

## Global movement of educational reforms and the national digital education policy: implications of distance and hybrid education in the reconfiguration of teaching work

*Movimento global de reformas educacionais e a política nacional de educação digital: implicações da EaD e da educação híbrida na reconfiguração do trabalho docente*

*Movimiento global de reformas educativas y la política nacional de educación digital: implicaciones de la educación a distancia (EaD) y la educación híbrida en la reconfiguración del trabajo docente*

Kátia Curado Silva<sup>1</sup>  
Universidade de Brasília

**Abstract:** This essay analyzes the global movement of educational reforms and its implications for the redefinition of the school, teaching work, and public teacher education policies, focusing on Brazil's National Digital Education Policy (PNED), established by Law No. 14.533/2023. Drawing on a critical-theoretical approach grounded in Gramsci, Freire, Saviani, Ball, Dardot, and Laval, the discussion argues that these reforms are not merely a set of technical measures but rather a political and ideological project of hegemony, aimed at shaping subjectivities and reorganizing teaching work under the logic of informational capitalism. It concludes that this process constitutes a new educational hegemony, sustained by an epistemology of technique and by the ideology of efficiency. In contrast, the essay reaffirms the epistemology of praxis as a theoretical and political foundation to resist technological subordination, defending the teacher as an organic intellectual of the working class and the public school as a space for human, critical, and emancipatory formation.

**Keywords:** Global Educational Reform; National Digital Education Policy; Teaching work; Hegemony; Epistemology of praxis.

**Resumo** - O ensaio analisa o movimento global de reformas educacionais e suas implicações na redefinição da escola, do trabalho docente e das políticas públicas de formação, tomando como foco a Política Nacional de Educação Digital (PNED), instituída pela Lei nº 14.533/2023. A partir de uma abordagem teórico-crítica, fundamentada em Gramsci, Freire, Saviani, Ball, Dardot e Laval, discute-se que essas reformas não constituem apenas um conjunto de medidas técnicas, mas um projeto político e ideológico de hegemonia, voltado à conformação de subjetividades e à reorganização do trabalho docente sob a lógica do capital informacional. Conclui-se que esse processo configura uma nova hegemonia educacional, sustentada por uma epistemologia da técnica e pela ideologia da eficiência. Em contraposição, o artigo reafirma a epistemologia da práxis como fundamento teórico e político para resistir à subordinação tecnológica, defendendo o professor como intelectual orgânico da classe trabalhadora e a escola pública como espaço de formação humana, crítica e emancipatória.

**Palavras-chave:** Reforma Educacional Global; Política Nacional de Educação Digital; Trabalho Docente; Hegemonia; Epistemologia da práxis.

**Resumen:** El ensayo analiza el movimiento global de reformas educativas y sus implicaciones en la redefinición de la escuela, del trabajo docente y de las políticas públicas de formación,

---

<sup>1</sup> Doutorado em Ciências da Educação. Universidade Paris VII (UPVIII), Paris, França. Instituto Federal de Goiás (IFG), Goiânia, GO. Brasil. E-mail: [joana.peixoto@ifg.edu.br](mailto:joana.peixoto@ifg.edu.br); Lattes: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/5636200472384576>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9469-5680>.

tomando como eje la Política Nacional de Educación Digital (PNED), instituida por la Ley n.º 14.533/2023 en Brasil. Desde un enfoque teórico-crítico, fundamentado en Gramsci, Freire, Saviani, Ball, Dardot y Laval, se sostiene que dichas reformas no constituyen solo un conjunto de medidas técnicas, sino un proyecto político e ideológico de hegemonía, orientado a la conformación de subjetividades y a la reorganización del trabajo docente bajo la lógica del capital informacional. Se concluye que este proceso configura una nueva hegemonía educativa, sostenida por una epistemología de la técnica y por la ideología de la eficiencia. En contraposición, el ensayo reafirma la epistemología de la praxis como fundamento teórico y político para resistir a la subordinación tecnológica, defendiendo al profesor como intelectual orgánico de la clase trabajadora y a la escuela pública como un espacio de formación humana, crítica y emancipadora.

**Palabras clave:** Reforma Educativa Global; Política Nacional de Educación Digital; Trabajo docente; Hegemonía; Epistemología de la praxis.

