The Symbols of Group Control from their Logics of Action in the Institutional Context

Florentino Silva Becerra

Departamento de estudios en Educación, Universidad de Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico

ABSTRACT

This research seeks to explain how secondary school teachers integrate their groupness from the institutional framework of group composition, where their articulated actions as a regulating space of the organizational habitus where they establish intersubjective links to institute a social order in the school. A qualitative approach is pursued with a descriptive analytical ethnographic conduction to integrate the intersubjective links of the school organization. The information is collected through unstructured techniques by means of participant observation and interview as an approach to the interactions between teachers that constitute their *institutional habitus*. It is assumed that this theoretical sequence allows establishing as a premise that every subject, being a subject, has a relationship of influence in social interaction and that this is built symbolically as a human condition, because it appropriates its identity through dependence and retains a power that ensures its preservation, constituting an organizational underworld, which, accessed through micropolitics, establishes the institutional in a scenario where the actors develop their political skills and appropriate it from the group, constituting its space of the group, where the school is configured to legitimize its organizational vision. As a conclusive argument, it is established that the group appears as a field undermined by the interactions, intertwining and positioning of its group constitution in a real and possible scenario where the exercise of the regulatory role of school life is developed.

Keywords: group space; groupality; organizational habitus; institutionalism; micropolitics.

In this interaction with the groups of interest it is established as a premise that every subject, being a subject, has a relationship of influence and, therefore, this is understood in its joint action in a shared world, as a condition of its existence in the social interaction that is built symbolically.

So, starting from this vision as a human condition that, as a subject bound by the interaction of power relations, "invading life entirely" (Foucault, 1986, p. 169), hence it is annexed to another by the control and subordination exercised over him.

In these relationships produced by human actions through dependence subject to a power that ensures its preservation giving rise to a relationship of influence that generates what Foucault (1986) calls biopower, where regulates the social life of the subject that is immersed producing an order , a norm, and a social conduct.

In these constituents of the institutionalism of the school where the structuring of its unity is developed, through its identity composed by a surface of coexistence; a context of relationships where confrontation is not appreciated, but a world configured of correspondences of one with the others; a school organization that has institutional sense, a site where the discourses that contend in a dimension to maintain a conclusive organizational dynamics from which an order that is under siege is derived, where power emerges as a substance or ideality; a non-linear disposition from which a struggle for control emerges, because it is a matter of accounting for those interactive, conflictive, strategic and ideological aspects of organizational life; under the expression of "micropolitics" that incorporates issues related to school conflicts, where an organizational underworld context is constituted, which gives shape to institutionality giving germination to the shadow side of school life.

It is in this scenario where school micropolitics is established in the institutional; a field of interactions and intertwining of the individual, from where the events that establish identity arise, events and shared occurrences among subjects who champion created benefits; access and control of resources, leading ideological interests (Ball,1987,1990), interests exposed in collegiate discourses for teaching and learning constituting themselves in debates in defense of their organizational forms , and it is from this logic that their institutionalized symbolic organization is constituted.

As a consequence, these processes that create institutionalism give existence to the school culture that derives from the educational policies from which the practices of the members of the collective are derived: the way of teaching, the relationship with parents, with students, with teachers and with school management, among others; elements that constitute institutionalism.

In this nature of the institutional, a convenient culture is born, originated in a scene where the actors develop their political skills and appropriate themselves by resignifying their organizational space within their collective practices, that is to say, an adjudication that gives birth to groupality, giving life to an *institutional habitus*.

In this restructuring of the school culture constituted by surveillance and social control; in this sense Foucault (2005), states that these center the institution through a series of devices that act as catalysts that strengthen the institutional organization and, in this ratification, the school is configured as a socializing instance where interest groups are incubated; currents of thought that develop according to the different actions that make up a disciplinary society such as the school, giving life to a confronted interaction between the instituted and the instituting, that is to say, what is and what is wanted to be.

For this reason, the search for power turns them into subjects of the group, where their *habitus* is constituted in a space "subjected by the other, by control and dependence" (Foucault, 1986, p. 31).

A culture in which conflict forms an experience that gives representation to different interests; utilities that seek to maintain a thought that confronts the other, giving rise to conflict and with it the evolution of the logics of action in the institutional space, and consequently the creation of subcultures that try to impose themselves on each other; where those closest to the dominant culture absorb the weaker ones. In this way, the institutional condition starts from the relationship that has as a circumstance with the State from which the relationships between professors are derived.

The objective of this institutional condition is: to explain how the teachers of a secondary school integrate groupness from the institutional framework of their group composition integrating themselves through their logics of action articulating their identity as a regulating space of the organizational habitus establishing the intersubjective links to institute a social order in the school.

In the space that gives rise to the birth of the logics of action (Hoyle, 1986), as strategies that support their thinking and thus strengthen their power in the organization of institutional actions, it addresses the institutional life from which micropolitics derives as the space that harnesses but also obscures the life of schools, where individualisms appear that give birth to imaginative positionings that legitimize their organizational vision to promote their interests becoming a "product of common sense, values and norms that correspond to the interests of the political class in power and to the legitimizing function of the school" (Martínez, 2006, p. 12). 12).

In this condition, it is asked: How are the group's logics of action articulated from the institutional framework to generate groupality? What are the elements that from the institutional framework are linked to groupality in the institutional framework? What is the reason for the relational mechanisms established between interest groups that give meaning to groupality?

In this circumstance of institutionalism is the school integrated by a set of images and representations produced by each subject that gives tonality to their relationships; then power in the organization is acquired when a subject or a group of subjects have the ability to make their point of view or approach predominate in the institutional existence.

Consequently, the birth of micropolitics that is born in the group from ideological positionings is defined with its own characteristics depending on the institutionality of where the relationships between the different groups and individuals develop, which logically "can be produced at any level of the organization" (Blase, 1991, p. 11).

Because, schools control their members and are professional communities (Collins,et al. 1979), where they elaborate their own rules of interaction, from which different symbols of control are derived according to the whole web of interests that each school shapes from its organization, i.e. what Bacharach and Mundell (1993) call "*logics of action*" that integrate an inseparable scheme of ideas, beliefs and positions in the face of the different situations that arise in the organization, and that the structure of the school reproduces in its diversity of limits, due to the relative autonomy it possesses.

Then, in the group, the institutional is cultivated; its own way of being and doing, because the events are crossed by subjectivities that, when connected by the logics of action, become social intersubjectivities that permeate the school, constituting the institutional, which approaches a dialectical approach in a molding of a paradigm of complexity.

Then, in the institutionalism, groupness is presented as a field undermined by the interactions and intertwining of individual and group positions, where the social gives rise to the emergence of shared events and processes among subjects who pursue common goals, and that manifest themselves in the mediation of their practices product of their shared elements that define the school culture (Atkinson, 2011), in this way groupness emerges, that linking of some with others, subject to a network of identifications that function and give meaning to the psychic apparatus (Freud, 1984), in this linkage of use with others according to Kaës (2000) integrates a soul work from where the intersubjective links both group and individual, and thus the group forms a device of another level as is the groupality that starts from the relations of the self with the other and, therefore, this would have an unconscious quality.

In this conceptual framework, it is possible to ask: How are inter-subjective links integrated in the school? Why does groupality have an unconscious quality?

To say that the school space is institutional, because in it teachers not only occupy it, but also develop in the generation of its power dynamics through its appropriation; an existential habitus.

