

Chapter 104

School, society and culture - the relevance of heritage school

 [10.56238/tfisdwv1-104](https://doi.org/10.56238/tfisdwv1-104)

Adelcio Machado dos Santos

PhD in Engineering and Knowledge Management (UFSC).
Post-Doctor in Knowledge Management (UFSC). Professor
and researcher in the Graduate Programs "Stricto Sensu" in
Development and Society and Education of Uniarp.
Address: Rua Prof. Egídio Ferreira, nº 271, Apto. 303 -
88090-699 Florianópolis (SC) Brazil
E-mail: adelciomachado@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Man, an ontologically social being, shows the necessity of knowing and building comprehension of the methods and processes which are fundamental to the organization and the viability of the act of living. Knowledge is a product of conscious activity of thinking that determines the social nature of human beings and makes their history and culture. But man is not born to live together in society. He must be raised to learn how to live in society. It is necessary that he is raised to learn how to live with his history and the

making of it. To do so, different institutions have been created inside societies, whose primary function is to control certain sectors of the behavior of individuals through the transmission of patterns of behaviour and culture. One of the most social formations which interacts directly with society, influencing and allowing themselves to be influenced, is the educational organization. Through it, man learns how to live socially, assimilating the culture, the pattern of behaviour, the knowledge produced. Education also exerts social control over human behaviour. It is evident, thus, the deep interaction that exists between education and society. The educational process must engage the social role, mediating sociability and preparing the man for the application of knowledge through the exercise of the transforming activity of nature. In this context, it is necessary the school to act as guardian of the historical development, through the "Heritage Education".

Keywords: school, society, heritage education.

1 INTRODUCTION

Individuals are interacting socially at all times. This interaction process has, as one of its initial and fundamental phases, the school. It is in the educational environment, which extends beyond the restricted family environment, that human beings begin to live more directly with other human beings, learning to know rules and establish interactive relationships. All knowledge transmitted in educational formation is based on the relationship between man and society.

Education was socially instituted in the attempt to train individuals prepared for social life. This infers the close relationship between education and society that remain in a constant process of interactivity and exchange. The human being has a social nature and, although different currents or epistemic tendencies can be identified, it is of general understanding that human sociability constitutes a fundamental paradigm. The classical observations about this sociability and the centrality conferred on it, in the studies of the different human sciences, prove that human identity is only recognized and established before a group.

In other words, the human being only makes himself as such before another, with which he establishes diverse mechanisms of constant interaction. It is this interaction, in the origin between individuals, in the end between groups and entire societies, that defines another of the fundamental human characteristics, namely that of social life. Education exerts a profound influence on the way the socialization of man is constructed.

The need for social life, that is, of the social organization of man, is based on the human capacity to know, to build understanding about the means and processes fundamental to the organization and facilitation of the act of living, says Ferreira (2001). Since the dawn of caves, man has realized that by acting alone before the forces of nature, he could not go very far.

Thus, the gangs and clans emerged, from the natural perception of the need for the use of collective force, the only way that could ensure the protection of each of the challenges imposed by the environment. To the extent that the challenges were overcome, the need to organize themselves socially, living in groups and developing the organizing processes that aggregated the groups around the facilities conquered for daily living was reinforced. The ability to know developed social life, and this group life, in turn, expanded human knowledge itself, evidencing the constant interactivity between knowledge development and society. This civilizing process extended throughout the millennia, reaching the current society, with an extremely complex social organization, formed of different social formations.

In this context, the concept proposed by OLIVEIRA and WENCESLAU (2007, p. 45) will apply:

We understand by heritage the particularities and specificities of a place, region or society. According to the constitution of 1988, the patrimony consists of material and immaterial assets that refer to the identity, action and memory of the different formator groups of Brazilian society.

