

International
Journal of
**Human
Sciences
Research**

**TEACHING GEOGRAPHY
AND BASIC FIELD
EDUCATION**

William James Vendramini

Doctoral Student of the Postgraduate
Program in Geography – Master and
Doctorate in Geography - CPT

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: The purpose of this text is to carry out a theoretical presentation of concepts involving rural education and the agrarian question. The debates related to the agrarian question and agribusiness, dispute of bourgeois, working and peasant social classes, relativizing with Rural Education, having the territory as a delimitation, which is fundamental in the fight against hegemonic to allow the confrontation between the peasant class and the capitalist bourgeoisie. We consider that it is necessary to dialogue on topics such as liberating education and the teaching of geography in rural schools, being very beneficial to subsidize studies focused on the agrarian question, among them Rural Education, which is a right of all Brazilians who are in the rural area, uniting theory and learning through the pedagogy of alternation, valuing the practice and specificities of rural subjects.

Keywords: Agrarian question; Peasant class; Field Education.

INTRODUCTION

Studying, debating, knowing and offering scientific knowledge with a bias towards rural education, has become more evident and necessary over time, supported by the crisis in education with the cut of investments and expenses in recent years and new teaching practices. that with the advent of the global capitalist system, allied to neoliberal forms of government and managers, rural activities are purposefully adapting to the goals of capital, which has a divergent pedagogical proposal between what must be applied in urban schools and rural.

The teaching of areas of scientific knowledge such as geography, can contribute to the cognitive and spatial formation of students, in the case of students from rural schools, the practical line of teaching must initially consider the place of experience of each student, and

from this aspect, to correlate a dialectical interaction between the various territorial scales, contemplating a “multiterritoriality” (HAESBAERT, 2006).

Therefore, the school is not an island of purity where class contradictions and antagonisms are not present. Thus, “in a class society, all education is classist. And, in the class order, educating, in the only acceptable sense, means raising awareness and fighting against this order, subverting it” (GADOTTI, 2016, p.13).

Thus, “when social classes articulate to make their projects of society viable, through public policies, they are disputing a portion of the State” (CAMACHO, 2017, p.12). From this perspective, Education assumes a central role, as it serves both as an instrument of the status quo and of liberation. It must be noted that the rights for quality education in a place close to your home is mentioned above in the Federal Constitution of 1988 and in the Law of Directives and Bases - (LDB) 9394/1996

We understand that Rural Education is connected with the alternative educational experiences that peasant socio-territorial movements, especially the Landless Rural Workers Movement, have been developing in camps and settlements. These movements were systematized in regional and national seminars and meetings from the second half of the 1990s onwards. With the joint efforts of some entities, in 1998 they formed the National Articulation “For a Rural Education”. This movement was created to face the reality of abandonment by the State. They began to demand public policies from government institutions, as well as funding for research related to educational issues in rural communities, such as the National Program for Education in Agrarian Reform (PRONERA) and the Programa de Apoio à Formação Superior em Licenciatura em Educação do Campo (PRONERA). PROCAMPO) that allowed significant

advances (ARROYO; CALDART; MOLINA, 2004; CAMACHO, 2014).

In this sense, the objective of this text was to carry out a theoretical presentation, therefore bibliographical, of concepts involving rural education, the agrarian question and the teaching of geography in Brazil, emphasizing the dispute of social classes such as the bourgeois, working and peasant, relativizing with Rural Education, having the rural territory as a delimitation.

MATERIAL AND METHODS OR METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in the development of this research was bibliographic and exploratory research. According to Gil (2002), bibliographic research is developed based on material already prepared, consisting mainly of books and scientific articles, based on technical criteria, being qualitative and quantitative.

Within the perspectives of obtaining satisfactory data, the research was based on the exploration and survey of existing data in a bibliographic way, from the PRONERA Operations Manual, and in other published texts (article), laws, regulations, ordinances that analyze the theme.

