


Pedagogical practices and teaching in rural education: Historical and contextualized reflections

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2024.024-010>

Andréia Moreira¹ and Laudemir Luiz Zart²

ABSTRACT

This article is part of the research developed within the scope of the Graduate Program in Education - PPGEdU of UNEMAT and is part of the theme of pedagogical practices aimed at rural education. The present study had a problem question: what are the pedagogical practices and the necessary teaching for an educational practice contextualized to rural education? To answer the question of the study, we established as a general objective to analyze the pedagogical and teaching practices proposed for a contextualized educational practice in rural education. As for the methodological aspects, the research is qualitative and used the techniques of bibliographic research and field observation. Among the main results achieved, we can highlight that the studies of the authors who founded the present research guide so that the educational practices and teaching experienced in rural education are contextualized to the reality of the countryside and the people who live and resist it, in order to guarantee not only educational rights, but also the land and to live on it, staying in the field.

Keywords: Teaching, Rural Education, Initial Training, Pedagogical Practices.

¹ Master in Education from the State University of Mato Grosso. teacher at the Municipal Department of Education. Cáceres, MT, Brazil.

E-mail: andrea.moreira@unemat.br

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3304-8967>

² Doctor in Science and Technology Policy. Professor at UNEMAT. Cáceres, MT, Brazil.

E-mail: laudemirzart@unemat.br

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9117-0782>



INTRODUCTION

This article is part of the dissertation elaborated throughout the academic trajectory experienced in the Master's Degree in Education, at the State University of Mato Grosso Carlos Alberto Reys Maldonado. During the course we developed studies on pedagogical practices in rural education, considering that for a contextualized performance, it is necessary that teachers experience in their training processes, experiences that enable them to work in rural education, thinking that it is a modality of education permeated with specificities, which requires both initial training, and the continued one aiming to encompass all the needs and particularities about teaching and learning.

We mentioned the initial teacher training, the graduation, it is the reference space for the initial learning of the profession. On this issue, Gatti (2010) shows that initial training, by itself, does not encompass all the knowledge necessary in teacher training, and is intended to apply this knowledge in the classrooms. Thus, based on a technicist model, some higher education institutions have their work focused on disciplines that sometimes distance themselves from the reality and practice of academics, which can have negative effects on professional life.

Pedagogical practices refer to the actions thought and developed by educators, within the scope of educational spaces, with a view to mediating the construction of students' knowledge. For us, these practices should guarantee the construction and reconstruction of knowledge in a contextualized way with the place and with the knowing subjects. They should serve to value and strengthen the identities of these subjects, aiming at social transformation and quality of life.

Having the specific pedagogical practices for rural education as the object of this article, the problematizing question that we sought to answer with the elaboration of the study was: what are the pedagogical practices and which are the necessary teaching for an educational practice contextualized to rural education?

The present study contributed to the reflection on the pedagogical practices and teaching that have been oriented towards the realization of the educational processes experienced by the subjects in the context of rural education. Thus, through a bibliographic review and field observation, we will bring the conceptions and ideas about rural education, based on authors such as: Caldart (2012), Arroyo (2009), Zart (2014), Carvalho (2020) and others, who from Freire's pedagogy have been developing studies that have greatly contributed to the appreciation of pedagogical practices and teaching that have the field and the people who live in it as the centrality of the process, what we can call rural education. In other words, an education made for and with the people who live in it.

PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES AND TEACHING IN RURAL EDUCATION

According to Veiga (2012), training should be in line with the social, economic and political context, aiming at strengthening and building proposals that are committed to the inclusion of plural



subjects. In this sense, we enter the universe of possibilities of Rural Education³ that is permeated by pedagogical practices, which should aim at the transformation of social conditions. In the view of Peripoli and Zoia (2019), the countryside is formed in many spaces by adverse situations of work structures, transportation, road maintenance in rural areas, distances between school and home, and expanded reproduction of life. The adversities of the materiality of existence imply the organization of school spaces, the attitudes of fathers and mothers towards their children, the desires to remain or abandon the countryside, the positions of educators in relation to teaching-learning and the multiple challenges for the development of rural education.

From the assumptions of rural education and the observation of materialities, we investigate and reflect on the conditions and theoretical bases on which it is necessary to think about the educational system that we experience in this context, which comes from fragments of urban education, which ends up becoming an imposition on the peasant environment, a decontextualized and subordinate education, And on top of everything, as mentioned, several structural problems are faced, connected to the low salaries that contribute to the lack of teachers to meet the real needs of school spaces in the countryside.

It is in the midst of these and many other challenges that rural education has been resisting, seeking to conquer a space worthy of survival. A scenario that resists through the claims of social movements that fight for an education that meets the specificities in favor of an education that contributes to the formation of men/women in the countryside. As Zart, Bitencourt and Gitahy (2019) demonstrate, the struggles in defense and the construction of spaces and pedagogical experiences are continuous, of an emancipatory education based on the principles of social organizations, work and the experiences of peasants, from social movements focused on the creation of public policies that deal with better living conditions in the countryside.

