

## The principles of Rural Education in the training of Mathematics teachers: an analysis of the legal aspects

*Os princípios da Educação do Campo na formação de professores da Matemática:  
uma análise dos aspectos legais*

*Los principios de la Educación Rural en la formación de profesores de Matemáticas:  
un análisis de los aspectos legales*

Arminda Rachel Botelho Mourão<sup>1</sup>  
Universidade Federal do Amazonas

Heloisa da Silva Borges<sup>2</sup>  
Universidade Federal do Amazonas

Patrícia Barros Teixeira<sup>3</sup>  
Universidade Federal do Amazonas

**Abstract:** This work is part of a dissertation defended in the Graduate Program in Education at UFAM and aims to analyze how the Principles of Field Education are contemplated in the official documents of teacher training in Mathematics and Field Education, at the federal level and in the municipality of Manaus (AM), from 1996 to 2019. The procedures were: bibliographical research, using as studies the authors: Arroyo; Caldart and Molina (2011), Borges (2016b), Dourado (2016), Ferreira; Mourão (2016), Gatti et al., (2019), Marx (2013), Silva et al., (2020), and in documentary research: LDB nº 9.394/1996, Decree nº 7.352/2010, Pronacampo Document/2013. Law No. 13.005/2014, Resolution No. 02/2015, Resolution No. 02/2019, Law No. 2000/2015 and Resolution No. 005/2016, we used Content Analysis. We found recognition of the sociocultural diversity of rural peoples, characterized as an advance in guaranteeing access to public policies. However, not all the principles of Rural Education are covered. **Keywords:** Teacher Training; Mathematics; Rural Education; Amazon Context.

**Resumo:** Este trabalho é recorte de uma dissertação defendida no Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da UFAM, e tem como objetivo analisar como os Princípios da Educação do Campo são contemplados nos documentos oficiais da formação de professores da Matemática e da Educação do Campo, no âmbito federal e do município de Manaus (AM), no período de 1996 a 2019. Os procedimentos foram: pesquisa bibliográfica, tendo como estudos os autores: Arroyo; Caldart e Molina (2011), Borges (2016b), Dourado (2016), Ferreira; Mourão (2016), Gatti *et al.*, (2019), Marx (2013), Silva *et al.*, (2020), e na pesquisa documental: LDB nº 9.394/1996, Decreto nº 7.352/2010, Documento do Pronacampo/2013. Lei nº 13.005/2014, Resolução nº 02/2015, Resolução nº 02/2019, Lei nº 2000/2015 e Resolução nº

<sup>1</sup> Doutora em Educação. Universidade Federal do Amazonas (UFAM). Manaus, Amazonas (AM), Brasil. E-mail: [heloborges@ufam.edu.br](mailto:heloborges@ufam.edu.br); Lattes: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/3864748731992379>; Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1940-9477>.

<sup>2</sup> Doutora em Educação. Universidade Federal Amazonas (UFAM). Manaus, Amazonas (AM), Brasil. E-mail: [heloborges@ufam.edu.br](mailto:heloborges@ufam.edu.br); Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/9429409939324333>; Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7629-7056>.

<sup>3</sup> Mestre em educação. Universidade Federal do Amazonas (UFAM). Manaus, Amazonas, Brasil. E-mail: [pbt.mestradoedu@gmail.com](mailto:pbt.mestradoedu@gmail.com); Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/7939259068108490>; Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1783-8689>.

005/2016, utilizamos a Análise de Conteúdo. Constatou-se o reconhecimento da diversidade sociocultural dos povos do campo, caracterizado como um avanço na garantia do acesso às políticas públicas. Porém, não estão contemplados todos os princípios da Educação do Campo. **Palavras-chave:** Formação de Professores; Matemática; Educação do Campo; Contexto Amazônico.

**Resumen:** Este trabajo es un extracto de una disertación defendida en el Programa de Posgrado en Educación de la UFAM, y tiene como objetivo analizar cómo se contemplan los Principios de la Educación Rural en los documentos oficiales de la formación de profesores de Matemática y Educación Rural, a nivel federal y en el municipio de Manaus (AM), en el período de 1996 hasta 2019. Los procedimientos fueron: investigación bibliográfica con los autores: Arroyo; Caldart y Molina (2011), Borges (2016b), Dourado (2016), Ferreira; Mourão (2016), Gatti et al., (2019), Marx (2013), Silva et al., (2020), y en investigación documental: LDB N° 9.394/1996, Decreto N° 7.352/2010, Documento Pronacampo/2013. Ley N° 13.005/2014, Resolución N° 02/2015, Resolución N° 02/2019, Ley N° 2000/2015 y Resolución N° 005/2016, utilizamos el Análisis de Contenido. Se verificó el reconocimiento de la diversidad sociocultural de los pueblos rurales, caracterizado como un avance en la garantía de acceso a las políticas públicas. Sin embargo, ni todos los principios de la Educación Rural están contemplados.

**Palabras clave:** Formación de profesores; Matemáticas; Educación Rural; Contexto de Amazónico.

---

**Received on:** October 10, 2024

**Accepted on:** December 01, 2024

---

## Introduction

Rural Education is a concept that emerged from the mobilizations of social movements and organizations for public policies in the face of the scenario of abandonment historically experienced by rural peoples, configuring itself as a counter-hegemonic movement, as it opposes the rural school model, which trains individuals to meet the interests of the market (Arroyo, 2010; Borges, 2016a). This struggle by social movements has contributed to the approval of critical and emancipatory projects in the field of educator training, including Resolution no. 02 of July 1, 2015 (Brasil, 2015), which has been guiding the restructuring of curricula for initial and continuing teacher training, based on critical and humanizing training (Arroyo, 2010; Silva, Anjos; Molina; Hage, 2020; Taffarel, 2020).

However, teacher training has been strongly attacked and threatened by the current Brazilian educational reforms. These reforms are aimed at serving the economic interests of the Brazilian elite and large business groups, who use this to sell educational services, using public resources. Faced with this fact, researchers, associations, unions and progressive organizations are denouncing these attacks, whether through debates and academic productions by the National Association for the Training of Education Professionals

(ANFOPE), the National Association for Graduate Studies and Research in Education (ANPED) and academic journals (Cabral; Carvalho, 2024).

Against this backdrop of setbacks in education, the then government of Jair Bolsonaro made changes to the composition of the National Education Council (CNE) and the National Education Forum (FNE) in 2019. CNE/CP Resolution No. 02/2015 (BRASIL, 2015) was repealed and CNE/CP Resolution No. 02/2019 (Brasil, 2020) was approved. Another resolution approved by the CNE was CNE/CP Resolution No. 4, of May 29, 2024 (Brasil, 2024), which is linked to the privatization of education and is based on the matrix of competencies and skills, pragmatist and utilitarian, without a critical view of society. The approval of the last two resolutions was marked by a lack of debate with scientific societies, higher education institutions and researchers.