Another methodology was action research with a qualitative approach. According to Tripp (2005), action research requires action both in the areas of practice and research so that, to a greater or lesser extent, it will have characteristics of both routine practice and scientific research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION RURAL EDUCATION AND THE AGRARIAN QUESTION PARADIGM

We understand that Rural Education is connected with the alternative educational experiences that peasant socio-territorial movements, especially the Landless Rural Workers Movement, have been developing in

campes and settlements. These movements were systematized in regional and national seminars and meetings from the second half of the 1990s onwards. With the joint efforts of some entities, in 1998 they formed the National Articulation "For a Rural Education". This movement was created to face the reality of abandonment by the State. They began to demand public policies from government institutions, as well as funding for research related to educational issues in rural communities, such as the National Program for Education in Agrarian Reform (PRONERA) and the Programa de Apoio à Formação Superior em Licenciatura em Educação do Campo (PRONERA). PROCAMPO) that allowed significant advances (ARROYO; CALDART; MOLINA, 2004; CAMACHO, 2014).

This article aims to establish the relationship between the theoretical conceptions of the Paradigms of the Agrarian Question (PQA) and Rural Education, making a comparative analysis to a reality of a rural school located in the district of Cangas, municipality of Poconé/MT, in order to defend an education that meets the needs of men, rural women and their children, that values their way of life, strengthens their political-economic organization, producing knowledge that improves the quality of life in the countryside. The methodology of the article was carried out through a bibliographic review and analysis of authors who built the original paradigm of Rural Education, where it is a product of the materiality of territorial disputes in the countryside and the action of peasant movements, fostering resistance and the conquest of peasants. peasant territories, allowing their recreation as a social class and way of life, in addition to contributions and analysis carried out in postgraduate studies. This analysis starts from the premise that the interpretation of the field of Rural Education is based on the ideological assumptions inherent

in the Agrarian Question Paradigm.

The reasons behind the struggle for Rural Education in Brazil is the existing reality of suppression of rural inhabitants. The lack of access to an “education that allows the territorial development of rural communities is related to the history of the agrarian structure in Brazil based on large estates and the deterritorialization (expropriation) of peasant populations from their working land” (CAMACHO et al, 2015). The context of struggle for Rural Education occurred, firstly, by the social and educational marginalization, in which the rural residents are. And this situation of social inequality and the destructive advance of capital in the countryside were complemented by the absence of public policies for education in the countryside. Thus, the struggle for Rural Education is made possible by the fact that “peasant socio-territorial movements are building their struggle for land and for another development project for society different from the agribusiness project” (CALDART, 2005; CAMACHO, 2014).

For Molina (2012) and Caldart (2010), some public bodies spread a model of Rural Education, often far from social movements and their struggle flags, sometimes creating public policies that do not reflect or are not put into practice. with the reality of rural schools and, ideologically, tend to exclude the issue of conflict present in the countryside, as they see it as negative, and must be eliminated from the Rural Education debate. It is as if we could think about Rural Education without the countryside, without contradictions, conflicts, territorial disputes, violence, expropriation, resistance and, above all, without peasant socio-territorial movements, without inserting the praxis of the subjects, the their material and symbolic needs for reproduction, precursors of Rural Education.

In Rural Education, built from the PQA, “conflicts must be dealt with politically, as they

are the possibility of building overcomings, changes, transformations”. (MOLINA, 2012, p. 592). In addition to conflict, as an intrinsic characteristic of Rural Education, we understand that if it is disconnected from the struggles of socio-territorial movements, it will not truly be considered Rural Education. “Peasants are active historical subjects of their reproduction process, that is, they are not just undersized/passive to the destructive structural logic of the capitalist mode of production, especially under the modern and barbaric form of agribusiness” (CAMACHO, 2014, p.77).

The Paradigms are defined by Camacho (2014) as intellectual constructions that point to lines of interpretation of reality. These paradigms resonate in the way institutions work, in the elaboration of public policies, in socio-territorial movements, in parties, in research groups, in the elaboration of different visions of the world. Therefore, they are “theoretical and political territories that contribute to transforming reality”, they portray a worldview in accordance with the theoretical assumption that engenders this paradigm (Fernandes 2004, p.28).

In an introductory approach to the paradigmatic debate, the Agrarian Question Paradigm (PQA), which believes that there is a clash of classes between the peasant and the landowner, in constant dispute over land, culture and life in society. It is in the peasant current within the PQA that in this study we intend to punctuate the theoretical-ideological defense of the existence of the peasant as a social class from the central thesis that its recreation occurs by the unequal and contradictory movement employed by capitalism in the agrarian having as a pillar Education do Campo that appropriates the subjects of the field of scientific knowledge that provide argumentative support for possible political and ideological confrontations (Martins, 1981;

Oliveira, 1999, 2004; Fernandes, 2001, 2004a; Almeida & Paulino, 2010; Camacho, 2014).

