RESEARCH ARTICLE

Curriculum Configurations: Formative Purposes and Learning Content

Configuraciones del currículo: propósitos formativos y contenidos de aprendizaje

Configuraciones curriculares: propósitos de treinamento e conteúdo de aprendizagem.

*Alexander Luis Ortiz Ocaña

* Doctor in Educational Sciences. Professor, Universidad del Magdalena, Santa Marta, Colombia. Professor of the Doctorate in Educational Sciences RUDECOLOMBIA-Universidad del Magdalena, Colombia. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5594-9422

OPEN ACCESS

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18634/sophiaj.18v.1i.1018

Article information

Received: April 2020
Revised: October 2020
Accepted: November 2021
Published: January - June 2022

Keywords: Education, training, pedagogy, curriculum, didactics, teaching, learning, evaluation.

Palabras clave: Educación, formación, pedagogía, currículo, didáctica, enseñanza, aprendizaje, evaluación.

Palavras-chave: Educação, formação, pedagogia, currículo, didática, ensino, aprendizagem, avaliação.

How to cite:
Ortiz, A (2022) Curriculum configurations: formative purposes and learning content. Sophia 18 (1)

Sophia-Education, volume 18 number 1. January/June 2022. English version.

Summary

The concept of pedagogy, the subject of education and pedagogy as a science, discipline, knowledge, or reflection, have been studied by multiple authors in all continents. The traditions of Germany, France, the United States and Latin America stand out in this approach. The conceptions of this science, which have been configured throughout the history of education, differ in the various regions and countries. That is why a thorough, detailed, and profound analysis of the epistemic configuration of this notion requires considering not only its epistemic dimension but also its geographical dimension. This article reflects on the configurations of the curriculum: the formative purposes and the learning contents. It is assumed that formative purposes should guide learning actions and that curricular contents are not beautiful or ugly, easy, or difficult.

ISSN (electronic): 2346-0806 ISSN (Print): 1794-8932

Conflict of interest:

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Author correspondence:

alexanderortiz5000@gmail.com

RESUMEN

El concepto de pedagogía, el tema educativo y la pedagogía como ciencia, disciplina, saber o reflexión, han sido estudiados por múltiples autores en todos los continentes. Destacan en este abordaje las tradiciones de Alemania, Francia, Estados Unidos y Latinoamérica. Las concepciones sobre esta ciencia, que se han venido configurando a lo largo de la historia de la educación difieren en las diversas regiones y países. Es por ello que un análisis minucioso, detallado y profundo de la configuración epistémica de esta noción requiere tener en cuenta no solo la propia dimensión epistémica de la misma sino además su dimensión geográfica. En este artículo se reflexiona sobre las configuraciones del currículo: los propósitos formativos y los contenidos de aprendizaje.Se asume que los propósitos formativos deben guiar las acciones para aprender y quelos contenidos curriculares no son bonitos o feos, fáciles o difíciles.

RESUMO

O conceito de pedagogia, tema pedagógico e pedagogia como ciência, disciplina, conhecimento ou reflexão, tem sido estudado por múltiplos autores em todos os continentes. As tradições da Alemanha, França, Estados Unidos e América Latina se destacam nessa abordagem. As concepções de pedagogia que forammoldadas ao longo da história da educação diferem nas diversas regiões e países.É por isso que uma análise minuciosa, detalhada e aprofundada da configuração epistêmica da noção de pedagogia requer levar em conta não apenas a dimensão epistêmica dela, mas também sua dimensão geográfica. Este artigo reflete sobre os configuraciones do currículo: propósitos de formação e conteúdo de aprendizagem. Presume-se que os propósitos de treinamento devem orientar asações de aprendizagem e que o conteúdo de aprendizagem não é bonito ou feio,fácil ou difícil..

Introduction

This article groups the quotes from the authors according to the contributions they make to curriculum theory, reflecting on the episteme that has been configured throughout the history of education on the triad pedagogy-curriculum-didactics, and its consequences for education.

Coll (1994) proposes four questions that should guide curriculum design: What to teach? When to teach? How to teach? How to teach? and What, how and when to evaluate? The first question refers to school objectives and content, and the others are related to pedagogical and evaluative strategies. This author argues that a properly designed curriculum should provide information on the answers to these questions.

De Zubiría (1994) then developed and argued the assumption that these same questions could be useful to delimit a pedagogical model of educational organization, and that the level of generality of the answers to them could place us in an educational theory, a pedagogical model or a school curriculum.

According to Coll (1994), the configurations of the curriculum and the elements it contemplates to successfully fulfill the above functions can be grouped into four chapters:

1. It provides information on what to teach. This chapter includes two sections: contents and objectives.
2. Provides information on when to teach.
3. Provides information on how to teach
4. Provides information on what, how and when to evaluate.

On the other hand, the Curriculum Theory tries to answer ten essential questions that denote the actions to be developed by teachers and students: Who teaches, Who do they teach, What do they teach for, What do they teach, How do they teach, Who learns, Who do they learn with, What do they learn for?
What does he learn, how does he learn (Addine, 2004). Likewise, Flórez (2005) explains five basic questions that pedagogues have formulated throughout the history of education, from Comenius (2012) to the present day, and that define the eligibility criteria of any pedagogical theory in a coherent and harmonious manner: "in what sense or towards where is an individual humanized, how is this humanization process developed, with what experiences, with what techniques and methods, and with what methods?
How is teacher-student interaction regulated?" (p. 114). From the answer to these questions are derived the criteria of pedagogical eligibility that allow distinguishing a pedagogical theory from another that is not: to define the basic goals of formation in correspondence with the type of human being to be formed; to characterize the formation process, the ways, the path to follow, its dynamics and sequence; to describe the essential educational experiences to stimulate and enhance human development; to identify the regulations that allow qualifying the interactions between teacher and students; to determine the methods, techniques and procedures to be designed and used in the educational practice.

The application of curricular configurations in the classroom gives us away. We can identify the curricular approach that predominates in our educational praxis just by analyzing the terms we use to formulate our educational intentions, the characteristics of the contents we deal with, the way we organize teaching and the classroom, the texts we use in class, the students' notebooks, the notes we make on the board. The curricular theory that underlies the class is revealed not only in the method used but also in our intentions, in the contents, in the resources used and in the evaluation. These configurations are the unmistakable imprint of our pedagogical conception (De Zubiría, 2011). Each pedagogical theory and each pedagogical model defines its own didactic conception differently.

If we generalize these heuristic proposals, we could say with Coll (1994), De Zubiría (1994), Addine (2004) and Flórez (2005), that the curriculum of the educational organization must deploy the configurations of the formative process, and in doing so answer the following questions aimed at operationalizing in pedagogical practice the epistemic principles of training, teaching, learning, evaluation, and the role of the teacher and the student: Why teach and why learn? (problems); Why teach and why learn (formative intentions); what to teach and what to learn (curricular contents); How to teach and how to learn

ISSN (electronic): 2346-0806 ISSN (Print): 1794-8932

(Methods or methodological strategies); With what to teach and what to learn (didactic resources); What and how did the students learn (evaluation).