One of the movements that marked the struggle for quality education was organized by rural workers in resistance to the expropriation of land, the so-called Landless Rural Workers Movement (MST). Constituted as the largest social movement in the countryside in the country, it began in 1979, consolidating itself in 1990, as the greatest symbol of resistance in the social struggle for agrarian reform in defense of political, economic and educational rights, building the pedagogical educational paradigm beyond the organizational and physical structures of rural schools, since the MST itself, By involving the subjects in the movement, it conceives the opportunity for training in the non-formal educational context, enhancing the claims of cultural reality, work relations and socialization.

³ Rural Education came to be so named after discussions at the National Seminar held in Brasília in November 2002, approved by the opinion of the National Council of Education (CNE) No. 36/2001, regarding the Operational Guidelines for Basic Education in Rural Schools and with the imprint and expansion of the peasant and union movements involved in this struggle (Caldart, 2012, p. 258).



Teaching practice is built in spaces/times where encounters, disagreements and conflicts occur, weaving relationships that enable the construction of new knowledge of multiple singularities in the formation of plural subjects. When we mention the space of formation of plural rural subjects, we refer to an education that takes place in all spaces of the community, in cultural expressions, in labor relations, as well as in the struggles for public policies that meet their needs for the integral formation of rural subjects.

The school acts as a sphere for the synthesis of knowledge in a decentralized way, so that all the environments and situations that make up the space contribute to human formation in a dialectical way between school, community and society.

The educator acts as a mediator in the process of production and reproduction of knowledge, thus, this must occur from the undergraduate course, as explained by the LDB, when it describes that it is in the initial training that the construction of identity begins, with public policies being primordial to the valorization of teacher training.

When thinking about rural education, initial teacher training and the constitution of the educator's identity to work in the field, we are reminded of the conceptions of Caldart (2012, p. 259), who explains:

The reality that produces Rural Education is not new, but it inaugurates a way of confronting it. By affirming the struggle for public policies that guarantee rural workers the right to education, especially school, an education that is in/of the countryside.

From the above, we are challenged to think about the importance of initial teacher training that deals with aspects related to rural education, as well as the need for subjects who live in the countryside to have the opportunity to train teachers to work in their communities, as a way of strengthening the identities of subjects who live in the countryside, as well as a form of resistance to the impositions of the curricula and the characteristics of urban education education in/of the countryside.

Arroyo (2009, p. 74) states that "rural workers need to be respected, as they are subjects of rights". In this way, he reiterates that "as subjects of history, of struggles and of intervention as someone who builds, who is participating in a social project". From these reflections, we perceive the need for an education that seeks to understand the reality of the subjects, aiming to meet their specificities.

The movement for rural education links the struggle for education with the set of struggles for the transformation of the social conditions of life in the countryside; That is why in our meetings we are always concerned with making and helping educators to make a historical reading of the broader reality; and that is why we argue that one of the tasks is to help organize the people so that they participate in this struggle (Caldart, 2011, p. 152-153).



In the pedagogical proposition for a rural education, we start from the proposal about an education beyond the teaching-learning processes based on ready-made content booklets coming from traditional education (banking and capitalist). Our proposal is based on Zart who conceives:

The field is interpreted by the subjects as a space that is constituted by multiple social configurations. a) Living space, in the sense of *oikos*, constitutes a territory of multiple dimensions and forms a totality that relates the conditions for human diversity to human existence. b) cultural diversity that integrates the tradition, values, beliefs and social practices that configure the territories of rural peoples. c) education that develops the intellectual, technological and organizational perspectives and needs of peasants (2014, p. 128, 129).

From the author's conception, we understand that Rural Education has been resisting, articulating historical experiences in favor of the development of an education focused on its specificities, aiming at an organized work based on the reality of the subjects, scientific knowledge and popular knowledge of accumulated knowledge, in a dialogical and organized way between the field and the school, which must be constituted from the place and the subjects, who are educated in it from the context in which they are inserted.

In this sense, we can mention Freire's pedagogy, which developed in the light of socialist pedagogy, where Paulo Freire materialized it as a reference for rural education. Freire's pedagogy presents as its main proposal the formation of subjects from materiality and unveiling a new look at the relationship between educator and student.

According to Carvalho, "Paulo Freire's theory of education contributes in a relevant way to the development of human thought and praxis in the sense that men and women assume the role of subjects in the relationship of the unveiling of the world-consciousness" (2020, p. 19). For the author, this thought is linked to the position that the educator needs to adopt in relation to the importance of the experiences lived in the daily life of the student as a source of reflection for the construction of knowledge. We seek to understand this proposition, beyond the construction of knowledge, also understanding it in the construction of the school institution in the countryside, in which this knowledge is built.

