

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Role and Importance of Teachers from a Social Justice and Curriculum Justice Perspective

Función e importancia del profesorado desde la justicia social y la justicia curricular

Papel e importância dos professores da justiça social e da justiça curricular

*MAGALY HERNÁNDEZ ARAGÓN 

* PhD. in Educational Research and Innovation. Master's Degree in Education, field Teacher Training. Full-time Research Professor at the Institute of Educational Sciences of the Universidad Autónoma "Benito Juárez" in Oaxaca, Mexico. Line of research: Human Rights, Education and Social Justice. E-mail: magaly.haragon@gmail.com

OPEN ACCESS 

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18634/sophiaj.18v.1i.1044>

Article information

Received: July 2020
Reviewed: June 2021
Accepted: July 2021
Published: January - June 2022

Keywords: Teachers, curriculum, knowledge, social justice, curricular justice.

Palabras clave: Profesorado, currículum, saberes, justicia social, justicia curricula.

Palavras-chave: Professores, currículo, conhecimento, justiça social, justiça curricular.

How to cite:
Hernández Aragón, M. (2022). Role and importance of teachers from social justice and curricular justice. *Sophia*, 18(1). <https://doi.org/10.18634/sophiaj.18v.1i.1044>.

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

ABSTRACT

The figure and role of teachers has been the subject of extensive analysis and debate. Its study is approached from multiple and diverse perspectives, especially recognizing its importance in the educational development of a country. This article analyzes the figure and function of teachers from the perspective of social justice and curricular justice, two powerful concepts that make us look at the pedagogical practices developed by teachers in schools; at the type of training provided to children and young people and, consequently, at the subjectivities and collectivities that are configured from the educational point of view. That is, the questioning of the role of teachers as promoters of a dominant and unjust social structure or as teachers who bring about changes from their micro-spaces aimed at forming people with thoughts and actions that allow them to forge fairer, more plural, and inclusive societies.

Copyright 2022. La Gran Colombia University



Conflict of interest:

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Author correspondence:

magaly.haragon@gmail.com

RESUMEN

La figura y función del profesorado ha sido objeto de un amplio análisis y debate. Su estudio es abordado desde múltiples y diversas perspectivas, sobre todo reconociéndola importancia que reviste en el desarrollo educativo de un país. Este artículo sitúa el análisis de la figura y función del profesorado desde la justicia social y la justicia curricular, dos conceptos potentes que nos hacen volcar la mirada en las prácticas pedagógicas que desarrolla el profesorado en los centros escolares; en el tipo de formación que se brinda a los niños, a los jóvenes y, por consiguiente, en las subjetividades y colectividades que se configuran desde lo educativo. Esto es, el cuestionarse acerca de la función del profesorado de situarse como promotor de una estructura social dominante e injusta o la de ubicarse como un docente que gesta cambios desde sus microespacios encaminados a formar personas con pensamientos y actuaciones que permitan forjar sociedades más justas, plurales e incluyentes.

RESUMO

O papel e a função dos professores têm sido objeto de extensa análise e debate. Seu estudo é abordado a partir de múltiplas e diversas perspectivas, especialmente em reconhecimento à sua importância no desenvolvimento educacional de um país. Este artigo analisa o papel e a função dos professores sob a perspectiva da justiça social e da justiça curricular, dois conceitos poderosos que nos fazem olhar para as práticas pedagógicas desenvolvidas pelos professores nas escolas; para o tipo de educação oferecida às crianças e aos jovens e, conseqüentemente, para as subjetividades e coletividades que são moldadas pela educação. Em outras palavras, o questionamento do papel dos professores como promotores de uma estrutura social dominante e injusta ou como professores que provocam mudanças a partir de seus microespaços com o objetivo de formar pessoas com pensamentos e ações que lhes permitam forjar sociedades mais justas, plurais e inclusivas.

Introduction

Teachers, in their role and function, have been a recurrent topic of research and analysis. This article approaches its study from the development of their pedagogical practices within the framework of the implications derived from *social justice and curricular justice*; that is, do they position themselves as reproducers of the hegemonic social order permeated by social injustice and a fragmented and classist vision of reality? Or, do they position themselves as agents that transform reality and enable dialogue with alternative visions and logics of thought to the hegemonic one? These questions invite us to a permanent reflection on *what, how and from where* we teach; *for what or for whom* we train.

The article is structured in three sections: *education and social justice* provides the reflective framework from which the complex weavings of the relationship and linkage of social justice with and in education are interwoven; *knowledge, devices of social power* accounts for the configuration and institutional validation of knowledge marked by the dominant rationalities generated from the pedagogical neoliberalism that segregates and invisibilizes both cognitive and social alternatives; and finally, *teachers and curricular justice*, a relationship that allows directing attention to the curriculum where certain knowledge is legitimized and promotes pedagogical practices carried out by teachers that are monitored by hegemonic visions that generate and perpetuate unequal, unfair and excluding practices. However, it is also the teachers who can rethink their training practices, through self-reflection processes, from the approaches of social justice and curricular justice that make it possible to configure fairer, more inclusive and plural thoughts and actions.

