Pedagogía Social
REVISTA INTERUNIVERSITARIA
Journal of Research in Social Pedagogy

eISSN: 1989-9742 © SIPS. DOI: 10. SE7179/PSRI_2017.29.02
http://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/PSRI/

INCLUSIVE CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION. THE FUNCTIONS OF SOCIAL EDUCATORS IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

EDUCACIÓN INTERCULTURAL INCLUSIVA. FUNCIONES DE LOS/AS EDUCADORES/AS SOCIALES EN INSTITUCIONES EDUCATIVAS

EDUCAÇÃO INTERCULTURAL INCLUSIVA. FUNÇÕES DE Os/AS EDUCADORES/AS SOCIAIS EM INSTITUIÇÕES EDUCATIVAS

Teresa TERRÓN-CARO, Rocío CÁRDENAS-RODRÍGUEZ
& Rocío RODRÍGUEZ CASADO
Universidad Pablo de Olavide

Received date: 02.IX.2016
Reviewed date: 08.IX.2016
Accepted date: 02.XI.2016

KEY WORDS:
Social Education
Social Educator
cultural diversity
cross-cultural
education
school

ABSTRACT: Cross-culturalism in schools, as a focus of the treatment and management of cultural diversity in educational institutions, requires measures at the pedagogical level which are based on a cross-cultural, egalitarian education, promoting socio-educational conditions that will make people aware of the cultural diversity which surrounds them and give equal rights to all persons. Coordination and collaboration between all of the agents who intervene in an educational institution which aims to bring about a transformation for the better and the inclusion of all persons should be conceived in a natural manner. In this regard, the paper focuses on the profile of social educators as essential figures in schools, and who have recently been recognized as professionals within the sphere of regulated education (Jiménez Jiménez, 2013). In short, they are professionals in those educational institutions whose aim is to create a transformative, renovative, innovative educational culture. The objective of this research is to ascertain the functions and competencies –individual and/or shared- performed by social educators in schools in Andalusia in order to intervene with ethnic minorities and in cross-cultural education, as one of their fields of action. Quantitative research methodology using surveys was employed to gather information by means of a questionnaire. According to the results of the study, the functions most frequently performed by social educators are as intermediaries between all of the members of the educational community in the quest to improve harmony in the school, and in questions related to the design, coordination, development and evaluation of socio-educational integration programs and projects.

CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORS: Teresa Terrón-Caro. Facultad de Ciencias Sociales Edificio 11, Despacho nº 17 (segunda planta). Ctra. de Utrera, 1, 41013 Sevilla. Correo Electrónico / E-mail: mttercar@upo.es
FUNDING: Universidad Pablo de Olavide. Proyecto de Investigación "Atención a la diversidad cultural en instituciones educativas". Investigación enmarcada en el Grupo Emergente de Investigación SE-457.

PALABRAS CLAVES:
Educación Social
Educador/a social
diversidad cultural
educación
intercultural
escuela

RESUMEN: La interculturalidad en la escuela, como enfoque de atención y gestión de la diversidad cultural en las instituciones educativas, exige medidas a nivel pedagógico basadas en una educación intercultural e igualitaria, favoreciendo condiciones socioeducativas para que las personas sean conscientes de la diversidad cultural que les rodea y de la igualdad de derechos de todas las personas. La coordinación y colaboración entre todos los agentes que intervienen en una institución educativa, que pretende la transformación para la mejora e inclusión de todos y todas, debe ser concebida de forma natural. En este sentido, el presente artículo se centra en el perfil de los/as educadores/as sociales como figura imprescindible en los centros escolares y reconocida recientemente como profesional del ámbito reglado (Jiménez Jiménez, 2013). En suma, profesional de aquellas instituciones educativas en las que se pretende conseguir una cultura educativa transformadora, renovadora e innovadora. El objetivo de esta investigación es conocer las funciones y competencias –singulares y/o compartidas- que realizan los y las educadores y educadoras sociales en los centros educativos de Andalucía para intervenir con minorías étnicas y educación intercultural, como uno de sus ámbitos de actuación. La metodología de investigación es cuantitativa, usando como técnica de recogida de información la encuesta y el instrumento utilizado ha sido el cuestionario. Según los resultados del estudio, las funciones que los/as educadores/as sociales realizan con mayor asiduidad se refieren a la intermediación entre todos los miembros de la comunidad educativa para el logro de una mejora en la convivencia escolar y en cuestiones de diseño, coordinación, desarrollo y evaluación de programas/proyectos de integración socioeducativa.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE:
Educador social
diversidade cultural
educação
intercultural
escola

RESUMO: O modelo intercultural nas instituições de ensino requer medidas pedagogicamente com base na educação intercultural e promovendo a igualdade de condições para as pessoas a ter consciência da diversidade cultural em torno deles e os direitos iguais de todas as pessoas. Coordenação e colaboração entre todos os atores envolvidos em uma instituição educacional, que visa melhorar a transformação ea inclusão de todas as pessoas, deve ser concebido naturalmente. Neste artigo vamos olhar para uma figura que consideramos essencial nas instituições de ensino, sendo reconhecido recentemente como um nível formal de centros profissionais, como evidenciado Jimenez Jimenez (2013). Especialmente nessas instituições é de alcançar uma cultura de transformação e renovação da escola. Referimo-nos aos educadores sociais. O objetivo desta pesquisa é conhecer e as funções e competências que os educadores e assistentes sociais nas escolas da Andaluzia para intervir com as minorias étnicas e educação intercultural, como uma das suas áreas de actividade. A metodologia da pesquisa é quantitativa, utilizando como técnica de coleta de informações eo instrumento de pesquisa utilizado foi o questionário. De acordo com os resultados do estudo, os papéis que os assistentes sociais realizaram mais freqüentemente se referem a intermediação entre todos os membros da comunidade educativa para alcançar uma melhoria na vida escolar e problemas de design, coordenação, desenvolvimento e avaliação programas / projectos de integração social.

1. Introduction

The cross-cultural model, as a discourse in the context of the cultural diversity typical of democratic societies, requires pedagogical measures based on cross-cultural, egalitarian education which promotes the necessary conditions for people to be aware of the cultural diversity that surrounds them and of the equal rights of all people. In this regard, understanding cross-culturalism as a way of thinking, a socio-educational practice and a reflection on education as a process of cultural transmission and construction, this model should activate:

> (...) educational practices aimed at each and every one of the members of society as a whole; (...) a model for analysis and action that affects all dimensions of the educational process. It aims to achieve equality of opportunity (understood as opportunities to choose and to access social, economic and educational resources), to overcome racism and equip everyone, whatever their cultural reference group, with cross-cultural competency (Aguado, 2004, p. 40).

