

Socialization and Pedagogization

Socialização e pedagogização
Socialización y pedagogización

Mario Díaz-Villa* 
Maria Teresa de Jesús Carrillo-Hernández** 

Fecha de recepción: 15 de diciembre de 2022
Fecha de aprobación: 28 de febrero de 2023

How to cite

Díaz-Villa, M. y Carrillo-Hernández, M. T. (2023). Socialization and Pedagogization. *Pedagogía y Saberes*, (59), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.17227/pys.num59-17972>

* PhD in Educación. Professor (J) at Universidad del Valle, Colombia. mdiazvilla@gmail.com

** PhD in Philosophy with an emphasis in Educational Studies. Professor at Universidad Autónoma de Coahuila. Lecturer at Escuela Normal Superior de Coahuila, México. teresa.carrillo@hotmail.com



Abstract

In both the field of sociology and in pedagogy, the nuclear concepts of this paper are linked to the constitution of identities, which differ in terms of the historical change in the social basis. Thus, while the concept of socialization represented the ordering of behavior, character, manners, and forms of relation, which responded to modern rationality; pedagogization represents the decentering of hierarchical forms of socialization, mediated by rigid limits, and the emergence of subtle, imperceptible, diffuse and apparently empty modes of control modalities. However, these concepts coexist and hybridize in the 21st century. These two concepts are described and analyzed in this paper, in which some relevant aspects are developed to understand the difference between socialization and pedagogization, and to clarify the historical role of both concepts in the constitution of identity and, contemporarily, in the domestication and control of mind. For analytical purposes, first, we will refer to the concept of socialization; secondly, we will address pedagogization. Finally, we propose some issues to read critically the value systems and the constellation of imaginaries built by pedagogization, which feeds flexible, transitive, hedonistic, healthy lifestyles, through which the subject is co-opted and decentered. Therefore, the paper is the result of the theoretical research process carried out by the authors on the relations between pedagogy and culture, relations that have crossed the social formations throughout history.

Keywords

discipline; control; modernity; postmodernity

Resumo

Tanto no campo da sociologia quanto no da pedagogia, os conceitos nucleares desde artigo estão ligados à constituição de identidades, que se diferenciam pela mudança histórica das bases sociais. Assim, enquanto o conceito de socialização representava o ordenamento de comportamentos, caráter, maneiras e formas de relacionamento que respondiam à racionalidade moderna; a pedagogização representa o descentramento das formas hierárquicas de socialização, mediadas por limites rígidos e a emergência de formas sutis, imperceptíveis, modalidades difusas e aparentemente vazias de controle. No entanto, esses conceitos coexistem e se hibridizam no século xxi. Estes são objeto da descrição e análise durante este artigo, onde são desenvolvidos alguns aspectos relevantes para entender sua diferença e esclarecer seu papel histórico na constituição das identidades e, contemporaneamente, na domesticação e controle do pensamento. Para fins analíticos, primeiramente, nos referiremos ao conceito de socialização; em segundo lugar, abordaremos o da pedagogização. Por fim, propomos algumas considerações para ler criticamente os sistemas de valores e a constelação de imaginários construídos pela pedagogização, que alimenta estilos de vida flexíveis, transitivos, hedonistas, saudáveis, através dos quais o sujeito é submetido e cooptado, descentrado. Portanto, o artigo é resultado do processo de pesquisa teórica realizado pelos autores sobre a relação entre pedagogia e cultura, conceitos interdependentes que atravessam as mais diversas formações sociais ao longo da história.

Palavras-chave

disciplina; controle; modernidade; pós-modernidade

Resumen

Tanto en el campo de la sociología como en el de la pedagogía, los conceptos nucleares de este artículo están vinculados a la constitución de identidades, que se diferencian en términos del cambio histórico en las bases sociales. Así, mientras el concepto de socialización representaba el ordenamiento de la conducta, el carácter, las maneras y formas de relación, que respondían a la racionalidad moderna, la pedagogización representa el descentramiento de las formas de socialización jerarquizadas, mediadas por límites rígidos, y el surgimiento de modalidades de control sutiles, imperceptibles, difusas y aparentemente vacías. Sin embargo, estos conceptos coexisten y se hibridan en el siglo xxi. Ellos son objeto de descripción y análisis en el presente artículo, en el cual se desarrollan algunos aspectos relevantes para comprender su diferencia y esclarecer su papel histórico en la constitución de la identidad y, contemporáneamente, en la domesticación y control del pensamiento. Para efectos analíticos, en primer lugar, nos referiremos al concepto de socialización; en segundo lugar, abordaremos el de pedagogización. Finalmente, planteamos algunas consideraciones para leer críticamente los sistemas de valores y la constelación de imaginarios construidos por la pedagogización, que alimenta estilos de vida flexibles, transitivos, hedonistas, saludables, a través de los cuales el sujeto es sujetado, cooptado y descentrado. El artículo es el resultado del proceso de reflexión teórica que adelantan los autores sobre la relación entre pedagogía y cultura, conceptos interdependientes que han atravesado las diversas formaciones sociales a lo largo de la historia.