People have characteristics in communion, that is, needs that need to be met constitute a "condition sine qua non" of survival and adjustment to the condition of being social. As Pessoa (2001) points out, among the numerous social needs, some are considered universal, being shared by people from all societies. These needs, such as food needs, need to be met in order for people to have a normal existence in their social environment. In an attempt to meet any of the universal needs, individuals follow certain behaviors standardized and shared by members of society.

Thus, by relevance, it is necessary to bring to the glue the magisterium of HALL (200: 109):

It is precisely because identities are built in and not outside the discourse that we need to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites, within specific discursive formations and practices, by specific strategies and initiatives.

2 SOCIABILITY

The constitution is a characterization of a company, according to Morrish (1977), and must take into account some assumptions: (a) take the necessary steps to maintain adequate relations with the environment; (b) provide adequate paper differentiation; (c) need to provide a means of communication for its members; (d) provide shared cognitive orientations and experiences; (e) needs to establish a shared and articulated set of goals; (f) prescribe the normative regulation of means for achieving the goals; (g) need to regulate affective expression; and finally, (h) a society must socialize its members. Consequently, society comprises a permanent set of persons, a group characterized by certain purposes and certain relationships that link its

components. Everywhere, Saldanha ([s/d], maintains, humans live in society and form different cultures, due to the peculiar configuration of their life.

In the process of the result of social organization, the characterization of human society emerges through culture. In the light of the magisterium of ferreira's mining (2001), the whole civilizing process could only take place in pugilo, in society and its product is called culture. By knowing, registering, sharing the product of his thinking activity, man creates culture. For the author cited, there is a long procedural thread that has been woven by human cognitive ability throughout history, to unite, in a sense-filled totality, the spaceships controlled by computer networks at the first wheel that rotated under the hands of a caveman.

Man is, above all, a social being that, in the exercise of this characteristic, develops its culture, patterns and social formations. Thus, culture is situated among the elements that human beings acquire in social life, since they do not receive it through genetic inheritance. Culture is conceptualized by Pessoa (2001), as the complex that includes patterns of behavior, ideas and objects, having objectivity, that is, it does not exist in itself and is not a mere product of the human imagination. By transmitting the knowledge of the cultural collection, the older generation ends up exercising a certain coercive power, since there is social pressure on the younger generation to acquire culture.

In societies, the process of internalizing culture achieves some objectives. First, it maintains social unity, a necessary condition for its survival, because this unity is largely due to the common culture peculiar to every society. Secondly, through the transmission of social experience, society is guaranteed its social continuity, that is, its social unity from the perspective of time. Each generation acts as a connecting element between the previous generation and the future generation. Thirdly, by transmitting culture, it contributes to social evolution as the social person adapts to socio-cultural changes, making it open to these transformations.

In this sense, Swift (1977) states that culture is not only something that man does, but also something that does it. Culture essentially establishes models of conduct, that is, patterns of behavior assimilated by social formations. A social formation comprises a set of behavior patterns shared by society and oriented to meet the needs of the group. Thus, it is possible to infer, in line with the magisterium of pessoa's mining (2001), that the main social informations refer to the patterns of behavior, guiding people in the satisfaction of their basic social needs. The first social formations are: (a) family, the educational; (b) economic; (c) politics; (d) religious; and finally (e) recreational.

Within the social sphere, these institutions mentioned, among other secondary institutions, cannot be understood as acting in isolation, but, on the contrary, they are interinfluential. The institution is not reduced to individuals: it goes beyond the simple gathering of people, enabling interaction. Therefore, colliding with school education, it is possible to observe that it exerts influence over the other ones and, at the same time, receives a lot of influence from them. For Pessoa (2001), the school represents a social institution of fundamental importance in the coexistence of man in society, due to its growing influence on

the socialization of the new generations. The process of integration between the various institutions within a given social system is called the institutional network of society.

Another aspect that can be emphasized, in relation to social institutions, refers to the fact that these institutions do not have the same pace of social change. By way of example, one can take religious institutions, which change through a very slow process, while economic formations, due to technological innovations, have a very fast pace of social change. This ends up causing a sociocultural gap that is equivalent to the difference in progress at this level between two formations.

