

School and future: failed interpellations

Myriam Southwell¹

University of La Plata and FLACSO, Argentina

Introduction

The future has been a strong structuring notion of the development of the school from its origin and until today, we could say that it is an inherent notion to the very idea of school. Modern school was consolidated through an articulation between education and utopia: society would be what school made of it.

This notion is reactualized whenever it is argued that some social phenomena arise as a result of insufficient school education from aspects that can range from solidarity and democratic values, to traffic laws and tax education.

My interest in this article is to problematize this school / future articulation by dwelling on the ways in which it is currently enunciated in our schools, as well as on the evocation usually made of how that formulation worked in the not too distant past.

I am also interested in analyzing whether this is the only way - with a universalist claim - that the school can be linked to the future or whether it is a particular story, and thus one of several possible ways. Finally, we will conclude by proposing some possibilities to recreate that relationship.

Perceptions about the future

To begin, we will present some testimonies of Principals of Secondary Schools of the provinces of Neuquén, Salta, Buenos Aires and Buenos Aires city (Argentina). These testimonies were collected through a research program "Intersections between inequality and secondary education: an analysis of the dynamics of production and reproduction of school and social inequality in four jurisdictions" which began in 2006 and has been continued through different projects.

A conceptual aspect that should be highlighted is that the principals' perception of who the school students are and who they can be, what role the community has and what kind of links with the culture the school must lead, model, configure and establishes strong marks on the decisions that promote certain training experiences for the young people who attend them.

Thus, a central conceptual element for our analysis is the performative character of language, that is, following Austin (1962/1988), performative acts must be considered in terms of their effectiveness, success or failure, and the effects they produce.

It is about the production of subjects, that is, the constitution of subjects as effects of the meaning of social discourses, which form significant frameworks that interpellate subjects through different subjective "types", constituting them (young, excluded, student, delinquent, etc). As we will explore later, interpellation - as a form of nomination - produces the subject by establishing the coordinates of their identification



TO CITE THIS ARTICLE PLEASE INCLUDE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING DETAILS:

Southwell, M. (2017). School and future: failed interpellations.

Transnational Curriculum Inquiry 14 (1-2) <http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci> <access date>

and therefore their positioning (and existence) in the network of relationships that structure the social. Interpellation does not address a subject that already exists prior to this act, but produces it in its own operation. The very gesture that "places us" in the framework of social meaning, invests us with a power to be and to do. It constitutes us in the social existence and enables us to be able to do from that positioning.

What perceptions do principals have about the future of their students? What links exist between these perceptions and the horizon of school action? The following testimonies arose from consulting the principals about the future they envision for their students and what is the impact of the school in relation to that future. Responses significantly varied based on the social sector to which students belong:

The students know that the secondary certificate serves them to be repositories of merchandise in (supermarket), they know that they arrive there, nothing more, but the objective of the school would be to achieve something else" (State school, Buenos Aires city that attends middle-low classes).

They are students who are still pursuing progress, who expect the school to give them a degree for their job, without many aspirations, of course. The secondary school gives them certifications ... maybe, in their perspective, the university is not yet much. Here, for example, many of these families are registered to be police, for the army, for the Armed Forces in general "(State school, province of Salta, which serves the lower class).

For these students? I believe that they have no insertion (...) In these cases I believe that our children are disadvantaged because they are young people who do not have facilities to access some work, much less thinking about their orientation: mercantile expert. That's something we see, our graduates are working in a supermarket, they are not working in an accounting studio, they are helping as secretaries. (...) "And, I do not know if I see them studying, I do not think most of them go to the University" (School state, province of Neuquén, that attends to lower class).

I think most of them do not want anything, they want social assistance and nothing else, they do not have aspirations, they have no future, they will get a taxi driver" (State School, Buenos Aires province, which serves low sectors).

We also asked principals how they would define "being literate," and what they think their students should know to live better in the world. The responses in this case also varied significantly based on the social sector to which the students belong:

P: DO YOU THINK THIS GUIDANCE YOU HAVE, DOES IT TOOLS TO THE STUDENTS?

