

SOCIAL EDUCATION IN THE NEW SPACES AND TIMES: THE INTERTWINED REALITIES OF SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL INTERVENTION

A EDUCAÇÃO SOCIAL NOS NOVOS ESPAÇOS E TEMPOS: AS REALIDADES ENTRONCADAS DA INTERVENÇÃO SOCIAL E EDUCATIVA

LA EDUCACIÓN SOCIAL EN LOS NUEVOS ESPACIOS Y TIEMPOS: LAS REALIDADES DE ENCUENTRO DE LA INTERVENCIÓN SOCIAL Y EDUCATIVA

Ernesto Candeias MARTINS¹

ABSTRACT: The article is based on the following objectives, on a hermeneutic (analytical) methodology that coincides with the structural points of the text: To analyze the indications/traces of the current reality and the direction of social education; Clarify conceptually and semantically social pedagogy and social education, in the field of Educational Sciences; Understand the (inter)relationship between social pedagogy (theoretical scope) and social education (practical scope), especially the practice of pedagogical-social action of social educators in the community; To deepen social pedagogy and social education in the context of school social intervention. We use a theoretical-conceptual framework led by a set of expert studies on social pedagogy and social education, which led us to deepen these concepts in the new spaces and current times of society in general. The spaces and times nowadays mark pedagogy in the social sphere, whether at the school and non-school level. We know that globalization has proliferated 'space and time' in learning and ways of living together, with new characteristics and areas of action or intervention. We want social education to include a series of intervention characteristics related to specific areas that are fundamental today, in addition to those that its evolution and identity have encompassed, for example: school for adults, elderly and intergenerational education; social entrepreneurship; environmental and ecological education; the management and promotion of culture, heritage and ecological/rural tourism; immigrants, refugees and ethnic groups; the promotion of women; mediation (school, social), etc.

KEYWORDS: Social education. Social and school intervention. Social pedagogy. New social realities. Profession.

RESUMO: *O artigo norteia-se pelos seguintes objetivos, na base de uma metodologia hermenêutica (analítica) que coincide com os pontos estruturais do texto: Analisar os indícios/vestígios da realidade atual e o reto da educação social; Clarificar conceptual e semanticamente a pedagogia social e educação social, no âmbito das Ciências da Educação; Compreender a (inter)relação entre a pedagogia social (âmbito teórico) e a educação social*

¹ Polytechnic Institute of Castelo Branco (IPCB), Castelo Branco – Portugal. Coordinator of the Master Degree of Social School Intervention and member of scientific commissions for master's degrees at Higher School of Education. PhD in Education/Educational Sciences. Coordinated the Transfrontier Project between University of Extremadura (Badajoz-Spain) as institutional manager 'Emotional Intelligence Program for Basic Education Students in the Castelo Branco Region' (between 2011-2017). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4841-1215>. E-mail: ernesto@ipcb.pt

(âmbito prático), especialmente a prática da ação pedagógico-social do educador social na comunidade; Aprofundar a pedagogia social e educação social no contexto da intervenção social escolar. Servimo-nos de um quadro teórico-conceitual norteado por um conjunto de estudos de especialistas sobre a pedagogia social e educação social, que nos levaram a aprofundar estes conceitos nos novos espaços e tempos atuais da sociedade em geral. Os espaços e tempos na atualidade marcam a Pedagogia no âmbito social, seja ao nível escolar e não-escolar. Sabemos que a globalização fez proliferar 'espaço e tempo' no aprender e nas formas de conviver, com novas características e áreas de ação ou intervenção. Pretendemos que a educação social inclua uma série de características de intervenção, relacionadas com áreas específicas que são hoje fundamentais, para além daquelas que a sua evolução e identidade têm abarcado, por exemplo: educação escolar de adultos, gerontológica e intergeracional; o empreendedorismo social; a educação ambiental e ecológica; a gestão e promoção da cultura, do patrimônio e do turismo ecológico/rural; os imigrantes, os refugiados e os grupos étnicos; a promoção da mulher; a mediação (escolar, social), etc.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Educação social. Intervenção social e escolar. Pedagogia social. Novas realidades sociais. Profissão.

RESUMEN: *El artículo se guía por los siguientes objetivos, basados en una metodología hermenéutica (analítica) que coincide con los puntos estructurales del texto: Analizar las evidencias / huellas de la realidad actual y la educación social directa; Clarificar conceptual y semánticamente la pedagogía social y la educación social, en el ámbito de las Ciencias de la Educación; Comprender la (inter) relación entre pedagogía social (alcance teórico) y educación social (alcance práctico), especialmente la práctica de la acción sociopedagógica del educador social en la comunidad; Profundizar la pedagogía social y la educación social en el contexto de la intervención social escolar. Utilizamos un marco teórico-conceptual guiado por un conjunto de estudios de especialistas en pedagogía social y educación social, que nos llevó a profundizar estos conceptos en los nuevos espacios y tiempos actuales de la sociedad en general. Los espacios y tiempos de hoy marcan la Pedagogía en el ámbito social, ya sea a nivel escolar o no escolar. Sabemos que la globalización ha hecho que el "espacio y el tiempo" proliferen en aprendizajes y formas de convivencia, con nuevas características y áreas de acción o intervención. Pretendemos que la educación social incluya una serie de características de intervención, relacionadas con áreas específicas que hoy son fundamentales, además de las que su evolución e identidad han abarcado, por ejemplo: educación escolar de adultos, gerontológica e intergeneracional; el emprendimiento social; educación ambiental y ecológica; la gestión y promoción de la cultura, el patrimonio y el turismo ecológico/rural; inmigrantes, refugiados y grupos étnicos; la promoción de la mujer; mediación (escolar, social), etc.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: Educación social. Intervención social y escolar. Pedagogía social. Nuevas realidades sociales. Profesión.

