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Abstract

In this article we meditate and analyze how the society, through its educational practices, has generated parameters of segregation and social exclusion which then have been reproduced by educational institutions. Thus, we can understand that the society has not been sufficiently integrating as at the beginning, by its clearly relational nature, it might seem, considering the different individuals, the diversity in general, as something negative. This diversity, of individuals and human communities, has become, in many occasions, inequality as the peculiarities of individuals or group of individuals interact with society’s demands, which have used the parameters of normality as a symptom of control, of power and, of course, rejecting the right of being different.
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1. Social changes and exclusion: an emergent practice in the society of the globalization

The educational practices depend greatly on the meaning and the valuation that we have of a series of essential dimensions as the individual, the society, the culture and how they relate to each other. Thereby, education in general and the school as an institution have suffered diverse changes due to the changes experienced by the world and the societies in the course of the time. Thus, the education and the school have progressively adapted themselves to new circumstances, despite some authors like Armando Vega (2003: 444) thinks that “the school still has a wide range of educational possibilities to be explored”. At the moment there are some investigations which indicate that the capability of the school to influence the education process has been weakened ostensibly. This can be explained by three factors (Cajiao, 2001): the development of the media which offers a wide range of information in all fields of the culture, the science and the entertainment; the quick urbanization of the population, with the concomitant loss of the traditional family and community organization patterns; and finally the transformation of the socialization process of children and young people that takes place not only in the school but also in a more accessible and attractive society.

This relative loss of influence does not mean that the formal education has lost relevance, or that closing schools is the most appropriate recommendation for the time being. However, teachers already feel overcome by too many difficulties regarding to their own traditional duties which includes teaching subjects and moral issues. Nowadays students seem to have quite strong and diverse criterion to those of them, with a clear attitude of rejection toward the speech moralist that made crucial part of the effective school education until the end of the seventies.

In the field of the knowledge the situation is not different, because beyond what the teacher or the school text say the students have access to an enormous quantity of information, even when the socio-economic level is poor. This varies considerably from one country to another, and, especially, between urban and rural sector, because the availability of information is very different in one or another context. Anyway, the diffusion of the media and the access to a great
variety of technological devices generate new ways of learning which have not yet seem to be fully considered at most of the schools and educational institutions. This situation gives rise to a notorious different between the formal education provided by the curriculums at schools (with very traditional pedagogies method still employed) and the informal way of learning through television, interactive electronic games and with the continuous exchange of ideas between students. This can be even more complicated in those cases when children and young people have free access to internet and satellite/broadband television, because the huge amount of information is hard to handle.

Schools completed a crucial paper in socialization processes from its origin in the XVII century until the end of the seventies. Nowadays there are new relationship models, especially in modern city life style, that weaken significantly the influence of formal schools but influence the citizens' education. At the moment adolescents enjoy the possibility of going to many different places which allow them to generate activities and autonomous organizations different to the family and school institutions. This situation leads to new types of young cultures characterized by a specific way of social behaviour, fashion, sexuality, power, authority, and another series of behaviours that get away from the legacy of the tradition transmitted by the adults. This autonomy is highly developed when youths with difficulties are taught dexterities for real life in contexts where they will be needed, like in cafes, restaurants, buses, market, etc (Castanedo, C., 2006).

These first ideas point out that the formal school system does not have a great influence in the process of children and young's integral education as other social influences do. Certainly, it is necessary to also mention the definitive role that plays - and that it has always played - the productive sector in the education of people, as much about what it refers to concrete and specific knowledge required by the workers as what it concerns to the "managerial culture" that establishes behaviour forms, disciplines, observation of norms, hierarchical relationships and expectations of life. Also in this field the crisis is very strong, because beyond the enormous problems of poverty, deterioration of the quality of life, unemployment, informal work and deinstitutionalization of the professional work, the labour environment exercises a certain educational impact that is reflected in the social organization and in the access to opportunities educational with the group of the society.

It is clear then that the responsibility on people's education in a society, in a country or in a municipality falls on the social group, and this responsibility...
should be assumed in an explicit and conscious way in order to guarantee a better environment for children, youths and adults since their well-being and human development are intimately bound to their possibility of permanent education. This is what it makes the education to be a matter that should be solved in the environment of the public sector.

Saying that “everybody educates” is nothing new neither it constitutes a great contribution, because this - in one or another way - it has always happened. Neither helps to say that everybody is responsible, because when introducing to the social group in the same pot we are again like at the beginning. For that reason the effort should be focused on defining the fields of diverse social factor's influence, to try to specify its role and its responsibilities, and to make progress in practical mechanisms that allow those functions to be assumed in a positive way.

It is advisable to overview six topics that I find fundamental and, in my opinion, they should always be considerate all together when thinking about the education of a community, region or a country. If we look at those topics independently it will be very easy to get lost with technical terms or in slanted visions. The cores of understanding the educational phenomenon as social responsibility can be the following ones:

“The responsibility of the whole society and the sense of a public idea for the education”.

“The role of the government in the development of the educational”.

“The work of the educators and the teacher's role as an intellectual”.

“The function of the society in the educational development”.

“The influence of the media and information”.

“The children and the girls like main characters of the educational and social processes”.

These nuclei can make us understand, like Castell expressed (1998:42) that "a new society arises when a structural transformation can be observed in the relationships of production, in the relationships of power and in the relationships of experience". Each one of these changes will have to do with the "human baggage" of the new generations. In the relationships of production the changes are appreciated in the productivity and in the competitiveness. The technology of the information and the cultural capacity to use it are essential for
the new mark of the production. In a wide, social sense, Durkheim (1975: 32) already expressed that "the education is not for the society but the means through which prepares in the spirit of the children the essential conditions of its own existence". Applied to the sense that it takes today we can say that whoever is educated, in the appropriate organizational environment, can be able to adapt him/her-self to the new tasks which characterizes the new time.

In the environment of new ways of making political decisions, the most characteristic thing is the uncertainty of people to delegate their will to politicians groups with capacity for giving answers to problems. However the power of the new society does not disappear because of that but it rather acts in a new environment; where the citizens find structural deficits to keep their social environment. In this way the politics becomes matter of administration of the own citizenship, making decisions to achieve its purposes. Then the participation appears like an unavoidable attitude in the new citizen.

