

The continuing training of teachers in a rural school in Parintins/AM

Érica de Souza e Souzaⁱ 

Federal University of Amazonas, Manaus, AM, Brazil

Heloisa da Silva Borgesⁱⁱ 

Federal University of Amazonas, Manaus, AM, Brazil

Gabriel Rodrigues do Nascimentoⁱⁱⁱ 

Federal University of Amazonas, Manaus, AM, Brazil

Abstract

This article is an excerpt from a master's degree research developed within the scope of the Postgraduate Program in Education at the Federal University of Amazon. It aims to present the continued training of teachers who work at a rural school in Parintins, Amazonas. The same is based on the studies by Arroyo, Caldart and Molina (2011), Borges (2015), Borges and Souza (2021), Caldart (2012), Coelho (2017), Molina and Antunes-Rocha (2014), Pimenta (2015), Souza (2017) and other authors. The results indicate that the continuing training promoted by the Municipal Secretary of Education of Parintins does not always meet the needs, particularities and singularities of teachers who work in schools in the field of this county. We conclude that aligned teacher's training is emerging to the principles of Rural Education, which can contribute to the praxis of rural teacher, based on a critical perspective of emancipation humanity, in these intermediations with the reality of the working class peasant.

Keywords

rural education; field school; continuing training of teachers.

A formação continuada de professores/as em uma escola do campo em Parintins/AM

Resumo

Este artigo é um recorte de uma pesquisa de mestrado desenvolvida no âmbito do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da Universidade Federal do Amazonas. Visa apresentar a formação continuada de professores/as que atuam em escola do campo em Parintins, Amazonas. Encontra-se fundamentado nos estudos de Arroyo, Caldart e Molina (2011), Borges (2015), Borges e Souza (2021), Caldart (2012), Coelho (2017), Molina e Antunes-Rocha (2014), Pimenta (2015), Souza (2017) e outros autores. Os resultados apontam que as formações continuadas promovidas pela Secretaria Municipal de Educação de Parintins nem sempre atendem às necessidades, particularidades e singularidades dos docentes que trabalham em escolas do campo desse município. Conclui-se ser emergente uma formação de professores/as alinhada aos princípios da Educação do Campo, que possa contribuir para a práxis do/a professor/a do campo, pautada numa perspectiva crítica de emancipação humana, nas suas mediações com a realidade da classe trabalhadora camponesa.

Palavras-chave

Educação do Campo; escola do campo; formação continuada de professores/as.

La formación continua de docentes en una escuela rural de Parintins/AM

Resumen

Este artículo es un extracto de una investigación de maestría desarrollada en el ámbito del Programa de Posgrado en Educación de la Universidad Federal de Amazonas. Tiene como objetivo presentar la formación continua de los docentes que trabajan en una escuela rural en Parintins, Amazonas. Se basa en los estudios de Arroyo, Caldart y Molina (2011), Borges (2015), Borges y Souza (2021), Caldart (2012), Coelho (2017), Molina y Antunes-Rocha (2014), Pimenta (2015), Souza (2017) y otros autores. Los resultados indican que la formación continua promovida por la Secretaría Municipal de Educación de Parintins no siempre responde a las necesidades, particularidades y singularidades de los docentes que trabajan en las escuelas en el ámbito de este condado. Se concluye que está surgiendo una formación docente alienada a los principios de la Educación Rural, que pueden contribuir a la praxis docente rural, desde una perspectiva crítica de la emancipación humana, en sus intermediaciones con la realidad de la clase trabajadora campesina.

Palabras clave

educación rural; escuela de campo; formación continuada de los profesores.

1 Introduction

The training of teachers in rural Brazil has been discussed at national, regional, and local levels, present in academic debates, and in the agendas of the demands of countryside social movements, due to the need to face educational problems and build reflections on the paths of transformation of rural areas.

When we focus on training teachers to work in rural schools, we historically identify that school education in the countryside has always been precarious, both physically, administratively, and pedagogically, evidenced by the presence of the teacher as a layman, indicating the absence and/or scarcity of training suitable for the exercise of the profession (Molina; Antunes-Rocha, 2014). This reality changed with the actions of rural social movements and the rural working class organized in the struggle for Rural Education, from the 1990s onwards.

Through historical struggles, rural social movements have been designing public policies for teacher training, helping to build a model of rural education and school development in the country, aimed at the human formation of the working class and their children (Borges; Souza, 2021). This is because “[...] the discussion about the training of educators from the perspective of Rural Education requires that the project of society,

countryside, and school that we want to build has to be explicit” (Molina; Antunes-Rocha, 2014, p. 225).

For this purpose, it is possible to emphasize effective achievements of public policies and programs such as the National Education Program in Agrarian Reform (Pronea, Decree nº 7,352, of November 4, 2010), Support Program for Higher Education in Rural Education (Procampo) and National Rural Education Program (Pronacampo, Ordinance nº 86, of February 1, 2013). They enabled the materiality of concrete practices and experiences of initial and continued training of teachers in rural areas.

