RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 27/09/2026 | aceito: 04/10/2026 | publicação: 09/10/2026

From prefiguration to algorithmic execution: the impact of generative AI on the alienation of teachers' planning

Da pré-figuração à execução algorítmica: o impacto das IAs generativas na alienação do planejamento docente

De la prefiguración a la ejecución algorítmica: el impacto de las IA generativas en la alienación de la planificación docente

Thiago Guedes Strassemann – Espírito Santo State Department of Education – Sedu, profthiagoguedes@gmail.com
Lóren de Souza Jarreta – Federal University of Espírito Santo – Ufes, lorenjarreta@hotmail.com

Abstract:
This article investigates the impact of the uncritical use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (genAIs) on pedagogical practice, focusing on the alienation of teachers' planning. Drawing on Historical-Dialectical Materialism and Cultural-Historical Theory, it discusses how the platformization of education and the scarcity of time for organizing teaching push teachers to outsource their teleological capacity for prefiguration. Algorithmic automation and managerial policies based on metrics and standardized routines tend to split educational work between conception and execution, reducing teachers to bureaucratic operators of ready-made packages. In opposition to this tendency toward subjective depletion and occupational illness, the text proposes revaluing teaching activity through two structuring axes: attentive curation of available materials and, above all, collective planning. It argues that joining the rigor of theoretical study with the strength of collectivity is the path for schools to overcome digital alienation and recover their primary role in forming conscious, autonomous, and emancipated subjects.

Keywords:
Generative Artificial Intelligence. Teaching work. Collective planning. Alienation.

Resumo:
Este artigo investiga o impacto do uso acrítico das Inteligências Artificiais Generativas (genAIs) sobre a prática pedagógica, com foco na alienação do planejamento docente. Partindo dos fundamentos do Materialismo Histórico-Dialético e da Teoria Histórico-Cultural, discute-se como a plataformização da educação e a escassez de tempo para a organização do ensino empurram o(a) professor(a) à terceirização de sua capacidade teleológica de pré-figuração. A automação algorítmica e políticas gerencialistas baseadas em métricas e rotinas padronizadas tendem a cindir o trabalho educativo entre concepção e execução, reduzindo o docente a um operador burocrático de pacotes prontos. Em contraponto a essa tendência de esvaziamento subjetivo e de adoecimento profissional, o texto propõe a revalorização da atividade de ensino fundamentada em dois eixos estruturantes: a curadoria atenta dos materiais disponíveis e, sobretudo, o planejamento coletivo. Argumenta-se que a união entre o rigor do estudo teórico e a força da coletividade é o caminho para que a escola supere a alienação digital e recupere seu papel primordial na formação de sujeitos conscientes, autônomos e emancipados.

Palavras-chave:
Inteligência Artificial Generativa. Trabalho docente. Planejamento coletivo. Alienação.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 27/09/2026 | aceito: 04/10/2026 | publicação: 09/10/2026

Resumen:
Este artículo investiga el impacto del uso acrítico de las Inteligencias Artificiales Generativas (genAIs) en la práctica pedagógica, centrándose en la alienación de la planificación docente. Partiendo de los fundamentos del Materialismo Histórico-Dialéctico y de la Teoría Histórico-Cultural, se discute cómo la plataformización de la educación y la escasez de tiempo para organizar la enseñanza empujan al profesorado a externalizar su capacidad teleológica de prefiguración. La automatización algorítmica y las políticas gerencialistas basadas en métricas y rutinas estandarizadas tienden a dividir el trabajo educativo entre concepción y ejecución, reduciendo al docente a un operador burocrático de paquetes preparados. Frente a esta tendencia de vaciamiento subjetivo y deterioro de la salud profesional, el texto propone revalorizar la actividad de enseñanza a partir de dos ejes estructurantes: la curaduría atenta de los materiales disponibles y, sobre todo, la planificación colectiva. Se argumenta que la unión del rigor del estudio teórico y la fuerza de la colectividad es el camino para que la escuela supere la alienación digital y recupere su papel primordial en la formación de sujetos conscientes, autónomos y emancipados.

