

Re-Politicization of Teacher Education in Post-Pandemic Times: A View From The South

Ilich Silva-Peña
Universidad de Los Lagos

Julio Hizmeri-Fernández
Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción

Roxana Hormazábal-Fajardo
Universidad Arturo Prat

Gustavo González-García
Universidad Católica Silva Henríquez

Bessie Rojas-Rodríguez
Universidad Arturo Prat

Enriqueta Jara-Illanes
Universidad Andrés Bello

Our role as teacher educators implies questioning more than our actions inside the classroom, especially during a crisis like the one that our country and the world are currently experiencing. In October 2019, Chile awoke with a student revolt that extended nationally. After this, the COVID-19 epidemic also altered Chile's political and socioeconomic landscape. Rethinking the role of teachers in a new scenery is an issue that we address as a team of academics working on teacher education. It's a two-pronged approach: First, we look back to observe the depoliticization of teachers and society in a neoliberal context; and second, we look forward to the issues we see in this process of post-pandemic change and Chile's new Constitution. In the end, we connect with other components that we think are critical to re-politicizing teacher education.

Keywords: professional development, Chile, politics, society, social movements, crisis

INTRODUCTION

On October 18, 2019, we witnessed a strong popular demand for Chile's social justice, dignity, and democracy. Institutionalized abuses and injustices generated citizen fatigue, and the rage that had accumulated over time exploded (Mujica, 2020; Silva- Peña & Paz-Maldonado, 2019). The movement meant giving social substance to a set of demands developing for almost two decades. Various groups

joined forces to demand a change of direction. In all possible spaces, the people show the disaffection with a neoliberal system imposed by fire. During the transition to democracy, this system was legitimized by focusing on productivity (ECLAC, 1992; Moulian, 1997; Rodríguez, 2009). It is argued that poverty is decreasing and the middle class is increasing in Chile (Barozet & Fierro, 2014). In definitive terms, this movement triggered a weariness with a social system founded on economic transactions, i.e., the commodification of life.

That has been the mood of the last few decades in our society, so the pandemic caused us to think about something else. During the summer of 2020, the movement decreased in intensity, and then, with an overflowing March 8, women once again placed the social movement in a strong position, especially from a feminist perspective. The institutions were getting ready for the contingency, which was already different from usual. Everything indicated that, as teacher educators, we had to prepare for upcoming strikes, occupations, and demonstrations. However, the national social movement was bartered by a worldwide crisis; the COVID-19 pandemic caught us planning for the 2020 academic year and, in some cases, ending 2019. If the beginning of 2020 had already been strange, finishing it would be an unexpected experience. Throughout the pandemic years, we navigated across a new, turbulent, and mutant river. The uncertainty was installed in our daily spaces—domestic, labor, economic, academic, political—and, in the end, life. Also, the virus created new reflections added to the ones we had already been generating.

Both the October movement and the pandemic confirmed a long-standing situation of social injustice. During the confinement, the movement continued through social networks, while an ineffective government caused the tension to grow. In this crisis framework (social movement and pandemic), far from anything coming to a standstill, processes of political transformation continue to advance. The icon is the path to the creation of the new Constitution. Changing the Magna Carta of our Country means starting a long process of building a new society, a new social subject. Although there is a long debate about the necessary changes, our contribution is framed around the type of teacher education we need as a society that is thinking about a new development model. It is understood that teachers will emerge to play an essential role in the social transformation of Chile.

Thus, in this piece, we turn our thoughts to the role of policies in initial teacher education. We do so in a post-October movement, a post-pandemic society. While the reflection may be mixed up by the unexpected twists and turns generated by this social journey, we focus such thinking on our role: educating teachers for this new Chile. Looking at society's path in recent history, we do this exercise reflexively aware that it is in a developmental stage. The exercise is not easy, and the ambition is high: on the one hand, we reflect on an ongoing process, and, on the other hand, we intend to make a long-term projection in which depoliticization and re-politicization of teacher education will be our main themes.

DEPOLITICIZATION OF SOCIETY, EDUCATION WITHOUT IDENTITY

In the 1990s, with the transition from dictatorship through a political consensus, Chile reasserted the neoliberal model. The “Chilean style” transition process was based on a technocratic political negotiation model (Araujo & Martuccelli, 2012; Garretón, 2012), generating a society where the values of community or solidarity were exchanged for the value provided through consumption (Moulian, 1997, 1998). One of the characteristics of the transition's beginning was a society that gradually became depoliticized (UNDP, 2015). In other words, politics was replaced by the market. With the modernization strategies of the Concertación¹ the citizen focus shifted to the achievement of services and goods, weakening the struggle for spaces of social and political participation. The importance of private space prevailed over public space and public life (Rodríguez, 2009). That political setting impacted the educational system in the same way.

