

The Epistemic Sense of Training Fields

Florentino Silva Becerra

Tenured research professor, SNII level 1, PRODEP Profile, assigned to the Department of Education Studies of the University Center of Social Sciences and Humanities of the University of Guadalajara Guadalajara, Jalisco, México

ABSTRACT: This work integrates the group from the elucidation that is presented in a multidimensional way of which the theoretical bodies that make up this study on tensions, instead of invalidating them, makes it possible to think about the group from the constitution of a network of intersections with varied effects, of senses and non-senses, product of human groups. Its objective is to explain through the inductive generation of conceptual categories expressed in the regularities between investigated phenomena that access possible interpretative theories of the reality of fragmentation as an institutional group. Addresses a qualitative methodology; a flexible design, dealing with the social interaction between teachers and managers in a subjective, dynamic reality composed of a multiplicity of contexts. From ethnography, open interviews and participant observation is permanently addressed, as well as the use of reflexivity, obtained from the analysis of the subjective and intersubjective meanings of collegiate work, where fragmentation was analyzed through participation and significance. of the group. The effects that the group produces on the subjects that comprise it, giving rise to group hood, understood as “a relational structure where it is possible to recognize a clear discrimination between subject and object.

KEYWORDS: FORMATIVE fields, fields of meaning, epistemic didactics, correctionality, construction of knowledge.

INTRODUCTION

The knowledge society establishes a boost for contemporary pedagogy, generating a framework for its improvement through its transformation. A pedagogy that creates non-fragmentary knowledge by proposing an understanding from the training fields, underlining the global need for curriculum integration, under interdisciplinary relationships that occur in broad fields of knowledge; a reflection on the criticism of reality that is committed to its innovation; from a whole and not in isolation.

Curricular integration by fields proposes an articulated relationship between disciplinary, scientific knowledge and community knowledge, that is, the encounter and dialogue that opposes the scheme of memorization or repetition. Incorporating a new type of understanding to respond to the dynamics that allow the construction of knowledge, therefore, in this way the paradigm that had as a vertical base a large amount of knowledge in its intellect is destructured, hence the insistence that the paradigm of memorization under the premise that only in this way could a person be trained to achieve success.

It is important to note that, in this framework where knowledge is developed and transformed, mainly, through the use of information and human knowledge, the teaching that was based on memorizing content through teacher verbalization that instructed content in a space of inflexibility with the premise of single thought, now this has ceased to have value as a methodological form, its momentum was preserved in feudal society and then had its development in the formation of industrial society, where today it collapses to allow it to weaken. his strength, but that resists when encountering the transformation, because traditional education focused on content and rigidity continues to predominate in the classrooms, in this space where pedagogy and didactics are transformed to give way to a new structure, where today memorization is It is surpassed by various means and it is no longer necessary to store or preserve them in memory, therefore, we are faced with a paradigm that emerges from a new social context.

Therefore, it allows us to ask: What is the feeling of teachers regarding this new way of seeing teaching and learning? How do teachers of the subjects that make up a training field for epistemic construction articulate the content? What is the meaning pursued in the development of the teaching-learning process to approach reality? How are the evaluation processes established by a structure determined by the relationships that the actors that make up a training field have among themselves?

In this way, this approach is that the actors involved in the relationships they establish among themselves in the development of their teaching practice as involved in the process of generating the meaning of the secondary training field approach reality through the articulation of the constituted elements. in his epistemic didactics.

The objective is to analyze the epistemic didactics that teachers use to give meaning to the articulation of the training field in the approach to the reality of a structure determined by the senses that are in connection with the objects, where the plurality of

The Epistemic Sense of Training Fields

knowledge and knowledge of different disciplines allows us not to fragment the vision of reality that gives meaning to the object through systematic observations and interviews adapted to the context.

The approach responds to training projects as a general and comprehensive strategy to achieve the four key goals proposed by socio-training: form and consolidate the ethical life project, have entrepreneurship, develop the necessary skills to face the challenges of the context and work in a collaborative (SEP, 2022a).

Therefore, from this perspective, the training field consists of an articulated set of activities to solve one or several problems that arise in the context, then participation is sought to solve problems and not the process of structuring knowledge decontextualized from reality. and, therefore, "seeking the formation of at least one competence and achieving a specific product" (Tobón, 2013, p. 16).

In this way, contemporary pedagogy addresses the transformation processes of teaching and learning, a methodological position that breaks with unique forms of thought, to think about social life in a relational way.

