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Introduction: Redirecting AND resituating cultural studies IN A globalizing world

CATHRYN TEASLEY
University of A Coruña
CAMERON MCCARTHY
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

With Transnational perspectives on culture, policy, and education: Redirecting cultural studies in neoliberal times, our aim is to offer a kind of “voyage out”—to borrow a notion Virginia Woolf so compellingly pursued from her own particular ethno-national situatedness in the imperial center—out of the as-yet Anglocentric realm of cultural studies and toward a more expansive, cross-cultural, and interdisciplinary plane of inquiry. The world is now witness not only to a surge in the volume of movement across borders: a movement of people, information and material goods that goes hand in hand with the neoliberal pulse of the global marketplace; it is also witness to a transgression of orthodoxies and gatekeeping in conceptual spheres. Within this scenario, understanding how popular culture articulates with formal culture (i.e., public policy, institutions, etc.) is our major concern here, for, in the greater, fluctuating scheme of things, the inhabitants of this limited planet, of societies both young and old, must negotiate their respective identities, histories, and possibilities within growing world dynamics marked by interdependency, domination, and power. In this volume, these cultural processes are explored through scholarly insights emerging primarily from the Iberian Peninsula of Europe, the Caribbean, Latin America, and East Asia, the alternative voices of which bring new perspectives to the kind of cultural inquiry that, regardless of its
origins, remains focused on a shared concern for human rights and dignity, social justice, and peaceful coexistence.

As the cumulative effects of worldwide scholarship coalesce into an ever-expanding global knowledge base, the clearly collective nature of research becomes undeniably apparent, this despite the progressive atomization of academic inquiry so characteristic of our late modern times. Ironically, even as novel research inevitably influences the course of development of this growing corpus of knowledge—at times challenging its very foundations—academic tradition continues to tame and mold such epistemological instability into canonical categories of certainty and predictability, imposing boundaries on the various schools of thought and on the extent to which they can be questioned or destabilized. Some scholars have argued that such resistance to change is primarily the result of methodological conservatism or preservationism (a critique most evident in postmodern theorists such as Derrida, Lyotard, or Baudrillard), while others have placed greater emphasis on ideological, cultural, gendered, and economic power plays that seek to secure turf, territory, or place, in our highly stratified and increasingly globalized world—consider the work of Foucault, and that of postcolonial scholars such as Bhabha, Hall, or Said; or feminist researchers Butler, Benhabib, and Fraser; not to mention Birmingham School ideologues Hoggart, Thompson and Williams; or neo-Marxists Bourdieu and Eagleton. Yet despite the respective differences in emphasis among these informed thinkers, all would likely agree that resistance to paradigmatic breakdown, or to deprivileging the traditional objects and centers of study, is due, above all, to an interaction between the aforementioned key factors of method and place in the conservation of privilege, as these operate within the overlapping spheres of scholarly activity, material gain, and hegemonic culture.

The very persistence of such avid investment in academic stability makes the degree to which it is challenged so central to cultural studies. In keeping with this critical cultural project, we propose that the present volume be considered an exercise in degree. While the intercultural aspirations within the field have been significant, an overwhelming bias toward its Anglo origins nevertheless remains: the bulk of research in cultural studies is written in English and the majority of its scholars live in English-speaking countries (Spivak and Harasym, 1990; Bhabha, 1994). When they reside elsewhere around the world, they tend to work in English or Communications departments, both of which are dominated, once again, by pan-Anglo cultural perspectives (e.g., on the Iberian Peninsula, the few existing forums on cultural studies have been initiated by scholars of English). Thus, while the contributors to this volume indeed subscribe to the raison d'être for the interdisciplinary exploration of culture pursued in cultural studies, they must do so from the periphery, for most live and work in linguistic, national, economic, and academic contexts located beyond the habitual range of exchange of
cultural studies scholarship. Herein lies the degree to which this volume moves beyond the dominant realms of cultural inquiry: over half of the authors speak mother tongues other than English (Spanish, Galizan-Portuguese, Portuguese, Catalan, Korean, and Dutch), and reside in countries where English is not an autochthonous language. Finally, six of the chapters have come to this volume by way of third-party translation.

The overall purpose of this book, then, is one of multiple border-crossing, which requires, at a minimum, an investment in both relationality (McCarthy and Dimitriadis, 2000) and translation, and at a maximum, transgression. This volume puts into practice the theoretical orientation of critical relationality and radical contextualization by bringing diverse national, epistemological, and linguistic perspectives to the analysis of popular and institutional culture, for the purpose of uncovering points of articulation across cultures that promote social justice in these new times of popular culture and public policy, dominated as they are by neoliberalism and the ever-expanding corporatism and re-feudalization of the public sphere. Where translation is concerned, while many of the chapters have effectively been translated in the literal sense, the act of translating—indeed, the very notion of translation itself—entails so much more. Taking the concept beyond mere linguistic operations, scholars such as Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2005) or Homi Bhabha (in Rutherford, 1990) have pointed out that translation is a profoundly cultural and potentially transformational undertaking. According to Santos, cultural translation facilitates reciprocal intelligibility amongst, on the one hand, knowledge bases and cultures, and on the other, social agents and practices. It is therefore the kind of work that is at once intellectual, political, and emotional in nature because it directly confronts issues of access, understanding, and mutual respect, and can pave the way for establishing intercultural links while simultaneously identifying cultural gaps.

More than this, however, this volume constitutes an exercise in transgression to the extent that most of its contributors are "outsiders" to the field of cultural studies, and not merely because their academic specializations vary, but because their access to the English-language forums of cultural studies has been limited, and their experience and professional dialog with cross-cultural realities diverse. For example, the interdisciplinarity reflected in these contributors ranges from fields such as sociology and anthropology, to pedagogy, psychology, linguistics, communications studies, and English philology, while their transnational and ethnocultural affiliations include ties to Barbados, Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Argentina, El Salvador, Portugal, Spain, and the Netherlands, as well as the United Kingdom, Australia, and the United States. Further, all of the authors are committed to removing the cultural obstacles to fair representation and a minimally decent standard of living in the worldwide neoliberal scheme of things.
today—an ideologically and politically informed stance that more often than not requires opposing and transgressing the established modes of production of both official knowledge and material gain in the academy and beyond.

REDIRECTING CULTURAL STUDIES (THE VOYAGE OUT)

Because *Transnational perspectives on culture, policy, and education: Redirecting cultural studies in neoliberal times* has been forged by way of the aforementioned principles of relationality, translation, and transgression, it brings to the field of cultural studies, the fresh voices of scholars—most of whom are firmly established in their respective national contexts—that have nonetheless seldom had access to globally privileged English-speaking forums. For example, several of the Iberian contributors are concerned with issues related to the relatively recent role of immigration in the young democracy of Spain, and how this novel reality is being met through popular culture and public policy. Moreover, the authors’ respective national origins can be mapped along a continuum ranging from the so-called First World to the Third World, with Spain and Portugal still having qualified, in the not-too-distant past, as “Second World” countries—that is, until the legacies of dictatorial rule finally began to fade following the collapse of the Franco and Salazar regimes in the mid-1970s.

These alternative interdisciplinary voices and contexts of inquiry lend a uniqueness to this volume that counters a trend in other recently edited books on popular culture and cultural studies that attempt to incorporate transnational perspectives. For example, if we consider the collective volume *Global ethnography: Forces, connections, imaginations in a postmodern world* (Burawoy et al., 2000) the international contexts addressed in this book are overwhelmingly articulated through their peripheral connections to immigration and corporate capital flows centered in the United States. Likewise, the collection *Media and cultural studies: Keyworks* (Durham and Kellner, 2001) maps a canon for an emergent field of research clearly dominated by West European and North American scholarly traditions, contexts, and points of reference, to which the book’s few postcolonial contributors are nonetheless invariably linked. In the present volume, Michael Giardina and Cameron McCarthy point out in Chapter Six that the rapidly expanding, global interconnectivity of popular cultural artifacts, which Kellner (1995) has identified as the *global popular*, is “raising challenges to the problematic place-boundness of the (British) cultural studies tradition” (Giardina and McCarthy, this volume, p. 115; see also Carrington, 2001).

*Transnational perspectives on culture, policy, and education: Redirecting cultural studies in neoliberal times* thus “redirects” our attention to other (subaltern) centers
of critical scholarship on popular and institutional culture. These contributors' diverse cultural experiences, national contexts, and scholarly pursuits—many of which circulate widely, albeit outside the dominant Anglo circuits—stand not only to inform and enrich, but to broaden the cultural scope and to decenter the professional priorities of an interdisciplinary and cross-cultural field of research such as cultural studies. In this sense, the volume embodies a form of cultural translation and transgression: it performs a kind of inclusion, or access, aimed at eventually transforming the world-hegemonic centers of knowledge production that inevitably ride the tide of economic globalization. The ultimate goal, then, with projects such as this one is to transform such established canons into more porous, malleable, equitable, multilingual, multinational, and transcultural spaces of integration and exchange.

NAVIGATING THE PERIPHERIES OF CULTURAL STUDIES

The sixteen international contributors to this volume take on highly current issues of global scale and impact, such as: the role of religious diversity in cosmopolitan societies; forging interdisciplinary arrangements that enrich the collective contribution of research to the advancement of social justice in today’s interdependent world; deconstructing the pessimism associated with cultural difference and social transformation; understanding the nuances of power in and between popular and institutionalized cultural expressions; and cultural resistance to the marginalizing effects of neoliberal globalization. These themes articulate with each other to the extent that they widen the cultural lens and the transnational understanding of intercultural phenomena and processes as these play out in a world dominated by privileged centers of knowledge and global mechanisms of economic control.

Part One (“Problematicizing conceptions and constructions of culture and identity”) addresses convergent and divergent conceptions and constructions of cultural identity as these emerge from popular experience and institutional structures. General concerns are raised around how disparate assumptions about culture are confronted and reconfigured.

For instance, in Chapter One, Álvaro Pina opens this section of the book with a thought-provoking exploration into community, culture, and freedom, and the ways these can be articulated to form the foundation of rigorous cultural studies practice—one that incorporates the principled intellectual analyses of Raymond Williams and Edward P. Thompson, and one that is capable of renewing and developing their solid democratic project. By focusing on community, culture, and freedom as concepts and practices, he analyzes their theoretical status and political potential in today’s societies. By constructing a position founded on
the articulation of these three key components, he proposes a mode of intellectual inquiry of the contemporary that can offer alternative views of the world we live in, and open independent configurations of the human, the social, and the cultural. Through this form of articulation, Pina takes on recent challenges to cultural studies; he reexamines Williams’s common culture project, and he reassesses this project as a basis for a democratic view of common humanity which is further informed from Zygmunt Bauman’s recent work.

Firmly committed to understanding the deeper implications of the popular for cultural analysis, Susan Harewood takes us on a journey in Chapter Two into the power of popular art, masquerade, and music in breaking dominant molds for perceiving and conceptualizing blackness, national identity, and difference. Parting from the premise that cultural studies’ discussions of blackness follow predictably consistent tropes, and that race relations in academic Anglocentric centers such as Britain and the United States have dominated the discussions and truncated the analysis of blackness, Harewood posits a way of broadening our understanding of both blackness and its relations to nationalism by focusing on Barbadian popular musical performance. Using the examples of Barbadian calypso/soca musicians, she explores their performances of competing nationalist narratives. These narratives illuminate the ways in which artists’ imaginative work exceeds the limits set by academic criticism, and thus can challenge cultural critics to rethink some of those concepts that have become settled, such as binary discussions of nationalism and blackness, which tend to focus almost exclusively on blacks either as victims of racist white nationalist movements or as participants in black nationalist movements.

Parting from a shared concern regarding the ways race-related matters are addressed in academia, Teresa San Román explores in Chapter Three the changing role of philanthropy in cosmopolitan societies. She draws our attention to the all-too-familiar arguments proclaiming the incompatibility of cultures that are used as much to reinforce mixophobia as to justify a desire for the public integration of diverse cultural groups. Yet, the problem may only sometimes lie in incompatibility. When incompatibility in a given context is genuine, this must indeed be negotiated, as it may not necessarily apply in a general sense to the cultures in contact, or to their respective peoples. This is so, according to San Román, because a cultural project, considered in overall terms, cannot be objectively measured because we cannot judge or valorize other cultures without relying on preexisting cultural values. However, one thing is to give equal value to all cultures, while it is quite another to assign equal value to all cultural phenomena (our own and those of “others”). Because this latter action constitutes a particularist assessment, it cannot be universally imposed; while it can instead be universally proposed without this implying either an overall exaltation of the culture upon which the proposal is based, or a complete disapproval of the same. What San Román argues that we have to find,
then, is that comfortable niche that Todorov sought somewhere between dogmatism, which seeks to possess the truth, and skepticism, which denies all truths.

Related to this, in Chapter Four Eduardo Terrén grapples with redefining coexistence in heterogeneous social contexts where religious diversity is intentionally polemicized and artificially polarized. Like Pina, Terrén finds inspiration in Bauman's work inasmuch as the notion of "togetherness" has implications for cosmopolitan coexistence in Mediterranean Europe. He argues that with the transition from the 20th to the 21st century, a series of phenomena tied to economic globalization and population movements are opening new horizons for citizenship, including the identity demands—particularly those related to religion—of very diverse collectives. He highlights the ways in which the growing multiculturalism of resident populations in the same national space clearly oblige us to reflect on the necessity of forging a new concept of citizenship: one capable of providing an alternative project around rights, participation, and belonging to an increasingly complex and heterogeneous civil society. It is within this context that contemporary Europe is facing the challenge of redefining its own identity, a challenge with particular dimensions for South European countries now transformed, according to Terrén, into kinds of semi-reluctant hosts. While immigration is not the only source of cultural diversity in Spain, it obviously places new demands on a country used to five centuries of cultural homogenization; only within the last twenty years has Spain become a viable destination for immigrants. A very old state with a very young democracy (as young as its experience with immigration) is now forced to rethink and reconfigure the way in which "coexistence" has been constructed historically. This chapter starts off by approaching cultural diversity as an opportunity for reinforcing democracy and civil society, and then focuses on the barriers to this project, as rooted in the cultural and historical experience of Mediterranean countries such as Spain.

Part Two of the book ("Transnational cultural policy, global neoliberalism, and racism") problematizes prevailing forms of extra-state neoliberal policies and governance, and the transnational cultural institutions, practices, and discourses attendant to this process of control.

Such policies are manifested through elite (institutional) discourse. Teun van Dijk opens this section, in Chapter Five, with a revealing examination of the racial logics of this kind of discourse in the European context, where the challenges to public policy from popular cultural trends have taken center stage in the European Parliament and other institutional settings. Within the broader framework of a theory of racism as a social system of ethnic domination, van Dijk argues that, contrary to the positive self-image and denial of racism that most symbolic elites project, they play a prominent role in the reproduction of racism in society. This thesis is based, on the one hand, on arguments contending that these elites control
access to) public discourse in political, scholarly, educational, corporate, legal, and communications arenas, and that the acquisition of racist ideologies, which is a condition for the reproduction of racist practices in society, takes place especially through the influence of such elite discourse and institutions. The impact of elite discourse in the perpetuation of racism is further illuminated, van Dijk argues, through international empirical research, which has shown that, rather than providing solutions, more often than not the elite embody a major source of racism. More specifically, this chapter summarizes the findings of various projects on discourse and elite racism in Europe.

In Chapter Six, Michael Giardina and Cameron McCarthy critically interrogate the prevailing contemporary figurations of so-called “urban” popular culture, as suggested within and against filmic narratives of sport and the racial logics of late capitalism. Attempting to forge a contextual understanding of the conflicting representations of (urban) subjectivity, the authors locate “urban” America within broader conjunctural developments that have given rise to its mainstream appellation. They then focus on how urban popular culture is currently represented within broader “pop” culture formations—especially Hollywood cinema—before concluding with a close read of the Spike Lee film *He Got Game*, which, they argue, is both an example and a symptom of popular racial representation that is compatible with the politics of a conservative (black) middle class.

Where nongovernmental regulating institutions are concerned, Jin-kyung Park examines, in Chapter Seven, the impact of one such institution on Third World athletes: that of the World Anti-Doping Association (WADA). Her chapter examines the governing practices of the this agency as a global organization established in 1999 to cope with the crisis of illicit performance-enhancing drug use in international sports. She analyzes the background, structure, and policies of WADA while reflecting upon recent debates on governmentality and cultural policy. In so doing, Park illustrates how WADA policies fundamentally work to police athletic bodies, while impacting in particular ways on the Third World. In this sense, she suggests that WADA embodies a First World, technologically driven governance of doping.

On the related issue of transnational instruments of corporate control, Emily Noelle Ignacio takes up, in Chapter Eight, the cultural effects of international accords such as the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA). She reveals the links such policies have to the selective, discursive reframing of popular demands for social justice in El Salvador, the United States, and beyond. Because many scholars have argued that racial discourses are simultaneously formed within and across nations in relation to specific political and economic contexts, Ignacio establishes the imperative that we study racial formations in relation to changing cultural, political, and economic contexts. She argues that we must also examine
how the emphasis on the success of civil rights and other social movements, peace accords (such as in El Salvador), and multiculturalism policies have been used to exacerbate racism and hide the negative impact of globalization and free market agreements on racially subordinated groups and/or widening social class inequalities in the Americas and around the world. This emphasis on our successes, coupled with inadequate discussions about the impact of border-crossing neoliberal economic policies, make it difficult, in turn, to talk about pervasive and global structural racism. Using Michael Omi and Howard Winant’s theory of racial formation, George Lakoff’s theories about values and framing, Stuart Hall’s theory of representation and articulation, and, more generally, Antonio Gramsci’s theory of hegemony, Ignacio focuses on the reconstruction of the writings and speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr. in the United States, and of Monseñor Oscar Arnulfo Romero in El Salvador.

Finally, Part Three (“Critical cross-cultural projects in education”) explores the complexities and implications of education as a modern institution, and its role in the reproduction or transformation of diverse cultural dynamics.

For instance, in Chapter Nine, Jurjo Torres Santomé confronts neoliberal and hegemonic forms of cultural exclusion through what he refers to as “an optimistic curriculum.” He argues that there is an urgent need to revise both the selection of cultural contents taken up in classrooms, as well as the methodological strategies employed therein, for it is at the compulsory level of education that mental habits are formed, which then characterize citizens’ modes of thinking about reality. For most of us who have passed through classrooms, the contents of schooling remain too abstract, ahistorical, and vague. According to Torres Santomé, there is also a tendency to protect students from considering social inequalities and injustices, to shelter them within a kind of artificial paradise—which explains the childish and affected format of most textbooks. This “Walt Disneyfication” of life in general, and of school culture in particular, works in turn to stimulate the consumption of cultural products from multinationals, and to enclose children’s lived experience in artificial paradises, while giving rise to excessive silences around reality. Preventing children from engaging more realistically with the world around them perpetuates a negative image of the potential for positive human intervention and transformation of the world. One of the essential tasks for teachers, then, is to awaken a reflective and critical spirit in their students. Torres Santomé thus finds it of paramount importance that we offer images of human achievements. This can be accomplished through institutionalized education, despite its reproductive capacity. It can and should also be a space for educating people in the commitment to opposing injustice, and in their capacity to intervene in, and improve reality.

Mar Rodríguez Romero takes educational change further by addressing, in Chapter Ten, the potential of situated educational reform for contending with the
oppressions of today’s globally reconfigured social landscape. She asserts that the field of educational change has been colonized by managerial discourses, and that the most recent reforms in education insist upon increasing social exclusion and symbolic control. In order to challenge this situation and stimulate the construction of alternative visions for education, this chapter reconfigures educational change as a cultural politics. Rodríguez Romero analyzes reform as a versatile social practice, constructed and defined by a multitude of conflicting social interests. Special attention is dedicated to the discourses and practices of those social groups that attempt to expand the spaces of dissidence through recognizing difference and achieving equality. Reform is explored as a strategy that can challenge both forms of injustice, creating uneasy and contingent alliances among the various social actors. Specifically, situated reform strives to contend with the diverse faces of oppression, using the power of local commitment and democratic deliberation to create heterogeneous public spaces in schools that are more responsive to the rights of traditionally disenfranchised student groups and individuals.

Focusing on higher education, in Chapter Eleven Dolores Juliano questions the lack of dialog across academic fields, such as educational studies and anthropology, and explores the benefits for multicultural school populations if these camps were to mutually inform each other to a greater degree. She argues that some of the social demand for anthropological support in solving problems related to multicultural coexistence in schooling and society is based on a functionalistic conception of culture and the assumption that cultural diversity in schools has significantly increased. Juliano notes, however, that a multiple world must not be regarded as a mere patchwork of different cultures, but as a complex field of interrelations and mutations, one that produces ever-evolving identities and spatial movement, and one that values these developments: a world in which we feel that we learn from life as the landscape around us changes. Nonetheless, scholars of anthropology in the Spanish State context, Juliano contends, have failed to develop sufficient interest in the ways these events are playing out in formal learning contexts, for students of anthropology are not systematically engaged with educational issues; nor have anthropologists made enough effort to remain current on the theoretical and practical proposals arising from the educational sector. Forums for dialog with educators have thus failed to emerge to the extent that might be considered desirable. But while anthropology offers no clear answers to the problems, it does offer the opportunity to see them in a different light. Likewise, the change from strong to weak paradigms that goes hand in hand with postmodernism does not provide stand-alone answers, but opens the door to trial and error as well as to individual thought. This is one way, according to Juliano, in which the most productive form of cross-cultural coexistence can be sought.
In Chapter Twelve, Mariano Fernández Enguita articulates the institutions of school, work, and family to reveal the fractures and links between subaltern groups and the dominant culture of Spain, and within each minoritized collective. He explores, for instance, the functions of universal schooling, with its successive expansions in terms of time and scope, and its role in postponing young people’s entrance into the labor market while preparing them for integration into a model of economic activity centered on the marketplace as a mechanism of exchange, and on formal, bureaucratic organization as a mechanism of cooperation and discipline—both of which are predicated on the displacement of any other form of socialization around attitudes toward, and qualifications for, work. Within the dominant culture, the educational institution, and the teaching profession itself, this process of preparation is assumed to be unproblematic, even as it faces a manifest, yet unplanned challenge: the (non)meeting of, on the one hand, an accelerated expansion of the educational system, with, on the other hand, the alternative economy of the Roma/Gypsies, or with the distinct patterns of transition to adult and economic life that characterize significant sectors of the immigrant population of Spain, especially among Arabic North Africans. Enguita goes on to point out another such encounter at the intersection between educational policy and gender relations: in a school institution initially designed to meet the demands of ethnically dominant males, uniformity and bureaucratic equity policy have together translated into noteworthy gains for the integration of ethnically dominant women, as well as significant gains for women from minority groups, relative to the male members of those groups. But the same educational policies have done little for ethnic minorities in general. Finally, these institutional effects, taken together, configure a complex and charged panorama, replete with (mis)encounters between the teaching profession and the new publics at school, and with unpredictable consequences for action.

In Chapter Thirteen, Juan José Bueno Aguilar maps the ways in which emergent forms of racism in Spanish society are projected through the mass media and education. He analyzes, for example, the dynamics of racism in relation to the diverse cultures now coexisting in Spain and the construction of a multicultural society, which is increasingly influenced by the relatively recent phenomenon of immigration. Bueno Aguilar shows how these new racisms diverge from older forms by means of translation: earlier biological and differential racisms are transformed into new constructs, attitudes, and behaviors that may, in the long run, prove even more pernicious to humankind, especially to those groups who have most suffered from racism. Even so, the immigration factor is complex and dynamic, for it affects Spanish society as a whole and, more clearly than ever, education in particular. Bueno Aguilar offers analytical proposals drawn from critical multicultural perspectives in education that are aimed at contesting these...
new racisms as they inundate the various cultural spheres of our media-driven reality today.

Cathryn Teasley addresses racism in Spanish society and schooling as well, but prefers to focus, in Chapter Fourteen, on deeply rooted forms of racism and the ways that these inform the biased institutional dynamics through which “diversity” is instituted at school. Specifically, critical ethnographic inquiry guides her examination of the ways in which a group of experienced teachers at an urban secondary school in Spain have responded to a series of new regulations of their practice in the context of markedly increased student diversity at the school. Teasley’s analysis centers on the ideological stances represented and produced through the educators’ discourses and actions, and on the implications for the education of the school’s Roma/Gypsy students, as members of what is generally considered to be the most disenfranchised ethnic group of Spain. This chapter concludes with the exploration of some alternative means, especially through action research, for producing professional commitments that are more conducive to socially just and culturally responsive educational interventions.

To close this section of the book, in Chapter Fifteen Cameron McCarthy explores scholarly writing on the topic of globalization processes, which are too often cast in terms of simplistic binary oppositions: “homogenization” versus “heterogeneity,” “uniformity” versus “diversity,” “cosmopolitanism” versus “localism,” “centralization” versus “decentralization,” etc., and how these views influence educational contexts. Because globalization is often seen as a set of processes happening “way out there” in the world, far from what educators, teachers and students actually do, it is therefore depicted as embodying movement and dynamism. On the other hand, schooling, particularly in the urban setting, is frequently represented within the discourse of “stasis” and tradition. McCarthy confronts this unreflective dualism, showing how globalization, when articulated to neoliberal policies—such as, for example, the Bush government’s “No Child Left Behind Act” of 2002 in the United States—is effectively restructuring the organization of knowledge in educational institutions and undermining their vital function as institutions dedicated to the public good. McCarthy argues that “movement” and “stasis” are therefore intimately related in the reorganization and restructuring of education, and in the larger processes of the re-feudalization of the public sphere.

**IN CONCLUSION**

In the Coda to the volume, James Ladwig gets at the heart of what drives the various authors to engage as they do with the intersections between popular culture, race, public policy, and the neoliberal times in which we live. To quote Ladwig
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(this volume), “Race in this analysis is about the culturally created social groups stratified by some bizarre moral universes that have littered the pathways of human history” (p. 343). This history, as well as the future of such “bizarre moral universes,” are confronted on multiple fronts in this volume, for, as the respective chapters can attest to, certain dominant forms of (bizarre) “normalcy” across the globe have, ironically, encouraged the emergence of social injustices where popular culture, institutional culture, and the political economy intersect, at both local and global levels. The particulars of the situated, transnational experiences and practices around identity, cross-cultural coexistence, racism, sexism, and other forms discrimination brought together in this book, are, moreover, addressed through theoretical levels of analysis that provide one of the keys to transforming the epistemology of an academic field in formation, such as cultural studies. It is our hope that this volume contribute, through these subaltern perspectives, to the opening up of a rapidly forming canon, and that, in the process, a more inclusive and informed approach to sociocultural justice be forged.
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CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Roma youth at school: Instituting inclusion from a legacy of exclusion

CATHRYN TEASLEY

UNIVERSITY OF A CORUÑA

INTRODUCTION

The decades that directly followed Franco’s death in 1975, which marked the end of 40 years of dictatorial rule in Spain, represented a watershed for the country’s educational institution. In the 1980s and early 90s, the then Socialist Party majority-government instituted a number of educational reform laws, the most comprehensive of which is known as the LOGSE. This law established, among other substantive reforms, the extension of compulsory education by two years, to age 16, which meant that for the first time in the history of Spanish schooling, all youth would be required to attend secondary schools. Consequently, since the mid-1990s, high school teachers have been receiving students that do not fit the traditional, privileged mold—a change that is especially evident in those schools where students of Roma or Gypsy and immigrant origins have since enrolled. This historic event, while packed with opportunity, has nonetheless constituted an important challenge to the Spanish educational system inasmuch as it elicits institutional response to the ever more present effects of popular cultural forms on the dominant cultural politics and social environments of modern institutions such as
schooling. In this case we witness the meeting of an institutional context steeped in elitist and exclusionary cultural tradition (Varela and Álvarez-Uría, 1991) with youth whose cultural identity formation has largely evolved on the periphery of Spanish society, and through diasporas that transcend what numerous scholars argue are the monolithic identity politics characteristic of nation-states and their institutions (Hall, 1996; Benhabib, 2002; Young, 2002).

Two decades after the transition from the dictatorship to the current parliamentary monarchy, however, the social and political institutions of Spain came to echo the conservative restoration that emerged in the 1980s and affected contemporary politics throughout the world (McCarthy, this volume; Torres Santomé, 2001). In fact, no sooner had the LOGSE been fully implemented—the process was completed in 2003—than it was significantly modified by a neoconservative counterreform: the Quality in Education Act (Ley Orgánica 10/2002, de 23 de diciembre, de Calidad de la Educación), or LOCE. This law was approved at the end of 2002 by an administration led by the Popular Party, which had come to power in 1996. The LOCE contained new measures related to streaming at younger ages; ability-grouping or tracking; tightening cultural controls over the base curriculum; restricting access to grade-promotion; and reinforcing the privatization of public education. Nonetheless, when the Socialists regained parliamentary majority two years later, in 2004, they placed a moratorium on the implementation of the more controversial aspects of the LOCE—such as streaming, the subject of Religion, and grade-promotion—and went on to establish yet another educational reform: the LOE of 2006.

It was the LOGSE of 1990, however, that introduced structural changes substantial enough to inspire the ethnographic inquiry represented in this chapter, which is fundamentally concerned with the ways in which students who, since the turn of the millennium, have ostensibly been newly included or “integrated” into the educational system as a result of mandated reforms, enter into an interplay of ideologies, cultural constructs, and practices at school that—while ideally allowing for the emergence of promising educational opportunities—may, on the contrary, have engendered new forms of discrimination.

By honing in on a particular site of “recontextualisation” ( Bernstein, 2000) of the LOGSE reform, we gain insight into some of the ways that top-down educational policy—as official knowledge discursively constructed and issued beyond the institutional contexts in which it is to be applied—combines with material and symbolic forces to be channeled, filtered, and reconstructed through the disputed professional space of local teacher agency. This process is of crucial relevance to Gypsy youth, whose hitherto overwhelming exclusion from secondary education in Spain warrants approaching this historic conjuncture with the utmost concern for cross-cultural comprehension and social justice. Yet, how has the initial
LOGSE reform actually played out since its implementation at the compulsory secondary level was finally completed in the 1999–2000 academic year? And what have the implications been for students and educators alike?

THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT OF INCLUSION

Before these questions can be answered, the LOGSE reform must be further situated in its larger sociopolitical and historical context. When the reform was approved in 1990, nearly fifteen years had elapsed since the termination of four long decades of fascist rule in Spain. The Spanish State had recently attained full membership in the European Economic Community, and to meet the demands of a rapidly changing society, the then–Socialist administration set out to develop comprehensive social institutions premised on democratic principles. The LOGSE “updated” and overhauled the educational system, setting precedents with the establishment of Compulsory Secondary Education (for ages 12 through 16, followed by two noncompulsory years of Secondary Education for ages 16 and older), as well as Early Childhood Education (for ages 0–6), counseling departments, tutoring periods, class-size reduction, and, among other important measures, curricular adaptations for the “compensation of inequality in education” (according to the heading of Title Five of the LOGSE).

Yet the decentralization of educational administration in Spain, as stipulated in the Constitution of 1978, has meant that the responsibility for the application and implementation of the LOGSE’s statewide mandates corresponds to the seventeen, locally elected regional governments (Autonomous Communities). A specific set of policies developed by one such Community, Galiza (or Galicia), is central to the present analysis, for it served as a central institutional reference through which specific aspects of the LOGSE reform relating to compensatory and special education would be channeled, reinterpreted, and eventually converted into local practice at a particular school site. This regional set of policies, the product of legislation advanced by a conservative Galizan administration, was broadly termed “Attention to Diversity,” and was designed to regulate the incorporation of nontraditional students into mainstream schooling in Galiza. The particular Attention to Diversity policies reflected in this study are currently in effect (in the year 2007), and are comprised of measures such as diversifying instructional approaches within the “regular” curriculum and classroom contexts, adapting the curriculum through individual learning plans, or tracking students into self-contained behavior-management programs for up to two years per referral (see Consellería de Educación e Ordenación Universitaria, 1999). Specifically, under examination are the ways in which this regional policy was received by a
group of experienced teachers at an urban, public, secondary school—one affected by the aforementioned transformation in student enrollment.

