

Curriculum and Special Education in/from the Countryside: what do researches say about the theme?

João Henrique da Silva¹, Alessandra Peternella²

^{1, 2} Universidade Federal de Roraima - UFRR. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Centro de Educação. Avenida Capitão Ene Garcês, 2413, Aeroporto. Boa Vista - RR. Brasil.

Author for correspondence: jhsilvamg@icloud.com

ABSTRACT. This article has the following question as a problem: what do researches that tackle Special Education in/from the Countryside say about school curriculum for subjects with disability, autism spectrum disorders and high skills/giftedness? Thus, it aims to: analyze scientific production deriving from theses and dissertations produced in Brazil about the topic of Special Education in/from the Countryside, as well as if they tackle and how they tackle school curriculum for these subjects. The study was carried out by means of the adoption of bibliometric approach and content analysis, which took as a data source the Brazilian Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (Biblioteca Digital Brasileira de Teses e Dissertações – BDTD), which is maintained by the Brazilian Institute of Information in Science and Technology (Instituto Brasileiro de Informação em Ciência e Tecnologia – IBICT). Results reveal 31 works on the theme of Special Education in/from the Countryside over the last 25 years. Out of these, only five works tackle school curriculum in/from the countryside for the target audience of Special Education, albeit not directly, but as a theme that emerges from the main theme tackled by their authors. Therefore, investigating about the development of school curriculum for the audience of Special Education in/from the countryside is a challenging task.

Keywords: School Curriculum, Special Education, Rural Education, Bibliometric Analysis.

Currículo y Educación Especial en el/del campo: lo que dicen las investigaciones sobre el tema?

RESUMEN. Como problema tenemos: ¿qué dicen las investigaciones que tratan sobre educación especial en el/del campo sobre el currículo escolar para sujetos con discapacidades, trastornos del espectro autista y altas habilidades/superdotación? Como objetivo: analizar la producción científica procedente de tesis y disertaciones producidas en Brasil sobre la temática de la educación especial en el/ del campo, así como ellas tratan y como manejan el currículo escolar para estos sujetos. El estudio se llevó a cabo mediante la adopción de enfoques bibliométricos y análisis de contenido, como fuente de datos tenemos la Biblioteca Digital Brasileña de Tesis y Disertaciones (BDTD) que es mantenida por el Instituto Brasileño de Información en Ciencia y Tecnología (IBICT). Los resultados revelan 31 trabajos sobre el tema de educación especial del/en el campo en los últimos 25 años. De estos, solo 05 trabajos abordan el currículo escolar en el/ del campo para el público meta, pero no directamente, sino como un tema que surge de la temática principal abordada por sus autores. Existe la necesidad de futuros estudios y avances del tema en cuestión. Por lo tanto, investigar sobre la organización del currículo escolar para la educación especial del/en el campo es una tarea difícil.

Palabras clave: Currículo Escolar, Educación Especial, Educación del Campo, Análisis Bibliométrico.

Currículo e Educação Especial no/do campo: O que dizem as pesquisas sobre o tema?

RESUMO. Este artigo tem como problema a seguinte questão: o que dizem as pesquisas que tratam da educação especial no/do campo sobre currículo escolar para os sujeitos com deficiência, transtornos do espectro autista e altas habilidades/superdotação? Assim, objetiva: analisar a produção científica oriunda de teses e dissertações produzidas no Brasil sobre a temática da educação especial no/do campo, bem como se elas tratam e como tratam do currículo escolar para esses sujeitos. O estudo foi realizado mediante a adoção das abordagens bibliométrica e da análise de conteúdo, o qual tomou como fonte de dados a Biblioteca Digital Brasileira de Teses e Dissertações (BDTD) que é mantida pelo Instituto Brasileiro de Informação em Ciência e Tecnologia (IBICT). Os resultados revelam 31 trabalhos sobre o tema da educação especial no/do campo nos últimos 25 anos. Desses, somente 5 trabalhos tratam do currículo escolar no/do campo para o público-alvo da educação especial, porém não diretamente, mas como um tema que emerge da temática principal tratada por seus autores. Assim, constata-se a necessidade de estudos futuros e avanço do tema em tela. Portanto, investigar sobre a organização do currículo escolar para o público da educação especial no/do campo é uma tarefa desafiadora.

Palavras-chave: Currículo Escolar, Educação Especial, Educação do Campo, Análise Bibliométrica.

Introduction

Special Education in/from the Countryside¹ is a rather recent theme in both the National Policy on Special Education (*Política Nacional de Educação Especial*) and Countryside Education Policy (Brazil, 2002, 2008a, 2008b, 2010).

It is an interface that needs investigations and propositions to ensure the learning and development of children and teenagers with disability, autism spectrum disorder and high skills/giftedness who live in/off the countryside.

According to the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics – IBGE (2010), 15,63% out of 190.755.799 Brazilians live in the countryside. At the interface of Special Education and Education in/from the Countryside, data reveal that 16,28% of persons with disability live in the countryside, which corresponds to 8,59% of the total countryside population.

Countryside Education movement claims the right of all students to have access to knowledges, knowings and values produced by men who live in the countryside and in the city. It is a project that aims to overcome inequalities and exploitation coming from the capitalist society, which has been affecting doubly the students that present some type of

disability as it has been shown by studies on the theme (Fernandes, Cerioli & Caldart, 2011; Caiado & Meletti, 2011; Caiado & Gonçalves, 2013).

Caiado and Meletti (2011) and Jesus and Anjos (2012) demonstrate the lack of scientific production relating to the interface between Special Education and Countryside Education. To Marcoccia (2011, p. 64), “... the small amount of works on the Countryside Education-Special Education interface reveals that the trajectory of the theme in the field of researches in education in Brazil is in its early stages, therefore it is a story that needs to be built”.

Nozu, Bruno and Heredero (2016, p. 9) consider that the “... production of knowledge at the interface between Special Education and Countryside Education is still scarce and is under construction”. According to Hayashi & Gonçalves (2016), there is only one “Special Education” line of research in research groups about Education in/from the Countryside, which shows that “... it is a theme that urges to be approached by research groups, since there are persons with disability in the countryside”. (Hayashi & Gonçalves, 2016, p. 19).

