

Teaching Work and Inequality: Contributions of Educational Research in Argentina

The issue of the multiple links between teaching work, schooling processes and social inequalities has possibly been one of the biggest concerns in the field of educational research in Argentina in recent decades. The way in which the task of teaching and the problem of inequality are related and shaped together has integrated the agendas of the different traditions and areas of knowledge with which the field of pedagogy has established joints. As part of an ongoing research project, this article aims to conduct a critical and systematic analysis of scientific production on the links between teaching work, schooling, and inequality in the period 1985-2019 with the aim of examine the main conceptual and theoretical-methodological debates in research, as well as their main contributions to current discussions in the field of education.

Keywords: teaching work; schooling; inequality

Introduction

The issue of the multiple links between teaching work, schooling processes and social inequalities has possibly been one of the biggest concerns in the field of educational research in Argentina in recent decades. The way in which the task of teaching and the problem of inequality are related and shaped together has integrated the agendas of the different traditions and areas of knowledge with which the field of pedagogy has established joints. As part of an ongoing research project, this article aims to conduct a critical and systematic analysis of scientific production on the links between teaching work, schooling, and inequality in the period 1985-2019 with the aim of examine the main conceptual and theoretical-methodological debates in research, as well as their main contributions to current discussions in the field of education.

Method

This article focuses on how academic productions released in the period 1985-2019 in Argentina inscribed in the processes of shaping the pedagogical field as a field of knowledge and power, and of the reconceptualizations and reformulations of the theoretical-methodological languages of research in education (Hillert, 2009; Llomovatte, 2009; Suárez, 2008). To this end, a corpus of 40 research and studies developed in that period was released and systematized to conduct a critical and systematic review of scientific and academic production on the links between teaching work, the processes of inequality, based on a series of coordinates:

- 1 - Conceptual frameworks that research and studies use to approximate
- 2 the links between schooling, teaching work and inequality.
- 3 - Theoretical-methodological definitions taken by research and studies to
- 4 produce knowledge about the links between schooling, teaching work
- 5 and inequality.
- 6 - Contributions and new questions contributed by research and studies on
- 7 the links between schooling, teaching and inequality, as well as the
- 8 discussions placed in the field of education by these scientific
- 9 productions.
- 10 - Senses about schooling, teaching work and the inequality that research
- 11 and studies build. These meanings are inscribed in the debates that
- 12 cross the pedagogical field as a dynamic field of knowledge and power.
- 13

14 From these axes and an interpretive work of analysis of the content of the
15 lathered texts, the article reconstructs three cores of discussion in academic and
16 scientific production in Argentina on the links between teaching work, the
17 processes of schooling and inequality. First, the text will explore the discussions
18 and contributions of the reformulation of structural approaches and the
19 redirection of the gaze towards subjects and school institutions. In a second
20 instance, the paper analyzes the discussions arising from the critique of the
21 generalizing approaches to teaching work, addressing the ways in which the
22 field of educational research incorporated concerns focused on heterogeneity
23 and dynamism of social identities when analyzing the processes of schooling
24 subjects in contexts of inequality. Finally, the article explores the ways in
25 which academic production placed the debate on the place of poverty contexts
26 in training and teaching work, reconstructing the ways in which new approaches to
27 the analysis of the links between teaching, schooling and inequality.

30 Results

32 **The Question of the meaning of Inequality in the Field of Educational** 33 **Research in Argentina**

34
35 In Argentina, educational research aimed at researching the processes of
36 building inequality had one of its important milestones in the pioneer work of
37 Braslavsky (1985) around the discrimination processes in the school institutions.
38 This study was a valuable contribution in terms of deepening the break with the
39 pedagogical optimism that had inaugurated some developments in the field of
40 sociology of education, based on analyzing how the Argentine education
41 system developed differentiated forms of school integration that perpetuated
42 social inequalities through schooling circuits or segments for different social
43 sectors. It also noted the need to question what was going on within schools to
44 address the issue of inequality, which raised questions about the distribution of
45 opportunities between different schools, between teaching modalities and

1 between schools, families' own expectations, tracing a series of agendas and
2 problematizations that would be recovered by further investigations.

3 From that research, it is possible to say that – by the mid-1980s – the
4 socio-economic segregation of the Argentine education system was a common
5 practice and generated different educational circuits between schools of
6 different quality in relation to the social origin of students. Discrimination
7 involved not only practices of exclusion from impoverished sectors, but also
8 differences in the realization of the right to education in terms of the type of
9 schooling accessed by the popular sectors in respect of the one to which they
10 access high and high middle sectors. Thus, the school played an important role
11 in reproducing social inequalities. In this sense, there were differentiated
12 circuits that expressed the ways in which education as a right was unevenly
13 distributed in the different educational circuits, establishing articulations
14 between schooling and socioeconomic origin of the students, who – according
15 to the social sector to which they belong – traveled parallel circuits without
16 contacts with each other (Braslavsky, 1985). These trajectories included several
17 costs for those trying to move from one circuit to another (Braslavsky and
18 Filmus, 1988).

19 Segmentation and disarticulation of educational systems constituted
20 specific expressions and modalities of their horizontal and vertical differentiation
21 dynamics. Horizontal differentiation manifested itself in situations where
22 educational establishments that, according to legislation, had a very different
23 curriculum and offered very different conditions for learning. The vertical
24 differentiation, on the other hand, gave an account of the existence of various
25 orientation and conduction bodies of each level of the educational system
26 operating independently, being able to configure a disjointed system. As a
27 result, segmentation and disarticulation were functional to the preservation of
28 the monopoly on education in minority social groups (Braslavsky, 1985).
29 Inequality, in this case, was based on the reservation of access to socially and
30 culturally relevant knowledge, skills and patterns to certain segments and
31 levels of the education system, and the deployment of certain market
32 mechanisms that left these processes cleared to the various possibilities of the
33 population. It was also expressed in access to non-equivalent levels of
34 knowledge and different possibilities of continuing within the formal education
35 system. According to Braslavsky (1985), in Argentina the incorporation into
36 the segments was realized at key moments: the incorporation into the
37 preschool, the passage to primary school, the passage to the secondary school -
38 about it stops the research carried out - and the passage to the university level.

