

Education In Rural Contexts In Ibero-America: Paths, Perspectives And Challenges

*Arya, Sunil,
Princeton University, United States*

Abstract

Addressing the rural and the education aimed at the planet generates a series of challenges, especially if the concern is to expand a reading beyond Brazil. We enter a field of interdisciplinary knowledge production that requires, from our specialized vision in education, a comprehensive effort of problems, themes and theoretical constructions that are not prioritized in the area, but that are foundations in/from our social practice. This special edition of the Ibero-American Journal of Education brings research, reports and reflections on Education in Rural Contexts of Ibero-America, demonstrating the plurality of practices in the face of contextual differences and the common challenges and potentialities to build an education that represents and is produced in the peoples of the Ibero-American area. The text aims to make an introduction to this monograph, presenting initial discussions and promoting reading for those interested in (re)knowing rural and countryside education in Ibero-America.

Keywords: Rural education; education in the field; rural schools.

1. Introduction

The realization of the debate around Education in Rural Contexts presses a reconhecimento of the existence of territorial specificities that trace implicações in the processes of human formation. This can be seen, for example, when we analyze the direction of education in Ibero-America, considering how it is feasible, or not,

for the different subjects linked to rural contexts. Questões como o acesso, a permanência, a infraestrutura das escolas ea qualidade educacional ganham highlight and show that social inequality impacts in a more intense way in nesses cenários, mainly those linked to Latin America. The Covid-19 pandemic scenario showed, even more, social segregation. Focus on other dimensions of the theme also draw attention to diverse sociability and its impact on the educational process. Or that it is related to the ways of production of life that are often disconcerted, devalued, or that seem to be extinguished. Additionally, we have a scenario of different social representations in dispute that reveal the imagination about what education the subjects that we produce in the territory we can, têm, ou devem ter. Sem quecer da pergunta: wich education do the subjects want, do we want?

Affirming that the subjects produce the territory and that this construction is disputed (Fernandes, 2006, 2012) is not something banal, pressupõe reconhecer authoria e participação necessária dos povos na construção da vida nos espaços que occupym. This is a starting point for understanding the education we are dealing with. It demands a historical perspective on the social relations that are established in different contexts and points to the need for a human formation that allows the improvement of exploration towards autonomy in the construction of the present and the future. And how does the rural highlight arise? Because, at this point, we can assume that it is valid to think about this educational concept for all subjects.

In the specific Brazilian case, we have a conceptual displacement that seeks to remove the “rural” to characterize and configure the “field”. Something that is not shared by Ibero America and, in its own country, is not always present in the spaces of the State and itself by perspectives on academic production on the

subject. In this way, it is worth highlighting that the relocation is not just semantic, it is, above all, political. The historical movement of social movements, unions and various social institutions was born that established a reading of the reality of Brazil in relation to occupation and use of the land, the existing educational policies, two data on formal education and apontam in the direction of what or what There exists a concept of education and development of the country that does not represent and does not condiz as the people of the countryside precisely and clam. On the contrary, existing education in Brazil dating back to the 1990s, called rural education, contributed to the intensification of social exploration and exclusion, being guided by the quenching of social diversity and ways of life focused on the construction of alternatives to capitalist hegemony. Assim, there is the political and social construction movement of Rural Education to surpass Rural Education.

The process of overcoming the educational paradigm of Rural Education for the Rural Education has many fronts of struggle and work in Brazil. Thinking about public financing and structuring decrees for rural schools are ways to guarantee changes, but these must happen tacitly, involving changes in curriculum, school calendar, pedagogical practices, didactic books and initial and continued training of teachers to adapt these schools.

This initial problem is to be seen in our attitude and our history as university professors of two Brazilian public universities – the Universidade Federal do Triângulo Mineiro and the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais – that offer and receive rural students to be trained as school teachers. do field in Brazil. These are the quests that are presented from the start in the construction of specific graduate courses for the training of educators to act in the field, or in schools that receive

reconnoitrely subject to the field. Thus, we falamos the place of Bachelor's Degrees in Field Education.

