino (1998) teaches us by offering the idea of *authorization* – that is, "[...] the capacity to authorize oneself, to become, at least, a co-author of what is socially produced. If the actor is always, more or less explicitly, a bearer of meaning, the author is the source and creator of meaning" (Ardoino, 1998, our translation[2]). Similarly, Lévy (1999) conceives knowledge as something constructed collaboratively (collective intelligence), in distributed knowledge networks. When using a IAGen, is the human not accessing a collective memory, trained with an infinity of texts, images, and data produced by other humans, therefore, a 'distributed authorship'?

Undoubtedly, IAGen operates through patterns, statistics, and probabilities. Its algorithms are capable of generating texts, images, music, and code with quality and coherence. However, it lacks intentionality, subjectivity, and consciousness. It is the human being who defines the theme, selects the inputs, configures the parameters, chooses what will be used or discarded, makes fine adjustments, and connects the content to a larger purpose.

This realization takes me back to the text on the screen. I did feel like an author. But an author in transition, between the human and the artificial. I knew that these writings would exist independently of the machine. But I was also convinced that the machine would not write that text without me. So, I thought: perhaps we are experiencing not the end of authorship, but its metamorphosis, which requires courage to see beauty in what we do not yet fully understand.

Faced with the challenges that authorship encounters in the era of Generative Artificial Intelligence, which involve not only technical issues but also epistemological, ethical, and political implications, the critical-reflective essay proved to be the most adequate approach, given that, by its subjective, dialogical, and open nature, this form of writing breaks with traditional methods and values the author's lived experience, articulating sensitivity, critical thought, and the relationship between theory and practice. Thus, more than describing, the essay problematizes. By combining arguments, experiences, and references, it tensions practices, concepts, and policies from a critical and propositional perspective.

Situated on the frontier between the literary and the philosophical, between lived experience and theoretical reflection, it carries a subjective intentionality on the part of its author, whose role is not neutrality, but that of someone who engages with the object and problematizes the relations of knowledge; it does not seek definitive conclusions, but traverses paths of thought that are constructed in the very act of writing.

Inspired by the tradition of Montaigne (2016), who understood it as an exercise in intellectual freedom and self-knowledge, this text adopts a writing that moves between the personal and the universal, without pretensions of reaching absolute truths, but which values the dialogue between experience and reflection. It also draws on the ideas of Adorno (2003), for whom the essay is a philosophical and epistemological form that opposes the rigidity of conventional scientific methods. Instead of following fixed rules, the essay is structured by internal coherence, by the critical articulation of ideas, and by the refusal to separate subject and object, operating through approximations, displacements, and conceptual constellations that can illuminate aspects of reality that escape positivist approaches.

Adopting the critical-reflective essay, therefore, is to recognize doubt, incompleteness, and subjectivity as legitimate parts of the knowing process. This choice values writing as a practice of thought and allows the construction of living, situated, and human knowledge, capable of questioning practices, revisiting experiences, and broadening the understanding of educational phenomena in their multiple dimensions – ethical, historical, cultural, and political.

[2] In the original: *[...] capacidad de autorizar-se, de hacerse a sí mismo, al menos, coautor de lo que será producido socialmente. Si el actor es siempre, más o menos explícitamente, portador de sentido, el autor es fuente y productor de sentido.*

Authorship in Times of Generative Artificial Intelligence: A Metamorphosis in Progress

Authorship has never been a fixed point. And now, more than ever, it moves. Characterized by the presence, concealment, or disguise of the author's identity within the work, authorship – historically conceived as the singular expression of a creative subject – has been continuously reshaped by multiple forces and resignified over time. Whether in textual, visual, sound, or other forms of production, the concept of the author as the bearer of a particular form of knowledge or talento has undergone displacements, being replaced, in the networked digital world, by a collaborative/collective performance (Amaral, 2014).