39 This research and its results allowed to move away from classical
40 reproductive models and enabled the incorporation of the perspectives,
41 attitudes and representations of social subjects, accounting for the discussions
42 in the field of sociology of education in the mid-1980s. The study analyzed the
43 impact of some features of teaching work –like labor stability and training – on
44 the educational processes and school performance of students. It also addressed
45 how the pedagogical model of institutions prioritized knowledge transmission
46 or socialization but did not include in the inquiry how teachers position

1 themselves in relation to their task. Braslavsky's work involved a valuable
2 contribution in terms of dismantling the construction of the egalitarian
3 appearance of the school system, disarming the hegemonic pedagogical
4 optimism in the educational field in that time:

5
6 *"Instead of the single or common primary schools provided for by the current*
7 *law (Number. 1420, year 1884), equally equipped, with pedagogical practices*
8 *that respond to the same model of pedagogical action, where levels and profiles*
9 *of knowledge are taught equal to , in principle, allow equal access to successive*
10 *levels within the formal education system, countless schools have been set up, in*
11 *each of which the equipment is different, pedagogical practices are divergent, the*
12 *acquired levels and knowledge profiles are not equivalent (...)* The educational
13 *system is therefore clearly organized into different circuits that have crystallized*
14 *as educational segments"* (Braslavsky, 1985:142)
15

16 The thesis of segmentation and unequal trends in terms of learning was
17 based on an argument that identified both trends in reproduction and change,
18 postulating that the State could assume this responsibility (Braslavsky, 1985).
19 Democratization was understood in terms of improving learning and acquiring
20 specific knowledge rather than socialization guidelines. These concerns led to
21 research that diagnosed the hesitation of socially relevant knowledge of the
22 education system and the obsolescence of programmatic content, advocating
23 for the State to assume primary responsibility as content provider to the school
24 system (Tiramonti, 2004). Democratization was associated with the equal
25 provision of knowledge. In an open discussion with Orthodox Marxist
26 reproductivism, that perspective supposed a vision of the State as a space to be
27 conquered to transform school education from there.

28 The breadth and extent of the research lines opened by Braslavsky's work
29 became visible in the following years in Argentina. The sociological studies of
30 education put the focus on inequality as a social production and the way
31 educational institutions developed processes that came into strain with
32 promises of liberation and equality. The research in field of sociology of
33 education incorporated the analysis of teacher/student interaction and the role
34 of the subjectivity of social actors in the production and reproduction of
35 inequality.

36 The gaze oriented towards the interior of the "black box" of the school,
37 giving notice of the revision that the field of sociology of education had made
38 of the objectivist models of the functionalist or Marxist type that favored the
39 view of the whole (Tenti Fanfani, 2007), incorporating theoretical currents of
40 Anglo-Saxon origin such as symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, and
41 social phenomenology. The shift towards processes, subjectivity, practices, and
42 experiences of social subjects also took place in the educational research field
43 in Argentina, hand in hand with the entry of social anthropology in these
44 perspectives. This involved the deployment of other approaches that
45 confronted the hegemonic "quantitative" sociology at that time (Batallán,
46 1999), enabling the deployment of social anthropological perspectives and
47 ethnographic approaches into the analysis of links between subjects within the

1 classrooms. These movements deepened the shift away from reproductive
2 models and strengthened the growing interest, in the field of socio-educational
3 research, in developing more processual approaches that accounted for the role
4 of social subjects.

5 Thus, problems such as school repetition or exclusion, which until the
6 early 1980s were diagnosed by extracurricular causes began to be analyzed
7 from the subjects' behavior, especially teachers (Batallán, 1999, 2007).
8 Ethnography, as a perspective articulating theory, methods and techniques, was
9 directed to document the undocumented to account for processes whose
10 complexity exceeded the strictly didactic and in which forms of coercion,
11 negotiation and resistance. Research on education and inequality aimed at
12 reconstructing the perspectives of subjects on their daily lives to describe in the
13 various situations of school life.

14 This emphasis on subject prospects had various expressions in the field of
15 educational research. One of them was that studies began to investigate how
16 expectations of teachers on their students influenced schooling processes and
17 exclusionary dynamics (Kaplan, 1992,1997). Low prospects seemed
18 concentrated on children of popular or subaltern sectors in terms of ethnicity or
19 gender (Morgade, 1992, 2001, 2006). Contributions to studying inequality as a
20 social production focused on the study of the naturalization of the differences
21 and categories with which the world is learnt by students, and on the
22 production and reproduction of these processes (Tenti Fanfani, 2007; Kaplan,
23 1992, 1997, 2008).

24 Emphatically aside from deterministic perspectives on school success and
25 failure during the 50s and 60s, socio-educational research in the last decades
26 became a key contribution to the show that teachers' representations operated
27 as verdicts on student boundaries in relation to school success or failure,
28 structuring a target effect (Kaplan, 2008). These discussions were based on the
29 idea that inequalities in capitalist societies lied on the unequal distribution of
30 material and symbolic conditions. Thus, subjective representations of teachers
31 must be understood as a frame of present and past social configurations, and as
32 productive acts and intervene on students' educational trajectories.

33 These research lines boosted discussions on the fact that students' [´]
34 educability does not depend on their natural interiority or external social
35 conditions, but on the way schooling built relations between subjects that
36 affected learning (Castorina, 2008; Llomovatte, 1988). As several studies
37 showed (Kaplan, 1992, 1997, 2008; Morgade, 1992, 2001, 2006), attributes of
38 gender, age, ethnicity and class were automatically linked to other properties that
39 were presented as natural and non-arbitrary. The naturalization of intelligence in
40 magisterial discourse occupies a central place in teachers' [´] judgment.

41 Furthermore, research in the field of education in Argentina in the last
42 decades approached the ways schools built the production and reproduction of
43 inequality from the point of view of subjects and institutions. These studies were
44 based on the obsolescence of the conceptual instrument of social scientists to
45 analyze the problems of society, in the context of the restructuration of social
46 relations and regulatory frameworks of subject actions. This need to revise

1 conceptual scaffolding was added to the fact that the distances between the
2 different social strata had reached unthinkable levels by the beginning of the
3 2000 decade, producing new inequality scenarios in Argentina. The school
4 expressions of these situations could no longer be explained only in socio-
5 economic terms, although they conditioned schools and educational subjects
6 (Tiramonti, 2004).