Bearing in mind these initial remarks, we problematize: what do the researches that tackle Special Education

in/from the Countryside say about school curriculum for subjects with disability, autism spectrum disorder and high skills/giftedness?

This way, the current research had as an overall goal to analyze scientific production that came from theses and dissertations produced in Brazil on the theme of Special Education in/from the Countryside, as well as if they tackle and how they tackle school curriculum for this audience. In addition to that, to identify and characterize these theses and dissertations according to the following parameters or bibliometric indicators: authorship, mentorship, level of studies, institutional, temporal and geographic set-up of works, areas of knowledge and also to examine countryside populations included in studies on Special Education in/from the Countryside, themes and analyses present in the works, from information of both the abstract and the text in its entirety.

The article is divided in three sections. Apart from the introduction and conclusion, we explain the methodology utilized, the results on the scientific paramount of the production in relation to the theme, besides the discussion verified in researches on school curriculum, analyzing them under the perspective of Historical-Critical Pedagogy and

Historical-Cultural Psychology. We hope that this study makes it possible to contextualize the state of art about Special Education in/from the Countryside, as well as to unveil new research possibilities, inclusive relating to school curriculum.

Methodology

The research was carried out by means of the adoption of both the bibliometric approach and content analysis. Bibliometry is a methodology that makes it possible to assess scientific production from areas of knowledge and produce quantitative and qualitative indicators in relation to that production (Maroldi, 2017).

In order to effect:

... bibliometric analyses, it is necessary to elaborate instruments that provide enough information for that purpose, that is to develop bibliometric indicators. These are widely utilized for the assessment of scientific production from scientific communities in different domains of knowledge and can be obtained from statistical analyses of quantifiable characteristics of scientific literature. (Maroldi, 2017, p. 46).

Thus, to define the bibliometric paramount of the documentary corpus, data source was the Brazilian Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (*Biblioteca Digital Brasileira de Teses e Dissertações – BDTD*) which is maintained by the Brazilian Institute of Information in

Science and Technology (*Instituto Brasileiro de Informação em Ciência e Tecnologia – IBICT*) which “... integrates and disseminates, on one single portal, complete texts of theses and dissertations defended in Brazilian teaching and research institutions” (Ibict, 2020). The justification for our choice of Database had the following reasons: a) coverage: currently comprised by 596.156 documents, out of which 438.268 master’s dissertations and 157.888 doctoral theses defended by Brazilian and foreign researchers in hundreds of institutions (Ibict, 2020); b) digital accessibility, since the access is free, public and provides link to complete texts of works.

This way, the work defined the following search descriptors for data collection, combined among themselves, namely: special education, education in the countryside, countryside education, inclusive, indigenous education, rural school, settlement, *quilombolas* in BDTD/IBICT. We tracked 19 studies that cover the theme of Special Education in/from the Countryside. With the survey of production on the same theme performed by Caiado (2015) and Nozu et al. (2016), we added eight studies. And we acknowledged four recent productions from graduate programs that had not been added to the productions in IBICT.

Next, data were collected and recorded in the protocol of bibliometric data registry (Hayashi, 2014), by means of MS Excel software. In the protocol, we utilized production indicators, by means of the following variables: total of documents, level of studies, temporal distribution, mentors frequency, areas of knowledge, country’s institutions and regions, which made it possible to trace a bibliometric paramount of scientific literature selected for the analysis.

It is worth highlighting that data sample was made of works that covered Special Education in/from the Countryside, with a focus on school institution, by reading the work titles, abstracts and keywords that helped us verify the presence or absence of the focus on that theme. Lastly, we did the sorting, bibliometric treatment and analysis of collected data. Thus, after the exclusion of duplicated records and of those that did not fit in the scope of the research, and besides the inclusion of new studies, final researched corpus resulted in 31 works.

Content analysis was also applied to abstracts and to the work in its entirety to identify countryside populations, themes and curricular characterizations present in the studies.

Countryside population stemmed from the definition of Resolution

CNE/CEB no. 2/2008 (*Resolução CNE/CEB nº 2/2008*), namely that of “... family farmers, extractivist, artisanian fishermen, riverines, settlers and campers from Agrarian Reform, *quilombolas*, *caiçaras*, indigenous and others”. (Brazil, 2008b, art. 1st). Next, the main study themes were categorized, which enabled us to comprehend recurring themes and their recurrences in the documentary corpus.

In the sequence, we categorized studies on curricular discussion: “curriculum at stake”, that is, a category comprised by works that present a topic or discussion about curriculum as an element of primary, secondary or tertiary analysis in chunks of text; “normative and pedagogical curricular discussion”, that is, works in which the subject “curriculum” is not analyzed or deepened but just cited or poorly explored; “silenced curricular discussion”, works that do not allude to the curricular subject or those in which the term “curriculum” is a part of generic arguments.

This categorization allowed us to identify works that reflect upon curriculum in Special Education in/from the Countryside, albeit it was not their main goal. Taking this identification as a basis, we constructed a question that served us as a script: how is the curriculum thought of

and worked on in Special Education in/from the Countryside?

Knowledge production in Special Education in/from the Countryside (1994-2019)

The balance sheet of scientific production on Special Education in/from the Countryside include 31 works throughout 25 years of researches, written by 29 researchers (female and male). Among them, there were two female authors who covered the “interface” theme in their doctorate and master, namely: Luciana Lopes Coelho and Michele Aparecida Sá, with two productions each.

The 31 researches that came from graduate programs in Brazil, published between 1994 and 2019, comprise 21 works written on a master’s level (68%), nine on doctorate (29%) and one on professionalizing master (3%). This means that the amount of masters in Brazil impacts on research production.

Works were guided by 21 professors (male and female). 19 of them worked on the theme only once and there were only two of them – Kátia Regina Moreno Caiado (*Universidade Federal de São Carlos – UFSCar*), and Marilda Moraes Garcia Bruno (*Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados - UFGD*) – with four and eight mentorships each.