Palabras clave:
Inteligencia Artificial Generativa. Trabajo docente. Planificación colectiva. Alienación.

1. Introduction

Human beings, organized in society, are characterized by their ability to transform space and adapt their actions to the context in which they live in order to ensure their survival and satisfy their needs. Writing, for example, initially needed to record harvests and trade, became part of human civilization, essential to understanding the world in which we live and to ensuring the perpetuation of knowledge and history over time. From Egyptian hieroglyphs, through the emergence of Gutenberg's printing press, to the current use of acronyms and abbreviations on the internet, writing has evolved without losing the human character of the use of this technology.

Indeed, it was through writing that, during World War II, Alan Turing developed an electromechanical machine capable of deciphering the code of the Enigma machine, used by Nazi Germany to encode its messages. Through his efforts and advances during World War II, Alan Turing became known as the father of computing, inspiring subsequent generations to develop increasingly advanced technologies, aiming for the moment when machines would be able to imitate human intelligence (Tahiru, 2021).

The development of digital technologies, beginning with this first prototype in the 1940s, brought major changes to how human beings interact with the world around them, bridging distances previously considered impossible and changing the work they perform. Digital technologies enable the automation of processes and tasks, which would benefit workers

by reducing the time needed for a series of tasks, while also making those same workers' conditions more precarious through the platformization of work. This reorganizes labor activities and "makes it possible to turn the worker into a just-in-time worker, that is, a worker (any worker) who is always available for work and can be used in the exact measure of capital's demands" (Rosenfield; Almeida, 2021, p. 10), without, however, guaranteeing their basic labor rights.

Educational work, like other categories of labor, is equally susceptible to changes brought about by new technologies, whether digital or otherwise. From traditional teaching models, which view the teacher as a transmitter of knowledge to a passive student, to the active methodologies currently implemented, which "value students' active participation, the problematization of reality, and learning based on meaningful experiences" (Paixão et al., 2026, p. 4), the educational process sees in the development of digital technologies ways to bring the classroom context closer to the world students now have access to, whether by integrating digital technologies into classrooms through online teaching platforms or even by using social media to attract students.

In 2022, the discussion of digital technologies and artificial intelligence in the classroom acquired new nuances, as that was the year when Chat GPT, the first Generative Artificial Intelligence platform—genAIs—capable of creating content "from scratch" and being trained to better imitate a human being's voice and abilities, became widely incorporated into everyday life, reaching 100 million active users within a few months (Bick; Blandin; Deming, 2024). Today, various technology companies, such as Google, Meta, and Microsoft, make their own AI systems available for indiscriminate use by users across the most diverse areas of life.

Teaching work is affected by this new artificial intelligence, just like other fields. If our own students begin using this technology to conduct research and ask for suggestions for their assignments and essays, teachers can also be expected to use it, whether to help prepare activities or even automate processes for marking and evaluating their teachers, precisely because these systems can imitate human voice and perception, with their use increasingly encouraged by big tech companies and education departments throughout the country.

As a counterpoint to an inherently positive view of scientific development, Santos Dumont's biography (Jorge, 2007) shows how technological innovation brings with it a series of dangerous possibilities when it is directed toward authoritarian projects of power rather than the common good.

From this perspective, and considering the contemporary reality of teaching, it is imperative to reflect on how new information technologies can offer valuable possibilities while also posing a risk to what we understand as teaching activity.

An essential factor in considering the merits and dangers of these devices in teaching is what distinguishes us from other animal species: the ability to prefigure the product of human labor before its execution.

In this preceding stage, the human mind systematizes which procedures will be developed, which instruments will be used, and, above all, which motives will guide the activity to be carried out.

In addition to the abundance of technological resources, among which genAIs deserve particular attention, another feature of our time is curricular proposals guided by external indicators such as Ideb and Pisa. Under the aegis of these metrics and the assessments that determine them, a conception of the teacher as a mere executor of standardized lesson models is increasingly growing. Policies such as the Educational Pedagogical Routines—RPE (Rotinas, 2026)—impose unilaterally which content and methodologies each teacher must develop, removing from their practice the creative potential that makes planning a central moment of teaching activity (Rovetta, 2025).

