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ABSTRACT: The stigmatisation of some marginalised groups is a common, cross-cutting form of social exclusion. However, just as there are some common forms of exclusion among discriminated groups, certain strategies of resilience in the face of social exclusion are also shared by different groups within their various social contexts. This paper is based on a comparative analysis of three case studies of individuals who have experienced processes of resilience when faced with stigmatisation and social exclusion. One is a person who emigrated from an impoverished country to Spain; another, a person with an intellectual disability; and the third is a person of gypsy origin living in a marginalised neighbourhood. In the first phase, in-depth interviews and focus groups were used to collect data for each of the three case studies. The data from each of them were then analysed by using their own emerging system of categories. In the second phase, common categories within all three case studies were identified. This was effected by using a similarity-based comparative analysis of cases. We were therefore able to see that there were some categories common to the three case studies, namely stigmatism and dehumanisation; suffering and pain as driving forces behind the struggle; resilience and empowerment, and socio-educational help. These shape what we term resilient dynamics or processes generated by people and their environments, and provide interesting synergies and resistance to social exclusion.
1. Introduction

There are a number of forms of oppression that are common to socially excluded groups. Stigmatisation is one of these oppressive practices. While it operates under different labels, they all have the same purpose: to exercise a form of power and social control over the other.

Stigmatisation may be dealt with by accepting and reproducing the stigma that causes inequality, but there are other ways to confront it. In this paper, following a discussion of the state of the art regarding research on resilience, we intend to show what there is in it that can help empower individuals and their communities. Through a comparative case study, this research aims to provide evidence to enable the understanding of how resilience can be a way of resisting and altering the oppression generated by stigma.

More specifically, based on a comparative analysis of three individual cases, this paper aims to present the common patterns of segregation linked to social stigmas that affect people who are placed in certain groups. Subsequently, it will highlight the ways in which individuals and groups build counter-hegemonic interpretations that empower them and challenge the stigmatising oppression. These are certain strategies that trigger resilient educational processes, where individuals and communities go hand in hand.

This paper is based on evidence and interpretations from the comparative analysis of three case studies: The case of Rafael, a 30-year-old person from Málaga with Down’s syndrome; the case of Nordin, a 16-year-old boy born in Morocco who has lived in Málaga for over 9 years; and the case of Francisco, a 19-year-old gypsy boy who lives in a deprived neighbourhood in Malaga (Los Asperones). A similarity-based comparative analysis of cases was used to identify resilient processes in the face of stigmatisation and social exclusion existing in these three oppressive realities.
2. Studies on resilience

The concept of resilience is derived from the Latin term ‘resilierē.’ This notion is borrowed from the field of physics to describe materials with a high degree of endurance and reversal to a strong impact, and began to be used later in the English-speaking world by US, European and Australian scientists in the field of psychiatry and paediatrics. These researchers (Dugan & Coles, 1989; Garmezy, 1991) began to study various cases of socially at-risk children who managed to resist, adapt and grow despite living in conditions of poverty, neglect and violence.

While in the English-speaking world the term ‘resilience’ has been studied for over half a century and used in the last two decades by professionals working in the field of social exclusion (Jollien, 2000; Ungar, 2004; Daniel, 2006 & 2010; Hart & Heaver, 2013), in Spain the concept is only now beginning to be introduced in the fields of research and socio-educational intervention.

It is interesting to note the developments that have taken place in studies on resilience. The study of human resilience was initially conducted within the field of psychology. The initial research, such as that by Werner and Smith (1982), pointed to individual factors as being the only ones responsible for developing resilient processes. Subsequently, in recent decades, research on resilience has expanded to the educational field and to the area of social work. Studies such as Melillo (2002), Cyrlinik (2002 and 2009), Mancaux (2010), Ungar (2004), Suárez-Ojeda (2008), Hart et al. (2011), Forés & Grané (2012), Ungar, Ghazinour & Richter (2013), Punch (2013), Runswick-Cole & Goodley (2013), Allan & Ungar (2014), Porcelli et al. (2014), Theron, Liebenberg & Malinidi (2014), Ungar, Liebenberg & Ikeda (2014) and Ungar, Russell & Connolly (2014) have begun to point to the inescapable relationship between environmental or cultural factors and the individuals in terms of developing resilient processes.

