Open Minds

Internacional Journal

ISSN 2675-5157 vol. 2, n. 3, 2026

ARTICLE 2

Acceptance date: 13/02/2026

BETWEEN ALGORITHMS AND RESUMES: THE RESUME IN DISPUTE IN THE AGE OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Patrícia Pinheiro de Sant'Ana
PUIC São Paulo
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7765-3392

Maria da Graça Moreira da Silva
PUC São Paulo

Abstract: This article analyzes the tensions between the instrumental use and critical pedagogical appropriation of generative artificial intelligence (GAI) in higher education, considering its curricular and institutional implications. It starts from the assumption that the incorporation of GAI into pedagogical practices is not restricted to individual decisions by teachers, but is conditioned by institutional policies, models of educational innovation, and conceptions of curriculum. The research adopts a mixed methodological approach, combining quantitative data from an institutional survey conducted at Senac São Paulo with qualitative analysis of in-depth interviews with higher education teachers. The analysis revealed four central axes: purposes attributed to IAGen, impacts on authorship and evaluation, student engagement, and conceptions of technology. The results indicate the coexistence of technological instrumentalization practices and experiences guided by critical pedagogical mediation, revealing contradictions between technical innovation and curricular intentionality. It is concluded that the critical appropriation of IAGen requires explicit institutional policies, continuous teacher training, and curricular integration guided by ethical-political principles.

Keywords: higher education; curriculum; educational policy; educational technology; artificial intelligence.

Introduction

The rapid dissemination of generative artificial intelligence (GAI) tools in higher education has led to significant changes in pedagogical practices, assessment processes, and forms of academic knowledge production. Systems based on large-scale language models have become part of study routines, teaching planning, and textual production, often without systematic pedagogical mediation or clear institutional guidelines. In this context, tensions arise between predominantly instrumental uses of technology and proposals for critical pedagogical appropriation, guided by curricular intentions and formative principles.

From a curriculum perspective, the incorporation of technologies cannot be understood as simply adding tools to teaching and learning processes, but rather as a reconfiguration of practices, knowledge, and power relations that permeate educational institutions. As argued in the critical literature in the field of curriculum, technologies actively participate in the organization of pedagogical work and the definition of what counts as legitimate knowledge, influencing both teaching practices and students' ways of learning.

The emergence of IAGen intensifies this debate by introducing devices capable of producing texts, images, sounds, and codes, putting pressure on conceptions of authorship, evaluation, and creativity. This reconfiguration of authorship processes highlights what Feenberg (2003) calls the "ambivalence of technology": the same devices that can expand expressive and creative capacity can also standardize and automate thinking, depending on the interests and rationalities that guide their institutional use.

At the same time, institutional policies for educational innovation often emphasize the adoption of technological solutions as a strategy for modernization, not always accompanied by in-depth pedagogical reflection. As Ball (2012) warns, these policies

operate according to global networks that privilege market solutions, subordinating pedagogical issues to imperatives of efficiency and control.

Given this scenario, this study investigates how higher education teachers have incorporated IAGen into their pedagogical practices and how these practices are articulated with curriculum concepts and institutional policies on the use of educational technologies. The question that guides the research can be summarized as follows: is the use of IAGen in higher education a form of critical pedagogical appropriation, or is it limited to a technological instrumentalization conditioned by institutional policies and innovation models?

The objective of this article is to analyze the tensions between the instrumental use and critical appropriation of IAGen, considering both teaching practices in the classroom and the institutional context that guides or limits these practices.

Theoretical Framework

Curriculum, technology, and pedagogical mediation

Critical approaches to curriculum understand school knowledge as a social and historical construct, traversed by political and cultural disputes. In this sense, technology is neither neutral nor merely instrumental (Feenberg, 2003; Selwyn, 2016), but acts as a mediation that reorganizes pedagogical practices (Buckingham, 2022), school times, and forms of assessment. Authors such as Valente (1998; 2018) emphasize that the educational potential of digital technologies depends on how they are integrated into the curriculum, as they can reinforce instructional models or favor constructionist and collaborative practices.

Sacristán (2010) conceives the curriculum as a practice that is constructed at the intersection between educational policies, school culture, and teaching action, while Young (2008) draws attention to the role of the curriculum in the organization and legitimization of socially relevant school knowledge. From this perspective, pedagogical mediation takes center stage. This discussion is directly in line with Freire (1986), for whom critical education presupposes dialogue, problematization, and the production of meaning, elements that are weakened when technology is used in an uncritical and automated way. Complementarily, Feenberg (2003), based on Critical Theory of Technology, argues that technical artifacts incorporate social values and interests, being the result of political and economic choices. Thus, the adoption of technologies in education also implies the adoption of certain models of rationality, often guided by efficiency, standardization, and control.