Given, then, this brief overview of the political, social and institutional factors affecting the implementation of educational equity policy at the local level, our attention will be centered primarily on the teachers themselves as key—albeit structurally conditioned—agents in the recasting of public policy; but also on their Gypsy students, as members of what many researchers consider to be the most disenfranchised population of Spain (see, for example, Calvo Buezas, 1990; Asociación Presencia Gitana, 1992; San Román, 1997; or Fernández-Enguita, 1999a). Through the critical analysis of a limited selection of observations, interviews and conversations collected during a two-year ethnography at the teachers’ workplace (1999–2001), another aim is to bring to the forefront the “politics of representation and difference” (McLaren, 1994) at the school, as revealed through the specific ways in which these educators responded to the new “demands” (according to the LOGSE) for student integration and inclusion.

Finally, the paper will explore some alternative means, especially through ethnographic action research, for producing “pedagogy as a performative practice” (Giroux with Shannon, 1997)—one that is conducive to more socially just and culturally responsive educational processes. The transformative potential of this method is explored in the paper’s conclusions.

A LEGACY OF EXCLUSION IN PERSPECTIVE:
THE ROMA OF SPAIN

Beyond merely informing professional practice, the ethnography reflected in this paper is ultimately meant to serve the Gypsy people, which is why an additional overview of their experiences with social and educational injustice will facilitate a better understanding of the degree of marginalization at issue. The collective works of historians, sociologists, and activist groups in Spain and beyond, retell a history of severe oppression and persecution of a once nomadic people: the calé, the rom, the sinti, and other ethnic and linguistic groups within the Roma diaspora of Europe. Since their arrival to the Iberian Peninsula in the fifteenth century, the Gypsies have long suffered often brutal injustices such as genocide missions, torture, incarceration, and exile simply for practicing a nomadic lifestyle, speaking an unfamiliar language, or living in relative independence (Asociación Presencia Gitana, 1992; Fonseca, 1996; San Román, 1997).

In the more recent past, incorporation of the Roma into public schooling in Spain occurred as late as the 1970s, through compulsory primary education and the creation of experimental “bridge-schools.” These latter institutions were
largely located in Roma settlements and neighborhoods, and managed separately from mainstream schools, although their purpose was ultimately to make mainstream schooling more accessible to Gypsy youth (see Fernández-Enguita, 1999a). Official intentions aside, this policy turned out to nonetheless exacerbate preexisting forms of segregation, and was largely abandoned in the late 1980s when legislation concerning compensatory education was instituted. Nonetheless, Spain is today riddled with similarly marginalized schools, or educational ghettos, concentrated especially in and around urban centers (many immigrant students now experience this reality as well). In the year 2000, nearly one million of the approximately 40 million inhabitants of Spain were Roma, and over half of this group was 16 years old or younger; but according to the advocacy group Asociación Presencia Gitana (2000), only 30 percent of that age group was fully schooled. Another Roma organization, Asociación Secretariado General Gitano (2000), further confirmed that, even within this limited percentage of school-going Gypsy youth, the majority experienced significant degrees of school failure. In fact, in 2001, a young Roma woman was interviewed and presented on Galizan television as the first of her ethnicity to attend a Galizan university—a poignantly revealing circumstance.

Finally, scholars have pointed out that the Gypsy people continue to receive some of the harshest forms of racist, xenophobic, and classist discrimination in Spanish society (see, for example, Calvo Buezas, 1990 and 2000; Jover and Reyero, 2000; or Vargas and Gómez, 2003). It is not so uncommon to read in the press about incidents of vehement parental protest against the first-time enrollment of Roma children in schools traditionally attended by non-Gypsy youth. Yet one of the most enduring injustices suffered by the Roma of the Iberian Peninsula has been attributed to historic linguistic repression, which impeded the development of a literary tradition in the Gypsies’ root language, Romani (see Torrione, 1994 or Fernández-Enguita, 1999a.). Transnational Roma advocacy groups are now working to overcome this legacy, but as a general rule it can be said that, in Spain and throughout Europe, schooling has never been for the Roma (Liégeois, 1998). Nonetheless, since the LOGSE, Gypsy youth are now attending high schools in more significant numbers, as was the case at the school where the ethnography described below was conducted.

A SCHOOL IN TRANSITION

The secondary school chosen as the object of our analysis will be referred to as Instituto Central. A selection of a few key encounters at this institution will offer a contextualized view of the changing educational reality for Gypsy youth and
teachers alike. To begin with, there is the portrait of the school prior to the initial implementation, in 1998, of the LOGSE’s Compulsory Secondary Education (hereafter, CSE). Instituto Central was the second of its kind to be erected in the city in the 1940s, near one of the wealthiest neighborhoods, and has long held a position of prestige in the greater municipality. Perhaps not surprisingly, most of the staff members were mature and tenured. Since the LOGSE reform, however, the school not only began to receive Roma students—twelve in total—but there was also a sharp increase in the number of ethnic-majority youth from blue-collar origins, as well as a first-time enrollment of four differently abled students (physically and cognitively challenged). And more generally, grades seven and eight were adjoined to the high school, as part of the new, four-year CSE, which brought in students ages 10–12 (to a school setting that formerly only admitted students ages 13–14 or older).

These student groups, however, were not the only new faces at the high school; a cohort of eleven, experienced, primary school teachers was transferred to Instituto Central from a local feeder school to help attend to the newly enrolled younger pupils. Thus, the presence of both new students and transferred teachers was cause for some stir among the high school’s original staff members. One of the teachers from this original group expressed his opinion about the transformation by exclaiming, “We’ve been cheated, defrauded!” and then adding, “This isn’t teaching; this is baby-sitting! It’s not what we were educated to do.” He later clarified that this “we” referred to the original staff cohort. And comments from most of the transferred teachers conveyed their general perception of a less-than-warm reception at the high school. Nonetheless, the school principal or “director”—himself an original-staff member—was highly critical of his peer group’s rejection of the incoming teachers.9

In these ways and more, then, the educators at Instituto Central could not be treated as a homogeneous group with the same professional or ideological persuasions. On the other hand, none were of Roma descent, and it would later become apparent that the very premise of the LOGSE reform—that is, the extension of the comprehensive nature of a basic education—was fundamentally questioned, especially by the original staff members.

These professional concerns, tensions, and frustrations elucidate not only the teachers’ complex situatedness in the reform, but some of the ways in which they would come to fit the nontraditional students into their working world. And the Gypsy collective indeed captured a great deal of their attention. Significantly, the staff’s main interest in these students stemmed from the problems perceived in their schooling, particularly those related to lesson disruption, exceedingly low achievement levels, and chronic absence. Moreover, most of the teachers commented that the Roma students generally manifested “problematic” or “conflictive” behavior that
“disrupt[ed] the peaceful coexistence” and “lower[ed] the overall academic performance” at the school. As regards the frequently absent half of the Gypsy students (usually six), a common comment to this regard was, “They don’t want to be here,” although there was also a tendency to blame the newly formed Counseling Department for a lack of coordination and commitment to addressing this issue.

Nonetheless, given the vehemence of the staff’s complaints regarding the nonconformist attitudes attributed to most of the Gypsy students, the analysis that follows will focus on the teachers’ reactions to, and representations of, these students in particular. And perhaps most importantly, it appears that their common concerns with respect to these pupils served to channel the design of the school’s specific Attention to Diversity program. But before addressing that policy, let us first consider some ways in which the Roma students came to be constituted as a problem.

“PROBLEM STUDENTS”: CONSTRUCTION OF A CATEGORY

Certain students’ names repeatedly arose during assessment meetings, interviews, and informal conversations with staff members. Of the approximately twenty mostly male youth identified as “problem” students, most were of working class origins, and seven were Roma. This meant that Gypsy students were patently overrepresented in this problem grouping. Further, the tendency to categorize these students as misbehaved or disruptive reflects an implicit correlation between the teachers’ employment of signifiers—those that signify the conflictive with those that signify the ethnically and/or racially different in students.

Whereas blatantly racist discourse per se was not directly observable amongst the teachers through this field study, several interviewees were quick to clarify that their perceptions of the Roma students “did not stem from racism” but from their “specific disruptive behaviors.” As further “proof” of this, a few of these teachers noted that “not all Gypsies are dark,” and that one of the Roma boys was “blond haired and blue eyed.” The mere need to make these remarks, however, necessarily involved race. Moreover, if we consider this confluence of comments and perceptions conjointly with the aforementioned emergence of Roma ghetto schools throughout Spain, or with documented cases of mainstream racism and xenophobia toward Gypsies at school (see especially Calvo Buezas, 1990 and 2000; San Román, 1997; Jover and Reyero, 2000; or Vargas Clavería and Gómez Alonso, 2003), we may, at a minimum, acknowledge that the correlation between the signifiers “Gypsy students” and “conflictive behavior” may indeed help pave the way for the local emergence of institutionalized or de facto forms of discrimination, be these a result of racism, ethnocentrism, classism, sexism—or a mixture thereof.
ATTENDING TO INCLUSION THROUGH DIVERSITY: POLICY VERSUS PRACTICE

Focusing in on a particularly significant instance of teacher agency at Instituto Central, in November of 1999, a special meeting had been convened to review and assess the school’s plan for addressing the “confictive” students. Toward the end of the previous year, one of the school’s classrooms, Room 10, had been designated as the site for a remediation program established in response to the Galizan Attention to Diversity mandate, and was coincidentally called Atención á Diversidade (Attention to Diversity). The original purpose of Room 10 was two-pronged: on the one hand, it was conceived as a space where individual students could go during class hours to receive tutoring on their work; on the other, it would also serve as a detention/punishment center. In this way, the teachers in charge would each serve in the dual capacity of tutor and disciplinarian, thus enacting a perhaps more defined version of the Janus-type role most of them claimed to already experience in the regular classroom. This said, all eight teachers present at the meeting acknowledged that, in practice, Room 10 functioned nonetheless almost exclusively as a disciplinary measure.

With the exception of the school principal, all those present were women. They were assigned weekly duty in Room 10 either because they had gaps in their teaching schedules, or because they ranked low on the seniority scale. Two of them remarked that they had accepted the assignment voluntarily, but the rest, along with most of the high school teachers, considered this responsibility as wholly undesirable. As for the principal, during his presentation at the meeting, he clarified that Room 10 indeed did not constitute a “complete” program of “attention to diversity,” but that it was “surely better” than what a nearby high school had developed: there, a self-contained classroom, popularly known as “the dummies’ class,” represented the kind of tracking and segregating program that this principal would not have at Instituto Central. His professed rejection of such a program is significant because the Attention to Diversity policy, as mandated by the Galizan educational administration, indeed allowed for partial tracking (in some subjects), as well as separate ability- or behavior-management groupings organized into one- or two-year cycles (see Consellería de Educación e Ordenación Universitaria, 1999).

The principal’s words set off a fairly intense debate amongst the teachers present, who did not directly oppose his stance, but who did question the general effectiveness of Room 10, including everything from handling recurrent visitors (“the regulars”), to the paucity of engaging learning materials in the room. Eventually the group proposed applying some stricter rules and consequences within the program; however, the conceivable latent tension between the tasks of tutoring and
punishing in the same space remained unchallenged, just as, more importantly, the group failed to transcend the dominant conceptual framework for this program: that of attending to “diversity”—understood primarily as misbehavior—by means of discipline. What is more, the formal name of the Room 10 program, “Attention to Diversity” remained unquestioned, despite the contradictions.

THE DISRUPTIVE AS DE FACTO DIVERSITY

While the intent here is not to discredit the legitimate establishment of norms meant to promote mutual respect and viable coexistence in institutional settings, the intent is to point out that disciplinary sanctions serve as selective, negative deterrents in the absence of broadly based positive interventions that address the roots of the perceived problematic behavior. As the punitive consequences accumulate, along with the general feeling, in the case of the teachers interviewed, that one’s role is more that of oppressor than of mentor—or in McLaren’s (1999) terms, that of hegemonic overlord than of liminal servant (as shall be explored in further detail below)—the tendency to equate sociocultural diversity with misconduct becomes all the more apparent. In this sense, it is therefore crucial to examine how this tendency emerges from everyday institutional practice. What is it about this educational institution and the dynamics occurring within its realms that can lead to this form of discrimination?

In the case of Instituto Central, the 20 teachers interviewed (eleven transferees and nine original staff members) reacted similarly when faced with the challenge represented by the problematized students, locating the sources of their perceived behavior problems in four main causation factors: (1) the specific students and their “deficient” social environments; (2) the “unrealistic” structuring of schooling; (3) the “elitist mentality” of some of the teachers themselves; and (4) ineffective teacher education. Each one of these perceptions has its implications for attending to diversity in the teaching profession, but as we shall see, some of them held more sway than others at Instituto Central.

BLAMING THE VICTIM, OR THE CULTURAL OTHER AS A PROBLEM

As an example of the first causation factor cited above, one major complaint shared by the teachers interviewed was that—in addition to the observable stress many experienced in their interactions with the nonconformist students—they were concerned that the academic achievement of “the rest of the students” was
being adversely affected by the “troublemakers.” This attitude, in which a minority collective or individual is perceived as more or less directly responsible for harm suffered by the majority, has been characterized in the research as “blaming the victim” (see, for example, Sue and Padilla, 1986). In other words, nonconformist students—many of whom are themselves victims of sociocultural disenfranchise-
ment and accumulated school failure—receive the burden of the blame for conflicts arising in the multicultural educational setting. The failure on the part of institutional agents to deindividualize conflict, or to situate it in its broader social context—a reality documented by ethnographers such as Paul Willis (1981) or Douglas Foley (1990)—results in a failure to address the underlying and interrelated sources of conflict, and in a tendency to repress through a “discourse of legit-
imation” (Foucault, 1980), in an institutional culture and structure that is upheld against the essentialized cultural Other.

It is also worth recalling here Foucault’s insight that institutional structures of control are continually met with both intended and unintended manifestations of resistance and/or compliance on the part of all participants subject to such control. Blaming the nontraditional students can be conceived as one such manifes-
tation of teacher resistance to change—a resistance resulting, as Apple (1995), Hargreaves (1994), McLaren (1999), and others have pointed out, in part from ideology, in part from context rituals and constraints, and in part from greater historical socioeconomic dynamics. As for the students, they too continually chal-
lenge the authority vested in the hegemonic culture of schooling. Through an ethnography at a Toronto Catholic secondary school, for instance, Peter McLaren (1999) documented the ways in which working class Portuguese immigrant stu-
dents resisted conforming to behavior norms derived from middle class Anglo-
Saxon culture by frequently attempting to impose what this researcher refers to as their “streetcorner state” (characterized by any student’s spontaneous *modus operandi* outside of institutional settings). Likewise, Laurie Olsen (1997) has depicted how Latino immigrant students at an urban high school in California initially attempted to resist internalizing the racialized definitions of themselves imposed by schoolmates, teachers and US society at large, but eventually felt the need to position themselves within one or another dominant racial category in order to “fit in,” while being simultaneously marginalized from the center. According to McCarthy and Dimitriadis (2000), this process of negative assim-
lation often involves some dose of Nietzschein “resentment” or negation of the ethnic or racial Other in oneself.

A couple of Roma students whom I interviewed and observed at school, at home in the settlement, and at a local community outreach center, seemed to be struggling with this very process. In what can be considered a significant instance of student agency and resistance, one of these boys practically pleaded with me to
have him and his friend transferred to a nearby high school because, at Instituto Central, he said, “We’ve been figured out” (pillados). That is, he felt the two of them could no longer “start over” because they had become “regulars” in Room 10, and been preemptively pigeon-holed as “bad” (malos), as he saw it. He thus seemed to view their current school identities as immutable and reified, each identity having developed a kind of life of its own. He added that, “Here, they treat us Gypsies like dogs,” whereas his impression of the other school—an impression in part derived from Roma acquaintances there—was clearly more favorable.

Curiously enough, that neighboring high school was the same one the principal had described as maintaining a segregated, remedial (“dummy”) class for students behind grade level, most of whom were also Gypsies. Thus, this student’s hopes of gaining “a second chance” there may unfortunately have already been thwarted in important ways, given the dominant-culture educators’ disqualification of said program. Whereas a range of international scholars of ethnic, racial, class- and gender-related antagonism in education acknowledge that members of oppressed collectives can often find support in contexts of culturally homogeneous educational groupings—in what might be referred to, in a broader sense, as a “war of manoeuver” (Gramsci, 1971; also see Hall, 1996)—these same scholars also denounce the limits of this support.11 Such programs become counterproductive when they discourage social integration by addressing one group’s needs over all others, or when they emerge as mere by-products of social exclusion. This last dynamic is most visible in the formation of school ghettos, where educational expectations remain low and de facto segregation high. In any case, the bleak state of affairs for these boys at Instituto Central drove them to envision an alternative institutional existence elsewhere. This desire can be interpreted as an attempt to regain control over their own identity formation, and to escape institutional control mechanisms requiring that they conform to unfamiliar—and at times repressive or hostile—cultural norms. It is a situation that bears a strong resemblance to the experiences of minority students at another high school as far away as Texas. Ethnographer Douglas Foley (1990) offers a vivid overview of the strikingly similar dynamics occurring there:

In this case, the vast majority of Mexicano youth were not getting ahead, escaping the sting of class and racial prejudice, or developing a well-articulated class consciousness. They were tracked into practical sections of semi-literates and passed on through social promotion policies until more than 50 percent dropped out. The vatos ended up being a thorn in the administration’s side and amusing entertainers that enlivened the deadening routine of academic work—and school failures. (p. 203)

As Rizvi (1998) has observed, the practices of so-called integration in education have tended to promote mere access to schooling for traditionally excluded
students, while they have done very little to challenge the actual culture of schooling or to make learning itself more accessible:

Pedagogic and curriculum practices have remained largely unchanged with respect to the need to cater for a wide range of differences which are now acknowledged to exist in schools. [...] Schools are still based on the assumptions of homogeneity and uniformity. They still require conformity and obedience to rules that are based on the requirements of administrative convenience rather than moral principles. (Rizvi, 1998, p. 55)

Which brings us back to the first perceived causation cited above: the cultural-Other-as-problem. How might these boys indeed resist such a reductive and essentializing label which denies the organic, dynamic nature of cross-cultural contact, learning, and identity formation, while reproducing ethnocentric, even racist, forms of discrimination at school? Some light must therefore be shed on the deeper issues underlying the predominant reaction among teachers when challenged by nonconforming students such as the two cited above—whose ethnicity, gender, and social class are overrepresented in programs throughout Spain such as that of Room 10 (Fernández-Enguita, 1999).

IDENTITY, IDEOLOGY, AND REPRESENTATION IN SCHOOLING

As a digression from our discussion about the teachers’ four perceived causes of nonconformist behavior in these and other students, several facets of a dominant practical ideology can be identified in the staff’s practices that operate to the detriment of the students concerned. Ideology is understood here in the Althusserian (1971) sense as not primarily produced within the conceptual realm of mere ideas and knowledge, but as formed, conditioned, and exercised within a concrete, material world of daily social practices, including the context of professional activity. Ideology, in this sense, represents a “subjective slant on the world [that] is a matter of lived relations rather than controvertible propositions” (Eagleton, 2007, p. 152). This practical basis for the formation of ideologies thus serves to legitimate and reinforce particular ideological adherences. The problem is that, as Kickbusch and Everhart (1985) have argued, educational interventions that—due to this “practical ideology”—are assumed to be necessary (such as that of Room 10) can contribute to the reproduction of the very problems they aim to solve.

The first facet of this dominant practical ideology consists of a conception shared especially by the original staff, and concerns the particular intellectual/
academic and cultural standards that “most students” should attain through curricular contents that have been successfully transmitted and assimilated in the past—a ritual reference based on a relatively privileged student body that has now become more heterogeneous and less privileged overall. And although this conception was openly censured by the school principal, by several of the transferred teachers, and by some original staff members, it was nonetheless considered to inform the prevailing ideological stance regarding educational priorities at the school.

Secondly, in interviews, the teachers agreed more or less on what constituted a minimally acceptable social climate in the classroom, one necessary for acquiring the desired curricular standards: the students should be attentive and obedient vis-à-vis the teacher’s authority, although there was observable variation as to how much and what kind of student talk was permitted. Even so, in the five regular classes observed, verbal interactions and learning dynamics were teacher-centered, and student participation individually oriented. In two of these classrooms, however, the four Roma students (two boys per class) tended to count amongst the most vocal and active of pupils.

Lastly, and as previously indicated, nearly all 19 of the regular-program teachers commented in interviews that what the traditional majority students stood to lose in a “disrupted” classroom environment lay at the heart of their concerns over the nonconformist students, in addition to their own discomfort when working with the latter. In other words, the fundamental injustice was that the problems attributed to one or two students affected the rest. Likewise, what the “problem” students lost by being dismissed from class did not figure directly into the teachers’ discourse on this matter. When asked to consider the rights of the nonconformist students, the teachers mainly associated these with a hypothetical “right to not have to attend school.” This perceived right, expressed by over half of the respondents, in turn justified further comments suggesting the separation of such students from the majority, either through the alternative behavior- or ability-based groupings permitted by the Galizan Attention to Diversity policy, or through more substantial structural modifications of the basic legislation (the LOGSE)—an option that soon became a reality through the conservative LOCE counterreform (the Quality in Education Act of 2002) and the most recent LOE of 2006.12

What was evident in these educators’ ideologically informed discourse and actions was the centrality of historically contextualized and ritualized cultural points of reference. That is, what was missing in the majority of the staff was a professional disposition or a practical ideology leading to performance rituals favorable to the nontraditional students, as opposed to the majority. Amongst the roles teachers adopted through their performance as professional educators,
best I observed that of “teacher-as-entertainer,” and at worst, that of “teacher-as-hegemonic-overlord,” but rarely that of “teacher-as-liminal-servant” (McLaren, 1999). McLaren describes the liminal servant as

both a convener of customs and a cultural provocateur—yet she (or he) […] does not subordinate the political rights of students to their utility as future members of the labour force. […] Whereas the teacher-as-entertainer is intent upon conditioning for sameness; the liminal servant nurtures counter-hegemonic forces through the formation of an alter-ideology. […] She is closer to her students than to her profession. (ibid., pp. 115–116)

The cumulative effects, then, of the institutionalized conditioning of dominant performance types and the formation of practical ideology requires that we critically reconsider the role of ritual in teacher agency.

The structure of schooling

The significance of ritual is further visible in the second source factor cited by nearly all the interviewees as partially responsible for, on the one hand, the perceived conflicts related to student diversity, and on the other, the failure of Room 10 to diminish their occurrence. “Modifying the entire system” made up this most frequently cited means for solving these problems. Not surprisingly, the types of changes suggested had much in common with a return to the ritually familiar, precompulsory system. While many of those interviewed rejected the possibility of establishing tracks for specific students, as outlined in the Galizan Attention to Diversity policy, they were instead inclined to suggest streaming or “itineraries” of study applicable to the entire student body. For example, such streams might commence at age 14 (when noncompulsory secondary education used to begin). One stream might be oriented toward terminating all schooling at age 16; another toward continuing on to Vocational Education; and another toward entering the two-year College Preparatory Program. In fact, similar streams were established in 2002 as a result of the LOCE counterreform (but never implemented due to the shift toward Socialist Party leadership in Spain in 2004). Many of the interviewees suggested that general streaming or tracking would not stigmatize the students as much as the Attention to Diversity schemes were. However, the suggested streaming mirrored past rituals in that all students would be presorted according to “choice” or to qualifications. After all, and significantly, a common lament among the original staff was the fact that, in the previous secondary school system, the pupils were “manageable,” so why not presort the current student body as well?
Colleague “mentality”

A third set of responses regarding the purported causes of behavior problems reflected an ideological disposition that competed with those oriented toward blaming the students or restructuring schooling. At least six interviewees—including two from the original cohort, and four newcomers from the primary school—considered that the “elitist mentality” of many of the traditional staff members constituted a significant source of conflict at the school. According to this view, a general “snobbinness” reigned amongst the senior staff, as well as a lack of willingness to collaborate and pool efforts for the benefit of the nontraditional students. But those who the six respondents claimed received the brunt of this “corporatism” were the pupils, who were also said to be labeled by the “elitist” teachers as “hopeless cases,” “not worth investing in,” or “incapable of attaining the ‘high’ academic standards” traditionally maintained at the school. As a possible solution to this problem, the informants suggested not only “recycling” the staff (through the retirement of older members), but also improving professional development and restructuring secondary education in the ways outlined earlier. In any case, care must be taken not to accept at face value this critique of class-related discrimination and practical ideology, as it may simultaneously constitute a kind of evasion tactic, or “passing the hot potato” on to one’s colleagues. For instance, the Resource Specialist (from Special Education) considered that there was a “generalized lack of contact and collaboration with the students’ families,” which, as she saw it, was more serious than the division amongst the staff.

Professional development

Finally, the “mentality” issue also extended into a fourth cited cause of perceived misbehavior in students: that of inadequate professional preparation and development. A great majority of the teachers considered themselves and the rest of the staff to be poorly prepared to “deal with” the nontraditional students at the school. This position was presented and qualified, however, more as a critique of the system than of their own commitment to ongoing professional development. It extended into preservice teacher education, but was mainly centered, on the one hand, on deficient inservice preparation for the LOGSE reform (including CSE), and on the other, on the actual design, once again, of the LOGSE itself, and the perceived lack of teacher involvement in its development. This last critique is especially noteworthy in that it may just reveal that these teachers assumed the stated reform goals were indeed contingent not only upon certain organizational constructs supposedly beyond their control, but also upon their own professional backing of the reform. For this very reason, the importance
of the interpretive and ideological framework of these educators, as generative or “artistic” (Elliott, 1991) mediators of educational policy, cannot be downplayed or ignored (as has also been argued by Ball, 1987 and Hargreaves, 1994). By extraction, nor can their role in the politics of representation and difference—including the reproduction of bias—be overly attributed to institutional constraints. After all, education as an institution, as Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) have asserted, is part-product and part-producer of hegemonic culture. This notwithstanding, it became clear that the Galizan education authorities had indeed made little organized effort to facilitate access to professional development associated with the reform (e.g., nonteaching days allocated for professional development, or a series of cohesive inservice sessions at the teachers’ work-site, etc.).

POLICY, PRACTICE, AND PARADOX
IN THE REPRODUCTION OF SOCIOCULTURAL BIAS

Theoretical perspectives on injustice in education have tended to set symbolic or cultural agency off against material or structural determinants. However, the teachers’ combined comments and actions attest to the interrelatedness, and yet nonsynchronous (McCarthy, 1990) or contradictory dynamics, in and between cultural and structural tendencies. Competing ideologies were continually played out, disputed and negotiated among the staff. Some indications of this competition with the dominant ideology—which locates conflict in the cultural Other—are reflected in teachers’ comments related to: reportedly desiring improved teacher education; resisting certain tracking procedures; denouncing “elitist mentalities”; desiring a greater degree of collaboration amongst educational professionals; and, as observed in a few cases, making some attempts to adapt instruction to individual learning needs through modified paper-and-pencil activities in the regular classroom, in Room 10, and for homework.

Contrary to these potentially critical stances, however, most staff members also tended: to send more Roma students to Room 10 (in proportion to their number at school) than any other ethnic group; to associate student diversity—most notably that involving Gypsy students—with behavior problems; to treat the symptoms of conflict with disciplinary means instead of seriously investigating the causes or exploring more culturally informed and global pedagogical responses; and to envision segregational streaming measures in order to ensure, and to favor, the academic “rights” of the majority students. Moreover, they generally failed to establish ongoing contact with the most disenfranchised sectors of the school community, or to collaborate with colleagues and other professionals in productive ways. They also avoided interactions with the “disruptive” youth (most teachers...
were assigned to Room 10 against their will), and they tended to blame either the students, “the system,” or their colleagues as opposed to their own actions.

Clearly, multiple forms of discrimination—especially those involving ethnocentrism, class bias and racism—were at work in the teachers’ interactions with the Gypsy students. We must not forget, however, to totalize (McLaren, 1994) this problematic portrayal of professional agency, by situating it in its larger context. The teachers’ perceptions, imaginings, decisions, and actions—as components of their practical ideologies—were clearly conditioned not only by institutional constraints, but by underlying sociocultural factors as well. Concerning institutional constraints, the interviews revealed that none of the teachers suggested, for example, to increase the number of educators available to students in the regular classrooms as a viable response to the perceived behavior problems. Such an option was later described as institutionally “impossible” given the administration’s hiring record. Moreover, as regards the reported lack of staff cooperation, the interviewees did not transcend the personal-attitude level. For instance, no references were made as to the negative effects of the Balkanization of schooling—for example, isolated disciplines and the nonintegrated curriculum, single-teacher classrooms, separate departments, strict scheduling requirements, etc.—none of which are conducive to collaboration or to a more relational and responsive learning environment (Hargreaves, 1994; Torres Santomé, 1998).

Along these same lines but on a larger scale, educational ethnographer Barry Troyna (1995) revealed, through a study conducted in 1992, the negative repercussions of institutional arrangements applied in England and Wales, where Local Education Authorities were disbanded by a 1988 reform act and replaced by Local Management of Schools schemes. This process of decentralization in turn led to the weakening of the already minimal antiracist education enacted under the auspices of the Local Education Authorities.

In addition to the influence of these kinds of institutional constraints, some latent sociocultural factors must also be considered. The ethnic and generational homogeneity of the staff constitutes an important source of cultural difference vis-à-vis their new students, as do the teachers’ ritual notions of behavior norms and “high standards” in their workplace. The conflicts arising from perceived hierarchies between the original and transferred teacher-cohorts are also significant to the extent that they attest to the hegemonic and exclusionary tendencies associated with social class. That is, the perceived sociocultural disparities between professional groups may lead to corporatism, a lack of coordination amongst the staff, weaker commitments to serving specific students, and, ultimately, an unequal distribution of cultural capital throughout the educational system (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977). Moreover, teacher engagement with the Roma community surrounding Instituto Central was nearly nonexistent: teachers and students were
separated not only physically through material living conditions (place of residence), but also symbolically through differences in cultural (including racialized) identity. And nonconformist behavior on the part of some Gypsy students only seemed to widen the gap. One teacher, drawn to tears during an informal gathering, expressed her frustration with some of these students by remarking, “For years I’ve had no problems; but now, suddenly, I have to deal with this!”

We must nevertheless once again be careful not to target teacher agency alone (or individual manifestations of practical ideology) as the sole factor(s) at work in this form of professional rejection and disengagement from the students served. And here is where the additional factor of gender enters into these discriminatory dynamics. For instance, regarding the feminization of the teaching profession in Spain, Mariano Fernández-Enguita (1999b) has criticized what he perceives to be a growing tendency amongst women teachers toward minimizing their professional commitments by demanding reduced hours or abandoning the school site during noninstructional working hours. The fact, however, that women teachers as workers generally attend to higher levels of daily unpaid labor at home than male workers do, helps explain the formers’ desire for more time off from work. To this respect, researchers have argued that the gendered division of labor, as a structural concern, indirectly contributes to the formation of practical ideology in schooling (see Weis, 1988). It also implicates these teachers—just as it does their students—in a nonsynchronous interaction of sexist, classist, racist, and cultural biases in the reproduction of inequality through professional agency. On this point, we should recall that the staff members at Instituto Central who were placed in direct charge of Room 10 were all women, many of whom ranked low on the seniority scale. Moreover, additional gender-related antagonisms between teachers and Roma students complicated matters: they involved both the disproportionate abandonment of schooling amongst adolescent Gypsy girls (as compared to boys), as well as the perception amongst many women teachers that Gypsy boys tended to disregard teacher authority more in women than in men. As we have seen, perceptions such as these can become generalized and ritualized, operating both tacitly and organically through individuals and institutions alike.

