

# Social and Politic Capital Vs the Cultural and Academic. Groups of Professors at the Autonomous Indigenous University Of Mexico

Guerra-Garcia E<sup>a\*</sup>, Sandoval-Forero EA<sup>b</sup> and Lopez-de-Haro PA<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Indigenous Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico

<sup>b</sup>Autonomous University of the State of Mexico, Mexico

<sup>c</sup>Indigenous Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico

## Article Info

### Article History:

**Received:** 06 July, 2021

**Accepted:** 10 July, 2021

**Published:** 20 July, 2021

**\*Corresponding author:** Guerra-Garcia E, Indigenous Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36266/GJASS/149>

## Abstract

At the Autonomous Indigenous University of Mexico, in more than 20 years of history since its foundation, groups of professors that unite according to their political, academic, labor, economic, religious interests, etc. have been formed. Each group develops processes of identification-differentiation that allows them to include, exclude, grant or remove hierarchies and define individual and group actions. Each group presents a combination of capitals, be it social, political, cultural or academic, the objective is to describe this dynamic that gives a profile to the Institution and that explains what is happening internally. Through a microethnographic study, the groups found are described: the political and intercultural groups, who are the majority, the researchers and the indigenous (Yoreme Mayo), who are the minority and the others who have also exerted influence, the religious, the standardizers and founders. The result is that indigenous people continue to be a minority and with less weight in decision-making at the indigenous university. The importance of the study lies in showing how, through the groups of teachers and their capitals, the acculturating colonialist processes continue.

**Keywords:** Indigenous University; Professor Groups; Social Capital; Cultural Capital; Political Capital; Academic Capital

**Copyright:** © 2021 Guerra-Garcia E et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

## Introduction

At the universities, all events and actions are developed through plots that could even look a little theatrical; in these, some groups of professors appear who, as actors, can be identified by their interests, their way of thinking and particularly for the social, political, cultural and academic capital that presents dynamics that give a very characteristic profile to each institution. The Autonomous Indigenous University of Mexico (known in Spanish as Universidad Autónoma Indígena de México, also known as UAIM), is not exempt from this, given that, twenty years after its foundation, groups of professors that are defined by their ideological position and actions have been incorporating. Since the beginning of Intercultural Universities in México, the importance of the teacher profile has been pointed out, but one of the problems that these institutions have encountered is that the teaching staff has constantly fluctuated [1]; However, at least in the case of the UAIM, practically for each rectory period, staff who have remained and who maintain a certain ideological influence have been incorporated. Founded in December 2001, the UAIM was incorporating professors who present differentiated capitals; cultural, social, political and academic; in such a way that even

though it seems that in the Institution there was a single thought of a single harmonically consolidated group of teachers, in reality it has not been so; In the continuous internal struggles, groups with very defined interests and recurrent rhetoric have been identified. The result of these disputes has, in the end, marked the institutional profile. Understanding which groups have been formed, their capital, their interests, their way of thinking and acting, can explain more clearly what has been experienced in the UAIM and similarly in the other intercultural universities In the field of Intercultural Universities there is not enough research on teachers and their careers, professional experiences and training needs are pending as lines of research [1].

## Materials and methods

Through an ethnographic work, we briefly describe the groups that have defined UAIM for these 20 years of history. The importance of these results aims to explain what happens within the institution as a result of their interaction. From the methodological point of view, it's important to place ourselves at a specific level of observation; to gather the similarities and differences between these different groups of professors, to approach the ways of expression, the manifestation of positions and the speeches, and the