The traditional conception of authorship has its roots in philosophical and legal reflections on intellectual creation. From Classical Antiquity to the early modern period, prior to the consolidation of print culture, works often circulated as open creations..., in constant transformation, without concern for their finalization. Narratives, epics, tragedies, and other cultural manifestations were subject to modifications and additions over time. In this era, God was regarded as the supreme source of inspiration and, therefore, the true author of works.

The need to attribute authorship to a specific individual, according to Chartier (2006), arises in the 16th century as a strategic mechanism of the Catholic Church to combat discourses considered transgressive. Texts that contradicted religious and political orthodoxy were classified as apocryphal and profane, subject to punishment. Foucault (1996) observes that this repressive function attributed to discourse reinforces the figure of the author, consolidating authorship as a process centered on individuality.

This understanding intensifies with Cartesian thought, which promotes the image of a rational and conscious subject as the agent of knowledge. The Protestant Reformation, by advocating direct contact between the individual and the divine, contributes to this displacement, as does the Renaissance, with its valorization of humanism, and the Enlightenment, which exalts reason and autonomy in the face of religious dogma.

With the invention of Gutenberg's printing press and the expansion of print culture, a distinction was established between the 'author,' whose proper name confers authority upon the work, and the 'writer,' simply the one who writes. For Chartier (2006), the very structure of the printed book imposes the author-function, consolidating the work as a closed and finished product, with no room for subsequent modifications.

In this context, public and collective reading, common in the Middle Ages, gradually gives way to silent and individualized reading, reinforcing the separation between author and reader. Between the 18th and 19th centuries, a series of political, economic, philosophical, technological, and aesthetic transformations in Europe favored the emergence of Romanticism, a movement that deepened the notion of authorship. The author ceased to be seen as a mere artisan inspired by external forces and began to be celebrated as a creative genius, almost divine, whose work is the original expression of their affective experience and subjectivity.

However, still in the 19th century, this model was profoundly unsettled by the ideas of Darwin, who explained evolution based on changes in populations rather than individuals; Marx, who highlighted the role of socioeconomic structures over individual action; and Freud, who revealed the influence of the unconscious on the constitution of the subject. As Hall (2002) emphasizes, these contributions paved the way for a new understanding of authorship.

This movement intensifies with post-structuralism, in which language comes to occupy the center of discourse, displacing the subject from its central position. Consequently, the notions of author and authorship are revised, ceasing to represent a sovereign and individualized instance and becoming categories in constant tension and questioning. In this context, Barthes (2004) asserts the non-existence of the author outside of language, or prior to it, conceiving them as an imitator of a gesture or word preceding them, never original, their only power being to mix writings. In doing so, he shifts the focus from a subject who knows everything, unified, and intended as the 'place' of language production, to the reader. Foucault (1992), in turn, investigates the author-function as a social and discursive construct, operating within specific regimes of knowledge and power. Current debates on remix culture and collaborative production in networks render intellectual and artistic work "[...] collective, multiple, and, not infrequently, anonymous, fragmented, unfinished, mutating, and fleeting [...]" (Amaral, 2014, p. 204), expanding intellectual collaboration, with a closer intertwining between author and reader.

The growing presence of Generative Artificial Intelligence intensifies the debate on the authorship question. However, it does not mark the end of authorship, even though, fed by large human databases, it

radicalizes this displacement by producing cohesive, argumentative, creative texts, requiring us to rethink the boundaries between authorship, mediation, and co-authorship. Writing has also become an act of creative curation, given that the centrality of authorship is no longer in the 'hand that writes,' but in the mind that chooses, directs, recontextualizes, and gives meaning to what is generated. An intentional, ethical, and sensitive gesture that evidences human presence in cultural and intellectual production mediated by machines. Human authorship, in this new context, shifts from being exclusively productive to becoming an orchestrator of possibilities.

It is necessary to understand that these questions go beyond technique, insofar as not only automates tasks but simulates interaction, generates content, and supports interpretation the world. Depending on how we position ourselves towards it, it can be perceived as a 'mirror, partner, and threat.'

