



The Research Agenda in Sociology of Education in Brazilian Postgraduate Programs

Camila Ferreira da Silva¹  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2348-9350>

Rodrigo de Macedo Lopes²  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7047-4530>

Amurabi Oliveira³  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7856-1196>

¹ Universidade Federal do Amazonas, ² Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, ³ Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

ABSTRACT

The self-reflection exercises have marked the history of the Sociology of Education (SE) in Brazil: while the discipline has developed, its researchers have dedicated themselves to thinking about its foundations, trajectory, disputes and contradictions. The fact that in this particular country SE lies at the intersection of two areas – sociology and education – gives it a particular heterogeneity. This article takes this intersection to the analysis and proposes to continue the debate about the specificities of the Brazilian SE, for such it takes as its study object its research agenda. Sociology and Education postgraduate programs (PPGs) served as the basis for mapping of research lines directly linked to SE, accredited teachers / researchers on such lines had their curricula scrutinized to map research projects. In the current research, these projects, finally, were our main source to outline the research agenda of the Sociology of Education today

KEYWORDS

Sociology of education. Brazilian sociology. Academic field. Research agenda.

Corresponding to Author

¹ Camila Ferreira da Silva

E-mail: ferreira.camilasilva@gmail.com

Universidade Federal do Amazonas,
Manaus, AM, Brasil

CV Lattes

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/3520518346076110>

Submetido: 07 nov. 2019

Aceito: 06 mar. 2020

Publicado: 19 mar. 2020

 [10.20396/riesup.v6i0.8657431](https://doi.org/10.20396/riesup.v6i0.8657431)

e-location: e020044

ISSN 2446-9424

Antiplagiarism Check



Distributed under



A Agenda de Pesquisa em Sociologia da Educação na Pós-graduação Brasileira

RESUMO

Os exercícios de autorreflexão têm marcado a história da Sociologia da Educação (SE) no Brasil: ao passo que a disciplina tem se desenvolvido, pesquisadores que a compõem têm se dedicado a pensar as suas bases, sua trajetória, disputas e contradições. O fato de, nesse país em específico, a SE estar situada na interseção de duas áreas – a Sociologia e a Educação – confere-lhe uma heterogeneidade particular. O presente artigo toma esta interseção à análise e se propõe a dar continuidade ao debate acerca das especificidades da SE brasileira, para tal toma como objeto de estudo a sua agenda de investigação. Os programas de pós-graduação (PPGs) de Sociologia e de Educação serviram de base para o mapeamento das linhas de pesquisa diretamente ligadas à SE, os professores/pesquisadores credenciados em tais linhas tiveram seus currículos escrutinados com vistas a mapear os projetos de pesquisa em andamento, estes projetos, por fim, constituíram nossa principal fonte para traçar a agenda de pesquisa da Sociologia da Educação na atualidade.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Sociologia da educação. Sociologia brasileira. Campo acadêmico. Agenda de pesquisa.

La Agenda de Investigación de la Sociología de la Educación en los Programas de Posgrado Brasileños

RESUMEN

Los ejercicios de autorreflexión han marcado la historia de la Sociología de la Educación (SE) en Brasil: mientras la disciplina se ha desarrollado, sus investigadores se han dedicado a pensar en sus fundamentos, trayectoria, disputas y contradicciones. El hecho de que en este país en particular SE se encuentre en la intersección de dos áreas – sociología y educación – le da una heterogeneidad particular. Este artículo lleva esta intersección al análisis y propone continuar el debate sobre las especificidades de la SE brasileña, ya que toma como objeto de estudio su agenda de investigación. Los programas de posgrado en Sociología y Educación (PPG) sirvieron como base para el mapeo de líneas de investigación directamente vinculadas a SE, los profesores/investigadores acreditados en esas líneas tuvieron sus currículos analizados para mapear proyectos de investigación. En la investigación actual, estos proyectos, finalmente, fueron nuestra principal fuente para delinear la agenda de investigación de la Sociología de la Educación de hoy.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Sociología de la educación. Sociología brasileña. Campo académico. Agenda de investigación.

Introduction

The present article analyzes the Brazilian Sociology of Education (SE) as a “part”, positioned in the “whole” of the country's Sociology, endowed with historical specificities and its own struggles around the establishment of its foundations. Such struggles, as the specialized literature has demonstrated for at least three decades (GOUVEIA, 1989; WEBER, 1992; OLIVEN, 1998; NEVES, 2002; COSTA; SILVA, 2003; COSTA; NOGUEIRA, 2009; MARTINS; WEBER, 2010; OLIVEIRA; SILVA, 2014; CÊA; SILVA, 2015; ALMEIDA; HEY, 2018; BARBOSA; GANDIN, 2020), reveal the relationships between the areas of Sociology and Education as spaces in which SE has been developed and reproduced through its consolidation and the formation of new roles.

In spite of the different conclusions that such analyzes led to, it is visible that they converge in the sense of reaffirming the stability and continuous expansion of this field of research. Its interdisciplinarity is also recognized, based on the interface between Sociology and Education, which has intensified in recent years (BALL, 2004; BARBOSA; GANDIN, 2020). However, this interdisciplinary characteristic does not lose in its own horizon the disciplinary characteristics of Sociology, which enable the development of a research centered, above all, on the relationship between social inequalities and schooling (FORQUIN, 1995), mainly in modern societies, which constitute the scope of an analysis on Sociology (GIDDENS, 1997). Thus, the balances find in the amount of the analyzed production¹ the reaffirmation of Sociology as a discipline that observes education from a socially denaturalizing angle, and that allows the support for public policies through its investigative results (SEBASTIÃO; CAPUCHA; MARTINS; CAPUCHA, 2020).

From the objectification of the intersection between the areas in question, the balances about SE in Brazil have multiplied in recent years, revealing a resumption of self-reflection exercises in this field. It is important to highlight that this preparation is carried out both by researchers institutionally linked to the University Faculties of Education, and by those located in Departments of Social Sciences / Sociology. This institutional division - perhaps one of the most incisive characteristics of this field - constitutes the central focus of the analysis undertaken here, provided that despite the recognition by the above mentioned balances and the elaboration of different agendas in these spaces, little attention has been paid to a more empirical analysis on the existing constitutive differences.

From a Bourdieusian perspective, the present article faces the task of objectifying the themes and objects that researchers linked to the Sociology of Education have been working on recently. With the main objective of analyzing the research agenda developed by academics working in the field of SE in Brazil, the graduate programs in Sociology and Education appear here as the first source of data and information, followed by the curriculums

¹ It is important to state here that the aforementioned balances come from different bibliographic bases and methodological excerpts, therefore, there would not be a properly presumed definition.

of these researchers, which provide information related to our empirical object: their ongoing research projects.