influence of their reasoning. The study considers the historical space-time context in which these groups developed in order to understand their positions better [2]. The method consisted on two basic aspects: 1) the ethnographic practice whose center is the field work and 2) anthropological reflection, centered on desk work [3]. As it is mentioned by Restrepo, ethnography would be defined by its emphasis on description and situated interpretations. It offers 'a description of several aspects of social life, taking into consideration the meanings associated by the specific actors' (2015: 163). More specifically, we performed a microethnography, which is centered on the analysis of patterns with which the members of the community interact; from there, we focused our attention in the identification and characterization of the groups of professors, without aspiring to have the scope of the ethnography, given that, instead of trying to analyze the phenomenon from a holistic standpoint, we studied the interactional situations according to the object of study [4]. At the universities, there is a determined social space and a particular group of actors with a wide range of ways to give their opinion [5]. When professors enter institutions, they bring a wide range of cultural tools and dispositions of conduct, which are well defined and forged by their background, that belong to a system of definitions that was acquired from childhood as a result of conscious or unconscious practices as a result of the family, socioeconomic status, education, ideology and likes derived from the individual story which Bourdieu calls habitus [6]. 'Habitus is the history made body, internalized as a second nature; it is the active presence of all the past in which one is a product. For Bourdieu, habitus are schemes of perception and action' 'The concept of habitus allows us to think about the structural determination without falling into mechanism, and the great diversity of practices of the agents without falling into individualism. It is a mediating concept between structures and practices'. Continuing with Bourdieu, each teacher has a cultural capital and their practice is observed influenced by the internalization of cognitive and affective schemes acquired from childhood, which as a whole are known as dispositions [7]. In this way, it is logical to find that, in intercultural institutions, the cultural capital of the indigenous teacher differs from the others. In addition, we could specify an academic capital that is based on the knowledge and recognition of their professional work; this provides a power that is accredited both by the university and by external organizations that grant distinctions. In this sense, the volume of academic capital appropriated by professors, for example that of researchers, generates differences among the rest of the teachers in this Institution [8]. The weight of the past is in the professors that are oriented by dispositions that are the product of history of the collectivities in which they have been immersed [9]. Their patterns of behavior are taken advantage of, whether in alignment or not, with government policies or adscription with different internal groups, momentarily, intermittently or permanently, according to their ideals and interests [10]. So, all the professors manifest in daily life, individually and collectively, cultural forms: rituals, strategies, tactics, habits that guide interaction and participate in the formulation of roles and narrative

plots [9]. In this way, the thinking of the professors is organized according to the political symbolic structures that are available, which vary from group to group and are materialized in magical, speech, political, and economical practices [11]. Group is conceived here as 'a plurality of people that form a set and generally match in opinion and interests, and they share space and time. Each group possesses characteristics that are determined by the social identity of each of their members' Each group remits to one of very diverse socially constituted realities in a plural and dynamic way; in this sense, we elaborate interpretations 'from the particularities of their historical, social, cultural, political and economic contexts, which generates different ways to understand their world view and different aspects to exchange meanings and perform social practices' At the same time, the cultural imagination of the groups of professors are the mental baggage with which they approach the "real", and the means by which they 'classify, distinguish, interpret and characterize the world and the people around them' So, the social reality of the university has a series of encounters and interpersonal relationships whose closest analogy es Theater, where professors, like actors, conform to certain stereotyped sequences of behavior that promulgate social dramas[12]. In the theatrical actions, the collective representations (myths, perceptions, opinions, notions, values, moral beliefs, academic and religious conceptions, among others) are the mentality of the groups, which they express, in this case, the way in which the group of professors is considered in their relationships with what affects them [12]. 'Every human experience remits a framework shared by a social group of a determined culture. The internal groups at the university leave their mark in space and in time, they forge their identities through experiences, choices, myths, symbols, beliefs and this has a special meaning for the group and for the history of the institution. Rhetoric and other communicative elements allow them to gather wills and forge identities. 'The social group is an imagined community; the myths, rituals and symbols are the vehicles of collective memory' At the same time, the relationships between social groups 'are started from the time they begin sharing social spaces, creating needs that generated differences and barriers' Each group develops processes of identification-differentiation that allow them to include and exclude, to grant and to remove hierarchies and to define individual or group performances. In this way 'the gestures and postures of the people, are not, in and of themselves, mere physical actions, but true symbols' These identifying processes aren't only performed within the institution, but they also apply outside of the institution, in the social capital of each professor and their group, in which the 'shared relationships among subjects turn into a benefit producing (or inhibiting) device' Some professors have political capital that can be of two types, personal and by assignment. The first one is based on the idea of social relations in general, and the popularity of the teacher; refers to notoriety and popularity. This can be configured in a political capital with the collection of experience, charisma and manipulation of emotional ties. The second is obtained through the assignment by a political authority or by obtaining a position or position [13]. The rituals are acts that are

