

**The author in the voracious night: educating researchers in the
age of Generative Artificial Intelligence**

*O autor na noite voraz: formação de pesquisadores em tempos
de Inteligência Artificial Generativa*

*El autor en la noche voraz: formación de investigadores en
tiempos de Inteligencia Artificial Generativa*

*L'auteur dans la nuit vorace: formation des chercheurs à l'ère
de l' Intelligence Artificielle Générative*

Jaciara de Sá Carvalho

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas (PUC-Campinas), Campinas/SP, Brazil
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1497-3930>
jaciara.sa@puc-campinas.edu.br

João Luís Peçanha Couto

Universidade Estácio de Sá (Unesa), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8470-6419>
joaoluizpecanhacouto@gmail.com

Adriana Rocha Bruno

Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (Unirio), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5646-8919>
arbruno2208@gmail.com

Abstract

The article examines what distinguishes humans from other beings in a context shaped by the contemporary centrality of Generative Artificial Intelligence. It argues that, beyond technical or cognitive abilities, it is the capacity for narration that singularizes human experience, as suggested by Huston. Narrative, understood as an exercise of authorship grounded in lived experience, is articulated with Walter Benjamin's reflections on experience, as well as with Plato's allegory of the cave, in order to problematize the limits of generative AI outputs. The text contends that the education of researchers, particularly at graduate level, should prioritize the development of narrative capacity as a critical and authorial dimension. It concludes that, although generative AI may support the problematization of reality, it is

through the narration of lived experience that the ethical and critical (self-)formation of researchers is constituted.

Keywords: Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI); narrative; writing; researcher education; subjectivity.

Resumo

O artigo problematiza o que distingue os humanos de outros seres em um contexto marcado pela centralidade contemporânea da Inteligência Artificial Generativa (IAGen). Sustenta-se que, mais do que a capacidade técnica ou cognitiva, é a faculdade de narrar que singulariza a experiência humana, conforme Huston. Uma narrativa, entendida como exercício de autoria ancorada no vivido, é articulada às contribuições de Walter Benjamin sobre a experiência, bem como à metáfora da caverna de Platão, para tensionar os limites das produções da IAGen. O texto defende que a formação de pesquisadores, especialmente na pós-graduação, deve priorizar o desenvolvimento da capacidade narrativa como dimensão crítica e autoral. Conclui-se que, embora a IAGen possa apoiar a problematização do real, é por meio da narração do vivido que se constitui a (auto)formação ética e crítica de pesquisadores.

Palavras-chaves: inteligência artificial generativa (IAGen); narrativa; escrita; formação de pesquisadores; subjetividade.

Resumen

El artículo problematiza lo que distingue a los seres humanos de otros seres en un contexto marcado por la centralidad contemporánea de la Inteligencia Artificial Generativa. Se sostiene que, más allá de la capacidad técnica o cognitiva, es la facultad de narrar la que singulariza la experiencia humana, según Huston. La narrativa, entendida como un ejercicio de autoría anclado en lo vivido, se articula con las contribuciones de Walter Benjamin sobre la experiencia, así como con la metáfora de la caverna de Platón, para tensionar los límites de las producciones de la IAGen. El texto defiende que la formación de investigadores, especialmente en el posgrado, debe priorizar el desarrollo de la capacidad narrativa como una dimensión crítica y autoral. Se concluye que, aunque la IAGen puede apoyar la problematización de lo real, es a través de la narración de lo vivido que se constituye la (auto)formación ética y crítica de los investigadores.

Palabras-clave: inteligencia artificial generativa (IAGen); narrativa; formación de investigadores; subjetividad.

Resumé

L'article problématise ce qui distingue les êtres humains des autres êtres dans un contexte marqué par la centralité contemporaine de l'Intelligence Artificielle Générative. Il soutient que, plus que les aptitudes techniques ou cognitives, c'est la faculté de narrer qui singularise l'expérience humaine, selon Huston. La narration, comprise comme un exercice d'autorité ancré dans le vécu, est mise en relation avec les contributions de Walter Benjamin sur l'expérience, ainsi qu'avec la métaphore de la caverne de Platon, afin de mettre en tension les limites des productions de l'IAGen. Le texte défend que la formation des chercheurs, notamment au niveau du troisième cycle, doit prioriser le développement de la capacité narrative en tant que dimension critique et d'autorité. Il conclut que, bien que l'IAGen puisse soutenir la problématisation du réel, c'est par la narration du vécu que se constitue l'(auto)formation éthique et critique des chercheurs.

