EmRede
Revista de Educação a Distância
UniRede

EmRede, v.11. 2024

# Hybrid Education, Digital Education and Brazilian contexts: much to discuss and learn

**Alessandra Maieski**
Federal University of Mato Grosso (UFMT), Cuiabá, Mato Grosso, Brazil
alessandra.maieski@ufmt.br

**Ana Lara Casagrande**
Federal University of Mato Grosso (UFMT), Cuiabá, Mato Grosso, Brazil
analaracg@gmail.com

**Katia Morosov Alonso**
Federal University of Mato Grosso (UFMT), Cuiabá, Mato Grosso, Brazil
katia.ufmt@gmail.com

**Abstract**: The article aims to problematize the inaccuracies in the definition of Hybrid Education (HE) in light of the National Digital Education Policy (PNED) and the use of digital technologies in education. Through a bibliographic and documentary review, an essay is proposed that defends a solid educational policy for HE, supported by pedagogical practices that prioritize interaction, dialogue, and collaboration. Among the results, the need to overcome the simplistic view of HE as a mere combination of face-to-face and distance learning stands out, emphasizing the importance of the PNED, which includes clear guidelines for HE in line with the digital culture of today.
**Keywords**: Digital Technologies in Education; Hybrid Education; Digital Culture; National Digital Education Policy.

## Educação Híbrida, Educação Digital e os contextos brasileiros: o muito a debater e aprender

**Resumo**: O artigo objetiva problematizar as imprecisões na definição de Educação Híbrida (EH) frente à Política Nacional de Educação Digital (PNED) e o uso das Tecnologias Digitais na Educação. Por meio de uma revisão bibliográfica e documental, propõe-se um ensaio que defende uma política



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

educacional sólida para EH, sustentada em práticas pedagógicas que priorizem a interação, o diálogo e a colaboração. Entre os resultados, destaca-se a necessidade de superar a visão simplista da EH como mera combinação de presencial e a distância, ressaltando a importância da PNED incorporar diretrizes evidentes para a EH, alinhadas à Cultura Digital, na contemporaneidade.

**Palavras-chave**: Tecnologias Digitais na Educação; Educação Híbrida; Cultura Digital; Política Nacional de Educação Digital.

## Educación híbrida, educación digital y contextos brasileños: mucho que debatir y aprender

**Resumen**: El artículo pretende analizar las imprecisiones en la definición de educación híbrida (ES) en contraposición a la Política Nacional de Educación Digital (PNED) y al uso de las tecnologías digitales en la educación. A través de una revisión bibliográfica y documental, se propone un ensayo que defiende una política educativa sólida para la ES, basada en prácticas pedagógicas que prioricen la interacción, el diálogo y la colaboración. Entre los resultados, se destaca la necesidad de superar la visión simplista de la ES como una mera combinación de educación presencial y a distancia, enfatizando la importancia de que la PNED incorpore directrices claras para la ES, alineadas con la cultura digital de la época contemporánea.

**Palabras clave**: Tecnologías Digitales en la Educación; Educación Híbrida; Cultura Digital; Política Nacional de Educación Digital.

Received on: 2024-07-04

Accepted on: 2024-10-17



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The debate on Hybrid Education (HE) in education has taken on new dimensions with the pandemic caused by the new coronavirus SARS-CoV-2, especially with the resumption of face-to-face activities (suspended to contain contamination). This period is considered a milestone in time, as Emergency Remote Education (ERE) has given rise to experiences that have led to some confusion about HE.

The text is an essay and is methodologically based on studies developed by theorists who discuss the topic and on legal documents, in order to bring together ideas, criticisms, reflections and to problematize some issues on the topic. Before proposing premises, it is necessary to accumulate understandings that can then support learning that implies expectations about possible didactic-pedagogical organizations that express the challenges posed in contemporary times.

Therefore, we identify the persistence of misunderstandings about the concept of HE, also addressing the presence of Digital Technologies (DT) in education as a synonym for this approach. In this scenario, there is also the discussion about the Educational Policy for Digital Education (PNED) - (Lula government 2023-2026), whose project was approved by the Committee of Science, Technology, Innovation, Communication and Information Technology and foresees actions to expand access to technology on five fronts: digital inclusion, digital education, training, digital specialization, and digital research, which are part of the debate mobilized here.

In this context, this text arises from the need to problematize the issue, highlighting its complexity and the importance of a more comprehensive understanding, since the official documents that deal with the subject present a superficial understanding and can generate errors and implications in institutional decision-making. It is worth emphasizing that public policies are essential in a society that wants to be democratic and that promotes quality education with a social reference.

Therefore, a broader understanding is needed that includes, in addition to the pandemic, Distance Education (EaD - in Brazil) in the midst of conceptual confusion, understanding it as an educational modality, according to Brazilian legislation, whose teaching-learning process experiences occur through multidirectional and collaborative interaction, with pedagogical mediation anchored in the Virtual Learning Environment (AVA) and Digital Technologies (DT), with presential support centers distributed throughout the country. In addition, it is noteworthy that DT played a fundamental role in sustaining educational activities. Given this, it is natural to ask how these technologies will continue to influence the educational scenario in the future. However, it is crucial to emphasize that



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

HE cannot be reduced to the mere use of DT in an instrumental and technocentric way, as this runs the risk of reinforcing traditional educational practices coated with a digital veneer, without bringing about real changes in the teaching-learning process.

