

Humanist Political Discourse: Illusion in the Implementation of the New Mexican School

Discurso político humanista: Ilusión en la implementación de la Nueva Escuela Mexicana

Monica Gonzalez Silvamonica.gonzalezsva@gmail.com<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-9470-112X>**Instituto Superior de Ciencias de la Educación del Estado de México - México**

Received date: April 30, 2025 Reviewed date: May 20, 2025 Accepted date: June 30, 2025 Published date: July 4, 2025

ABSTRACT

This research analyzes the coherence between the humanist discourse of Mexican educational policy and school practice in a public elementary school during the implementation of the New Mexican School. The objective was to identify how humanist principles are manifested in teacher planning and evaluation. A qualitative approach with an ethnographic design was adopted, employing observation and interviews as techniques, and a triangulation of critical-discursive analysis. The results reveal a gap between political discourse and school realities, where teachers adapt their practice to comply with regulations, without reflecting the humanist training required by educational policy. Planning and evaluation become technical mechanisms that simulate results. The conclusion is that current educational policy promotes an illusion of humanist transformation that is not realized in practice, generating contradictions between normative intentions and actual school experiences.

Keywords:

Educational policy; humanism; planning; evaluation; Mexico

RESUMEN

Esta investigación analiza la coherencia entre el discurso humanista de la política educativa mexicana y la práctica escolar en una primaria pública durante la implementación de la Nueva Escuela Mexicana. El objetivo fue identificar cómo se manifiestan los principios humanistas en la planificación y evaluación docente. Se adoptó un enfoque cualitativo con diseño etnográfico, empleando observación y entrevistas como técnicas, y una triangulación de análisis crítico-discursivo. Los resultados evidencian una brecha entre el discurso político y las realidades escolares, donde los docentes adaptan su práctica para cumplir normativamente, sin que ello refleje una formación humanista exigida por la política educativa. Las planificaciones y evaluaciones se convierten en mecanismos técnicos que simulan resultados. Se concluye que la política educativa actual promueve una ilusión de transformación humanista que no se concreta en la práctica, generando contradicciones entre las intenciones normativas y las experiencias escolares reales.

Palabras clave:

Política educativa; humanismo; planificación; evaluación; México

INTRODUCTION

Every educational policy in Mexico is informed by a discourse that reflects the needs and/or problems it is intended to address during its implementation. This is a key element for every educational institution, as it guides the goals, objectives, and strategies of education that have the potential to improve the quality of education and foster human development to generate potential in school workers. In this sense, educational interests are comprised of political, labor, economic, cultural, and social visions and interests that seek to impact and transform other areas intrinsic to the school system.

The current educational reform governing the country, known as the New Mexican School (NEM), emerged from the desire for change. This educational project was announced in 2019 by the Ministry of Public Education (SEP), but has been gradually incorporated until it is fully implemented in the country's elementary schools in the 2023-2024 school year. The NEM is characterized by its attempt to transform education into four pillars: philosophical, epistemic, curricular, and pedagogical. All of these are relevant to understanding the new reform; however, the first of these (philosophical) is of utmost importance, as it is the central axis that guides the rest. From this, the meaning given to the concepts, the curricular change, and the actions of professionals is born; it becomes the philosophical basis that contains the joint vision of what the new school reform aims to achieve. This basis is supported by humanism, specifically Mexican humanism.

Currently, the term humanism has been present in various forms of education, specifically in primary schools. It is often mentioned in the Technical School Council (CTE) when reviewing curriculum plans and programs, teaching guidelines, and videos from the Ministry of Education. This has led to some teachers in the CTE (Technical School Councils) speaking to the class about humanistic education, arguing that they embrace this vision in their pedagogical relationships. However, do we truly understand what it means for education to be based on this humanistic philosophy?

Reflecting on the above and articulating the

professional experiences I have gained at the workplace where I have personally worked as a primary school teacher (in Toluca, State of Mexico), uncertainty arises about the reality within schools and whether this creates a gap between the political discourse and the humanist philosophy of the New Mexican School. Therefore, this research arises from the question: What is the coherence between the humanist discourse of educational policy and the school reality within a primary school in the context of the New Mexican School?

Based on the above reflection, it is important to analyze that incorporating human educability into the basic school system is, first and foremost, a focus of interest and a necessity that the political-educational system currently has. Recently, it has been disseminated through various media that children and adolescents (NNA) are the focus of education, which seeks their intellectual and moral development to educate them in a humanistic sense. However, despite the fact that human educability is a social and academic necessity, when it is incorporated into political organizations, it is conceived as a problem because its promotion is discursive. However, when it is put into practice, the challenge of implementing, evaluating, and demonstrating it begins to emerge. Hernández (2012) mentions that the implementation of any educational policy runs the risk of failing in practice, since when the intentions of the political sector overlap with social and school intentions, then “without citizen trust [...] the implementation runs the risk of failing” (p. 42). This is without forgetting that, although in most cases, the discourse is of improvement, in the implementation political interests surpass the initial intentions, which do not foresee the actions that bring the discourse to life. These must account for their objectives, even if these are not in accordance with the real conditions within the institutions, therefore, “there is an intermediate space between the declaration of intentions and the declaration of results” (Hernández, 2012, p. 43). This intermediate space is what, when trying to incorporate humanistic education, turns its implementation into a school problem.