For Freire, emancipatory education needs to go against the capitalist pattern in the process of human interrelation. In his book "*The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*" the author brings deep reflections on the social relations of power and authoritarianism that are developed in capitalist society, which are projected into the school environment causing damage to the teaching/learning process.

The violence of the oppressors, which also makes them dehumanized, does not establish another vocation - that of being less. As a distortion of being more, being less leads the oppressed, sooner or later, to fight against those who have made them less. And this struggle only makes sense when the oppressed, when seeking to recover their humanity, which is a way of creating it, do not feel idealistically oppressors, nor do they become, in fact, oppressors of the oppressors, but restorers of humanity in both (Freire, 2005, p. 32).



According to Freire, for education to be consolidated in the principles of a liberating education, it is necessary to break with the barriers of the capitalist pattern, otherwise this formation of oppressive and oppressed subjects will continue, where the educator acts as the holder of knowledge and the learner as a mere passive receiver.

In the process of formation of knowing subjects, according to Freire's pedagogy, the life experience, the empirical knowledge of the learner cannot be rendered useless, so that it will also be part of the process of knowledge construction.

According to Gadotti (1995), based mainly on socialist pedagogy, as well as on the pedagogy of the oppressed, rural education has been consolidating itself as a space for the production of knowledge for transformations based on praxis in a dialogical way.

For Carvalho (2020), the encounter with the elaborated knowledge that the educator and student subjects is challenged to be amazed, admired and asked about themselves and reality, and consequently, to develop the ability to think reflectively.

If it is true that education alone cannot bring about social transformation, it also means that its struggle must extend beyond the walls of the school, it must not be limited to its campus [...] if tomorrow a transformative education is possible, it is only because, today, within a conservative education, the elements of a new education, of another, liberating education, they were formed within this education (Gadotti, 1995, p. 76, 77).

In this way, we understand the school as a space for problematizing the reality experienced by the rural subject. For Zart, "the social subjects of the countryside must have adequate skills of understanding and action in the reality of the countryside, enabling sustainable development. The question is to know whether the education that is in the countryside affirms or denies the possibilities of adequate practical-intellectual formation of the subjects of the countryside" (2014, p. 135).

Based on Zart's (2014) statement, we are provoked to reflect on the formation of the subject in the field, and we agree that it needs to enable these subjects to think critically, and from the reflection on their own reality to be able to intervene in the social environment in which they live, seeking to transform and transform themselves. However, we cannot fail to mention that the school is a fundamental element in the mediation process in the formation of the knowing subject, a means that enables paths for the appropriation of systematized knowledge.

Bringing important arguments about our previous expositions, Caldart (2005) exposes that the school has a specific place in rural education, and for it:

To understand the place of the school in rural education is to be clear about what human being it needs to help form and how it can contribute to the formation of the new social subjects that are constituted in the countryside, today the school needs to assume its universal vocation of helping in the process of humanization with the specific tasks that it can assume in this perspective (Caldart, 2005, p. 30).



From the author, it is understood that the school has the social function of promoting the insertion of social subjects in the articulation of necessary knowledge, aiming at the transformation of space as a space for the production of knowledge occupied by workers, seeking the realization of basic social rights, in the sense of human emancipation. For us, this is the great challenge to be faced in the teaching process. In this regard, Zart (2014) states:

The countryside as a space of education: "of the need for the education of the man and woman of the countryside, to keep them in the countryside as a socially viable life", not the education that alienates them, that takes the worldview of the city to the countryside and that promotes the departure of men and women, especially young people from the countryside, but rural education, which affirms the culture, symbology, and language of the countryside, and translates peasant culture into a project of integral development of the countryside, which associates rural education with peasant ecology and economy (Zart, 2014, p. 131-132).

From the author's idea, it is understood that rural education is the result of interventional actions, thought by rural subjects, based on the reality of the place in which they live and are constituted. From these reflections we understand the need for an articulated planning between theory and practice, in which the teaching-learning process must be planned seeking theoretical understanding, approaching pedagogical practice aiming at social transformation.

We cannot fail to mention the importance of the Pedagogical Political Project (PPP) and the construction of the curriculum, in the training process, so that it is in line with the paradigm⁴ of rural education, since its development is carried out collectively, of local culture and knowledge, in the reflection carried out by Ribeiro, Silva, Bianco and Zart (2023) the collective of educators build action plans based on local identities, in customs, in the values of the community, in the forms of organization of work, in the relationship with nature. The complexity of the themes elevates the pedagogical organization to the needs of interdisciplinary epistemological training, because, as we have already mentioned, the process of formation based on the materiality of the subject provides opportunities for reflection-action in numerous spaces and is not restricted only to the school context. The open, democratic and participatory rural school enables reflections on overcoming the exploited work for the construction of organizational and formative processes of associated work.

