Abstract: This article presents part of the results of qualitative research on the processes of identity formation of individuals who earned degrees in pedagogy at Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) and Universidad Veracruzana (UV) in 1950, 1970, and 1990. The results consider the pedagogues’ degree plans and emphasize the traits that have defined their identity. The central question was: Which traits have formed the identity of pedagogues at UNAM and UV? As a function of this question, the pedagogues’ identity was studied. Interviews were carried out with twelve pedagogues in total (six from each institution, and two from each graduating class) and an analysis was made of their comments and institutional documents. Pedagogues’ identity has been constituted as historical, relational, and hybrid: a professional who fills various functions, all linked to general education (formal, non-formal and informal), and who confronts these functions differently from other professionals in education.
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Introduction
This research is the result of concerns I had as an undergraduate student in pedagogy: Do we pedagogues have an identity like doctors and lawyers? What is our specific field of action? Pejoratively, are we pedagogues known as a jack-of-all-trades? My concerns also took the form of another question: What is the identity of the pedagogue? These questions motivated me to read the work of authors like Hall (2000), Bhabha (1996), Grossberg (1996), Lacan (1971/1975), Zizek (1992), Foucault (1970), Laclau and Mouffe (1987/2004), among others, who address from various disciplines the topic of identity. They agree on the need to deal with identity from a horizon of non-essentialist reconstructive intelligibility. In other words, the individual constructs his identity by assuming various positions, roles or poles of identity: a person throughout his life history can be a pedagogue, a parent, an Atheist, a politician, a soccer player, and so on, and in this sense, identity is reconstructed constantly by acquiring new positions and by attaching new meaning to these positions.

Reading these authors and making an historical review of pedagogy degrees, documentary sources and testimonials, in addition to other references, allowed me to see the ingenuousness of my initial questions. I increasingly understood that at most, one can aspire to ask: How has this identity been represented and how is it now expressed? My intent in this research has not been to explain the professional identity of pedagogues in definitive universal terms, but to show the process of identity construction undergone by my interviewees in the 1950s, 1970s, and 1990s. I also attempt to describe traits that characterize these individuals in general, along with other prevailing aspects of the professional training of pedagogues in each of these decades. Especially, I shall take into account as references the institutional/curriculum, political, epistemic, and historical conditions that enabled these individuals to construct their identity.

I have structured this research report into four sections. The first section explains the methodology and perspectives of research used; the second presents a brief characterization of the institutional contexts in which my interviewees studied; the third alludes to the discussion of results; and the final section mentions certain reflections on the studied topic.
Perspective of Approach and Analytical Tools: Political Analysis of Discourse and Complex Thought

The methodological horizon of my empirical referent is qualitative research, particularly from the perspective of the political analysis of discourse (APD) (Laclau y Mouffe, 1987/2004, 1994 on social and political movements; Buenfil 1994, 1995, 1998 in Mexico on the educational field). This focus can be understood as a hybrid, heterogeneous toolbox (Wittgenstein, 1988/2003: 27) where diverse disciplinary perspectives converge: political theory, analysis of discourse, social theories, philosophy, psychoanalysis, history, and other perspectives. Such theoretical eclecticism, as a form of understanding reality, implies epistemic vigilance in search of the greatest consistency possible, in order to utilize other conceptual sources. From APD, I took the analytical strategy of reactivation (Husserl, 1984/1997; Laclau, 1994) and conceptual categories such as discourse, to determine the origin of interpellations that form identities; hegemony to understand how some meanings are established and others are not in this process, which interpellations are strongest and most effective for leaving a mark and configuring an individual’s identity; and identity, to discover how the pedagogue undergoes subjectivization, and which elements prevail and are repeated, and how new meanings are incorporated into the subjectivization process.

I also turn to the notion of complexity by Morin (1990/2003), a concept that implies seeing not only the joint creation, but also the parts that form this whole, by seeing the entity and the multiple. Complexity returns to the empirical world; uncertainty; as well as the inability to attain certainty, formulate a law, conceive an absolute order. (Here we observe the epistemological compatibility of complex thought and the APD perspective.)

Categories, principles, and notions such as those described above have played a constructive role in the delimitation of the object of analytical and interpretative study regarding the empirical referent. It is important to explain that the construction of my object of study involved:

1) Research questions, formulated at the beginning but modified, broadened and delimited during the research,
2) A theoretical referent, in which categories were outlined, some made secondary, and others were created or emerged.
3) Initial empirical referent (selection of informants, topics, interview, documents, and so on), adjusted during research.

Thus the construction of the object of study is a process of elaboration with permanent adjustments (including epistemological and ontological principles, and principles of analytical strategies and the articulation of results), in the interplay of research questions and theoretical and empirical referents. For example, during the research, categories were produced: identity, ethos and professional subject. Criteria of “intra- and inter-institutional” analytical grouping were formulated.

Using these conceptualizations to approach the problem of pedagogues’ professional identity, the statement can be made that their identity has been based not only on educational policies, the conditions of the discipline and the institution (especially the degree plans in effect at the time of their professional education), but also on multiple factors that conditioned their identity, in greater or lesser intensity of interpellation. Therefore, professional identity is the way the individual appropriates a professional/institutional project that corresponds to a disciplinary field, in addition to appropriating what that project and field imply in terms of physical space and means of constitution/formation. In the case of this study, the pedagogue’s professional identity depends on the type of relation and experiences the pedagogue has with the institution where he was trained, the discipline, and his working life in a specific era and context.
I used the following techniques to obtain information: *historical/documentary analysis*, which included a review of the degree plans at Universidad Veracruzana (UV) and Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM), as well as the gray and specialized literature on the topic; and *interviews* held with four individuals from each decade (1950, 1970, 1990) (two pedagogues from UNAM and two from UV), a total of twelve interviewees.\(^8\) The selection of respondents was intentional (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The basic criteria for their selection included three points: a) That they had studied for a degree in pedagogy in the 1950s, 1970s, and/or 1990s; b) that they were graduates of UNAM (main campus) or UV (Xalapa); and c) that they were university professors.\(^9\)

To obtain in a general manner the professional profile and trajectory of my interviewees, I present some of their characteristics in Table 1, which I suggest reading in vertical form.