This work is developed from the approaches from which a theoretical approach emerges in which the concept of field and meaning is developed, from the methodological framework obtained from the description and analysis of the observation and interview of the participants, where systematizes the teaching practice in beginning, development and closure, to reach the discussion of the results resulting from the analyzes to build the elements that structure this work.

METHODOLOGY

This work is approached from a qualitative nature, seeking to understand from the frame of reference of the person who acts and, to describe and analyze ideas, beliefs, meanings, knowledge and practices, from within, emphasizing the subjectivity of the participants, therefore, the design of the study tends to evolve throughout the project.

Methodologically, the aim is to confirm the properties applicable to the research work from teaching practice. Its method is made up of strategies, procedures and techniques that direct actions towards the purpose of this work.

APPROACH

It is about the production of a descriptive analytical study of the epistemic practices carried out by secondary school teachers as a result of the school culture, so the ethnography has the facts that are experienced and observed in the classroom in the search of the new reality that occurs between the elements that emerge from the interaction of the constituent parts in this study. An investigation focused on a group of people in their own environment for a certain time.

RESEARCH TECHNIQUES

It addresses participant observation that involves the direct intervention of the observer, in the words of Goetz and LeCompte (1998), it refers to a practice that consists of being inside the classroom where interactions are carried out between teachers and students who construct their reality to the which is studied in relation to epistemic didactics, because the planned interaction obeys an objective, in which the participant observation and the semi-structured interview have the purpose of generating their free expression from which their beliefs, interests and values are collected, as resources to obtain knowledge.

PARTICIPANTS

The participants are secondary school teachers, as subjects who perceive, understand and interpret reality, that is, those who intervene directly or indirectly in a significant way in the decision-making involved in the processes that make up the training fields that they seek to obtain. the best information, according to the specific circumstances surrounding both the researcher and the subjects or groups investigated. It is based on voluntary participation at the request of the researcher, the information is what guides the sampling, and therefore it can evolve in the field itself since it is necessary to cover all the conceptual requirements of the study.

RESULTS

In this journey focused on the concept of a training field woven together by epistemic didactics from which it is possible to limit the action of the participants to the reality of a structure determined by the senses that are in connection with the objects, where the plurality of knowledge and Knowledge of different disciplines allows us to integrate the vision through systematic observations.

The beginning as a didactic sequence constitutes the organization of the learning activities (Díaz Barriga, 2013), all the subjects that correspond to the training field express activities that allow the opening or recapitulation of the session. When the teacher gives instructions, he writes the theme on the blackboard, and proposes linking elements of the previous theme in accordance with the co-design established in the transversal project. It opens a new access to reality from which meaning emerges through an approach to the object, although it is not yet recognized in its discourse that realities can be located or described to get closer to the meaning of the field, but it is found in the construction through the enunciation that without losing meaning adapts to the information in the context.

The Epistemic Sense of Training Fields

Therefore, the construction of meaning in a training field is “based on the relationship between the objects of knowledge that comprise it and the subjects that participate in their approach through teaching and learning” (SEP,2022b, p. 7). In this way the relationship is established with the knowledge that is developed below.

The relationship with the objects of knowledge in the subjects in the approach to meaning

In this exhibition, the space of the object of knowledge and knowledge is found in a disposition in training fields that interweaves disciplinary positions and that takes on meaning beyond its particular meaning in the relationship established between them, corresponding to the being as it is the object of the intellect (Vargas, 2020).

In this way the object of knowledge becomes an active part in relation to everything that can be known or that one seeks to know, in this way in this interaction the subject is the who, while the object is the what of knowledge, because When we talk about the world we refer to reality (Markus, 2017).

The meaning allows the teacher to guide the students' activities didactically and this is established when the students' knowledge is intertwined through the activities indicated by the teacher, thus finding the meaning of knowledge and therefore the meaning within the training field.

Connection points of the object through sense

Didactics is the structuring way for the generation of connections between subject contents, that is, a training field in terms of Bourdieu and Wacquant (1995) is “a network or configuration of objective relationships between positions” (p. 64).

These connections give rise to the connection points to give way to *verstehen* (understanding) as a fundamental operation for the construction of meaning through didactic action, because connection means building the “space of points of view” and “positioning oneself in the geometric locus of different perspectives” (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 9-10).

From this specific logic, a field is based, according to Bourdieu (1999), in the form of habitus, “spirit” or “sense” (p.25), and the foundation of the training field is the connection points of knowledge that lead to the baggage of knowledge, which is located at the articulation points for the generation of knowledge through teaching situations and learning situations based on cultural productions applied to the daily reality of students.