Lastly, international scholars of educational reform have pointed out that teachers have not only traditionally received societal blame for the perceived failure of reform efforts initiated outside their conventional (and ritual) realms of professional practice (Apple, 1995; Martínez Bonaí, 1998; Popkewitz, 1991), but they have also come under attack from today’s growing corporate culture in education (Torres Santomé, 2001; Whitty et al., 1998). Neoconservative reformers and parents alike treat standardized achievement scores as quality indicators of educators and schools, as if these were mere products, production line workers, and factories to be managed and selected according to neoliberal market logics and patterns of
consumption and investment. In these cases, there is a blatant disregard for civil liberties, equal rights, or variations among the sociocultural circumstances of the respective school communities. Such institutional and structural dynamics must therefore be factored into critiques of teaching professionals themselves.

This is not to let teachers off the proverbial hook, but rather to locate their reproductive tendencies within the larger, multiple-sited, structural, cultural, and often nonsynchronous processes of educational exclusion. This will aid our attempts to deconstruct the biases and to envision some ways out of the cycles of oppression.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE CROSS-CULTURAL PEDAGOGY**

With this account of the ways in which the teachers at a Spanish secondary school incorporated the novel presence of Gypsy students into their professional lives, the aim has been to reveal how institutionalized expressions of bias can be reproduced through local teacher agency, even when top-down equity policy, such as the LOGSE reform, is enacted to provide students who do not fit the ideal-typical cultural mold with greater access to education. When we consider teacher agency at Instituto Central within a broader historical, political, and transnational context, we see how it is part-product of a very particular confluence in Spain of cultural, political, and economic dynamics both local and global: in the local sense, political sentiments during the postdictatorship were ripe for change and open to the progressive investment in social welfare and democratic process. In the more global sense, this openness—as represented through the Spanish mass media of the 1980s—reflected a kind of generalized anxiousness to “catch up” economically and socially with so-called developed nations throughout Europe and the West. Subsequently, as the decade of the 1990s unfolded, influences from global dynamics such as immigration, neoliberal market forces, and neconservative backlash became familiar in the still newly reformed Spanish State. Thus, some of the teachers from the study observed that whereas student heterogeneity resulting from rapidly growing immigrant populations in Spain, as well as the LOGSE’s instating compulsory secondary education, may have helped some educators to perceive old prejudices toward the Gypsies in new ways, it is clear that more conservative reactions to such global trends were gaining a foothold—the move toward streaming procedures serving as an example. It is through this larger lens, then, that this study is also meant to serve as a call to educators such as those at Instituto Central to reflect upon their own agency within these broader dynamics, and to challenge the potentially harmful ritual and global references that inform their practical ideologies.
Given the complex confluence and interplay of structural and cultural factors that figure into the discriminatory teacher practices described above—that is, blaming the students, the system, one's colleagues, or professional preparation for their continued marginalization—a potentially powerful approach to the disruption of such ritualized bias in schooling would require that educators at all levels, but especially those working in the schools, attempt to transcend the traditional divide between theory, policy, and practice. Through the development of action research projects in their respective school communities, teachers who are themselves overwhelmingly treated as the mere technicians of policy-makers might thus reclaim pedagogies from the experts, who frequently lack direct experience with—and thus adequate knowledge about—most levels of institutional conditioning of school-site practice. Teachers would in this way participate in the reconstruction of schooling that pedagogical activist groups in Spain have long pursued through their conception of school as a key site for democratic participation and deliberation (see also Castoriadis, 1991).

Carr and Kemmis (1986), and Atweh, Kemmis, and Weeks (1998) approach action research in ways that are particularly amenable to this end, as they embrace an actively promoted exchange and development of critical pedagogic inquiry and intervention in and between all spheres of pedagogical knowledge production, including that pertaining to students, parents, scholars and other community members. If we consider that this process has ethical and political implications, and that ethics—in keeping with Bakhtin's (1993) understanding of it—cannot exist in theory but only in practice, the performative in action research becomes highly significant: educators may become not only more reflective, but also more deliberative and collaborative as researchers, practitioners and community agents. In the process, the participants' moral commitments to actively contesting the complex manifestations of bias in their own workplace are potentially enhanced through the diverse perspectives brought to the collective negotiation of meanings.

Opening up institutional spaces to more relational, inclusive and deliberative forms of professional communication offers a kind of “dialogical hope” (Benhabib, 1992) for overcoming the seemingly hopeless (e.g., discriminatory) realities of schooling. By contrast, the traditionally closed and hierarchical institutional realms of cultural production in education have conditioned the prioritization of ideologically informed decisions in practice (Carr, 1995). The teachers of this study have demonstrated this tendency through their performance of contradictory, potentially critical, but predominantly oppressive practical ideologies. In this sense, and in keeping with Zeichner’s (1995) recommendations, planting the seed of critical action research in preservice teacher education is paramount to empowering teacher agency. Above all, forging stronger links between teaching, research, policy, and socially responsible action is most promising when approached not only...
collectively but in tandem with the needs and participation of otherwise disenfranchised school community members, or as a kind of social movement (Sleeter, 1996). In this lies one of the means for promoting the kinds of cross-cultural exchanges so crucial to the fair participation and representation in education of subaltern groups such as the Roma.

Educators willing to transform ideologies, actions and the institution itself—one that is historically steeped in bias toward specific cultural and economic preferences and selection processes (see Ladwig, 2000 or Varela and Álvarez-Uría, 1991)—might further stand to gain from reenvisioning their role at work as that of McLaren’s “liminal servant,” and as that of “critical public intellectual” (Giroux with Shannon, 1997). The first of these might involve, for example, a cross-cultural commitment to transgressing racist, classist, and sexist ideologies reflected in the curriculum. According to McCarthy (1993), a multicultural focus on racism, for example, would entail, among other engagements, critically examining the construction of school knowledge and the centering of Western (dominant) culture in the curriculum; pursuing not only the cultural diversity of school knowledge, but the inherent “relationality” of that knowledge; developing a much more “nuanced” discussion of the racial identities not only of the minority groups, but also of the majority; and promoting democratic initiatives in the curriculum, in pedagogical practice, and in social relations at school. As for the teacher as public intellectual, taking on such a role may ultimately influence not only public opinion but policy-making itself, especially if such intellectual activity is approached, once again, as a collective effort.

Some of the staff at Instituto Central have already viewed an earlier version of this analysis. A forthcoming broader analysis will be presented to all participating educators, students, their families, and community agents as well. It is further hoped that this process serve to inspire the teachers to not only reflect more critically on their praxis in a prebiased institution, but to actively promote collaborative, community-based, cross-cultural pedagogical alternatives, so that it can be said, at least in their case, that schooling is for the Roma … as well.

NOTES

1. This chapter is closely based on Teasley (2005).
3. Such students and their parents generally refer to themselves in Spanish as gitanos—meaning Gypsies—as opposed to romá or Roma. This latter term has emerged of late primarily amongst
activists and scholars as a means of promoting a historically informed, transnational ethnic identity. Out of respect for both postures, the terms Gypsy and Roma will be used interchangeably in this chapter.


5. Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación (Organic Law on Education). This law may be consulted at the Web site: http://www.mec.es/mecd/gabipren/documentos/A17158-17207.pdf (last retrieved on November 2, 2007).

6. This autonomous community is commonly referred to as “Galicia”, although “Galiza” is also officially recognized. In recent years, certain sectors of Galizan society and government have been promoting the use of “Galiza” as more coherent with this polity’s linguistic legacy (the persecution of which was rampant during the dictatorship).

7. The manual Atención á diversidade: medidas organizativas offers an overview of this policy. See Consellería de Educación e Ordenación Universitaria (1999), or the pdf version at the Xunta de Galicia Web site: http://www.edu.xunta.es/portal/mostrarfile?tipoRecursoCampoID=678dc5f-c0a8f6d3-0067a7b-393b5b95&recursoID=0d38412c-4532174a-01c7a26c-23042b46&lleng=gl (last retrieved December 6, 2007).

8. Due to space limitations, a detailed overview of these measures cannot be included here. See Consellería de Educación e Ordenación Universitaria (1999).

9. At the time, school principals were (and still are) elected into office by staff, student, and parent representatives. This particular principal assured me that he “owed his election” especially to the voting parents.

10. As for the construction of the Other as an essentialized, static being, Bhabha (1994) has pointed out that while the object of identification is always ambivalent, the agency itself in identification is, more significantly, “… never pure or holistic but always constituted in a process of substitution, displacement or projection” (ibid., p. 162). Likewise, Hall (1992) has denounced the myth of ethnic and cultural absolutism, and underscored the undeniable, historical processes of ethnic “hybridity” of national cultures in the West.

11. McCarthy (1998) has argued that the forms of cultural resistance pursued by African Americans through alternative institutions of learning can be characterized as a kind of “war of maneuver,” but that a “war of position” (challenging dominant ideologies and institutions from within) has also been instrumental and necessary. See as well: Freire (1970) on the need for indigenous literacy programs to transcend the sole use of local linguistic and cultural knowledge; hooks (1994) on her own experience in US educational contexts of varying degrees of racial homogeneity; Fernández-Enguita (1999a) on the problems with the bridge-school experience at Gypsy settlements in Spain; Willis (1981) on the false resistance implied in students’ retreating into (or over-identification with) certain more restrictive practices associated with subordinated social-class cultures; McCarthy and Dimitriadis (2000) on the negative effects of the essentialized space of racial origins; and Nieto (2002), Grant et al. (1999), Sleeter (1996), and many others on the tragedies of ghetto schools and the benefits of multicultural education.


13. One teacher arriving toward the end of my presence at the school took charge of Room 10 in part because he had worked for years with Roma communities through a local Christian charity organization. But his is a story apart.

14. See, for example, the agenda of the State Confederation of Movements for Pedagogical Renewal (“MRPs”), at: http://cmrp.pangea.org/ (last retrieved January 10, 2008).
15. Not all approaches to action research escape positivist influence (Kincheloe, 1993). Moreover, although I concur with most of the premises set forth by John Elliott, I beg to differ with him on the role of consultation: while Elliott rejects teachers’ resorting to “experts” at any cost, I do not believe that all aspects of consultancy should be thus disqualified. On this point, Zeichner (1995) argues a strong case for closing the gap between university- and school-based realms of research.
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Learning about Learning: An Agenda for Inquiry

*The International Journal of Learning* sets out to foster inquiry, invite dialogue and build a body of knowledge on the nature and future of learning.

New Learning
We might have heard the talk in recent years of a ‘knowledge society’ and ‘new economy’ and listened with a great deal of scepticism, as we did to earlier talk of a new society. As educators, however, we need to grasp what is rhetorically or genuinely new in our times. We must seize the drift of contemporary public discourse, and position ourselves centrally. And how more appropriately than in an epoch that styles itself as a ‘knowledge society’? Here is our chance: the stuff of knowledge is no more and no less than the stuff of learning. Surely too, this new kind of society requires a new kind of learning and that a new social status is ascribed to education.

This is how we may come to consider the dimensions of a ‘new learning’. It is also how we might imagine of a possibly better society which locates education at the heart of things. This heart may well be economic in the sense that it is bound to personal ambition or material self improvement. Equally, however, education is a space to re-imagine and try out a new and better world which delivers improved material, environmental and cultural outcomes for all. Education must surely be a place of open possibilities, for personal growth, for social transformation and for the deepening of democracy. Such is the agenda of ‘new learning’, explicitly or implicitly. This agenda holds whether our work and thinking is expansive and philosophical or local and finely grained.

Learners
No learning exists, however, without learners, in all their diversity. It is a distinctive feature of the new learning to recognise the enormous variability of lifeworld circumstances that learners bring to learning. The demographics are insistent: material (class, locale, family circumstances), corporeal (age, race, sex and sexuality, and physical and mental characteristics) and symbolic (culture, language, gender, affinity and persona). This is a conceptual starting point which helps explain the telling patterns of educational and social outcomes.

Behind these demographics are real people, who have always already learned and whose range of learning possibilities are both boundless and circumscribed by what they have learned already and what they have become through that learning. Here we encounter the raw material diversity — of human experiences, dispositions, sensibilities, epistemologies and world views. These are always far more varied and complex than a first glance at the demographics would suggest. Learning succeeds or fails to the extent that it engages the varied identities and subjectivities of learners. Engagement produces opportunity, equity and participation. Failure to engage produces failure, disadvantage and inequality.
Pedagogy
And what makes for engagement? Learning is how a person or a group comes to know, and knowing consists of a variety of types of action. In learning, a knower positions themselves in relation to the knowable, and engages (by experiencing, conceptualising, analysing or applying, for instance). A learner brings their own person to the knowing, their subjectivity. When engagement occurs, they become a more or less transformed person. Their horizons of knowing and acting have been expanded. Pedagogy is the science and practice of the dynamics of knowing. And assessment is the measure of pedagogy: interpreting the shape and extent of the knower’s transformation.

Curriculum
In places of formal and systematic teaching and learning, pedagogy occurs within larger frameworks in which the processes of engagement are given structure and order, often defined by content and methodology, hence the distinctive ‘disciplines’. Then, well might we ask, what is the nature and future of ‘literacy’, ‘numeracy’, ‘science’, ‘history’, ‘social studies’, ‘economics’, ‘physical education’ and the like? How are they connected, with each other, and a world in a state of dynamic transformation? And how do we evaluate their effectiveness as curriculum?

Education
Learning happens everywhere and all the time. It is an intrinsic part of our human natures. Education is learning by design, in community settings specially designed as such—the institutions of early childhood, school, technical/vocational, university and adult education. Education also sometimes takes informal or semiformal forms within settings whose primary rationale is commercial or communal, including workplaces, community groups, households or public places. What are the similarities and differences between these settings? And how do these different settings connect?

The Learning Journal provides a forum for dialogue about the nature and future of learning. It is a place for presenting research and reflections on education both in general terms and through the minutiae of practice. It attempts to build an agenda for a new learning, and more ambitiously an agenda for a knowledge society which is as good as the promise of its name.
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Postcolonial Learning in Neocolonial Times
Cathryn Teasley, University of a Coruña, Spain

Abstract: By critically examining four broad dimensions of learning through the postcolonial lens, the aim with this study is to promote alternatives to today’s neoliberal variant on the technical-rational imaginary for learning. Such alternatives are meant to help learners of all ages, origins, and conditions, but especially those belonging to identity groups who regularly experience one or more forms of discrimination, inequality, and injustice, to identify neocolonial cultural and economic dynamics so that they might create a cross-cultural common ground from which to resist such oppression, as a means of empowering and perhaps even emancipating themselves from its damaging effects.
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About a year ago, at the University of A Coruña, some graffiti appeared spray-painted in large black lettering across the white, outer wall of a faculty building. It read, in the Galizan language:

O SISTEMA DE ENSINANZA É A ENSINANZA DO SISTEMê

While an exact translation of this statement would be difficult (because the term sistema de ensinanza literally translates into “system of teaching,” but in common usage refers to the educational system as a whole, or to both teaching and learning), a close equivalent in English might read:

THE SYSTEM OF LEARNING = LEARNING THE SYSTEM

Whether we agree or disagree with this denunciation of “the system” — which, as can be inferred from the encircled, anarchistic “As,” extends beyond the educational system itself and into the larger, globally dominant political and economic order of the day: that is, representational democracy and global capitalism — the simple directness of this anti-establishment statement at least incites us to stop and reflect. In fact, it led me to consider four interrelated and, as I shall argue, highly significant dimensions of learning today. These include: conceptions of learning (ideologies, imaginaries, discursive and conceptual frames, stated purposes); contexts of learning (geopolitical, economic, socio-cultural, temporal, and institutional locations and conditions); contents of learning (curricula, subjects, disciplines, canons, grand narratives, cultural emphases and omissions); and conduits of learning (methods, media, processes, dynamics, causations, catalysts).

The aim here is to critically examine these four broad dimensions in ways that promote a particular interpretation and representation not only of learning, but of learners themselves,

1 A Coruña is a city located in the region of Galiza (also known as Galicia), in north-western Spain.
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as agents rather than objects of study, and as creators of learning, not as passive recipients of the kind of reified and commodified learning we have witnessed since the late 1980s, with the rise of neoliberal educational policies. Neoliberalism, as a doctrine, fosters what Cameron McCarthy (2008) has critically referred to as an “enterprise ethic” in education, which is evident in policies such as: a la carte learning through school competition over parental choice; the conditioning of public learning venues by for-profit interests; rote learning for high-stakes testing; or a focus on learning as product rather than process, as is apparent in the publication of school rankings based on learner outcomes, not learner input or improvement, as the primary quality indicators (Apple, 2001; McCarthy, 2008; Torres Santomé, 2001).

What follows, then, is an ethical plea to educators to promote alternatives to this new variant on the technical-rational imaginary for learning so that youngsters of all ages, origins, and conditions — but especially those belonging to identity groups who regularly experience one or more forms of discrimination, inequality, and injustice — can move beyond not only their pre-assigned roles as mere cogs in “the system,” but also beyond being empowered, and toward empowering and perhaps even emancipating themselves from oppressive conceptions, contexts, contents, and conduits of learning.

Conceptions

Of course, this point of departure is itself a conception of learning. It is informed by postcolonial critique, which is inscribed in a legacy of scholarly reflection and activism emerging in the late-modern era as a countercurrent to the ideological mainstream of cultural discourse and practice in capitalist societies. Where learning is concerned, world scholars of education have laid to bear the positivistic, individualistic, psychological, instrumental, and mercantile biases present in the hegemonic spectrum of mutually complementary currents in education, and have since forged alternatives through fields of research with roots in modernist thought, such as critical pedagogy, critical theory, critical race theory, and feminism.3 The epistemologies generated through such investigation, however, have come to incorporate (if not give rise to) postmodern and post-structural lines of inquiry as well. These theoretical developments have in turn received ongoing cultivation through more recent, interdisciplinary fields such as cultural studies, queer theory, and postcolonial studies. And it is this last camp that has primarily, if not exclusively, inspired the conception of learning and learners set forth here.

The transversal terrain of postcolonial analysis critically assesses the uneven effects of our shared colonial past on the present, placing special emphasis, as Fazal Rizvi (2007) notes, on cultural forms of impact. Postcolonial thought coalesced as a corpus during the second half of the 20th century, its influence spreading more rapidly following the United Nations declarations condemning colonialism as an imperial practice. By that time, as Joanne Sharp (2009) points out, there were basically no more regions and populations left in the

2 Neoliberalism refers to the re-signification of classical Enlightenment liberalism, as a doctrine of individual freedom, now much more narrowly conceived in terms of the freedom of movement of capital. This translates into attempts to limit and even eliminate government intervention and restrictions on free-market activities in all spheres of public life (see Torres Santomé, 2001).

world to colonize. The origins and identities of postcolonial intellectuals, artists, and activists are linked in significant, if not always direct ways to the unequal but inter-dependent legacies that colonialism and imperialism have left on the inhabitants of nation-states across the globe. From this standpoint, postcolonial writers and scholars have set out to deconstruct past and present in ways that offer powerful potential not only for re-conceptualizing the socially invented world in which we live, but learning itself, as an intellectual and cultural pursuit, as a human right, and as a public good.

To better understand this potential, however, the very desire to contest and destabilize the dominant conceptions of learning and learners might first be further explained from a few related angles. Jennifer Williams (1979) pointed out years ago that positivistic epistemologies tend to frame learning as primarily a technical, scientific, and value-neutral concern, which not only renders invisible the disparate socio-cultural and economic conditions of learners, but also produces uniform and, presumably, universally applicable prescriptions for learning in ways that silence the teeming, subjective world of experience, perspective, and difference. These factors cannot be ignored because they heavily condition how learners make sense of information both new and old (Kincheloe, 2004). Yet another manifestation of the dominant, technical-rational conceptualization of learning can be found in what Paulo Freire (1970) so lucidly denounced as the “banking concept” of learning, wherein bits of information are deposited, so to speak, into the minds of passive learners; or in the view of learning as mere transmission from those who “possess” knowledge to those who supposedly do not, the latter thus conceived as devoid of any ability, or right, for that matter, to question the validity of such official knowledge, or to negotiate its multiple meanings, as Ivor Goodson (1998) has noted. And all this is compounded by the neoliberal policies mentioned earlier.

These preponderant conceptions of learning obscure the broader ideology, or the ever more globalized “system,” upon which they rest: capitalist democracy. What is more, the cultural impact of this hegemonic frame is strong; for, as conveyed by the aforementioned graffiti, it carries with it cultural consequences. 4 But postcolonial critics, such as: Frantz Fanon (1963, 1967); Gayatri C. Spivak (Spivak & Harasym, 1990); Stuart Hall (1992); Homi Bhabha (1994); Edward Said (1978, 1993); Arjun Appadurai (1996); or those specializing in pedagogy, such as Cameron McCarthy (2008; McCarthy & Dimitriadis, 2000), Greg Dimitriadis (Dimitriadis & McCarthy, 2001); and Fazal Rizvi (2007); to name only a few, have opened these cultural consequences up to a much more complex and nuanced plane of inquiry than the exponents of monolithic assimilation and acculturation theories have been able to achieve (see e.g. Berry, Trimble & Olmedo, 1986 or Gordon 1964). By introducing non-essentializing notions such as cultural and/or identity containment; displacement; hybridity; porosity (McCarthy, 2008); contingency; agency; re-inscription; mimesis; translation (Bhabha, 1994); and more; postcolonial scholars sift through an ongoing dialectic of negotiated, cross-cultural identity formation through power relations that flow in all directions, and that include neocolonial strategies of domination. 5 For example, regarding what is often described as an assimilationist conception of educational integration — whereby a biased directionality of cultural adaptation is expected of subaltern learners, such as immigrant and minority students

---

4 This is a post-structural focus that Douglas Foley (1990) pursued in his ground-breaking study *Learning Capitalist Culture*.
5 The postcolonial vision of power generally coincides with Foucault’s (1980) understanding that power can be exercised on many levels and by all social actors, and therefore does not necessarily entail domination. Domination is, in this sense, simply one more way to exercise power.
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from the postcolonial perspective, this process is contemplated as an exercise in domination that operates both overtly and covertly. Thus, stereotyped “outsiders” or “others” are expected to both learn and conform to pre-established cultural norms if they are to be included and integrated, by ubiquitous gatekeepers, into the mainstream sphere of learning with its particular access to greater degrees of freedom and power in society. In the meantime, however, postcolonial perspectives remind us that the dominant cultural standards that inform this ethnocentric dynamic are ever more challenged by the steady advance of multi- and cross-cultural reconfigurations of populations worldwide today.

Drawing on Jacques Derrida’s (1994) postmodern reading of the Nietzschean concept of resentment, or resentment, McCarthy and Dimitriadis (2000) see resentment in the subjective engagement with the kind of damaging cultural learning that echoes the operations so characteristic of colonial rule: cultural correction and restrictive assimilation. Resentment, in this sense, is a form of internalized self-discipline practiced by those who attempt to conform to the power-culture standard by abandoning or “resenting” their own socially devalued markers of identity, and mimetically replacing these with other, more normalized versions. But just as occurred in colonial times, today’s neocolonized subjects eventually realize that their newly fashioned selves, or resentment-identities, are not quite accepted as equals by their hegemonic role models. They are instead often perceived as mere simulacra. This is not to say, however, that such othered cultural learners are lacking in resources to resist and transcend these destructive cultural conceptions and mechanisms. And here is where context plays a key role, because no conception of learning or learners can be understood in isolation from its broader realms of situatedness.

Contexts

A personal anecdote on situated learner resistance will serve to introduce this section on contexts for learning. During my childhood in the early 1970s, my Californian family and I lived for two years in the West African nation of Sierra Leone, a former British colony, where both of my parents served in the Peace Corps. Upon arrival, we were promptly taken to a small town to be immersed in the main language of the country: Krio. Our language instructor was a young Sierra Leonean man, and a Muslim. One day, while he was conversing informally with my father, the topic of religion came up: namely, the Catholic faith, which was the one my family observed. The teacher then exclaimed, “What a coincidence!”, for he was in fact very well versed in Catholicism because he had attended a Catholic missionary school throughout his youth. He had gone to mass every day; had gone through First Holy Communion and Confirmation; and had even become an altar-boy. My father, perplexed, then asked him, “If you were such a devout Catholic then, why are you a Muslim now?” He pondered the question for a moment and then, with a shrug of the shoulders, replied, “School ended!”

The Peace Corps is a United States government agency whose professed philanthropic aim is to promote world peace by offering US models and instruments of development to poor countries that solicit such aid. Yet, since its establishment in the 1960s, Peace Corps activities and aims have come under scrutiny for their perceived propensity to function as just another arm of US economic and cultural imperialism. But that is a topic for a separate discussion (see e.g. Kumashiro, 2004). To further contextualize this experience, my family’s racial, ethnic, and class profile is white, Anglo-Italo-American, and white-collar or middle class (of modest means at the time).
His spontaneous reasoning here speaks not only to the broader cultural contextualization of learning, but to learner agency as well. It exemplifies resistance through the subjective re-signification of imposed cultural values. But this kind of agency is of course not limited to learners in Third World contexts alone — where the legacies of colonialism are particularly salient — it occurs in the First World as well, as shall be explored ahead. But where the privileges of the First World are concerned, they would probably never exist today were it not for its colonial past, as Caribbean intellectual Eric Williams (1944/1994) asserted more than half a century ago in his *Capitalism and Slavery*. Colombian scholar of alternative development theory Arturo Escobar sums up this legacy of privilege in the following terms: “Whereas Europe was feeding off its colonies in the nineteenth century, the First World today feeds off the Third World” (1995, p. 83). This is manifested by the fact that developing countries together pay billions of dollars more each year in foreign debt than they receive in new lending.

Still less obvious, but very real neocolonial dynamics are propitiated today through transnational capitalism and communications. Ample research on globalization has shown that there have been several globalizing junctures throughout the ages, but that today’s particular moment, fueled by information technologies and free-market doctrine, has intensified the movement of material and symbolic capital, as well as people (often cast as human capital), across national borders and continents, from the formerly colonized peripheries to the metropolitan centers of yesterday’s and today’s Empire.7 The postcolonial lens, then, focuses on the common ground between these inter-dependent temporal, spatial, and symbolic spheres: past with present; Third World with First; “us” with “them.” And no matter how remote these interconnected historical, geographical, and cultural contexts may at first seem, they are of utmost importance to learning in our globalized world because they condition not only what we learn, but, in more subtle ways, how and why we learn as well.

In any case, postcolonial perspectives may in some instances seem a bit far removed, especially in a country such as Spain, whose colonial past ended hundreds of years ago. Nonetheless, if we examine the region of Galiza (an Autonomous Community of the Spanish State with a significant nationalist movement), it offers perhaps one of the clearest examples as to why such analysis is indeed relevant. According to Galizan political economist Xosé Manuel Beiras (2006), or sociologist Xosé Santos Solla (2004), among others, the Galizan people bear a long history of economic drain and dependency due not only to the overwhelming, external exploitation of the country’s natural wealth from other centers of economic power within Spain, but to cultural colonization as well. For instance, centuries of linguistic domination in Galiza (of Spanish over Galizan) was more recently exacerbated by the Franco dictatorship (from 1939-1976); and that, coupled with the continued flight of capital, has amounted to the impending death of a major component of Galizan ethno-national identity — its language — which is rapidly disappearing as a first language of socialization today (Álvarez Cáccamo, 2003; Nova Escola Galega, 2004). These workings, over time, have in fact given rise to several periods of mass-emigration from Galiza mostly to Latin America and Europe. And although the last major exodus ended in the 1970s, today the country is experiencing the flight of its most qualified young adults to more prosperous economies.

---

7 See, for example, Arjun Appadurai (1996); Manuel Castells (2000); Ulrich Beck (2000), David Held (Held & McGrew, 2002); or Robbie Robertson (2003).
within Spain and beyond. In 2005, for instance, more inhabitants left Galiza than non-
Spanish immigrants entered (Instituto Galego de Estatística, 2006).

But more and more members and descendents of this diaspora are now returning to Galiza,
and, along with them, a rising flow of immigrants in general, a small majority of which are
women. These are mostly from poor Latin American countries whose pasts were subjected
to colonial rule, often more than once. Such immigrants respond primarily to service-sector
demands in Galiza, including house cleaning and cooking, child and elderly care, and, among
others, sexual demands. This last set of demands is largely met through the illegal trafficking,
or modern slavery, of young women who are coaxed into crossing the Atlantic under legiti-
mately framed pretexts, only to find their passports confiscated upon arrival, and their persons
forced into prostitution in order to “buy back” their freedom. In fact, according to sociologist
Laura Oso (2003), the province of A Coruña is a major hub of this gendered enslavement,
as is Valencia.

Critical awareness about this and other, underlying, unjust infrastructures and ideologies
that connect such transnational contexts is essential, if youth and their parents are to under-
stand the effects of the colonial past on the neocolonial present: as shared context; as a
glocal concern (at once global and local); as a common denominator to cross-cultural coex-
istence; as a reason to unite in mutual comprehension and solidarity against a persistent
source of injustice that affects all of us, albeit in very unequal ways; and as a means of pro-
moting cross-cultural justice.

Contents

Building such critical awareness in learners involves their being exposed to certain cultural
contents that can help them collectively devise alternative vantage points from which to con-
template and construct this common ground. As Portuguese sociologist Boaventura de
Sousa Santos (2003) notes, the unilateral and exclusive orientation of traditional grand nar-
ratives in textbooks and other curricular resources leads to frequent omissions in the Western
canon that amount to a monoculture of knowledge. In response, Santos has developed what
he calls a “sociology of absences,” through which he explains that “what does not exist is,
in fact, actively produced as nonexistent” (p. 5).

Perspective is paramount here. To exemplify this point, we can turn to the oft-cited, biased
discourse on the “Discovery” or the Spanish “Conquest” of America, which is still circulating
in even the most recent of textbooks in Spain (see e.g. García Sebastián et al., 2004). To
oppose this discourse, we might also consider the magnificent trilogy Memoria del fuego
(1982, 1999, 2002), through which Uruguayan intellectual Eduardo Galeano offers a much
needed counter-narrative on the colonized history of Latin America. But there are other,
lesser known examples as well. For instance, in the year 2002 the following news headline
appeared in a Galizan newspaper: “Quinientos alumnos de Secundaria recibirán clases de
cultura gitana”, which translates into “Five hundred Secondary students to receive lessons
on Gypsy culture”. 8 A first reading of this news captures the progressive promise of the
cross-cultural learning about to take place. However, a second reading, this time from a so-
ciology of absences, detects the tragedy behind the fact that this kind of learning is even
considered news. Is such cultural knowledge really so novel in Galiza, or in Spain for that

8 La Opinión de A Coruña, 19/06/2002, p. 8
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matter — home to a significant part of Europe’s Roma/Gypsies for over half a millennium? Unfortunately, it is. What is more, because this “new” curricular content is introduced through a special program, it represents a kind of contingency plan, an extra, or a peripheral addition to the otherwise stable curriculum. It embodies, in this sense, what Louise Derman-Sparks (1989) and Jurjo Torres Santomé (1998) have respectively characterized as the “tourist curriculum,” or what James Banks (1993) has called “additive” multiculturalism, both curricula of which can only lead to superficial and tendentious cultural learning because neither seriously challenges the carefully preserved, official “Culture” of mainstream curricula, as Michael Apple has long asserted (1993, 1996). So what pedagogies can challenge this stubborn mold?