Regarding education, we know that the depoliticization process began during the civil-military dictatorship (Bernal & Tapia, 2021), and it gained strength during the democratic transition period. The neoliberal model installed the proposal of education as the axis of productive transformation with equity (ECLAC, 1992), which was criticized at the beginning of this century (Silva-Peña et al., 2003). This view removed from the educational system the capacity to create and recreate subjects as political actors. As

Giroux states, “Education under neoliberalism is a form of depoliticization, which kills the radical imagination and the hope for a more just, equitable and democratic world” (2015, p. 20).

From the neoliberal model, the figure of the “expert” or “technician” (belonging to “think tanks”), who emphasizes practical or utilitarian work, lacking reflection or political positioning, was strengthened. The role of the “experts,” enhanced by the media and their participation in advisory commissions, contributed to the creation of national policies (Pinilla, 2012), which through public discourse were removing the word “politics” from everyday life (Reyes, Muñoz, & Vázquez, 2013). In addition, the separation of academic knowledge (scientific) from immediate action occurred. Thus, the citizenry was gradually absorbed into consumption, the university into the scientific, and the “experts” into the technical. Politics was co-opted by this professional group belonging to political parties and their think tanks, although these distinctions seemed not to alienate politics, but political parties. While a disaffection with partisan politics remained, the interest in political issues in general persisted (De Tezanos-Pinto, Cortés, & Concha, 2016).

In relation to the central topic at hand—teacher education—the technocratic factor has also impacted two aspects: First, the design procedure is technically defined by specialists belonging to a small group of study centers and universities. This procedure, known as “top-down,” has been questioned in the educational policies of the 1990s and 2000s (Navarro, 2002; Raczynski, 2002). Second, the designs have become regulatory frameworks that aim to homogenize initial teacher training based on strict standards and aim to achieve better results in cognitive learning, which can be evaluated by international tests. These regulatory training frameworks or performance standards for initial education diminish the possibilities for educational institutions and teachers to define their own elements and identity educational content (Montecinos, 2014). The public policy now has its own teacher development agenda. Thus, we note that depoliticization also operates in such a way that teacher education content and proposals are defined without the active participation of the teaching body itself.

On the other hand, our depoliticization view also appeals to micro-politics, that is, those closer power relations in our daily and immediate environment (Blase, 2002; Silva-Peña et al., 2019), whether in the classroom, at school, or in any educational space. Obviously, power is part of the educational relations policy in its different dimensions: relations with knowledge, between teachers and students, between teachers, between students, between teachers and management teams, with families, and with the community. For example, the relationship with knowledge and the relationship between teacher and student can determine the way in which one exists politically and lives together in the school.

This is evident when, from a traditional perspective, we understand the school, on the one hand, as the guarantor of the transmission of pre-established knowledge or as the place of the universal, the neutral, or the objective. On the other hand, we can understand it as a space where hierarchical and impersonal relationships between teachers and students are reproduced—as a place deprived of the subjectivity, experience, and differences of those who are part of it. This brings with it challenges in teacher education in light of the changes that society is experiencing and the new challenges of school life. In this way, the conception of society, the vision of the school, and the teaching task become intertwined. The limits established by a school that is neutral or uninvolved with singularity contrast with the need for teachers to be prepared to embrace differences. In a country that is increasingly aware of its differences, it is necessary to experience diversity as a common experience. Learning to recognize others, to welcome otherness and subjective experiences, or to live in diversity is part of this process of politicization that we carry out as a society.

The school is always a political space. From the moment children join the school environment, school life is transformed into political coexistence. In the school environment, the world becomes public (Masschelein & Simons, 2014), and, in this connection, the questions of political life and existing politically require our reflection as teachers of teachers:

If there is anything that needs our focus as educators, it has to be an interest in opportunities to exist politically, an interest in trying to feel at home in the world and tolerate strangers. This is, at the same time, an educational and political responsibility

because what is at stake is the possibility of our very human existence in a world in common (Biesta, 2017, p. 139)

And what does the school have to do with all this? We cannot forget that, during the 2019 movement, the massive participation in the demonstrations unleashed a new discussion on the politicization of society. Although in academic circles there was already evidence of a re-politization of youth (Molina & Makuc, 2020), the indisputable fact that ignited this reactivation was the actions of hundreds of young high school students who rebelled in 2019. It is worth saying that it is those “inhabitants” of the school space who demand that citizenship be resituated and regain its political place. In view of this, how can we ignore the call to rethink teacher education based on the political responsibility demanded today by the younger generations? Are not these same high school and university students the ones who should receive our greatest concern and dedication as the backbone of the educational system?