Given this scenario, the passing of Bill 2798/2022 in the Chamber of Deputies, which aims to include a specific chapter on Rural Education in the National Education Guidelines and Bases Law (LDB) (BRASIL, 1996), is an encouragement in the face of the setbacks we have seen so far in relation to the training of rural mathematics teachers. Analyzing the principles of rural education defended by rural social movements in legislation on the training of rural educators is relevant and allows us to understand that these laws were passed in a context of class struggles.

Based on these facts, we seek to clarify the principles of Rural Education in the legislation on teacher training, and the question that guides this research is presented: how are the principles of Rural Education covered in the official documents of teacher training in Mathematics and Rural Education, at the federal level and in the municipality of Manaus (AM), from 1996 to 2019?

Considering this, the general objective of this work is to analyze how the principles of Rural Education are contemplated in the official documents of teacher training in Mathematics and Rural Education, at the federal level and in the municipality of Manaus (AM), from 1996 to 2019.

### **Mathematics Education and the Curriculum Guidelines for Mathematics Teacher Training**

Discussions about teacher training in Brazil in recent decades have followed the guiding principles of CNE/CP Resolutions 01 and 02/2002 (BRASIL, 2002), CNE/CP Resolution 02/2015 (BRASIL, 2015) and CNE/CP Resolution 02/2019 (BRASIL, 2020). Before these resolutions, math teacher training was based on the 3+1 model, which, in other

words, was basically three years of training in specific content (Mathematics), followed by another year of Didactics (teaching) (Moreira; Ferreira, 2013).

When Resolution CNE/CP No. 01/2002 (BRASIL, 2002) came into force, it obliged undergraduate courses to comply with it. However, this proposal was ineffective, as degree courses maintained in their curricula the predominance of training based on specific subjects and little space for pedagogical training, remaining the format of the 3+1 model (Gatti, 2015; Gatti et al., 2019).

In the last decade, several movements have acted to rethink teacher training and the valorization of these professionals. The CNE unanimously approved, and after approval by the Ministry of Education (MEC), resulted in CNE/CP Opinion No. 2/2015 and CNE/CP Resolution No. 2/2015 (BRASIL, 2015), which define the new guidelines for the initial and continuing training of basic education teaching professionals (Dourado, 2015; 2016).

For Dourado (2015), CNE/CP Resolution No. 2/2015 (Brasil, 2015) aims to outline the development of solid theoretical and interdisciplinary training, the unity between theory and practice, the centrality of work as an educational principle in professional training, as well as the understanding that research is a cognitive and formative principle and, therefore, the core axis of this training.

This CNE/CP Resolution No. 2/2015 (Brasil, 2015), approved by the CNE, is considered by Silva et al. (2020, p. 10) to be a victory as it “represents the historical struggle of organized civil society in favour of training and valuing teaching professionals, by directing training action in line with the construction of a National Common Base consisting of emancipatory processes”.

In order to meet the recommendations of Resolution CNE/CP No. 2/2015 (BRASIL, 2015), higher education institutions (HEIs) have been implementing adjustments based on this resolution. According to Zaidan et al. (2021), by 2019, of the 298 Mathematics degree courses in the face-to-face modality, 172 had made the adjustments throughout Brazil, in accordance with CNE/CP Resolution No. 2/2015 (Brasil, 2015).

During the implementation of Resolution CNE/CP No. 2/2015 (BRASIL, 2015) by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), the CNE revoked the legal framework of this resolution by approving Resolution CNE/CP No. 02/2019 (BRASIL, 2020), meaning setbacks in the teacher training policy that was being built in Brazil. According to Silva et al. (2020), Jair Bolsonaro's government used the strategy of recomposing decision-making spaces, excluding representatives of research institutions and representatives of civil society from the CNE and MEC for a project that had no social backing. For the authors, this was the strategy for attacking the legal frameworks for teacher training by approving CNE/CP Resolution No. 02/2019 (2020).

The approval of CNE/CP Resolution No. 02/2019 (2020) by the CNE in a vertical and authoritarian manner, without discussion with organized civil society, has set teacher training back decades, by removing a critical training project defended by representative entities. The text of the resolution proposes generalizing and homogenizing training, which ignores socio-cultural diversities, inequalities and the specificities of the diversity of subjects.

## **Rural education and its fundamental principles**

Education is a phenomenon specific to human beings. Thus, understanding the nature of education involves understanding human nature (SAVIANI, 2012), since, in this process, man, through work, when interacting with nature, produces his existence and educates himself. Marx (2013, p. 255) points out that “work is, above all, a process between man and nature, a process in which man, by his own action, mediates, regulates and controls his metabolism with nature”.

The historical process of building knowledge through work has undergone profound transformations, diversified and improved in line with the interests of the prevailing modes of production. In the communal system, work and education were homogeneous and integral activities, a process considered essential for sharing the knowledge built up to produce the community's existence, as there was no class division (Ferreira; Mourão, 2016).

With the creation of private property, in which the social division of labor, manual labor and intellectual labor was established, this integrated relationship between education and work was broken, both by the slave system of antiquity and by the feudal serf system (Ferreira; Mourão, 2016). For Saviani (2019, p. 36), the “development of production led to the division of labor and, from there, to the private appropriation of land, causing the rupture of the unity in force in primitive communities and generating the division of men into classes”.

Education is a political act, being “determined by the basic characteristics of the society in which it is inserted. Thus, when society is divided into classes whose interests are antagonistic, education serves the interests of one or other of the fundamental classes” (Saviani, 2019, p. 112).

Ghedin (2007, p. 39) says that “Education, over the decades, has perverted human relations and condemned large masses of the working classes to conformism and alienation; precisely because it represents the logic of the system”. In this speech, the

author shows how much education has served the interests of the bourgeoisie, making the working class increasingly alienated.

For Ghedin (2007), we need to radically break with this logic. According to the author, education is a means to an end not only personal and individual freedom, but also political liberation from all forms of oppression. It is for this reason that the social movements of the countryside defend an education that is of and in the countryside.

Education in the countryside is a concept that understands that subjects have a history, have names and faces, participate in struggles, and are therefore also holders of knowledge. In this sense, they are capable of self-direction (Borges, 2016a).