Palabras clave

disciplina; control; modernidad; posmodernidad

Introduction

The central theme of this article is related to two cross-cutting concepts in the social sciences: *socialization and pedagogization*¹. Socialization is a macro-concept that, in the 20th century, was paradigmatic as a signifier of entry into order and forms of relationship and identity through specialized agencies such as family, school, religion, and institutionalized procedures in society. According to Durkheim (1976), socialization plays an integrative and regulatory role, while, for Weber (1922/1977), it is a socially oriented action following values, regulated in terms of values, and measured. Simmel (1926/2014) distinguishes between the form and content of socialization:

I call the content or matter of socialization everything that exists in individuals (concrete and immediate carriers of all historical reality) capable of originating action on others or receiving their influences; call it instinct, interest, purpose, inclination, state, or psychic movement [...]. Socialization only occurs when the isolated coexistence of individuals takes on determined forms of cooperation and collaboration falling under the general concept of reciprocal action. (p. 103)

In turn, Parsons (1959) considers that “the socializing function can be summarized by saying that it consists of developing within each individual those skills and attitudes that constitute the essential requirements for their future development in life” (p. 298).

The theoretical development of the concept of socialization is inscribed within the framework of modernity, where a cultural transformation gives rise to a new concept of education and action on individuals and social groups. As individuals become a source of development and productivity, the need arises to educate, train, and regulate their behavior, ways, and relationship forms, contributing to their social position. On the one hand, the core family—the nuclear family—shapes new generations with retrospective and prospective values; on the other hand, the school controls the content of education and the pedagogical models and management modalities of the individual and the group. According to Bruner (1992),

the advent of modernity is marked by a complete revolution in the organization of socialization processes, enabling everyday functioning in society and the transmission and use of knowledge as they began to be assumed by an increasingly inclusive structure of formal education centered on the school. (p. 12)

Socialization is then consolidated as the basic principle of social order in the family, establishing limits, order, and stability. At the same time, the school constitutes the collective foundation of training for working life. According to Pérez-Agote (2010), the socializing function of educational systems “fundamentally consisted of forming a homogeneous citizenship, regulated by habits and routines that allowed its adaptation to the productive machinery of society, and integrated by patriotic bonds in the mold of the nation” (p. 28).

On the other hand, pedagogization refers to a broad and operational sense, dependent on the contemporary meaning of culture or the pluralization of cultural modalities². Socialization and pedagogization have likely hybridized (Bernstein, 1998; Tyler, 2004) and, in this way, a semiotic convergence of socialization, pedagogization, and culture has occurred concerning the configuration of socially constructed dynamic structures of meaning (Geertz, 2003) that renew themselves under the profound influence of cultural and economic change instability.

Since it is of interest to educators to understand the mechanisms underlying postmodern informal or formal pedagogical practices and understand their relationships with the multiplicity of contemporary languages, as well as the way they intertwine and hybridize in identity, we propose in this article to develop some relevant aspects to understand the difference between socialization and pedagogization and clarify the historical role of both concepts in the constitution of identity and, contemporaneously, in the domestication of thought.

To this end, first, we will refer to the concept of socialization; second, we will address that of pedagogization. Finally, we present some considerations for critically reading the value systems and the constellation of imaginaries constructed by pedagogization,

1 The article is the result of the reflection process undertaken by the authors on the relationship between pedagogy and culture. These interdependent concepts have traversed various social formations throughout history.

2 Historically, pedagogization is linked to the Welfare state typical of 20th-century modernity. According to Depaepe and Simon (2008), the concept was raised in Germany in the late fifties by the sociologist Janpeter Kob (Höhne, 2002; 2004). It is linked to the increasing penetration of education in daily life and the search for economic performance in the subject via professionalization.

which nourishes flexible, transitive, hedonistic, and healthy lifestyles through which the individual is subjected, co-opted, and decentered.

About Socialization

Socialization has been considered an intrinsic pedagogical problem in the social and human sciences. It is a pedagogical problem because pedagogical practice has been intrinsic to any form of socialization. In the tradition of the social sciences field, it is possible to find a diversity of approaches that delineate the nature of socialization into multiple objects and processes—learning, competencies, cognitive and socio-affective development—dependent on relationships within and between disciplines—anthropology, history, ethnology, psychology, and sociology—whose languages diverge and converge in the search for principles, practices, and relationships. In a sense, the study of socialization as a concept is a matter of mutual recontextualizations within and between the different social sciences³ disciplines. Each approach tends toward its singularity and legitimization.

Sociology has accumulated a whole arsenal of viewpoints or approaches to socialization that possess differentiated and stratified specialized languages over time. Thus, we find structuralist, functionalist, Marxist, interactionist, and phenomenological positions, each with languages claiming legitimacy regarding the form and content of their discourses on what has schematically been called socialization. Despite the differences between subjective and objective perspectives, there is an inevitable convergence on the issues or questions posed regarding socialization and its consequences.

Generally, socialization presupposes a dialectical relationship between culture and the individual (Bauman, 2002)⁴. For others, culture presupposes a symbolic order, a “sum of productions and institutions that distance our life from that of our animal ancestors and serve two purposes: protecting man against nature and regulating relations among men” (Freud, 1997, p. 3033). From this perspective,

3 The growing division of the socialization labor informs us about the profound segmentation and differentiation of this practice and the differential valuation of its discourses, as well as the socializing experiences along with their perspectives and visions. In particular, these latter seem to undergo increasing dispersion over time and, why not say, a profound transformation in the generation and regeneration of modalities within culture.

