

ANDALUSIA, SPAIN'S 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR
IMMIGRANT EDUCATION: PROMOTING
INTERCULTURALISM OR ASSIMILATION?

by

CAROLINE PAIGE WHITAKER

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of International Studies
and the Robert D. Clark Honors College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts

June, 2016

An Abstract of the Thesis of

Caroline Paige Whitaker for the degree of Bachelor of Arts
in the Department of International Studies to be taken June, 2016

Title: Andalusia, Spain's 2016 Comprehensive Plan for Immigrant Education:
Promoting Interculturalism or Assimilation?

Approved:  _____

Edward M. Olivos

This honors thesis examines the Socio-Educative section of Andalusia, Spain's 2016 Comprehensive Policy for Immigration and its wider implications for how the Andalusian education system treats cultural and linguistic diversity. It finds that the intercultural rhetoric used in the policy has little substantive value because the content and programs of the policy treat cultural and linguistic differences as deficits. Furthermore, the policy treats diversity as a necessary transitional phase in the end goal of cultural and linguistic assimilation of immigrants. It recommends that the PIPIA be revised for a fourth time to incorporate programs based on enrichment theory and interculturalism.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my primary thesis advisor Professor Olivos for guiding me in this process and helping me to explore and understand Andalusia's 2016 Comprehensive Plan for Immigrant Education. I would also like to thank Professor Fracchia, and Professor Rosiek for taking the time to serve on my thesis committee. I am grateful to have such excellent professors willing to help me do my best work. I would also like to thank my family and friends who have supported me throughout this strenuous process. Thank you mom and dad, especially, for your unending words of encouragement. This would not have been possible without all of you.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Background	1
Combatting Racism through Education	6
Research Question	7
Background on the PIPIAs	8
The PIPIA III	10
Contribution to the Field	11
Chapter 2: Methods	12
Overview of Frameworks and Definitions	12
Process of Analysis	17
Limitations	18
Importance	19
Chapter 3: Literature Review	21
Previous Research on the Subject: GEISA's Studies	21
Discourse Creating Asymmetrical Power Relationships	22
Recurrent ambiguous terms	24
Deficit Models in Andalusian Public Education	25
Summary	26
Framework for Analysis of Educational Programs for Minority Students	27
Tove Skutnabb-Kangas's Framework	27
Colin Baker's Framework	31
Skutnabb-Kangas's Framework Continued	42
Deficit and Enrichment Theories	45
Chapter 4: Analysis of the PIPIA III	49
Introduction	49
Welcoming and Integration Programs	54
Teaching of Spanish Language	57

Programs for the Maintenance of Cultures of Origin	64
Chapter 6: Summary and Conclusions	68
Summary	68
Implications	71
Recommendations for Further Action	73
References	77

List of Figures

Figure 1. Political Map of Iberian Peninsula and Spain's Autonomous Communities 1

List of Tables

<i>Table 1.</i> Skutnabb-Kangas's definitions of mother tongue.	28
<i>Table 2.</i> Baker's chart of programs creating weak and strong forms of bilingualism.	34
<i>Table 3.</i> Features of immersion programs.	40
<i>Table 4.</i> Skutnabb-Kangas's factors of Segregation, Maintenance, Submersion, and Immersion programs and their outcomes.	43
<i>Table 5.</i> Deficit vs. Enrichment theories.	47
<i>Table 6.</i> Summary of PIPIA III programs and outcomes.	69

Chapter 1: Introduction



Figure 1. Political Map of Iberian Peninsula and Spain's Autonomous Communities

Adapted from *Maps Open Source*. Retrieved

from <http://www.mapsopensource.com/spain-political-map.html>.

Background

From the 8th century onward under the rule of the Moors, the culturally, linguistically, and religiously diverse people of Andalusia, Spain, or al-Andalus as it was known from the 8th through the 16th century, lived in harmony for hundreds of years (Ruiz, 2007, p. 8). The Moors greatly influenced Andalusian culture, language, and history and al-Andalus was a major center of Muslim power and intellectual, scientific, agricultural, and cultural advancement (Ruiz, 2007, p. 17). The Islamic polity followed the Quranic mandate and protected Jewish and Christian communities, although many people in al-Andalus converted to Islam, motivated by the civil advantages granted by the state for conversion (Menocal, 2002, pp. 28-29).

Intermarriage was common amongst all three monotheistic faiths and cultural relations between them made up the vibrant culture of al-Andalus (Menocal, 2002, p. 30).

However, the peace and harmony of the region began to decay in 1009 when civil wars among rival factions of Muslims began to tear apart the region (Menocal, 2002, p. 36). The destruction of al-Andalus culminated in 1212 after Pope Innocent III led the crusades through the region and united the Spanish Christians together to defeat the Moorish rulers of al-Andalus (Menocal, 2002, p. 46). The Christians were victorious in their crusade and Muslim cities fell one by one to them (Menocal, 2002). In 1248, Ferdinand III of Castile took Seville as the capital of Spain and the city of Granada remained the last memory of what was al-Andalus (Menocal, 2002, p. 47). In 1492, this last Islamic polity finally fell to King Ferdinand II of Aragon and Queen Isabella I of Castile (Menocal, 2002, p. 49). These events marked the beginning of centuries of Catholic domination in Spain.

In 1478, King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella officially proclaimed Moorish and Jewish presence in Spain a problem with the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition (Ryan, 2015). This judicial institution was put in place to combat heresy, and it “policed the purity” of Spain as a Catholic state (Ryan, 2015). The Moors and Jews of Spain were ostracized from society and forced to convert to Catholicism under this system (Bartels, 2009, p. 118). Once converted, the Moors were referred to as “Moriscos” and were targeted as Christian heretics and treated as second-class citizens (Bartels, 2009, p. 118). In 1492, all Jews were expelled from Spain with the Alhambra decree, also known as the Edict of Expulsion (Green, 2015). Discrimination against “Moriscos” in

Spain escalated until their expulsion in 1609 as ordered by King Philip II (Bartels, 2009, p. 118).

Today, despite the repression of Islam after the fall of Granada and the expulsion of the “Moriscos,” Moorish culture continues to play an important role in the culture of the country that emerged in the place of al-Andalus, especially in the autonomous region of Andalusia. Andalusia is the largest of the seventeen autonomous regions that were formed with the Spanish Constitution of 1978 and has preserved the unique character and heritage that was shaped by the Moors, as well as the Phoenicians, Celts, Greeks, Carthaginians, Romans, Vandals, Visigoths, Jews, Syrians, Arabs, Berbers, and Iberians (Ruiz, 2007, p. 107). Andalusian art, architecture, cuisine, dance, and music today all exhibit heavy influences from Moorish culture (Ruiz, 2007, p. 8). This culturally rich and diverse region of Spain continues to be home to an ethnically diverse population. Its history as an Islamic capital in the early 11th century is reflected in the fact that the city of Granada in Andalusia is home to one of the largest Islamic communities in Spain, with over 15,000 Muslims (Ruiz, 2007, p. 108).

As Barbara Fuchs argues, Spanish contemporary attitudes towards the Moors and the Moorish heritage of Spain give insight into Spain’s development as a nation and its tensions between religious assimilation and racialization of minorities (Fuchs, 2011, p. 2). The Spanish government aimed to systematically eliminate Moorish culture and identity through its repressive legal apparatus and the Inquisition in hopes of creating a more unified nation (Fuchs, 2011, p. 3). The negative repercussions of these policies are evidenced in the issues that contemporary Spain faces, including tensions between local and national cultures, centralized and regional governments, and political power and

religious policy (Fuchs, 2011, p. 2). In trying to racially and religiously homogenize its nation, Spain created an environment of intolerance in the 17th century that is still reflected in treatment of immigrants in the country today.

Contemporary Spain, while growing in its religious, cultural, and ethnic diversity through the recent influx in immigration since the 1990s, is still made up of mostly ethnically Spanish and religiously Catholic people, the same groups that the Spanish Inquisition over 500 years ago, along with other policies and practices throughout history, aimed to retain. Today, 94% of Spanish citizens are Roman Catholic (“Europe: Spain,” n.d.), only 0.05% of people are Jews, and around 92% of the population is ethnically Spanish (including the Spanish sub-groups of the Basque, Galician, and Catalan people) (Minority Rights Group International, 2007).

Not only does Spain lack non-Spanish ethnic, cultural, and religious diversity, it has maintained racist attitudes, especially against Islamic people, which contribute to the marginalization of non-Spanish minority populations. Immigrants and non-Spanish groups, for example, often face racial profiling and discrimination on a day-to-day basis in Spain. An Amnesty International report found that “people who do not ‘look Spanish’ can be stopped by police as often as four times a day...for identity checks at any time of day or night, in any place or situation” (“Spain: Discrimination,” 2011). Even though the practice is unlawful under Spanish and International law, the report found that the behavior was frequent and even condoned by law enforcement authorities. The practice discriminates against foreigners and Spanish nationals from ethnic minorities, fueling prejudice and reinforcing negative stereotypes when witnesses presume the victims to be engaged in criminal activities.

The Pew Global Attitudes Project, conducted in the spring of 2008, showed that anti-Muslim attitudes have grown in Europe during recent years. Of the European countries surveyed by the Pew Research center, Spain was the country with the highest percentage of the population with negative perceptions of Muslims at 52% of the population (as cited in van Driel, 2012, p. 1279). In a public survey conducted by the Center for Sociological Research in Spain about Spanish attitudes towards immigration in March 2014, 30.5% of those surveyed, of which 95.9% were of Spanish nationality, answered that in general Spanish people treat foreign immigrants with distrust (“Actitudes,” 2014, p. 5). These statistics show that racist and anti-immigrant attitudes pervade in Spain.

In 2013, an independent United Nations expert urged Spanish authorities to make fighting the prevalent racism and xenophobia in the country a priority (“Spain must make,” 2013, p. 1). The Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Mutuma Ruteere, warned that the stigmatization of certain groups (including immigrants), racial prejudice, and negative stereotypes depicted by the Spanish media was concerning (“Spain must make,” 2013). Additionally, the use of hate speech and xenophobic discourse by politicians and political leaders emerged as a problem, along with the use of using vulnerable groups, such as immigrants, as scapegoats for the causes of economic hardships (“Spain must make,” 2013).

This intolerant climate raises questions about what the Spanish government is doing to improve foreigners’ experiences in the country and how it is combatting negative societal perceptions of these groups. While efforts can and should be made in

all sectors to eliminate discrimination against immigrants in Spain, this paper focuses on one sector of society in particular that has the potential to make a lasting impact on discriminatory attitudes—education.

Combatting Racism through Education

As explained by Susan Garnett Russell and Monisha Bajaj in their chapter in *Education and International Development: An Introduction*, “Education has the potential to offer students tools for critical social analysis and to build informed civic identities and social cohesion...however, as has too often been seen, education also carries the potential to fuel divisiveness, intolerance, inter-group conflict and violence...” (Russell & Bajaj, 2015, p. 108). Thus, education can be a critical tool in either fueling or fighting discrimination and prejudice in a society.

While education can be an effective tool for change, schools themselves are reflections of the societies they exist in. As stated by the Research Group for the Study of Sociocultural Identities in Andalusia at the University of Seville, hereon after referred to by its Spanish acronym GEISA, the educational experience of individuals is “a complex and multidimensional process...resulting from mechanisms of cultural transmission that are juxtaposed in different spheres of social life: family, neighborhood, schools, and colleges, informal public learning processes and political action, among others” (López & Madroñal, 2007, p. 3). Schools transmit, shape, and project the culture of a nation. Furthermore, they often perpetuate the power relations associated with class, gender, religion, and region that are external to the school system itself (López & Madroñal, 2007, p. 3). Therefore, while schools can be powerful forces for progress and change, they do not exist in a vacuum and also reflect the unequal

power relations and discriminatory attitudes of the respective societies they are created by and exist in. Thus, it is important that the education system is mindful at the national, regional, and local levels of whether its policies and practices preserve historical inequalities by passively allowing them to continue or acknowledges the existence of the inequalities and actively creates an environment that attempts to eliminate them.

Research Question

I specifically examined the education section of an immigrant integration policy of the government of Andalusia. My analysis seeks to determine whether this policy encourages immigrant assimilation, promoting a homogenous Spain, or creates a dynamic in the classroom that fosters interculturalism and values diversity. I have chosen to study Andalusia in particular because of its history as the center of the tolerant and diverse al-Andalus region, which provides an interesting contrast to the predominantly Catholic contemporary Spanish population's widespread negative views of Muslims (van Driel, 2012, p. 1279).

I studied the Third Horizontal Comprehensive Plan for Immigration in Andalusia (III Plan Integral para la Inmigración en Andalucía Horizonte), referred to as the PIPIA III for the rest of this paper, approved in September of 2014 by the Andalusian Ministry of Education. This policy summarizes the Autonomous Community of Andalusia's approach to immigration in all sectors, including the education, labor, sanitation, cultural, and judicial sectors. I focus on the socio-educative section of this policy, which assures that the Andalusian Education System will combat inequalities to ensure principles of "equality, equity, and solidarity" are used as axes of the educational process (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 84). Before I explain how I

examine this policy, it is important to put the PIPIA III and the previous PIPIAs into context.

Background on the PIPIAs

It is impossible to understand the PIPIAs and their history without first understanding the context from which they emerged. Since the influx of immigration in Andalusia in the 1990s, the GEISA has determined that expert discourse in Andalusia at the state level has largely been developed to engrain attitudes and perceptions that the rising level of immigrants in the region is a problem (Cabezudo, Madroñal, Manjavacas, 2011b, p. 12). According to GEISA, the PIPIA I and II did not stray from this norm.