And in this relationship these connections between subjects who live involuntarily are integrated, because from this joint relationship the teacher finds in his actions a shared world for the development of his critical judgment, a circumstance for his objectivity with the others who are symbolically constructed. And, in this approach to school organization, it is impossible to elucidate the school without delving into culture because it "shapes the thinking of its agents" (Kaës, et al., 1989, p. 89), a system of values and norms of thought and action that is interwoven and reconstructed, where certain rules materialize in a world of meanings that evidence a series of power practices sustained in their "effective autonomy of the forms and subjective means of signification" (Johnson, 2004, p. 42).

Thus, in the world of social reality where the "production of culture", which manifests itself in discourse; a complex emphasis on the understanding of power and politics from considering as a basis a world or social reality that is constructed in a textual or discursive way.

Therefore, this *organizational habitus* leads to the question: How is micro-politics intertwined with institutionality? How do power groups build institutionality?

In this regard, Farfan (2009) says that social action in its interpretation incorporates the motivations and purposes of the group, as well as its relational mechanisms that generate the symbols that make possible the reproduction of intersubjective action, i.e. the shared meanings that the actors exercise in their relational practices that are jointly enriched, and as a consequence operate their organizational habits, resulting in a symbolic construction and, in it is found the production of meaning that guides them in their reciprocal process.

In these shared objects produced by the group are constructed in their conscience, deriving a meaning that is found in the relationship of the actors, where the meaning is constituted that integrates their thinking that offers a perspective of justification and validation of the "other" allowing an interpersonal synchrony that is expressed in school life; social relations, from which a network of perceptions of reality is woven that permeates the school organization from where the sense-producing elements of groupality are derived.

METHODOLOGY

This work approaches a qualitative, non-linear methodology, seeks to understand from the frame of reference of those who act and to describe and analyze ideas, beliefs, meanings, knowledge and practices within the framework of the school's institutionality, from the inside; emphasizing the subjectivity of the selectively selected participants, therefore, the design of the study tends to evolve throughout the project.

It is an ethnographic study, of a descriptive analytical nature that seeks to integrate the intersubjectivity expressed in the subjects. All of which is constructed *intersubjectively*, that is, in relation to others. It is precisely from intersubjectivity that subjectivity is constructed in the links of the school organization, which make up the institutionality, and which gives rise to the approach on groupality, where micropolitics is incubated, implying a dense description to obtain the meanings of the group in its own environment to interpret human behaviors from the perspectives of its members that led to build categories in a manual- interpretative way.

Participant observation and interview are approached as a practice within the school context, a public high school, where interactions between teachers are carried out and studied in relation to their micropolitical action logics, to collect their beliefs, interests, values and symbols that constitute the school institutionality.

Teachers of public secondary schools in a total of 85, which constitute an approach to a part of the reality dependent on a sample of voluntary participants in their *institutional habitus,* where events and shared occurrences arise between subjects who pursue common goals, and which incorporate issues related to school conflicts configured the correspondences of one with the other to give meaning to their organization heading ideological interests, where the practices of the members of the collective constituted in the school culture are derived; the way of teaching, the relationship with parents, with students, among teachers, school management, among others; practices that give life to a context in a daily life that constitute a whole condition that is imposed on the subjects.

The ethical principles and values that guide this work are supported by the Code of Ethics of the University of Guadalajara approved, with the Opinion No. IV/2018/117 by the University General Council; such as honesty in which the collection, use and conservation of the data, as well as in the analysis and communication of the results, in which the responsibility that the researcher exercises with the authorization and personal acceptance of the key informants, generates the development of the "participation" of the researcher, emphasizing his experience, establishing his objective by being "inside" the groups to accentuate the deepening in the understanding of the meanings that animate the elaboration of this project in the exercise of the substantive activity as a researcher (SNII) in the university that sponsors the registration and financing of this research project.

Theoretical framework

In order to try to explain this plot, we start from the establishment of the group's logics of action in an institutional framework where the interaction forged through micropolitics and as a consequence of this becomes groupality, tissues that structure the organization of the school that are built symbolically, considering the other and in interaction with the other (Schutz and Luckmann, 1973).

In this same sense, Foucault (2005), states that these center the institution through a series of devices that act as catalysts that strengthen the organization and structure it as an institution and, in this, the school structure is configured, giving it the nuance of a socializing institution. The interactions within the school context are constituted in debates, dialogues, coalitions and structuring of power groups that give life to micropolitics,

which since the 70's in authors such as Iannacone (1975) in the analysis of the interactions of teachers, principals and students, are established as an object of study in a space where the interactions of teachers in the school, mark the site where the sense of production of the organization is concentrated and as a result of this social construction the term micropolitics in education is coined.

It is from the identification of this object of study in schools that Hoyle (1986) raises in his elucidations where politics is the dark side of the organizational life of schools since interactions give existence to cliques; voices that surround the context; expressions that emerge in search of a dialogue that manifests their collective voice, where the hidden interests that are the structure that generates the pedagogical theory of the school are externalized.

In this sense, the works of Bacharach, S. and Lawler, E. (1982) are considered the classics within this perspective, pointing out the presence of power in the school, through the groups that dispute the organization, contributing to this perspective the essence of micropolitics constituted in the logics of action of the interest groups.

With this perspective Ball (1989), already concretizes it in his work "the micropolitics of the school" and one of his theoretical approaches is what he calls "Science of Organization" (p. 25), a clearer vision conceptually developing micropolitics; pointing out the nature of conflict in the school organization, giving it the classification of "fields of struggle", composed of conflicts among its members and, therefore, to understand schools and explain their nature, the presence of the groups and subgroups that compose it must be studied.

In this regard, Fernandez (1992) says that in this conflictive nature there is "direct negotiation with the other strata" (p. 89), negotiation that generates its own context and makes the difference in each school, giving it a distinction that gives it a place in its performance.

Santos Guerra (2020) emphasizes that the school is an unpredictable organization, unique, full of values and full of uncertainty" (p.97), i.e., one never knows what can happen in it among its members, this is a space of ghosts that tend to give the organizational status.

In this perspective on theoretical construction, González (1990) calls micropolitics "the critical theory of education" because the interactions generated in the school are the basis of its transformation; its school practices, its values define the institutional structures from a framework of group action.

Why, this leads to collective awareness aimed at detecting "the contradictions implicit in organizational life and to discover the forms of false consciousness that distort the meaning of existing organizational and social conditions" (p. 123).

In this search for school organization Blase (1991), one of the most significant researchers in the study of micropolitics, emphasizes that this refers to the use of "formal and informal power by both individuals and groups "to achieve their own goals and aims in a school organization" (p. 11).

Power takes its place in the context of school micropolitics, in this regard Anderson (1995) addresses power as: who has it, who wants it and for what purposes, and how it is used to achieve individual and group goals, i.e. a power enclosed in the school context.

In this regard, Bardisa (1993; 1995), points to the internal struggles in schools caused by external pressures that demand quality and these generate the articulated union of their structures and with this the state of school turbulence.

In this space of ideas about the power exercised in schools as a site that gives rise to diverse interactions and with the intention of manifesting itself, Willower (1991) addresses this context, such as power, control, ideologies, interests, conflict, coalitions and negotiation, proposing in this sense to start from the interests of teachers, because power plays multiple interests and values, where complex forms of domination are developed..., "influencing micropolitics" (Guerra, 2000, p.227).