It is necessary to note that the training teachers to work in rural areas needs to solid, qualified, and permanent training process, whose curricular and methodological organization is related to the formative matrices of collective struggle, culture, land, knowledge, farm work, relationships social, cultural, political and economic that organize the projects of people, school, countryside and society, under a sociability that is not the logic of the capital.

For the challenges of the public education system in the Brazilian countryside, we understand that initial and continued teacher training must promote training processes in line with the concept of Rural Education, allowing a complete view of the reality of people who live and work in the countryside.

This article is an excerpt from the master's degree research in Education available in the Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (TEDE) of the Universidade Federal do Amazonas (UFAM). It was developed in the Postgraduate Program in Education at UFAM and connected to the study and research group of the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq/UFAM) “Countryside Education, Curriculum and Teacher Training in the Amazon”, financed by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal em Nível Superior (Capes) and the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Amazonas (Fapeam), whose objective is to present the continued training of teachers at a rural school in Parintins.

In this text, we divided the article into sections, plus the introduction. In the first section, we present the methodology used in the study. In the second, we address what teachers say about Rural Education in the municipality of Parintins, its relationship with rural schools, and teacher training promoted by the Municipal Department of Education

(Semed/PIN), to understand whether training has met or not the interests and needs of teachers who work in the rural school investigated.

2 Methodology

Methodologically, empirical and field research was developed, in which the analysis method used was historical-dialectic materialism, intending to go beyond the appearance of the phenomenon to reach its concrete essence (Netto, 2011), no longer as the chaotic representation of a whole, but as a rich totality of many determinations and relationships (Marx, 2011), understanding the contradictions posed in the studied reality.

We also adopted different procedures, such as literature review, document analysis, and application of questionnaires through WhatsApp, together with a Semed/PIN technician and five teachers who work at the Luiz Gonzaga municipal school, located in the Santo Antônio do Tracajá community, an area of settlement of the Instituto Nacional de Colonização e Reforma Agrária (Incra) in Parintins, state of Amazonas, Brazil.

The five teachers are women from Parintins, a socio-historical characteristic of the teaching profession. Furthermore, they are mothers, between 29 and 54 years old, all living in the community of Santo Antônio do Tracajá. Most teachers have been teaching for more than nine years, with more than seven years of experience in rural schools. The identity of the research participants is fictitious, and their identities are kept confidential.

We observed that women teachers, historically, are the references in basic education. All teachers in the research are in full professional practice and are residents of the community. For Rural Education, the education professional must be from the community, because, for Borges (2015), Molina and Freitas (2011), and Souza (2017), being part of the community means being in tune with the objective reality of students and the community.

The municipality of Parintins has 146 schools ranging from early childhood education, elementary school, and middle years, distributed between urban and rural areas, 118 of which are rural, distributed in floodplain areas (26), dry land/settlement (85), and indigenous (7) (Semed/PIN, 2021). We emphasize that this study was approved by the institution's Ethics Committee, by Resolutions nº 196/1996 and 251/1997, of the

National Health Council, and carried out during the Covid-19 pandemic, caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus, complying with the biosafety protocols determined by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Fundação de Vigilância Sanitária (FVS).

From this perspective, we dialogue with the studies of Arroyo, Caldart and Molina (2011), Borges (2015), Borges and Souza (2021), Caldart (2012), Coelho (2017), Molina and Antunes-Rocha (2014), Pimenta (2015), Souza (2017) and other scholars who discuss the training of rural teachers as a counter-hegemonic proposal connected to the reality of the communities where they work, contributing to the construction of a territoriality for the working class.

In processing the information coming from the analyzed questionnaires, we sought to understand the object of study in the categories of Rural Education, Rural School, and Teacher Training, seeking to answer the research questions.

3 Results and discussion

The construction of a democratic country project, in which rural subjects have a leading role in decisions about the construction of the education, rural area, and society they need, presupposes thinking about Rural Education, the school model, and the training of educators who desire as the elementary basis of this project.

In this topic, we gathered what the teachers and the Semed technician said to understand the treatment given to Rural Education, the rural school, and the teachers' continued training by the municipal education system in Parintins, in dialogue with the main national theoretical references. Thus, we start from these subjects' understanding of Rural Education.

I understand Rural Education as a teaching modality that was born from social movements, more specifically from the MST. [Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais sem Terra]. It symbolizes the struggle of different people in rural areas, who fight for education connected to their work practices (Flor do Maracujá, May 2021, Semed technician).