The Bachelor's Degree in Field Education emerges as a public policy of an affirmative nature and is characterized as a higher course oriented toward training in alternating times and training spaces between the university and the community of origin of two students. Thus, training aims to relate theory and practice, whose training commitment recognizes local and global social demands, proposing, or carrying out, interventions in communities. The objective and form of organization of this course seeks to account for the historical lack of teachers to work in the field. There is also a different form of organization for the initial training of teachers that aims to make it possible for the student to manage to make compatible his way of life linked to the countryside and his trip to the university, an institution that is generally distant from his locality.

It may seem simple, it is not trivial to the dynamics of the course and there are subjects such as students and students. Throughout our experience as teachers, we identify that there is a specific social practice, social relations and quests that we go through to achieve individuality. Starting out, the presence of a training course scheduled in alternating times and training spaces makes Superior Education possible for a profile of people who generally do not access the University. This is how university spaces are questioned and moved, not only about their practices and policies, but also through more elements to understand how rural areas are constituted in our country – Brazil – and in other countries. .

Subjects of the field. Field Schools. Developmental Projects. In this interweaving of tensions that is placed on the main question: what is the way to train teachers to adapt to the Ibero-American rural contexts? We start from a assumption that there

is no guarantee of access to education and permanence that further enhances physical inequalities. Therefore, ter uma educação no/do/com/para os povos do campo passa, a nosso ver, essencialmente, por uma formação de professores con princípios que privilegiem o protagonismo desses povos, o projeto de Sociedade dos movimentos sociais e Sindicais campesinos e a school of direitos. Isso also says an extensive trail of struggles for teacher training policies that privilege the principles listed here. This is a portrait of what happens in Brazil. Other Ibero-American countries have different ways of teaching rural education and teacher training to teach these schools.

With this perception we set out to promote this reflection on Education in Rural Contexts in Ibero-America. Thus, the main objective of this dossiê was to construct a space for the socialization of knowledge that allows fostering the analysis and debate on education in rural contexts, in its challenges, demands, policies, didactic-pedagogical proposals and theoretical perspectives in current affairs, considering the different territories and populations of Ibero-America, mainly in the post-pandemic scenario.

2. O Rural ea Escola Rural Ibero-Americans

Despite the consensus on the existence of a reality that can be called rural, there are divergences on the content of this category (Arcila e Silva, 2013). In this way, addressing rural education focused on it poses a series of challenges, above all, it is concerned with expanding a reading for all of Brazil. We enter a field of production of interdisciplinary knowledge that requires our specialized thinking in education and a comprehensive effort to address problems, themes and theoretical constructions that are not prioritized in our area, rather than being the foundations of our social practice.

As Pérez (2004) problematizes, the historical dynamics of rural areas and their relationship with urban areas have been transformed in recent decades and configured differently in Latin American and European countries. Thus, demarcating the rural context in Ibero-America can vary according to the criteria and understandings of the configurations of two countries and there are challenges for establishing comparisons between them. Reality that needs to be deepened.

As Caballero (2023) explains, most of the time this demarcation is based on statistical criteria linked to population density, but it differs very much not quantitatively between countries. For example, to be rural, Portugal considers a place with ten thousand people; Chile and Nicaragua, in turn, consider a thousand people. In Latin America other criteria are considered, such as the type of activities carried out (primary activities), or the number of adjoining houses, whether or not there are public services, among others. On the one hand, these readings demarcate the local rural area, making regional and global understandings of the subject difficult.

Likewise, Arcila e Silva (2013) points out that the reduced size of the fields, the low demographic density and the predominance of agriculture in the productive structure are some two aspects generally used to represent and delimit the rural area. However, we also recognize the multiple activities associated with this space (apart from agriculture) and the connections and exchanges between rural and urban areas. For the authors, there are different ways of interpreting this reality, but consider that these forms do not involve the notions about the rural areas constructed by the populations themselves who live in these contexts. In this way, as Social Sciences we need to advance with our theoretical frameworks, objects and forms of knowledge production.