Mots-clés: intelligence artificielle générative (IAGen); narration; écriture; formation des chercheurs; subjectivité.

1 Introduction

What distinguishes humans from other living beings? We have long come up with possible answers, shared through the arts and sciences. Today, the focus of the living has increasingly shifted to issues involving Artificial Intelligence and promises of its increasingly human nature. Until they are, or not, fulfilled, we agree with Nancy Huston (2010) that our ability to narrate is unique. And if narrating makes us human, our deeds do not cease to be narratives to create, modify, and make the world “world”.

There are many possible facets to be discussed regarding the writing process in educational research training. The theme of this dossier invites us to reflect on the urgency of the problem with automating part or all of this process from the perspective of the constitution of the subject through digital technologies based on techniques of generative Artificial Intelligence (gen-AI).

Educational research, as a human achievement, narrates scientific production fundamentally through writing. Writing under academic auspices is process and product, challenge and glory, inherent to the practice of research, the training of researchers, and the constitution of these subjectivities. Narrating through academic writing is neither the most pleasant nor the most agile task, qualities so coveted in contemporary times. But artificial intelligence-based features proliferate that promise everything from quick writing to promoting certain pleasures. “Writing is [also] taking risks; it is exposing oneself to public debate” (Diniz, 2013, p. 72), and, for those researchers who do not fear or seek greater exposure, automation with AI contributes to increased productivity, albeit under the growing criticism of academic productivism.

In fact, scientific narratives in Brazilian universities have been mostly produced by researchers and postgraduates who sometimes begin with work related to scientific initiation at undergraduate level. They learn that an academic text describes the way in which the researcher constructed the object and how they share it with the reader, and this can be focused on a aspects or something that seeks to be unprecedented in this construction. Experienced researchers, Ghedin and Franco (2011, p. 83) recall that “the realization or the result of a piece of research in the area of Human Sciences is the consequence of a process of explanation, understanding, and interpretation of reality”.

Although it is linked to the situation in which it is produced and to other texts, the writing has an unfinished nature due to its linguistic-historical materiality. According to

Orlandi (2001), its unfinished nature contributes to enable its reading at different times and linked to the context it is being read in. For Stein (1996 *apud* Ghedin; Franco, 2011, p. 95-96), the texts of a field “are worthless if they are not read in different eras and, to some extent, surpassed by interpretation and by other works that refer to them and intend to present their truth in a new way”.

In some respect, “novelty” can be created in the way the researcher’s “truth” is narrated by them. But what can be said of “novelty” when the object is, in part, automated through statistical calculations that recover old narratives? These old narratives might probably be identified by experienced researchers in the feedback provided by generative Artificial Intelligence applications, at least in parts of the writing, but researchers in training may not only repeat outdated narratives but also compromise their subjectivities.

2 Gen-AIs in academic research

The automation of education through Artificial Intelligence techniques is expanding in leaps and bounds, following the historical trend of education and technology studies, with discourses affected by a kind of exacerbated optimism or pessimism (Lima, Ferreira, Carvalho, 2024). It seems no different in academic research that has been using generative Artificial Intelligence resources in its practices.

The topics listed by Ramos (2023), summarized below, show that academic writing with AI permeates various axes, not only as a product, but also as a research process, affecting the researcher’s (self)training and improvement of their practices, whether they are a beginner or an experienced researcher. This raises many questions on the complex topic of authorship, although they predate the expansion of gen-AI.

Table 1 – Uses of gen-AI tools in the academic production process

Stage of the academic process	Possibilities of use
Research design	Hypothesis generation; literature review; meta-analysis; abstract; idea extraction; research project.
Scientific writing	Assistant writer; language translation; text converter; paraphrase; data interpretation; title and keyword generation; reference management.
Editing and proofreading	Vocabulary enhancer; grammar checker; spelling checker; consistency checker; citation checker.
Academic publishing	Journal finder; journal style formatter; journal peer review; ethical compliance checker; technical compliance checker.

Source: Ramos (2023).