frequently repeated in which they reproduce stereotyped sequences and more or less rigid [14], in which it is allowed to conform to particular ethics and to produce and reproduce moral feelings in which the professors recognize the people who are and the people who are not part of the group. Within these, for example, in the conversation, they try to avoid topics that could be threatening for the beliefs of the group or could alter their identity, there lies the disturbance towards those who think differently [9]. That's why, when people are with members of different groups, it is intended to talk about topics that wouldn't produce disagreement, but eventually, they send messages that are intended to prevail the ideas of one of them, the group that does this especially is the group in power. It is important to clarify that none of the "performances" of a ritual is exactly the same as others, given that each professor is different. However, it is possible to identify groups with traits of identity like battlefields [14]. The performance here is the reiteration of sociointercultural scripts in which certain norms, rules and patterns of learned behavior are identified, in which the groups experience and re-experience identity codes [14-15]. We consider that, within an institution, a set of different groups and sub-groups are imbricated, they share certain rules and are in interaction around sociointercultural objects that are in dispute because of the value they have, 'social groups interact around social objects, and influenced by the relationships they establish (opposition, competition, cooperation, domination, power, etc.)' This doesn't imply that there will always be a consensus within each identified group of professors on a specific aspect, neither does it imply that the positions remain partially or totally, they can change over time.

## Results and discussion

Here, we present a brief description of the found groups according to the presented methodology and the theoretical elements outlined.

### Group of Founders

This is the group of professors (mostly non indigenous) who started at the University, who were indoctrinated in a very peculiar educational model that has been withering away with time, but they evidently tend to defend it. Even when this educational model has been distorted and each professor references it, the claim of these professors is to go back and rescue the elements of the initial educational model in which the ethnographic and educational precepts were based, proposed by the first Rector, the anthropologist Jesús Ángel Ochoa Zazueta, it went against the isomorphic attempt and standardization of many Higher Education Institutions in Mexico. The defense of the initial educational model has been centered on the precepts that are implicit in the document "Mochicahui, new borders" [16] which served as a basis for the creation of the University. However, many of the original ideas are also on the PIFI 2.0 and the first speech of the first Rector, which was in march, 2003. This model proposed "educational facilitators" instead of professors, "academic titulars" instead of students, it promoted learning in open spaces, with tutorships instead of class

Pubtexto Publishers | [www.pubtexto.com](http://www.pubtexto.com)

and there were no failed students [17]. The founders of the Institution have certain capital: a) social, since they have had more time to establish relationships both within the university and abroad, b) political, since they have acquired charisma since they are referents in all institutional processes and c) cultural, because the first rector period forged them due to the learning that occurred when starting the University. Professors of this group have held, in different periods, practically all the positions of the Institution, and have influenced the entire curriculum, since they have participated in all university dynamics, since its inception. This group is not always seen with good eyes by the rest of the professors, who think that they have done more for the University than the founders themselves and that the founders' ideas are obsolete. The contrarian professors are opposed to the ethnological and educational ideas that were against interculturality presented by Ochoa [18]. However, professors that entered the institution after this, while they started acquiring power, propelled the disarticulation of the initial ideas, displacing the founders' group to implement other educational proposals.

### Group of Standardizers

It is a group of professors that have worked on the standardization of the university elements in order to make them work according to the current public policies and educational legislation. The three subgroups are: a) toyotists, b) pedagogizers and c) legalists. The toyotists seek to impulse elements of the quality doctrines in the university framework, from the establishment of the elements of strategic planning, the standardization of procedures and, in general, they cluster around the precepts of what they consider quality. They follow an educational philosophy inspired in neoliberal economic concepts, habits and values [19]. This concern for quality in intercultural education is not new, diverse authors [20-22] have made proposals in this regard. Schmelkes (2013) reinforces these ideas by saying that "school asymmetry is fought by offering quality education to indigenous people at all educational levels, from preschool to university" (2013: 7). This influence of entrepreneurial productive systems in education has been analyzed in diverse papers [23-25]. Elements such as teamwork, efficiency, accountability, quality, competence, competitiveness, processes, procedures, optimization, reduction of costs, among others, have become common within the institutions. They seek compliance with the standards, their concern is the certification of study programs and all aspects of university life. They follow economic and efficiency precepts and other proposals of Toyotist influences. These teachers maintain a political capital that comes from the impulse of national and international policies and specifically of political actors who have wanted to establish Toyota and economist elements in education; on the other hand, they maintain a cultural and academic capital in terms of the knowledge acquired either due to the careers they studied at conventional universities or the courses they have taken in this regard. The pedagogical teachers have as a priority to manage a pedagogy for the Institution, like Peiro and Merma think that 'for an effective intervention, in the classroom and in the center, it is