The understanding of Rural Education highlights similarities with what theorists discuss regarding Rural Education at the national level, converging with what the legislation ensures through the Federal Constitution of 1988, in Title VIII – Social Order, in its article 205, which establishes that “[...] Education is the right of everyone and the

duty of the State and the Family [...]”, therefore places education as a fundamentally social right for all individuals, including the rural population. What establishes the Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional (LDB), nº 9,394/1996, accentuates this debate by sanctioning and guaranteeing Rural Education as a right of rural populations, highlighted in Chapter II, which deals with Basic Education – Section I, of the General Provisions, in its article 26:

Elementary and high school education curricula must have a common national base, to be complemented, in each education system and school establishment, by a diversified part, required by the regional and local characteristics of society, culture, economy, and clientele (Brasil, 1996).

Article 28 establishes that education systems must adapt to meet regional and rural needs and peculiarities.

When offering basic education to the rural population, education networks will promote the necessary adaptations to suit the peculiarities of rural life and each region, especially: I – curricular contents and methodologies appropriate to the real needs and interests of students from rural areas; II – school organization dictated by the own school, including adapting the school calendar to the phases of the agricultural cycle and climatic conditions; III – adaptation to the nature of work in rural areas (Brasil, 1996).

These legislations were fundamental as subsidies in the construction of the conception of education differentiated from the paradigm of Rural Education, synonymous with backward, archaic, and of low quality, in which the few policies and programs were thought and elaborated without the participation of the rural working class. The historiography of education aimed at the various social groups in the countryside in Brazil reveals that it was historically neglected by the State, relegated to marginal spaces, constituting Rural Education thought from urban reality, whose curricula did not value history, memory, work, culture, identity and right to citizenship for rural subjects (Arroyo; Caldart; Molina, 2011; Borges, 2007; Hage, 2006).

Caldart (2009) states that Rural Education was born as a critique of the reality of Brazilian education, particularly the educational situation of rural workers. Rural Education, therefore, is born from the rural social struggles, from the Movimento dos Trabalhadores Sem-Terra (MST), from the need of squatters/settlers who lack education, differentiated from the logic of their own destruction as a class or social group and cultural, as humanity. This educational project focuses its struggle on the school to guide

its practices, criticizing the dominant knowledge and the epistemological hierarchization typical of this society, delegitimizing the original protagonists of Rural Education as producers of knowledge that resist building their own references for solving problems through another logic of production and work, different from productive work for capital (Caldart, 2009).

In the construction of the epistemological materiality of Rural Education, Caldart (2004) explains that it is based on three priority theoretical references: the first is the tradition of socialist pedagogical thought; the second is the reference in the Pedagogy of the Oppressed and in the entire pedagogical tradition resulting from the experiences of Popular Education; and the third comes from a more recent theoretical reflection, called Movement Pedagogy.

The tradition of socialist pedagogical thought [...] can help us think about the relationship between education and production from the particular reality of rural subjects; it also brings us the pedagogical dimension of work and collective organization and reflection on the dimension of culture in the historical process, which we can today combine with some specific questions about learning and teaching processes that come from more recent studies in sociocultural psychology and from other sciences that seek to understand education more deeply, from a humanistic and critical perspective. The Pedagogy of the Oppressed and the entire pedagogical tradition resulting from the experiences of Popular Education [...] include dialogue with the pedagogical oppression (the educational dimension of the oppressed condition itself) and culture (culture as shaper of the human being), especially in Paulo Freire. Rural Education can perhaps be considered one of the practical achievements of the pedagogy of the oppressed, as it affirms the rural poor as legitimate subjects of an emancipatory and, therefore, educational project. Movement Pedagogy [...] comes from a more recent theoretical reflection, which we are calling Movement Pedagogy, which also dialogues with previous traditions, but is produced from the educational experiences of social movements themselves, especially social movements in the countryside. It is a pedagogical matrix whose theoretical constitution takes place at the same historical time as Rural Education. It can be said that this is a dialogue that will at the same time be the formulation of its conceptions and its practical developments (Caldart, 2004, p. 14).

Based on the analysis of the priority of Rural Education, in this conception of differentiated education, the working class assumes a connotation of Popular Education widely disseminated by the thought of Freire (2021) with the pedagogy of the oppressed, incorporating the dimension of collective pressure towards the emancipation of rural subjects, therefore:

Understanding the epistemological matrix that supports the conception of Rural Education permeates not only the training and education of rural subjects, but also the understanding of the theoretical construction, produced by the Peasant

Social Movements, which underlie the philosophical and pedagogical discussion of rural schools (Borges, 2015, p. 57).

Understanding the materiality of Rural Education that was built on the dialogue of universal issues of pedagogy and education. This dialogue revolves around a conception of a human being, whose training is necessary for the implementation of the rural and society project that integrates this Rural Education project, in a critical tradition connected to the political objectives of emancipation and the fight for justice and social equality (Caldart, 2004).