---

**Received on:** Received: October 7, 2025

**Accepted on:** November 10, 2025

---

## Introduction

Over the past decades, there has been an intensification of the global movement of educational reforms, characterized by the dissemination of policies guided by principles of efficiency, productivity, and technological innovation. The so-called *Global Education Reform Movement* (GERM) represents a set of policies and strategies implemented across various countries with the declared aim of “modernizing” educational systems, making them more efficient, and aligning them with the demands of a globalized world. In practice, however, it is a political, economic, and ideological process that seeks to redefine the role of the State in education, shifting the centrality of human formation toward the logic of productivity, competitiveness, and measurable outcomes (Ball, 2012; Dale, 1999; Robertson, 2012).

This movement is neither spontaneous nor neutral. It arises from the articulation among multilateral organizations—such as the World Bank, OECD, UNESCO, and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)—and corporate and philanthropic networks, which act as disseminators of a new market-centered educational rationality. Through reports, recommendations, and funding programs, these institutions induce countries to adopt management and evaluation models inspired by the private sector, based on efficiency, accountability, and performativity (Ball, 2005). Roger Dale (1999) calls this process *supranational governance of education*, emphasizing that national policies are increasingly guided by global agendas that materialize differently according to each country’s context.

Stephen Ball (2012) is incisive in stating that these reforms represent a new mode of social regulation in which schools and teaching work become objects of control, comparison,

and competition. For the author, the discourse of quality and technological innovation conceals a profound process of commodification and depoliticization of education, while legitimizing the growing presence of the private sector in the formulation and implementation of public policies. The managerial logic penetrates education through management tools, standardized curricula, digital platforms, and large-scale assessments, establishing what he calls a *new culture of performativity*—a regime that measures the value of educational work in terms of quantifiable results, rankings, and performance indicators.

In the Latin American and Brazilian contexts, the global reform movement assumes particular contours, combining historical legacies of structural inequality with the new demands of the global economy. Dalila Andrade Oliveira (2018) analyzes that, beginning in the 1990s—especially after the Jomtien Conference (1990) and the launch of the *Education for All* document—education came to be conceived as an instrument of structural adjustment and competitive integration into the global market. Within this perspective, teacher education and curricula were progressively subjected to the logic of rationalization and standardization, reducing the complexity of educational practice to operational competencies and skills.

Susan Robertson (2012) complements this analysis by emphasizing that educational globalization occurs not only through the diffusion of policies but also through the constitution of transnational networks of actors and flows of ideas, producing what she terms a *global policy market*. The circulation of concepts such as *digital governance*, *Education 4.0*, *21st-century competencies*, and *disruptive innovation* is not neutral—it expresses a new epistemology of technique that seeks to replace the ethical-political and ontological foundations of education with a technocratic and corporate ideology.

In this sense, the global movement of educational reforms can be understood as a project of hegemony within the educational field, in which the very meaning of human formation is disputed. The reforms not only redefine curricula and methodologies but also reconfigure teaching work, transforming the teacher into an executor of standardized tasks and an operator of digital platforms (OLIVEIRA, 2018; FREITAS, 2022). This restructuring expresses the process of subsuming pedagogical work to capital, as the human and collective mediations of educational practice are replaced by technical and algorithmic mediations.

Therefore, critically confronting the global movement of educational reforms implies not only denouncing its commodifying logic but also reconstructing a conception of education that restores educational work as an act of creation, dialogue, and transformation of the world.

Within this framework, the *National Digital Education Policy* (PNED), established by Law No. 14.533/2023, can be seen as a State policy aimed at promoting digital inclusion, connectivity, and the development of digital competencies from basic to higher education.

While it contains relevant elements for democratizing access to technologies, its formulation and implementation occur in a context of increasing influence of the neoliberal discourse of innovation, in which technology and the digital are converted into ends in themselves, detached from the human, ethical, and social dimensions of education (Dardot; Laval, 2016). Thus, this policy is part of a broader reform movement that seeks to redefine the role of the State, displacing the centrality of the right to education toward the logic of performance and global competitiveness.