The integration of the object through meaning

In terms of training fields, integrating refers to joining the points, connecting them to give them orientation, that is, to give them meaning, because otherwise “the points would remain separated” (Leoni, Venville & Wallace, 2012, p. 1).

As a consequence of this integration, the composition of meanings is structured, which includes reconstructing the whole or completing it by adding or uniting parts that are dispersed, from the link to the idea of the different elements that constitute a whole. In this way, we can identify the whole, understanding the need for integration of knowledge to get closer to understanding what surrounds us. Didactic actions weave the network of that “totality of coexisting factors conceived as mutually interdependent” (Lewin, 1946, p. 240)

For this reason, the student incorporates new knowledge connected to the previous knowledge about the object of knowledge, allowing it to be “restructured in its inner universe and applying the integrated knowledge to new concrete situations” (Rorgiers, 2007, p. 26).

Desde el aprendizaje disciplinar se fortalece una visión de conocimiento que permite promover un aprendizaje holístico de la realidad y vincular los contenidos curriculares con la vida cotidiana de los estudiantes, desde un enfoque de integración (SEP, 2023a, p. 25).

Por lo que de esta manera la integración del currículo contribuye a “una construcción de la realidad en la que niñas, niños, adolescentes y adultos aparecen como sujetos históricos capaces de acercarse al mundo, interpretarlo y contribuir a transformarlo desde diferentes perspectivas” (SEP, 2023b, p. 27).

Interdependence of the object through meaning and common points

Two people participate in this development of actions for teaching and learning; one needs the other, that is, an interdependence manifested in a learning ecosystem Guetl and Chang (2008), where components are classified that give life to the teaching and learning process, constituting a space for encounters and interactions in which, and through which, the subjects mediated by didactics in context are affirmed in their learning processes.

The fundamental point of the connection between contents in a Training Field is carried out through the management of teaching situations and learning situations applied to everyday reality, processes that are carried out from didactics since from this the points that must be articulated.

In this way, the integration of common points allows for resignification and rearticulation, expressed to build the whole from articulating the common points. In this way, the common points of the subjects are integrated, constituting a whole “seeking to cross the borders of the disciplines and outline others that integrate them” (SEP,2023c, p.25).

The Epistemic Sense of Training Fields

Then, the common points of the subjects allow us to give affinity to the work and find spaces that can “interweave disciplinary boundaries and provide secondary education students with more and better opportunities for meaningful learning” (SEP,2023d, p.25).

This occurs within the beginning of the class and can correspond both to the activation of prior knowledge and also to the exposure of material that provokes the students' interest in learning a certain content, always linking it with the students' daily lives so that they make it easier to relate new information to your meaningful experiences. teacher, these allow links between the subjects that make up this training field and the theme that allows the links, it is the geographical space, this becomes a field of meaning in which interactions are poured for the construction of knowledge and in this field, the subjects of Civic Education, Geography and History participate with their connections: links between previous knowledge and new information to be learned, from geography we advance to the formation of the changes that manifest in space.

The development or continuation of activities

To establish connections based on prior knowledge, conjunctions are instituted with the subjects that integrate the knowledge, because these connections established in the transversal curriculum have as their guiding thread the interaction constituted in dialogue, integration, synthesis and exchange, In this way, the meaning sought avoids the fragmentation of the disciplines that hold meaning towards the creation of a knowledge that is more particular than universal; a process in which the pieces interact like living organisms, creating segments through didactics that lead to meaningful connections between the parts and expanding the disciplinary perspective (Van der Linde, 2007).

The geographical space as an articulatory axis unifies the direction of the diversity of knowledge, practices and knowledge, as well as the conceptual productions of the areas of knowledge that integrates the training field that is installed in the teaching processes through pedagogical practice (Zapata, 2003). This becomes a site of direction in the search for the construction of meaning, shaping the interactions between the teaching and learning process through linking the contents that lead to non-fragmentary knowledge, in this field the Training subjects Civics, Geography and History link their didactic participation.

Therefore, teachers link the geographical space with points of epistemic link such as the day of the dead and the construction of the triptych that is built from the space and time of history with the identification of meaning through the links that lead to identity. , generating a real space in which knowledge is deposited for the construction of the whole, that is why in Geography the identification of meaning is articulated, building “an effort that nominates, classifies, distinguishes, recognizes, interprets, challenges, creates meaning to the things of the world giving the self a place for itself” (Ramírez Grajeda, 2017, p. 195).