In this same sense, Malen (1995) in his review of the state of micropolitics insists on the debate about politics in its macro and micro spheres, affirming that it is an unresolved issue, stressing that micropolitics has been especially concerned with what happens within organizations, leaving aside the interaction of organizations in their context.

Lindle (1999) contributes by affirming that the focus of micropolitics is inherent to the processes that are lived in schools" (p.176) and in the same tone Guerra (1992, 2000), emphasizes that the subway conflicts that the school lives "are far from being peaceful places, without tensions of any kind" (p. 184), from here the elucidation that the school can be seen and studied as a political entity.

According to Bacharach and Mundell (1993) micropolitics is developed in school, but it is not a matter of contexts, because micropolitics is not defined by the context in which it is produced, but rather by its nature (p. 432), therefore, the object of this point is the analysis of the treatment of conflict where "people or social groups that seek or perceive opposing goals, affirm antagonistic values or have divergent interests" (Jares, 1991, p. 108), from here it is distinguished that the school can be seen and studied as a political entity. 108), from here it is distinguished that the conditions of the school offer this type of interaction since it is its nature that creates the *habitus* of debates and discussions that play in an environment; the environment for the development of micropolitics.

Thus, micropolitical dynamics configured as logics of action give life to an ideological role in a sociocultural context in which the school is immersed.

In this way, the school is consolidated as a space that "is not an island, but part of the continent" (Brunner,1997,p. 19), in this identification is found the institutional of the interest group that structures its history, its ghosts, its myths, its conception and its representation endowing the context with a style of functioning, that is, a fence of property integrated by dreams that struggle to become projects of the relational subjects, from where "the curriculum and organizational structures" are constituted (Beltrán,1991, p. 225).

In this institutionality the leaders champion their vested benefits, access and control of resources, leading ideological interests (Ball,1987,1990), interests that in the academic collegiality constitute discourses in defense of their organizational forms. And as a result of the struggle for power interwoven by the logics of action that constitute a symbolic organization of the formation of a "power struggle between power groups" (Ball,1987,1990, p. 277).

From this institutional framework where the school is located, where diverse thoughts come together to make use of the logics of action that give firmness to the values and interests that have been established as intersubjective and therefore symbolic ties that shape the institutional; a dialectical approach that gives rise to a complex paradigm since it allows "a non-linear reading of the phenomena that happen there" (Frigerio, G., Poggi, M., and Tiramonti, G. 1992, p.6).

In this context of groupality, which is born of a human condition that, as a subject involved in the interaction of power relations, a field is established, dug by the intertwining of positions of the individual that make up the group, where the emergence of shared events and processes between subjects who pursue common objectives takes place (Frigerio, G., Poggi, M., and Tiramonti, G. 1992, p.6), Poggi, M., and Tiramonti, G., 1992), in this way it is situated in the school trajectory "invading life entirely" (Foucault, 1986, p 169).

In this concordance Bauleo (1997) understands groupality as "indefinition of the limit, emergence of agglutinated forms" (p. 42), i.e. it is not something palpable but something sensitive, something found in the environment, a phenomenon that implies the dissolution of the bond understood as a relational structure. 42), i.e. it is not something palpable but something sensitive, something found in the environment, a phenomenon that implies the dissolution of the bond understood as a relational structure; this constitutes a level of group phenomenon, which functions in permanence in the group building in the complex linkages and unlinkages of the group becoming by the set of reciprocities and unconscious links of the group in the dialectic between internal groups in the spaces of social and institutional intersection.

Therefore, groupality is a group psychic reality produced in the nodes and intersections between the different subjectivities, it is structured in the dialectic moments between groups generating a reciprocal interrelation between the subjective unconscious of the constituent persons of the group in a psychic unit.

Groupality as a discursive reality is the effect of the reciprocity of the discourses produced between the different spheres defined by Bleger (1967), subjective, bonding and group, crossed in turn by institutional, community and social spheres. An effect of the interdiscursivity between the imaginary registers: real and symbolic, and between the thoughts, affections and actions of the members.

Groupality is a discursive field generated in the processes of intersection of the discourses constituted by the needs, passions, fantasies, thoughts, affections, desires, and actions of the subjects that constitute the group (Gómez Esteban, 2024, p.5).

Groupality is a "psychic structure, where the units that compose it dissolve" (p.76), groupality is a certain play of forces showing a certain conflictivity and a certain valence of these forces that consists of the group psyche (Bleger J., 2005, p. 15).

Groupality refers to "the problem of domination understood as the control of resources of some over other groups" (Ayestarán, S., 1993, p.2009), a communication process that gives access to a shared symbolic world; groupality is a movement and a psychic state produced by the group situation, "imaginary and transitory nature" (Balboa, 2006 , p. 87).

In this framework of interaction becomes the institutionalism that represents the order, the norm and a social conduct in which the subject is immersed "absorbing it and rearticulating it" (Hardt and Negri, 2010, p. 25).

Thus, the institutional culture Bernal (2004) points out that the organizational structure of an institution is not the concretion of "a neutral and rational model, but the result of the struggle for control and influence in that institution" (p. 5), from this configuration the institutional framework creates a psychic process, which cultivates the belonging of protection and security and, which develops from the struggles of the internal groups, i.e. "systems of object relations, of complexes and imaginaries, the original fantasies" (Kaës, 2001, p. 75).

In this way, a framework is represented that institutes its routines, its uses of time, its expressions, its rites that compose a whole condition imposed on the subjects (Trilla, 1985). In this institutional culture that develops in a space of coexistence that, in reference to (Dani, 2016), allows the constitution of groupness in a real and possible scenario for the exercise of the teaching role. Because, in this the practices and perceptions of the teaching staff and the shared elements that define the school culture were measured (Atkinson, 2011).

In this way the school gives spirit to its institutional world "symbolic and imaginary systems (Kaës, et al., 1989, p. 92) in a frame of reference for the understanding of everyday situations, guiding and influencing the decisions and activities of all those who act in it (Frigerio, G., Poggi, M., and Tiramonti, G., 1992).

Groupality, giving life to an *institutional habitus* "a current that guides teachers' expectations towards a particular direction" (Diamond et al., 2004, p.76).

In this sense Freud (1984) points out that groupality is the linking of some with others, subject to a network of identifications that function and give meaning to the psychic apparatus and that link the "object relation systems", where "complexes, imaginaries and original fantasies" are found (Kaës, 2001, p. 75).

According to Kaës (2000), the intersubjective links that generate group productions arise from the psychic work, configuring a device that starts from the relations of the self with the other and, therefore, groupality would have an unconscious quality.

And in this relationship, these connections between subjects are integrated in an involuntary way, because in this joint relationship the teacher finds in his actions a shared world for the development of his critical judgment, a circumstance for his objectivity and in this act with the others is symbolically constructed.

Furthermore, in this approach to school organization, the school cannot be elucidated without delving into the culture of how it "shapes the thinking of its agents" (Kaës, et al., 1989, p. 89), a system of values and norms; a system of thought and action that is interwoven and reconstructed in the sphere of institutionality, where certain rules materialize in a world of meanings that evidence a series of power practices sustained in its "effective autonomy of the forms and subjective means of signification" (Johnson, 2004, p. 42).

In this same space, the relational mechanisms of the group make their point of view or focus on institutional existence predominate in order to obtain "recognition, spaces, resources, benefits, privileges, positions, or any other objective they propose" (Frigerio, G., Poggi, M., and Tiramonti, G. 1992, p.23).