In this article we share ideas about the formative intentions and characteristics of curricular contents. These are curricular configurations on which teachers must reflect today. The following is an epistemic overview of each of these curricular configurations, with a double illustrative intention: as a pedagogical, curricular and didactic debate, and to serve as a conceptual and methodological reference to the work that each teacher must develop in his or her daily life.

The formative purposes should guide the learning actions.

Nowadays, there is a proliferation of books, recipes and manuals on how to study efficiently, obtain excellent academic results and be a good student. These books describe various study strategies and techniques, but almost never refer to the student's motivation, which is essential in the learning process, nor to his or her objectives and intentions in this regard. In order for the student to learn in an authentic and developmental way, it is not enough to teach him/her fast-reading techniques and study methods. This is important, it is necessary for the student to develop study, calculation, writing and reading skills, but more important than these skills is to recognize that learning involves a lot of effort, and to have intentions to learn in depth, otherwise, all the study skills developed will be of little use.

De Zubiría (2011), based on Delval and Peñaloza, points out that the question of what for allows us to define the purposes and goals of education. However, in the process of micro-curricular design, the teacher does not always determine and formulate the objectives in the first instance; many times these are implicit and become concrete at the end of the process, although we know that the purposes and intentions should guide the teaching and learning actions, hence it is important to make the objectives explicit, in order to know what is intended to be achieved.

In his book Basic Principles of the Curriculum, Ralph Tyler describes two proposals for the formulation of academic objectives, both of which are based on learning theories. Tyler (1986) refers to the two volumes on the psychology of mathematics published by Thorndike, a volume on the psychology of algebra and another book on the psychology of arithmetic. In these books published more than 70 years ago, Professor Thorndike formulates thousands of specific objectives because his theory of learning states that the student must establish connections between specific stimuli and specific responses. In this way, a behaviorist conception of learning is applied, considering it as a very specific matter, similar to the specific formation of habits: the stimulus-response relationship.

Tyler (1986) also refers to the proposal of Judd and Freeman, who formulated a theory totally different from Thorndike's, at the same time, but at the University of Chicago. This theory conceives teaching as a generalization of solutions to problems, based on developing generalized models of approaching situations. This generalized theory of learning implies the formulation of general objectives.

Teachers often use Benjamin Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. This is a classification that summarizes in a quick, specific and synthetic way the verbs that should be used in the formulation of objectives, as well as the aspects that can be evaluated in objective tests, such as criteria, concrete facts, methodology, conventional rules, sequences, trends and terms. However, this typology of objectives is framed within a behaviorist approach to education.

Formative intentions are the guiding component of the pedagogical process. As can be seen, sometimes we speak of goals or purposes, other times we refer to achievements or aspirations, sometimes we speak of expected results. Álvarez de Zayas (1992), following Tyler, refers to objectives, which constitute "[...] the pedagogical model of the social task; they are the purposes and aspirations that during the process [...] take shape in the student's way of thinking, feeling and acting [...]" (p. 58).

Alvarez and Gonzalez (2003) define the objective as the pedagogical expression of the social task; it is the aspiration, the purpose to be formed in the students. With this definition, it is stated that the objectives constitute the component that best reflects the social character of the pedagogical process and institute the image of the human being that is intended to be formed in correspondence with the social demands that the school is responsible for fulfilling (Calzado, 2004).

On the other hand, Bruner (2012) emphasizes that from the point of view of competence as an objective of education, it is necessary that the school curriculum (whether macro or micro) formulate the objectives, an argumentation of the skills that the student should configure, as well as the activities that will allow to evaluate them.

As can be seen, it has been a frequent practice to formulate instructional objectives in order to carry out a teaching process in which teachers have a clear idea at the beginning of each topic of the learning that students should achieve at the end of that unit or subject, since "without goals that serve as focal points, instruction may be disorganized, ineffective and confusing" (Bisquerra, 1998, p. 340). However, by its very designation as a goal, it seems as if the student is being excluded from its formulation and that the school is solely responsible for determining them. Moreover, the objectives may concentrate only on the cognitive and intellectual dimension of the human being, ignoring and relegating to the background the value, axiological and attitudinal aspects. If the objective is instructive, it would have serious limitations to achieve an adequate formation of the students. For this reason, I think it is better to speak of training purposes or training intentions, but intentions that take into account the holistic character of the students' personality and also provide the possibility for them to participate in their formulation, and not only the teacher who defines what he/she wants to form in the student.

Wallon (1984, 1987) affirms that the child should be studied and educated based on the main dimensions of his or her psychological development and evolution. From this point of view, educational intentions should take into account not only the cognitive dimension, but also the affective and motor dimensions. "The first dimension would be linked to concepts, conceptual networks and cognitive competences; the second to affection, sociability and feelings; and the last to praxis and action" (De Zubiría, 2011, p. 45). Human beings think, feel and act; they configure knowledge, being and doing; they develop cognitive, attitudinal and procedural processes; that is, in their daily biopraxis their cognitive-intellectual, affective-emotional and praxeological-instrumental configurations emerge. Hence, formative intentions must take into account these three human configurations. In this sense, De Zubiría (2011) characterizes three types of human competencies: cognitive, praxical and socio-affective. Correspondingly, formative intentions can be of three types: cognitive, procedural and evaluative (knowing, doing and judging).

Coral (2004) proposes several purposes that students must achieve in order to be able to perform in the 21st century. These purposes are derived from the Conceptual Pedagogy model, and are related to learning to work in teams, acquiring a democratic sense, configuring thinking skills, developing creativity and comprehensive reading, having a capacity for abstraction and a prospective sense, being flexible, ethical and autonomous. I think that all people have talents to develop, but the school must discover them, that should be the main function of education: to contribute to the development of natural human aptitudes. The main task of education, which has its genesis in the ideas of the Enlightenment, is, in the words of Kant (2004), "to form each one's capacity for judgment and reflection so that everyone has his own head, his own ideas" (p. 97). In other words, the purpose of education in the 21st century should be none other than to form a critical spirit in students, a reflective capacity to think for themselves, a creative and configurational thinking.

Bain (2007), on pages 99 and 100 of his book What the Best College Professors Do, notes that Arnold Arons, a physicist at the University of Washington, identified some general patterns about the reasoning ability of his students and made reasoning inventories that he then systematized in the configuration of ten reasoning skills and critical thinking habits.

The development of configurational thinking must become a formative intentionality. Reasonableness is more important than rationality, freedom is more important than causality, and in this same line of thought, Hoyos (2013) argued that ideas and culture are more important than research.

One of the main educational intentions in this third millennium is related to the stimulation and empowerment of the capacity to contextualize knowledge and learn knowledge from a holistic perspective. Education must contribute to the self-formation of the subject, who learns to become a citizen, a solidary, respectful and responsible person, firm and solid in his national identity, who learns to live together and assumes the human condition.