There are other possible criteria that are also used to demarcate the rural, but are also based mainly on a dichotomous view between the rural and the urban, being: (i) the administrative that considers the rural from the political division of a State and that is found outside the capitals, districts, provinces or municipalities; (ii) or functional that considers as rural the administrative units that do not fulfill the functions of social services such as roads and basic infrastructure equipment, public services and others; (iii) the economic sector, which defines as rural the population centers that need the development of secondary and tertiary productive activities; (iv) the legal criterion that establishes the rural from the legal provisions in force, without considering population density, or other variável (Arcila e Silva, 2013). In this context, in reading that we possuimos that the construction of two criteria to delimit what is rural, but that a technical instrument is a political instrument that is transformed and that contributes to the construction of certain visions and public policies that do not necessarily contemplate complexity and demands of various realities and their subjects.

The research field, the researcher assumes, predominantly, the spacial-demographic criteria, but due to current methodological reasons there is a lack of information on the rural area than for epistemological reasons, thus reducing the rural area to the size of the population (Arcila e Silva, 2013). . Therefore, it is important to understand that the rural category is a social and historical construction on reality and that is expressed with diverse visions that impact the configuration of the knowledge produced, of educational actions and social policies in a general way.

This sense, a brief reflection on the interpretative models of rural life, synthesized by Arcila e Silva (2013), is relevant. Sendo eles: (a) a rural and urban dichotomy

and its delay-progress correlation; (b) or rural-urban continuum; (c) deruralization and rural persistence; (d) a rural-urban fusion; (e) or reunion with rural life; e (f) a new ruralidade. Despite the dichotomous perspective being considered surpassed in the reading of reality, Arcila e Silva (2013) problematizes that is still present in the very definitions of what seja rural as an opposition to urban, full of views that are understood as uncultured and backward.

To the extent that the socioeconomic limits are fading with the expansion of communication technologies, the inadequacy of the rural and urban dichotomy is assumed, and the rural is also considered as a continuum from a scale derived from the degree of diffusion of two urban lifestyles. This vision, despite progress, is also in contrast to the urban area.

In relation to deruralization and the defense of the disappearance of rural areas, arguments have been made regarding the erasure of populations in rural areas with the loss of their knowledge and practices and their participation in activities other than agriculture. In opposition to this understanding, some authors defend persistence, but simply deny the impacts of globalization on rural societies, considering that the ancient modes of production of peasants and indigenous people remain together or modern, for example in Latin America. For the authors, this requires an overcoming of the rural and urban opposition and the reconfirmation that the people of Campos are not passive subjects of the two urban styles, despite having coexisted with the ways of life.

Nesse limiar, arises from the purpose of the rural-urban fusion that recognises the changes generated by modernization, the expansion of communications in the migratory movement, placing in focus the urban-rural interactions in opposition to seeking to find criteria to demarcate these spaces and their modes of life. Both the

population flows from rural to urban, as well as from urban to rural, are highlighted, aiming at the diversification of ways of life, of benefits and services and, many times, or reconfirmation of hybrid ways of living.

The conception of the rural reunion, in turn, aims to highlight the processes of rebirth and social recomposition of rural societies in the face of the transformations of society. Thus, we contribute to the specificities of rural identities, in urban relations, even as we reconheça their integration in the globalized context. There is a tension in the relationship with the representations of the rural, in the direction of characterizing from the community spirit two ways of life, focusing on nature, quality of life and tranquility, replacing those that link rural to poverty, due to lack of personal development, social isolation and backwardness. In general, it is a perspective assumed by which it defends more sustainable ways of life, often linked to the defense of a return to rural life. However, Arcila e Silva (2013) establishes an important question, the valorization of rural areas does not necessarily imply the valorization of rural communities and, at the same time, this perspective can produce a new object of capitalist consumption, such as rural tourism.

