



Corresponding to Author

¹ Juliana Santos da Conceição

E-mail: julianasantosc@yahoo.com.br

Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto

Ouro Preto, MG, Brasil

CV Lattes

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/4907788756368682>

Submitted: 05 Nov 2020

Accepted: 14 Jan. 2022

Published: 14 May 2022

 [10.20396/riesup.v9i0.8661946](https://doi.org/10.20396/riesup.v9i0.8661946)

e-location: e023011

ISSN 2446-9424

Antiplagiarism Check



Distributed under



The University Field at UFMG (Brazil) and at UBA (Argentina): the Clash Between Scientific Capital and Pedagogical Capital¹

Juliana Santos da Conceição¹  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1767-0364>

Júlio Emílio Diniz-Pereira²  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5401-4788>

¹ Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto ² Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

ABSTRACT

This article aims to discuss the university field in Brazil and Argentina from a comparative study of professional teacher development actions carried out in a public university in each of these countries. We draw on Bourdieu to discuss the concept of field and, based upon it, scientific and pedagogical capital at the university field. The methodological approach adopts a qualitative approach linked to the principles of comparative research. Altogether, the comparative analysis presented in this research reveals university fields with marked distinctions regarding the value given to the capitals involved in each field, and these differences are directly related to the place where professional development actions will occupy the university. We defend the existence of another capital within this field, other than scientific capital, already widely discussed by Bourdieu, and we believe that, with another configuration of the university field, pedagogical capital may come to occupy a prestigious place within it.

KEYWORDS

University field. Scientific capital. Pedagogical capital. University teaching.

¹ Translated by Júlio Emílio Diniz Pereira.

O Campo Universitário na UFMG (Brasil) e na UBA (Argentina): o Embate Entre Capital Científico e Capital Pedagógico

RESUMO

Este artigo tem como objetivo discutir o campo universitário no Brasil e na Argentina a partir de um estudo comparado de ações de desenvolvimento profissional docente realizadas em uma universidade pública em cada um desses países. Apoiamo-nos em estudos de Bourdieu para discutir o conceito de campo e, a partir dele, o capital científico e o capital pedagógico no campo universitário. O percurso metodológico adota uma abordagem qualitativa atrelada aos princípios da pesquisa comparada. No conjunto, a análise comparada apresentada nesta pesquisa nos revela campos universitários com acentuadas distinções no que se refere ao valor dado aos capitais envolvidos em cada campo e essas diferenças têm relação direta com o lugar em que as ações de desenvolvimento profissional ocuparão na universidade. Defendemos a existência de um outro capital dentro desse campo, que não o capital científico, já amplamente discutido por Bourdieu, e acreditamos que, com uma outra configuração do campo universitário, o capital pedagógico pode vir a ocupar um lugar de prestígio dentro dele.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Campo universitário. Capital científico. Capital pedagógico. Docência universitária.

El Campo Universitario en la UFMG (Brasil) y en la UBA (Argentina): el Choque entre Capital Científico y Capital Pedagógico

RESUMEN

Este artículo tiene como objetivo discutir el campo universitario en Brasil y Argentina a partir de un estudio comparativo de las acciones de desarrollo profesional docente realizadas en una universidad pública de cada uno de estos países. Nos apoyamos en los estudios de Bourdieu para discutir el concepto de campo, y a partir de él el capital científico y pedagógico en el ámbito universitario. El enfoque metodológico adopta un enfoque cualitativo vinculado a los principios de la investigación comparada. En conjunto, el análisis comparativo que se presenta en esta investigación revela campos universitarios con marcadas distinciones en cuanto al valor otorgado a los capitales involucrados en cada campo, y estas diferencias están directamente relacionadas con el lugar que ocuparán las acciones de desarrollo profesional en la universidad. Defendemos la existencia de otro capital dentro de este campo, distinto al capital científico, ya ampliamente discutido por Bourdieu, y creemos que, con una configuración diferente del campo universitario, el capital pedagógico puede llegar a ocupar un lugar de prestigio dentro del mismo.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Campo universitario. Capital científico. Capital pedagógica. Docencia universitaria.

Introduction

This article aims to discuss the university field in Brazil and Argentina from a comparative study of professional teacher development actions carried out in a public university in each of these countries. We draw on Bourdieu to discuss the concept of field and, based on it, scientific and pedagogical capital at the university field.

As a methodological strategy, we used the comparative research approach having as research field the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), in Brazil, in which we analyzed the action of a professional teaching development called “PerCurso Docente”, and at the University of Buenos Aires (UBA), in Argentina, in which we analyzed the *Carrera Docente*, developed by the pedagogical advisors of three UBA faculties: *Facultad de Farmacia y Bioquímica*, *Facultad de Odontología* and *Facultad de Derecho*.

We emphasize that the data presented in this article refer to an excerpt from the analysis of the investigation carried out in a doctoral research² that sought to analyze the actions of professional teaching development in Brazil and Argentina. Specifically, our focus in this paper is not to present a comparative analysis of professional teaching development actions, but to discuss the university field and the predominant capitals in each of these fields.