**Table 1**

*Interviewees’ Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNAM</td>
<td>B 1959</td>
<td>B 1976</td>
<td>B 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^1)</td>
<td>A M</td>
<td>A F</td>
<td>A F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Professional Employment</td>
<td>A 50</td>
<td>A 26</td>
<td>A 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 35</td>
<td>B 26</td>
<td>B 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work History: A Brief Description</td>
<td>A -Teacher at Pedagogy School, UV (FP-UV); and Normal Veracruzana. -Director of FP-UV. -Pedagogical adviser in various states in Mexico.</td>
<td>B -Teacher at Pedagogy School, UV (FP-UV). -Teacher project adviser.</td>
<td>B -Teacher at Pedagogy School, UV (FP-UV). -Teacher educator. -Educational researcher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) In the 1950s, all undergraduate students in pedagogy at UV were male (Source: Archivo Histórico de la UV); at UNAM, most were male (Source: E-UNAM-50A).
The basis for analyzing the information for each of the three decades was the following:

- Institutional conceptions of pedagogy and of being a pedagogue at UNAM and at UV in the 1950s, 1970s, and 1990s.
- Graduates’ conception of pedagogy prior to starting and after finishing the degree: Transformation, change and repeatability?
- The pedagogue’s professional employment: a delimited field of action?

Based on these general categories (nodal points) the empirical information was organized, presented and analyzed to explain the process of constituting professional identity. Concomitantly, some characteristic traits (at the intra- and inter-institutional levels) of the pedagogue’s identity were derived, since results from case studies cannot be generalized.

**Brief Characterization of Institutional Contexts**

Delving into the history of any social entity serves not only to learn its genealogy (Foucault, 1970/1999) but also to comprehend its development, permanence, and transformation over time; i.e., to ask how it has come to be what it is at the present time. In addition, the focus of my interest—the pedagogue’s professional identity in terms of discursive construction—cannot be interpreted at the margin of the conditions of epistemological, political and institutional production. For this reason, in this section I present the moment when pedagogy became a university degree in Mexico. With its institutionalization, a new professional in education was born: the pedagogue with his own formation and identity.

I center on the Pedagogy School of Universidad Veracruzana (1954), and the Pedagogy College of Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, founded in 1955. These two public universities established the first degrees in pedagogy not only in Mexico, but also in Latin America. The almost simultaneous founding of the two programs allows an analysis of the role the pedagogical tradition of these institutions has played in the ontological self-conception of today’s pedagogues.

**Pedagogy Degree at Universidad Veracruzana**

The idea of creating a Pedagogy School at Universidad Veracruzana (FP-UV), according to Pérez (1986:8), dates back to 1902, when Manuel R. Gutiérrez [then the director of Escuela Normal Veracruzana (ENV) (Veracruz Teachers School)] told his students that the school’s new name would be
Escuela Normal Primaria (Elementary Teachers School); many were surprised by the implication that higher studies in pedagogy could exist outside of ENV. One of Gutiérrez’ students was Manuel C. Tello, who promoted the idea in 1944 that the professional studies at Escuela Normal Veracruzanana were simply a first step in pedagogy. Given the pressing need to provide pedagogical training to secondary school teachers, the university established a specialty in secondary school education. The course was offered only one year, but a decade later would become the cornerstone of the Pedagogy School.

On March 11, 1953, Marco Antonio Muñoz Turnbull, the governor of the state of Veracruz, requested from Tello a study to support and organize a Pedagogy School. He provided Tello with a letter addressed to Ezequiel Coutiño, then the rector of Universidad Veracruzana, to argue the importance of studying pedagogy. The central part of the letter states:

The cultural tradition of the state of Veracruz and especially its position as the first state in Mexico to promote and create a Normal School for teacher education, convince us of the need to create a center of higher learning for teaching, where teachers and university students in general, called to the most noble profession of teaching and cultivating the sciences at the upper levels, can perfect their knowledge and methods, which upon being transmitted, translate into the best technical and intellectual preparation for our future generations [...] (Hernández, 1986: 109).

The rector presented the founding project and the letter to the members of the university council at their regular meeting, and a unanimous vote approved the creation of the institution considered necessary for preparing secondary school teachers (Pérez, 1986:8-11).

Manuel C. Tello presented a project with emphasis on background, purposes, and characteristics. It proposed, in first place, the establishment of a secondary normal school (Escuela Normal Secundaria) for teachers in service at secondary school, graduates from normal school, and high school students who had completed preliminary courses in pedagogy. The proposal was to establish undergraduate and doctoral degrees in pedagogy at the university level (Hernández, 1986).

The opening declaration was on April 10, 1954, and on May 3 of the same year, the Pedagogy School of Universidad Veracruzana began work at a provisional location at Number 25 Lerdo de Tejada, the street now known as Xalapeños Ilustres (Pérez, 1986:8-11).

Eighty-three students enrolled in the first and second years. Accepted into the second year were teachers who had completed the first course in the short-lived secondary school specialization in 1944; the coursework was revalidated by Universidad Veracruzana. A master’s degree would be awarded, entitled Maestro en Educación Secundaria, in compliance with the objective of training teachers for secondary education.