This conception of Rural Education is defended by Caldart (2004, p. 17), which is “In” and “Of” Rural. “In” meaning “the people have the right to be educated in the place where they live; “Of”: the people have the right to an education designed from their place and with their participation, linked to their culture and their human and social needs”.

This concept of Education in the Countryside is a historical and collective construction, which has been developed over the last 25 years by the dynamic conditions of life in the countryside, in the face of the movement of current contradictions (Caldart, 2024). For Caldart (2024, p. 102), rural education is a historical totality, with a human formation matrix, allowing us to “affirm, build”.

This construction of a rural education in the countryside, thought up, elaborated and managed by the people who live and work in the countryside, began in the mid-1980s, when social movements in the countryside, especially the landless workers' movement (MST), launched a strong struggle for an education that values people's way of life, their cultures and their relationship with nature through work (Neto, 2023).

However, the model of education that hegemonic culture tries to impose on the countryside devalues the values, beliefs and knowledge of the countryside. For this reason, the curricula are designed for the city, for urban industrial production. It is therefore necessary to go to the cultural roots of the countryside and work on them, incorporating them as a collective heritage that mobilizes and inspires struggles for land and rights (Arroyo; Fernandes, 1999).

The learning of the working classes, especially the peasants, has always been looked down upon by the elites because, due to the process of colonization in the first four centuries of the constitution of Brazilian society and, related to it, the regime of slavery, the latifundia and the predominance of extractive and agricultural production aimed at export did not require the qualification of the workforce (Ribeiro, 2012).



The people of the countryside were left to fend for themselves as capitalist society turned to the cities, leaving the rural population without public investment in various areas. The school education that predominated and predominates is called Rural Education or Rural School, which means a decontextualized education outside the reality of the countryside (Borges, 2010).

This reality of abandonment experienced historically by rural people led social movements in the countryside to raise the issue of public school education again. It was in the 1990s that rural workers, through major national mobilizations and articulations, managed to secure a policy for rural education, from a perspective that eschewed the rural school model (Borges; Vilhena Júnior, 2016).

It is through this struggle that rural social movements have won public policies to meet the universal right to education, which has been denied to rural peoples throughout history, bringing together the diversity of social subjects under the same banner. However, this struggle, which gives Countryside Education its identity, is not capable of showing its totality on its own (Caldart, 2024).

It was against this backdrop that Rural Education emerged. It emerged from discussions at the 1st National Meeting of Agrarian Reform Educators (I ENERA), held in 1997 and promoted by the Landless Rural Workers' Movement (MST) and organizations (Arroyo; Caldart; Molina, 2011).

The initial movement for Countryside Education emerged with the intention of fighting for public policies for Education in and of the Countryside and denouncing the advance of “latifundia, the destruction of nature, the degradation of the environment, the extinction of cultures and the expulsion and/or extermination of traditional peoples, whether they be people from the countryside, the waters or the forests” (Tafarell, 2024, p. 9-10).

It has also been a movement of pedagogical reflections on the resistance experiences of rural peoples, constituting the concept of Rural Education (Caldart, 2004). For Caldart (2008, p. 69), “the concept of Rural Education is rooted in the materiality of its origin and in the historical movement of the reality to which it refers”.

Caldart (2004) says that the construction of the political and pedagogical project of Rural Education involves dialog with pedagogical theory, with the reality of rural subjects, seeking human formation, with the intention of emancipation and the struggle for social justice and equality. Caldart (2004, p.14) recognizes that Education in the Countryside has three priority references: 1st) Tradition of socialist pedagogical thought, 2nd) Pedagogy of the Oppressed; 3rd) Pedagogy of the Movement.

It should be noted that Rural Education is a set of actions that involve participation, aimed at the collective construction of a new society. Recognizing and reconstructing the identity of the subjects who help form the new society (Borges, 2015).

According to Silva (2005, p. 39), “this identity has a concept and principles that support and underpin it. The principles of rural education are like the roots of a tree, which draws its sap from the earth, nourishes the school and makes it bear flowers and fruit”.

The principles that underpin rural education must respect the diversity of rural peoples, valuing social, cultural, environmental, political, economic, gender, generational and ethnic aspects; they must also encourage the creation of political-pedagogical projects that stimulate the development of schools as spaces for social, environmental and sustainable development, relating to the world of work.

Therefore, the scenario that is shaping up for Rural Education, based on current analysis, leads us to defend peasant territories, fight for public policies for Rural Education, the persevering confrontation of conceptions, the personal and collective self-education of Rural Education activists, grassroots work: agitating, educating and organizing (Caldart, 2024).

## Methodology

### Methodological procedures

The methodological procedures used to develop this work, in order to achieve the proposed objectives, took place in two stages. Firstly, bibliographical research was carried out on the categories: Mathematics Education and Rural Education. According to Triviños (1987, p. 54), categories are “forms of awareness of the concepts of the universal modes of man's relationship with the world, which reflect the most general and essential properties and laws of nature, society and thought”.

During the bibliographical research, the following activities were carried out: readings, fiches, reviews, summaries, etc., in such a way that a theoretical framework was developed to support the category used in this research.

Secondly, documentary research was carried out. The official documents were approached according to the research objective. The analysis of the documents was based on Bardin's Content Analysis (2016), which made it possible to examine the legal aspects of Mathematics Teacher Training and Rural Education. According to Bardin (2016, p. 15), content analysis is “a set of increasingly subtle methodological tools that are constantly being improved and applied to extremely diverse ‘discourses’ (contents and continents)”.



The content analysis carried out on the laws, resolutions and guidelines used official documents at federal level and in the municipality of Manaus (AM): LDBEN No. 9.394/1996 (Brasil, 1996), Decree No. 7.352/2010 (Brazil, 2010), Pronacampo Guiding Document/2013 (Brazil, 2013b), Law No. 13.005/2014 (Brazil, 2014), CNE/CP Resolution No. 2/2015 (Brazil, 2015), CNE/CP Resolution No. 02/2019 (Brazil, 2020), Law No. 2000/2015 (Manaus, 2015) and Resolution No. 005/CME/2016 (Manaus, 2016).

Taking these facts into consideration, we present below the phases of Content Analysis from the perspective of Bardin (2016). The first phase of Content Analysis is called Pre-Analysis, which deals with the organization of the analyzed material, with the aim of making it operational, systematizing the initial ideas. In this phase, we decided, based on the research objective, which information would be coded.

The second phase consisted of exploring the material (data categorization). According to Bardin (2016, p. 131), this “essentially involves coding, decomposition or enumeration operations, based on previously formulated rules”. In this phase, we established the registration units, based on the process of coding the data from the official documents that deal with mathematics teacher training and rural education. The elements that make up the coding process: the recording unit and the category of analysis. The category of analysis we used in the analysis of the data collected, based on Bardin's Content Analysis (2016), was the Rural Education category of analysis, based on the research problem and theoretical support.

