

## THE CONCEPT OF KNOWLEDGE FROM EXPERIENCE MADE IN PAULO FREIRE: AND ITS CRITICAL FORMATIVE DIMENSION



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n1-201>

Submission date: 12/24/2024

Publication date: 01/24/2025

**Vinicius Melo de Freitas<sup>1</sup> and Thaiany Guedes da Silva<sup>2</sup>.**

### ABSTRACT

We argue that sociocultural diversity needs to be part of educational practice, and that this knowledge is an inseparable part of the construction of knowledge from a liberating and therefore critical perspective. To think about these relationships, we sought in Paulo Freire, and more precisely in the concept of “knowledge made from experience” reflective and proactive paths for the construction of a critical transformative curriculum. It is necessary to take into consideration authors such as Silva (2012), Apple (2020), Paulo Freire (1993, 1987, 2001), Arroyo (2012), and Ana Maria Saul (2000), in defense of a critical and dialogic curriculum with the knowledge and cultures of the peoples. The methodological path adopted here includes the use of the dialectical method with a qualitative approach and the carrying out of bibliographic research with a descriptive design of an exploratory nature, analyzing empirical studies and essays on the topic in question. This text is composed of three parts: the first part analyzes the concept of knowledge from experience in the works of Paulo Freire; the second part examines the perspective of the critical transformative curriculum in its relationship with the concept of knowledge from experience; and finally, the third part presents the final considerations on the topic.

**Keywords:** Paulo Freire. Dialogic. Criticality. Knowledge. Experience Made.

---

<sup>1</sup> Master's student in Education – PPGE/UFAM  
Federal University of Amazonas - UFAM  
E-mail: Viniciusufam1993@gmail.com  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6725-0376>  
LATTES: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1905654811053903>

<sup>2</sup> Doctor in Education – PPGE/UFAM  
Federal University of Amazonas – UFAM  
E-mail: professorathaianyguedes@ufam.edu.br  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9007-2467>  
LATTES: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1605473259537850>

## INTRODUCTION

The Brazilian context is a source of multiple realities, subjects, and identities, the knowledge that deepens, materializes, and gives meaning to the lives of students and educators. We argue that sociocultural diversity needs to be part of educational practice and that this knowledge is an inseparable part of the construction of knowledge from a liberating and therefore critical perspective. To think about these relationships, we sought in Paulo Freire, and more precisely in the concept of “knowledge made from experience” reflective and proactive paths for the construction of a critical curriculum.

At the heart of the debate about the construction of a critical curriculum in the context of Education, it is necessary to take into consideration authors such as Silva (2012), Apple (2020), Paulo Freire (1993, 1987, 2001), Arroyo (2012) and Ana Maria Saul (2000), for a defense of a critical and dialogic curriculum with the knowledge and culture of the people. In light of what has been discussed so far, this theoretical essay aims to critically investigate the concept of knowledge from experience as used in Paulo Freire: and its critical formative dimension. The methodological path adopted here includes the use of the dialectical method in the construction of a critical update on the relevance of play as a learning tool. We opted for a qualitative approach (GIL, 2017) and carried out bibliographic research with a descriptive design of an exploratory nature, analyzing empirical studies and essays on the topic in question. This text is initially composed of three parts. The first part analyzes the concept of knowledge from experience as used in Paulo Freire's works. The second part examines the perspective of the transformative critical curriculum in its relationship with the concept of knowledge from experience. Finally, the third part presents the final considerations on the topic.

## THE CONCEPT OF EXPERIENCE-BASED KNOWLEDGE IN PAULO FREIRE'S WORKS

This chapter presents two sections: the first seeks Freire's thought regarding the knowledge of experience-based knowledge and his conceptions about the concept in his works; the second opts to explore the understanding of the concept of critical curriculum and its approximation to the knowledge of experience-based knowledge.

I think we agree when we say that Paulo Freire's works invite us to reflect on the process of humanization of people, based on this understanding when Freire (1981, p.52) writes that “only men and women, as open beings, are capable of carrying out the complex operation of capturing reality and expressing it through their creative language”. With this,

we can understand that men and women are subjects of their history, their knowledge, and their culture, with education being a process of human formation.