Education and Social Justice

Social justice, in terms of its nature, scope and priorities, takes on different nuances depending on the dominant ideological position. Based on this ideological construct, a model of society is determined and with it its social and institutional relations, giving them and prioritizing specific values and ideals of *social justice* that, in turn, condition the models of participation, attention and prioritization of needs that integrate a society (Torres, 2012).

From this perspective, a conception of social justice underlies every social structure, a conception that does not begin and is not configured from scratch, since it is the product of social and historical processes that underlie specific rationalities that dictate the paths taken and to be taken (Veleda, Rivas & Mezzadra, 2011). In this context, it is important to pay attention to the rationalities underpinning the dominant models of society and, consequently, to the types of social and institutional relations legitimized, since it is neither valid nor acceptable to establish a social order in which a single worldview is considered and segregates the 'minorities' that do not agree with the hegemonic ideologies and orders:

[...] Nothing, not even the advance of science and/or technology, can legitimize a disorderly "order" in which only the minorities in power squander and enjoy while the minorities with difficulties even to survive are told that reality is like that, that their hunger is a fatality of the end of the century [...] (Freire, 2012, p. 97).

It is essential not to forget that social justice, regardless of political and ideological uses and conveniences, goes beyond individual and collective rights, and demands a *balance and harmony* that must preside over the social life in which we interact (Connell, 2006). Hence, the need to pay attention, from an emancipating, analytical and reflexive point of view, to all those spaces where visions aimed at perpetuating the dominant social and ideological orderings are developed or where efforts are channeled to promote changes with dialogic, plural and solidary visions; school education being one of these spaces.

Education, as a human right, has a universal character, being established as one of the guiding principles of a democratic social structure, recognized since 1948 in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, whose objective is to ensure access to education for children and youth around the world, thus enabling equal opportunities and the creation of sustainable and sustainable societies instituted with the ideals of peace, freedom and justice (Unesco/Unicef, 2008).

The more comprehensive and social vision of *education as a right* that does not restrict it only to the issue of "free access" is based on the four principles established in 1989 by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, namely:

[non-discrimination; the best interests of the child; the right to life, survival and development of the child to the maximum extent possible; and the right of the child to express his or her views on all matters affecting him or her and to have those views given due weight in accordance with his or her age and maturity (Unesco/Unicef, 2008, p. 8).

These principles detonate the power and scope granted to education as a social right to train children and youth as autonomous and socially active agents. Although it is clear that the study of education as a human and social right is a field that is still under construction and in constant change (Veleda et al., 2011).

However, the achievement of such scope is going through complex and winding roads, due to multiple and varied problems, obstacles and circumstances presented in different parts of the world, such as war conflicts, poverty, gender issues, as well as the indifference and opposition of many governments, attributed to cultural and religious issues (Fontán, 2015). Therefore, the issue of education as a human right has to be located in the recognition of social inequalities, since to promote it, it is necessary to start from the knowledge of the people to whom it is addressed, since the subjects in conditions of social inequality, before being placed as *subjects of rights*, have to be recognized as *subjects of need* and from that condition to locate inequality and social injustice (Veleda et al., 2011).

This has created a scenario of concern and social despair, as there are more and more young people, boys and girls without access to basic education; although this also calls for thinking that the right to education should be seen and practiced beyond the issue of access and formal free education, that is, beyond the school (Veleda et al., 2011, 2011); promoting those non-formal, non-governmental actions and programs that have an impact on reducing educational backwardness, moving from a school-based and closed education to a permanent, open and free access education, without discrimination or exclusion, which makes it possible to reliably place "education as a fundamental human right, and not as a service" (Fontán, 2015, p. 118); that is, to place education as an active transforming means and not as a passive means provided by the State or governments; inasmuch as the right to education "is not something that is offered nor can it be compatible with any idea of education as merchandise to be bought and sold [...]" (Veleda et al., 2011, p. 56).

In this sense, it is important to focus on the scope of education as a universal human right and its impact on the configuration of just societies, since education, both as a process and as a product, implies an *act of justice*, although for some people, education and social justice belong to two different categories. Both categories are intimately involved in the generation of conditions that mobilize established power structures, as well as in the distribution of privileges and opportunities, generating the classes of the advantaged and the disadvantaged (Connell, 2006).

Historically, education and social justice have been in an interesting relationship. On the one hand, education, as indicated above, has been considered a universal human and social right; on the other hand, the presence of justice in education has been considered from the point of view of access to schooling and the degrees awarded, speaking of *distributive justice*: who receives a given social good (education, for example) and how much of it they receive. However, the limitation of this vision is that education is not seen from its own nature, that of being a social process; that is, education is not only distributed; education is lived and developed from the interactions we have with others, through which they communicate a vision of being and being in the world:

Justice cannot be achieved by distributing the same amount of a standard good to all children of all social classes. Education is a process that operates through relationships, which *cannot be* neutralized or changed to include in their very essence the possibility of an equal distribution of the social good. This "good" means different things to the children of the ruling class and to the children of the working class, and it will bring (or entail) different things to everyone (Connell, 2006, p. 28).