In a temporal analysis of publications, we verified that the first 15 years had only three dissertations, as shown in Figure 1. As of the year of 2009, the average of publications per year is of approximately two researches. We entertained that publications on Special Education in/from the Countryside may have had an expressive increase in virtue of the implementation of the inclusive educational policy or school inclusion, especially, aimed at these teaching modalities from the publication of the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (*Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva*) (2008), from Resolution CNE no. 2/2008 (*Resolução CNE n.º 2/2008*) – which set forth complementary guidelines, norms and principles for the development of public service policies of Basic Rural

Education – and of Decree no. 7.352/2010 (*Decreto n.º 7.352/2010*) which, in turn, provided on the Countryside Education policy and the National Program of Education Program in Agrarian Reform (*Programa Nacional de Educação na Reforma Agrária – PRONERA*).

However, we must consider that Brazilian educational policy assumes the discourse of inclusive school in 2003,ⁱⁱ in Brazilian president Luís Inácio Lula da Silva's first term. Multi sided organizations influenced the educational political agenda of Lula and Dilma's administrations, in defense of an inclusive educational system (Mendes, 2006; Michels & Garcia, 2014). The administration programs and projects did not wave an articulation with Education in/from the Countryside, which was only included in normative documents in 2008.

Figure 1 - Temporal set-up of works.



IBICT (2020); Caiado (2015); Nozu, Bruno and Sebastián Heredero (2016).
(Source: authors' elaboration).

Resolution CNE no. 2/2008 provides in its article 1st, paragraph 5th that,

Teaching systems will take actions for children and young persons with special needs, object of the Special Education modality, living in the countryside, to have access to Basic Education, preferably in common schools from regular teaching network. (Brazil, 2008b).

This provision was also present in the National Policy on Special Education (Política Nacional de Educação Especial) of 2008, acknowledging the specificity and singularity of indigenous and countryside peoples, among other kinds. It suggests that academic production was in line with social policies of Lula and Dilma's administrations. However, discussing the proposition of the interface between

Special Education and Countryside Education is not enough to promote the necessary changes because both teaching modalities are the result of historical, social and political contradictions, as well as a product of an educational policy that denies differences and pedagogical specificities, making use of artifices to create consensus and domination. (Marcoccia, 2011; Caiado, 2015; Nozu, Bruno & Heredero, 2016).

Works defended along these 25 years are currently found in 17 different higher education institutions, which are mostly public (n=29), according to Table 1. However, the amount of research groups about Countryside Education covers 29 institutions, that is, the interface between Special Education and Education in/from

the Countryside is not a subject with wide coverage in Brazil (Hayashi & Gonçalves, 2016).

Table 1 - Set-up of works per institution.

INSTITUTIONS	TOTAL OF WORKS	APPROXIMATE FREQUENCY (%)
UnivERSIDADE Federal da Grande Dourados (UFGD)	8	25%
UnivERSIDADE FedERAL de São Carlos (UFSCar)	6	20%
UnivERSIDADE FedERAL do Espírito Santo, UnivERSIDADE Estadual do Rio de Janeiro (n=2)	4	13%
UnivERSIDADE de São Paulo, UnivERSIDADE EstADUAL Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho”, UnivERSIDADE FedERAL de Santa Maria, UnivERSIDADE FedERAL de Juiz de Fora, UnivERSIDADE FedERAL da Paraíba, UnivERSIDADE de Brasília, UnivERSIDADE FedERAL Rural do Rio de Janeiro, UnivERSIDADE FedERAL do Amazonas, Universidade Católica Dom Bosco, UnivERSIDADE Tuiuti do Paraná, UnivERSIDADE EstADUAL de Londrina, UnivERSIDADE EstADUAL de Roraima, UnivERSIDADE FedERAL de Santa Catarina (n=1)	13	42%
TOTAL: 17 INSTITUTIONS	31 works	100%

Source: Caiado (2015); Nozu, Bruno and Heredero (2016); IBICT (2020).

From table 1, we verify that UFGD and UFSCar have an important representation in researches carried out on Special Education in/from the Countryside, especially due to the mentors of the researches. At the same time that studies are focused in these two universities, works are spread in different institutions and Brazilian regions. We add that UFGD is not listed as a specific research group about social education (Hayashi & Gonçalves, 2016), since the main professor responsible for the publication – Doctor Marilda Moraes Garcia Bruno – focuses much more on the theme of Indigenous School Education at the interface with

Special Education, while Prof. Dr. Kátia Regina Moreno Caiado is inserted in the Group of Studies and Researches in Countryside Education of UFSCar (Hayashi & Gonçalves, 2016).

Besides that, 13 works are from the Southeast region, 10 from the Midwest region, four from the South region, three from the North region, one from the Northeast region. Such researches do not correspond to the existence of research groups about Countryside Education in Brazil, for the study by Hayashi and Gonçalves “... revealed that 61,1% (n=22) of research groups are located in regions Northeast (n=33,33%), North (n=16,7%)

and Midwest (n=11,1%), while regions Southeast (n=22,2%) and South (n=16,7%) of the country gather 38,9% (n=14) of the groups” (2016, p. 14).

The amount of works in relation to the interface in both regions – Southeast and Midwest – may represent a combination of two factors: amount of graduate programs and interests of determined research professors, since the representativity of these productions does not coincide with the universe of countryside or rural school institutions, which are approximately 83 thousand rural schools and 6,6 millions of enrolled students (FAI, UFSCar, 2017).

Even though the coverage of researches in this reality is limitrophe, 21 works were produced in graduate programs in the field of Education, which is equivalent to approximately 68%. Also, six

works were defended in the field of Special Education (19%), two in the field of Psychology (6%), one in the field of Sciences and another one in Linguistics (7%). Thus, we consider that the public university and the field of Education are setting themselves to research the theme of Special Education in/from the Countryside, not forgetting their responsibility and commitment to school institutions. Besides the fact that most research groups come from the field of Education, we cannot keep from taking into account that “... the presence of research groups of other fields of knowledge corroborates with the understanding that the Countryside Education theme is interdisciplinary (Hayashi & Gonçalves, 2016).

Population covered in these productions can be seen on Table 2.

Table 2 – Distribution of countryside populations that participated in the studies

POPULATION	AMOUNT OF WORKS	APPROXIMATE FREQUENCY%
THOSE WHO LIVE IN/OFF OF THE COUNTRYSIDE	13	42%
INDIGENOUS	11	35%
RURAL SETTLING	4	13%
Quilombolas	2	7%
RIVERINES	1	3%
TOTAL: 5 GROUPS	31	100%

Source: Caiado (2015); Nozu, Bruno and Heredero (2016); IBICT (2020).