As a 'mirror,' IAGen reflects what we are and the traces we leave in the digital world. Fed by our data, texts, images, sounds, and cultural patterns, it reproduces our discourses at speed and scale, our discourses, biases, creativity, and human limitations, as Crawford (2021) states. In the interactions we establish with this technology, we deal with the projection of what we collectively produce, given that, as a mirror, it returns our amplified, edited, and sometimes distorted image. Indeed, this mirror is also the reflection of our own human condition, our contradictions, and potentialities.

As a 'partner,' IAGen positions itself as an assistant and collaborator, insofar as it enhances creative processes, supports learning, facilitates complex analyses, and democratizes access to information; a partnership that requires ethics, criticality, and intentionality (Sampaio et al., 2024). From this perspective, I emphasize that we can delegate tasks, but we cannot delegate thinking. This demands active, reflective, and responsible participation, understanding that technology does not replace the human.

Generative Artificial Intelligence can also be seen as a threat (Harari, 2024), when it moves beyond its instrumental role and begins to occupy decision-making or formative spaces without human mediation, enabling the dehumanization of social, educational, and affective processes, besides contributing to job displacement or the dissemination of misinformation. Indeed, the great fear is not IAGen dominating the world, but the threat of humans renouncing their humanity in the name of algorithmic efficiency.

Possibly, we are facing the need to invent a new category for this intelligence, one that escapes the 'author/non-author' dichotomy. Perhaps, for example, 'significant algorithmic mediation,' 'assisted co-creation,' or even 'technical-creative partnership'? This would allow recognizing its role in the process, without attributing to it a condition that requires consciousness, intentionality, and responsibility – inseparable elements of authorship as we know it.

From this perspective, between the mirror, the partnership, and the threat, Generative Artificial Intelligence invites us to an ethical and pedagogical choice: how do we want to relate to what we create? Will we be mere consumers of ready-made answers or protagonists in the weaving of new meanings?

In my view, when we write with IAGen, we inscribe our presence into it, that is, we subvert the common sense that using this tool would be merely delegating tasks, in order to leave our imprint, reveal our intentions, concerns, and own style. We nourish this type of writing that pulses between the human and the artificial, dialoguing with a technology that also participates in creation. Not exactly a formal inscription, but a tacit association, insofar as, by bringing intention, context, and creative impulse, we become part of its functioning, and it, part of our expression, responding with possibilities, suggestions, and new connections. Thus, IAGen does not initiate the creative gesture on its own; it is provoked, conducted, shaped by human choices. Style, questions, silences – all of this feeds the machine and defines the tone of creation.

In this context, writing is more than the final text: it is a formative process; a 'journey,' a practice of reflection and subjective construction. Authorship does not happen by chance. It is choice, presence. This has educational and philosophical implications, given that, learning being through interaction, this writing can reveal to the author their own gaps, thematic obsessions, or stylistic vices. From this perspective, the human not only forms the text but is formed by it, in dialogue with the suggestions, refutations, and variations that IAGen proposes.

Indeed, the future of this relationship depends less on the technology itself, and more on the human intentionality that guides it, shifting the focus away from algorithms and toward the ethics of creation. This implies taking responsibility for its use, given that technology, being non-neutral, amplifies what we insert into it. The way we choose to use it shapes the type of culture we are building. Furthermore, it is necessary to preserve the dialogical character of writing with IAGen, privileging exchange and discarding submission.

Pedagogy of Encounter: When Education and Generative Artificial Intelligence Embrace

Think of an embrace - a true embrace -machinic where bodies intertwine, silences are heard, breaths are shared, and energy and recognition circulate between those involved. Now, imagine an embrace between Education and Generative Artificial Intelligence. You might argue that this is practically impossible. How to unite the the technological and the human, the calculated and the sensitive, algorithmic logic and the uncertainty of affection? However, it is necessary to consider that Education has always been fertile ground for silent revolutions. From the chalkboard to the screen, from chalk to code, each technological innovation that intertwines with teaching redefines not only how we learn, but also how we think about the very act of learning. In this scenario, the encounter between Generative Artificial Intelligence and education is not merely a functional partnership; it is a profound embrace between possibilities and purposes.