7 From these coordinates, educational research in Argentina revised the
8 conceptualizations around educational segmentation to account for how the
9 processes of inequality were involved with the existence of a fragmented
10 educational field in which actors move within a relatively enclosed space that
11 marks the limits of their options. In dialogue with the category of
12 segmentation, the conceptual production around educational fragmentation as a
13 lens through which to observe the issue of inequality was meticulously
14 supported in the analysis of the role played by expectations institutional
15 resources, the cultural capitals of families and the strategies social sectors
16 developed (Tiramonti, 2004). It also showed the inadequacy of the concept of
17 class to explain those dynamics:

18
19 *"Unlike the segment, which is constituted as a distinct space within the*
20 *framework of an integrated set, fragmentation refers to an overlapping field*
21 *characterized by ruptures, discontinuities, and the impossibility of passing from*
22 *one to the other. This names the loss of unity, the absence of common references*
23 *and a multiplication dynamic that moves away any possibility of recovery from*
24 *the unit"* (Tiramonti, 2007:26).
25

26 The fragment as a theoretical concept accounted for a self-built space
27 inside which included schools that had little articulation with other institutions.
28 Some studies in the framework of this research line analyzed the heterogeneity
29 of the teachers' training institutions, the construction of their profiles and the
30 strategies they develop in relation to students (Poliak, 2004), and the teaching
31 representations about the public sphere (Arroyo, 2004). In this way, the
32 revision of the category of segmentation implied the abandonment of structuralist
33 views that established continuities between social positions and educational
34 inequalities, enabling the consideration of subjects. This research showed that
35 teachers presented ideas of acceptance of the context and absence of references
36 to the responsibility of society for all its members. Thus, in the context of the
37 fading of the public dimension in the conception of their work, teachers
38 became mirrors of the fragments the way of dealing with educational problems,
39 disassociating them from a broad social gaze (Arroyo, 2004). Inequality not
40 only reached students and their material conditions, but also the teachers who
41 teach them.
42

43 **Research on the Links between Schooling and Teaching Work in Contexts** 44 **of Social Inequality** 45

46 Several recent research on schooling in poverty contexts in Argentina
47 contributed to the construction of a perspective that argued that it was not

1 possible to sustain the idea of unity of the educational system and the senses
2 associated with it, and that it was conceptually unfeasible to assume a
3 homogeneity of subject positions. These studies shifted a perspective on
4 inequality in more mobile and flexible terms than the old divisions of social
5 class or positions of power (Dussel, 2005). Equality was not a static or defined
6 state, but a set of strong relationships that are established between subjects and
7 that encompass different areas: wealth, income, job opportunities, gender,
8 ethnicity, geographical region, among others. The relational nature of inequality
9 led to questions about society, and not just about the border that demarcates
10 those who are excluded, as it is a political and social problem that is at the
11 heart of institutions and subjectivity (Dussel, 2005). In this context, some
12 authors emphasized the need to look inward from the school system when
13 thinking about the relationship between it and inequality, focusing on the
14 organizational conditions of institutions (Redondo and Thisted, 1999;
15 Southwell, 2008).

16 In this sense, educational research argued the concept of exclusion did not
17 allow us to see the inclusions that coexist and how both processes can be part
18 of the same face of the coin (Dussel, 2004). This category often meant
19 acceptance of the exclusionary order and made invisible the struggle for
20 inclusion. Redondo (2004) pointed out that there was a risk in defining
21 exclusion as a state and not as a process on which interventions could be made,
22 warning of the risks of shifting the notion of inequality:

23
24 *"The shift from the concept of 'inequality' to 'exclusion' naturalizes the current*
25 *processes of social disaffiliation and places them, in a discursive operation of*
26 *legitimacy, in new relationships of power that have their direct expression in the*
27 *construction of social policies, including education" (Redondo, 2004:68)*
28

29 The field of educational research in Argentina sought to account for
30 impoverishment scenarios by showing how they reached teaching workers,
31 whose socio-demographic, socio-economic and socio-economic characteristics
32 varied. Some studies highlighted how situations of job precarization crossed
33 teaching subjects (Filmus, 2006). The research led by Tenti Fanfani (2005)
34 showed that Argentine teachers perceived that they were worse than previous
35 generations and they felt they were in a process of downward social mobility
36 process that impacted on their daily work (Dussel, 2006).

37 As several research lines showed, these processes were parallel to a series
38 of substantive changes in the conditions of teaching work In Argentina, in the
39 framework of policies that aimed at changing its organizational contexts, trying
40 to reconfigure the professional profile of teachers (Birgin, 1999, 2000; Tenti
41 Fanfani, 2006; Feldfeber and Andrade Oliveira, 2006). Teaching workers were
42 at the center of Latin American educational reforms, being in the place of
43 responding to demands that would seem to go beyond their training,
44 particularly when they develop their task in poverty contexts. The new
45 educational regulations have caused a significant intensification of teaching
46 work and precarization of employment relationships that have an impact on
47 identity and teaching status (Tenti Fanfani, 2005).

1 These studies argued that new regulations resulted in a restructuring of
2 teaching work, altering its nature extending it beyond classroom activity. These
3 dynamics occurred in a context of intensification of teaching work which,
4 according to research studies, expressed a sense of overflow based on the
5 demand of other professional knowledge, the diversification of responsibilities,
6 and the demand for emotional commitment (Tenti Fanfani, 2006). This occurs
7 in the context of an increase in demands to the school in terms of teaching,
8 restraint, care, accompaniment, health promotion and social assistance,
9 protection of rights and extension of social participation, a situation that
10 acquires specific particularities in the conditions of precariousness, poverty and
11 inequality of the Latin American context (Dussel, 2006).

12 Also, these perspectives enabled to strengthen a view of the relationship
13 between teaching work and inequality in contexts where teachers worked with
14 students who belonged to families excluded from employment (Tenti Fanfani,
15 2006). Towards the beginning of the 21st century in Argentina, the expansion
16 of the phenomenon of extreme poverty, vulnerability and exclusion of large
17 groups had effects on the work and identity of teachers:

18
19 *"Life's difficulties in conditions of extreme poverty (malnutrition, disease,*
20 *violence, neglect, etc.) manifest themselves in the daily life of the school and*
21 *affect the content of teachers' work. In many cases, they are obliged to perform*
22 *socially considered urgent care tasks (food, affective restraint, moralization, etc.)*
23 *that hinder the achievement of the school's traditional mission: the development*
24 *of learning. These phenomena put in crisis certain professional identities and*
25 *require a discussion: either the Magisterium chooses to deepen its professional*
26 *specialization or develops a new pedagogical/assistive professionalism*
27 *(organizer and mobilizer of social resources for children, depending on learning*
28 *objectives and development of subjectivities)"* (Tenti Fanfani, 2007: 41)
29