Consequently, education as a formal and institutionalized process, has to start from the recognition of its homogenizing and segregating vision that permeates it in its teaching mechanisms, as well as in its institutional and curricular organization, which entails favoring those most favored by the system and accentuating social and educational inequalities, attributing such inequalities to individual merits and not to social advantages or disadvantages external to the school, since: "educational justice depends in the first instance on what happens outside the school: the social structure, access to work, family living conditions, service infrastructure and health care" (Veleda et al., 2011, p. 32).

It is therefore necessary to provide a different relationship between education and social justice, so that the views of this relationship transcend the distributive vision based on the granting of a right and move towards the analysis of educational processes as a hegemonic social construction of knowledge and forms of teaching that legitimize unequal social structures and practices, reproducing opportunities for the most favored and segregating the least favored. Connell (2006) calls the latter "cycle of poverty", with schools legitimizing social hierarchies, producing and distributing a type of knowledge that represents a hegemonic way of understanding the world and maintaining power relations that favor a certain social group. Therefore, it is important to recognize that all knowledge reproduced in classrooms integrates specific *cultural contents*, whose selection, distribution and transmission helps to preserve the interests of a certain hegemonic group and to build power relations that legitimize its dominant social order (Torres, 2012).

Knowledge, Devices of Social Power

Knowledge is derived from a social structure; it does not develop in the abstract since it is the result of social and historical processes with specific referents and interests granted by the people who legitimize and endorse it. Knowledge that, once produced and legitimized, is constituted as regulators of school practices developed in classrooms, which configure ways of seeing, understanding and relating to the world. Thus, educational knowledge is one of the most efficient ideological means to strengthen inequalities or to mark a break with the system; hence the importance of paying attention to the processes of *construction, selection and distribution* that take place within the framework of the transmission of educational knowledge (Bernstein, 1997).

In this sense, it is important to emphasize the scope of knowledge as systems of control or systems of government, as Popkewitz (2010) calls them, since knowledge not only configures a formative profile, but also conditions and predisposes a lifestyle; that is, the ideological impact of knowledge not only falls on its cognitive dimensions, but also transcends the internalization of dispositions to understand reality, forming specific subjectivities and collectivities. Therefore, the construction of thoughts and actions goes through a series of systems of power and control, whose processes are so stealthy that the effects produced in our reason and behavior cannot be consciously perceived.

Thus, considering the legitimacy that society confers to formal educational knowledge, it is understandable that its integration, development and validation that it possesses in a certain space and time, is a reflection of the dominant rationalities marked by pedagogical neoliberalism (Gómez-Sollano & Adams, 2019), which has a monopoly to validate and legitimize between what is true and what is false, between valid and invalid thinking, between recognized viable knowledge and disqualified or disqualified knowledge. Adams, 2019), who has the monopoly to validate and legitimize between true and false, between valid and invalid thinking, between recognized viable knowledge and disqualified or ignored knowledge (Santos, 2018a); thus constituting knowledge that has been naturalized as the only, certain and valid, that is, *global knowledge*, regardless of the social and cultural context in which it is developed.

The understanding of global knowledge as legitimate and valid throughout the world necessarily leads us to the analysis of its very foundations: Western hegemonic thought, which instituted its instruments to achieve capitalist, colonial and patriarchal domination; being one of these instruments par excellence, the knowledges, endorsed in the category of science or scientific knowledge, welcomed under the so-called *abysmal thought* that is responsible for unilaterally marking the division between the knowledges, experiences and actors that are visible, intelligible or useful and those that are invisible, unintelligible, forgotten or dangerous (Santos, 2018b).

From the sociologies of absences, it is possible to identify the five *monocultures* that Eurocentric knowledge has configured and developed: the monoculture of valid knowledge, the monoculture of linear time, the monoculture of social classification, the monoculture of the superiority of the universal and the global and the monoculture of productivity (Santos, 2018b). Through these five monocultures have been constructed, not only the different canons of knowledge that have been established for school levels, but also the schemes of thoughts and patterns of behaviors that regulate social relations have been designed.

To move towards proposals that imply a rupture with these five monocultures of Eurocentric knowledge where the diversity or plurality of existing knowledge in the world is recognized (ecology of knowledge);

demands, in the first instance, "taking distance from the Eurocentric tradition" (Santos, 2018b, p. 25), in order to enable an analytical gaze and identify realities that have been ignored or rendered invisible through colonialism (of power, knowledge and being), capitalism and patriarchy, the latter process undertaken by the "sociology of absences", through which the "ways and means by which non-existence, radical invisibility and irrelevance are produced" (p. 47) are identified (p. 47).

