

LITERACY PRACTICES IN RURAL EDUCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL
EDUCATION

*PRÁTICAS DE LETRAMENTOS NA EDUCAÇÃO DO CAMPO E NA EDUCAÇÃO
AMBIENTAL*

*PRÁCTICAS DE LETRAMIENTO EN LA EDUCACIÓN DEL CAMPO Y LA
EDUCACIÓN AMBIENTAL*



Maria Alzira LEITE¹
e-mail: mariaalzira35@gmail.com



Maria Arlete ROSA²
e-mail: mariaarleterosa@gmail.com



Maria Antônia SOUZA³
e-mail: masouza@uol.com.br

How to reference this article:

LEITE, M. A.; ROSA, M. A.; SOUZA, M.A. Literacy practices in Rural Education and Environmental Education. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 18, n. 00, e023083, 2023. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v18iesp.1.18483>



| Submitted: 22/03/2023
| Revisions required: 15/05/2023
| Approved: 29/07/2023
| Published: 19/09/2023

Editor: Prof. Dr. José Luís Bizelli

Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

¹ Tuiuti University of Paraná (UTP), Curitiba – PR – Brazil. Professor at the Graduate Program in Education (UTP) and Collaborating Professor at UNIVALI. PhD in Portuguese Language and Linguistics (PUC Minas).

² Tuiuti University of Paraná (UTP), Curitiba – PR – Brazil. Professor and editor of the journal of the Graduate Program in Education (UTP). Doctorate in Education: History, Politics, Society (PUC/SP).

³ Tuiuti University of Paraná (UTP), Curitiba – PR – Brazil. Professor of the Graduate Program in Education (UTP) and Professor of the Professional Master's Course in Inclusive Education in Network (PROFEI/UEPG). Doctorate in Education (UNICAMP). CNPq Research Productivity Scholarship - Level 1B.

ABSTRACT: *The objective of this work is to problematize the concept of social literacies based on bibliographical studies and establish dialogues with Rural Education and Environmental Education, taking as a reference the investigations carried out at the Nucleus of Research in Rural Education, Social Movements and Pedagogical Practices (Nupecamp), from the Graduate Program in Education, at Tuiuti University of Paraná. It brings together results of documental and bibliographical research and empirical work carried out in municipalities in the Metropolitan Region of Curitiba (RMC) from 2010 to 2022. This study has as the central reference the conception of social literacies, from Street (2014) and opens dialogues with Tfouni (2006, 2010). The methodological course favored the qualitative, exploratory approach and the bibliographic procedure. It is concluded that Rural Education and Environmental Education make up the social practices and policies that underlie social literacy in a critical perspective.*

KEYWORDS: *Social Literacies. Rural Education. Environmental Education.*

RESUMO: O objetivo deste trabalho é problematizar o conceito de letramentos sociais a partir de estudos bibliográficos e estabelecer diálogos com a Educação do Campo e a Educação Ambiental, tomando como referência as investigações realizadas no Núcleo de Pesquisa em Educação do Campo, Movimentos Sociais e Práticas Pedagógicas (Nupecamp), do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná. Reúne resultados de pesquisas documentais, bibliográficas e trabalhos empíricos realizados em municípios da Região Metropolitana de Curitiba (RMC) no período de 2010 a 2022. Este estudo possui como referência central a concepção de letramentos sociais, a partir de Street (2014), e abre diálogos com Tfouni (2006, 2010). O percurso metodológico privilegiou a abordagem qualitativa, exploratória e o procedimento bibliográfico. Conclui-se que a Educação do Campo e a Educação Ambiental compõem as práticas sociais e as políticas que fundamentam o letramento social em uma perspectiva crítica.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Letramentos Sociais. Educação do Campo. Educação Ambiental.

RESUMEN: *El objetivo de este trabajo es problematizar el concepto de letramientos sociales a partir de estudios bibliográficos y establecer diálogos con la Educación del Campo y la Educación Ambiental, tomando como referencia, las investigaciones realizadas en el Núcleo de Investigación en Educación Rural, Movimientos Sociales y Prácticas Pedagógicas (Nupecamp), del Programa de Posgrado em Educación de la Universidad Tuiuti de Paraná. Reúne resultados de investigaciones documentales, bibliográficas y trabajos empíricos realizados en municipios de la Región Metropolitana de Curitiba (RMC) de 2010 a 2022. Este estudio tiene como referente central la concepción de los letramientos sociales, de Street (2014) y abre diálogos con Tfouni (2006, 2010). El recorrido metodológico favoreció el abordaje cualitativo, exploratorio y el procedimiento bibliográfico. Se concluye que la Educación del Campo y la Educación Ambiental conforman las prácticas y políticas sociales que fundamentan el letramiento social en una perspectiva crítica.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: Alfabetizaciones Sociales. Educación Rural. Educación Ambiental.