Due to this gap between political intentions and their implementation (Aguilar, 2017), he

mentions that all educational policy refers to "courses of action aimed at solving problems, where [...] they also denote the intentions of political forces, particularly those of rulers, [...] they tend to mean intentions rather than consequences" (p. 15); which are manifested in "a set of intentional and causal actions, oriented towards the achievement of an objective of public interest/benefit [...] in correspondence with the fulfillment of public functions that are of a permanent nature" (Aguilar, 2017, p. 17) ; from this aspect arise the experiences that each teacher builds.

The aforementioned policy is not just a document that describes what is intended to be rescued, addressed, and/or implemented in education. The Diplomatic Academy (2019) mentions that an official document containing the organization of education must necessarily mention the planning, budgeting, implementation, reporting, monitoring, and evaluation of each educational level. Therefore, that policy depends on visions, interests, and strategies for its development. To develop an educational policy, Aguilar (2017) It mentions that a creation cycle is required consisting of four stages: 1) Gestation, where it is detected what the new political plan must attempt to solve; 2) Formulation, which is the construction of the action plan and monitoring; 3) Implementation of the practical aspect of the constructed agenda and; 4) Evaluation as a reflection of the changes and/or reproductions that occurred in relation to the initial problem. By focusing on these stages, this article will place greater emphasis on the implementation phase. With this, it is intended to visualize how human educability is the center of intention in the political dissemination discourse, but leaves spaces for conflict when it is implemented as an institutional agenda.

Although the education system expresses a need for human development, the focus on production and the fulfillment of economic aspirations is stronger than the desire for moral and humanistic development. Therefore, currently, "arts and humanities programs, at all levels, are being eliminated in favor of the cultivation of technical programs" (Nussbaum, 2016, p. 16). This

distances the idea of building educational programs that foster the development of human potential, relegating them to the background. The tendency among the population is to view education as the possibility of "teaching students to be economically productive [...] leaving aside training in the humanities" (Arias and Molano, 2016, p. 25) . This brings education into play, where its discourse points to an idea of training agents, but with different interests in their development.

The governmental community, instead of promoting a humane education, has attempted to turn education into a kind of social contract, which promises better educational opportunities, but which, in practice, falls into unequal and illusory conditions, pretending to achieve "mutual benefits, at the cost of the exclusion and subordination of all human beings and discarding [...] interaction, reflection and reciprocity with others" (Arias and Molano, 2016, p. 25). This contract will help the authority always obtain greater benefits by using the human development of its society to manipulate it to achieve its objectives, regardless of the damage it causes to the development of individuals. In this way, the need to participate in an educational policy focused on human development arises.

Now, educational policy is defined by the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education (INEE, 2018) as the "capacity of governments to sustain, develop strategies and direct state activity towards the achievement of objectives [...] to transform the educational reality" (p. 12). In this way, when dealing with policies within education, it is inevitable to set aside the economic, labor and cultural purposes of planning in schools. Therefore, educational policy goes deeper than just strategies to transform education, being an element that is "part of a device, which [...] is inscribed in a power game that [...] is formulated from a certain ideological horizon by political, business and intellectual elites who exercise a certain power-knowledge over other agents" (González, 2019, pp. 11-12). The political game within the school organization makes use of a discourse that responds to certain interests that are held for the school sector.

Policy must reflect a humanistic interest, and

its discourse will focus on the development of social and intellectual skills, encouraging individuals to teach based on self-reflection so that they can build an autonomous human being, capable of regulating themselves and their interactions with others, thus making humanization the main objective of educational policy. For Arias and Molano (2016), educational authorities must focus their attention on educating under humanistic justice and recognizing individual and social capacities. In this regard, it is necessary to guarantee training aimed at caring through the possibility of building a dignified life based on "self-care, respect, demand, love, and reciprocity for oneself and others [to] guide social relations [...] and the permanent search for shared happiness" (p. 27); allowing schools to contribute to achieving the demands and purposes of a humanistic education.

Students need an education that leads them to autonomy and an education based on "values, culture, respect for others and the environment, moral commitment, learning and clarification of different ethnicities" (Arias and Molano, 2016, p. 117). The aforementioned elements within education help cultivate humanity and especially students, who are the social future. To achieve these objectives established in educational policy, criteria to follow within the educational system must be created. The agents involved in said organization are responsible for implementing the actions that help achieve the goals.