This vision of cross-cultural education requires the construction of a public ethic and institutional responses based on cross-culturalism, constructed on the basis of fundamental principles such as equality of rights, and equity, understanding that students should not encounter barriers in their learning.

As mentioned above, cross-culturalism is, or should be, a practice which affects all groups. According to Merino Fernández (2013, p. 161), it is understood as an "(...) educational model that facilitates the development of a cross-cultural society and inclusive schools". This educational model is accompanied by an increase in the participation of the entire educational community in learning processes (Banks, 2008). In short, it requires the construction of a shared school culture, accompanied by transformation and improvement based on the solution of problems through cooperation,

eISSN: 1989-9742 © SIPS. DOI: 10. SE7179/PSRI_2017.29.02
http://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/PSRI/

using different methodologies in which all of the community feels that it is a participant (Moliner, Sales & Escobedo, 2016).

García-Cano, Márquez and Antolínez (2016, p. 253) state that cross-culturalism is "very ideological in its approach, propositive in its interests and ambitious in its commitments". It is therefore understandable that today many studies, such as those by the authors cited above, focus on specific experiences and possible practices in inclusive cross-cultural education. We believe that enquiring into how this change is produced in the educational culture at school level (micro) will facilitate the detection of good educational innovation practices which lead to the consolidation of key factors of the keenly sought inclusive cross-cultural education.

In this regard, as one of the conclusions of their research, Moliner, Sales and Escobedo (2016, p. 52) indicate the relevance to teachers of

> (...) change that comes from the classroom, in practical terms, for the solution of day-to-day problems. Grand speeches and plans for improvement do not seem to motivate or change the attitude of resistance which education professionals display when faced with innovation. Endeavors should be focused on moving from personal dissatisfaction and the individual quest for solutions to collaboration, the creation of small communities of practice which contrast and share a discourse and practices which make sense. (...) (Moliner, Sales & Escobedo, 2016, p. 52).

We agree with these authors, and believe that transformation is largely achieved from the bottom up, through the involvement of the key players who take part in the teaching-learning process, and by recognizing the great importance of the role of the teacher in the process. This latter claim has been shared in the academic literature in recent years, and a transcendental role has been associated with the teacher, especially in schools where there is great cultural diversity, documenting the fact that teachers must evolve from being a mere transmitter of information to being an educator (Leiva, 2010).

This article, though, focuses on a figure who we also believe to be essential in educational institutions, having recently been formally recognized as a professional in the school, as noted by Jiménez Jiménez (2013), and all the more so in those schools which aim for a transformative, renovative educational culture. We are referring to social educators. Our study concentrates on the role that social educators play in the management of cultural diversity in schools in Andalusia, asking the following questions: What are the functions they perform, both individually and jointly with other professionals, in order to address cultural diversity in schools? Specifically, in educational intervention with ethnic minorities and cross-cultural education, what are the main functions that social educators perform and what type of functions are they - preventive, educational or mediation?

2. Justification

Coordination and collaboration between all of the agents involved in an educational institution that seeks transformation for the better and the inclusion of all, must be conceived naturally. As stated by the social educator Sarai Menacho (2013, p. 15), there must be networking between all of "(...) the social agents, institutions, social centres, associations, etc. All those of us who make up society have the responsibility to intervene in the all-round development of persons. There must be coordination in order to achieve a positive result".

For years, social education in the educational environment has been subtly integrating into the development of innovative activities designed to meet the emerging needs which are rapidly appearing in society and in schools. This reality has facilitated the formal, regulated inclusion of the social educator in schools in some regions of Spain, such as: Castilla la Mancha (2002), Extremadura (2002), Andalusia (2006) (Jiménez Jiménez, 2013). We must highlight, though, the need to continue working in this line, including the figure of the social educator as full members in their own right of the interdisciplinary teams that work in schools at a national level (López, 2013; Menacho, 2013). These professionals should be incorporated into all schools in order to work not just on the resolution of conflicts, but also "(...) on prevention and from a community perspective (...)" (Laorden, Prado & Royo, 2006, p. 91).

In different regions of Spain (Aragón, the Canary Islands, Castilla - León, Catalonia, Galicia, the Balearic Islands, Madrid, Navarre, the Basque Country and Valencia), social educators intervene with different projects and specific programs in the educational sphere through social services, associations, companies, local councils, etc., while in other regions they have for some time being demanding their formal incorporation into the academic sphere (CGCEES, 2015). The General Council of Colleges of Social Educators (CGCEES) campaigns for social education professionals to form part of the "Faculty of Teachers and/or to be members of the Department of Attention or Counseling for special educational needs, reporting to the head of Department, in collaboration with the school management and tutors, and

to undertake the function of liaison and direct mediation with all of the social resources of the community" (CGCEES, 2015, p. 19).

In Andalusia, where our study took place, the figure of the social educator in schools is regulated by the following measures of the Regional Ministry of Education:

- Resolution of 16 October 2006, of the Directorate General of Human Resources Management, which called for provisional coverage of social education posts in schools in the 2006-2007 academic year.
- Decree 19/2007, of 23 January, under which measures were adopted for the promotion of the Culture of Peace and the Improvement of Harmonious Coexistence in Schools, financed from public funds. This decree included the figure of the social educator in the "educational counseling teams which work with schools that attend to pupils facing special problems of harmonious coexistence at school (...)" (Article 36.1) and they could be seconded to the Counseling Department "in secondary schools which attend to pupils facing special problems of harmonious coexistence at school (...)" (Article 36.2).
- Instructions of 17 September 2010 of the Directorate General of Participation and Educational Innovation of the Regional Government of Andalusia, which regulates the intervention of social educators in the educational sphere. The first instruction states that "Social Educators join the educational system as professionals specialized in personal, social and family interventions, constituting an essential support and resource for the improvement of teaching actions in Schools and in Educational Communities".