Introduction

This article presents research results carried out in municipalities in the Metropolitan Region of Curitiba (RMC), in the context of the Nucleus of Research in Rural Education, Social Movements and Pedagogical Practices (Nupecamp), linked to the Graduate Program in Education, Masters and PhD, from Tuiuti University of Paraná. From 2010 to 2022, field work, intercity seminars, extension courses and pedagogical workshops were carried out that problematized the policies and practices of Rural Education in the light of the concept of Rural Education. In this context, political-pedagogical projects were restructured based on studies on diversity, curriculum, identity of rural schools, policies and practices of environmental education, alphabetizing and literacy, special education, among other topics requested by pedagogical teams and public-school teachers located in the field.

In the context of these activities, dissertations and theses were produced, authored by teachers from public schools in the countryside, who recognized the existence of the countryside and investigated rural schools and pedagogical practices based on critical perspectives of education and literacies. From the analysis of their own reality, the teachers dialogued with approaches linked to the multiple character of literate practices, based on concrete, cultural and social situations. In this line, the teachers questioned the view that the field and the school, in this context, are anchored in a view of backwardness and/or inferiority, and, with that, they were able to reorganize political-pedagogical projects; reviewing the identity of schools and re-dimensioning pedagogical practices.

The objective of the article is to problematize what is called social literacies, considering the discussions of policies and practices of Rural Education and Environmental Education, considering the results of several educational researches carried out at Nupecamp and which are linked to the *stricto sensu* postgraduate course and Basic Education.

Between 2010 and 2022, 17 master's dissertations and 11 doctoral theses were completed that investigated education in public schools located in the countryside, whose authors are teachers in these schools. In the same period, 5 dissertations dealing with Environmental Education in rural schools and 4 doctoral theses were defended. Furthermore, 4 collections were published dealing with rural people, work, education and public schools. The chapters of these collections contain results of individual and collective research, dialogued in co-authorship by students, professors of the *stricto sensu* post-graduation in education, and professors of public schools.

What is the relationship between these productions and social literacies? In Brazil, there are several works that deal with issues involving literacy(s), such as those written by Magda Soares (2001), from the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), since the 1990s, and studies by Ângela Kleiman (1995) and Roxane Rojo (2009), from the State University of Campinas (UNICAMP). And at the international level, we highlight the studies of Brian Vincent Street (1984, 1993, 1995), which are fundamental for understanding the plural concept of literacy, paying attention to the social nature of literacy. In this regard, it is worth highlighting an excerpt from the interview for the Blog da Parábola Editorial, in which Street (2017) defends the term literacies, in the plural, stressing that “the school is far from the everyday literacies with which people engage” (STREET, 2017, p. 2, our translation).

When considering the literacies scenario, one of the factors that has driven research at Nupecamp is the distance between the university and the rural/field territory in Brazil. Working in a metropolitan region made up of 29 municipalities, 18 of which are marked by rurality, one notes the invisibility of labor relations and pedagogical practices in rural schools in undergraduate courses and *stricto sensu* postgraduate courses. Undergraduate students are rarely put in contact with the realities of the people of the countryside, the waters and the forests. Even though they come from rural communities, students predominantly do internships in urban centers.

It should be noted that in an attempt to overcome this gap in the training process and to dialogue about the territory, countryside-city relationship, Nupecamp created several training fronts – initial and continued – aimed at social literacies. What do students live in the countryside? What do teachers experience in schools located in the countryside? Are there facilities? Are there difficulties? What are the images of work, education and rural school portrayed by the rural subjects themselves? How to carry out the pedagogical practice based on literacy as a social practice? What are the difficulties identified in the pedagogical practice in undergraduate and graduate courses? It should be noted that these questions are linked to a central question: what are the contributions of Rural Education and Environmental Education to social literacies? How to value the rurality of the Brazilian territory and the work of people from the countryside, waters and forests in school training processes in order to strengthen social literacies?

In order to fulfill the objective, and in view of the answers to the questions in this text, the methodological route favored the qualitative, exploratory and bibliographical approach.

This article is structured in three parts, namely: the first, which deals with the conception of social literacies; the second problematizes the potential of Rural Education for social literacies, and the third discusses Environmental Education as a social practice.