From a more instrumental perspective, the practice of authorship in academic writing without such resources results from a patchwork of paraphrases from other texts, from research data and findings, and from the positions of the author of the work – both in the structure of the text and explicitly. However, it also involves a component of the constitution of subjectivity, as we will explore below. From undergraduate to graduate, Diniz (2013) recalls that researchers resort mainly to paraphrase for the presentation of a literature review, elaboration of a research problem, presentation of a theoretical framework and discussion of findings. It is possible to find paraphrases even in the final considerations of research in the humanities, which can be quite problematic.

In the dynamics of language, Orlandi (2001) explains that repetition and displacement are two fundamental processes. Paraphrase refers to this repetition and maintenance, functioning as a memorial matrix or collection. Polysemy represents displacement, openness and the possibility of rupture, referring to creativity. As Orlandi, we understand that a paraphrase can easily be automated; on the other hand, polysemy, due to its disruptive nature, does not result from a statistical probabilistic chain and, therefore, gen-AI applications show limitations. Thus, polysemy is associated with authorship, which gives identity to the text and is integrated into the subjectivity of the author, the narrator.

Gen-AI writing results from a statistical procedure of frequent use of a word after the previous one. The use of language is almost always correct, which suggests scientific rigor and neutrality, in addition to the illusion of “truth”, but contradicts the authorial marks of the researcher, either in the choice of words from their lexical universe, or in the form of engendering ideas – an action that, in turn, is also part of their (continuing) training process as a researcher and producer of knowledge. For Henriques (2025, p. 13), scholarly writing calls for the unpredictable, the imaginative, and constitutes itself as political writing:

Scholarly writing sets out towards what is alien, to what is not mastered and, if possible, to what cannot be conceived in advance, most often with familiar language. The scholar does not need to know which are the most accessible or the most cryptic authors but must know those whose company enables better question. Writing, once in progress, complexifies the path, asking for the unpredictable. It separates itself from all ease and imagines an intellectual community experience, in which several people think at the same time, in order to constitute itself as political writing. The political field is neither the exercise of completeness nor the hypothesis that all has been said, but the arena of infinite reformulation. Scholarly writing can always be intercepted, as the political order always awaits its interruption.

In this context, and in education, it may be essential not to forget that reading and writing are formative activities not only for the promotion of researchers but also for their

constitution and intellectual density. Batkhin (1992), Vygotsky (2007) and other authors emphasize that thought and language are not separate entities. Automating the production of abstracts, paraphrases, threads of ideas, and concepts certainly has consequences for the intellectual training of researchers, as well as for the production of knowledge.

Concerned about this scenario, some researchers have been focusing on the human implications resulting from gen-AI or large-scale language models (LLMs), such as Kosmina *et al.* study (2025) on the neural and behavioral consequences of LLMs-assisted essay writing.

Over the course of four months, LLM users underperformed at neural, linguistic, and behavioral levels. These findings raise concerns about the educational implications, [...] of the role of AI in learning processes (Kosmina *et al.*, 2025).

The elements pointed out involve tensioning what may or may not be automated by the gen-AI, the implications for the development of academic research in the current context, the limitations of gen-AI in the process of narrating and being an author. The question of subjectivity is undoubtedly one of the aspects at play.

3 Subjectivities

Subjectivity is understood as the constitution of a singular and inner point of view about the world, woven by lived experiences, affections, emotions and the feeling of self, and that cannot be limited to algorithmic operations or quantifiable data. In addition, human subjectivity is inextricably linked to the bodily condition, configuring itself as the very experience of a living organism. According to Gonzales Rey and Patiño Torres (2017, p. 123), subjectivity is

[...] the complex way in which the human psyche participates in the development of people and all human processes. Unlike subjectivism, subjectivity allows us a conception of mind that is inseparable from the history, culture, and current contexts of human social life. Subjectivity emerges when emotion becomes sensitive to symbolic records, allowing humans to produce upon the world in which they live, and not simply to adapt to it.

Antidicotomic, the idea of subjectivity presented by this author disregards the frequent polarization that opposes subject and object, reason and emotion, *yin* and *yang*, singular and plural etc., because subjectivity is articulating, integrating and rhizomatic. The subject is historical, cultural, psychic, environmental, pedagogical, biological and linguistic. The subject constitutes themselves with the other through language; language and the other singularize and pluralize him. According to Bakhtin (1992, p. 318), “an utterance is opened

by the distant and almost inaudible resonance of the alternation of the speaking subjects and by the dialogical nuances, by the extremely tenuous borders between the utterances”.