This idea of process emphasises the fact that resilience is based on a dynamic relationship between subject and environment in facing elements that hinder the individual’s development. This understanding of the generation of resilience is based on the theories by Bruner (1984), Bronfenbrenner (1987), Vygotsky (2012), among others, who demonstrated the influence of the environment on the development of the subject. As Melillo (2002) argues, if resilience is a process in which what we are at a given moment is interwoven with affective resources present in the social ecological environment, the lack of these resources can make the subject succumb, but if even the slightest support is given, the construction of the resilient process can be take place. (p. 70)

In this regard, we can say that resilience is a process that is shaped between the subject, the possibilities offered by the environment and various contexts, and the educational relationships generated between them (Ungar, 2015). Resilience from a systemic or procedural conception transcends the limits of an individualistic conception and opens up a new focus on culture, the education community and a supporting educator (Costa, Forés & Burguet, 2014) as elements to be considered in resilient processes.

3. Methodology

As mentioned above, this paper is based on a comparative analysis of three case studies. Comparative case studies are usually performed in order to study similarities and differences between various cases (Eysenck, 1976; Yin, 2014). In the strategy of similarity-based comparison, cases are studied through a similar variable or phenomenon that is common to all of them (convergence). A difference-based comparison is used to find explanations for the differences that occur in each case (divergences) (Coller, 2000). In our study the strategy of similarity-based comparison analysis was used with a view to understanding the common phenomena and convergences between the three cases. Such analogies are evidenced by similar categories that emerged from the individual analyses of each of the three case studies, which ultimately led to the common categories detailed below.

In line with Stake (1998), when selecting cases for this study it seemed appropriate to take into account the significance that they could have for the phenomenon under study, and to prioritise the learning opportunities offered by each of them. This study is based on a comparative analysis of the cases of three people who face adversity (being labelled and socially excluded) with the benefit of educational support. The selection criteria for the three case studies were as follows:
- We selected the cases of three people who have suffered social stigma and discrimination under the following conditions: in the first case (Nordin), due to his status as an immigrant in Spain; in the second case (Rafael), due to his status as a person with a disability; and the third (Francisco), due to his belonging to a marginal neighbourhood and being a gypsy.
- The second requirement was that they should be cases in which resilient processes could be identified in the face of stigmatisation and
social marginalisation. This would imply that the individuals chosen should have transcended the expectations of their environment through educational processes that had helped them think of themselves beyond the social mandates. In this sense, the three cases selected should not only stand out for their unusual academic achievements (for example) or simply for being pioneers, but mainly for the constructions that drive them: self-recognition, empowerment and building what we elsewhere called identities of interpretation (Ruiz-Román, Calderón-Almendros & Torres-Moya, 2011).

- And finally, a no less important requirement in the selection of cases was that all the people involved should wish to participate voluntarily in the study and be committed to cooperate with the case study researchers.

Appropriate negotiations were carried out to ensure the democratic nature of the processes at all times, both in access to the informants and in the use and ownership of the data, as well as in the preparation, return and validation of the reports. Narratives that were accessible to the population under study were developed. All the discussions were recorded and included in the corpus of data in each case. This was all done on a systematic and ethical basis, in keeping with the highest standards in qualitative research to ensure its veracity: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

During the fieldwork the procedures used for data collection in the three case studies were based on a broad range of ethnographic strategies: interviews (in-depth, semi-structured and group), focus groups, panel discussions, collection of documents and artefacts, participant observation and researcher diaries. This broad variety of methods ensured the triangulation of methodological strategies. Two of these data collection strategies were predominant to obtain information for each of the cases: in-depth interviews (79 in total) and focus groups (9 in total) (Taylor & Bogdan, 1980; Krueger, 1994; Greebaum, 1998; Flick, 2004). In addition, each case study used a diversity of informants, so that another triangulation of data could be carried out using the information thus collected. Different types of informants were interviewed depending on the characteristics of each case, notably including the individuals on whom the case studies were being conducted, and their relatives, friends, teachers and educators, neighbours, academics, politicians, students, counsellors and other key informants. Pseudonyms have been used throughout to protect the identity of informants.