3 SOCIAL TAXIONOMY

Also in relation to social formations, Neto (1977) classifies them as regulative and operative. The regulative (primary) are those whose functions are vitally important for society, controlling certain sectors of the behavior of individuals. The (secondary) operatives are the institutions to which restricted functions are attributed, which are of interest to certain groups, at a certain time, within a society. This institutionalist approach allows us to reach a typology of societies, by distinguishing the different forms of one or more of its main institutions.

The human condition is characterized by the ability to know, to build understanding about the means and processes essential for the organization and facilitation of the act of living. Knowledge is a product of the conscious activity of thought that determines the social nature of the human being and conditions its history and culture. It is a human need of the most important, to understand the way knowledge is given, because it is through this understanding that human society has the possibility of advancing its process of civilization. For this understanding to be feasible, according to Ferreira (2001), it is necessary to constantly question the nature of human cognitive forces, about knowledge itself and the process through which the human being constructs thinking. As he unveils the process through which he obtains the knowledge of the world, man perceives himself as an integrated person in the realidadand.

Human consciousness is not only a merely subjective and departing field from the real world; it is the stage on which perception and concept, as two complementary aspects, are confronted constituting reality. The act of knowledge is revealed as self-conscious participation of reality, from the moment this act becomes aware of itself (GREUEL **apud** FERREIRA, 2001).

This awareness is only acquired through social integration, where man begins to acquire and, later, produce knowledge. In this sense, Vasconcellos (2002) maintains that, through knowledge, the subject captures the objective structure of the real and subjectively represents it. This representation can become an instrument of freedom, a means to create a new ethical-political form as a source of new initiatives. A knowledge to conduct the action must be loaded with meaning (understanding) and affection (emotional involvement). For Vasconcellos (2002), it is also necessary that the work with knowledge be articulated with reality in order to seek to obtain its transformation. It is true that not all knowledge enables immediate practical articulation, but it is important that, even through mediations, its bond with the transformation of

reality is ensured, a role to be exercised by education, especially in terms of cultural preservation, as Lemos (1981, p 29) precollects:

We must then, in any case, ensure the understanding of our social memory while preserving what is significant within our vast repertoire of component elements of Cultural Heritage.

4 EDUCATION - SOCIAL PROCESS

Education, in the last instance, comprises an action exercised, that is, an activity developed in the social environment, through which the adult generation intends to transmit its cultural heritage, its social heritage to younger generations. It is due to the fact that in each organism two beings are considered: one individual and one social. The individual being is that given through the biological inheritance provided by the parents themselves, through the process of heredity. The social being, in turn, is formed of a system of ideas, feelings, habits of social groups of which each organism is part and to which it integrates, especially through the educational process. Human beings are not born sociabilized, but throughout their lives, mainly through the education process, they learn to interact socially (OLIVEIRA, 1990).

As time passes, as a result of technological progress, many cultural traits are added to culture and some may fall into disuse because they become outdated. The culture of a people does not always remain the same. It is modified over time, through the transformations that the new generations are making. Education plays a socializing function, by forming a social being in each one. It also exercises the function of social control by adjusting students to current cultural standards, to social behavior models, making them able to integrate into society in a way that is appropriate to the development of culture, and may be conservative or innovative.

Education is thus still a social technique, and can be used as a conservative factor, thus maintaining the social order as a constructive factor of conscious and intentional transformation of the current social order, that is, as a factor of social change. In other words, education is used as a social technique, that is, as a method to influence human behavior, so that it fits the prevailing patterns of social interaction and organization.