The concept of New Rurality is taken forcibly in Latin America, aiming to confront the insufficiency of the traditional concept of rurality. As characteristics of the new rurality are aimed at overcoming the rural and urban dichotomy, at the diversity of expressions of our subjects (such as farmers, riverside workers, fishermen, artisans, agricultural entrepreneurs, people dedicated to rural services), or focus on multifunctionality two territories and reconhecimento da pluratividade for the preservation of rural economies, with an emphasis on management and conservation of natural resources and reconhecimento of environmental services as

a way to energize the rural economy and valorization of rural areas. However, the authors highlight debates on its consistency and its focus of analysis, being a Latin analytical perspective and itself potentially being erased when its meaning comes to refer to any new element on the rural, or something that was not observed by previous readings.

Faced with the existence of a diversity of interpretative models, Arcila e Silva (2013) promotes reflections that we also consider in our practice of training of field teachers, both to delimit the subject of two courses of Bachelor's Degree in Field Education, as well as to delimit or space for professional training and future adjustments. How do these models impact us? To begin with, there are two felt impacts to be seen as the rural and urban zone itself in the cities with the construction of official conceits around the countryside and that contribute to delimiting what is a rural school.

In accordance with Decree No. 7,352, dated November 4, 2010, which provides for the Rural Education Policy and the National Agricultural Reform Education Program - PRONERA in Brazil, "Country School: one located in a rural area, as defined by Fundação Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE), or one located in an urban area, since it predominantly serves rural populations." You see, we have so many other challenges to demarcate what IBGE defines as rural. According to Pera e Bueno (2016), IBGE defines its census sector as urban or rural in accordance with its position in relation to the urban perimeter delimited in the municipal urban legislation. However, not all municipalities have such legislation. In short, what we want to outline is that in this debate we join others that reveal or characterize two subjects that are attended to in schools located in the urban area, rather than recognized as the rural population.

In short, what we can glimpse from this debate is that there are various changes, vegetations and historical ways of occupying and producing our Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American rural spaces. Assim, we can, in a simple and direct way, say rural, not plural. Plurality expresses the ways of thinking, feeling and moving two subjects, families and communities that materialize their lives in spaces, producing identities, subjectivities and socialities from references that serve as a common point and structure in our conception of a relationship with each other. earth. We cannot leave aside how much this element is temporally intertwined in many tensions: occupied land, explored land, expropriated land, productive land, colonized land, land-life.

It is for thinking that we consider that land is an element-space-territory in dispute in Ibero-America. This is directly linked to the historical movement of occupation of two territories, with inequalities resulting from the intense struggle of forces that are unequal (Kay, 2019). We also link to development projects that are directed to non-urban areas that, in turn, are closely linked to society, countryside, education and, especially, school projects. This last element becomes important because we consider that the way we see the field and its subjects directs practices, curricula and teaching for rural and field schools.

To further this reconhecimento, Caballero (2023) points out an important characteristic that the school assumes in rural contexts. Due to the very absence of general services, and due to the centrality and obligation of the State with education, it has a great authority in the community for being one of the most established institutions and, in some cases, the only one. Many times it is the only way to link the community to the State and also a form of access to the learning it fosters.

3. Historical challenges, diversities of subjects and analytical cuts

Historically, the rural context is revealed as a scenario of exclusion and precarization of education for different peasant groups, especially in Latin America, as well as the lack of social participation in the construction of policies, their theories and practices (Cabellero, 2023, Juárez, 2017, Pérez, 2004). Is this instigating to think, what proposals and responses have the different countries built in recent decades for their education? What education has been completed? Currently, it is also worth analyzing the educational reality in the face of the Covid-19 Pandemic confrontation that severely affects rural schools.

From this perspective, we take an analytical look at rural education in Ibero-America and identify that there is a predominance of academic products in a historiographical perspective, encompassing primarily some two countries in this territory, such as Mexico, Brazil, Bolivia, Argentina, Colombia, the Republic Dominican, Chile, Peru and Spain (Werle, 2011, Civera & Lionetti, 2010; Pérez & López, 2009). In turn, Juárez (2017) focuses on the context of the last decade, presenting the dimensions of education carried out in rural Ibero-America, analyzing the context of Mexico, El Salvador, Spain, Chile. Juarez et al. (2020) update the article, mainly on Latin America, treating two contexts from Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguai, Bolívia, Peru, Dominican Republic, Argentina, Cuba, Chile, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Venezuela and Spain.