Pedagogical practices deprived of the sphere of planning expose the latent alienation (Marx, 2013) of teaching work and, contrary to the almost promotional efforts supporting these policies, turn that work into something sterile, without intention or meaning. This hollowing out of teaching practice, alongside the poor working conditions to which we are subjected, results in increasing mental illness among a significant proportion of education workers. The need to teach at several institutions to earn a decent salary, the imbalance between classroom hours and planning periods, and other factors rapidly accelerate teachers' psychological exhaustion, leaving them dissatisfied with the present and deeply apprehensive about the future.

Aligned with these policies and the neoliberal bias embedded in their theoretical and methodological foundations, genAIs are sold as a miraculous salvation for teachers overwhelmed by an exhausting routine and disillusioned by the sense of powerlessness this scenario produces. The variety of materials produced, together with the speed at which these tools process complex data, provides immediate relief from many teachers' everyday difficulties, but their indiscriminate use carries the risk of further emptying teaching activity of meaning.

On this point, Sondermann (2026, p. 10) argues that "every educational idea deserves a rigorous planning process before it becomes material or an activity (...) AI, far from dispensing

with this planning, makes it even more necessary." More than guidance, this statement warns of the dangers of the uncritical use of these particular tools.

Clearly, such caution should apply to any instrument, but AI, as General Purpose Technologies (Kaufmann, 2018), stands out for its ability to significantly change the configuration of labor relations, particularly educational work.

What was once a shortage of content has become an excess of low-quality materials for teachers and students, transforming the teacher from an individual endowed with knowledge into the person responsible for curating available material to avoid oversimplification and the propagation of content lacking pedagogical validation (Bhaskar, 2016).

This change of roles, whether because of the speed at which it is imposed or the lack of interest among those who develop the guidelines and rules for pedagogical work, produces new insecurities and concerns among education professionals. From this perspective, this article seeks to investigate how the commodification of educational work and the chronic scarcity of conditions for planning push teachers toward extensive use of genAIs, not as a resource guided by pedagogical intentionality, but as a mechanism replacing prefiguration (Sánchez Vázquez, 2011)—the ontological stage in which subjects consciously determine the purpose of their actions.

To specify our guiding question, we intend to contribute to discussions of the extent to which outsourcing teachers' planning to generative algorithms splits teaching activity, turning educators into mere bureaucratic and alienated operators, deprived of their humanly creative character.

2 Generative AI and teaching work

2.1 Work and its relations

Throughout his work, Karl Marx used the concept of labor as a lens to describe the functioning of capitalist society. Understood as "a process between man and Nature, a process in which man (...) sets in motion the natural forces belonging to his corporeality, arms and legs, head and hand, in order to appropriate natural matter in a form useful for his own life" (Marx, 2013, p. 211), this idea concentrates one of the main contradictions we experience as members of the working class: the constant struggle between labor's power to create and modify the

objective world and subjects, and its alienation, brought about by the bourgeoisie's concentration of the means of production.

The direct influence between forms of organizing labor and ways of organizing life is central to Marx's work. In The Poverty of Philosophy, Marx (2017) argues that "Social relations are intimately connected with productive forces. In acquiring new productive forces, men transform their mode of production and, in transforming it, changing the way they earn their living, they transform all their social relations" (Marx; Netto, 2017, p. 125). From the earliest stages of human development, we can point to how different modes of producing material goods determine different forms of social organization and the (re)production of life (Engels, 2019). From primitive communal modes of production, through enslaved labor and the vassal/suzerain structure of feudal society, to the echoes of each stage of the industrial revolution, social life has moved in accordance with the world of work.

2.2 The problem of labor in late capitalism

In the current period, which Mandel (1972) calls Late Capitalism, factors such as the flexibilization of labor laws and the emergence of new occupations associated with corporations such as Ifood, Uber, and similar companies produce serious setbacks in working conditions. The loss of rights and guarantees achieved through decades of working-class struggle, combined with new unregulated jobs, raises questions and sounds an alarm about the formation of individuals and the consequences of this reality for the alienation of labor.