Caldart (2012) emphasizes that Rural Education consists of social practice in a process of historical constitution that cannot be understood in itself or only based on education issues and that exposes and confronts the social contradictions that produce it. In summary, the author presents the main characteristics to identify the novelties or the “consciousness of change” that the name expresses:

- It constitutes a social struggle for rural workers' access to education (and not just any education) carried out by themselves and not just in their name. Rural Education is not for or just with, but rather, of the worker, a legitimate expression of a pedagogy of the oppressed.
- It assumes the dimension of collective pressure for more comprehensive public policies or even a clash between different logic of formulation and implementation of Brazilian educational policy. It does this without ceasing to be a struggle for access to education in each location or particular situation of the social groups that make it up, a materiality that allows for collective awareness of the right and the understanding of the social reasons that prevent it.
- It brings together the fight for education with the fight for land, for Agrarian Reform, for the right to work, culture, food sovereignty, and territory. Hence, its original relationship with workers' social movements. In the logic of its subjects and their relationships, a Rural Education policy will never be just education in itself or school education, although it is organized around it.
- It defends the specificity of this struggle and the practices it generates, but not in a singular way, because the questions it poses to society regarding the particular needs of its subjects cannot be resolved outside the terrain of the broader social contradictions that produce them, contradictions that, in turn, specific analysis and action help to better understand and cope. And this refers both to the education debate and to the counterpoint of logics of life production, of a way of life.
- Its practices recognize and seek to work with the social richness of human diversity and its subjects: forms of work, roots and cultural productions, forms of struggle, resistance, organization, political understanding, and way of life. But its path assumes the tension of reaffirming, in the diversity that is the heritage of humanity, that it seeks unity in the main confrontation and in the class identity that aims to overcome, in the countryside and the city, capitalist social relations.
- Rural Education was not born as an educational theory. Its first questions were practical. Its current challenges continue to be practical, not being resolved solely through theoretical disputes. However, precisely because it deals with counter-hegemonic practices and struggles, it requires theory and demands increasingly greater rigor in the analysis of concrete reality, a perspective of praxis. In the struggles that have built it, Rural Education reaffirms and reinvigorates a conception of education with an emancipatory perspective, connected to a

historical project, struggles, and long-term social and human construction. It does this by moving towards the formative needs of a class that has the future of thinking about pedagogy from its specific reality, but not only aiming at themselves: the totality matters to them and is broader than pedagogy. The school has been a central object of the struggles and pedagogical reflections of Rural Education due to what it represents in the challenge of training workers, as a fundamental mediation, today, in the appropriation and production of knowledge that is necessary for them, but also due to the perverse social relations that his absence on the field reflects and his achievement confronts. • Rural Education, mainly as a practice of rural social movements, seeks to combine the struggle for access to public education with the struggle against the political and pedagogical tutelage of the State (reaffirms in our time that the State should not be the educator of the people). • Educators are considered fundamental subjects of pedagogical formulation and school transformations. Rural Education struggles and practices have defended the valorization of their work and specific training in this perspective (Caldart, 2012, p. 263-264).

The exposed traits reveal that Rural Education is a project that opposes the productive logic of capital, exposing the contradictions and social inequalities that occur in the countryside, allowing education to be thought of based on the social and human richness of its diversity, valuing forms of work, social, political and cultural relations as important in this project.

Some of these traits are present in the understanding of teachers at the Luiz Gonzaga School about Rural Education. Their conceptions point out that Rural Education is a different practice, concerned with the reality of rural populations, involving knowledge, curricula, and knowledge that contemplate the context of rural students and their ways of life.

It is the education given to rural people (Beija-Flor, May 2021).

Rural Education is one where all acquired knowledge is aimed at people from the countryside, transforming knowledge into innovative practices, and, at the same time, who teaches is also learning (Vitória-Régia, May 2021).

It is a different practice, where the reality of children is worked on, helping them to better understand the environment that surrounds them and in which they live. Education in the Countryside is taking knowledge and working with students through their lived knowledge and knowledge brought from their daily lives, increasingly enriching their learning and transforming what they have as a wealth, which is hidden, bringing it to their reality. Rural Education should have training aimed at training students, preparing them to live according to their knowledge, and leading them to understand their environment (Angelim, May 2021).

Rural Education are activities focused on educational practices related to rural activities, and agricultural activities experienced in students' daily lives. It is clear that Rural Education in Parintins still needs several adjustments related to the life of rural people, as it is clear that, in most cases, the proposed activities are still not suitable for these aspects (Seringueira, May 2021)

*It is an education focused on the reality of the field within the context of activities carried out in it. Rural Education is or should be aimed at rural people to transform daily knowledge into innovative practices and diversify unexperienced knowledge as a way of inserting it into different areas of activity within their environment. **Countryside Education in Parintins is much talked about, but not applied**, as what is taught and learned is to take you out of your habitat, and not to prepare you to work on improving the place (Sinos da Mata, May 2021, emphasis added).*

The concepts of professors Seringueira and Sinos da Mata signaled the understanding of Rural Education in the municipality, which still needs to advance to meet the needs and specificities of the reality of rural populations. Rural Education in Parintins is still under construction and has gained strength and advanced with the support of social movements, obtaining new schools with better infrastructure. However, the Covid-19 pandemic has revealed an intense crisis in public health, making online a challenge, in a region with difficulties with Internet connection and mobile telephony. The rural communities are hit harder as not everyone has access to these telecommunications systems nor do they have constant electricity.