important that the teacher is clear, first of all, the pedagogical model, or the pedagogical theory, on which he will base his intervention' (2012: 130). In the current reality, this is not the case, since the pedagogical disorder is evident despite the standardization efforts. Pedagogizer professors are focused on teaching as a key construct to solve educational problems. Through the curricular design, the development of plans and programs of study, the establishment of contents and the determination of the teachers' and students' activities, they seek to control pedagogical processes. The impulse to the application of tests, professor evaluations and the establishment of teaching-learning processes are the priority for this group. They have an academic cultural capital linked to pedagogy and education and their political capital arises when the institution determines the need to redesign study plans and programs. Outside of these periods, any discussion of a pedagogical nature is left to second or third level of importance. The legalists are mainly lawyers who think the solution to all of the university problems and indigenism already exists on the Mexican legislation, and that it's only a matter of locating the juridical "thesis" to solve the problems that appear. Any university action has to be observed by law, which is why they impulse the development of an exhaustive normativity, which would encompass all aspects to be able to act according to the principles of law, even when these are unfair and don't favor indigenous causes. The group of legislators have a cultural and academic capital of relevance in the institution, and a social and political capital that comes mainly because they belong to Bar Associations that seek that their members have better positions in the Institutions. These three subgroups of standardizers are in contrast to the founders in the sense that they don't accept the original educational model, given that it doesn't establish quality standards, it contradicts national educational laws and it doesn't follow conventional pedagogy; they try to impulse a university model promoted by the Sub secretary of Higher Education. For them, the indigenous situation always comes second and it may even have no importance, given that what the State wants to do with indigenous peoples and communities is already stipulated in laws and the role of the institution is reduced only to the application.

### **Indigenous - Yoreme Mayo Group**

In the Latin American context and particularly in Mexico, since the seventies and even before the Intercultural Universities began, education pertinent to the contexts of native peoples was demanded by indigenous organizations [26]. However, in the case of the UAIM, the professors of the Yoreme Mayo ethnic group are a minority and have not been found in the institutional decision-making bodies; They have been joining the UAIM mainly to attend the subject "mother tongue" required by the federal government. They ascribe to the Yoreme Mayo ethnic group and they mostly have studies related to education in general and indigenous education. This is a marginal group, which historically has had less compensation than other professors, but they remain in the struggle to claim their culture within the institution. When the University started, they hired two Yoreme Mayo professors and three with the Pubtexto Publishers | [www.pubtexto.com](http://www.pubtexto.com)

category of "competent facilitators", the latter were recognized by their knowledge in the language and culture, but they did not have any university degrees. Eventually, with the coming of intercultural policies and the establishment of the yoremnokki language, their mother language, they hired more than 10 associate professors who have tried to explain their culture to the rest of the university, they teach some expressions in their mother tongue and show the dances and rituals in the festivities. One of the relevant aspects of this group has been the formation of a collegiate group that has standardized its language. The capital of these teachers is cultural due to the knowledge of their culture and that the Institution needs and uses to justify itself; they have little political capital since political actors and operators give them little relevance since, on the one hand, racist behavior persists and, on the other, they represent very few votes in electoral contests. Indigenous organizations, such as the Supreme Council of Kobanaros and traditional indigenous Governors of the State of Sinaloa, represent for indigenous teachers a social capital with little political force within the Institution. The claim of the Yoreme professors has provoked several protests and demonstrations, their demands have been: 1) Greater participation of indigenous personnel, 2) the right to occupy higher-level positions and 3) fair salaries comparable to those of the teachers who they are not Yoreme. They justify their claims due to the fact that it is an indigenous university and that the operating budget is indigenous. All the Rectory administrations have been non-indigenous and have given the Yoreme Mayo a folkloric value since the interest has been to please the distinguished visitors and justify the institutional indigenous character. The Yoreme professors' claim has created several protests, manifestations that have taken the institution on more than five occasions; their demands have been: 1) A larger participation of indigenous personnel, 2) the right to occupy higher level positions and 3) Fair and equitable salaries, as compared to professors who are not Yoreme. They justify their claims by the fact that it is an indigenous university and that the operative budget is for indigenous people, especially the one the institution started with. All of the Rector administrations, which have never been indigenous, have given a more folkloric value to Yoreme people, given that the interest has been to focus on distinguished university visitors and to justify the indigenous character of the institution. After 20 years of institutional life, the Yoreme Mayo group presented two candidates in 2021 to be Rector, which polarized the university community in two groups: the ones who think it is necessary to have an indigenous Rector and the ones who still follow non-indigenous interests in a university that was created for the indigenous. Finally won one of the members (non indigenous) of the political group.