As educators, we cannot avoid analyzing how these precarious forms of work affect teaching work. Factors such as the lack of time to plan and evaluate our pedagogical practices and the accumulation of duties in the school environment, growing daily because of the virtualization and commodification of education, become barriers between the meaning of being a teacher and increasing demands for scores in external assessments and for a kind of publicity of work.

Contexts such as ours result from significant changes in modes of production, while also producing further changes. Addressing these mechanisms (generally technological), which profoundly transform the structure of society, the economy, the sciences, and labor relations, Bresnohan and Trajtemberg (1995) define the concept of General Purpose Technologies—GPT. The authors identify three specific characteristics of these technologies:

1- Broad penetration: They gradually spread across practically every sector of the economy and sphere of social life, ceasing to be a niche and becoming basic infrastructure.

2- Potential for continuous improvement: The technology becomes cheaper and evolves over time, generating derivative innovations that stimulate new products and services.
3- Synergistic complementarity: They catalyze other innovations, requiring profound transformations in organizational forms, institutions, and the skills demanded of workers.

Examples of GPT that we can easily identify in human history include:

• Steam engine: identified as the main driver of the Industrial Revolution. Its adoption enabled the leap from manufacturing to the modern production line;
• Electricity: represented a leap beyond the steam engine because of its greater power and flexibility, while also enabling factories to operate at night;
• Internet: developed during World War II, it transformed communication and the transportation/storage of information.

2.3 Generative AI as GPT

As with these tools, Kaufmann (2018) suggests that genAIs can be understood as GPT. Her thesis rests on three central aspects shared by all AI systems of this kind: their cross-sector reach, their capacity to reorganize productive processes, and the systemic effect and institutional disruption caused by their widespread use in diverse circumstances.

The first aspect—cross-sector reach—concerns the inherent tendency of GPTs to spread across practically every sector of the economy and culture, abandoning their status as a technological niche to become basic infrastructure for contemporary society. GenAIs have this capacity because, given the speed at which they access content from various sources, they “are in every area of knowledge (and almost all of social life)” (Kaufmann, 2018, p. 22).

In education, this reach does not appear merely as an optional teaching resource; it imposes itself from the bureaucratic management of education departments to the micromanagement of everyday classroom life, redefining the very fabric of pedagogical interactions.

Regarding the second point, the author emphasizes the power to reorganize productive processes. Historical analysis shows that GPTs profoundly alter the technical foundation and the social division of labor. Following this movement, Kaufmann (2018) argues that AI acts directly on data processing, language, and cognition, reorganizing how we perform complex tasks. In education, this technology is incorporated into the logic of school managerialism to reshape teaching work; under the pretext of optimizing time, the tool directly affects the

formulation of planning, destabilizing the traditional way educators conceive and develop their practice.

Finally, examining systemic effects and institutional disruption means recognizing that a GPT's impact goes beyond technical aspects, placing pressure on institutions' regulatory, ethical, and formative foundations. Kaufman (2018, p. 67) shows that the advancement of these systems entails "unwanted repercussions, such as influences on institutions, violations of privacy" and profound disruptions in markets and labor relations. In public schools, this disruption intensifies the contradictions of late capitalism: by destabilizing references for authorship and teaching, genAIs institutionalize an instrumental rationality that commodifies knowledge, accelerating the expropriation of teachers' subjectivity and the alienation of their work.

3. The death of prefiguration

Considering the context presented, in which the development of Artificial Intelligence technologies invades the everyday lives of professionals in every sector, Tahiru (2021, p. 3) lists three main ways AI is used in the educational process: automation of administrative tasks, Smart Content, and Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS). Although focused on different aspects of schooling, the use of artificial intelligence to automate administrative tasks is particularly important, since the author understands marking assignments and lesson planning as "administrative" rather than pedagogical activities.

Since every GPT profoundly alters the social division of labor, generative AI enters schools to reorganize teaching work according to the same logic that governs large-scale industry: the radical separation between conception and execution. Far beyond its purported practicality, this split empties teaching activity of meaning and directly attacks each teacher's subjectivity.