For this, it is necessary to forge, on the one hand, an analytical, critical and dialectical reading of concepts that have been socially constructed and historically constituted, from a hegemonic viewpoint, which only provides a biased perspective of reality by not integrating the visions of social groups that have been marginalized and forgotten for not responding to the interests and conveniences of the dominant culture (Giroux, 2014). On the other hand, it is necessary the construction of new categorical concepts that allow to account for changing realities and enable the dialogue and expression of the voices, feelings and thoughts of people and cultural expressions that build realities that have been invisibilized and constantly marginalized in school curricula, in the forms of production and distribution of knowledge, in official discourses, in evaluation systems; in short, in all school practices carried out in educational institutions that are carriers of a specific hegemonic cultural load (Zemelman, 2001).

Thus, despite the processes of delegitimization and invisibility that, repeatedly and systematically, are made of knowledge and perspectives that do not conform to the hegemonic guidelines, they are still present, permeating daily social relations through resistance and marginalization.

A concrete example is the knowledge derived from cultural plurality. The plurality of cultures existing in the world is situated as a difference, inasmuch as their thinking is gestated from a non-Western worldview. From this logic, they produce knowledge and pedagogical practices founded from the collective, claiming their own knowledge, integrating their customs, rituals, symbolisms, needs, as well as their ethical systems and their own political structures that account for their vision of life, focused on autonomy, freedom and social justice (Stahler-Sholk and Baronnet, 2017).

This makes clear the presence of knowledge that differs from the globally useful ones, knowledge that responds to certain needs, contexts and practices; that is, to a particular reality, thus breaking with the homogenizing chain to which global knowledge responds, being the one that, in most cases, prevails in the curricula and in the different institutionalized school practices. Hence the transcendence of building, making visible and communicating knowledge problematized with the historical and social that makes it possible to articulate "[...] the past, the present and the imaginary with the here and now, establishing fluid channels between the macro and the micro, between the academic and the everyday, between the public and the intimate [...]" (Gómez-Sollano & Corenstein, 2017, p. 28), giving way to *socially productive knowledge* whose meaning is conferred given its interrelation, precisely, with the contextual, the historical and the social; articulating the cognitive and social plane.

From the approaches of epistemological alternatives aimed at the "production and validation of knowledge anchored in the experiences of resistance of all social groups that have systematically suffered injustice, oppression and destruction caused by capitalism, colonialism and patriarchy" (Santos, 2018b, p. 29), the bases for the establishment of a plural social order are sustained, where each social group is situated as a legitimized alternative that represents the world as they themselves conceive it and from their own terms and mechanisms, providing the voice to the social subjects, to know "the words with which they name their worlds" (Gagliano, 2009, p. 75). Because of this, conventional colonialist epistemology is challenged in two ways: one, it validates and vindicates knowledge that has been suppressed by the dominant logics (massive epistemicide) and two, it transforms the logic of the subject who knows and the object of knowledge, since knowledge is linked to certain social practices, they are not abstract entities, but historical, social and political products.

In this context, the articulation of epistemological alternatives founded on school education, based on the rationalities and voices of the most disadvantaged and historically invisible social groups, makes sense:

[...] as long as the school perpetuates its implicitly or explicitly discriminatory practices, as long as students belonging to the most disadvantaged families continue to be perceived as inferior, excluded or simply invisible, it will be impossible to advance in the construction of educational justice (Veleda et al., 2011, p. 60).

Therefore, it is important to move from "how much" is taught to "what" is taught, from which visions the teaching contents are configured; placing the reading angle on *whose knowledge and whose knowledge* is selected, distributed and transmitted at different school levels (Connell, 2006), since it is knowledge that mobilizes and materializes specific personal and collective *ethos ad hoc* to certain rationalities and interests (Gómez-Sollano & Adams, 2019).

Teachers and Curricular Justice

Santos (2018b) states that "there is no social justice without cognitive justice", not far from Connell's (2006) proposal of a *curricular justice*, whose sustenance arises from the integration of justice in education, but not in form, but in essence; focusing attention on one of the devices where specific inequalities are produced: the *curriculum* and from which multiple inequalities are generated at the level of interpersonal relationships. Hence, Tedesco (2017) points out that "promoting adherence to justice mobilizes different variables of the educational system. The main one, undoubtedly, is the curricular variable" (p. 210); noting with this, the intrinsic relationship between power relations, knowledge and curriculum.

The curriculum, in most of the times, is a device configured and developed from the hegemonic abysmal thinking as it marginalizes other forms of knowledge organization, is integrated in the power structure of the educational institutions and occupies the whole cultural space, by defining the ideas about what learning should be that common sense dictates to most people (Connell, 2006, p. 56).