In agreement with Camacho (2014) from the perspective of the PQA, the peasant is not a disappearing subject, but reproduces in the very contradictions of the capitalist system, based on the thesis of the peasant tendency of peasant recreation. It guarantees the ontological and epistemological need for the existence of a Rural Education for the formation of the peasant, contributing to the daily struggle for survival and improvement in the quality of social life in the countryside.

From the PQA, we understand that the peasantry lives in permanent conflict due to the antagonism of different models of territorial development in the countryside - peasant / agribusiness, including conditioning education, where the paradigm of Rural Education is a product / producer of the struggle of socio-territorial movements peasants with a revolutionary character and with the objective of achieving the overcoming of capital.

Caldart (2010) elaborates a synthesis for us to think about the central characteristics of this Rural Education that we defend. She points out five central elements. First, it is the relationship between particularity and universality, Education is particular, but seeks to insert itself into universality as a new project of society. According to her, it arises from the class experience of peasant movements, but includes other subaltern classes in the struggle. Third, Rural Education mixes the pedagogical radicality of peasant socio-territorial movements with the struggle for public policies. Fourth, Rural Education is a pedagogical project for formal school education and, concomitantly, for non-formal education as well. Fifth, Rural Education is the struggle for the access of the subaltern classes to the knowledge produced by humanity and, at the same time, it criticizes the dominant

Eurocentric-colonialist scientific knowledge production paradigm that disregards the popular knowledge produced by the subjects of the countryside in the non-logical logic. -capitalist.

RURAL EDUCATION: ITS DISPUTED TERRITORY

Rural Education is present in the process of historical materiality, in the struggle against the hegemony between the dominant class and the dominated class, highlighting the peasant class as a social group that must have the right to access education in their place of residence, that is, in the field. It started to have its space defined and to have specific public policies based on social movements, conquering programs such as the National Program of Education in Agrarian Reform (PRONERA), the National School Feeding Program (PNAE), the Food Acquisition Program (PAA), and the National Rural Education Program (PRONACAMPO) aimed at training teachers who work in rural schools.

Thus, the rural school must comply with the provisions of Resolution CNE/CEB n° 1/2002, that is, “the identity of the rural school is defined by its connection to the issues inherent to its reality, anchored in temporality and students’ own knowledge, in the collective memory that signals futures [...]”. In this perspective, we have the concepts and practices of agroecology, which aims to reconcile the knowledge of rural subjects with techniques and technologies appropriate to each environmental reality and each cultural specificity of rural peoples, be they quilombolas, indigenous, riverine, peasants, etc.

It is up to rural school teachers, as opinion makers and educational learning, to insert the theory of agricultural production into the pedagogical practice and methodologies applied at school, considering the characteristics and specifications of each school and each

reality of its students, emphasizing their experiences and life histories, highlighting the action and manipulation of the capitalist system, which is doomed to environmental imbalance, undoing the propaganda of false progress and development of rural activities disseminated by agribusiness. Demonstrating that production must take into account the economic, social and ecological balance is a necessity for the current reality, in which rural people present themselves as a more balanced way of production, where large monocultures are not the appropriate method from the point of view of From an environmental point of view, which aims at the sustainability of ecosystems, these precepts can be worked on by the geography discipline in an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary way.

Contrary to the ideal project and policies for rural education, some projects financed by agribusiness emerge with force and of course bring their ideology with a view to supplanting a distorted view of agricultural production and use of rural territories, from the point of view of balance of the environment, about what really benefits the most people.

As an example, there is the material of the “Agrinho project” implemented by the National Rural Learning Service (SENAR) together with the State government and the partnerships signed between some schools located in the countryside of the Rural Territory in Mato Grosso do Sul, for example, with agribusiness companies, there is an immersion of the agricultural capitalist system in rural schools. The program’s mission is explicit in its pedagogical proposal, which is “to promote education, information and knowledge in agribusiness for people in rural areas, with innovation and competence, contributing to the socioeconomic development of the State”, with the vision “To be a reference institution in education, innovation and knowledge of people from urban and rural areas, meeting the needs

of the various sectors of agribusiness in Mato Grosso do Sul”. We emphasize that “in a critical and more adequate understanding of reality, it appears that agribusiness is responsible for the generation of poverty, misery, exploitation, oppression, etc” (FABRINI, 2011, p.109).