The first PIPIA (2001-2004) emerged out of the political alarm that followed the racist attacks that occurred in El Ejido, a town in Andalusia comprised of more than 20 percent immigrants, mostly Moroccans (“The Message,” 2000). A group of Moroccans killed three Spaniards in the racial violence and more violence followed when Spaniards stoned Moroccan immigrants and burned their houses (“The Message,” 2000). The initial violence was sparked by the “virtual slavery” that immigrant workers in farming jobs were subjected to and the subsequent attacks were fueled by racial violence (“The Message,” 2000). The PIPIA I, created in 2001 and effective through 2004, was a reactive response to the Islamophobia and fears of racism that resulted from the attacks at El Ejido (Cabezudo et al., 2011b, p. 13). It was “conceived as a groundbreaking political initiative at state level” and created a policy that affected various ministries of the government of Andalusia affected by immigration (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, pp. 4-5).

The PIPIA II (2005-2009) developed as an adaptive proposal based on the external evaluation of the PIPIA I (Cabezudo et al., 2011b, p. 14). The PIPIA I created

measures of awareness and intervention based on the immigrant population, while the PIPIA II was comprised of actions targeting both the national and immigrant groups (Cabezudo et al., 2011b, p. 14). While the PIPIA I focused on developing awareness measures for immigrant groups so that they could adapt to and learn about Spanish society, the PIPIA II tried to influence relationships between different social groups in Spain through combatting racism, xenophobia, and general negative attitudes from the Andalusian population towards immigration (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 31).

Both plans were formulated under the Spanish Socialist Worker Party (PSOE), which has led the Andalusian government since 1982 (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 5). This party is considered the “laboratory of new political practices” in Spain and the PIPIA I and II could be considered two of its innovative experiments (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 5).

In Spain, the central government is responsible for laws of a general nature, but responsibility for the administration of education and the development and application of national laws falls to each autonomous community (Odina, 2009, p. 475). Both the PIPIA I and II were framed by the Strategic Plan of Citizenship and Integration 2007-2010, Spain’s national immigrant integration plan, and the state-endorsed Organic Law 2/2009 for the Integration of Foreigners, a law primarily focused on controlling migration fluxes (Cabezudo et al., 2011b, p. 14). Additionally, the policies followed the provisions of EU directives and EU summits (Cabezudo et al., 2011b, p. 14). Thus, both the PIPIA I and II reflected the state and EU’s principles and action lines, but their specifics were not confined to any sort of national model for diversity or multicultural policy in Spain.

In fact, many authors consider Spanish national immigration policy to be a “non-model” of diversity management because of its efforts aimed primarily at the policing of borders and migration fluxes control, whilst leaving the funding and service provision for the immigrant population in the hands of the autonomous regions and municipalities (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 6). According to these critical positions, Spain is deficient in its national government’s ability to handle its rising diversity, and instead of creating a coherent immigrant integration policy it tolerates “the coexistence of different regional and local models with their own assumptions, expectations, and institutional balance resulting from the interaction of historical, political, social, economic and cultural specific factors” (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 6). Thus, local and regional policies are largely shaped by their local and regional historical, political, social, economic, and cultural contexts. My research attempts to unveil whether or not the PIPIA III provides a regional model that aims to value and foster diversity, as the history of al-Andalus might suggest, or that follows the lead of the historical hegemonic policies and creates an environment that values cultural and religious homogeneity.

The PIPIA III

The PIPIA III acknowledges that a new socially and culturally diverse student population has emerged in Spain. It states that to accommodate the immigrant population, the “traditional mission [of the education system] of transmission of knowledge should be complemented with instruction and exercise of essential values like respect of diversity, tolerance, participation, and solidarity” (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 85). The actions of the PIPIA III in the Socio-Educational Section are aimed at achieving “a set of specific objectives, with which it is intended to ensure equal

education” (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 85). From the very start, the PIPIA III seems to establish that it is committed to fostering diversity and equality, but the programs themselves are what achieve these objectives.

The PIPIA III plans to carry out these objectives through three main lines of action, which each come with multiple programs: Reception and Integration, Teaching of Spanish, and Maintenance of Cultures of Origin (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 85). In order to understand if the PIPIA III is using empty rhetoric or actually promoting diversity and tolerance, this study looks at the programs in each of these pillars, as well as the semantics of the actual policy, through educational policy frameworks explained in the next chapter.

Contribution to the Field

During my research I did not find an analysis of the current PIPIA III and its programs. Thus, this study will serve as an analysis of this most recent PIPIA and it will analyze the changes specific to the Socio-Educative section. This study will also uncover whether or not the Government of Andalusia remedied the problems that the GEISA found in its studies of the previous two PIPIAs (these studies will be examined in Chapter 4) or disregarded GEISA’s criticisms.

Chapter 2: Methods

Overview of Frameworks and Definitions

There exists a wide spectrum of how a society treats minority groups. This spectrum ranges from extreme forms of cultural and ethnic intolerance like genocide to extreme forms of cultural pluralism, as exhibited by the Amish community of the United States (Healey & O'Brien, 2015, p. 51). Between these two extremes exist different levels of integration and acculturation (Healey et al., 2015, p. 53).

In my analysis, I examine how the programs and semantics of the Socio-Educative section of the PIPIA III promote **interculturalism** or **assimilation** as these terms are defined in James Banks' *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education*. According to Banks in the context of education, "**Cultural assimilation** is the process by which an individual or group acquires the cultural characteristics of a different ethnic or cultural group. Because the dominant racial, cultural, ethnic or religious group controls most of the social, economic, and political institutions within a society, members of ethnic minority groups must acquire its cultural characteristics in order to experience social class mobility and structural inclusion in society" (Banks, 2012, p. 168). Thus, in societies where cultural assimilation is practiced, a group experiences a degree of acculturation in order to reap the benefits of political and economic integration. It is important to note that the term assimilation is not often openly used in education policy and oftentimes the word "integration" is used to refer to the assimilation phenomenon (Allemann-Ghionda, 2012, p. 1214).

Intercultural education, by contrast, aims to create a society where acculturation is not necessary in order for non-native groups to fully participate in political and economic life. It is both a pedagogical approach and a field of education in Europe. As explained by Francesca Gobbo, Professor of Intercultural Education at the University of Turin, in Banks' encyclopedia, intercultural education is a "European response to multicultural societies whereby cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and religious pluralism is seen as an opportunity for human interaction rather than for separation or segregation" (Gobbo, 2012, p. 1218). This educational approach valorizes diversity and supports an inclusive educational approach regarding diversity of students of immigrant backgrounds (Gobbo, 2012, p. 1218).

However, intercultural education does not solely focus on valorizing the cultures of students from immigrant backgrounds. It encourages everyone, including the collective nation, to reflect on his or her own cultural and religious loyalties.

Intercultural education is most often referred to as 'multicultural education' in the United States (Allemann-Ghionda, 2012, 1213). The term 'multicultural education' as it is used today developed during the civil rights movement, according to Banks and Banks (2001), and has four phases (as cited in Gopalakrishnan, A., 2011, p. 22).

The first phase is the insertion of ethnic studies into the school curriculum (Gopalakrishnan, A., 2011, p. 22). However, teaching about the histories and cultures of ethnic minorities does not change attitudes towards the ethnic minorities (Gopalakrishnan, A., 2011, p. 22). Thus, the second stage tries to change attitudes toward ethnic minorities by advocating for equality and equity for all cultural minority groups in the education system (Gopalakrishnan, A., 2011, p. 22). The third phase

incorporates experiences of disabled people, gay and lesbian people, women, and other groups that have experienced discrimination into the curriculum (Gopalakrishnan, A., 2011, p. 22). The final stage acknowledges the intersectionality of “race, class, and gender across cultures, histories, and experiences” and develops theory, research and practices for classrooms to promote educational equity for all (Gopalakrishnan, A., 2011, p. 23). These stages of multicultural education demonstrate the different levels there are to promoting equity in the classroom and how solely teaching the history of ethnic minorities in a country is not sufficient to remedy the inequity that the group may face.

In order to maintain clarity and consistency, I use the European term ‘intercultural education’ in this study instead of multicultural education because this is the term used in the PIPIA III, as well as the educational frameworks and previous studies of the PIPIAs. In the European Union, intercultural education and multicultural education are used as “umbrella terms” with overlapping meaning, and are often even used interchangeably (Mehedi, 1999, p. 2). However, I will define intercultural education using Gobbo’s following definition.

Intercultural education is a perspective and a discourse that challenges the goals of national and linguistic unity that school systems are expected to strive for (Gobbo, 2012, p. 1219). Thus, intercultural education supports bilingualism and development of a student’s mother tongue (Gobbo, 2012, p. 1219). Through its validation of linguistic, cultural, social, ethnic, and religious differences, intercultural education aims to act as an “antidote” to discrimination and violence, reproduction of social stratification, and maintenance of the status quo (Gobbo, 2012, p. 1218). Gobbo’s definition states,

“Presenting, explaining, and comparing the different cultural practices or religious beliefs is an important step toward achieving intercultural learning” (2012, pp. 1219-1220). This process has three important effects. It first causes those engaging in the intercultural interaction to both acknowledge their differences and understand why those differences are relevant in their lives. Next, it challenges the intercultural learners to reflect on themselves and challenge their own assumptions about culture. Finally, the open dialogue may cause intercultural learners to draw connections between their own cultural beliefs and those of others, creating mutual respect and tolerance between the learners (Gobbo, 2012, p. 1220). In this way, intercultural education aims to eliminate discrimination and increase mutual understanding between different individuals and groups.

Allemann-Ghionda (2012) explains that discussions about and treatments of intercultural issues are based upon different paradigms and can therefore lead to opposed goals and outcomes (p. 1215). Ultimately, if these discussions and treatments of intercultural issues are based on deficiency models, their end goals are not interculturalism. Rather, interculturalism is used as a temporary state seen as necessary for the end goal of assimilation. Thus, it is important to understand the model for which the foundations of programs are based as the models also expose the underlying goals. The two models that I will be looking for underlying the programs and semantics of the PIPIA III are **deficit models** and **enrichment models**. I will be analyzing the language program section for deficit and enrichment models as well, but I will also be analyzing each program for its outcome of either a high degree of success (HDS) or a low degree of success (LDS) of bilingualism. These definitions and models are explained in greater

depth by frameworks set up by professor and linguist Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and professor Colin Baker in Chapter 5. However, I will briefly explain their meanings here.

According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1995), deficiency models treat culture (other than that of the majority population) as a handicap that needs to be corrected through assimilation (p. 52). Deficit theory envisages that the minority should become majority language speaking fast, but as long as the children still speak their original mother tongue, the school should help them to appreciate it (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 54). According to Skutnabb-Kangas, deficit theory bases ‘handicaps’ of minority children off of linguistic, social, and cultural factors and deficit theory itself is grouped into four different stages (Skutnabb-Kangas 1995, p. 54). These are explained further in Chapter 3.

Conversely, enrichment paradigms aim to change the schools to fit the needs of the children. Enrichment models truly exemplify intercultural education because they do not aim to change the student so that he or she conforms to the homogeneous norms of the school. Instead, enrichment models theory posits that the school should change to fit the needs of heterogeneous student population.

Some of the measures put in place under the justification of deficit theory are useful because they help children learn about their own culture and assist them in L2 acquisition (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 54). However, these measures are based upon the idea that the child is deficient due to his or her culture and language. The measures try to compensate for language and culture “deficiencies” in order to change the child to fit the school. Conversely, enrichment theories are based upon the notion that schools should be adapted to children (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 54). Thus, the child’s mother

tongue, cultural, and social background “should be a positive starting point for the school” (Skutnabb-Kangas 1995, p. 54). Minorities may be expensive for a society, but that cost is outweighed by the benefits and enrichment a society receives through cultural diversity (Skutnabb-Kangas 1995, p. 54).

Because language is a transmitter of culture, language programs are essential to understanding how a society views cultural difference. Language programs categorized by a high degree of success (HDS) by Skutnabb-Kangas (1995) for bilingualism in minority populations aim to maintain or strengthen a child’s mother tongue, thus promoting cultural and linguistic pluralism. Language programs categorized by a low degree of success (LDS) for bilingualism in minority populations are transitional in nature and aim to make the minority population majority language-speaking fast, while promoting monolingualism. The mother tongue is used as a tool to achieve the monolingualism at times, but these are not true bilingual programs according to Skutnabb-Kangas’s definition (as explained in Chapter 3). The goal of bilingual programs with a LDS is cultural and linguistic assimilation to the majority language and culture.

Process of Analysis

I qualitatively analyzed both the semantics and the programs of the PIPIA III. Semantically, I analyzed the PIPIA III for rhetoric and terms identified by GEISA’s previous studies that were found to perpetuate inequality for immigrant students. Specifically, I looked for recurrent ambiguous terms and discourse found to create asymmetrical power relationships by GEISA. These terms are further explained in Chapter 3.

I analyzed the programs of the PIPIA III for their use of either deficit or enrichment theory, as defined through the frameworks for education of minority groups created by Skutnabb-Kangas and Baker, as their foundation. Programs of a compensatory nature are based on deficit theory and ultimately result in assimilation of the immigrant student. When ideas and programs are founded upon enrichment theory, they promote intercultural education by placing value on a linguistically, culturally, and religiously diverse society.

For the purposes of my analysis, I divided the PIPIA III's Socio-Educative section into four main sections: the introduction, the welcoming and integration programs, Spanish language teaching programs, and culture of origin maintenance programs. For the language section of the policy specifically, I analyzed each program in terms of its achievement of a LDS or HDS of bilingualism as defined by Skutnabb-Kangas, as well as what type of program it is and its larger goals as defined by Baker. These frameworks are discussed further in Chapter 3. For all other sections, I looked at the terms and discourse used, along with the theories upon which programs are based, as previously explained.