Introduction

In the last few decades, a range of social, economic, technological, cultural, political factors, etc. has taken place, which imply new visions / approaches to address different needs

and new forms of learning, which support new pedagogical possibilities to be satisfied, according to the challenges and complexity of society (MORIN, 2001). Some of these emerging factors have caused, for example: the increased demand for education for excluded people and/or collectives (inclusive education) from the education system; changes in the labor and business market that imply new forms of professional formation and qualification (continuous formation, updating); expansion of leisure and free time that generates needs for new actions adjusted to the socio-educational and cultural scope, with new professions; changes in the traditional family structure and in the forms of daily life of the people that originate new institutions that assume educational functions to satisfy the family in its impediment or replacement; social sensitivity to intervene in sectors of social conflict, drug addicts, socioeconomic and cultural marginalized, disabled and incapable, ethnic groups and emigrants/refugees, as a form of social justice and as a social control feature; etc. All this provoked, on the one hand, the proliferation of new educational spaces inserted in the school and/or in the community and, on the other hand, the change in the orientation of the pedagogical discourse. Some of these speeches (critical pedagogy) related to the school and the diagnostic scope of the gap between the educational system - social system and the labor market, locating their correspondences in systemic terms.

At the same time, social education itself (from now on SE) grows based on the conception of the social, as a field of problems and needs, which require interventions based on socio-educational treatment, mediation and inclusion actions and practical cultural transmission (interculturality), constituting a service and a social right to legitimize citizenship (TIMÓTEO, 2013). Given the scenario of changes and impacts, of those factors in society, social pedagogy (from now on SP) and HE reflect on these issues, situations and human social conflicts, knowing that any space in time(s) is close to the process to learn to learn, conducive to developing skills or competences in individuals, with an emphasis on the role of educational institutions and the family, and, therefore, the pedagogical-social implies the current need to open education to life in all its diversity in the community (NÚÑEZ, 2002). Education of and for all, in its civic, citizenship, affective-emotional, cognitive or simply daily basis, requires commitments and responsibilities for an adequate human coexistence.

On the basis of the context referred to above, we will establish the following analysis objectives, which coincides with the two structural points (and subpoints) of the text: Analyze the evidence/traces of the realities that require responses within the scope of SP and SE; Conceptually and semantically clarify the SP and SE, within the scope of Educational Sciences, in order to understand their level of theoretical-practical intervention; Understand the

(inter)relationship between SP (theoretical scope) and SE (practical scope), especially the practice of the social educator's social-pedagogical action in the community (relational and convivial level); Deepen the role of SP and SE (school) in the context of school social intervention and the challenges and responses by the school.

We use a theoretical-conceptual framework guided by a set of studies by specialists on SP and SE and the social education profession, which impelled us to deepen these concepts, their area and field of theoretical-practical intervention, in the new spaces and current times in the community or society in general, for example: the diversified approaches of Spanish colleagues J. A. Caride, A. Petrus, J. M. Quintana-Cabanas, A. J. Colom, J. Ortega Esteban, Glória Pérez Serrano, X. Úcar, Jaume Trilla, J. V. Merino and of the Latin American Violeta Núñez; perspective of the Italian Anita Gramigna and of the Portuguese Adalberto D. Carvalho and I. Baptista, among others.

Our argument is based on a hermeneutic methodology (analytical, critical) to SP and SE, as a reflective argument for socio-educational action or intervention, developed in different territories, taking into account the new non-formal spaces of education (extra-school) and its articulation with students (CÁRIDE, 2005). Today's spaces and times mark Pedagogy in the social sphere, whether at school and non-school and/or community level. We know that globalization has made 'space and time' proliferate in learning and in ways of living, with new characteristics and areas of action or intervention emerging, diverting the pedagogical discourse(s) from the school and focusing on satisfaction and social and cultural formation/learning needs of the individual. The 'new spaces and times' of learning in the title are related to the 'old' or usual/traditional space/time of learning and, recognizing that they arose 'due to new forms of learning, in contexts', with a variety of means available to individuals. Now, the emergence of these 'new spaces', both to learn and to intervene (socialization processes), implies reflecting on the times of Pedagogy in these contexts or formal and/or non-formal situations of development and integration of the individual as an active citizen. In this sense, the SP emerged as a theory and category favoring a renewal of conceptualization for the curriculum, teachers, social educators, community educators and other technicians or professionals (PETRUS, 2000; SAMAGAI, 2006). It seems that we learned more outside school and family, confirming those assumptions of the de-schooling movement, in the 1970's. (theses by I. Illich, Reimer, Holt), which recognized the educational influences (good or bad) of the surrounding environment and the technological means available to the individual. Of course, the school does not have to be the only institution or space to satisfy the needs of learning, there are other spaces in time that are conducive to learning.

Our argumentative interest is based on the social and educational/school scope. We intend that the SE include a series of characteristics, related to specific areas of intervention (aspects), such as (RUIZ, 2003): procedural - actions that have their time to implement and execute the objectives; educational - attitudes and values that promote autonomy, emancipation and integration and community coexistence; cultural - relationship with the sense of belonging and local bond; transforming the community - action of people/groups for development; social tools - diagnostic and intervention techniques and strategies; articulation with non-formal and informal education (apprenticeships); openness to alternatives in the face of changes within society; oriented to all ages/generations and cultures; interactive intervention, in which the social actors are the protagonists themselves; support from specialized professionals in the areas of social, school and community intervention.

In short, the straight actions of ES (practical and/or praxiological aspect of the SP) must integrate several areas of action/intervention: socio-cultural, socio-educational and gerontological animation; insertion in the labor market and business formation; children and/or young people at risk or danger, including institutional care and adoption; marginalization, exclusion and juvenile delinquency; school, adult and gerontological (seniors) and intergenerational education; cooperation for local development and social entrepreneurship; environmental and ecological education (sustainability); the management and diffusion/promotion of culture, heritage and ecological/rural tourism; immigrants, refugees and ethnic groups; the promotion of women; violence and ill-treatment; mediation (school, social), etc. Today the social educator himself must have broadband formation, that is, specialized.