But also, the relationships of the daily life’s experience also change. They do it in the same way as traditional primary institutions expire: the devaluation of the symmetrical patriarchal family where the gender role is radicalized; the woman’s identity emerges in the social equality aspect, convulsing the basic forms, direct sources of identity. Flexible personalities appear from these changes, which are able to carry out a continuous readjustment of the “myself” - a continuous learning - instead of the traditional adaptation in a passive way to a univocal normative. Nowadays people produce new ways of sociability instead of following behaviour models.

In the view of these new expectations and focusing in the fact that we want to expose in this project, the integration and the social inclusion, we wonder if the current society is uniting people more or on the contrary it is separating them. At the moment social exclusion has been shown as one of the most important problems in the society. However, it is necessary to say that the exclusion has always existed and the society and has established parameters that fomented the exclusion in such a way that this has become a serious problem in our current world, and it is fundamentally a problem of social nature. This has been expressed by Walker (1997: 8) when defining the social exclusion:

"... it refers to a dynamic process that leads to be expelled, total or partially, from any of the social, economic, political and cultural systems that determine the integration of a person in the society. The social exclusion can also be seen as a negation (non realization) of the civil, political and social rights of the citizens."
Obviously this exclusion process has become apparent in the four ways of gaining access to the experience about the universe and ourselves which have been described previously: the direct experience, the one obtained through interpersonal structures, the one acquired through reading and writing and the one that provide us new technologies for information and communication. There have always been, at social level, divisions among individual people and among communities, what has generated classes, majorities and minorities. The current problem is that, from the perspective of the sought economic and cultural globalization, those excluded are becoming a majority, increasing the inequalities in a vertiginous way. Different authors (Castell, 1997; It darts, 1997; It darts and Tortajada, 1999; Tedesco, 1995) have tried to look for an explanation to the increase of the social exclusion in the current world and they coincide the cause can be in "the new society that emerges as a consequence of a change in the human experience, and the destabilization of its fundamentals in view of new realities and in view of never resolved problems " (Gimeno, 2001: 152). From this global perspective, the current society has some characteristics that help to foment exclusion processes. According to Parrilla (2007) it is in fact denouncing that exclusion the way we will help to the advance of the inclusion. Parrilla (2000: 27) has identified a series of basic characteristic of the current society that configure its profile: it is a "society based on the global economy and the information, is plural and replete of uncertainties and contradictions". Revising works we will find experiences (Fernández Batanero (2008), Martínez Domínguez (2008)) that demonstrate how there are schools/colleagues with students at risk of social exclusion which have known how to adapt and to impart an educational practice guaranteeing the school success for all its students.

From our perspective we consider, in accordance with Gimeno (2001), that at the present there are two essentials debates with impact in the education. The first one makes reference to the globalization of the culture that can take us to the "cultural homogenization", what can imply the exclusion of the less favoured ones. The second one has a new conception of the culture able to be sensitive and to still respond to the cultural differences, although it falls into "isolations and particularisms that can annul the individual's universality in the complex societies" (Gimeno, 2001: 76).

From the globalization concept that develops alliances, connections, economic exchanges among countries, among the forms of the individuals' life, their habits and their customs, we are entering in a new form of conceiving the world. This situation increases its impact with the incorporation of the new technologies that as Castell affirms (1997: 14) "they promise to expand positive
achievements, humanity progress for all”. However in a world like the current one, with strong inequalities among individuals, among towns, among nations, the globalization affects to the identity of people since not everyone occupy the same place in the society and in the culture and it can generate asymmetric processes, generating exclusion and inequalities in those that doesn't have possibilities to consent to the globalized economic, politics and cultural net, as well as important social imbalances. We cannot forget that 85% of the goods of the world is property of the 20% population. Ortega (2000: 94) describes these asymmetries bound to the globalization and classifies them in:

a. Social and educational asymmetries. It is referred to the position given in a net. Outside of the nets there are many people, countries and continents. Therefore, the inclusion/exclusion are a consequence of that position in the net. The education has already made big changes to facilitate the access through virtual nets and new accesses to the information while in some countries the illiteracy, the school absenteeism and the lack of resources for the education persist.

b. Asymmetries in the practice of the human rights. The exclusion in terms of non-recognition and the violation of the human rights is something that we can see in the media every day.

c. Asymmetries in the access to technologies for information and in the practice of the speech freedom. Without any doubt not all the countries neither all the people will have the same access opportunities to the information and therefore it generates a fracture between developed and developing countries. But as Castell affirms (1997: 18) the access to the information won't be the only obstacle but rather the capacity to process it will be a new obstacle that will make the differences greater, and that at the same time will be a challenge for the education in the future.

Undoubtedly, like Gimeno affirms (2001), to understand this recent scenario we will need new ways of thinking that allow us to find the way to adapt ourselves to it, to explore its strengths and its weaknesses, its threats and its opportunities, but mainly to be ready to experience the drama of a globalization that excludes. In this sense, from the education point of view, it is necessary to outline approaches of equality of opportunities from educational politics which make the differences in the school compatible for all. Approaches that unavoidably will make reference to the rights of people from a position of autonomy recognition, freedom and identity of everyone as a social being. Barton (1993) refers to these politicians of equality of opportunities like emancipating political when interpreting them "as elements that try to return the
opportunities to people who had been deprived of them”. “An emancipation politics is based on the elimination or reduction of the exploitation, the inequality and the oppression and it promotes the justice, the equality and the participation” (Barton, 1993: 243).

However, we should not forget that to generate the conditions of equality the educational institutions are not enough by themselves, even when we recognize that it corresponds to them a preponderant paper--it is evident, Gimeno indicates (2001: 160) that "the education is a condition for the social inclusion"--, but rather it is necessary to claim new social and economic politicians, sensitive to the recognition of the rights and the development of spaces for people's expression, of its freedom of its autonomy and of its own capacities.