Social Literacies

[...] we experience concrete social practices in which different ideologies and power relations operate under certain conditions, especially if we take into account local cultures, identity issues and relationships between social groups (STREET, 2014, p. 9, our translation).

Alphabetizing and literacy, new literacies or even social literacies are denominations that remain linked to the word and to the very meaning of literacy. Regardless of the choice of an approach, whether pedagogical, psychological, linguistic or anthropological, these studies assume a concern with social practices that involve reading, writing and, therefore, the critical production of meaning intertwined in cultural and ideological meanings.

The various studies that invest in debates of this nature aim to present the origin, problematizations and advances around literacies. In this line, it is confirmed that the different meanings for literacy are modified or completed, when we consider the countless 'literacy events' (HEAT, 1982) and the multiple character of their practices (STREET, 2014).

It is important to clarify that literacy events are connected to actions/activities that encompass an immediate context of reading and writing (HEAT, 1982). Literacy practices surround a larger context in which there are attributions of meanings for reading and writing based on literacy events (STREET, 2014). These concepts invite us to think about the social value of the uses of reading, writing, and even the production of meaning, within different groups, given the determinants that involve the political, economic or religious scenarios.

In this vein, it is also worth highlighting Tfouni (2010) when he argues that literacy needs to be understood as a socio-historical process. Therefore, the author associates this conception with the development of societies and explains that literacy is “[...] a product of the development of commerce, the diversification of the means of production and the growing complexity of agriculture” (TFOUNI, 2010, p. 23, our translation). That said, he points out that literacy practices go beyond the walls of the school. So, when privilege is given to a know-how centered on the literacy process with regard to codification/decoding and the uses of reading and writing, the sense of literacy, in this case, remains on the sidelines. Therefore, note that

[...] from the point of view of a theory of literacy that is not only focused on the acquisition of reading and writing, and also that has political and social concerns of inclusion and justice, it is not possible to think or propose that literacy it is restricted only to the social uses of reading and writing [...] (ASSOLINI; TFOUNI, 2006, p. 3, our translation).

Therefore, the 'significant' value of literacy composes the broader social processes, namely, “the socio-historical aspects of the acquisition of writing” (MORTATTI, 2004, p. 89, our translation) and not just learning to write – individualized.

In order to complete the discussion, Kleiman (2008, p. 19, our translation) is resumed to observe that literacy is “as a set of social practices that use writing as a symbolic system and as a technology, in specific contexts, for specific objectives”. The insertion of the individual in the world of literacy depends a lot on his actions in relation to his daily life and his interaction with the social environment. Thus, the greater their involvement with various social practices of reading and writing, considering collective productions and actions, the more varied their literacy may be.

It is also worth remembering the two literacy models proposed by Street (2014), the autonomous model and the ideological model. The autonomous model focuses on the cognitive effects of literacy and the dichotomous view between speaking and writing. This model employs the dominant conception, that is, it reduces literacy to a set of cognitive capacities that can be measured in subjects. According to this model, the use of certain expressions such as “literacy degree”, “literacy level” or “low literacy” is commonplace. The student, in this model, is evaluated in relation to his individual ability to deal with the written text.

The other literacy model proposed by Street (2014) is the ideological one. For the author, literacy does not necessarily need to be linked to school teaching-learning, that is, the subject may not know how to fill out a form or write a letter, but he can ask someone close to him for help to carry out this activity. In addition, the fact that one is not very resourceful with reading and writing does not mean the absence of other literacies.

Thus, for Street (2014), the term literacies, in the plural, encompasses the process of reading, writing and meaning, also contemplating the meaning and function of social practices in different environments. It is important to emphasize that the conception of literacy, linked to a “pedagogization” (STREET, 2014, p. 121), cannot be restricted to the school scenario of “learning literacy”. Now, this learning is connecting to the literacy paths and the social processes of reading, writing, awareness and critical positioning.

Potentials of Rural Education for social literacies

Our role is not to speak to the people about our worldview, or try to impose it on them, but to dialogue with them about theirs and ours. We must be convinced that his vision of the world, which manifests itself in the various forms of his action, reflects his situation in the world, in which he constitutes himself (FREIRE, 1987, p. 87, our translation).

Freire's work (1987), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, instigates us to think about social practice, dehumanization and humanization. For the author, “the great humanist and historical task of the oppressed is to free themselves and the oppressors” (p. 30, our translation). For Freire (1987, p. 32, our translation), the pedagogy of the oppressed is “the one that has to be forged *with* him and not *for* him, as a man or people, in the incessant struggle of his humanity”. The author states that “the big problem is how the oppressed, who 'host' the oppressor in themselves, will be able to participate in the elaboration, as double, inauthentic beings, of the pedagogy of their liberation”. He himself answers that “Only to the extent that 'hosts' of the oppressor are discovered will they be able to contribute to the midwifery of their liberating pedagogy” (p. 32, our translation).