THE CHALLENGE OF REBUILDING

We have experience working with students from low-income sectors. Our classrooms are filled with preservice teachers who have experienced poverty disguised as middle class. The shortages for an important group of our students are something known; they are a way of life and, for many, the only one they have experienced. Hence, the work carried out on a daily basis clashes between promises of social progress and a vulnerable origin. For this reason, we share the idea that the work of teacher educators is also a space of containment, hope, and projection of what professional life can be for a whole family.

Those of us on this team have participated in the demonstrations and spaces around the utopias reborn in the hope of the new emerging society. From our educative role, we support the collective transformation that Chile needs, and, as citizens who want a change, we participate with a different intensity and different roles of an idea of change that is the majority in Chile. There, in the street, we are citizens, and we are also citizens in our classrooms; we cannot divide ourselves because we conceive the professional and the personal as something indissoluble in the teaching role (Korthagen, 2010; Salgado & Silva-Peña, 2009). As much as we might try to make that division, our language, our corporality, and our experience say something in every class, in every conversation in which the subject of social movement is discussed. “El estallido social” (the social explosion) and “la revolución del torniquete” (“turnstile revolution”) are some names with which the movement has also been labeled, and we have become part of the conversation among colleagues and with our students. Our universities were occupied and reoccupied. Being connected to the contingency is unavoidable for us.

A fundamental point is related to an achievement that emerged from the demonstrations of these months: the plebiscite to change the Constitution created during the dictatorship. The development of the new Magna Carta is, in a way, a healing process. Chile generated an honest space to recover from the wounds left by the civil-military dictatorship. The formulation of a new Constitution provides the possibility of an open political discussion, through which we can restore lost democratic spaces and rebuild ourselves as a country. Therefore, there is an alert and a concern regarding the subject that summons us since a country that regenerates itself needs teachers who are also in this process. Teacher education should be more in line with citizen clamor than with external or top-down policies.

In line with this change coming in the new Chile, we must rethink the way we look at the teacher education process. We know that there is a professional development system and that clarifications are established in this regard at the institutional level. But for us as teacher educators, this new scenario invites us to rethink the way we see and experience the process. For a long time, the work of the “technical” and the birth of the “expert” tended to devalue the teaching experience and the voice of the educational institutions themselves, denying space to the singularity and the weight of the context that gives identity to the different educational programs in the national territory. The lack of teacher presence in consultations or decision-making in educational policies is part of this denial. We must re-educate ourselves to recover those spaces and those responsibilities.

BETWEEN HOPE AND SOLITARY SILENCE

The political agreement that established the plebiscite for a new Constitution did not signify demobilization. The struggle for that long list of demands continued on the streets, and even during the summer the process was kept alive. In March, an 8M that gave prominence to historical demands, announced the power with which 2020 was envisioned. However, the pandemic arrived a week later, and as if it were a tale of magical realism, we were sent home and locked up for months. Nevertheless, activism continued, but from the virtual world. The plebiscite was moved from April to October, but the replacement of the Magna Carta was still on the table. New forms of organization began to emerge, and the movement took new directions. Sometimes, the paths have been a bit uncertain as we live in uncertainty—perhaps that has been one of the great words that the pandemic has made us embody. For many people in the country, constitutional change means removing the fundamental cornerstone of the legacy of a de facto government that generated a neoliberal government through fear, betrayal, theft, and lies. So, we ask ourselves again, are we prepared for this constitutional change to be embodied in teacher training, in the classroom, and in the educational field?

With the pandemic came the confinement—something new in our experience as a society—that installed an emergency education through digital media as the only option to continue with the school/academic year. This same technical model, which places technology as one of the cornerstones that should support education in the 21st century, has seen how technology does not solve everything. Moreover, in many cases, the same thing we used to do in person has been transferred to a virtual format. Educational institutions, schools, and universities insist on efficient tasks. There is a repetition of schedules and workload. In academia, conferences multiply in an attempt to make themselves heard, without always having something to say. In these spaces, there is little room left for art, crafts, contact with nature, play or pain, anguish, and death “because the sign of our century is the race, and the most beautiful discoveries it prides itself on are not discoveries of wisdom, but of speed” (Leclercq, 2014, p. 13).