Because it is a space for exchange, discovery, and transformation, it is precisely at the point of tension between humans and technology that the Pedagogy of Encounter is born—an educational approach centered on valuing the relationship between educator and student, which is constructed through dialogue, loving care, listening and recognition of the other as a subject (Freire, 2021). This pedagogy understands that learning is a process that arises from meaningful encounters between people, histories, and knowledge. This 'encounter' is not merely physical or circumstantial, but an ethical, political, and existential encounter that establishes possibilities for mutual transformation; an invitation to listening, presence, and collaboration.

For Macedo (2024), the encounter constitutes an intercritical device for research and formation, contributing to the production of knowledge in education. For the author, within it, "[...] difference becomes an exuberant power for us to understand more, and in a different way, untying the bonds of hypothetical apriorism of scientific and academic instrumentalism" (Macedo, 2024, p. 57). Inspired by Baruch Spinoza and Gilles Deleuze, Tadeu (2002) questions the centrality of the categories of subject and object in education, suggesting that the curriculum should be more fluid and relational, in which learning occurs through encounters and compositions, focusing on the interactions and affections that emerge between the different bodies that inhabit it. By allowing itself to encounter Generative Artificial Intelligence, education recognizes in the "other", even when that other is a machine, a possibility for human amplification. In this sense, technology ceases to be a tool and becomes a partner, mediator, repository of possible worlds.

In the Pedagogy of Encounter, IAGen does not replace the educator but can be a partner in the weaving of knowledge, assisting in the personalization of teaching, in the generation of tailor-made didactic materials, and in the promotion of new forms of interaction between students and teachers. But the true encounter happens when this technology is used with awareness and sensitivity, as a catalyst for critical thinking and creativity.

For the Pedagogy of Encounter, learning is not limited to the transmission of content, but involves affections, questioning, and collective construction. As a relational and affective event, the encounter is charged with formative potential, which implies an ethics of coexistence and an aesthetics of shared creation, in which knowledge emerges from the intertwining of subjects, affections, and worlds. IAGen can help spark students' curiosity, suggest innovative paths, and democratize access to knowledge, but always based on listening and dialogue between humans.

Garcia (2013) argues that formative processes generally happen in and with encounters. From this perspective, drawing on the song 'Tem mais Samba' and drawing an analogy with samba circles:

> There's more samba in the encounter than in the waiting [...]
>
> There's more samba on the ground than in the moon [...]
>
> Come, let your suffering pass,
>
> If everyone samba'd,
>
> Living would be so easy (Buarque, 1991).

He argues that the encounter and samba circles share the same spirit: both are built on collectivity, respect for the exchange of knowledge, and the valorization of cultural expression.

In samba circles, musicians not only play; they listen, complement, and challenge one another. Each instrument has its role, but none overpowers the other. The music happens in the encounter, in the attentive gaze, in conscious improvisation. And the audience participates, sings, dances, and takes part in that moment of collective construction.

Just as in samba, which finds 'meaning-making' and gains more life on the 'ground,' formative processes also need the encounter of Education with IAGen in everyday school life, Where feeling, doing, and thinking as inseparable processes is valued, supported by the principles of welcoming, learning by doing, learning by growing, learning by exchanging, and certifying by practicing, as Warschauer (2017) teaches us - a space of dialogue, interactivity, and collaboration, i in joy, affectivity, and mutual respect (Amaral, 2024). Instead of rigid, unilateral teaching, learning is based on exchange, in which teachers and students learn together, in partnership with technology, like the samba players in a circle and the musical instruments. Knowledge does not come from a single place; it is formed in interactions with the other and with objects, in respect for individual histories and knowledge.