Before opening the discussions regarding our object of study, it is important to provoke the reader to reflect with us about a question that can be placed as the guiding thread of the present article: why objectify what we define as a Research Agenda? It has become increasingly common to publish reference works - whether papers or books - that reflect on the paths that each area of knowledge has followed over time. However, it is quite normal in this type of exercise to be almost naive when dealing with data and results, and it is precisely at this point that the present article aims to break the passivity of the results of this type of study. A research agenda is never presented only superficially: it is the result of historical disputes within one discipline and within the scope of its relations with other disciplines in the scientific field. It is also an expression of the exercise of symbolic strength, capital and the positions of agents and institutions that make up this academic space and, precisely because of these characteristics, when we face data on themes, objects, theories, epistemologies and methods that arise from the analysis of a discipline, historically and geographically located, we also face a manifestation of the power relations established within this field of science.

The article is organized as follows: at first, it presents the debate around the research agenda of a given discipline and what this debate can reveal, here are described the conflicts that are generally invisible by the hierarchical system of legitimate themes and objects; soon afterwards, this discussion unfolds and the Sociology of Education in Brazil is briefly presented in a perspective that flirts with historical reconstruction, but which is ultimately concerned with apprehending the oscillation movements in the research agenda over time; a brief methodological note bridges the gap between these first two parts and the presentation, discussion and analysis of the research findings.

2 Research Agendas: What do They Reveal?

The historical processes of autonomy of a certain area of knowledge in the scientific field are constituted of complex movements, not always coordinated or with the same purpose in the short and long term, which lead to the construction of conditions for the possibility of elaborating and consolidating institutional apparatus, human resources and its own academic products compatible with the “scientific game” (BOURDIEU, 2008).

In general, this process of autonomy gain occurs with the establishment of rules, tacit norms, disputes and struggles around the hierarchy of capitals (economic, social, cultural or scientific, or political), objects, epistemologies, methods and positions. The heterogeneity that marks a certain area of knowledge within the scientific field is an expression of how the elements in dispute end up being unevenly arranged.

This understanding allows us to look at what researchers do, that is, their work, in a correlational way: their educational trajectories, the positions they occupy in the field and, consequently, the themes to which they dedicate themselves [and how they do it] are elements that communicate to us, concurrently, the history of the agent and the history of the “specific academic space” (SILVA, 2017) that they compose. At the confluence of these two instances, individual and collective, there is a crucial element for the self-reflection exercise of the scientific field - an exercise that can already be considered typical in the scope of Philosophy, History and Sociology of Science, knowledge or ideas, as well as more recently in studies and researches called “state of the art”, “state of knowledge” or “state of the question”. We are talking about research agendas.

As the bases of a scientific discipline are built and its agents rationalize, design and consolidate consensus around the researcher's profession, a horizon of problems and themes considered relevant in each period of time takes shape (FOUCAULT, 2008). It is the movement of legitimation and disposition within a hierarchical and unequal relation of importance that ends up determining an investigation agenda, which will be assumed and carried out by the agents.

The “disciplinary eye” (BOURDIEU, 2008), that is, the particular names, or even the way of seeing, dividing and constructing the reality of each discipline, provides us, after all, with a clue to understand how this relative autonomy operates in practice on the one hand, and how tautologies are constructed and hierarchized. Regarding the establishment of a research agenda, we are talking about disputes within a discipline around the validation of theories, paradigms, methodologies, themes, objects and also proper names. Such correlated disputes summarize how hierarchies place themselves in the daily life of academic research. About this, Bourdieu (2013, p. 35) states:

The hierarchy of legit, legitimate or unworthy objects is one of the mediations through which specific censorship of a determined field is imposed which, in the case of a field whose independence is poorly affirmed in relation to the demands of the ruling class, can itself be masked of a purely political censorship. The dominant definition of the good things to say and the topics worthy of interest is one of the ideological mechanisms that prevent things that are also very good to say from being said and with topics no less worthy of interest that do not interest anyone, or can just be treated in an embarrassed or vicious way.

Therefore, taking the research agenda to analysis is an exercise that, in addition to mapping themes, problems and approaches, allows us to better understand the disputes surrounding the validation of research fronts at different historical moments. Such regard is also revealing of heterogeneous agendas and forces of legitimation, marked by regional differences, international influences, theoretical disputes and even political differences. The position and weight of the capitals important to science and the academy become, in this context, decisive for the exercise of vanguard power and to become a reference within the scope of the agenda, a power that influences other agents in the field - aspirants or already positioned within it - in order to continue this agenda, through the recognition of its relevance, by a public defense in favor of it, or even by the attraction of young researchers

who see the “avant-garde” as a great chance of insertion in the current research agenda, in a more specific way, and in the scientific field, in a more general way.

With the increasingly accentuated relationship between globalization and higher education and with its consequences at local, national and international levels gradually becoming more drastic (MARTINS, 2015; BIANCHETTI, 2015), nowadays speaking about the research agenda of a discipline in a specific geographical context is, to a certain extent, also dealing with issues dear to the discipline in question at a transnational level. Naturally, this does not mean that there is a single agenda for researchers in the same field at a global level. It means, on the other hand, that the themes and objects locally situated dialogue in a very fruitful way with themes, objects and concerns shared at a broader level by different countries.

The objectification of the research agenda is, therefore, revealing of the scientific game in its expression as a symbolic product: the value system ratified within the scientific field is materialized in the research themes. If the researcher's body, due to its formation and socialization, is an extension of the doxa of the scientific field (BOURDIEU, 2011; SILVA; ALVES, 2018), the research agenda is a crucial element for the dialectic that is present in the mutual insertion movements in the field, an incorporation of the logic of this social space and acceptance in playing the game.

Looking at SE in Brazil, through the research agenda that has been developing in the recent scenario, allows us to continue the self-reflection movements that have marked the national literature, as well as it represents an advance in the debate around what has been elected as a horizon of concern for researchers that constitute the SE space in that country.

In terms of the unfolding of this view, it is also possible to pay attention to the correlations between teaching, research and extension in the national context, depending on the configuration of Brazilian universities. In this way, the research agenda of the Sociology of Education also becomes a relevant expression for thinking about the training of teachers (thinking about degrees in Social Sciences / Sociology and in Pedagogy) and students (in this case more closely in the scope of Social Sciences /Sociology). This is evident in the relationship between the research agenda and the curriculum, and political-pedagogical projects of the courses in question, after all, the agents responsible for legitimizing the agenda are the same who act in the definition and updating of these curriculums, establishing a continuity in their roles.