Consequently, meaning is the manifestation, by students as learning subjects through the interactions generated by the teacher's didactics.

Because the development of the class means the search for meaning through articulation to integrate a training field, that is why meaning is the manifestation that emanates from the subjects in the "description of the properties that the contents of the subjects contain.” (Ramírez Grajeda, 2017, p. 14).

Because, the subjective purpose of meaning is built within the framework of an operational objective that seeks the integration of the parts to reach the totality of the body of the sense, where interactions are generated for the interconnection of the elements of the training field, although this is not presented with a symmetrical structure (Bueno Martínez,1996).

Then, the meaning is integrated into a putting into action of a structure that is for itself its own exercise, it has a “meaning” or a “sense” a meaning that has a purpose and that concentrates on “that which is sustained as thinkable to certain complex subjective objects: behaviors, theories, stories” (Albizu,2005, p. 9).

Therefore, the teacher is, above all, a professional in the articulation of the teaching and learning process in a situation; a professional of interactions that integrate shared meanings (Paquay, Altet, Charlier, & Perrenoud, 2005).

In short, there is a framing of pedagogical knowledge within the axis of learning and the consequent configuration of the training meaning.

The synthesis, closure and evaluation

This section presents the key ideas integrated by systematized actions that allow feedback on the knowledge addressed in the previous stage. In this space, doubts are clarified and the concepts for the construction of knowledge are generalized.

The closing of the class indicates that the evaluation is the tool to determine if the students have achieved the purposes of the class, that is, they have been directed by the meaning within the training field, interactions, which only acquire their meaning within a system of relationships (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005).

A system of relationships that allows after the process to reach the evaluation phase, where they become knowledge: In this closing phase it allows the evaluation to monitor the process, where within the framework of the training field it represents society as a context. in which agents and institutions meet positions they occupy in their spaces, because the field has a structure that is determined by the relationships that the actors involved maintain among themselves.

The Epistemic Sense of Training Fields

In this way, the field resides in a system constituted of social positions, as well as a “structured system of relations of forces between these positions” (Amparán,1998, p.182).

This structured phase of power relations allows for the construction of learning, because it contains the meaning that was woven epistemically from the beginning of the session positions they occupy in their spaces, because the field has a structure that is determined by the relationships that the actors involved maintain among themselves.

In this way, the field resides in a system constituted of social positions, as well as a “structured system of relations of forces between these positions” (Amparán,1998, p.182).

This structured phase of power relations allows for the construction of learning, because it contains the meaning that was woven epistemically from the beginning of the session positions they occupy in their spaces, because the field has a structure that is determined by the relationships that the actors involved maintain among themselves.

In this way, the field resides in a system constituted of social positions, as well as a “structured system of relations of forces between these positions” (Amparán,1998, p.182).

This structured phase of power relations allows for the construction of learning, because it contains the meaning that was woven epistemically from the beginning of the session.

Thinking relationally for the construction of the object through meaning

Thinking relationally from Bourdieu (1997) is a social space of force correspondences between agents, here the teachers who participate in the constitution of the training field are convinced that it is the way to integrate knowledge, and to do so they must appropriate that capital. Therefore, the field is a system of relationships. The establishment of relational thinking among teachers in the search for the construction of the object of study gives meaning to their didactics that constitutes their thinking. Thinking relationally among teachers to generate the interactions that occur in a training field is undoubtedly learning, it is the birth of learning that is the result of an interaction, where the relationships between themselves are manifested in an expression of varied knowledge, a knowledge from different areas that is articulated to create a transversal project, where the teacher's didactics is articulated and integrated giving way to the whole, this is the birth of a paradigm in teaching, which is nourished by the sustained relationships between teachers and that has a form in which develops, and a content that gives meaning to the relationship (Simmel, 1939).

Therefore, in this sense, epistemic didactics is a relational thought generated by the interaction in a training field in which relationships of force are established to reconstruct the object of knowledge that move based on the capital that defines the field, to develop strategies. didactics that allow the appropriation of capital with the objective of understanding and explaining the social universe taking into account the relationships between individuals (Simmel, 1939), then according to Bourdieu in his field theory, relational situations are constructed and with this a process of construction of the object of study.

