Components For An Educational Research. A Proposal

Armando Ulises Cerón Martínez, PhD In Pedagogy
Luis Arturo Guerrero Azpeitia, Postgraduate student
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, México

Abstract

Scientific language differs from the language of common sense because it's more precise about the phenomena to explain. A word or a term may have a different use or meaning in scientific language. In the case of educational research proper, accurate and explicit terms that support use is assumed. A first analysis of the detection of the use of theoretical concepts *field, habitus,* and *capital* proposed by the late French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, in the papers presented under the Tenth National Congress of Educational Research (X CNIE) of the Mexican Council communicates here educational research (COMIE) held in Veracruz, Veracruz in 2009. In the first part is exposed the place that theoretical concepts have in educational research in general and in the second one an analysis of the papers discussed it is to arrive at a conclusion. This work is part of an investigation into the production processes of dispositions to educational research at Masters level postgraduate and research seminars notes in them.

Keywords: Skills training, Educational research, Documentary analysis, Pierre Bourdieu

Introduction

A National Conference on Educational Research (CNIE, in spanish) invites those who produce or engage in some way educational research, and this presupposes a minimal use of inputs needed for research in this case, the theoretical concepts. If we understand an event like this as a force field in the sense proposed by Pierre Bourdieu, this would imply that some social actors are attracted to a greater or lesser extent, while others are expelled and others may be indifferent to it. This presupposes also that whoever is attracted by the forces of the field enters a fight with the other players involved when documents are requested papers in this case, need to be evaluated by reviewers committee. Thus, the papers accepted for CNIE have passed the filter two reviewers and have eliminated those who have not seemed to

conform to the standards and criteria governing such events. The reader of those papers accepted, also attracted by the forces of the field of educational research, is also able to express their own skills for evaluating the work that reads, and can also be subject to evaluation. The intention of this work is purely educational and, more specifically, a contribution to a pedagogy of educational research that may help enable the eye of those who start in the office of educational research regarding the use of concepts such as field (in their various dimensions), habitus and capital (in its various species) in the presentations. As part of a broader research findings are reported first findings.

The place of the concepts and theories in scientific research

The relevant management of a theoretical culture competition would be expected to acquire education researchers. Part of it depends on the research education received from the dominant scientific culture. With Cassirer (1945) can remember that every culture has five structural components of universal nature: art, religion, symbolic language, myth and science. These are exclusive human activities. But in social practices the fact that humans do not include all in all of them and less with a recognition of the "experts". Thus science, which is one of the universal cultural structures, is an activity that humans beings exclusive practice.

Indeed, scientific practices are not in the public domain in the sense that anyone not fully committed to them in an expert manner, and not all are professional players on a football team just for practice on weekends, or arrive to become neither Rembrandt nor Da Vinci by making strokes on the napkin breakfast. With this in mind one should consider that there are varying degrees of relating to science: either as an expert, a specialist, an amateur or a spectator, among others. Each of these categories means a place in a specific social field. The commitment to the field between one and other position also differs in the benefits derived from it.

But how to understand what is science? *Grosso modo* remember that in their historicity there are at least two ways to detect: modern science and prior to it. The so-called modern science, which currently governs us, has its reconfiguration since the sixteenth century in Europe based on the contributions of Galileo Galilei and Johannes Kepler, and curdled with the mechanistic conceptions of Newton's universe (Mardones, 1991).

But science has not always had the same meaning. Weber (1967) mentions at least five ways or senses science has passed: a) as a way to real being, when the notion of "concept" is invented by Plato; b) a way to true nature, that is, he that knew science knew about nature and both were managed as synonymous; c) a way to true art, where the technique and method are part of scientific practice in the Renaissance; d) the way the true

God, believing that God had revealed himself in his works and the language in which he wrote all was the mathematical language, and who managed mathematics was able to understand and to "talk" to God; and e) the way to true happiness, when science comes as the promise to solve the ills of mankind in all areas of human life. And the same concerns rescuing Max Weber, and we can ask about the current sense as science. This response can be recovered in the conclusions of this work.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century modern science is based on three equally recognized paradigms or particular modes of practice and, at least from the German tradition: in its Positivist version, Hermeneutics or Critical. The first "discovers" the problems and seeks how to "resolve" them apprehending know the regularities operate in order to investigate and objectifies social agents by treating them as subjects of social machinery; hence their methods and techniques are more quantitative. The second rescues motives, hopes, reasons, perceptions and feelings of those whose lives these conditions and favors the more qualitative aspects of social research. The critical perspective seeks to outrange both perspectives of the world to understand, not exclusive of each other but complementary, as objectivist and subjectivist moments in social research respectively (Mardones, 1991).