From the above, we can observe, as genealogical traits (Foucault, 1970/1999) that the origin is normal school and that the creation articulates the concerns of agents, institutions, public officials, and an image attached to the values of learning.

University Pedagogy at the School of Philosophy and Letters, UNAM

The background of the Pedagogy College at the School of Philosophy and Letters (CP-FFyL) dates back to the 1881 university project by Justo Sierra (Sierra, 1948) that created Escuela Normal y de Altos Estudios (Normal School and School of Higher Education). Sierra indicated that the school would have the fundamental objectives of training teachers and knowledgeable specialists, providing scientific and literary knowledge of an eminently practical nature, superior to that of professional schools. Sierra stipulated (1948) that a complete class of pedagogy would be established. This was the first occasion, Menéndez (1994:5) tells us, that the term, pedagogy was heard at Universidad Nacional.
In 1910, Escuela Nacional y de Altos Estudios was founded. It was divided into three organizational sections: Humanities; Exact, Physical and Natural Science; and Legal and Political Social Science. The pedagogical discipline was in the first section. This school, Menéndez (1994) states, had two directors: first, Porfirio Parrada, and second, Dr. Pruneda. In 1913, Ezequiel A. Chávez (López, 2004) was appointed director.

In 1922, Ezequiel A. Chávez created the Degree and Research Plan of Escuela Nacional de Altos Estudios. His insistence that the School of Higher Education (Altos Estudios) could not continue to exist if it were not directed as a normal school aroused three previously inactive groups: a) normal school graduates, who rejected the formation of a higher normal school within the university; b) the renewed positivists, who ensured that only positivism could solve the nation’s educational problems; and c) the group directed by Antonio Caso within the Escuela Nacional de Altos Estudios that was preparing the platform to make Altos Estudios a school of philosophy ad letters (FFyL). Under Álvaro Obregón, the school of Altos Estudios was finally closed, in 1924, and three institutions were created in the form of one: FFyL, Escuela de Graduados and Escuela Normal Superior. 13

In 1934, Escuela Normal Superior was separated from the university (Rojas, 2004), then national and autonomous, and intense rivalry began between university and normal school students. One year later (1935), Ezequiel A. Chávez was able to form a department of educational science within FFyL, which awarded master’s and doctoral degrees in educational science. The doctorate was soon eliminated (in 1938); and the master’s degree survived weakly until 1954.

In 1954, Dr. Francisco Larroyo replaced the department of educational science and founded the department of pedagogy, based on the pedagogical traditions he had brought from Germany. The creation of this new department was due primarily to Larroyo’s vision of university pedagogy differentiated from that of normal school (Menéndez, 1994).

The pedagogical studies at UNAM have acquired their own physiognomy […] Under this sign, in effect, the problem of university pedagogy arose, the problem of work different than that of the Secretary of Public Education [responsible for Escuela Normal Superior] […] The School of Philosophy and Letters ensures that its objective is this: university pedagogy (Larroyo, 1958:95).

Therefore, the departments of the School of Philosophy and Letters became colleges and were reduced to seven: Philosophy, Letters, Psychology, History, Geography, Pedagogy and Anthropology. These colleges offered a total of fifteen degrees.

At the meeting of the Technical Council on January 12, 1955, the Master of Educational Science degree was replaced by the recently created Master of Pedagogy. This degree was established as a specialization totally independent from the rest14 with a completely renovated degree plan, directed not only to training teachers, but also to training professionals in pedagogy capable of organizing schools, carrying out research, and advising at institutions (Ducoing, 1990:247).

The genealogical traits mentioned in previous paragraphs show an origin that combines the traditions of normal school with German pedagogy and the appearance of epistemic and institutional concerns about university pedagogy.

A consideration of the two institutions (UNAM and UV) allows me to make a comparison (intra- and inter-institutional) of the holders of pedagogy degrees and their identities, identity processes and moments, and identity referents (linked always to individual ethos), in order to emphasize equivalencies, differences and/or antagonisms that occur to a greater or lesser degree. In this manner, we not only can obtain a general panorama of the identity of pedagogues from these two institutions in the three defined eras, but also observe what makes these identities unique and what distinguishes them from
each other. Thus multiple and diverse forms of constituting identity can be defined within the same professional field in one and several eras and in different institutions.

**Discussion of Results**

*Traits that have Constituted the Professional Identity of Pedagogues*

The professional identity of these pedagogues has been reconstructed based on the overlapping of certain traits that characterize, embody, and express their professional identity, as manifested by each respondent. These traits of identity are derived from the experiential interactive relation, to a greater or lesser degree, between the pedagogues and a series of general referential elements (degree plan, educational community, work history) during their university and post-university trajectory, including some of their background before enrolling in pedagogy. Since this referential relation is situated in the context of the pedagogues’ lives and professional training, I can establish generational and institutional equivalencies and differences. Below I shall explain some of the traits that identify pedagogues trained in the 1950s, 1970s, and 1990s.

**Identity Traits of Pedagogues Who Graduated from UNAM and UV in 1950**

The interviewees’ interest in pedagogy in the 1950s, at both UNAM and UV, is strongly linked to teaching, and has its origins in elementary school. These respondents’ pre-university conception of the pedagogy degree as simply teacher education is equivalent among all, but is broadened during their university studies. At that point, they internalize other professional employment functions of pedagogues, not only as teachers, but also directors, school administrators, teacher educators, and advisers. In this sense, we can observe hegemonic institutional action regarding students; in other words, a power to convince as well as impose, through proposed objectives in the degree plan.