According to Eisner (1998), the strategy of triangulation or structural corroboration is intended to provide the confluence of multiple sources of evidence or the recurrence of instances that support a conclusion. In the study presented here structural corroboration was three-fold: the triangulation of data sources, researchers’ triangulation and the methodological triangulation. These measures sought to address the complex subjective data that feeds qualitative research (Contreras & Pérez de Lara, 2010; Stake, 1998), while giving the results the credibility and validity required in social science scientific research.

All the information generated was recorded on audio or video and later transcribed verbatim for the qualitative analysis of the data, together with the documents collected. Each of the three case studies was examined on the basis of the system of categories that emerged from its own specific analysis. The internal logic of the data was sought in each case study, conferred by the informants through patterns such as repetition, the assessment of certain issues, milestones or positions, as well as the interpretative relevance that a key element could have in understanding the dynamics of personal and social construction within a particular context. These are hermeneutical key aspects related to a certain way of living. In order to move from data to categories, we followed the steps suggested by Simons (2011: 60): identifying and confirming categories; establishing connections between them; and generating wide-ranging ideas to tell a story or part of a story in the case.

QSR International NVivo was the software used to analyse the qualitative data collected and to identify emerging categories. However, in each of the category systems of the three cases, some common categories emerged. We relied on them to make the similarity-based comparison of the case studies. The categories that appeared simultaneously in the three cases were: stigma and dehumanisation; pain and suffering as the origin of the struggle; resilience and empowerment; socio-educational help and resilient support. This research has been built on the patterns or categories that occurred in all three cases, a comparison and triangulation with multiple sources and techniques, and the episodes recounted with great hermeneutical value.

4. Results

4.1. Stigmatisation and dehumanisation

All human beings experience environmental conditions which, depending on their characteristics, can be interpreted as a straitjacket that does not
allow them to be who they are. In the socialisation process, people uncritically embrace the social and cultural elements of the environment, which become integrated into their personality. Sometimes this integration into the established social structure can be experienced as a process of oppression (Calderón-Almendros, 2011; Calderón-Almendros & Ruiz-Román, 2015).

In other words, the conditions of experience differ greatly between different social groups, and from one person to another. And the experience of people with disabilities, of gypsies or of those who have emigrated to Spain, as in the cases under discussion here, do not sit particularly well with this socialisation process. The social system has assigned a social role to people with Down's syndrome, gypsies living in disadvantaged areas and immigrants that is close to social marginalisation. The socialisation process maintains relationships of inequality based on the differentiation between the hegemonic group and minority groups. It is an exercise in power and control over others, where the concept of normality is generated. In line with this concept, those who build their identity on the margins of the hegemonic are judged as being outside the norm or the group (Ruiz-Román, Calderón-Almendros & Torres-Moya, 2011).

This is clear in the cases studied here. Society handles a range of social images about disability, immigrants and gypsies that strengthens stereotypes and their widespread use. These hegemonic cultural productions made into stereotypes are a form of social control, a simplistic generalisation that is assigned to a variety of individuals without knowing them (Abdenour & Ruiz-Roman, 2005). Stereotypes are based on uncritical preconceptions; they homogenise diversity, bring to the fore the inequalities that affect minorities, and flout the individuality of each person by seeing in them that which had been previously assigned. This is an unfair mark which, consciously or unconsciously, is attributed to that person. It is like a prison where the subject is typecast and denied the option of being what they are or want to be. Stigma (be it Down’s, immigrant or gypsy status) is not the person, so the stereotype constructed conditions the individual, that is, it reduces and incarcerates the complex being in every person.

Alicia: It’s a shame he always has to live... Diego: With that exposure, right?
Alicia: ... dragging, as he says, dragging the Down’s alongside him. Because in fact he is not the Down’s. He is him, and the Down’s is something that always accompanies him.
Diego: Yes, he can’t get away from it.

Alicia: That you are myopic. You are not myopic, you are Nacho and you are also myopic. But being myopic does not define you (Alicia and Diego, Rafael’s sister and brother-in-law).

Neighbour 1: And if you go to a job interview, and they look at your ID and see that you are from the neighbourhood of Asperones, you’ve got zero chance of getting work. They say, ‘we’ll call you...’

Neighbour 2: Or when talking to a girl, if she asks me where I’m from and I tell her I’m from Asperones, she blocks me straight away (from Whatsapp). And she doesn’t want to know one thing about me’ (Focus group, Francisco’s neighbours).