In the field of teacher education and teaching work, the implications of this policy are profound. The expansion of Distance Education (EaD) and hybrid education—widely promoted as innovative pedagogical solutions—expresses a process of productive restructuring within schools and universities. The organization and control of teaching work are increasingly mediated by digital platforms, evaluation metrics, and performative regimes that produce intensification, depersonalization, and precarization of pedagogical activity (OLIVEIRA, 2018; FREITAS, 2022). Within this scenario, teaching is called upon to conform to the logic of technical efficiency and permanent innovation, which reveals the subsumption of educational work to capital and the transformation of education into a field of business and geopolitical dispute.

On the other hand, the advancement of these policies poses the challenge of critically rethinking the meaning of digital education from a critical epistemological perspective (CURADO SILVA, 2023), which rejects technical reductionism and affirms education as a social and political practice. Reflection on the PNED, therefore, requires understanding the mediations between the global movement of educational reforms and the historical particularities of the Brazilian context, especially regarding the social function of public schooling, the valorization of teaching work, and the production of knowledge committed to human emancipation.

This article, therefore, aims to analyze the *National Digital Education Policy* in light of the global movement of educational reforms, highlighting its articulation with neoliberal policies and its implications for the configuration of distance and hybrid education in Brazil. It seeks to discuss to what extent the PNED represents the consolidation of a new model of educational regulation—centered on digitalization and data governance—and how it simultaneously expresses the contradictions between the promise of technological democratization and the deepening of the logic of commodification of education. By doing so, this essay intends to contribute to the debate on the reconfiguration of teaching work and to the theoretical-political critique of contemporary educational reforms, reaffirming the need for an integral human formation guided by ethical, political, and emancipatory values.

## The Political Project of Hegemony in Global Educational Reforms

The global movement of educational reforms, therefore, is not limited to implementing technical management and evaluation devices. It constitutes a political and ideological project of hegemony, whose purpose is to produce a new form of teacher and school subjectivity compatible with the demands of cognitive and informational capitalism. In other words, it is an attempt to reconfigure pedagogical consciousness itself, orienting it toward the acceptance of performativity, permanent innovation, and competition as natural and inevitable values of educational practice (Ball, 2012; Dale, 1999; Dardot; Laval, 2016).

Drawing from Gramsci's notion of hegemony, this movement can be understood as a process of moral and intellectual direction within the educational field. Reforms are not imposed merely through institutional coercion but through the production of consensus around certain values—efficiency, innovation, entrepreneurship, flexibility—that come to be seen as synonymous with quality and modernity. In this context, the school is called upon to form adaptable and self-managed subjects, capable of operating in the digital world and internalizing the demands of the global market. Hegemony, as Gramsci (2000) explains, is achieved when a ruling class succeeds in universalizing its particular interests, transforming them into socially accepted common sense—and that is precisely what occurs in contemporary education.

In this sense, educational neoliberalism operates through governance by performativity, in which teachers and schools are continuously evaluated, turning the act of teaching into a monitored and quantifiable practice. Teaching, subjected to indicators, metrics, and platforms, becomes redefined as measurable and comparable labor, losing its autonomy, creativity, and political dimension. The teacher, understood in the Gramscian sense as a collective intellectual, is weakened, becoming a manager of results—a subject captured by the logic of efficiency and control.

This reconfiguration of teaching is also a process of subjective formation. Dardot and Laval (2016) call this new subjectivity the “neoliberal subject”: an individual who internalizes performance and competition norms, transforming oneself into an enterprise. In education, this form of subjectivation manifests itself in the self-management of teaching: the teacher is urged to be innovative, creative, flexible, and resilient, converting into virtue what is, in fact, precarization and intensification of work. The ideology of innovation and digital education thus reinforces a pedagogy of self-performativity, in which teaching is permanently evaluated and reconfigured by algorithmic metrics.

This new form of regulation acts not only on curricula and policies but also on the affective and symbolic structure of the teaching profession itself. The teacher is induced to measure their worth through platform engagement, goal achievement, and compliance with technological protocols. What was once human relation, dialogue, and collective reflection becomes measurable digital performance, subjected to surveillance and control devices (Williamson, 2017; Selwyn, 2020). The school is transformed into a data capture space, and pedagogical work becomes a source of economic value.