A piece of data that is equal among the interviewees is that all were teachers when they entered CP-UNAM and FP-UV, where they studied and became the successors of their teachers. In this manner, the training institution’s continuity and sedimentation would be ensured. In this sense, the institution does not reproduce on its own. For sedimentation to be possible, discourse—as the object of sedimentation—must be recognized and approved by the part of the group or sector that is attempting to interpellate on behalf of the others.

The professional employment activities carried out by the pedagogues who graduated in the 1950s from UV go beyond the field of action proposed in the degree plan (which suggested, among other concepts, serving as teacher educators). The alumni do not distance themselves from the degree plan, however, since the actions they have performed are supplementary to teaching. Based on the analysis of the degree plans and the interviews carried out with the graduates from the 1950s, I found certain identity traits that characterize these pedagogues:

- **Pedagogical eros**, as an expression of all pedagogues who make pedagogy a noble and honorable profession; worthy only of pedagogues who make pedagogy respectable with all it offers as a professional activity and academic discipline. This pedagogical eros implies, for the respondents, a devotion to pedagogy in the broad sense of the word, especially intellectual and affective devotion. A pedagogical eros attributes value to pedagogy and the tasks that conform it.

- **Erudition**, in which the pedagogue “should be” the person whose primary activity is the search for knowledge—knowledge that is broad and vast, at least in the field of human and social sciences. A pedagogue with limited knowledge and little or no interest in science, culture, and art is unthinkable. Pedagogues think of themselves as scholarly in their discipline and in other areas, especially philosophical areas. The more one knows, the better the pedagogue. This attitude
towards knowledge implies ethical concern: if the pedagogue is responsible for educating students, he must first educate himself.

- **Interest in pedagogy is associated with interest in teaching as a principal professional activity**, which implies heavy ethical responsibility because of the results and effects of teaching. For pedagogues, a teacher “should be” a “social model to follow”.

- **Philosophical/humanistic view** in which the problems of pedagogy are viewed more from a philosophical perspective, as a result of training in languages (Latin, Greek) and classical thought, although positivist and experimental science are also present to study students’ psychological/biological development “scientifically” along with anthropometric characteristics.

*Identity Traits of Pedagogues Who Graduated from UNAM and UV in 1970*

The pedagogues who graduated in the 1970s from FFyL-UNAM and FP-UV have ideas and conceptions about what pedagogy and the pedagogue are, that are not far from the institutional proposal. However, the institutional proposal embodied in the degree plan was beyond their preconceptions. Thus, before beginning their studies in pedagogy, pedagogues from this era merged their ideas in a unique manner with institutional offerings and with the possibilities of professional employment. I use the word, unique, because the respondents (from UNAM and UV) work in pedagogy and have diverse academic interests (research, social pedagogy, educational administration, teacher education, inter alia), although they graduated from the same institution in the same years, and were classmates.

Some of the identity traits of the pedagogues from the 1970s, are the following:

- **Technical/scientific view of education** (UV and UNAM), as well as a **critical/social view of education** (UNAM). Although educational technology was in vogue in Mexico in this era, space began to open for a critical examination of education, to be known as critical pedagogy.

- **Pedagogy was marked by the idea of social intervention**, which at UNAM had at least two meanings: a) Pedagogy had to respond to the reality and needs of social groups (a pedagogue who is more practical than reflective) and b) research (a pedagogue who is more reflective than practical). It should be mentioned that all pedagogical interventions require actions that include theoretical reflection as well as instrumental reflection (means/ends). Interest is centered not only on immediately solving the problem, but also on understanding the problem.

- The pedagogue as intervener has the task of solving problems of a practical and/or conceptual nature related to education with various levels of abstract or instrumental complexity.

- In this decade, the notion of intervention seems to play an important role in training professionals, and particularly pedagogues. Although the purpose of all professions, through the individual who practices the profession, is professional intervention in addressing and solving problems and improving society, the term, intervention, began to become more common in the language of professions in the social sciences and humanities. In the 1970s, the notion of intervention as such began to have more of a presence in pedagogy (reality/awareness/intervention).

- The training of pedagogues in the 1970s and 1980s included a heavy load of social theory, mainly sociology, with the presence of structural-functionalism, Marxism, and so on (especially at UNAM). This social theory gives education more of a critical and political emphasis, and provides a basis for certain theoretical/ideological positions. Pedagogues from this period are distinguished by a process of politicization, almost always in opposition to the established social order, and training and concern for the use of educational technology (especially at UV).
For this generation, being a teacher was not a professional preference or interest, in contrast with the pedagogues of the 1950s. Pedagogy becomes somewhat more removed from teaching as a principal option of professional employment, although still linked with teacher educators in charge of preparing high school teachers and university professors. Pedagogy no longer required working as a teacher, but offered other professional options that coincided with the graduates’ interests or initial concerns, whether administration (E-UV-70A), learning differences (E-UV-70B), family education (E-UNAM-70A), or the education of the masses (E-UNAM-70B).

Identity Traits of Pedagogues who Graduated from UNAM and UV in 1990

The initial conception of pedagogy held by the interviewees of the 1990s was that being a pedagogue meant being a professor and “something more”. This idea is equivalent to that of the generation of the 1950s, who also believed that being a pedagogue meant being a teacher; and different from the idea of the graduates from the 1970s, who had a broader view of pedagogy and of being a pedagogue. While at the university, the graduates from the 1990s realized that being a pedagogue did not mean simply being a teacher, but also a researcher, adviser, planner, and so on.

Employment opportunities for pedagogues from the 1990s became diversified and were located on various scenarios; not only in formal education but also in “non-formal” and informal education, such as companies, adult education, consulting, and others.