The need for a critical and progressive education is anchored in the hope of promoting a pedagogical practice “that enables subjects to courageously discuss their problems, instead of being led, dragged to their destruction and subjected to the prescriptions of others” (FREIRE, 1967, p. 157). In this way, Freire’s reflection is related to critical proposals, arising from experiences and traditions.

Here we need to reflect on Paulo Freire’s works and how the concept of “knowledge from experience” was constructed throughout his writings, expressing itself in a relevant way as the author’s understanding of the relationship between knowledge and ignorance.

We can highlight that in his work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, without using the term knowledge from experience, Paulo Freire criticizes the oppressive ideology that, based on the disbelief of subjects, considers them incapable. Even without specifically mentioning knowledge from experience, in the work *Education and Change*, the author argues that “there is no absolute knowledge or ignorance; there is a relativization of knowledge or ignorance” (1993, p. 29). In a primary reflection, the concept of “knowledge from experience” emerges to distinguish it from narrated or transmitted experience, since the educator is treated as the one who knows and the students as those who know nothing, in the body of traditional pedagogy.

Within a broad thought of education, Professor Lukesi presents the conception of education as redeeming society, as reproducing society, and as transforming society. Liberal tendencies tend to be redemptive and reproducing. Progressive tendencies, on the other hand, will understand education from its transformative point of view.

Progressives do not treat education only from the point of view of schools, and in this way, we speak of the progressive liberating tendency. The essence of this tendency is in non-formal education, that is, education that takes place in extra-school environments, which will involve everything that influences man’s life. Thus, when we think of a progressive and liberating school pedagogy, we refer to the relationship that the school has with society. The teacher will then make use of the reality in which he is inserted with their students to list the contents that will be studied so that it will enable them to understand the aspects that influence their lives and, subsequently, transform them.

Liberating progressive pedagogy is critical since it presents an analysis of traditional liberal pedagogy, which is shown as a banking education, that is, an education in which

information is deposited in the students. Liberating progressive pedagogy is also critical of the renewed tendencies, both non-directive progressive and technicist, since it assumes psychological and individual liberation. They are understood as domesticating, since they do not in any way instrumentalize the subject to transform the social reality in which he is inserted, thus maintaining the status of oppression.

Liberating education must therefore concretely question the reality of man's relationship with nature and man's relationship with his species, aiming at transforming not only the individual but also the entire society. The teaching contents of this tendency are extracted from the problematization of the very location in which individuals are inserted, and are called generating themes. For this line of thought, traditional content is not significant; what matters here is not the transmission of content, but rather the awakening of a new way of relating to lived experience.

Paulo Freire, the creator of this way of thinking about education, made it very clear in his writings that his way of thinking about education is essentially political, but not partisan. The author stated that his way of thinking about political and critical education would prevent it from being put into practice by official education systems without first having a social transformation. Thus, for Freire (1984, p. 89), "it would be a very naive attitude to expect the dominant classes to develop a form of education that would allow the dominated classes to perceive critical social injustices".

In this sense, action and reflection are two poles of the dialectical movement of thinking, which together provide opportunities for dialogue and debate about the world. Thinking correctly is critical thinking that should underpin a pedagogy of liberation, which, by questioning the conditions of human existence in the world, challenges us to fight and seek to overcome dehumanizing living conditions.

This way of thinking is much more extra-curricular than actually scholastic. However, the fact that there is no education system essentially concerned with transforming the individual's social reality does not prevent teachers from thinking about education from a critical and liberating point of view. It is through dialogue that the educator and the student become active subjects in the construction of knowledge. Based on this premise, Paulo Freire criticizes the traditional education model, which he called banking, because banking practices subordinate students, stifling their taste for rebellion, repressing curiosity, discouraging their ability to challenge themselves, making them passive subjects and, as a result, inhibiting students' creative power, camouflaging any possibility of reflecting on the

contradictions and conflicts that emerge from the daily life of the school and the student. Freire also highlights that, in the process of overcoming, students must be active in their change, overcoming the alienating thinking and authoritarianism of a “banking” educator. In this way, the false awareness of the world created or idealized by an alienating model of education is also overcome. In *Politics and Education*, Freire reiterates his disagreement with the scientific view that overvalues science and undervalues common sense, stating the urgency of “demystifying science, that is, putting it in its rightful place” (1993, p. 12). It is in this sense that the term “knowledge from experience” represents an important contribution to the valorization of common sense, that is, to critically perceive, according to Freire (1992, p. 26), “what is common sense in it”.