In this scenario, the words of Flor do Maracujá (May 2021) bring her view of the current situation of Rural Education in Parintins:

Informally, I notice an advance in teachers' engagement conversation circles about Rural Education. In institutional terms, there was progress concerning the physical structure of the schools, as the new institutions that were opened have water wells and are air-conditioned; in the matter of school transport, there were also improvements. Another advance was the implementation of the connected school in rural areas, which facilitates contact with teachers remotely, when there is no power outage. In the pedagogical context, due to the pandemic, we are working within the possibilities allowed by social isolation. Students and teachers are being helped by the 'Learning at home through the radio waves' program. The students also receive handouts that were prepared by Semed's pedagogical team and monitoring is done by appointment and remotely. Given the adversities arising from this pandemic, related to schooling, Semed has been providing support from social workers to teachers and students.

This speech reveals that Rural Education in Parintins is built with many challenges and adversities, by different collective subjects that make up the countryside territories, presenting itself as a concrete possibility for social, agricultural, economic, and educational transformation of the rural area. It also emphasizes how the municipal education system has been working in the current context.

Remote teaching was the schooling alternative offered by Semed/PIN during the pandemic, taking place over the airwaves and through printed materials delivered to

schools and later to students. This moment highlighted the limits and contradictions in a situation where remote teaching excludes “[...] workers and their children, the poor and the people of the countryside, of riverside communities and forest people due to difficulties in accessing technologies using the Internet, which has increased social exclusion and inequalities among the most vulnerable groups in society” (Hage; Silva; Freitas, 2021, p. 302).

When we discussed teachers' continued training in rural schools promoted only by Semed/PIN, teacher Flor do Maracujá (May 2021) commented where it took place: “As mentioned, the latest training took place in communities itself, and it is our routine to report on the activities carried out”.

Regarding the meetings promoted by Semed/PIN for continued teacher training in rural schools, teacher Flor do Maracujá (May 2021) highlighted how they happened:

Before the pandemic, the technical-pedagogical team provided Continued Training at the centers of the communities for teachers in early childhood education, elementary and middle years. This was a new Continued Training format connected to the BNCC guidelines [Base Nacional Comum Curricular]; In these trainings, they began to participate in the annual action plan to try to include the specificities of different rural locations. I was participating in training with teachers from elementary, literacy, and physical education.

When asked whether the continued education for teachers met their interests and needs in rural schools, the professional said the following:

Formações Continuadas realizadas nos polos foram pensadas para tentarmos con The Continued Training in the communities was designed to try to meet the needs of Rural Education, instead of teachers participating together with city teachers, we thought it would be better to go and work on the ground at rural schools, to experience and listen to the needs of teachers, but the pandemic came and we were unable to finalize our training plan, much less carry out an assessment about it (Flor do Maracujá, May 2021).

When we asked teachers whether the proposal for continued teacher training meets the challenges and needs of rural schools in the Amazonian context of Parintins, we obtained the following answers:

Yes, for sure (Beija-flor, May 2021).

When I participated, there was almost nothing based on urban teaching, and almost nothing was aimed at rural teaching, so it wasn't useful either, it was more for literacy (Angelim, May 2021).

Sometimes, yes. Not every time, the workshops should be focused on the reality of rural people as a way of encouraging this process. These training most often take place in the city and others in some hub communities (Seringueira, May 2021).

When there were these training, they only partially attended to our needs. These meetings have not happened for a long time, but, when they did, they were very general, not specific to the rural area, and were focused on literacy in the initial grades. Most of the time, these meetings took place at the municipality headquarters and a few times in rural areas in different schools (Sinos da Mata, May 2021).

It has been a long time since this continued training for teachers took place, however, when it did happen, these trainings were more focused on Literacy, and not used methodologies aimed at rural people (Vitória-Régia, May 2021).

Only teacher Beija-Flor stated that continued training meets the challenges and needs of the school in the Parintins countryside. The positioning of the others reflects the desire for training more focused on the reality of the rural communities. In the same sense, we asked teachers whether the continued education courses offered expand their knowledge about Rural Education, meet their interests and needs, and provide the necessary support to work in rural schools.

Yes (Beija-Flor, May 2021).