When we replace the human factor in planning with any kind of algorithmic automation, we prevent teachers from recognizing and projecting themselves in the product of their work. This movement changes the meaning of labor as human subjectivation into a task defined solely by its consumption value (Sánchez Vázquez, 2011), measured through indicators and evidence at the expense of deeper signs of students' learning and human formation.

Technological tools (including genAI) are constantly sold through neoliberal discourse as time-saving devices or alternatives to everyday overload, but what they actually produce is

the expropriation of time for critical reflection, transforming this precious time into an alienated workflow.

On the one hand, generative Artificial Intelligence definitively establishes itself as a General Purpose Technology capable of permeating society's entire technical foundation (Bresnahan and Trajtenberg, 1995) (Kaufmann, 2018); on the other, its uncritical introduction into schools under the aegis of capital produces the expropriation of teachers' subjectivity. By automating material production and planning, AI acts like a sword that severs the link between the prefiguration of work and its product. At that moment, teachers gradually lose the ability to project their pedagogical intentionality teleologically and become passive operators of something ready-made and finished. This dynamic intensifies the alienation of educational work, hollowing out the humanizing and emancipatory dimension of school education.

The automation proposed by genAI, however much it speeds up teaching work, makes that work extremely simplistic and drastically reduces its ability to reach students, since AI selects according to statistical relevance whereas teaching activity depends on selecting materials according to pedagogical intentionality (Sondermann, 2026).

In her work The Social Formation of the Teacher's Personality: A Vygotskian Approach, Lígia Márcia Martins (2015) states that "Under the historical conditions of capitalist production, labor is expropriated of its highest humanizing expression, since these conditions establish a split between the worker and the product of their work" (Martins, 2015, p. 3). When we turn to teaching work, there are countless situations in which we can perceive this split between teachers and the full development of their students' abilities.

Just as a newborn child only recognizes itself as an individual by looking in a mirror, educators can only recognize themselves and thus assume their profession's social role when confronted with the reflection of their work: students. However, the growing involvement of private-sector entities has overloaded teachers with bureaucratic demands while, guided by the sterile results of external assessments, making teachers' planning rigid (Seki, 2021).

The result is a loss of space for intentionality, which we understand as "the presupposition of consciousness and, in turn, the core of personality" (Martins, 2015, p. 5). It is impossible to study teaching and the role of teaching activity without considering each teacher's subjectivity. However, initiatives such as School Pedagogical Routines (Rotinas, 2026) depersonalize this activity by removing from classroom teachers the responsibility and creative potential to analyze and define the direction of the curriculum (I did not like it) based on their perceptions. In this sense, educational practice closely resembles artistic work, given the intersection between "our way of being and our way of teaching" (Nóvoa, 1992, p. 17). On

this point, Sánchez Vázquez stresses that “man is not merely represented in it, but made present, objectified” (2011, p. 41), which can be related to both art and education.

Unlike the various forms of labor that produce physical objects, often valued solely for their possibilities of use, educational work aims at the full formation of individuals in their most diverse potentialities. This special character gives teaching activity another feature and provides the professional who performs it with “a process toward the human-generic” (Martins, 2015, p. 21).

However, given this particularity of teaching work, the production of meanings associated with it also becomes a special arena of class struggle (Marx and Engels, 2010). It is precisely because of its role in subjective formation and citizenship that public education represents a space of such interest to the bourgeoisie. Through “quite seductive discourses about valuing the person and their subjectivity” (Martins, 2015, p. 23), official documents ground curricular and methodological proposals in individuality and competition, factors strongly influenced by neoliberal logic. The result is the production of individuals increasingly disconnected from collectivity, whose activity “makes them one-sided and deforms them” (Márkus, 1974 apud Martins, 2015, p. 47), distancing them from their full potentialities.

Our duty as teachers and teacher educators in this context is to abolish and overcome this mode of producing knowledge through an emancipatory educational praxis. Whereas educators were once conceived as subjects endowed with all theoretical knowledge, today we no longer need to devote all our (labor) power to presenting objects. Instead, making accessible (or pointing out) to our students the human objectification in each of these objects increasingly requires our attention.