Throughout this article, the theoretical foundations used, and the results achieved by the research will be presented, highlighting the discussion about the university field and the value that is given to each of the capitals involved in this field.

Pedagogy and the University Field

The absence of policies that define the necessary profile for professors in both Brazil and Argentina means that the responsibility for professional teaching development, especially regarding pedagogical aspects, falls to educational institutions. In Brazil, we identified the emergence, in the last two decades, of several initiatives of professional teaching development programs aimed at university teaching. In Argentina, this movement dates from the beginning of the 1980s with the resumption of democracy in the country. However, they are still institutional initiatives and do not emerge as State educational policies.

Therefore, thinking about professional teaching development for university professors overcomes the simplistic idea that in-depth knowledge in a scientific area and the skill as researchers are sufficient for teaching in higher education. Studies such as that of Cunha (2006; 2009; 2016), Isaia (2006), Pimenta and Anastasiou (2011), Zabalza (2004) and Lucarelli (2015) point to the need for pedagogical knowledge that goes beyond mastering some teaching methodologies. It is necessary to understand the students and their specificities.

² CONCEIÇÃO, J. S. Ações de desenvolvimento profissional de professores da educação superior no Brasil e na Argentina: um estudo comparado entre o GIZ (UFMG) e as assessorias pedagógicas (UBA). 2020. 210f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2020.

Teachers must be able to understand their ethical, political, and social role, as they seek constant reflection on their practice.

From this perspective, when thinking about the university as a potential space for the professional teaching development of professors, since they do not have a specific training in their undergrad programs, we rely on the concept of field, by Bourdieu (1983), as we understand that it is in this social space, the university field, that a dialogue can be established between scientific capital and what, in this research, we call “pedagogical capital”. By understanding the existing competitive struggles in this field, we intend to identify how the actions of professional teaching development are perceived within this space and the place that teaching occupies at the university.

A field, according to Bourdieu (1983), is a complex social space, whose structure is a state of power relations between agents or institutions that are specific to it. The structure of the field is governed by laws, rules, and a specific capital. The dynamics of this social space is like a game, in which all agents participate in different positions. Each field is, therefore, a space for the struggle of these agents and institutions for the monopoly of legitimate symbolic violence within it and for the possession of the field’s own capital. A field is defined, among other things, by identifying the objects of dispute and the interests of other fields that are not perceived by those who were not trained to enter it.

Although there are specific ways to exist, the fields have common characteristics and their definition is subject to the way in which these spaces are constructed, which, in turn, are in constant movement. Thus, the structure of a field is related to the capitals that are valued there and the ways in which they are distributed among the agents that comprise them. Thus, the concept of field can be related to the concept of capital and habitus, considering that capital is moved by agents that make up the fields, which are social microcosms formed by specific habitus. Capital works as its own currency (not necessarily in the economic sense), as a useful resource in determining and reproducing social positions in a specific field of the global social space, and its possession is the condition for agents to participate in the social game and can, by virtue of their moves, accumulate more capital (BRANDÃO, 2010). Capital can be presented, essentially, in two ways: incorporated, in the form of dispositions; and objectified, in the form of material goods (BOURDIEU, 2008).

Bourdieu (2003) believes that there are general laws of fields. Fields as different as the fields of politics, sports, religion, have invariant operating laws and that is why he claims it is not absurd to develop a project for a general theory of fields, to use what is learned about the operation of each particular field to interrogate and interpret other fields.

Thus, based upon these theoretical elements by Bourdieu, we understand that the university can be considered a space for competitive struggles, endowed with a capital that makes up the university field and its subfields of struggle. For Bourdieu (2017, p. 115), university capital is possible to be obtained and maintained “through the occupation of positions that allow to dominate other positions and their occupants, [...] this power over the

instances of reproduction of the body university assures its holders a statutory authority”. The instances of reproduction mentioned here can be exemplified with participation in public examination or doctoral boards and in university advisory committees, with statutory authority being a kind of function attribute that is more linked to hierarchical position than to extraordinary properties of the work or the person.

The capital involved in this field is predominantly scientific capital. What is at stake in this scientific field,

it is the monopoly of scientific authority defined, inseparably, as technical capacity and social power, or, if you like, the monopoly of scientific competence (that is, in an authoritative and authoritative manner) that is socially granted to a particular agent (BOURDIEU, 2003, p. 112).

We understand the scientific field as a system of objective relationships between positions acquired by professors/researchers; it is the place, the playing space of a competitive struggle to obtain scientific authority (BOURDIEU, 1983).