Conduits

Of crucial significance here is how previously silenced cultural contents are indeed learned. One last anecdote speaks to the significance of this question by revealing how global forces interact with local ethnic identity and thus influence the ways in which certain contents reach certain learners. A Rom/Gypsy student that I had been following as an ethnographer at a secondary school in Galiza in 2002 had all but dropped out of school where he felt he did not belong. Nonetheless, he willingly attended an after-school learning group at a nearby community center frequented by other Roma/Gypsy youth. In that alternative setting, this boy introduced me to the lexicon of the Romani language, spoken by many East European Roma, but now virtually lost to the Iberian Roma (Courthiade, 1998). Mere remnants of this language remain in the caló: a vernacular and variant of Spanish spoken by the Spanish Roma (Torrione, 1994). In any case, what became evident to me was this student’s selective agency in learning, as demonstrated by his high level of “on-task” interest in reading and writing in this setting — an interest I had never observed in him at school.

But what most caught my attention was the fact that he had discovered the value of his people’s linguistic roots thanks, ironically, not so much to Romani activism, nor to progressive school pedagogies, nor even to the growing presence in Spain of Romani-speaking Gypsy immigrants from East Europe, but to none other than globalized Christian fundamentalism. That is, since the early 1990s, a branch of the international evangelical movement has been effectively harnessing a means for converting the Roma to their faith by teaching cultural pride alongside the gospel, through the promotion of the Romani language — a minimal gesture in what Nancy Fraser (2005) has referred to as cultural “recognition,” which nevertheless constitutes a highly powerful mobilizing force for an historically oppressed people. One of the burning questions, then, behind this story is: Why has public/state-run education, for its part, failed to recognize Romani culture in equally powerful terms? Is it because there is “no more room” in the hegemonic curriculum? Or is it that policy makers and educators are going about organizing learning not only through a monoculture of curricular content knowledge, but through rigid conceptions, contextualizations, and conduits of learning as well? Just how public is state-run education if under-represented groups such as the Roma fail to reap its benefits to the same degree that dominant groups do? Fortunately, the Roma have been actively organizing both locally and in cyberspace to transform this reality (Teasley, 2007).

These questions address all four of the dimensions of learning laid out in this study, but especially the conduits or ways of learning that promote critical awareness about those op-
pressive aspects of “the system” that have colonized our collective learning as such. The late Palestinian scholar Edward Said (1993) advanced the practice of “contrapuntal analysis,” which functions as a discursive countercurrent to neocolonial representations of the world’s inter-dependent socio-cultural realities, but without attempting to replace such discourse with yet another hegemony. This kind of analysis allows for differentiated subjectivities and voice to detect and qualify cultural hierarchies and perspectives. As educators, we can engage contrapuntal analysis with learners; we can put a sociology of absences into practice; we can use postcolonial analysis to create a common ground of negotiated, shared values in cross-cultural learning that problematizes the unjust tenets of today’s global dynamics (i.e. the worldwide financial crisis now underway and other neocolonial forms of economic exploitation; neoliberal incursions into the public sphere; cultural domination, omission, resentment; etc.): a common ground that promotes cross-cultural justice and unity.

Finally, this critical vision of the concepts, contexts, contents, and conduits of learning in the world-system of our times represents an attempt to cross borders — to use a term Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) promoted — between epistemologies (modern and postmodern); between periods (colonial and neocolonial); between geographies (Third World and First, East-West, North-South); and between identities. It thus provides a means for building, in Alex Callinicos’s (2002) words, “unity in diversity”.
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In the five chapters we review in this essay, the authors seek collectively, if fitfully, to make sense of the extraordinary changes now bearing down on 21st-century society. They are particularly interested in the implications of these developments for diversity and inclusion approaches in education. The language varies within the chapters, as terms such as “globalization,” “postmodernism,” “postcolonialism,” “immigration,” “multiculturalism,” “inclusion,” and so forth are used to tag changes seen as generated in the local and global contexts of schooling in the new millennium. The authors identify various markers of diversity, such as immigration, trends in popular culture and the mass media, and the significant demographic changes now being registered in urban classrooms in North America as precipitating a necessary response from educators to the challenge posed by this new heterogeneity in schooling.

Some of these authors, such as Gloria Ladson-Billings and Keffrelyn Brown (Chapter 8), and Sonia Nieto, Patty Bode, Eugenie Kang, and John Raible (Chapter 9) see these matters of context as external, macro-level forces exerting pressure on schooling and needing urgent attention. Others, such as Frederick Erickson, Rishi Bagrodia, Alison Cook-Sather, Manuel Espinoza, Susan Jurow, Jeffrey L. Schultz, and Joi Spencer (Chapter 10), as well as Ming Fang He, Jo Ann Phillion, Elaine Chan, and Shijing Xu (Chapter 11) call attention to the necessity for closer readings of the classroom and in-school encounters between students and teachers. They are particularly interested in students’ experiences and the type of encounters that are internally produced and rendered meaningful in the school setting. In contrast to the other contributors, Mel Ainscow, author of the final chapter in the section, directs his attention to the organizational dimension of schooling, pointing to what needs to be done at that level to improve the quality of teaching in the area of diversity. All these scholars seem keenly aware that the school is itself a site for the production of difference and not simply a point of reception. As such, the authors recognize schooling as an arena in which important interventions can and must occur.

Yet, we find that the connections between context and schooling, while variously acknowledged in these chapters, are underdeveloped. These matters of context are articulated in the many ways in which the dramatic intensification of diversity is now occurring both inside and outside school—that is, with respect to the registering of intensifying patterns of immigration, cultural plurality, and the circulation of images and discourses derived from all parts of the globe. All these new developments provide cause enough for us to alter the ways we think through or theorize the key concepts on which diversity itself turns and the very processes and dynamics for which the word “diversity” is really a proxy.

This reading of change in society as warranting change in schooling is asserted rather than developed in a systematic way. A consequence of this lack of sustained analysis is that the critical terms “diversity,” “inclusion,”
and so forth—the terms that the authors identify as central components of the organizing principle of education in the new century—are underdeveloped and limited in scope. While there is a significant focus on cultural, racial, ethnic, and ability-based diversity and an emphasis on moving beyond static notions of culture and multiculturalism, there is little attention to issues of intersectionality or the complex ways in which race, class, gender, and sexuality both intersect and cut at right angles to each other in everyday school life.

The authors advance a commitment, ultimately, to a representational formula in which minority youth get more access and purchase in educational arrangements. As such, the diversity discourse in these chapters tends to break away from the contextual issues that precipitated the authors’ analytic interventions in the first place. Yet, it is precisely the issue of shifting social and institutional contexts—as defined by the current wave of neoliberal globalization—that warrants a rethinking of the categories associated with diversity and inclusion. Diversity has thus become the proxy word for the way governmental systems address problems lying “deeper down” in the socius: race, class, gender, and their expression in the fundamental inequality which schooling produces within its very organization of knowledge.

On the whole, the authors diagnose a specter haunting contemporary society. Today’s dominant form of globalization is throwing new systems-based identity crises onto schools, as educators are confronted with the proliferation of difference and multiplicity. New, complex forms of identity and affiliation are not only defining the lives and lifestyles of immigrant youth outside of school, but are powerfully impacting their in-school experiences as well. These developments not only affect participants in schools, but are reflected in the general population as well. We now feast on world cultures, new tastes, needs, desires, and dispositions precipitated by the intensification of electronic mediation and the movement of economic and cultural capital.

The authors in this section, by and large, retreat from this intuition. Instead, they reference the fact of the existential presence of these new dynamics in the 21st century while retreating to a largely nation-bound and Anglo-American framework to make sense of the new dynamics associated with diversity. The nexus between diversity and the reality of today’s global dynamics thus remain generally unexplored. Globalization therefore colors the landscape of racialized and ethnicized United States, England, and Canada, populating these countries with difference and the immigrant other. Yet, the authors do not go into what globalization means for rethinking race, ethnicity, and identity—key variables that flesh out the notion of diversity, making it intelligible in popular and establishment understandings of the operation of difference in everyday life.

In this essay, we will look at the strengths and limitations of each of these chapters. We draw some conclusions that point to the need for a new
framework for rethinking diversity and educational reform in light of current dynamics associated with youth culture and their relationship to globalization. The latter is the critical force that is partially diagnosed in these chapters as presenting new challenges to education.

THE CHAPTERS

In a provocative chapter, which inaugurates the diversity section of the handbook, Gloria Ladson-Billings and Keffrelyn Brown maintain that the contemporary curricular approach to diversity skirts fundamental issues of fairness and equality. Instead, they argue, these approaches promote a content-addition model in which cultural knowledge associated with minority, immigrant, and other excluded groups serve to color and embellish an already taken-for-granted, Eurocentric core. More pointedly, drawing on Michael Apple’s (1993) definition of the curriculum as “official knowledge,” Ladson-Billings and Brown maintain:

Despite the major challenges that were raised against what is called mainstream curriculum in the 1960s and 1970s in the United States, the inclusion of different offerings (e.g. Black Studies, Women’s Studies, Chicano Studies, Asian American Studies, Indigenous Studies) has not proven deep enough or long lasting enough to erase the persistent academic achievement gaps... between marginalized and dominant group students. (p. 154)

Against this historical backdrop, the authors seek to test the continued viability and relevance of Carter G. Woodson’s 1933 indictment of the U.S. educational system as supremacist and unequal. To do this, the authors draw on critical race theory (CRT) and the social problems and moral panics framework derived from British sociology (Blumer, 1971; Cohen, 1972; Goode & Ben-Yehuda, 1994; Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clark, & Roberts, 1978; Merton & Nisbet, 1976; Schneider, 1985) to get at the problems that for them lie “deeper down” beneath the veneer of the “content addition” model of addressing diversity in the mainstream curriculum in the United States and the United Kingdom.

As Ladson-Billings and Brown note, CRT arises out of legal studies scholarship. The focus of this framework, according to its proponents, has been to indict liberal legal scholarship for its marginalization of race, racism, and power (Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). It is precisely these issues that Ladson-Billings and Brown want to force onto the curriculum field. Drawing on CRT, they “argue that curriculum is a property... that is differentially available to students based on their social positions outside” (p. 155). This important insight points to how the reformist response of the school system to minority challenges in the 1960s and 1970s has been an utter failure in assuaging access and
achievement differences that continue to plague minority groups. By envisioning the curriculum as property, the inequality through which it is produced, accessed, and distributed becomes all the more apparent—a core injustice that multicultural education and the content-addition curricular model have failed to address.

The authors then direct us to the problem of agenda setting and how certain issues become part of a working program of priorities for an administrative system to solve. They look to the social problems and moral panics literatures and offer a brief characterization:

The former focuses on delineating the area of social problems, as well as defining the process by which a condition facing a society becomes defined as a social problem . . . while the latter provides a specific kind of explanation—for example, moral—for how and why particular social conditions get picked up and positioned as societal concerns. (p. 157)

The authors point to the process by which policy priority, as a discursive formation, has in the past set society on a course to address issues perceived and construed as urgent. They list and describe five of these crises: the 1957 Launching of Sputnik; the 1960s United States Civil Rights Movement; the 1983 Publication of a Nation at Risk report; The Education Reform Act of 1988 in England (the effort by Maggie Thatcher to introduce a National Curriculum); and the 2001 Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization Act—No Child Left Behind. Each of these segments reveals the power of discursive construction and textual production central to governance in the age of electronic mediation. This social problems/moral panics framework, they argue, underscores a top-down logic in the practice of policy reform. An urgency model for change of this kind also steps over or ignores whole constituencies, as the list of social problems/moral panics events stretches from the United States to Britain.

There is a strong hint in the assembling of these examples that the authors believe that initiative around diversity is necessary—not necessarily around moral panic, but its obverse: moral leadership. In the Gramscian idea of moral leadership, organizing principles and agenda-setting goals can be exercised from the point of view of mobilizing the plurality of differentially arrayed actors in a whole social field. The leaders of the education systems in the United States, however, have never really undertaken this model on the matter of diversity. Indeed, we would argue that such moral leadership is as critical as material resources are in the project of elaborating reforms to address the racialized, gendered, and elitist character of educational inequality.

We wish the authors had exercised, however, a more sustained elaboration of their brilliant insight into the notion of moral leadership; instead, they look to the research within the curriculum field, specifically, and “how [that literature] makes sense of diversity” (p. 163). The heightened intel-
Teasley Severino  9 - Race, diversity and curriculum

The central claim in this chapter—that educators have failed to come to grips with diversity in the 21st century—is warranted. Yet, there clearly remains more work to be done to establish the ground upon which “diversity” must be rethought. Ladson-Billings and Brown have offered in this chapter a potent diagnosis of where curriculum reform in the area of difference is currently oriented. But their framework of analysis, like that of the authors of each of the other chapters in this section, narrows around the Anglo-American complex, and around a specifically national focus.

By the end of the chapter the authors arrive at a set of questions of curricular urgency in which they highlight the need to integrate a global perspective in the curriculum changes for the new century. They ask, for instance, “How do we prepare prospective teachers for implementing a global curriculum?” (p. 168). The effort, however, appears to be merely a gesture.

In Chapter 9, Nieto et al. plunge into the ground at which Ladson-Billings and Brown hint. These authors, indeed, go the farthest in this section towards calling for a whole new framework for understanding race, ethnicity, and the political, cultural, and economic environment in which contemporary education operates. They argue that this environment and its political culture are fundamentally “postmodernist.” In other words, contemporary society is marked by the inchoate and polysemic nature of identity formation that is constantly being generated in the new century. Nieto et al. hint at the overarching presence of globalization as a haunting specter of the educational reality of the modern school. Yet they fail to engage in a sustained discussion of these processes, even as they note that in the postmodern era “comprehending this context requires analyses of trends towards globalization” (p. 193). They maintain that the old ways of talking about racial and other social categories are simply overtaken by events.

Unlike Ladson-Billings and Brown, Nieto et al. write from within the multicultural education tradition, pushing it out ever farther to an encounter with postmodernism and postcolonialism. It is through this lens that they go on to review the multicultural literature to establish a starting point for the critical understanding of the treatment of diversity in the educational enterprise. They maintain that there are powerful readings of
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contemporary education and society in the work of multiculturalist proponents, and that it is precisely these transformative theories of multicultural education that mainstream educators in the school system ignore. To connect multicultural education to a long, documented history of activists, intellectuals, and community members who have worked for a pluralistic approach to education, Nieto et al. point, for example, to James Banks’ (1996) “transformative” multicultural education; to Peter McLaren and Henry Giroux’s (1997) “revolutionary multiculturalism”; to Christine Sleeter and Carl Grant’s (2003) “social reconstructionism”; and to their own emphasis on the “socio-political context of multicultural education” and postmodern multicultural education (Nieto & Bode, 2008, cited on p. 178). The general claim, then, is that multicultural education theories, despite their limitations, have expanded the call for the address of diversity in education more so than any other critical discourse in the educational field. Nieto et al. attempt to draw on the best intuition in critical multiculturalism in order to push beyond the color-blind thinking that has consolidated in the mainstream approach to diversity in education and society in the past few decades.

Yet, the authors do not stop there. They reach beyond critical multicultural discourses to other critical perspectives: the radical identity theory of Pedro Noguera (2003); Frederick Erickson’s (2004) complex and situated understanding of culture; and the postcolonial analysis of education developed by Cameron McCarthy, Michael Giardina, Susan Harewood, and Jin Park (2003). Using a complex framework drawn from these theoretical approaches, they argue that the key terms associated with diversity: “race,” “identity,” and “culture”—the terms for which diversity is a proxy construct, as Ladson Billings and Brown assert—need to be rethought. These terms need to be rethought because the very conditions that appeared to hold these constructs stable in the modernist era have radically changed in these times of postmodernism. This is our contemporary epoch, the post-9/11 era, defined as it is by nation-state porosity, the intensification and rapidity of movement of cultural and economic capital across national borders, and the amplification and proliferation of images generated in and through electronic mediation.

These truly important insights help to build on the critique that Ladson-Billings and Brown make in the previous chapter regarding the disconnection between education and the world context. The diagnosis is also important because the mainstream response is squarely centered on right-wing efforts to retake education and to siphon public resources in education to already endowed private school systems and adventurist projects associated with voluntarism and neoliberalism. The latter, we might add, constitutes a primary force behind today’s economic globalization (Beck, 2000).

Nieto et al. maintain that current U.S. national educational policy, as evidenced by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, has displaced
the inequality issue in education onto the discourse and practice of accountability and standardized testing. This enshrined positivism is, in essence, colonizing the space of the lifeworld in schooling—the space for rethinking the curriculum and for reflection on the question of diversity. Indeed, Nieto et al. underscore their argument by citing the report of the U.S.-based organization Education Trust, which indicates that “[a]cross the country nearly $1,000 less is spent per student in the highest poverty districts than in the most affluent district” (p. 184).

Still, Nieto et al. want to point readers beyond this paralysis. The authors offer three identity-based case studies that show teachers, students, and parents grappling with the new identity dynamics of the 21st century. These are dynamics that modern schooling can no longer afford to eschew. The consequence is reflected in the difficult integration of postmodern school subjects into modern institutions. Nieto’s collaborators report on case study work that each of them conducted to examine how culture and identity play out in contemporary relations in the school setting and in the community.

The studies of Bode (2005), who reports on student perspectives in four middle and high school art programs, and Kang (2005), who reports on the classroom discourse on identity and difference in a ninth-grade urban high school, foreground the striking gap that exists between minority and immigrant youth and their teachers in the ways these youth absorb the school experience. These students continue to push for the integration of their knowledge and experience into the curricular and pedagogical practices of everyday life. In the case of Kang’s study, the students challenge the color-blind pedagogical practice of their classroom teacher. In the third study reported by Raible (2005), attention is focused outside the school, in the community. It is a provocative study of the experiences of the non-adopted White siblings of transracial adoptees. The focus on White youth experiences in the context of adoptee diversity is a new and fresh dimension on the question of the hybridity that now underwrites contemporary youth identity formation in the transforming social contexts in which they live. Data collected in this case study point to the fact that White youth have complex relations with their adoptee siblings and can be characterized as assuming a range of identities from “responsible sibling” to “transracialized subject” (p. 191).

Nieto et al. use the reports on these case studies of youth identities to drive forward and bolster the search for a more rigorous means for engaging diversity in the schools and for a more informed and responsive approach to teaching multicultural education in the classroom. This chapter opens up a striking line of inquiry through the documentation of the remarkable presence of multiplicity in young people’s lives and the paradoxical mismatch with a school curriculum environment that still seeks to inoculate the school against this difference, insisting on a positivist core of test taking and standardization. Again, though, these insights take us
only so far along the way to re-conceptualizing diversity in light of 21st-century developments.

In Chapter 10, Erickson et al. also take up the theme of student experiences, as an inherent and ever-present source of diversity. However, their questions are more pointed towards the level and quality of student participation in classroom life. Drawing on the work of Dennis Thiessen and Alison Cook-Sather (2007), Erickson et al. express strong interest in how children develop in the classroom. They are concerned with the question of how actively students are involved in shaping their own learning opportunities. Like Nieto et al., Erickson et al. situate their work in the growing scholarship on the “importance of learner identity in relation to learning” (p. 199). These scholars review research on student experiences that deploys a broad range of qualitative research techniques (e.g., narrative inquiry, discourse analysis, first-person accounts, ethnography). They see this work not as usurping quantitative models, but very much as an ally in the continuing inquiry into the school experiences and perspectives of school youth. Foregrounding the work of Jerome Shultz and Cook-Sather (2001), Erickson et al. underscore three powerful themes emerging from qualitative research: “Students want more human and humane interactions in school, ‘they want to be their whole selves,’ and they want school to be engaging” (p. 199).

A very distinctive focus of this chapter, and one also partly pursued by Ming Fang He et al. in the next chapter in this section, is the idea that schooling is very much an underexplored terrain, and that many of the answers to questions about learning differentials are really still to be discovered in the uncharted terrain of the classroom. According to Erickson et al.,

Classroom-based, deliberate instruction, implemented as mass public instruction, has only been in existence for two hundred years. It is small wonder that we are not yet able to do this instruction in ways that avoid the side effects of low academic achievement and alienation from school learning as a life project. (p. 213)

The authors go on to note that there is a pattern of disaffection and alienation that profoundly marks the school experiences of children from low economic and marginalized backgrounds. They maintain that this phenomenon is also a feature of the school lives of the students from affluent and elite circumstances. Erickson et al. propound an ecological approach to the study of student experiences in the classroom. This approach is complex and many-sided in ways that, as the authors argue, respond to diverse material and symbolic dynamics in the classroom that are best studied by careful attention to the multidimensional nature of its environment. These authors, therefore, maintain that the sociocognitive, cultural, and emotional elements of the learning process should be explored carefully in relation to each other and in nuanced ways. For them,
this multidimensional, interdisciplinary approach offers the best possibility for apprehending the student’s world, granting us insights that might help to modify and enhance the teaching and learning process in terms of diversity.

The authors present extensive summaries of intriguing studies that foreground student perspectives and experiences in schools. The studies, taken together, present a portrait of profound levels of diversity of circumstance by ethnicity and social economic status in the school setting. For instance, Cook-Sather’s (2002) study of elite White high school students from “Main Line” Philadelphia reveals unexpected disaffection and disaffiliation, which are summarized in the following statement from one of the students: “On the first day of school this one teacher handed out this sheet that was ALL about rules” (“Student B” quoted in the Bryn Mawr study and cited by Erickson et al., p. 210).

Across the socioeconomic divide, Joi Spencer’s (2006) study of low-income African-American and Latino students in a South Central Los Angeles’ Mathematics classroom highlights a similar type of disaffiliation. Here, students report being “upset” and not paying attention to teachers whose classroom practice alienates them. The third example focuses on Manuel Espinosa’s (2008) dissertation study of low-income junior-high Latino students participating in the University of California–Los Angeles (UCLA) Summer Immigrant Leadership Institute. Here, it is clear that the students enjoy their summer institute, and through this experience, they feel energized about ideas and their academic experience. They feel that their life experiences are respected and echoed in the material they read and discuss in the program. On the other hand, when asked to discuss their regular school classroom, they underscore their disaffection and describe their interactions in a language of disaffiliation: “muchos maestros nada más dan algo de leer para que digan o para que hagan algo”/“a lot of teachers assign readings so they can say that or so that students are doing something” (p. 211).

What all three of these studies point toward is the critical role of identity and identity formation in the learning process. Students’ relationships to school are deeply informed by the way they interact or are allowed to interact with each other and their perceived sense of the affective investment of teachers in their educational success. This is underscored by students from all socioeconomic and racial groups according to Erickson. This, then, is the most intriguing implication of Erickson et al.’s cross-class finding of disaffiliation in schooling. It challenges the social reproduction theories of Pierre Bourdieu (2000) and Jean-Claude Passeron (1977), MacLeod (1987/1995), Paul Willis (1977), and others who associate these sentiments with working-class, or lower-income students. But this chapter raises other poignant questions as well: Where should we be spending our energies in educational research? Is the repeated emphasis on context and community within critical research misplaced? Do the solutions to educa-
tional inequality lie endogenously within the school system and, more particularly, within the classroom?

Erickson et al. open up an interesting terrain by forcing us to consider the matter of the cultural, emotional, and cognitive transactions that take place in the classroom and the social encounter between student and student, and student and teacher as holding important answers to the problem of disaffiliation from schooling. In this chapter, the authors flatten out the extent of the challenge that diversity, in all its forms and manifestations, poses to curriculum practitioners and theorists by maintaining that all social groups of youngsters are now disenchanted with school routine. However, by showing the classroom setting to be, above all, about communicative distortion and the challenge of communicative competence, and by peering so deeply into the classroom reality, there is a sense that time has been induced to a standstill. The teeming world of multiplicity and difference associated with globalizing processes and their impact on youth identity formation, which is underscored in the Nieto et al. chapter, for instance, is somehow beyond the lens applied by Erickson and his collaborators in their exploration of the overlapping terrains of student disaffection and disaffiliation.

While He et al. share Erickson et al.’s focus on the qualitative character of schooling and its interior dimension, they return our attention more sharply to the question of diversity and marginalization of minority youth. Yet, like Nieto et al., these authors also bring forward the discussion of the complex role of community and context in the story of diversity and inequality. They go farther than any others in the section in marking off dynamics associated with globalization, extracting out the intensification of non-European immigration, particularly Asian, as a phenomenon that is overtaking metropolitan educational settings by events, whether these settings are in the United States or Canada. The sheer scope of the statistical diversity related to this new immigration is impressive:

The world landscape is becoming increasingly multicultural and multilingual as international migration rates grow each year. . . . UNESCO reported that in 2000, more than 6,806 languages were in use, including 114 sign languages, in 228 countries. Approximately 185 million people worldwide live outside their countries of birth, up from 80 million three decades ago. . . . The cultural and language diversity of the United States and Canada . . . demonstrate this world phenomenon. In 2000, the foreign-born population of the United States (31.1 million) represented 11.1% of the total population. . . . Latin America represented 32%, Asia 26%, Europe 16%, and other areas of the world 6% . . . . This global migration diversifies cultures and languages in countries, locales and inevitably schools. Cultural diversity, juxtaposed with linguistic diversity, has emerged as one of the urgent challenges facing 21st century educators. (p. 220)

He et al., like Erickson et al., direct their research emphasis to student experiences and the learning environment. In so doing, they bolster a
claim that has been building in this “Diversity” Section—that we just do not
know enough about the lifeworld of students. He et al.’s focus is clearly on
the distinctive experiences of Asian, Asian-American, and Asian-Canadian
students. They particularly want to direct researchers’ attention to the
nuance that exists within the Asian immigrant population. In this regard,
they are especially keen to critique homogenizing tendencies in main-
stream scholarship on diversity and education that tend to collapse all
Asian youth into one ethnic category. They are particularly concerned that
the model-minority myth might actually prove detrimental to particular
groups of Asian immigrant youth who might not be as successful in school
as their model peers.

He et al. seek to demonstrate the specificity and complexity of Asian
immigrant student experience in schooling. They draw especially on Stacy
Lee’s (1996) ethnographic research on the experiences of Asian-American
students “silenced by the model minority stereotype” (p. 227) and a set of
narrative inquiries derived from a “longitudinal narrative program” of
research on the Bay Street Community School—a school that is located in
one of the largest Chinese immigrant residential and business districts of
Toronto. These studies help to underscore some of the complexities and
nuances in the everyday lives of Asian-immigrant school youth. Further-
mor e, Lee’s work is based on an ethnographic study conducted in a high
school located in a major city on the U.S. East Coast. In this multiracial
school, Asian-American students coexist with White students and African-
American students, among others. Several questions guide Lee’s work. She
is particularly interested in examining the status of Asian-American identi-
ties and what this might tell us about both ethnic minority youth identities
and youth identities in general. She is also concerned to explore the
precise nature and impact of the model-minority stereotype on Asian-
American youth in-school experiences. Perhaps Lee’s most significant
finding, according to He et al., is that Asian-American youth identities are
defined relationally. Asian minority identities are not given but are pro-
duced, on the one hand, in relation to dominant White youth who see their
Asian-American counterparts as academic rivals, and on the other, minority
youth, such as African Americans, who resent the model minority status
normally attributed to Asian youth.

These issues of culture and identity formation are also important in the
set of studies that focus on Bay Street Community Elementary School (K–8)
that He et al. summarize. One of the observations that stands out about this
school is that its administration and teachers, in keeping with (and indeed
exceeding) the multicultural policy guidelines and provisions set by the
national government of Canada, have initiated a wide variety of programs
to assist immigrant students and help integrate their parents into the
school community. For instance, the authors maintain that the “staff at Bay
Street Community School work with parents, guardians, and local community
center staff to meet the needs of diverse students” (p. 229). This staff
involvement ranges from efforts to support the parents’ culture, language, and heritage in the school to providing health care.

What He et al. draw from their review of the literature and from their specific assessments of these two very different school settings is that there is a complex interaction of language, culture, identity, and power in the classroom and school setting that Asian-American experiences attest to, even as such dynamics are underexamined. The authors are also concerned that the growing body of research on minorities and immigrant experiences in schooling is misinformed by unhelpful generalizations such as the model-minority stereotype. A strikingly consistent theme raised by these authors is the importance of identity formation and the critical role that the affective dimension plays in encounters among students, and between students and their teachers. Here, efforts to keep alive, rather than ignore or discourage the heritage of immigrant and minority children, are signaled as constituting a vital aspect of a more wholesome experience of schooling for marginalized youth. He et al. maintain that the story of immigrant experience is not, and therefore must not be represented as, all gloom and doom.

Moreover, the Bay Street model of vigorous school investment in the heritage of their immigrant Chinese children has had, in their assessment, the effect of creating a fabulous school experience for the school youth and their familial connections in the community. Above all, the Bay Street Community School model suggests to the authors that a deep moral investment in the minority and immigrant educational experience is a crucial aspect of their successful negotiation of schooling. Drawing on this positive model of affective and material investment in the school experience of immigrant youth, the authors advance the notion of curriculum for diversity as a “curriculum of shared interests” (p. 231)—one in which all the constituents in the educational experience are in meaningful communication with each other, respecting and supporting cultural distinctiveness as part of a productive or generative multicultural school environment.

At the same time, like the authors before them, He et al. direct a path of retreat in their work from a diagnosis of the world transforming movement, migration and the circulation of language and culture, which they announce at the beginning of the chapter, to a defensive research program that narrows their interest to national and ethnic particularities in schooling. This research program shrinks their project from the potential recognition of the broad interconnections and redefinition of cultures and identities in the new century to a more narrow and specific consideration of the distinctiveness of the Asian-American and Asian-Canadian experience. There is an odd sense of recoiling from the moment—from the broad commingling of identities and cultures that are constantly being thrust forward in the globalizing processes that He et al. and the other authors in this Section nonetheless identify.
In the final chapter in this section, Mel Ainscow takes up the issue of the challenge of institutionalizing inclusiveness in the educational setting. Yet, unlike the previous chapters by Erickson et al. and He et al., his focus is not on student experiences. Ainscow notes that even as countries in the developed and developing world have expanded educational provision, “it has become increasingly apparent that traditional forms of schooling are no longer adequate for the task” (p. 240). The chapter serves as a repost to the earlier chapters in that it places the issue of practice and implementation at the center of reform discussion on diversity and education. To do this, Ainscow takes a detour through the special education literature. He maintains that it is in this marginalized subfield of special education (defined around various types of barriers to educational achievement) that diversity in schooling was first addressed. Ainscow thus works through the special education literature to get on the other side—a way of talking about diversity not as containment under the “medical model” (p. 241) of special education, but as the facilitation and enablement of curricular action towards diversity for all in the school environment.