In order to verify (mis)understandings and deepen the approach to the topic, it is supported by authors who discuss it, problematizing the simplification of the idea of mixing face-to-face and distance learning as a defining factor of higher education, as well as the confusion in the regulations that deal with the issue and the conceptions that permeate public policy (or the lack thereof) in relation to digital education.

As Velloso, Mill and Moreira (2023) point out, the boundaries between educational modalities are becoming increasingly blurred. Distinctions are increasingly blurred as students are physically present in a classroom while still connected to the Internet on their mobile devices. They participate in virtual environments but with sporadic presential meetings, taking courses in person combined with others at a distance. It is clear that in a single activity, there are experiences of synchronous moments combined with asynchronous interactions, bringing to the face-to-face classroom experiences acquired in virtual spaces. The formation of these subjects takes place in a constant reciprocity between the online and the offline, in such an integrated way that a clear separation between them has become practically impossible.

In view of this, the question arises: would there be definitive boundaries between the different ways of organizing the training process, considering the more intense use of DT in training processes?

This work does not propose absolute answers, the idea is to debate and reflect on possible understandings and new ways of organizing training processes in fluid and changing contexts in the so-called Digital Culture (DC).

## 2 DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES IN EDUCATION: SOME REFLECTIONS

Addressing the discussions that permeate DT in education requires understanding society's immersion in DC, therefore, with subjects who practice a culture that represents a set of practices, values, and interactions historically constituted by the intersection of different elements that influence (since World War II) social, economic, political and educational aspects (Gere, 2008), transforming the way one learns, communicates and establishes relationships with knowledge and with others.

The emerging trend is to see DC as characterized only by technological development, ignoring all the nuances that make it up. This reductionist view often limits the understanding of the true



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

potential of ICT in education, reducing them to operational tools and ignoring the need for pedagogical planning that critically integrates their understanding with pedagogical practices and educational goals.

On the one hand, it is undeniable that DTs pose challenges to teaching-learning processes; on the other hand, they represent a universe of possibilities, allowing the convergence of devices, resources, and plural digital media. However, in order to contribute to the formation of the social subject, it is important to take into account aspects such as: planned and structured public policies that promote the use of DTs; investments by public agencies, both in infrastructure and human resources, without neglecting the social inequality of access to them and to the Internet, since it is not enough to have access in itself, but to promote conditions for its dissemination with quality.

In this context, it is worth noting that DTs include a variety of resources and devices that allow access, processing, storage, and sharing of information in the most diverse areas of knowledge, in addition to allowing communication and interaction between subjects who are distant from the same space-time, breaking down the traditional physical barriers of education. In any case, it is necessary to consider not only the introduction of technology as a support tool but also the critical education of the subjects in DC.

Taking this into account, Castells (2016) warns that in the information society, a large part of social interactions are constituted in networks, and therefore relationships drive and are driven by DT, extrapolating the time and space of formation and affecting our understanding of the world. In this sense, its mobilization has a significant impact on education, generating new and different possibilities for teaching and learning.

Initial and continuing teacher education is at the center of the debate and is undoubtedly related to autonomy, dialogue, cooperation, interaction, and mediation, understood in an increasingly networked society. It is believed that the inclusion of DT in education is intrinsically linked to its social function, in order to overcome the view of the teacher as a transmitter of knowledge, maximum authority, and the notion of means as an end.

Regarding the performance of the subjects, Pretto (2011, p. 101, translated by us) addresses the process of collaborative action in the educational field, considering it "of fundamental importance because it potentially allows the understanding that contemporary technological devices, built and developed historically, constitute elements that contribute to the construction of other social practices".

In this way, (re)thinking the educational process in contemporary times means working with



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

different perspectives, with quite new problems that still have no answers, forcing us, as Pretto (2011) does, to deal with the idea of "educations", that is, there would not be just one way of organizing it, but different possibilities of the constitution.

In this sense, in relation to the Covid-19 pandemic and what was widely discussed as a lack of preparation to deal with DT in education, it ended up reflecting how educational institutions, in general, were (and are) unaware of the possibilities of working with DT as enhancers of pedagogical mediation, precisely because they provide spaces for and of educational dialogue.

Thus, mobilizing the use of DT in the educational context has the potential to contribute to the development of "personal skills and abilities ranging from communication actions, agility, information search to individual autonomy, expanding their possibilities for insertion in the information and knowledge society" (Tezani, 2011, p. 36, translated by us).

In this sense, the integration of DT in pedagogical practices allows the active participation of students in an increasingly digitalized and networked world, expanding their possibilities and improving the teaching-learning process.

It is not a question of defending their use in an instrumental way, but rather of including them as alternatives for pedagogical work, taking into account the cultural appropriations of our time in the digital context, as

> In times of enormous changes, of a world structured in a complex way where the analog and the digital, the real and the virtual, the human and the machine, the offline and the online coexist, of the recognition that we live in a new social, cultural, economic, political and even ethical order and of the dizzying evolution of technologies, we are faced with the need to redefine the educational paradigm (Moreira, 2018, p. 6, translated by us).

This redefinition includes the adoption of diversified strategies that promote interdisciplinarity, collaboration and critical thinking, taking advantage of DT to enrich the educational process and make it more dialogic and interactive.

