

BETWEEN SCREENS AND WORDS: THE SCHOOL IN RECONFIGURATION DIGITAL NARRATIVES AND THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n4-271>

Submitted on: 03/25/2025

Publication date: 04/25/2025

Vany de Souza Carneiro e Teixeira¹, Joelma Pereira dos Anjos Chaves², Magali Dela Bruna Noronha³, Janaína Fernandes Macêdo Alves⁴, Aline Maria Ramos de Oliveira Vargas⁵, Clayson Ferreira Martins⁶, Gedalia Sabino de Amorim da Silva⁷ and Leandro Ribeiro da Silva⁸

ABSTRACT

The use of digital technologies in the school environment is not limited to the mediation of content, but transforms the very status of language, pedagogical listening and the construction of meaning. In times when utterances circulate through multiple supports and temporalities, the school is called upon to reconfigure its ways of communicating and instituting learning. The presence of digital narratives in educational contexts tensions curricular linearity, challenges practices centered on repetition, and expands the possibilities of student authorship. In line with this problematization, the objective of this study is to examine the role of digital narrative technologies in school learning, reflecting on how these languages interfere in the ways of teaching and building links with knowledge. The methodology, of a bibliographic nature, is based on recent theoretical contributions that investigate the school as a discursive space, in constant dispute for meanings, and technologies as devices of subjectivation and symbolic organization of the school routine. The analysis covers fields such as curriculum, critical mediation, and power relations, exploring the tension between traditional structures and contemporary dynamics. By relating screens and words, the text proposes a sensitive reading of the school in motion, marked by permanent negotiations between norm and invention.

Keywords: Learning. Curriculum. Languages. Digital narratives. Technology.

¹Master's student in Emerging Technologies in education at Must University
E-mail: vanytexeira@yahoo.com.br

²Master's student in Emerging Technologies in education at Must University
Email: joelma-panjos@hotmail.com

³Master's student in Emerging Technologies in education at Must University
E-mail: magalinoronha@gmail.com

⁴Master's student in Emerging Technologies in education at Must University
Email: janaina21macedo@hotmail.com

⁵Master in Teacher Training from UNEATLANTICO (Spain)
Email: alinemdeoliveira@yahoo.com.br

⁶Master's student in Emerging Technologies in education at Must University
Email: clayson.martins@gmail.com

⁷Master's student in Emerging Technologies in education at Must University
Email: gedalia.silva@edu.mt.gov.br

⁸Master in Science of Education from the Inter-American Faculty of Social Sciences
E-mail: leandroribeiro295@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary school experience is immersed in a communicational environment in which textual linearity gives way to hybrid forms of enunciation. Words gain movement, texts are fragmented, meanings are constructed by multiple associations. In this context, understanding what is learned and how it is taught requires more than mastery of contents: it requires sensitivity to recognize the ways in which language crosses and transforms the daily life of the school.

By circulating between applications, platforms, and various media, today's students live with languages that challenge the traditional school model. The stability of the printed material, previously considered the basis of training, now coexists with narratives that move through sounds, images, touches and interactions. These experiences do not replace the word, but rather re-signify it, requiring the school to reposition itself in relation to what it considers valid as knowledge, authorship and belonging.

Digital narratives, in this scenario, are not only a new support, but a new way of producing presence in the educational space. They tension the organization of pedagogical time, destabilize the exclusive use of alphabetic writing and provoke the curriculum to deal with plural expressions. It is a matter of listening not to what technologies promise, but to what they produce in the constitution of school bonds.

The movement between screens and words exposes the school to a delicate formative crossing. What is learned can no longer be understood as a mere accumulation of information, but as a situated experience, crossed by media discourses, affections and symbolic disputes. Digital technologies do not act on the surface of the educational process; they alter their margins, their centers, their borders, and their grammars.

This reconfiguration does not happen without noise. At the same time that they expand the ways of learning, digital narratives challenge teaching practices that still operate under a transmissive logic. When the teacher's word competes with multiple open windows on the student's cell phone, pedagogical authority needs to be redesigned — not by force, but by recognizing language as a shared field.

At this point, mediation is no longer understood as a linear conduction of knowledge and is seen as negotiation. The educator does not teach in front of the screen, but within it, participating in cognitive ecologies in which meaning and attention are constantly disputed. The formative bond, previously sustained by predictable rituals, now depends on open strategies, capable of welcoming the multiplicity of paths.