30 Several approaches in the educational research field argued that teaching
31 in poverty conditions and social care practices towards students should not be
32 thought in a dichotomic way (Antelo, 2009; Redondo, 2004). In addition,
33 studies have emphasized that the quality of educational experience that certain
34 schools propose did not have to do with their students' social origin (Duschatzky,
35 1999; Dussel, 2005; Puiggrós, 1990; Thisted and Redondo, 1999). These
36 contributions showed how schools in Argentina were capable of opening
37 democratic horizons for students who live in poverty conditions. In this frame,
38 research projects highlighted that teaching work is traversed by unease,
39 frustration and anger, but also by stubbornness, daily and militant struggle and
40 voluntarism (Redondo, 2004; Southwell, 2004). Thus, there was an important
41 risk if all schools were understood as homogeneous and unable to provide a
42 quality education. In this way, the field of educational research advanced in
43 showing the heterogeneity of situations and positions that are deployed in the
44 processes of schooling sectors living in poverty:

45
46

1 *"There is no such homogeneity within poor schools, and (...) each institution is*
2 *permeated in a particular way with the surrounding context by building bonds*
3 *between education and poverty and it is in the making of each collective where*
4 *the senses that define whether this social frontier of poverty is set as an*
5 *educational frontier"* (Redondo and Thisted, 1999:170)
6

7 *"The educational reality of these schools is far from homogeneous or uniform.*
8 *Rather, the group of educational institutions that serve the child and adolescent*
9 *population in poverty represent a highly heterogeneous set. This is due to (...) the*
10 *prominence and positioning of the subjects inserted in these educational*
11 *realities, which produce diverse institutional and pedagogical practices,*
12 *heterogeneous and even contrasting"* (Redondo, 2004:78)
13

14 Within the framework of this heterogeneity, studies that reported situations of
15 educational fragmentation showed existence of a mandate of "containment" that
16 acquired a strong reproductive content at the average level of teaching, and that
17 did not have a single meaning for the subjects. In this context, there was research
18 on the meanings that teachers in Argentina attribute to their expectations in
19 territories characterized by disintegration and deinstitutionalization. Tiramonti
20 (2004, 2007) characterized these institutions as "schools to resist the collapse"
21 distinguishing religious schools with a pastoral component that aimed to develop a
22 guardian protection of their students with a marked pretension to provide material
23 and pedagogical assistance to help face the present. Research on educational
24 fragmentation in Argentina focused on the institutional profiles built by schools
25 and on the demands and ideas of pathways that families develop in relation to their
26 children's education, in addition to different meanings that teachers and managers
27 weaved around schooling.

28 In recent decades, Argentine schools, which were once built with a strong
29 equalization mandate, have been overrun, and at times overwhelmed, by the
30 effects of unequaling and differentiating policies. In this context, educational
31 institutions were constituted as the only expression of the State on the
32 periphery forming the last frontier of the public (Redondo and Thisted, 1999).
33 The school system has shifted its uniformity task towards the production of
34 cultural boundaries (Puiggrós and Dussel, 1999). Following the relational
35 conception of inclusion-exclusion, the idea of "borders of exclusion" was
36 raised to consider the differences between those who are included and those
37 who are excluded, without assuming that this relationship is given in
38 dichotomous or exclusive terms (Redondo, 2004). With the concept of border,
39 authors intended to account for the edges, boundaries, passages, crosses, and
40 margins that enable more complex glances of pauperization processes and their
41 expression in the daily lives of families and school institutions. The notion of
42 frontier departs from the mere celebration of differences and the binary
43 consideration of those included and excluded that follows a logic from inside
44 and outside (Puiggrós and Dussel, 1999). The border has nothing to do with the
45 separation of two elements already defined according to topographical
46 coordinates. On the contrary, at the borders of exclusion schools produce
47 various re-articulations of the links between education and poverty, opening a

1 field of positions that include strengthening inclusion processes and deepening
2 situations of exclusion.

3 Following these coordinates, Redondo (2004) reported heterogeneous
4 positions among teaching subjects working with students living in poverty:
5 those who sought to compensate for the shortcomings of their students through
6 affection and the inculcation of good habits, those who looked with
7 indifference what happened to them, and those who recognized the situation of
8 inequality and approached it from the conviction of producing reparation
9 through teaching, based on the recognition of dignity and rights. In some cases,
10 the configuration of the teaching identity was based on the link with students
11 named as "lacking" and on covering what they did not have (Redondo, 2004).
12 In addition, the author showed how teachers were crossed by what happened to
13 students in conditions of poverty while in other cases they acted with distance
14 and holding a stigmatizing vision of families for their children's "school
15 failure."

16 From the field of social anthropology, Padawer (2008) analyzed a teaching
17 initiative that discussed the organization by grades in primary school in
18 Argentina, pointing out that it referred not only to technical-didactic issues but
19 also to an expression of a debate on the political principles that structured the
20 system of instruction in relation to social inequality. To do this, she considered
21 the origins of school in relation to the graduation device and the experiences
22 recognized as background by the protagonists, approaching to two experiences
23 considering the social theories in use and particularities of teaching. This
24 research showed that many teachers deployed the idea that poverty produced a
25 "backward" cultural environment in children's homes and that this situation
26 irreversibly led to school failure. It also gave account of non-homogeneous
27 positions among teachers, including the idea that these conditions are a non-
28 definitive, and of various criteria of grouping students as a mode of addressing
29 their schooling. In addition, author found

30
31 *"underlying ideas about the relationship between school, poverty and failure,*
32 *where inequality is understood as difference or diversity, in a naive relativism*
33 *that hides deterministic positions on students' poverty conditions" (Padawer,*
34 *2008:277)*
35

36 Padawer showed that teachers developed complex reflections on their role
37 in the discussion of social inequality. Like other authors, her research enabled
38 to highlight the configuration of heterogeneous, contradictory and paradoxical
39 senses for the schooling of subjects in poverty (Redondo and Thisted, 1999;
40 Redondo, 2004; Tiramonti, 2004; Southwell, 2008). In this line, other research
41 projects in Argentina focused on how principals characterized their students
42 and their institutions (Southwell, 2012) arguing that these authorities
43 developed a variety of positions around homogeneity.

44 An important number of research in the field of sociology of education
45 and anthropology in Argentina investigated the relationships between schools
46 and families, highlighting their complexity. In the case of institutions that
47 worked with students in poverty, teachers pointed out that parents had "little

1 interest" in their children, and gave account of difficulties in getting parents to
2 come up to the institution (Tiramonti and Minteguiaga, 2004; Achilli, 2010).
3 According to these authors, teachers and principals conceived a certain
4 "disciplinary weakness" of families, which became an ineffective socialization
5 for the incorporation of their children into socially accepted patterns of
6 conduct. The work of containment carried out by school is linked to an
7 intention of social control and acquires affective and related edges related to
8 supplementing a supposed "lack of affection" by the social and family
9 environment of the students (Redondo, 2004). Some research noticed that
10 affection seemed to have a contradictory circulation in schools, as a component
11 of the increasing "affectivization" of pedagogical relations (Abramowski,
12 2010).

