Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY: CHALLENGES AND POSSIBILITIES THE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN THE AGE OF DIGITAL PLATFORMS

https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n6-009

Submitted on: 05/02/2025 **Publication date:** 06/02/2025

Cristiane Reis Farias[1], Nilma Bitencourt dos Reis[2], Livandia dos Santos Azevedo[3], Geila Maria Ferreira de Souza[4], Eudes Martins de Matos[5], Denise Pinto Ramos[6], Karen Oliveira do Nascimento Carvalho[7] and Leandro Ribeiro da Silva[8]

ABSTRACT

The educational experience crosses a sensitive threshold: between flows of data that do not cease and algorithms that shape formative decisions, a new learning regime is insinuated in which meaning becomes more elusive than evident. The present study is based on the intention of understanding how digital mediation, under the aegis of platforms, reorganizes the ways of teaching and learning, stressing the centrality of the teacher and the active position of the student in the training process. Rather than an uncritical adherence to technological innovation, it proposes to explore the invisible layers of control, repetition, and silencing that are often camouflaged under promises of personalization and engagement. The mobilized bibliographic methodology operates from an attentive listening to contemporary productions that problematize algorithmic culture, the displacement of pedagogical authority and the aestheticization of the school experience. More than diagnosing ongoing transformations, it seeks to question the ethical-formative meanings in dispute, opening space to think of education not as the application of platforms, but as the intentional construction of bonds, presences and pauses. In a scenario of machinic acceleration, perhaps resisting consists in sustaining zones of silence, listening intervals, and territories where the teacher's gesture and the student's voice can still mean something beyond the calculated performance.

Keywords: Learning. Ethics. Mediation. Platforms. Teacher.

[1]Master's student in Educational Science at the Inter-American School of Social Sciences
Email: cristianefarias498@gmail.com
[2]Master's student in Educational Science at the Inter-American School of Social Sciences
E-mail: nilmarbit@gmail.com
[3]Master's student in Educational Science at the Inter-American School of Social Sciences
E-mail: azevedolivandia@gmail.com
[4]Master's student in Educational Science at the Inter-American School of Social Sciences
E-mail: comercialgeila@gmail.com
[5]Master's student in Educational Science at the Inter-American College of Social Sciences
E-mail: martins.eudes2020@gmail.com
[6]Master's student in Emerging Technologies in education at Must University
E-mail: deniramos@icloud.com
[7]Master's student in Emerging Technologies in education at Must University
E-mail: karen521370@edu.santoandre.sp.gov
[8]Master in Science of Education from the Inter-American School of Social Sciences
E-mail: leandroribeiro295@gmail.com

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

INTRODUCTION

Disruptive movements do not always announce their arrival with a bang. Sometimes, subtle changes in daily life insinuate themselves, small inflections that, at first glance, escape perception, but soon reveal themselves as signs of a broader reconfiguration. In the educational scene, these metamorphoses do not erupt in a homogeneous way; they silently infiltrate the practices, gestures and temporalities that organize the encounter between teacher, student and knowledge. Technology, in this scenario, is not an accessory: it is a structure and condition of language.

Talking about digital platforms, in this context, is not restricted to naming tools; It is a matter of giving visibility to a new regime for regulating experience. It is not the simple introduction of devices in the school space that changes the field, but the transition from pedagogical logic to algorithmic models of ordering, where learning is inscribed in predictive and performative systems. It is in this almost imperceptible displacement that the meaning of what is learned is decided – and, even more, how and why it is learned.

The centrality of technology in educational practices challenges the classical categories of time, space, and authorship. What was once delimited by schedules, physical locations, and rigid institutional roles now dissolves into unstable, interactive, and permanently connected environments. However, fluidity is not synonymous with freedom; It often masks new forms of surveillance and control, organized according to business logics and performance metrics, which tensions the very notion of integral education.

It is important not to adhere, uncritically, to the promises of personalization and engagement that accompany the expansion of educational platforms. The discourse of innovation, often disguised as technical neutrality, operates an aesthetics of consensus that silences structural conflicts. Between the enthusiasm for connectivity and the fear of its instrumentalization, teachers and students occupy ambiguous positions, sometimes as active subjects of mediation, sometimes as objects of the machinic gaze that calculates, quantifies and distributes formative trajectories.