Social educators are seconded to the Educational Counseling Teams, which are interdisciplinary and specialized. They support teaching activity and have a local perspective, and they contribute to educational dynamism and innovation (Law 17/2007, of 10 December, on Education in Andalusia). As mentioned above, a Secondary School may exceptionally second the social educators to the Counseling Department. Specifically, according to the Andalusian Regional Government (Instructions of 17 September 2010) the areas of action of these professionals in secondary schools in Andalusia are:

- Education for harmony and conflict resolution.
- Prevention, monitoring and control of truancy.
- Dynamization and family and community participation.
- Accompanying actions and tutoring for pupils in situations of risk.
- Education in values and social skills.
- Educational intervention with ethnic minorities and Cross-Cultural education.

3. Objectives and methodology

The purpose of this research was to ascertain the functions and competencies, whether exercised alone or shared, of social educators whose work in schools in Andalusia involves ethnic minorities or cross-cultural education.

The research methodology was quantitative, using a survey for data gathering by means of a questionnaire. With respect to the validation of the questionnaire, a review was first undertaken by experts in quantitative research methodology and in the subject matter. Secondly, the validation was performed by means of a pilot study. This validation process allowed the questionnaire to be fine tuned and, after the necessary changes, the final instrument to be used in the research was obtained.

The questionnaire was divided into four blocks: identification data; actions, measures and resources used to address cultural diversity in schools; functions and competencies of the social educator in the management of cultural diversity and, lastly, training in cultural diversity.

In this paper, we shall focus on the third block, on questions related to the shared and/or individual functions and competencies of social educators working in the field of the cultural diversity of pupils in schools in Andalusia. The functions considered in this study are:

1. The elaboration and evaluation of proposals for harmonious coexistence programs in the school in order to address cultural diversity at school.
2. Collaboration with the school management in the field of compliance with school rules and internal regulations.
3. The design, implementation and evaluation of proposals to promote relationships between the school and the local neighborhood.
4. Collaboration in the design of programs of education for tolerance and equality, peace and other programs determined by the Counseling Department, the school management or other organs.
5. The creation of spaces and mediation and negotiation working teams to promote efficiency in conflict resolution.
6. The monitoring and control of truancy, academic failure and violence.

eISSN: 1989-9742 © SIPS. DOI: 10. SE7179/PSRI_2017.29.02
http://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/PSRI/

7. Monitoring of and collaboration in the schools' response to pupils displaying problematic behavior.
8. The development of programs to prevent and address conflictive activity at school. School integration programs.
9. The planning, coordination and development, together with the Counseling Department, of complementary and out-of-school activities, or with the Parents' Association or the School Council, and contextualized socio-cultural activities that improve relationships between the school and its surrounding neighborhood and which encourage the creation of stable communication networks.
10. The programming and execution, together with the Counseling Department and the school management, of actions aimed at guaranteeing the communication of the necessary information to the families with respect to the educational process of their children.
11. Information, counseling and advisory programs for pupils.
12. Participation in advisory, training and parents' association programs.
13. Support for teacher training.
14. Participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through socio-psycho-pedagogical evaluations.
15. Participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through the elaboration and development of Individualized Curricular Adaptations (ICAs).
16. Participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through the elaboration and development of Individualized Treatment Programs for combined teaching and collaboration in advice to parents.
17. Participation in innovative projects and training actions related to cultural diversity.
18. The coordination of the actions of the School with the Municipal Social Services, through the local Social Work Units, in the case of pupils in situations of risk or social disadvantage, in order to apply the specific measures for attention and to implement the socio-family intervention in an integrated manner.

Continuing with the description of the questionnaire, each thematic block was made up of closed, single-answer questions, multiple-choice questions and open questions.

With respect to information gathering, the questionnaires were delivered to schools in Andalusia where a social educator had been appointed following the publication of the "Instructions of the Directorate General of Participation and Educational Innovation which govern the intervention of social educators in schools" (Regional Government of Andalusia, Regional Ministry of Education, 2010), and in some schools which had a significant number of pupils of foreign heritage. For this study, this first sampling criterion was considered essential, since it allowed us to take an overview of the object of study, without the interference of preferences or the degree of accessibility of same. Of the 66 social educators who joined schools in the 2009 – 2010 academic year, a total of 37 completed the questionnaire. Lastly, it should be highlighted that the information obtained was processed with the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, updated version) program.

4. Results of the study

4.1. Profile of the educators in the schools

To begin the analysis, 61.1% of the educators interviewed were women and 38.9% were men, a question that is related to the fact that studies in social education and in the field of education have a higher proportion of women than men. According to the PISA Report (2012), the field of education is one of the professional areas with greatest gender segregation, with women representing 70% and men, 30%.

With respect to the qualifications held by the study sample, 67.6% of the persons surveyed held Social Education qualifications and were hired in that capacity, and 24.3% held a bachelor's degree, mostly in psycho-pedagogy. The rest of the subjects in the sample were: pedagogues (21.6%), psychologists (2.7%), social workers (2.7%), primary school teachers (2.7%) and others (2.7%). All of them were selected to form part of this study since, in their professional activity, they were responsible for managing cultural diversity in their respective schools.

With regard to the educational sphere in which the subjects of this research worked, the majority were employed in Secondary Education (58.3%), while only 8.3% worked in Primary Education and the rest (33.3%) worked in both Primary and Secondary Education. The data presented confirms that most of the professionals are employed in Secondary Education, where the management of cultural diversity is more relevant, since adolescence is a stage in which cultural differences are accentuated. In this same line, Carabaña (2007), cited by García Castaño et al. (2008), indicates that the cultural perspective is more irrelevant at younger ages and increases during adolescence,

and so greater difficulties of harmonious coexistence arise during Secondary Education as a result of the existence of more significant differences between the pupils, especially those originated by ethnic-cultural diversity.

Most of the professionals involved in the study, 48.4%, formed part of the Counseling Teams in the schools, except in some cases in which they belonged to external counseling teams, from outside the school (19.4%), such as Educational Counseling Teams, or to mixed teams (in-house and external) of the school (19.4%) or, lastly, to the internal School Management team (3.2%). In this respect, according to the social educators, they were usually seconded to an Educational Counseling Team (in-house or external), and their usual functions included: harmonious coexistence and conflict resolution, prevention, monitoring and control of truancy, pupils at high psycho-social risk, attention to ethnic minorities and cross-cultural education, inter-institutional coordination and the generation of social networks.