IAGen and education

IAGen differs from other AI applications in its ability to produce new content based on statistical patterns extracted from large volumes of data. In education, its use has been associated with both learning support strategies and academic task automation practices. Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019), in a systematic review of AI applications in higher education, identified that most implementations focus on administrative and automation tasks, rarely integrating with proposals for profound pedagogical transformation. In the Brazilian context,

recent studies point to risks and contradictions related to the potential displacement of teaching functions and the need for public debate on the impacts of these technologies on the social role of the university (Oliveira; Santos, 2025). An integrated analysis of the literature reveals two trends in the field: one instrumental, focused on the use of AI as a resource for the pragmatic improvement of practices; and another critical, which seeks to understand the limits and ethical and epistemological challenges of this technology in school organization and curriculum policies (Sant'Ana, 2025).

When AIGen technologies are used to automate text production without critical reflection, there is a risk of reinforcing the banking logic (Freire, 1986), replacing authorship with algorithmic reproduction and critical thinking with operational efficiency. Pedagogical mediation, therefore, should be guided by the pursuit of intellectual autonomy of the subjects, rather than by subordination to *the* automated *outputs* of machines.

On the other hand, when inserted into pedagogical proposals guided by problematization, authorship, and critical reflection, IAGen can contribute to the development of complex cognitive skills and the expansion of students' expressive repertoire. This ambivalence reinforces the need for curricular and institutional analysis of the ways in which technology is incorporated.

The ambivalence of IAGen is directly linked to what Feenberg (2003) calls "technical code": technological systems not only perform functions, but also incorporate values, priorities, and power relations. In the case of large-scale language models, the technical code reflects choices about which data were used in training, which linguistic patterns are privileged, and which forms of knowledge are legitimized. Thus, the pedagogical incorporation of IAGen cannot ignore its political and epistemological dimension. As Young (2008) argues, the curriculum defines what counts as legitimate knowledge, and technological mediation actively participates in this definition. For this reason, curricular reflection on IAGen must question not only how to use the tool, but also what knowledge, languages, and forms of thought it tends to reproduce or marginalize.

Institutional policy and technological governance

From the perspective of educational policies, the incorporation of digital technologies in higher education institutions occurs amid regulatory dynamics that often privilege discourses of innovation, efficiency, and modernization, to the detriment of more in-depth pedagogical and curricular debates. Ball (2012) analyzes this movement as part of global policy networks that reconfigure educational management according to business logic, shifting responsibility for the implementation of technological reforms to the level of teaching practice.

Apple (2013), in turn, warns that such processes tend to reinforce inequalities and subordinate the curriculum to interests external to the school community, weakening the democratic debate on the purposes of education. Sacristán (2010) argues that the curriculum is not limited to what is prescribed, but is constructed in the daily practice of teachers. When this practice is permeated by technologies whose rationalities have not been pedagogically problematized, there is a risk that the curriculum in action will un-

critically reproduce the values embedded in technological systems.

In this context, the absence of clear institutional guidelines for the use of AI contributes to the fragmentation of pedagogical practices, producing individual and disjointed responses, which compromises the construction of coherent and socially referenced curriculum projects.

The construction of these institutional guidelines requires rigorous ethical foundations. Floridi (2024) offers a relevant conceptual framework for educational institutions through his approach to AI ethics, proposing fundamental principles that should guide the development and use of intelligent systems: transparency, responsibility, fairness, and explainability. In the pedagogical sphere, these principles translate into the need for students and teachers to have access to clear information about how AI processes data, generates responses, and influences assessment processes. The author also introduces the concept of "distributed moral agency," recognizing that ethical responsibility in the use of AI cannot be attributed exclusively to developers or end users, but constitutes a shared responsibility among multiple actors: development companies, educational institutions, managers, teachers, and students. This perspective reinforces the urgency of training processes that develop digital ethical skills at all levels of the academic community, overcoming approaches that reduce ethics in AI to technical protocols or formal statements of compliance. The auditability and interpretability of algorithmic systems, discussed by Floridi (2024), are necessary conditions for higher education to exercise its critical function, allowing teachers and students not only to use, but also to understand, question, and, wh ly necessary, resist the rationalities embedded in the technologies that mediate educational processes.

