

<https://doi.org/10.23913/ride.v10i20.659>

Artículos Científicos

Psicopedagogía crítica para conceptos epistémicos y sociales en investigación universitaria

Critical Psychopedagogy for Concepts Epistemic and Social in University Research

***Psicopedagogia crítica para conceitos epistêmicos e sociais na pesquisa
universitária***

Mario Condori Nina

Fundación Universidad del Sur, La Paz - Bolivia

mariocondori2015@hotmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9224-9510>

Resumen

El objetivo de este trabajo fue proponer nuevas definiciones de términos epistémicos que son utilizados en el ámbito universitario y particularmente en ciencias socioculturales: *gnoseología*, *epistemología* y *teoría del conocimiento*, por un lado, y por el otro, los términos de *explicación* y *comprensión*. Para ello, estos conceptos pasaron por una exposición descriptiva para posteriormente ser tratados psicopedagógica y sociocríticamente, lo cual permitió conocer los pormenores intrínsecos que tienen cada uno ellos; este proceso garantizó una base teórica que permitió y fundamentó la propuesta de nuevas concepciones de los cinco términos en cuestión. Aparte del método de trabajo de campo de investigación, se utilizó el análisis teórico discriminante, el método descriptivo, el inductivo, el análisis-síntesis y de posición, el de la elevación de lo abstracto a lo concreto y lo histórico-lógico; también se recurrió al paradigma sociocrítico, al método propositivo y, particularmente, al método de la filofización de los hechos. Entre los resultados, primero, se logró cumplir con el objetivo de formular nuevas proposiciones conceptuales para los términos epistémicos y sociales ya mencionados; segundo, se detectó que cada uno de los autores revisados tiene una posición conceptual distinta respecto a un solo término universal, lo cual lleva a la confusión; tercero, las tres epistemes de la gnoseología, la



epistemología y la teoría del conocimiento son sinónimas, pero la epistemología se diferencia de las otras dos por ser la única que implica un tratamiento del método; y cuarto, respecto a los términos sociales de *explicación* y *comprensión*, ambos pueden contribuir ya sea de manera separada o conjunta a las ciencias físicas, naturales y sociales, pero el último de alguna forma se diferencia del primero porque es más profundo en su actuar en relación con todo tipo de hechos: si bien permite ver cuestiones objetivas, principalmente es útil para temas intersubjetivos y trascendentales de todo tipo de hechos materiales y humanos.

Palabras clave: comprensión, epistemología, explicación, filofización, gnoseología, psicopedagogía, teoría del conocimiento.

Abstract

The objective of this work was to propose new definitions of epistemic terms that are used in the university environment and particularly in sociocultural sciences: epistemology, epistemology and theory of knowledge, on the one hand, and on the other, the terms of explanation and understanding. To do this, these concepts went through a descriptive exposition to later be treated psychopedagogically and sociocritically, which allowed knowing the intrinsic details that each one has; This process guaranteed a theoretical base that allowed and supported the proposal of new conceptions of the five terms in question. Apart from the research field work method, the discriminant theoretical analysis, the descriptive method, the inductive method, the analysis-synthesis and position, the elevation of the abstract to the concrete and the historical-logical were used; The socio-critical paradigm, the propositional method and, particularly, the method of the philosophization of events were also used. Among the results, first, it was possible to meet the objective of formulating new conceptual propositions for the aforementioned epistemic and social terms; second, it was detected that each of the reviewed authors has a different conceptual position regarding a single universal term, which leads to confusion; third, the three epistemes of epistemology, epistemology, and the theory of knowledge are synonymous, but epistemology differs from the other two because it is the only one that implies a treatment of the method; and fourth, regarding the social terms of explanation and understanding, both can contribute either separately or jointly to the physical, natural and social sciences, but the latter in some way differs from the former because it is more profound in its action in relationship with all kinds of facts:

although it allows us to see objective questions, it is mainly useful for intersubjective and transcendental issues of all kinds of material and human facts.

Keywords: understanding, epistemology, explanation, philosophization, gnoseology, psychopedagogy, theory of knowledge.