2. The education as a socialization process: construction of an own identity process

The humans have an essential dimension that is the sociability, as Aristotle has already demonstrated. We are born inside certain social groups that will be something like the mould in which we will develop ourselves: we are born in a given family, in a certain neighbourhood, in a city, in a country, etc. It is inside those groups where we will develop our own identity. We are probably more a social and cultural product that a natural one. Have we ever thought that being born in a place or in another is by chance? Can we imagine what would have happened if we would have been born in another country or another family? Therefore, the personal identity is built in the society in a way that is like an interaction or, better, a dialectical, among different pressures based on the singularity of each one, their personal identity, and the pressures of the context, those of the social environment. At the end we all reach a social identity, as a result of this dialectical. After all, human beings are born as unsocial beings, as M. Weber said, and it is in the core of the society that we become social. Something that takes place through the socialization.

In sociology is usual to distinguish between different forms of social grouping, at least among these:

a) Mass: it is the smallest level of interaction and communication; we get lost in it and we are just a number (the image of a flock of sheep can help us to understand this).
b) Community of interests: the union is based on the interests shared by some individuals. A level of co-responsibility and objectives are given (e.g. a Not Governmental Organisation (NGO) or a sport federation).

c) Society: interests are shared but not objectives or activity. The linking is by *contract*, base of the norms or social and juridical rules that regulate our ownership.

d) Community of life: very recent concept. It is the highest level of sociability but respecting the freedom and based on the tolerance, since their ownership is voluntary. The desires of living, feeling and thinking together are shared. The mutual trust and the friendship are their base.

Socialization is the way we are integrated and we acquire a social identity. We cannot forget that we are born unsocial, and inside the society we acquire behaviour, habits, norms and rules that transform us into social beings. The socialization introduces us in the society and what we pay for it is the adoption of its manners and norms: juridical laws, moral, norms, etc. In this way, it is usually distinguished between two socialization types, the primary socialization and the secondary socialization.

The primary socialization is carried out through those social spaces or moulds, called social agents, as the family, the school or the state. During the childhood, children takes lists of attitudes and values from people they care (parents, siblings, teachers, friends) and they identified themselves with them. It is the first step toward the identity. The children don't only accept the social roles from these people but the world that they represent. The socialization implies the interiorization of roles. It is a process that goes from concrete to general. The process of primary socialization is more than a cognitive act, is experiential and emotional, it is the base of the identity. It is the acquisition of norms and values of their culture. This way of socialization transforms an individual into a social being.

The secondary socialization is a process by means of internalizing sub worlds or realities different to the world base, foundation of the primary socialization. It is a second socialization carried out through political, religious, labour institutions, etc. Unlike to the primary socialization, where children cannot choose since socializing patterns are imposed, children can now choose the patterns and rules that they will internalize and will make them theirs. There is a smaller emotional load and it is related with the maturity. Conflicts of identity and coherence can appear when discovering that the paternal or familiar reality is neither the only one nor the best, arising
identification problems with the family. The next text picked up from Berger and Luckmann (1984: 24) is enlightening:

“The individual is not born as a member of a society, they are born with a bias toward the socialization, and then they ends up being member of a society. Problems like self-identity and choosing people to be with don't exist in the primary socialization. The society introduces the candidate to a defaulted group of other similar people that he/she should accept as they are, without the possibility of opting for another arrangement. It is necessary to accept the parents that the fate has provided us. This unfair inherent disadvantage has the obvious consequence that, although children are not simple passive spectators, in the process of their socialization, the adults are who stipulate the rules of the game. The boy can intervene in the game with enthusiasm or with gloomy resistance, but unfortunately any other game doesn't exist. This has an important consequence. As the boy doesn't intervene in the election of their others, he identifies himself almost automatically with them. The boy doesn't internalize the world of their others as one of so many possible worlds but like the world, the only one that exists (...) For this reason, the internalized world in the primary socialization is implanted in the conscience with much more stability than the internalized worlds in secondary socializations”

It is clear, therefore, the fact that human beings tend to be related to others by nature. This characteristic is expressed in the socialization process that we internalize with the course of the time through relationships and interdependences, creating diverse communities that we feel close to. In these communities there are affinities and distancing with others at the same time, both characteristic of the human coexistence.

The relationships between individuals and the familiar/friends ties that are settled down among them must be compatible with the freedom and the autonomy characteristic of each individual. Which is the role of the education in this relational process and in the construction of an own identity?. Gimeno (2001: 107) thinks in this respect that the role of the education will be "to contribute to consolidate and to base those two seemingly contradictory dimensions to make them an instrument for the conquest of the autonomy and freedom, and at the same time to foment the establishment of social links for a peaceful coexistence."

In this sense, we take the conceptualization that Pérez Gómez (1992: 17), from a global perspective, attributes to the education like a socialization process:
"Since the social configuration of the species becomes a decisive factor of the individual's humanization, the education in a wide sense completes the unavoidable function of the socialization". "... This socialization process is usually designated like a education process (from a general point of view)."

This socialization is understood as a process directed to the integration of people in the society to get theirs participation in the culture.

As we can observe, Pérez's conception is related with the conformation and development of the social character of human as species, and with the transference of achievements to the coming generations. Therefore, it has a pronounced cultural character. In every society, group and culture there are learning processes and experiences (partially conscious and partially unconscious) through which the older generations incites, induces and forces to the youngest generation to adopt the way of traditional thinking, feeling and behaving. The role of the education would be to organize the process of acquisition of the culture that facilitates the individual's integration in the society. In this sense, Stenhouse (1987: 34) outlines that:

"... the education exists to provide to the individuals access to cultural groups that are outside of his own". "... Such a culture is transmitted, learned and shared and, through the development of the language, base on the communication between members as well as the way of thinking of some individuals. In certain way, the culture is a good of intellectual consumption, and the schools are in charge of that..."

The problem is that the ways that it can be settled down, from the educational environment to get this integration and social participation, can vary and diverge thoroughly. However, for the analysis level that we want to settle down we can agree that, in a general way and accepting the diverse applied formulas, the pedagogic action tends to prepare the individual for the life in society and to the access to the culture, understanding this in its wide sense (partner-anthropological) and not restricted that relates it with a certain type of knowledge and artistic manifestations.