For educational policy, school agents are seen as those who must necessarily identify with all the speeches and provisions, subjecting them to the "mandate as something that must be adopted, enforced and applied for the improvement of education [...] they become subjects of educational policy [...] they define the professional competencies and roles they will have to play" (González, 2019, p. 12). The above is seen in the change of educational policies in schools, where agents are molded according to the new established interests and provisions, forcing them to act according to political, labor, commercial and global convictions, forgetting individual and social needs.

Authorities are required to create appropriate

school reforms to support humanistic development. Reforms must see their objective as rescuing citizens, highlighting the authorities' desire for social development and student development, since "there is no government that does not include education among its [...] policies [...] social development and economic growth" (Pedraza, 2016, p. 17). In this way, educational policy is reflected in the discourse of state authorities and in educational reforms, serving as a guide for the work that must be developed within the educational system. This guide determines the objectives, purposes, content organization, profiles, evaluation periods, and general guidelines for the pedagogical activities that teachers must attend during the school years corresponding to the duration of the reform in force.

Generally, a new reform involves changing and modifying elements of the educational system, with the aim of addressing the current needs of society, as well as political and labor needs. However, when a new proposal is made in educational reforms, the expected changes do not manifest themselves immediately, since "educational change usually comes in the form of reforms [...] they only attempt to prevent revolutions and contradict the very etymological essence of 'action to re-educate' by reproducing the same policies and practices that proclaim change" (Bonilla, 2016, p. 92). Reforms are limited to contributing to the appearance of concern for educational change and are dedicated to reproducing acts, strategies, and technical content in the training of students, which leads to continued neglect of moral and human development within schools.

When speaking about humanism in education in Mexico, we must think about it in terms of the Mexican humanism. This, as part of the educational system, becomes the focus of its programs, projects, and objectives for achieving an ethical and just society, as it allows for a local response to national needs to guarantee equal opportunities for all citizens and, above all, promote moral and human culture. Within basic education, this shift in philosophical focus led to what De Sousa Santos and Meneses (2014) described as They mention as "an environment of

uncertainty, complexity and chaos in structures and social practices, in institutions and ideologies” (p. 293); which led to the curricular reorganization and the renaming of the school reform and the emergence of the NEM. This educational model places the student at the center of the teaching and learning process, promoting their interaction with the community and society in general. According to the SEP (2023), the NEM aims at the “integral human development of the student, reorienting the National Education System, influencing educational culture through co-responsibility and promoting social transformations within the school and in the community” (p. 9), therefore, to guide school actions, the NEM aims at human development, thus highlighting the importance of the humanistic philosophical approach; which, when articulated with the visions of the HM of Mexican politics, aims to ensure that each action and decision promotes the well-being and recognition of subjects within and outside of education.

For this reason, at the primary education level, the NEM maintains a discourse based on a series of principles that become the basic conceptions of content, objectives, and profiles for that school level. The main of these principles is human dignity, which is the center of educational actions, since it is considered "the intrinsic value that every human being has, which is inalienable and non-exchangeable" (SEP, 2024, p. 15). In its practice, it reflects the execution of the other basic concepts of the NEM: social justice and human rights; because in acting with dignity, the vision and action of "the recognition and effective exercise of human rights and social justice" are implicit (SEP, 2024, p. 15). These principles play a fundamental role in reorienting educational objectives, since now, every agent, every action, and all knowledge within basic education schools must aim towards "the recognition, care, protection, and development of the dignity of girls, boys, and adolescents" (SEP, 2024, p. 15); having as its main task "to encourage children and youth, together with their teachers, to encounter the humanity of others, understood in their diversity" (SEP, 2024, p. 15). In this way, humanistic education aims towards the recognition of others within the same community, which, in

turn, transcends to rescue national identity.

With the above and concretizing the political-educational vision of humanism, the NEM acts as part of the Government plan to seek "the integral human development of the student, reorient the National Education System, influence educational culture through co-responsibility and promote social transformations within the school and in the community" (SEP, 2023, p. 9). In this way, it is possible to understand that Mexican humanism (HM) is the axis of the NEM, and how this discourse transcends the sphere of individual and collective values to become a way of thought, action and culture that seeks to consolidate dignity, justice and democracy both social and national.

METHOD

In order to identify the relationship between the humanistic discourse of educational policy and the school reality within a primary school in the context of the New Mexican School, it is considered necessary to observe how the political-educational objectives are manifested in daily school practices within the primary level. Therefore, the vision of this research is distinguished by its qualitative nature, since it allows "to understand or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings that people give [to] the social construction of reality" (Denzis & Lincoln, 2012, p. 2). In this way, the possibility of understanding the conceptual construction of the ideologies that teachers have built on humanism is opened; bringing us closer to "the interpretive understanding of the human experience" (Denzis & Lincoln, 2012, p. 56). This allowed us to establish the methodological path to establish the processes and techniques that aim to approach the reality of schools; resorting to the ethnographic approach.