Furthermore, both the research agenda and the curriculums of the Higher Education courses mentioned above, being the result of disputes around a society perspective and being in constant relation with different social spaces in their definitions, end up revealing political and economic assumptions of men and women, and social relations. Ultimately, the research agenda is still a path for us to understand the meanings and directions of the ethical, social and political commitments of the institutions [universities, research bodies, vehicles for the circulation of publications, development agencies, etc.] and the agents that build, legitimize and reproduce it.

3 Sociology of Education in Brazil: A Look at the Relationship Between its History and its Agendas

The establishment of Sociology in Brazil necessarily involves education as an object of research. In the following topic we will try to present the different phases that SE went through throughout its history, focusing on the research agenda that emerges from the scenario of each period - it is not a list of historical facts about the area, but a movement to apprehend from the specialized literature the main inclinations that marked SE in the country.

The first decades of the twentieth century are marked by the presence of Sociology in normal schools (MICELI, 1989), by the translation of internationally recognized Sociologists works and by the production of original sociological syntheses - although, in fact, based on foreign thinkers. In this context, the production of sociology manuals focused on teaching in normal schools, the main teacher training institutions at that time, is highlighted in which authors such as Durkheim, Le Play and Dewey, stand out (MEUCCI, 2011). It is also important to note that the majority of authors responsible for carrying out such syntheses were self-taught in the field of sociology, with few exceptions, as it is the case of Gilberto Freyre (1900-1987), who had taken sociology courses during his master's degree in Social History at the University of Columbia in the 1920s, and who came to assume the chair of Sociology in 1928 at the normal school of Pernambuco, launching a manual of sociology in 1945.

It is important to understand this movement in the context of the attempt to modernize the school and, consequently, the Brazilian society. As Meucci (2011) rightly indicates, the introduction of Sociology represented the attempt to distance itself from a certain excessively “literary” knowledge existing in the school system, bringing to it a “sociological realism”. Sociology, both in teacher training and in complementary courses in secondary education, aimed to contribute to scientific training in the school system and to unveil socially relevant issues, which would be something fundamental for the consolidation of the transition from the old to the new Republic.

It is also important to point out that many of the first Sociology professors who started working in normal schools were linked to the educational reforms that were taking place in the states, and also at a national level, mainly between the 1920s and 1930s. Many of them joined the Brazilian Education Association (ABE), created in 1924, as it is the case of Fernando de Azevedo (1894-1974) and Alceu Amoroso Lima (1893-1983), who represented some of the most outstanding leaders in this institution, leading the clash between Liberals and Catholics in the institution, whose maximum point of tension came to burst with the publication of the New Education Pioneers Manifesto, which had Azevedo as one of its main authors (CURY, 1988).

All of these uncoordinated movements are expressions of the first steps of SE in the country, where a first effort is seen with the intention of thinking about national education

through the lens of Sociology. In this first moment, it is clear the concern with education as a right in view of the low education levels of the Brazilian population. It is important to highlight the parallel between these first steps, as we are calling it, and the transformations that Brazil was going through with the so-called “Era Vargas” (1930-1945) and its emphasis on developmentalism.

It is at this moment that the educational field itself begins to develop in Brazil, with the creation of the first university experiences, by ABE (as previously mentioned), with the advent of the Ministry of Education and Public Health in 1930, and with the elaboration of the first efforts to create national policies on education. In Brazil, as education begins to be taken as a means or instrument for the accomplishment of an ideal of economic and social development by the State, it also arouses greater interest in the research circuit - naturally these two aspects are correlated, since it is from this point that begins a more systematic incentive and funding for the development of research on education, in order to guide the decision-making at the national policy level, which is consolidated in the subsequent decades. At the same time, the first Social Sciences courses were created in the 1930s², at the same time as some of the main works in the field of social sciences were published, such as “Casa-Grande & Senzala” in 1933 by Freyre, and “Roots of Brazil” in 1936 by Sérgio Buarque de Holanda (1902-1982).

The 1950s, therefore, largely due to the country's modernization processes provided by the government of Juscelino Kubitschek, began to record sociological researches that took education as an empirical object for the first time. The social sciences in this historical moment, more broadly, take on the role of thinking about the processes of urbanization and industrialization that Brazil went through, so the relationship between education/schooling and development/prosperity ends up supporting a good part of the explanations rehearsed at that time (GOUVEIA, 1989). Research institutions were crucial for the consolidation of the Sociology of Education and of the research agenda developed in the first half of the 20th century, with highlights for the Anísio Teixeira National Institute for Educational Studies and Research (INEP) and the Brazilian Center of Educational Research (CBPE)³.

Notably, it is from the 1940s and 1950s that the results of a set of researches developed by the first generation of professional Sociologists in Brazil began to break out. In the 1940s, the Free School of Sociology and Politics of São Paulo had already opened its Graduate Studies division, which contributed to this process in an incisive way.

² The first social science courses created in Brazil are those of the Free School of Sociology and Politics of São Paulo (1933), University of São Paulo (1934), University of the Federal District (1935), Faculty of Philosophy, Sciences and Letters of Paraná (1938) and the Faculty of Philosophy of Bahia (1941).

³ The CBPE Case is emblematic insofar as its proposal, elaborated by Anísio Teixeira (1900-1971), it aimed, precisely, at the elaboration of research developed around social sciences applied to the field of education. During its operation between the 1950s and 1970s, the center had renowned social scientists on its staff, such as Gilberto Freyre, Florestan Fernandes, Darcy Ribeiro (1922-1997), Aparecida Joly Gouveia (1919-1998), although it was unable to fully achieve its goals (SILVA, 2002).

Still in 1954, the 1st Brazilian Congress of Sociology took place in São Paulo, in which, among the twelve included in the proceedings of the event, the following communications were presented: “The Role of the School’s Sociological Study in Educational Sociology”, by Antônio Cândido (1918-2017); “The Teaching of Sociology in the Brazilian Secondary School”, by Florestan Fernandes (1920-1995); “Two Experiences in the Teaching of Sociology”, by Oracy Nogueira (197-1996). Such communications point to the centrality of the educational debate in the community of Brazilian Sociologists at that time.