A structured system of social positions

The experiences allow them to be input to access the construction of relational knowledge and the meaning that it implies for teachers, this generates that from the collective point of view the possibility of assuming the actions that are developed in the search for the integration of knowledge of a field is combined. formative, integrating into personal phenomena that manifest themselves in the processes that, from their origin, configure the meaning, a relational meaning between teachers that structure the constitutive actions of the relational meaning, actions in the search for transversal articulation that integrates a series of characteristics social, it is also recognized that not all the relationships established by teachers in classroom life have this character, "since only those actions whose context corresponds to a conscious and intentional design or formulation have a social meaning" (Weber, 1984).

The systematic relationships between teachers give life to a social structure, that is, they are linked to each other, they share a certain belonging that implies "the use of a mode of relational thinking in which dichotomies such as that of subject/structure are dissolved and conceives them as a continuous result of the relationships between various elements" (Bourdieu, 2008, p. 180).

In this derivation of the linking activities, they occupy a position as articulators of the transversal project of this training process that accesses this dynamic, changing structure determined by the common objectives and the need to achieve the determined knowledge to build the teaching process. and learning.

These ideas connected to each other by the collegiate are integrated into the training field, unifying knowledge about school practices that contribute to ensuring the integration of knowledge by analyzing, questioning, reflecting and transforming the different situations and problems that were identified, as well as incorporating other contents that are not provided for in said programs (SEP, 2022c).

Therefore, the organizational agreements determine the role that the members of the training field play in the creation of a social structure in a natural way. A structural organization from the practices of organized groups related to each other, configuring identity, that is, a social structure, in a global system of relationships linked to members of a training field, from a structure that implies the existence of unity and permanence. of its elements.

The Epistemic Sense of Training Fields

Starting from the reading of reality from the contextualization of the contents of the synthetic programs that incorporate local contents that they consider necessary as and for this the co-design of contents and the construction of strategies oriented to didactic planning (SEP, 2022).

In this way, teachers find relational meaning, a meaning that leads to the meaning of the training field. The starting point is to seek the teachers' feelings in this paradigm, which becomes a vision that is incorporated into didactics, where the understanding of meaning is sought, to establish articulation, connection and evaluation, which are a new way of seeing. learning as a consequence of the transformation of the teaching task, because now there is a commitment to jointly weave the co-designed contents with the subjects that make up the training field among teachers, starting from the knowledge that the students possess to build knowledge, searching in this didactic process the meaning that these give it through the formative evaluation processes in an organization determined by the relationships that the actors involved have among themselves.

Therefore, seeing and feeling through their participation through the attention of teaching work that now extends to other areas through transversal planning, responding to the proposal of international organizations whose ideas propose integrated knowledge (SEP, 2022d).

Addressing training fields allows us to respond to the complex dynamics under which reality is lived, which proposes an ecology of knowledge between subject and contextual knowledge “an encounter and dialogue between disciplinary knowledge with another type of knowledge for itself” (SEP, 2022e).

DISCUSSION

What does this mean? That the school is undergoing a complete transformation to respond to the dynamics of knowledge construction, which involves living in today's world, but has there always been talk of building knowledge in basic school? What is the aim now in this curricular integration that indicates that training fields must be worked on? So, what is a training camp? This work originated from carrying out an analysis of the epistemic didactics that teachers use to give meaning to the articulation of the training field. That is to say, how do they carry out the articulation and connection of knowledge in management through epistemic didactics? What are the connections they use to integrate the knowledge of the three signatures so as not to fragment the knowledge? Where do they start from to integrate knowledge into the three curricular disciplines?

In this sense, a qualitative methodology was established seeking to understand what teachers express, to respond subjectively and descriptively to the relationship established from their teaching practice, where the knowledge that makes up a training field is built. In this conversation with the descriptive section that is exhibited and the subjective information that presents the concept of training field, from which the teaching practice is circumscribed, whose task is the integration of the senses that accompany students and teachers for the construction of knowledge. in a broader, more universal space, from the perspective of the reality that students live. From here, the training field is a surface of senses, it is a place where “appears” a “meaning” thing that is nothing other than the way of giving and conceiving a thing (Alcudia, 2016).

For example, “Christopher Columbus discovered America” (History) Christopher Columbus is a Genoese navigator (Civic Training) who arrived in America without knowing it (Geography); These are senses of the same thing 3+1 and 2+2, so we are facing a new realism of teaching practice. Because in the training field teachers integrate meaning, then meaning is a relationship between an object “something given” and a subject a “who” to whom that something is given, so meaning accounts for properties of objects. , that is, that they are in the objects and that the subject that formulates them, that is, an epistemic didactics.