Respecting the prior knowledge of students, generated in their social practice, in the dialogue between subjectivity and objectivity, and the connective exchanges between the subjects’ intersubjectivities, does not mean the idealization of popular knowledge on the part of the educator, but, precisely, in the perception required by correct thinking that there is no absolute state of ignorance or knowledge. Everyone knows something, just as no one is ignorant of or masters all knowledge. In this regard, Paulo Freire (1993) presents the following statement:

Literacy as an element of citizenship formation”, deepens the reflection on the knowledge gained from experience and the practice of the progressive educator. Highlighting that the knowledge gained from experience translates the students’ reading of the world and should be taken as a starting point in the relationship between educator and student. Based on this thought, the author clarifies that this does not mean going around in circles around this knowledge, but it requires overcoming it, specifying in a critical reflection the situations in which “we go to popular areas with our “theoretical” schemes set up and we do not worry about what people already know, the individuals who are there and how they know (FREIRE, 1993 p. 58).

This movement of seeking to overcome, however, is only valid when it is directed towards “being more”, that is, it is a challenge of liberation of the oppressed as a search for humanization, in this way man is in constant search for knowledge of the world and of himself.

Freire deals with a democratic and necessary intervention in which the action of the educator occurs through relationships with the subjects and the contexts in which they are inserted and not in any way, and that knowledge is created from their daily routine. Hage (2005, p. 61) emphasizes that:

One of the fundamental characteristics of the Amazonian reality is “heterogeneity,” which is expressed in a very significant way in the daily life, work, and social, cultural, and educational relationships of the individuals who inhabit it. This heterogeneity must be valued and incorporated into the processes and spaces for developing and implementing educational policies and proposals for the region.

As an Amazonian reality, we need to realize that knowledge is multiple, and the heterogeneity mentioned by Hage (2005) challenges educators, allied with Freirean epistemology, to think about what experiential knowledge is being constructed in the riverbeds, in the forests, in the huts, villages, and communities, as well as how school education can dialogue with and appropriate this knowledge as structuring elements of the curriculum. Recognizing our limits in responding to this challenge, we set out to foster its pedagogical and political relevance, since we are also subjects of historically neglected rights. In this sense,

it is necessary to embrace it as a historical construction of subjects whose consciousness can drive another Amazonian way of thinking, based on the human references that constitute it: caboclos, riverside dwellers, indigenous people, terra firms, quilombolas, fishermen, rubber tappers, floodplains, etc. (VASCONCELOS, 2016 p. 112).

Knowledge itself is purely experience-based, and in this way, teaching activity cannot deny the importance of everyday life in the educational process in school and non-school spaces. Pedagogical practice reflects the experience and theoretical perspective that the professional accumulates. This practice is also understood as a social practice, articulated with various social and cultural elements; it is impossible to talk about the practice of rural teachers without considering the reality of the countryside and the diversity of facets that exist there.

Working with Amazonian diversity, especially in the context of rural education, is in a way emphasizing the expression of local culture and experiences, as well as highlighting the interference that they have in the teaching and learning process. According to Vasconcelos (2016, p.11):

Due to its diverse nature, it is essential to reference it in pedagogical practices and in curricular relationships that dialogue with the multiple meanings of reality experienced in cultural traditions, legends, myths, and stories.

The valorization of only the scientific view here is criticized when the priority is to work more deeply on the knowledge of experience gained from childhood because, at the same time, it can highlight the importance of the concept and explain how much common



sense is undervalued and prevent this situation from occurring, the knowledge of experience comes to contribute to the importance of common sense knowledge so that one can critically perceive what is common sense in this knowledge.

We can understand that there is no single knowledge to be considered or even to be set as a curricular standard, as well as the knowledge of experience translates the worldview of students, anchors meanings shared by traditional communities, and values the secular production of rhythms of life and sociocultural construction. What Boaventura (2006) describes and clarifies as constellations of knowledge.

As a starting point, the knowledge of experience acquired from childhood in a critical curriculum that aggregates necessary knowledge. What is sought with this concept? It can be said that it seeks a critical view of reality and the overcoming of the alienating practice of the subject's reality and, in this focus, the subject of the field. The knowledge of experience, acquired in a certain way, also ends up being an instrument of struggle against the urban-centric policy of knowledge.