In this congruence, Farfan (2009) says that social action in its interpretation that incorporates the motivations and purposes of the group, as well as its relational mechanisms that generate the symbols that enable the reproduction of intersubjective action, i.e. the shared meanings that the actors exercise in their relational practices and that are jointly enriched, and as a consequence operate intersubjectively, resulting in a symbolic construction and, in it is found their production of meaning that is what guides them intersubjectively.

In these shared objects produced by the group are constructed in their conscience, deriving a meaning that is found in the relationship of the actors, where the meaning that integrates their intersubjective thinking that permeates the school organization from where the meaning-producing elements of these school subjects are derived.

These, are integrated as a result of a "power struggle between power groups" (Ball,1987,1990, p. 277), struggles for dominance among teachers, and with the other classes, that is, it is about significant distinctions, which express the differences of condition and position and that, in this way, "tend to the symbolic reduplication of class differences" (Bourdieu, 2011, p.12), where the reproduction of the structure of relations of domination and dependence is developed.

School micropolitics is established in the institutional; a field of interactions with intertwining of the individual, from which events and "events shared among subjects who pursue common learning objectives" (Frigerio, G., Poggi, M., and Tiramonti, G., 1992, p.6) emerge.

In this way they promote their interests becoming "the product of common sense, values and norms that correspond to the interests of the political class in power and to the legitimizing function of the school" (Martínez, 2006, p. 12), so it is inherent to the processes that take place in schools.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This project approaches a qualitative, non-linear methodology, seeks to understand from the frame of reference of those who act and to describe and analyze ideas, beliefs, meanings, knowledge and practices within the institutional framework of the school, from the inside; the reflexivity of the subjectivity of the participants, therefore, the design of the study tends to evolve throughout the research.

Approach

This is an ethnographic study, of a descriptive analytical nature that seeks to integrate the intersubjectivity expressed in the subjects. All of which is constructed *intersubjectively*, that is to say, in relation to others. It is precisely from this that subjectivity is constructed in the links of the school organization, which conforms to give life to the institutional and which gives rise to the approach on micropolitics, where groupality is incubated, implying a dense description to obtain the meanings of the group in its own environment to interpret human behaviors from the perspectives of its members.

Research techniques

Participant observation and interview are approached as a practice within the school context, where interactions between teachers are carried out and studied in relation to their micropolitical action logics, in order to collect their beliefs, interests and values, symbols that constitute the school institutionality.

Participants

Teachers of public secondary schools, which constitute an approach to a part of the reality dependent on a sample of voluntary participants in their *institutional habitus,* from which events and occurrences shared between subjects who pursue common objectives emerge, and which incorporate issues related to school conflicts configuring the correspondences of one with the others to give meaning to their organization heading ideological interests where the practices of the members of the collective constituted in the school culture are derived; the way of teaching, the relationship with parents, with students, among teachers, school management, among others; practices that give life to a school context in a daily life that constitute a whole condition imposed on the subjects.

RESULTS

The internal representation of the group

The group in its interaction has woven a series of relationships that allow it to maintain its representation in such sense Vercauteren, Müller, & Cedillo (2010) that the group has woven its relationships of the group in the "decision making, meeting devices, ways of speaking, traces of group history, circulation of information" (p.15), i.e. a whole institutional scheme that shapes the group in the school, but also "the distribution of functions and the provisions that allow or not to control them; economic actions, their transparency and the analysis of their effects" (Vercauteren, Müller, & Cedillo, 2010, p.15), all these elements have created the conditions that are incorporated into the group project and that allow it to configure a map of relationships within the group.

In these relationships there are connections that form a relationship that unites the participants and that, although there are differences and competition between groups, they maintain ties that identify them and allow them to unite at a key moment.

The connection between groups is surprising since they are configured and reconfigured through their members in different ways:

E1: The groups connect with each other, this person was not there when the evening was over and it was not so noticeable.

The logics of action of the interest groups are aimed at adding members to join identities:

E2: It's against I don't know if it's against the rules or the responsibility that they can't do anything to me.

The logics of action become criteria for evaluating situations:

E1: They see us as those who are in favor of the director.

All the subgroups are interconnected:

E2: The group of quartermasters and the group of secretaries, support staff is on the opposite side.

In this fragmentation, convincing through the school organization is a way to look for members:

E1: Those who are already here convince him.

A struggle for control of the organization's members is manifested in the way of integrating the membership:

E1: Someone new arrives and they take him in.

In these logics, authority appears, because this is part of the institutionalism that is lived in the school:

E2: This side shelters, part of all this is the same authority.

The confrontation between the two groups in the institutional environment allows friction for the power struggle:

E2: If there are two groups, the institutional is running out.

Not following the institutional means the establishment of the school organization and in it is the power that maintains the struggle.

E3: The institutional is not followed (Interview, 4/06/2024). .

The management of the times between the groups is integrated to the group's action logics, the times:

E2: I feel that it is institutional because they respect their schedule(Interview,30/05/2024).

The group also faces fractures, fragmentations that constitute it and that means its weakness:

E2: That part they still tolerate it, they are not imposed on them, the relationship is one of respect they greet and up to there(Interview,30/05/2024).

The marked relationship between the two groups constitutes school institutionality:

E1: Someone told him I did not believe that the school was so damaged

(Interview, 28/05/2024).

A manifestation that is presented within the group framework:

E2: How group representatives behave(Interview,30/05/2024).

To have power you have to approach the power and in this case the institutional power is the one who divides the two groups*:*

E2: He listens to them or they like to talk, the representative is on the side of the director(Interview,30/05/2024).

This allows for the institutional performance where the authority moves between the two interest groups:

E2: It is managed between two spaces one about responsibility and the other about giving them on their side and what they communicate is against us, because they cannot speak everything(Interview,30/05/2024).

It is as a result of the struggle for the control of the majority group that they point out their confrontation:

E3: As a result of the committee they were classified as reds and so they were called reds and as a result of that, and unfortunately they are new people or from the afternoon shift or the teachers that they sent to the bench and some who have their ideals against the normativity (Interview, 4/06/2024).

In contrast, there is a division of thoughts, which leads to a confrontation for the organization:

E2: Here that question has been marked as a result of the election of the new planilla, it is represented by the t-shirt, they are represented by the red shirt(Interview,30/05/2024).

The group establishes its own "*logics of action*" (Bacharach and Mundell, 1993), because they combine identities always aimed at the sum of members, that is, even when it seems that they are bitter enemies as confrontational groups in the context of the institutional, they are interconnected; that is, the group is also a place through which "the ideological is filtered since it is a product and a space permeable to the representations of each individual and to the determinations of the social context in which it is inserted" (Avila, 2001, p. 31). 31).

In this same context, Avila (2001) says that this is the result of an operative place that is erected from the intersubjective link, that is, there is a relationship between the group subjectivities that give birth to the group interconnection, and it is the institutional context that favors it.

According to Fernández (1985) the group has a common objective that manifests itself in a tactical space where group production takes place, via conflict resolution; a space of symbolization that projects a change in a dialectical movement (Pichón Riviere, 1978).

That is to say, a new product or imaginary structure where its own laws of organization are generated, which determines group functioning outside "the will of its members seen as automated individualities" (Avila, M., 2000, p.30).

In this regard, Blase (1994) points out the case of the directors of basic education referring that they have as political strategies of power, to point out praises to attract the complicity of teachers with the goals of those, i.e. they handle symbolisms to give meaning to their power; in this performance of the everyday in the school the exercise of the representative function "reflects, resists, renews power relations" (Rai, 2015, p. 1181).