4 In fact, for Bauman, the issue of culture is more complex. From his perspective, culture can be studied as a concept (differential or generic), as a structure, or as praxis.

culture socializes, imposes meanings, and produces limits, languages, and ways of perceiving. In this latter case, our perception is cultural, just like our retina. We see what we must see, what we want, or what we feel. In this sense, the other is not the other but rather my vision of the other, or the other in my eye, in my construction. A play of gazes and gazes of the interaction game. This is constitutive of personal experience or personal culture. As Goodenough (as cited in Geertz, 2003) suggests, it “consists of what one must know or believe to act acceptably to its members” (p. 25).

Culture is a universal constituent of identity and, within each cultural modality, of various forms or types. In this sense, culture is both universalizing and particularizing. Universalizing in the sense that it leaves its mark on individuals through education (Lévi-Strauss, 1971), and particularizing in the sense that it occurs within a complex system of groups, processes, and unequal social relations dependent on specific normative and evaluative contexts. In the first case, we can consider culture as the primary socializing principle—or educational principle—characteristic of integrating groups and individuals, on the one hand, and imposing limits, on the other. In this regard, Lévi-Strauss (1971) describes culture as the common heritage of all humanity, “a heritage whose origin dates back millions of years (...) takes the form of lived experiences [...] and allows each person to feel the intellectual and physical solidarity that binds them to all of humanity” (p. 16). In the second case—particularizing—we must consider the differences within or among each culture.

In both cases, socialization has always involved the projection of the social onto the individual through the transmission of customs, behaviors, modes, manners, and relationships. This extended process is filled with “thousands of unnoticed details, but that should be the object of observation [...] children are taught to control their reflexes, certain fears are inhibited, movements are selected, and what will stop them” (Lévi-Strauss, 1971, p. 18).

Therefore, while, as Schütz notes (1993, p. 41), appropriating Weber, one starts from the fundamental concept of the total unity of culture, the unequal distribution of meanings (and their orientations to them) within the specific modality of a culture must be considered. Likewise, Geertz (2003), interpreting Max Weber, considers that “man is an animal inserted into webs of meaning he has woven [...] that culture is that warp, and that the analysis of culture must, therefore, not be a science of laws, but an interpretative science in search of meanings” (p. 20).

From the same perspective, Bernstein (1993) distinguishes between the modality of culture and the modality within culture. The former refers to how culture implies the angulation of the world in the subject. In contrast, the latter refers to how power and control define the particularities of individuals' and groups' socialization within a specific culture. This translates into an unequal "creation, distribution, reproduction, and legitimation of physical and symbolic values [...] that regulate relationships within social groups and between them, and thus, their forms of consciousness" (Bernstein, 1993, p. 25). From this approach, it can be inferred that socialization within the modality of culture involves positioning in tacit or explicit pedagogical discourses and practices that, in turn, produce specific identities. The social basis of these identities is constituted by principles of social order (Bernstein, 1998). It is legitimized in informal sociolinguistic contexts (family, community, region) and formal contexts (those within the educational system or the workforce).

From this perspective, the socialization process signifies not only the entry into language but the insertion, through it, into the universal logic of the symbolic and the logic of values, norms, and responsibilities specific to particular modalities within culture. Halliday argues that language is important in developing the child as a social being. "Language," he adds, "is the main channel through which models of life are transmitted, through which one learns to act as a member of a society and adopt its culture, ways of thinking and acting, beliefs, and values" (Halliday, 1982). The author continues:

This does not happen through instruction, at least not in the preschool period; no one teaches them the principles by which social groups are organized, nor their system of beliefs [...] it happens indirectly, through the accumulated experience of numerous small, seemingly insignificant facts, in which their behavior is guided and regulated, and during which they form and develop personal relationships of all kinds [...]. The surprising truth is that it is the everyday uses of ordinary language with parents, siblings, neighborhood children, at home, on the street, in the park, in stores, and on trains and buses that serve to transmit to the child the essential qualities of society and the nature of being social (p. 18).

For Halliday, culture is learned through the learning of language. This, in turn, has a relationship with the structure of the social world, which could be considered a structure of intentional and intelligible meanings (Schütz, 1993).

The socialization process has been considered an act of semiosis and, as such, a function of the social contexts in which subjects interact. It is clear that while socializing contexts (instructional, regulatory) may be relatively similar, the orientation towards meanings produced in them is not the same for all social groups. Hence, in socialization processes, individuals are socially situated and located in different orders of meanings. If learning language is, as Halliday (1982) suggests, learning to mean, early and successive socialization practices constitute a fundamental learning resource for learning the culture of their group and the environment in which they live. But in the sociocultural context in which they live, some meanings are imposed over others. In this sense, we cannot consider socialization as a homogeneous process, nor the intrinsic social action as a neutral practice.

This perspective leads us to consider the close relationships between the conditions of existence and the processes of subject formation that become members of a social group. The conditions of existence, rather than being characterized by heterogeneous situations, are a generative principle of inequalities, stratifications, differentiations, and, consequently, the social value of identity. For this reason, when discussing conditions of existence, we must consider class relations as a constitutive principle, selectively influencing the orientation towards meanings and the unequal distribution of the positions of individuals in society. In a way, the tacit modeling inherent in family pedagogical practice reproduces this inequality.