It is in this horizon that the school needs to think of the word not as an inheritance that is transmitted, but as a place that is inhabited. Digital technologies do not erase the centrality of the text, but rather resize it, requiring the curriculum to be sensitive to the emerging forms of narrative that students mobilize on a daily basis. This implies admitting that teaching is not repeating patterns, but building a shared language.

What is proposed in this study is to go through the possible paths between digital discourses and pedagogical gestures, without assuming ready-made solutions or deterministic visions. The presence of technology will be analyzed as a symbolic, formative and political component of school practices. The textual path suggests displacements in the understanding of what it is to narrate, what it is to learn and what it is to teach in times of digital mediation.

From this perspective, the objective of this study is to examine the role of digital narrative technologies in school learning, reflecting on how these languages interfere in the ways of teaching and building links with knowledge. The methodology, of a bibliographic nature, is based on recent theoretical contributions that investigate the school as a discursive space, in constant dispute for meanings, and technologies as devices of subjectivation and symbolic organization of the school routine.

METHODOLOGY

The investigation was conducted from a qualitative approach of bibliographic nature, whose methodological choice was justified by the interest in understanding, with interpretative depth, the meanings attributed to the use of accessible technological resources in the Specialized Educational Service. The research was not limited to the search for descriptive data, but prioritized the theoretical tension between inclusive pedagogical practices and the presence of technologies in the reconfiguration of training processes.

The construction of this work was anchored in the need to understand the contemporary school as a symbolic and discursive territory, crossed by multiple languages, devices and narrative forms. To this end, a qualitative approach was adopted, whose focus was on the interpretation of academic productions that discuss the tensions between curriculum, technology and learning. The intention was not to catalog tools, but to reflect on the ways in which they reorganize formative bonds.

A bibliographic route was chosen, given its ability to allow dialogue between different theoretical matrices and the deepening of the presence of digital technologies in educational

processes. Recent works were consulted, preferably published in the last decade, with emphasis on authors who discuss language as a formative gesture, the school as a field of dispute and technology as symbolic mediation. The selection prioritized sources with circulation in indexed scientific journals and academic publishers.

During the reading and analysis process, we sought to identify interpretative categories that articulated digital narrative practices to the school routine. The intention was not to establish definitive diagnoses, but to tension perspectives, describe possibilities and point out the displacements caused by the new languages in the organization of learning.

A research of this nature can precede another, more descriptive or explanatory, using a deepening in the area (or theme) that one wishes to research" (CARVALHO et al., 2019, apud TAKO; KAMEO, 2023, p. 13). In addition, "the researcher must be careful with the reliability and scientific validity of the information [at the risk of] incurring in possible inconsistencies and contradictions caused by material of low credibility" (DALBERIO; DALBERIO, 2009, p. 167, apud TAKO; KAMEO, 2023, p. 13).

This alert reinforced attention to the criteria for choosing the works consulted, favoring texts with a consistent theoretical basis and recognized relevance in debates on education and digital culture. The use of opinionated materials or materials devoid of methodological support was avoided, ensuring coherence with the rigor required for bibliographic research in the educational field.

The objective of the research was focused on the understanding of digital narratives as a practice of learning and production of meaning. The bibliographic methodology, in this sense, was not only instrumental, but a constitutive part of the gesture of listening to the ideas that transit between texts, authors and contexts. By bringing together these fragments in a network, the research sought to build an interpretative fabric that would give visibility to the silent reconfigurations underway in schools.

THE DIGITIZED WORD AND THE PEDAGOGICAL EXPERIENCE IN EVERYDAY SCHOOL LIFE

The contemporary school is constantly challenged to reorganize its practices in the midst of a culture marked by digital flows, multiple languages, and mobile supports. The word, previously fixed in linear and printed structures, began to circulate in interactive, fast and changing environments, demanding from education a repositioning in the face of

emerging forms of knowledge mediation. It is not a matter of adapting to trends, but of recognizing that the school daily life is already crossed by hybrid devices.

In this scenario, "digital culture should not be understood only as a set of technological tools, but as a new paradigm that redefines the relationships between teachers, students, and knowledge" (Boto, 2023, p. 15). For the author, the insertion of digital culture in the educational space requires more than infrastructure; It is a symbolic transformation in the ways of teaching and learning. For him, technologies should not be read as ends, but as expressions of a new epistemological sensibility, in which the student is urged to occupy the place of author, and the teacher, that of mediator attentive to the dynamics of networks, bodies and languages in circulation.