We clarify that the group of people who live in/off of the countryside refers to the population described in the works, in general. It is not a categorization of researchers. They actually represent 13

works that were aimed at subjects who work and live off of the countryside.

The second group of populations is that of indigenous peoples who demarcated a good representativity. Groups of

quilombolas and riverines had a very small participation, revealing a gap in studies on the interface between Special Education and these groups. How is the Special Education in riverines and quilombolas schools set up? How does the schooling process of children with disability occur in these contexts? We were not able to identify researches with caiçaras, forest-dependent, extrativist peoples and artisanian fishermen.

From the goals we identified 12 main themes, according to Table 3. There was a higher incidence of themes aimed at

schooling, Special Education and school inclusion and teacher training, which reveals the concern with the teaching and learning conditions for the target audience of Special Education, that is found in the Education in/from the Countryside. The problematization also revolves around the inclusive education policy and training of these teachers to work with the referred target in schools in/from the countryside. Moreover, the pedagogical support service, Specialized Educational Service (Atendimento Educacional Especializado - AEE), was also an object of study.

Table 3 - Main themes.

MAIN THEMES	AUTHORS	AMOUNT	EQUIVALENCE (%)
SCHOOLING	Riche (1994), Souza (2012), Fernandes (2015), Mantovani (2015), Sá (2015), Nozu (2017), Santos (2018)	7	23%
SPECIAL EDUCATION AND SCHOOL INCLUSION	Marcoccia (2011), Evangelista (2017), Ferreira da Silva (2017), Kühn (2017), Almeida (2018), Lozano (2019)	6	20%
TEACHER TRAINING	Ponzo (2009), Buratto (2010), Lopes (2014), Silva (2014)	4	13%
SPECIALIZED EDUCATIONAL SERVICE	Costa de Souza (2013), Palma (2016), Portela (2019)	3	10%
DEAF EDUCATION	Coelho (2011, 2019) e Lima (2013)	3	10%
HIGH SKILLS/GIFTEDNESS	Peraino (2007), Castro Almeida (2018)	2	6%
EDUCATION OF PERSON WITH VISUAL DISABILITY	Sá (2011)	1	3%
EDUCATION OF YOUNGSTERS AND ADULTS	Gonçalves (2014)	1	3%
SIGN LANGUAGE	Vilhalva (2009)	1	3%
KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION	Anjos (2016)	1	3%
REPRESENTATION OF DISABILITY	Silva Souza (2011)	1	3%
LABOR AND SOCIAL RIGHTS	Silva (2001)	1	3%
TOTAL: 12 THEMES		31	100%

Source: Caiado (2015); Nozu, Bruno and Heredero (2016); IBICT (2020).

Works with a smaller representativity express objects of study that are aimed at a determined type of disability or high abilities/giftedness. Out of the 31 works, none of them had as the main theme the school curriculum aimed at the audience of Special Education in/from the Countryside. In the literature revision done by Fernandes (2015), in her research, the author utilized descriptors “special education in the Amazon”, “Amazon’s countryside education” and “special education”, coming to 12 themes in 31 works. In the latter, the theme “curriculum” appeared with a frequency of 12,9 % albeit relating to teacher training. The absence of researches with this theme waves the urgency to problematize the curriculum appropriation by students with disability, autism spectrum disorder and high abilities/giftedness in schools in/from the countryside.

Out of the 31 works surveyed by us, by means of the categorization previously defined, we verified five works in category “curriculum at stake”, 19 that cover “normative and pedagogical curricular discussion” and seven in “silenced curricular discussion”. For this article, we bring the results of category “curriculum at stake” because they provided answers to the question previously formulated: how is

curriculum in Special Education in/from the Countryside thought of and worked on?

Curriculum in Special Education in/from the Countryside: First Clues

Works by Marcoccia (2011), Sá (2011), Fernandes (2015), Castro Almeida (2018) and Coelho (2019), correspond to, approximately, 16% of the documentary corpus analyzed about the theme “Special Education in/from the Countryside”. That indicates that Curriculum is a relevant theme but very poorly covered in the analyses or that it arised in the comprehension of the reality investigated.

Since the implementation of inclusive educational policy or school inclusion, assumed by the Brazilian government, in 1988, nearly 32 years later we have a challenge for the educational research: to analyze school curriculum in a diversified social, political, cultural and economic context, marked by relationships that neglected knowledge for the working class and labor exploitation by the capitalist system.

According to the question previously constructed – how is the curriculum in Special Education in/from the Countryside thought of and worked on – we observed that the study by Lopes (2019) focused on the broader question of indigenous curriculum, not covering the interface;

Castro Almeida (2018) only contextualized the general reality of the interface in the research location; Fernandes (2015) described the curricular situation in different locations; Sá (2011) evidenced gaps of political projects in relation to specific educational needs of indigenous persons with visual disability; the research by Marcoccia (2011) brought up a description of the curricular set-up in schools in/from the countryside.

Despite different looks and analytical perspectives, we summarized the findings:

a. Teachers of Education in/from the Countryside defend a curriculum diversified and contextualized to the local reality (Marcoccia, 2011; Fernandes, 2015; Castro Almeida, 2018; Lopes, 2019).

b. Curriculums for Countryside Education and Indigenous School Education suffer interferences, even impositions from entities of educational departments (Marcoccia, 2011; Sá, 2011; Fernandes, 2015; Lopes, 2019).

c. Curriculum of schools in/from the countryside for target-audience students of Special Education takes into consideration both international and national Special Education literature (Marcoccia, 2011; Sá, 2011; Fernandes, 2015; Castro Almeida, 2018).

d. Nomenclatures curricular “flexibilization”, “adequacy” and “adaptation” are a part of concerns coming from the pedagogical work of teachers (Marcoccia, 2011; Fernandes, 2015; Castro Almeida, 2018).

e. Large-scale assessments have been interfering in basic education curriculum in the reality of schools in/from the countryside (Marcoccia, 2011; Fernandes, 2015; Lopes, 2019;).