We have mentioned that socialization presents a dialectical relationship between culture/society and the individual. The emphasis placed on one of the elements in this relationship is based on the perspective one has on them. In this sense, there are various approaches to socialization, the pedagogical practice — or pedagogy — it entails, and their different forms and contents. This relationship between the form and content of socialization had already been discussed by Simmel (1926/2014) when he stated that "on the one hand, a form of socialization must appear with completely different contents, for entirely different purposes, and on the other, the same interests must appear realized in various forms of socialization" (p. 105). Modes of control, for example, have the same end but can be realized in various ways. This is characteristic of pedagogical practice due to its transversal nature, as indicated in the article "What is this thing called pedagogy?"

The various approaches to socialization allow us to consider that the term has become semantically saturated. It not only means different things for

different authors but also different things for different historical moments. In some cases, cognitive and socio-affective aspects are considered. According to Bernstein (1977), in one case or another, theories are less examined and explored at the conceptual and empirical levels and more analyzed in terms of the underlying models of man and society. From his point of view, various approaches around socialization are part of sociological thinking. They are related to order or control, socializing-socialized social conflict, their structural relations, or the construction of the social reality of the other in negotiated encounters (Bernstein, 1977).

On the other hand, from the perspective of Parsons, Wrong (1961) examines the implications of the Hobbesian conception of order in socialization⁵. He argues that socialization means the “transmission of culture” from the group where the individual is born and the process of shaping them as human beings. In his analysis, Wrong adds that socialization refers to both the problem of the permanence of order and the possibility of its change. According to Wrong, the order problem can be seen as something external or internal to the individual. This conception is more specifically present in the thought of Bourdieu (1995)⁶.

The concept of external control over the individual has a particular Hobbesian foundation. Hobbes (1651/1994) distinguishes between two order types: normative and factual. Normative order refers to a given system of norms or normative elements, whether these are rules, purposes, or other types of norms. Order, in this case, means, according to Parsons (1951), “guidelines set according to a normative order” (p. 138). This concept is expressed in the defense of political authority, in the necessary authority for security and the maintenance of common welfare. Factual order refers to social order in

general. Both are defined as external forces acting on the individual and can be located at the macro level of the State.

What we call a conception of internal control within the individual suggests that control is exerted on individuals and exercised by them. According to Wrong (1961), individuals can recognize and accept control. The source of this conception is developed in the work of Durkheim. This aspect is of great importance for analyzing the implicit subjection to control in the so-called processes of pedagogization.

For Durkheim, there is nothing in social life that is not in individual consciousness. Despite his assertion that social facts exist outside of consciousness, his consideration of collective consciousness would suggest that social facts are both external and internal or internalized by the individual. His notion of constraint somewhat confirms the conception of internal control within the individual or internalized by them. Among the meanings he assigns to constraint is the following:

Cultural determination and the influence of socialization occur when individuals internalize specific socially given ideas and values. As a result, individuals acquire certain beliefs, desires, and feelings and act in a particular way. In this context, education is a continuous effort to impose on the child ways of seeing, feeling, and acting to which they do not spontaneously have access (Durkheim as cited in Lukes, 1973, p. 12).

As can be observed, the concept of socialization is related to Durkheim’s idea of society as a moral force:

We are now in a position to understand how there are rules called moral rules, which we all must obey because they order and direct our actions toward ends that transcend us while at the same time appear as desirable [...] society is the end of all moral activity [...] (i) it transcends the individual and is immanent in him, (ii) it has all the characteristics of a moral authority that commands respect. (Durkheim, 1953, pp. 53-56)

Durkheim’s perspective on morality fundamentally involves practices of discipline and control. These practices are implicit in the three elements that Durkheim distinguishes within morality⁷: the spirit of discipline present in morality as a “system of rules of action that predetermine conduct,” the collective ideal of morality or its content (collective

5 In Parsons’ terms, the problem of order refers to the integration of the motivations of actors with the normative cultural standards that constitute the action system in interpersonal contexts (institutionalization of a set of norms defining the limits of legitimate action). According to Parsons, these standards are a crucial part of the cultural tradition of the social system. See Parsons (1951) *The Social System*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, especially pages 36, 43, 71, and 118-119.

6 Bourdieu dialectically articulates subjective structures (mental frameworks) with objective structures (the social world). The organizing principle is habitus. However, it is essential to note that the order problem has been a constant theme in sociological thought. Authors such as Max Weber, Talcott Parsons, Wright Mills, and Lewis Coser have developed numerous analyses and critiques related to order. Due to space constraints, we will not delve deeper into this aspect.

7 It is essential to clarify that Durkheim’s concept of morality is entirely separate from the religious concept of morality. For Durkheim, morality is not about praying, or supplicating or indoctrination; rather, it is fundamentally about explanation.

representations), and autonomy, referring to the mental state of the moral agent⁸. The first and third elements are crucial for Durkheim in the socialization process.

On the one hand, discipline realizes

a vital function in the formation of character and personality in general since the most essential element of character is the disposition for self-control, the capacity for restraint, or, as it is said, inhibition, which allows us to contain our passions, desires, habits, and subject them to the law. (Durkheim, as cited in Luke, 1973, p. 113)

On the other hand, “acting morally is not only to respect discipline and be linked to the group; beyond this [...] we must have as clear and complete knowledge as possible of the reasons for our conduct” (Luke, 1973, p. 115).

From this perspective, socialization for Durkheim is a pedagogical practice that makes the children aware of their needs, initiating them into life and preparing them, thus, for the collective tasks that await them in modern life. The child needs to be taught morality to learn about the nature of the contexts in which they must live: family, community, nation, and the effects of these on their person. The child, says Durkheim, “needs to learn to coordinate and regulate his acts [...] he must acquire self-control, self-restraint, self-mastery, self-determination, a taste for discipline and order in conduct” (Luke, 1973, p. 123).