Although we understand a prompt as an utterance, the developments (production) from such an utterance by a gen-AI will be different from those developed by a human, since the latter integrates polysemy, polyphony and subjectivity.

Gen-AIs simulate the subject, perform subjectivity and do it in a very convincing way. As Peixoto (2025) warns, such devices are increasingly straining the boundaries between human and non-human; and this is apparent when young people/teenagers narrate that they prefer to undergo therapy with gen-AI. But, thought they simulate it, often convincingly, gen-AI do not live experiences, they are not “alive”.

AI has no conscious experience, does not suffer, does not want, does not feel shame or anguish. What it does is to operate with statistical models of language based on human patterns. It is as if it learns the way humans express subjectivity and reproduces it with great competence (Peixoto, 2025, n/p).

In simpler terms: it seems, but it is not. The problem is that many may believe that it is, rather, they believe that they can submit, share, and entrust their subjectivities to machines, disregarding the risks and consequences for human life. The subject cannot be reduced to a prompt.

By returning to the idea that humans are constituted with the other through language and narration, what happens when gen-AI convincingly simulates language as well? As Peixoto (2025) asks: Where is the limit?

It is important to understand that to narrate is to assume authorship, and this phenomenon also occurs through subjectivities. The constitution of the subjects implies, to list a few, contradictory, critical, and creative movements. As Rodrigues, Nunes and Albuquerque Junior (2026, p. 251) warn, when approaching gen-AI and subjects, “psychoanalysis indicates that language, misconception, and lack are not like noises to be eliminated, but elements that form desire and social bond”. Therefore, polysemy, polyphony, subjectivity, affections, authorship and contradictions comprise the subject. All this occurs in a certain historical and cultural context and, currently, in one of the main cultures: digital culture.

4 Digital decolonialities: culture and ethics

Digital culture is a space for producing subjectivities and not only for consuming hegemonic technologies, such as the various AI resources available. In today’s context, when

narratives are mixed and can be confused, another element is presented to deepen the debate, especially when we deal with gen-AI: ethics. It imposes many reflections and acts, and here the algorithmic biases stand out calling for changes in what Faustino and Lippold (2023) call digital colonialism: reproduction of social coloniality, demanding resistance and, therefore, decolonial movements.

Decolonization goes beyond mere awareness of the use of digital technologies, demanding the restructuring of the mechanisms that support and legitimize technological control. In this horizon, it is essential to foster a critical reading about the functioning of these systems – considering both the algorithms and the economic and corporate interests that permeate them – as a condition for engendering forms of resistance. Thus, by articulating the notion of digital coloniality to a critique anchored in human, cultural, and political dimensions, the understanding of the ways in which technologies, on a global scale, reiterate and deepen historically constituted inequalities is broadened. As Faustino and Lippold (2023) argue, the persistence of an exploitative dynamics in digital capitalism reinforces this picture, evidencing that digital colonialism can be understood as a new form of expropriation, supported by neoliberal rationality, although open to challenge through collective actions. Faced with the concentration of digital power, it becomes more than urgent that we overcome colonialism, which is also digital, and is strongly reflected in generative artificial intelligences.

But what does this have to do with academic research, narratives and subjectivities?

Algorithmic bias is born through culture, mirroring societies, and the texts produced by gen-AI are impregnated by the context. As much as they reflect and perform subjectivity, these devices do not create, critically, and are incapable of accessing aspects such as consciousness, desire, affection and even contradiction. Thus, platforms such as *Smart Sampa*¹ cannot distinguish the bad guy from the good guy and make serious mistakes, derived from digital colonialism, such as the case of a man who has already been arrested four times for being “mistaken for a fugitive for murder in Mato Grosso”².

¹ According to the website of the city of São Paulo, it is “the largest security monitoring system in Latin America, which uses facial recognition from smart cameras to identify cases of urban violence and police fugitives, as well as help find missing people” (<https://smartsampa.prefeitura.sp.gov.br/>). However, data from the Public Policy and Internet Laboratory (LAPIN) reveal that “the municipality’s video monitoring and facial recognition system has generated false positives, improper arrests and privacy risks, without concrete results for public safety” (<https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/geral/noticia/2026-02/pesquisa-aponta-problemas-e-prisoese-indevidas-partir-do-smart-sampa>). Accessed: 30 Mar. 2026.