We perceive a collapse of shared hope facing the followers of an absolute link between new technologies and teaching. Universities kept their spaces empty but have not stopped their activity in a virtual fashion. It is worth asking: what space is left in these activities to understand education and learning as interactions based on relationships, words, smells, and colors? How do teachers, on a screen with empty squares, democratize the word through intuitions, glances, complicities, and gestures? The image of a teacher addressing students through an empty screen could be the caricature of education in this COVID-19 context.

The pandemic has led us to think about and rethink teacher education. We see how the devastation of this virus further exposes those social injustices that have long plagued our societies (Santos, 2020). The pandemic showed us those realities that we knew about, but did not always manage to see. If before this event, the life of our students was blurred inside the classroom, today we feel those difficulties on a daily basis. We see inequality, pain, and poverty. We felt the difficulties behind the connectivity problems, layoffs, or shortcomings in fulfilling payments in a university subjected to the market. We saw how colleagues were dismissed, how budget cuts have been built, how the world we had is crumbling, or rather, being stripped bare. In definitive terms, the vulnerability we have as subjects in the face of the system and the model of life has become visible, and, even more, we have experienced it firsthand. If there is something good in this health crisis, it is that our institutions, including our educational system, are laid bare. The pandemic gives us an opportunity: to start from what we have, without inventing extra stories, without imagining something that does not exist. This invisible virus is allowing us to make visible what we had hidden.

If the awakening process was already underway since October 18, the pandemic came to confirm this citizen complaint and made us see what is happening. The virus leaves us cruel lessons about a stratified, colonial, racist society (Santos, 2020). If we look around us, this society has emerged with an immense field of social injustice. And justice is not only related to the inequalities of goods that we have but to the value and the recovery of the conscience that we are all part of this world.

Also, in pandemic times, we saw the emergence of apparently invisible racism. For example, in August 2020, indigenous community groups occupied five municipalities in southern Chile to support indigenous political prisoners. In a commune with a high indigenous population, the occupation of the municipality was rejected by a group of people. We still do not know why the police allowed this demonstration at a time when the curfew was in force, and we do not know who was behind this affront carried out at the same time that the Minister of Interior was visiting the region. It was a national impact to see a group of people jumping and shouting “the one who does not jump is Mapuche,”² in direct allusion to the rejection chant against the police action that became popular since October in the streets of Chile (“the one who does not jump is paco”³). This display of racism shows how we need an educational process that provides us with possibilities for transformation into a new society.

There are other examples in addition to this one. There is a deep social rage as a result of several femicides, for which there seems to be no progress in the justice system. Racism and machismo are part of this country that is a member of the OECD and that at the beginning of the century stood as an example to our Latin American siblings. We were the “jaguar of Latin America.” Today, ironically, putting on the masks makes our masks fall off.

The pandemic not only revealed the fragility of our health care system and our pension system, but also the fragility that our society is built on the basis of hidden deficiencies. Also, for a large part of Chile, the pandemic has reaffirmed the need to change the course of this wild, extremist, neoliberal model. Moreover, if we think about what the fragility of our educational system pointed out, we can understand the urgency of addressing uncertainty as part of the reflection. The positive thing is that the pandemic also gives us this possibility for change and transformation.

POLITICIZATION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IN TEACHER EDUCATION

We insist on the intrinsic relationship between politics and education, especially in these times. The milestone of building a new policy framework at the national level generates challenges beyond the operational level. It is no longer just a matter of access to education but also of social justice in a broad sense—that is, promoting the recognition and participation of those who have been marginalized (Silva-Peña, 2021). For some time now, the need for an inclusive, intercultural, coeducational school, with a democratic outlook, has been increasing. For those of us who think that social justice is the necessary path for education, particularly after October 18 and the COVID crisis, we ask ourselves even more forcefully why we have not achieved it, and what those pending challenges are.

One of these challenges is the need for a new type of citizen in our society in the coming decades. A teacher who starts her preparation in 2020 will graduate in 2025 and in her first 10 years of practice will train at least 400 people who will constitute part of the Chilean population of the 40s and beyond. For changes in our teacher education today, we must focus 30 to 50 years into the future. This is where the desire arises to have education faculties that think more in terms of proposals than in terms of reaction.