Durkheim’s model can be considered, appropriating Bourdieu’s term, a historical model of internalizing external cultural and social controls (symbolic control), in other words, how the social structure keeps the individual within its limits. “Society commands us because it is external and superior to us. But, on the other hand, it is within us and is us” (Durkheim, 1953, p. 57).

These controls are intrinsic to the processes and modalities of socialization, which are different for different groups. Durkheim seems to warn about this aspect when he suggests that “all moral systems

practiced by peoples are a function of their social organization. They are linked to their social structures and vary with them” (Durkheim, 1953, p. 56).

Durkheim’s approach was critical because it assigned a significant role to modern society in the socialization and definition of controls and social order external to the individual. However, his concern did not focus on the “how,” nor did he show the conflicts that arise from the relationship between the individual and society in socialization processes. His reference to pedagogy is fundamentally linked to the normative aspect of it, starting from the early experiences of the child in their social world and not to the pedagogical practices relevant to the achievements of socialization.

Durkheim’s contribution lies in providing the foundations for reflecting on socialization as a practice that articulates subjects, institutions, discourses, and practices that vary according to the position of the socializing agents in the social structure. Integrating these elements allows us to conceive socialization as a process of external and internal dynamics and analyze the different forms of relationship between categories and their practices, their historicity, changes in the very conceptions of order and control, and profound transformations in the internal order of individuals in an era marked by plurality, heterogeneity, and connectivity (Bermejo, 2005).

While it is true that the problematization of socialization has been extensive and diverse and the subject of many theoretical perspectives, today, it must undergo a profound critical analysis of its perspectives or approaches, nuances, levels, epochs, contexts, actors, modalities, etc., to this are added the social, political, and economic pressures (the market⁹) that different ideological forces face as they compete for the symbolic resources of socialization.

Pedagogization or the Postmodern Pedagogical Rationality

As Bermejo (2005) argues, diagnoses of the times coincide in affirming a paradigm shift: from unity to plurality, from unitary thinking to pluralistic thinking,

8 It is relevant that these three aspects, as we will see later, have transformed their semiosis. Thus, the spirit of discipline no longer rests on the production of docile bodies, typical of the disciplinary model under a watchful gaze (Costa and Rodríguez, 2010), but rather on biopolitical and psychopolitical power (the latter being part of what Han [2022] calls the “information regime”); the collective ideal of morality has become individual, and the object of realizations in one’s own life (individual ethics/morality on demand), and autonomy dissolves into visibility and exposure to control produced by a plurality of technologies.

9 From some perspectives, market principles have displaced the authority of certain classical actors as the primary socializing force. This has had a profound impact on the formative contexts of childhood, where norms have been displaced by personal choice, individual interest and satisfaction, hedonism, and the visibility of the subject. Norms are no longer a principle of unity and identity. Instead, there is the difference and multiplicity of options that, paradoxically, recognize little difference.

and from modern thought to postmodern thought. Applied to the concept of “pedagogization,” it becomes interesting to establish the underlying rationality, which, from our point of view, depends on changes in social foundations. As stated by Díaz Villa (2019), “pedagogization is associated with the constitution of new realizations of identity and individual and collective social practices” (p. 13), produced within the framework of economic, social, political, and cultural realities termed global, post-Fordist, or postmodern, which affected the relationships between and within individuals, their experiences, and their practices. In the described context, classical socializing agencies (family, school) ceased to be the epicenter of cultural modeling and identity formation. In a way, this heralds their crisis and a decline in their socializing models¹⁰.

With the expansion and development of global capitalism, the collective foundations of socialization weaken, and the insular pedagogical models inherent in educational institutions are in crisis in the face of the globalization of the media market that invades all areas of culture and socializing agencies. Thus, competition arises for appropriating models and control modalities¹¹ that operate with logic different from those of classical educational paradigms. As Bernstein (1998) argues, the State takes centralized control over funding, supervision, and the culture of institutions, management forms, appointment criteria, and educational contents in the educational field. Discourses of management and evaluation are also introduced. As a result of excessive state restrictions (standards, evaluation, accreditation, supervision, monitoring of institutional projects, pedagogical models), the autonomy of education weakens, and the formative function of institutions is subjected to the laws of the market. In this process, the pedagogical discourse is commercialized, giving rise to a new market for pedagogical management. Pedagogization emerges as a new culture that goes beyond

official knowledge and profoundly individualizes the education process. It becomes a matter of individual responsibility or enterprise (Bernstein, 1998).