For us, who work in rural areas, these courses could be in line with the students' reality, as many stay there. [...] some training took place in the communities, others in the field. As a report was not requested, we just participated (Angelim, May 2021).

In some terms, yes; in others not, especially because it has been a long time since these trainings took place. Most of the time, it is too general, where all teachers participate without division between countryside and city, and more in theory (Seringueira, May 2021).

In some situations, yes; others are not, considering that we do not have training aimed directly at rural schools. These trainings, as previously stated, were aimed at students' literacy, and not at the methodologies to be worked within the rural schools (Sinos da Mata, May 2021).

As I said, the little I did and learned helped me a lot. It's always good to learn something new, new suggestions. This greatly enriches learning (Vitória-Régia, May 2021).

According to the teachers, Semed/PIN training does not always consider the particularity of the countryside and the uniqueness of the reality of rural students, even in a municipality where the majority of schools are in rural territories.

Having presented these contradictions, we understand that, to think about a socially equal rural school for rural subjects, it is necessary to rethink the continued

training of rural teachers, not accepting just any proposal, because satisfactory results will not be achieved (Zuin; Dias, 2017). In other words, teacher training cannot follow an urban-centric model, which is why the presence of professionals who can meet the specificities and needs of rural subjects and who, through experience, understand that continued training is necessary to corroborate the quality teaching process of rural students (Cajaiba; Santos; Brito, 2022).

We also ask what format/configuration continued training courses could have for teachers who work in rural schools in Parintins.

Considering the reality of rural schools (Beija-Flor, May 2021).

I think that these trainings should really be aimed at Rural Education, that is, they would value rural life (Seringueira, May 2021).

In my opinion, training should be aimed more specifically at theoretical knowledge of the field to combine with practice (Sinos da Mata, May 2021).

In my opinion, the Semed team should hold these courses at the centers, since, for teachers in rural areas, it is difficult to go to the city for classes, or take the courses during vacations, or even create an online format, as some schools have internet access (Vitória-Régia, May 2021).

The teachers' responses indicate that the training held by Semed Parintins has not reached all rural teachers and is far from the rural reality.

Therefore, the training of rural teachers must be anchored in a process in which the context is understood, supported by theoretical and methodological approaches for this perspective. Despite the knowledge of these responsibilities, many training courses do not take into account the specificity of Peasant Education to overcome the urban conception of old teaching models (Cajaiba; Santos; Brito, 2022, p. 4).

Regarding the necessary elements in the proposal for continued training for teachers in rural schools in Parintins, the collaborators expressed themselves as follows:

Always emphasize the reality of rural school students (Beija-Flor, May 2021).

Activities aimed at Rural school reality (Angelim, May 2021).

One of these elements that should be included is agricultural practices (Seringueira, May 2021).

Agricultural practices (Sinos da Mata, May 2021).

Literacy and different methodologies to be worked on in rural schools. Workshops and games (Vitória-Régia, May 2021).

It was unanimous among the teachers that teacher training in rural schools in Parintins must take more account of the reality of rural schools and that is related to agricultural practices. The continued training of rural teachers must, therefore, connect the production process and the social existence of rural subjects (Medeiros; Aguiar; 2015). It is essential to work with knowledge from the field, which is why “[...] the rural educator needs training that enables him to reflect on his experience, committed to the struggle, which considers the way of producing life, with work with the land, water and plants as dignified and good” (Molina, 2010, p. 396). This is also one of the concerns raised by Pimenta (2015, p. 99):

[...] before any decision is made, the rural educator must know the specific ways of being and living in the countryside, such as the practices of family farming, extractivism, fishing, beliefs, and values, to provide these subjects to the valorization of their culture, enriching and bringing new facts that allow the sustainable development of their communities and populations, since this knowledge and cultures vary according to their forms of production and land cultivation.

Finally, we asked teachers to evaluate the continued training promoted by Semed/PIN aimed at teachers from schools in the countryside of Parintins.

The ones I did contributed a lot to my training (Beija-Flor, May 2021).

For me it's good (Angelim, May 2021).

These training courses are not yet suitable for rural schools. The challenge is to put into practice the programs that already exist, which are aimed at Rural Education (Seringueira, May 2021).

It is a training that is being talked about a lot, and it is being applied (Sinos da Mata, May 2021).

In my opinion, there is still a lot to do. There needs to be more training courses that help teachers because these courses are very good and what is good needs to continue (Vitória-Régia, May 2021).

The task of Rural Education in Parintins is not easy, going beyond continued training – important, but insufficient, with the process of discontinuity, so the challenge that arises is to overcome the rupture and compromise the results sought.

[...] conceive and develop a counter-hegemonic training, that is, to formulate and execute an education project integrated with a political project of social transformation led by the working class, which requires the integral training of rural workers, to simultaneously promote the world transformation and human self-transformation (Molina; Freitas, 2011, p. 24).