According to Costa (2019), the teaching material of the “Agrinho project” has simplified content and has no direct relationship between the texts and the reality of students in rural schools. The books do not present a critical approach to the contents, being incongruous and disconnected, with the aggravating factor of the presence of an ideological charge, in the service of private interests in public education. This results in the presence of stereotypes, the absence of content that addresses Agrarian Reform and the problems arising from land concentration, such as: conflicts over land, social movements, pesticides, monoculture.

[...] by not taking into account the Brazilian and Mato Grosso do Sul countryside as it was constituted in its historical process, with the countless class struggles that exerted and exert influence and impact on the lives of millions of workers, Agrinho constitutes itself in the expression capitalist dominant ideology. It presents agribusiness as “the” best and most beneficial agrarian “development model” that must be defended and accepted by all since it is the most “modern”, “inclusive” and “harmonious” system of structuring agriculture in society. current. (ROSSI and VARGAS, 2017, p.219)

Let’s see that the territory of Rural Education has been receiving more and more a bombardment of information that aims to alienate young people to fit into a model of commercial agricultural production, disregarding the essence of activities linked to the peasant class, therefore, the territory of schools from the countryside, who must be free to be autonomous in the production of knowledge and in the teaching-learning process linked to rural activities, is experiencing

a difficult time to maintain the culture of rural subjects.

The space is disputed by fractions of powers, where the State presents itself as controller and influencer in the development between who is dominant and who is dominated. Agreeing with Engels (1941, p. 162), if “the State is a product of society, it is composed of both the ruling class and the ruled class”. Of course, this composition is not balanced.

However, this way we can think of the State as the holder of control of the territory and, therefore, of power. “Although we know well how to be a State hegemonically dominated by the interests of capital”, as stated by Molina (2010, p.114). Camacho (2014, p.451), when synthesizing the speech of a militant student of the MST, points out that “the capitalist State is in favor of the ruling class”. In this sense, the actions of the State materialized in the form of public policies, whether they are aimed at the countryside or the city, “will not be granted by the capitalist State without the demand of organized civil society”, where the territory is the realization of the use and occupation of space.

This way, policies for rural education must be carried out by rural subjects, represented by social movements, so that we have a rural school with a physical, curricular structure and with education professionals who identify with the struggles of the countryside.

TEACHING GEOGRAPHY AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

Whether in urban or rural schools, it is observed that the transformations resulting from the globalization process, such as the intensification of the use of new technologies, as well as the constant redefinitions of the Brazilian Basic Education curricula, reflects especially on teaching methodologies, since the “new” attributes other perspectives in the teaching and learning process, in addition to

recognizing daily practices of knowing how to teach in teacher education.

In this sense, Geography as a school subject, is part of this nuance of new readings of the geographic space in the face of the dynamics of Basic Education, in which it demands other perspectives on the teaching and learning process that does not deny the approaches that structured its methodological organization, but that impose singularities in this conception of seeing and seeing oneself in the world.

Melo, Vlach and Sampaio (2012, p. 46) emphasize this issue when they highlight that: “the concern with the theoretical-methodological discussion of the teaching of Geography is linked to the teaching practice”, that is, knowing how to teach geographically has a great tendency to the methodological perspective. We understand that when dealing with Rural Education, the dialectical method is appropriate for working with students’ daily content, from the local to the global scale.

In this sphere of analysis, one of the main difficulties in teacher education in Geography refers to some aspects, such as: How to promote a more effective teaching and learning process? What are the most productive methodologies? What are the most significant methodological approaches and instruments in this process? The challenges of this search are also inscribed in the distance between Academic Geography and School Geography.

The debates on the interaction between the knowledge of Academic Geography and School Geography is a relevant topic that must be considered for the understanding of initial teacher training, especially when we analyze which academic knowledge is fundamental and must be mobilized in the classroom (ALMEIDA; PINHEIRO, 2018). In the case of schools inserted in rural areas, scientific knowledge must reconcile theory with the practice of each reality where the teacher is.