### **Intercultural Group**

It would seem that after the institution was recognized as one of the Intercultural Universities in 2006, we would find that all of the professors declared themselves intercultural, and that is not the case. Even when most of them say they are, in reality, very few of them defend this position. In the intercultural group, there are two

subgroups a) the naive interculturalists and b) the interculturalists of power. The former are professors who promote and live interculturality observing and maintaining harmonic relationships with ethnic diversity, mainly from students, they value the folkloric aspects of cultural manifestations, without questioning the structural dominion over indigenous people. They try to promote good treatment and to avoid any kind of violence and discrimination. For them, interculturality is an emotional concept of spiritual and aesthetic beauty. "it's something very beautiful", say many of them. These professors have important social and political capital since they rely on government programs on intercultural education, and over time they have acquired sufficient theoretical indoctrination to show sufficient specific cultural capital to defend their position. The interculturalists of power is the group of teachers and officials who possess political capital emanating from the federal government, they privilege miscegenation as an icon of interculturality; the supposed indigenous background, ideal in many cases, justifies not only their stay at the institution, but also their exercise of power. They manifest a folkloric appreciation for the Yoreme Mayo group but they don't give them positions of power. In some cases, they deny them, because they think they are not or should not be a reality, given that they have integrated in the dominant non-indigenous society. They impulse elements of intercultural education but they regard it as a kind of political flag, of the identity of the institution and a strategy to get economic resources. This group impulses the avoidance of conflicts as a policy, which present with the indigenous struggle, they try to limit their participation in the education in the institutional framework without participating in the protests that the Yoreme have in relation with the violation of their rights. Meaning that, the group of interculturalists works with indigenous students, but shuns the groups that clash against the government. It is a group that has been subscribed to the policies of the General Coordination of Intercultural and Bilingual Education and it tries to follow their philosophy and instructions to the letter; meaning, they have aligned to governmental interculturality, which is top down, because they have power to make choices within the institution. Also, even when they approach the critical intercultural proposals, where they grant a greater value and empowerment to the indigenous person, in the practice, they adopt and adapt according to the convenience of the dominance of the non-indigenous that is considered universal, without an ethnic group with an apparent stance of intercultural "neutrality". It is a group that has subscribed to the policies of the federal government and tries to follow its philosophy and instructions to the letter; In other words, it has aligned itself with the vertical governmental interculturality from top to bottom, which is why it has had power in decision-making within the Institution. In addition, even when they show their approach to critical intercultural proposals and in which a greater indigenous value and empowerment is granted, in practice they adopt and adapt them according to the conveniences of the domain of the non-indigenous that is considered universal, without ethnicity. This group accomplished its maximum expression when the institution changed its name and orientation

during the period from 2016 to 2019 temporarily becoming Intercultural Autonomous University of Sinaloa [27]; however, the defense of the indigenous group and some non-indigenous associate professors, accomplished the reversal of this choice, at least recovering the original name of the institution; but even when the term "indigenous" prevailed, the legislation proves to be markedly interculturalist.

### **Religious Group**

It is a group of (non-indigenous) professors who have gathered according to their christian faith, who take advantage of spaces to introduce religious elements in their communications. Given that most of the professors have a christian faith, they openly send messages that serve to unite and to strengthen their faith. Even when, in Mexico, the principle of secularity in education is supposed to be followed, this group at UAIM proposes religion as an important part of the interculturality they claim. For them, the institution is a space where different and even conflicting ways of thought must coexist peacefully, but without modifying the established status of oppressors and oppressed. Religious professors, the ones who ascribe and profess the Christian faith with some intensity, are frequently found in the institution or in some of the churches, mainly of Los Mochis, Sinaloa. We have observed the manifest presence of this group of religious professors who, through their religious message, present themselves as "reliable" people, because they are supposed to have a similar moral basis, as well as looking for some sort of distinction and certain protection as a group. Since the birth of the institution, the founder and first Rector of UAIM had encouraged the presence of religious imagery, which he considered elements of the cultures of both members of non-indigenous communities and the Yoreme Mayo, who present syncretism of catholic religion with their ancient religion. In this way, there were religious images of Saint Gerome, patron of Mochicahui, the place where the institution started, but at the same time, in the arbors to be used as indigenous ceremonial centers. The people with the most affinity and religious ascription have had ups and downs within the institutions, but in some periods, where the structure of the church has had power in governmental circles, former priests, former nuns and religious leaders have had key positions at UAIM. In the last Rector period, the Rector openly manifested her catholic religion and used the WhatsApp space to send this kind of messages. The group of religious professors immediately repel the incursion of people that have ideas that are contrary to their faith. They maintain a (non-indigenous) social, political and cultural capital supported mainly by their professions. In general, the group of religious professors operate along all levels watching that the ideas don't clash with the Christian ideology and ethical and religious principals, and they definitely have had a certain influence in the conformation and application of plans and programs of study and in the general curricula at UAIM.