f. School curriculum needs to work from the learning diagnosis of students with disability (Marcoccia, 2011; Sá, 2011; Fernandes, 2015;).

g. Curriculum of schools in/from the Countryside can be resignified according to the practices and singular knowings of a community (Marcoccia, 2011; Lopes, 2019).

h. Curriculum of Education in/the Countryside needs to know not only the knowings of its peoples but also to appropriate universal knowledges (non-indigenous, urban), with no harm to their development (Marcoccia, 2011; Lopes, 2019).

i. Differentiated curriculum can work with themes emerging from the social-cultural context in which students are inserted (Marcoccia, 2011; Lopes, 2019).

j. The pedagogical work of a determined teacher of Countryside Education can emphasize biological aspects of the student in detriment to an integral and formative vision (Marcoccia, 2011; Fernandes, 2015;).

k. “Indigenous education professionals claim that the inclusion of the mother tongue and knowings that are considered traditional in the indigenous school’s curriculum produced the effect of differing it from urban school”. (Lopes, 2019, p. 79).

Bearing in mind these results, we observe that there are many set-ups of the curriculum of Special Education in/from the Countryside, which enables us to ask:

has the appropriation of the knowledge selected in the curriculum by the target audience been being accomplished? Is there human development for such audience?

It is not our intention to answer these questions in the current article but to mark with them the position adopted in the approach of the theme, specifically: that of Historical-Cultural Psychology. For this theory, the development of human psychism is not a biological determination as in all other animals, but historical and cultural, which implies the appropriation of cultural signs that were objectified through human labor and appropriated social and individually in two inter-related plans, characterized by Vigotski (1998) as an interpersonal process that is transformed into an intrapersonal process, as the author himself explains:

An interpersonal process is transformed into an intrapersonal process. All functions of the child's development appear twice: first, on the social level, and then, on the individual level; first, between people (interpsychological) and then, in the child's interior. This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory and to concept formation. All higher functions come from real relationships between human individuals. The transformation of an interpersonal process is the result of a long series of events occurred along the development. (Vigotski, 1998, p. 75, emphasis added).

This way, human potential, resulted from historical and collective production, can only be produced in each singular man by means of socialization. This act promotes the development of higher psychological functions specifically human, such as: logical memory, arbitrary attention, voluntary perception, imagination, abstract thinking, conscious and planned actions, emotions and feelings. The process of socialization does not do without the language as a symbolic mediation necessary for communication between men and for the development of generalizing thought.

In the educational process, therefore, it is necessary to take into consideration the subjects involved in it, be them with or without disability, from the countryside or the city, if we conceive each individual as part of the human gender. We must also take into account the subject's historicity, the social place that they occupy. Also, the historicity of knowledges that will comprise the curriculum. In order to think up and plan school curriculum, it is necessary to consider the aims and purposes of the content for human formation to be accomplished. This exercise demands setting criteria that are defined upon how clear the role that teaching fulfills in the promotion of both learning and psychological development

objectified in singular subjects in/from the countryside/city, with and without disability.

When we delimit the curriculum to be comprised by determined knowledges and not all those available in culture, we are guided by Saviani (2012), precursor of Historical-Critical Pedagogy, who defines it as the conjunction of nuclear activities developed by the school, therefore it is necessary to select what is essential and what is accessory, so that extracurricular knowledges are not transformed into curricular ones and, subsequently, secundarized. It is necessary to prioritize the teaching of classics, of the systematized knowing.

And what justifies this priority? To answer this question, we used the postulates of Historical-Critical Pedagogy with those of Historical-Cultural Psychology, taking as a basis the discussion by Vigotski (2001) about the relationship between quotidian concepts and scientific concepts. For this theorist of Historical-Cultural Psychology, quotidian concepts are developed into the subject of empirical relationships established by them in their social and cultural medium, albeit without taking awareness over them. As for scientific concepts, they are developed in the schooling process and, when taught in an adequate way, they outdo quotidian

concepts, by incorporation, upon taking awareness of the historical processes of their signification. This awareness links up dialectically to the development of higher psychological functions in an interfunctional way, which are modified qualitatively by the aid of general laws of human development, ever since children's education. In this regard, Vigotski (2001, p. 283) affirms that "... in the field of attention and memory, the school student not only discovers the capacity for awareness and arbitrariness, but also that what constitutes the main content of all school age is the development of this capacity". That is, "... awareness passes through the gates of scientific concepts". (Vigotski, 2001, p. 290).

It is important to observe, in theoretical postulates exposed previously, the thin relationship between curriculum, didactics, teaching methodology (fields of scientific pedagogy) and Historical-Cultural Psychology, that is, between nuclear and universal cultural contents – symbolic mediators, selected from criteria that have as a premise the type of man to be formed and to which society (political commitment of the educational process), which will be taught by the teacher in an adequate (under the dialectical logics) and intentional way, to promote learning and psychic development (Higher

Psychological Functions linked to awareness of concepts, in a continuous surpassing process by incorporation). Understanding the educational pedagogical process this way contributes to overcome the splitting between the curricular proposition, the teacher's teaching activity and the learning process of subjects involved in it.

In the face of that, we agree and defend that diversity in/from the Countryside needs to be included in school curriculum because we share the conception of curriculum as a cultural and pedagogical instrument, whose main reason is to promote the development of human psychism in its genericity. However, this diversity of knowledges of countryside subjects to be included in the curriculum and school teaching, based on the premises laid out, requires the former not to be taken and kept in their empirical form, but overdone scientifically by incorporation, if we want subjects in/from the countryside and the target audience of Special Education, as well as those who are not, to raise heights of more elevated psychic development.

In the works that were analyzed, we were able to conclude that, in spite of curriculum not having been the focus of the studies, there are clues that indicate the existence of an effort, perhaps still not

conscious, from educators involved with the educational process in/from the countryside, to articulate quotidian and scientific concepts, manifested in the studies by Marcoccia (2011) and Lopes (2019) and when they point out that the curriculum of Special Education in/from the Countryside needs to know not only the knowings of its people but also the universal knowledges (non-indigenous, urban), with no harm to their formation. Moreover, in the following statement, that the pedagogical work of a determined teacher of Countryside Education can emphasize biological aspects of a student in detriment to an integral and formative vision (Marcoccia, 2011; Fernandes, 2015).

