Article

Teaching Digital Coexistence: Teacher Interventions for Fostering Responsible Citizenship

Enseñanza de la Convivencia Digital: intervenciones docentes para la formación de una Ciudadanía Responsable

Virginia Saez[1]

CONICET – Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA)

Karen Lopez[2]

Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA)

Argentina

Original work authorized for its first publication in the RIHUMSO Journal and its dissemination and electronic publication through various scientific portals..

[1] Investigadora Adjunta del Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas con sede en el Instituto de Investigación en Ciencias de la Educación (IICE) de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras (FFyL) de la Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA). Profesora Adjunta de la Universidad de Buenos Aires. Doctora en Educación por la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras (FFyL) de la Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA). Su formación de grado es en Ciencias de la Educación (UBA) y ha realizado una Maestría en Educación: Pedagogías críticas y problemáticas socioeducativas y un posdoctorado en Comunicación, Medios y Cultura (UNLP). Realiza actividades de investigación, docencia y extensión Correo: educaciondelamirada@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3043-4614

[2] Profesora y Licenciada en Historia en la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras (UBA). Profesora de Historia, Formación Ética y Ciudadana y Geografía en el nivel secundario. Investigadora de los equipos de investigación de Educación de la Mirada. Actualmente, se encuentra investigando sobre la enseñanza de la convivencia digital en escuelas de la Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, en el marco de una Beca Estímulo UBACyT. Correo: karen.lk.lopez@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-2203-0026

Abstract

In recent decades, digital coexistence has become a socially relevant issue that challenges secondary education. This qualitative and descriptive-interpretative study investigates the teaching of digital coexistence in a third-year secondary school class in Isla Maciel, Buenos Aires. The cooperative didactic methodology enabled teachers and researchers to design and implement teaching sequences tailored to the specific context of the students' school and social environment. Class dynamics and students' perceptions were analyzed through photographic records, audio recordings, and interviews. The results highlight the importance of creating dialogical contexts in social sciences education. Teaching interventions fostered critical reflection on attitudes and discourses that perpetuate violence, generating respectful digital coexistence. This approach contributes to the development of civic skills and the construction of a participatory democratic culture.

Keywords: digital coexistence, teaching, media and information literacy, socially relevant issues.

Resumen

En las últimas décadas, la convivencia digital es una cuestión socialmente viva que interpela la educación secundaria. Este estudio cualitativo y descriptivo-interpretativo investiga la enseñanza de la convivencia digital en un curso de tercer año de secundaria en Isla Maciel, Buenos Aires. La metodología didáctica cooperativa permitió a profesores e investigadores diseñar e implementar secuencias de enseñanza adaptadas a las particularidades del contexto escolar y social de los estudiantes. Se analizaron las dinámicas de clase y las percepciones de los alumnos a través de registros fotográficos, grabaciones de audio y entrevistas. Los resultados evidencian la importancia de crear

contextos dialógicos en la enseñanza de las ciencias sociales. Las intervenciones docentes promovieron la reflexión crítica sobre actitudes y discursos que perpetúan la violencia, generando una convivencia digital respetuosa. Este enfoque contribuye al desarrollo de habilidades ciudadanas y a la construcción de una cultura democrática participativa.

Palabras claves: convivencia digital, enseñanza, alfabetización mediática e informacional, cuestiones socialmente vivas.

Introduction

In his book *The Age of the Tyrannical Individual: The End of a Common World*, Éric Sadin (2024) asserts that the substance of our present "is unprecedented in every way" (p. 17). According to the philosopher, we live in an era where the individual has become the beneficiary of increased power, which leads them to consider themselves a totality in and of themselves. This, in turn, results in the rupture of the social bond and, even more significantly, in the increasing impossibility of projecting a collective future. Thus, understanding this unprecedented substance presents itself as an enormous task, on which our aim is not to attempt direct approximations. However, we argue that technologies and digital media—such as the Internet, the web, and social networks— constitute a crucial knot in the fabric of this unprecedented character.

We live, as Baricco (2019) suggests, in a world with two hearts that pump reality side by side within a single circulatory system, in "a reality system with dual driving forces" (p. 92), where the boundaries between the "real world" and the "virtual" are difficult to establish, and even if distinguishable, they become secondary (p. 88). It is, therefore, a world fundamentally different from the one we knew in the 20th century, where modes of relating to each other, of communicating, gestures, attitudes, perceptions of oneself and the surrounding world, languages, the relationship with the past, and the ways of inhabiting spaces and times have changed—apparently, everything.

Children and adolescents constitute a new humanity; "they constantly move in and out of both universes [the online, cyberspace universe, and the offline, face-to-face universe] without needing to explicitly distinguish their borders" (Morduchovicz, 2012, p. 10). And in this continuous movement, they construct themselves as subjects, relate to society, appropriate and recreate culture, shape and express their own voice, socialize, internalize norms, and, in short, participate in the fabric of a new type of society.