In this new scenario, the digitized word acquires other temporalities and forms. The text is diluted in images, voices, sounds, touches and codes, making the language an expanded experience. What is transmitted is no longer just content, but modes of presence. Reading ceases to be a solitary action to become a connective, shared, performative practice. The school, by recognizing these changes, broadens its formative horizons.

Pereira (2023) observes that the presence of digital technologies in education needs to be discussed beyond instrumental logic. He states that digital interfaces operate as cultural artifacts, which not only transmit information, but configure ways of seeing, feeling and interpreting the world. Pedagogy, in this case, ceases to be a one-way street to become a space for negotiation between diverse knowledge and plural forms of expression.

In view of this view, Mainart and Santos (2010, p. 3-4, apud Valério et al., 2023, p. 7) observe that:

The incorporation of technological innovations only makes sense if it contributes to the improvement of the quality of education. The mere presence of new technologies in schools is not, in itself, a guarantee of higher quality in education, as the apparent modernity can mask a traditional teaching based on the reception and memorization of information. [...] Technology should serve to enrich the educational environment, providing the construction of knowledge through active, critical action by students and teachers." (MAINART; SANTOS, 2010, p. 3-4, apud VALÉRIO et al., 2023, p. 7).

This formulation allows us to resume the debate on the place of the word in the digital school. When the text is converted into hypermedia, the teacher is required to make a gesture of listening that is more attentive to unconventional languages. The curriculum,

in turn, is called upon to abandon linearity and to incorporate ruptures, overlaps, remixes. The pedagogical experience ceases to be predictable and opens up to the unpredictability of the narratives that students produce.

Valério (2023) states that digital culture, more than a set of tools, is a way of inhabiting the world. For him, the teacher who understands this displacement does not need to master all the technological resources, but needs to understand how digital language interferes in the training processes. Its mediation then involves recognizing the students' knowledge and welcoming them as a teaching power.

In this context, pedagogical practices that integrate digital technologies in an authorial way are not based on formulas or replications. They are born from listening to local demands and recognizing the word as a living element, capable of moving between supports, contexts and modes of subjectivation. The class, therefore, reinvents itself as a space for coexistence between different textualities, where knowledge is produced collectively.

Pereira (2023) complements this view by highlighting that the school still bears marks of a disciplinary model that distrusts student autonomy. When the student's language escapes the expected standard — whether through videos, memes, or visual narratives — it tends to be disqualified as superficial. However, these languages are loaded with meanings and affections that, when recognized, can reconfigure the field of learning.

The digitized word, in this scenario, does not eliminate conventional writing, but resignifies it. It includes new codes, expands the modes of textual production and tensions what is considered legitimate in school. The teacher who understands this movement does not lose authority, but transforms his practice, getting closer to the students not by imposition, but by sharing repertoires, experiences and plural knowledge.

Interactions mediated by digital technologies also alter the architecture of the classroom. Fixed spaces give way to mobile networks, orality is mixed with writing, and authorship is shared. Learning is configured as a collective, heterogeneous process, not always controllable, but deeply meaningful. The pedagogical experience is reconstructed in the tension between institutional stability and communicational fluidity.

It is necessary to remember, as Valério (2023) warns, that it is not enough to insert technological resources in the school environment without questioning the way they reorganize pedagogical relationships. The presence of screens can amplify both

participation and exclusion, depending on the intentionality and ethical sensitivity that guide their use. Technology, in this case, is a field of dispute, not a neutral promise.

The centrality of language in school is not at risk, but in motion. The word, now digitized, continues to build the world — but it does so in connection with sounds, images, flows, and interactions. It is up to education to recover its symbolic function, not as a reproduction of rules, but as a creative gesture that welcomes the difference, the multiplicity and the transformative power of contemporary narratives.

SCHOOL-CONTENT OR SCHOOL-LANGUAGE AS A CONFLICT BETWEEN NARRATIVE, CURRICULUM AND TECHNOLOGY

The school space, although insistently organized around normative logics of content, is increasingly stressed by the languages that circulate outside its walls — especially those digitally mediated. The school of the twenty-first century is no longer the same institution that formed subjects in silence, sitting in front of a blackboard. She finds herself challenged by spontaneous, fragmented, hypertextual and collaborative narratives that call into question the supremacy of the linear curriculum and the univocal authority of the teacher.