This is inside the institution, parliaments are constructed that coexist in the conveniences in the ways in which spaces and places are used, as well as "words, scripts and speeches, to exercise representation" (Rai, 2015,p. 1181).

In the same vein Greenfield (1991) examined the basis for the development of a collaborative political culture and these relationships demonstrate the importance of micropolitics in school life. From this web emerge the "*power battles*" Osborne (1989), a complex network of micropolitical interactions (Spaulding, 1994).

Thus, authority appears in these symbolic logics, because it is the one who heads the institutionalism that governs the life of the school, because it mediates the confrontation between groups, allowing or channeling the friction for the power struggle.

Ties that strengthen the institutional

Institutionality is found in the daily actions oriented to the decisions and activities of all those who act in it, a world of "symbolic and imaginary systems" (Kaës, et al., 1989).

Consequently, these processes structure the institutional space where the practices of the members of the collective derive in a "paradigm of the group" that is constituted in its rhythms, its forms, its relationships, its meetings, its routines, its uses of time, its constituent expressions of a whole condition that is imposed on the subjects (Trilla, 1985).

In this closeness to reality, the participants were asked: How do the groups connect with each other?

To which they responded:

E2: It is against I do not know if it is against the rules or the responsibility that they cannot do anything to me, they see us as those who are in favor of the director (Interview 29/04/2024).

If they are in the center of everything, this means that from here the groups are divided into two segments:

E2: the group of quartermasters and the group of secretaries, support staff is on the opposite side, those who are already here convince him, someone new arrives and they shelter him.

In this way, the groups are connected to each other by convincing those who already belong to the institutional group:

E2: this side tucks in, part of all this is the same authority, if there are two groups the institutional is running out(Interview, 10/06/2024).

The institutional side surrounds all those who are integrated to the work center, in this way they are incorporated to the majority group, the memberships that allow them to have power in an institutional way:

E2: no if it follows the institutional, I feel that it is institutional because they respect their schedule, that part is still tolerated, it is not imposed on them, the relationship is one of respect, they greet and that's it, someone told him I did not believe that the school was so damaged(Interview,10/06/2024).

The school is divided in the relations of the personnel that integrate the two organizational positions from where the sensitivity is manifested in the context. So if the school is divided and this segmentation generates the confronted positions.

So ... What is the internal representation of the group?

E2: As a result of the committee they were classified as reds and so they were called reds and as a result of that, and unfortunately they are new people or from the afternoon shift or teachers who were sent to the bench and some who have their ideals against the regulations here, this issue has been marked as a result of the election of the new planilla, they are represented by the t-shirt, they are represented by the red shirt (Interview, 10/06/2024).

The institutional group is the one that exercises power from the power of the director, the institutional power and that by protecting itself with it acquires power:

E5:Two groups, one institutional, and I would put in parentheses the director's group that together with the administrative managers there is also the union representative and another group that would be the dissident in the full knowledge of that word which is I do not agree with everything but I am willing to work for the common good in the first group there is a figure that adds a role that hierarchically does not correspond to him, however he does so and is even capable of undermining those who normatively should work those aspects, of course with the consent of the Director, and some of that same group are given and granted the appointment of chief, however in the dissident group there is the possibility that anyone can represent the group, the function, however, due to personal characteristics of life history, this group is always supported by two or three individuals who are the pillars of the group (Interview, 05/13/2024).

Institutionality is understood from the proximity to the position of the authority:

E4: Well look representations depends on the facility, it is the direction and from there we can talk about the coordinators with the deputy director very in my case I represent the union a part of the school (Interview, 10/06/2024).

Each group has its representative, there is a way of communicating, a way of distancing the groups:

E4: The groups have a person who distinguishes them and represents them, for example, the decomposed Telephone you already knew that's how I found out, we all know everything and we know nothing, we do not ask and we do not show our faces, , we are led by feeling and not by reason (Interview, 10/06/2024).

The division of the groups is also classified in colors, the group contrary to the institutional one fights to displace the majority group.

If this division exists, how many members are those who make this representation:

E2: Contains support staff teachers, between teachers and support staff they represent 20 out of a total of 75 (Interview, 10/06/2024).

The group is relatively small, so we realize that the majority group continues to predominate.

E2: The power is held by one person and others, the afternoon staff, are the ones who assure, because they feel protected by the head of the group and they say that I will not move from here (Interview, 10/06/2024).

Power is found as an implicit strategy or in their relationships, so power should be considered as an action, hence its dynamic character:

E4: The social order is integrated by affinities, others I am contiguous because you justify me what I do and then I try to belong to this group, or all are red, and they say it was not planned it was casual, also we use it a we nourish ourselves with commentary (Interview, 10/06/2024).

The institutional group is the one that is protected by the authority, it is the one that serves the authority, it is the one that establishes the micropolitical position in the school:

E5: The institutional group is the group of personal interest, individuals feel protected in their interests, above their rights is the strong group, but it is a strong group numerically , it is not much the margin the dissident group is the persecuted group watched, crossed out however many of its members feel sheltered by the right that assists them and every day more are assuming the role that corresponds to them of being defenders of their rights(Interview 13/05/2024).

This division of groups sustains those who have lost their turn, due to the decrease in school groups, and this is a manifestation of against this group that withdraws and sustains itself in a defensive way.

If these two groups exist, how is their work articulated here in the school?

E2: For their gatherings they have their cooperation if they know how to do it I recognize, they do not join the work and if they join it is to criticize, they do not respond, they do not comment anything, they do not want to do it, because if they do it they would be accepting that they have power over them, I feel they were not included because they are reported and they go to discounts (Interview, 10/06/2024).

The relegated or minority group also seeks to sustain their relationships among themselves in order to sustain themselves in the working conditions they find themselves in.

How is the articulation of the ties that make it possible to give strength to the institutional? Protection ties are poured, we try to make them feel part of the group, part of the institutional organization, that is to say, the director is the one who leads the institutional group in a sublime way:

E2: Friendship, so that they feel protected when I need them I have them, the ties that are the interests of protection and they do not feel that they are harassed(Interview, 10/06/2024).

The institutional group has its guide who guides it, guided by the functions it performs in the school:

E5: The institutional group acts by means of orders that many times are the result of the person who executes them and those who obey do it because of how he gave each one out of fear and many times against what should be within the functions of each individual.(Interview 13/05/2024).

Institutional ties are established that are given to them and that they have to abide by, hence the institutional work is done:

E5: the dissident group by not existing any type of appointment and by considering all the majority apart important of that group act in a free and voluntary way, although many times being honest they do not participate for fear of repression even when they are activities that by right corresponds to them, but they fear to be pointed out persecuted and sanctioned by the official part(Interview 13/05/2024).

In contrast, the opposition group does not have positions in the institutionality, hence the counterbalance between the two groups is seen from this space.

The pastures that are received from the institutionality allow articulating the organizational work of the institutional group, so how is their work articulated here in the school?

E4:First that articulation is conscious or not, it is the hierarchy all my speeches of that hierarchical one initiates to if I teacher of so many years imposes its trajectory to excel in that aspect and it is articulated according to the importance of its complaint of its importance of that person and of the personality of the militants of the group (Interview 13/05/2024).

In this articulation appears the trajectory of the professor who is praised by giving him an institutional place and in this way becomes the institutional bond of the group. The exercise of institutional control of group power is found in the majority group, so what is the function of representation?