Evidence of the current reality: new demands for new responses

In the last decades, societies are in a process of social change, in all sectors, with emphasis on the problems of coexistence and human development and community life, the action of social movements and networks with specific participation, the emergence of environmental, socio-educational issues, the transformation of the labor market, the impact of new technologies on people's lives, etc. In this sense, education, simultaneously with some kind of crisis and commitment to the future, constitutes one of the fields of concern of the various actors, largely due to the emergence of new spaces and new times to learn to learn, new discourses that imply new conceptual questions, pedagogical and methodological to face these changes, especially at school. Following these previous allusions, we highlight some signs or traces in society that put pressure on educational institutions and education and pedagogy itself

and that compel the search for (new) responses from the school and the community (MORIN, 2001).

We must allude, right from the start, that the outbreak of social education coincided with these transformations, for example: of an economic nature (production economy, technological revolution, retraining and professional specialization) producing pockets of poverty, excluded, marginalized and unprotected people in need of intervention ; relational and social organization (breaking traditional communication and relationship networks, producing the 'cocoon' effect); and of axiological nature (values of consumption, loneliness, individualism, violence and transgression of human rights as spontaneous expressions, the disappearance of traditional family referents, the loss of collective sense and group action, indifference and anxiety in the face of changes (QUINTANA-CABANA, 2001). These changes contributed for the SP and the SE to intervene in these sectors of excluded and incapable of inclusion and adaptation, with special mention in the school context (school social pedagogy).

Let us look at some of these signs that exist in society that challenge the search for answers and measures in the current times by the SP and the SE and/or the intervention.

- **Sign 1:** Manifestations, supposed or controversial in society about education, that put pressure on school institutions and education and pedagogy itself, for example:

- A society demanding in education and/or formation (quality and excellence), but not in the practical field.
- The school, being more and more inclusive, does not perform new facilitating tasks, because its organizational model remains unchanged, as do the models of learning assessment.
- Families have little dialogue and cooperation with the school in solving school problems, due to the change in family structures, the emergence of new cultural and social diversities, occupation and work commitments and unavailability of time that prevent them from getting involved in projects and educational and parenting programs, as they delegate this action to the school.
- Teachers, even carrying out new functions, generally maintain the same traditional schemes in the organization and management of their schoolwork.
- New generations of students change, but teaching style and methodology change little (not adjustable to needs and requirements), even with the contribution of new technologies in teaching and learning.

In fact, educational/school institutions try to respond to these and other problems that today's society generates, instilling attitudes and behaviors in situations such as: failure, (early) abandonment, violence (bullying) and school indiscipline; xenophobia and racism; consumerism; lack of control and emotional management; the high traffic accidents in the youth population; changes in the environment; epidemics and pandemics (health education), etc. It seems that through a certain confusion of education and school in the formation for global and cosmopolitan citizenship it is necessary: to recognize that the school, even fulfilling its functions and solving practical problems of everyday school life, must adapt to the new realities interconnected in the formal and non-formal educational component; take into account the diversity and mutability of the labor market, which is increasingly demanding in professional qualification and specialization; redefine the possibilities of school education as an instrument for social equality, since the school promotes culture and individual emancipation; review the school-family relationship by mobilizing greater involvement in educational tasks and school projects; reconsider the role of media competence, valuing the usefulness of the media, digital media and other technological media; reconsider the sentimentality models transmitted, since the emotional strategies given correspond to overcome relational forms and social dependence; insist on inclusion and interculturality.

In view of these scenarios, it is necessary to redefine the limits of educational action, an indispensable condition for the school to promote its areas of cooperation and collaboration with the community, the family and social institutions (COLOM, 1987).

-Sign 2: Contradictions and dilemmas about the school. We think that there is a need within the school for an adequate reconstruction to the new times, since it does not present effective responses and measures (projects, programs) for practical situations and problems in the daily lives of students in formation (TIMÓTEO, 2013). In other words, the school must renew itself and adapt to its real functions, for example: articulating the formal and non-formal perspective of teaching and learning (TRILLA; GROS; LÓPEZ; MARTÍN, 2003; TROTTER, 2015); adopting effective measures (mediation) for situations of violence and school indiscipline, social inadequacy (VARGAS, 1998) and for issues of non-inclusion, cultural diversity (inter and multicultural); promotion of parental education; adapt to the demands of the labor market, through more effective professional formation (guidance, qualification); expand the possibilities of school education as an instrument for social equality (scope of culture and emancipation); review the 'school-family' relationship in a greater involvement in the students' educational process; deepen the 'school-media' relationship (media competence); reconsider the models of sentimentality, insisting on other affective-behavioral strategies and the development

of social and emotional skills, etc. In this renewal of the school, social education is predominant in the scope of educational action and/or socio-educational intervention, promoting areas of collaboration with the community; reinforcing and developing the acquisition of (new) basic and methodological skills essential to students (autonomous learning, emancipatory education and 'empowerment'), and also in understanding the current reality (environmental education) and pandemic (health education), as the one we go through.