In this way, it contributes to perpetuate unequal and exclusive social relations, favoring the hegemonic classes in their thinking and acting. Even, displacing the importance of the *content* by the *results*, that is, nowadays more attention is paid to the achievements or academic competences developed than to the contents that integrate the what to teach; because as Plá (2017) points out, "[...] the content, or more precisely, the knowledge, has been left out of the discussion on social justice and education". (p. 38)

The above promotes the so-called *process of de-differentiation* of knowledge, tending to homogenize the differences in knowledge production (Plá, 2017), making invisible the specificities provided by the context, senses and meanings produced by subjects in a specific space and under a particular logic of thought. Precisely, in contrast to these homogenizing and totalizing approaches, the support and scope of *curricular justice* implies providing a different view of the curriculum, from the point of view of the "others", the dominated, the marginalized, the excluded.

The above demands paying attention to what is taught, done and decided in classrooms in an environment of respect, understanding and integration of the visions and needs of all social groups and existing ideologies, both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic; since "committing to a critical and liberating education requires investigating to what extent the objectives, content, curricular materials, teaching methodologies and school organization models are respectful of the needs of the different social groups that coexist in each society" (Torres, 2012, p. 11) and not only aimed at imposing a cultural canon with a mutilated perspective of the social realities that make up our society. 11) and not only aimed at imposing a cultural canon with a mutilated perspective of the social realities that make up our society.

At this point, it is important to point out that it is not a matter of leaving out Westernist knowledge or perspectives; on the contrary, it is a matter of building bridges of dialogue in the multiple and diverse approaches to understanding the world that make more flexible the tensions and gaps between the different worlds that have been generated with the polarization resulting from a hegemonic order that controls and segregates. Therein lies the importance of generating conditions and promoting analytical tools that make it possible to make evident the impositions, discriminations and ideological omissions that are made, from the hegemonic vision, on those who do not share its vision of seeing and understanding the world.

Therefore, the scope of a curricular justice is not only related to the attention and improvement of the "[...] material inputs of the educational process (infrastructure, equipment, teachers' salaries, class hours, etc.), it is a necessary but not sufficient condition [...], but of policies accompanied by qualitative aspects of the teaching and learning process" (Tedesco, 2017, p. 218), aimed at forming subjectivities and collectivities with a social perspective "[...] that allow the development of a greater social conscience, reflexive solidarity, adherence to justice and social responsibility [...]. 218), aimed at forming subjectivities and collectivities with a social perspective "[...] that allow the development of greater social awareness, reflexive solidarity, adherence to justice and social responsibility [...]" (p. 222). This involves a double path of education: as a forger of this social construction based on a new and different individual conscience [...]" (p. 222).

mobilized by the educational actors that involve it as a process and as a result. And it is precisely at this point where the importance of the role played by teachers in their professional work of teaching intervenes and is related to the fact that it allows generating more democratic teaching relationships and promoting fairer and more humane social spaces (Zeichner, 2010).

Teachers are instituted as a key figure in the configuration of a certain type of formative processes and, consequently, in the change or perpetuity of a social structure, since they are the ones who "construct, transmit, appropriate and resignify knowledge" (Gómez-Sollano & Adams, 2019, p. 132). Therefore, being in charge of forming citizens, it becomes the central point in the transmission of the legitimized knowledge that is proposed in each of the school grades, since why does the official curriculum that operates in schools contain certain types of knowledge and not others, under what logic are selected, organized and distributed the knowledge that serve as the official ones to be developed in the formation of children or youth? Naturally, the selection of official or valid knowledge is not left to an open field, since it is situated as a means or device of power to achieve certain ends (Ducoing, 2014).

However, teachers also position themselves as transforming agents, promoting critical, reflective, supportive and plural bases for establishing fair social structures. Such positioning, demands that teachers operate the curriculum but from a social and historical perspective that accounts for the political-social spaces and times that permeate its configuration and development; that analyzes it as a fully observable category and of course, changeable, recognizing it as a carrier of a dominant ideology (Orozco, 2016); thus making it possible to analyze and mobilize the political intentions, the formative experiences and understand the hidden meaning of the teaching and learning processes developed in school spaces.

This would allow teachers to make evident the control and management of the subject that is carried out from the hegemonic rationalities to normalize and naturalize the patterns of thoughts, behaviors and attitudes that perpetuate the conventional system of government. For this reason, from the perspective of *curricular justice*, it is proposed that the configuration of a curriculum and the development of pedagogical practices carried out by teachers should consider the transversal integration of three principles that would allow the formation of critical thinking with a social, fair and solidary perspective (Connell, 2006):

The interests of the underprivileged. Socially and historically, it is conventional for the curriculum to integrate the vision of the hegemonic power or of the most favored classes. What is proposed with this principle is to constitute a counter-hegemonic curriculum, integrating the interests and perspectives of the underprivileged; that is, "to raise economic issues from the position of the poor and not the rich. Establish gender issues from the position of women. Raise race relations and territorial issues from the perspective of the indigenous. Expose sexuality from the position of homosexuals. And so on" (p. 64). A curriculum that is transversal in the configuration and distribution of knowledge and counter-hegemonic perspectives is required to enable changes in unjust and unequal social structures.