Ethnography Hammersley and Atkinson (1994) define it as the method that allows the researcher to approach and understand in a vivid way "the daily lives of people over a period of time, observing what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions, in fact, gathering any available data that serves to shed some light on the subject" (p. 15). This approach made it possible to obtain a detailed description of the events within a primary school in the city of Toluca, State of Mexico, and

to proceed to its interpretation, which is reflected from an epistemic vision with an ethical perceptive, being considered as the articulated knowledge of knowledge, experiences, theories and diverse horizons of analysis (Schaff, 1982) to construct a real and experiential thought for the subject, allowing him to transform his perspective and performance before others and his context.

For this purpose, observation and interview techniques were used to gather information from the participating educational subjects. These techniques required an articulation of the informants' ideologies with their own interpretations based on the critical stance of the humanistic theory of NEM. For this reason, a triangulation of analysis methods was established. Izcara (2014) defines this as "the exploration of qualitative material through the use of different methods [...] of content and discourse" (p. 30), implying "taking into account the formal content of the experience of the subjects studied, the context in which they are located, [...] as well as the influence of the social, technological, and professional background carried by the researcher" (Izcara, 2014, p. 14). In this way, the articulation for the analysis of the information presented consisted of presenting a personal interpretation of the observed facts and the comments that the primary school teachers shared about the facts seen through the interviews. With this, from different axes of analysis, results were reached that allowed to answer the research objective.

RESULTS

Regardless of what is experienced in school practices, educational policy is required to disseminate the achievements of what its discourse establishes in its educational plan. Therefore, it creates specific times within its educational processes to obtain evidence and results of its functioning, leaving teachers as mediators. For González (2019), policies, in addition to creating curricular organizations, establish spaces and actions for teachers to document what they expect to obtain within their training, which ultimately determines the "effectiveness or impact on the training of teachers and administrators themselves, as well as on student learning, classroom work, and

school life" (p. 12). This requires school policy to have objectifications within institutional norms, which help it provide evidence to show what its organization has established as goals. The objectifications are planning and evaluation, since both are processes that organize and compile the progress and results expected to be obtained within schools. These are necessary in education because they allow us to plan utopias of change and school improvement.

Planning demonstrates teachers' skills, aspirations, goals, and personalities. It is the written organization of their hard work at school. Assessment, on the other hand, is evidence of the different achievements of students and teachers. Pawan and Neha (2021) mention that assessment determines whether "students achieve the course outcomes and the information acquired, as well as the quality of their performance. [...] learning needs can be identified and students can be helped to learn and develop skills" (our own translation, p. 7). Thus, it is an opportune time to rethink strategies according to the areas of opportunity identified in students. It is the basis for school organization. Likewise, with these objectifications, teachers are responsible for articulating them so that the evidence presented shows the coexistence of the reforms that organize the level. It is at this point that these objectifications become an illusion. A gap arises between what should be contributed to education and its practical function, tainted by the demands and administrative burdens imposed by each school policy. Therefore, these objectifications are part of teachers' experiences, reflecting their practical integration into school practices, creating experiences and actions that reflect the demands of both reforms.

In primary education, teachers experience planning and evaluation as processes that, while they serve to demonstrate their work, are not conceived as school policy proposes. This leads them, on the one hand, to contribute to the school policy discourse and its humanist focus, and, on the other, to demonstrate what is truly experienced within schools. Therefore, these become two objectifications that both reforms contain and promise to demonstrate the results of human development, as well as to demonstrate real

experiences in their coexistence. For this reason, the remainder of this section presents how these objectifications are experienced in teachers' actions and the relationship they create with the humanist policy focus of education.

Educational policy is increased by the discourse it creates to maintain stability in its various organizations and the agents it seeks to reach. Within education, political discourse plays an important role in maintaining today's organization. It is the manifestation of the language through which worldviews are transmitted, and a series of networks are created by producing and perceiving words constructed to achieve a specific purpose of transmission, communication, and exposition. Rebillou (2017) mentions that it is "the sphere of expression, evolution, and transformation of language; it is also a reality that constitutes a practice [...] the transmitter par excellence of ideology" (p. 34). Therefore, discourse has the power to persuade and sell ideologies to a certain social group.

Within education, the discourse generated in policies is important to transmitting, convincing, and promoting interests and regulations. For this reason, discourse in any political sector is "an achievement that skillfully blends conviction and persuasion to gain the support of its recipient or audience, regarding the form of government and its implications" (Rebillou, 2017, p. 34). The goal is to convince through words, which soften interests and promote modifications to spread a vision of human development within primary schools.