Ainscow maintains that the medical model derived from special education has surfaced in much of the theory and practice of inclusive education in the last century and into the present. He offers a useful “typology of the ways of thinking about inclusion” (p. 242) that also serves as a kind of strategy of periodization in which he summarizes the education literature on the topic into five categories. He describes “inclusion as concerned with disability and special educational needs” (p. 242) as a tradition of theory and practice in the educational field in which inclusiveness is understood as the education of mentally and physically challenged students, often in segregated settings, for the purpose of giving these students a “special” curriculum. In the “inclusion as a response to disciplinary exclusion” (p. 242) “bad behavior” and disciplinary problems become markers for identifying and differentiating students as special education students. Ainscow notes that researchers such as Tony Booth, Patricia Potts, and Will Swann (1987) mark out a terrain for the learning disabled, a category that highlights behavior in the classroom. By the latter part of the 20th century and with the impact of multiculturalism, the notion of “inclusion as about all groups vulnerable to exclusion” (p. 243) incorporates the socially and economically disadvantaged, particularly disadvantaged minorities. The “inclusion as the promotion of school for all” (p. 243) approach draws on the British comprehensive school model, emphasizing the school as an institution for all. Lastly, the “inclusion as education for all” (p. 243) promoted by international policy makers (UNESCO Institute for Education being prominent here) seeks to enhance access across the world to educational opportunity.

Ainscow maintains that it is important to get beyond the dominant framework derived from special education in which diversity becomes a deficit model for curriculum. There is need, as he maintains, to think through the educational process in its entirety, the role of students, the role
of teachers, and, critically, the role of administrators in establishing an agenda and institutional tone for change. He is particularly concerned to get curriculum practitioners in the area of diversity to move beyond the individually guided instructional model that is a bequeath of the special educational approach to inclusion. Ainscow sees, instead, a model of collaboration in which the researcher can be helpful to the teacher in giving feedback in a manner similar to the “lesson study” model (used in Japan and some other Asian countries), in which the lesson serves as a basis of discussion and feedback/exchange between the teacher and classroom observer. Here, like Erickson et al. and He et al., Ainscow is clearly interested in the role of evidence-based practices in “transforming” the classroom environment and ecology. But Ainscow’s interest in transformative change that is inclusive reaches beyond the classroom. For him, the classroom is only one venue necessary for securing change. For whole-school change to occur, there is a need to effect change in the organizational and administrative aspects of the school. Such change must be “systemic” (p. 251). Thus, the goal is to achieve an “inclusive school culture”.

Recently my colleagues carried out a systematic literature review focused on the effectiveness of school actions. It found that there is a limited, but by no means negligible, body of empirical evidence about the relationship between school action and the participation of all students in schools. ... Schools with inclusive cultures are also likely to be characterized by the presence of leaders who are committed to inclusive values and leadership style that encourages a range of teachers to participate in leadership functions. (p. 251)

Ainscow goes on to emphasize, like He et al., that the cultural ethos of the school is important. Such an ethos must embrace the parents and the community. In the best of circumstances, this schoolwide ethos is buttressed by national policy, such as that of the Canadian government that promotes multiculturalism and inclusiveness. Ultimately, the most distinctive feature of Ainscow’s analysis in this chapter is the role that he sees the researcher can play as a change agent. This role is active, rather than benign and distant, in the matter of enhancing the school environment to respond to learner diversity. In this chapter, he offers an example of his involvement in this change-producing policy context in an English local education authority (LEA): “For the last 3 years we have collaborated with officers and school principals in an English LEA on the development and implementation of its Inclusion Standard and Instrument for evaluating the progress on their journey to becoming more inclusive” (p. 254).

In this way, Ainscow is perhaps the most instrumentally driven of these researchers who contribute to the diversity section. He brings this section to a close with his exploration of the question that the other contributors do not engage with: that is, the problem of the institutionalization of diversity measures as a schoolwide commitment. But Ainscow goes beyond this
concern to talk about collaboration across schools, which raises a whole new dimension in the area of curriculum reform directed at addressing diversity. It serves, too, to initiate a conversation in which there is an effort to accept collective, systemwide responsibility for the educational achievement of all school youth regardless of race, ethnicity, or disability. It sets up the potential for a different way to think about resources and resource allocation, as well as the movement of information and best practices in the educational field to address the key issues of access, equality, and participation that the current intensification of difference in societal and school settings present to educators. In this sense, Ainscow offers a forceful technical reading of contemporary school realities.

Finally, the subject of diversity is presented in this chapter as a phenomenon that can be empirically measured and behaviorally affected. And yet, broad, macro-structural issues bearing upon diversity, and sparked by globalization are kept at a distance. The researcher’s role is one that is best articulated in the lived reality of policy making, resource planning, and best teaching and learning practices that might bolster educational engagement and success across all social groups.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the five chapters that comprise this diversity section of The Handbook represent some of most current scholarship assessing the status of diversity in schooling. The chapters reflect a plurality of theoretical and methodological orientations that together make the insistent case that, by and large, and despite projects of educational expansion, addressing diversity in the school environment and classroom remains underdeveloped. The authors broadly recognize profound changes taking place in the social, economic, and cultural contexts of postmodern societies. These changes, they agree, are precipitating the accentuated presence of diversity in educational settings and the community environments in which they are embedded.

Ladson-Billings, Nieto, He, and their colleagues seem especially conscious of these developments, as they highlight particularly the demographic features of the manifestation of diversity. Nieto, Ladson-Billings, and their colleagues keenly underscore the role of social context in the educational arrangements. Erickson et al. and He et al., by contrast, focus more directly on student experiences and the learning environment of the classroom as particular social technologies that permit and reproduce practices of affiliation and exclusion. Erickson and colleagues are especially noteworthy in their suggestion that affiliation/disaffiliation is produced in the learning environment itself, and that we need to know more about the lifeworld of the classroom setting. The provocative aspect of Erickson et al.’s chapter is the claim that disaffiliation crosses all socioeconomic
groups in direct contradistinction to cultural reproduction theorists and others who identify disaffiliation overwhelmingly with the working class. In response to these chapters, Ainscow addresses the matter of the school environment as an organization, by focusing attention on inclusive practices through administration, school governance, and collaboration within and between schools in order to boost the productive participation of students in the teaching-learning environment.

Reading this scholarship, however, leaves us feeling that some of the starting points on the matter of diversity need, nonetheless, to be revisited and systematically explored. This begins with the concept of diversity itself and what it means in the era in which we live. Throughout, the authors seem to take the term for granted and apply it in a way consistent with mainstream policy makers’ usages, even as they critique mainstream curriculum approaches, and even as they (especially Nieto et al.) make a call for a rethinking of diversity. In this sense, they rely on a notion of diversity as the prima facie empirical presence of difference, for example, different groups, different cultures, and so forth. These different groups are understood as deriving from some sort of cultural, geographical, or national unities founded in distinctive heritages, language, and so forth (as in “African American,” “Asian,” or “Asian Americans”).

Here, then, the discourse of diversity is deployed to apprehend all human distinctions under a general or umbrella term. It is therefore deployed in political projects such as curriculum reform as a strategy of boundary maintenance and the elaboration of practices of affiliation, inclusion, and exclusion in the institutional and expressive orders of everyday existence. Physical characteristics, language, geography, ancestry, material capacity, and income are examples of these variables or “markers of difference” that are ordinarily used or mobilized to differentiate individuals and groups in a taken-for-granted manner. Diversity discourse therefore attempts to stabilize or manage these distinctions by leveling out the tensions, contradictions, and porosities that are articulated in and through each of these variables as they are produced in real, existing human communities and contexts. He et al., for instance, document the increasing presence of exactly these distinctively arrayed groups as stable, self-sufficient entities, for instance, “Asians” or “Asian Americans.” What this presents to us is the maintenance of a reliance on the idea of cultural unity for sorting out human groups—each group is counted as a distinctive ethnic, economic, or other kind of community.

This approach to diversity flies in the face of findings associated with the literature on globalization and youth identity formation, which point to a profound remaking of diversity and identity in our times. What precisely He et al.’s numbers point towards is the extraordinary forces that are disembedding groups from monolithic origins and simple unities. It is a dynamic landscape that is represented in the media culture that, as David Buckingham (2003) notes, young people now revel in, in a manner that
confounds adults and educators in schools. This is a cultural reality in which teachers seem overtaken by events, as Buckingham indicates, as school youth demonstrate a mastery of navigation of the world of electronic mediation and computerization that adults cannot hope to emulate.

There is no real sense in these chapters of the critical ways in which students are putting together their identities by drawing on a landscape of ethnic and cultural elements from all parts of the world, and from cultural sources that are different, even antagonistic to their putative origins or prima facie group affiliation. The challenge that researchers are presented with, we suggest, is to theorize this rising social density of difference (Sassen, 2000), and what it means for thinking about “diversity” in the classroom. What needs to be researched is the “cultural work” of diversity, “its” conditions of production, and the profound ways in which youth are performing difference all the time. This means thinking more carefully about the ways in which young people are constructing and putting their identities together from the available raw material of tastes, needs, interests, and capacities that are stimulated by images generated in the culture industry and the movement of consumer culture. We need more nuanced, sensitive data collection that documents the critical potential and alterity of the uses that young people put to culturally lived and commodified forms, and to the stock of knowledges associated with their heritages and those of others.

The fact is that contemporary youth are constantly trying on new identities, engaging in identity makeovers, drawing on the surfeit of images, styles and tastes that are now available (through electronic mediation and computerization) at their finger tips. These developments are brilliantly documented in the work of Nadine Dolby (2001). In her book, *Constructing Race: Youth, Identity, and Popular Culture in South Africa*, she calls attention to the fact that the practices of youth identity formation in post-Apartheid South Africa now more often revolve around aspects of taste discrimination and consumption of electronic-mediated images (what Levi jeans you are wearing and what music you are listening to) than factors “lying deeper down” such as ancestry, geography or language. Jennifer Kelly (2003) makes a similar point in her book *Borrowed Identities* in which she documents the many ways in which Afro-Canadian youth construct their identities from the electronic relays of music and images crossing the border from the United States. Although Ainscow, Ladson-Billings, Nieto, Erickson, He, and their collaborators delve into student experiences in their studies, they stay carefully outside the tremendous tumult of identity experimentation and remaking that Buckingham, Dolby, and Kelly document. We believe this radical porosity needs to be centrally taken into account as we think through curriculum reform, the challenge of diversity, and educational difference.

As Arjun Appadurai (2005) has noted, the diversity model on which the cultural diversity formula for curriculum reform currently rests promotes
the idea of representational or sampling diversity rather than intellectual diversity and systematic change in the methodologies for organizing school knowledge. In a sense, we are still so deeply invested in our disciplinary training that we still hold too earnestly on to the insulated subject matter specialization of the curriculum—a point that that Ladson-Billings and Brown, and Nieto et al. make. We hold on too fervently to the boundary maintenance organization of knowledge in schooling that separates the informal from the formal and that excludes the popular—the world of student experiences outside the classroom and the school—from consideration within the establishment curriculum and what we do inside schools.

We believe that an educational reform model that insists on the consolidation of more diversity in schooling, more inclusion, simply leads to an exhaustion of available school resources without changing the way in which knowledge is organized and education is delivered to minority and majority students. What we instead need is a more systematic exploration of the new, flexible subjectivities that are being formed in youth culture and in the new economies of our age. More attention, then, in a practical and rigorous intellectual sense, must be paid to the elaboration of the multidisciplinary approach that builds elements across the boundary maintenance of the formal and the informal, the establishment and the popular, Eurocentrism and multiculturalism. This means thinking relationally about curriculum on the topic of multiplicity and difference in education. It means integrating back into the pedagogical experience and the organization of knowledge in schooling all those tensions, contradictions, and porosities that we tend to suppress as we process human experience and historical specificity into curricular knowledge. It means quite literally abandoning the auratic status of concepts such as “culture,” “identity,” and “ethnicity”—the variables that Ladson-Billings and Brown and Nieto et al. postulate as lying beneath the surface of the diversity discourse—for a recognition of the vital porosity that exists among all human groups in the 21st century, and the tremendous potential this holds for developing a new ecumenical and cosmopolitan ethos in schooling.

This new ethos must be opened to the world as it is opened to addressing the wide range of inequalities that exists within schooling and society. It means foregrounding the possibility of a cosmopolitan ethos in which there is a material and moral investment in every school participant—every student, every teacher, every parent, every educator. Educational reform in the area of diversity must allow the intellectual autonomy of minority and majority students to flourish by incorporating an open-mindedness and inquiry that comes from letting traditions debate with each other under the rubric that we learn more about ourselves by learning about others. The whole framework of our approach to educational needs to change not just in the marginalized area labeled “diversity,” but also at the center and core of the curriculum as we rethink what it means to educate in the age of globalization, movement, migration, and multiplicity.
NOTES

1. This proposal becomes even more compelling when globalization is understood as an ongoing historical process. According to Held and McGrew (2002), globalization “denotes the expanding scale, growing magnitude, speeding up and deepening impact of transcontinental flows and patterns of social interaction” (p. 1), a process that has been integrating the world since the advent of modernity. Robertson (2003) further clarifies that the current wave of globalization diverges from previous waves in that there is now a general awareness about—and a greater ability to engage—actions that are global in scale as opposed to merely international. Finally, Beck (2000) underscores both the impetus and impact of neoliberalism behind today’s economic globalization.

2. Although Ainscow does not attempt to explain his preference for using the term “inclusion” per se (as opposed to, say, integration), his own insistence, and that of most researchers and educators of differently abled learners, in using this term is revealing to the extent that its obverse—exclusion—becomes most evident when contemplated through what is potentially the most extreme case of exclusion: that suffered by differently abled youth (especially those of ethnic minority backgrounds). The dual, even multiple, nature of this exclusion, which is at once symbolic and physical, leads us to contemplate inclusion as perhaps the most urgent call for, and precondition to, attaining a more equitable and just redistribution of power and participation among diverse groups; for it is only when all members of society are finally “included” in the active realm of public life that deeper levels of multilateral integration, or harmonious heterogeneity, may begin to be achieved.

Ultimately, then, inclusion in diversity speaks most directly to power (as Ladson-Billings and Brown, and Nieto et al. maintain), even as Ainscow prefers to accent access, participation, and opportunity. It does mark a shift in focus away from active subjectivities, identities, and affiliation of youth (as in previous chapters), and towards the educational institution itself and its agents, who hold the power to exclude such subjectivities.
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329
Globalisms and Power examines the effects neoliberal globalization is having on Spanish and Portuguese educational and curriculum policies and practices. The book dissects the nexus between globalization (or globalisms) and power under a global policy momentum, and analyzes how neoliberal globalization strategies eagerly led by nongovernmental institutions determine the educational agenda in each nation. Both Portugal and Spain were subjugated by military dictatorships for more than four decades; their education systems were laced with an authoritarian, militaristic, racist, and xenophobic ideology. Both countries’ secular authoritarian and conservative religious traditions are now dangerously entangled with the demands of neoliberal ideologies.

Shedding light on how education and curriculum policies and practices are determined and how they, in turn, determine the dynamics of ideological production in society, this book unmask the massive artillery borrowed from the private sector to fix public education and lays bare the fact that nothing is natural, normal, or inevitable in this corporate global momentum.

"João M. Paraskeva’s and Jurjo Torres Santomé’s edited collection, Globalisms and Power: Iberian Education and Curriculum Policies, is an insightful and timely critique of the diverse and destructive ways in which neoliberalism has penetrated the heart of education and curriculum policy and practice."—Susan L. Robertson, University of Bristol, UK

"Globalisms and Power: Iberian Education and Curriculum Policies features an impressive cast of Iberian curriculum theorists and philosophers. This edited volume is an important event in the educational community not only in Europe but on this side of the Atlantic. It inaugurates an urgent debate over the organization of knowledge and the future of education just as the very structural processes of our institutions of learning are becoming more and more compromised every day by marketization and neoliberal globalization—what our great colleague, Henry Giroux, calls 'this state of siege'. João M. Paraskeva and Jurjo Torres Santomé and the contributors to this marvelously insightful anthology help us to get beyond the siege mentality. This timely book should be read by all educators who are alarmed enough by the status quo of ‘enterprise education’ to work for insurgent action and change."—Cameron McCarthy, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
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Deconstructing Discourses on Racism in Educational Contexts in Spain
Along a Continuum of Racialization, New and Old

Cathryn Teasley

The mass media, the political elite, and dominant academic and educational circles in Spain have contributed variously to a hegemonic discourse on statewide cultural diversity and racism, which is heavily centered on the challenges posed by the country's rapid transition over the last two decades to a destination for migrants from poorer countries. Indeed, a remarkably sharp increase in the overall immigrant population between 1998 and 2010 caused this group to rise from 1.5% of Spain's population to just over 12% (INE, 1999, 2010). That trend has been paralleled by a steady rise in reports of racist and xenophobic incidents in recent years, and by findings such as those presented in a 2003 report on racism and xenophobia conducted by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (2003). Focused specifically on Spain, the report concludes that “racial or xenophobic violence continues to increase almost in tandem with the increase in immigration” (p. 3).

In these ways, mainstream discourse on racism in Spain has centered on its newness as a reaction to novel stimuli. However, while these reports reflect necessary and laudable efforts to expose and denounce such disturbing developments, I find that most of the reportedly new or exceptional racist and xenophobic reactions to human difference and cross-cultural contact are hard-
ly unprecedented in Spain. Many do, however, represent the most recent manifestations along a continuum of racism that extends far back into the multicultural contours of Iberian history—a kind of volcanic racism, if you will, whose activity may periodically slow down or remain dormant, but may also build and eventually erupt.

Although the current wave of globalization has given rise within the Spanish state to sustained contact among formerly distant and predominantly racialized subjectivities and collective identities, historian José María del Olmo (2009) has revealed how various manifestations of racist response to these recent interactions are far from new to the ethnic minority groups native to the Iberian Peninsula. The Roma/Gypsies, for example, who began to settle on the peninsula more than 500 years ago, are arguably the most affected by racist prejudice and violence (see Leblon, 1993; San Román, 1997; Calvo Buezas, 2003). But while it is most pronounced in the case of the Roma, experience with racism is certainly not limited to them. Other larger historic cultural groups such as the Moors and the Jews of late- and postmedieval Iberia also experienced such oppression, the most severe of which was unleashed against the Jews during the Spanish Inquisition. Nor are racist reactions new to the indigenous inhabitants of Latin America, once colonized and aggressively exploited by the Spanish monarchs. These populations now constitute significant sources of immigration to Spain and Europe. In all these ways, then, racism has been an essential part of the Hispanic cultural tradition.

Establishing this continuity in the historic ebb and flow of racism in Spain helps situate today’s racist outbreaks within the broader perspective of an enduring undercurrent of racism. To prevent the periodic eruptions, then, this undercurrent must be disrupted. The analytical tool of deconstruction, as advanced by Jacques Derrida (1974), is powerfully positioned to serve this purpose. Deconstruction exposes the artificial constraints in mainstream discourse, canonical texts, and epistemologies that not only tend to naturalize what is not natural in ontological concerns, but also are necessarily filtered, interpreted, and (re)presented through subjective human perception. Furthermore, where grand narratives about historical realities are concerned—such as those represented in textbooks—the written word, as opposed to speech, tends to limit the degree to which directly interactive interpretation of the various meanings involved can take place. This limitation makes comprehending the historical complexities surrounding the writers’ original intentions more difficult, while simultaneously reifying textual representations. Yet, deconstruction is not meant to silence or replace such discourse; its purpose is to reveal omis-
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sions, contradictions, and distortions, much as Edward Said's (1993) contrapun
tal analysis offers alternative understandings of historically significant events, 
but without aiming to replace one hegemonic discourse with another, or to 
mimic the canonical appropriation of discursive legitimacy.

Beyond drawing from these analytical tools, Michel Foucault's (1970) 
archaeological mode of inquiry into the origins of current social science princi
bles and practices offers another powerful means of historicizing, and thus relat
ivizing, destabilizing, and deconstructing, the epistemological foundations 
upon which certain positivistic assertions around racism rest. These foundations 
of the human sciences have come to be accepted as unquestionable, solid, sta
ble truths because they were laid through modes of inquiry modeled after the 
natural sciences, and have therefore been considered throughout the modern 
era to be the most rational, objective, and legitimate forms of inquiry. The post
modern perspective has now thrown such legitimacy into question. By embark
ing on a kind of postmodern analysis that aligns with Derrida's deconstruction, 
Said's contrapuntal analysis, and Foucault's archeological perspective, but 
that—in keeping with Boaventura de Sousa Santos's (2005) approach to post
modern critique—remains critical, my aim here is to historicize the manifes
tations of racism in Spain in ways that seek to unsettle dominant repre
sentations and justifications of racism now in circulation, particularly as 
they apply to educational settings.

As occurs with archeological excavation, this inquiry will start with the pre
sent and gradually work its way back in time in ways intended to challenge the 
"truths" frequently reproduced in school textbooks and mainstream discourse on 
social groups in Spain—narratives that education sociologists Julia Varela and 
Fernando Álvarez-Uría forcefully critique in their book Arqueología de la escuela 
(Archeology of the School, 1991). These authors observe, for example, that it is 
through the very codes that determine "justice for all" that certain injustices 
materialize among school youth: "[Codes] through which 'the political manage
ment of illegalities,' to use Michel Foucault's notion, operate for the underclass
es [through] the penal code, prisons, and reformatories; [and] for the middle and 
upper classes [through] the civil code, fines, bail, and impunity" (p. 260).

Whereas this observation is directed at social classes of youth, it retains a 
latent correlation with the discursive treatment of racialized youth as well. 
Cameron McCarthy (1990) has highlighted this connection in his analysis of 
the nonsynchronous nature of mutually yet unevenly influential and interac
tive forms of discrimination related to race, ethnicity, class, gender, and other 
determinants of human diversity. Another scholar of racism, bell hooks, reminds
us in her book Where We Stand, Class Matters (2000) that while wealth can indeed shelter those who might otherwise be targeted by harsh racism, it still “does not mean that racism does not daily assault [those] with class privilege” (p. 94).

Precisely because much of the racism expressed today is channeled beyond the reified cultural constructs or imaginaries consolidated in textbooks—consider the immediacy of racist encounters among children in the schoolyard or among neighbors in the local community, as well as the filtering and magnifying effects of the mass media, the Internet, video games, and so on—such active discourse must therefore be met and confronted with the same immediacy at school. This can be accomplished through a dynamic critical pedagogy and a curricular approach that prioritize ongoing democratic deliberation on the ethical significance and ramifications of racist discourse, ideologies, and practices. For this reason and more, I argue that public schooling specifically—as one of the “final frontiers” of cosmopolitan encounter—must be protected from neoliberal incursions (privatization policies) and promoted as a privileged site, along with cyberspace, for the collective deconstruction of racism in all of its manifestations, and for the creative construction of cross-cultural justice in today’s ever more interconnected world.

**Eruptions**

Annual reports from various sources such as SOS Racismo (2006a, 2006b, 2007, 2009, 2010), one of Spain’s largest antiracism advocacy organizations, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (2003, 2006, 2009), and the Ministry of Labor and Immigration’s Spanish Observatory of Racism and Xenophobia (see, e.g., D’Ancona & Valles Martínez, 2008) all point to a notable rise in negative attitudes among native Spaniards toward immigrants from poorer countries, and to increasing violence, conflict, and discrimination directed at or involving non-native inhabitants of Spain. For example, the racism and xenophobia detected in the answers to an attitude survey conducted by the Observatory of Racism and Xenophobia, which was repeated over time, were found to increase in the following terms: “The growth is gradual and advances the momentum of Spain’s establishment as a destination country for immigration. The greater visibility of immigrants…seems to be acting against the [autochthonous population’s] receptiveness toward immigrants” (D’Ancona & Martínez, 2008, p. 301). Here, the immigration process under way is directly linked to increasing expressions of racism found in the “autochthonous pop-
ulation” construed as a whole. I find, however, that the roots of such racism are not necessarily growing, precisely because they have always been present, albeit latent, in an ethnically diverse Iberian population that in fact has never been a monolithic cultural whole. But before exploring this aspect, some additional information on the racism directed at Spain’s immigrant populations will provide a context for the ways such oppression is now represented.

The series of high-profile, openly racist hate crimes and other incidents reported in the Spanish media at the outset of the sharp period of growth in the immigrant population in 1999 attest to this reality. The primary victims of these attacks were immigrants from the North African Maghreb, particularly Morocco—a former protectorate (colony) of Spain. They constituted the largest non-European immigrant group at the time. In Catalonia, for example, neo-Nazi groups took their violence to the streets, mugging individuals, vandalizing homes, and burning down a mosque in one town; in other locations, the construction of mosques was (and still is) widely protested. Following the murder of a Spanish woman by a Moroccan man in El Ejido, Andalusia, hundreds of native Spanish residents began to riot and randomly attack people of Maghreb origin who resided in the area. And following the Madrid train bombings orchestrated by Islamic extremists on March 11, 2004, in which nearly 200 people were killed, some Islamophobic activities have since been linked to that event. In fact, the most recent report from the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (2009) reflects the sustained nature of a growing trend in openly xenophobic and neofascist activity in Spain, and it is once again immigrants who have become the new scapegoat of this racist discourse and activity.

By contrast, low-profile discrimination against immigrants in education, housing, employment, healthcare services, and law enforcement has only recently captured more media attention. The now familiar controversy over the use at school of the hijab (the headscarf worn by many women of Maghreb origin) resurfaced in the media yet again in April 2010, in the case of a secondary school outside Madrid. Another example occurred in the municipality of Vic, just outside Barcelona, where the city has developed a selective school busing policy designed to evenly distribute newly arrived children of foreign origin among the schools. The reasoning behind this is to avoid the formation of “ghetto” schools in the lower-income neighborhoods where many such families tend to reside. Nevertheless, this policy is itself racially and ethnically segregational because no native residents must submit to the same busing requirement (Sevillano, 2007).
In the meantime, Fortress Europe—to use the powerful metaphor advanced by David Morley and Kevin Robin (1995)—is increasingly fortified in Spain through more restrictive immigration policies such as stricter border controls (SOS Racismo, 2006b), the racial profiling and persecution of undocumented immigrant youth in schools (Wagman, 2005),9 deplorable conditions in detention centers for undocumented migrants (SOS Racismo, 2010; European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, 2006; Migreurop, 2009; Wagman, 2005), and the ongoing tragedies suffered by those whose only means of migrating is by crossing the sea in makeshift vessels.10 What is more, the media help to fortify the borders by emphasizing the “onslaught,” “threat,” or “avalanche” of growth in the population of immigrants from poorer countries. Daniel Wagman (2003) argues that this kind of social racism in the media—a term that encompasses Teun Van Dijk’s (2008) elite racism11—must not be obscured by the dominant reporting of high-profile cases of racist violence, as the former is fed by deeply rooted prejudice and stereotypes evident in the metaphors employed above, which associate immigration with security issues. Echoing this critique, the aforementioned 2003 European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia report claims that the influence this news trend has on public opinion in Spain is causing “a media-driven perception that immigration is causing an increase in violence” (p. 3).

New Racism in Spain?

Scholars of the kind of racism now emerging in Spain point to its novel qualities. For instance, in her recent study on Islamophobia in Spanish press discourse, Ángela Ramírez (2010) finds that women and girls wearing the hijab are manipulatively construed as the quintessential exponents of the so-called clash of civilizations, which was famously and dualistically hypothesized by conservative ideologue Samuel Huntington (1996). Ramírez further explains that this elite form of racism diverges from Spain’s historic Maurophobia (rejection of the Moors; see Corrales, 2004) in that it centers on religious practices over racial/ethnic origin per se.

Michel Wieviorka (2009), a theorist of racism, synthesizes the distinctions between newer and earlier forms of racism postulated by Martin Barker (1981), Taguieff (1988), and Étienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (1991). He asserts that this neoracism emerged with the advent of decolonization and tended

to disim the principle of biological hierarchy, while favoring that of cultural diversity. This new racist discourse is less legitimated by the invocation of the inequality of “races,”
as it is by the idea of the irreducibility and the incompatibility of certain cultural, national, religious, ethnic, and other specificities. (Wieviorka, 2009, pp. 44–45)

But while Wieviorka recognizes the differences here, he questions whether the deeper logics of racism—hierarchism and differentiation—have indeed been overcome. He argues that pure differentiation as “a logic that is present throughout modern history” (p. 49) is now merely emphasized over hierarchism.

Sociologists Michael Omi and Howard Winant (2005) offer the view that “the meaning and salience of race is forever being reconstituted in the present. In the last half century new racial politics emerged in a process, usually decades long, that constituted a hegemonic shift or postcolonial transition” (p. 7). They claim that “very old patterns” (p. 8) of Islamophobia are resurfacing in the North, with the United States assuming a civilizing mission in the Muslim world “much as the British and the French (not to mention the Crusaders) did in the past” (p. 8). They add that this and related processes signal a regression in the West to a kind of twenty-first-century Orientalism, in the sense denounced by Edward Said (1993).

Other such “classic” expressions of racism are directed at the Roma/Gypsy people as well. Currently representing just over 2% (approximately one million) of Spain’s population, the Roma are arguably the most disenfranchised of the historic ethnic groups of the Spanish state. Since their establishment on the Iberian Peninsula in the 1400s, the Roma have endured everything from enslavement to ethnic cleansing through expulsions and genocide missions such as historic “hunt-to-kill” campaigns and Nazi concentration camps. While related practices continue to this day in some parts of Europe (a tragic reality that cannot be adequately addressed here), I examine just a few cases of racism recently directed at the Spanish Roma.

Spanish anthropologist Teresa San Román (1997) has found that current-day racism toward Gypsies can be grouped into at least two major expressions: a popular version of street militancy, and a refined, semi-institutionalized, indifferent version of omission. Examples of the former unfortunately abound in recent years. For instance, just before I conducted an ethnography at a public elementary school in 2001–2002 in a costal city of Galiza, a nearby provisional school located on a Romani settlement had been shut down. This prompted the transfer of some twelve Gypsy children to the mainstream school. The scene at opening day, I was informed, took the school staff by surprise. Angry protests were mounted by the majority-culture parents due to the first-time enrollment of these Romani children. My informant was a teacher who had taught there for many years. She asked me to remain as discreet as possi-
ble about the incident because she did not want her school to attract the same bad press another school had the year before in the Basque town of Barakaldo. In that case, a Catholic elementary school had been required to accept three Romani siblings tuition free because the school was receiving state funding for applying the same admission standards required by any public school. The frightened children had to be escorted in by local police—and by students and parents from a nearby secondary school, who also came to their defense—through a crowd of angry parents, some of whom were aggressive toward school personnel.

What did not come to the fore in the extensive reporting of this latter case, however, was the fact that such open manifestations of racism in Spain are far from new and are much more prevalent than is generally reported, as Tomás Calvo Buezas (2003), researcher of educational racism in Spain, has long argued. And while the roots of this racism run deep, I have noticed in interviews with both parents and teachers that “new” justifications are nonetheless offered, such as, “It’s not that we’re racist; it’s that those kids are a bad influence on the rest. They demand more attention in class, which keeps the majority from learning to their fullest potential” (emphases added). With adult attitudes like these, it is perhaps no wonder that researchers Gonzalo Jover and David Reyero (2000) have found that children of Spain’s majority culture tend to judge Gypsies more negatively than they do immigrants.

The second form of racism identified by San Román, institutional indifference, is particularly evident in a news item I came across in 2002 that involved the Roma in the curriculum. Its headline read, “Five hundred secondary students to receive lessons on Gypsy culture.” While a first reading of this news captures the progressive promise of the cross-cultural learning scheduled to take place, a second reading, this time from the perspective of deconstruction, reveals the tragedy behind the fact that this kind of learning is even considered news. In other words, is such cultural knowledge really so novel in a country that has been home to a significant share of Europe’s Roma for over half a millennium? Unfortunately, it is. The racism in this information occurs, then, by omission. Galician pedagogue Jurjo Torres Santomé (1991) has referred to the silenced cultures produced through this process, and Portuguese sociologist Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2005) has developed what he calls a sociology of absences to detect such instances of discursive void, marginalization, or censorship—an important aspect of elite racism. In one way or another, this kind of silencing, intentional or not, is present in all four interactions involving the Roma depicted here, but perhaps most clearly and directly in the first two cases.
at the schools in Galiza and the Basque Country. There, not only did the parents’ blatant rejection of Roma children echo “old” forms of racism—their *justifications* tended to gather, however, on the “new” end of the racism continuum—but also the fact that a teacher informant requested discretion about the existence of such rejection belied her particular contribution to racist omission and silenced cultures.