Traveset (2013) proposes some of the formative purposes that, along the lines argued here, could be included in the curriculum:

ISSN (electronic): 2346-0806 ISSN (Print): 1794-8932

- To decode the changes that occur in human relationships as a result of social and migratory movements, the different family typologies, the culture of separations and divorces, adoptions, etc.
- To provide tools and strategies to resolve conflicts with alternatives other than aggression.
- Educate for death. To provide cognitive and emotional skills to cope with grief and loss.
- Educate for life, so that they can find their place in the world in which they live, make life projects.
- Educating to tolerate uncertainty.
- To favor the configuration of a good self-concept and clarification of their identity, based on their talents and potential.
- Encourage the sense of belonging and the link to the family system, school, neighborhood, country, planet, universe, etc.
- To promote the acceptance of a model of coexistence that favors respect for one's own roots and respect for those of others.
- To be able to find appropriate goals.
- To be able to establish effective bonds with others.
- Be able to represent and symbolize their learning in different languages (verbal, musical, corporal, plastic).
- Being able to withstand effort and recover from failures.
- To be able to appreciate the good things, be grateful for what they have and enjoy it.
- To transmit significant knowledge, linked to life, and which is the heritage of humanity.

The educational intentions, from the humanistic approach, have been specified by Hamachek (1987): to help students recognize themselves as unique and unrepeatable human beings, and to foster the development of individuality, identity, potential and capabilities of students. Likewise, Roberts (1978) has described five objectives promoted by humanistic education: to stimulate positive feelings in students towards the content of the subjects; to favor students' personal growth; to promote students' imagination, creativity and originality; to provoke learning of the content by integrating experiential and cognitive aspects; to arouse experiences of reciprocal communicative exchange among students.

On the other hand, Bruner (2012) means that in the case of early childhood there is not enough research on what happens to the child at this age stage and its possible effects on competence, he urges us to continue with the debate on what intellectual competence really is and to what extent it includes the mind, the heart or the community in general, and warns that we cannot limit this issue to education. In any case, the most important thing in this sense, from the point of view of curriculum design, is not to limit our actions to the formulation of objectives, but to integrate competencies in the statement of educational intentions, and to do so not only from an intellectual and cognitive point of view, since there are other processes that are not strictly cognitive and yet influence the personality, such as hope in the future, confidence and the ability to control the environment. These and other affective and axiological processes must be taken into account not only in the formulation of formative intentions but also in the identification of the characteristics of the curricular contents.

Learning content is not pretty or ugly, easy or difficult.

To fulfill the formative intentions, the student needs to develop his or her thinking and this is achieved through the mastery of a branch of knowledge, which is called the content of learning, of teaching, of the educational teaching process, or curricular content, which is selected from the sciences, the arts, technology, techniques, that is, from the existing branches of knowledge, in short, "the content is extracted from the culture that humanity has produced in the course of its history" (Álvarez and González, 2003, p. 49), it is what is going to be taught and learned, it is what needs to be configured in the course of the learning process. 49), it is what is going to be taught and learned, it is what needs to be

configured by students in order to achieve his or her formative intentionality and solve the problem, "what the student needs to master in order to lead a dignified and happy life" (p. 49).

Alvarez de Zayas (1997) defines culture as "[...] the set of material and spiritual values created by humanity in the process of social-historical practice and characterizes the level reached by society" (p. 34). Addine (1998) also considers content as "[...] that part of culture and social experience that must be acquired by students and is dependent on the proposed objectives" (p. 22). For his part, Coll (1992) states that contents "designate the set of knowledge or cultural forms whose assimilation and appropriation by students is considered essential for their development and socialization" (p. 13).

González, Recarey and Addine (2004) point out that the content responds to the question "what to teach and what to learn", emphasizing that "what is taught is the result of culture, which, taking into account the political-social dimension, is selected for the student to appropriate it" (p. 70), evidencing features of traditional pedagogy in which it is the school and the teacher who determines what the student must learn and what must be taught. Nevertheless, I think that the teacher can make a synthetic and concrete proposal that expresses the conceptual invariants that the student must assimilate, since it is practically impossible to transmit to the students all the culture that humanity has accumulated throughout its historical development. It is therefore necessary to ask the question of what to teach and what to learn, so ignored by the pedagogical models that have proliferated in the history of education. It is necessary to prioritize, select and decide what content should be introduced into the curriculum, but who should make this selection and under what criteria? Content expires extraordinarily quickly. Knowledge is becoming increasingly obsolete and aging too quickly. On the other hand, teachers teach fragmented disciplines and subjects, without epistemic integration between them, but knowledge is only one, and teachers must be trained on the unity of science. What to do then?

González, Recarey and Addine (2004) assume four basic criteria that constitute systems for establishing the contents to be taught and learned: knowledge, skills and habits, experiences of creative activity and relationships with the world.

The knowledge system refers to "information related to nature, society, man, art, sports, science, technology, ways of acting [...] Such is the case of concepts, regularities and laws, theories, [...]" (González, Recarey and Addine, 2004, p. 70). The system of skills and habits is developed in an integrated way to the system of knowledge and vice versa, there is no learning of concepts separated from the development of skills and habits. "The system of relations with the world includes the systems of values, interests, convictions, feelings and attitudes; to be achieved in close interrelation with the other contents and other configurations of the teaching content" (González, Recarey and Addine, 2004, p. 71). It represents the attitudinal content, the axiological configuration of the human being, his affections, emotions, ideals and human convictions. These authors define the system of experiences of creative activity as that content related to problem solving, critical, reflective, divergent and creative thinking, cognitive independence, creativity, originality and imagination. Ultimately, these processes can be considered inherent to the axiological or affective-emotional configuration of the human being.

The configuration of these content systems guarantees compliance with the four basic pillars proposed by UNESCO to face the challenges of education in the 21st century. In this sense, González, Recarey and Addine (2004) establish the harmonious and coherent relationships that can be generated between these pillars and the systems they propose. Learning to know: System of knowledge and System of experiences of the creative activity. Learning to do: System of skills and habits, and System of experiences of creative activity. Learning to live together: System of skills and habits, and System of relationships with the world. Learning to be: System of experiences of creative activity and System of relationships with the world.

In a general sense, these authors propose the characteristics that the contents must have so that they "respond to a developmental teaching-learning process, promoter or agent of educational change: globalizing, articulated, organizing, functional and applicable" (González, Recarey and Addine, 2004, p. 72).

On the other hand, Perkins (2003) suggests that in the smart school model the most important thing is not the method and pedagogical strategies but the content. He states that educational reforms should focus more on shaping a global and holistic conception of what we want to teach and relegate the method to a second plane, although he recognizes the value of didactic theories, but he further

ISSN (electronic): 2346-0806 ISSN (Print): 1794-8932

enhances curricular content. This author considers it a mistake that teachers sometimes place too much emphasis on the application of new teaching methods and neglect the content, which is why for him the most important thing is not how to teach but to decide what we want to teach.