Limitations

My study is limited by the fact that it is solely an analysis of the policy itself. Because I am not studying how the policy is actually implemented on the ground, it is possible that the reality of how immigrants are treated in the Andalusian education system is much different than what the policy might suggest. Perhaps certain programs look different at different schools depending on who implements them.

Furthermore, my study is limited by the fact that I am not a native Spanish-speaker and the policy is in Spanish. There may be certain nuances in the language that are lost in translation to me or certain terms may have a different meaning to me as an American even if their direct translations are correct.

Importance

This brings me to the importance of my study. As Skutnabb-Kangas explains, “The interculturalism seen in government declarations and invading all European teacher in-service training courses and new curricula is important to analyze because it still represents deficiency models, even if the package in which it is served (ethnicism and linguisticism) is much more appetizing than was the old ‘racism-based-on-biological-difference’” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 54). Thus, it is important to understand how ‘intercultural’ rhetoric can serve to actually perpetuate assimilationist goals and hegemonic ideals. By examining whether the interculturalist rhetoric of the PIPIA III is based on a deficit or enrichment model, we can understand what goals it actually aims to achieve.

Furthermore, it is important to research how immigrants in Spain are treated. I want to know if the Spanish government is reducing racist attitudes through its educational institutions, promoting them, or simply allowing them to continue. If the Spanish government is, indeed, implementing an intercultural policy in its public education system then it is actively helping to create a pluralistic, more tolerant society instead of perpetuating the monocultural, intolerant society of its recent past, as explained in Chapter 1. If educational policy values different cultures and fosters diversity, it is contributing to combatting minority groups’ historic marginalization in

Spain. However, if it is simply using interculturalist rhetoric to cover up goals of homogeneity then it is contributing to the marginalization of these groups by not accepting them for their differences, but rather trying to change them to conform to traditional Spanish society.

A nation's policy is important to analyze and understand because it represents the physical manifestation of the values and agenda of the government. Additionally, if the government is regarded as legitimate and just by most of society, policy is generally widely accepted by the public.

Chapter 3: Literature Review

Previous Research on the Subject: GEISA's Studies

There are three main documents that analyze the PIPIA I and II for assimilationist and intercultural objectives. These studies were conducted by the Research Group for the Study of Sociocultural Identities in Andalusia (GEISA) at the University of Seville from 2011-2013 with funding from *Tolerance*, a collaborative research project within the European Union with the goal of creating a better understanding of institutional racism and its workings (University of Coimbra [UC], n.d.). The *Tolerance* project acknowledged the institutionalized racism deeply rooted in the history of European countries that still persists (UC, n.d.). The project was funded from March 2010 through February 2013 by the European Union's Seventh Framework program, which was designed to respond to Europe's employment needs, competitiveness in the labor market, and its people's quality of life (European Commission, 2015). *Tolerance's* two main objectives were to explore how public bodies, policies, and organizations at the national, regional, and local levels shape racism and anti-racism as well as to identify the impact of these policies on the marginalization of populations. Additionally, the project explored how anti-racism semantics contribute to integration and inclusion in minority populations (UC, n.d.).

For the purposes of my study, I examined three of GEISA's research papers: "Critical analysis of the immigration policy within the comprehensive plans of the autonomous government of Andalusia" (2011), "The Meaning of Interculturality in Public Schools in Andalusia (Spain): Discourses and Practices" (2013), and

“National/regional public policies on integration and (anti-) racism” (2011). GEISA’s in-depth critical analysis of the PIPIA I and PIPIA II, entitled “Critical analysis of the immigration policy within the comprehensive plans of the autonomous government of Andalusia,” is based on the Teun Van Dijk’s discourse critical analysis. According to Van Dijk, “discourse constitutes the main practice by which ideology is reproduced, where discourse is both controlled and shaped by ideology” (as cited in Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 2). Therefore, discourse acts as a vehicle for power relation reproduction while simultaneously being shaped by those power relations. Following this idea, GEISA’s study examined how language was used as an instrument to uphold hegemonic discourse or shift it towards a more intercultural approach in the PIPIA I and II. Ultimately, GEISA found that the PIPIAs contributed to the imposition and reproduction of unequal rights for individuals from countries of origin outside of the European Union, as well as a hegemonic ideology (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, pp. 2-4).

This study focused on the semantics of the PIPIA I and II and found that certain expressions built upon differences between social collectives and created asymmetrical power relationships while certain recurrent ambiguous terms promoted assimilation discourse (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 8). Because GEISA’s study analyzed the entire PIPIA I and II, I will only be focusing on the terms and expressions that are relevant to the Socio-Educative sections of the policies.

Discourse Creating Asymmetrical Power Relationships

GEISA found that certain expressions build upon differences between social collectives in order to create social categorizations and reinforce social inequalities based on these differences (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 10). The discourse is used to

create asymmetrical relationships between immigrants and nationals and build an otherness that puts the other (or immigrant) at an inferior level (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 10). However, this is an assumption of the discourse that is never overtly explained.

One example of a concept that builds upon differences between groups and reinforces asymmetrical relationships is the concept of the welcoming process itself. The welcoming process, the first pillar of the PIPIA I, II, and III, “presupposes an active attitude by the destination society, while downplaying the collective action of immigrant networks” (Cabezudo et al., 2011b, p.13). Thus, it does not create an equal relationship between the native and immigrant communities.

Additionally, GEISA found that the term ‘interculturalism’ was defined in the PIPIA I and II as a necessary stage in the end goal of cultural assimilation of students (Cabezudo et al., 2011b, p.15). The analysis states that the “interculturalism proposed must be challenged: we cannot interpret it as an interaction on equal footing between different groups, but as a kind of ‘temporary state’” that leads to assimilation of the minority group” (Cabezudo et al., 2011b, p.15). Furthermore, GEISA/US found that the interculturalism of the PIPIA I and II understood cultural diversity under a paradigm of compensation “since cultural diversity is understood as a series of factors (linguistic, training, formative....) constraining a ‘normal’ performance within the Andalusian educational system” (López & Madroñal, 2011, p. 18). Thus, the interculturalism of the PIPIA I and II was not found to be the same interculturalism defined by Gobbo and actually promoted assimilation of minority students.

Overall, GEISA determined that the semantics and the core discourse of the Plans for Immigration in Andalusia do not “fulfill the terms of equality expected” for an

institution of such a nature. Both of the PIPIAs' discourses continuously represent the national society and its political representatives in a clear unequal power relation with the immigrant. Phrases such as the "tolerance exercised by the host society" and "the normalization of ethnic minorities" throughout the PIPIA I and II were found to reinforce this discourse (Cabezudo et al., 2011b, p. 14).

Recurrent ambiguous terms

GEISA explains how recurrent ambiguous terms create a difficulty in understanding the precise meaning of what is said (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 8). Thus, they can be beneficial for policymakers because ambiguous terms leave room for various interpretations (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 8). One such term examined by GEISA is 'cultural mediator,' used in the second pillar of the PIPIA I, II, and III—Spanish Language Acquisition. The study found that there were no definitions in the PIPIA I or II for the role that cultural mediators play (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 29). Neither the level of training the mediators receive nor how the Andalusian government recognizes the mediators was explained in either policy.

The cultural mediators are considered human resources who solve integration problems somehow, but the competence and content developed by these mediators is not included in the PIPIA I or II (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 29). "Thus, they can be understood as translators of symbolic contents between languages in a multicultural context, or as a kind of facilitator of the necessary contents for the individual-minority "normalization," according to uses and standard practices in the social field... Instead of mediators they should be called "means" through which the minority is adapted/subjugated to the hegemonic contents" (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, pp. 29-30). The

report does, however, acknowledge the good that Intercultural Mediation courses designed to train specialized workers for social conflict solution and social mediation have done (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 30). The expansion of the presence of mediators to promote integration is a notable effort to increase mutual understanding between people of different cultural backgrounds.

Deficit Models in Andalusian Public Education

The last relevant finding by the GEISA is based on the compensatory nature of the programs of the PIPIA II. In 2013, the GEISA conducted a study of multiculturalism in public compulsory schools in the regions of El Ejido and Seville of Andalusia. The study examined both the legal education framework that creates the discourse on cultural diversity (including the PIPIA II) and it observed practices regarding multiculturalism in schools on the ground firsthand. The study found that the discourse surrounding cultural diversity in the education legal framework is based on the notion that individuals who “belong to differentiated collectives” experience a deficit (López et al., 2011, p. 1). Cultural diversity is seen as a factor that hinders the development of educational activities and access to them. This compensation paradigm from which Andalusian policy was found to operate on with regards to cultural diversity has an underlying goal of assimilation and attempts to hide institutional racism according to the study (López et al., 2011, p. 2).

The policies examined by GEISA (including, but not limited to the PIPIA II) take the mere coexistence of different cultures in classrooms as evidence of “integration and normalization” (López et al., 2013, 2). This gives an excuse to avoid implementing the structural and training changes needed to change the assimilationist effects of the

linguistic policy and curricular programs for minority populations in the area (López et al., 2013, 2). The study argues that only a change in the educational paradigm upon which the policies are based can change intercultural education to fully support minority populations and foster multiculturalism. “The programmes developed on attention to diversity are the same programmes and all operate from the paradigm of compensatory education, which is implicitly addressing cultural difference as a deficit that affects the student’s school integration” (López et al., 2011, p. 25). Thus, these programs operate on a deficit model as it is defined by Skutnabb-Kangas.

Summary

In sum, the previous studies on the PIPIA I and II by the GEISA found that in the Socio-Educative sections there were three main factors that actually caused eventual assimilation of immigrants rather than the creation of an intercultural education system that valued diversity. These three factors were discourse creating asymmetrical relationships, ambiguous terms with hidden assimilationist goals, and programs based upon the idea of cultural diversity as deficit. While I will be looking for these factors in the PIPIA III in my analysis, I will mainly be looking at the programs and wording of the PIPIA III to see if it is founded on deficit or enrichment theory, thus assimilating immigrants or fostering interculturalism, using frameworks created by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Colin Baker.

Framework for Analysis of Educational Programs for Minority Students

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas's Framework

In her article, "Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children," Tove Skutnabb-Kangas creates a framework for which to analyze an education system's level of cultural and institutional "linguicism" through analysis of the quality of its bilingual and multicultural programs. Skutnabb-Kangas defines the term "linguicism" as "ideologies and structures which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and non-material) between groups which are defined on the basis of language (on the basis of their mother tongues)" (1995, p. 42). This is an effect resulting from power relationships between speakers of different languages in a nation. Due to unequal power relationships, different languages have different political rights depending on their national context, not because of any inherent linguistic characteristics of the language, but because of the relationships between its speakers. Thus, language is used to legitimate and institutionalize unequal power relationships in the phenomenon known as "linguicism."

How is the linguicism defined by Skutnabb-Kangas relevant to intercultural education? If linguicism is present, thereby reproducing unequal division of power and resources, then true intercultural education has not been achieved because intercultural education's goal is to fight against the unequal power structures and relationships that exist in society. Furthermore, linguicism in bilingual education programs creates outcomes of cultural and linguistic assimilation because the dominant language and culture is favored over that of the minority, as we will see later in Skutnabb-Kangas's framework.

The definition of mother tongue is important in understanding the definition of linguisticism. Skutnabb-Kangas uses four criteria for its definition: origin, competence, function, and identification (1995, p. 44). For definitions of these individual criteria, see Table 1 below.

Table 1 Definitions of the mother tongue

<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Origin	the language(s) one learned first
Competence	the language(s) one knows best
Function	the language(s) one uses most
Identification	
(a) internal	the language(s) one identifies with
(b) external	the language(s) one is identified as a native speaker of by others

Table 1. Skutnabb-Kangas's definitions of mother tongue.

Adapted from *Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children*, p. 44, by T. Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, Bristol, Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Any of these criteria can be used individually to define “mother tongue” or in combination with others. In addition to these, the author lists three different theses that she claims hold true for a “mother tongue.” First, “the same person can have different mother tongues, depending on which definition is used” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 44). Second, “a person’s mother tongue can change during her lifetime, even several times, according to all other criteria except the definition by origin” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 44). And finally, she asserts “the mother tongue definitions can be organized hierarchically according to the degree of linguistic human rights awareness of a society” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 44).

In this final thesis, she claims that the definition by function is the most primitive one, the definition by competence is next on the hierarchy, and the use of a combination of definitions by origin and identification show the highest degree of

linguistic human rights awareness (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, pp. 44-45). Through defining a minority child's mother tongue as the one the child uses most (function) or as the one the child knows best (competence) an institution reflects cultural linguicism because both competence and function rely on what a society's official language is (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 44). If a child is not competent in school in his or her mother tongue because that is not the language of instruction, that is a product of the institutions of the society and the burden of this should not be placed on the child.

Acquisition and maintenance of both the official language of a nation and one's mother tongue are important for an individual. The official language enables participation in social, economic, and political life and gives access to education (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 40). The mother tongue allows the individual to speak to her parents, to know her history and culture, and to cultivate her own cultural identity (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 40). The linguistic minority must become at least bilingual in order to fully participate in her community economically, politically, and socially. Not allowing a child to learn and maintain his or her mother tongue, according to Skutnabb-Kangas, is a form of linguicism. Linguicism can be conscious and easily visible, as is typical in early phases of historical minority education, but it can also be unconscious, hidden, and passive, which is typical of the later phases of minority education development. According to Skutnabb-Kangas, this passive and hidden form of linguicism "blames the victim in subtle ways by colonizing her consciousness" (1995, p. 44). The results of institutional and cultural linguicism can create lasting and harmful effects for children.