The subjects of the field are the active agents of this struggle for recognition of their cultures, knowledge, and actions as subjects who, in their experiences and sociocultural relationships, construct and reconstruct conceptions of their reality. Mainly starting from Early Childhood Education, because when children enter the school environment they bring with them a lot of knowledge, constructed in their relationships Sociocultural and everyday life knowledge is essential for the construction of new knowledge. When the educator understands that this knowledge is the builder of new knowledge, a question arises.

Criticality is constituted by awareness, when one understands that history and sociocultural experiences give meaning to a reflective practice of reality within a society, knowing that one is the builder of one's reality so that we can give meaning to our experiences.

Human beings, being historical, are creators and in their relationships with the everyday life around them and with their peers, they become not only producers of materials but also builders of ideas and concepts. This is only possible through these established sociocultural relationships, and as a dialogic being, they share their conceptions, and this dialogue is reflected in pedagogical practices in formal or informal teaching spaces. Knowledge gained from childhood experience is essential if it is considered as a structuring part of a critical curriculum since this knowledge comes from

the child's own experiences of the world and its reality, the pace of maturation, and the socio-cultural context to which the child belongs.

This knowledge is the starting point in the search for self-improvement, which does not mean that scientific knowledge is disregarded. The dominant majority must not erase the growth of a dominant majority. In this way, knowledge will be articulated, and when knowledge is articulated, critical awareness is made possible.

In the current context of the topic, it is important to consider the similarities between the propositions of Paulo Freire and those of the sociologist Boaventura de Souza Santos. A first approximation between the authors can be found in the work *Pedagogy of Awareness: A Legacy from Paulo Freire to Teacher Training*. In agreement with Paulo Freire, Boaventura states, in one of his theses on the epistemological diversity of the world: "All knowledge is partial and social practices are rarely based on just one form of knowledge" (2005, p. 97). The authors agree on the view that all knowledge is related to a specific form of ignorance, as well as on the work of valuing common sense as one of the paths for discussing reality.

Aiming to expand and reflect on the knowledge gained from experience, one approach that needs to be considered is that of knowing how to listen, present in the work *Pedagogy of Autonomy*. Learning to listen is referred to by the author as a way to transform the authoritarianism of the discourse of those who speak to the students into the horizontality of those who speak with the students. Knowing how to listen is an attitude of respect for the knowledge gained from the experience of the students. Its main objective is to ensure that people and oppressed classes who accept this challenge can establish themselves as historical and social subjects who think, criticize, express opinions, have dreams, communicate, and make suggestions (FREIRE, 1997).

In the search for a critical curriculum, it is necessary to understand that within this construction process, factors such as listening, dialogue, and sociocultural issues are of multiple importance for transformations to be built in educational practices.

## **THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE CRITICAL CURRICULUM IN ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CONCEPT OF KNOWLEDGE FROM EXPERIENCE**

From this perspective, we need to understand that the curriculum places man on the same level as his historical era, that is, it is understood as a concept in cultural, social, and pedagogical contexts, in a way that is still recently treated in fields with a greater tradition in



pedagogical issues. As for the concept of curriculum, many definitions contradict each other, and this is because human practices of knowledge construction are interconnected by historical, social, and cultural circumstances and external conditions that predate human existence.

All concepts that have existed throughout history are, in a certain way, contributions to the many other moments of dialogue about the concept of curriculum, which resulted in the understandings that we have today, in its understanding of educational practice and its social functions.

The curriculum presupposes a concretization of the social and cultural intentions of attribution to education and of stimulating a reflection of the determined educational model. It is through instrumentalization that the curriculum relates to the school, thus making the school a social system. Although historically and due to the specificity of each context, the curriculum acquires conditionings in each educational system.

It is complex to outline the functions and forms that the curriculum assumes in a single discourse if we take into account each educational system, level, and school modality since they are multiple in their social, pedagogical, and philosophical orientations that are articulated with educational phenomena. In this way,

when we define the curriculum we are describing the concept of The school's functions and the particular way of focusing on them in a historical and social moment, determined for a level or modality of education, in an institutional framework, etc. (SAUL; SILVA, 2000, p.20).