Based on the above, Perkins (2003) criticizes that most of the topics taught from a traditional pedagogy do not generate the cognitive and mental development of students. He states that some topics are more relevant than others to generate mental processes that allow the understanding of the content, and therefore the teacher should identify those topics that generate understanding, selecting those concrete, real contents, derived from the student's environment and context, which are related to their interests and needs and may have some sense and meaning for them, in order to contribute to the solution of their problems.

Perkins (2003) points out three conditions that a topic must meet to be truly generative: centrality refers to the fact that the topic must occupy a central place in the curriculum, accessibility is achieved if the topic generates comprehension activities in both the teacher and the students, and finally richness is related to the promotion of "a rich set of extrapolations and connections" (p. 97). The contents must be contextualized, the abstract contents must be related to the concrete contents because, even if they are very important, without them they would be too limited.

The representative sensations with which we human beings perceive external objects need a long time to be formed from birth, these are eminently affective and are configured little by little, from the interaction that the child establishes with adults, in which he only perceives pain and pleasure. The small baby cannot grasp or walk, but slowly achieves this through an affective relationship with everything that surrounds it. This is one of the reasons why content cannot be limited or reduced to conceptual, cognitive and intellectual elements. The child not only learns concepts and notions through cognitive instruments, but also learns through affections. Without affectivity there is no learning. But he not only learns through affections, he also learns affections, not only concepts and skills. Therefore, more important than teaching him a content is to stimulate him to be sympathetic and enthusiastic about it.

Information is important in the learning process, but more important than information and data is the ability to organize this information, interpret it and give it meaning and significance. The new generations of young people need to develop their abilities to search for, select and interpret information (Pozo et. al., 1999), and this is so because knowledge expires very quickly, ages with extraordinary speed, and schools today are not in a position to offer students all the knowledge that science and humanity have accumulated throughout their evolution and development; no curriculum can provide all the relevant information because in liquid modernity information flows faster, is more dynamic, less stable, more flexible and more mobile than the educational institution itself.

Educational contents must be constantly modified, not only because science advances and develops, and truths deny each other, but also because the dynamics of the socio-cultural context also demand modifications. In this third millennium, the contents of the various subjects must be revitalized, which implies bringing them to life, not only from books, but also from the environment closest to the student. It is necessary to involve life inside the classroom, in this way both the content and the teaching method are subordinated to the socio-cultural context. The contents will be more reduced, but the didactic work will be more meaningful (Díaz-Barriga, 2012).

The human mind is dynamic and configurative, it does not work with hermetic sectors, rather it is a network of networks, a complex configuration formed by other networks and configurations. That is why the content of the various subjects cannot be presented to the student in a fragmented and isolated way so that he makes the effort to integrate it. We must present it to him in an integrated manner, as he perceives it in the world around him. It is important to establish relationships, interconnections, and links between the various contents of an area and between the various areas of knowledge, and thus the student will learn in a more meaningful and configurational way.

Curricular contents are not an end in themselves, they are a means to achieve a formative end. The contents are tools for training, they are instruments that allow the school's educational function to be fulfilled, they are a pretext for thinking, reflecting and contributing to the training of students. They must have a global and integrating conception, their character is holistic, and they are not exclusive to any particular teacher, even if they are distributed in subjects, they are the responsibility of all teachers. The contents must be assumed by all teachers, who must know their meaning and significance in order to integrate them and give them the necessary coherence and harmony.

We must warn against the danger of compartmentalizing and fragmenting curricular content, because this is a way of isolating not only knowledge but also teachers, which is harmful to democracy.

On the other hand, in Finland, the country that has had the best educational system in the world since 2000, is already thinking of eliminating subjects and teaching specific and integrative topics. Likewise, the Jesuit schools in Catalonia have begun to implement a new curricular model in which timetables, exams and subjects are eliminated, and teaching is now done through projects in which children shape their knowledge by solving problems in groups. In addition, Wellington College in England, since 2006, has introduced into its curriculum a one-hour-a-week subject called "happiness classes", through which children are taught how to live, by means of debates on emotions. Evidently, the most important thing in the educational process is not the contents but the way in which they live together in the learning environment, if what we want for our children is that "they grow up as citizens, as ethical, responsible beings, who have a dignified, aesthetic, pleasant, creative - in the sense that they have imagination - presence for well-being, then emotions play a fundamental role" (Dávila and Maturana, 2009, p. 139), and the main emotion that defines human action is love.

The primary reason for an educational institution is to educate for respect, for solidarity, for peace, for coexistence and for happiness, and this is not achieved only with the contents of the various areas or by configuring a lavish and dazzling discourse, full of well-intentioned slogans; this must be done, but the most important thing is to configure a cheerful, pleasant and welcoming school. Peace, harmony and happiness are not achieved only by filling all school spaces with paper doves or with songs of love for our fellow men; this must be done, but the most important thing is to love ourselves in our daily biopraxis.

Many important contents for human life are taught at school, but some contents that are not so necessary for living are also taught, and important aspects such as the study of the human essence and nature itself are overlooked. The five great humanizing forces defined by Bruner (2012) should become invariant contents: the manufacture of tools, language, social organization, the management of man's long childhood and the need to explain.

In our opinion, from an early age children should learn four contents that are very important for their formation and holistic configuration. They should learn at least one art, a foreign language, a sport and a trade. Aristotle's ideas on education led him to consider the value of music, art and literature in the formation of the citizen-ruler. On this point he again differed radically from Plato. For Aristotle, the arts have no practical utility and are therefore suitable for the ruling class, which does not engage in productive activities. The arts and humanities have great utility, in that they serve to "form a world worth living in, with people capable of seeing other human beings as entities in themselves, worthy of respect and empathy, who have their own thoughts and feelings" (Nussbaum, 2013, p. 189).

The human way of learning is very original. The human brain has the capacity to shape human life itself. What we traditionally call educational or curricular content is not reduced to the concepts and notions learned throughout our studies, it also includes affections, emotions, skills, abilities, attitudes, values, feelings. Content is the input that guarantees the functioning of the mind and the human brain. The dynamics of the neuronal and mental processes of the human being depends on the educational content, it is not the same to learn one or another content and teachers must take into account this consideration in the curriculum design. The life of a human being and his or her daily behavior depend to a great extent on what that person has learned. We human beings care about the food we eat and the clothes we wear, but very seldom do we care about the content we absorb, very seldom do we care about the books we read. This is not a trivial consideration: we are what we read. The content of the various subjects our students study will shape their lives.