The findings unveil the challenge that is laid out for differentiated curriculums, with regards to the articulation between traditional, specific, quotidian knowings and universal scientific knowledges, because the positioning of educators before the imposition of a curriculum for the adaptation of subjects in/from the countryside, often times incurs in the risk of centering them in singular and specific knowings, as it is possible to infer based on the clues identified in the studies, from which we point out: Teachers of Education in/from the Countryside defend a

curriculum diversified and contextualized to the local reality (Marruccia, 2011; Fernandes, 2015; Castro Almeida, 2018; Lopes, 2019). In addition, curricular “flexibilization”, “adequacy” and “adaptation” nomenclatures are a part of concerns that come from the teachers’ pedagogical work (Marruccia, 2011; Fernandes, 2015; Castro Almeida, 2018). Also, that the curriculum of schools in/from the countryside can be resignified according to cultural practices and singular knowings of the community (Marruccia, 2011; Lopes, 2019). Or yet, differentiated curriculum can work with themes emerging from the social-cultural context in which students are inserted (Marruccia, 2011; Lopes, 2019). But also, that “professionals of indigenous education affirm that the inclusion of the mother tongue and knowings considered traditional in curriculum of indigenous school produced the effect of differing it from urban school.” (Lopes, 2019, p. 79).

We observed in productions that the inclusion of specific and traditional knowings in the curriculum has been happening as an alternative to the predominance of scientific concepts, since the latter have been understood by educators, often times, in a static way, ready and finished in their formal definitions. Besides that, they are

frequently taught by means of didactic processes that prioritize mechanical memorization and verbalism, undermining the potential of these knowings in the curriculum and/or in teaching and, consequently, of the subject’s psychic development.

It corroborates to aggravate the problem the fact that countryside schools have not kept from suffering impositions to follow prescriptions from the executive power, linked to targets previously set forth to the national education and persecuted by the performance assessment system, albeit there is legal support to formulate differentiated curriculums, as it can be observed in works by Marruccia (2011), Fernandes (2015) and Lopes (2019), which highlight that large-scale assessments have been interfering in basic education curriculum in the reality of schools in/from rural areas.

This reality expresses a problem that needs to be faced: that of fighting the imposition of a curriculum and a teaching both considered traditional, from perspectives considered innovative, valuing cultural diversity, traditional knowings, although focusing on the risk of prioritizing quotidian, empirical knowings in detriment to scientific concepts.

Thus, we agree with Marruccia (2011, p. 135) when she affirms that,

Projecting school curriculum to students of special education in countryside schools involves the capacity of the teacher to provide activities that induce these students to advance, establishing adjustments with social relationships of countryside peoples, their culture, their way of producing life in the countryside etc. In that sense, once again it is noteworthy to bring up the dialogue of special education with countryside education, aiming to construct a new collective practice of knowledge, which will reveal which curriculum is supporting this reality and, at the same time, to contribute to promoting changes in the educational processes of these students and in the pedagogical practice of teachers who act in countryside schools.

We understand that this task is laid out as a challenge for educators and subjects in/from countryside areas, as well as for researchers who investigate the theme, at the interface between Special Education and Countryside Education in a humanizing perspective.

Conclusion

In this article, we had as a goal to analyze scientific production coming from theses and dissertations produced in Brazil on the theme of Special Education in/from the Countryside, as well as if they tackle and how they tackle school curriculum for these subjects. We concluded that there are few studies that discuss the Special Education-Countryside Education interface and that they discuss in a secondary or

tertiary way the matter of curriculum in/from countryside curriculum. Also that there are no studies on curriculum in/from the countryside, aimed at the target audience of Special Education, which proves to be an investigative necessity.

Our analyses identified clues that pointed to the fact that the 25 years of implementation of public policies for Special Education and Countryside Education fell upon practices of confrontation to the traditional curriculum and teaching, in order to adapt to the hegemonic society, although still at the edge of strategies that aim to include in curriculums and teaching the specific knowings of subjects in/from the countryside, linked to scientific knowledges. However, these scientific knowledges are, generally, taken in their finished form, centered only in their definitions and not in their historical processes of signification.

Therefore, investigating the development of school curriculum for the target of Special Education in/from the Countryside, guided by emancipating postulates, proves to be a great challenge.

References

Almeida, L. S. C. (2018). *Educação Inclusiva no campo: realidades e desafios no contexto escolar em Presidente Figueiredo no Amazonas* (Tese de

Doutorado). Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Manaus.

Anjos, C. F. (2016). *Realidades em contato: construindo uma interface entre a educação especial e a educação do campo* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória.

BIGS - Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics. (2010). *Censo demográfico: educação e deslocamento*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: IBGE.

Brasil, MEC (2002). *Diretrizes operacionais para a educação básica nas escolas do campo*. CNE/MEC, Brasília. Recuperado de: http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=13800-rceb001-02-pdf&category_slug=agosto-2013-pdf&Itemid=30192

Brasil, MEC. (2008a). *Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva*. Brasília, DF: MEC/SEESP. Recuperado de: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/revinclusao5.pdf>

Brasil, MEC. (2008b). *Resolução n. 2, de 28 de abril de 2008*. Estabelece diretrizes complementares, normas e princípios para o desenvolvimento de políticas públicas de atendimento da Educação Básica do Campo. Brasília, DF: MEC/ CNE/CEB. Recuperado de: http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=11841-rceb002-08-pdf&category_slug=outubro-2012-pdf&Itemid=30192

Brasil. (2010). *Decreto nº 7.352, de 4 de novembro de 2010*. Dispõe sobre a política de educação do campo e o Programa Nacional de Educação na Reforma Agrária-PRONERA. Recuperado de: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/docman/marco->

[2012-pdf/10199-8-decreto-7352-de4-de-novembro-de-2010/file](http://portal.mec.gov.br/docman/marco-2012-pdf/10199-8-decreto-7352-de4-de-novembro-de-2010/file)

Buratto, L. G. (2010). *Prevenção de deficiência: programa de formação para professores Kaingang na terra indígena Ivaí-Paraná* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos.