4.2. The functions of social educators in schools in multicultural contexts

The results obtained indicate that educational agents, mainly social educators, perform different functions to address the matter of cultural diversity in their institutions. The data (with over 50% in all items) reveals that all of the functions contained in this study (*Table 1*) were performed jointly with other professionals, and not exclusively by the social educators. In this regard, socio-educational intervention in multicultural, holistic contexts requires multidisciplinary working teams, with persons of different professional profiles, including social educators.

For greater analytical and interpretative clarity regarding the functions performed in schools by the professionals surveyed, the most significant data is given below, taking into account the percentages obtained with respect to the execution of each function and whether each function was considered to be performed by social educators alone or shared.

Firstly, we shall highlight those **functions least performed** by social educators in the field of cultural diversity in the school. In this matter, we believe that it is important to highlight those functions about which the subjects do not respond or they answer that they do not know, with respect to the performance of the function in question and whether, in turn, it corresponds exclusively to their professional profile (Singular Function, hereinafter, SF), or whether it is a function that is performed jointly with other professionals in the school (Joint Function, hereinafter, JF).

- 81.8% of those surveyed declared that they did not perform the function of participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through the elaboration and development of the Individualized Treatment Program (ITP) for combined teaching with advice to parents *(Function nº 16, see Table 1).*
- 66.7% said that they did not perform the function of participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through the elaboration and development of Individualized Curricular Adaptations (ICAs) *(Function nº 15, see Table 1).*
- 45.5% responded that they did not perform the function of support for teacher training *(Function nº 13, see Table 1).* Though this is not a majority, the proportion of survey respondents who did not perform this function is considered to be a high percentage.
- 38.5% did not perform the function of participation in innovative projects and training actions related to cultural diversity *(Function nº 17, see Table 1).* This figure is not a majority either, but we highlight it as it is considered a high percentage and since it refers to the specific area of cultural diversity.
- 37.5% did not perform the function of participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through socio-psycho-pedagogical evaluations *(Function nº 14, see Table 1).* This percentage is also considered to be high, especially as regards the participation of social educators in advice on the social evaluation of students with difficulties.

With respect to the **functions which the social educators state that they perform** in the exercise of their profession in the school and in the field of cultural diversity, the following can be highlighted:

- Elaboration and evaluation of proposals for harmonious coexistence programs in the school to address cultural diversity at school, with 82.1%, of whom 81.8% consider this to be a JF.
- Collaboration with the school management in the field of compliance with school rules and internal regulations, with 81.1%, of whom 89.3% consider this to be a JF. In this matter, it is significant that 18.9% responded Don't Know/No Answer.
- Collaboration in the design of programs of education for tolerance and equality, peace and other programs determined by the Counseling Department, the school management or other organs, with 78.4%, of whom 92.3% considered this to be a JF. Likewise, we should highlight

eISSN: 1989-9742 © SIPS. DOI: 10. SE7179/PSRI_2017.29.02
http://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/PSRI/

in this item that 21.6% of the respondents answered Don't Know/No Answer.

- With the same positive percentage as the previous function, 78.4% of respondents stated that they did perform monitoring and collaboration tasks with students showing problematic behavior. However, the difference with the previous function was that 80% considered this to be a JF. This is considered significant, although 21.6% of those surveyed responded Don't Know/No Answer to this question.
- The planning, coordination and development, together with the Counseling Department, of complementary and/or out-of-school activities, or with the Parents' Association or the School Council, and contextualized socio-cultural activities that improve relationships between the school and its surrounding neighborhood and which encourage the creation of stable communication networks, with 79.3%, of whom 90.5% said that this function was a JF.
- The programming and execution, together with the Counseling Department and the school management, of actions aimed at guaranteeing the communication of the necessary information to the families with respect to the educational process of their children, with 79.3%, of whom 81.8% indicated that this was a JF.
- With respect to information, counseling and advisory programs for pupils, 85.2% of the professionals responded that this was a function performed in the school, of whom 81% considered it a JF.
- Participation in advisory, training and parents' association programs, 70.4% replied that this was one of the functions performed in the centre, of whom 81.3% considered it a JF.

In order to determine the functions that define the profile of social educators addressing cultural diversity in schools (SF), we underline those functions which are undertaken most by the professionals in the sample among those which are most performed (see *Table 1*). According to this study, the **singular functions (SF) of social educators are**:

- **94.6%** declare that they perform functions related to the development of programs to prevent and address conflictive activity at school as well as school integration programs. Of this number, **34.6%** considered it an SF.
- **78.4%** responded that they performed functions related to the coordination of the actions of the school with the Municipal Social Services through the Social Work Units in cases involving pupils in a situation of risk or social disadvantage. Of these, **33.3%** consider it to be an SF.
- **89.7%** indicated that they performed functions related to the design, implementation and evaluation of proposals to promote relationships between the school and the local neighborhood. Of these, **32%** considered it an SF.
- **96.6%** stated that they performed functions related to the monitoring and control of truancy, academic failure and violence. Of these, **30.8%** considered it an SF.

Also related to the singular functions of the professional profile of social education, it should be highlighted that both in function nº 16, regarding participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through the elaboration and development of Individualized Treatment Programs (ITPs) for combined teaching and collaboration on advice to parents, and in function nº 17, on participation in innovative projects and training actions related to cultural diversity (see *Table 1*), **89.2%** and **59.5%,** respectively, of the professionals responded Don't Know/No Answer to the question whether they were singular functions of the social educator's profile.