At this moment, when different digital technologies decisively alter ways of living and organizing society, a new teacher must emerge, with heightened attention to the political character of their activity and with procedures and tools oriented toward forming autonomous subjects freed from alienated labor.

3. The collective way out

Faced with this scenario and the various concerns arising from its analysis, we urgently need to consider alternatives that allow us, as educators, to resist this movement that alienates and hollows out what we understand as teaching activity. We argue that preserving the human and humanizing character of education in late capitalism requires two structuring axes:

collective planning and attentive curation of available materials (whether produced by AI or otherwise).

In opposition to the expropriation of prefiguration produced by the indiscriminate use of genAIs, Rovetta (2025) argues that pedagogical work cannot be reduced to commodity dynamics or the mechanical execution of algorithmic routines, because the essence of teaching activity lies in creative capacity and pedagogical intentionality. From this perspective, collective work is central as a theoretical and methodological foundation for the formation of teachers' personalities.

The formation of autonomous and emancipated consciousness occurs not through isolation and individual work, but as a result of collective experience guided by a common purpose. It is within the space of exchanges, shared theoretical studies, and negotiation of meanings that teachers stop uncritically reproducing external guidelines and begin to author their own educational practice.

With this in mind, we argue that planning should cease to be seen as mere bureaucracy and be treated as a permanent movement of study and organization of teaching activity (Rovetta, 2025). Moving away from the prism of individuality and grounding teaching work in collective planning gives value to focusing on a common objective and socially valuable content. In collective planning, particular forms of knowledge are socialized, criticized, and re-signified, transforming the act of planning into a laboratory of human emancipation.

Thus, the conscious and orderly use of technological tools subordinated to collective interests subverts the logic of digital domination. While the uncritical use of genAIs expropriates teachers' right to think about and envision their lessons, collective planning grounded in a humanizing perspective returns control over the means and ends of their activity to teachers. Teachers reinsert themselves as historical subjects jointly responsible for students' humanization, recovering the aesthetic, creative, and transformative dimension of school education in the face of attempts to commodify knowledge.

Therefore, defending collective planning today goes beyond a mere methodological choice; it is a revolutionary requirement of resistance and ethical survival. At a historical moment when capital attempts to algorithmize the minds and automate the hands of education workers, joining the rigor of theoretical study with the strength of collectivity is the indispensable path for schools to recover their primary role: forming free, autonomous subjects capable of actively transforming social reality (Rovetta, 2025).

Through collective planning, the educators involved can take a position toward the range of content (of good quality or otherwise) to which we are exposed daily. This ability to "separate

the wheat from the chaff" is what keeps the use of genAIs essentially human, even within the context of precarious teaching work in which we find ourselves.

A question that has persisted since the beginning of studies of Artificial Intelligence concerns whether machines can replace the human brain and whether a computer can possess capacities and skills beyond what human beings can conceive. Over the last 70 years, considering 1956 as the beginning of specific studies in the field that would become AI (Mucci, 2024), we have witnessed improvements in digital technologies from supercalculators to generative AI platforms and applications. These operate through what is called machine learning, in which software is programmed to learn on its own, still attempting to imitate how we humans learn according to what is presented to us.

Even so, genAIs cannot think, but only repeat what is published and available on the worldwide internet, often operating through plagiarism of existing, productive authors and voices. This has also become a point for reflection and caution in academia when questioning the ethics of using tools such as Chat GPT in research (Barreto and Ávila, 2023). The ability to abstract and thereby anticipate the next steps of a story or a task is inherent to human beings, who, despite striving to turn technology into a reflection of themselves, cannot make AI systems think or be.

Thus, the indiscriminate use of artificial intelligence for planning teaching work is possible only up to the limit of materials available for theft, without using human creative capacity to do so. This makes education a space devoid of the teacher's personality, despite being more efficient according to the values of Capital, since "AI makes it easier to produce content quickly, but it is more difficult to evaluate authenticity, cognitive depth, and critical thinking" (Sondermann, 2026, p. 44).