Some of the characteristic traits of the respondents who graduated in the 1990s from the UNAM and UV are:

- They have constructed their professional identity through multiple social referents, such as liking some area of training in pedagogy, their relationship with professor and/or advisers, the type of reading they do, and their employment.
- Research takes on special emphasis as an area of training for pedagogues. Pedagogues’ training is reinforced, and particularly research in which a series of subjects related to research is added (methodologies, paradigms, epistemology).
- Latin American authors have a greater presence, including Freire, Puiggrós, Glazman, De Ibarrola (authors first read in the 1970s but still emphasized in the 1990s), and Díaz Barriga, De Alba, and others.
- The pedagogues from UV attach great importance to their theoretical training, while those from UNAM stress the solution of real, tangible problems.
- The pedagogues’ employment field became widely diversified, to the degree that they can be referred to as multifunctional pedagogues.
- Interests of professional action among graduates of UV are directed to university teaching and research; they recognize the diversity of employment opportunities but attach priority to their academic preferences. The interests of graduates from UNAM are aimed at the places where they are required and can develop.
- One pedagogue from UV and two from UNAM consider that their degree plans provided them with “good” theoretical training but with little experience in real problems. The other pedagogue from UV indicates that his degree plan was focused more on technical and operational activities and matters, to the neglect of theoretical and intellectual training. The observation is made that the interviewees from UV have different notions of theory. Certain questions can be posed: What type of theory is taught in the major? Theory for reflecting and studying reality conceptually? Or theory for executing technical procedures (didactic, administrative, professional graphics, psycho-pedagogical) and making the corresponding decision? From my perspective, these two
types of theory are intermixed in the pedagogue’s training, although to a lesser degree in the first type. The theory for executing technical procedures occupies most of the curriculum of pedagogy since the included areas of knowledge are of that nature, while the area that provides the philosophical, pedagogical and social basis to pedagogy is not given the emphasis it deserves. Therefore, discussions of this nature are scarce in the classrooms of pedagogy, and doubtlessly limit pedagogues’ critical and intellectual training.

What does it mean to be a pedagogue?

It is very common to hear teacher educators, scholars and researchers say that pedagogy “lacks” an “identity of its own”, “a true identity” that “defines” a pedagogue’s “clear identification” similar to other professionals, whether lawyers, doctors, or psychologists. Yet it is ingenuous to argue that doctors have a professional identity in hard terms because although the fundamental objective of a degree in medicine continues to be to save lives and prevent disease, the forms of saving, curing, and preventing are different from era to era; i.e., they are contextual, as are medicines, therapies, instruments, technologies, curative methods, and knowledge of the discipline.

In this sense, I sustain that that the question is not that pedagogues lack identity, but that their identity is difficult to compare with the identities of other professions. Although this situation means that pedagogues’ identity cannot be discerned as monolithic, homogeneous, and unified, pedagogues can be explained in terms of the disciplinary discourses that influence their training and professional work. Pedagogues are professionals who comply with diverse functions, all of which are linked to the educational setting in general (formal, non-formal and informal). If there is an identity trait that has become hegemonized, it is their characteristic of intervening in the problems, needs, processes and educational situations that need to be addressed for solution or improvement.

In terms of the assumption of pedagogues’ non-identity, the statement can also be made that their professional identity—like that of any other professional or any other person—is relational, historical and hybrid. Identity is relational because it is defined through its links to theoretical suppositions or the employment field of other professions, such as teachers trained in normal school, psychologists, sociologists, and so on. Identity is changing, differential, and fractured in the sense that identities never operate as fixations or perpetual totalities: they are constructed and reconstructed constantly in such a manner that often we do notice the process. In addition, such construction-deconstruction-reconstruction assumes complex rather than simple causality “of the process”. An identity changes as the individual decides or refuses to occupy certain positions (functions) in his historical/social context. In this sense, I sustain that the identity of the pedagogue, like that of any profession, is fractured and ambiguous, and the definition is temporary.

I also sustain that since pedagogues receive multiple and disperse disciplinary training (Graph 1), they are prepared to perform multiple functions at the same time (characteristics that permit their identity to enter into conflict and become fragmented). I can refer to pedagogues as a hybrid product, in which the constitutive elements of the pedagogical discipline are present (constituted as a hybrid discipline, Navarrete, 2007:17); I can also mention pedagogues’ appropriations and experiences in the pedagogical sphere (employment).

Along this line, I sustain that the process of identity construction should not be understood as mechanical, definitive, and final in providing identity with an essence or substance in a deterministic, sole sense, but as a recursive process of construction, de-construction, and reconstruction, in which the particular traits of each pedagogue are present. Such traits enable us to refer to pedagogues as such, as a unique professional who finds opportunities to work in the employment market.
Pedagogy: A Hybrid Discipline. Hybrid Training/Constitution of Pedagogues

Throughout the history of societies, the topic of education has been present among philosophical, political and social concerns. As we know, education consists broadly of a process of training individuals. Thus each society attempts to forge ideal members and citizens, who differ from era to era and from society to society. Education is a complex phenomenon, and as such, has been studied by many sciences; it constitutes a complex reality in that it involves processes, practices, spaces, and diverse social intentions; in addition, it is subject to the time in history. The study of education must take into account its factual complexity. Pedagogy is the discipline that interweaves or articulates the disciplines involved in the topic of education (Navarrete, 2007).

Pedagogy’s object of study is education, which cannot be conceived from a sole theoretical or disciplinary vision. The problem of education as a whole goes beyond a single discipline or single theory, implying omniscience, which is also impossible. In addition, the social nature of education does not permit a single view. As a social product, education is determined by geographical, political, cultural, ideological, historical, economic, demographic, ethnic, and genetic factors, and must be considered from multidimensional position.