Educational contents must be used as formative instruments for the configuration of the student's subjectivity, for the configuration of his personality and all his psychic functions, hence they are not only cognitive instruments but also affective, axiological and operative instruments. That is to say, there is not only one educational content, they must be structured according to the human dimensions, that is why there are contents related to the cognitive-intellectual configuration, contents related to the affective-emotional dimension and contents related to the praxeological dimension. Thus, there are

ISSN (electronic): 2346-0806 ISSN (Print): 1794-8932

conceptual contents (knowledge), attitudinal contents (values and attitudes) and procedural contents (skills and abilities). In fact, Coll (1992) proposes three types of content: cognitive, procedural and evaluative.

Conceptual content (knowledge, notions, concepts, theoretical information)

The theory of the intelligent school (Perkins, 2003) reminds us of the proposal for knowledge reform outlined by Morin (2011), based on the criticism of the characteristics of the knowledge we learn, since we live in a world that favors reductive and disjunctive thinking. Reductive thinking is that which reduces the complex to simple, instead of taking into account the configurations and networks of conceptual and praxeological relationships that entangle our world. Disjunctive thinking separates everything, fragments, divides. The fragmentation of scientific knowledge is so great that isolation causes insurmountable difficulties if we try to group global, essential and invariant knowledge, "then emerges the paradox of a knowledge that causes more blindness than lucidity" (p. 81).

This fragmented knowledge generates global cognitive backwardness. Due to the depth and breadth of conceptual fragmentation, the student is not able to integrate knowledge into a holistic and configurative system that allows him to establish the immanent relationships between the different types of knowledge. On the contrary, he appropriates fractioned and fragmented knowledge that does not allow him to relate to the world and that hinders his development and intelligence, causing more misdirection than mental enlightenment.

The reform of education proposed by Morín (2011) implies introducing the study of the vital, fundamental and global problems that are hidden in disciplinary fragmentation. This author proposes the study of four essential contents: human understanding, knowledge of the human, confrontation with uncertainty and the planetary era. In this way, pertinent knowledge is introduced into the curriculum, situated in its context and in the conceptual configuration to which it is related.

Knowledge is not an input or raw material that we introduce into our mind or brain, it is the result of the transforming action of reality, either materially or mentally. For Piaget (1945, 1954), knowledge is not a faithful copy of external reality, nor the product of a deployment of the capacities that the subject already possesses, but the result of the interaction between the initial endowment with which we human beings are born and our transforming activity of the environment. Knowledge is generated from a need. It is an adaptive process. "Faced with the new situation, knowledge must advance. Previous knowledge is not enough. There must be a process of creation, not repetition" (Carreras, 2003, p. 13).

Knowledge should not be reified, because they are not objects that are accumulated to be kept in the head, they are not things that we throw in a container, they are conceptual configurations of sense and meaning through which the student configures the world around him, his world, and in this sense "memory is not the compilation of files but the integration of information in a possible future towards which we project ourselves" (Meirieu, 2009, p. 77).

Procedural contents (skills, abilities, actions and operations)

Skills "represent the conscious and successful mastery of the activity, closely related to habits that also guarantee the mastery of the action, but in a more automatic way" (González, Recarey and Addine, 2004, p. 71). The student must not only configure knowledge but must also know how to apply the concepts learned to his daily biopraxis, he must know how to do and operate with the notions learned. Knowing how to do is integrated with knowing and vice versa. When one knows how to do something, it is because he knows it, and if he does not know how to do it, it is because he does not know it, and thinks he knows it. Sometimes the student expresses that he knows something but does not know how to do it. In reality he does not know it either, because if he knew it he would know how to do it. All knowing implies knowing how to do, and all knowing how to do implies knowing. In this sense, skills must be developed in close relation to knowledge; the dialectical unity between the two favors the intellectual and moral configuration of students. "Knowledge always exists closely linked to some or other actions (skills). The same knowledge can function in a great number of diverse actions" (Talízina, 1987, p. 14).

Attitudinal content (values, attitudes, affections, emotions and feelings)

Values are not formed only through a subject on ethics or through moral classes; they are an axiological configuration that is formed from the student's reflection on his or her condition as an individual, member of a society and of a species (Morín, 2001), and this triadic configuration determines the integral development of the human being.

Marina (2000) states that "knowledge is important, but it is feelings that make us happy or unhappy" (p. 26). Based on this conception, De Zubiría (2008) privileges feelings over academic knowledge, arguing that this is recommended by hundreds of scientific studies on what makes human beings happy or unhappy. "Happiness contributes to relationships with others and with oneself, and happiness surpasses knowledge because the latter is a means to the true purpose of human existence: to achieve one's own happiness and that of others" (p. 29). I think that any attempt to exclude some human quality and give greater importance to one over another, is failed by its own deterministic and reductionist conception. Happiness is generated from the holistic configuration of the various human processes, happiness is achieved from the balance, harmony, and coherence in human life. Knowledge is as important as happiness itself, because even knowledge is a powerful potential for human happiness. Marina (2000) is not referring to happiness but to feelings. In my opinion, happiness is generated from the configuration of knowledge, skills and feelings.

In one of his works, Morin (2007) refers us to a cognitive imperative formulated more than three centuries ago by Blaise Pascal, which justifies the need to integrate the various subjects within a subject and to integrate various subjects: "All things being caused and causing, aided and aiding, mediate and immediate, and all being maintained by a natural and insensible bond which links the most remote and the most different, I consider it impossible to know the parts without knowing the whole, as much as to know the whole without knowing the parts" (p. 51). Simmel (2008) had already formulated the same criticism when he pointed out that schools do not guide the way of life, they place students in front of a collection of their posts and force them to learn by heart their signposts. Traditionally in school learning we do not experience the holistic unity of life, we are configured from isolated elements, without meaning, we do not see the relationships and interconnections between the various concepts, notions and problems, much less between these and the values and skills. The holos has vanished from the training processes, only the parts dance out of rhythm, a music disjointed from the environment and the context of the students.

This metadisciplinary view is important in the definition of curricular contents and demonstrates the need to integrate knowledge, values and skills in the micro-curricular design and in each of the classes we develop. "The supremacy of a fragmented knowledge according to disciplines often prevents operating the link between parts and totalities and must give way to a mode of knowledge capable of apprehending objects in their contexts, their complexities, their wholes" (Morín, 2001, p. 16). The fragmentation of contents causes fissures in the rest of the configurations of the pedagogical process; however, even though the contents are not structured in an interdisciplinary way, a praiseworthy solution could be their integration from the didactic point of view, that is to say, from the methodological strategies.

Sergiovanni (1994) states that schools should not be considered only as educational organizations but as communities, because changing the metaphor of the school as an educational organization and conceiving it as a community also changes the way of thinking about the school, changes the conception of how schools should be organized and how the educational process should be carried out. And it changes the perception of the school because an educational community is not an uncritical mass of teachers and students who meet by chance, it is not a mechanical and algebraic sum of educational subjects who act in an isolated and random way, an educational community is not made up of people who meet by chance or by isolated interests, it is a human configuration, integrated by teleologically oriented human beings. In other words, we need teachers "who collectively analyze their progress and norms and theorize about them in order to establish a solid foundation for curriculum and school development in their context" (Simons, 1995, p. 222).