In this landscape marked by intense data flows and increasingly sophisticated interfaces, it is urgent to rescue the formative dimension of the educational experience as a territory of meaning and not only of management. The teacher, previously seen as a source of knowledge, is called upon to act as a curator of meanings; The student, in turn, is called upon to build paths that escape the logic of immediate response. Thinking about education in this scenario requires more than adaptation: it requires critical and ethical reinvention.

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

Digital mediation, far from being a pacified field, reveals itself to be crossed by disputes between performativity and listening, speed and pause, quantification and subjectivation. It is not a matter of rejecting digital media, but of questioning them based on the practices and values that sustain them. Perhaps the greatest contemporary challenge is to give education back its proper time—a time that is not measured in clicks, but in meaningful presences, productive hesitations, and bonds that resist capture.

The present study is based on the intention of understanding how the algorithmic culture, conveyed by digital platforms, reconfigures the contemporary educational experience. To this end, a theoretical analysis is articulated divided into six chapters that discuss the transformations in learning regimes, the new role of the teacher as curator, the effects of digital immersion, the tensions between personalization and standardization, the sensorial relationship between body and interface, and, finally, the possibilities of pedagogical resistance in the midst of the logic of the platforms.

METHODOLOGY

The investigative fabric that structures this study is anchored in a qualitative approach of bibliographic character, understood not as a review of sources, but as a dense reflective field in which thought is constructed in dialogue with discourses, tensions and paths already inscribed in scientific experience. The methodological path is not limited to the orderly collection of texts: it requires the researcher to listen rigorously to the theoretical voices, a reading committed to the complexity of the object and a continuous vigilance over the gestures of analysis that are carried out throughout the process.

The choice for this type of investigative construction does not rest on the ease of documentary access, but on the power that critical references offer to tension the meanings already established and reposition the object of study in a zone of expanded problematization. What is at stake is not the accumulation of data, but the reconfiguration of interpretative horizons. For this reason, the mobilized works were selected based on their ability to destabilize pedagogical certainties and to provoke significant theoretical shifts about the role of digital platforms in the contemporary educational experience.

It is not, therefore, a matter of describing a static method, but of inhabiting a path that is reconfigured in movement. Reading, in this scenario, does not act as a technical mechanism of collection, but as a formative, political and critical act. Priority was given to studies that offered elements of dense interpretation of digital mediation regimes, the effects of algorithmic culture

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

on learning, and the transformations of teacher practice in the face of the demands of school connectivity. Methodology is, in this sense, more than a technical resource: it is an epistemological condition for thinking about the world.

> It is a tireless movement of apprehension of the objectives, observance of the stages, reading, questioning and critical dialogue with the bibliographic material that allows, in turn, a range of possibilities in the apprehension of the multiple issues that involve the object of study. [...] Bibliographic research is reaffirmed as an important methodological procedure in the production of scientific knowledge capable of generating, especially in little-explored themes, the postulation of hypotheses or interpretations that will serve as a starting point for other research (LIMA; MIOTO, 2007, p. 44).

The forcefulness of Lima and Mioto's formulation points to the requirement of a methodological position that goes beyond descriptive formality. Appropriating bibliographic research, from this perspective, implies understanding it as a rigorous hermeneutic gesture, in which the collection and analysis of data are confused with the process of re-elaboration of the object. It is in this intertwining between critical reading and the construction of meaning that the methodological basis of this work is structured, which seeks not to reproduce discourses, but to reconfigure their intelligibility under new analytical axes.

ALGORITHMIC CULTURE AND NEW LEARNING REGIMES

The contemporary educational landscape is no longer just made up of books, blackboards or maps; it is mediated by invisible flows, automatic calculations, and predictive ordering that escape immediate perception. The entry of algorithms into everyday school life did not occur as an occasional innovation, but as a profound restructuring of the ways of teaching and learning. In place of the class as a shared experience, the logic of automated personalization emerges, in which the student's trajectory is monitored, adjusted, and predicted by invisible metrics, often naturalized.

When discussing the role of digital platforms in the educational process, Alves and Lopes (2024) warn that these technological structures not only mediate content, but also modulate the way knowledge is constructed, circulated, and legitimized. By operating under business logics, these platforms impose their own criteria of relevance and visibility, leading the student to increasingly filtered formative experiences. The teacher, in this new scenario, faces the challenge of repositioning his mediation in the midst of a technical ecosystem that, although seductive, silently redefines the roles and meanings of the pedagogical bond.