Table 1. Functions performed by social educators in their schools in the field of cultural diversity

	Functions performed	Yes	No	Don't Know/ No Answer	SF	Singular function (exclusive to my professional profile)
1	The elaboration and evaluation of proposals for harmonious coexistence programs in the school in order to address cultural diversity at school.	**82.1%**	17.9%	-	18.2%	
2	Collaboration with the school management in the field of compliance with school rules and internal regulations.	81.1%	-	18.9%	10.7%	
3	The design, implementation and evaluation of proposals to promote relationships between the school and the local neighborhood.	**89.7%**	10.3%	-	**32%**	
4	Collaboration in the development of programs of education for tolerance and equality, peace and other programs determined by the Counseling Department, the school management or other organs.	78.4%	-	21.6%	7.7%	
5	The creation of spaces and mediation and negotiation working teams to promote efficiency in conflict resolution.	**89.3%**	10.7%	-	21.7%	
6	The monitoring and control of truancy, academic failure and violence.	**96.6%**	3.4%	-	**30.8%**	
7	Monitoring of and collaboration in the schools' response to pupils displaying problematic behavior.	78.4%	-	21.6%	20%	
8	The development of programs to prevent and address conflictive activity at school. School integration programs.	**96.4%**	3.6%	-	**34.6%**	
9	The planning, coordination and development, together with the Counseling Department, of complementary and out-of-school activities, or with the Parents' Association or the School Council, and contextualized socio-cultural activities that improve relationships between the school and its surrounding neighborhood and which encourage the creation of stable communication networks.	**79.3%**	20.7%	-	9.5%	
10	The programming and execution, together with the Counseling Department and the school management, of actions aimed at guaranteeing the communication of the necessary information to the families with respect to the educational process of their children.	**79.3%**	20.7%	-	18.2%	
11	Information, counseling and advisory programs for pupils.	**85.2%**	14.8%	-	19%	
12	Participation in advisory, training and parents' association programs.	**70.4%**	29.6%	-	18.8%	
13	Support for teacher training.	**54.5%**	45.5%	-	18.2%	
14	Participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through socio-psycho-pedagogical evaluations.	**62.5%**	37.5%	-	13.3%	
15	Participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through the elaboration and development of curricular adaptations (ICAs).	**33.3%**	66.7%	-	12.5%	
16	Participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through the elaboration and development of ITPs for combined teaching and collaboration in advice to parents.	**18.2%**	81.8%	**89.2%***	*	
17	Participation in innovative projects and training actions related to cultural diversity.	**61.5%**	38.5%	**59.5%***	*	
18	The coordination of the actions of the School with the Municipal Social Services, through the local Social Work Units, in the case of pupils in situations of risk or social disadvantage, in order to apply the specific measures for attention and to implement the socio-family intervention in an integrated manner.	78.4%	-	21.6%	**33.3%**	

Source: Author.

eISSN: 1989-9742 © SIPS. DOI: 10. SE7179/PSRI_2017.29.02
http://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/PSRI/

In summary, it can be stated that most of the functions performed by social educators in schools and which address the matter of cultural diversity are usually shared (JF), despite these functions being defined as the tasks of the social educators. In turn, according to the responses of the social educators, most of their functions are related to the improvement of the climate at school, harmonious coexistence, truancy and the prevention and resolution of conflicts. These professionals are the nexus of union between the spheres of school, family and neighborhood, and these functions are considered more appropriate for social educators (SF).

The functions which are least attributed to social educators are those related to psycho-pedagogical attention, with three of the functions being considered inappropriate for social educators but, in our opinion, they are crucial to the cross-cultural focus. They are: teacher training, participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity in individualized curricular adaptations (ICAs), and participation in innovative projects and training actions related to cultural diversity.

Having evaluated the most significant data from this study, we can identify the singular functions which correspond to the social educator in the field of cultural diversity and compare them to the general functions indicated by the Regional Ministry of Education of the Andalusian Regional Government (2010) in the Instructions of the Directorate General of Participation and Educational Innovation which regulate the intervention of Social Educators in the field of education. It is important to remark that these Instructions contain a general description of the functions in all areas of intervention in which it is specified that a social educator should work, according to the Regional Ministry of Education of the Andalusian Regional Government (2010). In contrast, our research makes special mention of the field related to "educational intervention with ethnic minorities and Cross-Cultural Education".

Table 2: List of general and specific functions of the Social Educator in the field of education

GENERAL FUNCTIONS ANDALUSIAN REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	SINGULAR FUNCTIONS IN THE FIELD OF CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION DETECTED IN THE STUDY
Monitoring of truant pupils and mediation between the family and the school.	Monitoring and control of truancy, academic failure and violence. The design, implementation and evaluation of proposals to promote relationships between the school and the local neighborhood.
Mediation in conflicts: pupils-school, family-school and pupil-family.	The development of programs to prevent and address conflictive activity at school. School Integration Programs. The programming and execution, together with the Dept. of Counseling and the school management, of actions aimed at guaranteeing the communication of the necessary information to the families with respect to the educational process of their children.
Intervention with pupils and families in problems of harmonious coexistence.	The coordination of the actions of the School with the Municipal Social Services, through the local Social Work Units, in the case of pupils in situations of risk or social disadvantage, in order to apply the specific measures for attention and to implement the socio-family intervention in an integrated manner. The creation of spaces and mediation and negotiation working teams to promote efficiency in conflict resolution. Monitoring of and collaboration in the schools' response to pupils displaying problematic behavior. The development of programs to prevent and address conflictive activity at school. School Integration Programs.
Mentoring of pupils in situations of risk.	–
Organization and development of training activities for the families of pupils in situations of risk.	Participation in advisory, training and parents' association programs.
Coordination of out-of-school activities for students in situations of risk.	The planning, coordination and development, together with the Dept. of Counseling, of complementary and out-of-school activities, or with the Parents' Association or the School Council, and contextualized socio-cultural activities that improve relationships between the school and its surrounding neighborhood and which encourage the creation of stable communication networks.

Table 2: List of general and specific functions of the Social Educator in the field of education

GENERAL FUNCTIONS ANDALUSIAN REGIONAL GOVERNMENT	SINGULAR FUNCTIONS IN THE FIELD OF CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION DETECTED IN THE STUDY
Monitoring of the non-classroom activities of pupils.	Information, counseling and advisory programs for pupils.
Collaboration in healthy lifestyle programs.	–
Organization and development of socio-educational programs.	–
Development of leisure and free time activities with pupils in situations of risk.	–
Development of programs of social, communication and relationship skills with pupils in situations of risk.	–
Development of programs for multicultural integration.	–
Development of programs of education in values: education for citizenship, for the environment, etc, with pupils in situations of risk.	–
Coordination of local resources for use by pupils in situations of risk.	The design, implementation and evaluation of proposals to promote relationships between the school and the local neighborhood.
Collaboration with the teaching staff in running the harmony classroom.	The elaboration and evaluation of proposals for harmonious coexistence programs in the school in order to address cultural diversity at school.
–	Collaboration with the school management in the field of compliance with school rules and internal regulations.
Performance of all other actions or activities as necessary, at the request of the Educational Authorities.	–

Source: Author, from the Instructions of the Director General of Participation and Educational Innovation which regulates the intervention of Social Educators in schools (2010) and the data obtained in the study presented in this article.