Galván (2020) argues that the rural education theme was marginal in most of the countries in the analyzed territory. However, carrying out the analysis from Mexico, Colombia and Peru, he believes that the subject has received more attention, having focused on quests that are often obscure. Thus, despite identifying a diversity of aspects and investigative approaches in three countries,

he aims in common to focus on the dimensions of the rural school, its policies, its subjects, its practices and its meanings in different cultural contexts.

Galván and Cadavid (2021) affirm that the topic of rural education has been gained for research in Ibero-America. For the authors, the research has a proactive tendency, because they possess a renewed interest in the sense of contributing to the melhoria of education of different rural populations, attentive to their ways of life and years of their fundamental direitos.

Amaya (2022), in a representative way, addresses ethnic diversity in two different countries in Latin America and cites the existence of alternative pedagogies, either from indigenous peoples, or from popular social movements, as representative in Chile, Argentina, Mexico, Brazil and in Antilles countries. The author, considering the peasant reality crossed by the capitalist economic model, understands that community and/or popular strategies for educating two people is a trend in Latin America, defending as a way to make viable an education that contemplates interests and values das communities, which materialize as a liberating education, not a Freirean sense.

In Brazil, this scenario is representative, constituting specific movements and perspectives that characterize Educação Indígena, Educação Quilombola ea Educação do Campo. Despite all of our subjects legally falling under the category “countryside population”, there are different paths that intersect, but rather they are expressed in specific formats and legislation for educational care. This very diverse reality instigates us to a constant dialogue and analytical effort to understand the specificities of the rural contexts, but we will also think about the challenges in common so that we can build a more just and socio-environmentally dignified society.

4. Finally, a dossiê

The construction of this dossier, without a shadow of doubt, was a process of many learning and reconhecimento of a plurality of actions in Education in rural contexts in Ibero-America. Foram received and endorsed 64 (sixty and four) texts from different countries and with quite diverse themes, two quais dez passaram to constitute the dossiê.

Initially, we identified some trends in the submitted works, from those that do not formulate or debate around rural/field education and that are linked to thematic subjects of education or will be in rural contexts, to those that make a historical recollection of the configuration of the direction à educação das populações rurais, or same analyzes related to local, regional, national and/or international configuration of different phenomena, ou dimensions, of the educational area.

In addition to epistemic and academic quality, we have a dossier that is representative of two different countries of origin of the sub-products, as well as the set of themes that form proposals. Something fundamental is that we aim for a direct explicitation of the debate around education in rural contexts and that allows, on the one hand, generalizations or broader analyzes to go beyond pontuais aspects of two territories.

Logically, in the end, products related to the educational scenario of the Covid-19 pandemic, educational policies, teacher training, indigenous education and primary rural schools. In its entirety, we address the challenges of social practice that is crossed by the predominance of the dichotomous vision of rural and urban and the absence of direitos for the populations of the countryside. A scenario that expresses the inexistence or precariousness of social policies for rural contexts, but also the

efforts of educational professionals to construct strategies that take into account the daily demands of schools and their communities.

Likewise, among the articles, we have products that contrast experiences between two countries. A relationship between the pedagogical practices of rural education in Brazil and Spain and, based on historical specificities and approximations between the countries, focuses on the centrality of the school, the importance of exchanges and the construction of networks to strengthen the movement for a school. quality field (Martins, et al., 2023). Hoffman-Martins et al. (2023), in turn, presents initiatives by rural school teachers in Argentina and Brazil to maintain classrooms at the beginning of the pandemic and highlights the absence of public policies for rural territories, especially in this period, emphasizing participation as fundamental Field fields in your construction.

Ainda sobre la pandemic do Covid-19, or text by Romero et al. (2023) focuses specifically on rural schools with extended hours, located in the province of Entre Rios, in Argentina. There are two texts that address the pandemic context and reinforce what is feared about the pandemic and schools in rural contexts: the pandemic presents difficulties that already exist, mainly not that it says respect for access to Information and Communication Technologies. In turn, it addresses how the Covid-19 pandemic represents, on a global scale, and specifically in rural schools, a significant loss of educational opportunities. What we have seen is that rural education in the pandemic period consists, in large part, with teachers and stakeholders so that it can achieve its objectives and be maintained. Without these subjects, diverse upbringings, adolescents and rural youth, they have been established, but once, without access to education.