Concomitant to this movement, the National Faculty of Philosophy, associated with the University of Brazil, begins to elaborate a model of teacher training that has popularized in the country, from which the Bachelor’s Degree courses were followed by a pedagogical training that would guarantee the qualification for teaching in basic education. This course generally consisted of the following subjects: sociological foundations of education, biological foundations of education, applied educational psychology, school administration and comparative education, general didactics, in addition to special didactics.

It is also important to consider that, although Sociology was excluded from secondary education with the Capanema Reform in 1942, in which supplementary courses were extinguished, educational sociology continued to be taught in normal schools. And although there is a certain amount of reassignment between normal schools and social science courses, as Miceli’s analysis (1989) points out, there was a strong reorientation of careers in social sciences towards research and higher education. Added to this scenario is the fact that the first Education Guidelines and Bases Act (LDB) of 1961 guaranteed the right of those graduating from normal schools to teach the subjects of such courses, so that we can infer that the educational sociology taught in these institutions started to distance itself more and more from the debates developed in the Social Sciences courses.

In the scope of academic research, social and educational inequalities are increasingly gaining ground in research in the field of Brazilian SE. The following categories became correlated: family social origin, access to formal schooling levels, performance and dropout. Just like it happened in other countries, during this period researchers engaged in the field of SE in Brazil were dedicated especially to highlight the anti-democratic character of the school system.

The transition from the 1950s to the 1960s in Brazil ended up placing the issue of national education back into debate and in disputes that were ultimately transformed into reforms of the school system, on the one hand, and the strengthening of movements in favor of public education, on the other (GOHN, 2019).

The profound changes engendered by the military dictatorship (1964-1985) led many Social Sciences researchers to dedicate themselves to explaining the political variables and their implications on the educational field (GOUVEIA, 1989). At the institutional level, the University Reform of 1968 created Graduate courses in a model similar to what we have today, in addition to the Faculties of Education, which made possible an even greater

autonomy of the fields of research in Social Sciences and Education in Brazil. For Cunha (1992), we find in this Reform the genesis of the institutional cleavage of SE in Brazil, which would be marked by an increasing distance from the debate developed between the Faculties of Education and the Departments of Social Sciences / Sociology, with the educational research gradually becoming a specialty of such Faculties.

Nogueira (1990), points out that the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, within the scope of the Brazilian SE, was a period that privileged the debate on reproduction. Regarding this, Gouveia (1989, p. 74-75) states:

Despite the oppressive political climate created by the military coup and which was still being felt at the time, or perhaps for that very reason (GOUVEIA, 1985), the seventies were marked by intense discussions raised by theories about the conservative character of the school, held by French Sociologists (Althusser, 1970; Bourdieu, 1974; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1975; Establet, 1975); which, then, were connected to the dilations of radical economists in the United States, related to the linking of that country's school system to the requirements of capitalism.

Redemocratization, however, impels the scientific field to expand this scope of discussion. The Brazilian SE begins a cleavage between macro and micro-sociological perspectives and the school institution appears as the main space that deserves to be problematized. The critical character in the face of social and educational problems and inequalities, which was due to some extent to the post-dictatorial context, continues to have strength during the 1980s and early 1990s, a period in which education is understood as a fundamental key for the consolidation of the democratic project (WEBER, 1996). The theoretical, methodological and, consequently, thematic fragmentation starts to mark SE as of the 1990s: designing a research agenda since then has been a more complex task than ever. The expansion of higher education, the increase in the number of researchers, the multiplication of fronts and objects of research, in a society increasingly connected and with access to information and knowledge in an easy and fast way, constitute factors that are imperative for the comprehension of the current situation of what education Sociologists have done.

This brief tour of the SE agenda in Brazil, in addition to showing the panorama of thematic trends of each period, demonstrates a strong correlation between the historical moment and the problems, themes and theories that have been gaining centrality in the course of the discipline's development. It is known - by the pluri-paradigmatic character of sociology, as a human science, and also by the heterogeneity of themes that coexist within it - that, when the literature points out the main themes that marked this field in each period of its development, it does not mean that research on other themes was not developed in the same period. It means, then, that the legitimate research agenda, the one that managed to impose itself and exercise power to address the concerns of a more expressive number of agents in the field, was held as a mark of that particular moment.

After all, what this discussion hides are the disputes within the specific academic space of Sociology of Education, which, despite the "official" agenda, houses many other

more or less peripheral agendas subject to the dominance of the leadership of the scientific game. The dispute historically placed between the fields of Sociology and Education, in the case of Brazilian SE, is a clear example of how the establishment and legitimization of a research agenda within a discipline are complex processes necessarily linked to the struggles that are fought in the field and the power to indicate the horizon to follow: some terms that appear in the specialized sociological literature, when referring to SE work produced in the field of education, constitute the maximum outsourcing of this dispute (as "unscientific", "para-sociological", "without quality", etc.).

This process of struggles and impositions within the scope of the research agenda is directly related to the positions in dispute within the scientific field and, nevertheless, to the correlations between this field and other social spheres, such as politics and economics - as it is evidenced from the SE trajectory that we have just summarized here: the relationship with the State, the positions in national research institutions and the funding to develop investigations on certain themes are, therefore, examples of elements that are also part of the game of science, despite going far beyond its domain of production.

4 Methodology Note

The task of mapping and analyzing the research agenda of Sociology of Education in Brazil in the recent period implied a series of methodological decisions and lapidations in terms of the scope that the present study has gradually gained. The recognition of the cleavages that mark SE in this country, expressed by the place of Sociology and the place of Education, was crucial to trace the adopted design.

From a mixed, quantitative and qualitative approach, 5 stages were developed, namely: 1) review of specialized literature; 2) mapping of secondary information; 3) production of data from this information; 4) organization and data treatment; and 5) data analysis.

The first stage consisted basically of organizing, reading and establishing a dialogue with the specialized literature, that is, with those works that have been pondering about the research paths in Sociology of Education in Brazil. This stage was responsible for better detecting the object of study, as well as for providing a broader understanding of the current scenario, and it also enabled us to understand the debate about the research agenda in the area as a significant element of collaboration for the discussion.