E5: The main function of who represents the institutional group is the exercise of control within the institution, but a coercive control, and with different in a situation of, although some if and some not distinctions in the management of the administration while in the group discern those who lead act with the purpose or common interest (Interview 13/05/2024).

Control is power that gives them hierarchy within the institutional framework, so the question was asked: What is the place of the subject group within the institutional framework?

E2: There are three parts: the prefecture, the teachers' room and the laboratory, in the CTE they do not talk, they do not say anything, they talk among themselves, it is not in their interest what is discussed in the council, but they do nothing (Interview, 10/06/2024).

The bonds of identity allow for protection, security in the workplace, that is why these are the ones who most join in the activities, they are ways of showing that they can, that the school is managed and guided by them:

E5:The official group is the leading group in the school context however the success of many activities within the campus is due to the commitment and responsibility of several members of the dissident group because with work they show that they are not what many of the official group say about them(Interview 13/05/2024).

The dissident group also seeks to occupy a space in the institutional framework, through their work, and the strengthening of the group depends on whoever is in charge of the institutional framework:

E5: There is a fundamental characteristic that differentiates these two groups, it is called principles and values that in the institutional group their loyalty changes the moment another manager arrives, the dissident group maintains their ideals because they are the basis of the common interest (Interview, 05/13/2024).

The minority group has its own territories, where it interrelates and makes itself noticed as a group. What is the place of the subject group within the institution?

E5:The place is nonconformity and I am not even talking about a justified nonconformity from my perspective, before things before people because at the end of the day the proposals are the ones that have value (Interview, 10/06/2024).

Expressions such as "they see us as those who are in favor of the principal" reveal a fragmented institutionalism in the school organization that is dismembered in the ways of thinking and doing, where power is preserved as an organizational characteristic (Sarason, 2003).

In the institutional framework there is a series of "operators of domination" (Foucault, 1999), who have actions entrusted to them for the protection of the group and in these power relations, efforts are subtracted to any intention of change in the school organization that is not established from the institutional group, a space in which it is necessary to "recognize and try to change power relations, especially in complex traditional institutions: it is one of "the most complicated tasks that human beings can undertake" (Sarason, 2003, pp.35-36).

Power relations are established by a game of hierarchies "language, in its most diverse manifestations, plays its fundamental role" (Alvarez Sanchez, 2011, p. 149), So it develops a subject acting in group relations that is

configured in a process that shapes it according to "the needs and objectives belonging to the social structure, in which and for which the subject is produced" (Blase, 1991,p. 98).

In this game of relations according to the objectives established by the dominant institutional group, "subjects are configured who are apt to make possible the continuity of the system of social relations" (Blase, 1991, p. 98).

Therefore, the institutional context is a space full of symbols constructed by the group in its performance "reflects, resists, renews power relations" (Rai, 2015, p.1181), and in this symbolic representation linked to the construction of group leaderships that emerge from the institutionality where "the actions of the group members are molded through their rituals" (Pitkin, 1967, 103).

A complex network of "circulating powers" (Calveiro, 2005), where they enhance each other, but also fragment and disarticulate. In this context, symbolisms appear as a product of their actions in which the leaderships of the groups are recognized (Pitkin 1967), achieving the identification of its members and in this way recognitions are marked; a symbolic representation, but without rationally questioning the representation process, nor their own reactions to the symbols with which they associate certain affective responses generated through repetition and custom (Dovi 2015). These actions allow the group delineation a space where the relationships and bonds of the participants are gradually transformed; as a place of intersection of the former (Saidón, O., Heras, A. I., & Kendelman, G., 2020).

A space of power that is what preserves them as a property of the social class that distinguishes them in a space of conquest of their dominated territories and that become objects of group conservation is structured from the presence and participation of the members of the group who, having as a basis the joint activity, weave a system of interpersonal links that cannot be understood as a simple reproduction of each individuality; but as a carrier of an "individual" resized from its physical location and psychological presence in a specific group context" (Avila, 2001, p. 31).

A power defined as a play of actions on other actions, given that the subjects, in terms of Foucault (1991, p. 85) are acting subjects and whose actions "incite, induce and seduce [...] If power is defined as action, it is understood that it is a dynamic process that is exercised only on free subjects and only to the extent that they are free" (Foucault, 1991, p. 87).

In this space of construction and consolidation of the group in this feeling of the individual, in the conservation of their rights as a group of power that gives life to their doing in the school appears the groupness constructed through the ideological positions of the group, understood as a "totalizing emergence of subjects in which the other exists for each and every one, and not necessarily in a direct and personal way but as a representative of the human, similar and different at the same time (Avila, 2001, p. 31), a singular and unrepeatable exchange, a singular and unrepeatable interchange that is not only a group but also a group of individuals.), a singular and unrepeatable exchange in a group-context process since the group is spoken by "the argument of the social drama" (Fernandez, 1999, p.32), which allows the group to publish its history.

The articulation of institutional work

To follow the institutional, means the establishment of the school organization and in it is found who builds them; the power that maintains the struggle, the management of the times between the groups is integrated to the logics of action of the group:

The group also faces fractures; fragmentations that constitute it and that means its weakness so the marked relation between the two groups constitutes the school institutionalism , a manifestation that is presented within the framework of groupality, because to have power it is necessary to approach power and in this case the institutional power that is the one who establishes the group division. This allows the performance of the institutionalism where the authority advances between the two interest groups, this is the root of the contest for the control of belonging to the majority group in which these are pointed out and make their confrontation noticeable.

In contrast, there is a division of thoughts which leads to a confrontation for the organizational power struggle defined within the institutional framework. The following is an observation of a collegial meeting where institutionalism is pointed out:

At the opening of the meeting the director points out:

OC1: the principal enunciates at the opening of the meeting; the work what we have been doing since December from the diagnosis of all schools(Observation, 04/26/2024).

When he refers to the quality of the work being done, he strengthens the institutionalism of the majority group because this is the one that has done the work:

OC1: the coordinator starts and says that the physical education teacher has already arranged the groups for the flag honors(Observation, 04/26/2024).

The responsibility that they have on the formation of the students is pointed out:

OC1:the students do not retreat to others, the responsibility is of you the teachers(Observation, 26/04/2024).

It is pointed out that the students have already been informed and that it is possible to work with them:

OC1: ok something to add, the kids are already instructed(Observation, 04/26/2024).

At this moment the union part (the institutional group) is approaching to thank all those who supported them in the event of the teacher's games:

OC1: the union part comes to thank the teachers for their participation, they were sent a form for their data and those who have not come to incorporate their data are missing (Observation, 04/26/2024).

They must fill in some data which is mentioned:

OC1: the following is that on May 12 there is going to be a celebration. And the support staff also participates and helps us to get ahead (Observation, 04/26/2024).

And it is submitted to consensus regarding the teacher's day event:

OC1: it was put to vote and all are inclined for breakfast, we need your schedule to organize an event that you deserve(Observation, 26/04/2024).

We continue with the organization of the teacher's games:

OC1: for the magisterial games we need to make the registration of teams, to make the game roles to arrive and they are already made, for men and women there is going to be zumba and yoga(Observation, 26/04/2024).

Commitments are generated:

OC1: we are going to get the information to have the records as they are requesting(Observation, 04/26/2024).