Thus, we accept that a mental revolution has occurred, which, through digital tools, gave birth to a new type of nonlinear, individualistic, superficial humanity, capable of thinking

106

in reverse (Baricco, 2019; Maggio, 2021). We assume that "without realizing it, a new human being was born" (Serres, 2013, p. 21), and now, as the change becomes as evident as it is overwhelming, solid, and seemingly irreversible, new concerns, which lie elsewhere, begin to unveil themselves to us.

That is to say, the task is rather to anticipate where these paths we have opened and started to walk might lead. If we start from the premise that the hallmark of our time is change, the unprecedented, then taking distance and recovering, or at least strengthening, the ability to critically visualize possible future perspectives becomes essential. The society we may begin to glimpse after the hurricane of the digital revolution—is it the society we want?

On the other hand, in the current context of the decline of the institutional program of modernity (Dubet, 2006), the school is questioned for its inability to prepare young people for this new world, as it is argued that it fails to adapt to the current times (Bilinkis, 2024). The Internet, the web, and social networks invite us to rethink and redesign connections with the community within the framework of the teaching and learning process. The appropriation of various uses of digital technologies entails critical reflection on teaching interventions, representations of students, and the relationship between both with knowledge. Likewise, the curriculum has incorporated new content, some of which break significantly with the school format and the disciplinary codes of subjects.

The school has taken on, in response to the demands, needs, and requirements of the contemporary world, the task of educating for digital citizenship. Young people build relationships either fully or partially in digital environments; by consuming and/or producing digital content, they shape a particular way of experiencing that digital citizenship. When examining digital citizenship in relation to two of the most popular social media platforms among adolescents, Instagram and YouTube, Güell, Rojas, Nemirovsky, & Percara (2023) argue that social networks operate in the lives of young people who, by being on them, internalize and learn norms, ways of being, behaving, and ultimately, how to exercise their citizenship. The problem is that, since they were neither created nor used according to educational, pedagogical, ethical, and political

purposes, the type of digital citizenship they promote is not necessarily one that empowers young people, constitutes them as reflective, creative, and responsible citizens, or contributes to the creation of a democratic, just, and better society.

In this epochal context, it is fundamental to face the future with proposals that elevate the school as a space for constructing social knowledge and "do not abandon the new authorities of technocultural industries from their place as a public sphere, as a realm for the construction of the common" (Dussel, 2018, p. 13). What form does the knowledge of digital coexistence take in secondary schools? How do we position ourselves, as educators, in response to the increasingly evident processes of the "spherization" of life (Sadin, 2024), the emergence of a game for each player (Baricco, 2019), and the rise of a robust mass egoism? What level of commitment do we assume with the ethical dimension of our profession in a context of social fabric rupture, in a fractured space? These questions, in both senses, as doubts and as an issue that leaves us unable to remain immobile, form the scaffolding upon which this research work is built.

Digital Coexistence as a Socially Alive Issue

Previous research on the teaching of Social Sciences (Aisenberg, 2021; Saez, 2022 and 2023; Zibecchi and Haedo, 2024) indicates that it is crucial to focus teaching on current social problems to promote full citizenship. Therefore, in secondary education, it is essential for students to learn about these issues. From a socio-educational perspective, we consider socially alive issues as specific contents of Social Sciences that generate discussions and controversies in media and digital platforms (Legardez and Simonneaux, 2011). These issues challenge social practices and individual perceptions, so it is proposed to provide didactic time to critically analyze information from various devices and to develop autonomous thinking.

Digital coexistence has become a socially alive issue, especially after the pandemic. This problem, which involves knowledge and affectivity dimensions, means that the student's subjectivity is deeply engaged. Digital coexistence is a relatively new topic in both the academic field and the public educational agenda. In 2015, UNESCO supported universal Internet access as a fundamental human right; and in 2018, the UN addressed the promotion and protection of human rights online. The Human Rights Council Resolution A/HRC/RES/47/16 in 2021 highlighted the importance of freedom of expression and the issue of hate speech, emphasizing education as a key tool to combat misinformation and hatred (UNESCO, 2024).

The dimensions of digital coexistence are essential for creating a safe online environment. They include digital citizenship, respect and solidarity, safety, and responsible communication. It is crucial to consider materials produced by organizations such as UNESCO and UNICEF, which have outlined the concept of digital coexistence and serve as references for academic production and inclusion in schools. However, this concept has been embraced without deep critical analysis, presenting challenges in teaching digital coexistence.