The political discourse is promising, but there is a deception in reality within educational institutions, as words fail to transcend pedagogical actions, being limited by the political-school sector itself, creating an illusion between discourse and what is experienced in the school setting. Returning to the cycle of creating educational policies, during implementation, it is necessary to continuously plan and evaluate the strategies created; however, both planning and evaluation are segregated from the process. By being segregated, an appearance of the results of implementation is created. This aspect will be referred to as an illusion.

Illusion is considered a distortion of reality,

regardless of its context: "all illusions deceive us, seeing something that is not really present or seeing only part of what is" (Lazzari et al., 2016, p. 83). In the field of education, political illusion is created when a discourse of human formation is disseminated, but the conditions, norms, times and actions imposed by the system make this task impossible. This forces teachers and school agents to modify their actions, mechanize their thoughts and deceive in results, progress and experiences in order to obtain what is desired from them, limiting the benefits and potential that the aforementioned objectifications could manifest.

Within primary school, two important dimensions were identified where the above-mentioned discursive illusion is manifested: the normative process of planning (a moment that, when separated from the constant task within the implementation of school policy, will be called planning) and the evaluation processes where political deception and distortion are highlighted.

Educational planning. Illusory objectification in teachers' humanistic experiences

The gap between political discourse and reality in basic education is manifested in the burden of content and school, social, and regulatory practices that must be met in each cycle. This is reflected in teachers' planning, which shows how the school curriculum guides and directs the content, profiles, goals, and actions carried out within professional practices. Ponce (2018) refers to the educational guide for primary schools as curriculum, which "involves a theoretical and philosophical framework, [...] that guides educational theory and praxis" (p. 57); it is the guide for teachers to direct their work and actions in the classroom. Based on the above, the curriculum is defined as "the set of studies and practices intended for students to fully develop their potential" (Ponce, 2018, p. 57). Based on the above, practices are defined by the interests of the various sectors involved in education, making it difficult for teachers to address and organize their actions in response to the needs presented.

To direct school interests towards curricular development, a "historical construction that occurs under certain conditions is required. [...] It encompasses political, social, economic practices;

the production of teaching aids, administrative practices, and the control or supervision of the educational system [...] It serves as a nucleus for integrating knowledge and contributions” (Gimeno, 2010, pp. 12-13). Therefore, school planning can be considered an institutional policy, since it specifically determines what each institution needs to respond. Bashar and Sifawa (2022) mention that each school has its own policy, since they originate within the school itself, and educational authorities (such as the principal) determine who, what, and how each action and delivery document should be done. In this sense, planning requires incorporating current political, school, and social needs, trying to articulate them to guide professional actions. The above views planning as a “work instrument that facilitates the organization, execution, and control of the administrative task [...] it is responsible for delimiting the purposes, objectives, and goals of education. [...] allows us to define what to do, how to do it, and what resources and strategies are used.” (Carriazo, Pérez and Gaviria et al., 2020, p. 88). In an attempt to meet educational demands, school planning is limited to focusing on retaking technical and conceptual knowledge to achieve this, leaving moral and values education aside. This is reflected in teaching practices, where their strategies are aimed at the formal adaptation of the curriculum rather than at meaningful experiences, and these strategies, within planning, mechanize educational actions.

Within primary school, two instances were identified where the established curriculum, which is used to guide action during the school year, deviates from the reality presented by schools, and teachers must seek other means to meet the objectives set by education:

1. In a conversation with a teacher who served as assistant principal for one school year, I was responsible for reviewing and approving each teacher's lesson plans. At that time, my role was to lead a group at that school. My plan included a general plan, specifying all the content and elements to be developed, which are outlined in the plans and programs. I received some comments from the assistant principal, requesting that the general plan be broken down by day and that I

attach a copy of the assessment instruments. However, now that the teacher is in the role of a front-of-class teacher, he expresses his recognition that the elements in the plan I requested are not significant for classroom work, but in his role as assistant principal, they were necessary to avoid regulatory sanctions from his superiors and fulfill the dream of normative work.

2.- In the dialogue with a 5th grade primary school teacher, her concern was expressed about meeting the needs that she was able to see her students had in their training, which she recognizes are not in accordance with what the school policy requires her to establish in her curricular planning, so the teacher makes the decision to meet the real needs in her classroom and leave pending the contents of the grade indicated by the program of the same, however, in the planning that she submits for review, she includes the curricular contents so as not to have problems with its review.

These two cases show how teachers' planning must comply with certain elements to generate normative appearances before the authorities, but these do not necessarily guide their actions as professional guides with their students. Therefore, their organization, when submitted to the authorities, does not transcend the scope of the training activities.