Caiado, K. R. M. (2015). Educação especial no campo: uma interface a ser construída. In Baptista, C. R. (Org.). *Escolarização e deficiência: configurações nas políticas de inclusão escolar* (pp. 75-89). São Carlos, SP: Marquezine & Manzini; ABPEE.

Caiado, K. R. M., & Gonçalves, T. G. G. L. (2013). Educação especial em escolas do campo: análise de um município do estado de São Paulo. *Revista HISTEDBR On-Line*, 13 (50), 179-193. <https://doi.org/10.20396/rho.v13i50.8640301>

Caiado, K. R. M., & Meletti, SiS. M. F. (2011). Educação especial na educação do campo: 20 anos de silêncio no GT 15. *Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial*, 17(spe1), 93-104. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-65382011000400008>

Castro Almeida, R. P. (2018). *Projeto político e projeto pedagógico de escolas quilombolas amapaenses: contextualizando as altas habilidades/superdotação* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos.

Coelho, L. L. (2011). *A constituição do sujeito surdo na cultura Guarani-Kaiowá: os processos próprios de interação e comunicação na família e na escola* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Dourados.

Coelho, L. L. (2019). *A educação escolar de indígenas surdos Guarani e Kaiowá: discursos e práticas de inclusão* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Dourados.

Costa de Souza, M. C. E. (2013). *A Organização do Atendimento Educacional Especializado nas Aldeias indígenas de Dourados/MS: um estudo sobre as salas de recursos multifuncionais para área da surdez* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Dourados.

Evangelista, G. R. (2017). *Propostas para uma educação inclusiva no ensino regular em uma escola do campo* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora, Juiz de Fora.

FAI. UFSCar. (2017, 09 de fevereiro). *Número de escolas no campo diminui drasticamente no Brasil*. <http://www.fai.ufscar.br/noticia/numero-de-escolas-no-campo-diminui-drasticamente-no-brasil.html>

Fernandes, A. P. C. S. (2015). *A escolarização da pessoa com deficiência nas comunidades ribeirinhas da Amazônia paraense* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos.

Fernandes, B. M., Cerioli, P. R., & Caldart, R. S. (2011). Primeira Conferência Nacional “Por Uma Educação Básica do Campo”: texto preparatório. In Arroyo, M. G., Caldart, R. S., & Molina, M. C. (Orgs.). *Por uma educação do campo* (pp. 19-62). 5 ed. Petrópolis: Vozes.

Ferreira da Silva, L. (2017). *Políticas públicas de educação inclusiva: interfaces da educação especial na educação do campo no município de Conceição do Araguaia-PA* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro.

Gonçalves, T. G. G. L. (2014). *Alunos com deficiência na educação de jovens e adultos em assentamentos paulistas: experiências do PRONERA* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos.

Gonçalves, T. G. G. L., & Caiado, K. R. M. (2016). A educação para jovens e adultos com deficiência em dois assentamentos paulistas. *Comunicações (UNIMEP)*, 23, 177-193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15600/2238-121X/comunicacoes.v23n1p177-193>

Hayashi, M. C. P. I. (2014). *Análise bibliométrica: leituras teóricas, procedimentos metodológicos e protocolo de coleta de dados*. São Carlos. (mimeo).

Hayashi, M. C. P. I., & Gonçalves, T. G. G. L. (2016). Perfil bibliométrico dos Grupos de Pesquisa em Educação do Campo: (2000-2016). *Revista Brasileira de Educação do Campo*, 1(1), 4-25. <https://doi.org/10.20873/uft.2525-4863.2016v1n1p4>

IBICT. Instituto Brasileiro de Informação para Ciência e Tecnologia. (2020). Biblioteca Digital de Teses e Dissertações. Disponível em <http://bdtd.ibict.br/vufind/>

Jesus, D. M., & Anjos, C. F. (2012). Tecendo interfaces entre a educação especial e a educação do campo: o cenário do Espírito Santo. In *XVI ENDIPE – Encontro Nacional de Didática e Práticas de Ensino* (pp. 1820-1829). Campinas. SP: UNICAMP.

Kühn, E. R. (2017). *A educação especial na educação no campo: as configurações de uma escola da rede municipal de ensino* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Santa Maria.

Lima, J. M. S. (2013). *Criança Indígena Surda na Cultura Guarani-Kaiowá: um*

estudo sobre as formas de comunicação e inclusão na família e na escola (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Dourados.

Lopes, J. C. (2014). *Educação inclusiva na formação de educadores: uma experiência na licenciatura em educação do campo da Universidade de Brasília* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade de Brasília, Brasília.

Lozano, D. (2019). *A interface entre educação especial e educação do campo em uma escola municipal do interior paulista: um estudo de caso* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.

Mantovani, J. V. (2015). *A educação da pessoa com deficiência em comunidades remanescentes de quilombos no Estado de São Paulo* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos.

Marcoccia, P. C. P. (2011). *Escolas públicas do campo: indagação sobre a educação especial na perspectiva da inclusão educacional* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná, Curitiba.

Maroldi, A. M. (2017). *Estudos bibliométricos sobre educação indígena: frente de pesquisa, vida média e obsolescência da literatura citada em teses e dissertações* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos.

Mendes, E. G. (2006). A radicalização do debate sobre inclusão escolar no Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 11(33), 387-405. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782006000300002>

Michels, M. H., & Garcia, R. M. C. (2014). Sistema educacional inclusivo:

conceito e implicações na política educacional brasileira. *Cadernos CEDES*, 34(93), 157-173. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0101-32622014000200002>

Nozu, W. C. S. (2017). *Educação especial e educação do campo: entre porteiros marginais e fronteiras culturais* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Dourados.

Nozu, W. C. S., Bruno, M. G., & Heredero, E. S. (2016). Interface educação especial – educação do campo: diretrizes políticas e produção do conhecimento no Brasil. *Revista Ibero-americana de estudos em Educação*, 11, 489-502. <https://doi.org/10.21723/RIAEE.v11.esp.1.p489>

Palma, D. T. (2016). *Escolas do campo e atendimento educacional especializado em sala de recursos multifuncional* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Estadual Paulista "Júlio de Mesquita Filho", São Paulo.