However, the emergence of specific modes of pedagogization contemporaneously has led to the generation of new modalities of control and the constitution of new types of identity. As the logic of postmodern life has increasingly embraced pluralistic ideological principles, identity particularisms—linked to difference—have gained space in pedagogical agencies and social groups, where new forms of organization (division of labor) and social relationships that transcend disciplinary order have been imposed. Thus, the logic of discipline has transformed into the logic of control, draining the concept of socialization of its disciplinary positioning and giving way to plural games of control and their structuring effects on new forms of identity. These are relatively independent of narratives from the past and are much more oriented toward the market. In the present century, new forms of control, pedagogization, or identification run parallel to the multiplicity of lifestyles and the opening, decentralization, and educational and cultural cross-cutting (Díaz Villa, 2011) that occur as a consequence of the introduction of pedagogy into all possible spheres of life (Bernstein, 1998). Today, we witness a close relationship between the pluralization of these styles and the rapid dynamics of the collective foundations of society, grounded in the powers of the global market, deterritorialized (omnipresent), along with its fundamental ally, new information, and communication technologies. These have produced hegemonic forms of identity and identification, through which the individual, as Bermejo (2005) suggests, “has the possibility of different designs for the realization of one’s own life” (p. 112), through lifelong learning, short-term, on-demand, and differentiated. In a way, Žižek (1998) reconciles these perspectives when referring to individualization through secondary identification:

At first, the subject is immersed in the particular way of life in which they were born (family, local community); the only way to separate from their primordial organic community, to break ties with it, and assert themselves as an autonomous individual is to change their fundamental loyalty, recognizing the substance of their being in another, the secondary community that is both universal, not artificial, not spontaneous but mediated, sustained by the activity of free and independent subjects. (p. 165)

Secondary identification as self-organization and identity transformation is inseparable from the purposes, legitimacies, and social legitimations. In

10 Referring to the school, Pérez-Agote (2010) states that “the modern school has never fully achieved effectiveness as a socializing agency if what we understand by that is its ability to transmit the reference models necessary for the (self) constitution of subjects, consciences, and identities at will” (p. 28). He adds that, in this context, “educational structures are increasingly isolated. The processes of socialization and moral education are threatened” (p. 28).

11 This includes the proliferation of informal agencies and agents dedicated to education, a mix of coaching, influencers, applications, blogs, and, in general, social networks that, as Han (2022) argues, “take hold of individuals by creating profiles of behavior” (p. 22). Digital communication has increasingly contributed to this phenomenon.

this case, values beyond the family sphere related to life, education, and work shape the conditions for the distribution and framing of both the duty and the desire to be of the subject. In this sense, Žižek (1998) points out that “secondary identification remains abstract to the extent that it directly opposes particular forms of primary identification, that is, to the extent that it compels the subject to give up their primary identifications” (p. 166). In this case, the collective foundations of society become the source of secondary identification and a generative principle of participation in social life. However, we should question what social life means today and how it is a source of the constitution of a plurality of identities. Pedagogization emerges as a means of inserting the subject into the ongoing experiences of life and work. Education, linked to long-term expectations, gives way to the so-called “short-termism.” Bernstein (1998) describes it as follows:

When a task or work area, subject to continuous development, is condemned to disappearance or awaiting replacement when life experiences cannot be based on stable future predictions or the subject’s occupational position. In these circumstances, it is considered necessary to develop a new vital skill: trainability, the ability to take advantage of lifelong learning and thus cope with the new demands of work and life. (p. 88)

Hence, the singularistic semantics of socialization has ceased to be something irreducible to the essentialist normalization of the isolated individual, giving way to processes of temporary pedagogization based on a new pedagogical regime, supported by another one, that of information (Han, 2022). For this author, “in the information society, the means of confinement of the disciplinary regime dissolve into open networks” (pp. 13-14). If, as Deleuze (2012) suggests, referring to Foucault, in the disciplinary society that extends until the mid-20th century, control is visible and operates based on isolation and confinement. Socializing models of agencies like family or school are in crisis in control societies. This process takes decades because, as Bell (1976) states, “social systems take a long time to die” (p. 29). In this context, for example, “the company replaces the factory, lifelong learning tends to replace school, and continuous assessment replaces exams” (Deleuze, 2021, p. 1). This leads to pedagogization processes oriented toward the future and characterized by flexibility, modularization, interaction, diversity, and independence from requirements or regula-

tions. The increase in pedagogization extends to local contexts and practices that legitimize new forms of care¹², learning (playful), and competencies that deeply penetrate life, education, and work.

Generally, the theme of socialization and its semantic allies has historically been assumed in terms of entry into a single, total sociocultural order. This order has two meanings: One refers to the universality of the individual’s entry into a symbolic (sociocultural) order that differentiates it from the natural world. The other relates to the unequal distributions of meanings produced by this order. In this sense, each individual’s destiny has a social, cultural, and class basis. This perspective ignores that social bases no longer adhere to the unique code of modernity. As Bermejo (2005) argues, “unity can no longer be thought of as the identity of the whole and the part but as relation and connection in the plural” (p. 3).

For common sense, there is nothing as natural as the individual’s socialization, a process filled with tacit or explicit pedagogical practices. However, today, due to the dynamic nature of society and the diversity of economic and cultural markets, whose effects are manifold in traditional contexts—such as family, community, and school—the socialization

12 The control of the body is replaced by the education of the body, now pedagogized through fitness. In this regard, Costa and Rodríguez (2010) state that body control “is related to the new form of knowledge and intervention in and on bodies where the aim is no longer to improve it from the outside but to operate on it, shape it, and even design or program it by entering it. With the development of surgeries (implants and transplants), biotechnologies, genetic therapies, and psychiatric pharmacology, the body-machine of orthopedics gives way to the operable or manipulable body whose functions can be enhanced: it is an informed and interchangeable material that can be corrected and reprogrammed as many times as necessary” (p. 156). This perspective has also been developed by Giddens (1991) when he argues that “the body is a project; it is an individual and collective project. Individuals work on their bodies according to cultural patterns and their desires, while societies seek to shape and regulate bodies based on cultural values and social norms” (p. 175). Both the exterior and the interior have become objects of repair, reconditioning, beautification, aestheticization, and pedagogization in a permanent interrelation. In this sense, there is a continuum from plastic surgery to coaching.