Participation and common schooling. We reject the elaboration of curricula from a dominant social position that does not allow the inclusion and participation of social groups that, historically, have been silenced, marginalized or less favored. In order to achieve inclusive participation in designs, decision-making and operations of public or social policies, it is necessary for everyone to have the same access and opportunities for education, not only from the viewpoint of distributive justice, but also from the type of knowledge and perspectives that constitute the curricular contents that are aimed at non-hierarchical and cooperative school practices (common curriculum).

The historical production of equality. It is based on the recognition that equality is not static, but rather, being the product of social processes, it takes on different nuances and forms; therefore, by approaching inequality from its production structure, it is possible to insert changes in the social relations themselves that generate more inclusive and egalitarian thoughts and actions.

The integration of these three principles, on the one hand, in the design and development of the curriculum and, on the other hand, in the pedagogical practices of teachers, would make it possible, on the one hand, to elucidate the real hidden interests in schools which, historically, have prioritized the needs and perspectives of the dominant political and social macro-structures despite the ideological, cultural and social diversity in which we are situated; on the other hand, it would generate spaces for meetings and dialogues with favored social groups.

and disadvantaged that contribute to the rupture of unequal, static social and ideological paradigms, hegemonic, mutilating and simplifying.

Consequently, and looking from the perspective of the teacher's role, implementing a curriculum under the guidelines of these three principles requires a whole platform that integrates from technical elements to ideological and political positions that allow mobilizing the hegemonic cultural contents that have been integrated in the official curricula and in formal school education, favoring the development of cognitive, affective and social capacities that make it possible to understand the world from alternative points of view, incorporating the plurality of social perspectives that exist and will exist, and have an impact on the establishment of cultures of dialogue, cooperation, solidarity and problem solving aimed at building fair and humane plural societies (Torres, 2012).

To speak of curricular justice implies that there is a counterpart, that is, a hegemonic curriculum that is characterized as unjust, implemented through educational institutions, identified as a producer and reproducer of discriminatory discourses; however, these institutions, given the social commitment attributed to it, should move towards positions that characterize it as a space of resistance and denunciation of discourses and actions aimed at legitimizing *marginalization practices* (Torres, 2012).

The transition made by educational institutions to become spaces of resistance and denunciation would make it possible to question those institutional actions that, for years, have been unquestionable, such as textbooks, school practices, official speeches, evaluation systems, among others, which have a privilege in themselves, to legitimize what they say and do, without questioning the origin of their cultural content; recognizing that these "select, organize and interpret the information to present them as objective, neutral truths, that is, as official knowledge and truth" (Torres, 2012, p. 214).

In this regard, Torres (2012), in pointing out textbooks as a school practice that encourages marginalization and discrimination, mentions nine types of biases that are developed in the curricular interventions operated by teachers, configuring a type of teaching and reality that is transmitted to the student and that generates the conformation of unfair and unequal thoughts and actions; but which, at the same time, are rooted in the thinking of the teacher himself, disabling his ability to question, criticize and prevent the reproduction of such discriminatory practices:

Segregation. It is a practice that manifests itself when groupings, contents and school tasks are differentiated on the basis of gender, social class, ethnicity and student abilities; categorizations made from dominant ideological models that determine the superiority of one social group over others.

Exclusion. They are those that are characterized by ignoring the plurality of cultures present in society, silencing their perspectives and social realities, establishing a vision as hegemonic and valid racist, classist, sexist, homophobic, among other discriminatory actions. Within this type of inadequate curricular intervention are the "silenced cultures", being curricular interventions that are based on a monocultural model, marginalizing the rest of the cultures that do not share their visions and interests. Santos (2018b), calls as "abysmal thinking" where everything that does not align with the hegemonic cultural and social canon is silenced and transgressed.

Disconnection. This refers to the fact that social situations arising from the presence of plural social and cultural groups are not addressed in a continuous manner and with the social foundation required. There are two modalities: "The day of..." and "subjectification". In the first, these situations or social problems are addressed on a special day and only on that day, since they are forgotten and marginalized during the rest of the year. The second is a common way of organizing and systematizing the contents to be studied, making it difficult to understand reality and, consequently, social, cultural, political and religious problems, since the contents are integrated in subjects that are disconnected and uncommunicated among themselves. They are established and developed as islands isolated from each other.

Misrepresentation. These are didactic strategies aimed at selecting and developing a certain type of text to legitimize social, economic, political, religious, ethnic, gender and linguistic inequalities, permeating the

construction of discriminatory thoughts that lead to racist and unjust actions. Hence

A truly emancipatory education, has to serve to bring to light this type of distortions, as well as subterfuges through which the racist explanations that permeate our common sense and, what is worse, the science that is sold as neutral and objective, have been built (Torres 2012, p. 233).

There are two types of misrepresentation: "naturalization and the ni...ni strategy". The first implies that situations derived from social and cultural plurality are reworked, reinterpreted to present them as guilty of their own problems and those of society in general. Racist, sexist, classist, etc., discourses are naturalized in accordance with hegemonic ideological patterns. On the other hand, the "neither...nor" strategies integrate those visions that are neither on one side nor on the other, endorsing indifference to social problems that do not affect their own interests.