On the other hand, the education like socialization process cannot be understood on the fringes of the ideological, economic and political values of the society (Lundgren, 1992). In this sense, the education understood as cultural participation takes different shades of meaning according to the prevailing paradigm in the society. In accordance with these positions, what we can understand for culture and social participation can also take different senses, such as the culture like something objective and neutral (positivism) or
the culture like recreation, when being reinterpreted and negotiated by its participants (Bruner, 1988, 1997). The education, therefore, guides our social identity. From this perspective the development of dominant ways of sociability is determined somehow by the culture that channels the configuration of interdependent relationships among the individuals. In this sense Gimeno (2001: 110) expresses that “the social relationships are related to the cultural component that provides the meanings that unleash them, make them possible, nurture them, facilitate them or hinder them.”

Parsons (1982), assimilating in his social system a substantial part of Durkheim’s ideas, sees in the education (in its terminology presented as socialization) the basic mechanism to build social and maintenance systems and to preserve them in form of societies. Without the socialization the system is unable to stay integrated, to preserve its order, its balance and to conserve its limits. To make the system survive, the new individuals that become part of it need to assimilate and internalize the values and the norms that govern its operation. Parsons, contrary to Durkheim, doesn't stand out so much the restrictive aspect of the system according to the individual, but he points out the complementary of mechanisms that act with the purpose of satisfying the requirements of the social system and of the system of personality. As well as the system has needs to socialize its members, the individual also has needs that only the system can satisfy.

However, when certain authors assume that the socialization processes, even in the schools, are not unidirectional but rather are the result of an interaction between the individual and other dimensions of their social experience, the researchers are more willing to understand and to locate the results of the process like a psychosocial trajectory in the individual environment, and not to consider aspects of the dynamics between institutions and groups that affect in the school and redefine the socialization.

When some researchers reject the perspective of autonomy from the educational systems toward the society, we go to an environment of thinking where the education is seen reproductive mechanism of the social life, its hierarchy and its inequalities, and from which structural changes are not operated in the society. Such theories introduce the concepts of power and dominance in the analysis of the relationship education and society, sharing perceptions fundamentally different from how the power and the control work in the interest of the dominant society, so much inside as outside of the schools (Giroux, 1986: 107).
In the nineteen seventies this type of approach produced several analyses about the education system. Theirs contributions want to demonstrate the impossibility of the education to build individuals who make their action, because there is almost not room to train certain agents. Very concisely we would say that the referred studies belong to the structural perspective, where the society is assumed like non homogeneous everything, hierarchy heterogeneities, as the three instances of social practices: economic, politics and ideological, where the first one is the fundamental one for structuring the society into classes, situation that is originated in the social division of the work and the differential appropriation of the production means. The relationship among classes is of antagonistic character and it is included into outlines of dominance and subjection that cross the three instances of social practices.

From those suppositions arise the concern of pointing out and understanding the social mechanisms that allow the continuity and conservation of such dominance structures. Many authors find in the formal education the institution that partly guarantees the reproduction of the society and the acceptance of the inequalities.

However, the system educational show dominance interests and intends to operate as "transmitter of representations and practices that facilitate the legitimation and reproduction of dominant interests in a social order" (Giroux, 1986: 207). This configuration of representations is, in the structuralist context, what is considered the dominant ideology. In such a case, we would say that the school is par excellence a socialization agency, unilaterally determined by the dominant groups. In the school images, concepts and contents are known and accepted as objective, external elements, being suitable for the individuals and regulating their own interactions. It is interesting to point out that in this idea the transmission of the dominant ideology is practically the only one contemplated, because when the existence of ideologies linked to other social groups is accepted, it is considered that these doesn’t spread by the school but by other means. The structuralist context doesn’t reject the possibility that some autonomy can exit in the school institutions, and it can include some evidences of the conflicting and antagonistic social life that exists outside the school, but this is not enough to penetrate the school and to produce structural changes. Its function is just the opposite, "it is of maintenance" (Giroux, 1986: 113).

On the other hand, it is necessary to highlight the existence of some authors that, accepting the structural point of view for understanding the social life, they are mainly interested in explaining the reproduction mechanisms in the cultural environment. It is the case for Bordieu and Passeron’s work (1977) and
Bernstein’s work (1977). We understand that in the effort they make there is a aim of surpassing the idea of the school function as indoctrination or ideological inculcation, proposing the field of the cultural transmission and the socialization as the suitable one to find the elements that underlie to the structure, and that operate as mediators in this process. The idea of an unequal society is presented, in which there are conflicts and a dominance structure that is reproduced by several mechanisms, belonging the education one to them, even when this can show certain autonomy.

In such studies the cultural reproduction is maintained to include political aspects, and the socialization that it is given in the school institutions is recognized and considered of interest for the study of the social dynamics. Disclosing these mechanisms is the principle of the work for those researchers that finally are interested in the analysis of the permanency of a culture class that is dominant. These contributions were really important and a great number of subsequent efforts were based on theirs theories to analyze specific cases of educational situations.

On the other hand, these authors express that the socialization is not only made in terms of instilling ideas, concepts or opinions, but rather attitudes and dispositions that regulate the behaviours are also instilled. These structured principles that organize the thinking and action are transferable and unconscious, as well as they are common for certain groups.

Following the outline of Bourdieu and Passeron, we would say that we are in a situation of ideological imposition for the individual and in a conformation of cultural capital in the group, that go to the homogeneity and not to ruptures and changes. The socialization would produce unavoidable results and the culture would depend on structured schemes of dispositions and attitudes that are inexorably transmitted to the members of a society. These authors supplement social reproduction scheme adding and elucidating the aspect of the cultural reproduction, but always in a process with deep connections or determinations regarding the structure of distribution of the economic capital and of participation of the power (Gómez, 1991).

The interest in understanding the questions related with the persistence of structures of power and control from the transmission of cultural rules was also a idea that worried Basil Bernstein. His work is developed from a language-social perspective and, in the context of socialization processes, it looks for "delimiting those that operate in the social distribution of the knowledge that is unequal and it is affected by the system of classes" (Bernstein, 1991: 288).
When giving continuity to our intention of relating the postures regarding the education and its corresponding derivation of characteristics for the socialization, then we could point out that Bernstein, in spite of not working with an outline mechanic of structural correspondence among class, school and political control, leaves little room for the education to be able to operate as an agent that enlarges the symbolic delimitations defined by the relationships between classes and establish wider forms of participation that are able to surpass the mechanisms of social reproduction. In this case one could think that the formal education would maintain different cultures of the diverse social groups in tight compartments, strengthening the prevalence of the culture of the hierarchically high groups. If we transfer this reasoning to the environment of the culture and the socialization processes it makes sense to say, according to these authors, that the school process would end up in the confirmation of a dominant culture and the inhibition or devaluation of the culture of the submissive groups.