The third phase was the interpretation of the Analysis Category (Education in the Countryside) configured in the data processing process, with the aim of understanding the object investigated. Thus, for the category of analysis chosen, based on the research objective, we prepared a text, which aimed to interpret the units of records, according to the theoretical framework of the categories: Mathematics Education; Rural Education related to the research problem.

### **Analysis of the legal aspects of teacher training in mathematics and rural education at federal level and in the municipality of Manaus (AM)**

When analyzing articles 23, 26 and 28 of the LDB (Brasil, 1996), there are elements that deal with the specificity of the countryside, in terms of social, cultural, political and economic aspects, such as: school calendar, climatic conditions, agricultural cycle, curricular content, methodologies. According to Fernandes (2011, p. 142), the LDB “recognizes sociocultural diversity and plural rights, making it possible to draw up different operational guidelines”.

Article 23 points to the LDB's (Brasil, 1996) adherence to the multiple realities that contextualize the schools' pedagogical proposal, characterizing it as important for Rural Education. We would like to point out that Rural Education, treated as rural education in the LDB (Brasil, 1996), is mentioned for the first time in Article 28, constituting an achievement for the Rural Education movement, by proposing measures to adapt schools to rural life, taking into account regional and local specificities. According to Molina (2012, p. 454), it was in Article 28 that rural people were guaranteed the right “to the construction of an education system suited to their sociocultural diversity, requiring networks to make the necessary organizational and methodological adaptations, and curricula that take into account their specificities”.

Although the LDB (Brasil, 1996) recognizes the diversity of the countryside, the legislators of this law do not break with the interests of the capitalist system. Borges (2006) points out that although education has a social function, there are models established by the economic structure to be met by the system. This is why it is so important for social movements to fight to guarantee rights for rural populations.

Given the above, and the existence of a new form of sociability, and recognition of the socio-cultural diversity of rural peoples, which are addressed in the records identified in the LDB (Brasil, 1996), we believe that in the history of education, the guarantee of access to specific policies for rural subjects was a breakthrough.

Another normative milestone for rural education was Decree No. 7352/2010 (Brasil, 2010), which elevated rural education to state policy, obliging the state to establish ways to expand the provision of education to people living in rural areas. According to Molina and Freitas (2011), Decree 7.352/2010 (Brasil, 2010) materializes the universality of the right to education, obliging the state to make possible interventions that consider the specificities of the countryside and guarantee this universality.

Items I and II of paragraph 1 of the decree identify rural populations, recognize the specificities of the countryside, the way in which people produce life, and classify rural schools, with their conception and service to rural populations, with their identifying characteristics, whether they are located in the countryside or outside it, but which serve these populations.

Other relevant aspects are the principles of Education in the Countryside, established in items I, II, III, IV and V of article 2 of Decree 7.352/2010 (Brasil, 2010), with a view to adapting the institutional project of schools in the countryside, such as respect for the diversity of the countryside, the formulation of specific political-pedagogical projects, the development of professional education training policy to meet

the specificities of schools in the countryside, the valorization of the identity of the school in the countryside and the participation of the community and social movements in controlling the quality of school education. For Caldart (2017), the construction of educational work in rural schools needs to consider the specificities of the region, the particularities of the place, the uniqueness of the culture and the identity of rural subjects.

It is important to note that the National Movement for a Rural Education formulated the preliminary draft that served as the basis for drawing up the aforementioned decree. The decree was not the brainchild of the MEC, but rather the protagonist role of social movements in the process of building a rural education policy.

In this way, we stress that Decree 7.352/2010 (Brasil, 2010) is based on the five principles, representing the field of the counter-hegemonic struggle. This decree is not the ideal law advocated by the social movements because it is a decree, but it is a step forward in guaranteeing the policy of Rural Education.

As for the Guiding Document - Pronacampo (Brasil, 2013), its importance for teacher training stands out. According to Molina and Antunes Rocha (2014), the creation of Pronacampo has brought great possibilities for teacher training in Brazil, an example of which are the degrees in Rural Education, to meet the needs of rural subjects.

The program was made up of four axes. It can be seen that Axis 1, Management and Pedagogical Practices, more specifically in the National Textbook Program - PNLD Campo, which had its first edition in 2013, was a major advance for rural populations, valuing the context of the countryside, its subjects, its identities, contributing to the construction of pedagogical proposals with themes and contents consistent with the specificities of the countryside (Sarmiento; Batisti, 2016).

Axis 2 includes the School of the Earth Program, created by Ordinance No. 579 of July 2, 2013, which aims to provide continuing training for teachers working in rural schools, which according to Hage et al. (2018) recognizes and articulates different learning spaces, times and knowledge, offering improvement courses, pedagogical follow-up actions and management of training processes and pedagogical practices.

It is worth noting that axis 3, in relation to Pronatec Campo, contains several aspects that are contrary to the principles of Rural Education, due to the participation of Brazilian agribusiness in this program, since it invests in professional education vacancies in private institutions, through Senar.

Axis 4 shows that the model for building schools in the countryside has “specific and standardized architectural projects” (Brasil, 2013, p. 14). This aspect of the program

does not take into account Brazil's climate and terrain. The specificities of the Brazilian countryside must be respected.

Therefore, these actions, which were being implemented through Pronacampo, suffered setbacks and attacks under the Bolsonaro government, with the extinction of the Secretariat for Continuing Education, Literacy, Diversity and Inclusion - Secadi, demonstrating its perversity against rural subjects, leading to the reduction of these actions and programs, and preventing the participation of society in monitoring management. However, the former Secadi was recreated in 2023 in the third Lula administration, and in the recreation, it dedicated a directorate to deal with public policies for ethnic-racial education and quilombola school education.

In 2014, Law No. 3.005/2014 (Brasil, 2014) was passed, which provides for the National Education Plan (PNE). This law presents goals and strategies that ensure progress in strengthening the Countryside Education Policy, due to the contemplation of the many demands of social movements in the construction of this plan and the incorporation of the term "Countryside Education", since it is the first plan that respects the representativeness of the term, as opposed to the term "Rural Education", present in previous plans.

In the Guidelines for Overcoming Educational Inequalities, listed in sections I, II and III of article 2 of the PNE (Brasil, 2014), there are 9 (nine) goals, including goal 1, which has 17 (seventeen) strategies and only one strategy (1.10) deals with early childhood education for rural children. This strategy is important because it ensures that the socio-cultural diversities and specificities of rural populations are recognized, that they are served in their communities, helping to curb the closure of rural schools, which leads to the process of "nucleation" of these schools.