For us, the re-politicization of teacher education is considered as the process of conscientization that Freire described in 1978, understood as that way of reading the world. We speak, especially, of re-politicization around building teacher education for social justice (Diniz-Pereira and Soares, 2019; Silva-Peña et al., 2017). The purpose of this text is far from being a conceptual reflection. Nevertheless, we understand politics as the way to become part of the social change process, that is, the praxis of the *demo* (of the people) that deals with collective events (Rodríguez, 2009). In this way, politicizing is to become aware that we are part of this society (of the *polis*) and that we have the capacity to act. That path entails working consciously to achieve the common well-being, contributing to a formative conception that goes beyond knowledge. This educational vision is assumed in the interaction with the other. Educating is not a transmission act, but a creative, constructive, and transforming act.

Applied to university teaching for teacher education, such distinctions mean advancing reflection regarding how one is behaving in the classroom. The political role is related to the critical reflection on one’s own power in the classroom. That is the reason why we agree that part of the teacher education process means understanding and discussing public policies (Ferrada et al., 2018). Moreover, such a

perspective needs to be complemented by an everyday political one that occurs in the corporality, speech, and emotionality that we share on a daily basis. These points are part of the social demand that means valuing human qualities rejected by the neoliberal model and that the pandemic has caused us to put on the list of priorities. Teacher education, therefore, needs to become more attuned to this sense of collective transformation.

One of the educational purposes that has emerged is to encourage students to question themselves regarding their own desires. A large part of the educator's job is to create the time, space, and ways for learners to find their true purposes and to examine, select, and transform them, as Biesta (2019) states:

At stake here is the question as to what should have authority in our lives, and the question of authority is precisely about coming into dialogue with what and who is other. It is about letting something or someone have power in our lives. It is about authorizing what and who is other, it is to let it speak, so to say, to make it into an author (p. 61).

As we see, this guidance provides another element that has been denied by this model of life, which is authority, that is, the possibility of recognizing oneself as the legitimate author of one's own life. In the academic field, it means to be authors of knowledge. To allow ourselves to feel at home, or to question what has the most authority in our lives, leads us to think about the way in which the school or university is lived and recreated in relation to the changing society. This is where we make the distinction between politicization and indoctrination. Politicizing is related to promoting that transforming capacity is present in the being. On the other hand, to indoctrinate is to externally impose a certain transformation on the being.

Therefore, when we see the Chilean society being challenged to rebuild itself, we are challenged as teacher educators. Political existence, perhaps, should lead us to think about whether we feel at home at university or school. This perspective gains strength when the university and school landscapes—teacher education spaces—appear to be increasingly circumscribed by devices that attempt to govern the time of training experiences, the relationships within them, the actions of teachers, and the lives of children and young people.

As teachers, politicizing also means knowing how to encourage participation in social, political, and cultural movements, both from the macro-politics of education and from the micro-political relationships that are built on a day-to-day basis. That is to say that politicization becomes a daily practice endowed with critical reflection and action. It also implies redefining what we understand by inhabiting and defending the territory of education and not only locating ourselves functionally at the service of a pre-established system.

THE RE-POLITICIZATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN A POST-PANDEMIC CHILE

Before the military coup, teacher education in Chile was involved in collective, social, and political tasks (Pérez, 2017; Zemelman & Lavín, 2012). However, as we have indicated, the process of dismantling the state's teaching function was accompanied by a depoliticization process. For this reason, we speak about re-politization as a way to reposition teachers in the political space that belongs to them as promoters of social transformation.

Rethinking the teaching performance requires us to make room for issues that have been neglected. Re-politicization implies recovering teachers' memory about our training past (Olivos-González, López-Torres, & Silva-Peña, 2020). The organizational, discursive, and creative disarticulation experienced by the teaching world in our country has a clear origin, which was the civil-military dictatorship. In the following decades, attempts to restore the role of teachers did not achieve the necessary reparation.

The responsibility for a new type of teacher education lies not only with those of us in the teaching profession. It is also necessary to ensure a space in the public life of the country for this to happen. The current times are giving us the reason to demand that we transform future teacher education, but decisions must always look at the footprint left by the past. Memory is a way to draw back the veil that the neoliberal model imposes on us to do our work because depoliticizing memory is also a control strategy (Reyes, Muñoz, and Vásquez, 2013).

Since the beginning of the century, Chile has undergone several reforms, along with a series of changes, innovations, and minor adjustments, which appear whenever gaps in the school system are noticed or when the current government defends its ideology. As an example, we have a series of devices aimed at organizing school life (General Education Law, Quality and Equity Law, SEP Law, changes in curricula, standards, frameworks for good teaching, teacher evaluation system, etc.). These tools make their appearance in the educational system from the university to the school. This reality challenges us as teacher educators concerning the adjustment of teachers to a technical role within the bureaucratic formalism. A meaningless pedagogical framework is generated. A regulation that leads to overwhelm. A disorientation regarding what is essentially educational. In this way, we see how the possibility of living and imagining the school as a space different from the regulated one diminishes. Politicizing is to encourage teachers to act in search of that imaginative dream that the school has the mission of educating.