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

According to Alves and Andrade (2022, p. 1018)

> The problem here lies in the fact that algorithmic government does not give way to an active subject, capable of legitimizing or resisting this government. [...] perhaps we are sacrificing our freedom, in the sense of an autonomous, spontaneous, deliberate, reflected action, capable of transgressing what is given and resisting what is imposed (ALVES; ANDRADE, 2022, p. 1018).

The fragment above shifts the discussion from the technical sphere to the ethical-political plane. Learning, in this new regime, is not only reconfigured: it is captured by patterns that limit reflective autonomy and condition forms of subjectivation. The absence of an active subject, as indicated by the authors, imposes on the school the challenge of resisting algorithmic training and reconfiguring education as a space for counter-narrative and deprogramming. The pedagogical function, therefore, is not restricted to the technical domain of mediation, but requires openness to the unpredictability of the encounter.

The contributions of Alves and Lopes (2024) indicate that algorithmic culture does not operate only on content, but on the grammar of the school experience itself. By replacing pedagogical criteria with parameters of usability and engagement, platforms undermine the time for listening and critical elaboration. The acceleration of the answer, the calculation of relevance and the prediction of interest impoverish the field of learning, dissolving the space of error, hesitation and doubt — essential dimensions for the construction of meanings. It is in this erasure of the pause that the greatest formative risk is installed.

Perhaps it is not a question of refusing the devices, but of tensioning them from within. What is proposed here is the reinvention of a pedagogical gesture that, without ignoring technological possibilities, reintroduces the human as an undisciplined power in the face of machinic logic. Reconfiguring learning regimes requires bringing the teacher back to the condition of ethical curator and restoring in the student the possibility of inhabiting knowledge with amazement, delay and critical awareness. To resist the algorithm, in this sense, is to give back to the school its ability to form not only competencies, but subjects.

TEACHER MEDIATION AND CURATORSHIP OF KNOWLEDGE IN DIGITAL ENVIRONMENTS

Mediation does not disappear under the impact of digital technologies — it shifts, resignifies and sometimes tensions. The presence of platforms in everyday school life introduces layers of automatism that reconfigure the ways of approximation between the

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

student and knowledge. Faced with incessant flows of information filtered by algorithms, the role of the teacher is no longer just that of transmitter and starts to require a curatorial look, capable of questioning what circulates and reestablishing intentionality in the pedagogical act.

Veloso and Bonilla (2018) highlight that, in the context of cyberculture, teacher authorship does not take place in isolated instances, but is constructed in a network, in a relational and living temporality. In this movement, mediation gains density when the teacher mobilizes his memory, his cultural knowledge, his listening to the other and the accidents of everyday life. The curation of knowledge, in this sense, is not a technical action of content selection, but a formative gesture that organizes the experience and re-inscribes meaning where the algorithm only calculates relevance and visibility.

> We observed, in this process of research-training, that the authorship/creation of the teachers took place in a network, in its specific and relational temporality. This network was made up of several elements, knots that were intertwined in the movement of creation; Among them, we highlight: internal and external motives, resources, cultural relations, memory, chance, collaborative training, teaching knowledge. From the perception of this network, we conclude that, in this context, the teacher-author is not born ready and that it is in the relationship with the other and with culture that new creations emerge. (VELOSO; BONILLA, 2018, p. 19).

The conception of authorship expressed in the previous excerpt allows us to understand that the teacher does not act as a reproducer of content, but as a subject who transits between zones of knowledge and experience, creating unpredictable connections. By inserting itself in the networks of symbolic production, its mediation takes place through presence, listening and invention. Curatorship, therefore, is only effective when teaching is understood as creation and not as delivery. It is in this relational gesture that teacher mediation takes on an ethical, aesthetic and political character, repositioning the act of teaching as the art of composing meanings.

Aureliano and Queiroz (2021) analyze that the use of digital technologies during remote teaching revealed how much teacher training needs to be expanded beyond the operational technique. In their findings, the authors emphasize that mediation, in this context, required interpretative skills, contextual sensitivity and decisions anchored in ethical-formative principles from the teacher. Curatorship, then, ceased to be a collateral task and became the core of pedagogical practice, especially when it comes to sustaining bonds and elaborating meanings in the face of digital dispersion.