Psychologization is that which seeks to explain situations of marginality based on the analysis of individuals or interpersonal relationships, without analyzing them from macro categories such as power, hegemony or social structures.

Paternalism and pseudo-tolerance. They are based on hierarchical visions of superiority of some cultures or realities over others, justifying the acts of barbarism or racism that have been carried out, historically, by some cultures over others. One of the representative strategies of this type of curricular intervention is the "Benetton treatment", a model that uses information on social problems but depoliticizing them and reading them with a different vision and scenario, its treatment is to give them an emotional perspective, with the aim of promoting sentimentality in the viewer, but without generating a critical and political vision.

Infantilization. It is developed through two modalities: "waltdisneyzation" and "tourist curriculum". The first refers to when students are kept away from the analysis of social problems, keeping them in a kind of artificial paradise, presenting them with a romantic view of real life. The second refers to when social situations derived from the complexity of the society in which we live are treated with students in a very superficial and banal way, without going deeper into the corresponding analysis that these problems deserve. These two strategies minimize the analysis and reflection capacities of children, denying them the right to know the problems with their respective meanings and implications, handled in a language according to their age, but not with an infantile language and vision.

As a foreign or strange reality. This is when complex realities go beyond the mechanisms of schools (often intentionally) and are approached as a reality that is distant or alien to the actors involved in the school. The different, the strange and the foreign to the hegemonic culture is emphasized so that it is seen as something picturesque or folkloric, giving the message that they are problems without scope or solution.

Presentism, without history. This type of curriculum development recognizes the different cultures and realities but erases their history and social development. That is to say, it does not recognize their social trajectory of struggles, recognitions and triumphs. The intention of this is that the new generations do not consider options of social transformations that allow ending the continuous marks of injustice and inequalities that characterize the present that we live today.

Making notorious the invisible (sociology of absences) about what, from the design and development of the curriculum, is silenced and generated, demands the recognition that we live in an unjust and unequal society with racist, classist and sexist social actions, whose motive is the hegemonic vision that seeks to maintain power. It is recognized that educational systems were created from a Eurocentric vision that discards all kinds of alternative proposals to the guidelines it establishes. However, institutions and times are not static because the subjects that integrate them are people who can promote transformations, but for this it is necessary to create bases and networks of teacher and school training that are placed under a different logic to the hegemonic one that allows mobilizing macro social categories to understand the influence and relationship that exists between the macro social structure and micro school organizations, such as the classroom, which as a training space, needs to be questioned from critical, plural, reflective and proactive perspectives.

Conclusion

Mobilizing unjust curricular structures and promoting pedagogical practices based on social justice, requires that teachers possess and operate from a critical, reflective and emancipatory thinking, assuming a philosophy of fair, supportive and critical multicultural education; stimulating in the formation of the student body: a *global perspective* of the socio-cultural circumstances that surround them in a mediate or immediate way, the approach to *questions of power, historicity and conditioning factors* in social problems, *general and integrated frameworks of analysis*, the development of the *dimensions of justice and equity, of alternatives in the solution of problems, evaluating and reflecting* on actions carried out, as well as the incentive to assume *responsibilities and decision-making*. This requires that teachers start from and value *the experience and knowledge of the students themselves*; promote in classes, with proactive examples, the *overcoming of conflicts and situations of marginalization and oppression*; recognize and enhance the *styles and personalities of each student*; use *flexible and participatory* teaching and learning strategies and integration of students from different social and cultural groups (Torres, 2012).

Hence, it is essential to look at two moments of curricular justice. One, referring to the curriculum that teachers implement at different school levels, and two, to the curriculum that is implemented during their initial training, since if teachers are considered "a vital force for change", it is necessary, in the first instance, to pay special attention to the configuration and development of their training path, which will have an impact on the formation of a sensitive, critical and committed teacher not only with what happens in the classroom, but in the whole community.

To achieve this goal, teacher training and performance must break away from traditional schemes of conceiving social, educational, economic and political problems as alien to them, and move towards multi-referential, complex thoughts and views that make it possible to see beyond what apparently happens; cultivate a more receptive cultural sensitivity of teachers that favors the recognition and integration of voices and perspectives that have been silenced and marginalized but are part of social and school life, since, as Zemelman (2006) mentions, man is always built in the micro-spaces, that is, in the actions and the evolution of everyday life; therefore, "the life of the educational process is just in the relationship of the teacher with the man, child, young person or adolescent in front of him..." (p...)." (p. 85). And it is there where the power of teachers, through the development of socially committed teaching practices, to provide significant contributions to the construction of fair, dynamic, open, supportive, and inclusive societies is generated.