In this perspective of limiting the role of the school, measures (programs, projects) for the integration and insertion of diverse groups of children and young people at risk should be taken into account, in order to allow their real coexistence in the community (social relationship model active and participant) and inclusion. In this way, the school will define its social functions in the construction of a new school culture based on collaboration with other social institutions, with the family and the community (CAPUL; LEMAY, 2003). For this reason, it is desirable to build a (social) school pedagogy in the relationship between 'school-social education' based on the triad: formation teachers and professionals who know the new realities (socialization) and school culture (problems); provide answers and implement measures aimed at coexistence and the construction of active citizenship, based on socio-educational guidance and mediation in conflict resolution; foster cooperative work among professionals (multi-professional teams) within the school, in line with the technicians of the municipality and community institutions, within the scope of prevention and educational and cultural promotion (AZEVEDO *et al.*, 2014). In view of these supposed nominees, we bet, at the level of school and social action/intervention, in the institutionalization process of SP and SE at school level (CÁRIDE, 2003; COLOM, 1983).

-Sign 3: new pedagogical discourses to reform, modernize and readapt educational systems and address the challenges of an increasingly complex and technological (digital) society (MORIN, 2001). Modernization and technological advances determine the active participation of schools, families, and other institutions in the community. From this amalgam of discourses, 'new' concepts related to pedagogy appeared, such as adult and/or permanent education, informal and non-formal education, andragogy, inclusive education, the educational society or learning society (educational city), intergenerational education, etc. This conceptual proliferation associated with pedagogy basically shares two general principles: heterogeneity (education is a broad, complex, and heterogeneous phenomenon) and globality (holistic view of the educational process). It is in this perspective (global and integrative) that all educations are mixed and intertwined in the education of the student and that they must be understood by educational institutions (RUIZ, 2003). Now, this implies the paradigm of the educational

environment, in which all educational action is understood as relational in a specific environment/situation or context, whether at school, family or community, knowing that the environment influences/conditions and configures the educational relationship (educator-student) and is associated with other determining elements (new technologies, environment, non-formal learning).

It is evident that non-school education is very broad, with a repertoire that goes from the aspect: of occupational and professional formation and/or in a business context (professional internships), qualification and professionalization programs (reconversion); free time (idleness, leisure) and culture (socio-cultural animation, socio-educational and community animation); strand of social education in educational institutions in solving problems (social conflicts); school aspect with school-family and community involvement programs / projects; strand of intergenerationality and multiculturalism with actions and programs involving different generations and cultures. We believe that this range of educations and pedagogies stands out for the development of the sociability of the individual(s), especially the groups of conflict or social risk and in contexts or means of non-formal and formal education (ÚCAR, 2013).

New times and new spaces of social pedagogy versus social education

At this point of approach, we must first explain the identity and evolution of 'Pedagogy' and its approach to 'social', converting that area into a social and pedagogical science, of a normative character (values), by proposing theoretical explanatory foundations of practical processes of socio-educational and socio-cultural intervention, which is the dimension of social education (MARTIN, 2009). In other words, Pedagogy maintains its identity as a scientific area independent from other sciences, having in 'normativity' the unavoidable principle of its epistemological justification, since it has the possibility to develop educational norms with scientific support that provide it to the Educational Sciences, with the capacity to scientifically validate these norms (autonomy as a science) (MERINO, 2005).

In fact, the educational and community reality caused multiple distinct activities and interventions to emerge from the SP and/or SE, listed at the confluence of the 'educational and / or pedagogical' and the 'social', largely due to the origins, identity and historical development of these areas (CARIDE, 2005). While the 'pedagogical' reveals a certain inspiration to recover the sense of the Greek *'paideia'* of an education at the service of people and their own development, the 'social' expresses the sensitivity of education to the needs of all, especially the groups marginalized, excluded, in precarious living conditions and inadequacy (ORTEGA

ESTEBAN, 2005). We know that it is the practical needs that shape the theoretical-practical reflection of the conceptualization and paradigms, of the intervention methodology and research techniques of SP and SE (PÉREZ SERRANO, 2004).

Historically, since the beginning of the last century, Pedagogy has advanced towards its characterization as a science of approach to education, as a historical and social construction, which presents its convergences with other social and human sciences (anthropology, sociology, history, economics, law, psychology, among others) (CARIDE, 2003). Thus, in the SP, since Paul Natorp, the 'social' of education and pedagogy took a long time to renew the pedagogical conception about the social conditions of education and social life and, therefore, in the words of the professor at the University of Santiago Compostela J. A. Caride (2009), all pedagogies and their educations are social and intertwined in the frontiers of theory and socio-educational praxis. At these borders, technological networks have submitted SP to renewal, making SE emerge within the scope of social services and social and cultural policies (TRILLA, 2000). In this sense, many of these formalities claimed SO for themselves, leading to the construction of identity signs as science, as a scientific area and as a profession. That is, it was listed in the scope of theory-practice, reflection-action and in the scientific, academic and professional field (CARIDE; GRADÁILLE; BELÉN CABALLO, 2015).

But how do we define or what is SP and SE?

SP has as its object SE (socialization of the individual) and social work (help, support for human and social needs) (DIÁZ, 2006). Both terms, on several occasions, are used interchangeably. While SP is the science of social education (more theoretical) for the individual/group in attending to their problems and needs (human, social, educational), SE constitutes the scope of intervention or action (practice) in solving those problems or existing needs (social policies) (QUINTANA-CABANAS, 2001). Therefore, the SP implies the knowledge, action and technique or technology necessary for the education of people and groups in situations of marginalization, precariousness, exclusion and social conflict and, therefore, it is designated as: pedagogy of socialization (addresses the epistemological integration, technological and standardized); pedagogy of inadequacy and marginalization; and specialized pedagogy (ORTEGA ESTEBAN, 1999). These aspects, of a pedagogical-social nature, are a constant in the development of new intervention scenarios, configuring the SP as a pedagogical science that created a *corpus* of its own knowledge concerned by the social dimension of education (SILVA *et al.*, 2011).