Taking as a reference these reflections by Freire (1987) and more the reflections in the work *The importance of the act of reading in three articles that are completed* (1986), in which he states that “reading the world precedes reading the word”, we affirm that Rural Education incorporates political concepts and positions in relation to the countryside as territory and place of work, culture and life; education as a transforming practice and the school as a place for dialogue about knowledge, both scientific and from experience, from social practice. In this article, we share the writings of Souza (2016a) and Souza and Paula (2022) on Rural Education.

The social literacy produced in the Movimento da Educação do Campo comes from the political-pedagogical praxis of social movements and, therefore, is marked by criticism and resistance to the impositions of agrarian capitalism and ultraliberal ideals. How do literate subjects read the world? What is the reading of the world made by children *without land*? What is the reading of the world made by “illiterate” leaders of movements fighting for land and agrarian reform? How do teachers read the Landless Rural Workers Movement (MST) or the Homeless Workers Movement (MTST)? What is the reading that Pedagogy students have about the countryside and the schools located in the countryside? We can have at least two answers to these questions: one that has a critical perspective and that will recognize the workers' movements as historical subjects that fight for existence and for their own humanization, for recognizing themselves in inhumane conditions. Another perspective, marked by

individualism, which attributes the blame for failure to the subjects and, from this perspective, social movements are criminalized, they are labeled as disturbers of “order and progress”. Which literacies have been strengthened in schools?

Between 2010 and 2014, the Nupecamp collective carried out a survey on teacher literacy. A total of 52 teachers who worked in schools located in the countryside, in the RMC, answered a research instrument containing 58 questions/challenges. One of the objectives of the research was to identify the conditions of teachers in terms of reading and writing skills of content present in different types and textual genres, focusing on general culture, pedagogical knowledge and understanding of Rural Education.

The results of the research are published in Souza (2016b) and Fontana (2016) and indicate that “On the individual dimension of teachers' literacy, that is, the skills of reading and writing and interpreting information in various textual genres, it appears that most have these skills developed” (FONTANA, 2016, p. 268, our translation). However, with regard to critical reading and writing skills, the research indicated the need for greater investment in continuing education processes, given the difficulty of teachers in understanding the conception of Rural Education, in understanding the historical contradictions of society and in questioning the difficulties that mark life and work in the countryside.

There are two situations highlighted in the research: one concerns teachers who live in the countryside and have difficulty understanding the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production, as they unknowingly “host the ideas of the oppressors” and are against struggles for agrarian reform. Another situation concerns teachers who live in cities and who graduated from on-site or distance teaching courses, and who have not studied the countryside or the public schools that are in the countryside, nor the educational policies conquered by the people of the countryside, the waters and forests since 1998. These are social practices built in different places, but with discourse incorporated from the media, religious or party ideals that oppose the struggles of rural workers.

Street (2014) contributes to the understanding of these situations according to the conception of social literacies. Guided by the understanding that people learn writing from social practices, it makes us reflect on colonial literacy (external, colonizing practices and ideologies) and dominant literacy (practices constructed by dominant class groups or ethnic groups). In this sense, what we identified among teachers is a social practice, most of the time, reproducing a dominant ideology, materialized in the reading of the world or the written word without critical or historical foundations.

Silva and Azevedo (2017) provoke us to think about the relationship between literacy and social inequalities, when they discuss discourses related to literacy in Brazil. One of the authors' questions is about: "what configurations of gender, ethnic-racial and age inequalities are it possible to apprehend in publications on literacy?". In the case of rural people in Brazil, it is possible to ask "what place do the countryside and agrarian reform have in publications on literacy?". How are people formed to "think" or "reproduce" oppressive relations in Brazilian society? In a year of presidential elections in Brazil, the MST, for example, was linked to a negative image of Brazilian society, on the side of an ultraliberal party. On the other hand, from the Workers' Party, the MST was praised as organizing a rural settlement recognized as the largest producer of organic rice in the country.

How to take social practice as a starting point for critical literacy? Paulo Freire (1987) shows us ways when proposing dialogic education.