In addition, other concepts are discussed that also deserve to be problematized, such as the fact that DC has implications for higher education and public policies. By transforming the dynamics of knowledge production and circulation, DC challenges traditional teaching-learning structures, the reconfiguration of pedagogical practices and educational policies. However, this reconfiguration is not always articulated and reflected, as can be seen in the following discussions.



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

EmRede
Revista de Educação a Distância
UniRede

## 3 HYBRID EDUCATION: (MIS)UNDERSTANDINGS

Reflecting on HE is at the same time complex and challenging, as it involves many errors, from its nomenclature to its very definition, especially with regard to official Brazilian documents dealing with the subject.

Although the focus is not to dwell on the topic of ERE, it is necessary to contextualize how the discussion of HE is arrived at. During the Covid-19 pandemic, educational institutions as a whole, including teachers, students, technicians and other professionals involved, rethought the didactic-pedagogical organization of presential classes to online classes, due to the mandatory social distancing imposed by the pandemic.

The ERE enabled curricular flexibility through the intensive use of TD. As time passed and the pandemic stabilized due to the effective vaccination campaign, educational institutions gradually returned to their previous pedagogical practices, based mainly on face-to-face learning.

However, in the post-pandemic 21st century, a new reality has emerged in educational institutions called hybrid education. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) document entitled "Hybrid Education, Learning, and Assessment: a reader - an overview of frameworks, issues and developments in light of COVID-19 and the way forward"[1], recognizes that the many practices implemented during the pandemic have given substance and impetus to new developments in pedagogical practices in hybrid modes (UNESCO, 2023). But what exactly are we talking about? In order to answer this question, it is important to clarify a priori that ERE, HE, and EaD are not synonymous, just as it is a mistake to consider curricular flexibility as HE, as each has its specificities.

A point worth reflecting on in this sense is the warning against the simplification that HE articulates presential and non-presential activities with a mix of activities, as presented in the General Guidelines on Hybrid Learning: "resulting from the integrated articulation of face-to-face and non-face-to-face educational activities, mixed with curricular activities carried out at other times and places" (Brasil, 2021, p. 7, translated by us).

This definition ends up impoverishing the understanding of this issue on the agenda. Moran (2015), for example, addresses the complexity of the concept of HE, pointing out that in the field of education, there are several types of mixtures: of knowledge, values, and methodologies that include

[1] Free translation: "Blended Education, Learning and Assessment: A Reading – An Overview of Frameworks, Issues and Developments in Light of COVID-19 and the Way Forward".



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

challenges, activities, projects, among others; of technologies and the articulation of more formal processes with informal ones; of open and networked education.

A second important aspect is the confusion of nomenclatures and definitions presented by public bodies. For example, the Brazilian National Education Council (CNE) published the General Guidelines for the Provision of Hybrid Learning (Brazil, 2021). Attention is drawn to the variety of nomenclature used to address hybridization in education, which will vary between teaching, learning, and, what is considered most appropriate here, HE. In the aforementioned document, HE is characterized as

> [...] articulation of presential and non-presential educational activities, mixed with curricular activities carried out in other times and places, in which synchronous and asynchronous educational activities are developed, mediated or not by information and communication technologies (Brasil, 2021, p. 7, translated by us).

It is clear that this guideline remains in the shallow field of understanding of relay, alternation, and/or combination between face-to-face and distance learning without further deepening. The very terminology "hybrid learning" or even "hybrid teaching", as it appears in the document, indicates a certain shift in the focus of the teaching-learning process. Therefore, the appropriate terminology will be considered in this text: Hybrid Education, precisely because it denotes a broader process that goes beyond teaching itself.

When talking about teaching-learning processes, it is important to take into account that the subjects are cultural practitioners immersed in the DC, in which interactions, mediations, collaborations, and dialogues take place in a continuum. In support of this understanding, Christensen, Horn and Staker (2013) consider HE as a formal educational program, partly online and partly in a physical space, subsidized by time, place, mode, and/or pace of study. In the same vein, it is also defined by Lencastre (2013) as a diversity and variety of combinations.

The fact is that pedagogical practices during the Covid-19 pandemic, through the intense use of DT in training processes, have driven transformations in education. Thus, in the post-vaccine period, a new perspective on HE has emerged, inspired by new pedagogical practices. It is important to note that HE is seen as going beyond the bricolage between presential and distance education, "breaking the boundaries not only of time and space, but also of teaching methods and forms, and of the concept of learning, which is now expanded to include different experiences that students have inside or outside the educational environment" (Lima; Rodrigues; Cruz, 2021, p. 64, translated by us).

The third point to reflect on concerns the error of considering HE as a learning methodology,

as presented in the General Guidelines for Hybrid Education: "with the flexible methodology of hybrid education, we seek to expand the current regulatory guidelines, without the percentage limits established for practices and remote learning possible for students" (Brasil, 2021, p. 12, translated by us).

Considering HE only as a learning methodology reduces its complexity and transformative potential since it is not only a technique or a set of practices to be followed, but integrates several dimensions of the educational process, including DT, pedagogy, school organization, and professional development of educators. From the point of view of Veloso, Mill and Moreira (2023), HE is also a collaborative and integrated teaching-learning process, combined with DT, and goes beyond the perspective of merging two modalities. Therefore, HE:

> It is not limited to active methodologies, to the mix of presential and online, of classrooms and other spaces, but it shows that teaching and learning has never been more fascinating, because of the countless possibilities it offers, but also more frustrating, because of the difficulties in getting everyone to develop their potential and really mobilize themselves to evolve even more (Moran, 2015, p. 28, translated by us).