Rural education must contemplate this context of multiple singularities with the main focus on the formation of the subject based on his/her needs in an integral way, on this, Severino (1944) mentions that the rural school presents its pedagogical matrix from a perspective of work as a trainer in the human dimension, so that the student is able to produce and transform the environment in which he/she is inserted.

⁴ The paradigm of rural education is a construction carried out from the social movements, which took place at the end of the twentieth century, bringing a new look to the education of peasants, inserting this reality in the political agenda, instructing the government to create programs as well as educational policies.



From this perspective, Molina and Sá (2012) address that one of the great challenges in favor of the transformation of the rural school is the resignification of scientific knowledge so that it becomes pertinent to the reality of the students based on the development of potentialities aiming at critical autonomy in the face of their reality.

This resignification reveals itself as a strategy of incorporation of the teaching-learning processes, based on the social reality of insertion, aiming to overcome fragmented knowledge, enabling the construction of knowledge from the perspective of organic intellectual formation.

The intentionality of a project for the formation of subjects who critically perceive the socially accepted choices and premises, and who are capable of formulating alternatives for a political project, attributes to the rural school an important contribution to the broader process of social transformation. It poses the challenge of conceiving and developing a counter-hegemonic education, that is, of formulating and executing an education project integrated with a political project of social transformation led by the working class, which requires the integral training of rural workers, to simultaneously promote the transformation of the world and human self-transformation (Molina and Sá 2012, p 327).

Thus, to speak of rural education from the perspective of the emancipation of the subject is to be faced with a range of possibilities with regard to the planning of pedagogical practices, so that each people/community/school has its specificities, which demand different problematizations. Thus, planning will be in constant mutation because knowledge will never be ready, it will be resignified according to the training needs of the subjects themselves. About this dynamic, Caldart states that:

On the level of pedagogical praxis, Rural Education projects a future when it recovers the essential link between human formation and the material production of existence, when it conceives educational intentionality in the direction of new patterns of social relations, through the links with new forms of production, with free associated work, with other values and political commitments to social struggles that confront the contradictions involved in this process (Caldart, 2012, p. 263).

The author also addresses the importance of fostering training based on practices pedagogically woven into the modes of production, organization and subsistence; peasant agriculture, agroecology, collective work, in the reform of agricultural cooperation, in areas of agrarian reform, social inequalities, etc. For her, this education proposes a heterogeneous education, marked by "human life mixed with land, with sovereign production of healthy food, with a relationship of respect with nature of non-exploitation between generations, between men and women, between ethnicities" (Caldart, 2012, p. 263). In this sense, Franco (2015) addresses pedagogical practices as an instrument for the realization of educational intentionality:

Pedagogical practices are those practices that are organized to fulfill certain educational expectations. These are practices loaded with intentionality and this occurs because the very meaning of praxis is configured through the establishment of an intentionality, which directs and gives meaning to the action, requesting a planned and scientific intervention on the object, with a view to transforming social reality (Franco, 2015, p. 4).



The propositions of rural education presuppose a critical analysis of political hegemony and the constitution of the collective of subjects, so that the dialogical exercise is ensured. Freire defends the dialogical pedagogy, therefore, of the "use of the word, of the dialogue mediated by nature as opposed to the pedagogy of silence of banking education" (1987, p. 58). Frigotto argues that:

The school, therefore, will have a revolutionary role to the extent that it builds by a dialectical historical materialist method, starting from the concrete subjects, with their culture, knowledge and common sense, critically dialoguing with the existing heritage of knowledge - the scientific bases that allow us to understand how the phenomena of nature and social relations are produced (Frigotto, 2012, p. 270).

Rural education is constituted from the concrete subjects, from the conjunction of forces between communities, social movements and higher education institutions committed to the process. It is worth emphasizing the important role of educators in the school/educational/social environment in this process of social transformation, based on a collective effort.

In order for the rural school to contribute to the strengthening of the resistance struggles of the peasants, it is essential to guarantee the political-pedagogical articulation between the school and the community, based on the democratization of access to scientific knowledge. The appropriate strategies for the cultivation of this participation should promote the construction of collective spaces for decision-making on the work to be carried out and on the priorities of the communities in which the school may have contributions (Molina; Freitas, 2011, p. 26).

The strengthening generated from the democratization of scientific knowledge enables the teaching-learning process on solidified bases, providing systematized knowledge from the interrelationship between school and community.

To this end, it is necessary that educator and student understand each other, build themselves as subjects in the composition of this process of liberation, co-creating the conditions of learning based on social and political emancipation. An education committed and carried out in a dialogical way, makes it possible to break the paradigm of an education that liberates, breaking with the armor of banking education based on technicality that collaborates with the structure of social class inequalities.

For Carvalho (2020), from the perspective of Freire's thought, the educator is a historical being who remakes himself in the search to be more.