In the literature on digital coexistence, we find two approaches: one that studies coexistence with the digital world and another that analyzes coexistence in the digital world. We focus on coexistence in digital spaces. In the *Digital Coexistence Awareness Guide* (Unicef, GBA & Faro Digital, 2020), it is considered a component of digital citizenship, but we argue that citizenship is a dimension of digital coexistence. Coexistence is inherent to community life, while citizenship depends on a coexistence situation.

Furthermore, digital coexistence is addressed as a set of individual attitudes, focusing on aggressive behaviors. However, this may distract from structural problems that affect coexistence. Coexistence is often equated with the implementation of rules, suggesting that compliance would resolve the problems. This perspective ignores the need for a shared horizon in coexistence.

It is crucial to critically review the concept of digital coexistence, particularly in relation to its place within digital citizenship and its negative approach, centered on digital violence. Digital coexistence should be seen as a dimension of the broader issue of coexistence. While digital spaces have particularities, such as anonymity and depersonalization, these should not be absolutized.

Materials and Methods

This study is a qualitative, descriptive-interpretive, exploratory research designed as a single case study (Stake, 1998).

Based on the idea of the school as a producer of specific knowledge (Terigi, 2007), a cooperative didactic methodology was chosen, bringing together teachers and researchers in joint work where they share epistemic responsibility (Joffredo-Le Brun, Morellato, Sensevy & Quilio, 2018). The teachers and researchers organized teams to design sequences on digital coexistence, considering the specificities of the group and the school where it would be implemented. Additionally, the cognitive context of the action (Sensevy, 2007), i.e., the set of shared knowledge and meanings formed from prior experiences in the educational community, was taken into account.

We selected and thoroughly analyzed a case that incorporated the didactic proposals on digital coexistence that were developed. The case corresponds to a 3rd-year class from a public secondary school in Isla Maciel, Buenos Aires Province, during the first semester of 2023. The classes were guided by a pedagogical pair, consisting of two teachers. This student group had a relationship with digital technologies that led us to move away from some assumptions we had. Many of the students did not own their own mobile devices, either at school or outside of it, but shared them with others (mainly family members), limiting their use in terms of time. The teaching staff expressed concerns regarding certain problematic uses in the school, such as making "live" broadcasts on social media

during class hours. There were also coexistence issues that originated outside the institution but later transferred to the school. These issues did not arise solely in digital spaces; some were related to coexistence in the neighborhood, as the students, according to the teachers, were local residents of the surrounding areas. Additionally, some students were unfamiliar with the instrumental functionalities and uses of technologies, as they were not as present in their daily lives (for example, application settings). According to information collected through surveys, the most used social networks by students were YouTube, Instagram, and TikTok, in that order. It was common practice to both broadcast live on social media platforms such as Instagram or Facebook (the latter absent in case 3, corresponding to the most recent workshop) and post statuses on WhatsApp. The concern raised by these surveys was related to the issue of grooming and, more broadly, to the situation of meeting people online. There was no concern about violence on the internet, but rather about what is perceived as risky on the web. It is interesting to note that these students live in a context marked by numerous forms of violence, including economic and social violence arising from inequality. In this scenario, it is possible that a violent comment or posting a photo without consent may not be perceived by the students as a serious or concerning case of violence, when their daily experiences face them with more complex situations. The normalization of digital violence, and not only—this also applies to racism, homophobia, xenophobia, etc., in their discursive expressions at least—could be due to its trivialization in the face of daily life.

The classes were documented through photographic records, audio recordings, field notes, and interviews with the teaching staff. The data analysis was based on Maxwell's (2005) qualitative-interactive approach, using two techniques to understand the data: contextualization and coding (Maxwell & Miller, 2008), in order to identify close connections and similarities between the data.

Results and Discussion

In the post-pandemic phase, Social Sciences teachers have identified the need to expand the didactic time (Sensevy, 2011) allocated to digital coexistence as a socially alive issue (Legardez and Simonneaux, 2011). With the return to in-person classes in 2021, teachers perceived conflicts in digital media as a key topic that needs to be addressed at school (Saez and Cappadona, 2023). The aim of the proposal was to offer a space for students to reflect on their position in social networks and enhance their agency in relation to this socially alive issue.

Two common aspects in all cases are, on one hand, the naturalization of violence, and on the other, the perception that it is easier to justify and legitimize aggression on social media. One teacher describes:

> There is a lot of naturalization around violent comments made in everyday life and also how to see them... Like a joke, or something that, if it doesn't affect my classmate because we joke with each other and everything's fine, there's no problem saying it, even if it's in a violent tone or with violent connotations. (Teacher 1, April 8, 2024)

Therefore, the teaching interventions aim to de-naturalize these behaviors, allowing students to reflect on "what is given." The teachers set two necessary conditions for implementing teaching devices. First, there is a need to expand the didactic time devoted to digital coexistence, which is why specific lessons on these topics were organized. Second, the presence of reticent and dialogical teaching interventions is crucial. Reticence (Sensevy, 2011) refers to the teacher's containment in allowing students the autonomy to think for themselves about the most appropriate positions to take on social media. On the other hand, the dialogical character (Dysthe, 2013) encourages diverse voices to be expressed, enabling students to develop new cognitive elaborations.