Resumo

O objetivo deste trabalho foi propor novas definições de termos epistêmicos utilizados no ambiente universitário e particularmente nas ciências socioculturais: epistemologia, epistemologia e teoria do conhecimento, por um lado, e por outro, os termos de explicação e compreensão. Para isso, esses conceitos passaram por uma exposição descritiva para serem posteriormente tratados psicopedagogicamente e sociocriticamente, o que permitiu conhecer os detalhes intrínsecos que cada um possui; Esse processo garantiu uma base teórica que permitiu e apoiou a proposta de novas concepções dos cinco termos em questão. Além do método de trabalho em campo de pesquisa, foram utilizadas a análise teórica discriminante, o método descritivo, o método indutivo, a síntese-análise e a posição, a elevação do resumo ao concreto e o histórico-lógico; O paradigma sócio-crítico, o método proposicional e, particularmente, o método da filosofização dos eventos também foram utilizados. Entre os resultados, primeiro, foi possível cumprir o objetivo de formular novas proposições conceituais para os termos epistêmicos e sociais acima mencionados; segundo, foi detectado que cada um dos autores revisados tem uma posição conceitual diferente em relação a um único termo universal, o que leva à confusão; terceiro, os três epistemólogos da epistemologia, epistemologia e teoria do conhecimento são sinônimos, mas a epistemologia difere das outras duas porque é a única que implica um tratamento do método; e quarto, com relação aos termos sociais de explicação e compreensão, ambos podem contribuir de forma separada ou conjunta para as ciências físicas, naturais e sociais, mas a última de alguma forma difere da primeira porque é mais profunda em sua ação em relacionamento com todos os tipos de fatos: embora nos permita ver perguntas objetivas, é útil principalmente para questões intersubjetivas e transcendentais de todos os tipos de fatos materiais e humanos.

Palavras-chave: compreensão, epistemologia, explicação, filosofização, gnoseologia, psicopedagogia, teoria do conhecimento.



Introduction

From a general perception of the university community, normally the subject of epistemology has been understood as a subject similar to philosophy, that is, as if both were difficult to understand because their textual contents resemble cryptographic writings; but despite this perception, epistemology is so relevant for the advancement of science and interciencias, that for this reason it is not possible to leave aside and not treat epistemological concepts, for this it is initially pertinent to resort to critical psychopedagogy, which in this document allowed to analyze and propose new content of concepts of epistemic and social terms: epistemology, epistemology and theory of knowledge, on the one hand, and on the other, explanation and understanding. Thus, in the present work it will not only be to act as a replicator of theories, since we must realize that we are humans endowed with various intellectual potentials that may well serve to mechanically repeat theories, but can also serve to innovate and create material things and Non-material intersubjective facts raised in the field of companies. In this sense, in this document, progress is made in this type of work, that is, in the innovation and purposeful creation of new concepts of the epistemic and social genre.

Based on the foregoing, here it is understood that psychopedagogy can contribute to the change of the conceptual themes of epistemology, which is why, in the following paragraph, an advance of the development of this work is presented as an example: the procedure of how it is possible to equip of a concept of psychopedagogy that contributes to the purpose of this writing.

First of all, the title of this article requires establishing an appropriate meaning of psychopedagogy, for which we proceed to separate the words that comprise it: psychology and pedagogy; then, in the same way, we proceed to separate each of these terms even more with the purpose of demonstrating, knowing and establishing the concept that will guide this article. Thus, it begins with the first word, psychology, which can be “broken” into two: psycho and logy, the first meaning 'soul' or also 'human mental activity', and the second meaning 'treaty' or 'study'. Similarly, the second word, pedagogy, is also made up of two terms: paidòs ('boy') and agogè ('driving'), and together they mean 'boy led to school education', although in this case it is the student led to college education. In this sense, by merging the meanings of both words, psychology and pedagogy, the following sentence is obtained: "soul or human mental activity for

education and teaching." It should be noted that the human being is being talked about not in the sense of object, physical matter or anatomy; We are talking about the human being from its subjective component, which imposes the form of relationship that the physical body of the person must have in any case of action in society. For these reasons, psychology and pedagogy, in this article, are united in order to contribute to demonstrate that, with the attitude of possessing the soul or spirit of the scientific researcher or writer, said person is motivated to review higher education topics such as they are the epistemic and social concepts, which are part of this work. In summary, critical psychopedagogy is understood as the shared science that is present in the mind, soul and spirit of the researcher or writer, whose essence and purpose is intended to guide its realization with the mental attitude of investigating, describing, socio-critically analyze and propose new concepts of social terms and classic epistemic terms that are used in university higher education.

Therefore, the present work of research and philosophical and epistemological reflection aims to propose new concepts of epistemic and social terms that are used in the university environment and particularly in sociocultural sciences. Said objective will be achieved on the basis of the treatment of concepts from prestigious authors of epistemic and social theories.