In our text on the Brazilian context, we pay attention to what was presented by Sá et al. (2023) that demonstrates the access and permanence of students and students with deficiencies in rural schools in Brazil. The authors show a reality that is sometimes silenced and traces the need for attention to special and inclusive education in rural schools as well.

Regarding the importance of public policies, or a specific project for rural education, Mexico also stands out. As it relates to teacher training, it is evident when we get to know the Mexican reality from Cano et al. (2023). The authors present, through a documentary research, the challenges for the training of teachers of basic education in rural Mexican territories. We recognize the need to advance the concept of rural education present in the country's public policies that are only limited to the demographic criteria, still prevailing a negative view of rural schools and to teaching.

Other two texts complement the contextualization of public policies in Mexico: Martínez (2023) analyzes specific public policies for multiserial rural schools, pointing to the fragility of schools and the predominance of the absence of the State. Abellán (2023) analyzes the actions of the National Council for Educational Development (CONAFE) in the State of Chihuahua, in the framework of social equity, based on narratives from educators of different levels of basic education teaching.

The article by Montes e Tineo (2023) problematizes the participation of indigenous people in the constitution of public policy on rural education, mainly not that it says respect for bilingual intercultural education. Although, since 2015, Peru has recognized the existence of 24 native languages in the country, there are still challenges for the implementation and reconfirmation of Quechua-Spanish

teaching. Differently, in the Brazilian context, the country's education is composed of a group of educational modalities with specificities, not only framed under the same proposal for the country's education and indigenous education. As we can see, in Peru – and in the rest of Latin America – rural education is also defined as that intended for indigenous and native people.

In the scope of the analysis of educational strategies and projects aimed at the rural context that we can point to some successful paths, the text by Bermejo et al. (2023) traces an analysis of the Liceu Científico Dr. Miguel Canela Lázar that uses the STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Mathematics) method, specifically in the rural area for secondary education. The authors analyze the configuration and practices of the Liceu and draw a comparison between the results of the students with external evaluations with other Liceus of the Miraba Sisters province. Thus, we believe that the Liceu Dr. Miguel Canela Lázar has achieved satisfactory results and stands out among the training centers in the Dominican Republic.

Finally, we have a text by Díez-Gutiérrez (2023) that, analyzing the local Spanish situation, presents a central quest of education in rural contexts in Ibero-America: the rural value for the subjects and communities that develop their lives in the countryside. The role of school in front of these questões. The problem stems from the predominance of the social imagination of the countryside as backward and without development possibilities, or what makes young Spanish rural people leave their communities looking for new life possibilities.

From two highlighted aspects in the relationship to the articles that make up the dossier, we can identify that there is a strong relationship between the educational purpose and the current economic, social and cultural policy, that education in

rural contexts is the result of a field project, of education and society. Not saying that it is politics or disinvestment in rural schools, as well as politics in deciding to date schools, to “deixar” the young people from the countryside and to implement in the countryside a school with principles and practices that we do not value the subjects and communities peasants in Ibero-America.

In this sense, we reaffirm the importance of positioning ourselves in defense of a rural education/education of the countryside/education in rural contexts and territories that guides life, or work, to the valorization of the countryside and its communities

Finally, we continue to mourn and hope for a Countryside Education! Nessa searches we know that many things are necessary and we confirm the importance of the training of teachers who pautes these quests, that they do this with/from/for the subjects and rural communities, protagonists of the school process and the transformation and valorization of their territories .

References

Abellán, J. (2023). Inequality and inequity in Mexican rural education: the experience of CONAFE in the state of Chihuahua. *Ibero-American Journal of Education*, 91(1) 115-133. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie9115568>

Martins, M. de F., Rocha, E. & Boix, R. (2023). Pedagogical practices in rural territories: approximations between rural schools in Brazil and those of Catalonia in Spain. *Ibero-American Journal of Education*, 91(1), 23-37. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie9115537>

Amaya, C.J. (2022). Rural education in Latin America. Between the community and the popular. *ProPulsión Magazine. Interdisciplinary in Social Sciences and Humanities*. 4(1), 65-77.