Therefore, there are some perspectives

that address the fact that the Geography that is taught in schools is not the same as in universities, in undergraduate courses. It is about “Geography(s)”, each one with its concerns, its “specific end(s). In general, “there is a bookish heritage in the teaching of Geography in Basic Education that comes from its institutionalization in the 19th century, in which Academic Geography has been seeking, for almost a century, to break or at least minimize” (MELO; VLACH; SAMPAIO, 2012).

Geography is an indispensable science to understand the world and its totality, since it allows students to understand multiple scales of analysis relating them to social, economic, political, environmental, etc. elements. So, the geographic categories and concepts feed back the development of a complex thought that provides students with an expansion of the critical cognitive capacity and, therefore, of the understanding of the totality of the world from the articulation of scales (VESENTINI, 2009).

To understand the importance of Geography, we can enter the scope of its teaching and learning process. According to Castellar (2006), there is a recurring criticism in the various fields of knowledge, referring to a certain lack of knowledge about the conceptions and meaning of learning in teaching practice.

The interlocution between the theoretical actions carried out during the project, such as readings, discussions, bibliographic surveys, etc., and the association with the production of didactic-pedagogical material constituted essential results in the academic training of academics and were scrutinized in the perspective of understanding regarding the importance of promoting educational practices that go beyond the exclusive use of textbooks in Geography classes. (PEREIRA and FONSECA, 2020, p. 14)

In agreement with Pereira and Fonseca (2020), the materials produced are part of an

approach that had the categories of Geography as a background, as a way of promoting the transposition of this academic knowledge, obtained through theories and conceptual definitions in the course of training, academic, for a more adequate and/or articulated language to the Basic Education.

From this perspective, the stage of production of didactic-pedagogical material by the academics involved in the project must aim to relate the categories of Geography with the development of interactive games and differentiated activities, which allow promoting a teaching and learning process playful and meaningful, so that these categories are apprehended in the theory and in the practice of doing and teaching geographic for the Rural Education students.

Camacho (2011) presents some practical possibilities for the teaching of geography that showed good results to carry out an identity analysis of the student’s profile, working concepts of the geographic analysis categories (Place, Region, Landscape and Territory) in an interdisciplinary way with other disciplines, such as the Portuguese language for example. Themes such as migration, rural exodus, work activities in childhood and adulthood, the agricultural production of family farming and agribusiness and their reflections on the daily lives of rural residents were worked on.

The activities applied in the classroom such as writing a text describing the place where he lives, making illustrations about his relationship with the space and usual environment of coexistence, in order to use an “adopted methodology demarcates our theoretical-political-ideological positioning of bring into the classroom the history of the conquest of territories-settlements by the subjects of peasant social movements” (CAMACHO, 2011, p.26)

Another applied activity was the presentation of the film “Dois filhos de

Francisco” and the analysis of the poems “Morte e Vida Severina” and “Madrugada Camponesa”, exploring various geographic concepts and themes, allowing the playfulness of the students to be free to express themselves. and demonstrate the interpretation of man’s relationship with nature.

COUNTRY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

The Escola Estadual do e no Campo “Dom Francisco e Aquino Corrêa”, located at Rua Santa Terezinha S/N, in the District of Cangas, has as Patron Dom Francisco de Aquino Corrêa, an important religious in the region of Baixada Cuiabana in the 1960s.

The District of Cangas is located 22 km from Poconé, its development is in the exploration of gold activities, since 1787, later the state government promoted a distribution of lots to peasants who already lived in the region and to new settlers. In view of this, the farmers’ children needed to study, so the first school was created that served students in a multigrade way, from literacy to 5th grade.

In 1981, the state government created, through decree N° 1321/81 of 09/25/1991, the Dom Francisco de Aquino Corrêa School Unit to gradually attend elementary school students. In 1996, the Alternative Teaching project - PAEM was implemented at the School, which lasted 03 (three) years. In the year 2000 (two thousand) the Regular High School was implemented, which works until today. In 2005, it incorporated attached rooms to serve more distant communities, which are mostly quilombola communities. In 2022, it started to serve indigenous communities through the attached rooms using the alternation pedagogy due to logistics.

It is noticed that the school serves a varied diversity of rural peoples (peasant, quilombola and indigenous), and these specificities must be incorporated into the curriculum matrix

to strengthen the school’s identity. However, state management does not consider the importance of the school and applies the same administrative methodology as urban schools.