To end this introductory part, the structure of this article is briefly exposed: a) the method, where the six research procedures used to achieve the objective of this work are presented; b) the results, the content of which constitutes the characteristic of this work, and where the themes of these results are brought together, of which the pertinent socio-critical analyzes were subsequently carried out to culminate in the elaboration of the respective proposals, that as a new paradigmatic procedure for treating these results and the holistic connotations of each epistemic and social term; for this reason, this way of proceeding is also a novelty included from yapa (that is, of increase or plus) to the official structure; c) sociocritical discussion and analysis, in this section the analysis is made based on the episteme of criticism, and finally, d) the proposition, where new concepts are contributed to universal scientific theory, based on innovation and the creativity.

The methodical

Treating epistemic concepts in itself is a theoretical matter, therefore, for its treatment it was pertinent to resort to research methods that contributed to the process of investigation and study of the epistemic contents of the terms in question. For this reason, in the present investigation it was established to take into account the following methodical body:

- 1) The field research work method, through which the theories were investigated in different sources of information such as libraries and virtual source centers.
- 2) The content analysis method and the discriminant theoretical analysis; This method, according to Delgado and Gutiérrez (1999), stands out in the following terms: This method tries to describe the singularity —generally semantic— of individual texts, frequently produced by different authors. It is a matter of detecting the peculiar features of each text - or of the subject to which it can be attributed - that is, those that identify it in contrast to the others. These features are either exclusive to the text —or subject— in question, or appear in it with a sensitive frequency different from that detected in the others (p. 201).
- 3) The descriptive method, which helped to punctually and textually review the sentences of the contents of the concepts of the epistemic and social terms.
- 4) Theoretical methods, such as induction-induction, analysis-synthesis and position, the elevation of the abstract to the concrete and the historical-logical; each of them were used in the theoretical treatment of the information obtained.
- 5) The method of sociocritical analysis, which consists of the critical and social psychopedagogical attitude that the researcher must put in relation to any topic, which must be contextualized with the historical dialectic of his social field.
- 6) The purposeful method, which also consists of resorting to and assuming a critical and purposeful psychopedagogical attitude through innovation and the creation of new theories. In this way, they acted in a human way through the philosophization of the facts, in this case, the theoretical facts and not only mechanically, since the topics covered are of theoretical, subjective and transcendental characteristics.

The results, the socio-critical discussions and the proposals

For this section, abundant information on epistemic issues generated at different times and by various authors was recorded. The descriptive exposition of the subject was the basis for the subsequent socio-critical discussion of each of the contents of the epistemic and social concepts in the following paragraph. For this reason, the following begins with the description of the concepts of the following terms: epistemology, epistemology, theory of knowledge, understanding and explanation. But before proceeding it is worth mentioning some points regarding the delimitation, strength and weakness that this work presents. In this sense, it should be pointed out, regarding the delimitation, that only five concepts are dealt with in the field of episteme and in the social field, despite the fact that the conceptual components are enough in the theory of both areas; As for the strength, this work presents first that which I know is purposeful, that is, innovation and creation of new concepts is proposed, which represents an advance in terms of the requirements that the presentation of articles demands; There is, in addition, a second strength, which consists in that the part destined to the results merges with the discussion section and, in turn, this merges with the socio-critical psychopedagogical analytical treatment, which represents trying together and holistic the proposed themes. Regarding the weakness of the article, there is no such weakness, since the objective of this work is achieved.

Once the three topics mentioned have been exposed, we continue with the results and the holistic analysis of each one of them.

From the concept of epistemology

For the analysis and conceptual definition of the word epistemology, firstly, conceptual theories of various authors of philosophy and social sciences were used. Among them are the following authors and their respective conceptualizations:

- 1) For Álvarez de Zayas (2012), “epistemology is the philosophical discipline that explains the process of acquiring knowledge” (p. 120).
- 2) In its digital version, Encarta (2009) maintains the following: Gnoseology (from the Greek gnosis, 'knowledge', and logos, 'theory') is the branch of philosophy that aims to analyze the nature, possibility and limits of knowledge. It also analyzes the problem of the origin of knowledge and its forms. Gnoseology studies the different types of

knowledge that can be achieved and the problem of their foundation. On many occasions, it is identified with the concepts of theory of knowledge or epistemology.