The curriculum is the praxis, as Ana Maria Saul (2000) explains in her writings, conceiving the curriculum as the practice of what to do in education, being a practice that establishes a dialogue between social agents, students, teachers, and the community, that is, it is the context of practice, but at the same time, it is contextualized by it. It is possible to understand that as a concept of curriculum, many definitions contradict each other, as already mentioned. This occurs because, as Severino (2001) teaches us, human practices, including those of knowledge construction, are always linked to certain circumstances from which human beings act. In other words, as historical, social, and cultural beings, we assimilate a whole set of external elements that predate our existence and that make us see the world in a certain way and act by these conditions.

In this sense, although the term curriculum was not explicitly used at the beginning of schooling, in pedagogical theories, certain existing concerns already carried within

themselves the problems that would later be understood as curricular problems from an educational perspective.

And when we think of the school curriculum, we think of organization, ordering, when? How? What to compose? Saviani teaches us in his works an idea of what a curriculum would be. Thus, it can be seen that,

the notion of curriculum since the origin of the application of this term to school education is linked to the ideas of: control of the pedagogical process; establishment of priorities according to the purposes of education; coordination; sequencing and dosage of teaching content (SAVIANI, 2003, p. 60).

So the author tells us that the notion of the curriculum is linked to construction, what is this education proposing, and what are its purposes? He gradually creates an idea that we find in the curriculum, so we can understand that the notion of curriculum is strictly linked to this. Starting from an expansion given by Sacristán (2010, p.22) on this notion of curriculum, explaining that the curriculum goes beyond what has already been established, in addition to being the organization of these purposes, of these purposes, “the curriculum in practical terms is composed of everything that makes up and occupies school time”.

So when we think about curriculum, we can think in a more organized way and later we can expand on this notion as Sacristán explains to us,

That is why we argue that the curriculum is part, in reality, of multiple types of practices that cannot be reduced solely to the pedagogical practice of teaching; actions that are political, administrative, supervisory, production of resources, intellectual creation, assessment, etc., and that, when they are partly autonomous and partly interdependent subsystems, generate diverse forces that affect pedagogical action. Scopes that evolve historically, from one political and social system to another, from one educational system to another. All these uses generate decision-making mechanisms, traditions, beliefs, conceptualizations, etc. (SACRISTÁN, 2000, p. 12).

When the curriculum is thought out and organized, this series, the subjects, what to teach in the subjects, and when to teach, carries within itself a desire for change. This empowers us to understand that the curriculum, when constructed by the historical reality of society, can contribute to the transformation of the sociocultural reality of the actors in this reality; when not, it can be seen only as a power game. This means that whoever goes through the curriculum comes out differently. If we stop to think about it, the curriculum is like a passage, it is a desire for transformations and changes, understanding that change does not carry value judgments. For this reason, a curriculum must be very well thought out, from where one is and where one wants to go. This curriculum articulates educational

practices and educational theories and thus it becomes a process, this being one way of seeing the curriculum.

When this curriculum is established, there is a power relationship between those who decide what will be included in the curriculum and those who say what will be left out of this curriculum. In this way, we can understand the importance of a curriculum and how much care we need to be taken when dealing with a curriculum. It is never neutral, it imposes a choice on those who carry out the school activity. In this way, we understand that this is a power relationship. According to Sacristán (2000, p.10), “the curriculum is now considered a social invention that reflects conscious and unconscious social choices, which agree with the values and beliefs of dominant groups in society”. The curriculum as a power relationship reflects the desires of the dominant class, in which the production of material goods and the curriculum of wealth prevail. s by the majority of society. This implies understanding that,

the curriculum is modeled on a specific school system, is aimed at specific teachers and students, uses specific means, and finally crystallizes in a context, which is what ends up giving it its real meaning. Hence, the only possible theory that can account for these processes must be of the critical type, highlighting the realities that condition it (SACRISTÁN, 2000, p. 11).

We can understand that the curriculum will always be mediated, one thing is the document that is put together and ready, and another is how it is given, and how it happens, there is a distance between the real and the perceived, because it is permeated, whether by the textbook, by the teachers, by the relationships, by the institutions, by the school time, and thus it reaches the student. Thus,

the means are not merely neutral instrumental agents, as they play a very active role in determining, especially in our system, linked to a way of exercising control over practice, the narrow margins of decision that teachers have at their disposal, their low level of training and unfavorable working conditions (SACRISTÁN, 2000, p. 13).