Indeed, Generative Artificial Intelligence is no longer a future trend—it is already present in education. Recent research offers a comprehensive overview of how Generative Artificial Intelligence is being integrated (or not) in Brazilian schools, from both a technical and pedagogical and ethical perspective, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Generative Artificial Intelligence in Schools.

Institution	Study/Publication	Key Findings
Instituto Significare + UTFPR (2025)	Artificial Intelligence in Basic Education: Teachers' Perceptions and Challenges	• 61.6% of teachers use AI for lesson planning. • Only 14.3% use AI to create teaching materials. • 78.3% believe it is essential to teach ethics in AI use.
Porvir + NIC.br (2024)	Panorama nas Escolas" (School Overview)	• 90% of schools have internet, but less than 30% have sufficient equipement. • Average of 1 device for every 10 students.
CIEB – Center for Innovation in Brazilian Education (2021-2024)	Technical Note #21: Artificial Intelligence in Basic Education: New Applications and Trends for the Future	• (Focus on AI applications and trends)
	Technical Note #24: Generative Artificial Intelligence	• Generative Artificial Intelligence: Uses in the Management of State Education Departments
UNESCO (2023)	Guidance: Generative Artificial Intelligence in Education and Research	• Proposes age limit (13 years) for using AI in the classroom. • Recommends ethical and pedagogical validation of tools.
Geekie Educação (2025)	Geekie One Platform and free teacher training track on AI.	• AI used to personalize learning paths. • Tools like Geekie Test automate assessments and generate pedagogical data.

Source: Elaborated by the author based on the entities' websites.

Without a doubt, Brazilian schools are experiencing a moment of transition. Although Generative Artificial Intelligences (ChatGPT, Copilot and Gemini, among others), have been increasingly used by students, especially high school students - many teachers still do not feel prepared to integrate such technologies into their pedagogical practices. Concurrently, concerns about plagiarism, misinformation, digital exclusion, and other risks end up limiting their educational potential. The challenge, therefore, is to shift the use of this technology, often devoid of pedagogical intentionality, towards a critical-reflective, ethical, and inclusive practice. This requires consistent investment in continuing teacher education, favoring both the understanding and pedagogical use of these technologies and the promotion of reflections on authorship, responsibility in the conscious use of technology, and its social impacts.

It is worth remembering that, just as in samba, the 'encounter' needs active listening, rhythm, and harmony. In the 'Pedagogy of Encounter,' the algorithm does not command learning; it dialogues with it. The machine's intelligence does not override the educator's sensitivity, it amplifies it, makes it more complex, multiplies repertoires. And more: the student is not reduced to data, but understood as a being in transit, capable of critically appropriating technologies to produce meanings. An encounter that demands curation, ethics, and intentionality; it presupposes an educator willing to inhabit the new with feet firmly planted in human dignity, and a technology that serves life, diversity, and justice. A pedagogy in which human presence and artificial intelligence meet not to cancel each other out, but to reinvent each other mutually.

Indeed, if an embrace requires trust, in education we need to practice hope, in the most Freirean sense of the term, believing that something new can always emerge when there is space for listening, for otherness, and for the common.

From this perspective, the 'Pedagogy of Encounter', a concept that values interaction between human beings, animals, and objects, grounded in the idea that learning happens most meaningfully when we are open to the encounter with the other, whoever or whatever that other may be, emerges as a possibility for harmonious fusion between technology and education in the contemporary classroom; a possible path that

values the encounter between different forms of intelligence (human and artificial), stimulating cooperation and creativity, which demands understanding Generative Artificial Intelligence as part of a plural, inclusive, and meaningful educational ecosystem.

In this sense, the Pedagogy of Encounter approaches Freire's (2019a) thought, which has at its core dialogicity and the collective construction of knowledge, valuing the subjects' experience and promoting meaningful education.