Morosini (2006) highlights that the scientific field is guided by the concept of official science: a set of scientific resources inherited from the past that exist in the objectified state (instruments, works, institutions, etc.) and in the incorporated state (scientific habits, schema systems perception, appreciation, and action). For her,

the education system is the only one capable of assuring official science its permanence and consecration, systematically inculcating scientific habitus to the legitimate recipients of the pedagogical action; it is an order that encompasses the set of institutions in charge of ensuring the production and circulation of scientific goods at the same time as the reproduction and circulation of producers (or reproducers) and consumers of these goods (MOROSINI, 2006, p. 393).

The scientific field comprises two forms of power corresponding to two kinds of scientific capital. One of them is political power, related to the accumulation of institutionalized scientific capital and linked to the occupation of important positions in scientific and political institutions – such as commissions, representations, etc. – relating to collegiate bodies, regulators, evaluators, funders, and managers, among others. Institutionalized scientific capital is accumulated by specific political strategies that require time, such as participation in committees, thesis boards and competitions, in meetings and other events that are more or less conventional in the scientific sphere, and often, it is not possible to know whether the accumulation of this type of capital is the principle (by way of compensation) or the result of less success in the accumulation of pure scientific capital, which is more related to bureaucrats. Such pure scientific capital is the kind that corresponds to another, more specific form of power, which is personal prestige, the scientific recognition itself, acquired fundamentally by the recognized contributions to the progress of science, and which concerns mainly the professors/researchers (BOURDIEU, 2004).

Although the expression “pedagogical capital” is not mentioned in any of Bourdieu’s works dealing with the university field, we consider, in this research, that “pedagogical capital”, in addition to the renowned scientific capital and academic capital, is another type of capital to be considered in the analyzes of this field, since it also participates in its configuration dynamics. It is important to emphasize that we understand the university field as a dynamic social space and, as a result, its configuration can change a lot over time. Thus, certain types of capital that were previously highly valued within this field may one day lose value and other types of capital, currently devalued, may be valued and, therefore, transform the logic of operation.

Despite not having considered, in his work, the existence of “pedagogical capital” within the university field, Bourdieu (2017, p. 171) seems to agree with the dynamic nature of this social space, by admitting that this field

it is just the state, at a given moment in time, of the relationship of forces between agents or, more precisely, between the powers they hold in a personal capacity and above all through the institutions of which they are a part, the position occupied in this structure is in the principle of strategies aimed at transforming or conserving it by modifying or maintaining the relative strength of the different powers or, if you prefer, the equivalences established between the different types of capital. (BOURDIEU, 2017, p. 171)

We did not find other studies, apart from those by Corrêa and Ribeiro (2013) and Corrêa (2012), that used the concept of “pedagogical capital” to discuss the university field. It should be noted that these authors also did not make clear, in these works, a definition of what this “pedagogical capital” would be. They only mention it as something in opposition to scientific capital, linked to pedagogical knowledge.

Corrêa and Ribeiro (2013) discussed, in their article, the scientific field and the existing gap of the so-called “pedagogical field” in high education studies in Brazil. They consider that:

since scientific capital is the most valued and recognized type in the field, being fundamentally the product of research, teaching activities are in the background, at least with regard to the concern with its quality and reflection upon practice (CORRÊA; RIBEIRO, 2013, p. 324).

Another researcher who uses the term “pedagogical capital” in Brazilian educational literature is Lélis (1996), but her field of investigation is elementary schools. According to the author, such capital varies according to “school titles obtained, experiences in the plane of personal and professional life” (LÉLIS, 1996, p. 198).

Given the few studies on the university field, specifically with regard to the discussion of accumulation relations of the so-called “pedagogical capital”, an absence of how this type of capital could be conceptualized and, also, when considering that capital is moved by the agents that make up the field, we try, in this research, to seek elements that can help us to understand the “pedagogical capital” within the university structure.

Therefore, in this article, we consider that “pedagogical capital” can manifest itself within the university field through the domain of teaching knowledge, such as knowledge about the teaching object; mastering the most adequate pedagogical strategies and practices for teaching this object; and the good relationships established with students, who are conceived as protagonists in the learning processes. The accumulation of this capital is acquired in their personal and professional experiences, participation in professional teaching development programs offered by the university, acting in collegiate bodies and academic commissions (course collegiate, course coordination, teaching committees, etc.). The results of the performance evaluations completed by the students, the tributes from graduating classes are some ways to recognize the acquisition and accumulation of the so-called “pedagogical capital”.

Thus, one of our challenges in this research was to understand the competitive struggles between scientific and “pedagogical capital” in the Argentine and Brazilian university fields. Then, we asked the following questions: would the acquired capital and the habitus incorporated through professional teaching development actions, especially to the construction of pedagogical knowledge, which we can call pedagogical capital and habitus, have recognition in the field for the participating agents? How to make this capital an object of interest and recognition in the scientific and university field?