Since the founding of the current Spanish state in 1978, official steps have been taken to reduce both popular and elite racism through various compensatory measures designed to make compulsory and postcompulsory education equally accessible to formerly excluded Romani youth. José Eugenio Abajo and Silvia Carrasco (2004) have found that, since the 1980s, Gypsy youth have indeed tended to be fully schooled at the elementary level. However, while those under age 30 are now generally literate, secondary school absenteeism and dropout rates among the Roma continue to be the highest of all ethnic groups, which is due to a considerable extent to their own patterns of cultural resistance (Fernández Enguita, 1999).

Furthermore, misguided educational policies have been found to exacerbate the de facto segregation of Romani children. One such policy was in fact involved in one of the racist confrontations described above: The Gypsy children who were relocated to another public school in Galiza had until then been attending a so-called bridge school. Bridge schools were built in Romani communities as a result of an official policy implemented in the 1980s to bring formal schooling to the Roma. But after a decade of experience, this policy resulted in segregated “infra-schooling” (see Fernández Enguita, 1999). At a broader level of recent policy-making, Jurjo Torres Santomé (2001) has revealed how neoliberal school-choice policies have led to a segregated schooling situation in Spain that is comparable to the white-flight occurring elsewhere (see McCarthy, 1990), as the state funds private schools that (officially) apply the same tuition-free, nondiscriminatory admission standards as public schools. But in reality, these schools often maintain covert selection practices. For example, at the school in Barakaldo, the bigoted parents’ violent outbreak demonstrated just how much they had come to rely on the social distance such schools usually provide from community members tragically perceived as “undesirable.”

**A Continuum of Racisms in Spain**

To claim that most of the racism now occurring in Spain is hardly new is not to say that the social circumstances of the Spanish state—with its relatively
recent transition from dictatorship to democracy in the 1970s and 1980s—have been immune since that time to the broader cultural impact of the globalization of communications and transportation technologies, or of global capitalism. Quite the contrary: Sociologist Manuel Castells (2000) has revealed that the accelerated and fluid circulation of ideas, products, capital, and (albeit much less fluidly) people across borders, coupled with the corresponding rise in cultural hybridity or “porosity” (to borrow a vivid term from McCarthy, 2008)—especially since the establishment of grand neoliberal projects such as the European Union, NAFTA, and other international free-trade regions—all have greatly influenced not only the economy, the collective identities, and the very organization of the Spanish state, but also those of practically all sovereign states across the globe today. Nevertheless, globalization is understood here as an ongoing historical process that periodically coalesces into key moments of transformation. As Zygmunt Bauman (2010) asserts, ours is one of those moments of interregnum, in the Gramscian sense of the word, characterized by social rupture and transition. In other words, just as historic instances of interregnum have allowed all-too-familiar racist attitudes to surface, so too has the current transitional period of neoliberal globalization.

Intertwined in this process is the fact that Spain, like Portugal, is a relatively young democracy. This is significant, considering the fact that the greater contexts of coexistence may serve to lay—or, in contrast, to dismantle—the kinds of social foundations that support racism. In Spain, some of these foundations can be found in the fascist culture of authoritarianism, which was officially eschewed during the transition to democracy but far from fully eradicated. Remnants of Franco’s doctrine of National Catholicism, for instance, can be found in the crucifixes still hanging on many public school walls today, or in some sectors’ strong opposition to recently instated citizenship education, or in the privileged role Catholicism occupies even in teacher education programs. As the president of the Federation of Jewish Communities of Spain recently claimed, “Some still see us as foreigners” (Bedoya, 2009, p. 9). Thus, on this and other levels, Spaniards are still struggling with long-held and unresolved claims to cultural recognition (a term borrowed from Nancy Fraser, 2008) dating back to well before the contemporary accelerated arrival of immigrants.

This is why we must dig deeper into Iberian multicultural history, right down to the roots, for example, of anti-Semitism or the aforementioned Maurophobia. Central to Iberian cultural heritage, following the Roman Empire’s period of influence, is that of the al-Andalus, the Iberian territory of the Islamic empire, which lasted from 711 to 1492. Spain owes much of its art,
music, science, and literary legacy to that period. But the al-Ándalus eventually succumbed to the Reconquista, or reconquering, led by Christians from the north and completed by the Catholic monarchs in Granada, who then proceeded to "conquer" the Americas via the Conquista. In the meantime, the newly founded Kingdom of Spain (previously Castile) exiled, tortured, and executed all non-Christians, particularly Jews, through that brutal mockery of justice known as the Spanish Inquisition. As for the Conquista, still represented in some Spanish textbooks as the "Discovery" (García Sebastián et al., 2004), while Spanish domination and occupation of the Americas dates farther back than most other colonial processes there, it nonetheless set the stage for a continuing legacy of economic and cultural exploitation and dependency between the imperial North and the subjugated South—an indirect consequence of which is today's migration patterns. For instance, today we certainly are not witnessing a continuous flow of poor emigrants abandoning the North for the South.

**Implications for an Anti-Racist Pedagogy**

Awareness of this continuum of racism in Spain, then, as well as the interruption of its reproduction, can be promoted through a dynamic critical pedagogy that involves interdisciplinary deconstruction, contrapuntal analysis, archaeological inquiry, and a sociology of absences through ongoing democratic deliberation at school on the ethical implications of dogmatic discourses, unsolidary values, and historically constructed ideologies that serve to justify racism, xenophobia, and other forms of oppression. A major goal here is to uncover the ways racism is undergirded by neoliberalism, ethnocentrism, classism, and other expressions of discrimination. Schooling that is truly public provides one of the last social spaces for direct, cosmopolitan, cross-cultural encounters, and the collective negotiation of meanings that can destabilize the foundations of racism. Cyberspace also offers such contact, albeit indirectly and on a much broader scale. In these ways, then, let us create common ground at school on which to combat all of these impediments to the pursuit of intercultural justice—justice that relates past to present (historical/temporal), Third World to First (geographical/spatial), and "us" to "them" (cultural/symbolic).

**Notes**

1. This paper was funded by Research and Development Project EDU2008–04858, corresponding to the Sixth National Plan for Scientific Research, Technological Development and Innovation 2008–2011, sponsored by the Ministry of Science and Innovation of Spain.
3. These groups generally refer to themselves in Spanish as gitanos—meaning Gypsies—as opposed to Romá, or Roma. In Spain, the latter term has been embraced primarily by Romani activists and scholars as a means of promoting a historically informed, transnational ethnic identity. Out of respect for both postures, the terms Gypsy and Roma will be used interchangeably in this chapter.
4. Del Olmo (2009) and others also argue that native Iberian linguistic groups with nationalist aspirations and identities have themselves experienced certain rooted forms of racism, a contention that cannot be adequately addressed here.
5. What Sousa Santos (2005) has termed “critical postmodern theory” or “oppositional postmodernism” resists nihilistic strands of postmodern thinking that downplay, even negate, the role of agency in social transformation, especially where historic oppression is concerned.
6. This and all subsequent translations of Spanish-language sources are translated by the author (C. Teasley).
7. Fortunately, representations that condemn this kind of racism are also on the rise in Spain through reports such as those cited above.
8. Researcher Ángeles Ramírez (2010) argues a strong case for their existence, as do the authors of one of the reports from the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (2006, p. 73). Nonetheless, broadly supported resistance to the outbreak of Islamophobia after the attacks was also reflected in the media.
10. 1,271 immigrants were reported to have died between 1988 and 2006 while attempting to cross the sea from the Maghreb to Spain (see SOS Racismo, 2006b).
11. Van Dijk describes elite racism as subtle, indirect and primarily discursive, and as channeled via laws, reports, the mass media, and textbooks, among other sources.
12. State census information on the Roma is not available. This figure is based on the combined estimates of Roma advocacy organizations such as the Unión Romani or the Fundación Secretariado Gitano.
13. A growing proportion of this population is composed of immigrant Roma from Romania and other eastern European countries. Researcher Juan Gamella (2007) presents a critical analysis of their particular situation.
14. From the article “Quintientos alumnos de Secundaria recibirán clases de cultura gitana” (no authorship specified), appearing in La Opinión de A Coruña, June 16, 2002, p. 8.
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2 Educating against the cultural politics and complicities of containment

Cathryn Teasley

Public schools are privileged sites, if not the sites, for daily democratic encounter in today’s ever more culturally diverse societies. Numerous scholars have found that when the public educational offering is strong, this aspect in itself is particularly conducive to absorbing youth from varying backgrounds as they converge and interact at school in ways and degrees they rarely experience in their respective home environments (Apple 2001; Ball 2012; Frankenberg and Siegel-Hawley 2009; Pedroni 2011; Saltman 2009; Torres 2001, 2011). A separate issue is exactly how that basic educational context is put to use. In other words, what kind of education is or can be promoted from such a potentially inclusive and integrative space? As Paulo Freire argued in Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970), when policymakers and educators decide to move beyond what he called the predominant ‘banking’ model of education – predicated on an instrumental, competitive, meritocratic approach to rote learning that selectively churns out acquiescent workers for the (increasingly global) political economy – and instead choose to promote a pedagogical ethic founded on egalitarian social justice, critical empowerment for civic engagement, and cross-cultural coexistence; in that context, public institutions of learning become all the more capable of optimizing the education of otherwise disempowered minority groups and individuals.

In this sense, public education is of vital importance to the education of the Roma and Travellers, as the largest and most disenfranchised set of ethnic minority groups of Europe (Commissioner for Human Rights 2012). And yet, as will be advanced in these pages, the degree of educational equality the Roma experience vis-à-vis majority populations is seriously hindered by multiple forms of containment operating both inside and outside of educational systems. This chapter offers a critical, transnational, pedagogical inquiry into the ways in which Romani youth are adversely affected by containment, particularly by its more current manifestations stemming from the ‘epistemic privileging’ (Popen 2002) of some discourses over others, and from the neoliberal debilitation of the welfare state (Hall 2011; Klein 2007), which directly affects public education (Apple 2001; Ball 2012; Rizvi and Lingard 2010; Saltman 2009; Torres 2001).
Containment as an analytical tool

This is not the first time containment has been used to frame educational and other issues relating to the Roma. In his book, *Roma in Europe*, Jean-Pierre Liégeois (2007) cites two main repressive measures used against Romani populations throughout history and across borders: exclusion (including expulsion/deportation) and containment. He describes the latter as ‘including slavery, imprisonment and various bans’ (2007:9), the aim being ‘to remove Gypsies, not from the territory through banishment but socially by confining them, breaking up their group structures and making them conform to the standards of the surrounding society’ (2007:118–19). From this broad understanding, then, containment can be defined as dominant-group structural and cultural practices aimed at dominating other groups or members thereof by marginalizing, neglecting, denying, isolating, restricting, and thus ‘containing’ them, and any aspects of their identities or ways of life perceived as ‘undesirable’. This must not be confused with the *boundary maintenance* that Martin Levinson (2007) refers to when, drawing from John Ogbu’s oppositional cultural theory (see e.g. Ogbu and Simmons 1998), he describes the Roma’s defensive resistance to dominant cultural norms and practices, examples of which will be explored further ahead.

Containment was originally conceived by United States (U.S.) historian and diplomat George F. Kennan, who in 1947 described the notion as a set of economic, political, diplomatic, and military practices which he urged U.S. authorities to implement in order to limit the expansion of Soviet-style communism throughout the world (X [Kennan], 1947). And, as history has it, his ‘advice’ was enthusiastically embraced, at least until the Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc states of Europe began to give way to capitalist democracy in the 1980s.

More recently, U.S. education scholars such as Shari Popen (2002) and Thomas Pedroni (2011) have asserted that discourses and policies reminiscent of containment are now operative within the United States itself, both inside and outside of schools. It is a form of containment that leads to the *de facto* segregation of entire school communities, as well as individual schoolchildren within classrooms, schools, or a single school community (Pedroni 2011), and can also limit the very process of democratic meaning-making in learning contexts (Popen 2002). This shared concern about the role containment plays in segregation, oppression, and inequitable educational opportunity is present on both sides of the Atlantic, and thus serves as a link between the U.S. and European educational contexts.

Yet a further link stems from the effects of globalization itself. To evoke, in this way, the concept of containment regarding the education of the European Roma is to propose an analytical tool capable of responding to the increasing impact of globalized economic, political, and cultural dynamics on local populations. As has been argued elsewhere (McCarthy 2008; Rizvi and Lingard 2010), globalization poses complex challenges to established approaches to the equitable education of multicultural and multiracial populations in that it affects aspects such as the forms and degrees of diversity that communities and their individual members experience; the dialectics generated between minority- and majority-group
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interests; and the ways in which such interactions and struggles are, or may be, played out through education and beyond, in the quest for optimal cosmopolitan coexistence and social justice. Relative to these global concerns, containment, as a frame of analysis, offers an alternative lens through which researchers and educators may both adjust the angle of focus and broaden the scope of inquiry into said challenges – this ideally facilitating more finely tuned perception, comprehension, and intervention in cases of cross-cultural, interracial, and/or class-based injustices in education, most of which are all too familiar to the Roma (Calvo Buezas 1989; Farkas 2007; Fonseca 1995; Fremlova and Ureche 2011; Liégeois 1997; Miskovic 2009; Rodríguez 2010).

Researchers from various camps have also noted that the global reach and neocolonial nature of U.S. economic imperialism – which includes the commodification and proliferation of Empire-friendly cultural and symbolic perspectives and productions – can impact local communities, economies, and politics in unpredictable ways and cause diverse cultural responses (Appadurai 1996; Bauman 2008; Gilroy 2004; Hart and Negri 2000; McCarthy et al. 2005). One such reaction, sparked by the aforementioned spread of capitalist democracy, can be found in the exodus of many Roma from Eastern Europe following the fall of the communist regimes in the 1990s (Barany 2002). While an adequate analysis of the specific dynamics involved in that exodus would exceed the scope of this chapter, some of the reactions to it are relevant to our purposes here.

On the one hand, the mass migration has had the positive effect of heightening awareness and advocacy throughout Europe regarding Romani rights (Commissioner for Human Rights 2012). On the other, however, there have been some disturbing high-profile responses in the West, such as former Prime Minister of Italy Silvio Berlusconi’s decision in 2008 to forcibly remove all Roma from their settlements (subsequently razed) around Rome, or the direct deportation of East European Roma from France in 2010 by former French President Nicolas Sarkozy. In both cases, the official decisions to apply such drastic measures indiscriminately to all Romani settlers of the targeted areas sounded the alarms not only among the Roma, but among human rights advocates and the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), who censured the measures as indicative of underlying racist and xenophobic motives (see e.g. CERD 2010 for France, and CERD 2012 for Italy). What is more, these measures enacted containment in one of its more extreme forms: mass expulsion.

Another effect linked to the global spread of capitalist democracy is the local impact of neoliberal capitalism, a movement initially promoted by Milton Friedman and the Chicago School of Economics in the early 1970s (Klein 2008), and supported throughout Europe and the world through free-trade initiatives such as the European Union itself, or the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and the ongoing conservative agenda to limit the public sector in favor of private gain. British scholar of education policy Stephen Ball (2012) has noted that a key facet of neoliberalism is its antagonism with the Keynesian welfare state – the predominant state paradigm of Western European countries since World War II – which directly affects the ways equity is approached through education.
For Ball (2012), neoliberal influences on public education entail an increasing role of business, social, and philanthropic enterprises, and the emergence of a local-national-global network of school governance. Australian researchers Fazal Rizvi and Bob Lingard (2010) find that neoliberal globalization has driven education policymakers to perceive education solely as a producer of the required human capital. Regarding the impact on education in the very country from which the neoliberal agenda emerged – the United States – Kenneth Saltman (2009) observes that public education for democratic purposes, and as a civil/human right, has been seriously compromised by the advancement of this all-encompassing ideology.

Containment of the Roma is examined here from this transatlantic vantage point, then, to expand our viewing range not only over its most direct and traditional forms – some of which are particularly aggressive where the Roma are concerned – but also its more subtle, globalized manifestations through the promotion of neoliberal discourses, policies, and reforms in both education and local development. That is, the ways in which containment is condoned and actively pursued may vary in form, intentionality, and scope, but its effects are undeniable: as a cultural politics, it serves to sustain the status quo of privilege, power, and distinction for some, while disenfranchising, disempowering, and oppressing others. Conceptualizing these processes in terms of containment brings to the fore the inseparability of educational opportunity from the broader, albeit implicit, sociocultural organizing and development principles and strategies so characteristic of capitalist democracies today. What is more, international research attests to the fact that unjust dynamics of this kind are undergirded by widespread racism, classism, and sexism, which are channeled through official and everyday discourses and decisions affecting economic, political, and cultural realms of production and existence (Farkas 2007; hooks 1995, 2000; McCarthy 2008; San Román 1997; Torres 2011).

Confronting containment

Given the cumulative oppression resulting from historic and current mechanisms of containment, it is no wonder the Roma have developed, as have other ethnic minority groups, defensive strategies of cultural resistance and boundary maintenance (hooks 1995; Levinson 2007; McCarthy et al. 2005; Ogbu and Simmons 1998). Nonetheless, observers of minority populations around the world, including Spanish Romani scholars Antonio Torres Fernández (1987) and Julio Vargas Clavería (2003), and international ethnographers of local Romani communities such as Teresa San Román (1997), Martin Levinson (2007), or Begoña García Pastor (2011), express their shared concern that some such strategies have unfortunately exacerbated the exclusion and powerlessness Romani populations experience. For instance, defensive (reverse) racism toward all members of a dominant racial/ethnic group is one such tactic, as is associating racial/ethnic ‘purity’ with the degree to which one lives in accordance with the cultural ways and means of the local contained community, no matter how precarious basic
human rights and dignity may be in that context, or how oppressive some of those norms are. Levinson (2007) describes how some Roma and Travellers associate refusing to either become literate or go to school with being ‘truly’ Romani; likewise, pursuing further education is to behave like a gadje (a non-roma), or, more generally, to become a so-called ‘race traitor’ – even a ‘gender-traitor’ where Romani women are concerned (see Abajo and Carrasco 2004, below).

Nevertheless, boundary maintenance, as a relationship with the other, can have divergent effects depending upon how it is expressed. In the beneficial sense, it can successfully signify ‘pride in difference’ – a call for the just recognition (Fraser 2008) of one’s distinct markers of identity and rights to equitable representation – as a necessary element of personal or group esteem, emancipation, and empowerment (see also Benhabib 2006; Torres Fernández 1987; hooks 1995). However, the aforementioned negative forms of boundary marking can prove doubly harmful by not only generating endogenous oppression, but also facilitating exogenous oppression, by indirectly serving dominant groups’ racist or xenophobic desires to contain. Fortunately, such pernicious demarcations of identity are countered by grassroots Romani rights movements, which are rapidly growing in the case of the European Roma (Commissioner for Human Rights 2012). And this is occurring despite the formidable legacy of containment affecting such communities (Liégeois 2007).

In Spain, for instance, important contributions to the mobilization of collective self-empowerment have been advanced by prominent Romani rights organizations. And at the transnational level of protecting the Roma’s most basic civil rights and confronting the often grave racism directed against them, significant political strides have also been made in the European Union (E.U.). The Council of Europe (2011), for example, has published a high-profile factsheet entitled Protecting the Rights of the Roma, while in June 2011 the European Council approved the E.U. Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies, which is binding until 2020 (Commissioner for Human Rights 2012:34): ‘The EU Framework sets up goals in education, health, housing and employment and notes that EU governments must prepare, update or develop their national Roma inclusion strategies by the end of 2011.’

While encouraging, these efforts in the E.U. are as yet inadequate, as extreme cases of containment of the Roma are still registered on a regular basis throughout Europe. That said, the case is made below for pedagogically confronting containment from the classroom.

**Exposing containment: Where, why, how**

As the Romani rights movement gradually grows, educators themselves can embark on a cultural challenge to containment consisting of at least three levels of critical pedagogical engagement: first, raising awareness by exposing all students – both Roma and non-Roma – to the largely neglected and silenced role containment plays in reproducing discrimination, inequality, and injustice in local social and educational settings; then encouraging students to collectively negotiate
an ethic of coexistence that they can subsequently put into practice; and finally developing with students initiatives for intervention into the local and neighboring school communities, and/or the various levels of institutional decision-making. Whereas these three levels of critical learning are inter-dependent and therefore represent an integral process of empowerment and resistance to a widespread source of economic and sociocultural injustice, addressing all of them in depth would exceed the limits of this chapter. Emphasis will therefore be placed on the first level, with the remaining two taken up anew in the conclusion.

Epistemologies and policies as containment

Shari Popen (2002:387) has called upon educators to make the discursive and symbolic technologies of containment visible, readable, and ‘sayable’. This is accomplished when we attempt to reveal how ‘narrative authority’ (through the mass media, textbooks, etc.) filters, distorts, limits, or excludes all information – including possible interpretations of the same – considered to be excessive or somehow inappropriate. Such information is thus manipulated or ‘contained’ before observers even begin to make meaning from it. Popen argues that this form of containment operates mostly through literalism: decontextualizing information from its historic particularities. Portuguese sociologist Boaventura de Sousa Santos (1995) has suggested we use a ‘sociology of absence’ to reveal how such selective silencing is indeed actively constructed, while Galizan pedagogue Jurjo Torres (2011) speaks of ‘silenced cultures’ in school curricula.

Students and educators alike may be surprised to note, when their analytical lens is brought into careful focus, how various expressions of this type of containment can converge, for example, in a single brief news headline, such as the following: ‘Five Hundred Secondary Students to Receive a Course on Gypsy Culture’. At first glance, this event (occurring in a small Spanish city) seems positive, and yet the containment here is at least threefold: It is present in the very fact that such curricular contents are considered a novelty – a consideration that naturalizes the legacy of curricular exclusion of the Roma because the tragedy behind this protracted cultural absence is lost to the dominant perception of the Roma as an ‘exotic’ exception to the rule. Containment is also present in the contingent and non-essential curricular approach to learning about ‘Gypsy Culture’ via a self-contained course. And finally, it is even present in the seemingly inclusive collective noun ‘Students’, which, in this case, ironically, happens to exclude the Roma (based on further information presented in the article). All of these subtleties keep curricular inclusion and representation of the Roma ‘contained’.

At a broader level of knowledge production, mainstream educational literature, research, textbooks, and the mass media all too often frame disparate learning outcomes in ways that locate causation in the ‘dysfunctional’ family settings and ‘deprived’ home-communities of the low-performing youth, who are referred to as ‘disadvantaged’, ‘at-risk’, ‘confictive’, or worse still, intellectually ‘limited’, even poly-deficient, on the basis of their racial, ethnic, and/or social class characteristics. These perspectives have been heavily criticized for the racist overtones in their
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The tendency to ‘blame the victim’ – to use William Ryan’s (1976) now classic notion – and to thus racialize and locate the causes of the inadequacies within individual students or minoritized groups, as opposed to highlighting tendentious and detrimental research suppositions, policy orientations, or pedagogical practices (Apple 2001; Harry and Klinger 2006; Valencia 2010), or even in the unjust organization of democratic coexistence itself in racially and ethnically diverse societies (Benhabib 2006; Pedroni 2011).

In the context of Spain, this dominant ‘deficit thinking’ (Valencia 2010) regarding the disproportionately high truancy and drop-out rates among Romani secondary school students has, since the fall of the dictatorship in the late 1970s, also been painstakingly challenged by a growing number of researchers, activists, and institutional agents. For instance, Eugenio Abajo and Silvia Carrasco (2004) have highlighted various factors – such as family socioeconomic status and job opportunities, access to cultural and academic support networks, school/teacher responsiveness, and much more – that are influencing the Roma’s gradually increasing participation in secondary and further education. While some counterproductive boundary maintenance is still holding back female (Romi) adolescents in particular, even that is changing as more Romi than ever now attend adult and higher education.

The Asociación de Enseñantes Con Gitanos (Educators With Gypsies Association) has long held yearly conferences and published periodicals that are dedicated to combating the deficit paradigm, and improving equal educational opportunity for the Roma. Scholars Tomás Calvo Buezas (1989) and Mariano Fernández-Enguita (1999) have carried out some now classic studies on the interaction between societal discrimination of the Roma and schooling, while other educational studies have also had impact (e.g. Begoña García Pastor 2011; Jover and Romero 2000; Vargas Clavería and Gómez Alonso 2003). Through the Unión Romani, a federation of non-profit organizations by and for the Roma, President Juan de Dios Ramírez-Heredia and colleague Silvia Rodríguez Gómez (2010) produce yearly critical reports on international media representations of the Roma. Sergio Rodríguez (2010), former president of the Fundación Secretariado Gitano (Gypsy Secretariat Foundation), has focused on transversal issues affecting Romani rights past to present, as has scholar Juan Gamella (2007). Further, Bernard Leblón (1993) has authored a major historical account of the Spanish Roma; anthropologist Teresa San Román (1997) published groundbreaking in-depth ethnographies; and Roma scholar Antonio Torres Fernández (1987) conducted a unique early study on Romani (trans)nationalism. Finally, the public Instituto de Cultura Gitana (Institute for Gypsy Culture), founded in 2007, grants annual awards in the scenic and graphic arts, literature, music, research, and other areas to Romani recipients.

Most of these same researchers and social agents nonetheless acknowledge that their efforts have only been partially successful at eradicating the proclivity in non-Roma to blame the Roma for the containment they suffer. This is evident in the overrepresentation of Romani students in Special Education programs and segregated schools, which has gone hand-in-hand with the aforementioned deficit
paradigm – an ongoing process of containment that is echoed, and not by mere coincidence, in the education of African American students in the U.S. as well (Harry & Klinger 2006). While separate schooling for the Roma was abandoned in Spain around the turn of the millennium (Fernández-Enguita 1999), in Slovakia and the Czech Republic – where physical walls have even recently been erected to segregate and contain Romani neighborhoods (Thorp 2010) – the placement of Romani students in separate schools remains far too prevalent. This is so much the case that in a major study conducted by the U.K. non-profit organization Equality, with the Roma Education Fund (see Fremlova and Ureche 2011), the authors found that Slovak and Czech Romani immigrant children in the U.K. ‘who had been previously streamed into special schools/classes or de facto segregated (Roma only) schools/classes in the Czech Republic and Slovakia (...) were studying successfully in mainstream schools in the UK’ (ibid, 2011:7). The news about these promising findings was picked up, in fact, by a journalist from The Economist (E. L. 2011). He offered the following observation:

Grrrr. It’s easy to bash state education in Britain (and two of my own children are at state schools so I have plenty of experience of bureaucracy, low expectations, poor teaching, and the effect of peer group pressure from non-academic children). But it’s humbling that even a bog standard British school can be a life-changer for someone from countries that in other respects have rather good schools (Czech and Slovak kids on average easily beat their UK counterparts in subjects such as math).

Here, we are witness to the discursive intersection of globalized neoliberal ideology, education, and the Roma. The author replicates popular negative sentiments regarding state (public) schooling in the U.K., and thus not only discredits such schooling, but also indirectly (dis)qualifies the immigrant Romani parents’ judgment regarding educational success. Moreover, as noted earlier, this ideological trend is on the rise even as the segregating effects of neoliberal school choice policies have come under scrutiny. That is, state control over the public offering is increasingly diminished as alternative educational institutions, such as academies in the U.K. and charter schools in the U.S., gain ground. Charter schools, for instance, receive limited state funding and need not comply with certain state-run school requirements so that they may diversify through supplementary, non-state funding (mostly private) and alternative organizational and curricular arrangements. In a major Civil Rights Project report, however, Erica Frankenberg and Genevieve Siegel-Hawley (2009) warn of the risks charter schooling poses both for equitable educational opportunity and for racial, ethnic, gender, and class-based integration. Terri Wilson (2010) expresses similar concerns, exploring the epistemological approaches used to justify (or to critique) the ever more observable role charter schools play in segregating – both voluntarily and involuntarily – schoolchildren. Finally, international researchers such as Apple (2001), Au and Bollow (2012), Ball (2012), McCarthy (2008), Rizvi and Lingard (2010), Pedroni (2011), Saltman (2009), and Torres (2001, 2011) explain
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How neoliberal education policies in general, which reduce state intervention in various ways, ultimately impact negatively on equal opportunity and democratic coexistence and governance through schooling and beyond. Needless to say, these limitations on integration represent a form of containment.

This takes us into a related tendency among mainstream education analysts: that of locating the supposed roots of poor learning outcomes (usually measured by standardized tests); if not in the students themselves, then almost exclusively in the professional practices of teachers. While pedagogy is indeed a key factor, this isolated focus on teaching is all too often presented as largely or completely independent from the greater socioeconomic and cultural ordering of society and its influence on learning and schooling (Au and Tempel 2012; Ball 2012). Pedroni (2011) has in fact identified a collection of neoliberal urban (counter) development policies in the U.S. that function as containment in disempowered communities because they lead to *de facto* segregation from other communities. These include everything from *laissez-faire* (non)policing policies in poor, violence-ridden neighborhoods – once again, a practice not unfamiliar to the Roma (e.g. Verseck 2011) – to the selective construction and placement of infrastructure; or, as Pedroni notes,

‘clearcutting’ and then mothballing ‘vacant’ areas of the city for future [private] development, with current residents of those areas enticed to leave through federally-subsidized purchase offers, and, for the more determined holdouts, through the discontinuation of vital services such as utilities and police and fire protection.

(MacDonald & Nichols, cited in Pedroni 2011:207)

Such measures, which favor private developers to the detriment of poor local residents, serve to contain, and thus lay the foundations for additional containment as deployed through the school choice schemes addressed earlier. The impact, then, that teachers *themselves* have on learning outcomes is therefore overemphasized, even as it remains important. Since Freire’s (1970) critical pedagogy, educational researchers from across the globe have found that a monothematic focus on teaching is fundamentally flawed because no learning process can be properly understood in a vacuum from its greater social and historical situatedness.

Even so, those voices on educational achievement that are most privileged by the global mass media continue to insist on teachers and/or the *internal* functioning of the institution as the sole determinants of equitable educational opportunity. For example, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD 2012) recently published a ten-point summary of a report on equity intended for educational policymakers, in which school choice arrangements are taken for granted despite the OECD acknowledging their implication in the creation or exacerbation of *de facto* segregation. Returning to this point, the ‘white flight’ so well documented in the case of U.S. schooling (e.g. McCarthy *et al*. 2005) has been strikingly similar and prevalent in Spain as well, where Romani children are involved (San Román 1997; Fernández-Enguita 1999; Torres 2001) – its incidence...
now augmented by recent Spanish policies around school privatization and choice (Torres 2011). Moreover, in the OECD summary report, no mention is made of the need to address strategically related social and economic policies in local communities or the state, such as those relating to housing, development, and general welfare. This hegemonic insistence on decontextualized, individualized, or group-based (teacher or student) deficit paradigms for explaining educational inequality has created an epistemological bias that must be challenged, and a pedagogical void that must be filled.