It is not enough for teachers to interpret the world, it is necessary to transform it (Marx; Engels, 2014). Hence the need to work on continued training based on a counter-hegemonic process, based on an epistemology of praxis that articulates the work of the teacher, with a concrete praxis, subsidizing new reflections and new “[...] elements of the construction of the new hegemony in the intellectual organicity of teachers who can operate in the search for human emancipation” (Silva, 2019, p. 370).

We point out the need for greater debate and local dialogue with other collectives in Parintins, so that Rural Education, school, training and policies for rural teachers are well thought out and articulated with life, work, culture, knowledge, and the rural reality of the municipality.

5 Final considerations

In this article, we aim to present the teachers continued training in a rural school in Parintins. The analysis method allowed us to see the contradictions in the continued education offered to rural teachers, which still follow an urban logic and disregard the fact that the majority of rural schools and teachers are in the countryside of this municipality.

The results, through the positions of teachers at the municipal school Luiz Gonzaga, revealed that training provided by Semed/PIN does not always meet the needs, particularities, and singularities of rural schools.

Regarding the dynamics of teachers' continued training in rural schools offered by Semed/PIN, the teachers pointed out the fragility of these training and explained the need to consider more the reality of rural schools, relating to work and peasant agriculture, opposing the urban education model.

We conclude that teacher training aligned with the principles of Rural Education is emerging, contributing to the praxis of rural teachers, based on a critical perspective on the relationship with the reality of the rural working class.

6 References

ARROYO, M. G.; CALDART, R. S.; MOLINA, M. C (org.). *Por uma educação do campo*. 5. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011.

BORGES, H. S. Educação do campo como processo de luta por uma sociedade justa. In: GHEDIN, E.; BORGES, H. S. (org.). *Educação do Campo: a epistemologia de um horizonte de formação*. Manaus: UEA, 2007. p. 77-116.

BORGES, H. S. *Formação Continuada de professores(as) da educação do campo no Amazonas*. 2015. 203 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Manaus, 2015.

BORGES, H. S.; SOUZA, É. S. Os movimentos sociais na construção das políticas de formação de educadores/as do campo. *Revista da Faeeba: Educação e Contemporaneidade*, Salvador, v. 30, n. 61, p. 68-84, 2021. DOI: 10.21879/faeeba2358-0194.2021.v30.n61.p68-84.

BRASIL. Decreto nº 7.352, de 4 de novembro de 2010. Dispõe sobre a Política Nacional de Educação do Campo e sobre o Programa Nacional de Educação na Reforma Agrária. *Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 5 nov. 2010.

BRASIL. Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. *Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 21 dez. 1996.

BRASIL. Portaria nº 86, de 1º de fevereiro de 2013. Institui o Programa Nacional de Educação do Campo – PRONACAMPO, e define suas diretrizes gerais. *Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil*, Poder Executivo, Brasília, DF, 2 fev. 2013.

CAJAIBA, J. B. M.; SANTOS, A. R.; BRITO, V. S. L. Formação docente do/no campo: protagonismo do Programa Formação de Professores do Campo (Formacampo). *Educação & Formação*, Fortaleza, v. 7, p. e8075, 2022. DOI: 10.25053/redufor.v7.e8075. Disponível em: <https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/redufor/article/view/8075>. Acesso em: 3 nov. 2023.

CALDART, R. S. Educação do campo. In: CALDART, R. S.; PEREIRA, I. B.; ALENTEJANO, P.; FRIGOTTO, G. (org.). *Dicionário da educação do campo*. Rio de Janeiro: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio; São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2012. p. 257-264.

CALDART, R. S. Educação do campo: notas para uma análise de percurso. *Trabalho, Educação e Saúde*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 7, n. 1, p. 35-64, 2009.

CALDART, R. S. Elementos para construção do projeto político e pedagógico da Educação do Campo. In: MOLINA, M. C.; JESUS, S. M. S. A. *Por uma Educação do Campo: contribuições para a construção de um projeto de Educação do Campo*. Brasília, DF: Articulação Nacional por uma Educação do Campo, 2004. p. 10-31.

COELHO, M. M. O. *Formação de professor e o programa escola ativa: contribuindo para o processo ensino-aprendizagem em classes multisseriadas*. Manaus, 2017.

FREIRE, P. *Pedagogia do oprimido*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz & Terra, 2021.

HAGE, S. A. M. Transgressão do paradigma da (multi)seriação como referência para a construção da escola pública do campo. *Educação & Sociedade*, Campinas, v. 35, n. 129, p. 1165-1182, 2014.

HAGE, S. M.; SILVA, H. S. A.; FREITAS, M. N. M. Escola pública do campo no contexto das políticas educacionais: desafios às práticas formativas do Programa Escola da Terra no Brasil e na Amazônia Paraense. *Revista da Faeeba: Educação e Contemporaneidade*, Salvador, v. 30, n. 61, p. 299-314, 2021.