In other words, to build a training field it has to make sense and for this knowledge is integrated in the search for the construction of knowledge, knowledge that is built in a training field, in a space where it is integrated through the articulation of knowledge. Then, the senses allow the action of the participants to be limited to the reality of a specific structure that is in connection with the objects, where the plurality of knowledge and knowledge of the three disciplines allows the integration of the meaning that is the whole to highlight a vision. of knowledge that is integrated into knowledge from a contextual framework. This section allows us to ask ourselves: Has didactics been transformed? Why are we now talking about epistemic didactics? In this epistemic didactics, the teacher is recognized as endowed with the experience and knowledge to address other paths that lead to the construction of learning that allows them to problematize reality for the implementation of various solution strategies and to do so, it incorporates the methodologies considered as epistemic didactics contained in learning based on Community Projects, inquiry-based learning (STEAM), Problem-Based Learning (PBL) and Service Learning (AS).

Without a doubt, didactics reappears in a scheme that emerges to address the training fields from its epistemological function and achieve not only its transmission, recreation and assimilation by those involved, but also achieve the construction of scholarly knowledge as a result of said interaction (Montoya, 2008, p.63).

Here the opening session is presented in its sequence process as a didactic systematization in the epistemic space giving the teacher freedom to organize the activities based on knowledge. It is here where prior knowledge becomes links that are necessary to go in search of the structuring of knowledge. A process of restructuring and reconstruction appears in the context to attribute meaning to

The Epistemic Sense of Training Fields

the situations that are presented, a link between prior knowledge appears in the three subjects to give access to reality, integrating into the meaning that the training field has from the opening. of the session, establishing links with previous knowledge.

This sequence establishes the relationship with the object of learning, giving way to the articulation between knowledge to give continuity to the meaning that is intertwined with the knowledge that the students possess and that is necessary to establish the relationships between subjects of the training field that "acquire their meaning within a system of relationships" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005, p. 149).

In this network that is configured as a connection point between knowledge, the various points of view give rise to these links or connection points where the meaning of the space of the points of view is found. Habitus that are constituted in the sense, so that for a training field to be integrated, the connection between knowledge, between subjects, between the teacher and the students is necessary, that is, the fragments that are dispersed and that under the teacher's gaze are They connect, link the curricular contents with everyday life.

Bourdieu and Wacquant (2005) say that in this field the players agree, "by the mere fact of playing and not through a "contract", that the game deserves to be played, that it is worth playing, and this cohesion is the very basis of its competence" (p.151).

In this playing field we find the meaning that gives life to a training field based on the cohesion that drives them towards the achievement of educational purposes, then a basic element of meaning is cohesion, which is the link that allows the connection of senses in this relationship of knowledge and content from different perspectives. Because in analytical terms each particular field is constituted by a network of "objective relations between different positions" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005, p. 150).

The training field requires interdependence as an objective element that gives it meaning to build a space of encounters and interactions, because thinking in terms of field is thinking in relationships, "objective relationships between individuals that exist independently of the consciousness and desires of the individuals" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005, p. 96).

The training field integrates an entire context, a space where the teaching practice is developed and developed through the transversal project that establishes the links between subjects, where these actions are unfinished and come to life through meaning at the moment in which that practice does its exercise from planning, which is only an approach to foresee its development.

The common points between subjects are found in the context, the contents, students, and teaching practice; elements that allow integration into the transversal project to search for the meaning of knowledge from here because the training field establishes "a state of relations of force between the players which defines the structure of the field" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005, p. 151).

Therefore, the structure of the field is based on the common points between subjects to establish articulation and this is the meaning of teaching practice, seeking to link the constituent elements of knowledge to integrate into a training field, because a field is a space within which a field effect is exerted and a field effect is the joint so "what passes through it cannot be explained solely by the intrinsic properties of the object in question" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005, p. 154).

The development of the integrated class in a field is connecting common points found in the subjects, it is a dialogue between teacher, students and common points, where knowledge is found, where meaning leads them to become knowledge, because a formative field is the set of knowledge that brings us closer to reality that are objects of "formal meaning of determined individuals to a sufficient degree, about which we can have thoughts capable of truth (Gabriel, 2017, p.102).

The development of class means the construction of meaning, the integration of a field that becomes an object on which statements that emerge from reality can be woven, because an object in a field of meaning means not being an object in general, but to be under local conditions of identity (García, 2008, p. 83).