The implementation of HE should focus not only on overcoming percentage limits and methodological freedom but also on creating strategies that facilitate effective engagement and continuous development of all participants. Moran (2015) reminds us that for HE to be truly transformative, constant efforts are needed to motivate students, support teachers, and ensure that new educational practices not only delight but also provide tangible and inclusive results for all.

In this joint discussion, it is agreed that HE would not be a method, since it does not have specific and universalizable procedures that characterize it, according to the reflections presented. Santinello, Costa and Santos (2020, p. 3, translated by us), for example, consider it as a "type of pedagogical resource". An important component at this moment seems to be precisely the evaluation of a strategic plan, with the conditions of each context, so that school institutions promote changes to incorporate DT into pedagogical practices.

In this case, there are fundamental disagreements. DT, as we understand it, would imply profound (re)significations of institutional and pedagogical practices, especially those related to the bases of didactic-pedagogical organizations that, according to Casagrande, Maieski and Alonso (2023), would support the necessary dialogue between education and training.

Horn and Staker (2015, p. 35, translated by us) consider that it is "[...] a formal educational



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

program in which a student learns, at least in part, through online instruction. The student has some control over at least one of the following elements: time, place, mode, and/or pace of learning". Although it is therefore imperative to emphasize that the teaching and learning process is relational, its participants always evoke processes of interaction and mediation, as Vygotsky (2000) has already taught us, the controls are therefore secondary, implying for this context DT: those of relationships.

Therefore, it is understood that it is necessary to go beyond the bricolage between face-to-face and distance learning, understanding HE as part of a teaching-learning process linked to contemporary demands, intertwined with theoretical principles and procedures that articulate pedagogical practices in the face of the potential of DT in education. That is, to speak of a mixture of presential and distance education is a conceptual simplification.

In this sense, the most appropriate definition for HE, at this time, is consistent with a collective way of organizing the teaching-learning process, including strategies and methodologies combined between presential, online, and offline, assuming their use in line with DC, and achieving socially referenced quality.

This definition is based on the International Research Network called Quality and Regulation in the context of Open, Flexible or Distance Education in Brazil and South America, whose objective is to develop studies and research on aspects related to quality and regulatory processes in the context of Open, Flexible and Distance Education in Brazil and South America.

## 4 NATIONAL DIGITAL EDUCATION POLICY

Questioning what Paulo Freire (an author considered subversive by the military regime - post-1964 period) called banking, transmissive, in which content is deposited in order to withdraw investments at the end of a certain period, focused on results linked to numerical data and not to learning (Freire, 1987), is something relevant, not that this movement is unprecedented or recent.

However, it becomes essential when we realize the impact of what we might call "rote learning" on the understanding of the role of schools and teaching in the face of so many social networks and digital platforms available, at a time when videos of digital influencers hypnotize (sometimes literally, through the release of dopamine that generates hours of aimless browsing), generate likes and many followers.

It is important not to go to the other extreme and think of teaching as entertainment and the classroom as a space to compete with choreographed dances, well-edited/animated videos, and memes



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

(written or image-based texts that have a humorous effect) on social media because studying really requires concentration and effort. Pena, Gonçalves, and Oliveira (2022, p. 1676, translated by us) analyze the most recent pandemic period, observing how the challenges that existed before it have deepened in the face of the imposition of DT mobilization amid a "minefield" of disputes over power, profits, and inequalities in access to education.

It is used to emphasize the institutionalized teaching-learning process, with guidelines and assumptions based on Brazilian educational policies. Not to use the terms of the class as a show does not mean to imagine a content-based education, centered on the figure of the teacher, that worked for a certain time, in the sense that it was a naturalized practice, considered appropriate, without nostalgia for how efficient it was.

What one hears in praise must be put into perspective by the time when few people went to school, to the point where it is not possible to determine whether the results came from other social and economic privileges or from the primer, from memorizing information, from spit, chalk and paddle.

It should be noted that, before addressing the PNED, it is crucial to understand the education in which one believes, so that digital does not become a Trojan horse (like the strategy of the Greek present, which was decisive in the conquest of the city) ready to corrode the conception of the objective of education from within, as a synthesis of the link between education, innovation and productivism, in the consolidation of a clearly economistic vision, without concern for linking these objectives to the development of citizenship.

The quality of education is guaranteed with a social reference and aims at the development of a democratic society whose citizens actively participate in its construction, not only by voting. In other words, democracy is understood in a way that goes beyond participation in specific electoral periods. The definition of Libâneo, Oliveira and Toschi (2012, p. 34, translated by us) is used when discussing the fact that the population needs "a school of social and pedagogical quality that socializes culture, science and art as universal rights".

In this sense, it seems appropriate to discuss what is called digital education, especially considering the moment that society is going through intensifying the debate on Artificial Intelligence (AI), algorithms, and related topics. For example, the Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (ChatGPT), created by an artificial intelligence (AI) research laboratory called OpenAI, highlights the urgency of debates on creation, the limits of authorship, and digital literacy.

Among the general competencies established for basic education (BE) is the appreciation and



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

use of historically constructed knowledge about the digital world to understand and explain reality, and the use of different languages. The document of the National Common Curricular Base (BNCC), aimed at High School, states that access to knowledge about the digital world and DC practices should also be prioritized (Brasil, 2018). It can be seen that the current national curriculum guidelines address new literacies, stating that "it is necessary to consider digital culture" (Brasil, 2018, p. 478, translated by us).