- 3) The Russian authors Rosental and Iudin (2007) point out that the theory of knowledge is as follows: An important part of philosophical theory is about the faculty of man to enter into knowledge of reality, about the sources of the forms and methods of knowledge, about the truth and the ways to get to know it. The term was introduced by Kant. The starting point of the theory of knowledge lies in the diverse solution that is given to the fundamental question of philosophy.
- 4) For his part, Juárez (cited in Sánchez, 1996) maintains that the term gnosis must be understood in the following words: (From the gr. Gnosis, action to know and logos, treated). (Fil) Philosophical discipline that studies the origin, value and scope of human knowledge. Historically different names have been used to express this concept: epistemology, special metaphysics, theory of knowledge, criteriology.

Today the authors, although without total unanimity, usually reserve that of epistemology for the general theory of knowledge, and that of epistemology for the study of the nature, value and scope of each of the sciences (p. 693).

Sociocritical discussion and analysis

Following these references of the term epistemology, the four authors coincide in mentioning the word knowledge as the meaning of epistemology. Extending on this word, Rosental and Iudin (2007) and Sánchez (1996) point out that epistemology is the theory of knowledge and indicate, in addition, that it is the general theory of knowledge; thus, epistemology corresponds to the branch of philosophy that analyzes the nature, possibility and limits of knowledge. In addition to this, epistemology analyzes the problem of the origin and forms of knowledge. And study the different types of knowledge and their respective foundations.

From the general approach of content theory, in the concepts of the four authors the word knowledge prevails or stands out, and not the term know, for this reason it is understood that epistemology is synonymous with knowledge.

What is striking about these four definitions of epistemology is that each of the authors gives different approaches to a single universal term. This fact causes a problem of cognition and understanding, particularly when the interpretations are diverse, more when the historical time,

the space and the current epoch are gravitating for a concept to be appropriate for the present epoch. For this reason, in order to contribute to epistemic theory, the following paragraph presents the proposed definition of epistemology.

Definition proposal on the concept of epistemology

Epistemology is the philosophical and scientific theory of knowledge that studies the nature, possibility, origin, essence, foundations, classes and limits of human knowledge.

From the concept of epistemology

The conceptual theory of the word epistemology is broad and diverse. Rosental and Iudin (2007, p. 148), Bunge (2007, p. 62), Huanca (2012, p. 30), Conill (cited in Sánchez, 1996, pp. 547-553), Mansilla (2007, p. 48), Tamayo (cited in Mansilla, 2007, p. 48), Tafur (1994, pp. 13-14), Agreda (2007, pp. 106-108) and Álvarez de Zayas (2012, p. 165), each One of these authors, from his point of view and respective philosophical and scientific training, manifest the historical process of the concept of epistemology. Some of them, it is worth mentioning, make a comparative theoretical treatment between what is epistemology and theory of knowledge, although both are linked to processes of generation of knowledge and knowledge through various scientific methods, according to specific doctrines and universal.

Sociocritical discussion and analysis

For the present work it is necessary to determine the conceptual theoretical context that the word epistemology must have. In this line, firstly, an analytical treatment of the source of the word's origin is required, and this is done through etymology. According to Fernández (quoted in Sánchez, 1996, p. 553), this word comes from the Greek epistème, which means 'knowledge, scientific knowledge, and logos treated'. The Encarta (2005) and Larousse (1978, p. 413) dictionaries mention that epistemology (from the Greek ἐπιστήμη, 'knowledge', and -logy) is a doctrine of the foundations and methods of scientific knowledge.

According to these theoretical references, episteme means 'know', and knowing is synonymous with "knowing (knowledge), dominating and understanding" (Karten, 1985, p. 323). And the word logía means 'treaty, study'; then, epistemology, according to its etymology, is the treaty or study with respect to knowing or knowing; the action of carrying out the study is to scrutinize and explain the various ways of knowing or knowing, in such a way that theory is

being generated regarding knowing or knowing, which is ultimately the same theory of knowledge. In this sense, for example, the content of Sánchez's dictionary (1996, p. 1339) understands epistemology and theory of knowledge as synonyms.

Epistemology tends to respect etymological spaces in order not to confuse what is knowledge and what is knowledge. The latter is due to the Greek etymology *gnosis* ('knowledge') and *episteme*, which is 'knowing'. In this way, it justifiably departs from knowledge. So, epistemology is the study of knowledge, but, in turn, epistemology is a branch of the greater philosophical knowledge (Eid, 2005). With this, epistemology is further removed from knowledge, because knowledge is epistemology as part of the other branch of major philosophy; but it is more, because, according to the philosopher Ferrater (1964, p. 600), the word to know is related to flavor and that indicates that it is about "trying" things and seeing what they "know". This reference implies that *episteme* or the word know is more in contact with reality; the concept knowledge not so much so. For this reason, it is provisionally understood that epistemology is the study of knowledge more than knowledge itself.