For example, many minority children are forced to feel ashamed of their mother tongues, their parents, their origins, their group, and their culture through cultural and institutional linguicism and discrimination in society. As a result, children often disown their parents, languages, groups, and cultures. They try to adopt the majority language and culture but oftentimes not all members of the majority population accept the individual's new identity and he or she is not accepted into the group that she has been forced into identifying with (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 45). Additionally, many times the road back to his or her own group is closed psychologically, linguistically, and culturally (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 45). In order to avoid these situations, Skutnabb-Kangas creates a declaration of children's linguistic human rights. The declaration states the following: "(1) Every child should have the right to identify positively with her original mother tongue(s) and have her identification accepted and respected by others. (2) Every child should have the right to learn the mother tongue(s) fully. (3) Every child should have the right to choose when she wants to use the mother tongue(s) in all official situations" (1995, pp. 45-46). When these rights are not granted to minority children, linguicism follows in the policies and practices of society (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 46).

Skutnabb-Kangas argues that in order to avoid linguicism and to give every child an equal opportunity, it should be the duty of the education system to help children in the linguistic minority, or those whose mother tongue is not the official language of the nation, to become bilingual. This is because "bilingualism is a necessity for them and not something that they themselves have chosen" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 40). In fact, multi- or bilingual people generally have to learn another language

because their mother tongues have no official rights in their country and their powerless status hinders them from demanding official rights for their own language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 41). Skutnabb-Kangas asserts that the goal of minority education should be bilingualism according to the following definition: “A speaker is bilingual who is able to function in two (or more) languages, either in monolingual or bilingual communities, in accordance with the sociocultural demands made on an individual’s communicative and cognitive competence by these communities and by the individual herself, at the same level as native speakers, and who is able positively to identify with both (or all) language groups (and cultures) or parts of them” (1995, p. 46).

Most minority and majority linguistic populations agree that minority children should be given the opportunity to learn the majority language in school, however, these groups often disagree about the importance of learning and maintaining the mother tongue in the school setting as well, which is essential for Skutnabb-Kangas’s definition of bilingual (1995, p. 43). Instead, she argues, bilingual educational programs mostly focus on acquisition of the majority language by the minority population, with little regard for the minority population’s maintenance of its mother tongue (1995, p. 46).

Colin Baker’s Framework

Before I summarize Skutnabb-Kangas’s analysis of educational programs for minority and majority populations, it is necessary to bring in another source to help understand the different types of bilingual education programs, as Skutnabb-Kangas only gives brief examples of the different programs instead of definitions because some former knowledge of the reader of the programs and their effects is assumed. Therefore,

I will be using Colin Baker's book *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* to explain these programs and their goals.

In his chapters entitled "An Introduction to Bilingual Education" and "Bilingual Education for Bilingualism and Biliteracy," Baker emphasizes that "bilingual education is a simple label for a complex phenomenon" (2001a, p. 192). The term bilingual education is often used as an umbrella term to describe both classrooms where formal instruction is used to foster bilingualism and classrooms where bilingual children are simply present (Baker, 2001a, p. 192). Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish different categories of bilingual education. One way to distinguish between different types of bilingual education programs is through their aims. Baker identifies **transitional** and **maintenance** bilingual education as the two goal-oriented distinctions between programs.

Transitional bilingual education's goal is to shift the child from the minority language to the majority language. The goal is not proficiency in both languages, only the dominant language. Thus social and cultural assimilation into the majority language is the underlying goal of these forms of bilingual education and would constitute linguistic under Sktunabb-Kangas's definition (Baker, 2001a, p. 192). In contrast, maintenance bilingual education's goal is to foster and either maintain or strengthen the minority language in the child while also teaching the majority language. Static maintenance attempts to prevent mother tongue loss but not to increase skills in it. Developmental maintenance attempts to create full biliteracy and to further develop skills in the mother tongue. Developmental maintenance is also referred to as Enrichment Bilingual Education for language minority children or language majority

children who are learning a second language in school (Baker, 2001a, p. 192). Both categories of maintenance programs are guided by goals of cultural pluralism and linguistic diversity, although static maintenance does not develop the facility or extend the use of minority languages as much as developmental maintenance or enrichment bilingual education does (Baker, 2001a, p. 193).

Baker then identifies ten different types of education programs, categorized as weak or strong forms of education for bilingualism as seen in the table below.

Generally, the weak forms of education for bilingualism fall in the transitional bilingual education category because their societal and educational aims are assimilation, limited enrichment, or detachment and thus they do not aim to develop the mother tongue.

Conversely, the strong forms of bilingual education generally fall in the maintenance bilingual education category because their societal and educational aims include interculturalism, enrichment, and maintenance itself. While Skutnabb-Kangas only uses four different programs in her own research, Segregation, Submersion (including Transitional programs), Immersion, and Maintenance (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 50), I will be summarizing all of the programs as defined by Baker because it might aid me in defining programs used in Andalusia later on in my research. I have starred the programs that Skutnabb-Kangas uses in her analysis. Below I have included Baker's table of descriptions of the educational programs and outcomes and I have summarized his extended descriptions of them following the table.

WEAK FORMS OF EDUCATION FOR BILINGUALISM				
Type of Program	Typical Type of Child	Language of the Classroom	Societal and Educational Aim	Aim in Language Outcome
SUBMERSION (Structured Immersion)	Language Minority	Majority Language	Assimilation	Monolingualism
SUBMERSION with Withdrawal Classes / Sheltered English)	Language Minority	Majority Language with 'Pull-out' L2 Lessons	Assimilation	Monolingualism
SEGREGATIONIST	Language Minority	Minority Language (forced, no choice)	Apartheid	Monolingualism
TRANSITIONAL	Language Minority	Moves from Minority to Majority Language	Assimilation	Relative Monolingualism
MAINSTREAM with Foreign Language Teaching	Language Majority	Majority Language with L2/FL Lessons	Limited Enrichment	Limited Bilingualism
SEPARATIST	Language Minority	Minority Language (out of choice)	Detachment/ Autonomy	Limited Bilingualism
STRONG FORMS OF EDUCATION FOR BILINGUALISM AND BILITERACY				
Type of Program	Typical Type of Child	Language of the Classroom	Societal and Educational Aim	Aim in Language Outcome
IMMERSION	Language Majority	Bilingual with Initial Emphasis on L2	Pluralism and Enrichment	Bilingualism & Biliteracy
MAINTENANCE/ HERITAGE LANGUAGE	Language Minority	Bilingual with Emphasis on L1	Maintenance, Pluralism and Enrichment	Bilingualism & Biliteracy
TWO-WAY/DUAL LANGUAGE	Mixed Language Minority & Majority	Minority and Majority	Maintenance, Pluralism and Enrichment	Bilingualism & Biliteracy
MAINSTREAM BILINGUAL	Language Majority	Two Majority Languages	Maintenance, Pluralism and Enrichment	Bilingualism & Biliteracy
Notes: (1) L2 = Second Language; L1 = First Language; FL = Foreign Language. (2) Formulation of this table owes much to discussions with Professor Ofelia García. This typology is extended to 14 types of bilingual education in García (1997, p. 410).				

Table 2. Baker's chart of programs creating weak and strong forms of bilingualism.

Adapted from *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, p. 194, by C. Baker, 2001, Tonawanda: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

The following forms of bilingual education are “weak” according to Baker because the programs merely contain bilingual children and bilingualism is not fostered in school (Baker, 2001b, p. 204). Bilingualism, therefore, is not an intended outcome.

- **Submersion:** In submersion education programs, the language minority student will be fully and solely taught in the majority language, generally alongside fluent speakers of the majority language (Baker, 2001a, p. 195). Teachers and students are expected to use only the majority language in the classroom (Baker, 2001a, p. 195). There is also a sub-category of submersion programs called ‘Structured Immersion’ programs, in which only language minority children and no language majority children are present in the classroom. In these programs, the teacher will use a simplified form of the majority language and may accept contributions from children in their mother tongue (Baker, 2001a, p. 195). These programs usually aim to develop English language skills like grammar, vocabulary, and communication (Baker, 2001a, p. 195). This method results in language learning, social, and emotional problems for children of the minority language (Baker, 2001a, p. 196). For one, the formal and complex language of the classroom typically takes five to seven years or more to develop and children will inevitably struggle with the content of the curriculum when they cannot understand the language being taught in (Baker, 2001a, p. 196). Furthermore, the child’s home mother tongue language, along with identity, parents, home, community, and culture are

deprecated in this type of program because they are all denied to the child in school (Baker, 2001a, p. 196).

- **Submersion with Pull-Out Classes:** Submersion education sometimes adds withdrawal or ‘pull-out’ classes to teach the majority language. These ‘compensatory’ lessons in the majority language provide a way of keeping language minority children in mainstream schooling (Baker, 2001a, p. 197). However, the children in these classes may fall behind on curriculum content when they are withdrawn and peers may see the withdrawal of the child as a sign of ‘disability,’ ‘inability,’ or ‘limited in English.’ Withdrawal classes may be attractive to schools because they are administratively simple and require little to no additional expenses. A variation on pull-out classes is Sheltered English, Sheltered Content Instruction, or SDAIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English). In these programs, minority language students are taught the curriculum with a simplified vocabulary and “purpose-made materials and methods (such as cooperative learning)” but in English only. These programs are distinct from ESL because they do not teach English as a language but instead simplify it (Baker, 2001a, p. 198). Sheltered content programs “may involve temporary segregation from first language English speakers” which may result in “(1) greater opportunity for participation among students (they may be less inhibited due to no competition or comparisons with first language speakers of English); (2) greater

sensitivity among teachers to the linguistic, cultural and educational needs of a homogeneous group of students; and (2) a collective identity among students in a similar situation” (Baker, 2001a, p. 198).

However, this language segregation removes native language speakers from the classroom, may create social isolation and reinforce negative stereotypes, may encourage the labeling of segregated students as linguistically and educationally inferior, and may generate unequal treatment exhibited in curriculum materials and training of teachers (Baker, 2001a, p. 198).

- ***Segregationist Education:** Segregationist language education is a form of “minority language only” education (Baker, 2001a, p. 198). This occurs when minority language speakers are denied access to programs attended by majority language speakers. This monolingual education through solely the minority language can be used to create apartheid. The ruling class prescribes this type of program in order to maintain “subservience and segregation” in the minority population. The language minorities thus do not learn enough of the majority language or language of power to be able to influence society or to acquire a common language with other subordinated groups. Segregationist education forces monolingual language policy on minority groups to keep them relatively powerless.
- ***Transitional Bilingual Education:** Transitional bilingual education differs from submersion education because language minority students

are temporarily allowed to use their home language and they are often taught through their home language until they are proficient enough in the majority language to cope in mainstream education. Thus, transitional education is temporary and aims to increase use of the majority language in the classroom while proportionately decreasing the use of the home language in the classroom (Baker, 2001a, pp.198-199). The educational rationale behind these programs is based on the fact that children need to function in the majority language in society. Thus, competency must be established quickly in the majority language according to these programs so that children do not fall behind their majority language peers (Baker, 2001a, p. 199). There are two major types of Transitional bilingual education (TBE) programs: early exit and late exit. Early exit allows two years maximum help using the mother tongue and late exit TBE allows for around 40% of classroom teaching to be in the mother tongue until 6th grade (199). Majority language monolingualism is the aim of TBE, but teachers or their assistants need to be bilingual.

- **Mainstream Education (with Foreign Language Teaching):** This is the most common form of education in the USA, Australia, Canada, and much of Europe, so it does not need much explaining. Generally, a child whose parents are English speaking monolinguals will attend a school where English is the teaching medium for the “core program” (Baker, 2001a, p. 200). Second or foreign language lessons are a

separate subject and the language is the curriculum content (Baker, 2001a, p. 200). Generally, children receive on average a half an hour of this second language per day (Baker, 2001a, p. 200). The problem with this is that most second language teaching with this “drip-feed language teaching” does not produce competent use of the second language nor does it produce functionally bilingual children (Baker, 2001a, p. 200).

- **Separatist Education:** Separatist education can be described as a secessionist movement where a language minority aims to detach itself from the language majority by choosing to foster monolingualism in the minority language (Baker, 2001a, p. 200). The language community itself may organize this type of educational program as a way of protecting the minority language or for political, religious, or cultural reasons (Baker, 2001a, p. 200). This separatist idea of schools exists in small numbers and highlights that language minority education is capable of becoming isolationist instead of fostering pluralism (Baker, 2001a, p. 201).

The following programs represent strong forms of bilingual education because bilingualism is an intended and permanent outcome.

- ***Immersion:** Immersion bilingual education is an umbrella term for education. Its core and variable features are summarized in the table below. This type of bilingual education was first utilized in Canada with the aim of creating bilingual students in English and French

(Baker, 2001b, p. 204). Since it was first implemented in 1965 in Canada, it has spread in both Canada and parts of Europe (Baker, 2001b, p. 205).

<p>To summarize, Swain and Johnson (1997) provide a list of the core features and variable features of immersion programs</p> <p>Core Features</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The second language is the medium of instruction. (2) The immersion curriculum is the same as the local first language curriculum. (3) The school supports first language development. (4) Additive bilingualism occurs. (5) Exposure to the second language is largely confined to the classroom. (6) Students enter with similar (limited or nonexistent) levels of second language proficiency. (7) All the teachers are bilingual. (8) The classroom culture is that of the first language community. <p>Variable Features</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The grade level of which immersion is introduced. (2) The extent of immersion, full or partial. (3) The ratio given to the first and second language in content-based teaching at different grade levels. (4) Whether there is continuity from elementary to secondary education, and occasionally from secondary to further and higher education. (5) The amount of language support given to students moving from their first to their second language, including the training that teachers need so as to give such bridging support. (6) The amount of resources that are available in the first and second language and the teacher training to use these. (7) The commitment of teachers and students, administrators and politicians to immersion. (8) The attitudes of students particularly towards the second language culture. (9) The status of the second language. (10) What counts as success in an immersion program.

Table 3. Features of immersion programs.