In the second moment, information was sought about the graduate programs in the two areas that this study contemplates to portray SE in Brazil: Sociology and Education. The electronic pages of the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) and each graduate program were used, respectively, a) in the exercise of mapping graduate programs in the two fields that included areas of research directly linked to

Sociology of Education; and b) to have access to the researchers that compose such research areas. In this sense, we have the following scenario:

Table 1. Research Areas in Sociology of Education in Graduate Programs (PPGs) in Sociology and Education

PPGs in Sociology	
Institutions	Areas of Research in Sociology of Education
Federal University of Piauí (UFPI)	State and Society: Labor, Education, Political actors and social inequalities.
University of Brasília (UnB)	Education, Science and Technology.
University of São Paulo (USP)	Sociology of Education.
Federal University of Goiás (UFG)	Educational Practices in the Contemporary Society.
Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE)	Education, Labor, Science and Technology.
Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS)	Society and Knowledge.
PPGs in Education	
Institutions	Areas of Research in Sociology of Education
University of São Paulo (USP)	Sociology of Education.
State University of Campinas (UNICAMP)	Education and Social Sciences.
Federal University of São Carlos (UFSCAR)	History, Philosophy and Sociology of Education.
Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG)	Sociology of Education: schooling and social inequalities.
Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC)	Sociology and History of Education.
Federal University of Ceará (UFC)	Philosophy and Sociology of Education.

Source: Self-elaboration.

It is recognized here that there are both programs in Sociology with more generic areas of research, which also include the educational debate, or in the case of Education programs, some with broader areas that incorporate the sociological discussion. However, our intention was to provide visibility to the institutionalization of a specific research agenda in the field of SE in the two domains in question.

The production of data from the survey that was carried out in the previous step analyzes the researchers who make sense and manage these areas of research within their respective graduate programs. To this end, the subjects' curriculums were used in order to compile, organize and process data related to research projects that are currently under development. Our selection led us to 13 professors / researchers in the Sociology PPGs and another 62 professors / researchers in the Education PPGs.

Although it would escape the focus and scope of the article presented here, it would be interesting to note that among the researchers linked to Sociology programs, we mostly find researchers with doctoral degrees in Sociology / Social Sciences, while in Education we find a greater number of researchers with a doctoral degree not only in these areas but also in Education. Often we find researchers who have carried out an educational transition between Education and the Social Sciences, whether by carrying out an initial training in Pedagogy and graduate studies in Social Sciences, but also the reverse. In the case of researchers linked to Education Programs, we also find some cases of agents who carried out all academic

training in the area of Education, which may point to the fact that SE in these spaces, to some degree, constitutes a self-reported field, distanced from the *stricto sensu* debate developed within Sociology.

Of this total of professors, the projects that each of them developed were initially evaluated. For the sample, however, were selected only projects with the status "in progress" at the time of data collection: projects that did not dialogue with educational phenomena, debates or theories were not selected; and, finally, we paid attention to projects coordinated by professors belonging to the academic graduate programs in Education and Sociology. The treatment of data related to these research projects and the subsequent analysis undertaken gained meaning during the course of the study and here in this article, as they shed light on our object of investigation. The analytical categories that have been built gain centrality in the next topic of this text.

5 Results and Analysis: The Sociology of Education

The survey presented in this section is the result of a data collection carried out between the months of January and August 2019. This time marker provides a state of the production of research developed in the Graduate Programs of Sociology and Education that fit the major area of Sociology of Education.

Altogether 99 research projects were found. 8 of them are developed in graduate studies in Sociology and 91 are developed by professors linked to graduate studies in Education. At first, this number could lead to the belief that the numerical difference between PPGs in these two areas, 21 PPGs in Sociology and 136 PPGs in Education⁴, would explain the difference in the number of projects developed in both areas. However, when looking at PPGs that have research areas related to Sociology of Education, we have 6 PPGs in Sociology and 6 in Education⁵, although it should be considered that Education Programs tend to be larger, in some cases (as in USP and at UNICAMP) with more than one hundred accredited teachers.

The contrast is present among the number of teachers who dedicate themselves to the Sociology of Education in these programs. PPGs in Sociology present only 12 professors who carry out research on topics related to SE, whereas in Education PPGs there are 67 professors. Some researches have pointed to the lack of works that take Education as an object of study in the Sociology PPGs. Gouveia (1989) already pointed to the prominence of works related to

⁴ In Brazil there is a classification between PPGs whose characteristics are related to the development of research and advancement of science and PPGs that are aimed at proposing solutions to practical problems in the labor market. The first is called Academic PPG, while the second is called Professional PPG. The number we present refers to the total of academic graduate programs in both areas.

⁵ The research areas are formed by the professors who make up the PPGs and aim to present the PPGs' research interests. The research areas can be found on the websites of each PPG. In general, they provide a short description of the main fields of research. It was this description that led us to PPGs and professors who work with topics related to the Sociology of Education.

the Sociology of Education in the Education PPGs. In the 1990s, Neves (1991) highlighted that among 13 PPGs in the area of Sociology, only 4 PPGs had interests related to SE.

We also highlight the different ways of recruiting professors among these two institutional spaces, with specific admission exams focused on SE in the Faculties of Education being more frequent. Not surprisingly, we can see a more intense renewal of staff in the Education Programs, while in the Sociology Programs - although there is a smaller number of professors - we find a greater concentration of consolidated researchers, who have research productivity grants, who work as visiting professors abroad, and who participate in boards of scientific societies, giving advice for funding agencies, etc.

Searching for an alternate path to the dominant reading in the balances about academic production in the field of SE - which states that there are theoretical and methodological weaknesses in the research developed in the Education⁶ PPGs - we propose to question whether there has been a tradition of themes related to SE in PPGs in Education. Furthermore, we question the extent to which criticisms of the theoretical and methodological weaknesses of the works developed in the Education PPGs are mechanisms of scientific struggle for legitimacy in the academic field related to SE in Brazil.

After this preamble, which aimed to present and explain the general lines of what we have discovered in the survey, problematizing some lines of argument from previous balances, we will seek to detail the research projects developed by the SE area in Brazil.

After collecting the abstracts of the research projects, the first categorization of the works found was processed. In this stage, 37 analytical categories were created that varied according to the titles and abstracts of the projects. After that, we processed a new synthesis seeking to bring together projects that were initially in different categories. It was the cases, for example, of the categories "Sociology Teaching", "History Teaching" and "Philosophy Teaching", which became the category "Teaching". Or the case of the categories "Gender and diversity", "Indigenous education" and "Ethnic-racial diversity" that became the category "Education, Gender and Ethnic-racial Diversity". At the end of this synthesis work, we built 21 categories distributed as follows:

⁶ As Oliveira and Silva state, most balances covering production in the SE area indicate that there is a tense relationship between the Sociology and Education PPGs based on the continuous comparison between the productions developed in these PPGs. In addition, the authors point out that, because such balances are carried out by social scientists, it is common to point out theoretical and methodological weaknesses in the works developed in Education PPGs.