Therefore, the SP must be understood as a science of social education when addressing and analyzing issues inherent to the socialization of individuals in new social scenarios, such

as inadequacy and exclusion, orienting themselves towards their inclusion and improvement of living conditions, in a specialized and practical perspective. In other words, the object of the SP is the SE or the pedagogical-social or socio-educational action/intervention, since it is the theory and practice of the SE (NÚÑEZ, 1999). The socio-educational and/or the pedagogical-social is inserted in the (educational) scope of society and in the pedagogical of social work and, therefore, the improvement or transformation of a given reality/community takes place with a “[...] procedural intervention, in the sense of process” (author' highlights, our translation) technical-systemic (= science and technology of the phenomenon and socio-educational intervention) (ORTEGA ESTEBAN, 1999, p. 23). Thus, the SP's critical orientation is oriented towards dialectical or hermeneutic-dialectical positions, critical sociology, Mollenhauer's critical and emancipatory social pedagogy, some aspects of constructivism, Habermas's dialogical theory, communication theories, etc. (NÚÑEZ, 2002; VARGAS, 2008).

Let us see in the following two points the origin, evolution and identity of the SP and the scope(s) of social and/or socio-educational intervention of the SE to better understand the importance of the SP in the new spaces and times of today.

Social pedagogy/social education: From origins to identity

In order to understand the scientific construction and the practical intervention of SP and SE, we should refer to the origin, evolution, identity and prospective and methodological trends of these areas, based on several studies (BAENA; SÁENZ; QUINTANA-CABAÑAS, 2002; GRAMIGNA, 2003; PÉREZ SERRANO, 2004).

1- *German origin and diffusion in the center of Europe (19th century and after the Second World War)*. It is an idealistic and conceptualist aspect that relates the meaning of ‘pedagogy’ to ‘social pedagogy’, generating the link between SP-SE (this is the field and object of study of social pedagogy). The purposes of this pedagogy are of a social, political and philosophical nature, impregnated with influences from the sociologism and culturalism of Natorp and H. Nohl, as it is oriented towards the social education of youth, their well-being and protection, which later designated by 'Pedagogy of Urgency' post World War II (PETRUS, 1997). Having overcome the empirical-positivist influences, related to psychology and sociology, there was a separation between SP and ‘social work’. Thus, SP integrated the dialectic of its theory and practice within social work, diversifying into functions and types of institutions. Later, this strand was derived from critical rationalism (Popper, Topitsch) for other trends, such as the technological or systemic-empiricist strand (Brezinca, Rössner), in which

'social work' and SP (NÚÑEZ, 1999). This trend was followed in Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Holland, and Denmark, with its peculiarities.

2- *Anglo-Saxon origin and influence.* It is a philosophical, positivist and empiricist trend, disseminated in the USA, England ('Social Work') and, later, in Europe, integrating the analysis to the social and human needs and difficulties, made from sociology (sociology of education), (social) psychology, medicine and/or psychiatry. It expresses an assistentialist perspective (help, planning and management), which makes little mention of the concept of Pedagogy and even less of the concept of SP, despite the 'educational'/'pedagogical' being linked to 'social work' (CARIDE, 2005). Its fields of intervention are: excluded, unsuitable and antisocial subjects; conflicting minors (delinquency, marginalization, exclusion); childhood/youth and needy subjects (biopsychological). The intervention models are based on clinical, psycho-psychiatric, re-educational and/or medical-pedagogical treatment at the institutional level (prisons, nursing homes, reformatories, correctional colonies, specific institutions) (PÉREZ SERRANO, 2004). Social services are contributions from the social and assistance system to address these situations of risk and exclusion (GRAMIGNA, 2003).

3- *Francophone origin and influence.* A trend based on a rationalist tradition in several European countries, highlighting the political and sociological analysis of the school system and educational institutionalization (pedagogical activism, democratization of teaching, civic and citizenship education), based on popular education, adult education and, later, of socio-community or socio-cultural animation. This type of SE evolved throughout the 20th century, in its beneficial/assistentialist aspect, with a meritorious, philanthropic and pestalozzian orientation (19th century), in its protectionist and psychopedagogical approaches, having originated several formative initiatives of professionals and associations (CAPUL; LEMAY, 2003). The animation orientation itself was gradually implemented at the level of formation of technicians or undergraduate courses (SERAPICOS; SAMAGAIO; TREVISAN, 2011). This Francophone origin was associated with some Anglo-Saxon ideas, which had repercussions and influence in Portugal (AZEVEDO *et al.*, 2014).

4- *Origin and influence of critical pedagogy.* Critical theory with its reflexive-critical character influenced the SP (reference to Mollenhauer) and established a bridge between education and the structure and social context and, further, deepened the values inherent to educational institutions, in the way of thinking/analyzing reality environment (approaches, perspectives) (DIÁZ, 2006). In this sense, critical pedagogy, being communicative and consensual (ecological model), used research as a methodological strategy, giving relevance to cultural differences. Now, this strategy has referred to historical memory, to self-criticism and

reflection by collectives, with the intention of valuing practice and critically analyzing irrational conflicts, with a dialectic (theory-practice) that is relational, contextual, situational and intersystemic. In other words, critical social pedagogy started to address and analyze the economic, social and political aspects related to child and youth issues, of specific collectives, ethnic groups, immigrants and refugees, in the pretension of their adaptation, insertion, socialization and re-education for society. Thus, its socio-educational task consists of seeking answers to the social and educational needs caused by society and, therefore, it seeks human emancipation and the analysis of social structures, with the aim of improving and transforming them (CARIDE; GRADAÍLLE; BELÉN CABALLO, 2015).