Educational Assessment: Illusory Objectification in Teachers' Humanistic Experiences

One of the main factors that intervenes within school policy as a limiting objectification for human formation and development is evaluation. This is considered by the SEP (2018) as "a systematic and planned process of gathering information through multiple strategies, techniques, and instruments, which allows for making judgments and assessing whether students have achieved the expected learning outcomes" (p. 5). Despite promising changes in education, such as the shift to a vision of human formation, evaluation continues to be taken and conceptualized as a systematic process that methodically gathers information, with the purpose of "assigning a grade" (SEP, 2018, p. 7). Its limitation is due to the fact that, in its systematic process, already in practice, this term is flawed and

directed toward mechanizing content, actions, and assessments. Therefore, instead of viewing evaluation as a process of improvement, it remains limited to illusory evidence, without the possibility of achieving teaching utopias. Assessment ultimately adapts the experiences of teachers and students to what is politically required. Assessment, by having a school period segregated from the ongoing process of the system, seeks to systematize the skills, knowledge, thoughts, and behaviors of students and teachers. During this school period, assessment becomes a time of academic burden, forcing a restriction on the strategies and behaviors of teachers and students.

Within primary school, five moments are identified where evaluation frustrates the task of human development and transforms the actions, relationships, and experiences of teachers into mechanical-authoritarian operations adapted and determined by normative demands:

1. A dialogue is established between the school's health promoter and the two teachers in charge of the school's sixth-grade classes. The teachers express how the change in the school calendar affects their work schedules and organization; the days are longer, but they still face the same evaluation dates and the same curriculum completion requirements, creating the same pressures and depriving them of rest time between school years.

2. - A sixth-grade teacher expresses that, when facing evaluation periods, the conditions of the students, the school, and society are not favorable for carrying out this process. She recognizes that the working conditions of the community where the institution is located place limitations on ensuring that all her students have progressed or acquired certain knowledge that must be evaluated, since many of the children miss school on evaluation days to attend family or religious traditions activities first. This prevents her from visualizing the expected progress of her students. On the other hand, she must rethink how to organize the group so that the evaluation tests can be delivered in a timely manner.

3. During the assessment in a sixth-grade classroom, students are taking their knowledge test. The teacher instructs the class that they should

all review some questions on their test because they have errors in their answer choices. During this process, she explains how to solve some problems. The teacher asks them to comment on the questions she has identified that contain errors or difficulties in their resolution, in order to give them instructions on what and how to place the information so they can answer correctly.

4.- A dialogue is presented in which a fifth-grade student comments on the little importance he gives to his schoolwork, admitting that he does it mechanically, without reflection and without taking it as a learning experience, but he defines himself as "the best student" thanks to his grade, since he always gets 10 on his tests.

5. - A dialogue is established with a fifth-grade student, who expresses that she has managed to identify that she believes she does not have the knowledge or skills that she should obtain for the school grade in which she is enrolled, mentioning that her grade that she obtained the previous cycle is good because she submitted all her requested work, but she does not remember the content that she saw in her classes.

The cases described demonstrate that assessment is a mechanized process that measures individual effectiveness, neglecting individual development, meaningful learning, and the way in which individuals interact with their social and academic experiences. Students and teachers recognize this flaw in the education system, aware that obtaining a passing grade does not necessarily mean adequate training, much less the development of individual potential. Standardized tests are used for assessment, which guide the evaluation processes in basic education. However, in reality, they pressure teachers to obtain acceptable quantitative results, even if this means that the processes to achieve them are not ethically humanistic and create an illusion in the assessment results.

DISCUSSION

Despite having established curricular organizations, the school reality is different; it forces teachers to take actions contrary to what the school policy that governs the curriculum requires. With the results found, it is possible to reflect on

the differences that exist between what the school policy discourse establishes within the NEM and what teachers and students experience in their school reality. In this sense, we can begin to reflect on three important aspects: the first refers to how regulatory compliance can turn teachers into objects of evaluation, into figures that shape their professionalism, limiting their actions in the classroom, where "the uses and proposals for curriculum development: documents on curricular requirements [...] technical standards [...] and evaluation tests [...] will not significantly change the culture of schooling" (Gimeno, 2010, p. 28) , since the concern for curricular compliance causes school culture and relationships to become mechanical, fixed, and segregated from presenting evidence.

The second analyses how the regulations established within school policy create an illusion of reality, turning the curriculum into an "intention, a plan, an idea about what we would like to happen in schools [...] relationship between its two meanings: as intention and as reality" (Angulo, 1994, p. 2) . In this case, what it is desirable becomes illusory results created and falsified due to the fear of a sanction or reprisal, leaving what it is documented as a discourse that, shows fiction, far removed from school realities.

The third aspect can be posed by reflecting on what kind of humanism is manifested in the decisions and actions of teachers and school authorities, who must present their professional work in the face of school policies. And how can an institution that appears to display humanitarian training, strategies, and relationships in its regulations? School policy can lead school staff's experiences to go against human development, since their actions and formative example manifest illusion and pretense to authorities and peers. In this case, school planning, in the hands of the administration, serves as evidence intended to show, when required, what school authorities need to visualize; in this way, planning contributes to publicly demonstrating the discursive illusion of school policy.