However, what is contained in this strategy (1.10) does not guarantee that rural schools will not be closed. The Brazilian state needs to look at the people of the countryside in a way that values and respects their socio-cultural, economic and environmental aspects. The alternative to this situation is multi-subject schools, "which are a possible and necessary form of school organization in the countryside and can be of teaching quality if organized by cycles and multidisciplinary principles" (D' Agostini; Taffarel; Santos Júnior, 2012, p. 315).

The guidelines for promoting educational quality, listed in items IV and V of article 2 of the PNE (Brasil, 2014), contain four (4) goals, including goal 6. This goal contains 9 (nine) strategies and only one strategy (6.7) deals with rural education. This strategy is fundamental, since it understands that rural schools contribute to social transformation. However, for this

to happen, the school needs to formulate and implement an education project that is integrated with a political project for social transformation by the people of the countryside, which presupposes an integral education for these people, with a view to transforming the world and human self-transformation (Molina; Sá, 2012, p. 327).

Given the political scenario the country has experienced under the Bolsonaro government, with attacks on education in multiple dimensions, budget cuts, and the end of various programs aimed at developing public policies for Rural Education, the fulfillment of goal 6, and specifically strategy 6.7, has been compromised, given the inconsequential management of national public policies. In this sense, social movements and organizations were and are essential in the fight against setbacks in education, and for the guarantee and maintenance of historically won rights.

In the Guidelines for valuing education professionals, listed in item IX of article 2 of the PNE (Brasil, 2014), there are 4 (four) goals. We will look at goal 15, which has 13 (thirteen) strategies, and only one strategy (15.5) mentions rural education. Strategy 15.5, which deals with the specific training of education professionals, highlights the importance of this for rural subjects. Arroyo (2012, p. 365) points out that the training of rural education professionals must break with “instrumental qualification and affirm a training in which the root of everything is the human being, their process of humanization, of human emancipation”.

However, strategy 15.5 may not be fulfilled, given the civilizational setbacks of the Bolsonaro government, such as the implementation of the National Policy for Initial and Continuing Training of Education Professionals, which destroys the Guidelines contained in Resolution No. 02 of July 1, 2015.

In the Guidelines for the promotion of democracy and human rights, listed in items VI, VII, and X of article 2 of the PNE (Brasil, 2014), there are 2 (two) goals. We discussed goal 8 (eight), which is made up of 6 (six) strategies. Goal 8 is the only one of the twenty goals of the PNE (Brazil, 2014) that presents specific interventions in Rural Education. Its relevance for rural education is due to the guarantee of the right to education for rural subjects, which can be seen when considering the data from the 2010 Census, carried out by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics. These data point to the educational inequality between the young adult population living in the countryside and those living in the city (Ibge, 2010).

Although goal 8 is important, strategy 8.4 is related to the rationality emanating from the National Curriculum Guidelines for Technical Professional Education at the High School Level, approved by CNE/CEB Resolution No. 06 of 2012 (Brasil, 2012) and Pronatec, by

favoring concomitance over integration (Moura, 2014). Strategy 8.4 is operationalized through public-private partnerships, which is contrary to the paradigm of rural education advocated by social movements in the countryside.

Therefore, in the PNE (Brasil, 2014), rural education has made progress in relation to previous plans. However, as a public policy, it has made no progress in improving the quality of education for rural populations, due to the negligence of the Brazilian state with rural education. The PNE (Brasil, 2014) explicitly states that the Brazilian state's priorities for national education are not the countryside, but the current economic system.

In this sense, it is important to note that on June 26, the Lula government signed the PNE Bill (2024-2034) and sent it to the National Congress. This new PNE, which contains objectives, targets and strategies, makes references to quilombola, indigenous and rural school education. However, the objectives and targets will be achieved if the government makes them feasible and develops public policies.

As for Resolution No. 02 of July 1, 2015 (Brasil, 2015), it is clear that the initial and continuing training present in the National Curriculum Guidelines (DCN) of 2015 must take place in praxis. In this regard, Silva; Anjos; Molina and Hage (2020, p. 14) point out that “work and research as an educational principle are related to the dimensions of the relationship between theory and practice in teacher training. They guide a training project that is based on 'praxis'”.

Article 3, item II, recognizes the diversity of rural, indigenous and quilombola peoples, in line with the principle of Rural Education, listed in item I of Decree 7.352/2010 (Brasil, 2010). The 2015 DCN, after the comparison process, were revoked, demonstrating the setbacks in the Bolsonaro government's education policies, by approving Resolution No. 02 of December 20, 2019 (Brasil, 2019). This revocation by the CNE represented a setback in the field of teacher training, especially those defended by social movements in the countryside. In this regard, Silva et al. (2020, p. 8) state that the CNE imposes “a ‘new/old’ conception of training, which denies the interests and needs of the Brazilian people and prioritizes the interests of capital”.

As for Resolution No. 02 of December 20, 2019 (Brasil, 2020), it can be seen that the training of mathematics teachers and rural education was set back decades in theoretical and scientific aspects by the approval of the 2019 DCN, favoring the interests of the market, because with the Bolsonaro government, the CNE ceased to be a state institution, to be a government institution, being occupied by educational entrepreneurs. With this, they spared no effort to approve Resolution No. 02 of December 20, 2019 (Brasil, 2020).



Resolution No. 02 of December 20, 2019 (BrasiL, 2020) shows a generalist and homogeneous teacher training policy, disregarding sociocultural, inclusive and territorial diversities and does not recognize the specificities of rural subjects, failing to meet the principles of Rural Education, listed in Article 2 of Decree No. 7.352/2010 (Brasil, 2010).

In Article 4, there is a requirement for teacher training based on a pragmatic, content-based conception, in which the professional has a “secondary and compromised theoretical training, seeking to prioritize students who are already working in the professional field in the exercise of ‘competencies’ and ‘skills’” (Silva et al, 2020, p. 17).

Therefore, Resolution No. 02 of December 20, 2019 (Brasil, 2020), is a demonstration of the Bolsonaro government's strong attack on the training of rural subjects, destroying the training project defended by rural social movements, of critical and humanizing training.

As for the legislation of the municipality of Manaus, regarding Law No. 2000/2015 (Manaus, 2015), Article 2 deals with the Guidelines of the Municipal Education Plan (PME) (Manaus, 2015). In Item IV, a change was identified in relation to the PNE Guideline (Brasil, 2014), which reads “promoting the principles of respect for human rights, diversity and socio-environmental sustainability”, thus removing the term “diversity”, which goes against the principles of Rural Education.