Peraino, M. A. C. (2007). *Adolescente com altas habilidades/superdotação de um assentamento rural: um estudo de caso* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Católica Dom Bosco, Campo Grande.

Ponzo, M. G. N. (2009). *As políticas de formação do profissional docente em face da perspectiva educacional inclusiva no campo: do legal às vozes dos professores* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória.

Portela, S. M. C. (2019). *Identidade profissional do professor que atua na sala de recurso multifuncional: estudo a partir de uma Escola Estadual Indígena em Roraima* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Estadual de Roraima, Boa Vista.

Rabelo, L. C. C., & Caiado, K. R. M. (2014). Educação Especial no campo: um estudo sobre o sistema municipal de ensino de Marabá/Pará. *Revista Cocar*, 8(15), 63-71.

Riche, N. J. (1994). *Projeto rural: análise das interações entre classe especial e classe regular, fora do ambiente escolar, Vale do Paraíba/SP* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro.

Sá, M. A. (2011). *O Escolar Indígena com deficiência visual na região da Grande Dourados, MS: um estudo sobre a efetivação do direito à educação* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Dourados.

Sá, M. A. (2015). *Educação e escolarização da criança indígena com deficiência em Terra Indígena Araribá* (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos.

Santos, E. R. (2018). *A escolarização do público-alvo da Educação Especial nas escolas estaduais da Educação do Campo no município de Boa Vista, RR* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Estadual de Roraima e Instituto Federal de Roraima, Boa Vista.

Saviani, D. (2012). *Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica: primeiras aproximações*. 11 ed. rev. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados.

Silva, J. H. (2014). *Formação de professores para o atendimento educacional especializado em escolas indígenas* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Dourados.

Silva, J. H. (2020). *Federação Nacional das Apaes no Brasil, hegemonia e propostas educacionais (1990-2015)*. Curitiba, PR: CRV.

Silva, R. H. R. (2015). Contribuições da pedagogia histórico-crítica para a educação especial brasileira. *Revista HISTEDBR On-Line*, 14(58), 78-89. <https://doi.org/10.20396/rho.v14i58.8640380>

Silva, I. M. A. (2001). *O trabalhador com (d) eficiência física na área de assentamento rural* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal da Paraíba, João Pessoa.

Silva Souza, V. P. S. (2011). *Crianças indígenas Kaiowá e Guarani: um estudo sobre as representações sociais da deficiência e o acesso às políticas de saúde e educação em aldeias da Região da Grande Dourados* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Dourados.

Souza, S. R. C. S. (2012). *Educação no campo e a escolarização de pessoas com deficiência: uma análise dos indicadores sociais no Paraná* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Londrina.

Vigotski, L. S. (1998). *A formação social da mente*. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.

Vigotski, L. S. (2001). *A construção do pensamento e da linguagem*. São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.

Vilhalva, S. (2009). *Mapeamento das línguas de sinais emergentes: um estudo sobre as comunidades linguísticas Indígenas de Mato Grosso do Sul* (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.

¹Keeping in mind conceptual disputes around the expression “education from the countryside” and “education in the countryside”, as Hayashi and Gonçalves (2016) points out, we opted to utilize the combined expression “in/from” so that it is possible to cover the different perspectives of the production on the teaching modality.

ii The debate about inclusive education in the world started in the 1990s. Brazilian Federal Constitution (Constituição Federal – CF) of 1988 and National Education Guidelines and Framework Law (Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional – LDBEN), at that time, had a guise of school integration, inclusive, in virtue of the National Policy on Special Education (Política Nacional de Educação Especial) of 1994, which defended the model of school integration. Resolution CNE/CEB n. 2/2001 (Resolução CNE/CEB n. 2/2001) advanced in the regulation of Special Education in Brazil, however the proposition maintained an education along the lines of school integration because it enabled a variety of services of special education, among them the possibility of a substitutive education, developed and offered by private-assistance institutions. In Lula’s Administration, the Special Education Department (Secretaria de Educação Especial – SEESP), MEC’s portfolio, aimed to implement the school inclusion policy, seeking to write several attempts of amendments in Resolution CNE/CEB n.2/2001 (Resolução CNE/CEB n.2/2001) and modify the compliance of the National Plan of Education 2001-2010 (Plano Nacional da Educação 2001/2010). Lula’s administration, in 2003, invested in the Inclusive Education Program: Right to the Diversity (Programa de Educação Inclusiva: Direito à Diversidade). The proposition of inclusive education consolidates in the National Policy of Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (Política Nacional da Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva), published in 2008. In addition to the Decree 6.694/2009 (Decreto 6.949/2009), the school inclusion policy operated a constitutional mutation, that is, without occurring a formal amendment of the text present in CF/1988, inclusive in LDBEN/1996 it received a new understanding of the term “preferably”, which grants the right to education in regular schools to children and teenagers with disability, autism spectrum disorder and high skills. (Silva, 2020).

Información del artículo / Article Information

Recibido en: 20/04/2020
Aprobado en: 11/05/2020
Publicado en: 03/07/2020

Received on March 16th, 2020
Accepted on May 19th, 2020
Published on July, 03rd, 2020

Contribuciones en el artículo: Os autores foram os responsáveis por todas as etapas e resultados da pesquisa, a saber: elaboração, análise e interpretação dos dados; escrita e revisão do conteúdo do manuscrito e; aprovação da versão final publicada.

Author Contributions: The author were responsible for the designing, delineating, analyzing and interpreting the data, production of the manuscript, critical revision of the content and approval of the final version published.

Conflictos de Intereses: Os autores declararam não haver nenhum conflito de interesse referente a este artigo.

Conflict of Interest: None reported.

Orcid

João Henrique da Silva



<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0277-0466>

Alessandra Peternella



<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5410-1240>

How to cite this article

APA

Silva, J. H., & Peternella, A. (2020). Curriculum and Special Education in/from the Countryside: what do researches say about the theme?. *Rev. Bras. Educ. Camp.*, 5, e8967. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20873/uft.rbec.e8967>

ABNT

SILVA, J. H.; PETERNELLA, A. Curriculum and Special Education in/from the Countryside: what do researches say about the theme?. *Rev. Bras. Educ. Camp.*, Tocantinópolis, v. 5, e8967, 2020. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20873/uft.rbec.e8967>