The curatorship of knowledge, far from being a secondary function, becomes the inflection point where pedagogy finds its power. In a scenario of algorithms that organize

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

the visible and platforms that prioritize performance, it is necessary to reposition the teacher as a critical instance that diverts, reorders, and humanizes the formative path. Resisting automatism does not mean refusing the devices, but bringing the pedagogical act back to its sensible dimension: the one in which knowledge is not only given, but lived, situated and transforming.

DIDACTICS OF IMMERSION BETWEEN PLATFORMS, ENGAGEMENT AND SIMULATION

Contemporary formative dynamics no longer unfold only between walls, desks and paintings. They extend to screens, gamified environments, simulation platforms and interfaces that recreate the real with other grammars. The promise that digital immersion would lead to more active learning resonates in institutional and corporate discourses. However, the density of this experience depends less on the device and more on the pedagogical intentionality that runs through it. The challenge lies in ensuring that simulation does not become automatism.

Ortega and Irala (2022) note that the increase in formative practices mediated by digital environments requires rigorous tools to understand student engagement. It is not just about measuring presence in virtual environments, but about interpreting how the student responds cognitively, emotionally and behaviorally to immersive training proposals. The authors warn that there is still a lack of consistent theoretical-methodological models that account for the complexity of this relationship, which reinforces the urgency of didactic practices that are more integrated with the critical analysis of the digital experience.

> Considering the growth in relation to research directed to the theme of online engagement mentioned above, we evaluated, within the scope of the research project entitled 'Active and collaborative learning: analysis of teacher perception, student engagement, self-regulation and the evaluation process' and the Research Group on Learning, Methodologies and Evaluation (GAMA), that it is pertinent to identify the instruments and analytical techniques that are currently being used to measure the online engagement of students in higher education at the international level, in order to compare them and, subsequently, adapt and use them scalable to the national context (ORTEGA; IRALA, 2022, p. 2).

The quote reveals the methodological concern in building indicators that account for the complexity of online engagement. More than measurement instruments, it is about recognizing that the digital environment requires new strategies for observation and pedagogical action. Immersion, in order to be formative, needs to stop being a spectacle and become a field of critical experimentation. The teacher, in this scenario, cannot give in

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

to the logic of visualization, but must reconstruct the meanings of experience from a didactic of symbolic presence, even in virtuality.

Gonçalves and Ferreira (2021) demonstrate, based on an analysis of the difficulties faced by students with ADHD during remote teaching, that digital immersion can operate both as access and as exclusion. Engagement, when reduced to superficial interactions or mechanical responsiveness, deepens inequalities and silences singularities. The authors argue that the effectiveness of immersion depends on the ability of pedagogical practice to accommodate diversity, differentiated rhythms and plural modes of attention. Technology, in this sense, is a condition, not a solution.

To engage is not to entertain. The illusion that simulation solves the challenges of attention and engagement can reduce teaching to performance. The didactics of immersion, when not thought of critically, transform mediation into a spectacle, content into an interface, and the student into a consumer. Reconfiguring the sense of engagement requires returning to the act of learning its subjective thickness: doubt, hesitation, corporeality. Simulation will only be powerful when it does not erase the subject's reality — and his ability to resist the predefined.

FORMATIVE DISPUTES BETWEEN PERSONALIZATION OF TEACHING AND ALGORITHMIC HOMOGENIZATION

The promise of personalization, when crossed by algorithmic systems, becomes ambiguous. On the one hand, it offers the student adaptive trajectories, their own rhythms, experiences adjusted to specific learning styles. On the other hand, it captures these singularities in predictive frameworks that are based on accumulated data, recurring classifications, and patterns of behavior. Teaching, in this logic, is designed not by the pedagogical relationship, but by calculation processes that, by organizing the student's path, standardize the very idea of diversity.

Heggler, Szmoski, and Miquelin (2025) discuss how the use of artificial intelligence in education introduces risks of silent standardization, albeit under the guise of innovation. The algorithms used for pedagogical purposes operate from databases trained in specific contexts, and can reinforce existing inequalities by ignoring social, cultural, and affective variables. Personalization, in this case, tends to operate more as a behavioral adjustment strategy than as a device for cognitive emancipation. The student ceases to be the author of his learning and becomes a reader of his own metrics.