When inserted into this context, the challenge is to ensure that Generative Artificial Intelligence does not reinforce a banking concept of education, in which the student merely receives ready-made information, but rather enhances dialogue, problematization, and their emancipation; an ally in personalizing the learning process that respects different learning rhythms, through an inclusive and democratic approach.

Indeed, the integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence in education requires pedagogical intentionality, that is, its alignment with learning objectives, so that its use makes sense in the educational context. From this perspective, how to ensure that algorithms promote equity? How to enhance student autonomy? How to balance the logic of personalization without falling into individualistic isolation?

The answer to these questions lies in the construction of formative environments that value not only the transmissive-content bias but also dialogue, interactivity, collaboration, and critical thinking, which requires considering that Generative Artificial Intelligence complements and enhances the teaching work; it does not replace it.

The Pedagogy of Encounter, in this sense, can guide the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence, favoring active listening, recognition of the other, and the collective construction of knowledge. When used to build bridges between different realities, it offers plural paths for learning and fosters the active participation of students, having humanization as a guiding principle. In this perspective, it dialogues with the Freirean vision of education as a practice of freedom, in which men "[...] feel themselves to be subjects of their thinking, discussing their thinking, their own view of the world, manifested implicitly or explicitly, in their suggestions and those of their companions" (Freire, 2019b, p. 141).

Thus, even though IAGen favors our analyses and presents suggestions to us, it is fundamental to develop students' critical reflection, the questioning of sources, and the pursuit of autonomy. Its use, guided by ethical principles, must respect individuals' privacy and the transparency of algorithms, aiming to avoid biases that reinforce social inequalities, besides strengthening human interaction in the educational environment, enabling the development of intercommunicative and multidimensional processes (Bottentuit Junior, 2024; Alves & Santos, 2024).

Insofar as the intersection of Generative Artificial Intelligence with education, under the lens of the Pedagogy of Encounter, values human interaction and the construction of a more humanized and participatory educational environment, its presence demands openness and constant flexibilization of pedagogical practices, because whether through human contact, or in its relationship with objects, each encounter has the potential to enrich our experience and broaden our understanding of the world.

Final considerations

Rethinking the notion of authorship in the current scenario, marked by intense informational flows and the increasingly sophisticated presence of digital technologies, particularly IAGen, has become an ethical, epistemological, and pedagogical necessity. The modern idea of the author as a creative genius, sovereign over their work, has given way to a new configuration: authorship as a 'distributed' process, among subjects, machines, contexts, and languages.

Assuming authorship as distributed is to recognize that creation is not born in a vacuum. Every author is also a reader, interpreter, remixer, as their work is traversed by others' voices, influences, memories, and devices. From this perspective, IAGen operate as active mediators, capable of suggesting texts, images, titles, structures, and styles based on powerful databases and predictive algorithms, and cannot be considered authors, as they lack intentionality, subjectivity, or responsibility. However, I emphasize, their intervention can be significant enough to transform the work, if the user understands it as a partner, assuming the role of curator, taking responsibility for the composition, recombination, and tensioning of pre-existing elements, often produced by Generative Artificial Intelligence, communities, or social networks. Their authorial gesture resides precisely there: in the capacity to construct hybrid narratives, to operate displacements, and create intersections.

From this perspective, the introduction of this technology in education should not be seen as a threat, but as an opportunity for evolution. Far from replacing the figure of the educator, AI enhances their capabilities, allowing the promotion of more personalized, inclusive, and creative learning. When applied responsibly, it can transform education into a more humanized and liberating process, in which the teacher plays an essential role, by making conscious and prudent use of IAGen in schools, universities, and research, and students are encouraged to think critically, explore their own possibilities, and prepare for the challenges of a constantly changing future.