process has turned into pedagogization¹³. In other words, it has become a complex of practices and mediatic relationships that govern everyday life entirely. As a social construction, pedagogization is the sociocultural punctuation of being in the grammar of knowledge, know-how, and the power to act in a performative society (Ball, 2013). According to Ball (2000), “performativity is a technology, a culture, and a mode of regulation and, as Lyotard defines it, a system of terror, which involves judgment, comparison, and exhibition, taken respectively as forms of control, friction, and transformation” (p. 104). Additionally, it can be stated that the power to act in society does not solicit the power of being but rather power over being and its physio-psychosocial nature. This represents a shift in the nature of power and control. While socialization rested on the disciplinary power of a society that emphasized both external and internal order, sociocultural pedagogization adds performative nuances to the shift towards a society of control.

One of the central problems of pedagogization is its emphasis on decentralization in the forms and contents it conveys. The latter typically have a plural, arbitrary character and, in 21st-century society, do not adhere to the code of traditional socializing agencies but dissolve into the diversity of means deployed by information networks. This means that today, learners acquire knowledge differently, not by accessing per se or definitive knowledge but by recognizing contextualized problems that need solving. This makes learning performative: learning by doing, acting, solving problems, and playing the learning game. It develops in the context of an indefinite number of technological tools in service of a new regime, that of information, which has challenged communicative action and the presence of the other. Learning also involves becoming for contexts that are not permanent but contingent, with contingent tools challenging all rationality.

13 While socialization was considered a symbolic act, it adhered to the imaginaries of the socializing actors and their retrospective and prospective ideologies, along with their interests, expectations, lifestyles, frustrations, and projections. In this case, socialization was the projection of the imaginary body of the socializer onto another. This bond was not to be lost, as the other represented the realization of projections or the projection of realizations. It no longer represents the disciplinary regime with which the absolute identity of the individual was generated. Today, the process goes beyond the “socializing agencies.” It is mediated by the multiplicity and diversity of contacts, cultural contents, and ways of life that travel dissolved in the multiple connections generated by open networks (Han, 2022). For this reason, identity is a network of relationships, a product of the growing and massifying mediatic pedagogization of the individual and society.

Since pedagogization is not resolved as an instrumental matter of formal pedagogical strategies specific to the school but extends to all possible action contexts, life has ceased to be an essential, singular matter. Instead, it has diversified into forms of life, or lifestyles, that incorporate themselves as systems of meaning and make different modes of performance or action possible. Normalization, a characteristic of socialization, has ceased to be a matter of accumulating behaviors and has given way to a plurality of personal designs that produce the imaginary of autonomy, independence, and even autarky. Subjection operates differently, while individuals believe they are otherwise. The realization of one’s identity is also standardized. As Bermejo (2005) suggests, the individual ends up being a stranger to oneself: “a polyhedral, decentered, fragmented subject; an oscillating and weak subject, a plural subject constituted by patches and intersections [...] This is intended to highlight the loss of identity as a center, the loss of stable and linear references” (p. 113). In this context, Lipovetsky (2003) argues that “the empire of consumption and mass communication¹⁴ has led to a deinstitutionalized and optional individual, who claims the right to self-govern on all levels” (p. 104).

As observed, the transition from socialization practices to pedagogization involved a dissolution of the centrality of positional, supra-individual disciplinary processes in favor of the generalized pluralization of control forms beyond traditional agencies such as the family and school. The deinstitutionalization of these agencies runs parallel to the establishment of new forms of organizing the subject’s environment and converting their dispositions into contextualized, situated competencies that correlate with different narratives constituting the various identities adopted by the subject in their plural interactions. In summary, the process of pedagogization is invasive; control agencies take on a psychologizing role that privileges the autonomy of the subject, individual rights, desires, consumer capacity, and borderless individualism¹⁵.

14 Certainly, we could rephrase the term as the pedagogization of the masses.

15 Lipovetsky (2003) refers to it as irresponsible individualism, which is equivalent to nihilism, the “after me, the deluge [...] me first” mentality (p. 54). He adds that individualistic culture creates a more permissive ground for bypassing moral barriers and tends to relativize, trivialize, and excuse certain frauds.

Conclusion

In this article, we have presented some elements to differentiate between socialization and pedagogization. These are two perspectives that highlight historical differences regarding order and control. While the disciplinary model was governed by rules and techniques that celebrated explicit hierarchy and visibility of the controller, normalization produced behaviors, conducts, and forms of relationships marked by rigid limits. The model inherent in the control society is based on an imaginary autonomy delegated to the controlled, who acts based on new social referents and is subjected to imperceptible controls that generate the imagination of autonomy and difference. Pedagogization creates a sociocultural space where controls are decentralized, hierarchies dissolve, and individual lifestyles are celebrated, each subject realizing it in their way. This occurs within the framework of new forms of behavior management that exalt entrepreneurship, free choice, and free consumption, mediated by the social construction of the desire for consumption, which generates the compulsion for consumption. Here, we could conclude that pedagogization is a kind of generative grammar of control.