Adapted from *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, p. 194, by C. Baker, 2001, Tonawanda: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

- ***Developmental Maintenance or Heritage Language Bilingual Education:**
This type of program occurs when language minority children use their mother tongue language as a medium of instruction and the goal is full bilingualism

(Baker, 2001b, p. 208). In most cases, the majority language will take the form of second language lessons or a varying proportion (10-50%) of the curriculum will be taught in the majority language (Baker, 2001b, p. 209). The term 'heritage language' also means minority language or mother tongue (Baker, 2001b, p. 209). These programs feature mostly children who come from language minority homes, generally give parents a choice between mainstream school or developmental maintenance programs, and the minority language is used for approximately half or more of the curriculum time (Baker, 2001b, p. 210). When minority language is used for a majority of class time, it is justified by the fact that children easily transfer ideas, concepts, and skills into the majority language (Baker, 2001b, p. 210). Furthermore, minority language is easily lost because of its lack of use in the society whereas the majority language is easily gained because children are surrounded by it (Baker, 2001b, p. 210). These schools are generally elementary schools but this does not need to be the case (Baker, 2001b, p. 210).

- **Two Way or Dual Language Bilingual Education:** Dual language, also called two way, bilingual education occurs when about equal numbers of language majority and language minority students are in the same classroom. Both languages are used for instruction and learning, and thus the goal is to produce balanced bilinguals. These programs tend to have the minority language used for at least 50% of instruction that lasts for up to six years (Baker, 2001b, p. 213). Additionally, only one language is used in each period of instruction, language is adjusted to the student's language level, and language is learned mostly via

content (Baker, 2001b, p. 213). In these programs, an imbalance in the two languages among students may create one language being used more frequently than the other or one group may be sidelined and segregation may occur instead of integration (Baker, 2001b, p. 213). Thus, language balance is important in this form of program.

- **Mainstream Bilingual Education:** Mainstream bilingual education occurs when two or more majority languages are used in school. These types of schools are in societies where most of the population is already bilingual or multilingual (Baker, 2001b, p. 221). These bilingual education programs ensure that some curriculum content is learned through a student's second language. This communicative approach to second language emphasizes that communication purpose of language and provides a purpose for using that second language reflecting real, purposeful need for learning the language for success in the curriculum (Baker, 2001b, p. 222). Additionally, constructivist theory argues that learning is best when it takes place in a holistic way with the parts making a meaningful, unified whole (Baker, 2001b, p. 222). Thus, vocabulary and grammar should not be taught in isolation but in the context of using the language for real holistic learning (Baker, 2001b, p. 222). This type of learning also encompasses the International School Movement and the European School Movement.

Skutnabb-Kangas's Framework Continued

Now that the educational programs have been elaborated on, we can better understand Skutnabb-Kangas's analysis of them. She analyzes educational programs for

minority and majority children around the world and categorizes them as achieving a high degree of success (HDS) or a low degree of success (LDS) in making children bilingual, according to her previously stated definition, and giving them a fair chance of good school achievement (1995, p. 47). The table below summarizes her findings.

Table 3

	L1				L2		
	Segregation: LDS		Maintenance: HDS		Submersion: LDS	Immersion: HDS	
	Bantu	Turks	Uzbekistan	Finns, Chicanas	Zambia	W. Europe minorities	Canada
<i>Organizational factors</i>							
1 Alternative programmes available	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
2 Pupils equally placed vis-à-vis knowledge of ME	+	+	+	-	-	-	+
3 Bilingual (B), trained (T) teachers	B	B or T	BT	BT	B	T	BT
4 Bilingual materials (e.g. dictionaries) available	-	+	+	+	-	-	+
5 Cultural content of materials appropriate for pupils	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
<i>Learner-related affective factors</i>							
6 Low level of anxiety (supportive, non-authoritarian)	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
7 High internal motivation (not forced to use L2, understands & sympathetic with objectives, responsible for own learning)	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
8 High self-confidence (fair chance to succeed, high teacher expectations)	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
<i>L1-related linguistic, cognitive, pedagogical and social factors</i>							
9 Adequate linguistic development in L1 (L1 taught well (W), badly (B) or not at all in school)	B	B	W	W	-	-	W
10 Enough relevant, cognitively demanding subject matter provided	-?	+?	+	+	-?	-?	+
11 Opportunity to develop L1 outside school in linguistically demanding formal contexts	+?	-	+	-	+	-	+
12 L2-teaching supports (+) or harms (-) L1-development	+	+	+	+	-?	-	+
<i>L2-related linguistic, cognitive, pedagogical and social factors</i>							
13 Adequate linguistic development in L2 (L2 taught well (W), badly (B) or not at all in school)	B	B	W	W	B	B	W
14 L2 input adapted to pupils' L2 level	+	+	+	+	-?	-	+
15 Opportunity to practise L2 in peer group contexts	-	-	+	+?	-	-	-
16 Exposure to native speaker L2 use in linguistically demanding formal contexts	-	+	+	+	-	+	+

LDS = low degree of success
HDS = high degree of success

Table 4. Skutnabb-Kangas's factors of Segregation, Maintenance, Submersion, and Immersion programs and their outcomes.

Adapted from *Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children*, p. 49, by T. Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, Bristol, Multilingual Matters Ltd.

At the top, programs are grouped into their use of L2, the foreign or second language, or L1, the mother language, as the language of instruction. Then the programs are grouped under four main headings: Segregation, (Mother Tongue) Maintenance, Submersion, and Immersion and there are different countries under each program type. We can then see which factors contributed to the country's educational program by looking at the negative and positive signs in each column. We can see through this table that each Medium of Education (ME), meaning L1 or L2, led to both HDS and LDS depending on which program was used. Thus, Skutnabb-Kangas asserts that instead of asking which language a child should be instructed in to become bilingual, one should ask "under which conditions does instruction in L1 or L2, respectively, lead to high levels of bilingualism?" (1995, pp. 47-48).

Skutnabb-Kangas goes further and lists the preconditions for learning L2 effectively and groups them into four categories: organizational factors, learner-related affective factors, and linguistic, cognitive, pedagogical, and social L1-related and L2-related factors. I will not be analyzing programs for these factors because they are not relevant to the PIPIA III because these details of implementation are not included in it. Therefore, simply determining what type of program used, whether it is HDS or LDS, and its goals will be suitable for my research.

Skutnabb-Kangas uses case studies to identify the goals and outcomes of each method in the table. For example, submersion programs for minorities were by far the most common way of educating both indigenous and immigrant minorities in most countries in the world at the time the article was written (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 50). This method results in the dominance of the majority language at the expense of the

mother tongue, assimilation, marginalization of the minority group, and poor school achievement (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 50). In all HDS contexts, Skutnabb-Kangas shows that the linguistic goal has been bilingualism and the societal goal has been a positive one for the group concerned. In all LDS contexts, the linguistic goal has been dominance of the majority language and not bilingualism. The societal goal has been to keep the group “in a powerless subordinate position” (1995, p. 50).

According to Skutnabb-Kangas’s research, most majority and minority mother tongues in European and Europeanized countries do not enjoy the same rights in educational systems (1995, p. 46). Furthermore, their education systems are not designed to create true bilingualism, as defined by Skutnabb-Kangas. Nations often adopt policies of monolingualism under the guise of unifying the nation, and they condemn official multilingualism as “divisive” (1995, p. 42). For an individual, monolingualism almost inevitably translates to monoculturalism and monocultism which is also reflected in schools’ curriculums (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 42).

Deficit and Enrichment Theories

Deficit models are compensatory in nature and, as explained in Chapter 2, they treat culture (other than that of the majority population) as a handicap that needs to be corrected through assimilation (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 52). Deficit theory envisages that the minority should become majority-language speaking fast, but as long as the children still speak their original mother tongue, the school should help them to appreciate it (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 54).

Explanations for problems that children might face in school are characterized by four phases of deficit theory, according to Skutnabb-Kangas. The first phase posits

that learning deficits arise from a linguistic handicap because the child has not fully acquired the majority language, the second states that the minority parents create a socially conditioned handicap, the third argues that the whole minority group is responsible because the child's cultural background is different than that of the majority, and the final stage combines all of these stages to form the explanation as to why a minority child might struggle in school-- the child does not know her own language and culture fully which does not create a solid foundation for L2-learning and thus results in poor self-confidence ensuing from an impartial development of a sense of identity (Skutnabb-Kangas 1995, p. 54).

Education systems implement measures according to which phase they are in of deficit theory and often continue implementing measures from earlier phases when advancing to the next phase (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 54). The following table shows the four phases of deficit theory, the measures that result from the theory, and their underlying goals. It also shows the same for enrichment theories, which will be talked about later. The goal of deficit theory measures is to convert the minority population to majority language-speaking as fast as possible while "correcting" cultural difference through assimilation (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, pp. 52-53).

Table 4

<i>Reason for problems</i>	<i>Measure</i>	<i>Goal</i>
<i>Deficit theories</i>		
1 Linguistic L2-related handicap, learning deficit (the child does not master L2 well enough)	More teaching of MaL (auxiliary teaching, ESL, introductory classes etc); compensatory	MI is to become MaL-speaking as fast as possible
2 Social handicap, socially linked learning deficit (the child's parents come from lowest social classes)	More social and pedagogical help (aids, tutors, psychologists, social workers, career advisers etc); in addition to measure 1; compensatory	Same as 1
3 Cultural handicap, culturally linked learning deficit (the child has a 'different' cultural background; the child has low self-confidence; the child is discriminated against)	Inform MI-children about MA-culture/about their own culture; inform all children about MI-cultures/start multicultural/intercultural educational programmes; eliminate discrimination/racism in teaching materials; attitudinal courses for teachers; in addition to measures 1 and 2; compensatory	MiL in the family 1-2 generations; MI-children need help to appreciate MI-culture (until they become MaL-speaking)
4 Linguistic L1-related handicap, learning deficit because of L1 deprivation (the child does not know her own L properly and has therefore poor grounding for the learning of L2 CALP) (the child loses content while learning L2)	Teaching of L1 as subject; elementary education through the medium of L1 with as fast a transition to L2-medium as possible. MiL has no intrinsic value, it is therapeutic; compensatory (more self-confidence, better co-operation with home, gives better basis for MaL-learning, functions as bridge for transmission of content during L2-learning); in addition to measures 1 and 3	Same as 3
<i>Enrichment theories</i>		
5 High levels of bilingualism beneficial for the individual but difficult to attain, demands much work and energy. The primary goal is to learn MaL properly; it is a prerequisite for equal opportunity	Teaching through the medium of MiL for several years inside MA-school; obligatory teaching of MaL; transition to MaL-medium teaching after elementary education	MiL is allowed to be maintained for private use; bilingualism necessary; MiL is allowed to exist (in a diglossic situation) as long as demographic basis exists
6 Bilingualism enhances development. If problems arise, the causes are similar to those of monolingual children; some problems may be caused by racism/discrimination	Separate, equal school systems for MI and MA children, L1 is medium for both and L2 obligatory (or possible to study) for both. Positive discrimination of the MI economically (smaller units allowed)	Existence of minorities is enriching for the whole society. MiL has (at least some) official status and its use is encouraged, also for MaL-children

MI = minority; MiL = minority language; MA = majority; MaL = majority language.

Table 5. Deficit vs. Enrichment theories.

Adapted from *Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children*, p. 53, by T. Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, Bristol, Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Conversely, enrichment models use the child's mother tongue, cultural, and social background as a "positive starting point" for the school (Skutnabb-Kangas 1995,

p. 54). When minority children experience difficulty in school in enrichment theories, it is explained by the extra work involved with learning in a second language, or by similar reasons for why monolingual children may struggle combined with racism, linguicism, and discrimination faced in the classroom (Skutnabb-Kangas 1995, p. 54). Skutnabb-Kangas describes this as the only paradigm upon which policies can be based which can start to combat linguicism.

Chapter 4: Analysis of the PIPIA III

Introduction

In its beginning paragraphs, the Socio-Educative section of the PIPIA III asserts that the Andalusian Education System's goals are to establish the principles of "equality, equity, and solidarity as the pillars through which the educational process of Andalusian children will develop" and to provide free access to public education to every child in Andalusia (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 84). Then, the policy immediately defines its stance on diversity within schools. It explains that the general practice regarding diversity is to fully develop the capabilities and potential of each student while implementing and executing *compensatory* [emphasis added] measures when the system detects differences that could provoke inequalities (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 84). Immediately, the policy defines its own compensatory nature regarding diversity among students.

While compensatory measures may be beneficial to diverse students on a socioeconomic level, ensuring the existence of equal resources for maximization of learning outcomes, this section of the policy does not outline any sort of program that supports those with limited financial resources, such as free or reduced-price lunch programs. Instead, it focuses on language and cultural programs. The sentence following explains that the school-aged population in Andalusia, as with the rest of the population, is characterized by its *social* and *cultural* [emphasis added] diversity (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 85). Diversity or inequality of economic situations is not mentioned, and therefore the policy is compensating for its students' social and cultural

diversity, instead of embracing it as an enriching aspect of the school, as enrichment theories would explain the phenomenon. Therefore, it is only logical to assume that the “compensatory measures” to which the policy refers are in relation to the different languages and cultures that immigrants bring with them to schools.

According to Skutnabb-Kangas’s explanation, this outlook on culture and language is representative of a deficiency model because of its compensatory basis. As a deficiency model, deficit theory treats minority language, social structure, and language as handicaps that must be corrected through cultural and linguistic assimilation of the non-majority group (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 52).