If I have to be honest, I do not think so. (...) We cannot get them to read and write well; decades ago, a pupil who could not read and write well could not approve or finish primary school. Now ... one day we receive them, and they finish secondary school without knowing how to read, write and understand. Thus, they will not be able to understand the texts of study at the University. (State school, province of Buenos Aires that attends to lower class).

We do not succeed, the school fails to overcome what they bring, they bring a lack of reading and writing, some grammatical errors and a lack of understanding that



the secondary school years can not reverse. Despite all the efforts made at school when high school is over and professional studies are started ... the teachers themselves tell them that they have a very low level, and that they can't continue ... then they fail (State School, Buenos Aires city that attends low- and middle-low sectors).

I imagine some of the students on their land because, given the agricultural orientation of the school, the activities they have in their homes, I imagine them in their land. To other students I imagine them working in the companies because they long to work in companies. And others, quiet. (State school, province of Salta that attends low sectors).

Students talk a little, as is customary in their homes ... And it is something that will not allow them to be able to perform in the labor market, and continue university studies. (...) What I hope is that they continue studying. And I do not know if they will be able to continue studying, I think that as things stand, it will not be possible, at least for the majority. (State School, Province of Neuquén, that attends lower class).

Let us focus on some of the highlights that leave these testimonies. There seems to be no future surplus for students, especially those belonging to the most impoverished sectors; what could be a recognition of diversity (multiculturalism and different levels of knowledge) ends up describing a situation of social inequality that disrupts the life of the school. From diversity to inequality: this is a displacement that, on many occasions, "naturalizes" the different levels of knowledge as an inexorable product of social origin. There is a school production of its own, and not just a reproduction: to the extent that origin is seen as destiny, and just like that, there is an action done by the school (Dussel, 2008).

There is also a general view that the school has very little impact on that future, an almost null possibility of altering inexorable destinies; the possibilities of transforming and improving conditions seem to involve not the school, but rather more general political and economic institutions away from school. Frequently, the horizon is restricted to providing basic skills (associated even to primary schooling). Secondary schooling would not be an extension of this basic training, but a recovery of time lost in previous years. These perspectives conspire against the formation of reflexive and critical subjects, with an impact on collective dynamics.

In the testimonies included, there are references to behavior that are associated with a certain social sector (even when social class issues are not directly mentioned). In some cases, although there is not so much discontinuity in the social sectors of teachers and students, a vision of separate and opposing worlds persists (Dussel, 2008). In that sense, there is a consideration of the "inferior condition" of the new social subjects who entered secondary school in the last decade and is expressed in a construction of an opposition: "they", young people, new students and a "we": the adults, who were already here. "They" have different codes, different values. Expressions such as "we" receive them but "they" fail to reveal that dichotomy us-them and does not provide the best conditions to think about the incidence of what is done daily in school so that students have better tools for through a complex world.

In the scenario that we have been describing, institutions are positioned in different ways based on the idea of the future that they favor for their students and different ways in which they read their own formative potential. Likewise, the values raised by the principals account for a nostalgia that the school "before" contained a perspective of the future and was effective in that task, nevertheless, our present schools seem to have irretrievably lost that horizon. This can be seen in different aspects, for



example, a growing "resignation" with which they understand the conditions of departure of their students, the potentiality they assign to the school or socio-cultural characteristics of the nearest environment. In short, because the school does not empower the future that used to have as a horizon, then, that strengthens the feeling that there is no future for these students.

Conceptions of future

As we mentioned at the beginning, the notion of future structured the very idea of school from its origins. However, we would like to dwell on two aspects. On the one hand, this generalized and unquestionable notion of the future consisted of a peculiar construction that consolidated a particular set of values. Secondly, in the schools where our research was carried out, there was often a conviction that "futures were those of the past", but it is necessary to examine whether the Argentine school of the past decades was constructing an inclusive, promising and equalizing future for the whole population. We will begin by examining this second aspect in order to expand the argument on the former. Our analysis will be maintained at the middle school level, as will the testimonies with which we have begun the same.