13 In this context, relationships between schools and families were
14 characterized as oscillating and paradoxical, accounting for positions that could
15 be contradictory in the same subjects (Southwell, 2008). In some cases, the
16 institution was perceived as part of the community, but that in that movement it
17 set educational action to the limits of what was next, without linking with other
18 cultural horizons. In addition, some research focused on the issue of
19 educational inequality since school choice practices in Argentina (Narodowski
20 and Gómez Schettini, 2007). A series of work accounted for the relationship
21 between choice strategies and social class, considering how families developed
22 these practices by reflecting on what to demand from the education system
23 (Tiramonti, 2007). These authors argued that the question of educational
24 choice showed a growing market presence both in the material dimension of
25 educational offerings and in the dimension of discourses that legitimize their
26 logics. This presence set up on-demand schooling processes in Argentina that
27 displaced previous dynamics based on the supply of education within the
28 framework of broader social transformations (Pineau, 2001). In the same way,
29 other researchers identified

30
31 *"An expansion of the educational spaces governed by the rule of the market. The*
32 *administration and management of education systems has clearly been*
33 *heterogenized in recent decades, we have gone from dual systems where the*
34 *dependence of institutions could be public-state or private-particular to a field*
35 *where they exist multiple management models that articulate the public and the*
36 *private, to the point that in some cases it is difficult to establish clear boundaries*
37 *between each other" (Tiramonti, 2007:23)*
38

39 From the field of anthropology, Cerletti (2010) showed that families living
40 in poverty in Argentina gave a central place to education of their children as a
41 possibility of social ascent. The author showed a wide heterogeneity of senses
42 that families attributed to schooling in their educational choice practices. The
43 deployment of a diversity of assessments and choices gave account of an active
44 school search by families, who developed comparisons with their own
45 educational trajectories and built arguments regarding the quality of public or
46 private education. In this way, these practices of school valuation – and

1 avoidance of certain institutions– were not an exclusive heritage of rich social
2 sectors, but also reached impoverished families.

3 In addition, Redondo (2004) highlighted that for popular sectors school
4 remained as an opportunity and continued to be loaded with expectations, even
5 in times of absence of promises of social advancement in Argentina. In a
6 similar vein, in its analysis of the links between school and families in contexts
7 of social inequality, Achilli (2010) hypothesized that both areas were built in
8 dialectical processes and mutual conditionings. Several research discussed
9 widespread notions about teachers that, from their day-to-day work, tended to
10 hold families accountable for maintaining a supposedly passive and selfless
11 attitude towards the processes of schooling (Achilli, 2010; Santillán, 2012;
12 Tenti Fanfani, 2006).

13 14 **Discussions on the Links between School and Context in Educational** 15 **Research in Argentina**

16
17 In several discussions on the links between teaching work and social and
18 educational inequality, some authors argued on the suitability and relevance of
19 the idea that children should receive "local schooling" in Argentina, with an
20 emphasis on topics related to their cultural contexts. These adequations were
21 highlighted by some research that maintained a pessimistic judgment about
22 students and their interest to learn, founding these assumptions in problems of
23 discipline and motivation, in the context of a supposed antagonism between
24 what is popular and school (Tenti Fanfani, 2006). Some authors highlighted
25 teachers held an idea of giving more to the ones who had less in terms of
26 subsistence, family containment and behavior (Alliaud and Antelo). Based on
27 these diagnoses, initiatives such as preparing teaching for the context, adapting
28 the curriculum to the needs of students and relying on the support of specialists
29 were often developed in Argentina. In a different direction, educational policy
30 analysts continued to deepen a line of work from international agencies by
31 proposing "contextualized" training to work with poverty, as if specific
32 preparation to work with this sector were needed:

33
34 *"Schools where students from popular sectors attend should have teachers*
35 *trained to work in these contexts, including the different family and youth*
36 *cultures, who can enrich the fundamental contents of the curriculum to adapt*
37 *them to the knowledge and contexts of the students, and that they know how to*
38 *work with diversity"* (Veleda, Rivas and Mezzadra, 2011:120)

39
40 According to Serra and Canciano (2002), the issue of working with
41 students in poverty conditions in Argentina turned into formalized training
42 strategies that aimed to prepare teachers to educate poor children, turning
43 poverty into a differential feature of the other that reorganized the pedagogical
44 relationship (Serra, 2003). The assumption on which these proposals were
45 supported was that specific training was needed to work with poverty, as
46 teacher training revealed insufficient. Those initiatives were based on the idea
47 of the existence of a deficit, relative to the social environment of children and

1 their families. Poverty was essentialized, establishing what the poor were and
2 were not, what they could and could not, giving the context a decisive role.
3 Teachers were reduced to mere technicians who needed to be trained to work
4 with poverty. These operations reversed the way in which the relationship
5 between education and poverty had historically been built in Argentina, in
6 which school bet on teaching to ensure the consolidation of the social order.
7 This also enabled upward mobility for the popular and middle sectors, by
8 carrying out an intervention in relation to inequality. This operation was
9 revoked when policies declined the aspiration to institute the common. Thus,
10 the fragmentation dynamics of the education system were deepened:

11
12 *"To admit the question of how we educate the poor, from where and where to,*
13 *means supporting a reconfiguration of the field of pedagogy. The current*
14 *question about the culture of the other, their attention or respect, reconfigures*
15 *the pedagogical operation, and in the name of respect and attention to*
16 *differences, we blur the illusion of equality" (Serra, 2002:107)*
17

18 Several research strongly discussed the proposal for a "located" training
19 for work with specific populations. These studies attempted to address the
20 relationships between education and poverty as a link that delimits a
21 problematic field, showing that if context was assumed as a limiting factor for
22 educating it prevented school from becoming a place of construction of
23 democratic horizons (Alliaud and Antelo, 2009; Frigerio, 2004; Redondo and
24 Thisted, 1999; Redondo, 2004). This way of conceptualizing context as the
25 cause of school failure structured a logic of exclusion: the outside was frozen
26 as something associated with the evil (Dussel, 2004; Southwell, 2006). In this
27 sense, a set of investigations argued about the need to produce knowledge that
28 recognized the place of subjects and their potentiality, highlighting that the
29 experience of context as a limit for educational possibilities did not invade
30 schools in Argentina (Achilli, 2010; Cantero, 2006). These studies placed a
31 central focus on methodologically approaching the ways subjects and
32 educational practices are signified. They set the question of equality as
33 possibility that required educating in a school, and that depended on what
34 teachers did with their students (Dussel and Southwell, 2004). In this context,
35 ethical and political training of educators became central (Alliaud and Antelo,
36 2009; Birgin and Serra, 2012; Redondo, 2012).