Stereotypes objectify and ‘block’ the person. Objectification is a function of social control by the use of prejudice, a static and simplistic discriminating type of knowledge (‘they don’t want to know one thing about me’), leaving the person who is beyond the stereotype on one side. The stigma objectifies and robs the individual of their humanity, sending them into ‘another world’.

There is something that makes me very angry, and that is when they call me ‘moro’. When they call me ‘moro’, it’s as if I’m from another world (Interview with Nordin)
Researcher: Why doesn’t the underground stop here?
Neighbour 1: Because we are not people.
Neighbour 2: Well, I don’t know. It is kept here. If they wanted to they could bring it here.
Neighbour 3: It’s kept just where my street is, just as you go up, that’s where it is kept.
Neighbour 2: What is not normal is that the tube goes through here to be put away and it doesn’t go through for us to use it’ (Focus group of Francisco’s neighbours).

As can be seen from the evidence, stigmatisation highlights social injustice, because it robs individuals of part of their humanity (‘we are not people’). Rafael used another metaphor to talk about the stigma (in his case Down’s syndrome): the ‘coffin of the dead.’ In Rafael’s words, the Down’s (the stigma) is a coffin that imprisons him as an individual, prevents him from being what he wants to be and from showing himself as such.

... someone hurts me. Okay, I’m hurt, I have blood all over my body, but the Lord pushed me. He said: ‘You can. I give you the gift of music, fighting with the school.’ Okay, so the coffin that I was in— well, it was in my mind, it wasn’t real— I open the coffin and here I am. (Interview with Rafael)
The exclusion is evident: ‘not a person’, ‘being in the coffin’ in the ‘nickname’, ‘block you’, and being thrown into ‘another world’. These are forms of relationship that leave the individual violated and dehumanised, not only due to the attacks on individuality by the use of stigma, but also in terms of what remains as segregating attitudes and behaviours.

I had a problem with a girl I was introduced to, who I liked. We nearly started dating. And both her friends and her family said things to her about being so close to someone from Morocco. Her friends, her group, they didn’t say anything to me to my face so as not to seem racist, but behind my back they told her she should think twice before going out with a ‘moro’. Her family did not want her to be with me because I was a ‘moro’. When I phoned her on her home number and asked her mother if I could speak to her without saying who I was, she was always in, but when I said my name, and said it was Nordin, she was never in. ‘Don’t you think that’s weird?’ (Interview with Nordin).

Jose: And maybe you get to know a girl and say you’re from the Asperones and she turns her back on you. Sometimes I say that I am from Consul or Teatinos’ (Interview with Jose, a friend of Francisco’s).

Domingo: ... I can say I have treated Rafa badly. Badly how? By abusing him. By abusing him in the sense that as I was, in a way, the ‘clever’ one, and he was the ‘thick’ one, I tried to take everything in the direction I wanted. Just to give you an example... right now I can’t think of one... oh yes, maybe using him to protect myself, just with silly things, like, instead of eating chocolate, I can’t think of one… oh yes, maybe using him to protect myself, just with silly things, like, instead of eating a particular thing, [saying]: ‘Tell your parents we’re going to have chocolate’ or ‘we’re going down to the shop to buy ... ’

Researcher: Using him.

Domingo: Exactly, yes, using him. Used him, of course, that’s it’ (Interview with Domingo, a friend of Raphael’s).

4.2 Suffering and pain: the origin of a struggle

Stigmas, in addition to being stereotypical cultural constructions, leave marks on the body of the stigmatised individual. The stigma is a dagger which, as the individuals in the case studies themselves say, stabs and wounds them to the point of making them ‘bleed’ and ‘cry’. Being labelled by the mark of ‘the moro’, ‘the one with ‘Down’s’ or ‘the gypsy’ is painful. When the mark that has been imposed on you makes you feel inferior, insecure or afraid to relate to others, the stigma of the stereotype begins to make you ‘feel bad, suffer, cry, bleed, ...’ and shows the ways some people have of exercising power over others.