The interviewees from UNAM and UV believe that pedagogy is a discipline that is supported, because of its object of study (education), by diverse disciplines related to education. Each discipline centers its attention on dimensions that it is directly responsible for addressing.

The above leads us to consider that the study of education is characterized fundamentally by its interdisciplinary nature. This has given rise to the sciences of education; i.e., the set of disciplines that form their own fields of knowledge and methodologies to address some aspect of education that is the primordial object of study of the pedagogical discipline. An interdisciplinary nature most certainly is not exclusive to education, but is true of all social and even natural phenomena. Thus, for example, in the sphere of policy, reference is made to political economy, political philosophy, geopolitics, and so on; while in education, reference is made to educational policy, educational philosophy, educational legislation, and so on. In the sphere of medicine, reference is made to physiology and human anatomy; while in education, reference is made to pedagogical anthropology and anthropometry.

In this same area, Zemelman (1998:94) tells us that to “solve” or address the complexity of the reality under study, the idea of disciplinary articulation must be conceived “to the degree that it places us before a reality that goes beyond disciplinary contents [or limits]”. Such articulation gives rise to historical thinking (man’s ability to influence reality or construct reality).

The scientific character of education is often questioned, principally because education has no unified object of study like the physical and natural sciences, and is not yet positioned at the epistemological threshold. Without doubt, the problem of the scientific statute of education has been reduced to the question of its autonomy and unity. Dewey established the basis of existence for a science of education, which would be integrated by a series of indispensable disciplines for a scientific study. Of course, the comment would have to be made that the science of education exists in an interdisciplinary rather than a pure sense. This apparent fragmentation of education as an object of study, due to its being addressed by multiple disciplines, does not diminish the validity of studies focused on this topic. Quite the opposite, disciplines like pedagogy produce a plurality of regional knowledge that can be integrated into broader, systematic theory to provide knowledge that is more complete, although unfinished, of educational reality. This phenomenon is seen in the following graph.

GRAPH 1

Complexity of Education and the Interdisciplinary Nature of the Study of Education
**Why a degree in pedagogy?**

The analysis of the documentary and testimonial discourse of the two institutions and their graduates reveals that the identity trait that hegemonized (i.e., dominated and persuaded) pedagogues in the 1950s, 1970s, and 1990s is that most of them enrolled in pedagogy with the normal school idea of studying to be a teacher. At a later point in time, however, they broadened their vision of pedagogy and pedagogues, to understand that this discipline is not limited or reduced to teaching or didactics.

The idea that this degree is equivalent to studying to become a teacher exists among the bulk of the Mexican population, and this reduced assumption of pedagogy is held by students who enroll in the major. Thus the terms of pedagogue and professor, pedagogy and didactics are taken as synonyms. The assumption has its historical “origins” in the etymology of the word, which comes from the Greek *paidagoge*, the slave who escorted children to school and back: *paidos* meaning child, and *gogia*, to take or lead.

Pedagogy was not conceived as a science, and was used only as a denomination of a job: the job of the pedagogue, which consisted of guiding the child and perhaps giving him advice. In Mexico, the word, pedagogy, has been heard in the educational field since at least 1811, under Justo Sierra, but always linked to teaching; and in the social imagination, pedagogy has meant being a teacher. Let us remember that teaching—at least until the middle of the twentieth century—was seen as one of the noblest and most honorable professions, requiring the “gift” of teaching. The social function of
teachers was not only to teach students but also to “form” their souls; thus the image of teachers was highly respected, comparable to that of priests. The difference was that the teacher would free people from ignorance while the priest would free them from “sin”. The teacher would be their social conscience and the priest their conscience before “God”. In both cases, the work of these agents was considered “Messianic”.

In the 1950s, most students who entered the pedagogy department had already earned a diploma. For example, the students at UV had studied at the Normal School; and those at UNAM had some other undergraduate degree, such as history. So, why did they decide to study pedagogy? In the 1950s, the creation of this degree at UV represented for students a professional option other than Normal School, which was the “first rung of pedagogy” (Tello, 1954); yet pedagogy also represented a new level of teaching work. For students at UNAM, pedagogy represented the possibility of acquiring didactic tools for carrying out their teaching function “correctly”. On the other hand, most students from the 1970s and 1990s enrolled in the major after having earned only a high school diploma, and not another undergraduate degree.

Pedagogues’ Professional Employment: A Limited Field of Action?
Although graduates’ original idea of pedagogy in the 1950s, 1970s, and 1990s revolved around teaching or earning a pedagogy degree to be a teacher, differences are perceived in their views of teaching. For graduates in the 1950s, being a teacher or being a pedagogue represented a “vocation of service”, while in the 1970s and 1990s, the idea of being a pedagogue was linked more to the “labor market and professional employment”.

In the 1950s, the employment field was teaching, in addition to teacher education, organization or school administration; by the 1970s, the field had broadened to include advising, counseling, and educational research; in the 1990s, pedagogues entered corporations, social organizations, and adult education, in addition to all areas related to the educational field.

In this sense, I insist that talking about the pedagogue’s identity in fixed terms would assume that pedagogues have been working in the same occupations since the 1950s, a fact that is impossible due to the constant mobility and expansion of the professional sphere.

Between the Image of Being a Pedagogue and the Institutional Symbolism of Degree Plans
The notion of discourse enabled me to see how certain meaningful configurations (institutional or common sense) hegemonized the identity of these pedagogues. For example, the curriculum the educational institution offered through its degree plan operated as an ideal of plenitude among graduates. In the 1950s, this ideal served as a means for more and better professional preparation in the field; in the 1970s at UNAM, the ideal led to intervention in social problems such as child abuse and the education of the masses; in the case of the two pedagogues at UV in the 1970s, pedagogy served to perform a professional activity such as administration or to solve pedagogical concerns such as differences in student learning skills; and for pedagogues in the 1990s, to become a teacher and “something more”.