Effectively, the SP appears in this historical evolution and consolidation of its identity, on the one hand, with a theoretical-practical character, since the practice often precedes the theoretical formulation, due to the typology of the existing needs and problems (collectives, individuals), in different contexts, which implies being a speculative aspect of the praxis itself (SILVA, 2009). On the other hand, they have a normative character that comes from being a pedagogical science that encompasses several educational themes. In addition, the polysemics of the term SE and the breadth of its theoretical-practical areas or fields, which we referred to earlier, makes it difficult to form an epistemological support of the SP design (PETRUS, 1997). In other words, we can understand SE from pedagogical theory, when limiting its conceptual (semantic) framework and taking into account its historical origins (QUINTANA-CABANAS, 2001) and, therefore, can be understood as: sociologist concept of education being the means of adapting the individual to society in the performance of their social role (Durkheim, Natorp, Kerschensteiner, Kieck, Dewey); formation of the individual in the socialization process and in the basic and continuous formation of the individual in the perspective of 'learning to learn' (civic education, for citizenship, for coexistence and solidarity, for peace, respect and tolerance) in the democratic context and in cultural diversity (interculturalism); form of social work referred to as an area specialized in the intervention with certain groups (children/young people at risk, marginalized and excluded, drug addicts, emigrants, refugees, vulnerable people/groups or in precarious conditions in society) who are the subjects of the socio-educational action of SE (THOMPSON, 2009; TROTTER, 2015).

Therefore, SE is a broad and integrating concept of education for citizenship, civism, and democratic politics, within the scope of an integral formation of the person. It is oriented to the individual/groups inserted in the community, in which their action or “[...] intervention of education and social pedagogy is the social itself” (ORTEGA ESTEBAN, 1999, p. 26, author' highlights, our translation). In fact, it is the social that emerges in the field of coexistence

and relationships, in equity, in the relational communication of people and groups, in such a way, that it lists a repertoire of practical applications essential to the formation of the individual, in the social sense and in the human relationships. Hence the task of higher education is the insertion/inclusion of individuals in their (community) environment, seeking the ethical-civic and entrepreneurial sense, providing them with an adequate awareness of the bonds that unite them to the community, with correct and compliant conduct. rights in the social field, to be able to improve and transform society. The purpose of SE is based on this social and moral maturation of the individual, on the promotion of their human relationships and on the preparation to live with others in society (TIMÓTEO, 2013). Nowadays, SE is concerned, in addition to the education of adults and the elderly (gerontology), for socio-cultural or socio-educational animation, for community development, for personalized and specialized education, covering intergenerational education and/or education throughout life for all generations and ages (ORTEGA ESTEBAN, 2005).

In fact, SE has a range of approaches and perspectives, such as for example (PETRUS, 1997): adaptation, socialization, the acquisition of social skills, the didactics of the social, qualified professional action (specialization), responses social maladjustments, citizen formation (global and cosmopolitan), social prevention and control, and also as social work, of a socio-educational scope and as non-formal and/or out-of-school education. Despite this panoply of ways of understanding SE, generalizing theories, using its historical origins and antecedents, consider it (MARTINS, 2013; GRAMIGNA, 2003) as: oriented towards social change, making the recipients themselves protagonists; socializing in seeking social adaptation; inserted within human and social problems; usually applied in non-formal contexts of education, but also in school; prioritizing its field of action in marginalization, social exclusion and in the prevention and protection of children and adolescents; it requires a constant contact of individuals and groups with the surrounding reality, using a qualified or specialized intervention (specialized social education) (ORTEGA ESTEBAN, 1999). These diverse actions, present at the community level and in society with their seals (marginalization, poverty, violence, exclusion, inadequacy, lack of inclusion), allow social education to take preventive socio-educational measures and innovations to improve the quality of life and formation of people, for social and community development (RUIZ, 2003). Thus, SE, in its various strains and conceptions, must be considered necessary and useful for the integration, inclusion and social development of people/groups, especially the most vulnerable (CARVALHO; BAPTISTA, 2004).

Social education as a scope for social and educational intervention

In terms of intervention, SE encompasses four main pillars, as they are (TRILLA, 2000): the social assistance area, corresponding to the life situations/problems of people/groups and/or families, which require immediate action by professionals in terms of help, monitoring, assistance and mutual help, with many organizations being a good example, for example Caritas and Non-Governmental Organizations; the socio-educational area with processes that facilitate integration and/or improve the lives of people/groups, promoting changes in attitudes and behaviors, valuing new values (civic, ethical-moral) desirable for the formation of citizens (global, cosmopolitan); the socio-cultural area referring to the promotion, dissemination, management and development of all dimensions of culture (especially heritage), but based on the action and protagonism of collectives/social groups; the socio-economic area for local development, focusing on aspects relating to unemployment and temporary employment, the promotion of self-employment and entrepreneurship, cooperativism at the community level (use of local resources) and giving special attention to disadvantaged and excluded groups; the area of inter and transgenerationality, promoting the exchange of knowledge and experiences between generations; in the active participation of the elderly in terms of citizenship and development and in learning (educational gerontology), with animation (sociocultural, socio-educational) having an important role.

In any case, the intervention and its limits in the field of action of SE professionals (social educator) make them master a variety of resources in order to respond to diverse situations and existing social (and school) conflicts, diagnosing, programming and planning projects (models, some more global and multi-purpose, others more specific) in practice, especially related to social policies and/or social services, but also in terms of the school context (AZEVEDO *et al.*, 2014; SILVA, 2009). Well, SE, based on its practical guidance, uses complex methods of intervention (Casework, Groupwork - Social groupwork and community work - community work, *Gemeinwesemarbeit*), each with specific and differentiated techniques, for example: preventive of an environmental nature, of help; of a therapeutic nature, oriented to work the social curriculum at school; conflict resolution, through social and school mediation, taking into account each case and intervention situation (PÉREZ SERRANO, 2004).