In one of his texts, Sacristán (2000) proposes to us that this curriculum should not be seen as a natural prescription, but rather as a movement and a process between what is prescribed and what must be done and which will be mediated by the teacher, by time and by the material, and reach the student. This process should be thought of as a curriculum that will somehow differ in quality and substance from what was thought and what was merely received, as it will be constructed in this relationship between students,

teachers, and reality. Given this, the curriculum needs to be thought of and under construction at all times, especially in a critical way, and here we find curriculum theories. Given this assertion, we can verify the following statement:

This means that a procedural conception of the curriculum leads us to see its real meaning and real importance as the result of the various operations to which it is subjected and not only in the material aspects it contains, nor even in terms of the ideas that give it shape and internal structure: political and administrative framework, division of decisions, planning and model, translation into materials, management by teachers, evaluation of its results, learning tasks that students perform, etc. (SACRISTÁN, 2000, p. 11).

When we talk about critical theories, we need to remember that no theory is neutral or disinterested; when one relies on a theory, one will always have a bias, an objective. Are critical theories much more concerned with what to teach? And why teach? Unlike traditional theories, the concern is not only to analyze and create a curriculum but also to think about the consequences of this curriculum.

When a curriculum is implemented, what does this curriculum do to those who go through it? By thinking critically in this way and observing this curriculum with the criticality and methods that will be proposed by this question, we can reflect, on what subject will be formed by this curriculum. What does this curriculum carry? What are the ideologies that are present in it? Who is it serving? Who does it value and who does it exclude? This is the basis of critical theory and will also be present in post-critical theories. Here we remember the curriculum in process proposed by Sacristán, the change in the construction and analysis of this curriculum is noticeable, and this is the idea of a critical theory.

Authors such as Apple (2020), Paulo Freire (1993), Bourdieu, and Passeron (1964/1970), work from the perspective that this curriculum is implemented and said to be neutral, and natural. It is a curriculum that reproduces a society, that reproduces exclusion. The curriculum of the poor maintains the poor, the curriculum of the excluded keeps the excluded in the position of the excluded. Passeron and Bourdieu (1970) bring up the idea of the excluded from within, that is, if you bring the student into the school but don't provide the tools for him to identify himself, he doesn't identify himself in the curriculum that is set, the subjects are not made to include, but rather to exclude, with the discourse that it is a knowledge of humanity so everyone has to "do the same thing", but people are different, have different origins, have different social classes, different income levels and everyone is put in the same curriculum.

In this way, the result for people who do not feel they belong to a curriculum is the feeling of exclusion, so the subjects are excluded by a curriculum that is said to be natural, but which is not natural and is social, operating for exclusions and the maintenance of some privileges and this is what the critical authors will point out to us.

It is necessary to understand that curriculum is about the relationship of power between knowledge, and cultures, and permeates political and economic issues, between a minority class that privileges its knowledge to the detriment of the wisdom of a majority class that thus has its knowledge denied in educational practices.

And, starting from this context between privileges and segregation and often the disconnection between school and the world in which the curriculum lives in dispute, it is necessary to build a curriculum based on criticality, which is necessary within the educational practice, as Paulo Freire (2003) assures us when he says that disconnecting the school and its connection with the world, silencing criticism and making it impossible for teachers and students to transform their school knowledge to enable reflection, and in this way act on their lives and their reality is an authoritarian ideology, of those who want passivity to take hold among students, teachers, and workers.

It is also necessary for the curricular concern to extend to rural schools, and this fact makes it possible to think of a rural school as an educational space suitable for those who live in rural communities. Ghedin emphasizes that:

[...] strengthening a critical curriculum based on the construction of a liberating project requires awareness of one's social role, generating new mentalities focused on a way of thinking that will only be successful if strengthened by a dynamic process mediated by collective/participatory management (GHEDIN, 2012, p. 136).

The curriculum must place man on an equal footing with his time, that is, rural people must use strategies to overcome socio-educational and political problems. Therefore, a curriculum is needed that enables this process with the participation of the subjects involved in these curricular problems in education in and of the countryside. Ghedin (2012, p. 140) states that the

[...] process of globalization and global warming that point to not very encouraging expectations for all of humanity and specifically for the peasant communities that live in the interior of the Amazon.