According to Vasconcellos (2002), formal education must transform simple knowledge into social knowledge, since theory itself does not transform the world. The point of arrival of education is the social praxis itself, understood not in terms of the students' synchronic terms. The theoretical knowledge itself cannot transform the world, it can even contribute to its modification, but, to do so, it must come out of itself and, first, it needs to be assimilated by those who will be responsible for causing the real, effective acts, that is, the transformation itself. Between epistemic knowledge and transformative operational activity, a work of education of consciences, organization of material instruments and concrete plans of action is instilled. According to Vasconcellos (2002), education is precisely placed in this task of assimilation, of education of consciences, constituting a way to mediate the process of objective transformation of reality. Therefore, from this perspective, the educational process does not directly and

immediately transform the social reality, but indirectly, that is, acting on the subjects of the future praxis, as Saviani maintains (1983 **apud** VASCONCELLOS, 2002).

In a sense, education plays a mediating role that has profound repercussions in the social environment, it is important to be in the way education develops and what contents are passed on in it. Because it is a social process, what should determine the organization of education and the construction of its curriculum is the objective of interference in practice, with the purpose of acting in its transformation, which means to say that, in general, all contents should be focused on the critical appropriation of reality, enabling the overcoming of the dichotomy between the classroom and the social world.

Ultimately, education is a social process that aims to raise and develop the potential of the individual. Education is not limited to developing the biological and psychic nature, the individual "i" of man, says Oliveira (1990). Education creates a new being – the social being – allowing it to develop physical, intellectual and moral qualities, forming a complete human being, able to socialize.

However, they clarify DIAS and SOARES (2007, p. 65):

What is necessary to realize is that this occurs in Popular Education as well as in Heritage Education and it is a process. In the same way that an educator cannot pressure the student to free himself, it is not up to him, or the State, to dictate what is heritage. Before anything, it is necessary to enable the student to perceive his condition in society and to choose what should be elected as equity.

5 CURRICULUM MATRIX

The curricular theme was always present throughout the 20th century in the debates on educational issues. As a result of these debates, the curriculum is no longer understood, simply, as the relationship and distribution of disciplines with their respective workload, or simply corresponding to the number of class hours and school days. In the first decades of this century, productions began to emerge regarding rationalization in the process of construction, development and testing of curricula; at the end of the 1940s, the idea of curricular organization and development emerged and from the 1970s on, the questioning provoked by critical pedagogical theorizations emerged; without forgetting to highlight, more intensely in recent decades, the postmodern approaches.

In Brazil, according to Oliveira (2001), the issue was also present from centralized curricular proposals for secondary education. However, only from the 1970s onto the 1970s, we began to work more and more with the idea of a common core, for the teaching of 1st and 2nd grades, and of minimum curricula, for higher education. More recently, from the second half of the 1990s, proposals for Guidelines, References and Curricular Parameters for basic education and greater freedom in relation to higher education curricula emerged in the country.

Although it is not known the time when the pedagogical meaning of the word curriculum began to be used, it is certain that this was already happening, although very limited, in the early years of the twentieth century. In fact, in Latin-derived language countries, to call the curriculum the study plans, the

programs or, in general, the documents in which the structure and functioning of the courses are defined, is a habit that has only been acquired in the last decades, bianchi (2001) assures.

The curriculum, according to Menegolla (1998), does not consist only of a serialization of studies that are called a curriculum basis for a given course, or a list of knowledge and contents of the most diverse disciplines to be taught systematically in the classroom. The curriculum should not be understood only as a relationship of delimited and isolated contents or knowledge, establishing stagnant topics, in a "closed" relationship, without an engaging and broad integration with all dimensions of knowledge. Curriculum, according to Menegolla (1998), is not simply a standardized plan, in which some principles and norms for the functioning of the school are related, as if it were an instruction manual to be able to activate a machine. Nevertheless, the curriculum also does not delimit itself in relating subjects, workloads or other norms consistent with the school life that an student needs to comply with in the school context. In this sense, the curriculum is not something restricted to the scope of the school or the classroom.