² Available at: <https://almapreta.com.br/sessao/cotidiano/smart-sampa-erro-homem-negro-detido/>. Accessed: 30 Mar. 2026.

This data reflects both the limitations of gen-AI productions and the breadth that subjective aspects have. Added to this, the discussion on authorship enters the debate and finds a strong alliance in narratives. There is some consensus that gen-AIs are not authors and that humans are undoubtedly authors – of the products generated with gen-IA as well as of the prompts and all production that feeds gen-AI.

In a context in which platforms, algorithms, and big data alter relations in societies, surveillance capitalism as conceived by Zuboff (2020) expresses the reconfiguration of the dynamics of domination, to the extent that capital, by capturing and exploiting human experiences through data extraction, wants to transform subjectivity itself into a commodity. Are subjectivities monetizable? We do not intend to give answers to this question, but to provoke reflection.

5 Benjamin's cave

The adoption of responsible practices marked by scientific rigor in the use and dissemination of gen-AI technologies is a reality in our universities. As such, gen-AI applications may be used to support certain processes as in the case of students who have difficulties writing and advancing writing. AI may suggest the organization of part of the text and the development of an idea so that the researcher in training can produce an essay. In parallel, there is also the possibility that the student will see gen-AI as a machine for writing and delegating such a task to it, renouncing the potentialities mentioned above.

Regarding research writing in education, there is much to be investigated and discussed, although there is consensus among higher education and scientific institutions regarding the defense of principles such as transparency and accountability. In this regard, in March 2026, the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) instituted the “integrity policy in the scientific activity of the CNPq” (Brasil, 2026), whose guidelines influence actions beyond the scope of the council, such as the research activities of graduate programs.

How to contribute to researcher training in education in times of expansion of practices with gen-AI? How do singularities, contexts, and particularities of research participants align with prompts of these types of resources, since neutrality does not exist? To seek to answer the questions above, considering a possible scope, we will need to retrace some steps and connect points of tradition in research.

[...] experience's shares are down, and everything indicates that they will continue to fall until their value disappears altogether. Simply look at a

newspaper to realize that its level is lower than ever, and that overnight not only the image of the outside world, but also that of the ethical world underwent transformations that we would not have thought possible before (Benjamin, 2026, p. 198; authors' translation).

In his famous text on the narrator, Walter Benjamin (2026), after stating that modernity has been removing layers of creative power from man, regarding his own possibility of narrating the world and himself, divides narrators into two types.

The first type of narrator, baptized by the German essayist as “traveling narrator” (or “merchant sailor”), is the narrator who, coming from afar, brings exotic stories from distant lands, adventures, and diverse cultures. In this way, his narrative authority comes from his experience of the world, from what he has seen and lived outside, that is, it represents knowledge acquired thanks to movement, circulation, travel. It is Baudelaire’s *flâneur* (2019), figured as the modern urban observer, an idle walker who wanders the Parisian streets, a “passionate spectator” or “asphalt botanist”, who seeks to blend in with the anonymous crowd while recording the movement, transience and beauty of the daily life of the city where he is. This first type of narrator fabulates in the same way.

The second type, for Benjamin, is the “sedentary narrator” (or “peasant/artisan”), one who remains in his place of origin and narrates the world from the impression of those who arrive but draws his attention even more deeply to the local traditions, customs and stories of the community in which he lives. The narrative authority of this specimen lies in the opposite of the first: collective memory and tradition are their essential mortar, from which they defend rooted knowledge, transmitted from generation to generation.

The figure of the narrator only becomes fully tangible if we keep these two groups in mind. “Those who travel have a lot to tell,” people say, and with this they imagine a narrator as someone who comes from afar. But we also listen with pleasure to the man who honestly earned his living without leaving his country and who knows its stories and traditions. If we want to embody these two groups through their archaic representatives, we can say that one is exemplified by the sedentary peasant, and the other by the merchant sailor. In reality, these two lifestyles have in some ways produced their respective families of narrators. Each of them has preserved, over the centuries, their own characteristics (Benjamin, 2026, p. 198-199; authors' translation).