If anything has characterized these science paradigms is its explicit rigor in how to develop research, but above all preconceptions against common sense that flood the consciousness of social subjects. Indeed, an explicit and proper use of language is something that sets you apart. In Social and Human Sciences thoroughness of language it is required. In the talks the everyday sense is permissible to think that a leave has fallen, science is more accurate saying that the leave has been attracted to earth.

With this in mind it is understandable consider that the use of language and scientific terminology does not occupy a minor place in scientific production, so this area requires special attention. But where do concepts and terms of science come from? They come from theories. The term theory comes from Greek, *θεωρία*, which refers to contemplate something carefully, the way as an observer of the stars do, or as a marine offshore stops to look at them for guidance in his journey (Gadamer, 2000). In practical terms, a theory is a way of seeing the world, to engage and operate on it. Therefore, any investigative act is theoretical and practical at the same time. But do so in the current educational research?

Components of a research topic

Bureaucratic categories distinguish between basic research and applied research, first seen as merely theoretical, the other more speculative and practical, ideal for laboratories in the natural sciences. But this

classification is only the objectification of the social division of intellectual labor where some theorize from the comfort of the desktop and others will get their hands dirty to field research to make practical things (application of surveys, polls, etc.).

The eminently discursive nature of social and human sciences tends to reinforce this bureaucratic distance. But this is an effect of the lack of consensus of what is an investigation in social and human sciences, and particularly in education. Indeed, if we take the idea of the "kitchen of the investigation" of Pierre Bourdieu (2005) it is rescued that often what is presented to the reader are the results, not necessarily the development. To enjoy a cake is not enough to have the necessary ingredients: it requires preparation. Having sugar, flour, eggs, butter, milk, etc., even so close together they are, if not ever prepared them all will not make a cake. Similarly, a research paper having an introduction, a theoretical framework, a "state of knowledge" a methodological section, etc., it does not ensure a full-blown investigation.

What ensures that a work intended to convey results is actually a scientific research in education? As well as color theory is a triad of colors (red, yellow and blue) that give place to other colors, or as music components are harmony, rhythm and melody, and as physical phenomena occur over time, matter and space, a social scientific research requires a theme, an empirical dimension and a theoretical dimension from which is "seen" such phenomena. Of these three components, the most difficult to incorporate properly is the theoretical for the long time it takes to be assimilated by the social agent.

Let’s say you want to investigate dropout (thematic dimension). What you need to do is find out the most appropriate way on the subject; is generally what some call the "state of knowledge". Despite making a documentary investigation (sometimes exhaustive) does not have a full-fledged educational research. It is required to limit the space and time phenomenon and choosing the subjects to be analyzed (empirical dimension). Even having these two components is not enough to pretend to have an educational research. With those components which we got, at best, it is a kind of journalistic investigation, but not a scientific. What gives a range of scientific research is the proper use of a theoretical and methodological culture application; from them educational problems can be constructed, strategy building and implementation of the instruments and the interpretation of the records that make the finding in scientific data.

The use of theoretical concepts in educational research. The case of papers X CNIE

An event like the X CNIE seems like a case where you can see the use of theoretical concepts in the papers because they are product of an educational research in progress or completed, and have passed the double filter of two expert reviewers in the subject to be exposed for publication in the form of electronic memory.

The proposed exercise is how to detect the use of theoretical concepts of *field, habitus* and *capital* of Pierre Bourdieu, as one example among other possible, and more particularly for being the sociologist most cited for 2001 according appointments Social Science Citation Index, which produces effects in the field of social research. It is obvious that it is not obliged review this author to support educational research, but what would be expected of one who does it is to have a sufficient conceptual management that allows support and direct their research optimally.