Bill No. 4,513/2020 is the seed of the initiative to create and promote digital inclusion, literacy, and citizenship, with the aim of meeting the needs of different population groups. The bill, approved by the Chamber of Deputies in August 2022, amends the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDB) - Law No. 9,394, of December 20, 1996 - with the aim of including digital skills in the BE curricula, starting from elementary education.

Law No. 14,533 of January 11, 2023, a regulation resulting from the aforementioned project, establishes the PNED and, as expected, amends the LDB, in addition to Law No. 9,448 of March 14, 1997, Law No. 10,260 of July 12, 2001, and Law No. 10,753 of October 30, 2003. The policy, whose priority is the most vulnerable population, is defined as an articulated set of programs, projects, and actions of different federal entities, areas, and government sectors, with the aim of "improving the standards and results of public policies related to the access of the Brazilian population to digital resources, tools, and practices" (Brasil, 2023, art. 1, translated by us).

The structure and objectives of the PNED are defined in four axes. The first of these is Digital Inclusion, developed according to the promotion strategies: of digital and informational skills; of online tools for self-diagnosis of digital, media and informational skills; of training in digital, media and informational skills, including the most vulnerable groups of citizens; of facilitating the development of and access to platforms and repositories of digital resources; of certification processes in digital skills and the implementation and integration of connectivity infrastructure for educational purposes (Brasil, 2023, art. 2, translated by us).

Such inclusion is urgent when considering what Santos and Torres (2021, p. 10, translated by us) call the "hyperconnected life", in which "the separation between being connected and disconnected from digital networks is diluted, changing the relationship with subjects, society, politics, culture, and education".

The second, Digital School Education, whose stated objective is to guarantee the inclusion of digital education in school environments, at all levels and modalities, based on the promotion of digital and information literacy and the learning of computing, programming, robotics, and other digital



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

skills, must be in line with the BNCC (Brazil, 2023, art. 3).

In fact, the current BNCC, a normative document, recognizes DC and the promotion of new forms of multimedia, multimodal interaction, and social action in networks, in a way that considers fundamental the understanding and incorporation by the school of "new languages and their modes of operation, revealing possibilities of communication (and also of manipulation), and that educates for a more democratic use of technologies and a more conscious participation in digital culture" (Brasil, 2018, p. 57, translated by us). Thus, there is an alignment between the basic guidelines and the second axis established in the PNED.

It should be emphasized that Digital Schooling would not have to run the risk of considering DT as a solution to the problems observed in education, since they are deeper and linked to historical, economic, political, and social aspects. For Moreira and Schelemmer (2020), a paradigm shift is needed, with mobilization based on dialogue, interaction, collaboration, interactivity, cooperation, and sharing.

It is with the aim of reducing this gap that the third axis, Policy, and Digital Training and Specialization, related to the world of work, was established, with the objective of training the Brazilian population of working age, providing them with opportunities to develop digital skills for full insertion in the same.

Priority strategies to achieve this include: the strengthening and expansion of the network of master's and doctoral programs specializing in digital skills; the promotion of actions to train teachers, with a focus on the fundamentals of computing and emerging and innovative technologies; digital qualification of civil servants and employees, with the formulation of a human resources management policy aimed at combating the deficit of digital skills in public administration (Brasil, 2023, art. 4, translated by us)

Thus, it is noted that there are implications for Higher Education (HE) when observing the strategies of policy and digital training and specialization, with regard to postgraduate and teacher training (undergraduate). In fact, there is a role for universities, here with emphasis given to public universities, in the configuration of pedagogical practices that value digital literacy.

The last axis is Research and Development in Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), which aims to develop and promote accessible and inclusive information and communication technologies (ICT) by, among other things: promoting the generation, organization, and sharing of scientific knowledge in a free, collaborative, transparent and sustainable way, within a concept of open science; creating a strategy for the training and requalification of teachers in ICT and enabling



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

technologies (Brasil, 2023, art. 5, translated by us).

Concerning ICT, which is defended as being promoted, it should be noted that this text takes into account the concept of DT, since it is a broader term in the contemporary world, permeated by DC, and in any case includes ICT. It should be emphasized that DT and ICT are not synonymous; the difference between the terms lies mainly in their scope and application. While ICT refers to any technology that uses electronic and digital systems to process, store, and transmit data. This includes a wide range of devices and resources such as computers, smartphones, tablets, and software. ICT, on the other hand, is a subset of ICT that specifically covers the systems and devices used to transmit and share information. It includes not only digital devices but also communication networks such as the Internet, mobile networks, and telecommunications infrastructures.

In this context, the debate on copyright and licensing is related to the production of open science, a relevant discussion today, as the structured system of scientific communication as it existed until recently is no longer the most appropriate, at least not in light of new production resources and sharing practices. Open Educational Resources (OER), for example, are materials with a permissive license, with the possibility of accessing and reusing the information.

As regards the sources of funding for the PNED, the following are described Union, State, Federal District and Municipal budget allocations; Fund for the Universalization of Telecommunications Services, from January 1, 2025; Fund for the Technological Development of Telecommunications, but public or private donations are also foreseen, and it is proposed that agreements, terms of commitment, cooperation agreements, terms of decentralized execution, adjustments or similar instruments may be signed with bodies and entities of the Federal, State, Federal District and Municipal public administration, as well as with private entities, under the terms of specific regulations (Brasil, 2023, art. 11, translated by us).