The introduction of the PIPIA III does not make provisions for schools changing to fit the unique educational needs of its students, as it would if it were based upon an enrichment model, although it does say superficially that it aims to combat racism and discrimination. Instead, the policy’s objective is to fit the students to its mold and guarantee equality of conditions for all students regardless of their minority or majority status (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 85). It is in this idea where the PIPIA III fails to address the unique needs of minority children and does not follow the enrichment theory model because it fails to see that the traditional schooling method may not be relevant or effective for minority populations. The objectives to guarantee equality of conditions to immigrant students are outlined on pages 85-86 of the policy as follows:

1. To implement programs to facilitate and promote interculturalism and multiculturalism

2. To promote acquisition of the Spanish language, integration within the school environment, and the maintenance of the student's culture of origin
3. To disseminate democratic values in the educational community and social environment with the objective of favoring a social climate of coexistence, respect, and tolerance
4. To promote an intercultural perspective in education centers
5. To encourage the participation of mothers, fathers, and immigrant students in the academic community
6. To promote the educational, social, and occupational advancement of adult immigrants
7. To promote access to the adult immigrant population at different levels of education to education programs about interculturalism, culture, and the Spanish language
8. To establish intervention strategies to incorporate new lines of work in continuing education related to the immigrant population

These objectives will be met and carried out by the Ministry of Education, according to the introduction, through the specific measures that fall into three pillars of action: Reception and Integration Programs, Spanish Acquisition Programs, and Programs for the Maintenance of Cultures of Origin. These objectives seem logical and to promote intercultural education at first glance. After all, the term 'interculturalism' itself is mentioned in three of the eight objectives, underlining its importance. However, what does "interculturalism" really mean in this context? The ambiguity of this term

was something criticized by GEISA's report on the PIPIA II and I, as explained in Chapter 3. Is the intercultural education of the PIPIA III the same as the intercultural education defined by Gobbo? While the Socio-Educative section does not provide a definition of "interculturalism" specific to its sector, "interculturalism" is defined in the policy's "Guiding Principles" section. This section defines interculturalism on page 70 as following:

Cultural diversity is considered one of the advantages of the integration model that the Regional Government of Andalusia supports. Respect for diversity enriches the dialogue between institutions and economic and social agents of Andalusia, facilitating the integration of the immigrant population and the cohesion of the Andalusian society.

Andalusia is a culturally diverse reality. It always has been. But the presence of the foreign population has incorporated a wider variety of backgrounds, experiences, and cultural events that enrich even more the existing diversity. In this regard, the Andalusian Regional Government, among other measures, will incorporate a strategic line of intervention in diversity management to increase the knowledge already acquired about the multicultural reality of Andalusia. Thus, our economic, cultural, and social wealth will increase, placing value on what is familiar as well as what we see as alien and new (2015).

More succinctly, intercultural education is defined as the following: "Intercultural education implies knowledge of cultural diversity as a positive phenomenon and desirable for all schools. The development of a model of intercultural education is seen as an improvement of the activities contained in the School Educational Project to achieve the aim of combining diversity, equal opportunities, integration, and socio-affective support for conflict resolution" (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 91). In contrast, the PIPIA I and II defined interculturalism as the following, respectively:

PIPIA I, Interculturalism: The cultural diversity that the immigration phenomenon entails can only contribute to a real and dynamic process of integration taking into account the interaction between the host society and the immigrant population, and taking also into account the

ecological contexts and social spaces where this interaction takes place, respecting the different cultures and their own peculiarities, all within the framework of Human Rights (Junta de Andalucía, 2001, p. 65).

PIPIA II, Interculturalism: Cultural plurality is considered as one of the advantages offered by the model of integration supported by the Junta de Andalucía. Respect for diversity will enrich the dialogue of the institutions and agents of Andalusia, facilitating integration into the Andalusian society (Junta de Andalucía, 2007, p. 106).

In these definitions, we can see the evolution that just one term has undergone in the past 15 years. In the PIPIA I interculturalism is portrayed as an unavoidable process which takes place as a result of the presence of immigrants, according to the critique of GEISA/US (Cabezuda et al., 2011a, p. 28). This relationship is not defined as positive or negative, but merely inevitable. In the PIPIA II, interculturalism is presented as an advantage offered by integration of immigrants into the population. However, these advantages are not elaborated on except in that they “enrich the dialogue” (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 28).

The PIPIA III improves upon these definitions in its second paragraph by explaining that economic, cultural, and social wealth increase with diverse opinions and cultural and social backgrounds. This is in line with Gobbo’s definition of intercultural education because it aims to increase the knowledge of cultural diversity and an enrichment model of education because it acknowledges the value of preserving diversity to society as a whole. Furthermore, the fact that its objectives promise to promote this interculturalism, not just tolerate it, aligns with the Gobbo’s definition.

Thus, the PIPIA III addresses the ambiguity of the term “interculturalism” criticized by GEIA, and according to my analysis remedies it. However, it will remain

to be seen if the actual programs and content of the policy actual foster interculturalism as defined in the policy.

The traditional mission of the school, according to the PIPIA III should be complemented with teaching” essential values like respect for diversity, tolerance, participation, and solidarity” (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 85). These are all clearly ideal objectives on the surface. However, it is the ideology that underlies them and the measures used to achieve these objectives where the problems arise and actually end up perpetuating homogeneity, intolerance, marginalization, and isolation, as shown in the following analysis of the programs.

Welcoming and Integration Programs

This is the first pillar of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan and includes three main programs: subsidies set up to aid non-profit organizations in directing intercultural mediation, cooperation agreements with local entities to create socio-educational intervention projects, and the provision of translation services to students and their families (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 86). Additionally, this section promises to provide financial support for supplementary support programs in institutions with a “significant number” of immigrant students and fund extended school time for these institutions (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 90).

According to GEISA’s previous analysis, there is an immediate issue with this section because the welcoming process “presupposes an active attitude by the destination society, while downplaying the collective action of immigrant networks” (Cabezudo et al., 2011b, 13). The mere existence of this section reinforces an unequal relationship between the immigrant communities and the state because of its lack of

acknowledgement of immigrant welcoming and support networks and assumption of the state as the sole duty-bearer for welcoming.

Now I will look a little closer at each of the programs defined in this section. The first program funds NGOs to hire intercultural mediators and develop intercultural mediation programs and trainings. The role of the intercultural mediator is defined as “acting in schooling processes and monitoring the integration of the immigrant student, as well as [promoting] awareness of the entire education community on interculturalism” (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 86). In its study of the PIPIA I and II GEISA found that the term “cultural mediator” was not clear because the level of training the mediators received and how they were recognized by the Andalusian government was not explained (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 29). According to GEISA’s analysis, “the intercultural mediators were considered to be human resources that solved integration problems somehow, but the competence and content developed by these mediators was not included in the discourse” (Cabezudo et al., 2011a, p. 29).

The PIPIA III fails to clarify these aspects of the cultural mediators. Thus, despite the importance that the intercultural mediators seem to play in all of the PIPIAs, an exhaustive definition of the roles they play is not included in the discourse. While GEISA acknowledged that intercultural mediation courses created to train specialized workers for conflict solution and social mediation have been helpful in resolving conflict, it also saw the mediators as means by which the minority is subjugated to hegemonic discourse and essentially assimilated.

The PIPIA III does say that intercultural mediators will also be responsible for promoting awareness of interculturalism for the entire education community, which is

an improvement to the “one-way bridge” they were found to be by GEISA in the PIPIA I and II because they did not make transfers of cultural understanding to the national student group (López et al., 2011, p. 7). However, how they will be “acting in schooling processes and monitoring the integration of the immigrant student” is left undefined and numerous issues, as stated previously by GEISA’s study, can arise from misuse or abuse of this position in order to further assimilationist aims.

The second program creates cooperation agreements with local businesses for Socio-Educational Intervention Projects. These Socio-Educational Intervention Projects promote the development of “programs for the prevention, monitoring and control of truancy, as well as care for the immigrant students” (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 86). This particular program is based on the assumption that immigrant students require extra monitoring to keep them in school. This is based on the second and third phases of Skutnabb-Kangas’s four phases of deficit theory, which posit that social and cultural handicaps, respectively, are responsible for a child’s learning deficit (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 53). This social handicap comes from the child’s parents’ social class and is remedied with extra social and pedagogical help. The cultural handicap comes from the child’s ‘different’ cultural background and the discrimination and lack of confidence he or she might face due to this (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 53). Cultural handicaps are also remedied through supplementary social and pedagogical support programs, in addition to others that are not relevant to this specific case.

The issue with this particular program is that it views immigrant children as socially and culturally handicapped, as exhibited through its assumption that they need extra support to prevent truancy because their social and cultural backgrounds are

different than those of the majority students. However, as explained before, compensatory measures create an asymmetrical relationship between the immigrant and the Spanish nationals, as well as with the school itself. While truancy might be more common among immigrant students, this could be exacerbated through measures that pinpoint the group as socially and/or culturally handicapped. Furthermore, the direct association of immigrant students with truancy through the program could perpetuate negative stereotypes of immigrants. If truancy is a problem in the school, this program should be extended to provide its services to students of all backgrounds.

The final program provides translation services for short texts, like informational or registration forms, to languages most common for immigrant students in order to facilitate communication between the education center and immigrant family (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 90). This service is beneficial and necessary for immigrant parents who may not speak Spanish. However, the fact that only “short texts” are translated may pose a problem because it might often be the more lengthy documents which parents might not be able to understand as well. Why limit translation of texts to only short ones? All information deemed necessary for parents whose mother tongue is Spanish should be accessible to those whose mother tongue is not Spanish. Not making these resources available is a form of linguisticism as defined by Skutnabb-Kangas (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 45).

Teaching of Spanish Language

The first sentence of this section states, “Spanish language learning is the key instrument that permits the academic and social integration of immigrant pupils. Due to this, it is one of the priorities of the Andalusian educational system” (Junta de

Andalucía, 2015, p. 86). It then lists the following programs that are implemented to achieve the goal of Spanish acquisition: Temporary Linguistic Adaptation Classrooms, Linguistic Support Programs for Immigrants, Virtual Spanish Classrooms, and the Spanish classrooms for foreigners. No mention is made in this introductory paragraph of the intention to develop or maintain immigrants' mother tongues.

As Skutnabb-Kangas explains, acquisition and maintenance of both the official language of a nation and one's mother tongue are important for an individual because the former enables participation in social, economic, and political life, while the latter allows the individual to speak with her family, know her history and culture, and know who she is (Skutnabb-Kangas 1995, p. 40). Not providing the means for a child to learn and maintain his or her mother tongue, according to Skutnabb-Kangas is a form of linguicism and promotes assimilation to the majority and loss of minority culture, as explained in Chapter 3.

To review, Skutnabb-Kangas's declaration of children's linguistic human rights states the following: "(1) Every child should have the right to identify positively with her original mother tongue(s) and have her identification accepted and respected by others. (2) Every child should have the right to learn the mother tongue(s) fully. (3) Every child should have the right to choose when she wants to use the mother tongue(s) in all official situations" (1995, pp. 45-46). When these rights are not granted to minority children, linguicism follows in the policies and practices of society (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 46). Linguicism can have lasting negative effects on minority children. Speakers of minority languages are often made to feel ashamed of their mother tongues, their parents, their origins, their group, and their culture through either overt or hidden

subjugation of the minority language. As a result, children often disown their parents, languages, groups, and cultures, assimilating into the majority population and culture of the society.

Skutnabb-Kangas argues that in order to avoid this linguisticism and to give every child a truly equal opportunity to learn, it should be the duty of the education system to help children in the linguistic minority to become bilingual (1995, p. 40). This is because bilingualism is a necessity for them, not something they have chosen. In order to be truly bilingual and thus be able to use each language for the needs perceived by the individual and his or her communities, it is essential to learn and maintain the mother tongue in the school setting (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 43). However, Skutnabb-Kangas writes that bilingual education programs generally focus on acquisition of the majority language by the minority population, with little regard for the minority population's maintenance of its mother tongue. Thus, I look at the PIPIA III's specific language acquisition programs to see if they create strong forms of bilingualism with a HDS, which develop both the mother tongue and the majority language, or if they create weak forms of bilingualism with a LDS, which deny the development of the mother tongue and focus on the majority language's development. Programs that foster strong forms of bilingualism promote multiculturalism and equality while programs that foster weak forms of bilingualism create linguisticism and assimilation in the minority population (Baker, 194).

The first program that the policy outlines is the Temporary Linguistic Adaptation Classroom (hereinafter referred to as ATAL). The policy states that ATALs develop a program of teaching Spanish aimed at immigrant students without knowledge

of the Spanish language. The program is designed for public primary and secondary institutions and students are pulled out of regular classes in order to participate in this program, which takes place during regular school hours with a special designated professor (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 87). The goal of the program, as stated by the Andalusian Ministry of Education is to assist immigrant students in gaining “linguistic and communicative competencies in Spanish” so that they are able to return to the ordinary classroom when the student’s language proficiency doesn’t “absolute determine his access to the ordinary curriculum (Consejería, 2007, p. 8).

This program is supposed to provide for the integration of the student into the school and social environment in the shortest possible time in order to guarantee progress in the regular classroom (Consejería, 2007, p. 8). While the Ministry of Education does outline specific actions that the program takes for the maintenance of the immigrant student’s culture of origin and mother tongue, it is clear that the transition from the ATAL to the ordinary classroom is meant to be as quick as possible, so any maintenance efforts will be short as well, and focus is on acquisition of the Spanish language through grammar and language lessons instead of its use as a vehicular language to transmit curriculum content. However, it does outline the following actions with the goal of maintaining the immigrant student’s culture of origin and mother tongue: enhancement of the knowledge of the culture of origin so that the immigrant child does not lose its richness, dissemination of information of each culture present in the classroom, building upon aspects of enrichment that provide knowledge of different cultures, encouragement of participation of immigrant students and their families in extracurricular activities, promotion of attitudes of solidarity and tolerance,

and fostering communication and a sense of belonging between students, teachers, and families (Consejería, 2007, p. 10). While all of these goals are admirable steps in achievement of intercultural education, the problem lies in the fact that these goals are only emphasized for the short time that the student is in the ATAL program.