In the context of teacher depoliticization, we bet on reading and writing in the reality of institutional places. Acting politically means assuming the key desires, feelings, experiences, knowledge, or contradictions as an educational community. Disciplinary knowledge and bureaucratic codes would remain to be considered at the local level under the framework. This way of looking at the role of teachers implies a broader view of society, school, and education. Macro-political thinking and micro-political action are focused on the construction of the school as the place we want, the place that students expect and citizens demand.

Re-politicizing requires us to highlight the desires for educational change, beyond what has been instituted, disrupting the existing order. Piussi (1999) refers to the political practice of placing behind what is sometimes in front, that is, the curriculum, the taxonomies, and the rules of the school institution. By no means does it imply those things should be canceled in an illusory way, but to see them like what they really are, a social and symbolic order to which one is accustomed and which, on many occasions, becomes an obstacle to the achievement of the school and university's purpose. Perhaps this is the reason why we emphasize the need to promote teacher reflection around these everyday events (Silva-Peña et al., 2018).

One of the important axes that this new educative path must address is the way in which we recover the word or restore the teacher's voice. One of these steps should be to recognize the difference between the academic vision, which is common in teacher education processes, and the pedagogical vision that attempts to resist it. The word teacher, precisely, restates the task and the labor task in the pedagogy as the main place and not in the discipline or the scientific side of it, as we have become accustomed to seeing in university spaces (Hizmeri, 2014). In this sense, we talk about a pedagogical teacher education that emphasizes the relationship with others, the importance of the context, and the recognition of the knowledge that emerges from the experience (of both teachers and students).

Re-politicizing teacher education encourages us to renounce certain academic egos (if not all of them) in order to have a horizontal relationship with the school, because, in order for the word to have a place, there must be genuine listening. Those who can name the educational reality with greater intensity are the teachers, not only because they know it and build it, but also because in their own language they give meaning, body, and history to the events of the classrooms, of the educational spaces. Providing spaces for this language and this way of describing reality implies another challenge: that the academy should be at the service of the school and not the other way around, as has been the logic of recent decades. In this way of describing reality, teachers are able to re-politicize the contents, which were deprived of meaning in the early years of the dictatorship (Cabaluz, 2015).

Another lesson learned from the social and health crises is the impossibility of controlling what happens to us as a society. However, we allow ourselves these lines to imagine and share what we understand as a need to rethink the teacher education we want for our country. In education there are no formulas, but perhaps there are recipes (Montoya, 2008). We are talking about proposals in which each elaboration requires special attention to the process.

In this manuscript, we set out some of the elements that we believe are essential for a collective reconstruction of teacher education. We provided our reflection with the understanding that each context is different, and each territory has a different need considering the conflicting nature of community life. This paper is a suggestion to initiate (and not to close) a discussion about which teachers we want and need for

this awakened and post-pandemic Chile. It is an invitation to talk, with our peers, with other teachers. However, it would be an even greater satisfaction if any citizen felt the invitation to discuss the ideas expressed in these pages. We need to change paradigms, especially in education. We need to incorporate multiple voices. Also, as a way of representing the social changes we are witnessing, we ask ourselves how we are generating space for the voice and participation of those who are the main driving force of the educational process: the students. After all, they are the ones who have awakened us.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Michelle Espinoza for her review and suggestions. And to ANID for the grant Fondecyt ANID 1201882. This text is part of the project “Micropolitical Literacy of Early Childhood Preservice Teachers” (Fondecyt ANID 1201882).

Translated & edited by American Publishing Services (<https://americanpublishingservices.com/>).

ENDNOTES

1. The Concertación de Partidos por la Democracia, English: Coalition of Parties for Democracy was a coalition of center-left that led the government for 20 years. One of the main proposals was the “democracy of agreement or democracy of consensus” (Borzutzky & Perry, 2021).
2. Mapuche is the name of the largest indigenous group in Chile and is present in the south of the country.
3. In Chile, “paco” is a derogatory term referring to a member of the police. The official name is “Carabineros de Chile.”