If it is by saying the word with which, ' *pronouncing* ' the world, men transform it, dialogue imposes itself as the path through which men gain meaning as men. For this reason, dialogue is an existential requirement. And, if it is the encounter in which the reflection and action of its subjects are united, addressed to the world to be transformed and humanized, it cannot be reduced to an act of depositing ideas of one subject in the other, nor does it become simple exchange of ideas to be consumed by the exchangers (FREIRE, 1987, p. 79, our translation).

The results of Nupecamp 's research in the RMC led us to organize continuing education courses, called itinerant extension courses, carried out in schools located in the countryside, with dialogues guided by the needs of teachers. In one school, when raising topics for the continuing education process, the teachers exposed the need to study traditional agriculture, organic agriculture, agroecology and agribusiness. They said they were daughters and wives of field workers, small farmers, and were unaware of the concepts. Considering the social practice and needs of the teachers, seminars were organized centered on the content of the *Dicionário da Educação do Campo* (2012) on the aforementioned concepts.

On another occasion, field teachers and master's and doctoral students, linked to Nupecamp, expressed the desire to organize an illustrated book that valued the field, subjects, work, education and school. Thus, the collection *Portraits of the Metropolitan Region of Curitiba* was organized by Souza and Pianovski (2019), as material resulting from postgraduate research and at the same time a possibility of didactic support for pedagogical practices in rural schools.

Studies and bibliographical productions contribute to the construction or reconstruction of the vision that one has of the countryside, peoples, schools and social struggles. In this way, taking into account the literacy condition of each subject, questions are provoked aimed at the political-pedagogical *praxis*, as defined in Souza and Paula (2022).

We understand that Rural Education enhances critical literacy. Returning to the master's and doctoral research carried out at Nupecamp, of the PPGED-UTP, the works of Cruz (2014, 2018); Caetano (2022); Debortoli (2020); Fedato (2022); Gonçalves Pinto (2010); Lopes (2022); Machado (2016); Pianovski (2012; 2017); Polon (2014); Rodrigues (2017); Silva (2014); Teles Maria (2015); Veiga (2019) stand out. Of these 15 surveys, 9 were produced by teachers working in public schools in the countryside.

When they entered the graduate program, they did not know the conception of Rural Education. They had a vision of Rural Education centered on contents that strengthened urban Brazil and made the struggles for agrarian reform and education demanded by social movements invisible. They reproduced a reading of the world centered on the dominant discourse on labor relations, property and public education. However, by participating in the research nucleus, in the Rural Education forums, in the intercity seminars and in network projects financed by the CAPES Education Observatory Program (2010 to 2017), they were able to build other practices, other readings, showing that literacy critical is collectively constructed.

Environmental Education as a social practice

critical literacy [...] is an educational perspective whose purpose is to instigate individuals to rethink their reality, helping them to become more conscious and autonomous in order to transform it, if they so decide. Critical literacy interrogates power relations, discourses, ideologies and stabilized identities, that is, considered safe or unassailable. It provides means for the individual to question his own worldview, his place in established power relations and the identities he assumes (CARBONIERI, 2016, p. 133, our translation).

Environmental Education as a social literacy practice dealt with here is articulated with rural education within the scope of the work carried out by NUPECAMP, as mentioned above.

One dimension of environmental literacy is Environmental Education as a social practice of literacy or multiple literacies, which permeates the pedagogical practices of teachers in the school space and in society. These practices make it possible to enhance an intentionality from a conservative/pragmatic or critical/transforming perspective in the relationship between human beings and nature.

The conservative strand is based on the anthropocentric paradigm, in which man holds power over nature by reproducing the relationships determined by the social, economic and political structure of domination and appropriation over the common goods of nature to add economic value in the process of capitalist accumulation. Anthropocentrism is hegemonic and structuring of consumerism in today's market society. Such determinations produce social literacy based on the reproduction of this anthropocentric model in different aspects of life in society.

The critical aspect establishes the questioning of this anthropocentric model and its principle is to establish an integrated relationship between human beings and nature. It seeks to promote a harmonious relationship on the part of the human being with the living and non-living elements of an ecosystem with balance and respect for the inherent dynamics of nature. A fact that also produces a social literacy based on this critical perspective. This intentionality of social practice underlies environmental education as a social practice of transforming the anthropocentric model of society.

Such aspects refer to the environmental social literacy built by the environmentalist movement from the 1970s to the present date. In this sense, Layrargues and Lima (2014, p. 23-38) develop an explanatory model by approaching the trajectory of Brazilian environmental education as a social field marked by three political-pedagogical macro-trends of environmental education: conservationist, pragmatic and critical, and claim that:

The conservationist and pragmatic macro-trends represent two trends and two moments of the same lineage of thought that adjusted to the economic and political injunctions of the moment until it gained the modernized, neoliberal and pragmatic face that characterizes it today (LAYRARGUES; LIMA, 2014, p. 34, our translation).