CONCLUSION

From the debate presented, it is possible to apprehend basic concepts of renowned authors who reflect and develop ideas, concepts and theories, on various aspects of practice and relations between social classes, having the agrarian issue and Rural Education as a pillar central in the discussion on themes related to the action and responsibilities of the State, the conflicts over the rural territory, the forms of use and occupation of the lived space and interconnected between the society and the Rural Education as a tool of dispute and manipulation of the capitalists, where the agribusiness presents itself as a force that also advances on rural schools, aiming to occupy and dominate all the spaces of alienation and subalternity of the peasant class.

There needs to be a counter-hegemonic resistance at different scales of action, through Rural Education, there is a pedagogical tool that enables the construction of critical, militant citizens, capable of being self-sustainable in food production, owners of their strength that are able to decode and value sustainable agricultural practices and agroecology is a necessary path nowadays.

We consider that the teaching of geography in the early years of Elementary School must be primarily related to the local reality. Classes must allow the student to bring his knowledge about the place where he lives to the classroom, so that from there he can build the concept of space and make increasingly complex connections regarding the local-space relationship. global space.

REFERENCES

- ALMEIDA, Cláudio Simone Lemos; PINHEIRO, Antônio Carlos. A relação entre os saberes da Geografia Escolar e da Acadêmica: impactos na formação do professor. **Revista Para Onde!?** Rio Grande do Sul. v.10, n.2, 2018.
- ARROYO, M. G., Caldart, R. S., & Molina, M. C. (2004). (Org.). **Por uma educação do campo**. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Resolução CNE/CEB 1/2002** - Institui Diretrizes Operacionais para a Educação Básica nas Escolas do Campo. MEC: Brasília - DF, 2002.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Resolução CNE/CEB/2/2008** - Estabelece diretrizes complementares, normas e princípios para o desenvolvimento de políticas públicas de atendimento da Educação Básica do Campo. MEC: Brasília - DF, 2008.
- CALDART, Roseli Salet. Educação do campo: notas para uma análise de percurso. In: MOLINA, Mônica Castagna (Org.). **Educação do campo e pesquisa II: questões para reflexão**. Brasília – DF: MDA/MEC, 2010. p. 103-126. (Série NEAD Debate, 20).
- CAMACHO, Rodrigo Simão. O ensino de geografia nos anos iniciais do ensino fundamental: um caminho para compreender a realidade em que se vive. *Revista: Ensino de Geografia, Uberlândia*, v. 2, n. 3, p. 3-35, jul./dez. 2011.
- CAMACHO, Rodrigo Simão. **Paradigmas em disputa na Educação do Campo**. 2014. Tese (Doutorado em Geografia) - Programa de Pós-graduação em Geografia da Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia da Universidade Estadual Paulista, campus de Presidente Prudente.
- CAMACHO, Rodrigo Simão et al. Evaluation of the relationship between education and sustainability in peasant movements: the experience of the national education program in agrarian reform. **Evaluation and Program Planning**, v.1, p.1 - 23, 2015.
- CAMACHO, Rodrigo Simão. O PRONERA: uma política pública de educação para inclusão social da classe camponesa. In: **Revista Mundi Sociais e Humanidades**. Curitiba, PR. V.2, n.2, 25, 2017. p.1-29
- CASTELLAR, Sônia Maria Vanzella. A Cidade e a Cultura Urbana na Geografia Escolar. **Boletim Paulista de Geografia**, São Paulo, v. 1, p. 95-111, 2006.
- COSTA, Rodrigo Ferreira. TERRITÓRIO RURAL DO BOLSÃO (MS): análise das escolas no campo e da produção acadêmica sobre Educação do Campo. **Dissertação**. Programa de Pós-graduação Mestrado e Doutorado em Geografia UFMS- Três Lagoas/ MT. 215p. 2019.
- ENGELS, Friedrich. Manifesto do partido Comunista. In: BOGO, Ademar (Org.). **Teoria da organização política: escritos de Engels, Marx, Lenin, Rosa, Mao**. 1ª ed. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2005, p.83-125
- FABRINI, João Edmilson. Território, classes e movimentos sociais no campo. **Revista da ANPEGE**, v.7, n.7, p.97-112, jan./jul. 2011.
- FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano. Movimentos socioterritoriais e movimentos socioespaciais: contribuição teórica para uma leitura geográfica dos movimentos sociais. **Revista Nera**, Presidente Prudente: Unesp, ano 8, n. 6, p. 14 – 34, jan./jun. 2005.
- FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano. **Conflitualidade e desenvolvimento territorial**. In: Luta pela Terra, Reforma Agrária e Gestão de Conflitos no Brasil. Campinas: Editora Unicamp, 2008.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Educação e Mudança**. 37ª ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2016. p.110
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários à prática educativa**. 54. ed. Rio de Janeiro, 2016.
- HAESBAERT, Rogério. **O mito da desterritorialização: do “fim dos territórios” a multiterritorialidade**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2006.
- LEITE, Sérgio Celani. **Escola rural: urbanização e políticas educacionais**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002. 120 p.