Findings

The operating-methodological strategy was analytically detect the papers published in the X CNIE COMIE and review in each where and how such notions were mentioned, although in isolation or together, as conceived by its author. Bourdieu (2005) emphasizes this in speaking of the relational unit concepts:

> So both concepts, habitus and field are relational in the sense that additional work fully *only in relation to one another*. A field is not just a dead structure, a set of "empty places", as proposed by the Althusserian Marxism but a game space that exists as such only insofar as they enter it players who believe in the rewards they offer and actively fight for them. Proper field theory, therefore, requires a theory of social partners [...] (p. 47).

If we add that a social position within a field consists of capitals (Ceron, 2012) which are administered by the sense of the game and the social partners attributed to the game and capital, the use of the three concepts is interlace.

What was found in the papers of X CNIE? Of the 850 papers distributed in 17 thematic areas, the concept that most found was *field*, with 565 mentions (66.47%) followed by *capital* with 74 mentions (8.7%) and to a lesser extent of *habitus* with 20 mentions (2.35%). However, during the analysis it was found that the notion of *field* is intermingled with other uses of which it was proposed to distinguish between which there is a *generic* and indistinct use (talking about workplace, school, political, scientific, etc.), with 391 jobs (46%) and a *methodological use* with 174 jobs (20.5%). The term is so open that it protrudes with respect to another.

The notion of *capital* appears not always linked to the theoretical system of origin. Indeed, there are three basic uses: *generic* or interchangeably (mostly as capital in its economistic dimension) in 12 cases (1.4%), as *human capital* in 17 times (2%), and 45 mentions (5.3%) in *its various species* (cultural, economic, social or symbolic), but in isolation, without reference to *field* or *habitus*.

There are 20 *isolated mentions* (2.35%) to the notion of *habitus*, which makes the least considered in the papers.

In 11 papers (1.3%) there is a use of *capital* and *field* in the Bourdian sense; *field* and *habitus* appear in 13 papers (1.5%), and *habitus*, and *capital* appear in 3 papers (35%) unrelated to the notion of *field*.

Only 13 papers (1.5%) in the three notions together as theoretical support system used for research were detected.

Conclusion

That an author of social sciences is the most cited does not mean that he is therefore the most understood in his theoretical dimension and in his analytical application. This can lead us to think that authors are understood less than what is assumed, even at events like the X CNIE.

A term such as "field" is so open that can lead to a generic use. This may be the effect of an error source in the theory itself, so it requested to recover its various theoretical senses (as a social space, game space, a market, place of forces, and a battlefield), and explicitly articulated whenever it’s used as well.

On the other hand, the notion of "capital" as used herein is detected, makes this concept of public domain almost as if everyone knew what was meant by the mere mention of the term. A pitfall is the fetishization of concepts by the concepts themselves.

Finally, the notion of "habitus" not being such generic a term, and is the least used and still detected in an isolated use, what weakens the analytical scope of the work thus employed.

This exercise is an invitation to rethink the proper use of theoretical concepts to not contribute to a common scientific sense so fashionable today by the social conditions of mass production of researchers.

References:

Bourdieu, P., y Wacquant, L. (2005). *Una invitación a la sociología reflexiva*. Buenos
Aires. Siglo XXI editores.
Cassirer, E. (1945). *Antropología filosófica*. México. Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Cerón, U. (2012) Habitus y capitales: ¿Disposiciones o dispositivos sociales? Notas teórico metodológicas para la investigación social. *Revista Latinoamericana de Metodología de la Investigación Social, 4*. Consultado el 12 de marzo de 2016.
http://relmis.com.ar/ojs/index.php/relmis/article/view/53
Gadamer, H. G. (2000). *Elogio de la teoría. Discursos y artículos*. Barcelona. Península.
Mardones, J. M. (1991). *Filosofía de las ciencias humanas y sociales. Materiales para una fundamentación científica*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
Weber, M. (1967). *El político y el científico*. Madrid. Alianza editorial.