A relevant situation in the didactic treatment of digital coexistence was the exchange between peers and teachers. We will focus on this moment to analyze the form the content took.

Situation of Exchange and Construction of the "Common"

Given the need for dialogical contexts in the acquisition of knowledge about socially relevant issues, a crucial point in the didactic sequence was the plenary situation where the exchange between peers and teachers took place. The goal of the exchange between students and teachers was to reflect on how the rules of coexistence in the virtual space are constructed.

Initially, in small groups, students were called upon to analyze real cases of digital coexistence problems, involving well-known figures in youth culture. The teacher explains the reason for selecting situations involving famous people: "We aim to maintain a distance from the cases and try to ensure that the resources we use both problematize and involve the students" (Teacher 2, March 25, 2024).

Each case was constructed from headlines and news published by media outlets, along with some social media posts, concerning issues like cyberbullying, digital shaming, cancel culture, and doxxing. The criterion for selecting cases was to choose episodes that could potentially engage the students, dilemmas they might have some knowledge about, yet not recent enough to focus solely on the narrative, thereby concealing what the teachers wanted to address (Perelman, Aren & Vergini, 2023). The purpose of this activity was to enable the students to distance themselves from their own experiences and practices so that their lesser involvement would allow them to reflect critically on digital violence.

The activity began with the reading of the case in small groups, followed by an exchange guided by two open-ended questions: "How did you feel when you read the case? What feelings did it leave you with?" (Task 1). Later, the third question was posed: "How is violence expressed in the situation analyzed?" (Task 1), inviting participants to delve deeper into the description and analysis of violence in the digital realm. The group debates, sparked by these initial questions, were documented on posters, which served as support for the plenary discussion.

The student group had no training in analytical readings of dilemmas or in the practice of exchanging arguments. Moreover, their relationship with reading was not very fluid, and the teachers did not know the students well. Therefore, another purpose was set: to use a register familiar to everyone, "celebrity gossip," to stimulate their expression. The teachers pointed out that, due to the difficulty of advancing the conceptual discussion, they decided to build a community of interpreters of the text read and encourage exchanges about what happened to the famous people. This later allowed the discussion to become more complex, as students distanced themselves from the specific case and began to approach the concept. The teachers' interventions focused on the "gossip," i.e., the story told. This created a common ground where students could intertwine their voices.

The teachers intervened by focusing attention on everyday violences that were not perceived as such due to their high degree of naturalization. In the plenary, Teacher 1 asked for more information about the protagonist of the case to allow students to express their perceptions of her and highlight the stereotypes:

Teacher 1**:** "Who is China Suárez?"

Student 1**:** "The one who cheated on Wanda Nara with her husband, I can't remember his name. Icardi, that's it."

Teacher 1**:** "I thought she was an actress and a singer."

Without issuing an ethical judgment about whether the description was right or wrong, Teacher 1 clarified in the interview that her intervention was aimed at "reflecting on what we say about the other" (Teacher 1, April 8, 2024). Additionally, there were interventions where the teacher, when faced with violent nominations, would ask, "What does this mean, why are you saying this right now?" (Teacher 1, April 8, 2024).

After exchanging in small groups, students participated in the plenary exchange with the rest of the class and the teachers. Each group selected a representative to speak on

behalf of the group to the entire class. This task format allowed for collective reflection and exchange on the students' impressions and thoughts.

In the plenary, each group was invited to describe their case for the rest of the class, specifying whether they were able to identify the type of cyber violence involved. The plenary was not limited to presenting the work done in small groups but became a fundamental space to debate ideas and positions. The goal was for students to reflect, take a stance on situations of violence on social media, and be able to argue from their own everyday experiences.

Knowledge was constructed through the questions posed by the teachers. Thus, oral conversations at this stage of the class were primarily centered around the teachers (Cazden, 1998). The teachers emphasized student participation rather than delivering an expository lecture on the topic. However, the students' contributions allowed the teachers to advance the problematization of violence situations in digital coexistence and supported the interpretations of those approaching the disciplinary topic.

It required highly personalized work with each group. During the plenary, some conflicts arose among the students, in which some groups refused to listen and respect others, as a form of "just response" for not having been heard first. It is noteworthy how the same violences they were analyzing in class, such as cancellation, were reproduced in the classroom situation.