Not long ago I had a really bad time at school. I went with a few mates to put our rucksacks in the locker. The first three kids put their rucksacks away, and one of them, my friend, told me to put mine in too, as there was room. So I put it in. But then another kid came along and the other said to me, laughing: ‘Hey, you, “morillo”, get your rucksack out’ so the other guy could put his in. And I laughed too, but inside I felt bad, it hurt so much that they treated me as if I were not a person. I wanted to cry, but I could not cry in front of them. So I went to the bathroom laughing and washed my face there so that they wouldn’t notice that I had been crying’ (Interview with Nordin).

...well, they have made him suffer a lot, and in fact there are things in which it is very noticeable that he was hurt by what they did to him, and that affected him, for example, the way he talked... he started speaking much worse... His stutter got worse, it was something awful, really bad’ (Interview with Silveria, Rafael’s sister).

Since my childhood I have fought to achieve what I’m doing and what I want to do. Until I got to a point where I said: ‘Not the Down’s. I am the way I am... I’m like you, like everyone else’ (Interview with Rafael).

‘I managed to overcome it’, say in astonishment some people who have known resilience when, after being hurt, they manage to learn to live again. However, this journey from darkness to light, this escape from the basement or abandonment of the tomb, are issues that require learning to live a different life, one that transcends suffering (Cyrulnik, 2002, p. 23)

Transcending, reinterpreting, but not escaping or merely bearing suffering. It is not enough merely to try to bear conflict and suffering, it is necessary to transcend it, so that ‘in some way, suffering ceases to be suffering at the moment it finds meaning’ (Frankl, 1991, p. 108).

In this situation, pain is the manifestation of oppression. Pain causes us to withdraw. However, resistance to pain empowers the individual against oppression: it frees them. If pain as oppression generates unconscious conditioned responses that result in the self-exclusion of the individual, on the assumption of stigma and blame, resistance to pain involves a reversal of the process (Calderón-Almendros, 2014). Pain becomes a reflection of social oppression, while the response to it, ‘not crying in front of them’, not giving in to oppression and ‘fighting’ is the beginning of resistance. Fighting to escape from the ‘coffin of the
dead’, ‘from another world’, ‘washing your face’ and ‘being people’ again.

4.3 Resilience and empowerment: going beyond resistance to pain and dehumanisation

I tell my friends that I’m not a ‘moro’, I’m Moroccan. And I tell them, ‘Hey, hey, I’ve got a name!’ (Interview with Nordin).

As we saw earlier, stigma and reification rob people of their dignity, generating oppression and pain. For this reason, there is a persistent tendency to fight for dignity and reclaim the person in the discourses collected from Rafael, Francisco and Nordin.

If you know, I imagine that you know, that I have Down’s syndrome, but apart from that, I am like anyone of you. And taking away... [its] importance. I want to emphasise that, first, the Down’s syndrome, I put it on one side, I leave it aside as if it was a nickname. But I am another person, just like anyone of you. That’s what I feel. (Interview with Rafael)

In this way it can be seen that the manner in which the stereotyped individual has of freeing themselves from typecasting is learning to seek mechanisms of resistance so that others do not typecast them even further. The stereotyped person wants to leave the ‘prison’, the ‘coffin’, the ‘other world’ so as not to suffer and ‘bleed’ any more and be recognised by others as a person.

The Down’s is a nickname. And I put it to one side. And then, I am me.’ (Interview with Rafael).

There are people from other places who say, ‘ooh, Asperones is dodgy. I’ve heard that [people there] are aggressive, and they are thieves’. And I tell them that both inside and outside of Asperones there are good people and bad people.’(Interview with Francisco).

Rafael, Francisco and Nordin put on one side the concepts of Down’s syndrome, gypsy and ‘moro’, respectively, and in an act of resistance to oppression, they claim to be ‘one more’ in society and not be relegated to a subsystem of it. They develop strategies to rebel against the mistaken culture that makes them suffer. To do so, besides using pain as a driving force for fighting, they need to unlearn acquired social patterns. Socialisation should be questioned so that the individual learns something that is not easy: the dominant culture is mistaken. In line with Cyrulnik (2002 & 2009) and Manciaux (2010), we understand that educational processes have to produce a reflection on unconscious socialisation and help individuals to interpret themselves beyond the boundaries of stigma. These educational processes are a form of empowerment in the face of the dehumanisation generated by oppression. The way to interpret oneself, to construct one’s narrative in life is considered a fundamental part of this resilient process (Frank, 1991; Cyrulnik, 2002; Manciaux, 2010), since it allows the individual and the community to change (themselves) when faced with stigma, offsetting its excluding power.