Some of the functions shown in Table 2, laid down by the Directorate General of Participation and Educational Innovation, do not have equivalents among the functions identified in our study, since some of them have little relevance to the field of cultural diversity, or they fall within other functions which have been defined in more general terms. In all events, almost all of the functions defined by the Directorate General as singular functions of social educators in the field of education coincide with those established in this study within the more specific field of cultural diversity.

At a more systematic level, Arrikaberi et al. (2013, p. 14-15), in line with ASEDES (2007), establish three types of function performed by social educators in schools:

(...) **1.- Preventive Functions.** Detection and evaluation of educational needs associated with situations of risk; detection and prevention of risk factors which could lead to favorable educational situations, prevention and treatment of truancy and violence; implementation of programs for the prevention of unhealthy habits among pupils, parents and the rest of the educational community.

2.- Educational Functions. Participation in the elaboration of the Tutorial Action Plan, an academic and professional counseling program and a program of out-of-school and complementary activities; the creation of channels for participation with groups and institutions in the community; intervention with parents in training and informative sessions or the creation of

eISSN: 1989-9742 © SIPS. DOI: 10. SE7179/PSRI_2017.29.02
http://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/PSRI/

family schools; coordination of the interventions of social educators with those of the Social Services and the Health Centre, community resources, etc.

3.- Mediation Functions. Mediation in situations of conflict at school, outside school and/or in the family; participation in the elaboration, execution, implementation and evaluation of the School Harmonious Coexistence Plan (Arrikaberi et al., 2013, p. 14-15).

In this regard, the functions that we have detected in this study are listed in the following table, with the three types of function proposed by Arribakeri et al.[1] (2013). In Table 3, the functions undertaken by social educators in the field of cultural diversity at school can be seen, highlighting **those which scored a higher percentage and establishing whether they are preventive, educational and/or mediation functions**:

Table 3: Types of functions of social educators in the field of cultural diversity in schools

Funciones	Porcentaje obtenido	Preventivas	Educativas	Mediadoras
The monitoring and control of truancy, academic failure and violence. **(Singular Function)**	96.60%	X	-	X
The development of programs to prevent and address conflictive activity at school. School Integration Programs. **(Singular Function)**	96.40%	X	-	X
The design, implementation and evaluation of proposals to promote relationships between the school and the local neighborhood. **(Singular Function)**	89.70%	X	-	X
The creation of spaces and mediation and negotiation working teams to promote efficiency in conflict resolution.	89.30%	X	-	X
Information, counseling and advisory programs for pupils.	85.20%	X	-	
The elaboration and evaluation of proposals for harmonious coexistence programs in the school in order to address cultural diversity at school.	82.10%	X	-	X
Collaboration with the school management in the field of compliance with school rules and internal regulations.	81.10%	X	-	X
The planning, coordination and development, together with the Dept. of Counseling, of complementary and out-of-school activities, or with the Parents' Association or the School Council, and contextualized socio-cultural activities that improve relationships between the school and its surrounding neighborhood and which encourage the creation of stable communication networks.	79.30%	-	X	-
The programming and execution, together with the Counseling Department and the school management, of actions aimed at guaranteeing the communication of the necessary information to the families with respect to the educational process of their children.	79.30%	X	-	-
The coordination of the actions of the School with the Municipal Social Services, through the local Social Work Units, in the case of pupils in situations of risk or social disadvantage, in order to apply the specific measures for attention and to implement the socio-family intervention in an integrated manner. **(Singular Function)**	78.40%	-	X	X
Collaboration in the design of programs of education for tolerance and equality, peace and other programs determined by the Counseling Department, the school management or other organs.	78.40%	X	X	-
Monitoring of and collaboration in the schools' response to pupils displaying problematic behavior.	78.40%	X	X	X
Participation in advisory, training and parents' association programs.	70.40%	X	X	-

Table 3: Types of functions of social educators in the field of cultural diversity in schools

Funciones	Porcentaje obtenido	Preventivas	Educativas	Mediadoras
Participation in and advice on the treatment of diversity through socio-psycho-pedagogical evaluations.	62.50%	X	X	-
Participation in innovation projects and training actions related to cultural diversity.	61.50%	-	X	-
Support for teacher training.	54.50%	-	X	-

Source: Author.

Table 3 shows that 16 (of the 18 functions studied) have obtained a higher percentage. The two functions not included in this table were given very low scores and referred to psycho-pedagogical functions, since they involved the intervention of the social educator in curricular adaptations and individualized planning of teaching-learning processes, functions which are not those of social educators.

In turn, it can be seen from Table 3 that the functions most frequently performed by social educators in the field of cultural diversity at school are preventive and mediation functions, since they have the highest scores and are, in fact, considered to be singular functions of social educators. Educational functions are those which have received the lowest scores and are not considered (except in one case) to be singular functions of social educators, but joint functions which the social educators share with other professionals.

5. Conclusions

We present below some of the conclusions drawn from this study. It is important to recall that this study refers not just to the functions of social educators in a school context but specifically to their intervention in the field of cultural diversity, that is to say, in multicultural school contexts.

Social educators who work in the schools sampled in Andalusia declare that they perform different functions in the field of *Educational intervention with ethnic minorities and cross-cultural education,* performing them, in the main, jointly with other professionals. We can therefore state that socio-educational intervention in multicultural and holistic realities requires multidisciplinary working teams whose members have different professional profiles, among which are the social educators.

In turn, most of the functions of social educators in the field of cultural diversity in schools are related to truancy, conflict at school, situations of risk or socio-cultural disadvantage. That is, preventive and mediation functions. However, we should not associate the figure of social educator exclusively with schools located in areas of social transformation or educational compensation zones, that is, they do not just perform their functions in contexts of social disadvantage, and it is important to incorporate the figure of social educator in all schools, since the socio-educational reality of schools is increasingly complex and requires the collaboration of social educators who can provide an educational complement to the intervention provided by the educational system.

According to the results of this study, the functions most frequently performed by social educators are mediation between all of the members of the educational community in order to improve harmony at school and in questions related to the design, coordination, development and evaluation of socio-educational integration programs and projects.