Given the lack of a prior relationship with the students, other interventions were proposed, explicitly stating the didactic contract: "The purpose of this activity is for us to listen to each other, to be able to express ourselves at each one's time" (Teacher 1, April 8, 2024). In the interview, Teacher 1 explained: "We had to be there to weave the bond as well, so they could understand why we brought those cases, why we thought they were pertinent, and why it was important to share them among all" (Teacher 1, April 8, 2024).

After the teachers' interventions, the students, in the plenary, introduced dimensions of digital coexistence (digital citizenship, respect and solidarity, security, and responsible

communication) and shared their experiences and prior knowledge, which helped them better interpret this socially alive issue.

Socially relevant issues as school content imply and question the subjectivity of young people, their relationships, and their daily lives. This can hinder openness to strangers. Together with Jackson (2016) and Mastache (2023), we recognize the importance of the acceptance and subjective recognition of what students do, think, and say. However, listening does not always mean accepting what is heard (Meirieu, 2016); rather, it involves recognizing students' frames of reference (Siede, 2010; Aisenberg, 2021) to "start" from them (Freire, 2023) and thus promote new cognitive practices while developing a deeper understanding of the social world.

The Axiological Component of Socially Lived Issues as School Content

Teaching digital coexistence in the school context involves a high axiological load, as it addresses issues that are intrinsically ethical and raise conflicts about fundamental values, such as digital citizenship, respect, solidarity, discrimination, racism, xenophobia, homophobia, authoritarianism, intolerance, hate speech, cyberbullying, privacy, among others. These topics form an interconnected network of values that aim to provide a legitimate perspective on digital coexistence but also pose ethical tensions and challenges for teachers in the classroom.

One of the key tensions lies in the relationship between creating spaces of freedom for students to share their experiences and positions, and the teachers' need to intervene and express their own ethical stance regarding violent, discriminatory, or anti-democratic comments, attitudes, and speeches. This tension emerges especially when young people, in their discussions and analyses, express attitudes that reproduce stereotypes or discriminatory speeches, raising the question of to what extent teachers should intervene, and how to do so without falling into "moralistic education."

On the one hand, there is the position of Teacher 1, who points out the difficulty of refraining from making judgments and the need to avoid judging students' discriminatory practices. The teacher believes that by asking questions and follow-up questions, students can be encouraged to reflect without necessarily imposing a value judgment, allowing the debate to focus on building a critical understanding without direct judgment.

On the other hand, Teacher 2 sees this type of intervention as a crucial pedagogical tool. For her, insisting on the questions and highlighting the terms used by students, especially those that reproduce stereotypes or discriminatory speeches, is a necessary strategy to deconstruct those prejudices. This approach allows students to become aware of the semantic implications of their expressions and the everyday practices that normalize discrimination.

The tension between the teachers' positions raises a central question: Is it possible to avoid teacher judgment when addressing socially lived issues in secondary school? If it is possible, is it desirable? Furthermore, what happens when discriminatory speeches or attitudes are expressed in the classroom, especially when these speeches go against democratic values or affect the students themselves? This leads to a broader reflection on the teacher's judgment in the school context.

Giuliano (2020) offers two perspectives on judgment: the first justifies its existence, considering it an innate human quality, while the second criticizes judgment, advocating for its suspension in the educational realm to allow free thinking. However, it is recognized that judgment cannot be completely eliminated when teaching issues such as digital coexistence, as teachers have an ethical responsibility to the values that must be transmitted.

The school, as an educational institution, is not neutral. As González Montañez (2017) argues, education is not a neutral process, as it always transmits certain values. These values are not only implicit in the content but are also present in the attitudes and practices of teachers. Freire (2023) reinforces this idea, asserting that education has a directive dimension that cannot be ignored. When teaching issues such as digital coexistence, which have a strong ethical component, the teacher must take a clear

stance in defense of democratic values, respect, and justice, even if this is done in a way that allows for critical reflection.

However, this ethical intervention by the teacher should not be dogmatic or authoritarian, but should open space for dialogue and reflection, as suggested by Trilla (1997). Teachers must be aware of when to intervene more neutrally, facilitating discussion, and when to intervene with a more confrontational stance, especially when attitudes or comments that go against democratic values are presented. In this regard, interventions can be both ideational and behavioral, and should be explicit and persuasive, aiming to influence the mentality and behavior of students.

In summary, teaching digital coexistence as a socially lived issue cannot avoid value judgments, but it must find a balance between fostering critical reflection and establishing direct interventions that defend fundamental democratic and ethical values. This stance not only involves the transmission of knowledge but also the formation of values that allow students to understand and build respectful and democratic digital coexistence.