They are informed that they are taking care of the cars in the parking lot:

OC1: on behalf of Mr. Juan tries to be aware of the cars and of what happens it would be from my part everything if they need anything there I am in the workshop (Observation, 26/04/2024).

In this social action that incorporates motivations and purposes of the institutional group (Farfan, 2009), where this space is useful to generate the symbols that enable the reproduction of intersubjective action, where it is noted to identify itself as a power group as a group strengthened by the institutional.

Hence, "every relation of forces is a relation of power" (Foucault, 1976, p. 123).

This institutional relation is "an action on other actions, on possible actions, on future or present actions" (Foucault, 1988, p.77).

So...the institutional articulation has as a component from which all the roots are derived, they are composed of the group, the micro-politics and the groupness that give it the nuances proper to each school,

In this constituent sense of the institutional where it is interconnected in all the senses of the group such as vision, touch, smell, excitement, can allow us to build the group body scheme (Saidón, O., Heras, A. I., & Kendelman, 2020, p.32).

The group, then, is delineated as a broader process than the mere gathering of individuals. Because from its dynamics, it becomes a space where "the relationships and links of the participants are gradually transformed; as the place of intersection of the former" (Saidón, O., Heras, A. I., & Kendelman,2020,p.32).

These links of the group subjects give the schools their own meaning, generating the differences between one and the other.

DISCUSSION

In the space where the logics of action come from (Hoyle, 1986), he approaches the institutional life from which micropolitics derives as the space that overshadows the life of schools, where individualisms appear and give birth to ideological positions that legitimize their organizational vision to promote their interests, becoming "the product of common sense, values and norms that correspond to the interests of the political class in power and the legitimizing function of the school" (Martínez, 2006, p. 12).

In this institutional condition the school is integrated by a set of images and representations produced by each subject that integrates the institutional group that gives color to its relations; then the power in the organization is acquired when a subject or a group of subjects has the ability to make their point of view or approach predominate in the institutional existence.

Consequently, the birth of micropolitics from ideological positionings is defined with its own characteristics depending on the institutionalism of where the school develops as a product of the relationships between different groups and individuals, which occur in any type of organization (Blase, 1991), because schools control their members and are professional communities (Collins,et al. 1979), where they elaborate their own rules of the game, from which different symbols of control are derived according to the whole web of interests that each school shapes from the control of the organization, that is to say what Bacharach and Mundell (1993) call "*logics of action*" that integrate an inseparable scheme of ideas, beliefs and positions in the face of the different situations that arise in the organization, and that give structure to the school, which will be reproduced by its diversity of limits, above all by its relative autonomy that it possesses.

Therefore, the institutional cultivates the group, because the events are crossed by subjectivities that, when connected by the logics of action, become social intersubjectivities that permeate the school, constituting the institutional, which brings us closer to a dialectical approach in the framework of a paradigm of complexity.

In institutionality, groupness appears as a field undermined by interactions and intertwining of individual and group positions, where the social gives rise to the emergence of shared events and processes among subjects who pursue common goals, where the practices and perceptions of teachers are mediated, as well as their shared elements that define the school culture (Atkinson, 2011), thus groupness emerges, that linking of one with the other, subject to a network of identifications that function and give meaning to the psychic apparatus (Freud, 1984), in this linkage of use with others according to Kaës (2000) integrates a psychic work from which the intersubjective links that produce both group and singular formations emerge and, in this way the group forms a device of another level as is the groupality that starts from the relations of the self with the other and, therefore, would have an unconscious quality.

In this conceptual framework, it is possible to ask: How are inter-subjective links integrated in the school? Why does groupality have an unconscious quality?

To say that, the school space is an institutional space, because in it the teachers not only occupy it, but also develop themselves by generating their power dynamics through its appropriation that is shaped in an existential habit.

And in this relationship they are integrated to these connections between subjects who live involuntarily, because in this joint relationship the teacher finds in his actions in a shared world for the development of his critical judgment, a circumstance for his objectivity and in this doing with others is symbolically constructed. And, in this approach to school organization, it is not possible to elucidate the school without delving into the culture that "shapes the thinking of its agents" (Kaës, et al., 1989, p. 89), a system of values and norms, a system of thought and action that is interwoven and reconstructed in the sphere of institutionality, where certain rules materialize in a world of meanings that evidence a series of power practices sustained in their "effective autonomy of the forms and subjective means of signification" (Johnson, 2004, p. 42).

Thus, in the world of social reality where the "production of culture", which manifests itself in discourse; a complex emphasis on the understanding of power and politics from considering as a basis a world or social reality that is constructed in a textual or discursive way.

Therefore, this *organizational habitus* leads to the question: How is micro-politics intertwined with institutionality? How do power groups build institutionality?

In this regard, Farfan (2009) says that social action in its interpretation incorporates the motivations and purposes of the group, as well as its relational mechanisms that generate the symbols that make possible the reproduction of intersubjective action, i.e. the shared meanings that the actors exercise in their relational practices that are jointly enriched, and as a consequence operate their organizational habits, resulting in a symbolic construction and, in it is found the production of meaning that guides them in their reciprocal process.

In these shared objects produced by the group are constructed in their conscience, deriving a meaning that is found in the relationship of the actors, where the meaning is constituted that integrates their thinking that offers a perspective of justification and validation of the "other" allowing an interpersonal synchrony that is expressed in school life; social relationships, from which a network of perceptions of reality is woven that permeates the school organization from which the meaning-producing elements are derived.

CONCLUSIONS

The group as a social nature that is integrated into the human relations of the school, generates the structure of institutional life, where the instituted and the instituting interact to give way to the groupality that allows the consolidation of a school institution.

The distribution of functions is part of the school institutionalism, distinguishing one school from another, even though their functions are marked by the institutionalism of the State, generating their own way of doing, in their own context, contextualized by the power groups, which are the ones that delineate the how and the when in the school.

Institutionality is structured by a scheme of relationships of free subjects; free within the framework of institutionality, but subject to the complexion of the group that governs their actions, limiting their thinking and acting within the limits conferred by power.

The logics of action make it possible to generate a network of interactions specific to the group, where these logics of action weave the instituted and the instituting from which institutionalism results, which is illustrated in each school woven by the group as an imaginary structure.

Groupality is the filter of the ideological, because it goes beyond being a group, because it is the expression of group production that expresses that the group has cohesion and its fragmentation is more complex.

The power constituted by circulating powers in the performance of daily life, of a way of doing that cannot be understood from the outside, a structure, a life of the institutional that manifests itself in the actions of the subjects that live together in the school.

The micropolitics constituted by symbolic logics; an internal representation of the group interconnected through power relations that is always in dynamic action of its own power logics.