The educational practice of the educator is a pedagogical act that is rooted in the commitment to the world and to life in the perspective of transforming it into an environment of full coexistence for all. As a historical being who makes and remakes himself or herself socially, the teacher in his or her social experience is what constitutes the condition of being more in the movement of the historical process (Carvalho, 2020, p. 20).

The author also brings, in line with Freire's thought, the reflection of the subject as an unfinished being that permeates the permanently indeterminate and constantly moving world. When



we reflect on the incompleteness, we are referring to the constant change in teaching/learning, where there will always be room for growth and change, considering the historicity in the training process; From this perspective, the educator positions himself or herself as a mediator of the knowledge of the knowing subjects. According to Carvalho (2020), "in historical experience, they become aware that they are responsible subjects capable of inventing the world of existence".

Education is a requirement of the awareness that the human being is being and constituting himself in the world of life. It is through awareness, an act of reflection, a unique dialectical process that connects consciousness and action, that human beings problematize the world and seek answers to the questions that arise in consciousness (Carvalho, 2020, p. 20, 21).

Problematization is a determining factor for the development of critical and constructive awareness, gnosiological education is built by the subjects involved in the teaching/learning process in a participatory way, so that learning happens in a dialogical way, for Freire:

Problematizing education, which is not reactionary fixism, is revolutionary futurity. Hence it is prophetic and, as such, hopeful. Hence it corresponds to the condition of men as historical beings and to their historicity. Hence they are identified as beings beyond themselves — as "projects", as beings who walk forward, who look forward; as beings to whom immobility threatens death; for whom looking back should not be a nostalgic way of wanting to return, but a way of better knowing what they are being, to better build the future (Freire, 2013, p. 102).

When we reflect on education as revolutionary in the process of formation of historical subjects, we cannot help but question ourselves about the pedagogical theories and practices in the teaching-learning process. According to Carvalho, "theoretical-methodological training is a fundamental instrument for the educator to understand the foundation of the organization of pedagogical work capable of reinventing educational practice" (2020, p. 37).

Freire brings us in his approach to the pedagogy of autonomy, the importance of narrowing the relationship between teacher and student with a focus on the formation of the individual as a being who thinks about his own existence and problematizes the world in order to seek to modify it, this entire context of formation is based on dialogue. This way of thinking and doing education is contrasting with banking education where teachers transmit knowledge and students only receive and reproduce the content without reflection.

Emancipatory education deals with the formation of the student in an integral way and the educator acts as a mediator in the construction of knowledge where theory and practice dialogue, enabling conscious actions aimed at individual and collective growth, in favor of liberating actions generated from reflection-action, promoting conditions and skills for daily experiences. For Freire:

When we try to enter into dialogue as a human phenomenon, something is revealed to us that we can already say is itself: the *word*. But, when we find the word, in the analysis of



dialogue, as something more than a means for it to take place, we are also required to seek its constitutive elements (Freire, 2013, p. 108).

The word based on dialogue is about the constitution of knowledge pertinent to the emancipatory practice and for there to be something to do in the sense of transformation, this walk needs to be complacent with the needs of transformation of the subjects.

The teacher's behavior as a facilitator, encourager, or mediator of learning, understood as pedagogical mediation, is what will make a difference in the student life of the whole society, no matter the teaching segment in which this professional is working, it is he who will make a difference in the formation of the critical, participative, and transforming student (Sacramento and Rodrigues, 2024, p.4).

We reflect on this process of formation in which theory and practice develop in a linear way, inseparable, thus becoming praxis of reflection on action in a dialectical way, disposing educators and educating them to a context of transformation, with capacities to intervene in the world. "This search leads us to surprise, in it, two dimensions: action and reflection, in such a solidary way, in an interaction so radical that, sacrificed, even in part one of them, the other is immediately resented. There is no true word that is not praxis" (Freire, 2013, p. 109).

Thus, with regard to the incorporation of theory and practice, we refer to the image of the pedagogical practices carried out in the school context and, simultaneously, this image is linked to the other resources used to assist the development of methodologies, such as; blackboard, chalk, books, notebooks, pencils, erasers, media, etc. The school becomes the place of reference, being the disciplinary space for the acquisition of experiential knowledge or practice.

The pedagogical practice is configured in a dialogical space. The first determination of mediation to teach is to sit down, placing oneself in the condition of equality so that dialogue with the other occurs. To connect to dialogue, it is important to develop the ability to listen, so that one can apprehend and understand the meaning of the content that mediates the act of teaching (Carvalho, 2020, p. 22).

In addition to the classrooms, we discuss pedagogical practices, seeking to understand this concept. According to Franco "it is only possible to judge a concept for pedagogical practices when the conception of pedagogy, of teaching practice, fundamentally, the epistemological relationship between pedagogy and teaching practice is defined a priori" (2016, p. 7). According to the author "there are pedagogically constructed teaching practices and there are teaching practices constructed without the pedagogical perspective, in a mechanical action that disregards the construction of the human" (Franco, 2016, p. 2).