In the context of the 21st century, pedagogization is monumental and is supported by what is called the “regime of information” that “takes hold of the psyche through psychopolitics” (Han, 2022, p. 11). While technologies act articulated, control becomes rhizomatic control that emerges everywhere, making its omnipresence a surveillance network from which it is impossible to escape. It is an invisible cage that today manifests itself in the totalitarianism of electronic and digital media through which society is pedagogized. Are we heading towards a fully pedagogized society? Or are we already in it?

References

- Bauman, Z. (2002). *La cultura como praxis*. Paidós.
- Ball, S. (2013). Performatividad y fabricaciones en la economía educacional: rumbo a una sociedad performativa. *Pedagogía y Saberes*, (38), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.17227/01212494.38pys103.113>
- Bell, D. (1976). *El advenimiento de la sociedad postindustrial. Un intento de prognosis social*. Alianza Editorial.
- Bermejo, D. (2005). *Posmodernidad: pluralidad y transversalidad*. Anthropos Editorial.
- Bernstein, B. (1977). *Class, codes and control, Volumen 3: Towards a theory of educational transmissions*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1993). *La estructura del discurso pedagógico*. Ediciones Morata.
- Bernstein, B. (1998). *Pedagogía, control simbólico e identidad*. Ediciones Morata.
- Bourdieu, P. (1995). *Outline of the theory of practice: structures and the habitus*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brunner, J. J. (1992). *América Latina en la encrucijada de la modernidad*. Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales.
- Costa, F. y Rodríguez, P. E. (2010). La vida como información, el cuerpo como señal de ajuste. Los deslizamientos del biopoder en el marco de la gubernamentalidad neoliberal. En V. Lemn (Comp.), *Michel Foucault: biopolítica y neoliberalismo* (pp. 151-173). Editorial Universitaria de la Universidad Diego Portales.
- Deleuze, G. (2012). Post-scriptum sobre las sociedades de control. *Polis*. <https://journals.openedition.org/polis/5509>
- Depaepe, M. y Simon, F. (2008). Sobre la pedagogización. Desde la perspectiva de la historia de la educación. *Revista de Educación (Serie Investigaciones)*, 18, 105-134. <https://digital.cic.gba.gob.ar/items/166d1543-9090-4a68-af91-3b95228ff926>
- Díaz Villa, M. (2011). Los discursos sobre la flexibilidad y las competencias en la educación superior. *Pedagogía y Saberes*, (35), 9-24. <https://doi.org/10.17227/01212494.35pys9.24>
- Díaz Villa, M. (2019). ¿Qué es eso que se llama pedagogía? *Pedagogía y Saberes*, (50), 11-28. <https://doi.org/10.17227/pys.num50-9485>
- Durkheim, E. (1953). *Sociology and Philosophy*. The Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1976). *Educación como socialización*. Sígueme.
- Freud, S. (1997). El Malestar en la Cultura en S. Freud *Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud* (pp. 3017-3071). Editorial Biblioteca Nueva.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernidad e identidad del yo. El yo y la sociedad en la época contemporánea*. Ediciones Península.
- Geertz, C. (2003). *La interpretación de las culturas*. Gedisa Editorial.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1982). *El lenguaje como semiótica social: la interpretación social del lenguaje y del significado*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Han, B.-C. (2022). *Infocracia. La digitalización y la crisis de la democracia*. Penguin Random House Grupo Editorial.

- Hobbes, T. (1994). *Leviatán o la materia, forma y poder de una república eclesiástica y civil*. Fondo de Cultura Económica (obra original publicada en 1651).
- Hönne, T. (2002). Pädagogisierung sozialer Machtverhältnisse. En T. Dörfler y C. Globisch (Eds.), *Postmodern practices. Beiträge zu einer vergehenden Epoche* (pp. 115-130). Lit Verlag.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1971). Introducción a la obra de Marcel Mauss. En M. Mauss, *Sociología y Antropología* (pp 13-42). Editorial Tecnos.
- Lipovetsky, G. (2003). *Metamorfosis de la cultura liberal. Ética, medios de comunicación, empresa*. Editorial Anagrama.
- Lukes, S. (1973). *Emile Durkheim, his life and work: A historical and critical study*. Penguin Books.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Parsons, T. (1959). The school class as a social system: some of its functions in American society. *Harvard Educational Review*, *xxi*, 297-318.
- PARSONS, T. (1968). La estructura de la acción social. Ediciones Guadarrama.
- Pérez-Agote, J. M. (2010). Los retos de la socialización en los sistemas educativos de las sociedades avanzadas. *Política y Sociedad*, *47*(2), 27-45.
- Schütz, A. (1993). *La construcción significativa del mundo social. Introducción a la sociología comprensiva*. Paidós.
- Simmel, G. (2014). *Sociología: estudios sobre las formas de socialización*. Fondo de Cultura Económica (obra original publicada en 1926).
- Tyler, W. (2004). Silent, invisible, total: pedagogic discourse and the age of information. En J. Muller, B. Davies y A. Morais (Eds.), *Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein* (pp. 15-29). Routledge.
- Weber, M. (1977). *Economía y sociedad*. Fondo de Cultura Económica (obra original publicada en 1922).
- Wrong, D. (1961). The oversocialized concept of man in sociology. *American Sociological Review*, *26*, 215-226. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11302-004>
- Žižek, S. (1998). Multiculturalismo o la lógica cultural del capitalismo multinacional. En F. Jameson y S. Žižek, *Estudios culturales. Reflexiones sobre el multiculturalismo* (pp. 137-188). Editorial Paidós.