We understand that this debate around Environmental Education is marked by the presence of these two trends that represent two political-pedagogical projects: one conservationist/pragmatic and the other with a critical perspective. Such projects are the object of permanent dispute for the hegemony of the field of Environmental Education, when seeking to influence the social practices of educators, public managers, environmental educators, researchers.

Thus, Environmental Education is a social practice with intentionality in dispute between such projects that unfold in social literacy from different perspectives.

Studies on social literacy contribute to the understanding of the pedagogical practices carried out by the school in the focus of Environmental Education in researches that were

defended in 3 dissertations and 3 doctoral theses. In these surveys, linked to Nupecamp, environmental education had as context and research site the schools and municipalities that make up the metropolitan region of Curitiba. The dissertations by Kusman (2014), Santos (2015), Costa (2016) are investigations that contribute to the production of knowledge about environmental education in the pedagogical practices of teachers in the metropolitan socio-environmental reality of Curitiba.

The results of these surveys showed that Environmental Education practices are developed in an isolated, punctual way, reproducing the concept of a conservative/pragmatic aspect of Environmental Education. The pedagogical contents are disconnected from the reality of the subjects who live in the countryside and deal with the reality of urban schools. Another finding is that environmental education is not addressed in the political-pedagogical project of the schools surveyed, and this school management instrument is crucial to highlight the presence of environmental issues in the school. Also, that the teachers never participated in adequate training on such topics, nor on environmental education.

The doctoral research defended by Buczenko (2017), Araújo (2019) and Back (2021) had as their object of study Environmental Education carried out in schools located in rural areas in municipalities that are part of the areas of public water supply in the Metropolitan Region of Curitiba and also in schools in rural settlements in Paraná.

The research by Buczenko (2017) and Back (2021) privileged the pedagogical work of pedagogical coordinators and teachers from schools located in the countryside and inserted in areas of permanent preservation in the Metropolitan Region of Curitiba found that the pedagogical coordination developed this work with alignment to the conservative and pragmatic aspect and a distance from the critical aspect of Environmental Education. It was confirmed in these studies that Environmental Education in the work of the pedagogical coordinator and in the pedagogical practices in schools located in the countryside, in the municipalities of Piraquara and São José dos Pinhais, which are part of the Environmental Protection Areas of spring, distances itself from critical trends and emancipatory aspects of Environmental Education. Still, the articulation between Rural Education and Environmental Education was not identified, even in the face of national discourses and documents that guide school practices in the critical perspective of education both in the countryside and in Environmental Education.

It was found that there is a gap between the current public policy and the pedagogical work/practice carried out at school by the pedagogical coordinator and the teacher. As well as

the existence of a dichotomous relationship between the model of the school in urban and rural areas and evidence of contradictions between what is prescribed in the political-pedagogical context and what is carried out in the school routine by the pedagogical work/practice. Furthermore, the reproduction of the conservative/pragmatic macrotrend in the work/pedagogical practice of coordinators and teachers was observed. This fact indicates the need for specific training in environmental and rural education in municipal schools. This ongoing training process must occur frequently so that the insertion of environmental education can be understood by the school collective as stated in its regulation, covering the axes of physical space, school management and curriculum organization, seeking the participation of the school community. The results of these surveys showed that in the process of elaborating the political-pedagogical project of the schools, the socio-environmental reality of the spring area was not considered as a determinant for planning school management actions, a fact that shows a detachment of school management from the socio-environmental reality in which schools are included. Environmental Education seeks to contribute to this environmental literacy of the school community in its integration with Rural Education in the critical and sustainable perspective of the school reality.

Final remarks

In the context of Rural Education studies with teachers from public schools located in rural territories that do not have the presence of social movements such as the MST, the construction of other readings and other social practices has been an exercise in resistance. The fact is that the pedagogical practice acquires new contours in schools where there are professionals trained in Pronera and Procampo courses, from Escola da Terra, as well as masters and doctors who research the field, teacher training, literacies, pedagogical practices, among other topics, according to the concept of Rural Education.

It is in this sense that the defense is for the expansion of dialogues on the Brazilian field in all undergraduate and graduate courses, which will enable the recognition of social literacies that may be questioned from the perspective of critical literacy. Rural Education is a collective phenomenon that builds pedagogical experiences and questions traditional paradigms in Higher and Basic Education.