In fact, according to Menegolla (1998), the curriculum is something very comprehensive, dynamic and existential. It is understood in a profound and real dimension that involves all the circumstantial situations of the student's school and social life. It can be affirmed that it is the school in action, that is, the life of the student and of all those who may have a certain influence on it. It is the interaction of everything that participates and, therefore, interferes in the educational process of the student's person. In other words, the curriculum concerns all educational situations that the student lives, inside and outside the school context, and therefore, the dimension of the curriculum is not restricted to issues or problems that are experienced directly within the school context. Still the understanding of Menegolla (1998), the curriculum is born beyond the walls of the school and its initial step is taken outside the school to be able to enter it. This procedure is justifiable, since the curriculum consists of all acts of a person's life, both past and present, and also with a perspective of the future.

The curriculum is also not restricted to the school environment, because the student is not enclosed within a school or a classroom. In the words of Menegolla (1998) the student's life does not correspond only to what the educator intends to transmit within the classroom. Most of the experiences are acquired and assimilated outside the school, and this non-school knowledge ends up being part of their "Curriculum Vitae". It can also be affirmed, according to Menegolla (1998), that the curriculum should be the organization of the life that the student lives outside and within the school; with this, the structuring of all the action triggered in the school, to organize and develop the "*Curriculum Vitae*" of the student.

In short, the curriculum should not be limited to the simple structuring of teaching subjects as something delimited, and one must go much further, take advantage of the experiences, activities, all the action of the student, the school and society, exercised on the student, in order to obtain the educational objectives. Everything that promotes and activates the educational process should constitute the school curriculum. In this comprehensive definition of the author mentioned above, all activities performed and experienced by the student and by all the personnel involved with the student necessarily constitute the

school curriculum. As a result, it can be said that the curriculum is the life of the student and the school in action, dynamic and constant.

However, by curricular matrix one should not only understand the juxtaposition of disciplines, but all its constitutive elements. In this context, several disciplines can house Heritage Education, conceptualized according to the teaching of SOARES (2007: 7):

Heritage Education is a methodology that seeks the valorization of cultural goods from material manifestations (objects).

6 THE CONCEPT OF "CULTURE" IN FOCUS

Culture, for researchers in general, constitutes the basic and central concept of their science. The term culture is not restricted to the area of Anthropology, because several other epistemic areas use it, in which they weigh the nuances. Often, the word culture is used to indicate the development of the individual through education, education. In this case, a cultured person would be one who acquired dominion in the intellectual or artistic field. Thus, it would be uneducated to which it did not obtain instruction. However, researchers do not use the terms cultured or uncultured, of popular use, nor do they make a value judgment about this or that culture, because they do not consider one superior to the other.

They are only different in terms of technology or integration of their elements. Culture has a broad definition. It encompasses the common and learned ways of life, transmitted by individuals and groups, in society (MARCONI; PRESOTTO, 1987). Culture, therefore, can be analyzed, meanwhile, from various approaches: ideas; beliefs; Standards; attitudes; standards of conduct; abstraction of behavior; Institutions; techniques and artifacts. Consequently, the human being is the cultural being, that is, a factor in culture.

It researches cultures in time and space, their origins and development, their similarities and disparities. It has an interest focus focused on the knowledge of human cultural behavior, obtained by learning, considering it in all its dimensions. The human is a man of the cultural environment in which he socialized. He is an heir to an extensive accumulative process, which reflects the knowledge and experience acquired by the abundant generations that preceded him. The proper and creative manipulation of this cultural heritage admits innovations and inventions.

For Barrio (2005), in turn, it is the study and description of the learned behaviors that characterize the different human groups. Cultural research deals with the material and social works that man created through his history and that allowed him to face his environment and relate to his congeners. As in all human science, its basic design consists in the problem of the relationship between instinctive and acquired modes of behavior, as well as that of the general biological bases that serve as a structure for cultural aptitudes.

Thus, researching the cultural implies the use of resources and research techniques, both linked to field observation. This is your laboratory, where you apply the technique of direct observation, which is completed with the interview and the use of forms for data recording.