In fact, due to social and economic changes, turbulence and demands in the labor market, societies are complex in their functioning and, therefore, social (and school) intervention is fundamental in the extension and guarantee of social and civic rights. (SILVA *et al.*, 2011). Now, these interventions are insufficient due to the contingency, the change in

people's values and ways of life, which force new forms of action/intervention by SE professionals, who work in emerging sectors, such as (SERAPICOS; SAMAGAIO; TREVISAN, 2011): gender (women) and social space issues; of the elderly and intergenerational relationships; in the problems of unemployment, in the new pockets of poverty and social exclusion; in situations of inter and multiculturalism; citizen participation and empowerment; in solidarity (generational, relational) at the community level; mobility of people and workers, in particular immigration and refugees; in the diversity of situations of violence, violations, xenophobia and racism; changes in personal and group relationships; etc.

Therefore, higher education has a fundamental role in the development and intervention in different groups / collectives, especially in the socio-educational aspect, in seeking to implement equal opportunities in society, in changing the perspective and social image of the individual (especially the woman) and further increase solidarity and inclusion (VARGAS, 1998). For this reason, within the scope of the SO, SE is the guiding principle for the development of positive and supportive attitudes among all citizens, regardless of sex, age, culture, religion or generation. However, social and educational intervention must be carried out at the community level to promote their development and well-being, but with recourse to various spheres of SP (socio-cultural, socio-educational, gerontological animation; participatory and community pedagogy; adult education and intergenerational education), in order to respond effectively with measures to improve and adapt people and groups to their own lives.

Some (IN)conclusive ideas for reflection

Knowing that education is an important reference in today's society, as we learn throughout life; sometimes it happens that from looking at the mirror so much, we do not pay due attention to problems or realities, in these new times with new spaces that appeared and interfered with the way of life, relationships, communication and the coexistence of people and groups. We cannot reduce education to the school aspect, because today we learn in different contexts and (new) non-school spaces (non-formal education where social education is inserted). It is evident that education is global, it is social, and it takes place throughout life (UNESCO motto: 'learn to learn' and learn to live together) (TRILLA *et al.*, 2003). If the objective of education is to empower and resolve situations/problems of people and groups to live in society, communicating and relating, education facilitates the formation of citizens in

the social skills necessary to discover the (new) reality (example pandemic) and the rights of others.

We refer throughout the text that the SP is oriented to the reflection on the 'intervention' or 'action' (theoretical component) of social/cultural situations and circumstances that originate them, using the SE (object of that and the action in practice) for this link with reality and respective narrations (activity of emancipation and human development) (CARIDE, 2005). We understand the SE as the action that promotes and dynamizes a society that educates and an integral education that helps/supports to avoid or repair social difficulties and conflicts (RUIZ, 2003). That is, it seeks, in the new scenarios, incisive answers about human and social problems (exclusion, marginalization, unsuitable or non-inclusive) in today's society, preventing their causes. Hence SE integrates areas or fields of action related to leisure and idleness (childhood, youth, adults), adult and permanent education (and seniors), socio-cultural and gerontological animation and specialized education (ORTEGA ESTEBAN, 1999).

On the other hand, the PS must collaborate with the school and its problems, in order to bring together energies, strategies and processes between the 'School-Family-Community' and other community microsystems, in mediation tasks, situations of conflict and violence, maladaptation, dysfunctionality, coexistence, dropout and school failure, difficulties in adapting, forms of emotional illiteracy, etc. (VIEIRA, 2013). It will be necessary to pay more attention to those in the school context and to the demands of the school culture, since higher education and school education are not opposite realities, because the reality is only one. The SO itself, when embarking on the school, gave rise to a (new) space for practical intervention of SE, in the prevention and treatment of specific situations (CARÍDE, 2015; NÚÑEZ, 2002). Thus, several fields of intervention have emerged for SE, with the implementation of projects and the creation of informative social networks (common citizenship project), highlighting the following aspects: favoring the construction of the interactive and intergenerational community, with special attention to the elderly and intergenerationality in the social reality; the spaces for meeting, exchanging and promoting coexistence in the inter multicultural sphere in favor of a citizenship (global and cosmopolitan) in diversity; in new physical, recreational and sports activities, which are factors of socialization and well-being for the health of individuals; the problems of immigrants and refugees in their integration into the host society; the purposes of the inclusive school with students with adaptation difficulties; specialized education for adult education and in the business level; in creating awareness of environmental education at the planetary level, etc. All of these new situations deserve a reflection-action-reflection of the SE

professionals at the intervention level (new models), contributing to the mediation in the integration of the individual in the new times and new spaces that arise in society.

Consequently, SP - SE constitute a daily 'praxis' in formal and non-formal socio-educational contexts, especially in the 'School-Community' relationship, but for this effectiveness changes in the styles of teachers and in the school's organizational models are required, generating close collaboration between the social educator and the other technicians or professionals who work for social learning.

REFERENCES

AZEVEDO, S.; CORREIA, F.; DELGADO, P.; MARTINS, T. A educação social em Portugal: novos desafios para a identidade profissional. **Interfaces Científicas Educação**, Aracaju, v. 3, n. 1, p. 113-124, 2014. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17564/2316-3828.2014v3n1p113-124>

BAENA, M. P. L.; SÁENZ, J. M. M.; QUINTANA-CABAÑAS, J. M. **Pedagogía social**. Madrid: Publ. Uned, 2002.

CAPUL, M.; LEMAY, M. **Da educação à intervenção social**. Porto: Porto Editora, 2003. v. 1.

CARIDE, J. A. Elogio de la pedagogía social: acerca de los nuevos y viejos desafíos de la educación social. Praise of Social Pedagogy: about the new and old challenges of social education. **Revista de Educação Pública**, Cuiabá, v. 18, n. 38, p. 449-468, 2009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29286/rep.v18i38.391>

CARIDE, J. A. **Las fronteras de la pedagogía social**. Perspectivas científica e histórica. Barcelona: Gedisa, 2005.