It is clear that the cultural explanations propose a culture notion as lived experience that tries to recover the human action. But it makes it at the cost of "devaluating the importance of the material practices and the different levels of specificity that they have inside the social entirety" (Giroux, 1986: 179). If a radical culturalism doesn't solve the problem of the dualism action-structure, the idea of the culture rescues the "individual" and opens interesting perspectives for the analysis of the culture and the socialization in the formal educational processes.

When the culture is understood as a creation that involve the determination and the innovative human action, allowing us to consider not only the existence of social classes but also other groups that participate in creation processes, resistance or cultural submission, producing specific actions, revealing the culture like a heterogeneous frame of practices and beliefs, the interpretive outline of the processes of dominance of cultures of classes becomes more complex. On the other hand, when this idea is pointing out, we perceive that heterogeneity of practices belongs to heterogeneity of social actors.

It is not possible to suppose that the social relationships of production are the only source of the social dynamics, even when one cannot doubt of their centrality due to its capacity to alter the material base of the society. Along with this economic dynamics we find that the social, political and cultural concept also possesses a relative autonomy that facilitates the interdependence. This argument allows us to think that the not classicist social sectors are located in social, political and cultural positions whose dynamic and oppositions belong to
them. What it matters is to keep in mind that the dynamic of the classist social fellows is crisscrossed with the dynamic of other social fellows who are organized and act in non economic oppositions. In consequence, it is artificial and arbitrary to reduce the dynamics to a single type of social fellows. On the contrary, the interrelation among the spheres is expressed as mediations that determine the specificity of a social fellow, whichever it is its origin. In this sense there are not pure fellows that are trapped and determined by what is happening in one direction; "the fellow will always be determined by social, economic, political and cultural mediations" (Durand Puts, 1989: 35).

It is clear that the sexual and social division of the work would be among the elements that propitiate this heterogeneity, but also the racial differences and even the variety of the social institutions that are specific, but maintain relationships to each other, are included. Therefore, the realities experienced by the individuals possess a complexity that doesn’t finish in a class outline, and the culture of the groups overcomes this situation and it is developed in a tessitura of diverse natures tensions. According to this vision it is assumed that the social fellow gets a new concept. It is an individual multi-determinated, who is no longer defined in an unique determination and dominance logic, with characteristics that confer him the opportunity to think about things carefully.

Up to now we have presented a vision of the structure as decisive action of the individuals or the social fellows and if the structure changes because of the individual action or of the fellows, as we have affirmed, it is completely insufficient to understand the fellows or the individuals like entities that possess some autonomy and own will. To claim this autonomy it is indispensable to introduce the “carefully thinking” concept, so, the capacity of the individuals to think about their own action, their practices and even the rules and, starting from it, “to react critically, to propose new classificatory principles and to fight for them” (Durand Puts on, 1989: 25).

This way to understand the culture and people is nowadays very close to the sociologists who are worried about studying the real and daily mechanisms of the cultural reproduction in the schools. If we are interested in the socialization starting from the education and referred to a certain culture, these recent postures are important to reprocess an analysis perspective on these topics. Following these reasoning, we would have to accept the consequences of the multi-determination of social fellows, and in the social dynamics and their movements.

When considering these elements we would observe a school institution that lives and reflects this reality of tension and movement among social fellows,
and as such it doesn't only represent a place of socio-cultural reproduction of inequalities, but also of emancipating interests, maybe prone to the justness. In conclusion, the school would reveal a cultural fight among fellows by elements like class, race, gender and religion. The culture lives and is constituted in these interrelations as well as the fellows in reason of their experiences mediated by institutional and normative instances.

In these terms there is not neutrality of the school with relationship to those confrontations of different fellows. There are oppositions, impositions, cultural resistances that the different fellows exercise in a given educational space and the results of that interrelation, even when in general they work in favour of the reproduction and also admit different ways out to this situation. These are possibilities to explore by the actors involved in the process and other agents that bring some ideas of change form alternative public spheres.

The existence of individuals with more than one dimension makes us to consider new and complex social relationships that are solved only in presence of democratic values, which admit the characteristic of its rights and defence. The idea of an universal, abstract individual, from who emanate rights, is given away and transform it into a perspective where differences are recognized, individuals are particularized and the defence of their multiple positions are supported. The identities are not permanent, they are strongly uncertain and differentiated, and almost always conflicting. From a democratic, multiple and plural perspective, in which the democratic rights only acquire sense when they are exercised and recognized collectively, it is where the non unitary social individual is conformed, in other words, a form of individuality "truly plural and democratic" (Mouffé, 1994: 93).

It seems that most of the authors, that we have revised (and many other are missed), reason starting from social models considered politically advanced, as far as they can be characterized as stable and modern democracies, with acceptable levels of civic participation and more justness in the distribution of economic resources. Even so, the social transformations, the differentiation and complexity of the relationships among the individuals, are making a new perspective of analysis of the social life and their actors, and consequently a new perspective of demands that a complex society can make regarding the civic formation and the political culture.

In this theoretical context there are authors who have worked with the aim of defining and discussing the paper of the school and the education in the socialization processes. These contributions are considered as answers to the growing demands of formation of new particular and plurals individualities for
the coexistence in those new political spaces. Certainly we are in a process of intense cultural changes and new orientations for behaviour rules. It has been affirmed that the processes of social transition will be based on the human action, partly individually defined, distanced from structural factors but linked to concrete cultural identities that would cohabit in terms of their communication capacity and advance.

Many of these authors outlines that the education, in its wider meaning, will have to be the responsible for this formation, but it will have to face a “traditional school that, by inertia or opposition, is not responding to new demands neither carrying out the new functions that are nowadays necessary” (Giroux, 1986: 309). Besides, this reformulation is based on a new definition of objectives of the education. The teachers, taken as mediators of the educational processes, will be committed with the democratic transformations and interested in the construction of a plural citizenship that is already in others alternative public spaces. In this case the school would clearly assume a social paper and it would show and would reinvent a new sociability, where the outlines of social reproduction could be surpassed.