Table 1. Categorization of Research Projects within the scope of SE

Categories	No of Projects	%
Higher Education	15	13%
Teacher Training	11	9%
Theoretical Study	10	8,5%
School Education and Social Justice	9	8%
Education, Gender and Ethnic-racial Diversity	9	8%
Teacher Work	9	8%
Teaching	8	7%
Studies on Academic Production	8	7%
Education Policy and Legislation	7	6%
Family-school	6	5%
Education and Political Participation	4	3%
Child Education	4	3%
Intellectuals and Pedagogical Thinking	4	3%
Education, Heritage and Memory	3	2,5%
Professional Education	2	2%
Basic Education Assessment	1	1%
Education, Science and Innovation	1	1%
History of Education	1	1%
Trajectories and Professional Careers	1	1%
Others (School and Cinema [1]; School and Infrastructure [1]; Pedagogical Action [1]; School life [1])	4	3%
Total	117	100%

Source: Self-elaboration.

At first glance, the total number divergences in relation to the total number of projects presented at the beginning of this section of the text draws attention. This happens because certain projects are in border regions between categories. This is the case, for example, of the project “Sociology Teaching: Teacher Training, Content and Teaching Resources”, which was included in the categories “Teacher Training” and “Teaching”. Or the project “Trainers of Classroom and Distance Teachers: between Processes of Professionalization and De-professionalization” that was included in the categories “Teacher Training” and “Teacher Work”.

The category that added up to most projects is "Higher Education". In its composition we have 4 projects developed in Sociology PPGs and 11 in Education PPGs. The projects address a wide range of topics at this level of education, from higher education models to internationalization, including topics such as dropout, expansion, inclusion and democratization. Curiously, among the 8 projects developed in the Sociology PPGs, half of them covers issues related to higher education. This number reflects a trend indicated in previous studies (MARTINS; WEBER, 2010; OLIVEIRA; SILVA, 2016). In this sense, the current production in the SE area in Sociology PPGs follows the same direction indicated by other studies.

The curious fact, however, lies in the case of Education PPGs. Traditionally, there has been a trend in the division of academic work in terms of research objects between these areas. Sociology PPGs usually are restricted to the study of higher education, while Education PPGs are dedicated to the study of phenomena related to basic education. The data indicate that there has been a change in this trend since researchers located in the field of Education have developed projects related to higher education.

Another curious fact is the category "Theoretical Study". Only works that related theoretical constructions by different authors to educational phenomena were included in this category. These are the cases of the "Critical Theory, Rationalities and Education" project, or of the "Education, Biopolitics and Human Rights" project. Projects such as - for example - "Hannah Arendt and Walter Benjamin: Eros of Friendship and Elective Affinities" or "Tensions in Sociological Theory and its Forms: the Concept of 'Constellation' and the Formative Processes of Theories of Society in Circulation", were not included in the valid sample for this work for not relating theoretical constructions to educational phenomena. Even more curious is the absence of works of this category in Sociology PPGs, which demonstrates a more empiricist direction of researches concerned with education in these programs.

The "Teaching" category, which contains 8 projects, has as its main characteristic the strong presence of projects related to Sociology Teaching. Of the total, 6 works are directed to the teaching of Sociology, the other two are directed to the teaching of History (1) and the teaching of Philosophy (1). This statistics is directly related to the resumption of the concern, within Sociology, with the issue of the discipline within Secondary Education in Brazil - the tension between the presence / absence of sociology in Basic Education, as well as issues concerning the curriculum, pedagogical practices, textbooks and also the Institutional Scholarship Program for Teaching Initiation (PIBID) became matters that not only rekindled Sociologists' interest in education, but also started to constitute themes of Admission Exams for Professors in the SE area at institutes / faculties of sociology and social sciences in Brazilian universities.

One category presents a strong institutional concentration, that is, many projects are developed within the same institution, it is the "Family-school" category. Among the 6 projects found, 5 come from the Education PPG of the Federal University of Minas Gerais. At

the opposite extreme, the category “Higher Education”, in addition to not having a strong institutional concentration, with research projects all over the country - except in the northern region - it is distributed among the two fields of knowledge. In this analysis, this category follows the trend of previous surveys, which point this issue as central to Brazilian academic concerns (NEVES, 2002; WEBER, 1992; ROMANELLI; NOGUEIRA; ZAGO, 2013).

Given the presented data, it is possible to infer that some categories have consolidated themselves as classic themes in the thinking about SE in Brazil. In the 1990s, Weber (1992) highlighted that the predominant themes were: State and Education; University and Society; the Teacher and their Pedagogical Methods; and Popular Education. In the early 2000s, Neves (2002) pointed to the following priority themes: Schooling and Social Inequalities; School and Violence; School and Teacher: Work and Profession; Education Policies; Higher Education in Transformation; Education and Work; Social Movements and Education; and, finally, Education and Gender.

In our survey, we see traditional themes blend with more recent ones. On the one hand, we have three blocks of themes that have been featured since the first surveys regarding SE in the country (even with other nomenclatures), they are: a) “Teacher Training” and “Teacher Work”, which together represent 17% of the total of projects mapped here; b) “School Education and Social Justice” (8%), which establishes a bridge with what Neves (2002) pointed out as the concern with the relationship between Education and Social Inequality; and c) “Education Policy and Legislation” (6%), which appeared in other surveys with works that were concerned with dealing with the performance of the State regarding National Education, Education as a Social Public Policy or even the analysis of specific Education Policies - in this case it is necessary to highlight that all these research fronts continue to feature within SE. On the other hand, we have themes more recently incorporated into the research agenda of the Brazilian SE and which have been gradually consolidated, such as: “Education, Gender and Ethnic-racial Diversity” (8%), “Studies on Academic Production” (7%), in addition to “Early Childhood Education” (3%) - the latter has found direct dialogue with the consolidation of the so-called Sociology of Childhood in many countries.

In summary, taking the aforementioned studies in a comparative view, we observe the following themes chosen by the scientific community as priorities:

Table 2. Privileged Topics within the Brazilian SE / Comparison between Balances (1992 / 2002 / Current)

Privileged Topics within the Brazilian SE			
Themes	Survey carried out by Weber (1992)	Survey carried out by Neves (2002)	Current survey
<i>Reflections on Higher Education</i>	University and Society	Higher Education in Transformation	Higher Education
<i>Reflections on the Teacher's Work</i>	The Teacher and their Pedagogical Methods	School and teacher: Work and Profession	Teacher Work and Training
<i>Reflections on the relationship between Politics and Education</i>	State and Education	Education Policies	Education Policy and Legislation
<i>Reflections on the relationship between Education and Social Movements</i>	Popular Education	Education and Gender Social Movements and Education	Education, Gender and Ethnic-racial Diversity

Source: Self-elaboration.