The teaching practice built on a mechanical action, disregards the subject's history, and can be disconnected from his reality, leading to the submission of technicism; An example of this is the



textbooks offered by the government, which are inserted in the rural school, completely out of the reality of the subjects.

By dialoguing about pedagogical practices, we enter a universe of possibilities for reflection-action, which aim at the transformation of the subject and social contexts; We are not referring only to the school context, in view of the above, when the author refers to teaching, she uses the terms "educational class and/or meeting", and the second may refer to a space beyond the school environment.

It will become a pedagogical practice when it is organized around intentionalities, as well as in the construction of practices that give meaning to intentionalities. It will be pedagogical practice when it incorporates continuous and collective reflection, in order to ensure that the proposed intentionality is made available to all; it will be pedagogical as it seeks the construction of practices that ensure that the referrals proposed by the intentionalities can be carried out (Franco, 2016, p. 2).

Thus, pedagogical practice, as an educational praxis, is configured as a participatory and conscious action in its multidimensional sense of teaching and learning. In the ontological sense, pedagogical practice "is a set of social practices that act and influence the lives of the subjects, in a broad, diffuse, and unpredictable way. In turn, Pedagogy can be considered a social practice that seeks to organize/understand/transform the educational social practices that give meaning and direction to educational practices" (Franco, 2016, p. 3).

We can see that the concept of practice studied here is followed by praxis, but it is of paramount importance to discuss such concepts in order to show that it is not the same thing, but an interrelation in which one gives a broad meaning to the other; the practice followed by praxis "is configured through the establishment of intentionality, which directs and gives meaning to the action, requesting a planned and scientific intervention on the object, with a view to transforming social reality" (Franco, 2015, p. 5). Thus, we understand that praxis is a reflexive action, which makes the pedagogically woven practice permeated by intentionalities and continuous reflection with liberating action.

Human nature is not given to man, but is produced by him on the basis of biophysical nature. Consequently, educational work is the act of producing, directly and intentionally, in each singular individual, the humanity that is historically and collectively produced by the group of men (Saviani, 1994, p. 6).

For Saviani, the act of producing comes from a historical process, that is, objective knowledge is historically produced in a collective way. We follow our understanding of pedagogical practices, based on what we understand about the pedagogical term, know-how and enabling the production of knowledge for emancipation from practice. According to Franco (2016, p. 16), "Pedagogy as a social



practice, which offers/imposes/proposes/indicates a direction of meaning to the practices that occur in society, highlighting its eminently political character". For Saviani:

This know-how cannot be a moment that precedes the political horizon, on the contrary, it is already a concretion of a certain political line. All know-how contains a certain vision of the world and is a political act in which certain general social intentions are concretized (Saviani, 1991, p. 41).

In this sense, pedagogy is understood as a process of organization/enhancement and interpretation of the intentions of an educational project. We are dealing with an approach to critical-emancipatory epistemological pedagogy, which Franco "considers to be Pedagogy as a social practice conducted by a reflective thought about what happens in educational practices, as well as by a critical thinking of what educational practice can be" (2016, p. 4). In the sense of dialectical praxis:

Pedagogical practices are carried out as supports for teaching practice, in a continuous dialogue between subjects and their circumstances, and not as reinforcements for practice, which would cause it to lose its ability to construct subjects (Franco, 2016, p. 4).

We understand pedagogical practices as a process that is organized in an intentional way in order to meet certain necessary educational demands, for a certain space of formation, considering the social reality in a dialectical way, in a space of contradictions aiming at its transformation.

According to Zart:

Change is not only manifested in the practical action of everyday life, but is registered in the gestures, words and concepts applied. The comprehension of language is fundamental to understand the relationship of adaptability or contestation of the socioeconomic structure and the pedagogical practice exercised by the cultures that are established in society (Zart, 2008, p. 4).

From the perspective of training for social transformation, the author reflects on the importance of understanding space and culture, so that this adaptability refers to a process of change accompanied by a corresponding educational praxis. Zart also ponders on the importance of not "deluding oneself with the rhetoric that desires social transformations, imagining that these are transformative just because the words "transformation" and "change" appear, so that for there to be change/transformation it is necessary to take into account the contexts full of signifiers that make explicit the contradiction, the relations and the historical movements where the subject is not detached from the praxis. For Kosik

Praxis is active, it is an activity that is produced historically - that is, that is continuously renewed and practically constituted - the unity of man and the world, of matter and spirit, of subject and object, of product and productivity. As human-social reality is created by praxis, history presents itself as a practical process in the course of which the human is distinguished from the non-human (Kosik, 1969, p. 205).



According to Franco (2015, p. 5), "in praxis, intentionality governs the processes. For Marxist philosophy, praxis is understood as the dialectical relationship between man and nature, in which man, by transforming nature with his work, transforms himself."