**Conclusion**

To fill this void, the pedagogical inquiry presented in this chapter has been developed to serve educators in our common quest to challenge containment wherever it exists, and to do so, borrowing once again from Thomas Pedroni, in ‘ways that beg for the imagination of new forms of resistance’ (2011:206). Where educational opportunity among the Roma is concerned, the first of the three pedagogical interventions outlined earlier represents a starting point. To start this consciousness-raising process, teachers might expose students to cases of containment similar to those presented in these pages. Students would then analyze the specific instances of discrimination against the Roma, as reflected in various news outlets, to unpack the collective operations and repercussions of containment.

While containment must be confronted on multiple levels, the emphasis here has been on the cultural front of critical learning. By heightening ethical awareness in students of Romani and non-Romani backgrounds, the hope is that they eventually take home to their families, friends, neighborhoods, parks, recreational and shopping centers, places of worship, and, of course, cyberspace, a more informed understanding of the essentials of social justice and cosmopolitan coexistence. Moreover, the most conducive site for this kind of cross-cultural learning is a truly public educational setting.

A second level of pedagogical intervention would involve promoting an alternative ethic of community life that serves as a means for dismantling the legitimating discourses of containment, while bolstering learning for emancipation and transformation. It would consist of deliberating on equal educational opportunity, basic human rights, civic and civil responsibility, equality in diversity, socioeconomic integration, and cross-cultural justice in students’ daily lives at school and beyond.

This collective consciousness would then be moved into a third level of action by encouraging students to creatively intervene in the (segregated) school community and larger educational system in ways (both on- and offline, and on and off school grounds) that influence the very process of educational and social policymaking. Transformation taken on in these terms would bring students much closer to what Antonia Darder and Zeus Yiamouyiannis (2009) have aptly referred to as ‘decolonizing community practice’. The time is now.6
Notes

1 Translated from the Spanish. See La Opinión de A Coruña (2002:8).
2 Enseñantes Con Gitanos is a loosely organized network of Spanish Romani and non-Romani educators, founded in 1979 and now based in Madrid. Website in Spanish: http://aecgit.pangea.org/ [accessed 3 May 2012].
3 The Romani Union was founded in 1986 by Spanish Roma, and is based in Barcelona, Catalonia. Its members publish annual critical reviews of news items on the Roma, as well as a monthly newspaper and other periodic publications. Website in English: http://www.unionromani.org/index.htm [accessed 3 May 2012].
4 The Fundación Secretariado Gitano was founded in 2001 and is based in Madrid, with multiple branches throughout Spain. It is the largest Romani rights advocacy organization of Spain, and publishes numerous annual reports and periodicals. Website in English: http://www.gitanos.org/ [accessed 3 May 2012].
5 Jean Anyon (2011) recently published a critical overview of the influence of the economic structure on educational achievement. See also Ball (2012), Apple (2001), and hooks (2000).
6 A special thanks to Maja Miskovic for her very helpful input on this chapter.
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CONCLUSIONES
Conclusiones

A través de los sistemas educativos del llamado mundo desarrollado, también hoy por hoy se están desatendiendo las necesidades educativas de demasiadas chicas y chicos que no comparten las características etno-culturales, socioeconómicas y/o físico-sensoriales más valoradas de entre las corrientes dominantes de cada país, corrientes que en muchos casos ahora son incluso transfronterizas. Para que no perdamos los muy importantes avances ya hechos en esta línea de acciones, y para que las personas que nos dedicamos a la profesión docente avancemos todavía más para hacer frente a estas injusticias y fomentemos el derecho a una educación plena, equitativa, capacitadora y emancipadora, es innegable que la institución educativa actual, y en especial una pieza esencial de la misma que es la formación del profesorado, ha de experimentar un cambio radical: es decir, de raíz, encaminado a la transformación y no a la reproducción de los fuertes sesgos culturales, sociales y económicos existentes en la sociedad.

Quien tiene un papel indiscutiblemente clave en cambiar el aparato educativo —en todas sus facetas, tanto políticas como axiológicas, teóricas, técnicas y prácticas— es el propio profesorado y sus formadores. Pero su fuerza colectiva en este sentido implica una lucha permanente, pues queda siempre matizada por otros agentes sociales. Es decir, actualmente las políticas educativas diferenciadoras promovidas por nuestros gobernantes tecnocráticos están en pleno florecimiento, y con esas políticas lo que pretenden es convertir al profesorado en meros técnicos o gestores del sistema educativo. De nuevo, se remite al público lector a un ejemplo harto recurrente de esta tendencia en el discurso político dominante sobre la organización del sistema educativo. La ex presidenta de la Comunidad Autónoma de Madrid, Esperanza Aguirre, en una ponencia pública reciente, intentó justificar la segregación entre niñas y niños en la escolarización concertada de la siguiente manera:

Las denegaciones de los conciertos para la educación diferenciada deben recurrirse al Tribunal Constitucional, a Estrasburgo, donde sea. [...] ¿Qué es esa historia de que los padres que llevan a sus hijos a colegios de educación diferenciada parece que sean oscurantistas y malos educadores? [...] La educación diferenciada es tan
Un día después, sin embargo, el Tribunal Superior de Xustiza de Galicia anuló los conciertos con los cinco centros católicos de Galicia pertenecientes al Opus Dei, que segregan niñas de niños en centros diferenciados. Estos conciertos fueron concedidos durante la legislatura del llamado gobierno “Bipartito” (formado por el Partido Socialista de Galicia-PSOE y el Bloque Nacionalista Galego-BNG) entre 2005 y 2009, para luego ser renovados en 2009 por el gobierno autonómico perteneciente al partido conservador (Galicia Confidencial, 2013, 14 de marzo). El Tribunal Superior falló así porque según el Artículo 84.3 de la LOE, máxima ley educativa del Estado Español en la actualidad: “En ningún caso habrá discriminación por razón de nacimiento, raza, sexo, religión, opinión o cualquier otra condición o circunstancia personal o social” (BOE, 2006). Asimismo, la propia Constitución del Estado Español de 1978 estipula lo siguiente en su Artículo 14: “Los españoles son iguales ante la ley, sin que pueda prevalecer discriminación alguna por razón de nacimiento, raza, sexo, religión, opinión o cualquier otra condición o circunstancia personal o social.”

De ahí que se haya propuesto a través de esta tesis una formación y un compromiso antisesgo para sentar una base en forma de disposición tanto epistemológica como pedagógica que permita crear culturas, políticas, prácticas y discursos profesionales más críticos y alternativos, y que oriente las demandas y luchas colectivas que el conjunto de enseñantes pueda movilizar desde el ámbito educativo.

Paulo Freire advertía que, a las y los profesionales de la enseñanza, les es demasiado fácil obrar al servicio de las culturas y pautas estructurales opresoras, por lo que “el liderazgo [pedagógico] se obliga incansablemente a desarrollar un esfuerzo de unión de los oprimidos entre sí y de éstos con él para lograr la liberación” (Freire, 1995, p. 226). Una parte importante de dicho esfuerzo libertador es, según Freire, la síntesis cultural, la cual implica que:

---

1 http://www.congreso.es/consti/
toda acción cultural es siempre una forma sistematizada y deliberada de acción que incide sobre la estructura social, en el sentido de mantenerla tal como está, de verificar en ella pequeños cambios o transformarla.

De ahí que, como forma de acción deliberada y sistemática toda acción cultural tiene su teoría, la que determinando sus fines, delimita sus métodos.

La acción cultural —consciente o inconscientemente— o está al servicio de la dominación o lo está al servicio de la liberación de los hombres.

Ambas, dialécticamente antagónicas, se procesan, como lo afirmaremos, en la y sobre la estructura social, que se constituye en la dialecticidad permanencia-cambio. (Freire, 1995, p. 236, cursiva en texto original)

Por esta razón, al conjunto de profesoras y profesores nos incumbe hacer lo que podamos por construir y promover una conceptualización y una canalización de nuestra acción cultural —que es, ante todo, la enseñanza— que redunde más directamente en beneficio de la justicia intercultural y social. Como bien reconocían Louise Derman-Sparks y la ABC Task Force (Derman-Sparks y ABC Task Force, 1989), “dado que el curriculum antisesgo tiene que ver esencialmente con el cambio social, se puede topar con resistencia por parte de otros profesores y profesoras, madres y padres y la Administración, así como con ambivalencias e incomodidades propias” (Derman-Sparks y ABC Task Force, 1989, p. x, traducido del inglés original).

En esta tesis se ha promovido una manera de facilitar esta labor, que consiste fundamentalmente en desarrollar una praxis pedagógica transformadora que parte de una concientización antisesgo del proceder profesional. Esta orientación se puede expresar, no obstante, a través de múltiples posibilidades pedagógicas al explorar críticamente los contextos, las conceptualizaciones, los contenidos y los conductos (o métodos, vías, medios) de la enseñanza-aprendizaje, tal y como se propuso en el capítulo 8 (Teasley, 2009). La decisión de denominar a esta formación como “antisesgo”, como se explicó en la Introducción a esta tesis, ha sido emergente, pues constituye una cierta culminación de años de investigación y de docencia en los campos de la Educación Intercultural, Educación Inclusiva, Pedagogía Crítica, Educación para la Paz, Organización Educativa y formación del profesorado en general.

2 Véase, además, otra publicación reciente suya sobre la educación antisesgo en Educación Infantil (Derman-Sparks y Olsen Edwards, 2010). Extracto original: “And, because at heart anti-bias curriculum is about social change, it may meet with resistance——from other teachers, from parents, from administrators——and from one’s own ambivalences and discomforts.”
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Durante las últimas décadas, las propuestas en este sentido —sin necesariamente nombrarlas como tal— han aflorado a través de investigaciones, políticas e iniciativas en los centros escolares. Por ejemplo, durante las dos legislaturas consecutivas gobernadas por el Partido Socialista Obrero Español-PSOE —2004-2008 y 2008-2011— se promulgaron varias normativas relacionadas entre sí: la Ley de Fomento de la Educación y la Cultura de la Paz de 2005 (BOE, 2005) y, a raíz de ello, un Real Decreto de 2007 que estableció el Observatorio Estatal de la Convivencia Escolar (BOE, 2007). Su función principal consistía en “[p]romover la colaboración entre todas las instituciones implicadas en materia de convivencia escolar” (Artículo 2.d), lo que ha dado lugar a la creación de Observatorios en las Administraciones Educativas de las distintas Comunidades Autónomas, así como planes más robustos de convivencia en los centros educativos.

En la formación del profesorado también ha habido avances. Por ejemplo, en las nuevas carreras de formación a través de los Grados en Educación Infantil y Educación Primaria, ahora existen asignaturas obligatorias que anteriormente figuraban en muchos de los casos como asignaturas meramente optativas, o como módulos tratados exclusiva y puntualmente en asignaturas consideradas como más básicas. Pero ahora, entre los estudios obligatorios se pueden ver asignaturas como “Educación Inclusiva y Multicultural” o “Valores y Educación para la Igualdad”. Aún así, queda por ver si esta tendencia seguirá ampliándose, porque, en el caso de la formación en Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y Bachillerato, y como ocurre con otros muchos temas, recibe un trato transversal que queda condicionado por el énfasis que le dé cada docente.

---

3 Este Real Decreto comienza con el siguiente enunciado indicativo de su orientación: “El artículo 10.1 de la Constitución Española proclama que la dignidad de la persona, los derechos inviolables que le son inherentes, el libre desarrollo de la personalidad, el respeto a la ley y a los derechos de los demás son fundamento del orden político y de la paz social. El aprendizaje y el ejercicio de estos valores deben tener su reflejo desde los primeros años del desarrollo de la persona cuando se construyen las bases que determinan, en buena medida, la personalidad futura del ser humano. En el ámbito escolar estos principios han de traducirse en una convivencia ordenada, en un aprender a vivir con los demás, a respetar y asumir la igualdad de las personas, cualquiera que sea su raza, su ideología, su sexo o su religión.” (BOE, 2007)

4 Asignaturas procedentes de los planes de estudio para estas especialidades de la Universidad de A Coruña.
En cuanto a la “Atención a la Diversidad”, según Aguado Odina, Gil Jaurena y Mata Benito (2008), esta temática sigue orientada hacia el alumnado con algún tipo de trastorno, discapacidad o desfase curricular; es decir su orientación sitúa el problema de aprendizaje en el alumnado, por causas principalmente funcionales pero también sociales:

El análisis de la formación inicial del profesorado en España indica que no se aborda de forma explícita el desarrollo de las competencias interculturales necesarias para atender la diversidad de los estudiantes y sus familias (Aguado y otros, 2006a). Existen cursos sobre este tema, habitualmente opcionales, y la forma en que se concibe lo “interculural” en ellos varía considerablemente de unos a otros. De forma mayoritaria, la diversidad no se plantea desde una perspectiva amplia, sino asociada a situaciones presumiblemente deficitarias o/y dirigida a grupos específicos. Etnicidad, lengua y origen son considerados como categorías de diferencias culturales y actúan como variables con las que agrupar a los estudiantes en la clase y en el centro. La educación intercultural, entendida como una educación para todos, no es la perspectiva generalmente adoptada en estos programas. (p. 277)

Por otra parte, los promotores de Educación Inclusiva, la Educación Multicultural Crítica, y la Educación Intercultural y Bilingüe, aconsejan abordar los problemas que tenga la institución para adaptarse a la más o menos amplia diversidad del alumnado, lo cual constituye una manera de repensar los enfoques deficitarios sobre la “diversidad” y abre nuevas vías de mejora para atender a la diversidad y las diferencias humanas en los sistemas educativos del mundo actual (Torres Santomè, 2012; Valencia, 2010).

Más adelante abordaremos otras recomendaciones relacionadas con una formación antisegu del profesorado, pero lo que se intenta subrayar por ahora es que el sistema educativo ha avanzado, por mucho camino que todavía le quede. Como explica Manuel de Puelles Benítez (Puelles Benítez, 2006), las quejas cíclicas que se acostumbran escuchar sobre la supuesta inmutabilidad e inercia de la institución educativa a menudo carecen de fundamento, aunque insistan determinados sectores emisores de las quejas, y aunque los medios de comunicación reproduzcan las

---

quejas, selectivamente. Según de Puelles, el “fracaso” de la educación pública es muy relativo, visto desde la anécdota del clérigo medieval que viaja en el tiempo hasta nuestra propia época:

La verdad es que el clérigo se encontraría sorprendido por múltiples cambios: los profesores son ahora predominantemente laicos —no clérigos como en el medioevo—; no sólo hay profesores, también hay profesoras, en las aulas no sólo hay niños sino, en la misma proporción, también hay niñas; todos los estudiantes permanecen en la escuela, al menos, hasta los 16 años de edad, y muchos de los adolescentes y jóvenes no salen del sistema educativo hasta bien pasados los 20 años; los estudios se efectúan siguiendo un currículum articulado y sistematizado de acuerdo con los diferentes niveles educativos; la lengua vehicular no es el latín sino la de la comunidad en la que los alumnos viven; la enseñanza se somete a ritmos y tiempos propios; la norma exterior a la escuela procede de los poderes públicos, no de los eclesiásticos. Aunque quizá lo más sorprendente de todo sea que el monje vería una escuela que no es patrimonio de unos pocos, como ocurría en su tiempo, sino de toda la población. (Puelles Benítez, 2006, p. 83)

Por eso, es imprescindible una comprensión histórico-genealógica del cambio educativo, sobre todo para situar los llamados fracasos, así como los progresos, en su debido contexto social más amplio (Fernández Enguita, 2008a; Fernández Enguita, Mena Martínez y Riviere Gómez, 2010; Gabriel Fernández, 2006; Varela, 2007; Varela y Álvarez-Uría, 1991; Viñao Frago, 2004).

Asimismo, y como se explicó en los capítulos 2, 3 y 7 del compendio (Teasley, 2004, 2005, 2008b), la propia ampliación de la educación comprensiva, gracias a la LOGSE de 1990, ha favorecido que muchos Institutos de Educación Secundaria hayan visto pisar sus centros por primera vez, y/o en proporciones significativas, al alumnado procedente de las clases más populares, así como de familias gitanas. Aparte de eso, en diciembre de 2006, se decretaron los currícula para Educación Infantil, Primaria y Secundaria Obligatoria, que incluyeron por primera vez la asignatura de Educación para la Ciudadanía y los Derechos Humanos, implantada durante el siguiente curso escolar. No obstante, esta misma asignatura ha sufrido cambios significativos de la mano del actual gobierno de España, en su campaña por recentralizar el control ideológico del currículum en torno, generalmente, a las nuevas reivindicaciones identitarias centralistas y los dictados de la Iglesia, interpretados por la Conferencia Episcopal Española. Desde comienzos del curso 2012-2013 la asignatura pasó a denominarse “Educación Cívica y
Constitucional”, y sus contenidos más “controvertidos” fueron eliminados y/o substituidos —aprendizajes en torno a la sexualidad humana en general, pero en particular, el aborto, la homosexualidad, las familias no tradicionales y las distintas identidades de género, así como cuestiones relacionadas con las identidades nacionalistas ibéricas que desafían la hegemonía del nacionalismo español (Taibo, 2007)\textsuperscript{8}.

Otra cosa diferente, sin embargo, es el grado de concienciación que tenga el profesorado ante esta dialéctica ideológica, y su capacidad para canalizar los aprendizajes de manera que los sesgos queden al descubierto. Claramente, el profesorado está en ello, junto con otros agentes sociales. Existen proyectos didácticos muy innovadores y prometedores, algunos de los cuales se han descrito en la cuarta publicación del compendio (Teasley, 2007) —La Casa de Shere Rom\textsuperscript{9} o Ponte...Nas Ondas\textsuperscript{10}.— Otro ejemplo más reciente es el proyecto interactivo Las mujeres gitanas de hoy, de la asociación Fakali, que desafía el sexismo a través de la figura de Mara, y desde la propia cultura gitana\textsuperscript{11}.

En todo caso, desde las interacciones que configuran la práctica diaria institucional de las escuelas, el profesorado afronta todo un abanico de situaciones y procesos en los que podrían aflorar los sesgos: enunciados del alumnado o del profesorado; culturas profesionales de interrelación; afirmaciones y exclusiones procedentes de los libros de texto y los medios de comunicación; decisiones didáctico-organizativas basadas en interpretaciones de la normativa educativa o del curriculum oficial; y conflictos, que en todo caso son naturales en toda relación humana; lo importante es cómo se resuelven (Apple, 1989, 1993; Ball, 1994; Gimeno Sacristán, 1998; Hargreaves, 1996; Jackson, 1994; Jares, 2005; McLaren, 1995; Sánchez Blanco, 2006, 2009; Santos Guerra, 2012; Torres Santomé, 2012). Si estas cuestiones no son manejadas con la debida reflexión, cuidado y conocimiento, en ellas pueden proliferar los estereotipos, estigmatizaciones, prejuicios,

\textsuperscript{8} El nuevo Real Decreto abarca las dos etapas escolares en las que se impartía, desde el 2007, “Educación para la Ciudadanía y los Derechos Humanos”, en Educación Primaria y Educación Secundaria Obligatoria. Véase BOE (2012).
\textsuperscript{9} Se puede consultar en: http://cat.bloctum.com/shererom/ (consultada el 7 de marzo de 2013).
\textsuperscript{10} Véase su web en: http://www.pontenasondas.org/ (consultada el 7 de marzo de 2013).
generalizaciones, favoritismos, fundamentalismos, maniqueísmos y procesos de selección, exclusión y control de todo tipo que siempre acarrean repercusiones personales y sociales.

Volviendo a un pasado no muy lejano, en un primer momento de la lucha pedagógica contra una educación altamente sesgada hacia los intereses educativos de las clases sociales pudientes y los grupos étnicos e identitarios hegemónicos, destacados investigadores internacionales de la educación —como el pedagogo Paulo Freire; los sociólogos Pierre Bourdieu y Jean-Claude Passeron; los antropólogos Paul Willis y John Ogbu; la pedagoga feminista bell hooks; el sociolingüista Basil Bernstein; el especialista en Estudios Culturales Henry Giroux; así como el pedagogo crítico Michael Apple— todos ellos, y muchas y muchos más han contribuido con sus análisis críticos a esclarecer las complejas dinámicas dialécticas entre lo cultural-identitario-simbólico, lo político-ideológico-institucional y lo económico-estructural-estamental, dimensiones éstas que entran en juego en las interacciones y relaciones habituales que se desarrollan en los sistemas educativos.

Algunas de esas voces contestatarias tuvieron resonancia en el primer estudio del compendio, realizado en el contexto educativo de California de 1990. Para orientar más específicamente las demandas socioeducativas en torno a una población escolar californiana cada vez más heterogénea, se concluía en ese estudio que se siguieran las recomendaciones de investigadoras como Laurie Olsen y Nina Mullen (1990), quienes propusieron cuatro áreas principales de habilidades o “competencias” pedagógicas procedentes de la educación multicultural y que todo docente debería adquirir. Recomendaron, a grandes rasgos, que el profesorado supiera desarrollar el lenguaje en un sentido general, a partir, por ejemplo, de nociones básicas como la interdependencia lingüística de Jim Cummins (2002); o que debiera saber establecer un entorno acogedor para un alumnado multicultural; que comprendiera el papel básico de la cultura y la experiencia individual en el aprendizaje; y que construyera un curriculum y practicara una didáctica que debiera partir de la diversidad cultural, no una que intentara uniformizarla, asimilarla o ignorarla. Además de desarrollar estas capacidades profesionales generales, en el primer estudio se recomienda una serie de competencias más específicas, inspiradas

En retrospectiva, sin embargo, la mayoría, si no todas estas perspectivas sobre competencias pedagógicas le atribuyen al profesorado casi toda la responsabilidad por mejorar la situación del alumnado menos favorecido, cuando, como se explicó en el último capítulo de la tesis (Teasley, 2013, en prensa), existen condicionantes más amplios de la práctica en las aulas que no se pueden afrontar adecuadamente y exclusivamente desde una serie de competencias pedagógicas (Au, 2009; Ball, 2012; Frankenberg y Siegel-Hawley, 2009; Gimeno Sacristán, 2008; Marsh, 2011; Pedroni, 2011; Zeichner, 2010). En todo caso, la mayoría de dichas competencias se podrían contemplar desde un marco algo más crítico, que Gloria Ladson-Billings (1994) ha denominado *culturally relevant teaching* (una enseñanza culturalmente relevante); se sustenta en las orientaciones recogidas en el Cuadro 2, que son aplicables tanto a la formación del profesorado como a la práctica profesional en centros escolares.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Las profesoras y profesores que practican una enseñanza culturalmente relevante:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sienten amor propio y tienen gran aprecio por los demás.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Se perciben a sí mismos como miembros de la comunidad local; conciben la docencia como al servicio de la comunidad; y animan a su alumnado a comprometerse con la comunidad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conciben la docencia como arte y a sí mismos como artistas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creen que todos los y las jóvenes pueden lograr el éxito escolar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ayudan a que su alumnado establezca conexiones entre la comunidad local y otros niveles de identidad y pertenencia, como lo nacional o lo global.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conciben la docencia como un proceso de “extraer el saber” del alumnado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Se relacionan con el alumnado de forma fluida y “humanamente equitativa”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultivan esta relación con el alumnado más allá del aula y del centro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procuran hacer visibles los vínculos culturales que tengan con cada alumna y alumno.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fomentan la formación de comunidades de aprendizaje.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promueven el aprender colaborando, así como la enseñanza entre iguales y la responsabilización mutua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conciben al saber como algo continuamente recreado, reciclado, y compartido.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mantienen un ojo crítico sobre el saber.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sienten pasión por el conocimiento.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Desarrollan en el alumnado las destrezas que necesitan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finalmente, conciben la “excelencia” como un estándar complejo que debe tener en cuenta tanto la diversidad como las diferencias individuales de cada alumna y alumno.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cuadro 2.** Resumen de las orientaciones pedagógicas para una *enseñanza culturalmente relevante*, desarrollada por Gloria Ladson-Billings (1994) (elaboración propia).
Esta forma de entender la enseñanza intercultural al nivel individual se extiende más allá de los conocimientos y las competencias específicas con respecto a un grupo étnico u otro —orientaciones, muchas de ellas, centradas en las cuestiones lingüísticas de la Educación Bilingüe e Intercultural (en el contexto norteamericano)——, pues la visión de Ladson-Billings (1994) en su impactante libro, *The Dreamkeepers*, se basa en la necesidad, hoy más urgente que nunca, de interrumpir la reproducción de determinadas injusticias socioeducativas mediante la docencia. Se trata de injusticias demasiado arraigadas y persistentes en la enseñanza y en la sociedad en general, gracias en parte a todo un sistema económico, político, social y cultural fundamentalmente sesgado. Ella parte de su propia experiencia como pedagoga afroamericana y de sus investigaciones con el alumnado también procedente del grupo étnico-racial afroamericano, que fue fuertemente oprimido en el pasado, pero que sigue siendo discriminado y minorizado actualmente en EE.UU.

Esta investigadora, así como muchas y muchos otros, dan cuenta de las tendencias en el sistema educativo norteamericano que marginan a un colectivo que, —de una manera muy parecida al caso del alumnado *Romanò*— acaba convertiéndolos en los otros de siempre. Y esta situación perjudicial se desarrolla con total normalidad (perversa) mediante lo que Cornel West (West, 1994) ha denominado la *mirada normativa* de las corrientes ideológicas hegemónicas, que a pesar de todo resultan opresivas. Como expresa James Frideres (Frideres, 2007), “Siempre y cuando las personas blancas no sean vistas y nombradas en términos raciales, funcionan como norma humana” (p. 43; traducido del inglés)\(^{12}\). Esta mirada normativa se canaliza a través del sistema educativo, explica McCarthy, de la siguiente manera:

La investigación educativa convencional de la corriente dominante ha estabilizado el discurso en torno a la “desviación” de los grupos en situación desventajosa, utilizando diversas medidas de las diferencias, como los tests de CI calibrados de acuerdo con la ejecución normativa de los varones blancos de clase media. (McCarthy, 1994, p. 34)

Importantes investigaciones como las de Alan Gartner, Colin Greer, Frank Riessman y otros (1999); Daniel Losen y Gary Orfield (2002); Beth Harry, Janette

\(^{12}\)“As long as White people are not racially seen and named, they function as the human norm.”
Klinger y Elizabeth Cramer (2007); o Gordon Stobart (2010) han revelado, por ejemplo, las causas culturales y pedagógicas detrás de la sobrerepresentación del alumnado afroamericano en los programas de Educación Especial en EE.UU. Entre otras causas, revelan la preponderancia de los sesgos culturales —lingüísticos, étnico-raciales y de clase social— en los tests de cociente de inteligencia (CI), que condicionan el destino del alumnado según sus resultados. De nuevo, algo semejante ocurre con el alumnado gitano, tanto de España (Abajo y Carrasco, 2004; Fundación Secretariado Gitano, 2012; García Pastor, 2011; Santiago y Maya, 2012; Vargas Clavería y Gómez Alonso, 2003) como de Europa en general (Commissioner for Human Rights y Council of Europe, 2012; Farkas, 2007; Fremlova y Ureche, 2011; Liégeois, 1998; Miskovic, 2009). En Europa del Este, por ejemplo, se tiende a declarar que la colocación intencionada de este alumnado en programas y escuelas segregadas responde más bien a su “desfase curricular”, más que a cuestiones funcionales con base física-cerebral, motora, sensorial o psíquica-emocional. Pero en cualquier contexto ese desfase se debe a su “contexto sociofamiliar” (Abajo y Carrasco, 2004; Fernández Enguita, 1999; Miskovic, 2009). El estudio etnográfico llevado a cabo en el Instituto Central corrobora esta percepción docente y legislativa (Teasley, 2005, 2008b). Es decir, a través de la mirada normativa (West, 1994), la diversidad y los puntos de referencia culturales de los Rromá son concebidos en términos principalmente de déficit (Valencia, 2010).

Por lo tanto, la enseñanza culturalmente relevante, según Ladson-Billings, debería incorporar y utilizar los propios conocimientos culturales del alumnado subalterno para darles el reconocimiento y la legitimación que merecen, y para transcender, de esta forma, los efectos negativos de la cultura dominante; efectos que provocan que muchos de esos alumnos y alumnas equiparen el rendimiento escolar “ejemplar” o “excelente” con la pérdida de sus señas de identidad. Es decir, tal y como ocurre con muchos Rromá, estamos de nuevo ante un proceso de mantenimiento de fronteras, pues —en el contexto que estudia Ladson-Billings— una parte importante del alumnado afroamericano también ha llegado a percibir el éxito escolar como algo sospechoso, o como “hacer el blanco”. Para expresar esta misma idea mediante una expresión popular afroamericana: alguien que hace así se convierte en la galleta “Oreo”: negra por fuera, blanca por dentro. A luz de todo ello,
Ladson-Billings desaconseja apoyar la tendencia hegemónica de la llamada colorblindness (“ceguera” ante los distintos colores humanos, racializados), pues como concepto bien sonante, tiende no obstante a recibir la mayor parte de su apoyo desde los estamentos de privilegio gozado principalmente por los miembros de la sociedad norteamericana “blanca”, aunque también por los miembros mejor parados de la población negra, como afirma bell hooks (2000). En este sentido, Ladson-Billings explica que:

[A]lgunos profesores [blancos] hacen afirmaciones como “Yo realmente no veo el color; yo sólo veo a niños” o “No me importa si son rojos, verdes o si tienen lunares; los trato a todos como niños”. Sin embargo, estos intentos de mostrar una ceguera ante el color enmascaran al “racismo disconsciente”, una costumbre mental acrítica que justifica la inequidad y la explotación al aceptar el orden existente de las cosas como algo dado (King, 1991). (Ladson-Billings, 1994, pp. 31-32)

Como se expresó en varias publicaciones del compendio, estas tendencias se enmarcan en un proceso cultural mayor sesgado, que Cameron McCarthy y Greg Dimitriadis (2000) han identificado como un proceso de resentimiento. El concepto fue desarrollado originalmente por el filósofo alemán Friedrich Nietzsche (1967), pero estos investigadores postcoloniales de la educación lo han aplicado de la siguiente manera:

El resentimiento en la sociedad del siglo XX tardio es el proyecto de las desorientadas clases populares y profesionales blancas, confrontadas con la panoplia de la diferencia que marca el ambiente institucional y social en el que los sujetos modernos viven en las sociedades industrializadas. Es muy posible que el resentimiento se haya convertido, efectivamente, en el tropo preeminente en el que (y por el que) “lo blanco” se vive en Estados Unidos hoy día. Lo blanco constituye una norma no enunciada, constituida como pura y real sólo en contraste con lo que no es. (McCarthy & Dimitriadis, 2000, p. 75, traducido del inglés)

---

13 “Thus some teachers make such statements as “I don’t really see color, I just see children” or “I don’t care if they’re red, green, or polka dot, I just treat them all like children.” However, these attempts at color-blindness mask a “dysconscious racism,” an “uncritical habit of mind that justifies inequity and exploitation by accepting the existing order of things as given.”

14 “Resentment in late-twentieth-century society is the project of the disoriented, white, working and professional classes, confronted with the panoply of difference that marks the institutional and social environment in which modern subjects live in industrialized societies. Indeed, resentment has become the preeminent trope in which (and through which) “whiteness” is lived in the United States today. Whiteness is an unspoken norm, made pure and real only in relation to that which it is not.”