In the Guidelines for Overcoming Educational Inequalities, listed in items I, II and III of article 2 of the PME (Manaus, 2015), there are 9 (nine) goals, including goal 1, which has 20 (twenty) strategies and only one strategy (1.10) deals with early childhood education for rural children, being identical to strategy 1.10 of the PNE (Brasil, 2014). Early Childhood Education was guaranteed in article 227 of the 1988 Federal Constitution, as a right of the child and a duty of the State, which was consolidated in article 29 of the LDB (Brasil, 1996), with the municipality taking priority responsibility for providing it. The right to education is not an abstract right, it has to be a concrete right, of concrete subjects, since these subjects have ethnicity, race and gender. For Arroyo (2006), this is the right of rural people to education linked to their human condition, and not as future agribusiness workers.

Strategy 1.10 is highly relevant in that it reinforces the specific needs of rural populations, guaranteeing that children remain in schools in their communities. However, it is necessary for the municipal government to guarantee the functioning of rural schools and stop the process of nucleation. This analysis is also shared by Borges (2016b, p. 103), who states that this nucleation policy distances students from their cultural roots, which leads to a

denial of their world, naturalizing the urban model, contrary to what is stated in resolutions 1/2002 and 2/2008 of the Guidelines for Basic Education in Rural Schools.

In the Guidelines for the promotion of educational quality, listed in items IV and V of article 2 of the PME (Manaus, 2015), there are 4 (four) goals, including goal 6. Goal 6 of the PME maintains the same percentages as the PNE (Brasil, 2014), contains ten strategies and only one strategy (6.7) deals with rural education. This strategy (6.7) is important because it understands that the rural school can contribute to the transformation of society based on the integral formation of rural subjects, from a Gramscian perspective of the Unitary School.

In the Guidelines for valuing education professionals, listed in item IX of article 2 of the PME (Manaus, 2015), there are 4 (four) goals. We analyzed goal 15, which deals with the Education Teacher Training Policy. This goal has 12 (twelve) strategies, and 2 (two) of these strategies, 15.5 and 15.6, deal with rural education. Strategies 15.5 and 15.6 of the PME (Manaus, 2015) are fundamental for the training of education professionals for rural schools, but these guidelines expose training through programs that are not aimed at the continuous training of these professionals, since, according to Borges (2016b, p. 113), these programs “have a scheduled time to start and end”.

In the Guidelines for the promotion of democracy and human rights listed in items VI, VII and X of article 2 of the PME (Manaus, 2015), there are two goals. We analyzed goal 8 (eight). This goal presents 9 (nine) strategies and also its operationalization through public-private partnerships, contrary to the paradigm of Education in the Countryside, which the social movements in the countryside defend.

As for Resolution No. 005/CME 2016/SEMED (Manaus, 2016), the records show aspects linked to the principles of Rural Education, reinforcing what is contained in the guidelines of CNE/CEB Resolution No. 1 of April 3, 2002, CNE/CEB Resolution No. 2 of April 28, 2008 and Decree No. 7.352/2010 (Brasil, 2010). According to Caldart (2012), the content of this legislation, which was achieved through the protagonism of peasant social movements, has useful provisions for the necessary disputes to be made at the different levels of government, whether at federal level or at state and municipal levels, which are often refractory to guaranteeing rights, due to the greater appropriation of these spaces of power by local oligarchies.

## Conclusions

The analysis of the legal aspects of Mathematics Teacher Training and Rural Education led to the conclusion that: 1) there is a recognition of the need for Field Education for the subjects of the field, from, the contemplation of the principles of Field Education, fruit of the struggle of social movements; 2) there is a recognition of the sociocultural diversity of the peoples of the field, characterized as an advance in guaranteeing access to public policies; 3) the approval of Resolution No. 02/2015 was an advance in representing the historical struggle for the benefit of the training and valorization of Mathematics teachers; 4) the approval of Resolution No. 02/2019 was a step backwards in the policy of training mathematics teachers, by ignoring socio-cultural diversity, gender issues, social inequalities and the specificities of the diversity of subjects; and 5) although it has made progress, it does not include all the principles of Rural Education, because in the process of drafting these documents, which took place in the class struggle, most of the proposals defended by the current system prevailed.

In this sense, we consider it relevant to deal with the documents on Mathematics Teacher Training and Rural Education, above all because they include some of the principles of Rural Education defended by social movements.

We emphasize the importance of the results achieved in this research, as they contribute to an understanding of how the principles of Rural Education are included in official documents. However, there are other official documents to be analyzed on Mathematics Teacher Training and Rural Education in the Amazonian context. Among them, it is necessary to deepen the studies on how the principles of Rural Education are included in the pedagogical projects of the Mathematics degree courses of the HEIs located in the state of Amazonas. We need to consider the need to analyze CNE/CP Resolution No. 4 of May 29, 2024 (Brasil, 2024), which establishes recent guidelines for teacher training in Brazil. This resolution points to training that is far removed from a critical, socio-historical, human and emancipatory education, and Bill 2798, which amends the LDB (Brasil, 1996) and establishes the guidelines and bases of national education to include a chapter on Rural Education.

## Acknowledgements

To the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) and the Amazonas State Research Support Foundation (FAPEAM) for the research grants. We would also like to thank the Postgraduate Program in Education (PPGE/UFAM), the Postgraduate Program in Education in the Amazon (PGEDA/UFAM), and the Faculty of Education (FACED) of the Federal University of Amazonas (UFAM) for their scientific support.

## References

- ARROYO, M. G; CALDART, R. S; MOLINA, M. C. (Org). *Por uma Educação do Campo*. 5. Ed. – Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2011.
- ARROYO, M. G; FERNANDES, B. M. A educação básica e o movimento social do campo. Brasília, DF: Articulação Nacional Por Uma Educação Básica do Campo, 1999. *Coleção por uma Educação Básica do Campo*, nº 2.
- ARROYO, M. G. Que Educação Básica para os Povos do Campo? *Educação Básica de Nível Médio nas Áreas de Reforma Agrária*. Textos de Estudos. Boletim Especial. ITERRA. Número 11. Setembro, 2006.
- ARROYO, M. G. Educação do Campo: movimentos sociais e formação docente. SOARES, L *et al*. *Convergências e tensões no campo da formação e do trabalho docente*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, p. 478-88, 2010.
- BARDIN, L. *Análise de Conteúdo*. Trad. Luís Antero Reto, Augusto Pinheiro. São Paulo: Edições 70, 2016.
- BORGES, H. S. Perspectiva de um Currículo Multicultural e Pluriétnico. GHEDIN, E. (Org.) *O currículo, Avaliação e Gestão por Projeto no Ensino Médio*. Manaus. Edições UEA/Ed. Valer, 2006.
- BORGES, H. S. *Formação Contínua de professores (as) da educação do campo no Amazonas (2010 a 2014)*. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Manaus, 2015. 206 f.
- BORGES, H. S. Passos dos tempos formativos do curso de aperfeiçoamento em educação do campo. In: BORGES, Heloisa da Silva *et al* (Org). *Trabalho e Educação do/no campo: agricultura familiar, agroecologia e alfabetização ecológica*. Manaus: FUA, 2016a, p. 141-152.
- BORGES, H. S. Projovem como política pública para a Educação de Jovens e Adultos do Campo. In: BORGES, Heloisa da Silva *et al* (Org). *Políticas Sociais Públicas, Cidadania e Educação de Jovens e Adultos do Campo*. Manaus: Editora Valer, 2010, p. 123-151.