37 Establishing a difference between education and transmission, Diker
38 (2004) noted that the latter offers an inheritance and the enablement to
39 transform and re-signify it, while education did not imply that a student
40 transformed what is taught to him. For this author, transmission could not set a
41 directionality since its effects depended on enablement of the new generations.
42 Unlike education, which pursued objectives, transmission provided a starting
43 point and allowed a subject to build the difference (Diker, 2004). In this
44 context, the question of the common, the collective and the production of
45 equality became essential:

46

1 *"The world and the country in which we live, where knowledge circulates and*
2 *communication creates new bonds, our lives are driven by inequality and*
3 *injustice; there, some long-standing debts are still present and new ones show*
4 *the limit of some past dreams. In that territory, we ask ourselves again about the*
5 *political –transformative – role of the institutions that have as their object the*
6 *common, the collective and among which we place the school (...) Education and*
7 *teaching have a political dimension that houses rights, which produces subjects,*
8 *that promotes or hinders the participation, democratization and transformation*
9 *of institutions and society"* (Southwell, 2009:180)

10
11 In that frame, several educational research in Argentina showed the need
12 to make visible the possibilities, commitments and utopias set to be developed
13 in pedagogical scenes (Redondo, 2004). Some authors raised the assertion that
14 all intelligences were equal as a theoretical fiction capable of opening
15 possibilities (Frigerio, 2004). This implied conceiving the other as capable of
16 inhabiting that possibility, of being a subject of possibility, a position marked
17 by an ethical perspective. That methodological position led to the production of
18 studies where the focus was on the potential that each situation showed,
19 approaching the way schools produced the plural within the common. These
20 are aspects that integrated the discussions on teaching work as the construction
21 of a position in specific scenarios, as a way of dealing with different policies
22 (Southwell, 2009). These discussions enabled a perspective that addressed how
23 teachers were producers of pedagogical knowledge and focused on the
24 recognition of what they did daily in schools.

25 26 27 **Discussion**

28
29 This paper aimed to account for how the field of educational research in
30 Argentina approached the analysis of the links between teaching work,
31 schooling and inequality in the period 1985-2019. The article went through the
32 inaugural works around educational segmentation to its most recent revisions
33 around the notion of fragmentation. Methodological movements that sought to
34 address the school "black box" shifted to the point of view of subjects and
35 educational institutions to problematize the production of school inequality.

36 One of the most important consequences of those movements was the
37 possibility of showing the inner heterogeneity of the dynamics of schooling in
38 Argentina, and how institutions and subjects built their identities. This resulted
39 in the possibility of showing the diversity of subject positions of teachers,
40 teachers, principals and families (Redondo and Thisted, 1999; Arroyo, 2004;
41 Poliak, 2004; Redondo, 2004; Tiramonti, 2004; Padawer, 2008; Southwell,
42 2008).

43 Among the contributions of the systematization of research that was
44 discussed in this paper, it is worth highlighting how studies incorporated the
45 idea that notions of equality and inequality as a relationship, ruling out the
46 possibility of considering them as immutable essences. As it was not a
47 beforehand state, equality implied a set of links that needed to be investigated.

1 The analysis focused on the senses built in the schooling of sectors living in
2 poverty, addressing school choice practices and the relationships between
3 schools and families (Achilli, 2010; Cerletti, 2010).

4 Studies also highlighted the need to recover a pedagogical question when
5 researching on the teaching profession (Alliaud and Antelo, 2005, 2009,
6 Birgin, 2006, 2012; Diker, 2004, 2008; Dussel and Southwell, 2004; Frigerio
7 and Diker, 2004; Hillert, Ameijeiras and Graziano, 2011; Pineau, 2001; Serra,
8 2002, 2007; Southwell, 2008, 2009, 2012), in order to extend our gaze beyond
9 labor-related issues. In this way, the agenda of educational research in
10 Argentina in relation to the links between teaching work, schooling and
11 poverty has thematized how the latter did not constitute an insurmountable
12 obstacle for more democratic horizons. This paper went over the
13 problematizations of some studies around the development of a more complex
14 approach based on what teaching could produce. Among other contributions,
15 they showed the need to build conceptual and methodological tools to make
16 visible the ways teachers in Argentina developed heterogeneous and valuable
17 pedagogical practices.

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48

- 21 Abramowski, A. (2010). *Maneras de querer. Los afectos docentes en las relaciones pedagógicas*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- 22 Achilli, E. (2010). *Escuela, familia y desigualdad social. Una antropología en tiempos neoliberales*. Rosario: Laborde Editor.
- 23 Alliaud, A. & Antelo, E. (2005). Grandezas y miserias de la tarea de enseñar. *Linhas*, 6
24 (1), 1-13.
- 25 Alliaud, A. & Antelo, E. (2009). *Los gajes del oficio. Enseñanza, pedagogía y formación*.
26 Buenos Aires: Aique.
- 27 Antelo, E. (2005). Notas sobre la (incalculable) experiencia de educar. In G. Frigerio &
28 G. Diker (Eds.) *Educación: ese acto político* (pp. 1-7). Buenos Aires: Del Estante
29 Editorial.
- 30 Antelo, E. (2009). Variaciones sobre la enseñanza y el cuidado. In A. Alliaud & E. Antelo
31 (Eds.) *Los gajes del oficio. Enseñanza, pedagogía y formación* (pp. 117-132).
32 Buenos Aires: Aique.
- 33 Arroyo, M. (2004). ¿Hay en la escuela algo que tenga que ver con un proyecto común? In
34 G. Tiramonti (Ed.) *La trama de la desigualdad educativa. Mutaciones recientes en la
35 escuela media* (pp. 119-146). Buenos Aires: Manantial.
- 36 Batallán, G. (1999). La apropiación de la etnografía por la investigación educacional.
37 Reflexiones sobre su uso reciente en Argentina y Chile. *Revista del IICE*, (14), 3-11.
- 38 Batallán, G. (2007). *Docentes de infancia. Antropología del trabajo en la escuela
39 primaria*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- 40 Birgin, A. (2000). La docencia como trabajo: la construcción de nuevas pautas de
41 inclusión y exclusión. In P. Gentili & G. Frigotto (Eds.) *La ciudadanía negada.
42 Políticas de exclusión en la educación y el trabajo* (pp. 221-239). Buenos Aires:
43 CLACSO.
- 44 Birgin, A. (2006). Pensar la formación de los docentes en nuestro tiempo. In F. Terigi
45 (Ed.) *Diez miradas sobre la escuela primaria* (pp. 267-194). Buenos Aires: Siglo
46 XXI.