By inserting education into the logic of informational capital, the global reform movement redefines the role of both the school and the teacher. The school ceases to be a space of social mediation and integral human formation to become a site of data and competency production; the teacher, from being an intellectual and critical consciousness builder, becomes a system operator and manager of informational flows. Digitalization, in this sense, is not merely a pedagogical innovation but a capitalist accumulation strategy, transforming knowledge, time, and attention into commodities.

As Dalila Andrade Oliveira (2021) observes, we are facing a new form of exploitation of teaching work, marked by intensification, dematerialization, and platformization. The teacher is continuously required to produce—lesson plans, reports, digital content—under the guise of autonomy but within a structure of invisible and constant control. This dynamic expresses the transition from *living labor* to *dead labor*, in which the educator's knowledge and creativity are captured and transformed into data and algorithms, reinforcing the subsumption of pedagogical work to technological capital.

### **The National Digital Education Policy (PNED) as an Expression of the Global Movement of Educational Reforms**

The *National Digital Education Policy* (PNED), established by Law No. 14.533/2023, represents, within the Brazilian context, the materialization of a new paradigm of educational regulation, directly linked to the global reform movement driven by international organizations and technological corporations. Although its discourse emphasizes democratization of access, digital inclusion, and the development of skills for the twenty-first century, the PNED translates a neoliberal mode of governance in education, in which the digital becomes the structuring axis of pedagogical action, school management, and teacher education.

From its formulation, the PNED reveals alignment with international frameworks of educational policies defined by the OECD, UNESCO, and the World Bank—especially those

related to the *2030 Agenda* and its *Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)*. Documents such as the *Education 2030 Framework for Action* (UNESCO, 2015) and the *OECD Learning Compass 2030* orient countries to develop digital competencies, socio-emotional skills, and forms of personalized and adaptive learning. The PNED incorporates this language by proposing the formation of “digital citizens” endowed with “computational thinking,” “technological fluency,” and “innovation capacity,” shifting the axis of human formation from the ethical-political to the technical and operational plane.

This convergence is not merely discursive. As noted by Ball (2012) and Robertson (2012), the global reform movement operates through the diffusion of transnational policies and metrics, creating a network of standardization and comparison among educational systems. In the Brazilian case, the PNED institutionalizes digitalization as a parameter of quality and modernity, linking educational policy to the dynamics of informational capitalism and the demands of the educational technology market. It is, therefore, a policy that internalizes the global logic of performativity and innovation under the appearance of democratic modernization.

Under the discourse of inclusion and innovation, the PNED introduces a new rationality in Brazilian education: that of *digital performativity*. By proposing indicators of connectivity, access, and pedagogical use of technologies, the policy converts infrastructure and technical mastery into criteria for evaluation and funding. This dynamic reinforces the process of standardization and measurement characteristic of global reforms, shifting the educational debate from the field of human formation to that of results management.

Teaching, within this context, is deeply affected. The PNED encourages the creation of a new teacher profile—the *digital educator*—who must be creative, innovative, self-managed, and technically competent. This idealization coincides with the neoliberal subject described by Dardot and Laval (2016): a worker who internalizes the demands of productivity and assumes individual responsibility for success or failure in their practice. The teacher comes to be viewed as a manager of their own performance, inserted into environments of algorithmic surveillance and constant evaluation. As Ball (2005) observes, this constitutes a process of *performative self-control*, in which teaching is reconfigured as measurable and monitorable activity.

Moreover, the PNED is closely linked to the expansion of Distance Education (EaD) and hybrid education, legitimizing the platformization of teaching and the outsourcing of formative processes. Educational technology companies, private foundations, and startups become the State’s privileged partners, participating in the production of materials, teacher training, and data collection. This phenomenon, which Williamson (2017) calls *platform*

*governance*, shifts control of educational policy from the public sphere to the private, consolidating a form of invisible privatization of education.

The PNED not only reorganizes institutional structures but also acts upon teacher subjectivity, promoting a culture of permanent innovation, entrepreneurship, and self-performativity. The discourse of “continuous digital training” presents itself as an opportunity for professional development but, in practice, reinforces individual accountability and the blaming of teachers for learning outcomes. As emphasized by Dalila Andrade Oliveira (2021), this policy expands mechanisms of intensification and control of teaching work while simultaneously worsening working conditions.