Final Considerations

It is necessary to recover the specificity of coexistence, both in its broad sense and in the realm of digital coexistence, considering it an essential content within the Social Sciences. We have identified a notable lack of definitions regarding digital coexistence. Although this concept comes from international organizations such as UNESCO, UNICEF, and Faro Digital and is linked to digital citizenship, there is no clear definition of what digital coexistence entails. The focus is mainly on behaviors in digital spaces, such as social media, with an emphasis on manifestations of violence. In this particular context, we understand the teaching practices of these cases.

The analyzed cases highlight the importance of creating dialogical contexts in teaching the social sciences, especially regarding digital coexistence. The pedagogical discourse

was structured through interventions where contextualization strategies predominated. The teaching interventions aimed at a form of situational knowledge and sought to build relationships of internalization with social knowledge (Edwards, 1993). Students were able to ask questions and reflect on their experiences. The exchange between peers and teachers emerged as a fundamental tool to build a common space where situations of violence in digital environments were problematized and analyzed, fostering a critical and collective understanding of these socially lived issues. In other words, it promotes the co-construction of meanings around controversial problems in an environment of respect and collaboration.

In the analyzed cases, there were repetitive teacher interventions that encouraged the exploration of individual experiences. To teach how to build a digital coexistence that is supportive and respectful, it is essential to start with four elements: how students coexist in networks, how they see themselves as part of a society, what problems they identify, and what they normalize. These four dimensions have a very strong situated component. Therefore, it is necessary to plan interventions that highlight these frames of reference (Aisenberg, 2021) to advance the teaching of a respectful and supportive digital coexistence.

Interventions aimed at this goal assume that form is also content: if the content is coexistence, it is not enough to simply talk about coexistence; it must also be practiced in the classroom situation as part of the content to be taught.

The analysis of the presented case highlights the importance of learning from the everyday in teaching the social sciences, especially when addressing relevant and complex issues such as violence in digital environments. This approach fosters a deep analysis of concepts such as digital citizenship and solidarity, offering young people tools to articulate their ideas and experiences.

The strategic intervention of teachers is crucial in this process. By using open and guided questions, educators create a space where students not only share their perspectives but are also encouraged to reflect on the attitudes and discourses that can perpetuate

violence. This participatory approach not only empowers students but also underscores the teacher's role as a facilitator of meaningful and transformative learning.

Teachers do not only act as transmitters of knowledge but as facilitators of a learning process that recognizes and values the voices of students. This reinforces the idea that knowledge is co-constructed and that the classroom can be a space for critical reflection on relevant issues in contemporary society.

The intervention of teachers was crucial to unmask the everyday violences that are often invisible in the daily lives of adolescents. By addressing stereotypes and prejudices through open-ended questions, critical reflection on how everyday discourses and attitudes can perpetuate violence was promoted. Unplanned interventions during moments of conflict became valuable opportunities to question the legitimacy of certain digital practices and explore the impact of digital violence on interpersonal relationships.

Likewise, the unplanned interventions during moments of conflict revealed the need to establish a clear didactic contract that favors active listening and mutual respect. These moments of dialogue became opportunities to question the legitimacy of certain online practices, such as doxxing and public shaming, and explore the underlying reasons that lead young people to normalize or justify acts of violence.

This poses a significant challenge for teaching, which must seek strategies to reconnect students with the gravity of these issues and promote a culture of respect in the digital environment. In this regard, persuasive interventions, which addressed the emotional component, are recognized for promoting the learning process of respectful coexistence in society (Grez Cook, 2022).

This raises the question: How can an alternative text to hate speech be produced and counter-narratives of hope be generated? (Saez, 2023, pp. 35-36). We emphasize the importance of the teacher being convinced of what they are teaching (Jackson, 2016) and promote the ethical dimension of the teaching profession, as well as the value of assertiveness or explicit positioning in these contents that involve shared values considered valuable by society. The key is, therefore, to recognize the potential of the

teacher's voice, as a form of judgment, to shape these subjectivities. And when we speak of voice, we also speak of silences. When we resign ourselves, when we remain silent and do not speak, we are also producing subjectivities. If we resign ourselves to not offering a vision of the future of the society we want, we are producing resigned subjectivities. We identify the need to recover the possibility of collectively thinking in the classroom about a future project, a horizon.

Regarding the axiological component of teaching digital coexistence, we start from the assumption that judgment is continuously present in the school; in any case, it is about recognizing that when students express opinions, they are materializing their thinking, which is a unique, original product that involves significant effort. Therefore, when judging it, care and respect are necessary (Jackson, 2016). There are no a priori reasons that allow for establishing, universally, the best position to adopt regarding contents that involve an axiological component. Rather, this varies depending on the components at play (Trilla, 1997), but it is crucial for teachers to make their position explicit. Otherwise, if they express opinions without stating that they are speaking from their perspective, they are manipulating, which is not legitimate (Trilla, 1997; Freire, 2023).