El caso es que la homofobia ha sido la fuente de una de las tasas más altas e intensas de discriminación y violencia presentes en la institución educativa, acompañado por un porcentaje muy elevado de suicidios (Epstein, O’Flynn y Telforn, 2001); tanto que las reivindicaciones de muchos colectivos de lesbianas, gays, bisexuales, transexuales, intersexuales y *queer* (LGBTIQ) de base vienen...
demandando *curricula* y centros escolares “seguros”\(^\text{15}\). En España, la Federación Estatal de Lesbianas, Gais, Transexuales y Bisexuales (FELGTB) ha publicado recientemente uno de los informes más amplios sobre esta preocupante temática (Generelo, 2012). Otras organizaciones e investigadores trabajan en el nivel didáctico y curricular (Carrera Fernández, 2013; Gabriel, 2008; Platero Méndez y Gómez Celto, 2008; Sánchez Sáinz, 2009, 2010)\(^\text{16}\).

Desde la investigación internacional sobre el papel de las identidades LGBTIQ en el ámbito educativo, la educación anti-opresiva de Kevin Kumashiro ha inspirado más directamente la perspectiva *anti-sesgo* desarrollada aquí. En su obra, aparte de destacar los sesgos heterosexistas de la sociedad mediante la noción más amplia de la heteronormatividad, Kumashiro indaga en las formas en que se construye y se enmarca, arbitrariamente, el *sentido común* para que éste transmita determinados mensajes y no otros (Kumashiro, 2000, 2001, 2004, 2008). Por ejemplo, cita cuatro conceptos que han sido re-enmarcados o re-significados y, por lo tanto, apropiados desde visiones homofóbicas del tema de la homosexualidad y su lugar en los centros escolares. Éstos son: la *inocencia*, que desde estas perspectivas conservadoras significa “proteger” a la juventud de la llamada “perversión” homosexual; la *neutralidad*, que se traduce en evitar completamente el tema en la escuela —lo cual constituye el tipo de silenciamiento intencionado criticado desde la *sociología de las ausencias* (Santos, 2005)—; la *igualdad*, o la demanda de que se incluyan en el curriculum, y “en igualdad de condiciones”, las supuestas repercusiones negativas de la homosexualidad; y finalmente la *verdad*, representada por diversas interpretaciones fundamentalistas de los libros sagrados, como, por ejemplo, la Biblia.

El problema con estos encuadres es que la homofobia constituye una forma de odio que perjudica a personas que están en su pleno derecho humano de vivir su sexualidad como quieran\(^\text{17}\). No sólo eso, sino que el heterosexismo es una tendencia

\(^\text{15}\) Por ejemplo, la página web de la red Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network (GLSEN), una de las más veteranas, grandes y activas del ámbito educativo, recoge mucha información al respecto: http://www.glsen.org/cgi-bin/iowa/all/home/index.html (consultada el 25 de marzo de 2013). Por otra parte, el grupo Youth Pride, Inc. (YPI) ha publicado una guía on-line para docentes (YPI - Youth Pride Inc., 1997).

\(^\text{16}\) Asimismo, el número 414 de la revista *Cuadernos de Pedagogía* (de julio-agosto de 2011) está dedicado casi íntegramente al tema de las diversidades e identidades sexuales.

\(^\text{17}\) Siempre que la relación sexual sea consentida entre las personas adultas que la comparten.
sociocultural dominante —un sesgo— que excluye y margina. Es decir, si la Declaración Universal de los Derechos Humanos de 1948, así como las demás declaraciones posteriores sobre los derechos civiles, sociales, culturales, políticos y económicos han de ser respetadas, no se debe “proteger” o tratar en “igualdad de condiciones” discursos o perspectivas que atentan contra esos propios derechos (Carlson, 2012; Ignacio, 2008; Jares, 2007; Torres Santomé, 2011). Finalmente, cabe añadir a todo ello lo importante que es mantener un ojo crítico sobre los usos de la noción de verdad, pues, según ha señalado Xesús R. Jares (2004), talibán es el plural de la palabra persa telebeh, o “buscador de la verdad”. Con esta advertencia no se quiere llegar a un relativismo paralizante (Santos, 2005) sobre la definición de la verdad, sino tal vez intentar, como alternativa, revelar realidades en vez de perseguir supuestas verdades.

En todos estos sentidos, Kumashiro aborda el lado político de los discursos pedagógicos que entran en el currículum de la mano de los discursos públicos hegemónicos basados en lógicas e ideologías sesgadas sobre la organización social. Es más, por mucho que haga falta ocuparse urgentemente de las formas más violentas y constantes de acoso homofóbico en las escuelas (Generelo, 2012), Kumashiro argumenta que esa necesaria lucha no deja de ser una primera respuesta que quita atención del heterosexismo reinante, producto de privilegiar la heterosexualidad en la sociedad (Kumashiro, 2008). Pues, bien, el no cuestionar el privilegio de la heteronormatividad está estrechamente relacionado con la idea que expresaron McCarthy y Dimitriadis (2000) anteriormente, sobre la raza blanca como norma no nombrada de la sociedad; algo que también ocurre con el patriarcado (Arnot, 2009; Gore, 1996; hooks, 1981; McIntosh, 1988; Weis, 1988a).

Por extensión, todo ello guarda mucha relación con la situación de la juventud Rromani de España y Europa. Tal y como se explicó en los capítulos 7, 8 y 11, sobre el grado de violencia sufrido por los Rromà histórica y actualmente, cabe recordar que los Rromà, por muy poca presencia que tengan en los medios de masas, cuando sí aparecen, suelen ser representados en los medios, o en los libros de texto, en sentido negativo, y más a menudo en el papel de provocadores que de víctimas.

---
Menos frecuentes son las noticias que los representan en clave positiva o neutra. Tampoco resulta común encontrar en los medios análisis críticos de los grupos étnicos mayoritarios.

Un caso llamativo en este último sentido es el de los miembros mayoritarios de la comunidad escolar de Barakaldo (País Vasco) ——mencionado en los capítulos 2 y 10——. En el año 2000, la mayor parte de las madres y padres del alumnado de un centro concertado intentaron impedir con violencia que tres hermanos gitanos de corta edad entrasen en el colegio. El caso es sólo una muestra del grado de opresión anti-gitana que perdura en España, trágicamente. Pero incluso en este caso, que da visibilidad a la etnia gitana como víctima, su presencia aparece contextualizada, como casi siempre, en un caso grave de conflicto o de contención (segregación y expulsión). El conflicto de Barakaldo terminó, afortunadamente, resolviéndose gracias a la rápida intervención del alumnado mayor del propio centro que, con el apoyo de una asociación gitana local, entre otras, salió a defender los derechos de la familia gitana, consiguiendo al final su ingreso en el centro (Camacho, 2000, 18 de mayo). Lo que parece resultar más difícil para los medios de masas, sin embargo, es girar el foco hacia los grupos mayoritarios y sus sesgos: su racismo, su etnocentrismo y su clasismo. Existe poca investigación orientada hacia el objetivo de revelar con claridad cómo las identidades étnicas mayoritarias, a pesar de ser opresivas, llegan a caracterizar la “normalidad” por defecto; cómo llegan a servir de “estándar” con todos sus privilegios sociales, legitimaciones y justificaciones.

Hasta ahora se ha puesto el acento en una vía pedagógica hacia la justicia sociocultural, que es el reconocimiento cultural, y no sólo el reconocimiento de los Rromà ——su historia, su lengua, sus prácticas, perspectivas y logros culturales, su presencia a pesar de la sociología de las ausencias (Santos, 2005) y la opresión sistemática que han tenido que soportar y superar poco a poco, luchando— sino también se ha puesto en relieve la hegemonía cultural de los grupos mayoritarios ——sus privilegios sociales, políticos, económicos y culturales, así como sus mecanismos de opresión, muchos de los cuales toman la forma de sesgos acumulativos no siempre intencionados ni percibidos—. Con esto no se quiere totalizar (McLaren,
1995) la representación de los grupos mayoritarios, pues como explicó Foucault (1979), el poder circula en muchos sentidos y no siempre en el sentido dominador u opresivo.

Sobre este punto, bell hooks (2000) nos recuerda que, más allá de la discriminación racista que un grupo dominante practique sobre otro subordinado, dentro de cada uno de estos grupos existen otras dinámicas opresivas diferentes procedentes del clasismo, (hetero)sexismo y/o otros “ismos”, incluido el neoliberalismo. Y cada uno de éstos tiene sus propios efectos perjudiciales endógenos. Por esta razón, hooks (1995), Ladson-Billings (Ladson-Billings y Brown, 2008; Ladson-Billings y Tate, 2006), Collins (2009, 2012) y otros se oponen a la colorblindness de los discursos hegemónicos individualistas sobre el racismo; mientras defienden la discriminación positiva20 para los grupos minoritarios históricamente oprimidos. Asimismo, Bourdieu (1998) nos recuerda que la cúpula de la élite neoliberal queda, en cierto modo, “impoluta” o no perjudicada; incluso a menudo se beneficia de las luchas entre los otros de las clases populares, intensificadas por el racismo y el sexismo. Esto es así porque, mientras los distintos grupos desfavorecidos luchan por el recurso escasos constituido por los puestos de trabajo, las patronales se aprovechan de la bajada en el coste de la mano de obra en el trabajo, producto de esa competición, a veces feroz.

Encontramos un ejemplo de esta dinámica en el caso de Barakaldo, de nuevo, en el sentido de que las familias del grupo étnicamente mayoritario competían por los limitados puestos escolares de un centro concertado, y por la distinción que este centro supuestamente les proporcionaba. Este mismo grupo podría haber incluido a familias económicamente menos favorecidas también —como a menudo ocurre con las que solicitan puestos en centros concertados, pues buscan mejorar el capital cultural de sus hijos de esta manera (Torres Santomé, 2001)—. Pues bien, el brote colectivo de racismo hacia la familia gitana en cuestión surgió más claramente cuando el grupo mayoritario veía “amenazado” ese recurso escaso (de los puestos escolares) por una familia Rromani que, según su perspectiva racista y clasista, no sabría “valorar” la importancia de conseguir un puesto escolar en dicho centro. E

---

20 También denominada “acción positiva” y “acción afirmativa”.
incluso en el caso de que sí, su presencia “bajaría” el prestigio del centro, y por tanto, su capital cultural y social\textsuperscript{21}.

Por estas razones, y desde la perspectiva \textit{antisésgo}, los “grupos” sociales, como constructos sociológicos, son necesarios precisamente porque facilitan el estudio de las tendencias colectivas y acumuladas, lo cual, a su vez, resulta altamente revelador para visibilizar los sesgos que se dan en determinadas circunstancias y colectivos, más que en otros. Aunque los integrantes a menudo ignoran o se niegan a reconocer que forman parte de un “grupo” tal, o carecen de conciencia de grupo en un sentido u otro, tales agrupaciones (según clase social, etnia, raza, género, sexo, edad, discapacidad, etc.) facilitan la imprescindible labor investigadora y heurística, por mucho que las agrupaciones queden lejos de corresponder nítidamente con las realidades multifacéticas, polisémicas y cambiantes vividas por los integrantes de cada una de ellas. Además, si no se identifica a los colectivos más perjudicados histórica o actualmente por determinados procesos, creencias, decisiones o actuaciones socioculturalmente hegemónicas, difícilmente se podrán llevar adelante las políticas de discriminación positiva, diseñadas precisamente para contrarrestar los efectos nocivos de esos sesgos. Y en sentido contrario, demasiado fácil sería confundir las causas, por ejemplo, del fracaso escolar si nos limitáramos a identificar las causas a partir de cada caso individual (Fernández Enguita, et al., 2010; Perrenoud, 1990). De esa forma, no saldrían a la vista los puntos en común detectables en los distintos casos particulares. Esto es precisamente lo que ocurre con muchos procesos de diagnóstico de la inteligencia, según han denunciado Harry et al. (2007), entre muchos otros.

Es, asimismo, en ese delicado equilibrio entre la necesidad de clasificar y el peligro de sobre-clasificar donde se ha instalado una de las críticas postestructurales. Su crítica es legítima, pero, como advierte Boaventura de Sousa Santos (1999), siempre y cuando no impida estudiar tendencias grupales. Se trata de una cuestión muy pertinente a la situación escolar del alumnado \textit{Rromanò} porque, la propia Constitución Española de 1978, en su Artículo 14, declara que, “Los españoles son iguales ante la ley, sin que pueda prevalecer discriminación alguna por razón de nacimiento, raza, sexo, religión, opinión o cualquier otra condición o circunstancia

\textsuperscript{21}Observaciones basadas en la lectura de varias fuentes de noticias sobre este incidente. Véase, por ejemplo, Camacho, (2000, 12 de mayo; 2000, 18 de mayo).
personal o social.” Es más, la máxima ley educativa vigente, la LOE, prohíbe realizar comparaciones entre los resultados de las evaluaciones del alumnado de distintos centros, y lo establece precisamente para no perjudicar a ningún grupo o centro:

La finalidad establecida en el apartado anterior no podrá amparar que los resultados de las evaluaciones del sistema educativo, independientemente del ámbito territorial estatal o autonómico en el que se apliquen, puedan ser utilizados para valoraciones individuales de los alumnos o para establecer clasificaciones de los centros. (LOE, Artículo 140.2) (BOE, 2006)

Por esta razón, los centros a menudo carecen de informaciones de índole étnico-racial, para evitar las comparaciones extraoficiales. Puede que dicha información figure en las fichas de inscripción de cada alumna y alumno, pero se trata de información sensible que queda protegida por la Ley de Protección de Datos de 1999 (BOE, 1999).

Con todo, tampoco se pretende totalizar la representación de los Rromà. Su realidad sociocultural, igual que la de cualquier grupo, está continuamente cambiando, aspecto que recibe mayor atención en el capítulo 4 (Teasley, 2007), dedicado a explorar la formación de unas identitarias transnacionales de los Rromà a través del ciberespacio, y las implicaciones educativas de las mismas. Como parte de la indagación etnográfica realizada en el Instituto Central (capítulos 2 y 7), la investigadora visitó también, en unas cuatro ocasiones durante el curso 1999-2000, un asentamiento en el que habitaba la mayoría de las familias gitanas del Instituto. En una de las reuniones que se mantuvieron en el centro cívico de ese barrio, surgió el tema de la prueba de la virginidad en las bodas gitanas. Unas cuatro familias habían asistido a la reunión, primero ambos padres de cada familia, pero hacia el final quedaron sólo las madres y alguna abuela, más sus chicas y chicos. Surgió el tema en torno al papel cada vez más activo que juegan las mujeres gitanas en el asociacionismo en España, y el hecho de que sus papeles en sus respectivas comunidades estaban cambiando, en positivo. Una madre mencionó, en ese momento, la prueba de la virginidad al comentar que, “Está cambiando. Ya no se hace tanto.” A eso, otra madre bastante mayor que la primera añadió, “Sí, [una pariente] se casó y sólo sacaron un pañuelo, como, de mentira, manchado por la sangre de una cabra recién sacrificada.” El grupo de mujeres empezó a hablar mucho entre sí para reafirmar que la prueba de la virginidad, como ritual, se estaba
quedando en el pasado. Éstas eran mujeres que, sin embargo, vestían de manera bastante tradicional: faldas largas de muchos pliegues, chales, pelo largo y moños, y pendientes largos y vistosos. Ellas mismas detectaron y aprobaron estos cambios culturales.

Por lo tanto, esa realidad cultural también era gitana; no sólo existe la que el documental y mini-serie _Palabra de gitano_, de la cadena televisiva Cuatro, retransmitió en febrero de 2013, y que incluía una auténtica prueba de virginidad. Desde su primera emisión, las asociaciones gitanistas, como Fakali o el Consejo Estatal del Pueblo Gitano (Instituto de Cultura Gitana, 2013), no han dejando de denunciar los estereotipos presentes en la serie. Además, como señalan las investigaciones de los Estudios Culturales y postcoloniales, ningún grupo étnico, ni cultura identitaria, son monolíticos ni impenetrables, ni uniformes, ni necesariamente estables o permanentes (Appadurai, 1996; Bhabha, 1994; Gilroy, 2004; Giroux, 1994; Hall, 1996; Spivak, 1990). Pero como se hizo constar en la Introducción, así como en varios de los capítulos del compendio, en especial en el último (Teasley, 2013), no conviene dejar de hablar de grupos étnicos o raciales, o de clases sociales, en un contexto impregnado de racismo, etnocentrismo, xenofobia y clasismo.

El caso de los dos alumnos gitanos de Instituto Central resulta instructivo en otro sentido también porque revela el casi nulo reconocimiento de sus propias señas de identidad _Rromaní_ en el centro. Esa circunstancia de ausencia e incluso de representación negativa difícilmente permite considerar otras cuestiones importantes como el tipo, grado o calidad de reconocimiento que se da, cuando sí existe. Los dos alumnos preferían acudir a clases extraescolares en el centro cívico del barrio para aprender sobre su lengua histórica, el _Rromanò_ o _Rromanès_ —un tipo de aprendizaje que nunca se materializó en el Instituto, ni en el Aula 10, ni mucho menos en las aulas para todo el alumnado.

Dada esa realidad excluyente, cabe volver a considerar la noción de la _inclusión_. La inclusión, como concepto, claramente supera los usos excluyentes, excepcionales y/o asimilacionistas de la previamente establecida noción de la _integración_ (Booth y Ainscow, 1998; Parrilla Latas, 2005). En todo caso, si la _capacidad_ de incluir (o excluir) es principalmente unilateral, emprendida por los agentes institucionales y escolares (Ainscow, 2008), podemos entonces preguntar:
¿Quién tiene el poder de incluir a quién? y ¿Qué ocurre después de la primera fase de la inclusión —la de cumplir con el sólido objetivo de afianzar la “educación para todos”? Estas cuestiones constituyen un eje central del Movimiento por la Vida Independiente, formación transnacional compuesta principalmente por personas con discapacidad. Su lema, “Nada sobre nosotros sin nosotros” transmite su reivindicación nuclear (Charlton, 2000).

En línea con esta reivindicación, se puede además preguntar si el enfoque inclusivo sobre las instituciones o grupos y su poder de incluir o excluir corre el riesgo de convertirse en paternalista, al no reflejar tan claramente las dinámicas y los poderes más horizontales del hibridismo sociocultural (Hall, 1992) o de las *multidireccionalidades* de la integración (Teasley, 2008a). Esta integración multidireccional se aleja totalmente del sentido tradicionalmente asimilacionista del término “integración” para denotar un proceso mutuamente negociado y experimentado. Que el hecho de integrarse sea mutuamente consensuado y deseado en esta dialéctica entre grupos con intereses específicos ya sería otra fase adicional, prestando atención a los Estudios Culturales, la Educación Multicultural Crítica, la Educación Intercultural y Bilingüe, la Educación Anti-Opresiva y los estudios filosóficos sobre el cosmopolitismo (Benhabib, 2002, 2005, 2006; Darder, 2012; Gause, 2008, 2011; Kumashiro, 2008; Martín Rojo, et al., 2003; Martín Rojo y Mijares Molina, 2007; May, 1999; McCarthy y Dimitriadis, 2000; Sleeter, 1996; Young, 2002). Como explica Kumashiro (2008):

> La opresión no es únicamente “la suma de las partes [involucradas]”, lo cual significa que el activism no se puede abordar de manera aditiva. El activism anti-opresivo debe abordar las *intersecciones*. (p. 95, traducido del inglés, cursiva añadida)

En este sentido, se podría contemplar como un proceso posterior a la inclusión inicial realizada por la institución. En el capítulo 5 del compendio, *Perspectivas postcoloniales sobre la acogida del alumnado inmigrante en Galiza*,

22 Movimiento cuyo origen se remonta a los movimientos por los derechos civiles de las décadas de los años 60 y 70, y al establecimiento del Center for Independent Living, de Berkeley, California. La página web de este movimiento en España se encuentra en (consultada el 14 de enero de 2013): http://www.forovidaindependiente.org/.

23 “Oppression is not merely ‘the sum of its parts,’ which means that activism cannot be approached additively. Anti-oppressive activism must address intersections.”
España (2008), se ofrece una representación gráfica de esta forma de integración, que se reproduce aquí en la Figura 1.

Figura 1
Direccionalidades de la Integración

Finalmente, al insistir en la multidireccionalidad de las relaciones interculturales en las aulas, el foco apunta más hacia las relaciones con y menos hacia el ser incluido por alguien. Pensar en la direccionalidad de la inclusión e integración pone el énfasis en la iniciativa propia, la capacidad decidoria y, en gran medida, la emancipación del alumnado tradicionalmente excluido, y en las capacidades de todos los grupos a la hora de participar, interactuar, convivir y establecer posibles terrenos comunes entre ellos. Aparte de eso, existen muchos casos conocidos de la alumna o el alumno “incluidos” pero sólo parcialmente, pues una vez presentes en el aula o en el grupo, casi no tienen oportunidades para interactuar con los demás. En todos estos sentidos, la inclusión se presta más a un primer paso, para superar la exclusión. Otro paso más, o quizás la meta final, sería que todo el alumnado que conviva en el aula y centro “se integre” por voluntad propia. Esto supone que, una vez incluidos, puedan acceder a información muy
relevante y significativa que les hace comprender la injusticia que suponen los procesos de discriminación, asimilación y opresión.

Por eso, resulta tan importante trabajar las conceptualizaciones que enmarcan nuestra docencia, así como aprender contenidos culturales como, por un lado, la enseñanza culturalmente relevante (Ladson-Billings, 1994) y por otro, prestar atención a los temas como los 26 que las evaluaciones PISA no examinan, según (Torres Santomé, 2011, p. 198), y que incluirían: la educación ética y moral; la educación para la ciudadanía y los Derechos Humanos; la Educación para la Paz; la capacidad de resolución de conflictos; los conocimientos y capacidades para interpretar y situar momentos históricos, fenómenos políticos y sociales; y muchos más.

Otro autor que ha indagado a fondo en el lado axiológico, afectivo, anti-compititivo y no-violento de la educación es Xesús R. Jares, a través de la Educación para la Paz y los Derechos Humanos, la convivencia y la resolución de conflictos (Jares, 1998, 2001, 2004, 2007). Son temas que también Henry Giroux ha abordado desde los Estudios Culturales y la Pedagogía Crítica, y elaborado más reciente con sus estudios sobre lo que él denomina la cultura de la crueldad (Giroux, 2012a), en referencia no sólo a la violencia simbólica sino real del sistema educativo en EE.UU., así como la crisis de valores públicos (Giroux, 2012b), producto de la cultura neoliberal mundial en general.

Éstas cuestiones culturales, en el fondo, son también estructurales porque su “inclusión” en los programas de formación y en los curricula oficiales implica repensar los programas tanto de la educación no universitaria como de la superior. Y no sólo esas estructuras, sino también repensar la propia infraestructura de la economía política neoliberal, cada vez más globalizada, sobre la cual descansa la propia organización de la mayor parte de nuestras sociedades hoy día.

**Estructura y redistribución en la formación antisesgo para la justicia sociocultural**

La formación antisesgo del profesorado está pensada precisamente para desarrollarse en las intersecciones de los sesgos que operan en la sociedad. Pero según autoras feministas como Nancy Fraser (2000, 2008) y Lisa Duggan (2003), el
movimiento por la justicia sociocultural está afectado por la globalización y, por eso, está dividido entre políticas que atienden a la identidad cultural de los distintos grupos (el reconocimiento) y políticas que atienden a la clase social y la redistribución equitativa de los bienes sociales. Por esta razón, desde la perspectiva *antisesgo*, ambas vías o conductos (Teasley, 2009) hacia la justicia sociocultural precisan ser exploradas a fondo.

Un espacio de intersección entre estas vías se encuentra, por ejemplo, en la propia aula: en el proceso de deliberar con el alumnado sobre los porqués de la emigración y de la inmigración. El objetivo final sería crear un *terreno común* de encuentro entre las identidades culturales presentes en clase (Teasley, 2008a), al llegar a entender las cuestiones estructurales de fondo que motivan las migraciones. Se emigra, por ejemplo, para conseguir un trabajo o para adquirir capital cultural (Bourdieu, 2000) a través de formarse mejor, aprendiendo lenguas y otros conocimientos culturales y especializados. Pero también se migra porque las políticas neoliberales no dejan que grandes segmentos de las poblaciones mundiales vivan dignamente en sus propios países.

Además, no se debe dejar de lado la perspectiva histórica sobre estas dinámicas migratorias porque el pasado colonial ha propiciado la explotación neoliberal actual —o neocolonial— en los países del sur, previamente colonizados, mientras ha enriquecido exponencialmente determinados sectores de los países del norte. En cierto modo, este ejercicio pedagógico consistiría en iniciar en el aula “actos de resistencia” (Bourdieu, 1998) ante una fuerza mayor: el capitalismo neoliberal. Dicha resistencia configuraría un lugar de encuentro entre grupos étnicos normalmente enfrentados por tener que competir por los escasos puestos de trabajo que aquí tenemos.

Otra manera de encauzar estos “actos de resistencia” consistiría en revelar las injusticias provocadas por las distintas operaciones del neoliberalismo en los propios sistemas educativos en general. Por ejemplo, la política de la evaluación que se apoya en pruebas estandarizadas basadas sólo en los resultados del alumnado, y con consecuencias injustas tanto para ellos como para el profesorado. Son evaluaciones que en su “mensaje oculto” están destinados a otorgar fondos públicos a proyectos privatizadores en el ámbito educativo. Otras consecuencias son: la
desprofesionalización del profesorado mediante la intensificación de controles externos y centralizados pero con consecuencias locales; el aumento del ratio de alumnado por profesor/a; y un largo etcétera (Au y Temple, 2012; Puelles Benítez, 2006; Ravitch, 2010; Rodríguez Martínez y Foro de Sevilla, 2013; Saltman, 2009; Torres Santomé, 2005, 2007, 2011).

Aparte de estas dinámicas de aula, el primer artículo del compendio (Teasley, 1995) nos remite a cuestiones estructurales de la propia formación del profesorado. Las reformas estructurales recomendadas son: el establecimiento de una “misión” o filosofía principal para el programa; la colaboración y consolidación permanente entre los departamentos concretos de Educación; la extensión del programa en duración; mejores criterios para la selección y reclutamiento de participantes en el programa, especialmente participantes procedentes de las diversas culturas presentes entre el alumnado; un mejor apoyo económico al participante; escuelas y aulas de prácticas que comparten la filosofía del programa de formación; la incorporación de la investigación etnográfica, el estudio de casos, el estudio de la teoría crítica y la ética; el empleo de estructuras de aprendizaje cooperativo; el desarrollo de un conocimiento de métodos específicos, variados y flexibles para hacer más accesibles las áreas curriculares a los alumnos que hablan lenguas o que practican culturas que no se contemplan normalmente desde la cultura escolar; el desarrollo de una base de conocimiento interdisciplinario sobre las culturas relevantes; y el desarrollo de relaciones públicas para involucrar a miembros de la comunidad local en la educación de sus hijos e hijas.

A todas esas sugerencias cabría añadir la formación en la investigación-acción (Carr y Kemmis, 1988; Elliott, 1993; Fine, 2006; Kemmis y McTaggart, 1992; Zeichner, 2010; Zeichner, 2010), para que el profesorado tanto en formación como en activo tenga una herramienta y vea la necesidad de seguir investigando durante su vida profesional. Otro componente consistiría en la promoción de experiencias transnacionales o intercambios durante la formación, así como la adecuada financiación para que éstas se lleven a cabo sin mayores gastos para el estudiantado24. Experimentar en primera persona cómo se siente al no poder contar

24 Un ejemplo son los programas de “internacionalización” que ahora están en pleno florecimiento en las universidades españolas, aunque no necesariamente por las mismas razones que las que se han expuesto en esta tesis.
con las mismas referencias culturales de siempre, o al tener que hacer esfuerzo por expresarse y por hacerse entender, es una de las mejores y más directas maneras de acercarse a una comprensión intercultural más profunda (De Vitis, 1991).

Finalmente, los programas de formación del profesorado deberían reforzar, transversalmente, sus perspectivas críticas más allá de la Teoría Crítica, los Estudios de Género, la Pedagogía Crítica o la Educación Inclusiva, incorporando el estudio de campos más recientes de investigación como los Estudios Culturales, los Estudios Queer, o los Estudios Postcoloniales. En principio, todas estas cuestiones deberían recibir un tratamiento transversal en el plan de estudios de la formación antisedgo del profesorado. Asimismo, todas ellas se enlazan con el fomento en el profesorado de una visión reflexiva de su propia labor (Franklin y Kliebard, 2000; Hargreaves, 1996; Jackson, 1994; Stenhouse, 1991) y de su papel como el de intelectuales públicos, activistas y contra-hegemónicos (Apple, 1986, 2010; Collins, 2012; Giroux, 1988; McLaren y Farahmandpur, 2006).

Sin embargo, este marco para el cambio sólo roza la superficie del problema. Debemos seguir identificando y cuestionando la reproducción, dentro del sistema educativo, de normas y asunciones culturales —o sesgos— que carecen de significado para mucha juventud hoy en día, y que pueden incluso perjudicarla. En este sentido, en la formación del profesorado tendríamos que incidir mucho más en las formas en que se instalan los sesgos en nuestros sistemas educativos y en nuestra práctica profesional. El habitus de Bourdieu (1990) representa una herramienta analítica útil para este fin. Según Stephen May (1999), el habitus facilita la labor de entender tanto los límites como los hibridismos culturales, así como los puntos de distinción y de encuentro entre colectivos, y entre pasado, presente y futuro. Fue teorizado por Bourdieu para explorar la desigualdades de poder entre grupos dominantes y grupos subordinados, sobre todo el poder de los primeros de dotar una práctica cultural u otra de suficiente capital cultural o económico. Mientras el habitus, como punto de referencia de clase social y de distinción cultural, se concibe como bastante estable en el tiempo, esto no quiere decir que no sea susceptible de modificaciones o de cambios mayores.

Una última reflexión con respecto a las políticas neoliberales extra-educativas y sus efectos en los sistemas educativos: En la Introducción se hizo referencia al
nuevo libro de John Marsh (2011) en el que el autor concluye que para crear sistemas educativos mucho más equitativos y justos, se necesitaría reforzar, más que la propia práctica profesional del profesorado, las políticas socioeconómicas del bienestar y el sindicalismo, tanto el del profesorado como de los demás sectores. Este autor, por lo tanto, no tiene mucha confianza en el potencial transformador de la enseñanza. Es lógico que no la tenga, considerando las políticas de la contención y sus efectos en las comunidades más desfavorecidas: las familias, ya antes de que sus hijos e hijas pisen las escuelas, son conducidas hacia la miseria y la segregación de facto (Lipman, 2011; Pedroni, 2011), lo cual ocurre también con los Rromà, incluso con tácticas mucho más directas y drásticas (Liégeois, 2007; Teasley, 2013). Esta situación recuerda las primeras líneas de la conocida canción de Tracy Chapman, *Across the lines* (Chapman, 1988):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Across the lines</em></td>
<td>Al otro lado de las vías</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Who would dare to go?</em></td>
<td>¿Quién se atrevería a ir?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Under the bridge</em></td>
<td>Por debajo del puente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Over the tracks</em></td>
<td>Cruzando los raíles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>That separate whites from blacks</em></td>
<td>Que separan a los blancos de los negros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dada esta realidad social de fondo tan injusta, nos incumbe como educadoras y educadores intentar detenerla. Más allá de las recomendaciones de Marsh (2011), que el pedagogo crítico Curry Malott (2013) encuentra todavía insuficientes —opina que el problema supera la mera redistribución de los bienes sociales porque lo que supone la causa-raíz de la desigualdad son las propias relaciones de producción capitalista— podemos probar el poder transformador de las pedagogías reseñadas en esta tesis. Inspirada en Paulo Freire y en la gran mayoría de los autores y autoras presentadas en este compendio, esta investigadora sí confía en nuestro potencial colectivo para emprender un viaje educativo hacia terrenos más propicios para la convivencia en dignidad para todas y todos.
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