On the other hand, the educators need to understand that different identities among the youths are taking place in new and generally unknown spaces for the schools. The pedagogy should redefine its relationship with the modern forms of culture, privilege and normative regulation and to serve as interpretation vehicle. The pedagogy as critic cultural practice needs to open new institutional spaces where the students can experience and define the meaning of being cultural producer. In this case, the schools can be seen as public spaces, actively committed in producing new forms of democratic community organized as places for interpretation, negotiation and resistance.

With these ideas and demands for the school it is clear that at the moment their function of political-social agency cannot be ignored and it is defined with a lot of vigour in highly complex societies. This is why there is a concern and insistence in the discussion of topics on ethics, values and multi-cultural education that have been generated in the educational field at the moment. Finally, today it seems clear that educational institutions are not seen as pre-condition for the construction or change in the participation forms and social attitudes, but rather they are part of a complex process of social life constitution. It is convenient not to forget this position so that we don't relapse with huge expectations regarding the educational processes, as generators of socio-political changes. The education should promote lifestyles that imply participation demands and growing demands. The school for all - not isolated,
that shows its actors, constituted in a plurality of social fellows - could be the result of this school proposal and its inseparable tasks of socialization and formation for the access to the labour world. Under this concept the education would establish the appropriate relationships with other activity spaces, and it would be constituted in central element for the social development, abandoning isolated proposals.

3. Diversity, difference and inequality

Every educative organization is configured around a community in which students, teachers and parents are integrated, and all they, as members of the educational community, are diverse and usually come from diverse cultures, have necessities, or, simply, have differential the education, interests, rhythms, learning styles, motivations and expectations.

"Because of diverse conditioning factors, we can end up seeing as anomalous what are normal conditions of the reality. It is a verifiable empiric fact comparable from the common sense, that, from the biological, psychological, social and cultural point of view, the human beings differ some of others. Each one constitutes a radical individuality beside others as singular as ours. The particular endowment with which we come to the world, the use we make of our qualities, the singularity of contexts we get through, the peculiar assimilation we make of those contexts and the individual initiatives we take, makes each of us a person with a biography and a singular idiosyncrasy" (Gimeno, 1999: 68).

The problem is that during many decades, as we have been seen in the previous epigraphs, our society has worried to know the most habitual and common rules in all the aspects of our life (physical characteristics, capacities, habits...). In our culture, frequently, what is valued about people it is not what they are, but their approach to what has been considered as ideals patterns. The culture of the norm makes the same expectations for everyone, being a point of reference to value different behaviours and the progresses of people. So culture of the homogeneity is promoted and the differences looks like something desirable, and therefore it constitutes a problem" (Of the Carmen, 2000: 7).

In many occasions, when one speaks of diversity in the classroom, it is thought that it is referred to students with difficulties. At social level the same problem is found. To speak about diversity is to talk about people that "are outside of the
norm” and this way has been shown along the history by means of segregation mechanisms and exclusion. It is clear in the quote from Ainscow (2001:25)

"It is convenient to remember that schools, as other social institutions, are influenced by the perceptions of the socioeconomic category, the race, the language and the gender. It is essential, therefore, to wonder how they influence those perceptions in the class interactions. In this way, it is necessary to extend the current insistence in the methods until the deficit view of the “difference” is revealed, that defines certain types of students like individuals 'lacking of something ' ".

The attention to the diversity should be seen as something related to the whole pupil, even to the whole educational community. It is something permanent for every educational work. In this sense, Gimeno (1999: 67) says:

"It is a traverse aspect in the investigation. On the other hand, in this topic we are forced to walk on the edge of an extraordinary ambiguity when we use the language. The diversity refers to the circumstance of the subject for being different (something that is worthy of being respected in a tolerant, liberal and democratic society). Although it also makes reference that the difference (not always neutral) is, in fact, inequality, as far as the singularities of fellows or of groups allow them to reach certain objectives in the schools and outside of them."

But diversity is not the same thing that inequality. The confusion between the diversity and inequality concepts shows the existent ambiguity in the debate and in the practice of the education in the diversity. So, when some authors prevent against the danger of introducing the neoliberal project of reproducing the social inequalities under the education in the diversity, both concept are being compared, so that to educate in the diversity would be synonymous of giving to each one what they need to keep their status in the social and cultural hierarchy. Or, in contrary sense, it has been said that a excess of understanding can have the contrary effects, because when trying to equal impossible we produce more inequality. We believe that diversity and inequality understand each other not from a causal relationship but dialectical, as the two faces of a coin (Essomba, M.A., 2006).

I don't believe there is someone with democratic mood who doesn't plead for the equality of all the citizens. Equality in the eyes of the law for everyone, equality of opportunities, of equality of rights is widely spoken. From this discourse we would also have to speak of inequality in the eyes of the law, inequality of opportunities, etc. This is not comparable to think about the
diversity for those same situations in the field of the differences. When one speaks of "equality in the eyes of... " the differences are not excluded, but rather these are those that can guarantee the possibility to claim the right of "to be the same in the eyes of... ". In this sense Pérez's Walls words are eloquent (1996: 142):

"To educate for the equality is to educate for the mixed races, regarding to the otherness that makes possible the mutual enrichment from the differences. If we are able to educate in the equality, that is important from the humanity's point of view, we will make progress toward the justice, to the freedom of everyone and with nobody frustrated for theirs own roots."

Therefore, from our perspective, "to speak about a school for everyone supposes to adopt a ideological position in the eyes of the education and its social function, rejecting the inequality under which hierarchies settle down and accepting the difference like a positive value" (García and Illán, 1999: 30).