We are aware that, when considering the current structure of Brazilian universities, especially public institutions, scientific capital occupies a prominent and powerful place in this field. It is the accumulation of this type of capital that today promotes career advancement and academic prestige within the Brazilian university field. However, it is necessary to emphasize that, in Brazil, before the university reform in 1968, research was an almost non-existent activity and occupied a secondary place in Brazilian universities. After this reform, following strong influences from US universities, research became one of the inseparable elements of the university tripod (teaching, research, and extension) and became the main responsible for the acquisition and accumulation of scientific capital.

We believe that Bourdieu’s field theory can help us to interrogate the university field, in order to broaden the discussions on the professional teaching development of professors, as we understand that the professional teaching development of professors cannot be detached from a look at this field.

Methodological Path

The academic investigation discussed in this article is guided by the methodological theoretical principles of qualitative research. From this methodological perspective, knowledge is not reduced to isolated data, disconnected from an explanatory theory, as highlighted by Goldemberg (1998). On the contrary, the investigating subject is an integral part of the knowledge process, insofar as he is the one who interprets the studied phenomena, giving them a meaning. Linked to the qualitative approach, the research was based upon

comparative methodology. The main argument of comparative research is that it interprets and constructs facts and does not limit itself to discovering or describing them.

For Araújo *et al.* (2008), for example, comparison emerges as a useful methodological resource for understanding social phenomena, especially when they see the growing attention of international organizations in discussing problems, proposing public policies, and articulating solutions for the development of Latin America. The information they have compiled is very useful, although not sufficient to carry out in-depth analyses. In the same direction, Krawczyk and Vieira (2003) highlight that comparison is part of the structure of human thought and the organization of culture. According to these authors:

[...] comparative studies do not compare because of the procedure itself, but because, as an analytical and interpretive resource, the comparison enables this type of analysis to adequately explore its fields of work and reach the goals it proposes. (KRAWCZYK; VIEIRA, 2003, p. 126).

The choice of the two fields of research – UFMG and UBA – is justified by the experience of these institutions in seeking to establish an institutional policy for professional teaching development through the offer of teaching training actions, that is, two institutions that have a culture of professional teaching development. As a data collection instrument, we used observations, document analysis, questionnaire, and semi-structured interviews (21 interviews in Brazil and 14 in Argentina). The interviews were carried out with professors participating in the professional teaching development programs, teacher educators and managers.

For data analysis, we used the thematic analysis technique proposed by Minayo (2010, p. 316) which, in short, “consists of discovering the nuclei of meaning that make up a communication, whose presence or frequency mean something to the analytical object targeted”. We used, as theoretical variables, the indicators for the analysis of professional teaching development programs proposed by Cunha (2014). Thus, we tried to analyze the teaching training actions by taking as reference the three professional teaching development models suggested by this author, who organized them in descending order of centralization: a) model of centralization and control of actions; b) partial model of decentralization and control of actions; and c) decentralized model for monitoring and controlling actions. These models were analyzed from four dimensions: 1) assumptions and characteristics of actions; 2) understanding of professional teaching development; 3) usual formats of training strategies; and 4) monitoring and evaluation formats.

The analyzes allowed us to carry out a comparative study of the two professional teaching development programs to answer the questions that guided this research, in addition to discussing the university field in Brazil and Argentina.

The University Field in Brazil and Argentina

According to Bourdieu, a field is governed by different capitals that will confer different values on it. In the university field, according to the Bourdieusian theory, scientific capital is what has the greatest value and can be acquired through academic titles, publications in prestigious academic journals, peer recognition, by the number of orientations, awards received, among others. Bourdieu (2017, p. 40) defines the university field as

the place of a struggle of classifications which, working to preserve or transform the state of the power relation between the different criteria and between the different powers they designate, contributes to making the classification as it can be objectively apprehended at a given moment in time; but the representation agents have of classification and the strength and orientation they can put into practice to maintain or subvert it depend on their position in objective classifications. (BOURDIEU, 2017, p. 40)

The university fields, in Brazil and Argentina, are quite different. During our research, we realized that the Argentine university field is much more influenced by the professional field than what we can call the “scientific or research market”, regulated by funding agencies. This characteristic influences the type of capital that will be valued by professors to occupy a prestigious place within the university. In Argentina, for example, teaching is governed not only by the qualifications of professors, but essentially by their pedagogical and professional experience. In the Brazilian university field, on the other hand, the title and condition of researcher are what confer a status and position of prestige, which is justified by the nature of the constitution of this field, which is currently strongly regulated by the “scientific market or of research”, being the development agencies an external body that has great influence in this field. Thus, according to Bourdieu (1976 cited by ORTIZ, 2003, p. 135), “depending on the degree of autonomy of the field in the face of external determinations, the social arbitrary part incorporated into the system of constitutive presuppositions of the considered field is greater.”

That is, depending on the autonomy of the field, external agents will determine the capitals valued within that field, as well as the strategies for accumulating these capitals. In the case of the current configuration of Brazilian universities, scientific capital is the one with the greatest value and which confers extremely high power on agents in the field. In Argentina, we cannot say that scientific capital is the only and most valued type of capital in this field. Other types of capital are also valued in Buenos Aires universities, such as capital built through teaching and professional experience, which can be configured as a new type of capital within this field – this new type of capital is called, in this paper, “pedagogical capital.” In Brazil, the domain of scientific capital within the university field is such that it reaches the point of non-recognition of “pedagogical capital” as a valid or legitimate type of capital in this field.