In addition to the above, epistemology has one more connotation, with which it fulfills a double function in philosophical theory. First, as already said, it means 'the study of knowledge'; and second, it is to act as a method. This for the following reason: the mere fact that epistemology is in contact with reality, as described above, makes it the means by which to reach knowledge or generate knowledge, that means, in other words, is procedure, way and also, ultimately, is method. The justifications come from the concepts that various authors have cited, both in terms of epistemology and epistemology, and a question of a theoretical nature. In this sense, first it was evident that the definitions of epistemology of most of the cited authors coincide in taking into account the words to know, knowledge and methodology, there is the first justification; second, nowhere in the structure of philosophy can a branch be found that represents and answers the following questions: how and with what to generate knowledge or knowledge and who studies the methods of philosophy, science and the same methods of epistemology. Thus, it is understood that the writers on philosophy, the philosophers themselves, neglected to include the essence of the method and research to arrive at knowledge or knowledge (that is a phenomenal and universal philosophical error), therefore, even epistemology itself needs a method. Now, if philosophy has methods (*maieutics* and others), these are of a philosophical nature, which does little or nothing to serve the multiple and diverse philosophies and sciences of the present time. Neither what Aristotle (3rd century BC) considered to mean in terms of what

episteme is “the way of knowing and reaching the truth” (Conill, quoted Sánchez, 1996, p. 547) in any way covers the flaw detected because it implies the concern only of "reaching the truth", but the truth is only a part of the knowledge and knowledge. So, in sum, epistemology studies knowledge and methods.

Proposal for definition of the concept of epistemology

Epistemology is the branch of philosophy that has the purpose of studying knowledge, knowledge, methods and the respective validity, with which new knowledge and knowledge were generated and generated both for the same philosophy and for the various sciences.

From the concept of theory of knowledge

The different bibliographic references indicate that the theory of knowledge is the same epistemology, and suggest going to consult the theories of epistemology, knowledge and epistemology. With this reference, it could initially be admitted that the theory of knowledge is equal to epistemology and epistemology. It is worth, however, going directly to the sources.

The philosopher and priest Hessen (1999) in his first original version text written in 1925 whose title is Theory of Knowledge, uses the words theory of knowledge and epistemology interchangeably, although he clarifies that “the theory of knowledge is, as its name indicates, a theory, that is, an explanation and philosophical interpretation of human knowledge”(p. 23).

For their part, the Russian authors Rosental and Iudin (2007), in a section dedicated to epistemology and theory of knowledge, point to these words in the sense of “theory of knowledge, epistemology. The term "epistemology" is used in British and American bourgeois philosophy; it is less frequent in French and German”(p. 148).

For García (cited in Sánchez, 1996) the theory of knowledge is the following:

The study of knowledge from the philosophical point of view is approached by the discipline known as epistemology or theory of knowledge that tries to give answers and solutions to different problems: approach and validity of knowledge, criterion of certainty, limits, forms of knowledge, degrees of safety and expression of them through language (p. 308)

Sociocritical discussion and analysis

Hessen (1999) uses the name of epistemologies to refer in turn to terms such as dogmatism, skepticism, subjectivism, relativism, pragmatism and criticism, which correspond to the possibility of knowledge. Also this author, instead of resorting to epistemology, uses the name of theory of knowledge. However, this has its explanation and justification, because according to Rosental and Iudin (2007), since Germans (like Hessen) use the name of theory of knowledge and not the word epistemology to refer to the six terms indicated. In this sense, the theoretical references provide a rough idea of what the theory of knowledge is. First, Hessen's concept is shared; second, that any group of philosophers, scientists or others are free to use the terms of theory of knowledge, epistemology or epistemology, and third, it is advisable to understand that the theory of knowledge is more epistemology than epistemology.

Definition proposal of the theory of knowledge concept

The theory of knowledge is the very epistemology of philosophy, whose theories are used according to the interest of the group of philosophers, scientists or others; it is synonymous - but remote - from epistemology.

General discussion and proposal of reconceptualization of epistemology, epistemology and theory of knowledge

According to the study of each one of the philosophical terms of epistemology, epistemology and theory of knowledge, the following aspects are perceived:

- Existence of fundamental differences between epistemology and epistemology.
- Existence of similarities between the theory of knowledge and epistemology; they become synonyms by essence.
- That epistemology has a double function: study of knowledge / knowledge and study of method.
- Epistemology is a method for all sciences and philosophies.
- There are superficial differences between the three philosophical terms, which indicates that they are synonyms.
- Each one is a different concept.