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

The formative risk is not only in the algorithmic model itself, but in the way it is inserted in a discursive field that displaces the role of the teacher. By attributing to technology the responsibility of "adapting" teaching to the student's profile, the platforms reduce teacher mediation to an instance of surveillance and confirmation. This functional mutation depotentializes pedagogy as a space of encounter and tension, and converts didactic planning into technical operationalization. Personalization, when automated, ceases to be critical and becomes conformist.

When reflecting on the impacts of artificial intelligence in the construction of adaptive learning experiences, Souza *et al.* (2024) point out that the effectiveness of these technologies depends on their articulation with the broader pedagogical project. Isolated, algorithmic solutions tend to respond to demands for productivity and measurement, rather than for comprehensive training. The pedagogical value of personalization is only realized when data mediates — and not substitutes — educational decisions. Without this mediation, what presents itself as adaptation may actually be domestication.

Personalizing is not just adjusting tracks: it is understanding the social, cognitive and affective conditions of the student in their historicity. Recommendation systems, by being based on past choices, ignore what the student does not yet know and does not know he wants to know. Training, however, implies openness to the unexpected, to the uncomfortable and to the break of predictability. Algorithmic homogenization, in this sense, is not imposed by direct imposition, but by the softness with which it silences difference under the logic of functional personalization.

The tension between personalization and homogenization needs to be thought of as an ethical dispute, and not just a technical one. Resisting the automation of teaching requires giving back to the school the ability to produce gaps, breaks and deviations. The teacher, as a curator of experiences, does not operate through efficiency, but through listening. And the student, as a subject in formation, needs to be exposed to multiple paths, including those that do not fit his "profile". Only in this way can personalization escape algorithmic capture and reinvent itself as a critical training project.

THE BODY THAT LEARNS IN A NETWORK SENSORY AND COGNITIVE EXPERIENCES IN DIGITAL INTERFACES

The body, for a long time silenced in pedagogical discourses, reemerges as an inescapable element in the contemporary formative experience. Not as a mere physiology,

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

but as a sensible, situated, implicated instance. In the crossing of digital interfaces, learning is no longer organized only by the logic of transmission, but by fields of intermittent presence, where seeing, hearing, touching and feeling become actions mediated by machines. However, not every touch is contact, and not every connection presupposes a bond. There is a difference between technical interactivity and affective presence.

Dravet and Castro (2019) emphasize that technological mediation, when not accompanied by an ethical formative gesture, tends to capture the body only as an image. The screen, in this case, transforms the subject into an avatar of himself, reducing corporeality to visual patterns or operational commands. The authors argue that training requires not only exposure to content, but sensitive engagement with the world, with the other and with oneself. To learn, in this sense, is to become an implicated, present body, capable of affecting and being affected in the symbolic networks that cross it.

> There is an ethical dimension to be preserved, or perhaps rescued, in the knowledge of the body and its relations with interiority/exteriority. Ethics of taking care of oneself and the other, but also of the world, because it is necessary to educate the new generations, these so-called digital natives, in relation to the recognition of one's own body, which is not only an image on the smooth surface of a screen, but also made of physical, mental and spiritual matter. [...] an entirely present presence, a daily companion that is capable not only of being seen, but also of feeling in its being-in-the-world here and now (DRAVET; CASTRO, 2019, p. 12).

The above formulation repositions the debate on the digital by shifting it from the field of efficiency to that of the ethics of presence. The student's body cannot be abstracted from the learning experience — it is the point of emergence of knowledge. When interfaces ignore sensory and cognitive diversity, they operate not as mediations, but as barriers. Education, therefore, cannot be reduced to commands or clicks: it needs to preserve the space of gesture, of looking, of hesitation and of shared breathing, even if in a network.

Vieira and Pacheco (2012) contribute by showing that digital technologies, when not conceived with attention to the sensory and motor specificities of the subjects, become devices of exclusion. In the context of limitations such as deafness, for example, the usability of information demands intentional projects that respect different rhythms and channels of reception and emission. For the authors, learning mediated by interfaces is only fully realized when it considers the body as a territory of enunciation, and not as an obstacle to be circumvented.