In this sense, the diversity of literary preferences is different to the diversity that settles down among who doesn't understand a text and who is able to recreate it. As neither it is the same thing to offer matters that allow the students to be guided than to classify them previously. If we understand diversity as everything that makes people and communities be different, and for inequality everything that establishes hierarchies in knowledge, in power or wealth, the prospect is clarified. We have already described in previous occasions (Torres González, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2002) that the manifestations of the diversity in the field of the education derive from social, economic, cultural, geographical, ethnic and religious factors, as well as the different intellectual, psychic, sensorial capacities. We can clearly observe two dimensions of these manifestations: diversity, understood as everything that makes people and communities be different since the human nature is revealed as multiple, complex, diverse and inequality like those processes that establish hierarchies in knowledge, in power or wealth of the individuals or collective. The diversity, therefore, makes reference to physical, genetic, personal and cultural factors, while the inequality will make reference to social, economic and political factors. If we extrapolate these concepts to the educational field, we will be able to speak about diverse or different people regarding to capacities, styles and learning rhythms, motivations, cultural values and we will be able to speak about inequalities in situations that produce disadvantages and lacks in connection with other individuals or collective. López Melero set out this idea as follow (1997: 174):

"... I want to clarify what I understand for diversity, difference and what I understand for inequality. The diversity makes reference to the person's quality..."
that makes each one the way we are and not how we would like to be. This recognition is in fact what configures the human dignity. The difference is the valuation of the diversity and it is in fact in this valuation where there are several manifestations, by rejection (dislike) or by understanding (sympathy). It is the consideration of the diversity as a value. And the inequality is about establishing hierarchies among people by social, political and economic power criterion. It is in fact the opposite of the equality."

Therefore, we all are different (diverse) and we all suffer some disadvantage situation or lack at some point, regardless to whether we decide to compensate it. The educational action from a democratic option will be governed by two strategic lines:

" to respect / to share the differences and
" to compensate / to overcome the inequalities.

In general we follow two big models to meet the diversity of students. The first model involve going into situations of diversity in depth: to respect, to promote and even to intensify the differentiating aspects - cultural value, interest and motivations, peculiar capacities, etc. The differentiating strategies prevail. The other model involve overcoming situations of diversity: to equal, to compensate, to bring levels closer - rhythms and development processes, inequalities of sexist origin, special educational needs, etc.

But the question becomes more complicated when we verify that the factors of diversity create inequality, from social effects or from effect of the same school: if the linguistic speech of a boy doesn't match with the standard of the school he will have more problems to learn than others; in the case of a girl she will find more problems to gain access to technological cultures. In these examples happens that the difference of linguistic code in the first case, and the gender in other, become factors of inequality, for the hierarchization that the school practices and social values produce.

The reality of people and educational activity is a complex entirety and therefore it is not easy to determine what should be deepened and what overcome. Only an appropriate combination of differentiating and equalizers strategies can approach the objective of developing the maximum potentialities of pupils. This makes us thing about the balance among the basic and diversification, regarding to the educational organization, the areas of action and the definition of the equalizers and differentiating strategies, and about the teacher's culture who are in charge of taking decisions.
We have been able to evidence previously how the society and the education have reacted in a very similar way in view of the human diversity. The school and the society in its educating perspective have deployed multitude of actions to try to correct the diversity, transforming the differences among the fellows into clear situations of inequality, in the desired of a certain social order, subjecting the individuals to its norms, to its curriculum and to its organizational structure (Forquín, 1985). Those ones that have lived, as student or as professor, the excluding school can prove it. It seems clear that the intents of the educational institution to confront the diversity have been based on an almost permanent intent of differentiated treatment of itself (Gimeno, 2000). In this sense the diversity has been approached, in the theory and in the practice, from the individuality, with a tendency to put the individuals into levels or classification scales, which means to structure the communities of people in differential groups. But we can't forget that the same thing has happened at social level. Can we speak then about a school that reproduce social rules? Can we say that the diversity was something that seems universal? as Ferrández outlined it(1997: 15). I believe so, between other reasons because the current society is highly differential at the same time that reproduce behaviour situations of short spectrum (many parents refuse their children share the education with different fellows: gypsies, muslim, etc). Finally, we must consider that the necessity of a change at social and educational level is indispensable but at the same time complex. Ferrández outlines (1997: 18) that "nothing would be achieved if a social change took place regarding the consideration of different people if at the same time people don't recognize the characteristics of theirs diversity". It is a social and educational challenge. The education, our field of professional development, must become the hope, denominated in the Delors report (1996) that can, on one hand, help to educate a society for the future, more fair, more supportive and also to fight against the inequalities.

4. The difficult challenge of conjugating the understanding and the diversity

The compulsory education in developed countries supposed a great conquest that today demands something more; an education of quality for everyone, far from the homogenized practices, the approaches of effectiveness and not favouring the students’ differentiation inside the schools (Gimeno, 1992). It is not only changing the conception of the educational institutions but a change coming from the own development of the democratic school systems that
converges with the changes that the analysis of the reality of the Special Education also promotes. This new conception of "school for all" is born because of the desires manifested by the communities which are affected by some diverse educational necessities and for diverse social interests that try to give an answer to the contradictions and the problems that the diversity outlines. "From a dynamic point of view of many inherent contradictions for the consumption society, an answer is demanded which can only give an attentive and respectful education with the diversity, a school that, from its social projection, accepts the diversity as one of the big educational values" (Sánchez Palomino and Torres González, 2002: 70).

As we have shown along this article, the man is by nature a social being, but at the same time he is an unique being. This takes us unavoidably to admit the diversity, but also to meditate on the meaning that it has regarding the sociability, that is the other aspect for reaching the minimum of a human being. Ferrández (1997: 20) manifested in this respect that "individuality and sociability are two didactic and therefore pedagogic actions that converge in the formation of the personality". in fact, the educational practices always suppose regulators framework that claim coincident answers in the individuals. That is to say, "the educational institutions force the convergences of the individualities" (Gimeno, 2001: 235). The maturing development of individuals is a constant game between the individual and the social concept. However it seems to be that the socialization heights are reached by promoting the potential of the individual capacities, so that social behaviours are reached thanks to the existence of a critical position of individual character. The true education, therefore, will strengthen the personal critical thinking, and from it, make the most of the individual contributions for the group, where a social-cognitive conflict is generated and forces to a critical opinion and to take decisions.