Joint concept proposition for the three epistemic terms

Theory of knowledge, epistemology and epistemology are philosophical terms that have the purpose of deeply studying the issues and problems of human knowledge and knowledge through the method of epistemology.

Of the concepts of understanding and explanation in the social and cultural sciences

Although the terms of understanding and explanation are not exclusively epistemic, they are terms that need psychopedagogical and sociocritical treatment from the episteme approach of the sociocultural sciences. For this reason, the results are initially presented in a descriptive way and then continue with the discussion and the respective proposal.

Schleiermacher (1967, quoted in Martínez, 2006) and Dilthey (quoted in Martínez, 2006), both authors representing sociocultural hermeneutical theory, indicate, by way of synthesis, that the principle of understanding was always to move in a hermeneutical circle (what that later gave rise to a virtuous circle), in a constant return and movement of the whole to the parts and from these to the whole, because a thing cannot be understood at once, in case it is a matter of understanding the best author of what he would have understood himself, even in Dilthey's words, interpretation is the grasp or understanding of a psychic life by another psychic life different from the first: to understand is to transport oneself to another life.

For Morín (1999) there are two understandings:

The intellectual or objective and human intersubjective; the first means to apprehend together (the text and its context, the parts and the whole, the multiple and the individual), the explanation is obviously necessary for an intellectual or objective understanding. As long as the intersubjective human understanding. This involves knowledge from subject to subject. The explanation is insufficient for human understanding. Understanding necessarily includes a process of empathy, identification and projection. Always intersubjective, understanding needs openness, sympathy, generosity (pp. 47-48)

While for Vázquez (quoted in Sánchez, 1996):

The topic of understanding and explanation, firstly locates this conceptual problem in the history of the Hellenic and Galilean era where positivism and antipositivism existed, and in the 19th century in the dilemma and dichotomy of Natural Sciences and Sciences of the Spirit, where the first they would use the method of explanation and the latter the method of understanding. (pp. 615-616)

Finally, Martínez (2006) shares the idea mentioned immediately above, although it is more explicit and clear in his position:

The spirit of all this epistemological orientation is not new, since it comes to us from the end of the 19th century, when Dilthey, Spranger, Weber, Jaspers and other German theorists clearly distinguished between explaining (*erklären*) and understanding (*verstehen*). The concepts are as follows:

The explanation focuses on the analysis and division to search for the causes of the phenomena and their relationship and similarity with other realities, with which it is compared, referred to and related, that is, "inserted into broader and more universal laws", and that it has more application in the natural sciences. The relations that it establishes may, however, remain external to the objects analyzed; they do not lead to their nature.

Understanding, on the contrary, is the capture of internal and deep relationships through penetration into their intimacy, to be understood from within, in its novelty, respecting the originality and indivisibility of phenomena. Instead of dividing the real, as the explanation does, the understanding respects its lived totality; so the act of understanding brings together the different parts in all compression and is imposed on us with clear evidence (p. 79).

Sociocritical discussion and analysis

Schleiermacher (quoted in Martínez, 2006) and Dilthey (quoted in Martínez, 2006) refer exclusively to the term understanding, and indicate that in order to understand it is necessary to move in a hermeneutic circle (which then, as we have said, becomes a circle virtuous), in a constant return and movement of the whole to the parts and from these to the whole, is to try to understand the author better than he would have understood himself. Morín (1999) indicates that understanding is useful in the social and human sciences, while the explanation is useful for

natural and exact sciences, as well as for the intelligentsia and its relation to the object. Similarly it is for Vázquez (cited in Sánchez, 1996). Finally, for Martínez (2006) in the act of explanation it is necessary to divide or divide reality, while for understanding the totality of the facts must be taken into account without dividing it.

Now, entering the discussion and socio-critical analysis of the words understanding and explanation, with a critical psycho-pedagogical attitude and epistemic focus, which is the purpose of this work, it is necessary initially to ask questions that will contribute to knowing some epistemic details that have both concepts. . In this sense, the following questions are raised, which will later be discussed and dealt with in an effort to answer each one. The questions are:

- 1) Why deal with the topics of explanation and understanding?
- 2) Is the purpose of explanation and understanding to reach understanding?
- 3) So what is the essence of explanation and understanding?
- 4) Are understanding and explanation an inseparable dichotomy?
- 5) Why is explanation not relevant to social science and understanding is not relevant to exact or natural science?
- 6) Do the explanation and understanding cover the multidiversity of the facts?
- 7) What is the conceptual proposal that brings together the terms explanation, understanding and understanding?