With the above, it is considered that, unlike policymakers, teachers know and interact with their students, know what they need and where they

have their greatest strengths; this gives them the ability to act autonomously to rethink how to organize and meet student needs. Alluding to what Schmelkes (1994) mentions as the necessary questions that every school must ask itself: "what and how students should learn? To do so, they must take into account [...] the official curriculum [...] the objectives outlined in the study plans and programs" (p. 14). Therefore, in the results mentioned within the planning aspect, we can determine that it is necessary for teaching; however, when it is documented, its function has been flawed, and both teachers and administrators create it thinking of being accountable to what school policy requires as evidence of what the educational system demands. Therefore, by addressing the above, the planning document becomes an illusion, since, in practice, each teacher, based on their experiences and needs, plans the organization of their activities according to their classroom conditions, even though this documentation is not provided. This creates a gap between practical planning and the planning provided by administrative circumstances, the latter being the one that remains documented as evidence of the school discourse.

Planning is limited to an objectification conceived as a working tool for educational policy, but within the classroom, it remains a technical activity recorded on paper solely to comply with standards. However, it serves neither as a support nor as a guide for teaching practice, much less to address real training needs within the classroom. There is a gap between planning practices and school policy discourse, which makes it evident that planning is viewed and experienced as a written document on paper that helps with administrative compliance in schools.

On the other hand, in the case of evaluation, teachers express concerns that differ from those suggested by political discourse. There is a gap between what is documented in educational policy and actual practice. According to teachers' responses, it is evident how political demands have shaped interests and actions. Political illusions continue to promote, in their discourses, documented in reforms and proposals, a concern for addressing individual and contextual needs.

However, the current Mexican educational context reveals that, despite their interests and needs, they fail to adapt their profiles and administrative and political-school demands to the real situation. Rather, they are documented to fuel the discourse that the system seeks to publish, obtain, and disseminate; creating an illusion that is transmitted throughout all school years, with results and processes created and recreated within the institutions. This obscures the experiences of school policy, leaving their actions unknown to the school community.

Within the experiences of education, the same objectification of the systematic process that is used in the conceptualization of evaluation is left in school practice, limiting it to experiencing it within the classroom as a mechanized school process, which generates tension and fictitious qualitative labels for teachers and students.

CONCLUSIONS

School policy must act on social, educational, and political needs so that they can be articulated within its organization and contribute to the development of students. School policy is responsible for organizing education and generating strategies for change and improvement in its conditions and objectives. These strategies are expressed and disseminated through a promising discourse of educational utopias and greater possibilities for the actions of school officials. The discourse of school policy is disseminated at all educational levels through school reforms. These reforms are the guiding project that sets the path, actions, and objectives for any school level, giving rise to the educational model that will guide teachers' actions toward the results expected by school policy.

To report on results, teachers are required to conduct certain objective assessments that demonstrate progress and changes in training. At the primary level, these objective assessments include planning and evaluation; these processes are conceived as evidence of teachers' work and the achievements of the current educational model. This evidence should show the results of each subject and, furthermore, progress in developing the humanistic visions of the discourse of change.

The humanistic vision is reflected in the axes and objectives of the NEM; however, behind the political discourse and the evidence of the objective assessments at this level, there is a gap and, at the same time, a coexistence of different school reforms that govern teachers' experiences.

Primary school teachers take courses, develop teaching strategies, create learning environments, and organize their visions and school objectives based on the humanistic discourse proposed by the NEM. This is because this school model requires evidence and accountability for its discourse; in contrast, teachers must also work with previous school reforms to demonstrate their work experiences. Despite being mindful of the NEM's discourse, their curricular organization must be guided by elements of previous school models, since their plans and programs are the ones officially disseminated to develop and plan their work.

In this way, the political aspect of education can be conceived as a system made up of segregated agents, areas, and processes, each with different interests and needs, yet responsible for organizing all educational actions and discursively directing them toward the hope of change.

This poses a challenge for teachers: they need to master the school models that govern them in order to identify the changes and differences they manifest; and despite this, they must work to achieve coexistence between them so that their objectifications reflect the unification of the humanist axis and their experiences within it. Unfortunately, the two objectifications presented (planning and evaluation) are experienced differently than they are expressed within the political-school discourse. This, in their diversity, forces both processes and practices to collaborate so that the political discourse continues to present, in its results, an illusion of humanist ethical experiences.

On the one hand, planning is conceived as an administrative process isolated from school needs, which, rather than transcending practice, is limited to being documented to demonstrate the illusion of what should be and be done within the classroom. Planning enhances the work of an institution, demonstrates and justifies school pedagogical

processes, but fails to transcend the process of adapting to educational needs. Meanwhile, assessment is understood as an isolated, linear process determined by educational authorities who demand that students be classified and labeled according to their wishes. This process is limited to a specific period of the school year and is excluded from the ongoing development of students.