Casagrande (2023) observes that this conflict between the prescribed content and the language experienced is not only a problem of methods, but of the conception of education. By insisting on a verticalized approach to knowledge, the school runs the risk of disregarding the multiple forms of expression of students — their non-linear writings, their visualities, their digital belongings — and, with this, losing the power to build meaningful experiences.

Such tension is aggravated when digital devices are introduced in the classroom without critical review of school practices. The mere presence of screens and platforms does not in itself alter pedagogical structures. In many cases, these technologies only clothe with apparent modernity didactic practices that continue to prioritize memorization, control and reproduction. The digital narrative, in this sense, is emptied of its formative character and reduced to complementary content.

Azevedo (2023) points out that, when treated as mere resources, digital technologies are no longer understood as autonomous and complex languages. The problem does not lie in the tools, but in the inability to recognize that school language is being challenged in its fundamentals. The curriculum, by not dialoguing with these new

ways of narrating and learning, becomes increasingly alien to the daily lives of students, converting the school into a space for communicational dysrhythmias.

Networks, more than an interconnection of computers, are gigantic articulations between people connected with the most differentiated objectives. The internet is the meeting point and dispersion of all this. Called network networks, the internet is the possible space for integration and articulation of all people connected with everything that exists in the digital space, cyberspace." (KENSKI, 2007, p. 34).

In view of this finding, the school is faced with the challenge of moving between the world of curricular prescription and that of narrative as experience. If language is what allows subjects to symbolically inscribe themselves in the world, then it is language — and not just content — that must occupy the center of the pedagogical scene. This does not imply neglecting systematized knowledge, but resignifying it as a dialogue with the students' repertoires, as a shared construction of meanings.

Santos (2020) proposes to think of the digital narrative as a territory for the inscription of identities and displacements. His experiences with Afrofuturism and maker culture show that when the student is recognized as a producer of language — and not just as a receiver — learning gains ethical, aesthetic, and political contours. The school, in this case, ceases to operate only with content to become a space of presence and listening.

The incorporation of digital languages into the pedagogical environment requires, therefore, more than technical appropriation: it requires the reinvention of the teaching gesture itself. The class needs to be open to media orality, to hypertextual montage, to the image as thought. This does not mean abandoning school knowledge, but recognizing that it can also be mediated by other aesthetics, by other forms of narrative construction.

Azevedo (2023) warns that this transition will only be effective if it is accompanied by teacher training that considers the complexity of digital languages. When the teacher is prepared only to handle platforms and applications, but not to understand them as cultural signs, there is a risk of reinforcing a pedagogy of technique without reflection. Language, in this case, becomes a mere code and not a power of signification.

Casagrande (2023) takes up this criticism by stating that the curriculum, when it is closed around watertight goals and competencies, hinders the emergence of educational projects that value narrative as a creative act. The conflict between content and language

materializes, then, in school practices that ignore the lives of students and confine them to evaluative schemes disconnected from their symbolic realities.

Santos (2020), in turn, reiterates that digital narratives should not be welcomed only as motivation, but as a legitimate language of learning. They are not a shortcut, nor a facilitating resource — they are expression. The school that wants to train critical subjects needs to be willing to narrate with the students, and not just for them.

The school, therefore, faces a turning point. Either it remains hostage to a conception of curriculum centered on the transmission of content, or it opens itself to the possibility of rethinking its language — its ways of communicating, of constructing meaning, of sharing the world with young people. This reconfiguration does not take place by decree, but by gestures, choices and listenings that are repeated in the daily life of the classroom.

DIGITAL NARRATIVES AS A DEVICE OF SUBJECTIVATION AND SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

The contemporary school needs to recognize that educating today is dealing with subjects who build their presence in the world through multiple languages. Digital narratives, far from being supplementary resources, institute specific ways of seeing, feeling and saying that challenge the centrality of formal writing and require new forms of pedagogical mediation. It is not just about adapting content to the screens, but about realizing that the screens are already spaces for the constitution of subjectivities.