Twenty-seven years after the first survey considered in the present work, it is possible to perceive the persistence of issues related to Higher Education, Educational Policies and the Teaching Profession, which was possibly reinforced by the Higher Education expansion acceleration in Brazil in recent years, and the consequent entrance of new audiences into the Universities, which has launched new challenges to the SE research agenda in Brazil. It can also be inferred that, with regard to the teaching profession, this debate gains centrality due to the teaching activities carried out at the Faculties of Education, and by the recent approximation between the Departments of Social Sciences / Sociology with the reintroduction of Sociology in basic education as from 2008. In the case of issues related to the relationship between Education and Social Movements, it is possible to perceive a slight turn in the direction of updating the scientific repertoire to understand new demands imposed by changes in social movements. In this sense, it is interesting to see how Gender and Racial themes were incorporated into scientific concerns, which tends to be related to the advent of affirmative actions in the educational system.

Finally, it is noted that these changes and shifts in the research agenda of Sociology of Education in Brazil concomitantly express broader social transformations in society that end up emerging old and new concerns that enter the scientific field and the very struggles within this field to define and legitimize a research agenda and its themes, objects and theoretical and methodological references. This understanding allows us to disrupt with an automated idea concerning the relationship between social issues and sociological issues, as if the concrete - through a kind of hyper-empiricism - determined what researchers are concerned with at each time, as well as with a purely formalistic and rationalist idea of the construction of an investigation agenda (BOURDIEU; CHAMBOREDON; PASSERON, 2007).

Conclusions

The Sociology of Education in Brazil is traversed by the history of the institutionalization of Sociology itself in the early 20th century, this being the first subfield of this discipline to become independent (MEUCCI, 2011), and then by the transformations undergone by the Brazilian Higher Education in the second half of this same century. The University Reform of 1968, the Graduate Programs and the creation of the Faculties of Education represented fundamental elements for the division that continues to this day between the areas of Sociology / Social Sciences and Education.

Based on the transits that Sociologists carry out between these two areas - either in the training, especially in the context of graduate studies, or in professional methods (OLIVEIRA; SILVA, 2016) - studies, researches and literature focusing on SE in the country have been concerned with understanding these two heterogeneous spaces that form what we call the Brazilian SE field.

Bearing this in mind, the present article started from the correlation between the areas of Sociology and Education and sought to map the research agenda that has been legitimized in the recent scenario. Sociology and Education Graduate Programs were the initial locus of study for the construction of the database with which we work - and, more specifically, the research projects of educational Sociologists accredited in the programs in question, that are currently under development and that have been taken into analysis, with a view to capturing and analyzing what themes / issues these researchers have been dedicated themselves to.

The data reveal thematic trends that cross the Sociology and Education PPGs. Among them, we highlight the continuity of certain topics, such as researches related to Higher Education, studies on the Teaching Profession and researches on Education Policies. On the other hand, it is possible to notice some changes in the topics already indicated by previous researches. This is the case with investigations that deal with the relationship between Education and Social Movements. In this case, the emergence of problems related to gender and racial discussions shows the direction that scientific transformations have taken.

It is also important to highlight a few curious elements of the SE research field in Brazil, namely: the preference of researchers located in the Sociology PPGs for topics related to Higher Education; the institutional concentration of a specific topic - such as the works that deal with the Family-school Relationship at the Federal University of Minas Gerais; and the nationalization movement of researches on Higher Education, since it is possible to find studies about it distributed in practically all regions of the country, except the North region.

The continuities and ruptures that arise from the analysis of the SE research agenda in Brazil communicate to us the transformations at two different levels: the level of the discipline itself, always understood in correlation in the scientific field; and the level of social changes that the Brazilian society experiences in general. Regarding the first level, the forces that have value in the academic universe operate here, such as: the weights of higher

education and research institutions; the positions that certain groups of researchers occupy and how, because of such positions, they can legitimize and pulverize trends within the research agenda; and also the historical and academic tradition that certain themes have reached within the discipline, to the point of becoming a distinctive element both for aspirants and for the more experienced researchers developing it. At the second level, the question is more complex, because here we face social changes and their representations for those who compose the scientific field: the social value and the scientific value of the issues and problems that arise daily in an imperative way for the Brazilian society, together, they corroborate [or not] their analytical approach and their incorporation into the research agenda. It is worth noting at this point that it is not uncommon to see researchers linked to SE - and here this question applies to many other areas of knowledge - that sporadically occupy positions in the political field (such as secretaries, consultants, among other positions) , which can also be a significant element when thinking about this possibility of fluidity of national public issues to the scientific field.

Finally, the trends identified in this paper reinstate classic issues in various disciplinary subfields that involve knowledge related to SE. It is known that SE composes the curriculum of undergraduate and graduate courses, either more centrally with specific subjects, or more tangentially with subjects whose contents mix debates of Sociology of Education with other issues, such as Education Policy . In this sense, it is worth questioning the possible relationships between the continuities and / or ruptures pointed out in this text and the formation of new generations of Sociologists in Education, whether of teachers for Basic Education or for Higher Education, researchers or professionals who work in other sectors - this reflection may point to a new front of study linked to the relationships between this specific academic space and its role beyond the scientific issues of the field, unfolding into an attention to the role of SE in the formation and renewal of teaching staff in the country.

References

ALMEIDA, Ana Maria; HEY, Ana Paula. Sociologia da Educação: olhares sobre um campo em ascensão. *In*: MICELI, Sergio; MARTINS, Carlos Benedito (Org). **Sociologia Brasileira Hoje**. São Paulo: Ateliê Editorial, 2018. p. 253-310.

ALTHUSSER, Louis. **Ideologia e aparelho ideológico do Estado**. Lisboa: Ed. Presença, 1970.

BALL, Stephen J. The Sociology of Education: a disputational account. *In*: BALL, Stephen J. (org.). **The Routledge Falmer Reader in Sociology of Education**. Londres: Routledge, 2004. p. 1-12.

BARBOSA, Maria Ligia de Oliveira; GANDIN, Luís Armando. Sociologia da educação brasileira: diversidade e qualidade. **BIB**, São Paulo, n. 91, p. 1-25, fev. 2020.