BORGES, H. S. Educação do campo e os planos de educação. *Revista Amazônida: Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da Universidade Federal do Amazonas*, v. 1, n. 1, 2016b.

BORGES, H. S; VILHENA JÚNIOR, W. M. Movimentos Sociais do Campo e a Disputa pela Terra. In: BORGES, H. S *et al* (Org). *Trabalho e Educação do/no campo: agricultura familiar, agroecologia e alfabetização ecológica*. Manaus: FUA, 2016, p. 79-100.

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

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Conselho Pleno. Resolução CNE/CP n. 02/2002. Institui a duração e a carga horária dos cursos de licenciatura, de graduação plena de formação de professores da Educação Básica em nível superior. *Diário Oficial da União*: seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 9, 04 mar. 2002.

BRASIL. Decreto nº 7.352, de 4 de novembro de 2010. Dispõe sobre a política de educação do campo e o Programa Nacional de Educação na Reforma Agrária - PRONERA. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, DF, 5 nov. 2010.

BRASIL. Ministério de Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Câmara de Educação Básica. Resolução CNE/CEB nº 6, de 20 de setembro de 2012. Institui Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Educação Profissional Técnica de Nível Médio. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, DF, 21 set. 2012.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Plano Nacional de Educação. Lei nº 13.005/14*. Brasília, DF: INEP, 2014.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Continuada, Alfabetização, Diversidade e Inclusão. *Programa Nacional de Educação do Campo (Pronacampo)*: Documento Orientador. Brasília: MEC/Secadi, 2013.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Conselho Pleno. Resolução CNE/CP n. 02/2015. *Diário Oficial União*: seção 1, Brasília, DF, n. 124, p. 8-12, 02 jul. 2015.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Conselho Pleno. Resolução CNE/CP n. 02, de 20 de dezembro de 2019. *Diário Oficial da União*: seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 87-90, 10 fev. de 2020.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Conselho Pleno. Resolução CNE/CP nº 4, de 29 de maio de 2024. *Diário Oficial da União*: seção 1, Brasília, DF, p. 26-29, 3 de junho de 2024.

CABRAL, I. S; CARVALHO, M. S. As atuais reformas curriculares e a educação profissional: qual o projeto para a classe trabalhadora?. In: LIMA, A. M; FRANÇA, C. F. S; OLIVEIRA FILHO, J. C. A; ALMEIDA, L. F. S. (Org) *A ideologia do capital e a mercantilização da educação no contexto neoliberal*. – Volume 6. Senhor do Bonfim, BA: Nova Terra Editora, 2024, p. 21-66.

CALDART, R. S. Elementos para construção do Projeto Político e Pedagógico da Educação do Campo. In: MOLINA, M. C; JESUS, S. M. S. A. (Org). *Contribuições para a Construção de um Projeto de Educação do Campo*. Brasília, DF: Coleção Por Uma Educação do Campo, nº 5, 2004, p.10-31.

CALDART, R. S. Sobre Educação do Campo. In: SANTOS, C. A. dos (org.). *Por Uma Educação do Campo: campo, políticas Públicas, Educação*. Brasília, INCRA/MDA, 2008.p. 67 – 86.

CALDART, R. S. Trabalho, agroecologia e educação politécnica. In: PIRES, J. H; NOVAES, H. T; LOPES, J. A; MAZIN, A. D. (Org) *Questão agrária, cooperação e agroecologia*. – Volume 3 –. Uberlândia: Navegando Publicações, 2017.

CALDART, Roseli Salete. Educação do Campo: o que não perder do percurso e quais nossas tarefas prioritárias. In: LIMA, A. M; FRANÇA, C. F. S; OLIVEIRA FILHO, J. C. A; ALMEIDA, L. F. S. (Org) *A ideologia do capital e a mercantilização da educação no contexto neoliberal*. – Volume 6 –. Senhor do Bonfim, BA: Nova Terra Editora, 2024, p. 97-116. Disponível: [https://grupos.moodle.ufsc.br/pluginfile.php/2557351/mod\\_resource/content/1/DIA%CC%81LOGOS%20CRI%CC%81TICOS.VOLUME6%20%28A%20ideologia%20do%20capital%20e%20a%20financeiriza%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20da%20educa%C3%A7%C3%A3o%29.pdf#page=97](https://grupos.moodle.ufsc.br/pluginfile.php/2557351/mod_resource/content/1/DIA%CC%81LOGOS%20CRI%CC%81TICOS.VOLUME6%20%28A%20ideologia%20do%20capital%20e%20a%20financeiriza%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20da%20educa%C3%A7%C3%A3o%29.pdf#page=97). Acesso: em: 14 Dez. 2024.

D' AGOSTINI, A; TAFFAREL, C. Z; SANTOS JÚNIOR, C. L. Escola Ativa. In: CALDART, R. S; PEREIRA, I. B; ALENTEJANO, P; FRIGOTTO, G (Org). *Dicionário de Educação do Campo*. Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Expressão popular, 2012, p.315-326.

DOURADO, L.F. Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial e Continuada dos Profissionais do Magistério da Educação Básica: concepções e desafios. *Educação & Sociedade*, Campinas, v. 36, n. 131, p. 299-324, abr./jan. 2015.

DOURADO, L.F. Formação de profissionais do magistério da educação básica: novas diretrizes e perspectivas. *Comunicação & educação*, São Paulo, ano XXI, n. 1, p. 27-39, jan./jun. 2016.

FERNANDES, B. M. Diretrizes de uma caminhada. In: ARROYO, M. G; CALDART, R. S; MOLINA, M. C. (Orgs). *Por uma Educação do Campo*. 5. Ed. – Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2011, p. 134-145.