Institutional policies play a central role in defining the conditions for the use of technologies; training programs, ethical guidelines, adequate infrastructure, and the availability of current assessment models directly influence teaching practices. According to Apple (2013), holding teachers individually accountable—without the corresponding investment in training, infrastructure, and institutional support—is a political strategy that masks structural contradictions in the educational system. In the case of IAGen, transferring the decision on how, when, and why to use these tools exclusively to teachers intensifies inequalities among both teachers and students, reproducing asymmetries in access, digital skills, and, consequently, cultural capital.

Methodology

The research adopts a mixed methodological approach. The quantitative component is based on an institutional report produced by Senac São Paulo on the use of IAGen by higher education teachers, with the application of a structured questionnaire and the participation of teachers from different areas and teaching modalities. The survey covered frequency of use, types of tools employed, and pedagogical purposes attributed to IAGen.

The qualitative component consisted of in-depth interviews with three university teachers who use IAGen tools in their pedagogical practices. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed through thematic categorization into four analytical axes: (a) uses and purposes attributed to IAGen; (b)

autonomy, authorship, and teacher evaluation; (c) student engagement and pedagogical innovation; and (d) conceptions of technology (critical vs. reproductive).

Results and Discussion

In this topic, the data are analyzed in dialogue with the theoretical framework of the field of curriculum, technology, and institutional policy, seeking to understand whether the practices observed are closer to critical pedagogical appropriation or remain limited to instrumental uses of IAGen.

The following is a summary of the data produced in table format.

The data indicate a predominance of uses aimed at optimizing teaching tasks and providing operational support for academic activities, characterizing a predominantly instrumental appropriation of technology. This pattern also appears in the teachers' statements, as in the following excerpt: "I use it more to prepare material and save time, mainly to organize examples and activities" (Interviewee 1).

The centrality of efficiency gains reinforces the interpretation that technology has been used primarily as operational support rather than as an element of curricular reorganization. This finding is consistent with what Valente (1998) calls the use of technology as a "teaching machine."

Valente (1998) already warned that the incorporation of computers into education could reinforce instructional models if there were no change in the underlying pedagogical concepts. Decades later, the same tension is evident with IAGen: the most sophisticated technology can serve limited educational purposes when its integration into the curriculum remains subordinate to the rationality of efficiency. Sacristán (2010) reminds us that the curriculum is materialized in practice, and that this practice is mediated by institutional, political, and cultural conditions. If the institution privileges discourses of innovation without investing in teacher training and without promoting spaces for collective reflection, practices tend to reproduce what Apple (2006) calls the "hidden curriculum": values, priorities, and rationalities that operate implicitly, without conscious pedagogical questioning or deliberation.

The insecurity reported by teachers regarding the criteria of originality and authorship highlights an institutional gap. Freire (1986) emphasizes that education should train individuals capable of "reading the world," of critically understanding the mediations that constitute their reality. When textual production is mediated by algorithmic systems without questioning their functioning, limitations, and biases, the educational process loses its critical dimension. Assessment practices should value the ability to question and transform the *outputs* of technology, not just detect its use.

One of the teachers states: "There is a lack of institutional guidance; each teacher ends up deciding for themselves what they can and cannot do with AI" (Interviewee 2). As Freire (1986) argues, critical education presupposes authorship, dialogue, and the production of meaning, which becomes problematic when automated tools begin to mediate textual production without clear pedagogical criteria.

This fragmentation reflects the transfer of responsibility to teachers without the creation of adequate institutional conditions, widening inequalities between those who

Purpose of use	Approximate incidence	Examples of reported practices
Teaching planning	High (over 60%)	Generation of examples, lesson plans, exercises, , and case studies
Support for student production	Average (around 40%)	Textual revision, organization of ideas, content synthesis
Assessment and feedback	Low (less than 25%)	Question preparation, support for rubric construction
Critical-reflective use in class	Very low (less than 15%)	Discussion of algorithmic biases, analysis of AI functioning

Table 1. Types of use of IAGen in teaching practices.

Source: Senac São Paulo institutional report (own elaboration).