CARIDE, J. A. Las identidades de la educación social. **Cuadernos de Pedagogía**, n. 321, p. 47-51, 2003.

CARIDE, J. A.; GRADAÍLLE, R.; BELÉN CABALLO, M. De la Pedagogía social como educación, a la educación social como Pedagogía. **Perfiles Educativos**, México, v. XXXVII, n. 148, p. 4-11, Suplemento 2015. Available: <http://www.scielo.org.mx/pdf/peredu/v37n148/v37n148a16.pdf>. Access: 10 Sep. 2020.

CARVALHO, A. D.; BAPTISTA, I. **Educación social**. Fundamentos e estratégias. Porto: Porto Editora, 2004.

COLOM, A. J. *et al.* **Modelos de intervención socioeducativa**. Madrid: Narcea, 1987.

COLOM, A. J. La pedagogía social como modelo de intervención socioeducativa. **Bordón**, Madrid, n. 247, p. 165-180, mar./abr. 1983.

DIAZ, A. S. Uma aproximação à pedagogia. **Revista Lusófona de Educação**, Lisboa, n. 7, p. 91-104, 2006.

GRAMIGNA, A. **Manuale di pedagogia sociale** (Scenari del presente e azione educativa). Roma: Armando Editore, 2003.

MARTIN, R. L. **Fundamentos políticos de la educación social**. Madrid: Ed. Síntesis, 2009.

MARTINS, E. C. A Pedagogia social/Educação social nos meandros da comunidade e da escola. **Educare et Educere**, Portugal, v. XV, n. 1, p. 5-24, 2013.

MERINO, J. V. Pedagogía social y educación social: Reto de conocimiento y de acción para el siglo XXI. *In*: RUIZ BERRIO, J. (Ed.). **Pedagogía y educación ante el siglo XXI**. Madrid: Publ. Universidad Complutense Madrid, 2005. p. 225-251.

MORIN, E. **O desafio do Século XXI**. Religar os conhecimentos. Lisboa: Instituto Piaget, 2001.

NÚÑEZ, V. (Coord.). **La educación en tiempos de incertidumbre: las apuestas de la Pedagogía Social**. Barcelona: Gedisa, 2002.

NÚÑEZ, V. (Coord.). **Pedagogía social: cartas para navegar en el nuevo milenio**. Buenos Aires: Santillana, 1999.

ORTEGA ESTEBAN, J. La educación a lo largo de la vida: la educación social, la educación escolar, la educación continua... todas son educaciones formales. **Revista de Educación**, Madrid, n. 333, p. 167-175, 2005.

ORTEGA ESTEBAN, J. **Pedagogía social especializada**. Pedagogía de menores en dificultad y en conflicto social. Barcelona: Ed. Ariel, 1999.

PÉREZ SERRANO, G. **Pedagogía social – educación social**. Construcción científica e intervención práctica. Madrid: Narcea, 2004.

PETRUS, A. Nuevos âmbitos en educación social. *In*: ROMANS, M.; PETRUS, A.; TRILLA, J. **De profesión: educador(a) social**. Barcelona: Paidós, 2000. p. 63-147.

PETRUS, A. **Pedagogía social**. Barcelona: Ariel, 1997.

QUINTANA-CABAÑAS, J. M. **Pedagogía social**. Madrid: Dykinson, 2001.

RUIZ, C. (Coord.). **Educación social viejos usos y nuevos retos**. València: Publ. Universitat de València, 2003.

SAMAGAIO, F. A educação social e a investigação: algumas generalidades em torno de um perfil profissional. **Cadernos de Estudo**, Porto, n. 3, p. 17-23, 2006.

SERAPICOS, A. M.; SAMAGAIO, F.; TREVISAN, G. Constructing and (re)constructing professional identities: na analysis on Portuguese social Educators. **European Journal of Social Education**, n. 20/21, p. 25-34, 2011.

SILVA, G. H. Educador Social: uma identidade a caminho da profissionalização. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 35, n. 3, p. 479-493, 2009. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1517-97022009000300005>

SILVA, R.; SOUZA, J. C.; MOURA, R.; MONTEIRO, E.; PESSAGNO, S. M. (Org.). **Pedagogia social: contribuições para uma teoria geral da educação social**. São Paulo: Expressão & Arte Editora, 2011.

THOMPSON, N. **Understanding social work**. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009.

TIMÓTEO, I. A evolução da educação social: perspectivas e desafios contemporâneos. **Praxis Educare – Revista da Associação dos Profissionais Técnicos Superiores de Educação Social**, v. 1, p. 12-17, 2013.

TRILLA, J. El universo de la educación social. *In*: ROMANS, M.; PETRUS, A.; TRILLA, J. **De profesión: educador(a) social**. Barcelona: Paidós, 2000. p. 15-59.

TRILLA, J.; GROS, B.; LÓPEZ, F.; MARTÍN, M. J. **La educación fuera de la escuela**. Ámbitos no formales y educación social. Barcelona: Ed. Ariel, 2003.

TROTTER, C. **Working with involuntary clientes, a guide to practice**. New York: Routledge, 2015.

ÚCAR, X. Exploring different perspectives of Social Pedagogy: towards a complex and integrated approach. **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, v. 21, n. 36, p. 1-17, 2013.

VARGAS, L. P. (Coord.). **Nuevos espacios de la educación social**. Bilbao: Publ. Universidad de Deusto, 1998.

VIEIRA, A. **Educação social e mediação sociopedagógica**. Porto: Profedições, 2013.

How to reference this article

MARTINS, E. C. Social education in the new spaces and times: the intertwined realities of social and educational intervention. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 15, n. esp. 3, p. 2167-2187, Nov., 2020. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v15iesp3.14423>

Submitted: 20/07/2020

Required revisions: 30/08/2020

Approved: 29/09/2020

Published: 30/10/2020