In Conclusion: Some General Traits that Characterize the Identity of Pedagogues
This section allows me to interweave the analysis of the information presented above and explain one of the objectives of research formulated in this thesis: to analyze the traits or aspects that constitute the professional identity of pedagogues from UNAM and UV, and that refer to possible equivalencies, differences and/or antagonisms between the identities of both universities (inter-institutional level), as well as between the identities of the graduates from each institution (intra-institutional level). In this
sense, pedagogy has been constituted as a hybrid discipline, like many others, which take on different knowledge (sociology, philosophy, psychology, anthropology, and so on) and in this form, progress from art to technique and from technique to professional degree. Since the education of pedagogues shows this sort of hybrid character, it is difficult to speak of their professional identity in homogeneous, unitary terms; in other words, the identity is not self-contained in and from itself, since thinking about its formation is possible only as an articulating construction of multiple disciplinary knowledge. The profession encompasses many areas of knowledge and professional action in the educational setting.

A trait that hegemonized (it prevailed because it offered a plausible identity model, ever since the creation of the pedagogy degree in Mexico in the 1950s, and has been continuing to mark the professional identity of pedagogues during the last half of the twentieth century) is the idea of a university pedagogue as different from the normal school pedagogue, with diverse functions in the setting of education. The general pedagogue (from the 1970s and the 1990s) enjoys the advantage of having a diverse disciplinary formation that gives him a more or less integral view of education and school, perhaps sufficient if a pedagogue is expected to serve as a consultant/counselor regarding concrete daily problems that affect the processes of education and school—in terms of the organizational, didactic/pedagogical level as well as the scholastic performance of students or adult education, for example. This is the framework of problems in which pedagogues act most. In this sense, I believe that in addition to being a theorist or scholar of education, the pedagogue, because of the type of education he receives, is also a professional whose primary function is pedagogical intervention.

During the study on the construction of the professional identity of pedagogues I was able to distinguish between two types: scholastic and social. The first works within the school’s institutional setting; the second goes beyond “formal” school and maintains closer contact with the community, diverse agencies, and social groups.

Based on the description of this section and without a typological pretension, or an essentialist or substantial pretension of what pedagogues are or should be, I would like to list some identity traits that hegemonized pedagogues, without being determining factors, since the creation of the pedagogy degree in Mexico until the 1990s:

• University education different from normal school. When pedagogy was instituted as a professional degree, it stopped being only part of the content of the content of normal school, and became a field of professional training. This field goes beyond didactic knowledge and the pedagogical principles that underlie this knowledge and teachers’ didactic practice. Pedagogy became a professional field dedicated to education in terms of its varying realities, problems—a professional field based on specialized knowledge that trains professionals.

• Hybrid disciplinary formation. This trait is the result of the disciplinary constitution of the pedagogy degree. In other words, when pedagogy became a professional degree with education as its object of study and intervention, it came to require the contributions and knowledge that other sciences have generated from their respective fields, with their own instruments of analysis and research, focused on the sociological, psychological, and philosophical dimensions that envelop the educational phenomenon. Before this, pedagogy was an equivalent to the didactic science of Comenio (1922/2005), and according to Herbart (1806/1983), it was a science supported by psychology and practical philosophy (ethics); yet according to Durkheim (1996/1999), pedagogy was only a practical theory. In these three cases, pedagogy is still knowledge that is subordinated to didactics, a speculation or a prescription that orients educational action. Returning to the hybrid formation of pedagogues, I believe such a formation
is indispensable if we want to have a somewhat integral understanding of education and especially if we want to intervene in education.

- A multifunctional professional, in the sense that being a pedagogue revolves around being a counselor, adviser, teacher, administrator, researcher, or trainer. This aspect makes the pedagogue develop professionally in spaces that are quite diverse but all linked to education.
- A very diverse field of employment although teaching continues to hold an ineludible position, at least in terms of image.
- Formal (school), non-formal and informal education (non-school) are the three major settings of the pedagogue’s professional action and intervention; each setting has unique problems that in turn require unique solutions. Thus, paraphrasing Pasillas y Furlan (1994:279), pedagogy intervenes discursively and argumentatively in configuring educational ideals and particular projects. Yet that is only the first part because carrying out that proposal requires a type of intervention marked by strategies, proceedings, and lines of action necessary for attaining the above goals.
- Their function is directly related to the education/training of individuals and the technical/pedagogical processes of schools.

The research on which this article is based required the elaboration of a device of de-construction of identity, which served as an analytical tool for explaining the elements that intervene in the construction of identity and the functioning of this construction. Besides the notions of identity, discourse and hegemony, it was useful to elaborate the conceptual category of professional ethos, which I use to sustain that “the way to assume the process of professional formation is the way to be a pedagogue”. The result is different types of pedagogues, along with their commitments, passions, preferences, styles, interests, and mentalities; in a word, their ethos. Ethos is the reflection of self as a thinking, moral individual and as a professional; in this case a pedagogue. Thus we can refer to the professional ethos from which the individual undertakes, in relation with others, his process of training to become a professional individual. With the help of these constructs and others, I was able to answer the questions posed by this research.

In the four sections of this report I have attempted to show the process of constructing professional identity as experienced by the interviewed pedagogues in two institutions, and in three eras. To explain this process, I turned to various referents of identity: institutional, historical, curriculum-related and labor, viewed from the perspective of the political analysis of discourse and put into play in the triad of theory, empirical matters, and research questions, as shown throughout the article.