Therefore, the reference in the teaching-learning processes will be the individuality of the fellows that constitute the group. That individuality, "from the personal autonomy and the consequent responsibility assumed in a critical way, guarantees the socialized work in all their dimensions" (Ferrández, 1997: 21). However it is necessary to keep in mind, just as Gimeno outlines (2001:235), that when the socializing function is excessive, it causes resistance, and it tended to promote the submission of what is diverse. In this sense the educational institutions have promoted the classification of the fellows in categories. Then the education has a difficult challenge; "on one hand to synthesize the ethical aspect of the individuality and, on the other, to join together the individuals in a net of projects and feelings that make community" (Gimeno, 2001: 236)
To claim an education with equitable views (equality of opportunities) and understanding doesn't mean in any case to claim the uniformity for all its students, but rather "it supposes to organize the educational attention in the respect of each student's peculiarities and knowing that the motivations, the interests and the learning capacity are very different among the students, due to a combined complex of factors as individual as socio-cultural, that interact to each other" (MEC 1989: 44-50).

The political option of the Educational Reformation in the 90's supposed the design of an obligatory teaching that offered the same instruction opportunities and the same educational experiences to all the students with independence of its social position, economic possibilities, gender, race and other individual characteristics. In this sense, the compulsory education is characterized by an education that seeks to be understanding (LOE, 2006) and at the same time diversified, difficult aspects to be conjugated and even of integrating, looking for the balance among them, because a basic and common education for all the students - non separatist and that makes possible the principle of equality opportunities - should be designed in a coherent way with the principle of satisfying the educational necessities of the whole pupil: paying attention to the diversity. "The principle of a understanding education should, therefore, be supplemented with an offer of diversified teaching that provides real satisfaction to the educational necessities of the students" (MEC, 1989: 119).

"This political option in favour of the understanding implies the necessity, in the pedagogic view, of designing procedures that integrate the diversity of students that are being distinguished progressively in order to give answer to its interests, capacities and learning rhythms" (Torres González, 1999: 136); from the social view, however, a series of purposes underlies (Cabrérizo, J. and Rubio, Mª. J., 2007):

- The improvement of the educational system (it improves the quality and correct deficiencies).
- The social justice (correction of injustices and equality of opportunities).
- The cultural and educational promotion of people (extension of compulsory education).

It is therefore necessary that the organization of the teaching that we adopt assures a real balance between understanding and diversity. But it is here
where problems begin. Even more when the diversity of the pupil in our classrooms is bigger and bigger. "At the present, the diversity has ended up being constituted as a norm. The supposed social homogeneity doesn't exist" (Casanova, 1999: 3). From our perspective, the respect of the differences and the mutual enrichment with them should constitute a basic educational position. With this purpose, and agreeing with Pérez Gómez (1995), the logic of the homogeneity should be substituted by the logic of the diversity.

But, meeting the diversity, does it mean that while a part of the pupils work on literature the others part colours maps? To answer affirmatively without more considerations would suppose a clearly differentiating treatment of the diversity. Nevertheless it could happen that a part of the pupil only worked on literature and it happened inside an integrative school framework. On what does it depend? Which is the balance between the integration and the separation in special groups to assist the pupil with specific or special needs for not contradicting the understanding education? Have the physical integration and timing been overvalued in the same space and in the same schedule of the whole pupil as starting point to educate in an integrative way? In the practice, it has been able to appreciate that the physical integrations don't avoid the real marginalization of certain students in some occasions. On what does it depend? How is that educational answer designed that seeks to assist to the diversity? The answer is: assisting each one of them. And maybe the reply is immediate: And how do I assist each one of them alone? The answer could be the following one: In that important task, we are not alone, but rather we have a series of resources that we can use for it (Cabrerozo, J. and Rubio, Mª.J. 2007, 45).

It is important to point out that it is good to think about this question with an integrative impulse, because the true is that in most of cases when we diagnose pupil's problems for learning we are in fact self-diagnosing an organization problem of teachers: we don't know what to make, or we cannot make it, or we don't come to an agreement. We don't really know if we have "a boy with problems" or "problems with a boy". The educational sense of an activity or strategy for assisting diversity does not depend so much of its technical components as for the value and meaning that it has in the organization context of the centre: if the organizational culture of the centre emits an integrative message or if it emits a hierarchical message.

It can be proven how a technical activity acquires a different educational meaning according to the context of the institution. Some indicators can be the following ones:
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- Value and conceptions about the diversity that dominate in the institution culture, in the action project and in the administration of the institution.

- Meaning and premeditation that teachers give to an integration activity.

- Meaning and value that the participant pupils, and the non participant, attributes to the activity.

- Participation grade and agreement of implied pupils.

- Quality of the physical integration in the ordinary group.

To this basic approach another factor of the context of the institution should be pointed out: the available resources. Sometimes the possible thing is not the best thing. Therefore, "understanding and diversity are not antagonistic principles but complementary. If we seek an integrative education and non separatist we should assume the challenge of giving answer to the enormous complexity of interests, problems and necessities that are given in the educational reality. But this perspective would not be valid if it doesn't contribute to compensate inequalities, making effective the principle of equality of opportunities that is in our Constitution. It is not an easy task, since at the present in the society and in the school exists a selective culture that takes root in the social, cultural and pedagogic convictions of teachers, students and parents. In this sense the culture of the diversity and respect of differences should not be promoted only in the educational environment, but rather it must be part and to be implied in the values that are promoted in the society. We would speak of diversity as a social and political value" (Torres González, 1999: 136). In this sense, we should not forget the existent gap between developed countries and not developed countries, which polarizes the populations. It is necessary, therefore, to try to understand what is happening in the whole society, on one hand, about absence of justness as the equality of opportunities in the development of the basic capacities, that is, of effective abilities for people to be able to make a project of life that doesn’t come down to the subsistence and, on the other hand, to reconsider the fundamental task of the education that is not another that the one of forming men and women with critical, autonomous and responsible capacity to cohabit consciously in the society, able to evolve and to adapt themselves to the complex reality of the contemporary world, to a world in constant and quick mutation that implies the
conformation in new ways of facing the teaching and learning processes in the search of the quality, of the excellence. This consciously cohabit in the society is related with "the process of trying to take certain values and ethical principles into practice in the classrooms and in the educational institutions" (Booth, 2006: 211).
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