According to Santos (2012), the semantic framework that characterizes the educational organization as a critical learning community is made up of three essential concepts: community, criticism and learning. These categories characterize the school. It is a community insofar as the subjects of education, educational actors, exchange affections, emotions and intellect, their actions are not isolated but teleological, they are oriented towards a common goal, even if they do not explicitly declare it, they share norms declared in a relative manner in school regulations and their daily relationships have a stability that guarantees the denomination of community. The school can be considered a critical community insofar as it has the "reflective and discriminating capacity of knowledge and reality. Science is not aseptic; knowledge is contaminated by perspectives, interests and needs. The critical community is not merely assimilative and transmitting, but elaborates, analyzes and takes a position" (p. 48). The educational organization, as a living, active and dynamic organization, does not accept the "tyranny of imposed meaning" (Giroux, 1997, p. 1).

ISSN (electronic): 2346-0806 ISSN (Print): 1794-8932

The school as a critical community configures its own meaning and gives meaning to its pedagogical practices, reflecting this meaning and significance in its macro-curriculum, in its institutional pedagogical model, based on a learning process that is not limited to the cognitive dimension of knowledge, but includes the procedural and attitudinal dimension. The school as a critical community not only learns new concepts, but also skills and abilities, attitudes and values that allow understanding the world in order to transform it. "A critical learning community is capable of seeking knowledge, analyzing it rigorously and putting it at the service of authentic values in society" (Santos, 2012, p. 48).

On the other hand, Santos (2012) affirms that only the confluence of will, knowledge and power can guarantee that the educational organization develops a process of permanent improvement. These principles are different but at the same time complement each other. The school must want to develop the process of shaping the institutional curriculum, teachers and managers must have the will to carry out this process. If the educational community is united with the desire and interest to improve its pedagogical practices, then the questioning questions and critical reflections emerge from the daily life itself, therefore, the understanding of the educational reality of the school emerges and, as a consequence, the educational process could be transformed, But if the school does not want to improve, then nothing can be done, not even learning, because there is no learning without action, and there is no action without motivation, and if the school is motivated, nothing and no one can stop it, because it will do what it has to do to act, learn, understand and transform, understanding itself and configuring itself.

The knowledge necessary for such change emerges from the will. It is true that improvement cannot be achieved with will alone, because it is necessary to apply the knowledge that serves as a lever for transformation; however, will guarantees learning, knowledge depends on desire, and improvement is achieved if the school develops the process with systematicity, seriousness and passion. Power is an unavoidable principle. The school can want and know, but not be able to, which would affect the harmonious development of the process. Educational management must guarantee spaces for institutional collective learning. Willingness and knowledge are insufficient, action is needed, and managers must promote it so that willingness and knowledge are not isolated, but are integrated into the daily pedagogical activity.

If the process is developed with will, knowledge and transforming action, the school could make decisions that allow for constant improvement, for which it must have the autonomy to take measures derived from its reflections, because if the higher structures (district, departmental secretariat, ministry of education) continue to impose norms and legal prescriptions then there is no sense in thinking and reflecting within the schools and these should dedicate themselves only to applying the external orientations and indications that come from 'above'.

The organizational curriculum is happening, it is becoming, it flows, it is not didactic ontology, it is rather pedagogical hermeneutics. It is an interpretative-comprehensive process through which teachers reflect critically on their pedagogical practices and those of their colleagues; however, "the institutional structures that shape teachers' classroom practices also shape their thinking about these practices" (Elliott, 1993, p. 55), and sometimes, in many schools, teachers do not have the space and time for collective reflection, which prevents self-criticism for individual and institutional improvement. Undoubtedly, the configuration of the organizational curriculum is a pretext for the collective learning of the educational organization and not only a moment whose result is embodied in a document. However, this process is not free of obstacles that block the school's learning (Santos, 2012).

New curricular proposals are currently emerging, derived not only from the postulates of the new school movement and active and critical pedagogies, but also from the new readings that are being imposed on education by the findings of neurosciences in the last 30 years, to such an extent that today we are already talking about Neurocurricula (Ortiz, 2015). This implies designing a curriculum compatible with the functioning of the human brain, which considers the dialectics generated from the interactions between neural processes and mental processes.

Conclusions

The approach to curricular configurations is essential for the operationalization of the curriculum: training intentions, characteristics of curricular contents, conception of methodological strategies, characteristics of didactic resources and formative evaluation.

In one way or another, most of the configurations that are proposed to structure the institutional curriculum are considered in Latin American educational organizations, but with a different organization,

and teaching managers do not have arguments to justify the order proposed. Moreover, its elaboration is not done following a scientifically rigorous strategy or taking into account the criteria of all educational actors, but is defined only by a commission in charge of designing it and then socialized to the rest of the community (sometimes it is not socialized), with the consequence that most of the teachers do not participate in the configuration of the curriculum assumed by the organization. Sometimes a general curriculum is adopted and a proper, authentic, contextualized curriculum, adapted to the educational reality and needs of the organization, is not configured. The configurations that are not developed in the curriculum of most organizations are: problems that the student must know how to solve, characteristics of the curricular content and characteristics of the class in the adopted curriculum. This indicates that the pedagogical and formative work is developed only on the basis of the contents established by the Ministry of Education of each country, thus contributing to reproduce the system and cultural capital, accentuating class differences and creating conditions for social exclusion and symbolic violence.

There are three methodological links for the configuration of the curriculum: design, development and evaluation. The design link corresponds to the curriculum that the educational actors conceive and think about, the curriculum they desire. The formative approach desired and assumed by the educational actors is reflected in the curriculum thought out. The dynamic dimension of the curriculum is expressed in the development link, which is nothing more than the formative process in its applicative expression, in its execution. Evaluation is the methodological link of the curriculum that has the sense of providing feedback to the curriculum itself and to the pedagogical practice of teachers.

As can be seen, the dynamic character of the curriculum implies an evaluation not as a final act but as an influx during the execution of the various links through which it passes. That is to say, it emerges from design and development, but it is not a specific and static moment in its configuration process.

In the act of educating, the thought curriculum (design) comes to life, manifests itself and materializes, which is why we can say that development is the lived, experienced, lived curriculum, which also adopts the psychological particularities and pedagogical and didactic conceptions of the educational actors. Hence, development is not a stage contiguous to design, but rather a link that is configured with it, forming a dialectical and complementary pair: when designing it, it is developed, and when developing it, it is redesigned. This means that there is not such a disproportionate distance between development and design, as is sometimes the case in educational organizations.

Sometimes we see a substantial difference between the lived curriculum and the thought curriculum, but this happens because it is not lived by thinking it and not thought by living it, but if teachers live it by thinking it, and think it by living it, then both moments merge into a single moment or configurative link.