Notes

1 A research perspective that began to be developed by Ernesto Laclau at University of Essex, England, in the 1970s, and has attained great relevance at the international level (Lechte, 1994/2000). In Mexico, it has been developed by Rosa Nidia Buenfil Burgos since the 1990s. This perspective is concentrated on the study of historical processes in which meanings are constructed and history is studied as a transformation of meaning (Buenfil, 1994:3).

2 Theoretical eclecticism that requires careful and rigorous epistemic supervision at all times to make it compatible with the ontological and political principles of the political analysis of discourse (for example, the criticism of diverse versions of essentialism) along with the principles of other theories used (González y Buenfil, at press).

3 The notion of discourse is understood as a “relational totality” of significant sequences (Laclau y Mouffe, 1987/2004), or what Foucault (1970-1999) calls regularity in dispersion. Discourse is then conceptualized as a significant totality, never totally fixed, complete, or saturated; rather, an open, incomplete and precarious structure that involves the relational and differential character of elements (Buenfil, 1994).

4 According to Laclau y Mouffe (1987/2004), hegemony is characterized by a type of political relation, a form, if you would like, of policy that involves relations of antagonism and also articulation; in other words, consensus and coercion, inclusion and exclusion. It is
not about a precise location in the field of social topography, and is essentially metonymic: its effects arise always from the excess meaning resulting from an operation of displacement.

1 Identity can be understood as the points of temporary fixation of an individual’s positions..., as points of encounter, of sutures between discourses and the practices that attempt to question, that speak to us or locate us as social subjects of particular discourse (Hall, 2000). Cf. Navarrete, 2006.

2 Complexity is effectively the interweaving of events, actions, interactions, retroactions, determinations, hazards, that constitute our world of phenomena. Thus complexity is present with perturbing traits of perplexity; i.e., the tangled, inextricable, disorderly, ambiguous, and uncertain. Below I mention some of the characteristics of complex thought (Morin, Roger y Mota, 2003:64-70):

1) The semantic and epistemological statute of the term, complexity, is not yet concrete.
2) Although many authors sometimes have a different opinion about complexity, almost all distinguish between complexity and complication.
3) Complex thought knows that generalized certainty is a myth and that a thought that recognizes vagueness and imprecision is more potent than a thought that excludes it repressively.
4) A complex thought is never a complete thought.
5) Complex thought knows that two types of ignorance exist: ignorance that does not know and wants to learn, and ignorance (the more dangerous) that believes that knowledge is a linear, accumulative process...
6) Complex thought does not despise simplicity; it criticizes simplification.

7) The concept of field is understood by Bourdieu (1992:73) as a relatively autonomous space for play, with its own objectives, with players competing among each other and dedicated to different strategies according to their playing cards and their wager (capital); at the same time, they are interested in playing because they “believe” in the game and recognize that “playing is worthwhile”.

8) In addition to these twelve interviews, I was able to carry out two special interviews with two specialized pedagogues: Dr. Libertad Menéndez Menéndez (FFyL-UNAM) and Dr. Graciela Miguel Aco (FP-UV-Xalapa).

9) Consideration had been given to interviewing pedagogues according to their degree plans. This idea was not possible because a previous project I had undertaken to determine the modifications to the degree plans at the two institutions revealed that at UV, seven degree plans have existed [1)1954-1958; 2)1958-1964; 3)1964-1967; 4)1967-1977; 5)1976-1990; 6)1990-2004; and 7) 2000- to date]; and at UNAM, four subjects have been changed [1)1955-1959; 2)1959-1967; 3)1967; and 4) 1967 (restructured in 1972)]; therefore, the two institutions could not be compared. As a result, the decision was made to study three decades of great importance for pedagogy in Mexico. First, 1950: the creation of the pedagogy degree from a university viewpoint and not from a normal school viewpoint. (The university rather than normal school viewpoint was institutionalized by the founding fathers of the pedagogy degree, although a certain normal school influence has existed since the beginning.) Second, 1970: period of “massification” of education and the expansion of the pedagogy degree. And 1990: decade of educational modernization, peak of neoliberal policies and demands for graduate school and increased diversification of activities for pedagogues (know-how) and professionals in general.

10) In the 1950s, the students enrolled in the pedagogy program at UV were only male; no females were present (Source: Historical Archives, UV); at UNAM, most were males (Source: E-UNAM-50A).

11) Universidad Veracruzana was dependent on the state executive branch; it was granted autonomy in 1997. Thus the governor’s decisions regarding the university were obeyed, we could state, without further discussion. This facilitated the university council’s creation of the Pedagogy School.

12) It should be mentioned that in 1885, in the Model School of Orizaba (Veracruz), founded by Enrique Lahluscher, a successful experiment was carried out with a novel degree plan and teaching methods for elementary education, supported by the principles of objective teaching; courses in pedagogy were offered (Curiel, 1981/1982).

13) As stated by Menéndez (1996). The pedagogical studies of that time, as it can be assumed, came out of FFyL and Altos Estudios, and were sheltered in Normal Superior. Normal Superior, between 1924 and 1928, within Universidad Nacional de México, had the purpose of training university professors in special subjects for secondary schools, normal schools, professional schools, and school directors. There was a degree plan to train school directors and other plan to train school inspectors.

14) The primary reason for this autonomy is that the Pedagogy College, different from other colleges, in 1955 definitively restructured its degree plan, thus attaining its independence. Students studying for degrees in other colleges took the same basic courses.

15) An example of how this codification should be read is: E-UV-50A Interviewee from Universidad Veracruzana from the 1950s who was in school before interviewee B of the same decade.
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