Based on situations of exchange where reluctant or neutral interventions were deployed to promote reflective analysis by students, and confrontational interventions, at times positive and at times negative, students were able to engage in complex discussions about the violences analyzed, which involved both their prior knowledge (Siede, 2010) and the ethical dimension, without falling into a moralizing discourse. We assume that, as González Montañez (2017) points out in the Social Sciences, a distinctive characteristic is the confluence of knowledge and values that emerge from their formative purposes.

In summary, learning from everyday life and the unmasking of violence are essential components for developing a critical understanding of digital coexistence. This not only involves reflecting on the responsible use of social media but also promoting ethical and respectful attitudes and behaviors, which are essential for forming responsible, conscious, and active citizens in the digital sphere. Teaching the social sciences, when

addressing these issues from students' lived experience, has the potential to transform their understandings and actions in the digital world. The way socially lived issues are addressed is closely linked to the development of critical thinking and reflection for the transformation of social and civic practice, which, in turn, supports education for a participatory democratic culture. Social problems that generate controversy are fundamental components for the comprehensive development of critical and reflective thinking, as they foster the formation of social thought.

References

Aisenberg, B. (2021). La construcción de conocimiento social en el aula: una aproximación didáctica. *Reseñas de Enseñanza de la Historia*, *19*, 13-37. https://revele.uncoma.edu.ar/index.php/resenas/article/view/3426

Baricco, A. (2019). *The game*. Anagrama.

Bilinkis, S. (2024, 7 de julio). ¿Están las escuelas preparando a los chicos para el 2040? En ese mundo van a vivir los que ingresan hoy a nivel inicial [Video]. Instagram. https://www.instagram.com/reel/C9IsBuNyjgW/?igsh=MW02cDE2MXRzcWIwbg==

Cazden, C. (1998). *El discurso en el aula: el lenguaje de la enseñanza y del aprendizaje*. Paidós.

Cornu, L. (1999). La confianza en las relaciones pedagógicas. En G. Frigerio, D. Korinfeld, & M. Poggi (Comps.), *Construyendo un saber sobre el interior de la escuela* (pp. 19-26). Novedades educativas.

Dubet, F. (2006). *El declive de la institución: profesiones, sujetos e individuos en la modernidad*. Gedisa.

Dussel, I. (2018). Sobre la precariedad de la escuela. En J. Larrosa (Ed.), *Elogio de la escuela* (pp. 83-106). Miño y Dávila.

Dysthe, O. (2013). Perspectivas teóricas sobre el diálogo y la enseñanza basada en el diálogo. En O. Dysthe, N. Bernhardt, & L. Esbjørn (Coords.), *Enseñanza basada en el diálogo: el museo de arte como espacio de aprendizaje* (pp. 45-80). Skoletjenesten.

Edwards, V. (1993). La relación de los sujetos con el conocimiento. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, *(27)*. https://doi.org/10.17227/01203916.5304

Freire, P. (2023). *Pedagogía de la esperanza: un reencuentro con la pedagogía del oprimido*. Siglo XXI Editores.

Giuliano, F. (2020). Razón evaluadora y escenarios del juicio educativo. *Revista Pensamiento actual*, *20*(34), 74-90. https://doi.org/10.15517/PA.V20I34.41836

González Montañez, E. (2017). *La escuela del pueblo de Dios: Un análisis sobre la interacción en la educación menonita, Los Jagüeyes, Chihuahua.* [Tesis de maestría, DIE-CINVESTAV-IPN]. https://repositorio.cinvestav.mx/handle/cinvestav/2906

Grez Cook, F. (2022). Usando las emociones para comprender cuestiones socialmente vivas en las clases de Historia. *Revista Perspectivas*, *24*, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.15359/rp.24.6

Güell, A., Rojas, R., Nemirovsky, L. & Percara, M. (2023). Redes sociales de uso masivo: en busca de la ciudadanía digital. En V. Saez & A. Iglesias (Comps.), *Educación de la mirada III: formar para una ciudadanía digital* (pp. 77-88). Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Buenos Aires.

Jackson, P. (2016). *¿Qué es la educación?* Paidós.

Joffredo-Le Brun, S., Morellato, M., Sensevy, G. & Quilio, S. (2018). Cooperative engineering as a joint action. *European Educational Research Journal*, *17*(1), 188-208. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904117690006

Legardez, A. & Simonneaux, L. (2011). *Développement durable et autres questions d'actualités, Questions socialement vives dans l'enseignement et la formation*. Educagri.

Maggio, M. (2021). *Educación en pandemia: guía de supervivencia para docentes y familias*. Paidós.