We will focus our socio-critical discussion on these seven questions.

From the first question, "Why deal with the issues of explanation and understanding?", It is worth mentioning that the life of the human being is surrounded by material objects and phenomena that govern it, as well as the soul, the spirit, the actions of customs, traditions, values, beliefs, religious tendencies and the like. In order to search for happiness, human beings must necessarily know and know the objective and subjective components that each of the elements that surround them presents, and among them is also the neighbor, therefore, to know, know and then understand it is necessary to resort to the act of explaining and understanding the facts. Without the action of explaining and understanding it would not be so easy to understand the reality of our environment. For this reason, the explanation and understanding of the facts are quite relevant for the development of human life.

Regarding the second question, "Is the purpose of explanation and understanding to reach understanding?", Understanding implies having grasped, withheld, mentally digested, having known and tasted the fact in question, and to reach that state of cognition it is necessary to go through receiving the explanation and / or the understanding, therefore, these two acts have the purpose of endowing the human being with the cognitive elements and epistemes for mastering the understanding of the facts. Thus, the purpose of explanation and understanding is to contribute to the understanding of the facts.

From the third question, "So, what is the essence of the explanation and understanding?", The content of this does not question the simple fact of making the conceptual treatment of both terms, but requires scrutinizing their components until they get to know their essence. or the nucleus that gives it life, or showing the being of what is. Consequently, it is necessary to clarify that explanation is synonymous with explaining, clarification and demonstration of the subject in question, for this we resort to dividing, separating, dismembering and making similar to the facts of material or non-material life, and in that process The bonding ties that each component has with the others are known. Likewise, the functions that they fulfill within the structured whole are being known, and in order to understand it, the separated thing is once again united, to form part of a framework, so that once it is finished and formed again it says "now I do understand !". This procedure of explanation is conducive to material objects, as noted above, but it is also conducive to social and cultural issues, such as cases of spiritualism, values, beliefs, customs, mental actions, and the like. Here, however, the following should be noted. In sociocultural issues, the process of explanation is intertwined or mixed with the subjective human component, the significance of which is more relevant than the simple material explanation, in this way it is also gradually passing to understanding, a term that, in the opinion of some from the cited authors, it is separate from the explanation. In this sense, the essence of understanding is to embrace all the elements of the fact, it is to scrutinize its composition while looking for the significant and transcendental subjective elements that make the fact exist and manifest in a given environment. In short, it is seeing the facts in their deep intimate components. On the other hand, the essence of the explanation is to see the facts in their most objective and superficial components.

Regarding the fourth question, "Is understanding and explanation an inseparable dichotomy?", The direct answer is no, since they can serve separately and each one can contribute according to his style to the particularized understanding, but for a complete understanding. it is necessary not to separate them. Thus, for example, explanation can contribute

significantly in sciences such as the natural, physical, and exact sciences, without the presence of understanding, and thus reach understanding, since in these materiality prevails, the simple deduction of facts and events, where quantities, costs, time and space are the reasons to be based only on a simple explanation. Therefore, in these sciences, the understanding that is a sign of subjectivity, induction and human has no significant relevance; the autonomy of the explanation is like noble discrimination due to the nature of these sciences. In what understanding does not discriminate. Understanding, by nature, can act separately as it can also act holistically and jointly with explanation. He acts profoundly when dealing exclusively with subjects of the social and cultural sciences, but when dealing with subjects of the natural sciences and the like, he necessarily resorts first to explanation.

Now, answering the question, for case studies oriented to the understanding of the facts, the explanation and the understanding can be separated and each one responding relevant to their respective sciences: the former can do without understanding to reach understanding, and this, the compression can proceed in the same way, which means that both do not form an inseparable dichotomy.

From the fifth question, "Why is explanation not relevant to social sciences and understanding not relevant to exact or natural sciences?", From its epistemic origins, explanation was used semantically in exact, physical and natural sciences (materialism quantitative), while understanding denotes making the human effort not only to understand sociocultural facts, but also to understand the intersubjectivities that exist in social relationships and transcendental material relationships.

Understanding is not relevant for exact or natural sciences because for these sciences the subjective and transcendental elements that material objects have are not relevant. Now, the explanation for the social sciences is not enough to come to understand and understand the subjective and transcendental questions that nature and human life have.