This program fits Baker's description of a Submersion Program with Withdrawal Classes, classified as a weak form of bilingual education, with the societal and educational aim of assimilation and an ultimately monolingual language outcome (Baker, 2001a, p. 194). Submersion programs in general result in language learning, social, and emotional problems for children of the minority language largely due to inadequate foundation in the formal and complex language of the classroom, which typically takes five to seven years or more to develop (Baker, 2001a, p. 196). While Pull-Out or Withdrawal Classes aim to remedy this, as a compensatory program, they also pose problems (Baker, 2001a, p. 197).

For one, children in these classes may fall behind on curriculum content because the withdrawal classes take them out of regular class time when other students are learning curriculum content (Baker, 2001a, p. 197). Furthermore, peers may see the withdrawal of children as "a sign of 'disability,' 'inability,' or 'limited English'" (Baker, 2001a, p. 197). Withdrawal classes are often attractive to schools because they are relatively inexpensive and administratively simple. They do have some benefits in that there is a greater opportunity for participation among students because they may feel more comfortable speaking English because they are not in the class with native speakers of English, teachers may be more sensitive to the needs of minority language-speaking students in this specialized setting, and a students may form a collective bond

in the classes (Baker, 2001a, p. 197). However, because this program segregates native language speakers from minority language speakers, this may create social isolation and reinforce negative stereotypes, including labeling of segregated students as linguistically and educationally inferior (Baker, 2001a, p. 198).

Because of its temporary nature, the ATAL program is a form of transitional bilingual education with early exit (programs that allow two years or less as a maximum of help in L2 acquisition using the mother tongue), as defined by Baker. Additionally, it achieves a LDS in bilingualism, as defined by Skutnabb-Kangas. Both categories of bilingual programs have outcomes of monolingualism and cultural assimilation.

The second type of program outlined in this pillar is the Linguistic Support Program for Immigrants. These programs take the form of extracurricular activities in the afternoon, after school hours and are taught by teachers or monitors of the school (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 87). The programs develop specific activities for Spanish language learning as well as activities to improve time-management and organization habits that “allow students to improve their academic performance” (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 87). These programs are helpful for immigrant students in that they give them extra support with Spanish language learning without taking them out of class and causing them to miss curriculum content. However, the fact that these programs are also focused on improving the time-management and organization skills of immigrants specifically assumes that immigrant students are automatically deficient in these areas based on their cultural backgrounds. Again, these programs are compensatory in nature and this time assume a deficit in work habits of immigrant students due to their different social and cultural backgrounds.

The third program of this section is the Virtual Spanish Classroom. These classrooms are aimed to complement previous measures aimed at Spanish language acquisition through distance learning organized by different levels and under the supervision of a tutor of the school (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 87). This service is offered by the Ministry of Education through a partnership with the Cervantes Institute, a Spanish government agency responsible for promoting the study and teaching of Spanish language and culture (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 87). Depending on its implementation, this could be a positive addition that the PIPIA III made to its previous plans because it allows for students to gain a better understanding of the Spanish language outside of the classroom so that they are not missing regular class time and therefore falling behind in curriculum content. However, ultimately these programs are still Withdrawal classes and have the same goals as the ATAL because they are transitional and create a LDS of bilingualism.

The final program will only be talked about briefly because it is aimed at populations outside of the public school system. The Spanish Classrooms for Foreigners are in Centers for Continuing Education and provide language learning resources, including faculty, textbooks, visual dictionaries, audio, and videos, for minority language speaking adults (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 87). These language acquisition resources are integral for minority language-speaking adults so that they can have access to resources for learning the majority language in order for employment opportunities as well as economic, political, and social engagement with the community.

Programs for the Maintenance of Cultures of Origin

The third and final pillar of the PIPIA III is made up of programs for the maintenance of immigrants' cultures of origin. These programs are extracurricular and aim to promote knowledge of different cultures present in the school for both foreign and Spanish students (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 87). Some of these programs are created through Conventions of Cultural Cooperation and other agreements with different countries to promote the teaching of their respective language and culture (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 87). In order for these programs to meet the goal of intercultural learning according to Gobbo, they must present, explain, and compare different cultural practices or beliefs (Gobbo, 2012).

The objectives of these programs are to “maintain and validate cultures of origin of foreign students” (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 94). The policy states “The required management of cultural diversity in Andalusian schools justifies a program that aims to disseminate the positive values of different cultures and thus contributes to an intercultural education based on tolerance, respect for differences and the dissemination of the principles governing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights” (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 94). This is achieved through support for programs that teach the language and culture of origin of the student and the provision of human resources for the organization of extracurricular activities for maintenance of the cultures of immigrant children (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 94). These programs aim to “maximize a school climate of conviviality and respect, encouraging education centers to participate and to be carriers of the values of intercultural education” (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 91).

In short, the programs in this section are truly what promote the “intercultural” values and objectives that the plan mentions numerous times. However, the policy leaves these programs largely undefined, whereas the programs in the other pillars were explicitly described. Perhaps this is due to programs outside of the PIPIA, such as the bilateral agreements with Morocco and Portugal that provide for teaching of their respective cultures and languages, explained later in this section. However, the fact that this section of the policy, the most important for the overall goals of the education section of interculturalism, is the briefest does not convince the reader that the goal of highest priority of the PIPIA III is truly interculturalism.

As mentioned, there are specific programs for speakers of Arabic and Portuguese in Spain derived from agreements signed between the Spanish government and the governments of Morocco and Portugal (Odina, 2009, p. 481). The bilateral agreement between Morocco and the Spanish government in October of 1980 created a program for teaching the Arabic language and Moroccan culture in Spanish schools (Ministerio, 2009, pg. 1). This agreement outlines the Spanish government’s facilitation of teaching of Arabic and Moroccan culture to Moroccan students (and non-Moroccan students if they wish) in primary and secondary public schools and Morocco in turn provides Spain with Moroccan teachers to teach these lessons (Ministerio, 2009, pg 2). These teachers and resources are provided to schools that have a large population of Moroccan students in order to meet their needs and those with very few Moroccan students in order to enrich their learning experiences.

For those schools with few Moroccan students, culture and language classes are taught outside of normal school hours and one Moroccan professor teaches at various

schools (Ministerio, 2009, pg 3). In schools with a high number of Moroccan students, classes take place during normal school hours and one Moroccan teacher is assigned to one school (Ministerio, 2009, pg 3). Thus, both maintenance of culture and language of origin, as well as awareness and development of Moroccan culture and Arabic language are fostered through the program. In the last report on this program, however, there were only nine teachers for Andalusia's 38 Primary and Secondary institutions (Ministerio, 2009, pg 8). Furthermore, this program has come under criticism because it teaches literal Arabic as opposed to Magrhebi, the dialect of Arabic spoken in Morocco (García, 2012, pg. 119). Thus, improvements can be made to the program and its scope could be made larger so that its positive effects reach more students. Overall, the program falls under Baker's category of Mainstream Education with Foreign Language Teaching (Baker, 2001a, p. 194). These types of programs create limited enrichment and limited bilingualism because the programs only provide enough instruction for limited use of the language and generally do not produce functionally bilingual children (Baker, 2001a, p. 200).

Nevertheless, programs such as the Moroccan-Spanish program for the teaching of Arabic and Moroccan culture do not reach every education center, as witnessed by the small number of Moroccan teachers available in Andalusia. The government of Andalusia should ensure that *every* education center is meeting the goals of fostering interculturalism by implementing a regional policy that holds every center accountable for implementing culture and language of origin programs. Otherwise, we are left with the compensatory programs outlined in the other two sections and the enrichment programs are left to the responsibility of the centers or outside agreements that do not

affect every school. When no framework or standards are established to hold education centers accountable for the goals in this last section, how does the government of Andalusia expect that these goals to be met? The answer seems to be that the achievement of interculturalism and intercultural education is of little real importance to the government of Andalusia, and the rhetoric is used to cover up policies that actually try to assimilate immigrants.

Chapter 6: Summary and Conclusions

Summary

Returning to my original research question, does the PIPIA III encourage immigrant assimilation, promoting a homogenous Spain or does it create a dynamic in the classroom that fosters interculturalism and maintenance of diversity? In order to answer this question, I have summarized my findings in the table below. The table gives a brief summary of every program or piece of discourse analyzed, states what framework it was analyzed upon, makes a conjecture for what the program's or discourse's goal is based on the framework used to analyze it, then finally the last column states whether or not the term, expression, or program promotes intercultural education or cultural assimilation, as defined in Chapter 2.

Section of PIPIA III	Summary program/term/expression analyzed	Framework used to analyze	Outcome of program/term/expression	Promotes Intercultural Education?
Introduction	The term “compensatory”	Deficit Theory	Assimilation	No
	The term “interculturalism”	GEISA’s previous study, ambiguous term	Interculturalism according to Gobbo definition	Yes
Welcoming & Integration Programs	Welcoming & Integration pillar itself	GEISA’s previous study, terms creating asymmetrical relationships	Asymmetrical power relationship	No
	Intercultural mediation program	GEISA’s previous study, ambiguous terms	Ambiguous	Ambiguous
	Socio-Educational intervention projects: Preventative measures for truancy in immigrant students	Deficit theory	Compensatory; asymmetrical power relationship	No
	Translation of parent resources into mother tongue	Skutnabb-Kangas’s linguistic definition	Positive that some resources in parents’ language are provided but all should be	Yes/No
Teaching of Spanish Language	Omission of mother tongue maintenance programs	Skutnabb-Kangas’s linguistic definition	Cultural/Linguistic Assimilation	No
	Temporary Linguistic Adaptation Classroom: fall in Baker’s category of Submersion program with Withdrawal Classes	Baker/Skutnabb-Kangas bilingual program framework	LDS of bilingualism/monolingualism/assimilation	No
	Linguistic Support Program: assumes deficit in work habits in immigrant students	Deficit theory	Compensatory; asymmetrical power relationship	No
	Spanish Virtual Classroom: improvement on previous withdrawal program	Baker/Skutnabb-Kangas bilingual program framework	LDS of bilingualism/monolingualism/assimilation	No
Maintenance of Culture of Origin	None outlined specifically	None outlined specifically	None outlined specifically	

Table 6. Summary of PIPIA III programs and outcomes.

In sum, the PIPIA III remedies its definition of interculturalism, defining it as a positive, enriching phenomenon. However, the majority of the programs that the PIPIA III’s Socio-Educative section uses are based upon deficit theory, a model that devalues non-dominant cultures by defining them as obstacles to the learning process and deficits for which immigrant students must make up for instead of enriching factors. In order to rid the minority population of their social, cultural, and linguistic “handicaps,” deficit theory posits that they must assimilate (although it is more likely the word ‘integrate’

would be used) into the majority language and culture. Thus, the fact is that the PIPIA III's Socio-Educative section uses interculturalist and enrichment theory rhetoric in to describe programs based upon deficit theory and promote assimilation of minority groups into the dominant culture and language.

Additionally, the PIPIA III's bilingual programs do not actually promote bilingualism, but rather the mother tongue acts as a vehicular language to acquire the majority language. Because there are no maintenance programs for the mother tongue of minority students, unless the school qualifies for a program like the Arabic language and Moroccan culture program, and programs that use the mother tongue in the classroom are only temporary, the goal is monolingualism in the school. This does not promote the values of linguistic diversity of intercultural education.

While some level of political and economic integration or assimilation is necessary for immigrants to function in Spanish society economically and politically, culturally, the education system is not upholding the "intercultural" values that it claims to promote. The very first stated objective of the PIPIA III is "To implement programs to facilitate and promote interculturalism and multiculturalism" (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 85). However, as my analysis found, there is only one program that can be considered to foster intercultural values even partially, the translation of parent resources into the mother tongue. Even this program does not fully foster interculturalism though because it does not provide all resources for parents in their mother tongue.

Thus, my analysis finds that the PIPIA III's claim that it fosters intercultural education is misleading. Most of the policy's programs in reality are based on deficit

theory, view non-dominant culture as a ‘handicap,’ have monolingual outcomes, and view interculturalism as a necessary step in the transition to a culturally homogenous society. Thus, the PIPIA III does not fully achieve its own first, second, and fourth objectives of implementing programs to facilitate and promote interculturalism and multiculturalism, promoting the maintenance of the student’s culture of origin, and promoting an intercultural perspective in education centers (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 85).

The PIPIA III is precisely what Skutnabb-Kangas would call a new package for ethnicism and linguicism, concealed through rhetoric of interculturalism (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 54). The PIPIA III’s interculturalist rhetoric itself may be more convincing than its previous versions in persuading its audience why Andalusia values diversity and what it’s doing to maintain it, but the programs themselves remain relatively unchanged and the masked outcomes of cultural assimilation are the same. Therefore, GEISA’s previous findings that the PIPIA I and II had underlying goals of assimilation and hidden institutional racism (described by the term linguicism in my study) hold true for the PIPIA III.

Implications

The implications of the PIPIA III’s lack of intercultural programs and promotion of cultural assimilation impact students and society on cultural, social, and educational levels. Culturally, the PIPIA III promotes homogeneity in Andalusia. As an education policy with an end goal of monolingualism and monoculturalism, Andalusia will also become monocultural and monolingual, further straying from the cultural, linguistic, and religious diversity of the historical al-Andalus.

Socially, programs based on deficit theory and with the desired outcome of cultural assimilation often make many minority children feel ashamed of their mother tongues, parents, origins, group, and culture because these different linguistic, social, and cultural backgrounds are depicted as deficits in schools (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 45). As a result, children will identify negatively with their own social and cultural groups and even disown them (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995, p. 45). Similarly, when schools teach content that presents a message that devalues certain ethnic or cultural groups or perpetuates negative stereotypes of them this can fuel inequality in both the classroom and in the broader community and society (Shah et al., 2015, p. 193). Thus, the PIPIA III actually contributes to the social marginalization of immigrant groups instead of promoting the intercultural society it promises.