Indeed, the Pedagogy of Encounter configures itself as a fertile field for the intertwining of knowledge, experiences, and creative potentialities, enabling a continuous movement of construction and collaboration between humans and Generative Artificial Intelligence. Such interaction is not limited to a simple instrumental use of the device, but implies a dialogical and recursive process, in which the inputs (prompts) and the produced responses feed each other mutually, refining ideas, broadening perspectives, and allowing creation to unfold in multiple directions. This feedback loop enhances the (co)creation of textual, artistic, and scientific productions, while simultaneously optimizing tasks of an operational nature, ensuring speed and efficiency. More than accelerating processes, this practice establishes new learning ecologies, in which technological mediation expands the conditions for shared authorship, fosters critical thinking about the very statements produced, and summons educators and learners to assume an active, ethical, and reflective stance towards the technologies that cohabit the educational space.

Indeed, the encounter between Generative Artificial Intelligence and Education is an embrace between the present and the future; the opportunity to reimagine learning as a more dynamic, inclusive, and creative process. But like every true embrace, it needs reciprocity: technology offers, but humanity chooses how to use it. May this embrace, therefore, be firm, yet sensitive, bringing us closer to knowledge, without distancing us from wisdom.

Data availability

This article is a reflective critical essay grounded in conceptual elaboration and the authors' own experience, without the use of empirical procedures or the collection of structured data. For this reason, no datasets are available.

Referências

Adorno, T. W. (2003). *O ensaio como forma*. In T. W. Adorno. *Notas de literatura I* (p. 15-46). Editora 34.

Alves, L., & Santos, W. (2024). Interações com inteligências artificiais contemporâneas: limites e possibilidades na área de educação. In C. Porto, E. Santos, & J. B. Bottentuit Junior. (Orgs.), *ChatGPT e outras inteligências artificiais: práticas educativas na cibercultura* (Vol. 2, p. 73-83). EDUFBA.

Alves, N. (2019). *Práticas pedagógicas em imagens e narrativas: memórias de processos didáticos e curriculares para pensar as escolas hoje*. Cortez.

Alves, R. (2021). *Ostra feliz não faz pérola* (3. ed.) Paidós.

Amaral, M. M. (2014). *Autorias docente e discente: pilares de sustentabilidade na produção textual e imagética em redes educativas presenciais e online* [Tese de Doutorado em Educação, Universidade Estácio de Sá].

Amaral, M. M. (2024) *A ciberpesquisa em educação: autorias e inspirações teórico- metodológicas do Grupo de Pesquisa Docência e Cibercultura – GPDOC*. Pedro & João editores.

Ardoino, J. (1998). Abordagem multirreferencial (plural) das situações educativas e formativas. In J. G. Barbosa (Coord.), *Multirreferencialidade nas ciências sociais e na educação* (p. 24-41). Vozes.

Bakhtin, M. (2011). *Estética da criação verbal*. Martins Fontes.

Barthes, R. (2004). A morte do autor. In R. Barthes. *O rumor da língua* (3. ed., M. Laranjeira, Trad.). Martins Fontes.

Bottentuit Junior, J. B. (2024). Inteligência artificial na educação: propostas pedagógicas com o ChatGPT. In C. Porto, E. Santos, & J. B. Bottentuit Junior. (Orgs.), *ChatGPT e outras inteligências artificiais: práticas educativas na cibercultura* (Vol. 2, p. 59-72). EDUFBA.

Buarque, C. (1991). Tem mais samba. [Álbum]. In *Chico Em CY*, Gravadora CID. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9qLdBOu4uvM.

Chartier, R. (2006). Esbozo de uma genealogia de la —función-autor. *Artefilosofia*, (1), 187-198. https://periodicos.ufop.br/raf/article/view/808/763

Crawford, K. (2021). *The atlas of AI: power, politics, and the planetary costs*. Yale University Press.

Eco, U. (2020). *Apocalípticos e integrados*. Perspectiva.

Foucault, M. (1992). *O que é um autor?* Vega.

Foucault, M. (1996). *A ordem do discurso* (24a ed.). Loyola.

Freire, P. (2019a). *Educação como prática da liberdade*. Paz e Terra.