Arcila, MTM, & Silva, AR (2013). The social construction of the rural. *Latin American Journal of Social Research Methodology*, (5), 24-41.

Bermejo, E., Peña, G., & Clemente, C. (2023). The STEAM approach as an educational project in a rural environment: comparative analysis in the Dominican Republic. *Ibero-American Journal of Education*, 91(1), 145-161. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie9115520>

Caballero, P.R. (2023). The tradition, the rupture and the continuity of rural education in the Ibero-American space. *Redipe Bulletin Magazine*, 12(2), 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.36260/rbr.v12i2.1937>

Cano, A., Espino, HM, & Espinosa, L. (2023). Challenges in the training of rural teachers in Mexico. *Ibero-American Journal of Education*, 91(1), 85-98. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie9115566>

Hoffman-Martins, SE, Carmo, NCC, Andrade, RMR and Ribeiro, LP (2023). Education in rural contexts in times of pandemic. Brazil-Argentina stories. *Ibero-American Journal of Education*, 91(1), 39-54. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie9115562>

Civera, A. & Lionetti, L. (2010). Dossier. Introduction: Rural education in Latin America 19th-20th centuries. *Naveg@mérica. Electronic magazine of the Spanish Association of Americanists*, (4), 1-4.

Díez-Gutiérrez, E.-J. (2023). The collective imagination about the value of the rural environment that the school builds. *Ibero-American Journal of Education*, 91(1), 163-178. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie9115493>

Fernandes, B. M. (2006). Os Campos da Pesquisa em Educação do Campo: spaces and territories as essential categories. In: MC Molina, Educação do Campo e Pesquisa: questões para reflexão. Brasília: Ministry of Agricultural Development.

Fernandes, B.Mo (2012), Território Camponês. In. Dicionário da Educação do Campo. / Organized by Roseli Salete Caldart, Isabel Brasil Pereira, Paulo Alentejano and Gaudêncio Frigotto. – Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio, Expressão Popular.

Galván, L. (2020). Rural education in Latin America: scenarios, trends and research horizons. *Márgenes Magazine of Education of the University of Málaga*, 1(2), 48-69.

Galván, L., & Cadavid, AM (2021). Perspectives of rural education in Latin America. Equity, inclusion and innovation. *Pedagogical Trends*, 37, pp. 1-6.

Juárez, D., Olmos, AE & Ríos-Osorio, E. (2020). Education in rural territories in Latin America. Rionegro: Universidad Católica de Oriente Editorial Fund.

Juárez, D. (2017). Rural basic education in Latin America. *Synectics*, (49). Access on July 13, 2022. <http://bit.ly/3yHqUU7>

Kay, C. (2019). Land Reform in Latin America: Past, Present, and Future. *Latin American Research Review* 54 (3), 747-755. <https://doi.org/10.25222/larr.517>

Martínez, L. (2023). Educational policies for multigrade primary schools in Mexico: relegated by graduated education. *Ibero-American Journal of Education* , 91 (1), 99-113. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie9115582>

Montes, U. & Tineo, LE (2023). The participation of indigenous peoples in public policies of rural schools in Peru and the challenges of Intercultural Bilingual

Education in the current context. *Ibero-American Journal of Education*, 91(1), 135-144. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie9115411>

Pera, CKL, & Bueno, LM de M.. (2016). Resale or use of IBGE data for research and territorial planning: reflections on the classification of urban and rural situations. *Cadernos Metropole*, 18(37), 722–742. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2236-9996.2016-3705>

Pérez, TG, & Pérez, OL (orgs.) (2009). *Rural education in Latin America: Historical experience and construction of meaning*. Madrid: Anroart Ediciones.

Pérez, C. (2004) The Latin American rural world and the new rurality. *Nomads (Col)*, 20, 180-193.