Brief history of the school model

When analyzing the relationship between secondary school and the horizon it opens for young people, it is important to revisit the history of the secondary level, as it provides some structuring elements of school organization and its founding myths that are still valid (see Dussel, 1997 and 2008, Tenti, 2003, Southwell, 2011). The history of secondary school in Argentina raises substantive differences to that of primary education. While primary education was aimed at the whole population, with an institutional organization that provided massive coverage, in secondary education its role was linked to the formation of elites, a characteristic that - with the expansion of the level - remained as part of its internal logic.

The first secondary schools - even before the construction of the Argentine educational system - were thought of as preparatory education. This was defined by their relationship with university education, on which they depended. They shared their same characteristics, the titles conferring only made sense within the longer course by university studies. Its main objectives were the formation of aristocracy and bureaucracy, colonial first and national later. To fulfill these functions, the preparatory schools had a strongly ritualistic and formalist character.

In the period 1863 - 1890, the model of National Schools (like public school) was developed in all the important cities of Argentina; the National School model carried a unified model of liberal education in big cities of the country. The humanities became a sign of cultural distinction, but also a technology of the self, in terms of which involved a governing work of the individual's passions and inclinations (Dussel, 1997). Being able to speculate and contemplate nature, or "high culture" were part of a more general transformations in the ways in which individuals should govern themselves (Hunter, 1988). It was an educational modality that covered a very low percentage of the population (less than 1%), belonging to the upper class of society. This model persisted with slight modifications throughout the 20th century, and included the existence of some educational institutions as reference models for all institutions.

The expansion of secondary schooling did not take place until the late 20th century, in the first decades of which different vocational modalities were created for social sectors that would't enter higher education. However, as Gallart' (2006) and Acosta' (2008) studies have shown, new vocational modalities had less social value than than "bachiller" (Upper Secondary Education Graduate) for upper and rising



middle classes, in the first decades of the 20th century. Throughout the twentieth century there was an expansion of enrollment (in 1960, 24.5% of young people and adolescents aged 13 to 18 attended secondary school). However, as the system grew more, as dropped out grew up. Tedesco (1986) points out in 1886-1891 period drop out in the National Colleges was 68%. Several recent papers indicates that the graduation rate was 50% in 1950. It achieved a positive evolution in the mid-1960s when nearly 70% of students graduated. This rate abruptly declined towards 1980s and was around 40% in the 1990s, a rate lower than 1950 (Acosta, 2008).

Between 1960 and 1980, there were attempts to modify the traditional structure of secondary school by other more "appropriate" modalities for massification processes. At that time, most establishments continued to form programs of the late nineteenth century, only partially modified in 1957 and ideologically retouched in 1983. With the return of democracy, in 1983, there was an increase in enrollment (whereas in 1960, 24.5 per cent of young people and adolescents between the ages of 13 and 18 attended secondary school, in 1996 the figure was 67.2 per cent). Also maintained an institutional model based on the rigid model of the humanist baccalaureate.

The school appeared as a rigid, almost prison space that allowed confronting, opposing, and also recognizing itself in that mirror of differentiation and identification that constitutes adolescent subjectivity (Kancyper, 2003). It is worth asking, how much of this matrix remains and how much has been transformed? This description does not seem to correspond with the Argentine secondary schools we know today, although some schools are still attached to certain rigid rituals and disciplinary guidelines, it is not generally perceived that a school is felt as a prison institution, or that the authorities or schedules are totally inflexible.

Looking at historical and current perspectives, the role of secondary school as preparing for distinction and social hierarchy, has remained present even when classrooms were occupied by students who did not belong to the elite. This history constituted a persistent matrix -with slight modifications- throughout the entire twentieth century. As Dussel (2008) argues: "among the elements of this lasted grammar, we can emphasize the centralized organization, (...); the encyclopedic humanistic curriculum as the basis of the hierarchy of knowledge established by the school; the organization of classrooms, rituals and school discipline that followed rigid forms, centered on adults and designed for the elite formation; the structure of schedules that perpetuated the fragmentation of knowledge and the disarticulation of the formative proposal in small topics". Moreover, there is an aspect that defines secondary schools identity: during all that time, a sense of "belonging" to a select group, and that belonging implied a formation that gave certain identity that unified teachers and students in the perception of doing something meaningful for their lives, and for the country.