REFERENCES

- Araujo, K., & Martuccelli, D. (2012). *Desafíos comunes: retrato de la sociedad chilena y sus individuos*. LOM.
- Barozet, E., & Fierro, J. (2014). La clase media en Chile: Implicancias sociales y políticas. *Revista Paraguaya de Sociología*, 51(141), 147–158.
- Bernal, F., & Tapia, A. (2021). Análisis crítico de las transformaciones en el sistema educativo chileno: Antecedentes y perspectivas actuales. In I. Silva-Peña, M. A. Oliva, O. Espinoza y E. Santa Cruz (Eds.), *Estallido Social en Chile. Lecturas sobre discriminación y desigualdad educativa* (pp. 25–40). Editorial UTEM.
- Biesta, G. (2019). ¿Cuál es la tarea de la educación? Despertando el deseo de querer existir en el mundo de una manera adulta. *Pedagogía y Saberes*, 50, 63–74.
- Biesta, G. (2019). What is the Educational Task? Arousing the Desire for Wanting to Exist in the World in a Grown-up Way. *Pedagogía y Saberes*, 50, 51–61.
- Blase, J. (2002). Las micropolíticas del cambio educativo. *Profesorado: Revista de Curriculum y Formación Del Profesorado*, 6(1–2), 1–14. Retrieved from <https://www.ugr.es/~recfpro/rev61ART2.pdf>
- Borzutzky, S., & Perry, S. (2021). “It is not about the 30 pesos, it is about the 30 years”: Chile’s Elitist Democracy, Social Movements, and the October 18 Protests. *The Latin Americanist*, 65(2), 207–232.
- Cabaluz, J.F. (2015). El proyecto curricular de la dictadura cívico-militar en Chile (1973-1990). *Perspectiva Educacional, Formación de Profesores*, 54(2), 165–180.
- CEPAL. (1992). *Educación y conocimiento, eje de la transformación productiva con equidad*.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2020). *La cruel pedagogía del virus*. Ediciones AKAL.
- De Tezanos-Pinto, P., Cortés, F., & Concha, M. (2016). Participación política y descontento en Chile: Una tensión entre el interés en los temas políticos y la desafección generalizada. *Midevidencias*, 6, 1–6. Retrieved from <http://www.mideuc.cl/wp-content/uploads/2016/MidEvidencias-N6.pdf>

- Diniz-Pereira, J.E., & Soares, L.J. (2019). Formação de educadoras/es, diversidade e compromisso social. *Educação Em Revista*, 35, e217314. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698217314>
- Ferrada, D., Villena, A., & Del Pino, M. (2018). ¿Hay que formar a los docentes en políticas educativas? *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 48(167), 254–279. <https://doi.org/10.1590/198053144740>
- Freire, P. (1978). *La educación como práctica de la libertad*. Siglo XXI.
- Garretón, M. (2012). *Neoliberalismo corregido y progresismo limitado*. ARCIS-CLACSO.
- Giroux, H. (2015). Pedagogías disruptivas y el desafío de la justicia social bajo regímenes neoliberales. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social (RIEJS)*, 4(2), 13–27.
- Hizmeri, J. (2014). Educación e infancia. Una vuelta al comienzo entre los leitmotiv o motivos recurrentes en la educación actual. In Á. Moreu, & H. Salinas (Eds.), *Iduna 9. Nuevas perspectivas pedagógicas* (pp. 105–116). U. de Barcelona.
- Korthagen, F. (2010). La práctica, la teoría y la persona en la formación del profesorado. *Revista Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 68, 83–101. Retrieved from <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3276048>
- Leclercq, J. (2014). *Elogio de la pereza*. RIALP.
- Masschelein, J., & Simons, M. (2014). *Defensa de la escuela. Una cuestión pública*. Miño y Dávila.
- Molina, W., & Makuc, M. (2021). Imaginarios juveniles y los desafíos de la educación pública secundaria en el contexto del levantamiento popular. In I. Silva-Peña, M. A. Oliva, O. Espinoza, & E. Santa Cruz (Eds.), *Estallido Social en Chile. Lecturas sobre discriminación y desigualdad educativa* (pp. 151–167). Editorial UTEM.
- Montecinos, C. (2014). Análisis Crítico de las Medidas de Presión Propuestas para Mejorar la Formación Inicial de Docentes en Chile por el Panel de Expertos para una Educación de Calidad. *Estudios*, 40(Especial), 285–301. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052014000200017>
- Montoya, M.M. (2008). *Enseñar: Una experiencia amorosa*. Sabina.
- Moulian, T. (1997). *Chile actual: Anatomía de un mito*. LOM.
- Moulian, T. (1998). *El consumo me consume*. LOM.
- Mujica, F. (2020). Emociones morales en educación: análisis del enfado en el contexto neoliberal. *Revista Educación, Política y Sociedad*, 5(2), 33–49.
- Navarro, L. (2002). Asesoría técnica a las escuelas y liceos en Chile: Análisis y elementos de propuesta para una política. *Pensamiento Educativo. Revista de Investigación Educativa Latinoamericana*, 31(2), 328–352.
- Olivos-González, F., López-Torres, L., & Silva-Peña, I. (2020). Revisitando las escuelas normales en Chile. Hacia una recuperación de la historia de la formación del profesorado. *Formação Docente – Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa Sobre Formação de Professores*, 12(23), 139–152. doi:10.31639/rbfpf. V12i23.306.
- Pérez, C. (2017). *Escuelas normales en Chile: Una mirada a sus últimos intentos de modernización y a su proceso de cierre (1961-1974)*. Dibam, Subdirección de Investigación, Colecciones Digitales. Retrieved from <http://www.museodelaeducacion.cl/648/w3-article-79564.html>
- Pinilla, J.P. (2012). Think Tanks, saber experto y formación de agenda política en el Chile actual. *Polis, Revista de la Universidad Bolivariana*, 11(32), 119–140. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-65682012000200008>
- Piussi, A.M. (1999). Más allá de la igualdad: Apoyarse en el deseo, en el partir de sí y en la práctica de las relaciones en la educación. In C. Lomas (Comp.), *¿Iguales o diferentes? Género, diferencia sexual, lenguaje y educación*, (pp. 43–67). Paidós.
- PNUD. (2015). *Desarrollo Humano en Chile. Los tiempos de la politización*.
- Raczynski, D. (2002). *Análisis de la oferta de programas e iniciativas del sector público y privado desde los establecimientos educacionales*. Informe Final de Consultoría para el Ministerio de Educación. Asesorías para el Desarrollo.
- Reyes, M., Muñoz, J., & Vázquez, F. (2013). Políticas de memoria desde los discursos cotidianos: La despolitización del pasado reciente en el Chile actual. *Psyke*, 22(2), 161–173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7764/psykhe.22.2.582>