GenAIs, now widely popularized for use at any time of day and to resolve the most diverse questions within human beings, have access to all human production indexed on the internet—approximately 4 billion pages (Kunder, 2025)—to satisfy users' curiosity and needs. Within these nearly 4 billion pages is a whole range of false and incorrect information that can reach ordinary users as absolute truth, since this technology cannot exercise moral judgment and therefore verify the information it accesses. It can become potentially hostile despite lacking the capacity for feelings, evoking Gerd Leonhard's (2026) words: "Technology will become morally corrosive, dehumanising our society, if we deploy it without questioning its design, purpose, consequences, and safeguards".

Given the immense amount of content available on the internet for use and republication, one factor keeping the human character of teaching activity alive lies in how

these data are observed and selected. As presented in the previous section, generative artificial intelligence tools base their decisions on statistical criteria, according to other users' responses and algorithms oriented toward delivering content as instantly and efficiently as possible. Teaching work, on the other hand, involves selecting materials oriented toward educational purposes, since pedagogical intentionality makes it possible to analyze available material and select what best suits each classroom's context. Sondermann (2026, p. 18) calls this curation, because "Without curation, there is an excess of information and little learning. With curation, there is pedagogical intentionality, coherence, and depth".

In the struggle to reappropriate the emancipatory character of education, teachers must once again recognize themselves as students, capable of learning to think critically about their work, and free themselves from the sterile assurance offered by technological tools that cannot be, although they can speak. Even before material is presented in the classroom, it is necessary to assess "why this material was chosen, what they [the student] should look for in it, how it connects to what came before and what will come after" (Sondermann, 2026, p. 19). Only in this way can teachers reconnect with what they wish to convey and, far beyond mere transmission, with what they wish their students to become, focused on the material world rather than a digital existence.

Final considerations

In light of what has been presented in the preceding sections, we can conclude that, even in the context of neoliberal reforms in which we find ourselves, there are viable alternatives for preserving the human character of teaching activity. In a world of high exposure to content without necessary verification, teaching practice is increasingly constituted by the ability to read, interpret, and select materials according to pedagogical intentionality.

This ability does not arise magically, nor solely from each teacher's individual study. In reality, only through collective study and planning does each teacher develop as such and become able to take a critical position in mediating between theoretical knowledge and their students. On this point, Sondermann (2026) affirms that

> "Quality educators will continue to be essential—not despite AI, but because of it. As AI takes on informational and operational functions, the human distinctive contribution to teaching becomes even more evident: presence, listening, motivation, creating bonds, and building genuine learning communities that AI cannot fully replicate" (Sondermann, 2026, pp. 72–73).

When we consider what subjects (and therefore what society) we intend to form through our teaching work, it becomes increasingly urgent to be certain of our role. Whereas being a

teacher once meant accumulating all knowledge and “transmitting it” linearly in the classroom as a ready-made, finished object, today it is our responsibility to select content according to pedagogical intentionality and stimulate critical thinking so that our students can read the world and appropriate it, becoming more human each day.

References

BARRETO, A. M. P.; ÁVILA, F. de. A inteligência artificial diante da integridade científica: um estudo sobre o uso indevido do ChatGPT [Artificial intelligence and scientific integrity: a study of the misuse of ChatGPT]. Revista Direitos Culturais, Santo Ângelo, v. 18, pp. 91–106, Aug. 2023. Available at: https://revistas.san.uri.br/revistas/index.php/direitosculturais/article/view/1373/630. Accessed: 7 Oct. 2026.

BHASKAR, M. Curated: the power of selection in a world of excess. London: Piatkus, 2016.

BICK, A. BLANDIN, A. DEMING, D. J. The rapid adoption of generative AI. National Bureau of Economic Research. United States, pp. 1–32, 2024.

BRESNAHAN, T. F.; TRAJTENBERG, M. General purpose technologies ‘Engines of growth’? Journal of Econometrics, v. 65, n. 1, pp. 108–191, 1995.