Considering that each capital has different values within a given field, the research reported here encourages us to question whether the capital accumulated from pedagogical knowledge and pedagogical actions could be configured in a new type of capital within the university field – the so-called “pedagogical capital.” Some questions are important to

understand and discuss the existence of “pedagogical capital”: what would be its values, its traditions within the university field? Could “pedagogical capital” add any value to a professor’s career in this field? Considering that it is the field that assigns, to each agent, their strategies, what would be the strategies to give value to the so-called “pedagogical capital?” By investing in the construction of pedagogical knowledge, would professors accumulate “pedagogical capital?” What is the profit given to this type of capital in this field?

Based upon the distinctions highlighted between the current configuration of the Brazilian university field and the Argentine university field, it is essential to understand the characteristics of the main types of capital and the value they receive in each of these two fields.

Bourdieu (1976 cited by ORTIZ, 2003), when dealing with the university field, speaks of succession strategies and subversion strategies. For him, succession strategies...

[...] they are suitable to ensure, at the end of a predictable career, the profits promised to those who realize the official ideal of scientific excellence at the price of innovations limited to authorized limits. Subversion strategies are infinitely more costly and risky investments that can only secure the profits promised to the holders of the monopoly of scientific legitimacy in exchange for a complete redefinition of the principles of the legitimacy of domination. The novices who refuse the outlined careers will only be able to beat the dominant ones in their own game if they commit a supplement of properly scientific investments without being able to expect important profits, at least in the short term, since they have the whole logic of the system against them (BOURDIEU, 1976 cited by ORTIZ, 2003, p. 127).

From the understanding of the specificity of the university field, some questions arise: would accumulating the so-called “pedagogical capital” be a strategy of subversion to the game established in the university field, by breaking with all the logic of the system? In that case, does it propose another game with its own rules without being able to expect profits?

In comparison to the Argentine university field, the university field in Brazil has a stronger emphasis on scientific capital. In Argentina, scientific capital is not configured with such dominance compared to what happens in Brazil. In the neighboring country, pedagogical knowledge and pedagogical actions have a much greater value for career maintenance and progression, that is, there is greater porosity in the Argentine university field and the existence of an opening for the appreciation of other types of capital than just the scientific, in which the capital accumulated from the construction of professional knowledge and teaching occupies a more privileged place in this field.

The differentiated value given to scientific capital within these two university fields is reflected in the conditions for entering a career in the two countries studied here. In the Brazilian university field, in the process of selecting professors, the pedagogical content has a lower value compared to the weight given to publications and the qualification of candidates. And, after joining the career, teaching activities – usually pejoratively called “didactic duties” – count for little for progression and/or promotion, just as the assessment that students make of professors is not even considered in these processes, and it is counted only during the

probationary period. On the other hand, in the Argentine university field, in the selection for the positions of assistant professors, no scientific activity or degree can have a higher score than experience in teaching. There is a specific regulation for this, which emphasizes that “the professors’ antecedents must constitute the item of greater evaluation, in this case evaluation can be surpassed by no other item” (UBA, 1999, art. 24).

Some reports of the interviews carried out in the research mentioned in this article confirm the little value that is given, within the current configuration of the Brazilian university field, to the capital accumulated from pedagogical knowledge. We saw the testimony of a professor from UFMG who reports that, even though she was participating in the professional teaching development program and acting as a teacher educator in a workshop, she did not bother to record these activities in her Curriculum Vitae. She did not register them because she recognized that these activities would not add any value to her career and her academic progression within the University. Participating in these activities does not guarantee any status in the current configuration of the Brazilian university field and it is not an agent for accumulating capital that is minimally valued. Another professor, also from UFMG, stopped prioritizing her participation in professional teaching development programs, when she realized that she would not be able to progress in her career if she did not invest in research, which is why she decided to focus upon academic investigations developed in its laboratory and in the production of patents, as these are the tasks that confer the acquisition of scientific capital and recognition within this field, in its current configuration.

In Argentina, the university field brings some distinct elements in relation to the university field in Brazil. At UBA, for example, most professors do not have exclusive dedication to the university and the degree has a much lower value within the Argentine university field, compared to the value it has in the Brazilian university field. Thus, what confers the greatest academic dividend within the current configuration of the Argentine university field is professional experience in the area in which it operates. This, perhaps, explains the fact that many university professors, called professors *ad honorem*, do not even have a salary to teach in Argentina. These professors are accredited by Argentine university institutions to teach only because of the social prestige that the task confers on them, and they maintain their offices or private offices in harmony with the teaching activity.