In relation to environmental education, this is linked to Rural Education in a critical perspective of a political-pedagogical project, taking into account human, emancipatory and

social transformation formation, with the student being the subject of his/her educational process of citizenship.

The great challenge in this context of studies involving Education in the Countryside and environmental education is the exercise of critical social literacy in the teacher training process, considering environmental education as a social practice that takes root on the school floor and flourishes in literacy future generations committed to the sustainability of humanity.

It is along these lines that critical social literacy is constituted as a binding axis of these educational modalities that resist the saga of dismantling educational policies won in the struggle of social movements.

REFERENCES

ARAÚJO, M. C. de. **Educação Ambiental nos Colégios de Assentamentos organizados no MST: Tendências conservadoras e crítica.** 2019. 191 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) - Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2019.

ASSOLINI, F. E. P.; TFOUNI, L. V. Letramento e trabalho pedagógico. **Revista ACOALFApl: Acolhendo a Alfabetização nos Países de Língua portuguesa**, São Paulo, ano 1, n. 1, 2006.

BACK, G. C. **Educação ambiental na educação infantil: percursos, processos e práticas evidenciadas em centros municipais de educação infantil.** 2021. 249 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2021.

BUCZENKO, G. L. **Educação ambiental e educação do campo: o trabalho do coordenador pedagógico em escola pública localizada em área de proteção ambiental.** 2017. 342 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2017.

CAETANO, M. Z. A. **A prática avaliativa no município de Paranaguá: um estudo em escolas de turmas multisseriadas.** 2022. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2022.

CARBONIERI, D. Descolonizando o Ensino de Literaturas de Língua Inglesa. *In:* JESUS, D. M. de; CARBONIERI, D. (org.). **Práticas de Multiletramentos e Letramento Crítico: outros sentidos para a sala de aula de línguas.** Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2016.

COSTA, M. H. **Educação Ambiental em escola de ensino médio localizada no campo do município de Rio Branco do Sul.** 2016. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2016.

CRUZ, R. A. da. **Educação e contradição: disputas político-pedagógicas em torno da escola pública do campo.** 2018. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2018.

CRUZ, R. A. da. **Reestruturação do projeto político-pedagógico das escolas municipais localizadas no campo no município de Tijucas do Sul.** 2014. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2014.

DEBORTOLI, S. F. B. **A escola pública da classe trabalhadora: contribuições de Miguel Arroyo, Paulo Freire e Roseli Caldart.** 2020. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2020.

FEDATO, R. B. **Influência da pedagogia socialista soviética nas práticas pedagógicas das Escolas Itinerantes do Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra (MST) no Paraná.** Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2022.

FONTANA, M. I. O letramento de professores de escolas localizadas no campo na Região Metropolitana de Curitiba. *In:* SOUZA, M. A. de (org.). **Escolas públicas no/do campo: letramento, formação de professores e prática pedagógica.** Curitiba: UTP, 2016.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do Oprimido.** 17. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.

GONÇALVES PINTO, D. **Organização do trabalho pedagógico nas escolas do campo: estudo dos Anos Iniciais no município de Araucária.** 2010. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2010.

HEATH, S.B. Protean shapes in literacy events. *In:* TANNEN, D. (org.). **Spoken and written language.** Exploring Orality Literacy. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1982. p. 91-117.

KLEIMAN, A. B. (org.). **Os significados do letramento: uma nova perspectiva sobre a prática social da escrita.** Campinas, SP: Mercado das Letras, 1995.

KLEIMAN, A. B. **Texto e leitor: aspectos cognitivos da leitura.** 11.ed. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 2008.

KUSMAN, R. A. **A Educação Ambiental nas Práticas Educativas dos Professores das Escolas Localizadas no Campo da Rede Municipal de Ensino de Contenda.** 2014. 137 f. Dissertação (Mestrado Acadêmico em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2014.

LAYRARGUES, P. P.; LIMA, G. F. da C. As macrotendências político-pedagógicas da educação ambiental brasileira. **Revista Ambiente e Sociedade,** São Paulo, v. 17, n. 1, p. 23-40, jan./mar. 2014.

LOPES, S. I. A. **Entre o que se fala e o que se cala na Educação Especial nas escolas do campo: inclusão e contradição.** Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2022.

MACHADO, R. das D. **A cultura como matriz pedagógica nas escolas do campo.** Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação), Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2016.

MORTATTI, M. R. **Educação e Letramento.** São Paulo: Unesp, 2004.

PIANOVSKI, R. B. **O jogo como atividade propiciadora de processos de mediação da aprendizagem entre alunos de escola rural com classes multisseriadas.** 2012. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2012.