### **Group of Researchers**

It is a group of professors that have promoted the development of

the graduate studies and research within the university. They have developed these activities outside of their regular working schedule, given that, by april 2021, 13 of the 22 doctors of the institution, accomplished the grant of belonging to the National System of Researchers. Most of the research activities that are performed by these professors obey the evaluation criteria of National Council for Science and Technology (known in Spanish as CONACYT); they seek to fill the requisites whether in the university or in other institutions, in case they can't provide the means. This group has different cultural capitals since it is generally made up of professors from two areas, those of the social disciplines and those of the biological sciences, who in stages have presented struggles for the predominance of their epistemological precepts and the prioritization of their lines of investigation. In 2020 they have been able to constitute themselves in the postdoctoral group to which the professors who are or have been members of the National System of Researchers belong. It distinguishes them from the rest of the teachers, but makes them subject to severe criticism. Despite the fact that research is one of the activities that all the institution's officials have mentioned in the different rector administrations, it is not understood or viewed well by most of the professors, that are observed diminished in their cultural capital. Professors who do not carry out research present various annoyances, because they think that the status and resources obtained due to this activity are discriminatory, firstly because of the different trajectories they may have developed: tasks such as community work, greater accompaniment to students. Students, political and union leadership, among others, involved similar efforts with different compensation; second, because there is competition for the level of knowledge between researchers and other professors, since they consider that in many cases the latter are not better teachers. In addition, many professors think that postgraduate courses are activities of personal interest to decorate CVs and that they become factors that promote personal egos and theater; When professors have studied postgraduate studies, the investment made by the institution is questioned, especially if they are totally or partially discharged. The research of those who carry it out is questioned because they do not observe the impact compared to the great researchers in the world. They think that what is being investigated is not relevant and that the academic peers of other institutions only know the results and in concrete terms, they leave nothing to the University. In fact, at the beginning of 2021, the representation of the postgraduate programs in the H. University Council of the Institution was denied, since these programs were observed as additional, but not essential for university life; It is thought that the purpose of the university is to address indigenous and low-income students who arrive at the institution from high school and that all resources should be focused on this.

### **Political Group**

It is the group of professors who develop political activities both inside and outside the institution; inside they work as elements that make up the social network to guide the opinion of the rest of the

Pubtexto Publishers | [www.pubtexto.com](http://www.pubtexto.com)

professors and get the approval and vote that favors them. They are attentive to the movements of the main academic and political leaders within the institution and of the different collective bodies that the institution has formally and informally developed. They establish a network of followers in each of the academies, seek the rapprochement of student leaders, the leadership of the main union positions and the alignment of the representatives of the University Council. At the same time, they seek to belong to groups that allow them to exert pressure or achieve particular objectives, such as the group of "founders" constituted by the first professors who had to start in the Institution and who mainly sought defense against the political attacks of the officials who were entering later, in addition to fighting against the aspects that seemed unfair on the part of the Rector administrations. It is a group that has promoted or led protests in different historical moments of the Institution to demand their rights and have raised their protests at the state and national level on various occasions. In these activities, they have also developed an approach with the state and national political class to obtain benefits for their group and in general for the institution; in addition to obtaining the pertinent endorsements to occupy better positions within the institution. Despite being a group that in general is not constituted by professors with high academic recognition, work with the grassroots has been fundamental to obtain recognition and legitimacy. In order to operate within the institution, they have developed the conformation of a series of messages that are taken as true and that they repeat continuously to discredit and harm their political opponents until they achieve it. For example, before the 2021 elections, they worked to discredit graduate professors, generating a negative image of them before the rest of the professors; all this with the aim of securing votes for a candidate and minimizing the risk of obtaining the position of Rector. This group is intensive in political capital that comes both from within the institution and from abroad and almost all activities are focused on further developing their strength and having the best position in the Institution from the Rectory.