In this regard, this study agrees with the results of the study by Conde and Tirado (2013) which showed that social educators performed, firstly, educational mediation functions between pupils and the rest of the educational community and, secondly, that they performed tasks related to the relationship between the school and the families of pupils and, lastly, that they collaborated in the development of programs for education in values and the improvement of harmony at school. That is to say, they are all functions related to:

- Mediation in conflicts.
- Joint activities with other local schools and institutions.
- The Harmony Classroom.

We believe it is important to mention that the functions which social educators report that they perform least are those that Arribakeri et al. (2013) called "Educational Functions". These functions referred to participation in individualized curricular adaptations and in individualized programs, that is, they are functions more suited to other professionals, and although they are

eISSN: 1989-9742 © SIPS. DOI: 10. SE7179/PSRI_2017.29.02
http://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/PSRI/

not singular functions, social educators can participate in these processes in order to improve the academic (and social) integration of pupils and their families. In fact, most of the survey respondents declared that they belonged to the Counseling Teams, which would allow social educators to participate in these processes. On this point, we understand that the "Educational Functions" mentioned by Arribakeri et al. (2013) refer to functions related to instructive teaching or psycho-pedagogical processes. From our point of view, we understand that all the functions performed by social educators (we refer to preventive and mediation functions) should also be considered educational functions.

Therefore, and taking the information gathered in our study into account, we propose the following classification of the functions performed by social educators in schools: Preventive Functions, Instructive or Counseling Functions and Mediation Functions, since all the processes in which social educators in schools are involved are educational processes.

Another of the results to be highlighted in this study is that social educators are usually present in secondary schools, but are hardly found in primary schools. It is important for social educators to be integrated into the whole educational system, intervening from the very first years of the school life of pupils, thereby contributing to equality of opportunity, preventing truancy and conflict situations, improving harmony in the school and encouraging appreciation of cultural diversity. To this end, the necessary channels must be created for the figure of the social educator to be understood, accepted and valued by all of the educational community (political and educational institutions, headteachers, administration personnel, teachers, pupils and families).

With respect to the field of cultural diversity in schools, it is important for the educational community to understand that cross-cultural education does not refer to specific actions or out-of-school activities which are closer to folklore than to the political-pedagogical and socio-educational approach implicit in cross-culturalism. To this end, in order to understand the importance of social educators in schools as part of the intervention to promote cross-cultural education, the educational community should become more aware that in order to promote cross-culturalism, it is essential to work to encourage equity, equal opportunities, harmony and conflict resolution in multicultural contexts, which are the singular functions of social educators.

As a future line of research and in accordance with the results obtained, it can be concluded that further work to identify good cross-cultural practices and training in cultural diversity through social education at school is both necessary and important. In the same way, as in all research, we must take into account the limitations in the methodological approach and fieldwork, especially with regard to the participation of the subjects studied, as well as other external factors which, in practice, exert a practical influence.

With this study, we continue to back the management of cultural diversity through cross-culturalism, which is understood as the achievement of cultural harmony, respect for cultural diversity and dialogue between different cultural groups, whose purpose is to reach out to all of the pupils, prioritizing solidarity, harmony and reciprocity between cultures (Terrón-Caro et al., 2015). We should add to this idea, as can be taken from this research, the need also to work on cultural diversity through the involvement of all of the socio-educational agents of the Educational Community in a school (teachers, pupils, families, school management and other socio-educational agents inside and outside the school).

As a final contribution and, in agreement with Terrón-Caro et al. (2015), we must continue to fight inequality, through the empowerment of the educational community and the full inclusion of all pupils, regardless of ethnicity, culture, social status or religion. This is one of the roads along which we can progress towards the improvement of education, which, obviously, concerns us all.

References

Aguado, T. (2004). La investigación en Educación Intercultural. *Educatio,* 22, 39-57. Retrieved from: http://www2.uned.es/grupointer/educatio_04_investig_edu_inter.pdf.

Arribakeri, M., Caballero, M. Huarte, J., Tanco, C. Biurrum, A. Etayo, Y., & Urdániz, S. (2013). Educadores y Educadoras Sociales en los Centros Educativos. *RES. Revista de Educación Social*, nº 16, enero. Retrieved from http://www.eduso.net/res/pdf/16/amesnavarra_res_16.pdf.

Banks, J.A. (2008). Diversity, Group Identity and Citizenship Education in a Global Age, *Educational Researcher,* 37 (3), pp. 129-139.

Conde Vélez, S., & Tirado Morueta, R (2013). Convivencia escolar como espacio profesionalizador del educador/a social. *RES Revista de Educación Social*. nº 16. Retrieved from: http://www.eduso.net/res/?b=20&c=194&n=641

Consejería de Educación, Junta de Andalucía (2010). Instrucciones de la Dirección General de Participación e Innovación Educativa por las que se regula la intervención del educador y educadora social en el ámbito educativo. Retrieved from:http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/educacion/webportal/abaco-portlet/content/bcf29fb5-6823-4fe2-a0f4-0277cbeb2365.

Consejo General de Colegios de Educadoras y Educadores Sociales (2015). *La Educación Social en el Estado Español: La profesión educativa emergente dentro y fuera del ámbito educativo*. Retrieved from http://ceesg.org/users/ceesg/obxetos/cgcees-es-en-centros-educativos-noviembre-2015.pdf.

Decreto 167/2003, de 17 de junio, por el que se establece la ordenación de la atención educativa a los alumnos y alumnas con necesidades educativas especiales asociadas a condiciones sociales desfavorecidas. BOJA nº 118 (2003).

Decreto 19/2007, de 23 de enero, por el que se adoptan medidas para la promoción de la Cultura de Paz y la Mejora de la Convivencia en los Centros Educativos sostenidos con fondos públicos. Boletín Oficial de la Junta de Andalucía, nº 25. Retrieved from: http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/boja/2007/25/2.

García Castaño, F.J., Rubio Gómez, M., & Bouachra, O. (2008). Población inmigrante y escuela en España: Un balance de investigación. *Revista de Educación*, nº 345, pp. 23-60.

García-Cano Torrico, M.; Márquez Lepe, E., & Antolínez Domínguez, I. (2016). Una comunidad de aprendizaje desde el enfoque intercultural: Diálogos, emergencias y contradicciones en la práctica escolar. *Educación XX1*, 19(2), 251-271. DOI: 10.5944/educXX1.13940.