Both objectifications are experienced as processes isolated from educational and training activities. Consequently, rather than acting as mechanisms for political and educational revitalization, they function as moments of contradiction to academic growth, mechanizing professional action. Contradiction refers to opposing, isolated elements that exist within the same system but fail to merge within it; they mark a contrasting line and acquire separate aspects of what should be and what is. This contradiction of objectification, in relation to the humanist discourse of school policy, creates a system composed of isolated elements that are systematized and force individuals to adapt to what is desirable, creating the illusion of a unified process while, in practice, it is segregated and unilateral.

Despite this, teachers must be accountable for the coexistence of conflicting school models at the primary level. They attempt to create humanistic experiences under pressure from the school system itself, and despite these social, political, and academic pressures and challenges, they manage to unify their evidence around what they want to publish. They manage to present results in their requested objectifications under a single axis. These results become technical, systematic, and authoritarian experiences thanks to the standards imposed on them by school policy, which pressures them to become linear and makes it impossible to propose other forms of evaluation, planning, and school policy.

REFERENCES

- Aguilar, C. (2017). Evaluación de políticas públicas. Una aproximación. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.
- Angulo, J. (1994). *¿A qué llamamos curriculum?* 17-29.
- <https://www.uv.mx/dgdaie/files/2012/11/CPP-DC-Angulo-Rasco-A-que-llamamos-curriculum.pdf>
- Arias, D. H., y Molano, F. (Eds.). (2016). *Escuela y formación humanista miradas desde la investigación educativa* (Primera edición). Universidad de la Salle, Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación.
- Bashar, S. I., y Sifawa, A. M. (2022). Educational policy: a review of its nature, forms, processes, rationale and misconceptions. *Educational Policy*.
- Bonilla-Molina, L. (2016). *Apagón Pedagógico Global (APG). Las reformas educativas en clave de resistencias*.
- Carriaz, C., Perez, M., y Gaviria, K. (2020). *Planificación educativa como herramienta fundamental para una educación con calidad*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.3907048>
- De Sousa Santos, B., y Meneses, M. P. (2014). *Epistemologías del Sur*. Ediciones Akal, SA.
- Denzis, N., y Lincoln, Y. (2012). *El campo de la investigación cualitativa. Manual de investigación cualitativa, Vo. I* (Vol. 1). Gedisa.
- Diplomatic Academy. (2019). *Education Planning*. <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/education-planning-practitioner.pdf>
- Gimeno, J. (2010). *Saberes e incertidumbres sobre el currículum*. Morata.
- González, I. A. (2019). Política educativa, actores y pedagogía, de Carlos Ornelas, Marco Aurelio Navarro-Leal y Zaira Navarrete-Cazales (coordinadores). *Perfiles Educativos*, 42(167), 226-230. <https://doi.org/10.22201/iisue.24486167e.2019.167.59532>
- Hammersley, M., y Atkinson, P. (1994). *Etnografía. Métodos de investigación* (2.^a ed.). Paidós.
- Hernández, S. (2012). *Implementación de políticas educativas. Los concursos de oposición y la Alianza por la Calidad de la Educación*.

- Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación. (2018). *La política educativa en México*.
- Izcara, S. (2014). *Manual de investigación educativa* (1.^a ed.). Fontamara.
- Lazzari, L. L., Moulia, P. I., & Gervasoni, A. I. (2016). *Aportes de las ilusiones ópticas a diferentes campos del conocimiento*.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2016). *Education for pro t, education for freedom*.
- Pawan, y Neha. (2021). A comprehensive study of evaluation in education. *IMPETUS. XAVIER'S INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL*, X, 6-13.
- Pedraza, R. (2016). *Terapia breve Mindfulness: El cambio docente*. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México.
- Ponce Naranjo, G. (2018). La teoría y la praxis curricular: Resignificaciones desde la práctica docente. *Revista Científica UISRAEL*, 5(2), 51-59. <https://doi.org/10.35290/rcui.v5n2.2018.90>
- Rebillou, M. P. D. (2017). *Proyecto canaima educativo: ¿ilusiones discursivas?*
- Schaff, A. (1982). *Historia y verdad*. Grijalbo.
- Schmelkes, S. (1994). *Hacia una mejor calidad de nuestras escuelas*. Organization of American States.
- Secretaría de Educación Pública. (2018). *Evaluar para aprender. La evaluación formativa y su vínculo con la enseñanza y aprendizaje*. SEP.
- Secretaría de Educación Pública. (2023). *La Nueva Escuela Mexicana: Principios y orientaciones pedagógicas*. SEP.
- Secretaría de Educación Pública. (2024). *Plan de Estudio de preescolar, primaria y secundaria 2022*. SEP.