It should be emphasized, therefore, that praxis allows man to conform his conditions of existence, transcend them and reorganize them. Only the dialectic of the movement itself transforms the future and this dialectic carries the essentiality of the educational act: collectively organized intentionality and in continuous adjustment of paths and practices (Franco, 2015, p. 6).

Pedagogical practices are the guiding thread of training/transformation, so that teaching-learning in a dialogical process, as opposed to the antialogical, requires reflection and action from the educator. Thus, it is necessary to describe a few lines in this regard, according to Freire "the antialogical, dominant, in his relations with his opposite, what he intends is to conquer him, more and more, through a thousand forms" (2013, p.191).

We can understand that this process of conquest is revealed from an objective of domination and oppression, contradictory to the dialogic that aims at liberation. For Freire, "one is not antialogical or dialogical in the "air", but in the world. One is not antialogical first and oppressive later, but simultaneously" (Freire, 2013, p. 191). Anti-dialogicity imposes itself in an oppressive way, oppresses not only in the economic sense, but also in the cultural sense, stealing the essence by removing the capacity of expression of the word and culture.

When we mention the dialogic, we are reflecting on the formation of the subject in his/her potential for communication, interaction and sharing of knowledge, as well as his/her decision-making skills, aiming at his/her humanization through the practice of dialogue, thus exercising respect for the other in a democratic way.

For the educator-learner, dialogical, problematized, the programmatic content of education is not a donation or an imposition – a set of reports to be deposited in the students – but the organized, systematized and added return to the people of those elements that they have delivered to them in an unstructured way (Freire, 2013, p. 116).

For Franco, "the absence of reflection, exaggerated technicality, disregard for the processes of contradiction and dialogue can result in spaces for the stifling of the capacities to discuss/propose/mediate didactic conceptions" (2015, p. 7). The awareness of the importance of developing a praxis resulting from a dialectical movement in the relationship of knowledge, structures the teaching-learning process, as Franco (2015, p. 5) considers:

I believe that pedagogical practices should be structured as critical instances of educational practices, in the perspective of collective transformation of the senses and meanings of learning. The teacher, in the exercise of his teaching practice, may or may not exercise pedagogically. In other words, their teaching practice, in order to become a pedagogical practice, requires at least two movements: that of critical reflection of their practice and that of awareness of the intentionalities that preside over their practices (Franco, 2015, p. 5).



In this way, we understand that knowledge makes a movement between teaching practice and pedagogical practice that translates into a challenge for educational action based on reflection. To discuss the construction of an intentional, critical and reflective practice is to enter into a multiple and provocative field, since it enters into the issue of the subjectivity of the individual, as a knowing being, as a human and social being.

We agree with Kosik when he states that " man's praxis is not a practical activity opposed to theory; it is the determination of human existence as the elaboration of reality" (1969, p. 205). Thus, the pedagogical practice is so diffuse as to establish relationships with other sources of knowledge to support the teaching knowledge, enabling them to be made aware, rethought and reconstituted before it, and in a dialectical condition, to modify it. Saviani (1991) understands "the nature of education as a necessary element for the formation of humanity in each singular subject".

The understanding of the nature of education as a non-material work, whose product is not separated from the act of production, allows us to situate the specificity of education as referring to knowledge, ideas, concepts, values, attitudes, habits, symbols under the aspect of elements necessary for the formation of humanity in each singular individual, in the form of a second nature, which is produced, deliberately and intentionally, through historically determined pedagogical relations that are established between men (Saviani, 1991, p. 38).

We understand that the historically determined pedagogical relationships permeate the practice of the educator to mediate the teaching-learning process, considering the knowledge, experiences and previous knowledge of the students. The pedagogical practice indissociated from the reality of the context of insertion of the subjects enables the development of knowledge aimed at social transformation.

By taking a position on emancipation based on Freire, we are willing to reflect on the relationship between political education and emancipation. For Freire, this triad is necessary in the elevation of the educational potential articulated through practice as an engagement of social issues that deal with the formation of subjects as knowing beings. It should be noted that this formation/transformation does not occur only through the educational practice that comprises this or that objective material need through collective praxis, this scenario encompasses essential factors in the intrinsic relationship between politics and education, this time, there is no empty political practice of educational practice, nor neutral education. Thus, from Freire's point of view, the role of the critical educator is to teach and challenge, problematizing the concrete existential situation for the learner, emancipation is a process of human, cultural, political and social liberation of those to whom they dedicate teaching-learning in a dialogical and committed way.



FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Based on the study that aimed to analyze the pedagogical practices and teaching proposed for an educational practice contextualized to rural education, from a bibliographic study and field observation, it was possible to understand that rural education is a modality of education aimed at people who live in the countryside and that its realization must be contextualized to the reality of the countryside and the people who live in it and resist, in order to guarantee not only educational rights, but also rights to the land and to live on it, remaining in the countryside as a space for living, working and culture, because in recent decades there have been many dominant forces, which aimed to remove the subjects from the countryside and force them to reside and constitute themselves in urban environments.