Bibliographic References

- Bernstein B. (1997). *La estructura del discurso pedagógico*. Morata.
- Connell, R.W. (2006). *Escuelas y justicia social*. Morata.
- Ducoing Watty, P. (2014). *La eficacia versus la emancipación del sujeto en la formación de profesores*. En P. Ducoing Watty (Coord.). *Pensamiento crítico en educación* (pp. 425-440). México: IISUE-Unam.
- Freire, P. (2012). *Pedagogía de la autonomía. Saberes necesarios para la práctica educativa*. Siglo XXI.
- Fontán, T. (2015). *La educación, ¿un derecho universal?* En *El Guiniguada. Revista de investigaciones y experiencias en Ciencias de la Educación*, (23) 111-123. En https://accedacris.ulpgc.es/bitstream/10553/14014/1/0235347_00023_0011.pdf
- Gagliano, R. (2009). *Saberes socialmente productivos y nuevas realidades educativas emergentes*. En M. Gómez-Sollano (Coord.). *Saberes socialmente productivos y educación. Contribución al debate*, pp. 61-78. Unam.
- Giroux, H.A. (2014). *Teoría y resistencia en educación*. Siglo XXI y Cesu-Unam.

- Gómez-Sollano, M. & Corenstein Zaslav, M. (2017). Referentes para pensar la relación entre saberes, sujetos y alternativas pedagógicas. Dimensiones de análisis y categorías intermedias. En Gómez-Sollano & M. Corenstein Zaslav (Coords.). Saberes, sujetos y alternativas pedagógicas. Contextos, conceptos y experiencias (pp. 21-40). Unam.
- Gómez-Sollano, M. & Adams, T. (2019). Hegemonía y alternativas pedagógicas. Los nudos ciegos de la teoría. *Educação (Unisinos)*. 23(1), 124-140. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4013/edu.2019.231.08>
- Orozco, B. (2016). Apuntes para la reactivación del discurso teórico curricular en México. En A. De Alba y A. Casimiro Lopes. (Coords). *Diálogos curriculares entre México y Brasil* (pp. 25-41). IISUE-UNAM.
- Plá, S. (2017). Pensamiento histórico y justicia curricular. Una reflexión teórica. En S. Plá y S. P. Rodríguez Ávila (Coords). *Saberes sociales para la justicia social. Educación escuela en América Latina* (pp.19-44). Bogotá: UPN.
- Popkewitz, T. (2010). Estudios curriculares y la historia del presente. *Profesorado. Revista de currículum y formación del profesorado*, 14(1), 356-370. En <http://www.ugr.es/local/recfpro/rev141FIRINV.pdf>
- Santos, B. S. (2018a). Pensando desde el Sur y con el Sur. En P. Meneses, Arriscado J., Lema, C., Aguiló A. y Lino N. *Construyendo las Epistemologías del Sur: para un pensamiento alternativo de alternativas* (pp. 31-71). Buenos Aires: CLACSO. En http://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/clacso/se/20181203040213/Antologia_Boaventura_Vol1.pdf
- Santos, B. S. (2018b). Introducción a las epistemologías del sur. En M. P. Meneses y K. Bidaseca (Coords). *Epistemologías del Sur* (pp. 25-61). Buenos Aires: CLACSO. En http://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/clacso/se/20181124092336/Epistemologias_del_sur_2018.pdf
- Stahler-Sholk, R. y Baronnet, B. (2017). La escuela es la comunidad: luchas indígenas y autonomía en México. En S. Plá y S. P. Rodríguez Ávila (Coords). *Saberes sociales para la justicia social. Educación escuela en América Latina* (pp. 99-135). Bogotá: UPN.
- Tedesco, J. C. (2017). Educación y desigualdad en América Latina y el Caribe. Aportes para la agenda post 2015. En *Perfiles Educativos*, XXXIX(158), 206-224. En <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=13253901012>
- Torres, J. (2012). *La justicia curricular. El caballo de Troya de la cultura escolar*. Morata.
- Unesco/Unicef (2008). *Un enfoque de la EDUCACIÓN PARA TODOS basado en los derechos humanos*. En http://www.unicef.org/spanish/publications/files/Un_enfoque_de_la_EDUCACION_PARA_TODOS_basado_en_los_derechos_humanos.pdf
- Veleda, C.; Rivas, R. & Mezzadra F. (2011). *La construcción de la justicia educativa. Criterios de redistribución y reconocimiento para la educación Argentina*. Buenos Aires: CIPPEC/UNICEF. En <https://www.cippec.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/2536.pdf>
- Zeichner, K. M. (2010). *La formación del profesorado y la lucha por la justicia social*. Morata.
- Zemelman, H. (2001). *Pensar teórico y pensar epistémico: Los retos de las Ciencias Sociales Latinoamericanas*. En <https://repository.unad.edu.co/bitstream/handle/10596/5564/Documento7.pdf?sequence=1>
- Zemelman, H. (2006). *El magisterio ante los desafíos del presente*. En M. Gómez Sollano y H. Zemelman (Coords.). *La labor del maestro: formar y formarse*. Editorial Pax