Following Soler, Planas, Ciraso-Cali & Ribot-Hours (2014), we are committed to an idea of empowerment linked to a process of growth, strengthening and development of the confidence of individuals and communities to promote positive changes in the context and gain power and the ability for decision-making and for change (Úcar, Heras & Soler, 2014). This implies the self-realisation and independence of individuals and communities, the recognition of groups / communities and social transformation.

From these ideas of empowerment, resistance and the reinterpretation of the stigmatising culture, the role of families, educators, and the close environments of the individuals at stake all have great educational value, since it helps to understand, from a systemic-ecological perspective, how resilience is interwoven between the individual and the environment at this point.

Indeed, the immediate surroundings of the three individuals in the case studies play an important role in shaping the resilient process, as they give it meaning and lead to taking a position against stigmas. We can see how in their immediate environments anti-hegemonic interpretations are made against oppression that create a common front in enabling the transformation of situations of exclusion.

Asperones is a marginal neighbourhood in Malaga, it was built with that idea... of not disturbing the rest. It is social injustice, a political embarrassment.’ (Interview with Beatriz, an educator in the Asperones neighbourhood).

On the walls of the house of one of the residents in the neighbourhood, which was facing the road, we painted with some locals graffiti that said, ‘When are we getting out of here?’ So that everyone who passes sees it from the street. That’s also street education.’ (Interview with Juanma, an educator in Francisco’s neighbourhood).

And one day, a friend came who belongs to an association against racism and intolerance and we put up
see one of his children go to university. And I think that with my brother Nordin we will succeed in doing this... (Interview with Yushra, Nordin's older sister).

One cannot fight alone against the world. People need to find reference points on which to rely, find compassion (people who find value in suffering the pain of others) and form a community. Compassion, as explained by Buxarrais (2006) is far removed from mere pity. The challenge of true compassion is to become one with the other, to cross the narrow boundaries of individualism and acknowledge that every other is another-like-me. This is how compassion turns into commitment or denunciation of the situation of another who has had his dignity violated. When this occurs, oppression loses power, and the subject and the community in which they are based emerge together.

Human support is what tells you that the others are with you, for whatever you need (Interview with José Francisco, Rafael's brother).

‘Human support’ is what provides the three individuals in our case studies with the greatest meaning to continue their struggle, to overcome the limits of the individualistic logic that society is imbued with. Collaboration is one of the greatest tools we have to cross borders, to ‘open doors’, and to question perspectives that are based on efficiency, effectiveness and productivity.

Supporting aids people in ‘coming out of the coffin’ of exclusion, breaking the boundaries with the ‘other world’, ‘opening doors’ and entering a ‘new life’ without resigning themselves to inequality.

This support process becomes an educational process that breaks moulds, challenges hegemonic interpretations of reality and generates resilient processes of empowerment and freedom. In these cases, it is not only an unconditional support of the individual, but at the same time it becomes subversion against marginalisation.
...it is through street education that processes or movements to reverse marginalisation begin. One example of this was when we accompanied the neighbourhood residents when they held a demonstration and blocked the street to complain about the way they were being treated. (Interview with Juanma, an educator in Francisco’s neighbourhood)

Researcher: Do you think people treat Nordin well?
Friend 1: Not sure.
Friend 2: Especially those...
Friend 3: Especially those who are not in his class.
Friend 2: I don’t know, they don’t treat him very well, and they don’t speak to him much.
Friend 1: We often protect him.
Researcher: Really? You protect him? From what?
Friend 2: From some...
Friend 3: Some kids who want to be...
Friend 2: There are some racists in the school (Focus group, Friends of Nordin’s).

Teacher: Later I learned that there had been problems for him to access the conservatory; the truth is that his family fought a lot in that respect, they even contacted the Ombudsman... Fortunately everything turned out well, and Rafa joined the conservatory. (Interview with Rafael’s teacher).

Researcher: I would like to know why you sided with Rafa, while the teachers and the Administration said otherwise.
Ombudsman: I always put myself on the side of the person who has the problem (in inverted commas). Because otherwise... Why would I side with the Administration? I choose the person... And obviously, when you side with the person, you fight (José Chamizo, Ombudsman of Andalusia, in an interview based on Rafael’s case).