Category	Empirical indicators	Curricular interpretation
Instrumental use	Task automation, rapid content generation	Reinforcement of instructional practices and focus on efficiency
Critical pedagogical appropriation	Activities that question AI in the classroom	Curricular integration oriented toward epistemological reflection
Authorship and evaluation	Uncertainty about plagiarism and originality	Need to review evaluation criteria
Institutional mediation	Absence of formal guidelines	Fragmentation and individualization of pedagogical decisions

Table 2. Analytical categories and empirical indicators.

Source: Interviews with teachers (own elaboration).

Institutional aspect	Effect observed in practices
Ad hoc teacher training	Use restricted to operational functions of AI
Absence of institutional ethical guidelines	Uncertainty in assessment and student use
Encouragement of technological innovation	Accelerated adoption without curricular reflection
Lack of integration into the pedagogical project	Difficulty in consolidating critical practices

Table 3. Relationship between institutional policy and pedagogical practices.

Source: Interviews and institutional document analysis (own elaboration).

have greater cultural capital and those who most need educational support (Ball, 2012; Apple, 2013). In the context observed, the lack of curricular integration of IAGen produces isolated experiences, preventing the construction of collective repertoires and the consolidation of critical and socially referenced pedagogical practices.

Even when there is openness to experimentation, teachers report a lack of articulation with the pedagogical project of the courses: "we test it on our own, but it is not part of the course planning" (Interviewee 1).

The predominance of instrumental uses is in line with the findings of Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019), who identified a concentration on administrative and automation tasks. This trend updates the technocratic rationality that reduces educational processes to optimizable operations, neglecting the political and ethical dimensions of education, historical patterns identified by Watters (2021) in his analysis of "teaching machines."

Final Considerations

Analysis of the research findings shows that the incorporation of IAGen in higher education occurs in a context marked by contradictions between technological innovation and curricular intentionality. Although there are experiences of critical pedagogical appropriation, they remain in the minority and heavily dependent on the individual initiative of teachers.

Overcoming the contradiction between the emancipatory potential and alienating aspects of GenAI (Vieira Pinto, 2024) requires the development of ethical and transparent protocols that involve all educational actors (Floridi, 2024), resisting the commodification of learning processes (Zuboff, 2021). This implies understanding technology as cultural and political mediation (Feenberg, 2003), guided by problematization, dialogue, and collective knowledge production (Freire, 1986), allowing students not only to operate technological systems but also to question their foundations and implications (Young, 2008).

References

Apple, M. W. (2013). *Can education change society*? Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1995) *Trabalho docente e textos*. Artes Médicas.

Apple, M. W. (2006) *Ideologia e currículo*. Artes Médicas.

Ball, S. J. (2012*). Global education Inc.*: New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary. Routledge.

Buckingham, D. (2022). *Manifesto pela educação midiática.* Edição Sesc.

Feenberg, A. (2003). *Transforming technology*: A critical theory revisited. Oxford University Press.

Freire, P. (1986). *Pedagogia da autonomia*: saberes necessários à prática educativa. Paz e Terra.

Floridi, L. (2024). *A ética da inteligência artificial*: princípios, desafios e oportunidades. PUCPRESS.

Oliveira, R. N.; Santos, D. P. A. (2025). Uso da inteligência artificial na educação: uma revisão integrativa das publicações de 2023 e 2024 na Revista Brasileira de Informática na Educação. *Revista Carioca de Ciência, Tecnologia e Educação*, v. 9, n. 2, p. 54-69.

Sacristán, J. G. (2010). La función abierta de la obra y su contenido. *Revista Electrónica Sinéctica*, n. 34.

Sant'Ana, P. P. (2025). Inteligência artificial generativa no ensino superior:

entre tensões e potencialidades na prática pedagógica. Dissertação de mestrado. PUC-SP.

Selwyn, N. (2016). *Is Technology Good for Education?* Polity Press.

Valente, J. A. (1998). *O computador na sociedade do conhecimento*. UNICAMP.

Valente, J. A. (2018). *Tecnologias digitais e educação: desafios e possibilidades*. PUC-SP.

Vieira Pinto, A. (2024) *O conceito de Tecnologia.* Vol. 1. Contraponto.

Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education -where are the educators*? International Journal of Educational Technology in HigherEducation* 16:39 https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

ZUBOFF, S. (2021). *A era do capitalismo de vigilância.* Intrínseca.

Watters, A. (2021). *Teaching machines*: the history of personalized learning. MIT Press.

Young, M. F. D. (2008). *Bringing Knowledge Back In*: From Social Constructivism to Social Realism in the Sociology of Education. Routledge.