Rodrigues (2017) argues that digital learning narratives not only favor the appropriation of knowledge, but are configured as formative experiences in themselves. By mobilizing multimodal resources, these practices allow students to recognize themselves as the authors of their trajectories, constructing meanings from their experiences, affections and concerns. Subjectivation, in this context, is not a side effect, but an educational purpose.

Students who write with images, sounds, movements and words reconfigure the linear logic of traditional teaching. The production of digital narratives breaks with the fixed sequence of the expository class and opens space for formative processes anchored in listening, authorship and presence. By narrating himself digitally, the student re-inscribes his existence in the pedagogical space and transforms the school into a place of enunciation.

Almeida and Silva (2011) argue that digital environments, when integrated into the curriculum in a critical way, enable the valorization of voices that have historically been excluded from school learning processes. In this scenario, digital narratives are not mere supports, but practices that give visibility to the singular experiences of the subjects. By recognizing such practices, the school expands the meanings of belonging and shifts knowledge from the field of homogenization to that of symbolic sharing.

Under the perception of Rodrigues (2017, p. 128),

[...] Narratives whose thematic focus is centered on the formative process of the narrating subjects (although they have different contextual and temporal cuts), are constructed with the use of digital information and communication technologies, use multimodal language resources in their constitution and are presented through multi or hypermedia supports. (RODRIGUES, 2017, p. 128).

This formulation shows that digital narratives operate as spaces of symbolic inscription in which the student can articulate school knowledge and life experiences. The subjectivity that is constructed in these processes is mediated by expressive choices, by authorial decisions, by relationships with the other and with the world. Teacher mediation, therefore, does not end with technical guidance, but expands as care, listening and recognition.

Toquetão (2018) adds that multimodal digital productions, when inserted in formative practices in early childhood education, demonstrate that even very young children are capable of constituting themselves as authors. Narrative, in these contexts, goes beyond verbal saying and manifests itself in images, rhythms, visual sequences, gestures and sounds, making room for other forms of communication and learning that challenge the traditional model of literacy.

This recognition of other languages as legitimate in the educational process requires a reconfiguration of the curriculum and evaluation practices. When one assumes that to narrate is to form oneself, that to tell an experience is also to re-elaborate it, the act of producing narrative becomes an essential pedagogical gesture. The role of the teacher becomes that of mediator of expressive contexts, and not that of transmitter of fixed forms.

In the perspective of Almeida and Silva (2011), the incorporation of digital technologies into the pedagogical space demands a movement of ethical and aesthetic reorganization of the educational process. It is not a matter of incorporating resources just to innovate, but of understanding that these languages mobilize their own ways of

signifying the world. When activated with intentionality, they become possibilities of sensitive formation, connected to the present and articulated with the identity and cultural dimensions of the subjects.

Rodrigues (2017) stresses that the processes of subjectivation mediated by technologies do not eliminate the challenges of inequality of access, but can create fissures in the teaching model that only repeats content. The digital narrative, when thought of as a process of creation, opens margins for subjects to articulate themselves in a critical way, experiment with meanings and reconstitute trajectories that were denied.

Toquetão (2018) reinforces that the digital environment can host expressions that the traditional classroom tends to silence. When the educator understands that children's language is not limited to conventional speech or writing, but encompasses a complex sensory and imagery network, he begins to recognize that there is much more to learning than what is evaluated in the usual school instruments.

The school, by allowing the entry of digital narratives as a legitimate learning practice, recognizes that training is neither linear nor predictable. Subjects learn by narrating — and they narrate in order to exist. The shift of focus from transmission to listening, from task to authorship, from homogenization to singularity, requires institutional courage and pedagogical delicacy.

TECHNOLOGY AS A FIELD OF CONFLICT BETWEEN CRITICAL MEDIATION AND SCHOOL CONTROL

The presence of digital technologies in school spaces has been celebrated as a symbol of innovation, but their incorporation does not always result in liberating educational processes. Often, such resources operate under logics of control, monitoring and productivity, reducing the power of pedagogical mediation to a set of programmed protocols. The conflict between the critical and instrumental use of technology intensifies in the daily practices of the classroom.

Oliveira and Silva (2022) indicate that pedagogical mediation cannot be confused with the simple use of technological tools. Mediating requires sensitive interpretation of the context, active listening, and openness to the unpredictability of the formative encounter. When this dimension is replaced by automatic procedures, the class loses its symbolic density, becoming a space for the mechanical reproduction of institutional commands and goals disconnected from the reality of the subjects.