Informe PISA (2012). In Focus. ¿A qué tipo de carreras aspiran los chicos y las chicas? OECD. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/pisainfocus/PISA%20in%20Focus-n%C2%B014%20ESP.pdf.

Jiménez Jiménez, R. (2013). Los educadores y educadoras sociales en el sistema educativo formal. Una mirada sobre los orígenes, funciones y propuestas de futuro. *Sinergias*, nº 1 y 2, abril, 81-106.

Laorden Gutiérrez, C., Prado Nóvoa, C., & Royo García, P. (2006). Hacia una educación inclusiva. El papel del educador social en los centros educativos. *Pulso*, 29, 77-93. Retrieved from http://revistapulso.cardenalcisneros.es/documentos/articulos/65.pdf.

Leiva Olivencia, J.J. (2010). La educación intercultural entre el deseo y la realidad: reflexiones para la construcción de una cultura de la diversidad en la escuela inclusiva. *Revista Docencia e Investigación*, nº 20. pp. 149-182.

López Zaguirre, R. (2013). Los educadores y las educadoras sociales en centros escolares, en el contexto español. *RES Revista de Educación Social*, nº 16. Retrieved from http://www.eduso.net/res/pdf/16/eduesc_res_16.pdf.

Menacho Hernández, S. (2013). El educador social y la escuela. Justificación de la necesidad de la Educación Social en la escuela. *RES Revista de Educación Social*, nº 16. Retrieved from http://www.eduso.net/res/pdf/16/eduesc_res_16.pdf.

Merino, J.V. (2013). Educación intercultural: reto educativo-social para una escuela inclusiva. *Educación y Futuro*, 29 (2013), 157-178.

Moliner, O., Sales, A., & Escobedo, P. (2016). Posibilidades y limitaciones de generar cultura de centro desde las prácticas compartidas de aula: el caso de la educación intercultural inclusiva. *Estudios sobre educación,* vol. 30 / 2016 / 51-70, DOI: 10.15581/004.30.51-70.

Resolución de 16 de octubre de 2006, de la Dirección General de Gestión de Recursos Humanos, por la que se realiza convocatoria para la cobertura provisional durante el curso 2006-2007 en puestos de educación social en el ámbito educativo. Boletín Oficial de la Junta de Andalucía, nº 213. Retrieved from: http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/boja/2006/213/11.

Terrón Caro, T., Rebolledo Gámez, T., Rodríguez Casado, Mª. R., & Esteban Ibáñez, M. (2015). La diversidad cultural desde la perspectiva de los/as educadores/as sociales: un estudio en los centros educativos de Andalucía. *Educatio Siglo XXI*. Vol. 33, nº 2, pp. 141–164.

Note

[1] Results of the work done as members of the Permanent Commission of Social Educators in the schools of the Official College of Social Educators of Navarre.

eISSN: 1989-9742 © SIPS. DOI: 10. SE7179/PSRI_2017.29.02
http://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/PSRI/

HOW TO CITE THE ARTICLE

Terrón-Caro, T., Cárdenas-Rodríguez, R., & Rodríguez, R. (2017). Educación intercultural inclusiva. Funciones de los/as educadores/as sociales en instituciones educativas. *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 29, 23-38. DOI: 10.7179/PSRI_2017.29.02.

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS

Teresa Terrón-Caro: Facultad de Ciencias Sociales Edificio 11, Despacho nº 17 (segunda planta). Ctra. de Utrera, 1, 41013 Sevilla. Correo Electrónico / E-mail: mttercar@upo.es.

Rocío Cárdenas-Rodríguez: Ídem. E-mail: mrcarrod@upo.es.

Rocío Rodríguez Casado: Ídem. E-mail: mrrodcas@upo.es.

ACADEMIC PROFILE

Teresa Terrón-Caro: Doctora en Pedagogía por la Universidad de Sevilla. Profesora del Departamento de Educación y Psicología Social de la Universidad Pablo de Olavide. Coordinadora del Máster Oficial de Género e Igualdad de la Universidad Pablo de Olavide. Ha participado en numerosos proyectos de investigación tanto a nivel nacional como internacional de eminente carácter socioeducativo. Actualmente es investigadora del Proyecto Europeo "GENDERCIT" FP7-PEOPLE-2012-IRSES. PIRSES-GA-2012-318960. Sus principales líneas de investigación son "La Educación Social ante la Diversidad Cultural" y "Migraciones internacionales, género y educación".

Rocío Cárdenas-Rodríguez: Profesora Contratado Doctor de la Universidad Pablo de Olavide. Directora del proyecto emergente "Atención a la diversidad cultural desde la perspectiva de género". Su línea de investigación gira en torno a la Diversidad Cultural, Género y Educación, con más de 15 proyectos de investigación de ámbito europeo, nacional y local, tiene una larga producción científica en este ámbito. Investigadora del Grupo de Investigación en Acción Socioeducativa. Autora de varias publicaciones relacionadas con la diversidad cultural, la participación comunitaria y la innovación docente. Ponente y participante en seminarios, conferencias y congresos relacionados con la temática. Investigadora de la Red GENDERCIT (Género y Ciudadanía), proyecto financiado por la Unión Europea a través de Marie Curie Actions. Ha obtenido la Mención de Excelencia en la actividad docente universitaria dentro del programa Docentia.

Rocío Rodríguez Casado: Docente del Departamento de Educación y Psicología Social de la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales de la Universidad Pablo de Olavide (UPO) desde el curso académico 2012-2013. Doctoranda en el Programa de Desarrollo y Ciudadanía: Derechos Humanos, Igualdad, Educación e Intervención Social de la UPO. Investigadora a tiempo completo del proyecto de investigación "Gender and Citizanship – GENDERCIT" con Ref. FP7.PEOPLE-2012-IRSES Nº 318960. UPO y Subprograma People 7ª Programa Marco Europeo de I+D en el marco del Programa Marie Curie Action. Investigadora con dedicación a tiempo completo del Grupo de Investigación en Acción Socioeducativa (GIAS), perteneciente a la UPO. Líneas de investigación destacadas: interculturalidad y género en el ámbito escolar, educación para el desarrollo e interculturalidad en contextos socioeducativos, actuaciones ante la diversidad cultural en los centros escolares de infantil y primaria, migraciones y género.