Thus, we perceive that the dominant positions within the Brazilian university field, in its current configuration, belong to those who have greater scientific capital and, consequently, who have greater academic prestige. However, it is important to emphasize that this configuration of the university field in Brazil was not always like this. As mentioned earlier in this article, prior to the 1968 university reform in Brazil, research was almost non-existent and occupied a secondary place in university institutions. After this reform, influenced mainly by American universities models, research became one of the inseparable elements of the famous “tripod”: “teaching, research and extension,” and became the main responsible for the acquisition and accumulation of scientific capital.

Cunha's book (2007) on the reformed university, in its last chapter, presents some criticisms about the university reform in Brazil, based upon Anísio Teixeira's ideas, one of the most important intellectuals in Brazilian education at the time. The author highlights the paradigm shift proposed by the reform, which breaks with the university's tradition as a place of teaching for the university that also develops research. Thus, in the words of Cunha (2007, p. 280), "there would be, in this higher education, a transition from a literary culture to a scientific culture, resulting from the introduction of experimental sciences in our faculties."

When the university reform was approved, Anísio Teixeira believed that, even by force of law, it could suddenly transform professors into researchers. In his analysis, "the restructuring that Brazil is dreaming of is a restructuring that will, by a miracle, transform all professors into researchers and all colleges into research institutions. It is completely unrealizable" (CUNHA, 2007, p. 281). More than five decades after the approval of this reform, we realized that the Brazilian university field favored the hiring of professors, for the most part, with the profile of researchers, and contradicted what Anísio Teixeira professed. In other words, the Brazilian university field has been transformed in such a way that its current configuration gives an infinitely greater value to research activities when compared to other activities that form the "tripod" on which universities in Brazil are based upon.

Thus, in the configuration assumed by the Brazilian university field after the 1968 reform, the professor who dedicates himself only to teaching undergraduate classes ends up being devalued by his own peers, as demonstrated by one of the reports of the academic investigation described here.

What fascinated me, what aroused my interest and what motivated me to work all these years... Professionally, it's a shot in your own foot within the university, because your assessment, as a professor, falls far short of other colleagues who invest in clinical research and in recognized publication, right, but I don't regret having made the choice for teaching. [...] No, it is not recognized, understand? So, in your progression... compared to your colleagues in the department... You will never have a productivity or performance according to the criteria established by the department, so there has to be a change in these criteria (Excerpt from a professor interview participant of the research, carried out on 18/08/2017).

The scientific field and the scientific community are not homogeneous. According to Bourdieu (1975), cited by Garcia (1996, p. 68), there is, in the scientific field, an existing classification system, not always explicit, which

treats certain domains, objects, methods, and theories as "worthy" or "unworthy" of receiving the interest and investments of agents in the field. And researchers always participate in the importance and symbolic value that the dominant representation attributes to their work and research objects, their problems, and methods of investigation.

The scientific aspirations of agents within the scientific field are proportional to the recognition capital that each one managed to accumulate. Thus, those professors and researchers better situated within the intellectual field tend to develop a more abundant and "ambitious" academic production the higher their position in the hierarchy of legitimacy in the field (BOURDIEU, 2007).

The constitution of the Argentine university field, according to studies by Badano *et al.* (2014), was marked by cuts and ruptures, always linked to the social and political context in which the country lived.

The article by Badano *et al.* (2004) analyzed where and how social knowledge is produced in the Argentine university field. The authors point to two perspectives of analysis: the first, inspired by Bourdieu, focuses upon the construction of fields of knowledge production with specific internal logics, and indicates, on the one hand, the largest margins of autonomy related to other social spheres, in this case, the European universities, which have shown relative stability. On the other hand, this perspective also highlights that Argentine universities, in addition to the specific modality of university co-management, also present a central aspect for understanding the dynamics of change in their field: the institutional vulnerability resulting from political discontinuity and the influence of the social and political contexts.

The second perspective proposes to place the State again at the center of the analysis and, for this purpose, it maintains that the constitution of Social Sciences is based upon processes intimately linked to development based upon the needs and demands of the State, which, in the late nineteenth century and in the early 20th century, they were modernized and bureaucratized with great speed, dedicated mainly to the elaboration and implementation of public policies.

To understand the path taken by intellectual groups, it is convenient to observe the relationship between the political field and the cultural field, as well as the specific figure that intellectuals acquired.

When considering the professionalization of intellectual practice, Badano *et al.* (2014, p. 238, our translation) emphasize that the figure of the scientific intellectual promoted by positivism would compete with that of the intellectual writer, “and in this way the aesthetic culture would advance its claims for hegemony in the intellectual field. However, the reaction did not take long to arrive, and the nucleus was directed towards the positivist culture, that is, science”.