- 1 Birgin, A. (Ed.) (2012). *Más allá de la capacitación. Debates acerca de la formación de*
2 *docentes en ejercicio*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- 3 Birgin, A. & Serra, M.S. (2012). Cultura y formación docente: viejas fórmulas y nuevas
4 encrucijadas. In A. Birgin (Ed.) *Más allá de la capacitación. Debates acerca de la*
5 *formación de docentes en ejercicio* (pp. 235-256). Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- 6 Braslavsky, C. (1985). *La discriminación educativa en la Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Miño
7 y Dávila.
- 8 Braslavsky C. & Filmus D. (1988). *Respuestas a la crisis educativa*. Buenos Aires:
9 Cántaro.
- 10 Cantero, G. (2006). Educación popular en la escuela pública: una esperanza que ha dejado
11 de ser pura espera. Desde ciertos saberes, prácticas y condiciones. In P. Martinis & P.
12 Redondo (Eds.) *Igualdad y educación. Escrituras entre (dos) orillas* (pp. 205-224).
13 Buenos Aires: Del Estante Editorial.
- 14 Castorina, J.A. (2008). Prólogo. In C. Kaplan, *Talentos, dones e inteligencias. El fracaso*
15 *escolar no es un destino* (pp. 9-12). Buenos Aires: Colihue.
- 16 Cerletti, L. (2005). Familias y educación: prácticas y representaciones en torno a la
17 escolarización de los niños. *Cuadernos de Antropología Social*, (22), 173-188.
- 18 Cerletti, L. (2010). *Una etnografía sobre las relaciones entre familias y las escuelas en*
19 *contextos de desigualdad social* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Universidad de
20 Buenos Aires.
- 21 Diker, G. (2004). Y el debate continúa. ¿Por qué hablar de transmisión? In. G. Frigerio &
22 G. Diker (Eds.) *La transmisión en las sociedades, las instituciones y los sujetos. Un*
23 *concepto de la educación en acción* (pp. 223-230). Buenos Aires: Novedades
24 Educativas.
- 25 Diker, G. (2008). ¿Cómo se establece qué es lo común? In. G. Frigerio & G. Diker (Eds.)
26 *Educación: posiciones acerca de lo común* (pp. 147-173). Buenos Aires: Del Estante
27 Editorial.
- 28 Duschatzky, S. (1999). *La escuela como frontera. Reflexiones sobre la experiencia*
29 *escolar de jóvenes de sectores populares*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- 30 Dussel, I. (2004). Inclusión y exclusión en la escuela moderna argentina: una perspectiva
31 postestructuralista. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 34 (122), 305–335.
- 32 Dussel, I. (2005). Desigualdades sociales y desigualdades escolares en la Argentina de
33 hoy. Algunas reflexiones y propuestas. In J.C. Tedesco (Ed.) *¿Cómo superar la*
34 *desigualdad y la fragmentación del sistema educativo argentino?* Buenos Aires:
35 IIPE – UNESCO.
- 36 Dussel, I. (2006). Impactos de los cambios en el contexto social y organizacional del
37 oficio docente. In E. Tenti Fanfani (Ed.) *El oficio de docente. Vocación, trabajo y*
38 *profesión en el siglo XXI* (pp. 143-173). Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- 39 Dussel, I. & Southwell, M. (2004). La escuela y la igualdad: renovar la apuesta. *El*
40 *Monitor de la Educación*, (1), 1-3.
- 41 Feldfeber, M. & Andrade Oliveira, D. (Eds.). *Políticas educativas y trabajo docente.*
42 *Nuevas regulaciones ¿Nuevos sujetos?* Buenos Aires: Noveduc.
- 43 Filmus, D. (2006). Hacia una política nacional de jerarquización docente. In E. Tenti
44 Fanfani (Ed.) *El oficio de docente. Vocación, trabajo y profesión en el siglo XXI* (pp.
45 13-18). Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- 46 Frigerio, G. (2004). La (no) inexorable desigualdad. *Ciudadanos. Revista de crítica y*
47 *propuesta*, 4, (7), 1-18.
- 48 Frigerio, G. & Diker, G. (Eds.) (2004). *La transmisión en las sociedades, las instituciones*
49 *y los sujetos. Un concepto de la educación en acción*. Buenos Aires: Noveduc.
- 50 Gómez Schettini, M. (2007). La elección de los no elegidos: Los sectores de bajos
51 ingresos ante la elección de escuela en la zona sur de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires. In