The current secondary schools are the result of two tendencies in the face of the challenge of massification: the tendency towards the continuity of the institutional model of the elite humanistic schools in the face of the tendency of rupture that supposed new modalities produced in the moment of expansion of the school high school. This form of configuration of secondary level institutions functioned as a model, an image for the schooling of young people, which often constituted a limit to the principle of equality of the republican proposal (Acosta, 2008). On the other hand, this model included a perspective of the future oriented to the inclusion in the administration of the State that was being formed and expanded, to dialogue with a certain hierarchy of academic knowledge where some social experiences were left out (such as manual labor and trades), in order to fulfill already expected and scarce social roles and leaving aside other vital experiences while being a student: parenthood and work among others.



Perhaps the appeal to that horizon of academic formation, rigid and ritualistic in today's middle schools - in another society and with broader social sectors - is the basis of a failed interpellation; a mismatch between institutional and curricular organization, on the one hand, and forms of relationship, authority and expectations.

Interpellations about the future

In the previous sections we raised a problem about the future prospects in our schools. I wrote that in these assessments operates a historical matrix of the school that is central to the adults of the institution, but that does not seem to affect the young people who study in them. We call that failure an unsuccessful interpellation. We will briefly dwell on a conceptual analysis of the notion of interpellation.

The notion of interpellation was described by Althusser in 1969 as a function by which individuals recognize themselves as subjects, that is, in this process the subject is articulated, constituted and subject to recognition in a specific identity. Althusser refers to the ways in which subjects are called to place themselves in certain social roles, interpellated by various ideological apparatuses (family, Church, school, among others).

We will take the Rosa N. Buenfil Burgos' definition (1993) on interpellation as an educational act:

What specifically concerns an educational process consists, from an interpellation practice, that the agent is constituted as an active educational agent incorporating some new content, behavioral, conceptual, etc., into this interpellation, that modifies his daily practice in terms of a more grounded reaffirmation. That is, from identification models proposed from a specific discourse (religious, family, school, mass communication), the subject is recognized in said model, feel alluded to or accept the invitation to be that which is proposed (Buenfil, 1993: 18-9).

Following the Pilar Padierna' analysis (2008), we will characterize interpellation as a process of invitation to recognize oneself in a discourse and be part of it, which involves a series of phases:

1. one related to discursive production from the issuer; this production of an interpellatory discourse is overdetermined by a series of factors that converge in its production
2. that refers to the incorporation or rejection of elements of that interpellation by the subjects
3. the resignification and enactment of the new identity configuration as well as the production of own interpellations (Padierna, 2008: 109-10).

Zizek (2001), supported by Lacanian studies, affirms that in order for the subject to be "hooked" in the identification process, interpellation is necessary (but not any) insists that a presymbolic mythical intention, present in the phantom created by the Other, is necessary. That is, the hidden reference to some element that in the fantasy of the subject will fill the lack. Thus, the subject identifies himself with an interpellation in a retroactive way, that is, he engages in the chain of the signifier (interpellation), and once the sense is fixed, it means retroactively. Thanks to the retroversion effect, the identification is lived by the subject as full, as something that has always been there and that responds to his desires.



The adherence of the subject to the interpellatory discourse is not given in block, but with specific elements in which it is represented. The elements put into play through interpellation play an important role in achieving membership. No discourse can fully encompass a social space to account for all the feasible conditions to be retaken by subjects to adhere to their cause; in the same way, the subjects questioned do not accept this invitation as a whole, but rather they are inclined towards different elements that fill the fault (not rational, nor capable of being filled). Through interpellation a serie of practices is developed that allow subjects to recognize themselves as members of the group and carry out actions to achieve their objectives. The subjects are constituted by identifying themselves with speeches that address them from multiple references. Not only large social spaces form subjects, the identification process is also possible in small spaces, in the local community, in the intimacy of the family, etc. (Padierna, 2008: 111-2).