It is true that the lived educational reality is unpredictable and is much richer than the thought educational reality, but if the pedagogical practice of teachers is lived and thought, and thought and lived, simultaneously and dialectically, then the boundaries between one and the other methodological moment are not perceived. They merge into a single process. However, the curriculum will be pertinent and of quality when it is appreciable in the daily life of the educational actors what they themselves have voluntarily declared that they are and do, that is to say, when harmony and coherence are appreciated. If teachers do in their pedagogical practice what they express orally in their daily reflections and what they have written in the curriculum document, then the lived curriculum and the thought curriculum are the same.

Sometimes, an external observer does not perceive the curriculum as it is experienced by teachers. For this observer, the perceived process is the visible curriculum, what he or she observes. There are even curricular processes that are not observed. This is the so-called hidden curriculum.

As can be seen, there are four curricular manifestations: the thought (design), the lived (development), the visible (observation) and the hidden (apperception).

In each of the methodological links of design, development and evaluation, the ontological conditions of sensitization, awareness and motivation must be fulfilled. It should be emphasized that sensitization, awareness and motivation constitute ontological conditions that are intertwined with the methodological links of design, development and evaluation, in the sense that in each of these three configurative moments, the educational actors are sensitized, sensitized and motivated, while at the same time they are individually and collectively self-formed, which is ultimately the intention of the configurative process of the curriculum: the transformation of the organization through the formation of its educational actors. Likewise, the synchrony between these methodological links and the structure of the curriculum is essential for the improvement and preservation of the quality of the process and for a dynamic, sustainable and sustainable configuration of educational organizations.

ISSN (electronic): 2346-0806 ISSN (Print): 1794-8932

The three methodological links are deployed in the configuration of each of the structural configurations of the curriculum of the educational organization, which take the form of stages or macro-links, depending on the way in which the educational organization develops the process: sequentially or simultaneously.

This approach to the curriculum as a process and not only as a document provides a configurational vision of the educational process. Thus, the curriculum is not only a document, a plan, a program or a design, but also implies its development and evaluation. It is not only the teacher (designer) who configures it, but all educational actors, who think about it, devise it in a systematized way, live it and value it, in order to understand their practices and be able to contribute to the transformation of the educational organization.

This process is configured on the basis of a system of reflexive actions developed by the educational actors. These actions are neither linear nor sequential, but configurative. A curriculum development stage should not be developed initially, followed by an implementation stage and finally an evaluation stage. The process is not rectilinear but circular. To the same extent that teachers reflect on their pedagogical practices and elaborate certain configurations of the curriculum, to the same extent they implement the findings and daily contributions in their daily classes.

The traditional stages of elaboration, implementation and evaluation are simultaneously integrated into a single configurative process. The design, development and evaluation of the process constitute a triadic configuration. They are not stages of the process but links, due to the interconnections and interdependencies that exist among them. While teachers are apparently designing a curriculum, they are simultaneously designing and implementing it, and at the same time evaluating their performance and the relevance and coherence of the curriculum for their educational context. Likewise, the implementation of the curriculum allows them to evaluate it and continue the reconfiguration process. On the other hand, any evaluative or diagnostic action developed by educational actors for evaluative purposes is at the same time an action of design and application.

These three methodological moments are inseparable, we only separate them theoretically, and from an abstraction, in order to study them, but in the pedagogical practice of teachers it is not possible to separate them, that is why we say that they constitute a triadic configuration, and that is why we say that they are methodological links. As can be seen, the process of curriculum configuration in its structure and dynamics is a configuration of configurations.

During the writing process of this article, some theoretical reflections were made that support the need and importance of the development and consolidation of an autonomous and authentic curriculum of its own, an emerging curriculum: the configuring curriculum.

Some of the contents of this article have been used in the training and professional development of professors and teachers' managers of various educational organizations in Latin America, in the presentation of papers at national and international congresses, in the development of diploma and postgraduate courses (specialization, master's and doctorate), and in the reconfiguration of the curriculum of educational organizations in Latin America.

The school is not only the physical space that we observe from outside this concrete structure, the educational organization is not a static territory, the school dynamics is expressed in the interaction between the subjects of education. The educational actors characterize school life and make up what we call educational organization. A school is not made up of walls but of human beings in constant interaction. An educational organization is an affective configuration of emotions, feelings, attitudes and values, which exchanges affection, knowledge, abilities, skills and knowledge. A school is a feeling-thinking community that acts based on its experiences and behaviors, and is therefore a learning community, a participatory community that transforms itself through the exercise of criticism.

While it is true that the activity of teachers in educational institutions must be eminently contextual, it is also true that without theory it is blind, because teachers would not know where they are going. That is why their activity should not be pragmatic but should be reflective, that is, a praxis, which is the activity interpreted, reflected upon and understood, theorized, that is, passed through a theoretical sieve that allows them to penetrate into the depths of its essence and nature, to unveil its sense and meanings. Nor should the activity of teachers be predominantly theoretical, in the style of some 'doctors' who levitate, because a theory without practice is mute, it does not really speak, does not communicate, does not say anything. But we can manage to configure theory and practice in a harmonious and coherent way.

There is no better practice than good theory. Teachers must form a community of learning and educational writers in schools. It is important to configure educational theories that allow us to derive pedagogical and curricular guidelines impregnated with scientific rigor. But emerging theories from the same educational praxis of teachers. We teachers are educators as we guide the process of learning, development and self-configuration of our students, but we are also pedagogues as we theorize about this process and reflect on our formative practices. We teachers are a critical learning community.

The process of configuration of the institutional curriculum is not only an event that takes place in the educational organization, it is the very life of the organization and should characterize the daily life of all educational actors, who must constantly be thinking and reflecting on their pedagogical practice. All of the above is materialized in the approach to curricular configurations: formative intentions, curricular contents, methodological strategies, didactic resources and evaluation, which materialize, come to life and become dynamic in the class developed by the teacher. Therefore, it is necessary to make explicit in the institution's curriculum the characteristics of the class in the pedagogical proposal assumed.

It is important to emphasize that the organizational curriculum is not just a static document that is configured only once and is ready forever, it is a process that is in permanent dynamics and transformation, it is not just a result, it is not just an end, it is a means to achieve the ideal and the formative purposes. It is not a destination, it is a path, it is not a goal to reach but a route for the journey towards the collective self-transformation of the institution. But it is not a rigid and dogmatic route, it is a flexible route that admits change, modification by the unexpected, that accepts and takes into account the improbable and the variations that occur along the way.