As progress took place in the process of economic and social modernization in which Argentina lived, the signs of differentiation between the political and cultural spheres would also become more perceptible for the conscience of its actors. The foundation of the *Facultad de Filosofía y Letras*, in 1896, at the UBA, for example, will intertwine several purposes of the ruling elites, among them: to institute the university study of humanistic disciplines, according to the rules of disciplined knowledge, to neutralize, with a faculty dedicated to the “selfless” search for knowledge, the “professionalist” tendency of a university until then oriented almost exclusively to the training of doctors, lawyers and engineers. In the authors’ words:

In this way a new instance of cultural authority arises, based upon the sources of intellectual reputation that were characteristic of the illustrated elite of the 1880s – literary creation, the exercise of journalism or the demonstrations of eloquence and ingenuity in civic debates or in the clubs of horsemen –, bell on the cultivation of a learned knowledge, academically defined and practiced according to the “disinterested” model of scientific investigation. In an intellectual medium that will continue to be seen, after entering the 20th century, numerically reduced, it began to be outlined as the differentiation between the subject actors, the “writers” and the “professors” (BADANO *et al.*, 2014, p. 240).

However, the scope of this segmentation between writers and professors should not be exaggerated, although the signs of differentiation of these actors became increasingly sensitive as the 20th century progressed, the exclusive exercise of university teaching or scientific work would remain, even at the end of the period, an exception. On the other hand, the subset formed by academic intellectuals did not ignore titles of literary nobility, but claimed other titles of cultural eminence, linked to knowledge of science and the cultivation of the erudite professor (BADANO *et al.*, 2014).

Then, in the Argentine context, intellectuals linked to science are not born within universities, but from an intellectual elite with strong influence from the cultural and political field. Hence, the differentiation between intellectual subjects follows, for example, the separation between writers and professors. Only in the 20th century are professors associated with the role of researchers in the university field and this is perhaps one of the hypotheses for the current configuration of the Argentine university field not being so dominated by agents who accumulate scientific capital in relation to what happens in the current configuration of the Brazilian university field.

Given this framework of comparison between Brazilian and Argentine university fields, how can we give value to teaching activities within universities in Brazil? If there were a score for teaching activities in career progression and promotion, as well as for activities related to research, would the Brazilian university field value more “pedagogical capital?” Would it be a path if we treated teaching in a similar way to how publications in the scientific area are treated? Is it possible? We asked ourselves, then, about which elements could give value to “pedagogical capital”: is the professor well evaluated in the evaluations carried out by the students? Or the professor who is often honored during graduations? Or the professor who takes on the coordination of an undergraduate program, who participates in commissions and teaching committees? Are these the paths for the accumulation of “pedagogical capital” within the Brazilian university field?

Final Considerations

Our effort, in the research reported in this article, was to analyze two university fields, in Brazil and Argentina, and raise a provocation about the possibility of the existence of another type of capital in the university field, even though we are aware that we will not find support in the Bourdieusian theory for this. We understand that, despite the strong influence of scientific capital in the university, we cannot deny the existence of other knowledge and

other expertise that can generate other types of capital in this field, including “pedagogical capital.” Discussing this type of capital is not a simple task, as we do not find a definition for it in the specialized literature. Thus, more than definitions, we seek to broaden the discussion around this new type of capital which, despite its lower value within the current configuration of the Brazilian university field, is a type of capital that needs to be valued. Such valuation aims to achieve a greater balance between the value attributed to teaching and research activities within universities, so that investment in activities related to teaching finds a more fruitful space, allowing for a greater balance in the professors’ careers, by directing their work to the area that has more affinity and not just to what is required by agents who currently dominate this field.

Altogether, the comparative analysis presented in the research mentioned in this article reveals that university fields with marked distinctions regarding the value given to the capitals involved in each field, and these differences are directly related to the place that professional teaching development actions will occupy at the university. We demonstrate, through this study, the need to value another type of capital, which is not just scientific, which should permeate the university field, which we called, in this paper, “pedagogical capital.”

We believe that the great contribution that this academic investigation brings to the field of pedagogy and university teaching focuses upon our effort to discuss professional teaching development actions in a broader perspective, analyzing these actions from a perspective of the university field in which each of these actions is inserted. We defend the existence of another capital within this field, which is not just scientific capital, widely discussed by Bourdieu. We believe that “pedagogical capital” can also come to occupy a prestigious place within the university field. However, we are aware that this is not an easy task.

Referências

ARAÚJO, Emilio; BITTENCOURT Jaqueline; CRISTOFOLI, Maria Silvia. Pesquisas educacionais de países latino-americanos: desafios na aplicação dos estudos comparados. *In: III Encontro Internacional de Pesquisadores de Políticas Educativas - Núcleo Educação para a Integração – AUGM, Porto Alegre, 2008. Anais do III Encontro Internacional de Pesquisadores de Políticas Educativas, Porto Alegre, 2008. P.157-163*

BADANO, María Del Rosario; BASSO, Raquel; BENEDETTI, María Gracia; ANGELINO, Afonsina; SERRA, María Florencia; VERBAUWEDE, Viviana; RÍOS, Javier. Campo científico: sujetos, saberes y prácticas en la universidad de los ‘90 Cultura, academia, política... y la producción de conocimiento social. **Ciencia, Docencia y Tecnología, Universidade Nacional de Entre Rios**, v. 4, n. 4, p. 231-245, 2014.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. A economia das trocas linguísticas. *In: ORTIZ, Renato (Org.). Bourdieu: Sociologia*. São Paulo: Ática, 1983, p. 156-183.