PIANOVSKI, R. B. **Ensino e aprendizagem em escolas rurais multisseriadas e as contribuições da Psicologia Histórico-Cultural e da Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica.** 2017. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2017.

POLON, S. A. M. **A regulação e a emancipação em escolas públicas localizadas no campo.** 2014. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2014.

RODRIGUES, F. A. F. **A prática pedagógica em turmas multisseriadas: desafios no processo de transgressão.** Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2017.

ROJO, R. **Letramentos múltiplos, escola e inclusão social.** São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2009.

SANTOS, L. S. V. dos. **A Prática Pedagógica Socioambiental na Escola Localizada no Campo na Região Metropolitana de Curitiba.** 2015. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2015.

SILVA, E. de S. **Práticas pedagógicas na perspectiva da alfabetização e letramento: estudo em uma escola do campo.** 2014. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2014.

SILVA, M. A. B. da; AZEVEDO, C. Letramento: processos educacionais no contexto social e político. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 12, n. 4, p. 2138–2154, 2017. DOI: 10.21723/riaee.v12.n4.out./dez.2017.8816. Available at: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/iberoamericana/article/view/8816>. Access: 14 Oct. 2022.

SOARES, M. **Letramento: um tema em três gêneros.** 2. ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2001.

SOUZA, M. A. A Educação do Campo no Brasil. In: SOUZA, E. C.; CHAVES, V. L. J. (org.). **Documentação, memória e história da educação no Brasil: diálogos sobre políticas de educação e diversidade.** v. 1. Tubarão: Copiart, 2016a. p. 133-157.

SOUZA, M. A. de (org.). **Escolas públicas no/do campo: letramento, formação de professores e prática pedagógica.** Curitiba: UTP, 2016b. Available at <https://app.utp.br/cadernosdepesquisa/arquivos/Livrocoletivoescolaspublicas2016.pdf>. Access: 15 Oct. 2022.

SOUZA, M. A. de; PAULA, R. A. da C. PRONERA: da política pública à práxis pedagógica nas escolas do campo. **Inter-Ação**, Goiânia, v. 47, n. 2, p. 359-373, maio/ago. 2022. Available at: <https://revistas.ufg.br/interacao/article/view/72158/38620>. Access 10. Oct. 2022.

SOUZA, M. A. de; PIANOVSKI, R. B. (org.). **Retratos da Região Metropolitana de Curitiba – Paraná: campo, sujeitos e escola pública.** Curitiba: UTP, 2019. Available at

https://utp.br/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/ebook_retratos_paisagem_CC.pdf. Access: 2 Oct. 2022.

STREET, B. V. **Literacy in theory and practice**. Cambridge University Press, 1984.

STREET, B. V. **Cross-cultural approaches to literacy**. Cambridge University Press, 1993.

STREET, B.V. **Social literacies: critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education**. Harow: Pearson, 1995.

STREET, B. V. **Letramentos sociais: abordagens críticas do letramento no desenvolvimento, etnografia e na educação**. Trad. Marcos Bagno. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2014.

STREET, B. V. Letramento como prática social. **Entrevista Blog da Parábola Editorial**, 22 jun. 2017. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial, 2017. Available at <https://www.parabolablog.com.br/index.php/blogs/letramento-como-pratica-social> Access: 10 Oct. 2022.

TELES MARIA, F. de A. **A prática pedagógica com o uso de livros didáticos em escolas localizadas no campo**. 2015. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2015.

TFOUNI, L. V. **Letramento e alfabetização**. 8. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2006. (Coleção Questões da Nossa Época; v.47).

TFOUNI, L. V. **Letramento e alfabetização**. 9. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010.

VEIGA, A. A. **Prática pedagógica na perspectiva do letramento em escola pública no/do campo**. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba, 2019.

CRediT Author statement

Acknowledgments: Not applicable.

Financing: Not applicable.

Conflicts of interest: Not applicable.

Ethical approval: The work respected the ethical principles of research in education. There was no need for analysis by the Ethics Committee.

Availability of data and material: Are the data and materials used in the work available for access? To describe.

Author contributions: Maria Alzira Leite coordinated the article by indicating the “thread”, literacy. Maria Arlete Rosa related environmental literacy to elements of research results in the field of Environmental Education, and Maria Antônia de Souza linked results of her research on Rural Education in Brazil to the debate on multiple literacies. After the individual contributions, the authors invested in collaborative writing - that is, privileging the whole, given a dialogic organization.

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.
Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation.