A crucial caveat concerns the participation of the private sector, even those designated as non-profit, in public policies, as it may lead to a strategy of distancing the State from its responsibilities. Such participation was recently observed by Pena, Gonçalves and Oliveira (2022) during the period of the Covid-19 pandemic in education. The authors identify the involvement of business groups and private institutions in formulating public education policies, with a focus on the efficiency of schools and education, disregarding their purposes.

The idea, specifically with regard to the financing of the PNED, is that the resources for the provision of the policy are included in the State planning, which provides a guarantee for its operationalization. When it comes to this guarantee, reference is made to the right of the citizen, which



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

is guaranteed by the responsibility of the public authority with a given policy.

It is clear that the PNED avoids the discussion on HE, which would allow the distinction between Distance Education, presential education, ERE (given as an exception during the pandemic period), seeking to situate, in addition to the idea of intersection, the pedagogical practice planned to be hybrid. From this point of view, it is necessary to characterize what this hybridization would consist of. Because in Distance Education, for example, there are also moments of personal interaction in the training process, without being defined as such.

The fact that HE is not specified in the PNED, and is only presented as general guidelines, leaves a significant gap in terms of nomenclature and concept within the scope of what this policy would be. This is a requirement for the educational community so that everything and/or anything does not involve DT mobilization. This can lead to a mixture of Distance Education, ERE, and HE, that is, the sense of highlighting and including pedagogical practices that are in line with the experiences of DC practitioners is lost.

Maximino (2018), for example, develops a case study related to the experience with hybridism (proposes the construction of a pedagogical experience by inserting the hybrid teaching methodology combined with the use of the educational social network platform "Edmodo") in a school in the state public network of Pará, in the municipality of Marabá, with two teachers in the field of Languages, Codes and their Technologies and students from a first-year high school class.

The author characterizes EH as a methodology that appears in different places in the text, such as "a teaching methodology known as hybrid teaching that aims to integrate the classroom with DT to improve the educational process" (Maximino, 2018, p. 19, translated by us); "the general objective of the research is to study the effects of the hybrid teaching methodology in basic education through the use of an educational social network to improve the educational process" (Maximino, 2018, p. 20, translated by us); "Hybrid teaching as an active learning methodology [...]" (Maximino, 2018, p. 56, translated by us); "To promote the hybrid teaching methodology, the research proposes the use of RSE - Edmodo, as a virtual educational tool and other technologies such as mobile phones and notebooks in the classroom" (Maximino, 2018, p. 86, translated by us).

Trevisani and Corrêa (2020), supported by Horn and Staker (2015), state that:

> [...] students take a more active, participatory stance in the construction of knowledge. The teacher, on the other hand, begins to guide them in this process, taking on the role of facilitator, in other words, advisor. Different venues can be used for these interactions, from the physical classroom to a social network or digital learning platform. Students can control the pace, time,



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

> place, and manner in which they learn content, allowing them to better understand what they are learning (Trevisani; Corrêa, 2020, p. 49, translated by us).

The authors talk about a hybrid class, whose main idea: "when planning a hybrid class, it is to integrate online and presential teaching, offering a learning experience in which these moments complement each other" (Trevisani; Corrêa, 2020, p. 50, translated by us).

Berlezzi (2017, p. 8, translated by us), in turn, speaks of hybrid language in relation to the curriculum when he defends the "importance of audiovisual language, script, and hybrid language as a narrative resource for systematizing ideas and as a way of translating the school curriculum". For the author, hybrid language should be incorporated as a teaching resource.

When dealing with hybridism, defined by Berlezzi (2017, p. 31, translated by us) as: "In education, it refers to the combination of two types of technologies, for example, face-to-face education (the student in the classroom/school) and distance education (the student relying only on the Internet and a device to access it)", the author mentions the change in formal education.

> [...] with the hegemony of verbal and textual language, to open space for the use of all languages, as the "culture of visualization" promotes reflection and impact on the aesthetics of the educational content produced, and requires teachers to rethink their practice, the selection of materials and promote hybridism in their classes (Berlezzi, 2017, p. 31, translated by us).

Some cases were mobilized to identify what is called conceptual imprecision about HE, as a way of highlighting the multiplicity found. Therefore, an in-depth study in this regard is recommended, for example through a systematic literature review.

The role of a policy is to serve as a guideline for educational practice. In this sense, it is expected that the PNED approach, together with the problematization proposed in this text about the conceptual imprecision regarding HE, will contribute to dimensioning the importance of an educational policy subsidy for the distinction and characterization of what is understood as HE, within theoretical, epistemological and methodological principles that help to make the PNED fruitful for pedagogical practices based on DC and the presence of DT in education.

## 5 CONSIDERATIONS

The HE and PNED were discussed in terms of education and DC. Both concern the direction of education in the present time. However, the gap identified in the PNED, especially with regard to



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

HE, leads to conceptual inaccuracies and a great diversity in the works related to the latter. It is clear that without a more coherent definition and well-defined guidelines, public policies run the risk of perpetuating disjointed approaches that are difficult to implement. It has been shown that a conceptual deepening is needed to explore more clearly the complexities of HE (beyond the simple idea of combining face-to-face and distance learning, which implies problematizing the definition of boundaries), especially with regard to its intersections with DC and the role of public policies in this process.