Freire, P. (2019b). *Pedagogia do oprimido*. Paz e Terra.

Freire, P. (2021). *Extensão ou comunicação?* (R. D. Oliveira, Trad.). Paz e Terra.

Garcia, A. (2013). Encontros e processos formativos: uma conversa sobre currículos e estágio na formação de professores. *Cadernos de Pesquisa em Educação – PPGE/UFES, 19*(38), 11-34. https://periodicos.ufes.br/educacao/article/view/7890/5598

Hall, S. (2019). *A identidade cultural na pós-modernidade* (7. ed.). DP&A.

Harari, D. N. (2024). *Nexus: uma breve história das redes de informação, da idade da pedra à inteligência artificial*. Companhia das Letras.

Jonas, H. (2006). *O princípio responsabilidade: ensaio de uma ética para a civilização tecnológica*. Contraponto.

Latour, B. (2012). *Reagregando o social: uma introdução à teoria do ator-rede*. Edufba.

Lévy, P. (1999). *Cibercultura* (C. I. Costa, Trad.). Editora 34.

Macedo, R. S. (2020). *A pesquisa como heurística, ato de currículo e formação universitária: experiências transingulares com o método em ciências da educação*. Appris.

Macedo, R. S. (2024). *O encontro: arte e dispositivo de pesquisa-formação*. Pontes.

Montaigne, M. (2016). *Ensaios* (S. Milliet, Trad. e notas; Obra original publicada em 1580). Editora 34.

Pimentel, M., Carvalho, F. P., & Silveira, V. J. (2024). IA generativa pode ser coautora? *Tríade: Comunicação, Cultura e Mídias*, 12(25), e024012. https://doi.org/10.22484/2318-5694.2024v12id5569

Ribeiro, M. R. F. (2015). *A sala de aula no contexto da cibercultura: formação docente e discente em atos de currículo* [Tese de Doutorado, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro].

Ribeiro, M. R. F., & Santos, E. O. (2018). Ciberautorcidadão: contribuição para pensarfazer a formação docente e discente na cibercultura. *Revista e-Curriculum, 16*(2), 565-597. https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/curriculum/article/view/36506

Sampaio, R. C., Sabbatini, M., & Limongi, R. (2024). *Diretrizes para o uso ético e responsável da inteligência artificial generativa: um guia prático para pesquisadores*. Sociedade Brasileira de Estudos Interdisciplinares.

Tadeu, T. (2002). A arte do encontro e da composição: Spinoza + currículo + Deleuze. *Educação e Realidade*, 27(2), 47-57. https://seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/educacaoerealidade/article/view/25915

Warschauer, C. (2017). *Rodas em rede: oportunidades formativas na escola e fora dela* (2. ed.). Paz e Terra

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Mirian Maia do Amaral: PhD and Master's in Education and Contemporary Culture with a concentration in Information and Communication Technology (UNESA). Post-doctoral degree in Education (UERJ). Professor at FGV/IDE. Sub-leader and researcher of the Sociabilities, Cyberculture and Education Research Group at the State University of Rio de Janeiro. Professor in the FGV Management Program at the Getulio Vargas Foundation.
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0647-6427
E-mail: amaral3378@gmail.com

Note: The author is responsible for the conception, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting and critical revision of the manuscript content, and approval of the final version for publication.

Associate Editor in charge:
Terezinha Oliveira (UEM)
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9841-7378
E-mail: teleoliv@gmail.com

Maria Terezinha Bellanda Galuch (UEM)
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5154-9819
E-mail: mtbgaluch@uem.br

Solange Franci Raimundo Yaegashi (UEM)
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7666-7253
E-mail: sfryaegashi@uem.br

Vania Fátima Matias De Souza (UEM)
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4631-1245
E-mail: vfmsouza@uem.br

Evaluation rounds:
Two invitations; two opinions received

Standardization reviewer:
Adriana Curti Cantadori de Camargo