- Rodríguez, J.P. (2009). Despolitización y democracia. Prácticas ideológicas en el Chile actual. *Némesis*, VII, 9–18. <https://revistanemesis.cl/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Nemesis-VII.pdf>
- Salgado, I., & Silva-Peña, I. (2009). Desarrollo profesional docente en el contexto de una experiencia de Investigación-acción. *Paradigma*, 30(2), 63–74.
- Silva-Peña, I. & Paz-Maldonado, E. (2019). Una reflexión acerca de la indagación narrativa autobiográfica en formadores/as de docentes para la justicia social. *Perspectiva Educacional*, 58(2), 169–189. Retrieved from <http://www.perspectivaeducacional.cl/index.php/peducacional/article/view/953>
- Silva-Peña, I. (2021). Justicia social como eje de la formación inicial docente. In I. Silva-Peña, M. A. Oliva, O. Espinoza, & E. Santa Cruz (Eds.), *Estallido Social en Chile. Lecturas sobre discriminación y desigualdad educativa* (pp. 207–220). Editorial UTEM.
- Silva-Peña, I., Chelme-Bustos, A., & Salgado-Labra, I. (2003). Educación y conocimiento: ¿Eje de la transformación productiva con equidad? El caso de Chile. *RELIEVE*, 9(1), 73–81. <https://doi.org/10.7203/relieve.9.1.4350>
- Silva-Peña, I., Diniz-Pereira, J., & Zeichner, K. (2017). *Justicia Social. El componente olvidado de la Formación Docente*. Mutante Editores.
- Silva-Peña, I., Hormazábal-Fajardo, R., Guíñez-Gutiérrez, C., Quiles- Fernández, E. & Ramírez-Vásquez, P. (2018). Explorando las relaciones de género en la escuela: Indagaciones narrativas para la justicia social. In D. Ferrada (Ed.), *Reflexiones y experiencias educativas desde las comunidades. Investigación en educación para la justicia social* (pp. 79–94). Ediciones UCM.
- Silva-Peña, I., Kelchtermans, G., Valenzuela, J., Precht, A., Muñoz, C., & González-García, G. (2019). Alfabetización micropolítica: un desafío para la formación inicial docente. *Educação & Sociedade*, 40, e0190331. <https://doi.org/10.1590/es0101-73302019190331>
- Zemelman, M., & Lavín, S. (2012). Formación normalista versus formación docente universitaria: Un rescate histórico de aprendizajes y desafíos de educación. *ISEES: Inclusión Social y Equidad en la Educación Superior*, (11), 17–44, 2012.