Teacher subjectivity is thus shaped by management and gamification devices that transform teaching into a performance-based activity. Teachers are induced to compete, self-assess, and produce data for platforms that, in turn, become sources of economic value. This capture of subjectivity represents a new form of subsumption of pedagogical work: the teacher not only executes tasks under technical command but internalizes this command, transforming themselves into self-managers and reproducers of corporate logic.

In this sense, the PNED expresses a reconfiguration of the school’s social function. The public school, historically conceived as a space for collective formation, is redefined as a laboratory for innovation and technological application. Teaching becomes a digital service, and the educational process, an object of profitability and control. Informational capital thus penetrates the very soul of teaching work, redefining the relationship between knowledge, power, and education.

### **Resistance and Praxis as an Emancipatory Horizon**

Despite its apparently consensual and progressive discourse, the PNED is traversed by contradictions that reveal its class character. While promising to democratize access to technology, it deepens inequalities among schools and regions, reinforcing Brazil’s technological dependence on global corporations. The promise of digital inclusion conceals a policy of subordinate integration into the global data market and platform economy.

Critically confronting the PNED, therefore, requires situating it within the broader dispute between two rationalities: the epistemology of technique and the epistemology of praxis (Curado Silva, 2019). Whereas the former transforms education into a means of adaptation to the digital world, the latter proposes understanding it as a practice of liberation

and of socially grounded knowledge production. Reaffirming praxis means recovering the ontological meaning of teaching work, recognizing it as a creative, mediating, and consciousness-forming activity.

As Paulo Freire (1996, p. 67) wrote, “technique is not neutral; it can serve the liberation or the domestication of human beings.” The PNED, if not problematized through a critical perspective, tends to consolidate the technological domestication of education. However, if appropriated through pedagogical praxis, it can be re-signified as an instrument of democratization of knowledge and strengthening of public schooling. The challenge lies in disputing the meaning of the digital, transforming it from a tool of control into a means of emancipation—and, above all, reestablishing teaching work as a foundational category of human formation.

Given this scenario, it is urgent to reintroduce the debate on education within the horizon of the epistemology of praxis (Curado Silva, 2019; Freire, 1996; Saviani, 2021). The hegemony of the global reform movement is not total; it is sustained by contradictions and fissures that allow for resistance. Reaffirming praxis means recovering the human, historical, and collective meaning of education, understanding teaching work as a creative activity rather than a mere technical function. It is a movement of reappropriation of knowledge and time that restores to the school its role as a public space of critical formation and meaning-making.

As Gramsci (2000) teaches, “every relationship of hegemony is necessarily a pedagogical relationship.” Thus, disputing hegemony in education means disputing the meanings of teaching and learning, confronting the neoliberal project that transforms the school into a corporation and the teacher into an entrepreneur of the self. The struggle for integral human formation and for the valorization of teaching work is, therefore, a struggle for the very humanity of labor—and for the affirmation of education as a social practice of freedom.

The *National Digital Education Policy* (PNED) is a concrete expression of this process in Brazil. Under the discourse of innovation and inclusion, the PNED consolidates the hegemony of neoliberal and technocratic rationality, transforming the digital into an instrument of regulation and social control. By inserting schools and teachers into the logic of performativity, the policy contributes to constructing a new teacher subjectivity shaped by the imperatives of efficiency, flexibility, and entrepreneurship—what Dardot and Laval (2016) call the *neoliberal subject*.

In this context, the teacher ceases to be the organic intellectual of the subaltern classes—committed to the production of critical and collective consciousness—and becomes

a functional intellectual of the new historical bloc of capital, engaged in meeting targets, managing platforms, and reproducing performance indicators.

Gramsci (2001) warns that domination relies less on coercion than on the conquest of consensus—a consensus that, in education, is produced through the ideology of “technological innovation” and “pedagogical modernization.” The PNED thus represents a contemporary form of *passive revolution*, in which structural changes occur without rupture, absorbing legitimate demands (such as inclusion and access) within an adaptive and conservative logic. The progressive discourse of digital education conceals the persistence of inequality and the subsumption of teaching work to informational capital, transforming pedagogical creativity and reflection into measurable productive force.