- 1 M. Narodowski & M. Gómez Schettini (Eds.) *Escuelas y familias. Problemas de*
 2 *diversidad cultural y justicia social* (pp. 101-126). Buenos Aires: Prometeo.
- 3 Hillert, Flora (2011). A modo de conclusión. In F. Hillert, M.J. Ameijeiras & N. Graziano
 4 (Eds.) *La mirada pedagógica para el siglo XXI: teorías, temas y prácticas en*
 5 *cuestión* (pp. 205-210). Buenos Aires: Editorial de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
 6 de la Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- 7 Hillert, F., Ameijeiras, M.J. & Graziano, N. (Eds.) (2011). *La mirada pedagógica para el*
 8 *siglo XXI: teorías, temas y prácticas en cuestión*. Buenos Aires: Editorial de la
 9 Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- 10 Kaplan, C. (1992). *Buenos y malos alumnos: descripciones que predicen*. Buenos Aires:
 11 Aique.
- 12 Kaplan, C. (1997). *La inteligencia escolarizada*. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila.
- 13 Kaplan, C. (2008). *Talentos, dones e inteligencias. El fracaso escolar no es un destino*.
 14 Buenos Aires: Colihue.
- 15 Llomovatte, S. (1998). *Vinculaciones entre la educación, el trabajo y el empleo.*
 16 *Perspectiva para los años 90*. Documento para la Reunión de Ministros de
 17 Educación Iberoamericanos. Buenos Aires.
- 18 Llomovatte, Silvia (2011). A modo de presentación. In F. Hillert, M.J. Ameijeiras & N.
 19 Graziano (Eds.) *La mirada pedagógica para el siglo XXI: teorías, temas y prácticas*
 20 *en cuestión* (pp. 9-11). Buenos Aires: Editorial de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de
 21 la Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- 22 Llomovatte, S. & Kaplan, C. (2005). Revisión del debate acerca de la desigualdad
 23 educativa en la sociología de la educación: la reemergencia del determinismo
 24 biológico. In S. Llomovatte & C. Kaplan (Eds.) *Desigualdad educativa. La*
 25 *naturaleza como pretexto* (pp. 9-20). Buenos Aires: Noveduc.
- 26 Morgade, G. (1992). *El determinante de género en el trabajo docente de la escuela*
 27 *primaria*. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila Editores.
- 28 Morgade, G. (2001). *Aprender a ser mujer, aprender a ser Varón. Relaciones de género y*
 29 *educación. Esbozo de un programa de acción*. Buenos Aires: Novedades Educativas.
- 30 Morgade, G. (2006). Sexualidad y prevención: discursos sexistas y heteronormativos en la
 31 escuela media. *Revista del IIICE*, 24, 27-33.
- 32 Narodowski, M. & Gómez Schettini, M. (Eds.) (2007). *Escuelas y Familias. Problemas de*
 33 *diversidad cultural y justicia social*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo.
- 34 Padawer, A. (2008). *Cuando los grados hablan de desigualdad*. Buenos Aires: Teseo.
- 35 Pineau, P. (2001). ¿Por qué triunfó la escuela?, o la modernidad dijo: ‘Esto es educación’
 36 y la escuela respondió: ‘Yo me ocupo’. In P. Pineau, I. Dussel & M. Caruso, *La*
 37 *escuela como máquina de educar* (pp. 27-52). Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- 38 Poliak, N. (2004). Reconfiguraciones recientes en la educación media: escuelas y
 39 profesores en una geografía fragmentada. In G. Tiramonti (Ed.) *La trama de la*
 40 *desigualdad educativa. Mutaciones recientes en la escuela media* (pp. 147-192).
 41 Buenos Aires: Manantial.
- 42 Puiggrós, A. (1990). *Sujetos, disciplina y currículo en los orígenes del sistema educativo*
 43 *argentino (1885-1916)*. Buenos Aires: Galerna.
- 44 Puiggrós, A. & Dussel, I. (1999). Fronteras educativas en el fin de siglo. Utopías y
 45 distopías en el imaginario pedagógico. In A. Puiggrós (Ed.) *En los límites de la*
 46 *educación. Niños y jóvenes del fin de siglo* (pp. 7-23). Rosario: Homo Sapiens.
- 47 Redondo, P. (2004). *Escuelas y pobreza. Entre el desasosiego y la obstinación*. Buenos
 48 Aires: Paidós.
- 49 Redondo, P. & Thisted, S. (1999). Las escuelas “en los márgenes”. Realidades y futuros.
 50 In In A. Puiggrós (Ed.) *En los límites de la educación. Niños y jóvenes del fin de*
 51 *siglo* (pp. 143-189). Rosario: Homo Sapiens.

- 1 Santillán, L. (2012). *Quiénes educan a los chicos: infancia, trayectorias educativas y*
2 *desigualdad*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
- 3 Serra, S. (2002). En el nombre del pobre. In E. Antelo et. al., *Lo que queda de la escuela*
4 (pp. 101-109). Rosario: Laborde Editor.
- 5 Serra, S. (2003). Infancias y adolescencias: la pregunta por la educación en los límites del
6 discurso pedagógico. In D. Arias, et. al., *Infancias y adolescencias. Teorías y*
7 *experiencias en el borde* (pp. 15-22). Buenos Aires: Novedades Educativas.
- 8 Serra, S. & Canciano, E. (2002). Formación docente y riesgo social: la pobreza en el/del
9 discurso pedagógico. *Ateneo Universitario "Derechos Humanos, Pobreza y*
10 *Exclusión"* [Paper presentation]. Universidad Nacional de Rosario, Rosario,
11 Argentina.
- 12 Southwell, M. (2006). La tensión desigualdad y escuela. Breve recorrido de sus avatares
13 en el Río de la Plata. In P. Martinis & P. Redondo (Eds.) *Igualdad y educación.*
14 *Escrituras entre (dos) orillas* (pp. 47-80). Buenos Aires: Del Estante Editorial.
- 15 Southwell, M. (2008). Hacer escuela con palabras: directores de escuela media frente a la
16 desigualdad. *Archivos de Ciencias de la Educación*, 2 (2), 25-46.
- 17 Southwell, M. (2009). Docencia, tradiciones y nuevos desafíos en el escenario
18 contemporáneo. In J. Yuni (Ed.) *La formación docente. Complejidad y ausencias*
19 (pp. 169-199). Córdoba: Encuentro Grupo Editor.
- 20 Southwell, M. (2012). Presentación. In M. Southwell (Ed.) *Entre generaciones.*
21 *Exploraciones sobre educación, cultura e instituciones* (pp. 7-12). Buenos Aires:
22 Homo Sapiens.
- 23 Suárez, D. (2008). La tradición crítica en educación y reconstrucción de la pedagogía. In
24 R. Elisalde & M. Ampudia M. (Eds.) *Movimientos sociales y educación: teoría e*
25 *historia de la educación popular en Argentina y América Latina* (pp. 193-214).
26 Buenos Aires: Buenos Libros.
- 27 Tenti Fanfani, E. (2005). *La condición docente. Análisis comparado de la Argentina,*
28 *Brasil, Perú y Uruguay*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- 29 Tenti Fanfani, E. (Ed.) (2006). *El oficio de docente. Vocación, trabajo y profesión en el*
30 *siglo XXI*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- 31 Tenti Fanfani, E. (Ed) (2007). *Nuevos temas en la agenda de política educativa*. Buenos
32 Aires: Siglo XXI.
- 33 Tiramonti, G. (Ed.) (2004). *La trama de la desigualdad educativa. Mutaciones recientes*
34 *en la escuela media*. Buenos Aires: Manantial.
- 35 Tiramonti, G. (2007). Subjetividades, pertenencias e intereses en el juego de la elección
36 escolar. In M. Narodowski & M. Gómez Schettini (Eds.) *Escuelas y Familias.*
37 *Problemas de diversidad cultural y justicia social* (pp. 23-37). Buenos Aires:
38 Prometeo.
- 39 Veleda, C., Rivas, A. & Mezzadra, F. (2011) *La construcción de la justicia educativa.*
40 *Criterios de redistribución y reconocimiento para la educación argentina*. Buenos
41 Aires: CIPPEC.
- 42