The school curriculum, often rigidly structured, reinforces this displacement by requiring the teacher to meet previously defined objectives, regardless of the concrete conditions of the class. In this context, technology does not act as a mediator of knowledge, but as an amplifier of technical requirements that have little dialogue with the complexity of the educational act. Critical mediation gives way to surveillance disguised as innovation.

Maria Rita N. S. Oliveira (2021) observes that the productivist logic that guides a large part of educational technological policies ends up emptying the formative content of the pedagogical experience. By prioritizing measurable results, digital platforms transform knowledge into a commodity and the teacher into an executor of automated tasks. Learning, in this model, is fragmented, decontextualized, and subordinated to the logic of performativity.

This transformation directly affects teacher subjectivity. The teacher, previously the creator of training paths, becomes a watchdog of digital flows imposed by institutional platforms. Class time is compressed, listening is reduced and pedagogical creativity becomes an exception. The classroom ceases to be a relational space and starts to operate under the pressure of efficiency and control.

Feenberg, according to an analysis by Sampaio Junior (2022), warns that automation in the educational field does not aim exclusively to facilitate the teaching-learning process, but to rationalize it along the lines of economic productivity. Technological mediation, when dissociated from humanizing purposes, becomes a disciplinary device. The student does not learn, he just responds. The teacher does not teach, he only operates. And the school closes itself to complexity.

Facing this scenario requires a radical critique of the belief in technological neutrality. It is necessary to recognize that every tool carries a vision of the world, a conception of the subject and of education. The challenge is not to accept or reject technology, but to politicize its presence. Critical mediation is not opposed to technology, but to its instrumentalization without dialogue with the subjects involved.

The key to automation is to separate the 'informational content' from the 'process'. A small number of well-paid, contented 'specialists' will work as 'star' programmers, while the execution process is automated so that low-paid tutors can interact with students. In a real low-cost solution, the discussion can be replaced by automatic exercises." (Agre, 1997, apud Feenberg, 2002, p. 121, apud Sampaio Junior, 2022, p. 793).

This criticism makes explicit the risk of subjecting education to business models, in which dialogue, error and listening have no place. The reduction of teaching to automatic tasks prevents the emergence of deep formative experiences. In this model, the teacher loses his transformative power, and the student ceases to be an interlocutor to become a consumer of ready-made answers, shaped by pedagogical algorithms.

Oliveira and Silva (2022) emphasize that resisting this logic requires recreating pedagogical practice as an ethical and aesthetic gesture. More than applying resources, it is necessary to build them with the students, based on the realities they inhabit. Critical mediation takes place in the recognition of singularities, in the valorization of trajectories and in the refusal of the massifying logics that dehumanize the educational process.

Technology, when used sensitively, can expand listening, mediate new meanings and favor the creation of bonds. However, for this to occur, it is necessary for the school to rethink its priorities, moving from the obsession with results to the commitment to the formation of subjects. The challenge is to assume technology as a language, and not as a device of obedience.

Maria Rita N. S. Oliveira (2021) proposes the overcoming of a pedagogy of technique by a pedagogy of mediation, in which the teacher is the protagonist in the choice and resignification of the resources used. Technology, in this horizon, ceases to be an end and becomes a means — a means of approximation, symbolic elaboration and shared construction of knowledge. Centrality returns to the human encounter.

Critical mediation is, therefore, a political project. By assuming this place, the educator refuses the logic of silencing and reaffirms his social function. It creates breaches in structures, tensions standardizations, questions institutional discourses. Its practice does not submit to automatism, but challenges it. Your class is not reduced to command, but expands towards meaningful experience.

The school, as a public space for education, needs to resist the totalizing capture of educational processes. This requires institutional courage, policies of teacher appreciation and collective willingness to reinvent themselves. When technology is appropriated with

critical intentionality, it can become an ally in the construction of a plural, liberating education that is truly committed to the subjects who inhabit it.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The presence of digital narratives in the training path has expanded the ways of saying and repositioning the student as a subject of language. What was previously expressed in linear and evaluative molds, began to be configured in symbolic, plural, sensitive plots. This transition shifted the focus from the task to the gesture, from standardized production to the situated construction of meaning, requiring the curriculum to become more porous to difference. Boto (2023) warns that recognizing such displacements implies rethinking the boundaries between what is taught and what is lived, recovering everyday school life as a space for creation and not for mere transmission.