COSTA, M. A. da. Políticas de Formação Docente para Educação Profissional: realidade ou utopia? [Teacher education policies for vocational education: reality or utopia?]. Curitiba: Appris, 2016.

ENGELS, F. A Origem da Família, da Propriedade Privada e do Estado [The origin of the family, private property, and the state]. Translated by Nélio Schneider. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2019.

JORGE, Fernando. As lutas, a glória e o martírio de Santos Dumont [The struggles, glory, and martyrdom of Santos Dumont]. São Paulo: Geração Editorial, 2007.

KAUFMAN, D. A inteligência artificial irá suplantar a inteligência humana? [Will artificial intelligence supplant human intelligence?]. Barueri: Estação das Letras e Cores, 2018.

KUNDER, M. de. The size of the World Wide Web (The Internet). 2025. Available at: https://worldwidewebsize.com/. Accessed: 7 Oct. 2026.

LEONHARD, Gerd. Digital Ethics & AI Power. Available at: https://gerdleonhard.com/digital-ethics-ai-power/. Accessed: 8 Oct. 2026.

MANDEL, E. O capitalismo tardio [Late capitalism]. Translated by Carlos Eduardo Silveira Matos, Regis de Castro Andrade, and Dinah de Abreu Azevedo. 2nd ed. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1985. 416 p. (The economists).

MARTINS, L. M. A formação social da personalidade do professor: um enfoque vigtskiano [The social formation of the teacher's personality: a Vygotskian approach]. 2nd ed. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 2015. (Teacher education series).

MARX, K. O Capital: crítica da economia política [Capital: a critique of political economy]. Book I. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.

MARX, K.; NETTO, J. P. Miséria da filosofia: resposta à filosofia da miséria do Sr. Proudhon [The poverty of philosophy: a response to Mr. Proudhon's philosophy of poverty]. Translated by José Paulo Netto. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2017. 214 p. (Marx-Engels series).

MUCCI, T. A história da IA [The history of AI]. 2024. Available at: https://www.ibm.com/br-pt/think/topics/history-of-artificial-intelligence. Accessed: 7 Oct. 2026.

PAIXÃO, J. L. da et al. Superando o ensino tradicional: metodologias ativas, engajamento discente e aprendizagem significativa [Overcoming traditional teaching: active methodologies, student engagement, and meaningful learning]. Revista Cadernos Cajuína. Teresina, v. 11, n. 3, pp. 1–18, 2026.

ROSATELLI, M. C., & Self, J. A. Supporting distance learning from case studies. In S. P. Lajoie, & M. Vivet (Eds.), Proceedings of 9th international conference on artificial intelligence in education, pp. 457–564, April 2000.

ROSENFIELD, C. L. ALMEIDA, J. Plataformização do trabalho [Platformization of work]. Sociologias. Porto Alegre, year 23, n. 57, pp. 9–16, 2021.

ROVETTA, O. M. Aprendizagem da docência de licenciandos em matemática: um movimento de estudo e organização de ações de ensino de geometria no clube de matemática [Learning to teach among mathematics student teachers: a movement of study and organization of geometry teaching actions in the mathematics club]. 2025. 245 sheets. Thesis (Doctorate in Science and Mathematics Education)—Instituto Federal do Espírito Santo, Vila Velha, 2025.

SÁNCHEZ VÁZQUEZ, A. As ideias estéticas de Marx [Marx's aesthetic ideas]. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2011.

SEKI, A. K. O capital financeiro no Ensino Superior brasileiro (1990–2018) [Financial capital in Brazilian higher education (1990–2018)] [electronic resource] / Allan Kenji Seki. Florianópolis: Editoria Em Debate/UFSC, 2021.

SONDERMANN, D. Diálogos sobre o design educacional: fundamentos, modelos e inteligência artificial [Dialogues on educational design: foundations, models, and artificial intelligence]. Vitória, ES: Edifes Acadêmico, 2026.

TAHIRU, F. AI in Education: A Systematic Literature Review. Journal of Cases on Information Technology. United States, v. 20, pp. 1–20, 2021.