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

More than just integrating the body into learning, it is about recognizing it as an epistemic core. The body feels before it understands, hesitates before concluding, resists before conforming. In digital interfaces, this sensitivity needs to be translated into pedagogical intentionality, into careful design of experiences that value being-in-the-world. A truly digital education does not ignore the body — it summons it, listens to it, and re-inscribes it as a source of meaning in a time that insists on transforming it only into data.

EDUCATION AS RESISTANCE IN THE FORMATIVE EXPERIENCE IN TIMES OF PLATFORM

The expansion of digital platforms in the educational field has produced not only operational reconfigurations, but profound shifts in the way knowledge is produced, distributed, and validated. Under the imperative of connectivity and efficiency, discourses emerge that promise innovation, inclusion, and accessibility, but often hide the standardization of processes and the capture of formative meanings by market interests. In this scenario, thinking of education as resistance requires going beyond the logic of adaptation and claiming criticism as a pedagogical foundation.

Barbosa (2022) argues that digital culture operates a new logic of power, more diffuse and imperceptible, in which surveillance is mixed with autonomy and control is hidden under the language of personalized choice. Educational action, in this context, is challenged to reconstitute its liberating dimension, creating spaces for listening, debate and production of meaning outside the algorithmic logic. Resistance, therefore, is not a technological refusal, but a refusal of formative subordination to interests that empty the subject of its agency and complexity.

The platformization of education, as highlighted by Alves and Lopes (2024), has been accompanied by a reconfiguration of institutional structures, teaching practices, and the very idea of curriculum. Platforms not only mediate content, but organize experiences, define rhythms, classify accesses, and regulate permanence times. This process imposes urgent ethical challenges, especially when the criteria of efficiency and visibility suppress the values of integral education and the collective construction of knowledge.

Under the veneer of innovation, there is a risk of reupdating the old forms of exclusion, now legitimized by technical parameters. Barbosa (2022) warns that the discourse of digital neutrality masks practices that, by reproducing structural inequalities, prevent the flourishing of critical and autonomous subjects. By becoming dependent on

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

operational logics external to the pedagogical field, schools and universities abdicate their historical role as spaces of counter-narrative and start to operate as extensions of a culture that transforms data into merchandise.

Alves and Lopes (2024) reinforce that, in order to resist the logic of the platforms, it is necessary to reconfigure pedagogical practices from within, activating the formative power of teacher mediation. The centrality of the teacher does not lie in his ability to deliver content, but in his sensitivity to establish reflective, collective and affective paths. Genuine personalization of teaching requires listening, situated construction, and attention to the margins, and not just adaptation to the profile mapped by digital metrics and recommendation systems.

Thinking of education as resistance implies shifting the focus from technology as a tool to technology as language and power. The criticism is not in denying the devices, but in politicizing their presence and stressing their effects on school time, the ways of teaching and the constitution of student subjectivity. For Barbosa (2022), this gesture requires that the educational space remain a place for the invention of worlds, where it is still possible to make mistakes, hesitate, deviate — and, above all, think beyond what is already programmed.

To resist, therefore, is to sustain the unpredictability of education in a time that insists on quantifying everything. It is to ensure that the educational act is not limited to the management of predictable paths, but remains a singular and unpredictable event. When the school is willing to inhabit dissent, incompleteness and debate, it affirms its public and political function. It is in this gesture that education rediscovers its vocation to form subjects capable of questioning the world — and not just operating it.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The articulation between the different chapters shows that the insertion of digital technologies in education, although widely disseminated, does not occur in a neutral way. The formative experience in environments mediated by algorithms reveals profound reconfigurations in temporality, presence and the way knowledge circulates. If, on the one hand, the platforms promise personalization and access, on the other hand, they stress values such as authorship, autonomy, and listening. The selected studies allow us to glimpse the dilemmas of this movement and the possibilities of resistance in the pedagogical field itself.

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

The discussion proposed by Aureliano and Queiroz (2021) about teaching practice in remote teaching shows that mediation with technologies requires not only technical mastery, but reorganization of ways of relating to the student and knowledge. Veloso and Bonilla (2018) reinforce this conception by understanding teacher authorship as a networked, relational and environment-sensitive process. Curatorship, in this case, becomes a formative gesture that refuses the neutrality of the algorithm and reintroduces the ethics of listening into pedagogical practice.