The analysis of the culture of a social formation establishes a reconstitution of reality, which is organized from the consciousness that the bearers of culture have of it. Without, of course, fixating on the conscious aspects of the conduct, it is through them, in their relation to the evident behavior, that culture can be reconstituted (DURHAM, 2004). It is important to recognize that the concept was constructed due to specific problems of anthropological research, which concern the study of so-called primitive peoples, that is, relatively undifferentiated societies.

In a way, it is possible to say that the general aspects of the concept of culture can be apprehended as a set of assumptions that stem from the way in which anthropology conceived its object and defined the basic problems of fieldwork.

Scholars of culture are therefore interested in understanding how a certain way of achieving a determined end can vary widely from one to another people, but serve each one to achieve their adjustment before life.

They try to specify how established forms of tradition change over time, either as a result of internal developments or contacts with strange ways, and how an individual born in a given society absorbs, uses and influences the customs that constitute their cultural heritage.

Since it deals with the works of the human in all its great variety, he stumbled, even to fix his nomenclature, with greater difficulties than any other branch of the discipline. Although cultural change is ubiquitous and its analysis is therefore fundamental in the study of the life of human groups, it should not be forgotten that, like any aspect of the study of culture, it takes place in terms of environment and subjectivity, and not in absolute terms. The culture is at the same time stable and changeable.

Cultural change can be studied only as a part of the problem of cultural stability, which can only be understood when one measures change related to conservatism. While culture can be automatic and sanctions given by supposed, any accepted form of action or belief, any institution within a culture makes sense. According to the magisterium of Laraia (1996), the consensus that genetic disparities are not caused by cultural discrepancies. There is no significant link between the distribution of cultural behaviors and the distribution of genetic characters. Thus, culture acts selectively, and not casually, in relation to its environment, exploring certain possibilities and limits to development, for which the determining forces are in the culture itself and in the history of culture.

Delazeri Preleciona (2007, p. 165):

We highlight that students and society should acquire the habit of knowing museums, monuments, archives, libraries to understand their importance, their cultural value and, with this, transmit to future generations all the knowledge acquired.

It can be said that communication is a cultural process. One of the tasks of epistemological research is to reconstruct the definition of culture, fragmented by numerous reformulations. More explicitly, human language is a product of culture, but it would not exist if man did not have the possibility of developing an

articulated system of oral communication. The cultural heritage, developed through countless generations, has always conditioned to react disparagingly in relation to the behavior of those who work outside the standards accepted by the majority of the community (LARAIA, 1996).

Therefore, the fact that man sees the world through his culture, in corollary the ability to consider his most natural and most correct way of life. Moreover, each culture commands in its own way the world that circumscribes it and that this ordination gives a cultural meaning to the apparent agitation of natural things. Culture is, above all, considered an acional phenomenon, and as such, it is associated with a precise territory and a common language, traditions, memories, symbols and rituals. Each cultural system is always this dynamic is important to reduce the clash between generations and avoid prejudiced behaviors. em transformação. Entender

In the same way that it is fundamental for humanity to conception of differences between peoples of different cultures, it is necessary to know how to understand the differences that occur within the same system. However, much of the cultural patterns of a given system were copied from other cultural systems. To these cultural loans anthropology calls diffusion. Without diffusion, the great current development of humanity would not be possible.

7 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

There is a consensus that man is a social being. Throughout the development of civilizations, man has always sought to organize himself more and more in society, to ensure his survival. However, man is not born a ready social being. On the contrary, it is through the transmission of patterns of behavior, the assimilation of culture, the characteristics of human organization and the interaction with society that the individual becomes a social being.

Cultural heritage involves natural and cultural assets, but we can also include intellectual and emotional goods (Ataídes, MACHADO and SOUZA, 1997).