MARX, K. *Grundrisse*. São Paulo: Boitempo; Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ, 2011.

MARX, K.; ENGELS, F. *A ideologia alemã (Feuerbach)*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2014.

MEDEIROS, E. A.; AGUIAR, A. L. O. Educação do/no campo: história, memória e formação. *Educação: Teoria e Prática*, v. 25, n. 48, p. 6-18, 2015.

MOLINA, M. C. Desafios e perspectivas na formação de educadores: reflexões a partir da licenciatura em educação do campo da universidade de Brasília. In: SOARES, L. *et al.* (org.). *Convergências e tensões no campo da formação e do trabalho docente*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2010. p. 369-388.

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 Pronera e o Procampo. *Revista Reflexão e Ação*, Santa Cruz do Sul, v. 22, n. 2, p. 220-253, 2014.

MOLINA, M. C.; FREITAS, H. C. A. Avanços e desafios na construção da Educação do Campo. *Em Aberto*, Brasília, v. 24, n. 85, p. 17-31, 2011.

NETTO, J. P. *Introdução ao estudo do método de Marx*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2011.

PIMENTA, A. C. T. *Educação do campo: recorte das políticas públicas no município de Maués-AM*. 2015. 152 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Manaus, 2015.

SILVA, K. A. C. P. C. A formação contínua docente como questão epistemológica. In: MONTEIRO, S. B.; OLINI, P. (org.). *Formação continuada e desenvolvimento profissional docente*. Cuiabá: UFMT, 2019.

SOUZA, C. P. B. A. *Políticas públicas de formação continuada para professores de escolas multisseriadas do campo em Vargem Alta-ES: desafios e possibilidades*. 2017. 213 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Políticas Sociais) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Políticas Sociais, Universidade Estadual Norte Fluminense Darcy Ribeiro, Campos dos Goytacazes, 2017.

ZUIN, A. L. A.; DIAS, J. S. Formação dos professores que atuam na classe multisseriada na área rural no sul do Amazonas. *Educação & Formação*, Fortaleza, v. 2, n. 4, p. 160-

180, 2017. DOI: 10.25053/edufor.v2i4.1916. Available at:
<https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/redufor/article/view/128>. Access on: Dec. 2, 2023.

Érica de Souza e Souza, Federal University of Amazonas (UFAM)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2470-2483>

Graduated in Pedagogy from the State University of Amazonas (UEA, 2014). Master in Education from UFAM. Postgraduate in Education from UFAM and scholarship from the Amazonas State Research Support Foundation (Fapeam).

Authorship contribution: Developed the research.

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/6562533933082081>

E-mail: souzaoficial7@gmail.com

Heloisa da Silva Borges, Federal University of Amazonas (UFAM), Department of Administration and Planning

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7629-7056>

Graduated in Pedagogy from UFAM, specialist in Youth and Adult Education from UFAM, master's degree in Education, in the field of Public Policies, and PhD in Education, in the line of Teacher Training, from UFAM. She is currently a professor at the Department of Administration and Planning and the Postgraduate Program in Education, at the Faculty of Education at UFAM. Improvement and Specialization Course in Rural Education with an emphasis on Projovem Campo Saberes da Terra (2010 to 2013); Escola da Terra Program.

Authorship contribution: Supervised the research.

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/9429409939324333>

E-mail: heloborges@ufam.edu.br

Gabriel Rodrigues do Nascimento, Federal University of Amazonas (UFAM)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2150-9984>

Bachelor in Fisheries Engineering from UFAM (2005) and degree in Pedagogy from the State University of Amazonas (UEA, 2009). He has a professional master's degree in Science Teaching in the Amazon at UEA. He is a teacher trainer in the Teaching Professional Development Division (DDPM) at the Manaus Municipal Department of Education (Semed), where he works with ongoing teacher training. He is currently a doctoral student in the Postgraduate Program in Education at UFAM, and has a scholarship from the Amazonas State Research Support Foundation (FAPEAM).

Authorship contribution: Text writing.

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1645498571626158>

E-mail: gabriel.nascimento@semed.manaus.am.gov.br

Editor: Lia Machado Fiuza Fialho

Ad hoc reviewers: Isabel Maria Sabino de Farias and Roberto da Silva Júnior

Translator: Marina Pompeu

How to cite this article (ABNT):

SOUZA, Érica de Souza e; BORGES, Heloisa da Silva; NASCIMENTO, Gabriel Rodrigues do. The continuing training of teachers in a rural school in Parintins/AM. *Educ. Form.*, Fortaleza, v. 8, e11926, 2023. Available at:

<https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/redufor/article/view/e11926>



Received on September 3, 2023.
Accepted on December 10, 2023.
Published on December 19, 2023.