REFERENCES

1. Álvarez Sánchez, P. (2023). Panoramic study on accessible translation in Spain: evolution, dimension and new challenges. Álvarez Sánchez, P. (2023). Panoramic study on accessible translation in Spain: evolution, dimension and new challenges.
2. Atkinson, Q. D. (2011). Phonemic diversity supports a serial founder effect model of language expansion from Africa. Science, 332, 346-349. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.119929 5. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.119929 5
3. Atkinson, Q. D. (2011). Phonemic diversity supports a serial founder effect model of language expansion from Africa. Science, 332, 346-349.
4. Avila, M. F. (2001). why the group in social http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.119929 5 psychology? Revista Cubana de Psicología, 18(1).
5. Ayestarán, S. (1993). Individuality and groupness: two dimensions that define the structure and dynamics of the group. Psicothema, 199-211.
6. Bacharach, S. and Mundell B. (1993). "Organizational politics in school: micro, macro, and logics of action", Educational Administration Quarterly, 29 (9): 423-452.
7. Balboa Gallardo, J. M. (2006). Estudio de la noción de grupalidad en el marco de las teorías psicoanalíticas grupales. Universidad de Chile.
8. Ball, S. (1989): The micropolitics of the school. Towards a theory of school organization. Paidós/MEC.
9. Ball, S. (1990). The micropolitical perspective in the analysis of educationalorganizations.I Congreso Interuniversitario de Organización Escolar, Barcelona: PPU.
10. Bauleo, A. (1997). Psychoanalysis and groupality: reflections on the new objects of psychoanalysis. In Psychoanalysis and groupality: reflections on the new objects of psychoanalysis (pp. 195-195).
11. Bardisa, T. (1997). Theory and practice of micropolitics in school organizations. Revista Iberoamericana de Educación: 15. http://www.campusoei.org/oeivirt/rie15a0 1.htm.
12. Beltrán, F. (1991). Política y reformas curriculares. Universidad de Valencia.
13. Bernal, M., & De la Hoz, J. (2011). Management styles and institutional culture in educational organizations in the district of Barranquilla and their impact on the quality of education (Doctoral dissertation, Tesis de maestría no publicada, Universidad del Atlántico).
14. Blase, J. (1991). The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation. Corwin Press, Inc., PO Box 2526, Newbury Park, CA 91319.
15. Bleger, J. (1967). Psychoanalysis of psychoanalytic framing. In Symbiosis and ambiguity; psychoanalytic study (pp. p- 237).
16. Bourdieu, P. (2011). Distinction: Criterion and social bases of taste.Taurus.
17. Bruner, J. (2015). Education, gateway to culture (Vol. 3). Antonio Machado Libros.
18. Calveiro, P (2005). Familia y poder. Araucaria Calveiro, P. (2013). Política y/o violencia. Una aproximación a la guerrilla de los años setenta. Siglo XXI.
19. Collins, R. (2019). The credential society: A historical sociology of education and stratification. Columbia University Press.
20. Dani, P. (2016). School coexistence in the framework of the construction of groupness (A real and possible scenario for the exercise of the teaching/tutor role).
21. Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. Annual Review of Psychology, 64, 135-168. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev- psych-113011-143750
22. Dovi, S. (2015). Hanna Pitkin, the concept of representation.
23. Farfán, R. (2009). Comprehensive sociology as a chapter in the history of sociology. Sociológica (Mexico), 24(70), 203-214.
24. Fernández, M. (1992). Power and participation in the educational system. On the contradictions of school organization in a democratic context. Paidós.

25. Foucault, M. (1986). Thinking from the outside. Fata Morgana.
26. Foucault, M. (1991). Microphysics of power. La piqueta.
27. Foucault, M. (2005) El orden del discurso. Fabula Tusquets
28. Freud, S. (1984). Hysteria. Collected Works. Amorrortu.
29. Frigerio, G., Poggi, M., and Tiramonti, G. (1992).Las instituciones educativas cara a cara. Troquel.
30. Gómez Esteban, R. (2024). Pensar la grupalidad. IV International Research Assembly "A par r de Pichon-Rivière", Montevideo, 13-15.
31. González, T. (1999). La perspectiva interpretativa y la perspectiva crítica en la organización escolar, in Q. Martín (Cod.), Organizaciones educativas. UNED.
32. Greenfield, PM (1991). Language, tools, and brain: Ontogeny and the phylogeny of hierarchically organized   sequential behavior. Behavioral and Brain Sciences , 14 (4), 531-551.
33. Greenfield, PM (1991). Language, tools, and brain: The ontogeny and phylogeny of hierarchically organized sequential behavior. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 14 (4), 531-551.
34. Hardt, M. & Toni, N. (2010). Biopolitical production. Empire.
35. Hoyle E. (1999). The Two Faces of Micropolitics, School Leadership & Management, 19 (2): 213-222.
36. Hoyle, E. (1982). Micropolitics of Educational organizations. Educational Management and Administration, 10, pp. 87-98.
37. Iannacone, L. (1975). Education policy systems: A study guide for educational administrators. Fort Lauderdale. Nova University Press.
38. Jares, X.R. (1996): "El conflicto, naturaleza y función en el desarrollo organizativo de los centros escolares". Domínguez, G; Mesanza, J.: Manual de Organizaciones educativas. Madrid: Escuela Española, 233-262.
39. Johnson, R. (2004). O que é, a final, Estados Culturáis? In O que é, a final, Estudos Culturais?, edited and coordinated by Tomaz Tadeu da Silva. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
40. Kaës, R. (2000). Las teorías psicoanalíticas del grupo. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
41. Kaës, R. (2000). The psychoanalytic theories of the group. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
42. Kaës, R. (2001). El psicodrama psicoanalítico de grupo. Amorrortu.
43. Kaës, R. (2001). The psychoanalytic group psychodrama. Amorrortu Kaës, R., Bleger, J., Enriquez, E., Fornari, F.,
44. Fustier, P., Rousillon, R., & Vidal, P. (1989). The institution and institutions: psychoanalytic studies. In The institution and institutions: psychoanalytic studies (pp. 255-255).
45. Kaës, R., Bleger, J., Enriquez, E., Fornari, F., Fustier, P., Rousillon, R., & Vidal, P. (1989). The institution and institutions: psychoanalytic studies. In The institution and institutions: psychoanalytic studies (pp. 255-255).
46. Lindle J. (1999). What can the Study of Micropolitics Contribute to the Practice of Leadership in Reforming Schools? School Leadership & Management, 19 (2): 171-178.
47. Malen, B. (1994). The micropolitics of education: Mapping the multiple dimensions of power relations in school polities. Journal of Education Policy, 9: 5 and 6, 147-167.
48. Martínez, D. R. (2006). Institutional, cultural and micropolitical dimensions: keys to understanding educational organizations. Interuniversity electronic journal of teacher education, 9(1), 1-14.
49. Osborne, J. (2004). An introduction to Game Theory. University of Toronto.
50. Osborne, J. (2004). An introduction to Game Theory. University of Toronto.
51. Pichón-Riviere, E. (1978). A new problematic for psychiatry. Revista de Psicoanalisis, p- 653.
52. Pitkin, H. F. (1967). The concept of representation. University of California Press.
53. Rai, SM (2015). Political performance: A framework for analyzing democratic politics. Political Studies , 63 (5), 1179- 1197.
54. Saidón, O., Heras, A. I., & Kendelman, G. (2020). Groups, theory and technique. Ediciones INCLUIR.
55. Santos, M.A. (1994). Entre bastidores, el lado oscuro de la organización. Aljibe.
56. Santos, M.A. (2020), La escuela que aprende, Morata.
57. Schutz, A. and Luckmann, T. (1973). Las estructuras del mundo de la vida. Amorrortu Editores. Amorrortu Editores.
58. Spaulding, A. M. (1994). The micropolitics of the elementary classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas   Tech University, Lubbock.
59. Trilla, J. (1999). Essays on the school. Laertes

60. Vercauteren, D., Crabbé, O., Müller, T., de Molina, M. M., & Cedillo, R. S. (2010). Micropolitics of groups for an ecology of collective practices. Traffickers of dreams.

61. Willower, D.J. (1991). "Micropolitics and the sociology of school organizations", Education and Urban Society, 23, (4): 442-454.