In the analysis of engagement and immersion, Ortega and Irala (2020) reveal the insufficiency of traditional measurement models in the face of digital dynamics. In addition, Gonçalves and Ferreira (2021) demonstrate how these same dynamics, if decontextualized, can accentuate sensory and cognitive inequalities. In this sense, Dravet and Castro (2019) propose an epistemic inversion: the student's body needs to be recognized as a source of knowledge and not just as a receiver of commands. Learning, in this horizon, becomes an affective, situated and ethical field.

The personalization of teaching, addressed by Heggler, Szmoski and Miquelin (2025), carries important ambivalences: it can mean recognition of trajectories or silent conduction to hegemonic models. Souza *et al.* (2024) reinforce this tension by indicating that artificial intelligence, when not submitted to critical mediation, transforms teaching into automation and empties the student's protagonism. Algorithmic homogenization, sometimes disguised as innovation, limits the emergence of difference as an educational power.

The contributions of Alves and Lopes (2024) show that the platformization of education is not only a technical phenomenon, but a structural change in the way knowledge is governed. Barbosa (2022) proposes that, in the face of this, resistance is not due to the refusal of technology, but to its critical re-inscription. Repositioning the teacher as an agent of counter-conducts and the student as a subject of formative enunciation becomes the key to breaking the performative logic that is imposed.

Vieira and Pacheco (2012) warn that digital environments that ignore sensory and motor differences reinforce barriers instead of democratizing access. By treating deafness as an example, they demonstrate that technologies should be thought of from the corporeality of the subjects and not as universal interfaces. In this sense, personalization should be reread in the light of expanded accessibility and the diversity of cognitive and sensory experiences, and not as a superficial adjustment based on statistical data.

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

The reading proposed by Alves and Andrade (2022) expands this reflection by identifying subtle forms of control in algorithmic regimes that act on students' subjectivity. Instead of promoting autonomy, certain models of "intelligent" teaching end up standardizing behaviors, silencing singularities, and reinforcing structures of vigilance and reward. Education, therefore, will only be effectively formative if it is capable of questioning the assumptions of these architectures and returning to learning its ethical, aesthetic and political dimension.

Finally, the conception of Lima and Mioto (2007) is resumed, who defend bibliographic research as a space for critical dialogue with tradition and reinterpretation of the object in the light of multiple voices. By operating from readings committed to reality and complexity, educational work resists technical superficiality and reinvents itself as a practice of thought. In the disputes over the platforms, reaffirming this density is also a political gesture of preserving the school as a place of critical formation.

CONCLUSION

The crossing between platforms, algorithms and digital interfaces does not represent a simple technical redirection of education, but a profound reorganization of training practices, didactic temporality and relations with knowledge. When critical mediation is absent, technologies end up compressing pedagogy into operational structures. In view of this, the school is challenged to sustain meanings in the midst of automation, preventing the educational gesture from dissolving into the programmed logic of the interfaces.

The present study was based on the intention of understanding how the educational experience is reorganized in the era of digital platforms, considering the disputes, resistances and transformations that cross the school daily life. The bibliographic methodology adopted made it possible to mobilize contemporary authors who discuss the impacts of algorithmic personalization, the challenges of teacher mediation, and the centrality of the body and listening as formative instances. It was not a question of idealizing technology or demonizing it, but of putting it under examination in the light of its pedagogical implications.

Among the main findings, the finding that personalization, although coated with democratizing promises, can operate as a form of silent homogenization stands out. Teacher curatorship, in this context, reappears as a strategy of resistance, to the extent that it is anchored in listening, sensitivity and situated reading of student singularities.

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

Learning, in order to maintain its formative power, needs to preserve incompleteness, dissent, and unpredictability — elements that algorithms tend to minimize.

The bodily dimension, often ignored in digitalized educational practices, needs to be placed back at the center of the training process. In interface-mediated contexts, the student's body cannot be reduced to a navigable icon or an answer data. The authors analyzed indicate the urgency of a pedagogy that revalues the sensitive, the ethical and the affective, as ways to resist the functionalization of experience. Re-enchanting the digital requires reconnecting knowledge to presence and otherness.

The architectures of control, ranking and rapid response, increasingly naturalized in the school routine, indicate a pedagogy at risk: the one in which training is reduced to training. However, by operating as a space for counter-narrative, the school can still assert its political vocation. Repositioning teaching as a gesture of listening and creation is a way of disarticulating the automatisms that, under the guise of innovation, corrode the formative senses. The teacher, in this in-between, sustains complexity as a pedagogical principle.