Malton, K. (2014). Cosmologies: how to win friends and influence people. In *Knowledge and knowers: towards a realist sociology of education* (pp. 148-170). Book Now Ltd.

Mastache, A. (2023). Desarrollo de la dimensión personal del rol docente en la formación del profesorado. En V. Sáez & A. Iglesias (Comps.), *Educación de la mirada III: formar para una ciudadanía digital* (pp. 105-122). Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Buenos Aires.

Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative research design: an interactive approach*. Sage.

Maxwell, J. & Miller, B. (2008). Categorizing and connecting strategies in qualitative data analysis. En P. Leavy & S. Hesse-Biber (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 85-106). Guilford Press.

Meirieu, P. (2016). *Recuperar la pedagogía: de lugares comunes a conceptos claves*. Paidós.

Meirieu, P. (2019). Riquezas y límites del enfoque por "competencias" del ejercicio de la profesión docente hoy (Trad. P. Montenegro). *Pedagogía y Saberes*, *50*, 97-108.

Morduchowicz, R. (2012). *Los adolescentes y las redes sociales: la construcción de la identidad juvenil en Internet*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Perelman, F., Aren, F. & Vergini, L. (2023). ¿Es posible la lectura crítica en la escuela? Comparación de noticias en las aulas de primaria y secundaria. En V. Saez & A. Iglesias (Comps.), *Educación de la mirada III: formar para una ciudadanía digital* (pp. 43-76). Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Buenos Aires.

Resolución del Consejo de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas A/HRC/38/L.10. (2018). Promoción, protección y disfrute de los derechos humanos en Internet, 2 jul.

Resolución del Consejo de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas A/HRC/RES/47/16. (2021). Promoción, protección y disfrute de los derechos humanos en Internet, 13 jul.

Sadin, É. (2024). *La era del individuo tirano: el fin de un mundo común*. Caja Negra Editora.

Saez, V. (2022). Las búsquedas de información como contenido de la educación mediática. *Revista de Estudios Explicativos en Educación*, 21(46), 155-170. https://doi.org/10.21703/0718-5162.v21.n46.2022.008.

Saez, V. (2023). ¿Qué aportan las ciencias sociales a la ciudadanía digital? Las cuestiones socialmente vivas como objetos de conocimiento mediados por las tecnologías. En V. Sáez & A. Iglesias (Eds.), *Formar para una ciudadanía digital: desafíos pedagógicos de la educación en medios, comunicación y tecnologías* (pp. 27-42). Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Buenos Aires. http://educaciondelamirada.com/lecturas/formar-para-una-ciudadania-digital-desafios-pedagogicos-de-la-educacion-en-medios-comunicacion-y-tecnologias/.

Saez, V., & Cappadona, A. P. (2024). La construcción de una mirada pedagógica sobre los medios digitales. *Cuadernos del IICE*, 12, 13-18. http://hdl.handle.net/11336/234126

Sensevy, G. (2007). Des catégories pour décrire et comprendre l'action didactique. En G. Sensevy & A. Mercier (Eds.), *Agir ensemble: l'action didactique conjointe du professeur et des élèves* (pp. 5-34). Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Sensevy, G. (2011). *Le sens du savoir: éléments pour une théorie de l'action conjointe en didactique*. Boeck.

Serres, M. (2013). *Pulgarcita. El mundo cambió tanto que los jóvenes deben reinventar todo: una manera de vivir juntos, instituciones, una manera de ser y de conocer*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Siede, I. (2010). Preguntas y problemas en la enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales. En I. Siede (Coord.), *Ciencias Sociales en la escuela: criterios y propuestas para la enseñanza*. Aique.

Stake, R. (1998). *Investigación con estudio de casos*. Morata.

Terigi, F. (2007). Exploración de una idea: en torno a los saberes de lo escolar. En R. Baquero, G. Diker, & G. Frigerio (Comps.), *Las formas de lo escolar* (pp. 99-118). Del Estante Editorial.

Trilla, J. (1997). *El profesor y los valores controvertidos: Neutralidad y beligerancia en la educación*. Paidós.

UNESCO. (2024, 12 de julio). Qué debe saber acerca del discurso de odio. https://www.unesco.org/es/countering-hate-speech/

UNICEF, GBA, & Faro Digital. (2020). *Guía de sensibilización sobre convivencia digital*. https://www.argentina.gob.ar/sites/default/files/senaf

Zibecchi, C. & Haedo, T. (2024). La enseñanza a través de la construcción de "problemas sociales": aportes para una didáctica de la sociología. *Entramados: educación y sociedad*, *11*(15), 105-119. https://fh.mdp.edu.ar/revistas/index.php/entramados/article/view/7561