Because these identity conditions decide whether something exists in a region of interaction and that means precisely whether something "is an object in a given field of meaning" (Alcaraz, E., Hughes, B., & Gómez, A., 2002, p.120).

In closing, it addresses the synthesis so that it leads to evaluation, where relational thinking builds a field with the density of the framework that enables its autonomy, because it is not the isolation in that set of knowledge that brings us closer to reality in an interdisciplinary perspective. To cover the space of thinking relationally, interviews were conducted with teachers with the objective of interpreting the dialogues of school life where relationality was present, starting from the notion of field that contains "the conceptual stenography of a way of constructing the object." that will govern all practical decisions (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005, p170).

That is, the hidden message of the information, a fact from the co-design of the contents where the contents are outlined in a relational way, to be integrated into the training field through the design of the strategies derived from the transversal project, because relationality is a product of the social world. So the training field is a world of socio-educational relationships that, based on didactics, become a world that thinks, and when it thinks it incorporates meaning, in this way relational thinking when interacting within the training field also becomes a field of sense in a field that speculates in a relational way that the reality of the social world, "is a technique that "thinks" in terms of relationships" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005, p.64).

In the system of relationships, teachers also generate a field of meaning, that is, a field of interpretation of the social world, because thinking in terms of field means "thinking in terms of relationships" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005, p.64).

The Epistemic Sense of Training Fields

Then the field of meaning integrated into the formative field deploys a network of objective relations between positions, these are objectively defined in their existence and in the determinations, they impose on their occupants, they are places of a potential structure or cultural capital (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005).

In this conformation of the deployment of the meaning of the relational, where what is real is relational, that is, for the real to exist, relationality is needed, because what exists in the world are relations, objective relations "independent of consciousness and individual will" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005, p.64).

Why relationships are those and not others and why social changes and transformations are the result of the change in the way of "relating relationships." In that "relationship of relationships" (Donati, 2009, p, 148).

For example, the players accept, by the fact of participating in the game, and not by "contract", that said game is worth playing, because the relationships establish the component of strength between the players, this is what defines the structure of the field, we cannot imagine a classroom without teachers, without the guidance of their words and thoughts that correspond to the different species of capital that they possess "at the same time as the global volume of the structure of their capital" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2005 ,p.65).

With all this, it can be stated with certainty that learning is relational, since the meaning of epistemic didactics in this construction considers the relationality of knowledge because knowledge is a system of relationships in multiple senses, in this vision through Reflection on the training fields allows the elucidation of the construction of knowledge and the positioning of meaning.

CONCLUSIONS

The training field is created from the meaning that didactics gives it in its ecology of knowledge from a perspective of reality in a place where knowledge appears with meaning configured in the way of giving and conceiving knowledge in a relationship that takes into account the properties of objects formulated by the subject.

The main function of epistemic didactics is the articulation of meaning in the relationship between an object and a subject to integrate knowledge into a framework that designs its object and, as a consequence, generates a theoretical approach in a process of restructuring and reconstruction to attribute meaning to it. reality by establishing the links of knowledge.

The articulation of knowledge allows continuity to the meaning that is intertwined by establishing relationships that acquire their meaning within a system that configures a point of connections between knowledge where the sense of the space of the points of view integrated into fragments that are dispersed is found. and that to make sense they must be linked to everyday life.

The relational sense of teachers in a training field is a game that deserves to be played and this cohesion is the force of the field that drives towards the achievement of educational purposes constituted by a network of objective relationships between different positions.

By constructing a space of encounters and interactions, a formative field is integrated that is also a field of meanings because thinking in terms of a field is thinking about relationships with points in common as a state of force that defines the structure of the field.

The structure of the field starts from the points in common to establish the articulation and this is the sense to link the constituent elements of knowledge in a space within which a field effect is exerted and a field effect is the articulation through what it passes through. which cannot be explained solely by the intrinsic properties of the object in question.

The formative field is the set of knowledge that brings us closer to reality that are objects of formal meaning of determined individuals to a sufficient degree, about which we can have thoughts capable of truth woven by statements that emerge from reality, because an object in A field of meaning means not being an object in general, but rather being under local conditions of identity.

The training field is a world of socio-educational relationships that, based on didactics, become a world that thinks, and when it thinks it incorporates meaning, a field of meaning, that is, a field of interpretation of the social world, because thinking in terms of field means thinking in terms of relationships.

Learning has its relational principle, since the meaning of epistemic didactics in this construction considers the relationality of knowledge because knowledge is a system of relationships in multiple senses, in this vision through reflection on the training fields it allows elucidation of the construction of knowledge and the positioning of meaning.