From the sixth question, "Does the explanation and understanding encompass the multidiversity of the facts?", One could answer yes, but separately. Understanding becomes more relevant because it is interested, from a holistic approach, the subjectivity and transcendence of objective matter, but particularly of social and cultural events. The explanation, for its part, generally focuses its attention on material objects and little or nothing interests the subjectivity of matter and social facts. As for multi-diversity, both concepts encompass the treatment of the plurality of material and human facts, assuming

all fields of diversity, but understanding is the one that most encompasses multi-diversity because that term is synonymous with totality, holistic: integrality of all the components of the facts.

From the seventh question, “What is the proposed concept that brings together the terms of explanation and understanding?”, As will have been noted in the exposition of the previous answers, both differ, but in some cases they work dichotomously, For this reason, it is possible to propose a concept that brings together both terms.

Uniting conceptual proposition

Comprehension is the qualitative way of understanding, assimilating, cognitively apprehending the meanings of objective, subjective, and transcendental facts and epistemic writings through hermeneutic treatment, respecting the internal, deep relationships of originality and indivisibility of phenomena actors. theoretical-epistemological, supported by history and the procedure of explanation.

Conclusion

The objective of this article was to propose new concepts of epistemic terms that are used in the university environment and particularly in sociocultural sciences. This was accomplished by assuming the treatment of the terms epistemology, epistemology, theory of knowledge, explanation, and understanding. For this purpose, the concept of critical psychopedagogy was initially elaborated, which contributed pertinently to the treatment of epistemic and social concepts, and with which it was successfully completed with the proposal of new concepts. Likewise, it was detected that each of the authors cited here has their conceptual position regarding a single universal term, which leads to confusion.

On the other hand, it was detected that the three epistemes of epistemology, epistemology and theory of knowledge are synonymous, but epistemology differs from the other two because it is the only one that deals with the topic of method. And with respect to the social terms of explanation and understanding, both can contribute separately and together to the physical, natural and social sciences, but this one differs in some way from the other because it acts more profoundly in relation to all kinds In fact, he even gets to see objective questions, although he mainly focuses on intersubjective and transcendental themes of all material and human facts.



Finally, this research left two questions that can be expressed as follows: should there be specific concepts of epistemology and epistemology for each of the various sciences? And will the proposed concept of explanation be suitable for the spiritual sciences? In this sense, those interested in this topic are invited to take on the challenge of answering both questions through research.

References

- Agreda, M. R. (2007). *Diccionario de investigación científica* (2.^a ed.). Cochabamba, Bolivia: Kipus.
- Álvarez de Zayas, C. M. (2012). *Epistemología del Caos Kipus* (2da. Ed). Cochabamba, Bolivia: Kipus.
- Bunge, M. (2007). *Diccionario de filosofía* (5.^a ed.). México: Siglo XXI editores.
- Delgado, J. M. y Gutiérrez, J. (1999). *Métodos y técnicas cualitativas de investigación en ciencias sociales*. España: Síntesis.
- Eid, R. G. (2005). *Filosofía y epistemología* (tomo I). (Documento de módulo de postgrado). La Paz, Bolivia.
- Encarta. (2009). *Diccionario*. Microsoft Corporation.
- Ferrater, J. (1964). *Diccionario filosófico* (5.^a ed.). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Sudamericana.
- Hessen, J. (1999). *Teoría del conocimiento*. Oruro, Bolivia: Latinas Editores.
- Huanca, V. D. (2012). *Epistemología*. La Paz, Bolivia: Campo Iris.
- Karten. (1985). *Diccionario de sinónimos, antónimos y parónimos* (3.^a ed.). Perú: Karten.
- Larousse. (1978). *Diccionario Larousse*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Larousse.
- Mansilla, L. G. (2007). *Tesis de grado* (2.^a ed.). La Paz, Bolivia: Garza Azul.
- Martínez, M. (2006). *Ciencia y arte en metodología cualitativa*. México: Trillas.
- Morín, E. (1999). *Los siete saberes necesarios para la educación del futuro*. Francia: Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura.
- Rosental, M. M. y Iudin, F. P. (2007). *Diccionario filosófico*. Lima, Perú: San Santiago.
- Sánchez, S. (1996). *Diccionario de las ciencias de la educación* (5.^a ed.). Madrid, España: Santillana.
- Tafur, R. (1995). *La tesis universitaria*. Lima, Perú: Montaro.