There is the impact of the pandemic (of course) and the urgency of understanding the new (not so new) modes of communication, in terms of production, processing, and sharing, mediated by DT. This future, in terms of hybrid and digital, still requires an in-depth discussion that takes into account the misunderstandings, the overlaps, and the lessons learned from previous policies and projects.

Concerning HE, we have sought a definition that demonstrates the integration between face-to-face and distance learning that is intentional, well-founded, and purposeful. The understanding is that it is inappropriate to consider EH as a methodology, precisely because it presupposes a reorganization and resignification of training in a broader sense. The notion of an integrated pedagogical approach seems more appropriate, in which the presence of DT is not limited to technological support, but acts as a potentializer in the construction of more flexible, collaborative, and critical educational practices.

Nor should it be seen as a mixture of presential and non-presential education, much less in-person and distance education, since the latter brings together the specificities of the modality, such as face-to-face support centers. The idea is that in the Brazilian context, distance education has its regulation, which is indicative of other ways of organizing the teaching-learning process.

There are aspects, such as financing, that should be addressed in the PNED, as well as an assessment of what is intended with HE. However, the focus is less on this or that moment/space and more on the objectives of the intended training, prioritizing relationships for interactive and collaborative work, essential characteristics in the educational practices of DC. Furthermore, funding policies are needed to ensure that DT and pedagogical practices related to HE can be implemented equitably in all educational contexts, especially in the most vulnerable.

It is also important to consider the link between copyright and the issues of free software and free technologies, in order to socialize the production of knowledge outside the sphere of profit, allowing access and appropriation by society as a whole and, of course, by educational institutions. It is appropriate that the discussion be integrated into educational policies in order to guarantee greater




DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

institutional and pedagogical autonomy.

In this sense, a "distance" approach is advocated, without distancing, with critical analysis of the information received and produced/shared, so that there would be a basis for digital inclusion, with a view to expanding digital and information literacy, which is costly due to the real need for citizens to use different languages, of which digital is undoubtedly one.

Thus, the intensive use of DT in the teaching-learning process requires that one first understands the place and, within it, the spaces of belonging through the collaborative sharing of knowledge and understanding of (and in) DC, constituting less unequal relationships socially and educationally. Promoting this requires a continuous effort of reflection and adaptation to ensure that DTs are used to reduce educational inequalities and not to increase them.

Of course, this challenge/understanding goes beyond HE and reaches the project of a society and education that humanizes, and promotes solidarity, with a view to a less instrumental use of DT, confirming an ideal that they never consist of: ends in themselves.

## 4 REFERENCES

BERLEZZI, F. L. C. **Formação de professores de educação básica para uso de linguagem híbrida**: a importância do roteiro de audiovisual no processo de ensino-aprendizagem. 155 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação, Arte e História da Cultura) - Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, São Paulo, 2017. Available at: https://dspace.mackenzie.br/items/0c1495f3-9547-4be0-a2c0-962c06703ff9/full. Accessed on: Jun. 20, 2024.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 14.533**. Institui a Política Nacional de Educação Digital. Brasília, 2023. Available at: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2023-2026/2023/Lei/L14533.htm. Accessed on: Feb. 22, 2024.

BRASIL. CONSELHO NACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO. **Institui as Diretrizes gerais nacionais para a aprendizagem híbrida**. Brasília, 2021. Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=227271-texto-referencia-educacao-hibrida&category_slug=novembro-2021-pdf&Itemid=30192. Accessed on: Jan. 26, 2024.

BRASIL. **Projeto de Lei n. 4.513 de 09 de setembro de 2020**. Projeto de Lei que instituiu a Política Nacional de Educação Digital. Diário Oficial da União: seção 1, Brasília, DF, 09 set. 2020.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular - Educação é a Base: Ensino Médio**. Brasília, 2018.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 10.753, de 30 de outubro de 2003**. Institui a Política Nacional do Livro. Diário Oficial da União: seção 1, Brasília, DF, 31 out. 2003.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 10.260, de 12 de julho de 2001**. Dispõe sobre o Fundo de Financiamento ao estudante do Ensino Superior e dá outras providências. Diário Oficial da União: seção 1, Brasília, DF, 13 jul. 2001.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 9.448, de 14 de março de 1997**. Altera a Lei n.º 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, e dá outras providências. Diário Oficial da União: seção 1, Brasília, DF, 17 mar. 1997.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996**. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Diário Oficial da União: seção 1, Brasília, DF, 23 dez. 1996.

CASAGRANDE, A. C.; MAIESKI, A.; ALONSO, K. M. Tecnologias digitais na educação pós-pandemia e educação híbrida: efeitos, lições e possibilidades. **EmRede**, v.10. p. 1-18, 2023, Available at: https://www.aunirede.org.br/revista/index.php/emrede/article/view/970/821. Accessed on: Jun. 10, 2024.

CASTELLS, M. **A sociedade em Rede**. 17ª Edição. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2016.

CHRISTENSEN, C.; HORN, M.; STAKER, H. **Ensino Híbrido**: Uma inovação disruptiva? Uma introdução à teoria dos híbridos, 2013. Clayton Christensen Institute, 2013.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do Oprimido**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.

