

Presentación

Cómo citar: Baron, B., y Henao, L. (2021). Research practices: a distinction under construction. *Praxis Pedagógica*, 21(31), 1-4. <http://doi.org/10.26620/uniminuto.praxis.21.31.2021.1-4>

ISSN: 0124-1494

eISSN: 2590-8200

Editorial: Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios - UNIMINUTO

Recibido: 20 febrero 2021.

Aceptado: 18 abril 2021.

Publicado: 4 julio 2021.

Conflicto de intereses: los autores han declarado que no existen intereses en competencia.

Research practices: a distinction under construction

Talking about research practices in general refers us to the understanding of those formative research activities that we develop as students, in which we learn through learning-learning, learning by doing, learning by feeling, and learning by serving (UNIMINUTO, 2021), to experience situated and applied knowledge from the identification and contribution to the solution of problems found in educational, artistic, cultural, and social contexts. This concept was constructed based on the field theory of Pierre Bourdieu (1980), who defined the field as the game scenario where the struggles for obtaining, increasing, and transferring capital (economic, social, and cultural) take place. For the research, Bourdieu is illuminating insofar as it allows us to recognize the two understandings of the practices, to distinguish them, and to define the direction they will take here.

First, Bourdieu recognizes a way of understanding practices from the scientific disdain of these, for considering them mechanical actions that are not reflected upon, nor thought upon, but executed in the order of the mechanical compression of the daily habit. In the words of Bourdieu (2005),

Practice is always undervalued and little analyzed when, in fact, to understand it, it is necessary to bring into play a great deal of technical competence, much more, paradoxically, than to understand a theory. It is necessary to avoid reducing practices to the idea that we have of them when we have no experience other than logic. However, scientists, lacking an adequate theory of practice, do not necessarily know how to use for the descriptions of their practices the theory that would enable them to acquire and transmit an authentic knowledge of their practices (p. 75).

Benjamín Barón-Velandia, PhD

bbaron@uniminuto.edu
Corporación Universitaria
Minuto de Dios - UNIMINUTO
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4968-6336>

Liz Mariana Henao Cardona, PhD (c)

193785@iberopuebla.mx
Universidad Iberoamericana Puebla
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6027-8301>



In accordance with the preceding, it is critical to recognize that practice transcends the mechanical events of everyday life and leads to the restitution of its value in the construction of theories, in the preponderant role it plays in the exercise of reflexivity itself, to feed and support the theoretical sources in a unique way.

As a result, Bourdieu (2005) intends to restore to them the value that necessitates constant reflection, namely, on the context and its development at the level of everyday life as well as in the realization of practices in the scientific field, because it is from there that comprehensions and solutions in accordance with the theory and the observed problematic are generated. The impossible and necessary dialogue between theory and practice must take place because it is necessary to recognize the unique validity that the practices' constructions have in the context and, in that sense, the distinction of the points of reference from where each one has been built, without undermining the *sui generis* of the source of information or knowledge (Juliao & Barón-Velandia, 2013). In this sense, research techniques constitute a place for encounters with cultural variety, a fusion of diverse ways of viewing the world and comprehending the subject under research.

Because of this intertwining between theory and practice, it is possible to observe that, as Lopez de Parra, Prada-Arias, and Martin Arango (2019) state, "the facts make sense from a theory; in turn, all the research practices that are organized as a result of the application of the chosen method are related to the respective theory" (p. 197). This statement allows us to recognize the current state of understanding of research practices, which have a fundamental commitment to the problems of the different societies in which they are inserted, since they are intimately linked by their need to expand the capacities to change the existing relationships between agents, by the mobility of habitus, and the equitable redistribution of capital, especially economic ones (Varón, Martnez, León, and Barón, 2020).