In short, interpellation is one of the factors that significantly influences the conformation of social identities. From the adhesion or rejection of various interpellations, subjects recognize themselves as members of diverse collectivities, perform actions, allow them to signify their social practice and elaborate new discourses leading transformation, to a greater or lesser extent, of the social grammar

Young people who attend secondary school today are not interpellated by the formative proposal, nor the notion of the future proper to the historical matrix that we have characterized, although some elements of that old discourse are resignified and relocated in new formulations. Many analyzes associate this difficulty with young people' disinterest or their difficult living conditions. In short, one of the factors that significantly influences the conformation of social identities is interpellation. From the adhesion or rejection to diverse interpellations, the subjects recognize themselves as members of diverse collectivities, perform actions that allow them to signify their social practice and elaborate new discourses that lead to the transformation, to a greater or lesser extent, of the grammar Social.

The young people who attend secondary school today are not questioned by the formative proposal, nor the notion of future proper to the historical matrix that we have characterized, although some elements of that old discourse are resignified and relocated in new formulations. Many analyzes associate this difficulty with "disinterest" of young people or their difficult living conditions. It is necessary to attend to the heart of the problem: purpose, conception, model and organization of secondary school itself.

Is the secondary school merely transmitting the demands? What place does the school have in the offer of other social and cultural possibilities? Can it do something to distort what is perceived as "social destinations"? What symbolic and material universe does it offer to students from different social groups?

The ways in which students are understood, intergenerational bonds in which we include them or forms of estrangement with which we conceive them, generates different paths for the potential of schools and the futures that are opened. These lines can contribute to expansion of educational outlook to different social spaces where subjects are developing novel practices not only in big spaces, but also interaction with media and languages.

A future for everyone?

In the above explanation the question was explored whether future promised by school was democratizing. As some studies have suggested (Power et al., 2003) the history of the school is the history of the middle classes, especially in secondary school, for the reasons we have outlined above. And this is true, not only because the middle class were the ones who made the most out of education system, but - above all -



because they managed to make education system take their values, conceptions and ways of life as their own and disseminate them as values of schooling and consecrate them as the universal values to which every educated person should adhere. In this way, those certain ideas associated with schooling were shaped as the universal sense of it. This construction in Argentina was articulated with academic curriculum and with a hierarchical social model.

Let us dwell a moment on that relationship between the universal and the particular that we outline. We have learned with Ernesto Laclau that universalism and particularism are two ineradicable dimensions in political identities, but the form of the articulation between the two is not evident. Among historical forms in which a relationship between universality and particularity was thought of, there are those in which the individual realizes in himself the universal - that is, he eliminates himself as a private individual and becomes a transparent medium in which universality opera - (the idea of pedagogical civilization and school culture has enough of this); or they denied the universal affirming their own particularism (Laclau, 1996: 47).

The separation between the universal and the particular is ineliminable and - this we are interested in emphasizing - the universal is nothing other than a particular that at one point has become hegemonic. For this reason, our point of departure has been to situate school format as the way in which a contingent and arbitrary series of reasons and instrumentations became hegemonic. We must also say that modern school format had tensions around the particular and the universal but built a hegemony based on some particularisms that became an inscription surface for all that was meant as a school and, even more, as education.

The best of the enlightened ideology and the educational systems that embodied it was a policy of massive distribution of knowledge; in that logic, the presence of the closest environment projected to a more universal scenario contributed to ascending social mobility and an opening towards other worlds. It must also be said that nothing indicates that these knowledge were emancipatory, nor egalitarian, nor inclusive by themselves. We have sought to put this in evidence with the description of the historical matrix of the Argentine secondary school, designed to include the population considered in a position to prosper and direct. Today, the inclusion of social sectors that had not had a massive presence in secondary school has posed challenges for that historical matrix that was constituted as a typical identity of "us" in front of the confusion and the problems that were posed by the arrival of "the new ones". This own force that has the historical matrix in the imaginary of those who "make" school, facilitates that young people are looked at very frequently in terms of deficits that become - sometimes - insurmountable.

This not only happens as a consequence of social inequality but also as a result of institutionalized patterns of interpretation and evaluation that constitute someone as not deserving of respect or legitimacy to occupy a certain position. School translates social inequality with clues that reproduce hierarchies and long-standing school classification systems, especially in relation to the old elitism of secondary schools, but that are updated and renewed with other languages. What are the options? To leave out of school those who are new and whose schooling must be guaranteed by law? Or revise the particular conception of the future that proposed that matrix and renew it to make it more inclusive?