In this process, the public school risks losing its character as a space of human and critical formation, becoming a laboratory for technology application and data extraction. Teaching work, reduced to technical operation, is stripped of its ontological and political potential. The teacher, instead of being a mediator of culture and science, becomes an executor of algorithms and curator of content—or, in Ball’s (2012) words, “a performative subject who lives under the permanent pressure to justify himself.” However, as Gramsci reminds us, “history is always open, and the terrain of hegemony is that of struggle.” It is within this space of contradiction that resistance emerges. Critiquing the PNED and the global reform movement cannot be limited to denunciation—it must also announce and build another historical possibility for education.

The epistemology of praxis, in Gramsci, is the living synthesis between theory and practice, between labor and consciousness, between subject and history. To conceive teacher education from the perspective of praxis means recognizing the teacher as an organic intellectual of the working class, capable of collectively and critically elaborating a new pedagogical common sense, founded not on technique but on ethics, solidarity, and emancipation. This conception reaffirms teaching work as the foundational category of human formation—not as mere instrumental execution, but as creative activity that produces culture, meaning, and humanity.

Within this horizon, resistance to digital hegemony does not imply rejecting technology but rather critically reappropriating it. The digital, when reclaimed through praxis, can become a means of knowledge socialization, democratization of learning, and strengthening of public education. The challenge lies in disputing the historical meaning of the digital—whether it will serve as an instrument of alienation and control, or of emancipation and collective sharing.

Thus, the struggle against the commodification and platformization of education is also a struggle for the formation of a new hegemony—a counter-hegemony grounded in praxis and in the defense of labor as the educational principle. Following Freire (1996), it is a matter of reaffirming education as a practice of freedom, not of technical training. Following Gramsci, it is about forming organic intellectuals of the working class—individuals capable of thinking and transforming the world, rather than merely reproducing it.

In summary, the global movement of reforms and the PNED reveal capital's effort to redefine the roles of the school and the teacher, but they also reveal the latent power of education as a space of counter-hegemony. The struggle over the meaning of digital education is, ultimately, a struggle over the very historical project of society: between passive adaptation to the existing order and the conscious construction of a new historical bloc founded on human emancipation.

## References

APPLE, M. W. *Educação e poder*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2003.

BALL, S. J. *Políticas educacionais: questões e dilemas*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2005.

BALL, S. J. *Global Education Inc.: new policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. London: Routledge, 2012.

CURADO SILVA, K. A. C. P. da. *Formação de professores e epistemologia da práxis*. Brasília: Universidade de Brasília, 2023.

DALE, R. The state and the governance of education: an analysis of the restructuring of the state-education relationship. In: HALSEY, A. H.; LAUDER, H.; BROWN, P.; WELLS, A. S. (Org.). *Education, culture, economy, and society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. p. 273-282.

DARDOT, P.; LAVAL, C. *A nova razão do mundo: ensaio sobre a sociedade neoliberal*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.

FREIRE, P. *Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

GRAMSCI, A. *Cadernos do cárcere: volume 1 – Introdução ao estudo da filosofia; A filosofia de Benedetto Croce*. 6. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2000.

GRAMSCI, A. *Cadernos do cárcere: volume 2 – Os intelectuais; O princípio educativo; Jornalismo*. 6. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2001.

OLIVEIRA, D. A. *Reestruturação do trabalho docente: precarização e flexibilização*. 2. ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2018.

OLIVEIRA, D. A. Trabalho docente, intensificação e regulação: um olhar sobre as políticas contemporâneas. In: SILVA, K. A. C. P. C. da (Org.). *Trabalho docente e formação: perspectivas críticas*. Brasília: UnB, 2021. p. 55–74.

OCDE. Organização para a cooperação e desenvolvimento econômico (OCDE). *OECD Learning Compass 2030: a series of concept notes*. Paris: OECD, 2019.

ROBERTSON, S. Globalisation and education governance: accountability and the politics of education for all. In: VERGER, A.; NOVELLI, M.; ALTINYELKEN, H. (Org.). *Global education policy and international development: new agendas, issues and policies*. London: Bloomsbury, 2012. p. 227–243.

SAVIANI, D. *Pedagogia histórico-crítica: primeiras aproximações*. 13. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2021.

SELWYN, N. *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2020.

UNESCO. *Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action – Towards inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all*. Paris: UNESCO, 2015.

WILLIAMSON, B. *Big data in education: the digital future of learning, policy and practice*. London: Sage, 2017.