As a result, it is critical to address a third idea that, in Bordieu's system of relations, forms the practice and, for our purposes, the research practice: the habitus. As a first stage, according to Pierre Bourdieu, it is critical to detect habitus, understood as

systems of durable and transferable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is to say as generating and organizing principles of practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to an end without presupposing the conscious search for ends and the express mastery of the operations necessary to achieve them, objectively regulated' and regular' without being the product

of obedience to rules, and, at the same time as all this, collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor (1980, p. 92).

Habitus, in this sense, are long-lasting, repeatable dispositions. That is, it is the relationship that is co-constructed between an agent's ways of thinking, feeling, and acting with the place of location or position occupied by an agent, in our case, a researcher in a specific field, and the capacity that he has to mobilize himself, which is understood as those struggles for the possession of some kind of capital in Bourdieu's approach. In general, what is sought is an agent's cultural capital, which has been assimilated from birth, going through the educational system, social, economic, and political ties, among other things, to define who we are and what we do.

Research uses cultural capital as a method to provide alternative ways of understanding the phenomena under research. Bordieu says, "It is about adding a little power to the illegitimate, heretical, heterodox term," (2011, p.51). The study practice causes a schism with commonly held attitudes and beliefs that are part of everyday arguments. As a result, the researcher provides power to what is not regarded as orthodox by a given community, an activity termed militant by Bordieu.

As a result, research practices have a political stake in the society in which they operate, as they suggest a new way of perceiving the world, combining disparate worldviews, emotions, and feelings into a single reality. They are a convergence of differences in their various habitus and capitals that integrate what is being researched.

These differences present a variety of unique issues, particularly in terms of how study findings are disseminated. Typically, these are transmitted to others who share the researcher's cultural and social capital. However, it is important to go beyond academic contexts to bring the knowledge acquired to society in general, particularly to those contexts where the research was conducted or where it may have special relevance and social impact, in search of a way to communicate the findings to the general public, with the disparities that this implies.

A number of challenges arise in this area, such as how to offer venues that allow the transmission of research processes beyond specialized contexts. How might new social communication tactics be implemented into formative research to make research practices more understandable to the general public? It is critical to explore these concerns in order to enable the societal application of information created through research procedures.

Referencias

- Bourdieu, P. (1980). "El capital social. Apuntes provisionales", en *Zona abierta*, N° 94-95, 2001, págs. 83-87. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/revista?codigo=1492>
- Bourdieu. P. (2005) *El Oficio del Científico. Ciencia y reflexividad*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Bourdieu, P. (2011). *Capital cultural, escuela y espacio* (I. Jiménez, Trad.; Segunda edición). SIGLO XXI EDITORES.
- Juliao, C. G., & Barón-Velandia, B. (2013). El enfoque praxeológico. *Praxis Pedagógica*, 13(14), 141-145. <https://doi.org/10.26620/uniminuto.praxis.13.14.2013.141-145>
- López De Parra, L. Prada-Arias. E. y Marín-Arango. D. (2019). Representaciones sociales sobre prácticas investigativas. Condiciones en la universidad. En: *Entramado*. Enero - junio, 2019. vol. 15, no. 1, p. 192-211 <http://dx.doi.org/10.18041/1900-3803/entramado.1.5405>
- UNIMINUTO (2021) *Sistema de Investigación, Desarrollo Tecnológico, Innovación y Creación Artística y Cultural de UNIMINUTO*, Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios - UNIMINUTO
- Villegas, Z. (2016) *Prácticas y Praxis de Investigación en las Universidades*. En: *Revista Ciencias de la Educación*. Julio - diciembre, 2016. vol. 26, no. 48. Disponible en Internet: <http://servicio.bc.uc.edu.ve/educacion/revista/48/art20.pdf>
- Varón, V., Martínez, S., León, Y., y Barón, B. (2020). Pedagogía de la alteridad: entre la educación como práctica social y el ejercicio intelectual. *Revista Insignare Scientia - RIS*, 3(2), 484-508. <https://doi.org/10.36661/2595-4520.2020v3i2.11582>