Santos (2005, p.32) emphasizes to educators that they “start changing their ways of thinking about the curriculum, looking at and feeling the present as a means of reflection

for building the future”. A dialogical relationship with rural subjects, in a constant reflective practice regarding the sociocultural experiences of students, cannot be left aside at this time.

The idea is to deconstruct an education model that does not contemplate the real interests of those who live in the countryside. When we are immersed in different customs, we can understand them and give them a new meaning. Thus, the problem arises of how to constitute knowledge that articulates the essential global knowledge of human society with the local knowledge of the sociocultural relationships of students. With this,

it becomes necessary to teach the methods that allow the establishment of reciprocal relationships and mutual influences between the parts and the whole in the complexity of the world. It is in the face of this challenge that we must think of a school that forms citizens with knowledge and awareness of this complex identity and at the same time with an identity common to their peers (GHEDIN, 2012, p.155).

Environmental education encompasses mechanisms capable of offering students the opportunity to develop an interpretation of their reality, thus making it possible to emancipate these subjects through the construction of their knowledge through attitudes and behaviors related to environmental issues, which in turn is an issue that students already bring to school from their interactions with their families.

Regarding the curriculum, the DCNEIs define it as the articulation between the experiences and knowledge of students as a fundamental factor of cultural and environmental heritage in the search for the promotion and integral development of children from 0 to 6 years old (BRASIL, 2010).

Regarding the pedagogical proposal for rural education, the Operational Guidelines for Basic Education in Rural Schools (DOEBEC) are flexible and value specificities, recognizing that rural people have their way of life for the construction of the identity of rural children, forests, and waters. The connection with the reality of the students and their traditions thus contributes to a more contextualized school practice. This valorization of knowledge through contextualized dialogue also enables a praxis that transforms realities. Based on experiences and theoretical contributions, rural education is based on respect and dialogue between its subjects, that is, with collective subjects and social movements in the countryside, aiming to break through these experiences with the banking conception of education. In this context, it is understood that rural education should not distance itself from the culture of rural people, it should preserve their identity and their human and social values. The education of rural workers should be attentive to the particularity of the subjects and their historical time, helping them in the process of humanization and their specific tasks (GREDIN, 2012, p. 133).



Rural education arises from the countryside itself, from its role in equitable development, and the recognition of its different subjects. In a certain way, the rural school is a privileged place for the construction and reconstruction of knowledge. However, it needs guidance to achieve critical thinking to transform the reality of the subjects involved in the educational processes. With this, it becomes clear that.

Riverside Early Childhood Education announces a shared project involving the school and the family, recognizing the right of children to participate, through actions that guide the collective construction of the curricular organization and the development of pedagogical practices, based on continuous dialogue with the subjects involved in the process (SOARES, 2017, p.67).

When committing to transform social reality, it is known that strengthening pedagogical proposals critically is of fundamental importance, with the intuition of understanding social reality. From this perspective, strengthening the fight for meaningful teaching that enables the appreciation of rural knowledge, cultures, and relationships, prioritizing the context and rural reality as a diversity of elements, is fundamental for democratic teaching in the search for critical thinking. From the perspective of Ana Maria Saul (2010), when we refer to a Freirean conception of curriculum, proposing the following understanding regarding this conception:

Paulo Freire refers to "curriculum" as a broad term, opposing the restricted and technical understanding of this concept, thus attributing to it a new meaning and significance. Curriculum is, in Freire's conception, the policy and practice of what to do in education, in the school environment, and in the actions that take place outside this space, from a critical-transformative perspective (SAUL, 2010, p. 109).

In this context, educators need to start changing the ways of thinking about a curriculum, looking at it and feeling it through reflection towards a dialogical construction with the subjects who are involved in this process, establishing a relationship with the students' experiential knowledge.

What can we understand as critical curriculum and its interconnection with experiential knowledge? It is through Freire's critical and dialogical pedagogy that subjects can transform the reality of the society in which they are inserted. It is through dialogicity that people exchange knowledge and in this way can they construct and reconstruct concepts and resignify their realities. Only in this way, through dialogue, can people be constructors of knowledge and experiences.

The subject who opens himself to the world and others inaugurates with his gesture the dialogical relationship in which he confirms himself as restlessness and curiosity, in a permanent movement of history (FREIRE, 2002, p. 50).