GERE, C. **Culture Digital**. Secon Edition, 2008**.**

HORN, M. B.; STAKER H. **Blended**: usando a inovação disruptiva para aprimorar a educação. Tradução: MONTEIRO, M. C. G. Porto Alegre, RS: ed. Penso, 2015.

LENCASTRE, J. A. Blended Learning: a evolução de um conceito. In: MONTEIRO, A.; MOREIRA, J. A.; ALMEIDA, A. C.; LENCASTRE, J. A. (Orgs.). **Blended learning em contexto educativo**: perspectivas teóricas e práticas de investigação. 2.ed. Santo Tirso, Portugal: De Facto Editores, p. 19-32, 2013.

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; OLIVEIRA, J. F.; TOSCHI, M. Z. **Educação Escolar**: políticas, estrutura e organização. 10 ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

LIMA, D. C. B.; RODRIGUES, M. C. N.; CRUZ, J. R. Educação Semipresencial e Híbrida no Brasil: descortinando conceitos e regulamentação. **EducaOnline**, v. 15, n. 1, jan./abr., 2021. Available at: https://revistaeducaonline.eba.ufrj.br/edi%C3%A7%C3%B5es-anteriores/2021-1/educa%C3%A7%C3%A3o-semipresencial-e-h%C3%ADbrida-no-brasil-descortinando-conceitos-e-regul. Accessed on: Jul. 23, 2024.

MAXIMINO, M. E. S. **Expansão das fronteiras da sala de aula**: uso de uma rede social educativa no contexto do ensino híbrido na educação básica. 175 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Faculdade de Educação. Belo Horizonte, 2018.

MORAN, J. Educação híbrida: um conceito chave para a educação, hoje. In: BACICH, L.; TANZI, A.; TREVISANI, F. M. **Ensino Híbrido**:



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082

personalização e tecnologia na educação. Porto Alegre: Penso, p. 27-45, 2015.

MOREIRA, J. A.; SCHLEMMER, E. Por um novo conceito e paradigma de educação digital onlife. **Revista UFG**, v. 20, p. 1-35, 2020. Available at: https://www.revistas.ufg.br/revistaufg/article/view/63438/34772. Accessed on: Jul. 23, 2024.

MOREIRA, J. A. Reconfigurando Ecossistemas Digitais de Aprendizagem com Tecnologias Audiovisuais. **EmRede** - Revista De Educação a Distância, v. 5, n. 1, p. 5-15, 2018. Available at: https://www.aunirede.org.br/revista/index.php/emrede/article/view/305. Accessed on: Jul. 19, 2024.

PENA, G. B. O.; GONÇALVES, L. P. S.; OLIVEIRA, K. Análise do Papel da Escola em Tempos de Pandemia da Covid-19: sob a Ótica do Ciclo de Políticas de Ball. **Revista e-Curriculum**, São Paulo, v. 20, n. 4, p. 1653-1681, out./dez. 2022. Available at: https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/curriculum/article/view/54879. Accessed on: Jul. 23, 2023.

PRETTO, N. O desafio de educar na era digital: educações. **Revista Portuguesa de Educação** - CIEd - Universidade do Minho, v. 24, n. 1, p. 95-118, 2011. Available at: https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/374/37421276005.pdf. Accessed on: Mar. 23, 2024.

SANTINELLO, J.; COSTA, M. L. F.; SANTOS, R. O. A virtualização do Ensino Superior: reflexões sobre políticas públicas e Educação Híbrida. **Educar em Revista**, v. 36, p. 1-20, 2020.

SANTOS, K. E. E.; TORRES, P. L. Educação Digital – Híbrida e Onlife. **Revista UFG**. Goiânia, v. 21, p. 1-26, 2021. Available at: https://revistas.ufg.br/revistaufg/article/view/70045/37744. Accessed on: Jul. 23, 2024.

TEZANI, T. C. R. A educação escolar no contexto das tecnologias da informação e da comunicação: desafios e possibilidades para a prática pedagógica curricular. **Revista Faac**, Bauru, v. 1, n. 1, p. 35-45, abr./set., 2011. Available at: https://repositorio.unesp.br/bitstream/handle/11449/134637/ISSN2236-3424-2011-01-01-36-45.pdf. Accessed on: Feb. 25, 2024.

TREVISANI, F. de M.; CORRÊA, Y. Ensino Híbrido e o desenvolvimento de competências gerais da Base Nacional Comum Curricular. **Revista Prâksis**, v. 2, p. 43-62, 2020. Available at: https://periodicos.feevale.br/seer/index.php/revistapraksis/article/view/2208. Accessed on: Jun. 21, 2024.

UNESCO. **Hybrid Education, Learning, and Assessment**: a reader – an overview of frameworks, issues and developments in light of COVID-19 and the way forward. International Bureau of Education, 2023. Available at: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000387639. Accessed on: Sep. 19, 2024.

VELOSO, B. G.; MILL, D.; MOREIRA, J. A. Educação híbrida como tendência histórica: análise das realidades Brasileira e Portuguesa. **Dialogia**, São Paulo, n. 43, p. 1-20, jan/abr. 2023. Available at: https://periodicos.uninove.br/dialogia/article/view/23864/10152. Accessed on: Jun. 5, 2024.

VIGOTSKI, L. S. A. **Construção do Pensamento e da Linguagem**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2000.



DOI: http://doi.org/10.53628/emrede.v11i.1052 ISSN 2359-6082