In that path to liberation, resisting, interpreting and creating does not suffice. The situation requires a degree of systematic analysis and dialogic learning, as well as the design of intelligent actions (including all types of intelligence) which are consistent and durable. These constructions should illustrate the educational processes that enable the breaking—in a wedge-like manner—of oppressive barriers that stubbornly emerge in our society. The wedge forces itself into the barriers when people and contexts do not yield to the stigma and oppression and when dreams prevail. These are strategic dreams; praxis, in Freire’s terms (1992).

And why can’t I play the trumpet? (Interview with Rafael)

And I wondered … Why can’t I finish school? (Interview with Francisco)

If I set myself to do something, I succeed. (Interview with Nordin)

In 10 years if I could, at least I’d like to be living a quiet life with my family, outside asperones, and being and living well.’ (Interview with Francisco)

Dreams become the driving force of action. As explicitly stated by the three individuals in our case studies: ‘Why not me?’ Dreams work insofar as they contribute to the construction of an identity that, in critical dialogue with the conditions of their experience and their relationships, expand their ideal and materially horizons and serve as a trigger to improve their context (Ruiz Roman, 2003). Only unstolen dreams provide the fuel needed to reach a different destination. A destination that is now not only for them but will also cause the horizons in their immediate environments to expand.

This is why Francisco’s case is so important, because it does away with the mark forced on him by the stigma of Asperones. (Interview with Juanma, an educator in Asperones)

5. Conclusion

In this study we have seen how resilient dynamics emerge through successive phases: the oppression caused by the stigma, the resistance to it and the empowerment that arises from socio-educational support. In the resilient dynamics that have been analysed in this comparative study of cases there is a first phase marked by stigma and oppression, in which the social system oppresses Rafael, Francisco and Nordin, and robs them of their humanity. ‘Not being a person’, ‘being in the coffin’, ‘blocking you’ and being thrown into ‘another world’ are ways of relating to the individual that denote exclusion and dehumanising oppressive processes.

After this there is a second phase, which is marked by resistance (Castells, 1997) and empowerment. This resistance is no stranger to pain and suffering, because oppression causes ‘suffering, feeling bad, crying, bleeding…’; all of which result from the power relations some people have with others. But in these resilient dynamics, pain acts as an incentive not only for the individuals being studied, but for their families and educators and for those who feel the pain of others and do not stand still.
Oppression and the suffering that it generates invites ‘the struggle’; the struggle for empowerment (Freire, 1985). Empowerment serves to question, reconceptualise and reinterpret the hegemonic systems of social meaning, and implements strategies to try to redress the unfair balance of the conditions of the individual’s experience. Thanks to this rebellious stage, projection and transformation is possible by creating dreams, ‘opening doors’, returning from ‘another world’, thus entering into a third phase.

These resilient dynamics cause mutual cooperation throughout between the individuals in the case studies and their environments. Resilience is always based on the relationship with others and on meaning, which may be mutually reinforced. Meaning is often constructed on a mobilising project, linking the interests of the person and their skills in a process that stimulates growth. Therefore, it is necessary to continue to delve into this area of research. It is essential to further explore the potential that educational support has as a tool that simultaneously helps the person develop and generates social transformation. The research project that this paper grew out of aims to investigate in the coming years what potential resilience may have beyond the development of personal qualities, as a transformative process for individuals and communities.

Resilience then moves from being a quality to being a community educational action. Since it is collectively developed, resilience holds within it the potential for social transformation through which the subject becomes a person who is able to break free and to realise their dreams.

This is where education must find its place, in dreams of transformation. Education is located between our reality and our dreams (Calderón-Almendros, 2014). Everything can be improved: the individual, society, the world. It is a phenomenon that fosters the freedom of individuals, and can promote social justice and equal opportunities. To do this, it should incorporate dreams, for without them it loses much of its nature and denies the projection that it seeks to construct. Educational settings must become dream incubators, in which people are able to build their freedom in a community and project themselves within it.
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1 ‘Moro’ is a derogatory term sometimes used in Spain to refer to people from northern Africa, particularly from Morocco.
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