### **Absences**

It should be noted that in the institution there are no left-wing groups, although some professor or official has expressed some ideas based on the precepts of Marx, in practice their proposals try to develop productive projects and community development. All professors tend to be conservative. Neither have there been any shock groups that demonstrate in favor of indigenous movements or struggles of marginalized groups, the takeovers and marches that have been carried out have been due to specific demands concerning the internal situation of the University and no causes that may annoy the governments in turn, have been supported mainly due to fear of having difficulties obtaining the budget.

### **Conclusion**

The seven groups of professors, founders, standardizers, indigenous Yoreme Mayo, intercultural, religious, researchers and politicians have presented permanent struggles in the Institution

that generate predictable plots regarding the positions that each one will take. The UAIM is then presented not as an institution of single and articulated thought, nor do the professors unconditionally adhere to the imposition of the federal government's intercultural policies. That is why it is constantly boiling away from any context of peace. As mentioned at the beginning, the groups have never been mutually exclusive and have changed over time. Within the group of founders there have been members who have been assigned to interculturality and to the different subgroups of standardizers; in the intercultural group there are promoters of standardization and some indigenous people; in researchers there are founders and standardizers. While in the political and religious groups there are adherents of all groups. The groups with the greatest power are the political and intercultural groups. The first has always borne fruit due to the support they receive from government operators at different levels of government, they print a political dynamic within the institution, but their lack of academic vocation and their interests away from those of indigenous educational needs always give the image of an inefficient institution in meeting its apparent objectives. The intercultural group was solidified thanks to the impulse of the General Coordination of Intercultural and Bilingual Education and its position remains latent since many of its followers are in the University Council where policies that favor them are issued. These two groups polarized the institution by opposing the indigenous group in the Rector Election process in early 2021. The result was obvious if the inertia of the group dynamics were followed. The political group won the minority groups are the indigenous group and the research group, they survive due to the support of national policies that justify their existence. Of the indigenous group, the institution has maintained them to justify the profile of the institution, but the notable decrease in both ethnic diversity and the number of indigenous students to less than 10% of the total enrollment in 2018-2019 is a reflection of the de-indianization of the institution [28-34]. The group of researchers was formed and solidified due to the institutional aspiration to have postgraduate programs in the National Quality Postgraduate Program of CONACYT; but in the opinion of the rest of the professors, researchers are like "a necessary evil". In fact, the social capital outside of the institution of the groups is different, because, while indigenous professors have the support of the Yoreme Mayo population as a minority group and with low political power, the researchers' group maintains a network with the outside that allows them to have resources in the academic sense, which sometimes, is exchanged with some members of the political group, this last one has its strength because they form a state and national network of political operators who compromise their plans and resources. In fact, the social capital of this group makes the cultural capital seem marginal to the researchers. The religious group has a wider network, but within it, there are also political-religious operators who seek to place members in the institutions, as is the case with UAIM. The founders' group has been losing strength from the outside, given that the main political operators, who started the university, have been disappearing from the political arena. The

standardizers' group maintains and increases its strength because of the orientation of the educational political policies that have been adopting economical elements and of a greater precision in legislation. At the same time, the intercultural group has been having more importance due to the impulse that the Government has given them.