The current society in its complexity is characterized by the presence of different social formations whose function is to socialize man. These institutions, although they have peculiar characteristics, do not exist in isolation, but establish a relationship of exchange of influences. In this sense, the educational institution that is one of the most important social institutions interacts directly with society and its other institutions, influencing and letting itself be influenced by them. Thus, the deep interactivity between education and society is evidenced. Education exists only to teach man to live socially, transmitting culture, patterns of behavior, knowledge produced; finally, it is a mechanism of socialization.

However, the matter does not only involve the universal approach. It is worth bringing to the past the magisterium of SOARES and KLANT (2007, p. 181):

The objective is the valorization of memory and regional identity, through a process of identification, recognition and valorization of local heritage.

Meanwhile, in which education socializes man, it exercises social control of human behavior. Education, through the transmission of knowledge, must play the transforming social role. The educational process should play the role of mediator in the context of social transformations, enabling the assimilation of knowledge of Patrimonial Education, preparing the student to value historical, material or immaterial elaborations.

Finally, it is worth alluding to the behest given to fire by SOARES and KLANT:

In this sense, the role of Patrimonial Education is to promote the cultural manifestations of all segments of society, in all historical periods, while consolidating a process of inclusion, rather than exclusion. It is important to point out that this process is primarily aimed at respecting the difference, be it ethical, religious, cultural or otherwise.

With the results of the ongoing research, further studies may elaborate criteria for the provision of teaching positions for the discipline Patrimonial Education, which is not the current focus, constituting a limiting factor.

However, for further studies, the following suggestions are presented:

- (a) preparation of a school curriculum matrix with a special focus on Heritage Education;
- (b) proposal of a training course for graduates in the intent of qualified to teach Property Education;
- (c) development of didactic material for the faculty of Patrimonial Education.

REFERENCES

- BARRIO, Angel B. Espina. **Manual de antropologia cultural**. Recife: Massangana, 2005.
- DURHAM, Eunice Ribeiro. **A dinâmica da cultura**: ensaios de antropologia. São Paulo: Cosac Naify, 2004.
- FERREIRA, Delson. **Manual de Sociologia**: dos clássicos à sociedade da informação. São Paulo: Atlas, 2001.
- LARAIA, Roque de Barros. **Cultura**: um conceito antropológico. 11 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1996.
- LEMOS, Carlos. **O que é patrimônio histórico**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1981.
- MARCONI, Marina de Andrade; PRESOTTO, Zelia Maria Neves. **Antropologia**: uma introdução. 2 ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 1987.
- MENEGOLLA, Maximiliano; SANT'ANA, Ilza Martins. **Por Que Planejar? Como planejar**. 6. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 1998.
- MORRISH, Ivor. **Sociologia da Educação**. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1977.
- NETO, A. Delorenzo. **Sociologia Aplicada à Educação**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Duas Cidades, 1977.
- OLIVEIRA, Pésio Santos de. **Introdução à Sociologia da Educação**. São Paulo: Ática, 1990.
- OLIVEIRA, Cleiton de. A questão curricular: um convite à leitura. In: BIANCHI, José João Pinhanços. **A Educação e o Tempo**: três ensaios sobre a história do currículo escolar. Piracicaba: Unimep, 2001.
- PESSOA, Xavier Carneiro. **Sociologia da Educação**. Campinas: Alínea, 2001.
- SALDANHA, Nelson Nogueira. **Sociologia da Educação**. Rio de Janeiro: Aurora, [s/d].
- SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da. **Identidade e diferença**: a perspectiva dos estudos culturais / Tomaz Tadeu da Silva (org.), Stuart Hall, Kathryn Woodward. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2000.
- SOARES, André Luis Ramos Soares (org.) **Educação Patrimonial**: teoria e prática. Santa Maria: Ed. da UFSM, 2007.
- SWIFT, Donald Francis. **A Sociologia da Educação**. São Paulo: Atlas, 1977.
- VASCONCELLOS, Celso dos S. **Construção do Conhecimento em Sala de Aula**. 13. ed. São Paulo: Libertad, 2002.