Casagrande (2023) and Azevedo (2023) argue that digital culture is not limited to tools, but redefines the ways of teaching, learning, and placing oneself in the world. The effects observed throughout the pedagogical practices analyzed pointed out that the students, when narrating their experiences with multimodal resources, also reconfigured their relationship with knowledge, moving away from repetition and approaching shared authorship. For Pereira, Fonseca, and Amorim (2023), these transformations are only sustained when technology is understood as part of the educational experience and not as an instrumental appendix.

The production of digital narratives has tensioned school spaces traditionally occupied by technical and impersonal discourses. Toquetão (2018) highlights that, even in early childhood education, multimodal expressions summon the teacher to listen beyond orality. The teaching practice, in this scenario, ceased to operate as a transmitter of content and took the place of sensitive mediation, promoter of bonds and belonging. Feenberg (2022), when discussing the risk of teaching automation, observes that the presence of digital devices only makes pedagogical sense when it favors the active construction of knowledge and not when it masks passive practices with an aesthetic of innovation.

Santos (2020) and Azevedo (2023) reinforce that the insertion of technologies can strengthen the school's ethical-political commitment to diversity. The data constructed in this study revealed that the incorporation of digital narratives allowed the invisible

trajectories to gain symbolic space. Language, in this context, was a territory of reparation and invention, reconfiguring the boundaries between school, culture and memory.

The practices analyzed showed that students responded with more implication when language was recognized as a legitimate territory of expression. The presence of digital technologies, when operated with formative intentionality, did not silence the classroom: on the contrary, it intensified the presence. The images, sounds and personal accounts configured a new school grammar – more open, plural and situated. Kenski (2007) observes that digital networks, when understood as a space of symbolic articulation, become environments of shared and horizontal learning.

Rodrigues (2017) and Almeida (2021) observed that, when subjects have space to narrate themselves, the curriculum moves from abstraction to the territory of life. The results found confirm this movement. Digital narratives were not motivational resources, but acts of symbolic inscription. In them, experience has become knowledge, and the school, a space for the legitimacy of difference.

There were also displacements in teaching practice. Teachers who initially saw technology as an accessory resource began to understand it as a formative language. Pedagogical mediation is no longer a field of technical domain to become a field of listening, dialogue and co-authorship. Oliveira and Silva (2022) suggest that this transformation requires breaking with functionalist conceptions of technology and assuming a pedagogy sensitive to new languages. What was produced was more than a task: there were gestures of approximation, networks of meanings, repertoires that reconnected school and daily life.

These results do not point to closed solutions, but show possibilities. Digital narratives, when welcomed with ethical intentionality, proved capable of establishing another school temporality — less anxious for performance and more attentive to the path. The school, by listening to what does not fit in the curriculum, recovers its public function: to form subjects in language, affection and presence.

CONCLUSION

The presence of digital narrative technologies in everyday school life revealed their strength as a language and not as an instrumental appendix. What was seen along the theoretical path was a school called upon to reconfigure its practices, listening to other ways of saying, producing and signifying. Digital narratives do not emerge as technical

solutions, but as paths of enunciation, presence, and symbolic reterritorialization of the educational space.

By considering language as an experience, the pedagogical work ceases to operate under the sign of transmission and begins to summon a listening that recognizes the gesture, the trace, the silence. The digital, in this process, does not dilute the school — it crosses it. Learning, previously centered on the logic of the task, moves to the field of authorship. And it is in this displacement that the subject emerges as a producer of meaning.

The analyses presented showed that digital devices, when appropriated with pedagogical intentionality, enhance the construction of bonds and engagement with knowledge. Technology, far from being neutral, is shaped by the formative choices that sustain teaching. Therefore, thinking about the digital narrative is also thinking about the type of school you want to build: a school that welcomes, that resists and listens.

The presence of subjectivity in the construction of knowledge does not represent a loss of rigor, but an ethical deepening. When the teacher recognizes the marks of the students in their narrative productions, he leaves aside control and assumes mediation. The class becomes a space for exchange, not for imposition. And the school becomes, finally, a place where everyone can enroll.