To further illustrate the two patterns of narrators identified by Benjamin, we turn to Italo Calvino, the Italian writer who, in his book *The Invisible Cities* (1990), tells the story of a friendship between the Mongol emperor of the Yuan dynasty, Kublai Khan, and the Venetian adventurer and explorer Marco Polo. Fresh from wandering around the world, Polo finds an emperor caged by bureaucratic impediments created by his own empire. Eager to hear stories of the world outside, the monarch invites the adventurer to stay a few days as

his guest and asks him to tell him about the cities he has seen, the foods and women he has tasted, the cultures he has known: these are the “Invisible Cities” that title Calvino’s work. In Benjamin’s terms, this strange friendship joins a travelling narrator (Marco Polo) filling the imagination of a sedentary narrator (Kublai Khan) with fabulations.

It is not known whether Kublai Khan believes everything Marco Polo says when the latter describes the cities visited in his diplomatic missions, but the emperor of the Tatars certainly continues to listen to the young Venetian with greater curiosity and attention than to any other of his envoys or explorers. There is a moment in the life of emperors that follows the pride in the immense breadth of the territories we have conquered, the melancholy and the relief of knowing that we will soon give up knowing and understanding them, a feeling of emptiness that arises at nightfall with the smell of elephants after the rain and the sandalwood ashes that cool in the braziers, a vertigo that annihilation of the last enemy armies from defeat to defeat, and opening the seal of the seals of Kings who have never been heard of and who beg the protection of our advanced navies in exchange for annual taxes of precious metals, tanned skins and tortoise shells: it is the desperate moment when it is discovered that this empire, which seemed to us the sum of all wonders, is an endless and shapeless splinter, that its corruption is too gangrenous to be remedied by our scepter, that the triumph over the sovereign adversaries of the Empire has made us heirs of its prolonged ruins (Calvino, 1990, p. 9; authors’ translation).

All this brings us to another allegory, this time from the classical era: Plato’s cave. Present in his work *The Republic* (2017), it constitutes one of the most powerful and persistent metaphors of Western tradition and seeks to illustrate two processes of knowledge acquisition. Plato describes a group of people who live chained inside a cave from birth. They are stuck so that they can only look at the wall in front of them. Behind them there is a bonfire, and between the fire and the prisoners people pass carrying objects. The shadows of these objects are cast on the wall, and the prisoners believe that these shadows are the only existing reality. When one of the prisoners of the cave manages to free himself, he realizes that reality is not that represented by the shadows cast on the wall of the cave, and upon returning and telling his discoveries to his companions, he is found and discredited.

It is at this point that we return to what gen-AI represents, regarding the boundaries of scientific knowledge and (more than controversial word, but we risk it) innovation. With unrestricted access to all human knowledge, to the episteme hitherto generated by the species *Homo sapiens sapiens*, gen-AI dwells as if in a gigantic Platonic cave, where all this pompous framework of knowledge is stored. So far, we believe no one disagrees. However, it “only possesses this”: chained, like the inhabitants of platonic allegory, it is not given the possibility of seeing “outside” and allowing itself to fable about it. Thus, the scientific knowledge that, over the centuries, has been created and recorded/dated by human intelligence is available

in the form of data and information: it remains, for science to advance, the articulation between the information, sometimes adding new inputs, sometimes only recombining knowledge to generate new scientific concepts. It was no different, for example, for Einstein in relation to Newton: if the latter did not exist, the lord of the Theory of Relativity would not have reached it.

For her part, Nancy Huston (2010) categorically states that what differentiates the *Homo sapiens* of the other species is their ability to create narratives: religions, law, stories. Narrating, therefore, is the starting point to establish the status of academic authorship, without prejudice to the creativity inherent in every creative act. In this way, both the narratives of Marco Polo to Kublai Khan and the efforts of the diasporic inhabitants of Plato's allegory constitute efforts to create marks of man on Earth, through narrative. Therefore, it would not be strange or disruptive to require researchers, at master's or doctoral level, to exercise their authorship in their texts aimed at academia, tensioning it: keeping it in the form required by the academic publishing bureaucracy, while at the same time "stretching the rope" to the maximum in order to test the limits of academic writing.