If the old mandates have declined in their enunciative efficacy, that is, in their power to interpellate and constitute subjects, we will have to examine what we understand by secondary school and with what future possibilities we can enrich it. Examine, also, if what we recognize with the name of secondary school includes the type and multiplicity of experiences that take place today in the concrete schools.



A possibility of democratization, then, is linked to new practices that in our society had restricted the universalism of our political ideals, that is, to limited sectors of the population. It is possible to retain the universal dimension at the same time as spheres of its application are expanded, which in turn redefines concrete contents of this universality. Universalism, as a horizon, expands, while breaking its necessary link with all particular content.

A new look on the notion of the future

We want to return to the problem with which we started this article, because we continue to worry that our schools coexist with a feeling that there is no future for the students that attend and that it can not be reversed. Once we affirmed that the generalized conception of the future was and is a particular construction that became generalized as universal, because it managed to be hegemonic and that we established the need for new forms of interpellation as practices for the constitution of subjects, we can - and that is our proposal - affirm that the notion of the future is an empty signifier.

With the use of empty significant category we refer to certain terms that are the object of an ideological struggle in society. Therefore, these terms tend to be tendentially empty signifiers - never totally empty - due to the fact that, given the plurality of conflicts that occur around them, they can not be fixed to a single discursive articulation (Laclau, 1996). Also, this characteristic of emptiness is what makes them liable to be articulated to different meanings and, therefore, a powerful ground for different positions. If, on the other hand, they were very fixed terms, they would not have the potential to become an inscription surface of different meanings and therefore they would lose potentiality as enunciators and articulators.

Futuro is an empty signifier that functioned as an inscription surface for different conceptions, models of society, notions about the insertion of young people and the integration of different social sectors. Also at present, in that presupposition that the school no longer qualifies for the future, those notions sedimented around the notion of future are updated.

What perspectives are open? Trying to restore that future construction that accompanied the constitution of the Nation-State and the slow expansion of the system? Is not this failed restitution of the notion of the future that accompanied another social model? Is that restitution productive to analyze contemporary society and the young people who are students today?

If democracy is possible, it is because the universal has neither a necessary form nor content; On the contrary, diverse groups compete to give their particularisms a function of universal representation. Society generates a whole vocabulary of empty signifiers whose temporary senses are the result of political competition. It is this final failure of society to constitute itself as a society, which makes the distance between the universal and the particular insurmountable and, as a result, puts the "concrete social agents in charge of this unrealizable task, which is what makes the democratic interaction" (Laclau, 1996: 68).

Our proposal is then to articulate the future signifier with other notions that, instead of restoring certain social structures and hierarchies of knowledge that were consolidated on the basis of a restricted and expulsion school system, allow us to think about an approach to the future that includes in a richer way characteristics of our contemporary society and students as an expression of it.

The history of designed reforms for that level is very extensive, we could say it has more than one hundred years of history. In those reforms was present the persistent question for who was a school?, whom to include and for what social place? But in addition, permanent concern about its reform or revision, realized very early on some



crucial aspects were not included in classic model, the one that -in occasions- is exalted.

There were necessary knowledge that the old model did not contain: preparation for the labor market (a problem that persisted throughout the 20th century), a more autonomous cultural model that was not a simple adherence to the European model, conceptions about young people they will not always imply a relationship of subordination, the incorporation of autonomous paths or local adaptations, among other aspects (Dussel and Southwell, 2008).

We believe that analysis we have done allows us to address the key problem: purpose, conception, model and organization of the secondary school itself. Examine your internal logic, your priorities, the horizon for which you educate, how it is inscribed in the culture, what selection of it teaches, what it includes and what it excludes, are some significant issues. Thus, we can avoid the blaming of young people for not possessing what school does not manage to generate in them. We allude with this to the revision of the school culture. This concept, used by historians of education since the second half of the nineties, is defined as "a set of norms that define the knowledge to teach and the behaviors to inculcate, and a set of practices that allow the transmission and assimilation of said knowledge and the incorporation of these behaviors "(Julià cited in Viñao, 2002: 203). This category seeks to emphasize that the school is not a simple reproducer of the global culture that is intended to transmit institutionally to new generations. School culture is one that can only be acquired at school and whose production involves teachers, government officials, students, managers, parents, experts and other agents involved in the field of education.