## References

1. Dietz G, Mateos LS. Las universidades interculturales en México, logros y retos de un nuevo subsistema de educación superior. *Estudios sobre las Culturas Contemporáneas*. 2019; 49: 163-190.
2. Palacios AB. Representaciones sociales de grupos culturales diversos: Una estrategia metodológica para su análisis. *Ciências Sociais Unisinos*. 2012; 48: 181-191.
3. Roman TS. Sobre la investigación etnográfica. *Revista de Antropología Social*. 2009; 18: 235-260.
4. Alvarez C. La etnografía como modelo de investigación en educación. *Gazeta de Antropología*. 2008; 24: 1-15.
5. Scott JC. *Los dominados y el arte de la resistencia*. México: ERA; 2000.
6. Bourdieu P. *La reproducción. Elementos para una teoría del sistema de enseñanza*. México: Fontamara; 1996.
7. Gayo M. La teoría Del capital cultural y la participación cultural de los jóvenes. El caso chileno como ejemplo. *Última Decada*; 2013; 38: 141-171.
8. Martínez N, Gutiérrez, DC. Prácticas y significados de la apropiación de capital académico en los profesores de la Universidad de Sonora. *IE Revista de Investigación Educativa de la REDIECH*. 2020; 11: 1-19.
9. Chihu A. Los marcos de la experiencia. *Sociológica*. 2018; 93: 87-117.
10. McFarland D. Student Resistance: How the Formal and Informal Organization of Classrooms Facilitate Everyday Forms of Student Defiance. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2001; 107: 612-678.
11. Barragán DM. La construcción de los otros. Los grupos sociales en los escritos de las elites colombianas en la segunda mitad del siglo XIX. *Procesos Históricas*, 2016; 30: 38-58.
12. McFarland D. Resistance as a Social Drama: A Study of Change – Oriented Encounters, *American Journal of Sociology*. 2004; 6: 1249-1318.
13. Alcántara M. La carrera política y el capital político. *Convergencia*. 2017; 73: 1-17.
14. Bianciotti MC, Ortecho M. La noción de performance y su potencialidad epistemológica en el hacer científico social contemporáneo. *Tabula Rasa*, 2013; 19: 119-137.
15. Mendoza MM. Performance y drama social: la representación de la Batalla del 5 de mayo en una localidad mexicana. *Convergencia, Revista de Ciencias Sociales*. 2010; 54: 93-110.
16. Ochoa JA, Valdez MJ, Galaviz H, Guerra-García, E. *Mochichahui, nuevas fronteras*. UAIM. México: UAIM; 2000.
17. Guerra-García E, Sandoval Forero, Lopez Torres, ER. Crítica del primer rector de la Universidad Autónoma Indígena de México a la interculturalidad. *Revista Latinoamericana de Educación y Estudios Interculturales*. 2021; 5: 31-44.
18. Guerra-García E. *La Universidad Autónoma Indígena de México en sus inicios. Surgimiento, primera rectoría, currículum y modelo educativo inicial*. México: INAPI; 2016.

19. Gonzalez LA. Tendencias de las políticas educativas en Centroamerica. *América Latina en Movimiento*. Dec 11, 2017.
20. Ascencio G. Educación intercultural. Escuela con calidad y equidad? *Revista Pueblos y Fronteras Digital*. 2011; 12: 2-4.
21. Viveros-Marquez J, Moreno-Olivos T. El enfoque intercultural bilingüe y su impacto en la calidad de la educación indígena: estudio de caso. *Ra Ximhai*. 2014; 10: 55-73.
22. Soriano E. Planteamiento intercultural del currículum para su calidad educativa REICE. *Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*. 2012; 10: 49-62.
23. Reta VE. Las Formas de Organización del Trabajo y su incidencia en el campo educativo. *Fundamentos en Humanidades*. 2009; 10: 119-137.
24. Montero A. Educación, economía y mercado: crónica de una difícil relación. *Educación*. 2006; 21: 17-34.
25. Minana C, Rodríguez J. G. La educación en el contexto neoliberal. *Universidad Nacional de Colombia*. Apr 30, 2002.
26. Olivera I, Dietz, G. Educación superior y pueblos indígenas: marcos nacionales para contextualizar. *Anthropologica del Departamento de Ciencias Sociales*. 2017;35: 7-39.
27. Periódico Oficial del Estado de Sinaloa Ley orgánica de la Universidad Autónoma Intercultural de Sinaloa. Ago 29, 2016.
28. Guerra-Garcia E, Viramontes-Olivas O, Macarena-Padilla M. La iniquidad territorial en la matrícula de la Universidad Autónoma Indígena de México (UAIM) y las comunidades yoreme mayo. In Fernández JA, Ortiz C, Coords. *Los Pueblos Indígenas en Sinaloa. Migración, interculturalidad y saberes tradicionales*. México: UAIM & Astra; 2021:101-150.
29. Garduno M, Pavon S. Los grupos humanos y la identidad social en el zoológico Zacango. *El Periplo Sustentable*. 2006; 11: 47-68.
30. Gonzalez R. Capital social: una revisión introductoria a sus principales conceptos. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Niñez y Juventud*. 2009; 7: 1731-1747.
31. Peiro S, Merma, G. La interculturalidad en la educación. situación y fundamentos de la educación intercultural basada en valores. *Barataria. Revista Castellano-Manchega de ciencias sociales*. 2012; 13: 127-139.
32. Restrepo E. El proceso de investigación etnográfica: Consideraciones éticas. *Etnografías Contemporáneas*. 2015 1: 162-179.
33. Schmelkes S. Educación para un México intercultural. *Revista Electrónica Sinectica*. 2013; 40: 1-12.
34. Zalpa, G. El Habitus: propuesta metodológica. *Estudios sobre las Culturas Contemporáneas*. 2019; 14: 43-59.