Thus, the construction of academic authorship, in communion with the mishaps of gen-AI, necessarily passes through the sieve of the ethics of the human author. In this way, narrating is more than juxtaposing events in a timeline: it is, first of all, to promote critical and subjective training, during the master's and/or doctoral degree, for example, for the use of resources with generative Artificial Intelligence, these understood as accessories to the processes of human thought and creativity of origin. As already said, gen-AI can contain absolutely all the episteme generated and dated by man over the centuries, but such a wonder of knowing offers only the shadows of what, as *sapiens*, we produce with regards to scientific knowledge.

Acknowledgements: CNPq – Processos: 310080/2026-6 e 312923/2026-0.

References

BAKHTIN, M. Os gêneros do discurso. In: Bakhtin, M. *Estética da criação verbal*. Tradução do francês por Maria Ermantina Galvão G. Pereira. 1 ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1992.

BAUDELAIRE, C. *As flores do Mal*. São Paulo: Penguin, 2019.

BENJAMIN, W. *Obras escolhidas I - magia e técnica, arte e política*. 8. ed. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2026.

- BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq). Portaria CNPq nº 2.664, de 6 de março de 2026. Institui a Política de Integridade na Atividade Científica do CNPq. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, DF.
- CALVINO, I. *As cidades invisíveis*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1990.
- DINIZ, Débora. *Carta de uma orientadora: o primeiro projeto de pesquisa*. 2. ed. Brasília: Letras Livres, 2013.
- FAUSTINO, D.; LIPPOLD, W. *Colonialismo digital: por uma crítica hacker-fanoniana*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2023.
- GHEDIN, E.; FRANCO, M. A. S. *Questões de método na construção da pesquisa em educação*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.
- GONZÁLEZ REY, F.; PATINO TORRES, J. F. A epistemologia qualitativa e o estudo da subjetividade em uma perspectiva histórico-cultural. Conversa com Fernando González Rey. *Revista de Estudos Sociais*, Bogotá, n. 60, p. 120-128, Apr. 2017. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7440/res60.2017.10>.
- HENRIQUES, A. A escrita acadêmica como experiência estudiosa na universidade. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 30, p. e300009, 2025. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782025300009>
- HUSTON, N. *A espécie fabuladora*. Porto Alegre: L&PM, 2010.
- KOSMYNA, N. *et al.* Your Brain on ChatGPT: Accumulation of Cognitive Debt when Using an AI Assistant for Essay Writing Task. *arXiv*, 10 jun. 2025. Available at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2506.08872>. Accessed: 13 Dec. 2025
- LIMA, G. M.; FERREIRA, G. M. S.; CARVALHO, J. . Automation in education: trending issues concerning Artificial Intelligence. *Educação e Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v. 50, e273857, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634202450273857en>.
- ORLANDI, E. *Discurso e texto: formulação e circulação dos sentidos*. Campinas: Editora Pontes, 2001.
- PEIXOTO, André. L. A. Inteligência Artificial Generativa e seu Impacto na Formação e no Exercício Profissional da Psicologia. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, [s.l.], v. 45, n.spe1, e298224, p. 1-14, 2025. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-3703003298224>.
- PLATÃO. *A República*. São Paulo: Lafonte, 2017.
- RAMOS, A. S. M. Inteligência Artificial Generativa baseada em grandes modelos de linguagem - ferramentas de uso na pesquisa acadêmica. *SciELO Preprints*, [s.l.], 24 May 2023. Available at: <https://preprints.scielo.org/index.php/scielo/preprint/view/6105>. Accessed: 6 May 2024.
- RODRIGUES, M. F.; NUNES, A. G. S.; JUNIOR, A. J. Além da lógica: A subjetividade humana e os limites da inteligência artificial. *Revista Psicologia, Saúde em Debate*, [s.l.], v. 7, n. 1, p. 349-362, 2026. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22289/2446-922X.V12A1A22>

VIGOTSKI, L. S. *A formação social da mente: o desenvolvimento dos processos psicológicos superiores*. 7. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2007.

ZUBOFF, S. *A era do capitalismo de vigilância: a luta por um futuro humano na nova fronteira do poder*. Tradução de George Schlesinger. Rio de Janeiro: Intrínseca, 2020.

Translation: Ananda Missailidis

Submission date of original in Portuguese: 31/03/2026

Approval date of original in Portuguese: 16/05/2026