Given this, the intersection of different points of view and cultures enables the dialogical process between the world and the subject, and in this way, we can understand that the curriculum without intertwining with the knowledge of experience is a curriculum of empty practices, without meanings for the subjects belonging to certain contexts, in this study the multiple subjects of the field.

## **CONCLUSION**

It is knowledge such as that constructed in experiences that can serve as an anchor for new knowledge and from this enable significant knowledge to be incorporated into the critical transformative curriculum in the educational process of schools. Knowledge that needs to be discussed is strongly present in everyday life, thus enabling new discussions and new perspectives on diverse topics, for many generations that can also be worked on in the classroom, as it is strongly linked to the historical coexistence that passes on, constructs and reconstructs knowledge.

Much of this knowledge from experience is not taken into account in the curricular proposals, which ends up silencing the subjects of the community, children or adults. Enabling a curriculum in which students are part of a possible reconstruction of their reality through critical awareness is of fundamental importance for the education of an entire country, starting from local to global sociocultural knowledge, within a diversity of identities and knowledge. It is essential for education and its modalities that the curriculum does not silence the individual it is covering.

This education for the development of critical subjects will only be possible through dialogue and articulation of knowledge from the perspective of the critical transformative curriculum. Understanding that the objective of education is citizenship, there will always be challenges to be faced throughout the educational process, and among these challenges is the difficulty of creating a cultural base that respects and considers differences, both cultural and social.

## REFERENCES

1. Apple, M. W. (2020). A luta pela democracia na educação: Lições de realidades sociais. Vozes.
2. Arroyo, M. G. (2008). A educação básica e o movimento social do campo. In M. G. Arroyo, R. S. Caldart, & M. C. Molina (Eds.), *Por uma educação do campo* (3rd ed., pp. 65–86). Vozes.
3. Arroyo, M. G. (2013). *Currículo território em disputa* (5th ed.). Vozes.
4. Arroyo, M. G. (2015). O direito à educação e a nova segregação social e racial – Tempos insatisfatórios. *Educação em Revista*, 31(3), 15–47. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698154212>
5. Arroyo, M. G. (2014). *Outros sujeitos, outras pedagogias* (2nd ed.). Vozes.
6. Arroyo, M. G. (2010). Políticas educacionais e desigualdades: À procura de novos significados. *Educação & Sociedade*, 32(113), 1381–1416. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302010000400015>
7. Brasil. Conselho Nacional de Educação. (2002). Resolução CNE/CEB nº 1/2002. Institui diretrizes operacionais para a educação básica nas escolas do campo. <http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/CEB012002.pdf>
8. Brasil. Conselho Nacional de Educação. (2008). Resolução CNE/CEB nº 2/2008. Estabelece diretrizes complementares, normas e princípios para o desenvolvimento de políticas públicas de atendimento da educação básica do campo. <http://portal.mec.gov.br/secad/arquivos/pdf/resolucao0208.pdf>
9. Freire, P. (2003). *Educação e mudança* (12th ed.). Paz e Terra.
10. Freire, P. (2011). *Partir da infância: Diálogos sobre educação*. Paz e Terra.
11. Freire, P. (2009). *Pedagogia da autonomia: Saberes necessários à prática educativa* (25th ed.). Paz e Terra.
12. Freire, P. (1992). *Pedagogia da esperança: Um encontro com a pedagogia do oprimido*. Paz e Terra.
13. Freire, P. (1987). *Pedagogia do oprimido* (17th ed.). Paz e Terra.
14. Freire, P. (2001). *Política e educação: Ensaio* (5th ed.). Cortez.
15. Freire, P. (1997). *Professora sim, tia não: Cartas a quem ousa ensinar*. Olho d'Água.
16. Ghedin, E. (2012). *Educação do campo: Epistemologia e práticas* (1st ed.). Cortez.
17. Kramer, S. (1999). *Infância e educação infantil*. Papirus.

18. Kramer, S. (2010). O que é básico na escola básica? Contribuições para o debate sobre o papel da escola na vida social e na cultura. In S. Kramer & M. I. Leite (Eds.), *Infância e produção cultural*. Papirus.
19. Pimenta, S. G. (2000). *Saberes pedagógicos e atividade docente*. Cortez.