FERREIRA, J. N; MOURÃO, A. R. B. Trabalho como princípio educativo na escola. In: BORGES, H. S *et al* (Orgs.). *Trabalho e Educação do/no campo: agricultura familiar, agroecologia e alfabetização ecológica*. Manaus: FUA, 2016, p. 55-77.

GATTI, B. A. Políticas de formação de professores. In: SCARELLI, G. (Org.). *Educação, culturas, políticas e práticas educacionais e sua relação com a pesquisa*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2015. p. 206-233.

GATTI, B. A; BARRETTO, E. S. Sá; ANDRÉ, M. E. D. A; ALMEIDA, P. C. A. *Professores do Brasil: novos cenários de formação*. Brasília: UNESCO, 2019.

GHEDIN, E. Perspectivas sobre a identidade do professor do campo. In: GHEDIN, E; BORGES, H. S. (Orgs.). *Educação do Campo – A epistemologia de um horizonte de formação*. Manaus: UEA Edições, 2007.

HAGE, S. A. M *et al*. *Programa Escola da Terra: cartografia da diversidade e complexidade de sua execução no Brasil*. Curitiba: Editora CRV, 2018.

IBGE. (2010). *Censo Demográfico*. Séries Históricas e Estatísticas. Brasília.



IBGE. (2023). *Tendência Demográfica*. Disponível em <https://www.ibge.gov.br/cidades-e-estados/am/manaus.html> Acesso em: 12 Ago. 2023.

MANAUS. Secretaria Municipal de Manaus. Lei N° 2000, de 24 de junho de 2015. Aprova o Plano Municipal de Educação do Município de Manaus – PME. *Diário Oficial do Município de Manaus*, Manaus, AM, 24 jun. 2015.

MANAUS. Secretaria Municipal de Manaus. Resolução N° 005/CME, de 05 de maio de 2016. Estabelece normas, diretrizes e princípios aplicáveis a Educação Básica no Sistema Municipal de Ensino de Manaus. *Diário Oficial do Município de Manaus*, Manaus, AM, 10 jun. 2016.

MARX, K. *O capital: crítica da economia política: Livro I: o processo de produção do capital*; [tradução de Rubens Enderle]. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.

MOLINA, M. C. Legislação educacional do Campo. In: CALDART, R. S; PEREIRA, I. B; ALENTEJANO, P; FRIGOTTO, G (Org.). *Dicionário de Educação do Campo*. Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Expressão popular, 2012, p.453-459.

MOLINA, M. C; SÁ, L. M. Escola do Campo. In: CALDART, R. S; PEREIRA, I. B; ALENTEJANO, P; FRIGOTTO, G. (Org.). *Dicionário de Educação do Campo*. Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Expressão popular, 2012, p.151-159.

MOLINA, M. C; FREITAS, H. C. A. Avanços e desafios na construção da educação do campo. *Brasília em aberto*. N. 85, 2011, p. 17 – 31.

MOLINA, M. C.; ANTUNES-ROCHA, M. I. Educação do Campo: história, práticas e desafios no âmbito das políticas de formação de educadores – reflexões sobre o prôprio e o procampo; *Revista Reflexão e Ação*, Santa Cruz do Sul, v.22, n.2, p.220- 253, jul./dez.2014.

MOREIRA, P. C.; FERREIRA, A. C. O Lugar da Matemática na Licenciatura em Matemática. *Bolema*, Rio Claro, v. 27, n. 47, p. 981-1005, dez. 2013.

MOURA, D. H. Educação Básica e Profissional no PNE (2014-2024): Avanços e contradições. *Revista Retratos da Escola*, Brasília, v. 8, n. 15, p. 353-368, jul./dez. 2014.

NETO, L. B. “Escola da terra” em tempos de negação da escola. *Revista Educação e Políticas em Debate*, Uberlândia, v.12, n.1, p.313 – 325, jan./abr. 2023. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.14393/REPOD-v12n1a2023-67549>. Acesso em: 16 Dez. 2024.

RIBEIRO, M. Educação Rural. In: CALDART, R. S; PEREIRA, I. B.; ALENTEJANO, P.; FRIGOTTO, G. (Org.). *Dicionário de Educação do Campo*. Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio, Expressão popular, 2012, p.295-301.

SARMENTO, S. BATISTTI, J. Programa Nacional do Livro Didático Campo: até que enfim! *Revista Educação em Foco*, ano 19, n. 27, p. 45-72, jan.-abr., 2016.

SAVIANI, D. *Pedagogia Histórico-crítica e luta de classes na educação escolar*. São Paulo: Associados, 2012.

SAVIANI, D. *Pedagogia Histórico-crítica, quadragésimo ano: novas aproximações*. – Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 2019. – (Coleção educação contemporânea).

SILVA, H.S.A.; ANJOS, M.P.; MOLINA, M.C.; HAGE, S.A.M. Formação de professores do campo frente às “novas/velhas” políticas implementadas no Brasil: r-existência em debate. *Revista Eletrônica de Educação*, v. 14, 1-22, e45622146, jan./dez. 2020.

SILVA, M. S. Diretrizes Operacionais para Escola do Campo: Rompendo o silêncio das Políticas Educacionais. BAPTISTA, N. Q. (Org.). *Educação Rural: Sustentabilidade do Campo*. 2ª Edição. Feira de Santana, BA. MOC; UEFS. SERTA, 2005.

TAFFAREL, C. N. Z. Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para formação de professores: a disputa nos rumos da formação. *Revista Fluminense de Educação Física*, v. 1, n. 01, 2020.

TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zulke et al. A luta de classes na educação do campo: os cursos de pedagogia, a função social da escola, o trato com o conhecimento. *Especiaria: Cadernos de Ciências Humanas*, v. 21, 2024.

TRIVIÑOS, A. N. S. *Introdução à pesquisa em ciências sociais: a pesquisa qualitativa em educação*. São Paulo: Atlas, 1987.

ZAIDAN, S. et al. *A Licenciatura em Matemática no Brasil em 2019: análises dos projetos dos cursos que se adequaram à Resolução CNE/CP 02/2015*. GT07 - Formação de Professores que ensinam Matemática. Brasília: SBEM, 2021.

TRIVIÑOS, A. N. S. *Introdução à pesquisa em ciências sociais: a pesquisa qualitativa em educação*. São Paulo: Atlas, 1987.

ZAIDAN, S. et al. *A Licenciatura em Matemática no Brasil em 2019: análises dos projetos dos cursos que se adequaram à Resolução CNE/CP 02/2015*. GT07 - Formação de Professores que ensinam Matemática. Brasília: SBEM, 2021.