- BOURDIEU, Pierre. Algumas propriedades dos campos. **Questões de Sociologia**. Lisboa: Edições Sociedade Unipessoal, 2003, p. 119-126.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. **Os usos sociais da ciência: por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico**. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2004. 86p.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. **A economia das trocas simbólicas**. Organização e seleção de Sergio Miceli. São Paulo: Perspectivas, 2007. 361p.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. **A distinção: crítica social do julgamento**. São Paulo: EDUSP; Porto Alegre: Zouk, 2008. 560p.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. **Homo academicus**. Tradução de Ione Ribeiro Valle. 2. ed. Florianópolis: Ed. UFSC, 2017. 310p.
- BRANDÃO, Zaia. Operando com conceitos: com e para além de Bourdieu. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 36, n. 1, p. 227-241, jan./abr. 2010.
- CORRÊA, Guilherme Torres. Formação pedagógica no ensino superior: um olhar sobre os mestrados e os doutorados acadêmicos em Saúde Coletiva. 2012. 118f. **Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação em Ciências e Saúde)** – Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2012.
- CORRÊA, Guilherme Torres; RIBEIRO, V. M. B. A formação pedagógica no ensino superior e o papel da pós-graduação stricto sensu. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 39, n. 2, p. 319-334, abr./jun. 2013.
- CUNHA, Luiz Antônio. **A universidade reformada: o golpe de 1964 e a modernização do ensino superior**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2007. 300p.
- CUNHA, Maria Isabel. Professor da Educação Superior. In: MOROSINI, M. C (Ed.). **Enciclopédia da Pedagogia Universitária Glossário**. v. 2. Brasília-DF: INEP/MEC, 2006, p. 349-406.
- CUNHA, Maria Isabel. A Educação Superior e o campo da Pedagogia Universitária: legitimidades e desafios. In: ISAIA, S. M. A.; BOLZAN, D. P. V. (Org.). **Pedagogia Universitária e Desenvolvimento profissional docente**. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 2009, p. 349-376.
- CUNHA, Maria Isabel. Aprendizagem da docência em espaços institucionais: é possível fazer avançar o campo da formação de professores. In: PRYJMA, M. F.; OLIVEIRA, O. S. (Org.). **Desenvolvimento profissional docente em discussão**. Curitiba: Ed. UTFPR, 2016, p. 63-78.
- GARCIA, Maria Manuela Alaves. O campo das produções simbólicas e o campo científico de Bourdieu. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, n. 97, p. 64-72, maio 1996.
- GOLDEMBERG, Mirian. **A arte de pesquisar. Como fazer pesquisa qualitativa em Ciências Sociais**. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 1998. 107p.

ISAIA, Silvia Maria Aguiar. Desafios à docência superior: pressupostos a considerar. *In*: RISTOFF, D.; SEVEGNANI, P. (Org.). **Docência na educação superior**. Brasília: INEP, 2006a, p. 63-84. (Coleção Educação Superior em Debate, v. 5).

KRAWCZYK, Nora Rut; VIEIRA, Vera Lúcia. Estudos comparados nas análises sobre política educacional da América Latina. *In*: KRAWCZYK, N. R.; WANDERLEY, L. E. (Org.). **América Latina: Estado e reformas numa perspectiva comparada**. São Paulo: Cortez Editora/ PUC-SP, 2003, p. 113-135.

LÉLIS, Isabel. **A polissemia do magistério: entre mitos e histórias**. 1996. 224f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica, Rio de Janeiro, 1996.

LUCARELLI, Elisa. **Las asesorías pedagógicas universitarias en la Argentina**. Educar em Revista, Curitiba, Brasil, n. 57, p. 99-113, jul./set. 2015.

MINAYO, Maria Cecília de Souza. **O desafio do conhecimento: pesquisa qualitativa em saúde**. 12. ed. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2010. 407p.

MOROSINI, Marília Costa. Campo científico. *In*: MOROSINI, M. C. (Ed.). **Enciclopédia da Pedagogia Universitária Glossário**. v. 2. Brasília-DF: INEP/MEC, 2006, p. 393.

ORTIZ, Renato. **A Sociologia de Pierre Bourdieu**. São Paulo: Olho d'Água, 2003. 169p.

PIMENTA, Selma Garrido; ANASTASIOU, Lea das Graças Camargos. **Docência no ensino superior**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011. 279p.

ZABALZA, Miguel. **O ensino universitário: seu cenário e seus protagonistas**. Tradução de Ernani Rosa. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2004. 239p.