This education has been thought of over the last few years, based on paradigms that need to be overcome, such as the attempt to adapt urban education to rural areas, the search for overcoming the challenges found in the context of rural schools, both in terms of material and human resources.

It was also possible to understand that this thinking of an education contextualized to the countryside and the people of the countryside is rooted in the perspective of the participation of social movements such as the MST and Agrarian Reform, in the struggles woven for an education that contemplates the particularities of the countryside and the people, which is capable of strengthening the identities of these subjects, enabling them to be active in the construction of their own education and the practices designed and carried out for them and with them.

Thinking specifically about the pedagogical practices and teaching guided by the authors who brought theoretical arguments to our study, it is possible to conclude that they are based on Freire's pedagogy, which emphasizes the need to value what is significant for the subjects of educational practice, with a view to contributing to the valorization of autonomy and the overcoming of oppression. Having as a perspective that education can be liberating or oppressive, and that breaking with oppression should be a daily and constant search, without, however, transforming the oppressed into an oppressor, but in a relationship that actually allows breaking the cycle of violence.

However, for this, among other necessary changes, that the training institutions are located beyond theory, evidencing the complexity of the school routine, guiding in a critical and reflective way, enabling the future teacher to have a training that helps him or her to deal with the various modalities of education, as well as the multiplicity of students, and their countless ways of learning, seeking not to detach them from the contexts in which they are inserted.

In this perspective, an initial training that contemplates in a broader way the construction of knowledge focused on education in/from the countryside is a pressing need, in addition to the importance of providing people who live in the countryside with theoretical training, academic and



professional practice, aiming at professional educational performance in rural areas, as a way of valuing the identity of rural subjects, strengthening the much-needed education for rural subjects.



REFERENCES

1. Caldart, R. S. (2005). Teses sobre a Pedagogia do Movimento. Texto inédito.
2. Caldart, R. S. (2011). A Escola do Campo em Movimento. In M. G. Arroyo, R. S. Caldart, & M. C. Molina (Orgs.), **Por uma Educação do Campo**. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
3. Caldart, R. S. (2012). **Dicionário da Educação do Campo**. Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio, Expressão Popular.
4. Carvalho, A. L. (2020). A formação centrada na escola: mediação para a organização do trabalho pedagógico. **EccoS – Revista Científica**, (55), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.5585/e8389>
5. Franco, M. A. do R. S. (2015). Práticas pedagógicas de ensinar-aprender: por entre resistências e resignações. **Educação e Pesquisa**, 41(3), 601-614. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1517-97022015071714>
6. Franco, M. A. do R. S. (2016). Prática pedagógica e docência: um olhar a partir da epistemologia do conceito. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos (on-line)**, 97. <https://doi.org/10.24109/2176-6681.rbep.97i241>
7. Freire, P. (2013). **Pedagogia do oprimido** [recurso eletrônico]. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
8. Gadotti, M. (1995). **Pedagogia da práxis**. São Paulo: Cortes.
9. Kosik, K. (1969). **Dialética do concreto**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
10. Ribeiro, J. A., Silva, J. A., Bianco, J. de A., & Zart, L. L. (2023). Pedagogia do trabalho e a educação do campo: os arranjos entre currículo e saberes locais. **Revista da Faculdade de Educação**, 39*(1), e392309. <https://doi.org/10.30681/21787476.2023.E392309>. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.unemat.br/index.php/ppgedu/article/view/11564>. Acesso em: 10 jun. 2024.
11. Peripolli, O. J., & Zoia, A. (2019). O Professor das Escolas do Campo: trabalhador de múltiplas jornadas de trabalho. **Revista da Faculdade de Educação**, 22*(2), 99-114. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.unemat.br/index.php/ppgedu/article/view/3965>. Acesso em: 10 jun. 2024.
12. Saviani, D. (1991). **Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica: primeiras aproximações**. Campinas: Autores Associados.
13. Saviani, D. (1994). Desafios atuais da pedagogia histórico-crítica. In C. A. da Silva Júnior & A. J. Severino (Orgs.), **Dermeval Saviani e a educação brasileira: o simpósio de Marília** (pp. 95-112). São Paulo: Cortez.
14. Veiga, I. P. A. (2012). **A aventura de formar professores**. Campinas, SP: Papius.
15. Zart, L. L. (2008). Tendências Epistemológicas e Sociopolíticas: Concepções Sobre Educação no Processo de Formação de Professores (as). **Revista da Faculdade de Educação**, 6(9), 1-16.
16. Zart, L. L., Bitencourt, L. P., & Gitahy, L. (2019). A Constituição de espaços educacionais pelo movimento camponês: as experiências do MST. **Revista da Faculdade de Educação**, 27*(1), 105-124. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.unemat.br/index.php/ppgedu/article/view/3922>. Acesso em: 10 jun. 2024.