BIANCHETTI, Lucídio. **O processo de Bolonha e a globalização da educação superior:** antecedentes, implementação e repercussões no que fazer dos trabalhadores da educação. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras, 2015.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. **Para uma sociologia da ciência.** Lisboa: Edições 70, 2008.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. **Razões Práticas:** sobre a teoria da ação. Campinas: Papirus Editora, 2011.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. Método científico e a hierarquia social dos objetos. *In:* NOGUEIRA, Maria Alice; CATANI, Afrânio Mendes (Orgs.). **Escritos de Educação.** 4. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2013. p. 35-42.

BOURDIEU, Pierre; CHAMBOREDON, Jean-Claude; PASSERON, Jean-Claude. **O ofício de sociólogo:** metodologia da pesquisa na sociologia. Tradução: Guilherme João de Freitas Teixeira. 6. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2007.

BOURDIEU, Pierre; PASSERON, Jean-Claude. **A reprodução.** Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Francisco Alves, 1975.

CÊA, Georgia Sobreira dos Santos; SILVA, Camila Ferreira. Mosaicos das sociologias da educação no Brasil: mapeamento da produção do GT-14 da ANPED na primeira década do século XXI. **Quaestio**, Sorocaba, v. 17, n. 1, p. 215-241, maio 2015.

COSTA, Marcio; NOGUEIRA, Maria Alice. Desiguais oportunidades de escolarização: antigo tema sob novos olhares na Sociedade Brasileira de Sociologia. **Revista Contemporânea de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 4, n. 8, p. 228- 233, 2009.

COSTA, Marcio; SILVA, Graziella Moraes. Amor e desprezo: o velho caso entre sociologia e educação no âmbito do GT-14. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, n. 22, p. 101-120, jan./abr. 2003.

CUNHA, Luiz Antônio. A educação na sociologia: um objeto rejeitado? **Cadernos Cedex**, n. 27, p. 9-22, 1992.

CURY, Carlos Roberto Jamil. **Ideologia e educação brasileira:** católicos e liberais. São Paulo: Cortez, 1988.

ESTABLET, Roger. A escola. **Revista Tempo Brasileiro**, n. 35, p. 93-125, out./nov. 1973.

FORQUIN, Jean Claude (Org). **Sociologia da Educação:** Dez anos de Pesquisa. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1995.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **A arqueologia do saber.** Tradução: Luiz Felipe Baeta Neves. 7th ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2008.

GOHN, Maria da Glória. **Participação e democracia no Brasil:** da década de 1960 aos impactos pós-junho de 2013. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 2019.

GIDDENS, Anthony. **As consequências da modernidade.** São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 1997.

GOUVEIA, Aparecida Joly. As Ciências Sociais e a pesquisa sobre educação. **Tempo Social**, São Paulo, v. 1, n.1, p. 71-79, 1989.

GOUVEIA, Aparecida Joly. Orientações teórico-metodológicas da sociologia da educação no Brasil. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, n. 55, p. 63-67, nov. 1985.

MARTINS, Carlos Benedito. Notas sobre a formação de um sistema transnacional de ensino superior. **Caderno CRH**, Salvador, v. 28, n. 74, p. 291-308, 2015.

MARTINS, Carlos Benedito; WEBER, Silke. Sociologia da Educação: democratização e cidadania. In: MARTINS, Carlos Benedito; MARTINS, Heloisa (Org). **Sociologia**. São Paulo: ANPOCS, 2010. p. 131-201.

MEUCCI, Simone. **Institucionalização da sociologia no Brasil: primeiros manuais e cursos**. São Paulo: Hucitec, Fapesp, 2011.

MICELI, Sergio. (1989). Condicionantes do desenvolvimento das ciências sociais. In: MICELI, Sergio (Org.). **História das Ciências Sociais no Brasil**. São Paulo: Editora Vértice/IDESP/FINEP. p. 72-110.

NEVES, Clarissa Eckert Baeta. Estudos Sociológicos sobre Educação no Brasil. In: MICELI, Sergio (Org.). **O que ler na ciência social brasileira 1970-2002**. São Paulo; Brasília: Editora Sumaré; CAPES, 2002. p. 351-437.

OLIVEIRA, Amurabi; SILVA, Camila Ferreira da. **A Diversidade de Agentes e Agendas na Sociologia da Educação no Brasil**. No prelo.

OLIVEIRA, Amurabi; SILVA, Camila Ferreira da. A sociologia, os sociólogos e a educação no Brasil. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais**, São Paulo, v. 31, n. 91, p. 1-15, jun. 2016.

OLIVEIRA, Amurabi; SILVA, Camila Ferreira da. Mapeando a sociologia da educação no Brasil: análise de um campo em construção. **Atos de Pesquisa em Educação**, Blumenau, v. 9, n. 2, p. 289-315, maio/ago. 2014.

OLIVEIRA, Amurabi; SILVA, Camila Ferreira. The Sociology of Education in Brazil Today. **RASE – Revista de Sociología de la Educación**, v. 13, n. 1, p. 39-54, 2020.

OLIVEN, Arabela Campos. O GT Educação e Sociedade: um balanço de sua atuação. **Anuário de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 97/98, p 319-329, 1998.

ROMANELLI, Geraldo; NOGUEIRA, Maria Alice; ZAGO, Nadir (Org). **Família e escola: novas perspectivas de análise**. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 2013.

SEBASTIÃO, João; CAPUCHA, Luís; MARTINS, Suzana; CAPUCHA, Ana Rita. Sociologia da Educação e construção de políticas educativas: da teoria à prática. **RASE – Revista de Sociología de la Educación**, v. 13, n. 1, p. 7-19, 2020.

SILVA, C. F. (2017). **(Ciências da) Educação no Brasil e em Portugal**: autonomização dos espaços acadêmicos específicos. 2017. 333f. Tese (Doutorado em Ciências da Educação) – Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal, 2017.

SILVA, Camila Ferreira da; ALVES, Mariana Gaio. As aspirações dos aprendizes: doutorandos em educação no Brasil. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 48, n. 167, p. 280-308, jan./mar. 2018.

SILVA, Graziella Moraes. **Sociologia da sociologia da educação**: caminhos e desafios de uma policy science no Brasil (1920-79). Braganca Paulista: Universidade São Francisco, 2002.

WEBER, Silke. A produção recente na área de Educação. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, n. 81, p. 22-32, maio 1992.

WEBER, Silke. **O Professorado e o Papel da Educação na Sociedade**. Campinas: Papyrus, 1996.