It is true that the process of elaboration and reconfiguration of the organizational curriculum activates and energizes the daily life of the school because it acts as a mirror. The school intensifies and strengthens its processes because it wants to resemble the curriculum configured by itself. It is not the curriculum, but it would like to be, although when it is, the curriculum must be configured anew, with other demands, higher requirements and different expectations. When the school perceives itself as having an identity similar to that of the curriculum, despite its different status, this indicates that pedagogical practices are on the right track and that the school has reached the ideal written in the institutional curriculum. However, we believe that it is imperative that researchers and teachers develop curricula in our educational organizations, knowing that the organization's curriculum is not a universal instrument, but a particular process, it is not even an instrument or a tool with which benefits are obtained by its use, it is the very life of the school, its food and sustenance, the air it breathes in order to live. Without a curriculum, the educational organization does not acquire a pertinent, relevant and useful dynamic.

Fortunately, we have reached the end of this article, the essence, benefits and advantages of the main aspects addressed in it are given in the possibility that the school has to configure its own and autonomous curriculum that allows it to guide a coherent, authentic and focused on their expectations training process, which is very valuable to influence the way our students feel, think and act. As can be seen, in order to be successful in the process of developing the institutional curriculum, it is necessary to eliminate some mental barriers that sometimes limit us in our conception of education. Epistemological obstacles paralyze us. To advance successfully in this process, it is necessary to educate educators.

Bibliographic references

Addine, F. et. al. (1998). Didáctica y optimización del proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje. La Habana: IPLAC.

Addine, F. et. al. (2004). Didáctica. Teoría y práctica. Ciudad de la Habana: Pueblo y Educación.

Álvarez de Zayas, C. (1992). La escuela en la vida. La Habana: Félix Varela.

Álvarez de Zayas, R. M. (1997). Hacia un currículum integral y contextualizado. La Habana: Academia.

Álvarez, C. y González, E. M. (2003). Lecciones de Didáctica General. Bogotá: Magisterio.

Bain, K. (2007). Lo que hacen los mejores profesores universitarios. Spain: Universidad de Valencia.

ISSN (electronic): 2346-0806 ISSN (Print): 1794-8932

Bisquerra, R. (1998). Modelos de la orientación psicopedagógica. Barcelona: Boixareu Universitaria.

Bruner, J. (2012/1971). La importancia de la educación. Barcelona: Paidós.

Calzado, D. (2004). La ley de la unidad de la instrucción y la educación. En: Addine, F. et. al. Didáctica. Teoría y práctica. Ciudad de la Habana: Pueblo y Educación.

Carreras, C. (2003). Aprender a formar. Educación y procesos formativos. Barcelona: Paidos.

Coll, C. (1992). Introducción. En: VV.AA. (1992). Los contenidos de la reforma. Madrid: Santillana. Coll,

C. (1994). Psicología y Currículum. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Comenio, J. A. (2012/1986). Didáctica magna. Madrid: Akal.

Coral, L. (2004/1999). Fundamentos sociológicos y axiológicos de pedagogía conceptual. En: De Zubiría, M., et. al. Pedagogía Conceptual. Desarrollos filosóficos, pedagógicos y psicológicos. Bogotá: Fundación Internacional de Pedagogía Conceptual.

Dávila, X. y Maturana, H. (2009). Hacia una era postmoderna en las comunidades educativas. Revista Iberoamericana de Educación. 49 (1), pp. 135-161.

De Zubiría, J. (1994). Los modelos pedagógicos. Bogotá: Fundación Alberto Merani.

De Zubiría, J. (2011). Los modelos pedagógicos. Hacia una pedagogía dialogante. Bogotá: Magisterio.

De Zubiría, M. (2008). Los fines y el método de la Pedagogía Conceptual. Bogotá: Fundación Internacional de Pedagogía Conceptual.

De Zubiría, M. y De Zubiría, J. (2002/1987). Fundamentos de Pedagogía Conceptual. Bogotá: Plaza y Janes.

Díaz-Barriga, A. (2012). Pensar la didáctica. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.

Elliott, J. (1993). El cambio educativo desde la Investigación acción. Madrid: Morata. Flórez,

R. (2005/1994). Pedagogía del conocimiento. Bogotá: McGraw-Hill.

Giroux, H. (1997). Los profesores como intelectuales, Barcelona: Paidós.

González, A. M., Recarey, S. y Addine, F. (2004). La dinámica del proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje mediante sus configuraciones. En: F. Addine, et. al. Didáctica. Teoría y práctica. Ciudad de la Habana: Pueblo y Educación.

Hamachek, D. E. (1987). Humanistic Psychology. Theory, Postulates and Implications for Educational Processes. En: Glover, J. A. y. Ronning, R.R Historical Foundations of Educational Psychology. New York: Plenum.

Hoyos, G. (2013). Filosofía de la Educación. Apuntes de su último seminario de doctorado. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre.

Kant, I. (2004/1784). Filosofía de la historia. ¿Qué es la ilustración? La Plata: Terramar.

Marina, J. A. (2000). Crónicas de la ultramodernidad. Barcelona: Anagrama.

Meirieu, Ph. (2009/1992). Aprender, sí. Pero ¿cómo? Barcelona: Octaedro.

Morín, E. (2001). Los siete saberes necesarios para la educación del futuro. Bogotá: Magisterio. Morín,

E. (2007/1998). Articular los saberes. ¿Qué saberes enseñar en las escuelas? Buenos Aires: Universidad del Salvador.

Morín, E. (2011). La vía para el futuro de la humanidad. Barcelona: Paidós.

Nussbaum, M. (2013). Sin fines de lucro. Por qué la democracia necesita de las humanidades. Madrid: Katz.

Ortiz, A. (2015). Neuroeducación. ¿Cómo aprende el cerebro humano y cómo deberían enseñar los docentes? Bogotá: Ediciones de la U.

Perkins, D. (2003/1992). La escuela inteligente. Del adiestramiento de la memoria a la educación dela mente. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Piaget, J. (1945). El nacimiento de la inteligencia en el niño. Barcelona: Crítica. Piaget,

J. (1954). Inteligencia y afectividad. Buenos Aires: Aique.

Pozo, J. I. et. al. (1999). El aprendizaje estratégico. Madrid: Aula XXI. Roberts,

T. (1978). Cuatro psicologías aplicadas a la educación. Madrid: Narcea.Santos,

M.A. (2012/2000). La escuela que aprende. Madrid: Morata.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). «Organizations or communities? Changing L Metaphor changes the theory» En: Educational Administration, Quateriy, 30, (2).

Simmel, G. (2008). Pedagogía escolar. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Simons, H. (1995). La autoevaluación escolar como proceso da desarrollo del profesorado: En apoyo a las escuelas democráticas. En: Varios. Volver a pensar la educación. Madrid: Morata.

Talízina, N. F. (1987). La formación de la actividad cognoscitiva de los escolares. La Habana: Ministerio de Educación Superior.

Traveset, M. (2013/2007). La pedagogía sistémica. Fundamentos y práctica. Barcelona: Grao.Tyler,

R. (1986/1973). Principios básicos del currículo. Buenos Aires: Troquel.

Zabalza, M. A. (1987). Diseño y desarrollo curricular. Madrid: Narcea.