It is thus completed that education, when understood as resistance, allows for tensioning the structures that condition it and reinventing its ways of existing. It is in this movement that its political strength lies: not in the adherence to the logics of platform, but in the creation of ethical, sensitive and collective spaces, where it is still possible to form subjects and not just profiles. The choice to educate is, above all, the choice for what one decides to preserve at a time when almost everything can be parameterized.

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

REFERENCES

1. Alves, L., & Lopes, D. (2024). *Educação e plataformas digitais: Popularizando saberes, potencialidades e controvérsias*. Edufba. https://repositorio.ufba.br/handle/ri/39372

2. Alves, M. A. S., & Andrade, O. M. de. (2022). Autonomia individual em risco? Governamentalidade algorítmica e a constituição do sujeito. *Cadernos Metrópole, 24*(55), 1007–1023. https://www.scielo.br/j/cm/a/MhymSLPFzLcpSbWFcYBdpqy

3. Aureliano, F. E. B. S., & Queiroz, D. E. (2021). As tecnologias digitais como recursos pedagógicos no ensino remoto: Implicações na formação e na prática docente. *Educação em Revista, 37*. https://www.scielo.br/j/edur/a/PDVy8ythhFbqLrMj6YBfxsm

4. Barbosa, M. G. (2022). Educação, poder e resistência na era digital. *Revista Espaço Pedagógico, 29*(3), 15–30. https://seer.upf.br/index.php/rep/article/view/14185

5. Dravet, F., & Castro, G. (2019). Aprendizagem, meios digitais e afeto: Propostas para um novo paradigma na educação superior. *Interface - Comunicação, Saúde, Educação, 23*. https://www.scielo.br/j/icse/a/nS7VmJR4Vx7PmyfN8WXsctz/

6. Gonçalves, S., & Ferreira, B. E. B. (2021). A convergência tecnológica e digital, o ensino remoto emergencial e os alunos com TDAH que frequentam os anos finais do ensino fundamental. *Linguagem & Tecnologia, 24*. https://www.scielo.br/j/tl/a/H3s6MLvgt5qf3r3LMGXZ9Wb/

7. Heggler, J. M., Szmoski, R. M., & Miquelin, A. F. (2025). As dualidades entre o uso da inteligência artificial na educação e os riscos de vieses algorítmicos. *Educação & Sociedade, 46*, Article e289323. https://www.scielo.br/j/es/a/qrTryFvZR9Y9WsRpG5fWGHB/

8. Lima, T. C. S., & Mioto, R. C. T. (2007). Procedimentos metodológicos na construção do conhecimento científico: A pesquisa bibliográfica. *Revista Katálysis, 10*(esp.), 37–45. https://www.scielo.br/j/rk/a/HSF5Ns7dkTNjQVpRyvhc8RR

9. Ortega, F. da C., & Irala, V. B. (2020). Mensuração do engajamento online de estudantes do ensino superior: Uma revisão de escopo na literatura internacional. *Linguagem & Tecnologia, 23*. https://www.scielo.br/j/tl/a/jXChbf9hNKcypthBkHXyw4D/

10. Souza, A. P. de S., Conceição, C. de J., Pancoto, M. A., Cecote, N. Q. B., Pedra, R. R., Oliveira, R. M. da S., Pinão, V. R. Z., & Gomes, W. T. (2024). Personalização da aprendizagem com inteligência artificial: Como a IA está transformando o ensino e o currículo. *Aracê, 6*(3), 5816–5831. https://doi.org/10.56238/arev6n3-092

11. Veloso, M. M. S., & Bonilla, M. H. S. (2018). O professor e a autoria em tempos de cibercultura: A rede da criação dos atos de currículo. *Revista Brasileira de Educação, 23*. https://www.scielo.br/j/rbedu/a/Z56Lw7VVRmJCfSFByNLsWDy

Revista ARACÊ
ISSN: 2358-2472

12. Vieira, E. M. F., & Pacheco, R. C. S. (2012). O enfoque cognitivo e o uso das tecnologias de informação em situação de limitação sensorial. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR, 10*(2). https://www.scielo.br/j/cebape/a/jVz9q695rRtmD48wHwwNy6t/