REFERENCES

- 1) Abreu, O., Gallegos, M. C., Jácome, J. G., & Martínez, R. J. (2017). Didactics: Epistemology and definition in the Faculty of Administrative and Economic Sciences of the Technical University of Northern Ecuador. *University education*, 10(3), 81-92.
- 2) Albizu, E. (2005). "Sense": A frontier of philosophy. *Topics*, (13), 5-27.
- 3) Alcaraz, E., Hughes, B., & Gómez, A. (2002). *Legal Spanish*. Ariel.
- 4) Alcudia, J. A. N. (2016). In defense of the World. Critical notes on Markus Gabriel's hyperpluralist ontology. *Analysis. Journal of Philosophical Research*, 3(1), 137-147.

The Epistemic Sense of Training Fields

- 5) Amparan, A. C. (1998). The theory of fields in Pierre Bourdieu. *Polis*, 1(2), 179-200.
- 6) Bourdieu, P and Wacquant, L. (1995). *Answers. For a reflective anthropology*. Grijalbo.
- 7) _____ (2005). *An invitation to reflective sociology*. 21st century editors
- 8) Bourdieu, P. (1997). *Practical Reasons. On the theory of action*. Anagrama Editorial.
- 9) _____ (1999). *Practical reasons*. Anagram.
- 10) _____ (2008). *Things said*. Gedisa.
- 11) Bueno Martínez, G. (1996). *The meaning of life. Six readings of moral philosophy*. Oviedo, Pentalfa.
- 12) Diaz, D. (2001). University didactics: an alternative to transform teaching. *Pedagogical Action*, 10, 64-72. D-University of the Andes Venezuela.
- 13) Díaz-Barriga, Á. (2013). Guide for the development of a didactic sequence. UNAM, Mexico, consulted on, 10(04), 1-15.
- 14) Donati, P. (2006). *Rethink society*. International University Editions.
- 15) Gabriel M. (2017) *Meaning and existence*. Herder Editorial.
- 16) García, A. P. (2008). What do we talk about when we talk about local identity? . *Prism (Historical)*, (22), 83-100.
- 17) Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1998). Data collection strategies. *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*, 124-171.
- 18) Gütl, C., & Chang, V. (2008). Ecosystem-based theoretical models for learning in environments of the 21st century. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, 3(2008).
- 19) Leoni, L.J.; Venville, G., & Wallace, J. (2012). *Knowledge that Counts in Global Community: Exploring the Contributions of Integrated Curriculum*. Routledge.
- 20) Lewin, K. (1946): "Action research and minority problems", in Gertrude Weis Lewin (ed.), *Resolving Social Conflict*, London, Harper & Row.
- 21) Markus, G.(2017). *Why the world does not exist. Past & Present*.
- 22) Montoya, H. V. (2008). The training, epistemological and investigative fields: elements that contribute to an emerging science such as didactology. *Poliantea*, 4(6).
- 23) Paquay, Altet, Charlier and Perrenoud (2005). *The Professional Training of the Teacher. Strategies and competencies*. FCE.
- 24) Ramírez Grajeda, B. (2017). Identity as a construction of meaning. *Scaffolds*, 14(33), 195-216.
- 25) Rogers, X. (2007). *Pedagogy of integration: Competencies and integration of knowledge in teaching*. Central American Educational and Cultural Coordination.
- 26) SEP (2022). *The training fields to understand and transform our reality*. National Commission for the Continuous Improvement of Education.
- 27) SEP (2023). *Curricular integration: challenge for the practice of secondary school teachers*. National Commission for the Continuous Improvement of Education.
- 28) Simmel, G. (1939). *Sociology. Studies on forms of socialization. Volume II*. Espasa-Calpe SA.
- 29) Tobón, S. (2013). *Training projects: transversality and development of skills for the knowledge society*. CIFE Institute.
- 30) Van der Linde, G. E. (2007). Why is interdisciplinarity important in higher education? *Notebooks of University Pedagogy*, 4(8): 11-12.
- 31) Vargas, J. C. (2020). On the "presence" of the object of knowledge in Duns Scotus's theory of intentionality. *Areté*, 32(1), 219-239.
- 32) Weber, M. (1984). *Types of domination (Vol. 38)*. NoBooks Editorial.
- 33) Zapata, V. (2003). The evolution of the concept of pedagogical knowledge. *Your transformation paths. Education and Pedagogy*, 15(37), 177-184.