A revision of the school format can enable the production of other discursive constructions, ensuring that other future productions include a plurality of meanings around the diversity of the formative experience and, therefore, relocating other particularisms in a new hegemonic conformation. A discursive construction where notion of school does not continue to be equivalent to middle class, urban, Western European values, referenced around elite education but can include young workers, with different codes and provisions, with greater openness to new knowledge and experiences. But in addition, another question that becomes evident is that school form can be modified so that it is not the target population that must transform its internal logic; it is their effectiveness and not that of the individuals that must be put under the spotlight. An exercise like this should give us the chance to redisplay invisibilizations, injustices and exclusions that included the most widespread form school as a way to question, tighten and, why not renew the school. This path can advance in a proposal that is not a return to a school model that has shown its limits, but rather to foster a renewed link with society and culture.

I would like to end with a reflection by a manager interviewed:

- *How do you see your students in the future, how do you imagine them as citizens, as workers?*

- *First of all, as coworkers.* (Private technical school, province of Buenos Aires, which serves the middle and lower-middle sectors).

Notes

¹ islaesmeralda@gmail.com

References

Acosta, F. (2008) La incorporación y expulsión simultánea como matriz de la escuela secundaria de masas en la Argentina: *Modelos institucionales y Desgranamiento* en la



escuela secundaria durante el siglo XX, *II Jornadas de Doctorado en Ciencias Sociales*, Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales.

Austin, J. (1988) *Cómo hacer cosas con palabras*, Barcelona, Paidós, 1988.

Buenfil Burgos, R. N. (1993) *Análisis del Discurso y Educación*, México DF: DIE-CINVESTAV.

Dussel, I. (1997) *Currículum, humanismo y democracia en la enseñanza media (1863 – 1920)*. Buenos Aires: FLACSO/UBA (Oficina de publicaciones del CBC).

Dussel, I. (2008) ¿Qué lugar tiene la escuela media en la producción y reproducción de la desigualdad? Elementos para el debate, en *Revista de Política Educativa*, Universidad de San Andrés, Buenos Aires.

Dussel, I.; Southwell, M. (2008) Escuela media: los desafíos de la inclusión masiva, *El Monitor de la Educación*. Revista del Ministerio de Educación de la Nación, Año V Quinta Época, No. 19, Buenos Aires, noviembre 2008

Gallart, M. A. (2006) *La construcción social de la escuela media. Una aproximación institucional*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Stella/La Crujía.

Hunter, I. (1998) *Repensar la escuela. Subjetividad, burocracia y crítica*. Barcelona: Pomares.

Kancyper, L. (2003) *La confrontación generacional. Estudio psicoanalítico*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Lumen.

Laclau, E. (1996) *Emancipación y Diferencia*, Buenos Aires, Ariel.

Laclau, E. (2005) *La Razón Populista*, Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Padierna Jiménez, M. P. (2008) Interpelación y procesos educativos en movimientos sociales. *Giros Teóricos en las Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades*, Córdoba, Edit. Comunicarte.

Power, S.; Edwards, T.; Whitty, G. and Wigfall, V. (2003) *Education and the Middle Class*, Buckingham, Open University Press

Tedesco, J. C. (1986) *Educación y Sociedad en la Argentina (1880-1945)*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Solar.

Tenti Fanfani, E. (2003) *Educación media para todos. Los desafíos de la democratización del acceso*. Buenos Aires: Fundación OSDE-IIPE-Unesco-Editorial Altamira.

Viñao, A. (2002) *Sistemas educativos, culturas escolares y reformas. Continuidades y cambios*. Madrid: Morata.

Zizek, S. (Ed.) (2003) *Ideología: un mapa de la cuestión*, Fondo de Cultura Económica, Buenos Aires

Submitted: November, 20th, 2017

Approved: December, 8th, 2017