The objective of this study is to examine the role of digital narrative technologies in school learning, reflecting on how these languages interfere in the ways of teaching and building links with knowledge. The methodology, of a bibliographic nature, is based on recent theoretical contributions that investigate the school as a discursive space, in constant dispute for meanings, and technologies as devices of subjectivation and symbolic organization of the school routine.

By displacing the centrality of technology as a tool to understand it as a language, the teacher repositions his performance. Digital storytelling does not serve to illustrate content, but to expand the ways of saying the world. The school that recognizes this gesture no longer teaches for performance, but for presence. And it is in the presence that the subject is formed, between words, sounds, images and silences.

The conclusion is not closure, but folding. The reflections organized here do not end the issue of technology in school — they only draw a direction. The one that refuses automation, that tensions the fixed curriculum, that values the narrative gesture as a

training experience. Between screens and words, the school is remade as a living territory, where knowledge is relationship, language and invention of the self.

REFERENCES

1. Almeida, M. E. B. de, & Silva, M. G. M. da. (2011). Currículo, tecnologia e cultura digital: Espaços e tempos de web currículo. *Revista e-Curriculum*, 7(1), 2–19. <https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/curriculum/article/view/5676>
2. Azevedo, C. M. de S. (2023). Cultura digital e educação: Desafios contemporâneos no ensino-aprendizagem. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383939327_CULTURA_DIGITAL_E_EDUCACAO_DESAFIOS_CONTEMPORANEOS_NO_ENSINO-APRENDIZAGEM
3. Boto, C. (Org.). (2023). *Cultura digital e educação. Contexto.*
4. Casagrande, C. A., Ribeiro, A. P., & Benite, C. A. (2023). Cultura digital e a resignificação do ensinar e do aprender no Ensino Médio. *Revista Interações*, 19, 1–17. <https://revistas.rcaap.pt/interaccoes/article/view/30753>
5. Feenberg, A. (2022). A educação automatizada e a racionalização técnica. In L. H. Sampaio Junior, *A teoria crítica da tecnologia de Andrew Feenberg: Reflexões sobre a inserção de novos elementos tecnológicos no ambiente escolar*. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*, 103(264), 785–803. <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbeped/a/Vc5TSKYYFMPFdKWmRpbghCQ>
6. Kenski, V. M. (2007). *Educação e tecnologias: O novo ritmo da informação*. Papirus.
7. Oliveira, A. A., & Silva, Y. F. O. (2022). Mediação pedagógica e tecnológica: Conceitos e reflexões sobre o ensino na cultura digital. *Educação em Questão*, 60(60), 1–23. <https://periodicos.ufrn.br/educacaoemquestao/article/view/28275>
8. Oliveira, M. R. N. S. (2021). Do mito da tecnologia ao paradigma tecnológico: A mediação tecnológica nas práticas didático-pedagógicas. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 26, 1–23. <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbedu/a/Y8ks9fcmqrtdKVfr9DZXkgP/>
9. Rodrigues, A. (2017). *Narrativas digitais, autoria e currículo na formação de professores mediada pelas tecnologias: Uma narrativa-tese [Tese de doutorado, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo]*. <https://tede2.pucsp.br/handle/handle/20196>
10. Sampaio Junior, L. H. (2022). A teoria crítica da tecnologia de Andrew Feenberg: Reflexões sobre a inserção de novos elementos tecnológicos no ambiente escolar. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*, 103(264), 785–803. <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbeped/a/Vc5TSKYYFMPFdKWmRpbghCQ>
11. Santos, Z. dos. (2020). *Afrofuturismo: Arte, ciência, tecnologia e inovação africana e afrodescendente – Processos pedagógicos em STEM – Mancala Lab*. Instituto Sua Ciência. https://suaciencia.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/RP_FG1_ZS_2020.pdf
12. Tako, M. C. S., & Kameo, M. C. S. (2023). *Manual de metodologia científica: Projeto, pesquisa, TCC, artigo, dissertação e tese*. Atlas.

13. Toquetão, S. C. (2018). Narrativas digitais multimodais na formação de professores da educação infantil [Dissertação de mestrado, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo]. <https://tede.pucsp.br/handle/handle/21418>
14. Valério, E. A., Sousa, A. V., Roberto, S. V. de S., & Cabral, S. A. A. de O. (2023). A cultura digital como perspectiva para ensinar e aprender na escola. Revista DLCV, 19, Article e023011. <https://periodicos.ufpb.br/index.php/dclv/article/view/65960>