MELO, Adriany de Ávila; VLACH, Vânia Rúbia Farias; SAMPAIO, Antônio Carlos Freire. História da Geografia Escolar Brasileira: continuando a discussão. In: VASCONCELLOS, Luiz Gonzaga Falcão; SAMPAIO, Adriany de Ávila Melo (Orgs.). **Geografia e Anos Iniciais do Ensino Fundamental**. 1ed. Curitiba: CRV, 2012, p. 31-48.

MOLINA, Mônica Castagna. Desafios teóricos e práticos na execução das políticas públicas de Educação do Campo. In: MUNARIM, Antônio et al. (Org.) **Educação do Campo: reflexões e perspectivas**. Florianópolis, SC: Insular, 2010. p.103-121.

MOLINA, Mônica Castagna. Políticas Públicas. In: CALDART, Roseli Salete *et al.* (Orgs.). **Dicionário da Educação do Campo**. Rio de Janeiro: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio; São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2012. p. 587-596.

PEREIRA, Ana Paula Camilo e FONSECA, Rafael Oliveira. Geografia e prática pedagógica: Análises e experiências a partir da Produção de materiais didáticos. **Revista Brasileira de Educação em Geografia**, Campinas, v. 10, n. 20, p. 318-336, jul./dez., 2020

ROSSI, Rafael.; VARGAS, Icléia Albuquerque. Ideologia e educação: para crítica do programa Agrinho. **Revista Nera**, Presidente Prudente, Ano 20, n 40, p. 206-224, set./dez. 2017.

SANTOS, Milton. **Por uma Geografia nova**. 6. Ed. São Paulo: Edusp, 2012. 285 p.

VESENTINI, José William. **Repensando a Geografia Escolar para o Século XXI**. São Paulo: Plêiade, 2009.

ARROYO, M. G., Caldart, R. S., & Molina, M. C. (2004). (Org.). **Por uma educação do campo**. Petrópolis: Vozes.

CALDART, Roseli Salete. Educação do campo: notas para uma análise de percurso. In: MOLINA, Mônica Castagna (Org.). **Educação do campo e pesquisa II: questões para reflexão**. Brasília – DF: MDA/MEC, 2010. p. 103-126. (Série NEAD Debate, 20).

CAMACHO, Rodrigo Simão. **Paradigmas em disputa na educação do campo**. 2014. 806 p. Tese (Doutorado em Geografia) - Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Presidente Prudente, 2014.

CAMACHO, Rodrigo Simão et al. Evaluation of the relationship between education and sustainability in peasant movements: the experience of the national education program in agrarian reform. **Evaluation and Program Planning**, v.1, p.1 - 23, 2015.

FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano. Movimentos socioterritoriais e movimentos socioespaciais: contribuição teórica para uma leitura geográfica dos movimentos sociais. **Revista Nera**, Presidente Prudente: Unesp, ano 8, n. 6, p. 14 – 34, jan./jun. 2005.

FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano. **Conflitualidade e desenvolvimento territorial**. In: Luta pela Terra, Reforma Agrária e Gestão de Conflitos no Brasil. Campinas: Editora Unicamp, 2008.

MOLINA, Mônica Castagna. Políticas Públicas. In: CALDART, Roseli Salete *et al.* (Orgs.). **Dicionário da Educação do Campo**. Rio de Janeiro: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio; São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2012. p. 587-596.