Educationally, evidence from international monitoring and testing by UNESCO (2010) suggests that monolingual teaching significantly contributes to educational disadvantage in the classroom and marginalization of minority language speaking groups (as cited in S. Aikman, 2015, p. 225). Similarly, the 2007 Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) found that students who reported not speaking the test language at home scored 20 percent lower than those who did and the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) conducted in 35 countries found lower reading achievement on average when the language of schooling and testing were different from that spoken at home (S. Aikman, 2015, p. 225). Thus, one can see how monolingualism or only transitional or pull-out programs with the mother tongue can translate to educational difficulties on top of the social and psychological issues that can arise from being taught that one's culture is a deficit.

Furthermore, the final pillar of the PIPIA III's Socio-Educative section is that which holds the most promise for the furthering of intercultural education aims. The section states that it is committed to maintaining and validating the cultures of origin of foreign students (Junta de Andalucía, 2015, p. 94), however the methods of how these goals will be achieved are not outlined. Because the other sections of the policy go into great detail about different programs and how they are implemented, this section of the policy is comparatively lacking in that it does not set up the infrastructure necessary to ensure that programs that maintain non-dominant cultures are set up in every education center. Due to this lack of infrastructure, the PIPIA III does not ensure that education centers are held accountable for the implementation of programs fostering intercultural education and bilingualism.

In sum, the PIPIA III's lack of intercultural programs and promotion of cultural assimilation will not combat and contributes to the marginalization of immigrant students. The PIPIA III perpetuates negative societal perceptions of minority groups by portraying their differences as deficits. Thus, it does not remedy the criticisms of GEIA nor does it reduce inequality or foster diversity.

Recommendations for Further Action

If Andalusia truly wants to create a more inclusive and diverse society through its educational system, it should change the programs of the PIPIA III to reflect an intercultural model of education. The government of Andalusia can make improvements in each of the sections of the PIPIA III in the following ways.

The PIPIA III should revise its language to omit all references to compensatory programs and to non-dominant culture and language as deficits. These terms perpetuate

unequal power relations and create feelings of cultural and linguistic inferiority in students, as discussed previously.

The Welcoming and Integration pillar should be revised to acknowledge and collaborate with existing immigrant networks to create the programs. Additionally, the specific duties of intercultural mediators and the training they receive should be defined and clarified in order to ensure that misuse of the position does not occur. How do mediators “monitor” the integration of the immigrant student and what “schooling processes” will they participate in? These are questions that should be answered. The Socio-Educational Intervention projects that act as preventative measures for truancy in immigrant students should be eliminated or extended to provide services to all students. By singling out one group, the program perpetuates negative stereotypes of immigrant students and labels them as handicapped because of their different cultural and social backgrounds. Finally, the translation of resources into parents’ respective mother tongues should continue and be expanded to provide all parent resources in the different languages spoken. No matter what their linguistic background is, all parents should be able to understand information given to them by the school.

In the second pillar, which includes programs that teach the Spanish language, there are no mother tongue maintenance programs. As explained in Chapter 3, not providing the means for a child to learn and maintain his or her mother tongue is a form of linguisticism and creates a loss of the minority culture. Thus, the government of Andalusia should add mother tongue maintenance programs to this section. Ideally, the Temporary Linguistic Adaptation Classrooms should be replaced with either maintenance/heritage language program or two-way/dual language program (as

described in Chapter 3), which promote maintenance of the mother tongue while effectively teaching the majority language and creating strong forms of bilingualism and biliteracy. The Linguistic Support programs should be revised so that they only include extra help with Spanish language skills. The organizational and time-management support should be provided to all students instead of singling out immigrant students for the services. Finally, the Spanish Virtual classrooms are positive in that they do not take students out of regular class time so that they fall behind in the curriculum content. However, as previously mentioned, these programs, which have monolingual outcomes, should ideally be replaced with programs that support strong forms of bilingualism and biliteracy.

The final pillar, which focuses on maintenance of cultures of origin, does not actually outline any specific programs. The government of Andalusia should remedy this by at least outlining the specific programs that are already in place (such as the Arabic language program explained in the previous chapter) and extending their funding to make them available to all schools in the region. Additionally, in order to promote intercultural education these cultural programs should be incorporated into the curriculum instead of being extracurricular. Furthermore, they should be available to students of all cultural backgrounds in order to promote intercultural dialogue. The PIPIA III should have some form of specific program outlined in this section and its language should hold schools accountable for providing programs for the maintenance of cultures of origin of their students and the creation of intercultural dialogue between students of different cultural backgrounds.

In sum, the PIPIA III does not achieve its stated objectives to promote intercultural education. The policy is misleading because interculturalism is actually used as a transitional phase in the process of assimilation of students instead of the end goal. In order to remedy this, the government of Andalusia should revise the PIPIA a fourth time to create programs in Andalusian schools that foster strong forms of bilingualism, promote the maintenance of cultures of origin, combat negative stereotypes associated with immigrant students, promote equality between students of different backgrounds, acknowledge all cultures as equally valuable, and foster intercultural dialogue.

References

- Actitudes Hacia la Inmigración (VII) [Attitudes Surrounding Immigration (VII)]. (2014, March 11). *Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas de España [Spanish Center for Sociological Investigations]*. Retrieved from http://www.cis.es/cis/opencm/ES/1_encuestas/estudios/ver.jsp?estudio=14056
- Aikman, S. (2015). Languages and Identities. In T. McCowan & E. Unterhalter (Eds.), *Education and International Development: An Introduction* (pp. 221-236). New York, NY: Bloomsbury
- Allemann-Ghionda, C. (2012). Intercultural education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (Vol. 4, pp. 1213-1217). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781452218533.n382
- Bajaj, M., & Russell, S. G. (2015). Schools, Citizens and the Nation State. In T. McCowan & E. Unterhalter (Eds.), *Education and International Development: An Introduction* (pp. 93-110). New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Baker, C. (2001). An Introduction to Bilingual Education. In C. Baker (Ed.), *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (181-202). Tonawanda: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Baker, C. (2001). Bilingual Education for Bilingualism and Biliteracy. In C. Baker (Ed.), *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (204-227). Tonawanda: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Banks, J. (2012). Assimilation, cultural and structural. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (Vol. 4, pp. 168-168). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781452218533.n58
- Bartels, E. (2009). *Speaking of the Moor: From "Alcazar" to "Othello"*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Retrieved from ProQuest ebrary.
- Cabezudo, F. M., Madroñal, A. C., & Manjavacas, J. M. Research Group for the Study of Sociocultural Identities in Andalusia, University of Seville. (2011). Critical Analysis of the immigration policy within the comprehensive plans of the autonomous government of Andalusia. Retrieved from http://www.ces.uc.pt/projectos/tolerance/media/WP2/WorkingPapers%202_Spain-Andalusia.pdf

- Cabezudo, F. M., Madroñal, A. C., & Manjavacas, J. M. Research Group for the Study of Sociocultural Identities in Andalusia, University of Seville. (2011). Spain (Andalusia): Critical discourse of the comprehensive plans for immigration of the government of Andalusia. In *Highlights: National/regional public policies and discourses on integration and (anti-racism)*. Retrieved from http://www.ces.uc.pt/proyectos/tolerance/media/Highlights%202020_final.pdf
- Carodozo, M.L. & Shah, R. (2015). The Politics of Education in Emergencies and Conflict. In T. McCowan & E. Unterhalter (Eds.), *Education and International Development: An Introduction* (pp. 221-236). New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Consejería de Educación de España [Spanish Ministry of Education]. (2007). *Orden de 15 de enero de 2007: Disposiciones generales [January 15th, 2007 Order: General dispositions]*. (Boltín Oficial de la Junta de Andalucía [Official Bulletin of the Government of Andalusia] No. 33). Sevilla: Spain. Junta de Andalucía. Retrieved from http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/educacion/portal/com/bin/Contenidos/PSE/participacion/Inmigrantes/APRENDIZAJEDELSPANOL/1216626441852_or den_atal.pdf
- Europe: Spain: People and Society. (n.d.). In *CIA World Factbook online*. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/sp.html>
- European Commission. (2015). Understanding the Seventh Framework Programme. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/index_en.cfm?pg=understanding
- Fuchs, B. (2011). *Exotic Nation: Maurophilia and the Construction of Early Modern Spain*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Retrieved from ProQuest ebrary.
- García, F. M. (2012). The Arabic Language and Moroccan Culture (LACM) Hispano-Moroccan learning program. In *Anaquele de Estudios Árabes [Bracket of Arab Studies]* (Vol. 24, pp. 119-135). Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- Gobbo, F. (2012). Intercultural education and intercultural learning in Europe. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (Vol. 4, pp. 1218-1220). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781452218533.n383
- Gobierno de España, & Observatorio Permanente de la Inmigración [Government of Spain and Permanent Observatory of Immigration]. (2016). Extranjeros Residentes en España [Resident Foreigners in Spain]. *Plan Estadístico Nacional 2013-2016 [National Statistical Plan 2013-2016]*, 1-18. Retrieved from http://extranjeros.empleo.gob.es/es/Estadisticas/operaciones/certificado/201512/Residentes_Principales_Resultados_31122015.pdf

- Gopalakrishnan, A. (2011). Chapter 2: The Essentials and Foundations of Multicultural Children's Literature. In *Multicultural children's literature: A critical issues approach* (pp. 21-48). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781452230382
- Green, D. B. (2015). This Day in Jewish History: 1968: Spain Revokes the Expulsion of the Jews. *Haaretz*. Retrieved from <http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/this-day-in-jewish-history/.premium-1.691993>
- Healey, F. & O'Brien, E. (2015). Assimilation and Pluralism: From Immigrants to White Ethnics. In J. Healey & E. O'Brien (Eds.), *Race, Ethnicity, Gender, and Class: The sociology of Group Conflict and Change*, (pp. 30-67). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Junta de Andalucía [Government of Andalusia]. Consejería de Justicia e Interior [Counsel of Justice and Home Affairs]. (2015). *III Plan Integral para la Inmigración en Andalucía Horizonte 2016 [Third Comprehensive Plan for Immigration in Andalusia 2016]*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía.
- Junta de Andalucía [Government of Andalusia]. Consejería de Justicia e Interior [Counsel of Justice and Home Affairs]. (2007). *II Plan Integral para la Inmigración en Andalucía 2006-2009 [Second Comprehensive Plan for Immigration in Andalusia 2009]*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía.
- Junta de Andalucía [Government of Andalusia]. Consejería de Justicia e Interior [Counsel of Justice and Home Affairs]. (2001). *Primer Plan Integral para la Inmigración en Andalucía [First Comprehensive Plan for Immigration in Andalusia]*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía.
- López, A. A. & Madroñal, A. C. Research Group for the Study of Sociocultural Identities in Andalusia, University of Seville. (2011). What is meant by intercultural education in Andalucía? The sense of interculturality in multicultural schools of Seville and El Ejido from the discourses and practices. *Tolerance*. Retrieved from http://www.ces.uc.pt/proyectos/tolerance/media/WP4/WorkingPapers%204_Spain-Andalusia.pdf
- Majid, A. (2009). *We Are All Moors : Ending Centuries of Crusades Against Muslims and Other Minorities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Retrieved from ProQuest ebrary.
- Mehedi, M. (1999). *Multicultural and Intercultural Education and Protection of Minorities*. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

- Menocal, M. R. (2002). *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- The Message of El Ejido. (2000). *The Economist*. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/node/329675>
- Ministerio de Educación de España y la Embajada del Reino de Marruecos en Madrid [Spanish Ministry of Education and the Embassy of the Kingdom of Morocco]. (2009). *Programa Hispano-Marroquí de Enseñanza de Lengua Árabe y Cultura Marroquí [Spanish-Moroccan Arabic Language and Moroccan Culture Teaching Program]*. (B.O.E. No. 243 1985). Madrid: Spain. Retrieved from <http://www.mecd.gob.es/dms-static/2e685421-9eda-4bf7-93cb-c1ac8737c999/lacm-pdf.pdf>
- Minority Rights Group International. (2007). World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples – Spain. *Refworld*. Retrieved from <http://www.refworld.org/docid/4954ce02c.html>
- Odina, T. A. (2009). The education of ethnic, racial, and cultural minority groups in Spain. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.ebib.com>
- Ruiz, A. (2007). *Vibrant Andalucía: Moorish Culture in Southern Spain*. New York: Algora Publishing.
- Ryan, E. (2015). Spanish Inquisition. In *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/topic/Spanish-Inquisition>
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1995). Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children. In C. Baker & O. García (Eds.), *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education*, (pp. 40-62). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Spain: Discrimination condoned by the authorities. (2011). *Amnesty International News*. Retrieved from <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2011/12/spain-discrimination-condoned-authorities/>
- Spain must make fighting racism and xenophobia a priority – UN expert. (2013). *UN News Centre*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=44013#.Vze2s2N0Of4>
- Spain and Portugal: 500 AD-750 AD. *Time Maps*. (2016). TimeMaps Ltd.. <http://www.timemaps.com/history/spain-750ad>.
- Spain Political Map. *Maps Open Source*. Retrieved from <http://www.mapsofsource.com/spain-political-map.html>.

University of Coimbra [UC]. (n.d.). TOLERACE - The research project. Retrieved from <http://www.ces.uc.pt/projectos/tolerace/pages/pt/about-tolerace/the-research-project.html>

van Driel, B. (2012). Islamophobia and anti-Semitism in Europe, educational responses to. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (Vol. 4, pp. 1278-1281). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781452218533.n404